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 362 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002291/13
do Komisji
Marek Józef Gróbarczyk (ECR)
(27 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Kontrole działalności rybackiej na Morzu Bałtyckim

1. Na jakiej podstawie prawnej przeprowadzane są na Morzu Bałtyckim kontrole działalności rybackiej, bez zachowania proporcjonalności oraz wybiórczym alokowaniem nadzoru tylko wobec niektórych państw członkowskich?

2. Dlaczego realizowana polityka kontroli odbywa się na dyskryminujących zasadach, czego rezultatem jest rażąca dysproporcja w stosunku do poszczególnych krajów basenu Morza Bałtyckiego, bez uwzględnienia wielkości floty?

3. Dlaczego nie są stosowane te same zasady kontroli w stosunku do wszystkich krajów basenu Morza Bałtyckiego, co powoduje, że niektóre państwa członkowskie pozostają bez nadzoru?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Marię Damanaki w imieniu Komisji
(25 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Komisja przeprowadza kontrole na podstawie tytułu X rozporządzenia (WE) nr 1224/2009 (rozporządzenie w sprawie kontroli) oraz art. 26-28 rozporządzenia (WE) nr 2371/2002 (rozporządzenie podstawowe).

Program inspekcji Komisji jest ustanawiany corocznie, a jego treść zależy od wielu czynników, takich jak ocena głównych zagrożeń zidentyfikowanych w poprzednim programie inspekcji, stan zasobów rybnych, równowaga pomiędzy uprawnieniami do połowów a zdolnością połowową itp. W przypadku stwierdzenia nieprzestrzegania prawa unijnego przez dane państwo członkowskie liczba odbywanych w nim wizyt kontrolnych może być wyższa niż w innych krajach. W wyjątkowych przypadkach, gdy wykryto poważne naruszenie przepisów UE (np. znaczne przełowienie), liczba wizyt kontrolnych w tych krajach może być znacznie wyższa. Oznacza to, że liczba wizyt kontrolnych przeprowadzanych przez Komisję odpowiada ocenie poziomu ryzyka dla każdego państwa członkowskiego. Każde z państw w regionie Morza Bałtyckiego zostało skontrolowane przynajmniej dwa razy w roku ubiegłym.

Równe traktowanie państw członkowskich jest jedną z głównych zasad, na których opierają się działania Komisji. Wielkość floty jest jednym z czynników, które należy uwzględnić przy tworzeniu programów inspekcji, ale nie jest najważniejszym czynnikiem. Jednym z powodów jest fakt, że wielkość statków wchodzących w skład floty jest bardzo zróżnicowana w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich. Na przykład Finlandia ma 3 241 statków, a Dania – 2 743 statki. Jednakże, jeśli chodzi o statki o długości powyżej 12 m (jest to część floty mająca największy udział w połowach), stanowią one 2 % w Finlandii i 17 % w Danii.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002291/13
to the Commission
Marek Józef Gróbarczyk (ECR)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Controls on fishing activities in the Baltic Sea

1. On what legal basis are controls being carried out on fishing activities in the Baltic Sea — controls which are disproportionate and which demonstrate that supervision is being selectively focused on certain Member States?

2. Why is the control policy being implemented on the basis of discriminatory principles which result in glaring disparities in the treatment of individual countries of the Baltic Sea basin, regardless of the size of their fleets?

3. Why are the same control principles not applied with regard to all countries of the Baltic Sea basin? In the current situation, this means that some Member States are left unsupervised.

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2013)

The Commission performs controls on the basis of Title X of Regulation (EC) 1224/2009 (Control Regulation) and Articles 26-28 of Regulation (EC) 2371/2002 (Basic Regulation).

The Commission inspection programme is established annually and its content is determined by various factors, such as the evaluation of the main risks identified during the previous year's inspection programme, the state of fish stocks, the balance between fishing opportunities and capacity etc. When non-compliance with EC law is detected in a Member State, the number of missions may be higher than in other countries. In exceptional cases, when a serious breach of the EU rules is detected (e.g. significant overfishing) the number of missions in those countries may be considerably higher. This means that the number of missions performed by the Commission reflects the assessed level of risk for each Member State. Every Member States in the Baltic Sea region was visited at least twice last year.

Ensuring a level playing field among Member States is one of the main principles on which the Commission's activities are based. The size of the fleet is one of the factors to consider when setting up inspection programmes, but it is not the main one. One reason is that the size distribution of the vessels in the fleet varies enormously between Member States. For instance, the Finnish fleet has 3241 vessels and the Danish fleet has 2743 vessels. However, vessels above 12m (the part of fleet that accounts for the largest share of the catches) are 2% for Finland and 17% for Denmark.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-002292/13
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(27 februarie 2013)

Subiect: Transparența fondurilor UE aplicate indirect de partenerii de aplicare

Anumite fonduri UE sunt aplicate indirect de parteneri precum statele membre, țările terțe și organizațiile internaționale. Pentru a spori transparența în utilizarea fondurilor, Comisia a emis instrucțiuni cu privire la standardizarea informațiilor care trebuie prezentate de diversele autorități de management implicate.

1. În ce constau aceste instrucțiuni și ce informații trebuie să pună la dispoziția opiniei publice partenerii de aplicare?

2. Sunt aceste informații puse la dispoziție în cel puțin trei limbi de lucru ale UE?

3. Intenționează Comisia să dezvolte un portal special, care să permită accesul la toate informațiile furnizate de către partenerii de aplicare?

Răspuns dat de dl Lewandowski în numele Comisiei
(17 aprilie 2013)

1. Comisia pune la dispoziție instrucțiuni privind standardizarea informațiilor referitoare la diferitele moduri de gestiune (partajată, descentralizată și comună), cum ar fi:

— orientări pentru statele membre care gestionează fonduri în gestiune partajată (fondurile structurale, Fondul de coeziune și Fondul pentru pescuit) în ceea ce privește conținutul informațiilor publicate și colectarea/publicarea datelor;

— obligațiile statelor membre în ceea ce privește informarea și publicarea sunt detaliate în actele de bază (pentru agricultură) sau în normele de punere în aplicare a fondurilor ([1]);

— în domeniul politicii externe, obligația de a furniza informații cu privire la beneficiari revine organizațiilor internaționale sau organismelor delegate și este prevăzută în acordurile de finanțare semnate cu acestea.

2. În funcție de sectorul de politică, informațiile sunt disponibile în toate limbile oficiale ale UE, cu excepția următoarelor domenii:

— ajutorul extern — informațiile sunt furnizate în una dintre limbile oficiale ale UE utilizată în țările beneficiare, și anume EN, FR, PT sau ES;

— ajutorul umanitar — partenerii de aplicare ai Comisiei prezintă rapoarte Comisiei în limba EN sau FR. Comisia publică informații în principal în EN, dar își dezvoltă un instrument de transparență în toate limbile UE;

— în cazul în care statele membre sunt responsabile de furnizarea de informații, fac acest lucru în limba (limbile) lor oficială (oficiale) și/sau în limba engleză.

([1]) De exemplu, programul general „Solidaritatea și gestionarea fluxurilor migratorii”.

3. Pe site-ul Europa se găsesc trimiteri la informații cu privire la beneficiarii fondurilor UE:

— informații privind toți beneficiarii de fonduri UE ([2]);

— informații privind fondurile care nu sunt aplicate direct de Comise (ajutorul extern și EuropAid) ([3]) și ajutorul umanitar ([4]);

— informații privind beneficiarii și contractanții care primesc fonduri din partea UE prin intermediul autorităților naționale și regionale. ([5])

În ceea ce privește gestiunea partajată, site-urile respective fac trimitere și la site-urile consacrate acestei teme din statele membre.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_ro.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/funding/beneficiaries_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/echo/funding/grants_contracts/agreements_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/beneficiaries/shared/index_en.htm
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/country/commu/beneficiaries/index_en.htm
http://ec.europa.eu/esf/home.jsp?langId=ro
http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/contracts_and_funding/the_european_transparency_initiative/index_ro.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002292/13
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Transparency of EU funds implemented indirectly by implementing partners

Some EU funds are implemented indirectly by partners such as the Member States, third countries and international organisations. To increase transparency in the use of these funds, the Commission has issued instructions on the standardisation of the information to be presented by the various management authorities involved.

1. What do these instructions consist of and what information are implementing partners required to make available to the public?

2. Is this information made available in at least three EU working languages?

3. Is the Commission planning to develop a dedicated portal that would give access to all the information provided by the implementing partners?

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

1. Instructions on the standardisation of information are provided by the Commission under different management modes (shared, decentralised and joint management), e.g.:

— Guidance to Member States (MS) operating under shared management (Structural, Cohesion and Fisheries Funds) is provided as to the content of the information published, and the collection/publication of data;

— Obligations of MS as for information and publication are detailed in basic acts (agriculture) or implementing rules of funds; ([1])

— In the external policy area, the obligation to provide information on beneficiaries lies with international organisations or delegated bodies and is reflected in the contribution agreements signed with them.

2. Depending on the policy sector, the information is available in all EU official languages with exceptions to the following:

— External aid — information is provided in one of the EU languages used by the beneficiary countries, namely EN, FR, PT or ES;

— Humanitarian Aid — the Commission implementing partners report to the Commission in EN or FR. The Commission publishes information mainly in EN but is developing a transparency tool in all EU languages.

— Where MS are responsible for the provision of information, they provide it in their official language(s) and/or in EN.

3. The Europa website provides references with the information on EU funds beneficiaries:

— Information on all recipients of EU funds ([2])

— Information regarding funds not directly implemented by the Commission (external aid and EuropAid) ([3]) and humanitarian aid ([4])

— Information on recipients and contractors receiving EU funds via national and regional authorities. ([5])

For shared management, the websites concerned also refer to dedicated websites in the MS.

([1]) e.g. General Programme — Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/contracts_grants/beneficiaries_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/funding/beneficiaries_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/echo/funding/grants_contracts/agreements_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/beneficiaries/shared/index_en.htm
http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/country/commu/beneficiaries/index_en.htm; http://ec.europa.eu/esf/home.jsp?langId=en;
http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/contracts_and_funding/the_european_transparency_initiative/index_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002293/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(27. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Türkei — Menschenrechtsverletzungen

Seit Jahren häufen sich Berichte von eklatanten Verletzungen der Menschenrechte in der Türkei. Sowohl Menschenrechtsorganisationen (Amnesty International Report 2012) als auch die Medien warnen vor einer Verschlimmerung der Lage.

Die Türkei wird am zweithäufigsten vor dem Europäischen Gerichtshof für Menschenrechte angeklagt und hat eine Umsetzung der in der EMRK garantierten Rechte noch nicht erreicht.

1. Sind der Kommission diese Entwicklungen bekannt?

2. Wenn ja, welche Maßnahmen plant die Kommission — insbesondere im Zusammenhang mit den Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der Türkei — zu unternehmen?

3. Ist eine konkrete Hilfe für die Opfer von Menschenrechtsverletzungen in der Türkei geplant (insbesondere für Kinder, Jugendliche, Flüchtlinge)? Wenn ja, in welchem Ausmaß? Und aus welchen Mitteln (bitte exakte Auflistung) würde diese finanziert werden?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(24. April 2013)

Die Entwicklungen, auf die die Frau Abgeordnete hinweist, sind der Kommission bekannt.

Die Kommission hat die Türkei wiederholt zu Fortschritten bei der Erfüllung der politischen Kriterien gemahnt. Die Garantie der Grundrechte im Einklang mit der Europäischen Konvention zum Schutz der Menschenrechte und Grundfreiheiten (EMRK) und die Rechtsprechung des Europäischen Gerichtshofs für Menschenrechte (EGMR) spielen dabei eine wichtige Rolle. Die Kommission hat die gravierendsten Unzulänglichkeiten der Menschenrechtssituation in dem Türkei-Fortschrittsbericht von 2012 aufgeführt und begrüßt das 4. Justizreformpaket, das vor kurzem vom Parlament verabschiedet wurde. Darüber hinaus sieht die Kommission der raschen Annahme des Aktionsplans für Menschenrechte entgegen, den die türkische Regierung in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Europarat ausarbeitet. Mit diesem Aktionsplan sollen die Probleme angegangen werden, aufgrund derer das EGMR die Türkei wegen Verletzung der EMRK verurteilt hatte.

Was die praktische Hilfe für Opfer von Menschenrechtsverletzungen angeht, so kofinanziert die EU eine Reihe von Projekten über das Instrument für Heranführungshilfe (IPA) ([1]) und das Europäische Instrument für Demokratie und Menschenrechte (EIDHR) ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/instruments/funding-by-country/turkey/index_de.htm
([2]) http://www.eidhr.eu/home

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002293/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Turkey — human rights abuses

Reports of flagrant human rights abuses in Turkey have been accumulating for years. Both human rights organisations (Amnesty International Report 2012) and the media are warning that the situation is deteriorating.

Turkey has the second-highest number of applications against it before the European Court of Human Rights, and has not yet fully implemented the rights guaranteed in the ECHR.

1. Is the Commission aware of these developments?

2. If so, what action does it plan to take, in particular in connection with the accession negotiations with Turkey?

3. Are there plans to provide practical assistance for victims of human rights abuses in Turkey (in particular for children, young people and refugees)? If so, to what extent? And what resources (please provide an exact list) will be used to fund this assistance?

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

The Commission is aware of the developments mentioned by the Honourable Member.

The Commission has repeatedly called on Turkey to advance towards fulfilling the political criteria, of which guaranteeing fundamental rights in line with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) is an important part. The Commission has outlined the main deficiencies of the human rights situation in the 2012 Turkey Progress Report and welcomed the 4th judicial reform package, which has recently been adopted by the parliament. Moreover, the Commission is looking forward to the swift adoption of the Human Rights Action Plan, which the Turkish Government is preparing in cooperation with the Council of Europe (COE) to address issues resulting from judgments of ECtHR which found Turkey in violation of the ECHR.

Regarding practical assistance for victims of human rights abuses, the EU co-funds a number of projects through its Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) ([1]) and the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/instruments/funding-by-country/turkey/index_en.htm
([2]) http://www.eidhr.eu/home.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002294/13
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(27. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Türkei — Kurden: Neue Entwicklungen im Friedensprozess

Seit Jänner 2013 verdichten sich die Anzeichen einer Annäherung der Konfliktparteien im türkisch-kurdischen Konflikt und es wird auf einen Waffenstillstand hingearbeitet.

Mittlerweile gab es bereits Verhandlungen von Vertretern der Regierung mit dem inhaftierten PKK-Anführer Öcalan, die positiv verlaufen sein sollen.

Allerdings ist eine Behandlung der Kurden als schützenswerte Minderheit und gleichberechtigte Staatbürger noch nicht gegeben.

1. Sind der Kommission die Fortschritte im Friedensprozess bekannt?

2. Wenn ja, gibt es Bemühungen von europäischer Seite, den Friedensprozess positiv zu unterstützen und für eine längerfristige Lösung zu sorgen?

3. Wie wirken sich die neuesten Entwicklungen — und generell die Türkei-Kurden-Problematik — auf die Frage der Beitrittsgespräche der Türkei aus?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(22. April 2013)

Der Kommission ist das von der Frau Abgeordneten angesprochene Problem bekannt, und es wird von ihr aufmerksam verfolgt.

Die EU unterstützt voll und ganz den laufenden Prozess zur Beendigung des Konflikts, der viel zu viele Opfer gefordert hat, und begrüßt die Tatsache, dass dieser Prozess von allen Beteiligten unterstützt wird. Die Kommission begrüßte auch den Aufruf vom 21. März 2013 an die PKK, die Waffen niederzulegen und sich hinter die Grenzen der Türkei zurückzuziehen, sowie die positiven Reaktionen auf diesen Aufruf. Sie begrüßte ferner, dass eine Reihe von der PKK festgehaltener türkischer Staatsbediensteter freigelassen wurden. Die Kommission ist bereit, diesen Prozess unter anderem durch das Instrument für Heranführungshilfe (IPA) zu unterstützen.

Eine friedliche Lösung der Kurdenfrage hätte entscheidende Auswirkungen auf die Fortsetzung der politischen und verfassungsrechtlichen Reformen und wäre ein wichtiger Schritt bei der Lösung lange anstehender Probleme im Rahmen der politischen Kriterien.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002294/13
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Turkey — Kurds: new developments in the peace process

Since January 2013 there have been increasing signs of a rapprochement between the parties in the Turkish-Kurdish conflict and efforts are under way to achieve a truce.

Negotiations have already been initiated between government representatives and the imprisoned PKK leader, Abdullah Öcalan, which have apparently had positive results.

However, there is no guarantee yet that the Kurds will be treated as a protected minority and citizens with equal rights.

1. Is the Commission aware of progress made in the peace process?

2. If so, are efforts being made on the European side to provide positive support for the peace process and to secure a longer-term solution?

3. How are the latest developments — and the Turkish-Kurdish problem in general — affecting accession talks with Turkey.

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

The Commission is aware of and follows closely the issue the Honourable Member has addressed.

The EU gives its full support to the ongoing process aimed at ending the conflict which has claimed far too many victims and welcomes the fact that the process has met the support of all stakeholders. The Commission has welcomed the 21 March 2013 call on the PKK to lay down arms and withdraw beyond Turkey's borders and the positive reactions to that call. It has also welcomed the release of a number of officials of the Republic of Turkey held by the PKK. The Commission stands ready to help this process, including through the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA).

A peaceful resolution of the Kurdish issue would have a crucial impact on the continuation of the political and constitutional reforms and would be an important step towards addressing long-standing problems arising under the political criteria.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002295/13
an die Kommission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(27. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Giftige Dämpfe in Flugzeugen

Medienberichten zufolge besteht die Gefahr, dass Triebwerke bei einzelnen Flugzeugen und Airlines die Atemluft abzapfen und dabei giftige Dämpfe in die Kabine transportieren. Airlines hatten angekündigt, dazu eine eigene Untersuchung durchzuführen, bislang hat diese aber noch nicht begonnen.

1. Ist der Kommission diese Problematik bei Airlines bekannt?

2. Plant die Kommission offizielle behördliche Untersuchungen?

3. Welche Rechte haben a) Flugpassagiere und b) Mitarbeiter hinsichtlich der Information über gesunde Atemluft im Flugzeug?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(8. April 2013)

Der Kommission ist die weltweite Debatte um die Qualität der Kabinenluft in Flugzeugen bekannt.

Angesichts der Bedeutung dieses Themas sowie der Tatsache, dass es für einen einzelnen spezifischen Interessenträger wie ein Luftfahrtunternehmen schwierig ist, eine umfassende Studie durchzuführen, hat die Kommission die Europäische Agentur für Flugsicherheit (EASA) beauftragt, alle verfügbaren Informationen zu analysieren und ihr über ihre Schlussfolgerungen Bericht zu erstatten. In diesem Zusammenhang hat die EASA am 28. September 2009 eine öffentliche Aufforderung zur Informationsübermittlung zu diesem Thema eingeleitet (A-NPA 2009-10), um von allen betroffenen Akteuren (darunter Flugbesatzungen und Passagiere, Fluggesellschaften, Hersteller und nationale Luftfahrtbehörden) so viele Daten wie möglich zu dieser Frage zu erheben.

Auf der Grundlage der bestehenden Studien ([1]) und nach einer Analyse der Informationen, die im Rahmen der oben genannten öffentlichen Aufforderung zur Informationsübermittlung erhoben wurden, kam die EASA im Januar 2012 zu dem Schluss, dass kein Sicherheitsproblem mit unmittelbarem Handlungsbedarf vorliegt und dass ein kausaler Zusammenhang zwischen gesundheitlichen Symptomen und einer Kontamination der Kabinenluft nicht nachgewiesen werden konnte. Mit Unterstützung der EASA wird die Kommission die laufenden Untersuchungen und Prüfungen anderer Gremien in diesem Bereich weiterhin aufmerksam verfolgen, um sicherzustellen, dass rechtzeitig geeignete Maßnahmen ergriffen werden, wenn diese sich als notwendig erweisen sollten.

([1]) http://www.easa.europa.eu/agency-measures/docs/agency-decisions/2012/2012-001-R/ED%20Decision%202012-001-R.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002295/13
to the Commission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Toxic fumes in aircraft

According to media reports, there is a risk that toxic fumes from the engines of certain aircraft of certain airlines could bleed into the cabin air. Airlines had said that they would launch their own investigation into this, but have not done so to date.

1. Is the Commission aware of this problem with airlines?

2. Is it planning any official administrative investigations?

3. What rights do a) passengers and b) aircrew have in terms of information on the safety of cabin/cockpit air?

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

The Commission is aware of the worldwide debate around the aircraft cabin air quality.

Given the importance of this topic, as well as the fact that it is difficult for one specific stakeholder such as an airline to conduct a comprehensive study, the Commission requested the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) to analyse all available information and report back on its conclusions. In this context, EASA launched on 28 September 2009 a public call for information on this topic (A-NPA 2009-10), with the intention of gathering as much data as possible on this issue from all concerned stakeholders (including, among others, crew and passengers, airlines, manufacturers or national aviation authorities).

On the basis of the existing study reports ([1]) and after an analysis of the information collected by the aforementioned public call for information, EASA concluded in January 2012 that there was no safety case that would recommend any immediate action and that a causal relationship between health symptoms and cabin air contamination could not be established. With the help of EASA, the Commission continues to carefully follow ongoing research and assessments done by other bodies in this area in order to ensure that timely and appropriate action be taken if this would prove necessary.

([1]) http://www.easa.europa.eu/agency-measures/docs/agency-decisions/2012/2012-001-R/ED%20Decision%202012-001-R.pdf

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-002296/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 27.)

Tárgy: Saját kezdeményezésű jelentés a 112-es szolgáltatásra való sms-küldésről szóló 17. pont kapcsán

A fogyatékossággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és beilleszkedéséről szóló jelentéssel és a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiával (különösen a 17. ponttal) összhangban, valamint a fogyatékos polgárok számára a 112-es szolgáltatáshoz való azonos hozzáférés biztosítására vonatkozó kötelezettséget figyelembe véve – a 2009/136/EK irányelv (egyetemes szolgáltatási irányelv) 26. cikke (4) bekezdésének megfelelően – növekvő számú tagállam veszi igénybe a 112-es szolgáltatásra való sms-küldést. Azonban amint azt a 112-es számon elérhető segélyhívó szolgálathoz való teljes és közvetlen hozzáférésről szóló (35/2011. sz.) írásbeli nyilatkozat jelzi, az sms-üzenetben nem jelenik meg a hívó helyzete, sem a hívó helymeghatározására vonatkozó információk azt követően, hogy az üzenet megérkezik az ügyet kezelő és a további segítségnyújtásért felelős hatósághoz.

Milyen végrehajtási intézkedéseket tervez a Bizottság annak biztosítására, hogy az ilyen szolgáltatás egyenértékű legyen a hanghívással történő szolgáltatással, ahol szintén korlátozottak a hívó helymeghatározására vonatkozó információk?

Neelie Kroes válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 16.)

Az egyetemes szolgáltatásokról szóló irányelv értelmében a tagállamoknak biztosítaniuk kell, hogy a fogyatékossággal élő felhasználók a segélyhívó szolgálatokat ugyanolyan feltételek mellett vehessék igénybe, mint a többi felhasználó. Az irányelv 7. cikke tovább részletezi a tagállamoknak a fogyatékossággal élő felhasználókkal szemben fennálló kötelezettségeit.

A Bizottság több kutatási projektet is indított a digitális befogadás előmozdítására a segélyhívó szolgálatokkal összefüggésben. Az információs és kommunikációs technológiák által támogatott REACH 112 projekt (REACH = REsponding to All Citizens needing Help) a hagyományos beszédalapú telefonszolgáltatás alternatíváinak fejlesztésére és tesztelésére irányul, és célja általában a 112-es számon hívható segélyszolgálatok hatékonyságának, valamint konkrétabban a hívó fél helyzetére vonatkozó információknak a javítása. E technológiai megoldások alkalmazása azonban a tagállamok hatáskörébe tartozik. A 112-es segélyhívó szám használatáról szóló legfrissebb végrehajtási jelentés szerint számos tagállam (köztük Belgium, Finnország, Franciaország, Luxemburg és az Egyesült Királyság) az sms vonatkozásában is meg tudja állapítani a hívásindítás helyét. E hasznos elem vitathatatlanul előrelépést jelent, de a fogyatékossággal élő személyek tekintetében nem tekinthető a beszédalapú hívással egyenértékű megoldásnak. A Bizottság mindenesetre továbbra is figyelemmel követi e kérdést, a tagállamokat pedig a helyzet javítására ösztönzi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002296/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: INI report regarding Point 17 about sending SMS to the 112 service

In accordance with the report on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the EU Disability Strategy 2010-2020 adopted in October 2011 (with special regard to Point 17), as well as with respect to the obligation to provide equivalent access to 112 for citizens with disabilities, according to Article 26.4 of Directive 2009/136/EC (Universal Service Directive), an increasing number of Member States are using the 112 SMS service. However, as the adopted Written Declaration on full and direct access to 112 emergencies services (WD 35/2011) indicates, caller location is not provided in an SMS message, nor is caller location information provided once the message reaches the authority which handles the case and is responsible for providing further assistance.

What implementing measures does the Commission plan to take to ensure such a service is equivalent to a voice call service, where even limited caller location information is provided?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

The Universal Service Directive requires Member States to ensure that access to emergency services for disabled users is equivalent to that enjoyed by other users. Article 7 of the directive gives further indications to the Member States on obligations relating to disabled end-users.

The Commission has launched a number of research projects to promote e-inclusion for emergency services. The ICT funded REACH 112 project ('REsponding to All Citizens needing Help') has supported the development and testing of alternatives to traditional voice telephony which would help improve the efficiency of 112 emergency services, in general, and caller location, in particular. However, the responsibility for implementing these technological solutions lies with Member States. From the most recent 112 implementation report it appears that a number of Member States (for example Belgium, Finland, France, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom) are able to establish caller location also for SMS. While this is a useful feature and a step forward, it is not yet considered by persons with disabilities as an equivalent to voice. In any case, the Commission will continue to monitor the situation and encourage Member States to improve the situation.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-002297/13
Komisi
Jan Březina (PPE)
(27. února 2013)

Předmět: Situace, které čelí ČEZ v Bulharsku

Nedávné politické kroky a prohlášení bulharských orgánů ohledně odebrání licence k distribuci elektrické energie, kterou vlastní podnik ČEZ Razpredelenie Bulgaria (ČEZ), vyvolaly oprávněné obavy, pokud jde o jejich soulad a slučitelnost s evropským právním rámcem pro vnitřní trh energií. Přes obtížnou politickou situaci by bulharský politický establishment neměl vyvolávat vůči žádné společnosti nepřátelství bulharských voličů nespokojených se současnou politickou situací.

1. Jaký je postoj Komise v tomto sporu s ohledem na současné řízení pro porušení právních předpisů vedené proti Bulharsku za neprovedení ustanovení třetího liberalizačního balíčku?

2. Jak hodlá Komise zajistit, aby Bulharsko splnilo evropské právní předpisy pro vnitřní trh s energií a aby se žádní zahraniční investoři, jako je ČEZ, nestávali předmětem diskriminace a pronásledování ze strany bulharských orgánů? Pokud k odebrání licence skutečně dojde z politických důvodů, jak bylo ohlášeno, a ČEZ utrpí ztráty v důsledku zmařené investice do její distribuční společnosti v Bulharsku, jaké bezprostřední kroky hodlá Komise podniknout proti Bulharsku jako členskému státu EU?

Odpověď Günthera Oettingera jménem Komise
(16. dubna 2013)

Komise odkazuje pana poslance Březinu na společnou odpověď na písemné dotazy P-001903/2013, který položil Hynek Fajmon, a P-001906/2013, který položil Pavel Poc ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002297/13
to the Commission
Jan Březina (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Situation facing ČEZ in Bulgaria

Recent political actions and statements by the Bulgarian authorities regarding the revocation of the licence for the distribution of electrical energy held by ČEZ Razpredelenie Bulgaria (ČEZ) have raised legitimate concerns as to whether they comply, and are compatible, with the European legal framework for the internal energy market. Despite the difficult political circumstances, the Bulgarian political establishment should not make any company hostage to Bulgarian electors dissatisfied with the current political situation.

1. What is the Commission's position on this dispute as regards the current infringement proceedings against Bulgaria for non-implementation of the provisions of the third liberalisation package?

2. How will the Commission ensure that Bulgaria complies again with European legislation on the internal energy market and that no foreign investors such as ČEZ are subject to discrimination and persecution by the Bulgarian authorities? If revocation of the licence goes ahead as announced on political grounds and ČEZ suffers losses due to lost investment in its distribution company in Bulgaria, what immediate steps does the Commission intend to take against Bulgaria as a Member State of the EU?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its joint answer to written questions P-001903/2013 by M. Hynek Fajmon and P-001906/2013 by M. Pavel Poc ([1]).

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

(An t-eagrán Gaeilge)

Ceist i gcomhair freagra scríofa E-002298/13
chuig an gCoimisiún
Liam Aylward (ALDE) agus Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)
(27 Feabhra 2013)

Ábhar: Slándáil an tSoláthair Uisce agus Sciobadh Talún

Meastar go bhfuil beagnach 900 000 duine ar fud an domhain i mbaol an ocrais agus an mhíchothaithe mar gheall ar an struchtúr atá ar an gcóras domhanda bia. De réir na n-eagraíochtaí atá bainteach leis an gceist seo, ní foláir go dtabharfaí faoi bhearta áitiúla, faoi bhearta náisiúnta agus faoi bhearta idirnáisiúnta chun saincheisteanna na talamhúsáide agus slándáil an tsoláthair uisce a réiteach, agus chun deireadh a chur leis an mbochtanas.

Ní mór, ar mhaithe le hinbhuanaitheacht feirmeacha beaga agus móra araon, go mbeadh talamh agus uisce ar fáil do na feirmeacha sin. Chuige sin, ní foláir go gcuirfí bearta práinneacha i bhfeidhm le go rachfaí i ngleic le sciobadh talún agus le go n-áiritheofaí slándáil an tsoláthair uisce. Le slándáil an tsoláthair uisce, tuigtear go gcosnaítear córais uisce atá faoi bhagairt, go dtugtar aghaidh ar thuilte agus ar thriomaigh, agus go ndéantar bainistíocht inbhuanaithe ar acmhainní uisce. Ní foláir go mbeadh teacht ag na daoine sin a bhfuil cónaí orthu i bpobail atá imeallaithe nó faoi mhíbhuntáiste ar áiseanna agus ar sheirbhísí uisce, ar mhaithe lena mbeatha a fheabhsú. In ainneoin na riachtanas sin, is minic a dhéanann rialtais agus comhlachtaí neamhaird ar shaincheist idirnáisiúnta na slándála uisce.

De bhun fhreagra an Choimisiúin ar Cheist i Scríbhinn E-007273/2012, an bhféadfadh an Coimisiún breis eolais a thabhairt maidir leis na bearta a bheidh á gcur i bhfeidhm aige i dtaca le slándáil an tsoláthair idirnáisiúnta uisce agus i dtaca le deireadh a chur leis an mbochtanas tríd an tionscnamh comhphleanála 'Water Challenges for a Changing World'? Anuas air sin, an bhféadfadh an Coimisiún sonraí a thabhairt maidir lena bhfuil bainte amach ag an gclár sin go dtí seo?

De réir na bhfigiúirí, sciobadh breis agus 80 milliún heictéar talún ó 2001 i leith. Chuige sin, an bhféadfadh an Coimisiún breis eolais a thabhairt maidir leis na hiarrachtaí straitéiseacha atá ar bun chun deireadh a chur leis an sciobadh talún, go háirithe sa mhéid a bhaineann leis an tionchar a imríonn sé ar phobail atá faoi mhíbhuntáiste?

Freagra ón gCoimisinéir Piebalgson thar ceann an Choimisiúin
(25 Aibreán 2013)

Tuigeann an Coimisiún an tábhacht a bhaineann le bainistiú inbhuanaithe talún agus uisce chun sábháilteacht bia a áirithiú. Sa Chlár Oibre le haghaidh Athraithe ([1]) dírítear ar réimsí amhail fuinneamh agus talmhaíocht, ar féidir leas a bhaint astu ar mhaithe leis an bhfás inbhuanaithe, agus dírítear ar dhul i ngleic le héagothroime, go háirithe trí rochtain níos fearr a thabhairt do dhaoine bochta ar thalamh, ar bhia, ar uisce agus ar fhuinneamh. Sa chreat sin tabharfar tuilleadh tacaíochta don chlár uisce, agus táimid ag súil go ndéanfaidh na tíortha comhpháirtíochta an nasc idir uisce, talmhaíocht agus fuinneamh a chomhtháthú agus acmhainní an AE á gclárú acu chun aghaidh a thabhairt ar a dtosaíochtaí forbartha ar an leibhéal náisiúnta. Sa chomhthéacs réigiúnach, áirítear sa Chlár Oibre le haghaidh Athraithe tacaíocht do chomhar trasteorann maidir le huisce, fuinneamh agus slándáil.

Tá sé mar chuspóir sa Tionscnamh Comhphleanála (TCP) 'Dúshláin Uisce do Dhomhan atá ag Athrú' tionchar na gclár náisiúnta Taighde agus Forbartha a chomhailíniú agus a uasmhéadú ar feadh a mbaineann le bainistiú fionnuisce. 18 dtír atá rannpháirteach go dtí seo. Tá córas rialachais dá chuid féin curtha ar bun ag an TCP agus tá fís aige chun aghaidh a thabhairt ar dhúshláin uisce, lena n-áirítear an bearna i dtimthriall an uisce a dhúnadh tríd an soláthar uisce agus an t-éileamh air a thabhairt ar aon dul le chéile, agus trí gheilleagar a chur chun feidhme a bheidh bithbhunaithe agus ciallmhar maidir le dúshláin uisce. Tá an TCP ([2]) seo ag an gcéim tosaigh. Céimeanna eile ina dhiaidh seo is ea Clár Straitéiseach Taighde a ullmhú, plean forfheidhmithe don tréimhse ó 2013 go 2015 a ullmhú, agus an chéad chomhghairm a sheoladh in 2013.

Maidir le saincheist an sciobtha talún, dírítear aire an Fheisire Onóraigh ar na freagraí a tugadh cheana ar cheisteanna eile ([3]), freagraí a léiríonn go dtacaíonn an Coimisiún le sásraí domhanda chun faireachas a dhéanamh ar idirbhearta agus ar thionscnaimh dírithe ar an trédhearcacht agus an gcuntasacht a fheabhsú, agus é sin a dhéanamh le haird ar na himpleachtaí i dtaca le rochtain ar acmhainní uisce d'úsáideoirí áitiúla, agus le haird ar an bhfianaise — fianaise atá ag treisiú — go bhfuil an t-uisce ag dul i dtábhacht mar eochairthoisc i mbearta gnó idirnáisiúnta talún.

([1]) COM(2011) 637 final.
([2]) Maoinítear gníomhaíocht tacaíochta WatEUr tríd an seachtú creatchlár (FP7), chun rannchuidiú le TCP an Uisce — http://www.waterjpi.eu/water-jpi/
([3]) E-005839/2012, E-006594/2012, E-0610/2013, E-266/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002298/13
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE) and Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Security of water supplies and land grabbing

There are an estimated 900 000 people worldwide at risk of starvation and malnutrition because of the poorly structured global food system. Organisations involved in this debate stress the fact that action must be taken at local, national, and international level in order to address the issues of land use and water supply security, and to help bring an end to poverty.

Land and water are essential for ensuring the sustainability of both small and large farms. Securing water supplies means protecting at-risk water supplies, taking measures to prevent flooding and drought and managing water resources in a sustainable manner. If we want to improve the lives of people who live in marginalised and disadvantaged communities, we must ensure that they have access to water facilities and services. The issue of global water security is all too often ignored by governments and public bodies, however.

With regard to the Commission's answer to Written Question E-007273/2012, could the Commission provide further information on the measures it intends to take in relation to the security of international water supplies and the implementation of the 'Water Challenges for a Changing World' joint-planning initiative to help bring an end to poverty? Furthermore, could the Commission provide details on what has been achieved by this initiative to date?

Figures show that since 2001, more than 80 million hectares of land have been acquired through land grabbing. Could the Commission provide further information regarding the strategic efforts in place to help bring an end to land grabbing, especially in relation to the impact it has on disadvantaged communities?

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

The Commission recognises the importance of sustainable management of land and water for food security. The Agenda for Change ([1]) has a focus on sectors that are motors for sustainable growth, such as energy and agriculture, and on tackling inequalities, in particular to give poor people better access to land, food, water and energy. Further support to the water agenda will take place in this framework, and we expect partner countries to integrate the nexus between water, agriculture and energy, in the programming of EU resources to address their national development priorities. In the regional context the Agenda for Change includes support to cross-border cooperation on water, energy and security.

The Joint Programming Initiative (JPI) 'Water Challenges for a Changing World' has the aim to co-align and maximise the impact of national R&D programmes related to freshwater management. Involving 18 countries so far, this JPI has set-up its governance system and developed a vision for addressing water challenges, including closing the water cycle gap by reconciling water supply and demand, and implementing a water-wise bio-based economy. This JPI ([2]) is in its initial phase. Next steps consist of elaborating a Strategic Research Agenda and an implementation plan for 2013-2015 and to launch the first joint call in 2013.

Regarding the issue of land grabbing, the Honourable Member is referred to the answers to previous questions ([3]), where it is indicated that the Commission supports global mechanisms to monitor transactions and initiatives to improve transparency and accountability, taking into account implications in terms of access to water resources for local users, with growing evidence that water is a key driver of international land deals.

([1]) COM(2011) 637 final.
([2]) FP7 funds a support action WatEUr to contribute to the Water JPI — http://www.waterjpi.eu/water-jpi/
([3]) E-005839/2012, E-006594/2012, E-0610/2013, E-266/2013.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-002299/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 27.)

Tárgy: INI jelentés 10. pontjának kérdésköre az innováció területén

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek mobilitásáról és befogadásáról, valamint a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiáról szóló európai parlamenti állásfoglalás (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a fogyatékosságügynek jelentős elmaradása van az EU 2020 területén (10. pont).

Mit kíván tenni ezen a téren az Bizottság, különösen az innováció területén, összhangban a demográfiai válság miatt várható kihívásokkal?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 18.)

A Bizottság az európai szemeszter részeként nyomon követi a strukturális reformok tagállamok általi végrehajtását, hogy biztosított legyen az Európa 2020 stratégia intelligens, fenntartható és inkluzív növekedésre irányuló, elfogadott célkitűzéseinek megvalósítása. Ennek keretében a Tanács elfogadja a tagállamoknak szóló országspecifikus ajánlásokat, amelyeket bizottsági szolgálati munkadokumentumok kísérnek. Az országspecifikus ajánlások és bizottsági szolgálati munkadokumentumok előkészítésekor a Bizottság folyamatosan szem előtt tartja annak szükségességét, hogy előmozdítsák a fogyatékos személyek befogadását, nevezetesen a nyitott munkaerőpiac révén, de emellett más területeken – köztük az innováció területén – is.

Az országspecifikus ajánlások és bizottsági szolgálati munkadokumentumok az egyes országok gazdasági és társadalmi sajátosságainak elemzésén alapulnak, és általában a következő 12 hónap során végrehajtandó intézkedésekre összpontosítanak. A 2012-es időszakra vonatkozó számos országspecifikus ajánlás és bizottsági szolgálati munkadokumentum – és különösen azok, amelyek az adóügyi és foglalkoztatási területeket érintik – foglalkozik a demográfiai kihívásokkal, és implicit módon kapcsolódik a fogyatékosságügyi szakpolitikákhoz.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002299/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 10 of the INI report in relation to innovation

As you know, the Parliament resolution adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that any reference to disability is significantly lacking in terms of the EU 2020 strategy (point 10).

What action does the Commission intend to take in this area, especially with regard to innovation, in keeping with the challenges that are expected due to the demographic crisis?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

As part of the European Semester, the Commission monitors the implementation by Member States of structural reforms to ensure progress towards the agreed goals of Europe 2020 in terms of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. Within this exercise, the Council adopts Country Specific Recommendations (CSRs) addressed to the Member States. CSRs are accompanied by Staff Working Documents (SWDs). In preparing the CSRs and SWDs, the Commission systematically takes into account the need to promote the inclusion of persons with disabilities, notably in the open labour market but also in all other areas, including innovation.

CSRs and SWDs are based on an analysis of the economic and social situation of each country, and usually focus on measures that need to be taken over the next 12 months. Many CSRs and SWDs of the 2012 exercise, in particular with regard to fiscal and employment measures, do address demographic challenges and have an implicit relevance for disability policies.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-002300/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-állásfoglalás 67. pontjának kérdésköre a vállalatok önkéntes társadalmi felelősségvállalására 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 európai parlamenti állásfoglalás (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a vállalatok önkéntes társadalmi felelősségvállalása fontos eszköz a fogyatékossággal élő emberek társadalmi befogadásához (67. pont).

Mit tett és mit kíván tenni a Bizottság, hogy különösen a fogyatékos gyermeket nevelő vagy ápoló nők hozzáférhessenek olyan foglalkoztatási formákhoz, amelyek lehetővé teszik, hogy az ilyen nők összeegyeztethessék a munkát és a családi életet, és milyen jó gyakorlatok állnak rendelkezésre Európában?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 24.)

A gondozást érintő kérdések, ezen belül a fogyatékkal élő gyermekek gondozásának témája az európai foglalkoztatás növelése céljából kidolgozott átfogó bizottsági stratégia részét képezi, továbbá megjelenik a 2010–2020 közötti időszakra vonatkozó európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégiában ([1]) is, amely számos tematikus terület, például a munkaerő részvételének növelése és a foglalkoztatottság kapcsán is foglalkozik a gondozást érintő kérdésekkel.

A nők és férfiak közötti egyenlőségre vonatkozó 2010–2015-ös uniós stratégia a prioritások egyikeként, az egyenlő mértékű gazdasági függetlenségre vonatkozó célkitűzés keretében foglalkozik a gyermekgondozás kérdésével ([2]). A témával számos, a Bizottság által az elmúlt években finanszírozott tanulmány is foglalkozik, például: „Long-Term Care for the elderly – Provisions and providers in 33 European countries" (Az idősek hosszú távú gondozása – szolgáltatások és szolgáltatók 33 európai országban) ([3]); „The provision of childcare services – A comparative review of 30 European countries" (Gyermekgondozási szolgáltatások – 30 európai ország összehasonlító vizsgálata) ([4]); és „Flexible working time arrangements and gender equality – A comparative review of 30 European countries" (Rugalmas munkaidő-szabályozás és a nemek közötti egyenlőség – 30 európai ország összehasonlító vizsgálata) ([5]). E tanulmányok megállapításait Unió-szerte közzétették.

A Bizottság 2011-ben közleményt fogadott el a vállalati társadalmi felelősségvállalásról, amely világossá tette, hogy a Bizottság e téren szigorú szabványok betartását várja el a vállalatoktól. Ez áll arra is, hogy a vállalatoknak nyitottnak kell mutatkozniuk a fogyatékkal élő gyermekeket nevelő nők alkalmazására annak érdekében, hogy az érintettek számára is lehetőség nyíljon a munka és a családi élet közötti megfelelő egyensúly megteremtésére.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:EN:NOT
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6568&langId=en, 14. o.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/elderly_care_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6578&langId=en
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6578&langId=en

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002300/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 67 of the INI resolution regarding voluntary social corporate responsibility

Parliament's resolution on mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) adopted in October 2011 states that voluntary social corporate responsibility is an important means of achieving the social inclusion of people with disabilities (point 67).

What action has the Commission taken and what action does it intend to take to ensure in particular that women raising or looking after children with disabilities have access to forms of employment enabling such women to balance their work and family life, and what good practices are available in Europe?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

Care issues, including caring for children with disabilities, are a part of the comprehensive approach that the Commission takes to increasing employment in Europe. This is also reflected in the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([1]) that addresses care issues in several thematic areas, such as Participation and Employment.

The EU Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015 addresses childcare as one of its priorities under the goal of equal economic independence ([2]). Care issues are addressed in numerous studies that the Commission has financed in recent years, such as 'Long-Term Care for the elderly — Provisions and providers in 33 European countries' ([3]); 'The provision of childcare services — A comparative review of 30 European countries' ([4]) and 'Flexible working time arrangements and gender equality — A comparative review of 30 European countries' ([5]). The findings of these studies were distributed across the EU.

In 2011 the Commission adopted a communication on corporate social responsibility, within which it is clear that the Commission looks for high standards on the part of companies in this area. This is true for the openness of companies to employ women with disabled children looking for a healthy life-work balance.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:EN:NOT
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6568&langId=en , p. 14
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/elderly_care_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=2803&langId=en
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6182&langId=en

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-002301/13
a Tanács számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI jelentés 35. pontjának kérdésköre a fogyatékossággal élő személyek parkolási kártyájára vonatkozóan

Mint ismeretes, a 2011 októberében elfogadott, a fogyatékos emberek társadalmi befogadásáról és mobilitásáról és az EU Fogyatékosságügyi Stratégia 2010–2020-ról szóló EP jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a 35. pont alapján és az abban foglaltakra figyelemmel, a fogyatékossággal élő személyek parkolási kártyájának egységes formát kell öltenie.

Mit tett és kíván tenni az Európai Unió ezen a téren?

Válasz
(2013. április 22.)

A Tanács 1998-ban elfogadta a fogyatékossággal élő személyek parkolási kártyájáról szóló ajánlást ([1]), amelyben azt ajánlja a tagállamoknak, hogy a vonatkozó nemzeti rendelkezésekkel összhangban vezessék be a fogyatékossággal élő személyek parkolási kártyáját, egy olyan egységes közösségi modell alapján, amelynek meghatározza a paramétereit. A Tanács 2008-ban módosította ezt az ajánlást ([2]) a tíz új tagállam csatlakozásának figyelembevétele érdekében.

Az e területen várható jövőbeli intézkedéseket illetően, szeretnénk emlékeztetni tisztelt Képviselő urat, hogy a Tanács jogalkotói minőségben csak az Európai Bizottság által benyújtott javaslat alapján tud eljárni.

([1]) A Tanács 1998. június 4-i, 98/376/EK ajánlása a fogyatékossággal élő személyek parkolási kártyájáról, HL L 167., 1998.6.12., 25. o.

([2]) A Tanács 2008. március 3-i, 2008/205/EK ajánlása a fogyatékossággal élő személyek parkolási kártyájáról szóló 98/376/EK ajánlásnak a Bolgár Köztársaság, a Cseh Köztársaság, az Észt Köztársaság, a Ciprusi Köztársaság, a Lett Köztársaság, a Litván Köztársaság, a Magyar Köztársaság, a Máltai Köztársaság, a Lengyel Köztársaság, Románia, a Szlovén Köztársaság és a Szlovák Köztársaság csatlakozása miatt történő kiigazításáról, HL L 63., 2008.3.7., 43. o.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002301/13
to the Council
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 35 of the INI report in relation to the parking card for people with disabilities

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the social inclusion and mobility of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that, based on point 35 and subject to the provisions featuring in it, the parking card for people with disabilities should exist in a standard format.

What action has the European Union taken and what action does it intend to take in this regard?

Reply
(22 April 2013)

In 1998, the Council adopted a recommendation on a parking card for people with disabilities ([1]) in which it recommends Member States to introduce a parking card for people with disabilities in accordance with the respective national provisions, on the basis of a standardised Community model, and sets out the specifications for such a model. In 2008, the Council modified this recommendation in order to take account of the accession of ten new Member States ([2]).

With regard to future action in this field, the Council would remind the Honourable Member that it can only act in a legislative capacity on the basis of a proposal from the European Commission.

([1]) Council Recommendation 98/376/EC of 4 June 1998 on a parking card for people with disabilities, OJ L 167, 12.6.1998, p. 25.
([2]) Council Recommendation 2008/205/EC of 3 March 2008 adapting Recommendation 98/376/EC on a parking card for people with disabilities, by reason of the accession of the Republic of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Cyprus, the Republic of Latvia, the Republic of Lithuania, the Republic of Hungary, the Republic of Malta, the Republic of Poland, Romania, the Republic of Slovenia and the Slovak Republic, OJ L 63, 7.3.2008, p. 43.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-002302/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI-állásfoglalás 25–26. pontjának kérdésköre az épített környezet 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 európai parlamenti állásfoglalás (P7_TA(2011)0453) sürgeti, hogy az európai uniós fejlesztési alapok, különösen az ERFA, járuljanak hozzá az épített környezet hozzáférhetőségéhez, és hogy a Bizottság kövesse nyomon a már meglévő szabályozás alapján (is) a megkülönböztetés elleni küzdelem eredményeit (25–26. pontok).

Mikorra várható, hogy a Bizottság közzéteszi a fogyatékos emberek érdekében a termékekre és szolgáltatásokra, valamint az épített környezetre fordított, az akadálymentesítést szolgáló források nagyságát, az egyes tagállamok által megvalósított projektek listáját, illetve azok elemzését?

Johannes Hahn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 22.)

Az 1083/2006/EK tanácsi rendelet ([1]) 16. cikke értelmében a fogyatékossággal élő személyek hozzáférése az egyik olyan kritérium, amelyet figyelembe kell venni a strukturális alapokból társfinanszírozott projektek megvalósításának különböző fázisaiban. A hozzáférhetőség az általános előzetes feltételrendszerek egyikeként az európai strukturális és beruházási alapokra vonatkozó, új szabályozási javaslatban is megjelenik, mégpedig a következő megfogalmazásban: „Olyan mechanizmus megléte, amely biztosítja a fogyatékossággal élő személyek jogairól szóló ENSZ-egyezmény eredményes végrehajtását és alkalmazását” ([2]). Az említett javaslatról jelenleg is folynak a tárgyalások az Európai Parlamenttel és a Tanáccsal.

A tagállamok évente számolnak be a projektekről, ideértve a hozzáférhetőséggel kapcsolatos intézkedéseket is, ugyanakkor a hozzáférhetőség biztosítására fordított teljes összeget csak az Európai Regionális Fejlesztési Alap 2007–2013 közötti programjainak befejezését követően lehet elemezni és jelenteni. A Bizottság ezt az utólagos értékelő jelentések részének tekinti.

([1]) Az Európai Regionális Fejlesztési Alapra, az Európai Szociális Alapra és a Kohéziós Alapra vonatkozó általános rendelkezések megállapításáról és az 1260/1999/EK rendelet hatályon kívül helyezéséről szóló, 2006. július 11-i 1083/2006/EK tanácsi rendelet (HL L 210., 2006.7.31.)

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/proposals_2014_2020_en.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002302/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of points 25-26 of the INI resolution in relation to the accessibility of the built environment

As you know, the Parliament resolution adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) urges the European Union development funds, especially the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), to contribute to making the built environment accessible, and the Commission to monitor the results of anti-discrimination actions, (also) based on existing rules (points 25-26).

When can we expect the Commission to announce the amount of resources to be spent on accessibility, allocated to products and services, as well as to the built environment for the benefit of people with disabilities, and the list and analysis of projects implemented by individual Member States?

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

Article 16 of Council Regulation No 1083/2006 ([1]) defines accessibility for disabled persons as one of the criteria to be observed during the various stages of implementation of projects co-financed by the Structural Funds. Accessibility is also included in the new regulatory proposal for the European Structural and Investment Funds as one of the general *ex-ante* conditionalities, namely 'The existence of a mechanism which ensures effective implementation and application of the UN Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities' ([2]). This measure is under negotiation with the European Parliament and the Council.

Member States report about projects, including on accessibility measures, on a yearly basis, but the overall amount of resources spent on accessibility can be only analysed and reported after the finalisation of the 2007-2013 European Regional Development Fund programmes. It is considered as part of the *ex-post* evaluation reports.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 of 11 July 2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/what/future/proposals_2014_2020_en.cfm

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-002303/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 27.)

Tárgy: INI jelentés 15. pontjának kérdésköre a fejlesztési lehetőségek 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 európai parlamenti állásfoglalás (P7_TA(2011)0453) felkérte az Európai Bizottságot, hogy tanulmányozza a támogatott döntéshozatal formáit és intézményét, beleértve az önkéntes munkával kapcsolatos fejlesztési lehetőségeket (15. pont).

Milyen eredményre vezettek a támogatott döntéshozatallal kapcsolatos elemzések és felmérések?

Készültek olyan munkák, amelyek minden (pénzügyi, államháztartási, költségvetési, szakmai, strukturális alapokra vonatkozó felhasználási, emberi jogi, fenntarthatósági stb.) szempontot valóban mérlegeltek?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 11.)

A támogatott döntéshozatalt érintő ügyek teljes mértékben tagállami hatáskörbe tartoznak. Ezen a területen a Bizottság szerepe elsősorban az, hogy felhívja a tagállamok figyelmét a jogi dokumentumok és eljárások akadálymentesítésével kapcsolatos megfelelő intézkedések fontosságára.

Ezt a figyelemfelkeltő tevékenységet, más kezdeményezésekkel együtt, tovább részletezi majd az európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégia (2010–2020) végrehajtásának első éveiről szóló bizottsági jelentés, amelynek előkészítése folyamatban van, és közzététele még idén várható.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002303/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 15 of the INI report in relation to development opportunities

As you know, the Parliament resolution adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) requested the Commission to examine the forms and institution of supported decision-making, including the development opportunities associated with voluntary work (point 15).

What has been the outcome of the analyses and surveys relating to the supported decision-making mechanism?

Have studies been carried out which have actually considered every aspect (financial, public finance, budget, technical, use of Structural Funds, human rights, sustainability etc.)?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)

Issues regarding supported decision-making are fully within the competence of the Member States. In this area the role of the Commission is mainly to raise awareness among Member States on the importance of proper assistance regarding access to legal documents and procedures.

Such awareness raising actions will be referred to among other initiatives in the Commission's report on the first years of the implementation of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020, that is under preparation for publication later this year.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-002304/13
a Bizottság számára
Kósa Ádám (PPE)
(2013. február 27.)

Tárgy: Az INI jelentés 13. pontjának kérdésköre a fogyatékossággal élő nők 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 európai parlamenti jelentés (P7_TA(2011)0453) rögzíti, hogy a fogyatékossággal élő nőket nagyobb hátrányos megkülönböztetés éri a mindennapokban (13. pont).

Mit tervez az Bizottság ennek csökkentésére?

Viviane Reding válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. április 18.)

A megkülönböztetésmentesség és a nemek közötti egyenlőség a kifejezetten a „fogyatékos férfiak, nők és gyermekek" kérdésével foglalkozó 2010–2020. évi európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégia ([1]) általános vezérelveit képezik.

Mindenekelőtt a nemek közötti egyenlőség szempontja a stratégia valamennyi intézkedésében érvényesül. A fogyatékosság kérdését szem előtt tartják továbbá a nők és férfiak közötti egyenlőségről szóló, 2010–2015. évi uniós stratégia intézkedései is, amely például az egyenlő mértékű gazdasági függetlenséggel foglalkozó részében kifejezetten említi a fogyatékos nőket ([2]).

A nemek közötti egyenlőség szempontja kiemelt helyet foglal majd el a 2010–2020. évi európai fogyatékosságügyi stratégia végrehajtásának első éveiről szóló bizottsági jelentésben is, amelynek előkészítése folyamatban van, és közzététele idén várható.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:HU:NOT
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6568&langId=en, 12. o.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002304/13
to the Commission
Ádám Kósa (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: The subject matter of point 13 of the INI report in relation to women with disabilities

As you know, the Parliament report adopted in October 2011 on the mobility and inclusion of people with disabilities and on the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 (P7_TA(2011)0453) states that women with disabilities are affected by greater discrimination in everyday life (point 13).

What does the Commission plan to do to reduce this?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

Non-discrimination and equality between men and women are general guiding principles of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 ([1]) that explicitly addresses 'men, women and children with disabilities'.

First of all, the gender dimension is 'mainstreamed' into all actions of the strategy. In addition, disability is mainstreamed into actions of the EU Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015, which, when addressing for instance equal economic independence, expressly mentions women with disability ([2]).

The importance of the gender aspect will also be dealt with in the Commission's report on the first years of the implementation of the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 that is under preparation for publication later this year.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0636:EN:NOT.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6568&langId=en , p. 12.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002305/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Balões de ar quente

A explosão de um balão de ar quente durante uma visita turística em Luxor, no Egito, em 26 de fevereiro de 2013, que causou a morte de 19 turistas, vem chamar a atenção para o fenómeno de algumas atividades recreativas de risco.

Não descurando o facto de entre as vítimas existirem turistas europeus, também no espaço da UE se realizam voos neste tipo de aeróstato.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que entidade é responsável pelo balonismo? Existe um plano de segurança dentro do qual este tipo de voos é realizado?

— Existe proteção jurídica que verse sobre esta atividade?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(18 de abril de 2013)

Por enquanto, as atividades de balonismo na UE, incluindo as de balões de ar quente, são realizadas em conformidade com as regras nacionais de cada Estado-Membro. A autoridade aeronáutica competente de cada Estado-Membro é responsável pela regulamentação e supervisão dos operadores de balões estabelecidos no seu território, verificando se estão em conformidade com a legislação nacional e com o plano de segurança do Estado. A responsabilidade dos operadores para este modo de transporte é também regida por regras nacionais.

No futuro próximo, as operações com balões de ar quente serão abrangidas por regras harmonizadas a nível da UE, tal como previsto no Regulamento (CE) n.° 216/2008 ([1]). Estas regras são adaptadas ao tipo de operações e à complexidade das aeronaves utilizadas, distinguindo, por exemplo, as operações de transporte aéreo comercial, as operações especializadas e as operações não comerciais com aeronaves não complexas.

O projeto de regulamento a este respeito foi desenvolvido pela Agência Europeia para a Segurança da Aviação (AESA) e que está atualmente a ser discutido por peritos das autoridades competentes dos Estados-Membros, pela Comissão e pela AESA. Importa salientar que, no domínio da aeronavegabilidade, os requisitos da UE e uma especificação de certificação (CS-31HB) estão em vigor já desde 2009.

A responsabilidade dos operadores para a exploração segura de balões, no âmbito do futuro regulamento da UE, será a mesma que para o funcionamento de outras categorias de aeronave.

([1]) JO L 79 de 19.3.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002305/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Hot-air balloons

The explosion of a hot-air balloon during a tourist trip at Luxor, Egypt, on 26 February 2013 causing the death of 19 tourists, draws attention to the existence of certain high-risk recreational activities.

Whilst not overlooking the fact that the victims included European tourists, it is also true that flights in hot-air balloons take place within the EU too.

I would therefore ask the Commission:

— What body is responsible for hot-air ballooning? Is there a safety plan governing the conduct of such flights?

— Is there any legal protection covering this activity?

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

For the time being, balloon operations in the EU, including hot-air ballooning, are carried out in accordance with national rules of each Member State. The competent aviation authority of a Member State is responsible for the regulation and oversight of balloon operators established in its territory pursuant to the national legislation and to its State Safety Plan (SSP). Operators' liability for this mode of transport are also governed by national rules.

In the near future hot-air balloon operations will fall under EU-wide harmonised rules as envisaged by Regulation (EC) No 216/2008 ([1]). These rules are tailored to the type of operations and the complexity of the aircraft used e.g. commercial air transport, specialised operations, non-commercial operations with non-complex aircraft.

Draft rules in this regard have been developed by the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) and are being currently discussed by safety experts of the Member States' competent authorities, the Commission and the EASA. It is to be noted that with regard to airworthiness EU requirements and a Certification Specification (CS-31HB) have been in force already since 2009.

The liability of operators for the safe operation of balloons will, under the future EU rules, be the same as for the operation of other aircraft categories.

([1]) OJ L 79, 19.3.2008.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-002306/13
till kommissionen
Marita Ulvskog (S&D) och Anna Hedh (S&D)
(27 februari 2013)

Angående: Projektet REVA och etnisk profilering i Stockholms tunnelbana

Den svenska polisen bedriver sedan en tid tillbaks projektet REVA tillsammans med den svenska kriminalvården och migrationsverket. Förkortningen REVA står för ”Rättssäkerhet och Effektivt Verkställighetsarbete” och syftar till att öka effektiviteten i verkställigheten av utvisningar. REVA medfinansieras av Europeiska återvändandefonden.

Projektet bedrivs på uppdrag av den svenska regeringen och sedan en tid tillbaka pågår kontroller av vistelserätt i Stockholms tunnelbana i samband med biljettkontroller. Dessa kontroller har lett till en omfattande debatt i det svenska samhället och det förefaller troligt att dessa kontroller baseras på människors hudfärg och utseende. Svenska medier har rapporterat om cancersjuka utan uppehållstillstånd som inte vågar använda tunnelbanan för att ta sig till sjukhusen av rädsla för att fastna i dessa kontroller. Svensk polis hävdar samtidigt att kontrollerna endast baseras på grundade anledningar och inte på basis av människors utseende, språk eller namn

1. Anser kommissionen att dessa kontroller kan genomföras utan att indirekt eller direkt baseras på människors utseende, språk eller namn?

2. Anser kommissionen dessa kontroller vara förenliga med EU-rätten och annan tillämplig rättighetslagstiftning?

3. Är dessa typer av kontroller förenliga med de regler som gäller för den Europeiska återvändandefonden?

Svar från Cecilia Malmström på kommissionens vägnar
(14 maj 2013)

I artikel 6.1 i direktivet om återvändande åläggs medlemsstaterna att fatta beslut att tredjelandsmedborgare som vistats olagligt på deras territorium ska återvända. Enligt artikel 6.4 står det medlemsstaterna fritt att bevilja dessa personer uppehållstillstånd av humanitära eller andra skäl ([1]).

Poliskontroller för att gripa irreguljära migranter kan vara ett nödvändigt och berättigat sätt att fullgöra den skyldighet som föreskrivs i artikel 6.1. Medlemsstaterna ska dock agera proportionerligt och måste i enlighet med direktivet och stadgan om de grundläggande rättigheterna återsända de aktuella personerna på ett humant sätt och med fullständig respekt för deras grundläggande rättigheter.

På grundval av den information som lämnats och kontakter med de svenska myndigheterna kan kommissionen inte dra slutsatsen att de kontrollåtgärder som parlamentsledamoten hänvisar till strider mot unionsrätten. Om kontrollerna utförs på ett icke-diskriminerande sätt (exempelvis i form av id-kontroller av personer som hoppar över biljettspärrar i kollektivtrafiken) bryter de inte mot EU:s antidiskrimineringsregler. Systematiska kontroller av personer med ett visst utseende är däremot diskriminerande. Vad gäller EU-reglerna om fri rörlighet kan kommissionen heller inte dra slutsatsen att dessa skulle ha brutits. De svenska myndigheterna har vidare meddelat att de aktuella kontrollåtgärderna inte längre vidtas.

Åtgärder som syftar till att förbättra de metoder som används för gripanden och som utgör en del av en integrerad återvändandeplan undantas inte i sig från medfinansiering via Europeiska återvändandefonden. De svenska myndigheterna har emellertid meddelat att det EU-stödda projektet REVA inte har någonting att göra med de kontroller som denna fråga avser.

([1]) Se vidare svaret på fråga P-1687/2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002306/13
to the Commission
Marita Ulvskog (S&D) and Anna Hedh (S&D)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: REVA project and ethnic profiling in the Stockholm underground

For some time now the Swedish police have been carrying out an operation called REVA together with the Swedish prison service and migration service. The abbreviation REVA stands for Legal Certainty and Effective Enforcement (*Rättssäkerhet och Effektivt Verkställighetsarbete*) and seeks to boost the effectiveness of enforcement of deportations. REVA is co-funded by the European Return Fund.

Under this project, which has been running for some time now at the behest of the Swedish Government, 'right of residence' checks are carried out along with ticket inspections in the Stockholm underground. These checks have led to a wide-ranging debate in Swedish society and it seems likely that they are based on people's skin colour and appearance. The Swedish media have reported cancer sufferers without a residence permit who do not dare to take the underground to go to hospital for fear of being caught in one of these checks. The Swedish police claim that the checks are carried out only for justifiable reasons and are not based on a person's appearance, language or name.

1. Does the Commission consider that it is possible for these checks to be carried out without being directly or indirectly based on people's appearance, language or name?

2. Does the Commission consider that these checks are compatible with EC law and other relevant legislation?

3. Are such checks compatible with the rules governing the European Return Fund?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)

Article 6(1) of the Return Directive obliges Member States to issue a return decision to any irregularly staying third-country national. According to Article 6(4) Member States are free to grant such persons a permit for humanitarian or other reasons ([1]).

Police controls to apprehend irregular migrants may be a necessary and legitimate tool for implementing the obligation laid down in Article 6(1). Member States must, however, respect proportionality and are obliged under the directive and the Charter of Fundamental Rights to carry out return measures in a humane manner and in full respect of fundamental rights.

Based on the information submitted and contacts with the Swedish authorities, the Commission cannot conclude that the control measures referred to by the Honourable Member are contrary to Union law. Insofar as such controls are carried out on a non-discriminatory basis (such as checking the ID of persons jumping ticket barriers in public transport), the EU non-discrimination rules are not infringed. Should controls systematically be carried out only of persons with a certain appearance, this would however be discriminatory. As far as EU free-movement rules are concerned, the Commission cannot conclude that these would have been breached either. The Swedish authorities have furthermore confirmed that the control measures referred to are no longer carried out.

Measures to enhance apprehension practices as a part of an integrated return plan are not per se excluded from co-financing under the European Return Fund. However, the Swedish authorities have confirmed that the EU sponsored project REVA has nothing to do with the on-the-spot checks subject of the present question.

([1]) See further answer to Question P-1687/2010.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002307/13
an die Kommission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(27. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Missbrauchskontrolle im Programm „Europäischer Freiwilligen Dienst"

Mit Beschluss Nr. 1719/2006/EG vom 15. November 2006 wurde das Programm JUGEND IN AKTION für den Zeitraum von 2007 bis 2013 eingeführt. Hierzu gehört auch der Europäische Freiwilligendienst (EFD), der die Beteiligung junger Menschen an verschiedenen Arten von Freiwilligenaktivitäten innerhalb und außerhalb der Europäischen Union unterstützen soll. Die Europäische Kommission trägt die übergeordnete Verantwortung für den Ablauf des Programms JUGEND IN AKTION, verwaltet die Haushaltsmittel, bestimmt die finanziellen Förderempfänger/in und ist für die ständige Festlegung der Prioritäten, Ziele und Kriterien des Programms zuständig.

Nun wurden jedoch ernsthafte Bedenken betreffend die Förderfähigkeit eines Projektträgers und die Missachtung der Förderkriterien an mich herangetragen. Im Jahrgang 2012/2013 entsandten die ungarischen Malteser eine junge deutsche Freiwillige in eine Kindertagesstätte nach Nagykanizsa. Sie berichtete von Arbeitsumständen, die den Verdacht einer Ausbeutung als billige, unausgebildete und von der EU finanzierte Arbeitskraft nahelegt. Freiwillige berichten auch über den Aufbau von Scheinstellen durch die ungarischen Malteser, so dass diese möglicherweise eine größere Summe EU Fördergelder abschöpfen können.

Dabei legt die EFD-Charta fest, dass die EFD-Freiwilligenaktivitäten keinesfalls eine berufliche Tätigkeit ersetzen oder Freiwillige als billige Arbeitskräfte ausgebeutet werden dürfen.

Dies vorausgeschickt frage ich die Kommission:

1. Welche Erkenntnisse hat die Kommission über den beschriebenen Missstand in Ungarn?

2. Welche Konsequenzen zieht die Kommission aus solchen Missbräuchen für das Programm des EFD, insbesondere im Hinblick auf die Vergabekriterien von EFD-Fördergeldern?

3. Unter welchen Voraussetzungen und mit welchen bindenden Folgen kann die Akkreditierung von Förderprojekten bei Nichtbeachtung der EFD-Charta zurückgezogen werden?

4. Welche Kontrollmöglichkeiten sind oder werden installiert, um eine wiederholte Missachtung der Qualitätskriterien zu unterbinden?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(22. April 2013)

Die Kommission hat die nationale Stelle in Ungarn, die für den Europäischen Freiwilligendienst (EFD) verantwortlich ist, gebeten, einen Kontrollbesuch durchzuführen und anschließend Bericht zu erstatten über das Projekt, die Aufnahmebedingungen und das Risiko, dem Freiwillige beim Erledigen der Aufgaben, mit denen sonst regulärere Mitarbeiter betraut wird, begegnen.

Die Einrichtungen, die an einem Projekt des EFD beteiligt sind, müssen zugelassen sein, außerdem wird jedes Projekt evaluiert, wodurch Projekte, die nicht mit der EFD-Charta im Einklang sind, ausgesondert werden können. Fälle von Missbrauch müssen hingegen mit Strenge behandelt werden.

Wenn gegen die Charta verstoßen wird, fordert die Kommission die nationalen Stellen auf, sicherzustellen, dass die notwendigen Verbesserungen bei den Entsende- und Aufnahmeorganisationen vorgenommen werden, damit das Projekt im Interesse des Freiwilligen abgeschlossen werden kann. Wenn dies nicht möglich ist, wenn die Gesundheit oder das Wohlbefinden des Freiwilligen aufs Spiel gesetzt werden, fordert die Kommission den Entzug der Zulassung, was das Ende des Projekts und gegebenenfalls die Rückforderung der Finanzhilfe zur Folge hat.

Die Zulassung einer Organisation ist auf die Dauer von drei Jahren beschränkt; für die Erneuerung ist eine Dokumentenüberprüfung notwendig. Die nationalen Stellen müssen außerdem einen Plan für Vor-Ort-Besuche bei den zugelassenen Organisationen und den finanzierten Projekten ausarbeiten. Des Weiteren beinhalten die Fortbildungsmaßnahmen für die Freiwilligen auch die Teilnahme an einem Halbzeitseminar, im Zuge dessen die Freiwilligen über alle Probleme, die durch einen Austausch mit der Aufnahmeorganisation oder dem Betreuer nicht gelöst werden konnten, berichten können.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002307/13
to the Commission
Bernd Lange (S&D)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Identifying abuse in the 'European Voluntary Service' programme

The Youth in Action programme for the period 2007-2013 was established in Decision No 1719/2006/EC of 15 November 2006. It includes the European Voluntary Service (EVS), which aims to support young people's participation in voluntary activities of various kinds within and outside the European Union. The European Commission bears overall responsibility for running the Youth in Action programme, manages the budget, decides who will receive financial assistance, and is responsible for setting the programme's priorities, goals and criteria on an ongoing basis.

However, serious concerns regarding the eligibility of a project promoter and failure to comply with the support criteria have been brought to my attention. In 2012/13, the Hungarian branch of Malteser International sent a young German volunteer to a day nursery in Nagykanizsa. She reported that working conditions there made her suspect that she was being exploited as cheap, untrained labour funded by the EU. Volunteers also report that the Hungarian Malteser association has created phantom jobs so that they may be able to skim off more EU funds.

The EVS Charter states that EVS volunteer activities must not replace any employment or exploit volunteers as cheap labour.

I would therefore ask the Commission:

1. What does it know about the above-described situation in Hungary?

2. What consequences does it think such abuses have for the EVS programme, in particular in terms of the award criteria for EVS funding?

3. In what circumstances can the accreditation of supported projects be withdrawn if they fail to follow the EVS Charter, and what binding consequences does this have?

4. What monitoring mechanisms have been or will be established to prevent repeated failure to respect the quality criteria?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(22 avril 2013)

La Commission a demandé à l'agence nationale (AN) hongroise en charge du Service volontaire européen (SVE) d'effectuer une visite de contrôle et de lui faire rapport sur le projet, les conditions d'accueil et le risque qu'un volontaire ait eu à accomplir des tâches normalement attribuées à un salarié.

Les organismes impliqués dans un projet de SVE doivent avoir été accrédités et chaque projet est évalué, ce qui permet d'écarter un projet non conforme à la Charte du SVE. En revanche, les cas d'abus doivent être traités avec rigueur.

En cas d'un non-respect de la Charte, la Commission demande aux AN de s'assurer, auprès des organisations d'envoi et d'accueil, que les améliorations nécessaires soient apportées pour que, dans l'intérêt du volontaire, le projet puisse aller à son terme. Si ce n'est pas possible, si la santé ou le bien-être du volontaire sont en jeu, la Commission demande que l'accréditation soit retirée, ce qui met fin au projet et conduit, le cas échéant, à recouvrer la subvention.

L'accréditation d'une organisation a une durée limitée à trois ans; son renouvellement est soumis à un contrôle sur pièces. Les AN doivent également établir un plan de visites sur place des organisations accréditées et des projets financés. D'autre part, les actions de formation des volontaires comportent la participation à un séminaire à mi-parcours au cours duquel les volontaires peuvent communiquer toute difficulté qu'ils rencontreraient, au cas où un échange avec l'organisation d'accueil ou le tuteur n'aurait pas permis de résoudre cette difficulté.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-002308/13
Komisi
Jan Březina (PPE)
(27. února 2013)

Předmět: Případ koňského masa

V celé EU v současnosti panuje znepokojení nad případy výskytu koňského masa v hovězích výrobcích. Znovu a znovu se objevují hovězí výrobky, které obsahují určité množství koňského masa, které není zmiňováno ve složení uvedeném na obalu.

1. Považuje Komise tuto záležitost za problém nedostatečné bezpečnosti potravin nebo za problém spočívající v klamání spotřebitele?

2. Jaké kroky nebo opatření Komise učiní, aby zabránila opakování takové situace?

Odpověď pana Borga jménem Komise
(5. dubna 2013)

1. K dnešnímu dni neexistují žádné náznaky bezpečnostního rizika. Falšování etiket na potravinách je však podvodem při označování potravin.

2. Provozovatelé potravinářských podniků jsou primárně odpovědní za zajištění toho, aby výrobky uváděné na trh splňovaly požadavky právních předpisů Unie týkajících se potravin, zatímco příslušné vnitrostátní orgány odpovídají za jejich prosazování tím, že provádějí vhodné kontroly a ukládají odrazující a účinné sankce.

Komise aktivně koordinuje dosud probíhající šetření v dotčených členských státech na politické i technické úrovni. Nedávno přijala doporučení o koordinovaném plánu kontrol ([1]), v němž vyzývá k celounijním kontrolám potravin, které jsou na trh uváděny jako potraviny obsahující hovězí maso, aby byly odhaleny podvodné etikety, a ke kontrolám koňského masa určeného k lidské spotřebě za účelem zjišťování fenylbutazonu, což je veterinární léčivý přípravek, jehož použití je povoleno pouze u zvířat, která nejsou určena k produkci potravin. Shrnutí všech zjištění bude k dispozici nejpozději v dubnu 2013.

Připravovaný návrh Komise o úředních kontrolách se zaměří na další posílení stávajícího systému, včetně ustanovení o sankcích.

([1]) Doporučení Komise ze dne 19. února 2013 o koordinovaném plánu kontrol s cílem posoudit rozšíření podvodných praktik při uvádění některých potravin na trh (2013/99/EU), Úř. věst. L 48, 21.2.2013, s. 28.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002308/13
to the Commission
Jan Březina (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Horsemeat case

There is currently concern throughout the EU over cases of horsemeat in beef products. Again and again, beef products appear which contain a certain amount of horsemeat that is not accounted for on the content label on the packaging.

1. Does the Commission consider this to be a problem of lax food safety or of consumer misinformation?

2. What steps or measures will the Commission take to prevent such a situation from occurring again?

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

1. To date, there is no indication of a safety concern; however, falsifying labels on foods constitutes fraud in food labelling.

2. 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.

The Commission is actively coordinating the pending investigations in the Member States concerned both on a political and a technical level. It 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 is allowed only in non-food producing animals. A summary of all findings will be available by April 2013.

The forthcoming Commission proposal on official controls will aim at further strengthening the existing system, including the provisions on sanctions.

([1]) Commission Recommendation of 19 February 2013 on a coordinated control plan with a view to establish the prevalence of fraudulent practices (2013/99/EU), OJ L 48, 21.2.2013, p. 28.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002309/13
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(27 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Finanziamenti norvegesi per l'incitamento palestinese a sentimenti antisemiti

Secondo varie notizie, il viceministro norvegese degli esteri, Torgeir Larsen, ha annunciato in un programma di informazione norvegese in onda il 27 febbraio 2013, a proposito di un libro chiamato Deception, pubblicato dal Palestinian Media Watch (PMW), che nel libro ci sono esempi che esprimono chiaramente l'odio. Ci sono anche esempi di antisemitismo, che si trovano nella società palestinese.

Attualmente, la Norvegia offre circa 53 milioni di dollari USA di aiuti all'Autorità palestinese (AP). Si tratta di uno dei primi paesi europei a riconsiderare i suoi contributi non specifici ai territori palestinesi alla luce delle notizie di incitamento a sentimenti antisemiti. Libri, eventi culturali e organizzazioni che promuovono l'antisemitismo sono citati come esempi nel libro del PMW.

L'emittente norvegese NKR, che ha trasmesso l'intervista con Larsen, ha anche osservato: «i bambini [palestinesi] crescono imparando che gli ebrei sono satana con la coda» […] gli adulti sentono che gli ebrei sono il male e non bisogna fidarsi. Forse non è sorprendente che l'odio [palestinese] stia crescendo. Il messaggero è il governo di una AP che riceve una grande quantità [di denaro] dalla Norvegia.

1. Alla luce delle notizie diffuse dai media norvegesi secondo cui la AP sta sostenendo l'incitamento contro gli ebrei attraverso il finanziamento di mezzi di comunicazione, è disposta la Commissione ad effettuare una revisione approfondita della utilizzazione dei finanziamenti UE destinati alla AP?

2. La Commissione è disposta a discutere con la AP la questione dell'incitamento al sentimento antisemita sui suoi canali televisivi, che indirettamente, ricevono finanziamenti UE?

3. La Commissione ha effettuato tentativi in passato, per discutere di questo problema con la AP e, in caso affermativo, quali ne sono alcuni dei risultati?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(26 aprile 2013)

1. Le notizie nei media norvegesi cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare sono state commentate dal viceministro degli Affari esteri, Torgeir Larsen il quale ha spiegato che il governo norvegese ha discusso la questione dell'incitamento all'odio con l'Autorità palestinese e che l'opzione di bloccare gli aiuti a quest'ultima non è stata contemplata.

I finanziamenti dell'UE all'Autorità palestinese sono assegnati in modo trasparente e verificabile. Tutti i finanziamenti, sia nel caso in cui siano programmati per il sostegno finanziario diretto o siano destinati ad appalti di organizzazioni palestinesi, sono soggetti a una rigorosa procedura di verifica ex ante ed ex post. Pertanto, una revisione dell'uso dei finanziamenti dell'UE non è prevista.

2. L'Unione europea rispetta la libertà di espressione quale elemento fondamentale di una società democratica. Allo stesso tempo, l'UE è fortemente impegnata nella lotta contro l'incitamento all'odio tra gruppi etnici o religiosi e le espressioni di razzismo, xenofobia, discriminazione, antisemitismo e islamofobia e continuerà a lottare contro tali deplorevoli fenomeni.

D'altra parte l'ente radiotelevisivo palestinese ha negato tutte le affermazioni contenute nel reportage televisivo norvegese in una dichiarazione resa il 18 febbraio 2013, affermando che il reportage non rispecchia in modo corretto la politica editoriale della televisione palestinese, che si basa sul rispetto della dignità umana e sulla libertà di espressione e religione. Pertanto, non sono necessarie ulteriori azioni da parte dell'UE.

3. La Commissione non è a conoscenza di casi di incitamento all'odio o alla violenza diffusi dalle emittenti pubbliche palestinesi. Qualora si verificassero incidenti simili, l'UE affronterebbe certamente tale questione con l'autorità palestinese e con le emittenti e, a tal proposito, l'UE mantiene un dialogo regolare sui diritti umani con l'autorità palestinese nell'ambito del programma europeo di vicinato.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002309/13
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Norwegian funding for Palestinian incitement of anti-Semitic sentiment

According to various news reports, Norway's deputy foreign minister, Torgeir Larsen, announced on a Norwegian news programme aired on 27 February 2013, on the subject of a book called *Deception*, published by Palestinian Media Watch (PMW), that 'there are examples in the book that clearly express hatred. There are also examples of anti-Semitism, which you find in Palestinian society'.

At present, Norway provides approximately USD 53 million worth of aid to the Palestinian Authority (PA). It is one of the first European countries to reconsider its non-specific aid contributions to the Palestinian territories in light of reports of incitement of anti-Semitic sentiment. Books, cultural events and organisations that promote anti-Semitism are cited as examples in the PMW book.

The Norwegian broadcaster NKR TV, which broadcast the interview with Larsen, also noted: '[Palestinian] children grow up learning that Jews are "Satan with a tail" […] Adults hear that Jews are evil and not to be trusted. It is perhaps not surprising that the [Palestinian] hatred is growing. The messenger is a [PA] government that receives large amounts [of money] from Norway'.

1. In light of reports in the Norwegian media that the PA is supporting incitement against Jews through the funding of media outlets, is the Commission prepared to undertake a thorough review of the use made of EU funding to the PA?

2. Is the Commission prepared to discuss with the PA the issue of incitement of anti-Semitic sentiment on its TV channels, which indirectly receive EU funding?

3. Has the Commission made attempts in the past to discuss this problem with the PA, and, if so, what were some of the outcomes?

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

1. The reports in the Norwegian Media that the Honourable Member refers to have been addressed by the Norwegian Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Turgir Larsen. He explained that the Norwegian Government had brought up the issue of incitement with the Palestinian Authority (PA) and explained that halting aid to the PA was not an option.

EU funding to the PA is allocated in a transparent and auditable way. All funding, whether intended for direct financial support or for contracts for Palestinian organisations, is subject to rigorous *ex ante* and *ex post* verification procedures. Therefore, a review of the use of EU funding is not under consideration.

2. The EU respects freedom of expression as a key feature of a democratic society. At the same time, the EU is firmly committed to the fight against incitement to hatred between ethnic or religious groups as well as to the expressions of racism, xenophobia, discrimination, anti-semitism or Islamophobia, and will continue fighting these deplorable phenomena.

Furthermore, the Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation denied all allegations made in the Norwegian TV report in a statement issued on 18 February 2013. This statement affirmed that the report misrepresents the editorial policy of Palestine television which is based on respect for human dignity and freedom of expression and religion. Thus further action by the EU is not required.

3. The Commission is not aware of incidents of incitement to hatred or violence made by Palestinian public broadcasters. Should any such incidents occur, the EU would certainly take this matter up with the PA and with the broadcasters. In this respect, the EU maintains a regular dialogue on human rights with the PA in the framework of the European Neighbourhood Programme.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-002310/13
до Комисията
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Victor Boştinaru (S&D), Silvia Costa (S&D), Karima Delli (Verts/ALE), Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE), Charles Goerens (ALDE), Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Ramona Nicole Mănescu (ALDE), Jan Olbrycht (PPE), Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D) и Oldřich Vlasák (ECR)
(27 февруари 2013 г.)

Относно: Разработване на програма „Еразъм“ за избраните местни и регионални представители

През октомври 2012 г. Европейската комисия създаде програма „Еразъм“ за избраните местни и регионални представители с цел да се улесни по-доброто усвояване на европейските структурни фондове. Тази инициатива пожъна голям успех, като за няколко дни бяха получени значителен брой заявления за участие.

В бюджета за 2013 г. отново са предвидени средства за въпросната инициатива.

Може ли Комисията да предостави сведения относно:

— съдържанието на първия период (октомври 2012—май 2013 г.);

— датата и условията за стартиране на втория период;

— вземането под внимание на този механизъм за периода 2014—2020 г.?

Отговор, даден от г-н Хаан от името на Комисията
(22 април 2013 г.)

От май 2012 г. се изпълнява подготвително действие по механизма за подпомагане на местните и регионалните представители на изборни длъжности, което включва следните три етапа:

- Участие на местни и регионални представители на изборни длъжности в дни на отворените врати през 2012 г. в Брюксел, с акцент върху направляваното от общностите местно развитие.

- Организация и провеждане на учебни посещения в пет европейски града и региона от март до май 2013 г.

- Заключителна оценка и заключителен семинар в Брюксел през юни 2013 г.

Както е обяснено в изпратения на бюджетния орган на 28 февруари 2013 г. първи междинен доклад относно пилотните проекти и подготвителните действия за 2013 г., тези текущи действия първо следва да бъдат подложени на оценка, преди да могат да бъдат поети нови ангажименти. Задълбочената оценка на подготвителното действие ще бъде извършена от изпълнителя по договор, който подпомага Комисията. Ако оценката е положителна, Комисията ще разгледа възможностите да заложи за изпълнение такива действия в контекста на политиката на сближаване за периода 2014—2020 г. Поради това не ни се струва целесъобразно наново да бъдат стартирани подобни действия на този етап.

В предложенията за политиката на сближаване след 2014 г. не се говори конкретно за такова действие. Сред единадесетте тематични цели, залегнали в съответствие със стратегията „Европа 2020“ в предложението за регламент за определяне на общоприложими разпоредби, обаче, е и „Укрепване на институционалния капацитет и ефективна публична администрация“. В него също така се споменава укрепването на административния капацитет.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-002310/13
Komisi
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Victor Boştinaru (S&D), Silvia Costa (S&D), Karima Delli (Verts/ALE), Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE), Charles Goerens (ALDE), Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Ramona Nicole Mănescu (ALDE), Jan Olbrycht (PPE), Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D) a Oldřich Vlasák (ECR)
(27. února 2013)

Předmět: Rozvoj programu Erasmus pro členy místních a regionálních zastupitelstev

Komise v říjnu 2012 zavedla program Erasmus určený členům místních a regionálních zastupitelstev s cílem umožnit lepší využívání strukturálních fondů EU. Tato iniciativa se setkala s velkým úspěchem a během několika dní se do něj přihlásil značný počet zájemců.

Tato akce je opět financována z prostředků rozpočtu na rok 2013.

Může Komise sdělit:

— jaká je náplň prvního semestru (říjen 2012 – květen 2013)?

— jaký je termín a jak proběhne zahájení druhého semestru?

— jaké má představy o fungování tohoto nástroje v období 2014-2020?

Odpověď Johannese Hahna jménem Komise
(22. dubna 2013)

Od května 2012 probíhá přípravná akce pro program určený voleným členům místních a regionálních zastupitelstev, která sestává ze tří kroků:

- účast místních a regionálních volených zástupců na Open Days 2012 v Bruselu, se zaměřením na místní rozvoj s vedoucí úlohou místních komunit,
- organizace a pořádání studijních pobytů v pěti evropských městech a regionech od března do května 2013,
- souhrnné hodnocení a závěrečný seminář v Bruselu v červnu 2013.

Jak je vysvětleno v první průběžné zprávě o pilotních projektech a přípravných akcích pro rok 2013, která byla zaslána rozpočtovému orgánu dne 28. února 2013, tato probíhající opatření by měla být nejprve vyhodnocena, než budou přijaty nové závazky. Hloubkové hodnocení přípravné akce bude provádět dodavatel, který podporuje Komisi. Pokud bude hodnocení kladné, Komise zváží možnost pokračovat v této akci v rámci politiky soudržnosti v období 2014-2020. Nezdá se proto vhodné obnovit podobné akce v této fázi.

V návrzích týkajících se politiky soudržnosti po roce 2014 žádný konkrétní odkaz na takové akce neexistuje. Nicméně „posilování institucionální kapacity a účinné veřejné správy“ je jedním z jedenácti tematických cílů vymezených v navrhovaném nařízení o společných ustanoveních, v souladu se strategií Evropa 2020. Zmíněno je rovněž budování správních kapacit.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002310/13
à la Commission
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Victor Boştinaru (S&D), Silvia Costa (S&D), Karima Delli (Verts/ALE), Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE), Charles Goerens (ALDE), Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Ramona Nicole Mănescu (ALDE), Jan Olbrycht (PPE), Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D) et Oldřich Vlasák (ECR)
(27 février 2013)

Objet: Développement de l'Erasmus des élus locaux et régionaux

Afin de permettre une meilleure utilisation des Fonds structurels européens, la Commission européenne a mis en place en octobre 2012 l'Erasmus des élus locaux et régionaux. Cette initiative a rencontré un vif succès en obtenant un nombre important d'inscrits en quelques jours.

Cette action bénéficie à nouveau d'un financement dans le budget 2013.

La Commission peut-elle nous informer:

— sur le contenu de la première session (octobre 2012-mai 2013)?

— sur la date et les modalités du lancement de la deuxième session?

— sur la prise en considération de ce dispositif pour la période 2014-2020?

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission
(22 avril 2013)

Une action préparatoire au programme destiné aux élus locaux et régionaux est menée depuis le mois de mai 2012. Elle est fondée sur une approche en trois étapes:

1) La participation des élus locaux et régionaux à l'événement *Open Days 2012* organisé à Bruxelles, qui porte principalement sur le développement local participatif.

2) L'organisation de visites d'étude dans cinq villes et régions européennes du mois de mars au mois de mai 2013.

3) Une évaluation globale et un séminaire de clôture à Bruxelles au mois de juin 2013.

Comme expliqué dans le premier rapport intermédiaire portant sur les projets pilotes et les actions préparatoires pour 2013, — transmis à l'autorité budgétaire le 28 février 2013 — ces actions en cours devraient être évaluées avant tout nouvel engagement. Une évaluation approfondie de l'action préparatoire sera menée par le contractant qui assiste la Commission. La Commission analysera les possibilités de développer les actions qui ont reçu une évaluation positive dans le cadre de la politique de cohésion 2014-2020. De ce fait, il ne semble pas opportun de relancer des actions similaires à ce stade.

Les propositions de politique de cohésion ne comportent aucune mention faisant spécifiquement référence à de telles actions après 2014. Cependant, la mention «améliorer la capacité institutionnelle et l'efficacité de l'administration publique» constitue l'un des onze objectifs thématiques définis par la proposition de règlement portant dispositions communes, conformément à la stratégie Europe 2020. Le renforcement de la capacité administrative est également mentionné.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002310/13
alla Commissione
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Victor Boştinaru (S&D), Silvia Costa (S&D), Karima Delli (Verts/ALE), Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE), Charles Goerens (ALDE), Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Ramona Nicole Mănescu (ALDE), Jan Olbrycht (PPE), Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D) e Oldřich Vlasák (ECR)
(27 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Sviluppo dell'Erasmus per gli eletti locali e regionali

Per consentire una migliore utilizzazione dei fondi strutturali europei, la Commissione europea ha istituito nel mese di ottobre 2012 il programma Erasmus per eletti locali e regionali. L'iniziativa ha avuto molto successo e ha ottenuto un gran numero di iscrizioni in pochi giorni.

Questa azione ha una nuova dotazione nel bilancio 2013.

Può la Commissione far conoscere:

— il contenuto della prima sessione (ottobre 2012-maggio 2013)?

— La data e le modalità di lancio della seconda sessione?

— L'eventuale considerazione di questo dispositivo per il periodo 2014-2020?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2013)

Un'azione preparatoria per il programma rivolto agli eletti locali e regionali è in corso dal mese di maggio 2012 ed è divisa nelle tre fasi seguenti:

— partecipazione degli eletti locali e regionali alle Giornate porte aperte tenutesi a Bruxelles nel 2012 e dedicati alle strategie di sviluppo locale realizzate dalla collettività;

— organizzazione e accoglienza di visite di studio in cinque città e regioni europee da marzo a maggio 2013;

— partecipazione a un seminario finale di valutazione e conclusione a Bruxelles che si terrà nel giugno 2013.

Secondo quanto stabilito nella prima relazione intermedia sui progetti pilota e sulle azioni preparatorie per il 2013 inviata all'autorità di bilancio il 28 febbraio 2013 è opportuno valutare innanzitutto le iniziative in corso prima di prendere nuovi impegni. La valutazione approfondita dell'azione preparatoria sarà eseguita dall'istituzione designata dalla Commissione. In caso di valutazione positiva la Commissione potrà decidere di perseguire analoghe iniziative nell'ambito della politica di coesione prevista per il periodo 2014-2020. Per il momento non sembra quindi il caso di organizzare iniziative analoghe.

Non si fa alcun riferimento specifico in proposito nelle proposte per la politica di coesione per il periodo successivo al 2014. Il rafforzamento della capacità istituzionale e il miglioramento dell'efficienza della pubblica amministrazione figurano comunque tra gli undici obiettivi tematici stabiliti dalla proposta di regolamento recante disposizioni comuni in linea con la strategia Europa 2020. Si fa riferimento anche a un potenziamento della capacità amministrativa.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002310/13
do Komisji
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Victor Boştinaru (S&D), Silvia Costa (S&D), Karima Delli (Verts/ALE), Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE), Charles Goerens (ALDE), Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Ramona Nicole Mănescu (ALDE), Jan Olbrycht (PPE), Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D) oraz Oldřich Vlasák (ECR)
(27 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Rozwój projektu „Erasmus dla przedstawicieli lokalnych i regionalnych wyłonionych w wyborach"

Z myślą o skuteczniejszym wykorzystaniu europejskich funduszy strukturalnych Komisja Europejska uruchomiła w październiku 2012 r. projekt „Erasmus dla przedstawicieli lokalnych i regionalnych wyłonionych w wyborach". Inicjatywa ta napotkała żywy odzew, którego wyrazem była duża liczba zgłoszeń w przeciągu kilku dni.

Działanie to zostanie ponownie sfinansowane z budżetu na rok 2013.

Czy Komisja może nas poinformować:

— o zawartości pierwszej sesji (październik 2012 – maj 2013)?

— o terminie i zasadach rozpoczęcia drugiej sesji?

— o tym, czy inicjatywa ta jest rozważana na lata 2014-2020?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(22 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Działania przygotowawcze do programu przeznaczonego dla przedstawicieli lokalnych i regionalnych wyłonionych w wyborach prowadzone są od maja 2012 r. na zasadzie trzech etapów:

— udział przedstawicieli lokalnych i regionalnych wyłonionych w wyborach w imprezie „Dni Otwarte 2012" w Brukseli, których tematem przewodnim był rozwój kierowany przez lokalną społeczność;

— organizacja i przeprowadzenie wizyt studyjnych w pięciu europejskich miastach i regionach w okresie od marca do maja 2013 r.;

— podsumowanie i wnioski podczas seminarium w Brukseli w czerwcu 2013 r.

Jak wyjaśniono w sprawozdaniu okresowym w sprawie projektów pilotażowych i działań przygotowawczych w 2013 r., przedłożonym władzy budżetowej w dniu 28 lutego 2013 r., trwające działania należy poddać ocenie przed podjęciem nowych zobowiązań. Wykonawca współpracujący z Komisją dokona szczegółowej oceny omawianych działań przygotowawczych. Jeśli ocena ta będzie pozytywna, Komisja rozważy możliwości kontynuacji takich działań w ramach polityki spójności na lata 2014-2020. Dlatego też wznowienie podobnych działań nie wydaje się wskazane na obecnym etapie.

We wnioskach dotyczących polityki spójności po 2014 r. brak jest konkretnego odniesienia do tych działań. „Wzmacnianie potencjału instytucjonalnego i skuteczności administracji publicznej" jest jednym z jedenastu celów tematycznych określonych we wniosku w sprawie rozporządzenia ustanawiającego wspólne przepisy, zgodnym ze strategią „Europa 2020". Uwzględnione jest także tworzenie potencjału administracyjnego.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-002310/13
adresată Comisiei
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Victor Boştinaru (S&D), Silvia Costa (S&D), Karima Delli (Verts/ALE), Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE), Charles Goerens (ALDE), Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Ramona Nicole Mănescu (ALDE), Jan Olbrycht (PPE), Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D) şi Oldřich Vlasák (ECR)
(27 februarie 2013)

Subiect: Dezvoltarea programului Erasmus pentru aleșii locali și regionali

Pentru a permite o utilizare mai bună a fondurilor structurale europene, Comisia europeană a creat programul Erasmus pentru aleșii locali și regionali, în octombrie 2012. Această inițiativă s-a bucurat de un succes foarte mare, obținând un număr important de înscriși în câteva zile.

Această măsură beneficiază încă o dată de finanțare în bugetul 2013.

Poate Comisia să ne informeze:

— cu privire la conținutul primei sesiuni (octombrie 2012-mai 2013)?

— cu privire la data și modalitățile de lansare pentru a doua sesiune?

— cu privire la luarea în considerare a acestei măsuri pentru perioada 2014-2020?

Răspuns dat de dl Hahn în numele Comisiei
(22 aprilie 2013)

O acțiune pregătitoare pentru programul dedicat aleșilor locali și regionali a fost lansată în mai 2012, pe baza unei abordări în trei etape:

- participarea aleșilor locali și regionali la Ziua porților deschise 2012 de la Bruxelles, unde s-a pus accentul pe dezvoltarea locală participativă;

- organizarea și desfășurarea de vizite de studiu în cinci orașe și regiuni europene în perioada martie — mai 2013;

- un seminar de evaluare finală și concluzii organizat la Bruxelles în iunie 2013.

Așa cum s-a explicat în primul raport intermediar privind proiectele pilot și acțiunile pregătitoare pentru 2013 — trimis autorității bugetare la 28 februarie 2013 — aceste acțiuni în curs trebuie să fie evaluate înainte de asumarea unor noi angajamente. O evaluare aprofundată a acțiunii pregătitoare va fi efectuată de contractantul care asistă Comisia în această privință. Dacă evaluarea este pozitivă, Comisia va reflecta asupra posibilităților de a continua astfel de acțiuni în cadrul politicii de coeziune pentru perioada 2014-2020. Prin urmare, nu pare adecvat să se relanseze acțiuni similare în acest stadiu.

Nu există nicio referire specifică la o astfel de acțiune în cadrul propunerilor pentru politica de coeziune de după 2014. Cu toate acestea, „consolidarea capacității instituționale și o administrație publică eficientă” constituie unul dintre cele unsprezece obiective tematice stabilite în propunerea de regulament de stabilire a unor dispoziții comune, în conformitate cu Strategia Europa 2020. Se menționează, de asemenea, consolidarea capacității administrative.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002310/13
to the Commission
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE), Sophie Auconie (PPE), Victor Boştinaru (S&D), Silvia Costa (S&D), Karima Delli (Verts/ALE), Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE), Charles Goerens (ALDE), Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE), Astrid Lulling (PPE), Ramona Nicole Mănescu (ALDE), Jan Olbrycht (PPE), Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D) and Oldřich Vlasák (ECR)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Development of the Erasmus programme for local and regional elected representatives

The Commission set up the Erasmus programme for local and regional elected representatives in October 2012 in an effort to encourage the more effective use of the European structural funds. This initiative proved to be highly popular, with a large number of people applying in a matter of days.

The programme has once again been allocated funding in the 2013 budget.

Can the Commission provide details of the content of the first session of this Erasmus programme (October 2012-May 2013), give the date of the second session and explain how it will be launched, and say whether this instrument is being considered for funding in the 2014-2020 period?

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

A preparatory action for the local and regional elected representatives scheme has been running since May 2012, following a three-step approach:

— participation of local and regional elected representatives in Open Days 2012 in Brussels, with a focus on community-led local development;

— organisation and holding of study visits in five European cities and regions from March to May 2013;

— a wrap-up evaluation and conclusion seminar in Brussels in June 2013.

As explained in the first interim report on Pilot Projects and Preparatory actions for 2013 — sent to the budgetary authority on 28 February 2013 — these ongoing actions should firstly be evaluated before new commitments can be made. An in-depth evaluation of the preparatory action will be carried out by the contractor which supports the Commission. If the evaluation is positive, the Commission will reflect on possibilities to pursue such actions in the context of 2014-2020 cohesion policy. Therefore, it does not seem appropriate to re-launch similar actions at this stage.

There is no specific reference to such action in the proposals for cohesion policy after 2014. However, 'enhancing institutional capacity and an efficient public administration' is one of the eleven thematic objectives established by the proposed regulation laying down Common Provisions, in line with the Europe 2020 strategy. Administrative capacity building is also mentioned.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002311/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(27 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Latte contaminato da sostanze cancerogene in Albania

L'Autorità per la sicurezza alimentare di Tirana ha rilevato un'elevata presenza di aflatossina, sostanza cancerogena prodotta da specie fungine che si trovano nel mangime.

Il direttore dell'Autorità per la sicurezza alimentare, Artan Gjergji, ha detto di aver chiesto ai produttori ma anche alle società di importazione di ritirare dai mercati i prodotti risultati contaminati. I produttori, dal canto loro, contestano che l'Albania non ha un laboratorio specializzato per l'analisi di prodotti contaminati e che, di fatto, si appoggia a laboratori accreditati negli Stati membri dell'UE.

Nella sua comunicazione «Strategia di allargamento e sfide principali per il periodo 2012-2013» COM(2012)0600 la Commissione europea sostiene che «(…) Si osservano progressi limitati per quanto riguarda la sicurezza alimentare e le politiche veterinaria e fitosanitaria. Occorre migliorare la definizione delle competenze, le responsabilità e la comunicazione sulla gestione del rischio, la registrazione degli spostamenti di animali e la lotta contro le malattie degli animali nonché potenziare gli impianti di produzione di alimenti e mangimi. I preparativi in questi settori sono ancora in fase iniziale».

Può la Commissione dire:

1. quali e quanti sono i rapporti di libero scambio tra l'Albania e gli Stati membri dell'UE in tema alimentare;

2. come intende intervenire per evitare che le gravi mancanze dell'Albania nel campo della tutela alimentare possano «contagiare» altri Stati membri dell'UE;

3. anche a seguito degli ultimi scandali sulla carne di cavallo, se ritiene necessario che tutti i Paesi dell'Europa, compresi quelli con cui si sono aperti negoziati di adesione, debbano essere provvisti di laboratori specializzati nel settore alimentare soprattutto se vi sono rapporti di import-export alimentare?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(9 aprile 2013)

L'Albania, nella sua qualità di paese candidato potenziale, è soggetta agli stessi requisiti generali per l'importazione di alimenti applicabili a qualsiasi altro paese terzo.

Per evitare che gravi carenze in tema di sicurezza alimentare esistenti in un paese terzo si ripercuotano negativamente sulla salute dei consumatori europei, viene adottata una politica impostata sul rischio per controllare alle frontiere gli alimenti importati da paesi terzi. Ciò avviene conformemente alle disposizioni del regolamento (CE) n. 882/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2004, relativo ai controlli ufficiali intesi a verificare la conformità alla normativa in materia di mangimi e di alimenti e alle norme sulla salute e sul benessere degli animali ([1]).

Il regolamento (CE) n. 178/2002 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 28 gennaio 2002, che stabilisce i principi e i requisiti generali della legislazione alimentare, istituisce l'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare e fissa procedure nel campo della sicurezza alimentare ([2]) prevede la possibilità, allorché si identifichi un problema potenziale per la sicurezza, di adottare con brevissimo preavviso misure di salvaguardia che impongono condizioni speciali all'importazione del prodotto sospetto, compresi controlli rigorosissimi all'importazione per tutelare la salute pubblica. Si noti però che un simile problema di sicurezza alimentare legato a un alimento importato dall'Albania non è stato ancora identificato.

È importante che tutti gli Stati membri e tutti gli altri paesi che esportano alimenti verso l'Unione europea abbiano accesso a laboratori specializzati in grado di eseguire le analisi necessarie per assicurare la conformità degli alimenti immessi sul mercato unionale con i requisiti dell'UE in tema di sicurezza alimentare. Ciò non significa necessariamente che tali laboratori debbano essere ubicati nel paese che esporta l'alimento.

([1]) GU L 191 del 28.5.2004, pag. 1.
([2]) GU L 31 del 1.2.2002, pag. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002311/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Contaminated milk in Albania: high levels of carcinogenic compounds found

Milk products tested by the Albanian food safety authority have been found to contain high levels of aflatoxins, carcinogenic compounds produced by certain species of fungus used in livestock fodder.

The authority's director, Artan Gjergji, says that he has asked producers and importers to remove any contaminated products from the market. In response, producers argue that Albania does not have its own specialist laboratory for testing contaminated products and must therefore rely on accredited laboratories in EU Member States.

In its communication entitled 'Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013' (COM(2012)0600), the Commission states that 'progress has been limited in the areas of food safety, veterinary and phytosanitary policy. Efforts are needed to improve the definition of competence, responsibilities and communication regarding risk management, the registration of movements of animals, the control of animal diseases, and the upgrading of food and feed establishments. Preparations in these areas remain at an early stage'.

1. What foodstuffs and food products are freely traded between Albania and EU Member States and what is the scale of that trade?

2. How will the Commission make sure that the impact of Albania's serious failings in the area of food safety does not spread to EU Member States?

3. In the light of the recent horsemeat scandal, does it think that specialist food safetylaboratories should be set up in all European countries, including those with which theEU has opened accession negotiations, particularly if the EU trades foodstuffs and foodproducts with those countries?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2013)

Albania as a potential candidate country is subject to the same general requirements for the import of food as any other third country.

To avoid serious failings in the area of food safety in a third country adversely affecting the health of European consumers, a risk-based policy is adopted to check food imported from third countries at the border. This is in accordance with the provisions of Regulation (EC) 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules ([1]).

Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and laying down procedures in matters of food safety ([2]) provides for the possibility, when a potential safety problem has been identified, to take, within very short notice, safeguard measures imposing special conditions on the import of that product, including very strict controls at import to protect public health. However, such a food safety problem with food imported from Albania has not yet been identified.

It is important that all Member States and all other countries exporting food to the European Union (EU) have access to specialised laboratories to ensure that the necessary analyses can be performed to ensure compliance of the food placed on the EU market with EU food safety requirements. This does not necessarily mean that these laboratories have to be located in the country exporting the food.

([1]) OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1.
([2]) OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002312/13
aan de Commissie
Philippe De Backer (ALDE)
(27 februari 2013)

Betreft: Grensoverschrijdend verkeer tussen Frankrijk en België voor vrachtwagens van 44 ton

België heeft voor vrachtvervoer over de weg 44 ton als maximaal toegelaten gewicht voor een vijfassige combinatie (trekker + oplegger of vrachtwagen + aanhangwagen), zoals meest courant gebruikt. Frankrijk heeft nu, sinds 1 januari 2013, eveneens het wettelijk maximum opgetrokken tot 44 ton voor het vervoer op Frans grondgebied. Vóór 1 januari 2013 lag dit maximum, op enkele uitzonderingen na, op 40 ton.

Een transport dat vertrekt in één land met als bestemming een locatie in een ander land valt onder het internationaal vervoer, dat is geregeld door Richtlijn 96/53/EG ([1]). Deze richtlijn bepaalt dat internationaal transport maximaal 40 ton mag zijn.

Dit betekent dus dat men met een combinatie van 44 ton kan vertrekken in België richting Frankrijk (of omgekeerd) tot men aan een landsgrens komt. Aan de grens moet het gewicht van het transport worden verlaagd tot 40 ton. Eens in het andere land is het maximum toegelaten gewicht opnieuw 44 ton.

Dit is een absurde situatie, aangezien er op vlak van veiligheid en geschiktheid van het wegennet in beide landen geen probleem is voor het toelaten van vrachtwagens met een gewicht van 44 ton.

Grensoverschrijdend verkeer toelaten zou een besparing betekenen voor alle economische operatoren en zou een positieve impact hebben op het milieu en het energieverbruik.

Vandaar mijn vragen aan de Commissie:

— Overweegt de Commissie bij de herziening van Richtlijn 96/53/EG het probleem van de grenspassage tussen twee lidstaten met hetzelfde toegelaten gewicht voor het transport aan te pakken?

— Overweegt de Commissie de betrokken lidstaten toe te laten bilaterale akkoorden te sluiten waarin wordt vastgelegd dat het maximum toegelaten gewicht binnen deze landen ook geldt voor de grenspassage tussen deze landen?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(18 april 2013)

1. Er wordt op dit moment gewerkt aan een herziening van Richtlijn 96/53/EG van de Raad houdende vaststelling, voor bepaalde aan het verkeer binnen de Gemeenschap deelnemende wegvoertuigen, van de in het nationale en het internationale verkeer maximaal toegestane afmetingen, en van de in het internationale verkeer maximaal toegestane gewichten ([2]). Deze herziening heeft ten doel de energie-efficiëntie van voertuigen te verbeteren aan de hand van een gestroomlijnder ontwerp van de vrachtwagens, en de doeltreffendheid van de richtlijn te verhogen door voor een betere naleving van de regels met betrekking tot te zwaar geladen voertuigen te zorgen. Er bestaan verschillende wetenschappelijke rapporten waarin wordt onderzocht wat de gevolgen zijn als voertuigen door een verhoging van de maximaal toegestane gewichten en/of afmetingen over meer laadvermogen zouden beschikken. In de conclusies van deze rapporten zijn de gevolgen van een dergelijke wijziging voor infrastructuur, *modal split* en verkeersveiligheid echter niet duidelijk. Om die reden zal het voorstel van de Commissie tot herziening van Richtlijn 96/53/EG geen veranderingen bevatten die aanzienlijke gevolgen hebben voor de gewichtsgrenzen van wegvoertuigen voor internationaal transport, in het bijzonder in grensoverschrijdende situaties.

2. Met Richtlijn 96/53/EG wordt beoogd voor gelijke concurrentievoorwaarden voor vervoerders van internationaal transport te zorgen. Bilaterale overeenkomsten kunnen leiden tot een toenemend aantal regionale normen die nadelig kunnen zijn voor de eengemaakte markt en die in het licht van de mogelijke gevolgen voor de internationale concurrentie in de transportsector, zorgvuldig moeten worden afgewogen.

([1]) Richtlijn 96/53/EG van de Raad van 25 juli 1996 houdende vaststelling, voor bepaalde aan het verkeer binnen de Gemeenschap deelnemende wegvoertuigen, van de in het nationale en het internationale verkeer maximaal toegestane afmetingen, en van de in het internationale verkeer maximaal toegestane gewichten.

([2]) PB L 235 van 17.9.1996.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002312/13
to the Commission
Philippe De Backer (ALDE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Cross-border movement between France and Belgium by trucks weighing 44 tons

Belgium has a maximum authorised weight of 44 tons for five-axle road haulage combinations (tractor + semitrailer or truck + trailer), as most commonly used. France now, since 1 January 2013, has likewise increased the statutory limit to 44 tons for transport within French territory. Before 1 January 2013 the limit — with a few exceptions — was 40 tons.

A truck setting out from a location in one country with a destination in another country is deemed to be engaged in international transport, which is governed by Directive 96/53/EC ([1]). This directive limits vehicles engaged in international transport to 40 tons.

It follows that it is possible to set out from Belgium to travel to France (or vice versa) with a 44-ton combination and drive to the national border. At the border, the weight of the vehicle must be reduced to 40 tons. Once it has crossed over into the other country, the weight limit applicable is again 44 tons.

This is an absurd situation, because as regards safety and the suitability of the road network, there is no problem in either country with allowing trucks weighing 44 tons to operate.

Permitting international transport would result in savings for all economic operators and would have a positive impact on the environment and energy consumption.

— When revising Directive 96/53/EC, will the Commission consider tackling the problem of the crossing of borders between two Member States with the same weight limit?

— Will the Commission consider permitting the Member States concerned to conclude bilateral agreements laying down that the maximum authorised weight in such countries should also apply to vehicles crossing borders between those countries?

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

1. A revision of Council Directive 96/53/EC laying down for certain road vehicles circulating within the Community the maximum authorised dimention in national and international traffic and the maximum authorised weights in international trafic ([2]) is currently under consideration. The objective of this revision is to improve the energy-efficiency of vehicles by allowing a more aerodynamic design of trucks and to increase the effectiveness of the directive by improving the enforcement of the rules related to overweight vehicles. The impacts of increasing the loading capacity of vehicle through an extension of the maximum weights and/or dimensions have been studied in several scientific reports. However the conclusions of these studies are unclear as to the impact of such a move on infrastructure, modal split and road safety. The Commission's proposal for the revision of Directive 96/53/EC will therefore not include changes which might have a significant impact on weight limits of road vehicles in international transport, in particular in cross-border situations.

2. The aim of Directive 96/53/EC is to put in place a level-playing field for hauliers carrying out international transport. Introducing bilateral agreements could lead to the existence of an increasing number of regional standards which may be detrimental to the internal market, and should be carefully considered in light of the possible impact on international competition in the transport sector.

([1]) Council Directive 96/53/EC of 25 July 1996 laying down for certain road vehicles circulating within the Community the maximum authorised dimensions in national and international traffic and the maximum authorised weights in international traffic.
([2]) OJ L 235, 17.9.1996.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002313/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Deteção precoce do nemátodo do pinheiro

Cientistas da Universidade de Coimbra e da Escola Superior Agrária de Coimbra desenvolveram um dispositivo para detetar a doença do nemátodo do pinheiro muito antes desta se manifestar, permitindo, desta forma, obstar à difusão da doença. O artigo que apresenta este trabalho foi distinguido com o «Best Student Paper Award» na Conferência Biodevices 2013, em Barcelona.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Conhecendo-se o impacto devastador desta doença, estaria disponível para apoiar a produção e difusão deste dispositivo, bem como para apoiar os seus criadores neste e em outros projetos relacionados com esta questão?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002339/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Nemátodo do pinheiro — novas descobertas

Considerando que:

— Um grupo de investigadores portugueses desenvolveu um dispositivo que consegue detetar de forma instantânea a presença do nemátodo do pinheiro, o que pode evitar o abate de muitas árvores afetadas por esta doença;

— Segundo a investigadora que liderou o projeto, as «técnicas atualmente utilizadas não impedem o abate das árvores após a deteção e identificação do nemátodo», sendo a «única solução o abate imediato dos pinheiros e a sua destruição, de acordo com a legislação em vigor»;

Assim pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento deste novo dispositivo?

Que avaliação faz da referida descoberta?

Resposta conjunta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(16 de abril de 2013)

O nemátodo do pinheiro está a causar danos importantes nas florestas de alguns Estados-Membros. Tem sido disponibilizado financiamento da UE através no âmbito de projetos ao abrigo de vários programas-quadro ([1]) destinados a estudar o problema, compreender a biologia das interações hospedeiro/parasita e procurar soluções para conter e combater esta praga. O desenvolvimento de vários métodos de deteção rápida da praga foi igualmente um dos principais objetivos desses projetos (projeto PHRAME ([2]) do 5.° PQ, projeto PORT CHECK ([3]) do 6.° PQ e projetos Q-Detect ([4]) e Rephrame ([5]) do 7.° PQ).

([1]) Quinto (5.° PQ (1998-2002), Sexto (6.° PQ, 2002-2006) e Sétimo (7.° PQ, 2007-2013) Programas-Quadro de Investigação e de Desenvolvimento Tecnológico.
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=OFFR_TM_EN&ACTION=D&RCN=4730
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/73841_en.html
([4]) http://qdetect.org/0_home/index.php
([5]) http://www.rephrame.eu/

O dispositivo a que se refere o Senhor Deputado vem juntar um novo elemento à caixa de ferramentas para a luta contra esta praga devastadora e devem ser prosseguidos outros trabalhos de investigação sobre a aplicabilidade e eficácia desta metodologia para a deteção precoce, no local, das árvores infetadas. Em primeiro lugar, as equipas de investigação em causa poderiam contactar a Euphresco -NET ([6]), que visa reforçar a cooperação entre os programas oficiais de investigação fitossanitária, e/ou a Foresterra ERA-NET ([7]), cujo objetivo é melhorar a investigação florestal na região mediterrânica através de uma melhor coordenação e integração.

Associar investigação e inovação é um dos objetivos do Programa-Quadro de Investigação e Inovação «Horizonte 2020» (2014-2020) ([8]), que deverá abranger a gestão sustentável das florestas no âmbito do Desafio 2 «Segurança alimentar, agricultura sustentável, investigação marinha e marítima e bioeconomia».

([6]) http://www.euphresco.org/
([7]) http://www.foresterra.eu/
([8]) www.ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002313/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Early detection of pinewood nematode

Scientists from the University of Coimbra and the Higher School of Agriculture of Coimbra have developed a device for detecting the presence of the pinewood nematode pest long before it becomes apparent, making it possible to combat its spread. The article presenting this work received the 'Best Student Paper Award' at the Biodevices 2013 conference in Barcelona.

My question to the Commission therefore is:

Being aware of the devastating impact of this pest, would the Commission be willing to support the production and distribution of this device, and to support its inventors in this and other projects related to this issue?

Question for written answer E-002339/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Pine wood nematode — new discoveries

A group of Portuguese researchers have developed a device that can instantly detect the presence of pine wood nematode, which may prevent many trees affected by the disease from being felled.

According to the lead researcher, the techniques currently used do not prevent trees from being felled once the nematode has been detected and identified and, under current legislation, the only solution is to immediately chop down and destroy the pine trees.

Is the Commission aware of this new device?

What is its assessment of this discovery?

Joint answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

The pine wood nematode is causing significant damage in forests of certain Member States. EU funding has been provided through projects from a number of Framework Programmes' ([1]) to understand the problem, the biology of the host/pest interaction and the search for solutions to contain and combat the pest. The development of various methods for rapid detection of the pest has also been one of the main objectives of these projects (FP5 project PHRAME ([2]), FP6 project PORT CHECK ([3]) and FP7 projects Q-Detect ([4]) and REPHRAME ([5])).

The device referred to by the Honourable Member adds a new element to the toolbox for combatting this devastating pest and further research on the applicability and efficacy of this methodology for on-site early detection of the infected trees should be continued. In the first instance, the relevant research teams could contact the EUPHRESCO ERA-NET ([6]) which aims to increase cooperation between statutory plant health research programmes and/or the FORESTERRA ERA-NET ([7]) designed to enhance forest research in the Mediterranean region through improved coordination and integration.

([1]) Fifth (FP5 (1998-2002), Sixth (FP6, 2002-2006) and Seventh (FP7, 2007-2013) Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development.
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=OFFR_TM_EN&ACTION=D&RCN=4730
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/73841_en.html
([4]) http://qdetect.org/0_home/index.php
([5]) http://www.rephrame.eu/
([6]) http://www.euphresco.org/
([7]) http://www.foresterra.eu/

Coupling research to innovation, is among the objectives of Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([8]) which is expected to cover sustainable forest management in the Challenge 2 'Food Security; Sustainable Agriculture, Marine and Maritime Research and the Bioeconomy'.

([8]) www.ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002314/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Legitimidade democrática e transferência de competências

Num discurso proferido no passado dia 25 de fevereiro de 2013 no Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, o Comissário Maroš Šefčovič declarou que «no aprofundamento da integração económica e monetária, temos de assegurar que o nível de legitimidade democrática continua a ser compatível com o grau de transferência de competências dos Estados-Membros a nível europeu.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Como pretende promover e assegurar essa compatibilidade?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002315/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Reforço do papel dos parlamentos

Num discurso proferido no passado dia 25 de Fevereiro de 2013 no Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, o Comissário Maroš Šefčovič declarou que «é agora a vez da UE aprofundar o tecido democrático do seu sistema de níveis múltiplos, reforçando o papel dos parlamentos, tanto a nível nacional como europeu. Como fazer isso — não se, mas como — está atualmente a ser debatido com os governos, os parlamentos nacionais e europeu».

O primeiro-ministro David Cameron declarou, no dia 23 de janeiro de 2013, que «os parlamentos nacionais são e continuarão a ser, a verdadeira fonte da legitimidade democrática real e da prestação de contas na UE».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Em que áreas crê que mais se justifica o reforço do papel dos parlamentos nacionais?

— Em que áreas crê que mais se justifica o reforço do papel do Parlamento Europeu?

— O debate em curso já produziu algumas conclusões, ainda que preliminares? Quais?

— Em que medida crê que, no quadro do referido debate, deverá ser tida em conta a afirmação, por parte do governo do Reino Unido, da necessária centralidade que os parlamentos nacionais têm, e não poderão deixar de manter, numa futura arquitetura institucional europeia mais democrática?

Resposta conjunta dada por José Manuel Durão Barroso em nome da Comissão
(15 de maio de 2013)

Aos níveis europeu e nacional, os papéis dos parlamentos na UEM são complementares: enquanto a Comissão responde perante o Parlamento Europeu, os parlamentos nacionais são essenciais na garantia da legitimidade da ação dos Estados-Membros no Conselho e no Conselho Europeu. Os poderes de controlo dos parlamentos devem, pois, ser reforçados a ambos os níveis. No âmbito do Tratado, as discussões devem centrar-se em medidas práticas.

A nível europeu, é importante o diálogo económico que possibilita discussões entre o Parlamento Europeu, por um lado, e a Comissão, os Estados-Membros, o Conselho, o Conselho Europeu e o Eurogrupo, por outro. Os debates no Parlamento Europeu devem ter lugar em momentos cruciais do semestre europeu. Os partidos políticos europeus devem ser reforçados (segundo as orientações propostas pela Comissão) e nomear um candidato para Presidente da Comissão antes das próximas eleições europeias.

A nível nacional, os parlamentos devem participar, segundo as regras nacionais, na tomada nacional de decisões, no contexto do Semestre Europeu. Para facilitar os trabalhos dos parlamentos nacionais, a Comissão está empenhada num diálogo reforçado sobre a Análise Anual do Crescimento e as recomendações específicas por país. A Comissão apoia plenamente a cooperação interparlamentar, que considera muito útil dada a interdependência das decisões dos parlamentos. Os parlamentos definirão a aplicação concreta dessa cooperação.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002314/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Democratic legitimacy and transfer of competences

In the course of a speech delivered on 25 February 2013 at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques in Paris, Commissioner Maroš Šefčovič said that in deepening economic and monetary integration, we must ensure that the level of democratic legitimacy continues to keep up with the degree of transfer of competences from the Member States to the European level.

I would therefore like to ask:

How does the Commission intend to promote this and ensure that it happens?

Question for written answer E-002315/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Strengthening the role of parliament

In a speech delivered on 25 February 2013 at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques in Paris, Commissioner Maroš Šefčovič stated that 'it is now the turn of the EU to deepen the democratic fabric of its multi-level system by reinforcing the role of parliaments at both national and European level. How to do this — not whether, but how — is currently being debated with governments, national and European Parliaments alike'.

Prime Minister David Cameron stated on 23 January 2013 that 'it is national parliaments which are and will remain the true source of real democratic legitimacy and accountability in the EU'.

I would therefore ask the Commission:

— In what areas does it think that strengthening the role of national parliaments is most justified?

— In what areas does it think that strengthening the role of the European Parliament is most justified?

— Has the current debate produced any conclusions yet, even if only preliminary ones? What are they?

— To what extent does it think that, in the abovementioned debate, account should be taken of the British Government's statement regarding the need for national parliaments to occupy — and continue to occupy — a central position in a future, more democratic European institutional architecture?

Joint answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)

The Parliaments' roles at European and national levels in EMU are complementary: while the Commission is accountable to the European Parliament, national parliaments are central in ensuring legitimacy of Member States' action in the Council and European Council. The Parliaments' scrutiny powers thus must be strengthened at both levels. Within the framework of the Treaty, discussion should focus on practical measures.

At European level, the Economic Dialogue providing for discussions between the European Parliament, on the one hand, and the Commission, MS, the Council, the European Council and the Eurogroup on the other hand is important. Debates in the European Parliament should be held at key moments in the European semester. European political parties should be further strengthened (along the lines proposed by the Commission), and nominate a candidate for Commission President ahead of the next European election.

At national level, the Parliaments should be involved, in line with national rules, in the national decision-making in the context of the European Semester. To facilitate national Parliaments' work, the Commission is committed to an intensified dialogue on the Annual Growth Survey and Country-Specific Recommendations. The Commission fully supports inter-parliamentary cooperation, which it considers to be very useful given the interdependency of the Parliaments' decisions. The Parliaments will define the concrete implementation of such cooperation.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-002318/13
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE)
(2013. február 27.)

Tárgy: Lóhús az élelmiszerláncban

Az élelmiszerláncban a címkén való feltüntetés nélkül megjelenő lóhús problémájának felmerülése óta több felhívás történt a feldolgozott hústermékek részletesebb címkézésének bevezetésére a származási ország megjelölése céljából. Véleményem szerint a feldolgozott élelmiszerekben található hús eredetével kapcsolatos uniós jogszabályoknak meg kellett volna akadályozniuk ezt a kellemetlen esetet. Megtörténtének fő oka az, hogy valaki szándékosan hamisan adta meg egy termék jellemzőit. Továbbá úgy vélem, hogy a kiskereskedelmi ágazatnak a Bizottsággal együttműködésben széles körű intézkedéseket kellett volna hoznia ennek az ügynek a megoldására és a fogyasztók megnyugtatására.

Mindezek alapján az alábbi kérdéseket szeretném feltenni a Bizottságnak:

1. Nem érzi-e úgy, hogy a jelenleg hatályban lévő korlátozásokon túl további uniós szintű szabályozásra van szükség ezen a területen?

2. Milyen szankciókat javasolna a vállalatok attól való visszatartására, hogy megsértsék a feldolgozott élelmiszerekben található hús eredetére vonatkozó szabályokat?

3. Tudná-e jelezni a Bizottság, hogy dolgozik-e új ötleteken és esetleg új ágazati politikán, az Unió erős kiskereskedelmi ágazatának megóvása céljából?

Tonio Borg válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. március 26.)

1. A kérdéses ügyben sérült az élelmiszerek címkézéséről szóló uniós jogszabály ([1]), amely előírja, hogy a címke nem vezetheti félre a fogyasztót, azon minden összetevőnek hiánytalanul szerepelnie kell. Az eredetmegjelölésnek a csalások szempontjából nincs köze az élelmiszer-összetevők jelöléséhez, a csalásoknak nem tudná elejét venni. A szóban forgó eset akkor is megtörtént volna, ha az eredetet kötelező jelleggel fel kellett volna tüntetni a címkén. A fogyasztók élelmiszerekkel kapcsolatos tájékoztatásáról szóló 1169/2011/EU rendelet ([2]), amelynek rendelkezései 2014. december 13-tól alkalmazandók, felülvizsgálta az eredetmegjelölés szabályait: a feldolgozatlan juh-, kecske-, baromfi- és sertéshúsra kötelezően előírta az eredet megjelölését. Ezen túlmenően a Bizottságot arra kötelezte, hogy 2013. december 13-ig készítsen jelentést az Európai Parlament és a Tanács számára arról, hogy a kötelező eredetmegjelölést ki lehet-e terjeszteni az összetevőként felhasznált húsra.

2. Az élelmiszerláncra vonatkozó jogszabályok betartatása a tagállamok felelőssége: hatósági ellenőrző rendszert kell kiépíteniük annak ellenőrzésére, hogy a piaci szereplők megfelelnek-e a jogszabályokban foglalt követelményeknek, és ha nem, azt szankcionálják. A Bizottság többek között helyszíni ellenőrzések révén felügyeli, hogy a tagállamok eleget tesznek-e a hatósági ellenőrzéssel kapcsolatos kötelezettségeiknek.

A hatósági ellenőrzéseket érintően a közeljövőben javaslat készül, amely – egyebek mellett a szankciók tekintetében is – tovább erősíti majd a meglévő rendszert.

3. A Bizottság megfontolás tárgyává teszi, hogy a fogyasztói bizalom visszaállítása és az élelmiszerekkel kapcsolatos visszaélések elleni hathatósabb küzdelem érdekében az eszközök megerősítésével szükség van-e külön lépésekre.

([1]) Az Európai Parlament és a Tanács 2000/13/EK irányelve (2000. március 20.) az élelmiszerek címkézésére, kiszerelésére és reklámozására vonatkozó tagállami jogszabályok közelítéséről (HL L 109., 2000.5.6.).

([2]) Az 1169/2011/EU rendelet a fogyasztók élelmiszerekkel kapcsolatos tájékoztatásáról, az 1924/2006/EK és az 1925/2006/EK európai parlamenti és tanácsi rendelet módosításáról és a 87/250/EGK bizottsági irányelv, a 90/496/EGK tanácsi irányelv, az 1999/10/EK bizottsági irányelv, a 2000/13/EK európai parlamenti és tanácsi irányelv, a 2002/67/EK és a 2008/5/EK bizottsági irányelv és a 608/2004/EK bizottsági rendelet hatályon kívül helyezéséről (HL L 304., 2011.11.22.).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002318/13
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Horse meat in the food chain

Since the emergence of the problem of undeclared horse meat in the food chain, there have been calls for more specific labelling of processed meat products, to indicate country of origin. In my view, EU legislation on the origin of meat in prepared foods should have prevented this incident. That it could occur is mainly the result of someone intentionally misstating the characteristics of a product. I also believe that the retail sector, in cooperation with the Commission, should have taken extensive action to deal with this incident and reassure consumers.

In light of this, I would like to ask the Commission the following questions:

1. Does it not feel that, in addition to the restrictions currently in place, there is need for further EU-level regulation in this area?

2. What penalties would it propose to deter companies from violating the rules on the origin of meat in prepared foods?

3. Can the Commission indicate whether it is preparing new ideas, and possibly a new sectoral policy, with a view to the preservation of the Union's strong retail sector?

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

1. The fraud in question breaches EU food labelling legislation ([1]), which requires that labelling must not mislead the consumer and must indicate all ingredients present. Origin labelling should not be confused with fraud in food labelling and cannot be considered as a tool to prevent it. This fraud could have occurred, even with mandatory origin labelling. Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers ([2]), which enters into application on 13 December 2014, has revisited origin labelling rules. It introduces a mandatory indication of origin for unprocessed sheep, goat, poultry and pig meat. In addition, it requires the Commission to submit a report to the European Parliament and the Council by 13 December 2013 on the possibility to extend mandatory indication of origin to meat used as an ingredient.

2. The responsibility for enforcing food chain legislation lies with Member States, which are required to establish a system of official controls to verify compliance by operators with requirements deriving therefrom and sanction non-compliances. The Commission monitors delivery by the Member States of its control duties, including through on-the-spot audits.

The forthcoming proposal on official controls will aim to further strengthen the existing system, including as regards sanctions.

3. The Commission is reflecting whether specific actions are needed to restore consumer confidence by strengthening tools and to improve the fight against food fraud.

([1]) Directive 2000/13/EC of the 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.

([2]) 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 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.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002320/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Introdução de gás natural na Madeira I

Tendo em conta que:

— A importância da diversificação das fontes de energia é um dos objetivos da União, a fim de reduzir a forte dependência dos Estados-Membros em relação ao petróleo e seus derivados e de, assim, cumprir o objetivo de utilização de 10 % de fontes de energias renováveis nos transportes até 2020;

— O gás natural é um combustível competitivo, em termos de custos, e menos poluente, sendo por isso uma alternativa à utilização de produtos petrolíferos na produção de eletricidade e para uso nos restantes setores da economia, nomeadamente nos transportes;

— As regiões insulares, pelas suas características naturais, têm potencialidades que devem ser aproveitadas, em particular no que diz respeito ao desenvolvimento de fontes de aprovisionamento diversas e, nomeadamente, energias renováveis e gás natural liquefeito;

— O objetivo da Região Autónoma da Madeira consiste em atingir, até 2020, o objetivo de 50 % de penetração de energia verde, embora, para uma maior viabilidade, segurança e estabilidade do sistema, seja necessário garantir também outras fontes de aprovisionamento, como o gás natural, um combustível fóssil mais limpo do que o fuelóleo;

— O CEF pretende apoiar o desenvolvimento de uma verdadeira rede de transportes e de energia a nível europeu e que, na proposta da CE, o apoio em dois dos setores aumenta o cofinanciamento europeu;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Se tem conhecimento da abertura do concurso internacional na Madeira no ano de 2010, para a construção do terminal de gás natural liquefeito (GNL)? Se a resposta for afirmativa, se tem a informação de que a obra está suspensa desde 2011, devido ao agravamento da conjuntura financeira que afeta a União?

2. Se existem instrumentos financeiros e técnicos na União Europeia, para que a Região possa iniciar novamente este projeto, essencial para a diversificação do aprovisionamento da ilha da Madeira?

3. Se não considera importante a introdução gás natural na Madeira, um projeto pioneiro a seguir por outras regiões insulares?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002321/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Introdução de gás natural na Madeira II

Tendo em conta que:

— A importância da diversificação das fontes de energia é um dos objetivos da União, a fim de reduzir a forte dependência dos Estados-Membros em relação ao petróleo e seus derivados e de, assim, cumprir o objetivo de utilização de 10 % de fontes de energias renováveis nos transportes até 2020;

— O gás natural é um combustível competitivo, em termos de custos, e menos poluente, sendo por isso uma alternativa à utilização de produtos petrolíferos na produção de eletricidade e para uso nos restantes setores da economia, nomeadamente nos transportes;

— As regiões insulares, pelas suas características naturais, têm potencialidades que devem ser aproveitadas, em particular no que diz respeito ao desenvolvimento de fontes de aprovisionamento diversas e, nomeadamente, energias renováveis e gás natural liquefeito;

— O objetivo da Região Autónoma da Madeira consiste em atingir, até 2020, o objetivo de 50 % de penetração de energia verde, embora, para uma maior viabilidade, segurança e estabilidade do sistema, seja necessário garantir também outras fontes de aprovisionamento, como o gás natural, um combustível fóssil mais limpo do que o fuelóleo;

— O CEF pretende apoiar o desenvolvimento de uma verdadeira rede de transportes e de energia a nível europeu e que, na proposta da CE, o apoio em dois dos setores aumenta o cofinanciamento europeu;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Se, tendo em conta os projetos já desenvolvidos no âmbito das Autoestradas do Mar da RTE-T, não considera importante para as regiões europeias a criação de um projeto-piloto ou ação, que vá ao encontro dos objetivos e resultados das ações 2010-UE-21112-S e 2011-UE-21005-S de introdução de gás natural liquefeito?

2. Se não pondera utilizar este projeto da Madeira como um caso pioneiro na introdução de gás natural liquefeito, que servirá, não só para a diversificação das fontes energéticas da região, mas também, no futuro, para uso nas embarcações marítimas?

Resposta conjunta dada por Günther Oettinger em nome da Comissão
(23 de abril de 2013)

1. A Comissão não tem conhecimento do concurso para o terminal de GNL.

2. No âmbito do CEF ([1]), a UE propõe instrumentos financeiros que poderão potencialmente ser utilizados se o mencionado terminal GNL ([2]) obtiver o estatuto da PIC ([3]), como proposto no Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo às orientações para as infraestruturas energéticas transeuropeias. Além disso, os fundos estruturais podem fornecer alguns instrumentos para ajudar a Madeira a diversificar o seu aprovisionamento energético.

3. A introdução do gás natural nas regiões insulares tem de ser apreciada caso a caso, com base numa análise custo-benefício. A Comissão acompanhará o desenvolvimento do projeto com grande interesse.

([1]) Mecanismo Interligar a Europa.
([2]) Gás natural liquefeito.
([3]) Projeto de interesse comum.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002320/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Introduction of natural gas in Madeira I

In view of the fact that:

— diversification of energy sources is one of the objectives of the EU, with a view to reducing Member States' substantial dependence on oil and its derivatives and thereby meeting the target of 10% renewable energy use in transport by 2020;

— since natural gas is a competitive fuel in cost terms and is less polluting, it provides an alternative to the use of petroleum products in electricity generation and in other sectors of the economy, particularly transport;

— because of their natural characteristics, island regions have potential that should be used, particularly in relation to developing diverse sources of supply, especially renewable energies and liquefied natural gas;

— while the Autonomous Region of Madeira aims to reach the target of 50% penetration of green energy by 2020, it is also necessary for the purposes of improving the viability, security and stability of the system to guarantee other sources of supply such as natural gas, a cleaner fossil fuel than fuel oil;

— the CEF aims to support the development of a genuine European transport and energy network and, in the Commission's proposal, the European co-financing rate would be increased for support to two sectors;

Wishes to ask the Commission:

1. If it is aware of the international invitation to tender launched in Madeira in 2010 for the construction of a liquefied natural gas (LNG) terminal? If so, is it aware that work has been on hold since 2011 as a result of the worsening financial environment in the EU?

2. Whether the European Union has financial and technical instruments available to allow the region to re-launch this project, which is essential for diversifying supply on the island of Madeira?

3. Whether it considers the introduction of natural gas in Madeira, which is a pioneering project that other island regions can follow, to be important?

Question for written answer E-002321/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Introduction of natural gas in Madeira II

— The diversification of energy supplies is one of the Union's priority objectives, in order to reduce Member States' dependence on oil and oil derivatives and thereby ensure that 10% of the energy used in transport comes from renewable sources by 2020.

— Natural gas is a less polluting, competitive fuel, in terms of costs, and is therefore a viable alternative to oil products in both electricity production and other economic sectors such as transport.

— The natural characteristics of island regions make them ideal for developing various supply sources, namely renewable energy and liquefied natural gas.

— By 2020, Madeira aims to achieve 50% green energy penetration. However, to make the system more viable, secure and stable, it must also guarantee other supply sources such as natural gas, which is a cleaner fossil fuel than fuel oil.

— The Connecting Europe Facility aims to support the development of a genuine trans-European transport and energy network and, as per the Commission's proposal, to increase support in two of the sectors through EU co-financing.

1. Given the projects already developed under the trans-European transport network (TEN-T) 'Motorways of the sea', does the Commission not think it important for EU regions to develop a pilot project or action that meets the objectives and results of the 2010-EU-21112-S and 2011-EU-21005-S actions on the introduction of liquefied natural gas?

2. Will it consider using the project in Madeira as a groundbreaking case in the introduction of liquefied natural gas, which will not only diversify the region's energy supplies but in future will be used in marine vessels?

Joint answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)

1. The Commission is not aware of such invitation for tender for the LNG terminal.

2. In the context of the CEF ([1]), the EU proposes financial intruments that could be potentially used if the mentioned LNG ([2]) terminal was to receive the PCI ([3]) status as proposed in the regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on guidelines for trans-European energy infrastructures. In addition, the structural funds may provide some instruments to help Madeira to diversify its energy supply.

3. The introduction of natural gas in islands has to be assessed on a case-by-case basis based on a cost-benefit analysis. The Commission will follow the development of the project with great interest.

([1]) Connecting Europe Facilty.
([2]) Liquified Natural Gas.
([3]) Project of Common Interest.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002322/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Excesso de consumo de bebidas energéticas

Cientistas americanos têm alertado as autoridades públicas do seu país para o excesso de consumo de bebidas energéticas e apelado à regulação deste tipo de bebidas e à limitação da dose de cafeína permitida. Note-se que, nos EUA, bebidas energéticas com elevados níveis de açúcar e cafeína foram associadas a 5 mortes, a um ataque de coração não fatal e a 20.783 hospitalizações por *overdose* daquele tipo de bebidas.

Nesta perspetiva, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento dos estudos científicas apresentados sobre o consumo de bebidas energéticas e a sua associação a ataques de coração, hospitalizações e mesmo mortes?

2. Tem conhecimento de hospitalizações ou mortes nos Estados-Membros associadas ao excesso de consumo de bebidas energéticas?

3. A União Europeia regula, de alguma maneira, estas bebidas energéticas, ou impõe limites à dose de cafeína que nelas é permitida?

4. No caso de resposta negativa à questão anterior, pondera a União Europeia vir a tomar medidas no sentido de apresentar legislação sobre as bebidas energéticas, nomeadamente limitando os níveis de cafeína e açúcar permitidos?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(9 de abril de 2013)

Embora que a Comissão não tenha conhecimento dos estudos dos EUA mencionados, vários Estados-Membros levantaram preocupações relativamente à segurança do consumo de cafeína, especialmente no caso de indivíduos que consomem alimentos com cafeína juntamente com outros produtos alimentares como as substâncias encontradas nas «bebidas energéticas».

A Autoridade Europeia para a Segurança dos Alimentos (AESA) publicou recentemente um relatório intitulado «Gathering consumption data on specific consumer groups of energy drinks» ([1]) (Recolha de dados sobre grupos de consumidores especificos de bebidas energéticas) em resposta à identificação pelo Fórum Consultivo da AESA do aumento do consumo de «bebidas energéticas», especialmente no âmbito das crianças e dos adultos jovens, enquanto risco potencial risco ([2]).

Além disso, como resultado de preocupações levantadas por alguns Estados-Membros, a Comissão solicitou à AESA que avaliasse a segurança da cafeína, em particular para determinar se e até que ponto o consumo de cafeína juntamente com outros componentes alimentares como o álcool ou substâncias encontradas em «bebidas energéticas» poderiam representar um risco para a saúde em resultado de interações destes componentes ([3]). A avaliação dos riscos deve estar finalizada até ao final de 2013.

A Diretiva 2002/67/CE ([4]) harmoniza a rotulagem de bebidas que contenham cafeína. Para mais detalhes, a Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para as respostas dadas às anteriores perguntas escritas E 000464/10 e E 002353/10 ([5]).

([1]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/doc/394e.pdf
([2]) Relatório Anual sobre a Rede de Intercâmbio no âmbito dos Riscos Emergentes 2011, AESA-Q-2011-00399.
([3]) Número da pergunta: AESA-Q-2013-00220.
([4]) JO L 191 de 19.7. 2002.
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pt/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002322/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(27 February 2013)

Subject: Excessive consumption of energy drinks

American scientists have warned US public authorities about the excessive consumption of energy drinks and have called for the regulation of such beverages and a limit on the amount of caffeine they contain. In the United States, energy drinks containing high levels of sugar and caffeine have been linked to five deaths, a nonfatal heart attack and 20 783 overdose-related hospitalisations.

1. Is the Commission aware of these scientific studies on the consumption of energy drinks and their association with heart attacks, hospitalisations and even deaths?

2. Is it aware of any hospitalisations or deaths in the Member States linked to the excessive consumption of energy drinks?

3. Does the EU regulate these energy drinks in any way or limit the amount of caffeine they contain?

4. If not, will the EU consider taking steps to introduce legislation on energy drinks, in particular to limit the amounts of caffeine and sugar they contain?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2013)

Whereas the Commission is not aware of the US studies mentioned, several Member States have raised concerns about the safety of the consumption of caffeine especially in individuals consuming foods containing caffeine together with other food constituents such as substances found in 'energy drinks'.

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has recently published a report 'Gathering consumption data on specific consumer groups of energy drinks' ([1]) in response to the identification by the Advisory Forum of EFSA of the increasing consumption of 'energy drinks', particularly in children and young adults, as a potential emerging risk ([2]).

Furthermore, as a result of the concerns raised by certain Member States, the Commission has requested EFSA to assess the safety of caffeine, in particular to determine whether and the extent to which the consumption of caffeine together with other food constituents such as alcohol or substances found in 'energy drinks' could present a risk to health as a result of interactions of these constituents ([3]). The risk assessment should be finalised by the end of 2013.

Directive 2002/67/EC ([4]) harmonises the labelling of beverages containing caffeine. For further details the Commission refers the Honourable Member to the answers given to the previous Written Questions E-000464/10 and E-002353/10 ([5]).

([1]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/doc/394e.pdf
([2]) Annual Report on the Emerging Risks Exchange Network 2011, EFSA-Q-2011-00399.
([3]) Question Number: EFSA-Q-2013-00220.
([4]) OJ L 191, 19.7.2002.
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-002323/13
à la Commission
Patrice Tirolien (S&D)
(28 février 2013)

Objet: Renouvellement de la décision 2004/162/CE en ce qui concerne les produits pouvant bénéficier d'une exonération ou d'une réduction de l'octroi de mer

Sur la base de l'article 349 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne (ex-article 299, paragraphe 2, du Traité CE), la Commission a rénové le mode de fonctionnement de l'octroi de mer en 2004. Ce dispositif est désormais une taxe qui impose de manière différenciée les produits vendus aux Antilles, en Guyane et à la Réunion.

Le rapport de la Commission du 14 décembre 2010 expose des manquements à la bonne évaluation de l'octroi de mer, notamment quant à son impact sur le niveau des prix. En outre, ce dispositif demeure très critiqué par les partenaires caribéens, dans le cadre des négociations de l'accord de partenariat économique entre l'Union européenne et le Cariforum.

Au demeurant, cette modification avait pour objectif principal de mettre la législation communautaire en accord avec la jurisprudence de la Cour de justice de l'Union. Elle introduit ainsi un dispositif plus équilibré permettant d'allier protection des économies insulaires et intégration au marché unique. Ce même rapport d'évaluation reconnaît à ce propos l'intérêt majeur de l'octroi de mer dans le maintien d'un certain nombre de «productions locales capables d'occuper une part plus ou moins grande du marché local». De plus, cette taxe contribue de manière importante au financement des autorités locales, dont les budgets sont particulièrement contraints par la crise économique. Cette taxe a donc une dimension systémique dans les économies et le financement de l'action publique dans les RUP.

1. La Commission entend-elle pérenniser l'octroi de mer? Quelles sont les pistes de réformes envisagées? Une annualisation de la révision de la liste de produits est-elle envisageable?

2. Comment la Commission entend-elle concilier l'octroi de mer et les attentes des partenaires ACP quant à l'entrée de leurs produits sur les territoires des RUP?

3. Il apparaît enfin que la future RUP de Mayotte sera privée de l'essentiel de ses financements entre la fin des droits de douane au 1er janvier 2014 et le renouvellement de l'octroi de mer en juillet 2014. Quelles dispositions transitoires la Commission entend-elle prendre pour pallier à ce vide juridique?

Réponse donnée par M Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(9 avril 2013)

Les autorités françaises ont manifesté leur intention de demander le renouvellement de la décision du Conseil 2004/162/CE du 10 février 2004 qui autorise l'application d'une taxation différenciée plus favorable pour certains produits fabriqués et consommés dans les départements français d'outre-mer (DOM) par rapport aux produits provenant de l'extérieur. Elles ont par ailleurs indiqué leur intention d'appliquer un dispositif similaire à Mayotte. Toutefois les autorités françaises n'ont pas à ce jour, ni pour Mayotte, ni pour les autres DOM introduit de demande formelle, spécifiant les produits précis concernés et les différentiations qu'elles souhaitent appliquer. La Commission n'est donc pas encore en mesure d'arrêter sa position sur ce dossier.

En tout état de cause, toute demande visant une autorisation à appliquer un régime tel que l'octroi de mer doit être dûment justifiée et basée sur des éléments appropriés permettant l'identification et l'évaluation de l'importance des surcouts à compenser.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002323/13
to the Commission
Patrice Tirolien (S&D)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Renewal of Decision 2004/162/EC with regard to products eligible for exemption from, or a reduction in, dock dues

In 2004, on the basis of what is now Article 349 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (formerly Article 299(2) of the EC Treaty), the Commission revised the functioning of the dock dues system. As a result, special rates of duty are now applied to products sold in the Antilles, French Guiana and Reunion.

The Commission report on the system published on 14 December 2010 exposed shortcomings in the way that dock dues are assessed, notably as regards their impact on prices. Moreover, in the EU-Cariforum partnership agreement negotiations, the Union's Caribbean partners have continued to level much criticism at the system.

The main aim of the revision was to bring the relevant Union legislation into line with Court of Justice rulings. To that end, it introduced more balanced arrangements to reconcile the protection of island economies with integration into the single market. In that regard, the Commission's evaluation report recognised the importance of the dock dues system in sustaining the production of a number of local products capable of occupying 'a greater or lesser share of the local market'. This form of duty also makes a major contribution to the revenue of local authorities whose budgets are severely squeezed by the economic crisis. Dock dues are thus of systemic importance to the economies of the outermost regions and the financing of public provision there.

1. Does the Commission intend to put the dock dues system on a permanent footing? What is the thrust of the reforms envisaged? Might the list of products concerned be revised on an annual basis?

2. How does the Commission intend to reconcile the dock dues system with the expectations of the Union's ACP partners in relation to access for their products to the outermost regions?

3. Lastly, it seems that Mayotte, due to become an EU outermost region, will lose most of its financing in the period between the end of customs duty on 1 January 2014 and the renewal of the dock dues system in July 2014. What transitional arrangements does the Commission intend to put in place to bridge this gap in legal provision?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2013)

The French authorities have expressed their intention to request renewal of Council Decision 2004/162/EC of 10 February 2004 authorising the application of a differential taxation scheme that favours certain products manufactured and consumed in the French overseas departments (DOMs) over imported products. Furthermore, they have indicated their intention to apply a similar scheme in Mayotte. However, the French authorities have not to date submitted a formal request, either for Mayotte or for the other DOMs, specifying the exact products concerned and the differentiation that they wish to apply. Therefore, the Commission is still not able to adopt a position on this matter.

All requests for authorisation to apply a scheme such as dock dues must in any case be duly substantiated and based on relevant factors, so that the extent of additional costs to be compensated may be identified and evaluated.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002324/13
a la Comisión
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(28 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Reapertura del procedimiento de infracción por contaminación de nitratos en la Comunidad Valenciana

En los casi tres años trascurridos desde que la Comisión Europea decidiera archivar el procedimiento de infracción por incumplimiento de la Directiva 91/676/CEE sobre nitratos (ES 2002/2009 ENVI), han seguido produciéndose en la Comunidad Valenciana casos de contaminación por este tipo de sustancias.

En concreto, en el municipio de Alzira se ha tenido que prohibir el consumo de agua del grifo tras detectarse restos de pesticidas por encima de los límites permitidos por la UE y de sustancias ya prohibidas por la legislación europea. El mismo caso se registró hace un año en el vecino municipio de Carcaixent, donde también tuvo que prohibirse el consumo de agua doméstica por no poderse garantizar su potabilidad.

La Comunidad Valenciana se comprometió en 2011 ante la Comisión Europea a tomar medidas para que la agricultura intensiva de regadío que se da en la zona no siguiera ocasionando graves problemas de exceso de nitratos en el agua. Sin embargo, tal y como demuestran los casos concretos de Alzira y Carcaixent, la cartografía presentada por las autoridades valencianas con sus correspondientes planes de gestión ha resultado insuficiente para garantizar la salubridad del agua y la salud de las poblaciones abastecidas.

A esta situación, hay que añadir el amplio plantel de incumplimientos de la legislación medioambiental sobre agua de los que las autoridades valencianas han tenido que dar cuenta a la Comisión en los últimos años, entre los que cabe citar las infracciones abiertas por violación de la Directiva relativa al agua destinada al consumo humano y los problemas derivados del incumplimiento de la normativa sobre depuración de las aguas residuales a cuya resolución la Unión Europea ha destinado fondos.

Ante los hechos aquí descritos:

1. ¿Considerará la Comisión la posibilidad de reabrir el expediente por incumplimiento de la Directiva sobre nitratos?

2. ¿Puede garantizar la Comisión que se está cumpliendo la legislación comunitaria relativa al agua destinada al consumo humano en el caso de la Comunidad Valenciana?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión está evaluando los resultados de los controles de calidad de las aguas de todos los Estados miembros, de conformidad con el artículo 10 de la Directiva sobre los nitratos ([1]), recibidos recientemente. Sobre la base del estado de calidad de las aguas y de las tendencias al respecto, incluida toda prueba del deterioro de la calidad del agua potable, la Comisión examinará si las zonas vulnerables a los nitratos y los programas de acción, incluidos los de la región de Valencia, se ajustan a los objetivos de la Directiva, y adoptará medidas en caso necesario.

Asimismo, la Comisión está evaluando los últimos datos comunicados en el marco de la Directiva relativa a la calidad de las aguas destinadas al consumo humano ([2]), que se refieren a los años 2008-2010. Analizará esos informes, en particular respecto a la región de Valencia, a fin de determinar si hay problemas sistemáticos de calidad del agua potable. En función de ese análisis, la Comisión decidirá sobre la adopción de medidas apropiadas.

([1]) Directiva 91/676/CEE, DO L 375 de 31.12.1991.
([2]) Directiva 98/83/CE, DO L330 de 5.12.1998.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002324/13
to the Commission
Andrés Perelló Rodríguez (S&D)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Reopening of infringement proceedings for nitrate pollution in Valencia

Almost three years ago, the Commission closed infringement proceedings for failure to comply with Directive 91/676/EEC on nitrates (ES 2002/2009 ENVI). However, cases of nitrate pollution have continued to occur in Valencia.

Specifically, residents in the municipality of Alzira have been banned from drinking tap water after it was found to contain traces of pesticides above EU limits and substances already banned by EU legislation. The same thing happened a year ago in the neighbouring municipality of Carcaixent, where residents were also banned from drinking domestic water whose potability was called into question.

In 2011 Valencia pledged to the Commission that it would take measures to ensure that irrigated intensive farming in the area would not continue to cause serious problems in terms of excess nitrates entering the water supply. However, as demonstrated by the specific cases of Alzira and Carcaixent, the cartography presented by the Valencian authorities and its corresponding management plans have proved incapable of guaranteeing the quality of water and the health of the people it is supplied to.

In addition, the Valencian authorities have had to report numerous breaches of environmental legislation on water to the Commission in recent years. These include open infringements for violation of the directive on water destined for human consumption and problems derived from the failure to comply with legislation on residual water purification, the resolution for which the EU has earmarked funds.

1. Will the Commission consider reopening proceedings for failure to comply with the directive on nitrates?

2. Can it guarantee compliance with EU legislation on water destined for human consumption in Valencia?

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

The Commission is currently assessing recently submitted water quality monitoring results from all Member States, in accordance with Article 10 of the Nitrates Directive ([1]). Based on water quality status and trends, including any relevant evidence on drinking water quality deterioration, the Commission will assess whether the current Nitrate Vulnerable Zones and Action Programmes, including in the Region of Valencia, are in line with achieving the objectives of the directive and will take action if appropriate.

The Commission is also assessing the latest reported data under the Drinking Water Directive ([2]) which refer to the years 2008-2010. The Commission will analyse these reports, including for the region of Valencia, in order to identify if systematic problems with drinking water quality are identified. Based on this analysis the Commission may decide to take appropriate action.

([1]) Directive 91/676/EEC, OJ L 375, 31.12.1991.
([2]) Directive 98/83/EC, OJ L 330, 5.12.1998.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002325/13
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(28. februar 2013)

Om: Krydsoverensstemmelsesregler

Europæiske landmænd kan kun modtage den fulde udbetaling af EU's direkte landbrugsstøtte, hvis de overholder krydsoverensstemmelsesreglerne, som indeholder en række krav til miljø, sundhed, dyrevelfærd og god landbrugsmæssig stand (forordning (EF) nr. 1122/2009).

Den enkelte landmand skal bl.a. angive nøjagtige arealangivelser og oplysninger om plantedækkesammensætningen for at overholde krydsoverensstemmelsesreglerne, jf. betragtning 16 i forordningen

På den baggrund bedes Kommissionen oplyse antallet af overtrædelser af krydsoverensstemmelsesreglerne og/eller fejlindberetninger i ansøgningen om landbrugsstøtte fordelt på medlemslande i hhv. årene 2010, 2011 og 2012.

Kommissionen bedes yderligere oplyse, hvor stort et beløb af landbrugsstøtten i de enkelte medlemslande, der blev tilbageholdt på grund af overtrædelser af krydsoverensstemmelsesreglerne og/eller fejlindberetning i ansøgningen om landbrugsstøtte i hhv. 2010, 2011 og i 2012.

Kommissionen bedes endvidere oplyse, hvad det koster myndighederne i medlemsstaterne at føre kontrol og tilsyn med landmænds ansøgninger om landbrugsstøtte og overholdelse af krydsoverensstemmelsesreglerne.

Ydermere bedes Kommissionen oplyse, om den mener, der eksisterer en rimelig sammenhæng mellem omkostningerne til kontrol og tilsyn med overholdelse af krydsoverensstemmelsesreglerne i forhold til antallet af konstaterede brud på krydsoverensstemmelsesreglerne og/eller fejlindberetninger i ansøgningen om landbrugsstøtte.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Dacian Cioloş
(23. april 2013)

Den senest foreliggende statistik vedrørende overtrædelser af krydsoverensstemmelsesreglerne i medlemsstaterne og om konsekvenserne heraf for landbrugsstøtten omhandler regnskabsåret 2011/ansøgningsåret 2010. Dette svar er vedlagt to bilag. I bilag I angives antallet af ansøgere, antallet af kontroller på stedet og antallet af ansøgere, der er blevet pålagt sanktioner. I bilag II angives det samlede støttebeløb, der er blevet udbetalt til henholdsvis samtlige ansøgere og ansøgere, der er blevet kontrolleret, samt det samlede antal sanktioner per medlemsstat for overtrædelse af krydsoverensstemmelsesreglerne som led i henholdsvis specifikke kontroller af krydsoverensstemmelse og som led i andre kontroller (bilag II). For så vidt angår regnskabsåret 2010 vedrører de foreliggende tal udelukkende antallet af ansøgere, der blev pålagt sanktioner (bilag III).

Samme oplysninger vedrørende fejlindberetninger i ansøgninger, resultaterne af administrative kontroller og kontroller på stedet af arealers støtteberettigelse er ligeledes vedlagt for regnskabsårene 2010 og 2011 (bilag IV og V).

Bilag I og V findes i GD AGRI's årlige aktivitetsrapport for 2011 sammen med en kortfattet redegørelse ([1]). Bilag III og IV findes i den årlige aktivitetsrapport for 2010.

Samme oplysninger for regnskabsåret 2012 findes i DG AGRI's årlige aktivitetsrapport for 2012, som DG AGRI er ved at lægge sidste hånd på.

Det skal nævnes, at sanktionssystemet for krydsoverensstemmelsesreglerne har til formål at tilskynde landmænd i EU til at overholde de grundlæggende milljøforskrifter. Derfor bør udbyttet af kontrollerne af overholdelsen af krydsoverensstemmelsesreglerne ikke måles på antallet af overtrædelser, men snarere på landmændenes overholdelse af disse miljøforskrifter.

Medlemsstaterne tilrettelægger kontrollerne forskelligt og fremlægger ikke systematiske oplysninger om omkostningerne ved dem.

([1]) Side 98 og 116 i bilagene og side 39 og 46 i den årlige aktivitetsrapport for 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002325/13
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Cross-compliance rules

Direct EU agricultural support can be paid in full to EU farmers only if they observe cross-compliance rules, under which there are a number of requirements to be met with regard to the environment, health, animal welfare and good agricultural conditions (Regulation (EC) No 1122/2009).

Farmers must *inter alia* make precise area declarations and provide information on plant cover composition in order to meet cross-compliance rules (cf. Recital 16 in the regulation).

In the light of this, would the Commission say how many breaches of cross-compliance rules and/or incorrect calculations in applications for agricultural support there were, broken down by Member State, in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

Would the Commission further say what amount of agricultural support was withheld in each Member State in 2010, 2011 and 2012 because of breaches of cross-compliance rules and/or incorrect calculations in applications for agricultural support.

Would the Commission moreover say how much it costs Member State authorities to check farmers' applications for agricultural support and verify that cross-compliance rules are being met.

Would the Commission also say whether, in its opinion, the cost of checking and verifying observance of cross-compliance rules is reasonably in proportion to the number of cross-compliance rule breaches and/or incorrect calculations in agricultural support applications which are established.

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)

The latest available statistics regarding breaches of the Cross-Compliance requirements in the Member States and their impact in terms of agricultural support, concern financial year 2011 in respect of claim year 2010. Two tables are annexed one of which contains the number of claimants, the number of on-the-spot-checks and the number of claimants sanctioned (Annex I) and the other contains the total amount of aid paid to all claimants, to the claimants checked and the total amount of sanctions per Member State split between cross-compliance sanctions due to specific cross-compliance checks and to other checks (Annex II). For financial year 2010, the information available only relates to the number of claimants sanctioned (Annex III).

The same information regarding the incorrect calculations in applications, the results of administrative and on-the-spot-checks for land eligibility is also annexed as a table for financial year 2010 and 2011 (Annex IV and V).

Annexes I and V can be found in the 2011 annual activity report of DG AGRI with an explanatory summary ([1]) and Annexes III and IV in the 2010 annual activity report.

The same information for financial year 2012, is currently being finalised and will be available in the 2012 annual activity report of DG AGRI.

It should be mentioned that the cross-compliance sanctioning system's objective is to encourage European farmers to comply with underlying environmental regulations. Therefore the benefit of cross-compliance controls should not be measured by number of breaches but rather seen in the light of the respect of these environmental regulations by the farmers.

Organisation of controls is different in every Member State and they do not provide systematic information on the cost of those controls.

([1]) Pages 98 and 116 of annexes and pages 39 and 46 of AAR 2011.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002326/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ισοζύγιο εμβασμάτων στην ελληνική οικονομία

Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία που διαθέτει για το ισοζύγιο των εμβασμάτων στην Ελλάδα κατά το προηγούμενο έτος (2012); Διαπιστώνεται έλλειμμα ή πλεόνασμα; Προς ποιες χώρες κατευθύνονται τα μεγαλύτερα ποσά; Σε σχέση με τα τελευταία χρόνια διαπιστώνεται σημαντική μεταβολή του συγκεκριμένου ισοζυγίου;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Απριλίου 2013)

Η Eurostat παρέχει τριμηνιαία στοιχεία όσον αφορά τα εμβάσματα των εργαζομένων. Η τελευταία δημοσίευση στον ιστότοπό της παρέχει στοιχεία μέχρι το τρίτο τρίμηνο του 2012.

Σύμφωνα με αυτά τα στοιχεία, κατά παράδοση η Ελλάδα ήταν καθαρός αποδέκτης εμβασμάτων από τον υπόλοιπο κόσμο. Με άλλα λόγια, οι εργαζόμενοι στον υπόλοιπο κόσμο αποστέλλουν περισσότερα εμβάσματα στην Ελλάδα από αυτά που αποστέλλουν οι εργαζόμενοι στην Ελλάδα προς τον υπόλοιπο κόσμο.

Ωστόσο, εξαιτίας της σοβαρής μείωσης των εμβασμάτων με προορισμό την Ελλάδα, η τάση αυτή αντιστράφηκε σύμφωνα με πρόσφατα δεδομένα. Από το δεύτερο τρίμηνο του 2010, οι εργαζόμενοι στην Ελλάδα αποστέλλουν περισσότερα εμβάσματα στον υπόλοιπο κόσμο σε σύγκριση με αυτά που λαμβάνει η Ελλάδα. Το 2011, οι εργαζόμενοι στην Ελλάδα απέστειλαν εμβάσματα ύψους 922 εκατ. ευρώ προς τον υπόλοιπο κόσμο. Οι εργαζόμενοι από τον υπόλοιπο κόσμο απέστειλαν εμβάσματα ύψους 663 εκατ. ευρώ στην Ελλάδα. Οι εκροές εμβασμάτων από την Ελλάδα υπερέβησαν τις εισροές προς την Ελλάδα κατά 259 εκατ. ευρώ.

Στα πρώτα τρία τρίμηνα του 2012, τα εμβάσματα που αποστάλθηκαν από την Ελλάδα υπερέβησαν τα εμβάσματα που αποστάλθηκαν στην Ελλάδα κατά 272 εκατ. ευρώ. Ο αντίστοιχος αριθμός κατά τα τρία πρώτα τρίμηνα του 2011 ανήλθε σε 196 εκατ. ευρώ. Εντούτοις, θα πρέπει να σημειωθεί ότι τα στοιχεία σχετικά με τις πιο πρόσφατες εξελίξεις μετά και την παρέλευση του τρίτου τριμήνου του 2012 δεν έχουν δημοσιευτεί ακόμη από την Eurostat.

Το 2011, οι σημαντικότερες εισροές εμβασμάτων στην Ελλάδα προήλθαν από τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και ανήλθαν στα 324 εκατ. ευρώ (48% του συνόλου των εισροών εμβασμάτων), από τη Γερμανία στα 254 εκατ. ευρώ (38%), το Βέλγιο στα 28 εκατ. ευρώ (4%), το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο στα 12 εκατ. ευρώ (2%) και τον Καναδά στα 10 εκατομμύρια ευρώ (2%).

Η σημαντικότερη εκροή εμβασμάτων από την Ελλάδα είχε προορισμό την Αλβανία και ανήλθε στα 405 εκατ. ευρώ (44%), τη Γεωργία όπου το ποσό ανήλθε στα 118 εκατ. ευρώ (13%), τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες στα 86 εκατ. ευρώ (9%), το Ισραήλ στα 56 εκατ. ευρώ (6%) και τη Γερμανία στα 50 εκατ. ευρώ (5%).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002326/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Balance of remittances in the Greek economy

On the basis of the data available to it, can the Commission provide information on the balance of remittances in Greece last year (2012)? Was there a deficit or a surplus? To which countries are the largest amounts being remitted? Compared to the last few years, has there been any significant change in this balance?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(15 April 2013)

Eurostat provides quarterly data on worker's remittances. The latest release on their website offers data until Q3 2012.

According to this data, Greece has traditionally been a net recipient of remittances from the rest of the world. In other words, workers in the rest of the world have been sending more remittances to Greece than workers in Greece have sent to the rest of the world.

However, driven by a large decline in remittances sent to Greece, this pattern has reversed in recent data. Since Q2 2010, workers in Greece have been sending more remittances to the rest of the world than Greece has been receiving. In 2011, workers in Greece have sent EUR 922 million in remittances to the rest of the world. Workers in the rest of the world have sent EUR 663 million in remittances to Greece. On net, remittances from Greece have exceeded remittances to Greece by EUR 260 million.

In the first three quarters of 2012, remittances sent from Greece exceeded remittances sent to Greece by EUR 272 million. The equivalent number in the first three quarters of 2011 was EUR 196 million. However, one should note that data on more recent developments after Q3 2012 is not yet published by Eurostat.

In 2011, the largest inflows of remittances to Greece came from the United States with EUR 324 million (48% of total remittance inflows), Germany with EUR 254 million (38%), Belgium with EUR 28 million (4%), the United Kingdom with EUR 12 million (2%) and Canada with EUR 10 million (2%).

The largest outflow of remittances from Greece went to Albania with EUR 405 million (44%), Georgia with EUR 118 million (13%), the United States with EUR 86 million (9%), Israel with EUR 56 million (6%) and Germany with EUR 50 million (5%).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002327/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Αδρανείς τραπεζικές καταθέσεις στην ΕΕ

Διαθέτει η Επιτροπή στοιχεία για το ύψος των αδρανών τραπεζικών καταθέσεων στην ΕΕ; Ποια η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας; Καθώς στα κράτη μέλη υπάρχει σε εξέλιξη συζήτηση σχετικά με την αξιοποίησή τους, είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή κατά πόσον η αξιοποίηση των αδρανών καταθέσεων προς όφελος του δημοσίου συμφέροντος είναι συμβατή με το κοινοτικό δίκαιο;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Απριλίου 2013)

Δεν υπάρχει ενωσιακή νομοθεσία που να ρυθμίζει τη χρήση αδρανών λογαριασμών και η κατάσταση αυτή ποικίλλει από το ένα κράτος μέλος στο άλλο. Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία που διαβιβάστηκαν από 23 κράτη μέλη το 2012, υπάρχουν τρεις κύριοι τύποι προσέγγισης των αδρανών λογαριασμών:

1. Σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη, τα ποσά που τηρούνται σε αδρανείς λογαριασμούς παραμένουν για πάντα στην απόλυτη κυριότητα των πελατών και συνεπώς δεν είναι διαθέσιμα για κανένα άλλο σκοπό.

2. Σε αρκετά κράτη μέλη η νομοθεσία προβλέπει την παραγραφή ή τον αποκλεισμό του δικαιώματος αυτού, 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 όσον αφορά τους αδρανείς λογαριασμούς που να προβλέπει τι συμβαίνει με τις καταθέσεις μετά την πάροδο του εν λόγω χρονικού διαστήματος.

3. Σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη, τα ποσά 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 απαιτήσεις.

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με τα ποσά των αδρανών καταθέσεων στις ελληνικές τράπεζες. Η ερώτηση αυτή θα πρέπει να απευθυνθεί στις ελληνικές δημόσιες αρχές. Ωστόσο, ο ελληνικός 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-002327/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Dormant bank deposits in the EU

Does the Commission have any data on the amount of money lying in dormant bank deposits in the EU? What is the situation in Greece? Since there is an ongoing debate in Member States about the use of such deposits, can the Commission say whether the use of dormant deposits in the public interest is compatible with Community law?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(12 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, there are 3 main types of approaches to dormant accounts:

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. In some Member States funds are transferred to the state or used for special purposes by the government. In 2 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 amounts of dormant deposits in Greek banks. This question should be addressed to the Greek public authorities. However, Greek law 1195/1942 foresees that: 'amounts held in dormant deposits are transferred by the credit institution to the Greek state after the elapse of a twenty year period since the last movement of the account.'

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002328/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Απειλές στο διαδίκτυο

Σύμφωνα με έκθεση της McAfee Labs ο αριθμός των απειλών στο διαδίκτυο παγκοσμίως αυξάνεται με ανησυχητικό ρυθμό. Για παράδειγμα, το ποσοστό κλοπής μοναδικών κωδικών μέσω Trojans έχει αυξηθεί κατά 72% το τελευταίο τρίμηνο, ενώ διαπιστώνεται ότι οι περισσότερες επιθέσεις phishing εξακολουθούν να έχουν βασικό στόχο τα χρηματοπιστωτικά ιδρύματα, αλλά έχουν εξαπλωθεί και σε άλλους τομείς, όπως τα τυχερά παιχνίδια.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει αν διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με το ποσοστό των ευρωπαίων πολιτών που έχουν πέσει τουλάχιστον μια φορά θύμα απειλής στο διαδίκτυο;

2. Αξιολογεί πως οι μέχρι σήμερα πρωτοβουλίες της στην προσπάθεια περιορισμού των συγκεκριμένων απειλών ανταποκρίνονται στις διαρκώς αυξανόμενες διαδικτυακές απειλές;

Απάντηση της κ. Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Απριλίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή διεξήγαγε ειδική έρευνα του Ευρωβαρομέτρου το 2012 για την ασφάλεια στον κυβερνοχώρο. Στην έρευνα περισσότερο από το ένα τρίτο των χρηστών του Διαδικτύου ανά τη ΕΕ (38%) ανέφεραν ότι έχουν λάβει ηλεκτρονικά μηνύματα, με τα οποία τους ζητούσαν με δόλιο τρόπο χρήματα ή προσωπικά δεδομένα. Επιπλέον, το 13% αυτών δεν μπόρεσαν να έχουν ηλεκτρονική πρόσβαση σε υπηρεσίες εξαιτίας επιθέσεων στον κυβερνοχώρο και το 12% έπεσαν θύματα ηλεκτρονικής απάτης. Το 8% των χρηστών του Διαδικτύου ανέφεραν ότι τους υπεκλάπησαν τα στοιχεία ταυτότητά τους ([1]).

Παρά ταύτα και μολονότι και άλλες μελέτες δείχνουν ότι οι απειλές και το έγκλημα μέσω του κυβερνοχώρου παρουσιάζουν εν γένει άνοδο, σημειώθηκε ταυτόχρονα κάποια πρόοδος στην καταπολέμηση του ηλεκτρονικού εγκλήματος, χάρη ιδίως στην εξαιρετική συνεργασία μεταξύ των κρατών μελών της ΕΕ και άλλων χωρών. Παραδείγματος χάρη, μόλις πριν από λίγες ημέρες εξαρθρώθηκε ένα παγκόσμιο εγκληματικό δίκτυο, το οποίο διέπραττε απάτες με στόχο τις πιστωτικές κάρτες και τις ηλεκτρονικές συναλλαγές, με διεθνή αστυνομική επιχείρηση της Ρουμανικής Μονάδας κατά του Ηλεκτρονικού Εγκλήματος, σε στενή συνεργασία με το Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο κατά του Ηλεκτρονικού Εγκλήματος (EC3) ([2]).

Για να εξασφαλισθεί η επιτυχής καταπολέμηση του ηλεκτρονικού εγκλήματος, η εν λόγω συνεργασία είναι αποφασιστικής σημασίας, όπως και η διαμόρφωση του αναγκαίου νομοθετικού και θεσμικού πλαισίου για την ανάπτυξη διεθνούς συνεργασίας. Αυτός είναι και ο λόγος για τον οποίο η Επιτροπή πρότεινε, μεταξύ άλλων, την οδηγία για τις επιθέσεις κατά των συστημάτων πληροφοριών, η οποία αναμένεται να εκδοθεί το συντομότερο δυνατόν ([3]), δημιούργησε το EC3, το οποίο άρχισε να λειτουργεί από τον Ιανουάριο του 2013, δρομολόγησε τον Δεκέμβριο του 2012 την Παγκόσμια Συμμαχία κατά της Σεξουαλικής Κακοποίησης Παιδιών στο Διαδίκτυο και ενέκρινε στρατηγική για την προστασία του κυβερνοχώρου της ΕΕ και πρόταση οδηγίας για την ασφάλεια δικτύων και πληροφοριών, με σκοπό να βελτιωθεί το συνολικό επίπεδο ασφάλειας και προστασίας από περιστατικά και επιθέσεις στον κυβερνοχώρο στον δημόσιο και τον ιδιωτικό τομέα.

([1]) Ειδικό ευρωβαρόμετρο 390 — Ασφάλεια στον κυβερνοχώρο, Ιούλιος 2012, σ. 46.
([2]) https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/global-credit-card-fraud-network-dismantled
([3]) COM(2010)517 τελικό.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002328/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Web threats

According to a report by McAfee Labs, the number of web threats is increasing worldwide at an alarming rate. For example, the percentage of thefts of unique codes via Trojans has increased by 72% in the last quarter and it has been found that, while most phishing attacks still basically target financial institutions, they have also spread to other areas, such as gaming.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have any data on the percentage of European citizens who have fallen victim at least once to a web threat?

2. Can it assess how the initiatives taken so far to tackle specific threats are able to keep up with the ever increasing number of online threats?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

The Commission conducted a Special Eurobarometer survey on Cyber Security in 2012. In response to this survey, more than a third of Internet users across the EU (38%) reported having received emails fraudulently asking for money or personal details. In addition, 13% have not been able to access online services because of cyber-attacks, and 12% have experienced online fraud. 8% of Internet users say they have experienced identity theft ([1]).

While this and other reports suggest that web threats and cybercrime on the whole are on the rise, there have also been some successes in the fight against cybercrime, notably due to excellent cooperation between EU Member States and beyond. For instance, just a few days ago a global fraud network focused on credit card and online fraud was dismantled in an international police operation led by the Romanian Cybercrime Unit, in close cooperation with the European Cybercrime Centre (EC3) ([2]).

To ensure success in the fight against cybercrime, such close cooperation is key, and it is essential to ensure that the necessary legislative and institutional framework for international cooperation is in place. That is why the Commission has, *inter alia*, proposed the directive on Attacks against Information Systems, which should be adopted as soon as possible ([3]); created the EC3, which has been operational since January 2013; launched the Global Alliance against Child Sexual Abuse Online in December 2012; and adopted a Cybersecurity Strategy for the EU and a proposal for a directive on network and information security to improve the overall level of security and protection against cyber incidents and attacks in the public and the private sector.

([1]) Special Eurobarometer 390 — Cyber Security, July 2012, p. 46.
([2]) https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/global-credit-card-fraud-network-dismantled.
([3]) COM(2010) 517 final.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002329/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Άστεγοι στην ΕΕ

Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή αν διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με την έκταση του φαινομένου των αστέγων στα κράτη μέλη και την μεταβολή του αριθμού τους σε σχέση με το παρελθόν; Διαπιστώνει ότι τα κράτη μέλη — ιδίως εκείνα που βρίσκονται σε οικονομική κρίση — εφαρμόζουν πολιτικές περιορισμού του κοινωνικού προβλήματος; Διαπιστώνει την ύπαρξη και εφαρμογή βέλτιστων πρακτικών ή πιλοτικών προγραμμάτων σε κράτη μέλη τα οποία θα μπορούσαν ως καλές πρακτικές να υιοθετηθούν και από άλλα κράτη μέλη;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(25 Απριλίου 2013)

Το «Πακέτο κοινωνικών επενδύσεων» και ιδίως το έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής (ΕΕΥΕ) «Αντιμετωπίζοντας το πρόβλημα των αστέγων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση» ([1]), καταγράφει την εξέλιξη του προβλήματος των αστέγων σε επίπεδο ΕΕ και προτείνει ορθές πρακτικές που επιτρέπουν στα κράτη μέλη να αντιμετωπίσουν αποτελεσματικά το εν λόγω πρόβλημα με την υποστήριξη της ΕΕ.

Μολονότι δεν είναι διαθέσιμα εναρμονισμένα δεδομένα σε επίπεδο ΕΕ, το ΕΕΥΕ επισημαίνει ότι οι άστεγοι φαίνεται να έχουν αυξηθεί στα περισσότερα κράτη μέλη, τόσο ως αποτέλεσμα της κρίσης, όσο και ως αποτέλεσμα άλλων κοινωνικοοικονομικών παραγόντων, όπως η γήρανση του πληθυσμού, η μετανάστευση και οι δυσμενείς αλλαγές στη στεγαστική αγορά. Επίσης, μεταξύ εκείνων που κινδυνεύουν να μείνουν άστεγοι, συγκεταλέγονται τώρα περισσότεροι νέοι, μετανάστες, άτομα που ζουν σε συνθήκες ένδειας, γυναίκες, οικογένειες με παιδιά και Ρομά.

Για να ανταποκριθεί στο πρόβλημα, το «Πακέτο κοινωνικών επενδύσεων» προτείνει τα κράτη μέλη να προβούν σε ριζικές μεταρρυθμίσεις για την υλοποίηση ολοκληρωμένων, προσανατολισμένων στη στέγαση και συναφών προληπτικών στρατηγικών, σε αναθεώρηση του ρυθμιστικού πλαισίου για τις εξώσεις και σε κινητοποίηση των κονδυλίων της ΕΕ, σύμφωνα με τις οδηγίες που παρέχονται στο ΕΕΥΕ. Η Επιτροπή θα συνεχίσει να θέτει το θέμα των αστέγων στο πλαίσιο των προσπαθειών για την εφαρμογή της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020» κατά τις διαδικασίες του μελλοντικού ευρωπαϊκού εξαμήνου.

Ορισμένα έργα κοινωνικού πειραματισμού της ΕΕ που χρηματοδοτούνται στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος «Progress» σχετίζονται με την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος των αστέγων. Περαιτέρω χρηματοδότηση καινοτόμων προσεγγίσεων του προβλήματος έχει προταθεί στο πλαίσιο του πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου για την προσεχή περίοδο. Παραδείγματος χάριν, τα αποτελέσματα του έργου *Housing First Europe* και του πιλοτικού έργου *Work in Stations*, τα οποία αναμένονται στα τέλη του 2013, καθώς και ενός νέου πιλοτικού έργου, το οποίο αφορά το δικαίωμα στη στέγαση και θα δρομολογηθεί εντός του τρέχοντος εξαμήνου, μπορεί να δημιουργήσουν νέες προοπτικές στην αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος των αστέγων.

([1]) SWD(2013) 42 τελικό της 20 Φεβρουαρίου 2013, στη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en&newsId=1807&moreDocuments=yes&tableName=news

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002329/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Homeless people in the EU

Can the Commission say whether it has any information on the extent of homelessness in the Member States and the change in the number of homeless people compared with the past? Has it found that Member States — particularly those experiencing an economic crisis — are pursuing policies aimed at reducing this social problem? Has if identified the existence of best practices or pilot programmes being implemented in Member States which could also be adopted as best practices by other Member States?

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

The Social Investment Package and in particular the Commission Staff Working Document (CSWD) 'Confronting Homelessness in the European Union' ([1]), identifies EU-wide trends in homelessness and proposes good practice enabling the Member States to tackle homelessness effectively with the EU's support.

Although harmonised data at EU level are not available, the CSWD points out that homelessness seems to have increased in most Member States, both as an effect of the crisis and as a result of other socioeconomic factors, such as ageing, migration and adverse changes on the housing market. There are now also more young people, migrants, people living in poverty, women, families with children and Roma among the homeless and those at risk of homelessness.

To take up the challenge, the Social Investment Package proposes that the Member States undertake comprehensive reforms to implement integrated, housing-led, preventative homelessness strategies, revise the regulatory framework for evictions and mobilise the EU Funds, in line with the guidance provided in the CSWD. The Commission will continue to raise the topic of homelessness in connection with efforts to implement the Europe 2020 strategy in future European Semester procedures.

A number of EU social experimentation projects financed under the Progress programme are relevant to homelessness. Further funding of innovative approaches to the problem has been proposed under the Multiannual Financial Framework for the forthcoming period. For instance, the results of the *Housing First Europe* project and the *Work in Stations* pilot project, which are expected in late 2013 and of a new pilot project on the right to housing to be launched this semester, may offer new avenues for tackling homelessness.

([1]) SWD(2013) 42 final of 20 February 2013, at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1044&langId=en&newsId=1807&moreDocuments=yes&tableName=news

(An t-eagrán Gaeilge)

Ceist i gcomhair freagra scríofa E-002330/13
chuig an gCoimisiún
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(28 Feabhra 2013)

Ábhar: Spriocanna Forbartha na Mílaoise

De réir fhigiúirí na Náisiún Aontaithe, tá 85 % de 118 dtír i ndiaidh sprioc mílaoise amháin ar a laghad a chur i bhfeidhm ó cuireadh tús leis an gclár. Meastar go mbeidh ráta bochtanais domhanda 15 % bainte amach faoi 2015, ráta atá i bhfad níos ísle ná an sprioc 23 % a leagadh síos. Ina ainneoin sin, tá ag teipeadh ar roinnt Spriocanna Forbartha eile Mílaoise; na spriocanna sin a bhaineann mar shampla leis an gcaighdeán oideachais a bhíonn ar fáil, leis an líon páistí a bhíonn ag freastal ar scoileanna dara leibhéal, leis an neamhionannas inscne agus leis an bhforéigean i gcoinne na mban.

An bhféadfadh an Coimisiún eolas a thabhairt maidir lena bhfuil á dhéanamh chun tuiscint cheart a fháil ar an bhfáth nach bhfuil ag éirí le Spriocanna Forbartha na Mílaoise go háirithe i réimse an chomhionannais inscne agus cé na bearta is féidir a chur i bhfeidhm chun dul i ngleic leis na teipeanna sin? Tá dul chun cinn suntasach déanta ó thaobh deiseanna bunoideachais do chailíní de, agus 96 cailín do gach 100 buachaill ag freastal ar bhunscoil sna réigiúin atá i mbéal forbartha. Tá éagothroime inscne fós ann san oideachas dara leibhéal, áfach. I gceantair amhail ceantar Orissa na hIndia, ní éiríonn le 71 % de chailíní an mheánscolaíocht a chríochnú. Céard atá á dhéanamh chun aghaidh a thabhairt ar an ráta ard sin?

Freagra ón gCoimisinéir Piebalgson thar ceann an Choimisiúin
(25 Aibreán 2013)

Aontaíonn an Coimisiún leis an tuairim go bhfuil dul chun cinn nach beag déanta ar chuspóir Sprioc Forbraíochta na Mílaoise (SPM3) maidir le comhionannas inscne san oideachas, ach mar sin féin tá an Coimisiún den tuairim go maireann éagothroime fós agus go bhfuiltear fós féin ag déanamh leithcheala ar na mná i dtaca le rochtain ar an oideachas, ar obair agus ar shócmhainní eacnamaíocha, agus i dtaca le rannpháirtíocht sa rialtas.

Tá Pleananna Gníomhaíochta an AE maidir le Comhionnanas Inscne um Fhorbraíocht 2010-2015 (CIF), agus maidir le Cearta Daonna agus an Daonlathas (2012), bunaithe ar an bprionsabal gur bunriachtanas é an comhionannas inscne chun na SPManna uile a bhaint amach. Tá sé mar chuspóir acu inniúlacht an AE a fheabhsú chun cur leis na SPManna a bhaineann le hinscne.

Tá roinnt sásraí á gcur ar bun faoin bPlean Gníomhaíochta CIF chun comhtháthú an chomhionannais inscne a neartú i ngach gníomhaíocht forbraíochta, agus cuirtear béim láidir sna sásraí sin ar an oideachas ar leibhéal na bunscoile chomh maith le leibhéal na meánscoile agus na hollscoile.

Is léir ó na tuarascálacha forfheidhmiúcháin go bhfuil níos mó scagtha á dhéanamh ar ár gcláir i dtaca le híogaireacht inscne agus go bhfuil na táscairí iomchuí á gcur i bhfeidhm lena áirithiú go mbaineann na mná an tairbhe chéanna as na gníomhaíochtaí forbraíochta. Pléitear na hábhair imní seo níos minice anois i gcomhráití polaitiúla le tíortha comhpháirteacha ([1]).

Measann an Coimisiún gur gá níos mó a dhéanamh chun na SPManna a bhaint amach faoi 2015 agus gur cheart go leanfaí leis an gcomhionannas inscne mar thosaíocht thábhachtach don tréimhse tar éis 2015.

Maidir leis an India, tá comhionannas inscne bainte amach cheana féin san oideachas ar leibhéal na bunscolaíochta. Tá bearta ar leith á gcur chun feidhme lena áirithiú go mbeidh rochtain uilíoch ar an meánscolaíocht ag gach cailín faoin mbliain 2017. Leis an ranníocaíocht de EUR 80 milliún don tréimhse 2011 go 2013 atá sé a thabhairt do chláir na hIndia maidir le rochtain uilíoch ar bhunscolaíocht agus ar mheánscolaíocht d'ardchaighdeán, lena n-áirítear rochtain ag cailíní, tá an AE ag cuidiú leis an India a áirithiú go mbeidh comhionannas inscne sa mheánscolaíocht freisin.

([1]) Ó 2004 i leith, a bhuíochas sin don tacaíocht ón AE, tá breis is 9 milliún scoláire tar éis clárú ar an rolla sa chóras bunscolaíochta agus breis is 85 000 cailín nua sa chóras meánscolaíochta, rinneadh breis is 10 milliún comhairliúchán maidir le sláinte atáirgthe agus cuireadh cúram ó phearsanra sláinte oilte ar fáil ag 4 mhilliún breith. Le tuilleadh eolais a fháil, téigh go dtí an suíomh gréasáin: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/millenium-development-goals/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002330/13
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Millennium Development Goals

According to UN figures, 85% of 118 countries have implemented at least one millennium goal since the programme began. It is expected that global poverty will have reached 15% by 2015, a rate which is much lower than the 23% target which was set. Nevertheless, the Millennium Goals have failed in other ways, for example as regards the goals on the quality of education available, the number of children who attend secondary schools and issues of gender inequality and violence against women.

Could the Commission provide information about what is being done in order to get a proper understanding of the failures of the Millennium Development Goals, particularly in the area of gender equality? What measures can be put in place to deal with these failures? Significant progress has been made regarding primary education opportunities for girls, with 96 girls for every 100 boys attending primary school in developing regions. However, gender inequality still exists in second level education. In places such as the Orissa district of India, 71% of girls fail to complete secondary education. What is being done to address this high rate?

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

The Commission agrees that although good progress has been achieved on the Millennium Development Goal (MDG3) target on gender parity in education, gender inequality persists and women continue to face discrimination in access to education, work and economic assets, and participation in government.

The EU Plans of Action, on Gender Equality in Development 2010- 2015 (GAP), and on Human Rights and Democracy (2012) are based on the conviction that gender equality is central to achieving all the MDGs. They endeavour to improve the EU's ability to contribute towards the gender related MDGs.

The GAP puts in place a number of mechanisms to strengthen the integration of gender equality in all development activities, with strong emphasis on education, at the primary as well as the secondary and university level.

The implementation reports show that an increasing number of our programmes are screened against their gender sensitiveness and that appropriate indicators are being applied to check that women benefit equally from development activities. These concerns are also more often raised in political and policy dialogues with partner countries ([1]).

The Commission considers that further efforts are necessary to attain MDG3 by 2015 and that gender equality should remain an important priority for the post 2015 period.

Concerning India, gender parity has already been achieved in primary education. Special measures are being implemented to ensure universal access for all girls by 2017 to secondary education. Through its contribution of EUR 80 million for 2011-2013 to India's programmes for universal access, including for girls, to quality primary and secondary education, the EU is helping India to ensure gender parity also in secondary education.

([1]) Since 2004, thanks to the EU's support, more than 9 million pupils have been enrolled in primary education and more than 85,000 new female students in secondary education, more than 10 million consultations on reproductive health were carried out and 4 million births were attended by skilled health personnel. For more information, please refer to the following website: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/millenium-development-goals/index_en.htm

(An t-eagrán Gaeilge)

Ceist i gcomhair freagra scríofa E-002331/13
chuig an gCoimisiún
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(28 Feabhra 2013)

Ábhar: Bogearraí agus Cleachtais Shriantacha Ghnó

Is clár fíorúsáideach é *Microsoft Office* a bhfuil an-tóir air agus a bhíonn á úsáid go laethúil ag na milliúin Eorpach. Rinne *Microsoft* athrú le déanaí ar Chomhaontú Ceadúnaithe Úsáideora Deiridh na cuideachta ionas nach féidir le duine *Microsoft Office* a úsáid anois ach ar ghléas ríomhaireachta amháin de chuid an cheannaitheora. Is é an toradh atá air seo ná go mbíonn an tomhaltóir faoi bhrú síntiús a íoc le haghaidh phlean *Microsoft 365*, rud a cheadaíonn don úsáideoir ceadúnas agus bogearraí a fháil ar cíos agus iad a úsáid ar ghléasanna iolracha ríomhaireachta. Is údar imní é seo, go háirithe ós rud é go bhfuil rialuithe ann ó Chúirt Bhreithiúnais an Aontais Eorpaigh lena gceadaítear bogearraí úsáidte a dhíol.

An bhféadfadh an Coimisiún a thuairim a thabhairt maidir le cleachtais shriantacha ghnó den chineál seo agus an sáraíonn siad dlíthe iomaíochta an AE toisc an ceannas atá ag *Microsoft Office* sa mhargadh?

Freagra ón gCoimisinéir Almunia thar ceann an Choimisiúin
(18 Aibreán 2013)

Is gnáthchleachtas é ag díoltóirí i dtionscal na mbogearraí saghsanna éagsúla ceadúnas bogearraí a thairiscint de réir riachtanais a gcustaiméirí agus praghas dá réir a chur orthu. Ní haon chúis imní an cleachtas sin ó thaobh iomaíochta de toisc go ligeann sé do thomhaltóirí an pacáiste ceadúnúcháin is fearr a oireann dá riachtanais a cheannach ar phraghas a oireann dóibh.

Bheadh aon mheasúnú a dhéanfaí faoi dhlí iomaíochta an AE gan dochar do chearta an cheannaitheora thánaistigh a cheannaíonn ceadúnas bogearraí brath ar dhul in éag an chirt dáiliúcháin de réir Airteagal 4(2) de Rialachán (CE) Uimh. 24/2009 chun na bogearraí i dtrácht a úsáid go dleathach. Dhearbhaigh an Chúirt Bhreithiúnais an prionsabal sin ina bhreithiúnas ar an 3 Iúil 2012 i gCás C-128/11 (UsedSoft/Oracle).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002331/13
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Software licensing and restrictive business practices

Microsoft Office is a very useful programme which is very popular and is used daily by millions of Europeans. Microsoft made a recent change to the company's End-User Licence Agreement so that a person can now only use Microsoft Office on a single computer device belonging to the purchaser. The result of this is that the consumer is under pressure to subscribe to the Microsoft 365 plan, which allows the user to hire a license and software and to use them on multiple computer devices. This is a worrying development, especially since the Court of Justice of the European Union has ruled that the resale of used software is allowed.

Could the Commission give its opinion on such restrictive business practices and whether the market dominance of Microsoft Office is in breach of EU competition law?

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

It is a common practice in the software industry for vendors to offer different types of software licences in accordance with customer needs and price them accordingly. This practice does not, in itself, give rise to competition concerns, as it can allow consumers to purchase the licensing package which best suit their needs at a price of their choice.

Any assessment under EU competition law is, however, without prejudice to the rights of a secondary purchaser of a software licence to rely on expiry of the distribution right under Article 4(2) of Directive 2009/24 to use the software in question lawfully. This principle is confirmed by the Court of Justice in its judgment of 3 July 2012 in Case C-128/11 (UsedSoft/Oracle).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002332/13
do Komisji
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(28 lutego 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Rozporządzenie Rady (WE) nr 1099/2009 z dnia 24 września 2009 r. w sprawie ochrony zwierząt podczas ich uśmiercania

Proszę o informację, które państwa członkowskie zawiadomiły Komisję o bardziej restrykcyjnych przepisach krajowych, o których mowa w artykule 26 Rozporządzenia Rady (WE) nr 1099/2009 z dnia 24 września 2009 r. w sprawie ochrony zwierząt podczas ich uśmiercania, oraz czego te przepisy dotyczą.

W ilu państwach członkowskich jest obecnie zabroniony ubój zwierząt bez oszołomienia?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(12 kwietnia 2013 r.)

W rozporządzeniu (WE) nr 1099/2009 ([1]) w sprawie ochrony zwierząt podczas ich uśmiercania ustanowiono ogólną zasadę, że zwierzęta są uśmiercane wyłącznie po uprzednim ogłuszeniu. Jednocześnie w art. 4 ust. 4 tego rozporządzenia zezwala się państwom członkowskim na odstąpienie od tej zasady w przypadku zwierząt poddawanych ubojowi według szczególnych metod wymaganych przez obrzędy religijne, pod warunkiem że ubój ma miejsce w rzeźni. Jak wyjaśniono wcześniej w odpowiedzi na pytanie P-11704/12 ([2]), artykuł 4 ust. 4 należy interpretować – jak wszelkie odstępstwa – w sposób wąski, biorąc pod uwagę cele rozporządzenia oraz Kartę praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej, w szczególności jej art. 10.

Cztery państwa członkowskie zawiadomiły Komisję, że nie korzystają z powyższego odstępstwa. Są to: Finlandia, Litwa, Polska i Szwecja.

([1]) Dz.U. L 303 z 18.11.2009.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002332/13
to the Commission
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing

I would like to ask for information provided to the Commission by the Member States on the stricter national rules mentioned in Article 26 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing and what these rules apply to.

In how many Member States is the slaughter of animals without stunning currently forbidden?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 April 2013)

Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 ([1]) on the protection of animals at the time of killing establishes the general principle that animals shall only be killed after stunning. Yet Article 4(4) of this regulation allows Member States to derogate from this principle for animals subject to particular methods of slaughter prescribed by religious rites, provided that the slaughter takes place in a slaughterhouse. As already explained in the answer to P-11704/12 ([2]), like any derogation, Article 4(4) has to be interpreted in a narrow way taking into account the objectives of the regulation and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, in particular its Article 10.

Four Member States, namely Finland, Lithuania, Poland and Sweden, have let the Commission know that they do not make use of the derogation.

([1]) OJ L 303, 18.11.2009.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002333/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Declarações da Vice-Presidente Viviane Reding

Recentemente, em Portugal, a Vice-Presidente da Comissão Europeia Viviane Reding referiu que «a austeridade não é receita de maneira nenhuma».

Pergunta-se:

1. Concorda com as afirmações da Vice-Presidente Viviane Reding?

2. Estas declarações não entram em contradição com a prática da Troika, da qual faz parte a Comissão, no que respeita ao programa de ajustamento negociado para Portugal?

3. Para quando medidas para incentivar o crescimento económico, em detrimento das que têm levado a um excesso de austeridade?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(18 de abril de 2013)

Por ocasião de uma entrevista concedida à Lusa, a Vice-Presidente Viviane Reding afirmou que não gosta da palavra «austeridade» porque «esta não é de maneira nenhuma a receita». Acrescentou que existem problemas estruturais importantes em Portugal que devem ser resolvidos através de medidas de consolidação orçamental e reformas estruturais, visto que caso contrário não se vislumbra qualquer futuro para a nova geração em Portugal. Também afirmou que embora o país se esteja a confrontar com tempos difíceis já se vê luz no fundo do túnel em resultado das reformas que estão a ser realizadas pelas autoridades portuguesas no âmbito do Programa de Ajustamento Económico.

Na mesma ordem de ideias, o governo português está de momento a implementar medidas no quadro do Programa de Ajustamento Económico. Este programa inclui uma grande variedade de medidas de reforma com o objetivo de tornar a economia portuguesa mais flexível e competitiva, gerando assim a confiança necessária para atrair mais investimento e criar condições para um crescimento sustentável e a criação de emprego. Esta é uma estratégia muito mais promissora se comparada com o estímulo da economia com medidas orientadas para a procura que, tal como a experiência passada demonstrou, não foram particularmente vantajosas para Portugal.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002333/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Statement by Vice-President Viviane Reding

In a recent visit to Portugal, Vivian Reding, the Vice-President of the European Commission, said that austerity was not the answer.

1. Does the Commission agree with the Vice-President's statement?

2. Does this statement not contradict measures taken by the Troika, of which the Commission is part, with regard to the adjustment programme negotiated for Portugal?

3. When will measures to stimulate economic growth replace those which have led to excessive austerity?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

In an interview to Lusa Vice-President Reding said that she does not like the word 'austerity' because 'this is not at all the recipe'. She added that there are important structural problems in Portugal which must be addressed by means of fiscal consolidation measures and structural reforms since otherwise there is no future for the new generation in Portugal. She also said that while the country is currently facing difficult times there is already light at the end of the tunnel as a result of the reforms being undertaken by the Portuguese authorities as part of the Economic Adjustment Programme.

On the same line, the Portuguese Government is currently implementing measures in the framework of the Economic Adjustment Programme. This Programme includes a wide range of reform measures that aim at making the Portuguese economy more flexible and competitive thereby generating the trust and confidence necessary to attract further investment and setting the conditions for sustainable growth and jobs. This is a much more promising strategy than stimulating the economy with demand-oriented measures which, as past experience has shown, have not served Portugal particularly well.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002334/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Financiamento da economia

Considerando o seguinte:

É unânime que os Bancos não têm financiado devidamente a economia nestes tempos de crise. Esta semana, em Portugal, a Troika vai reunir com oito bancos, entre os quais alguns dos que recorreram à utilização da linha de recapitalização pública temporária e reembolsável.

Pergunta-se:

Qual o âmbito dessas reuniões?

Não considera necessário que os bancos encontrem forma de financiar as economias, agora que já se encontram equilibrados, muitos deles com ajudas públicas?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(17 de abril de 2013)

Durante as missões de inspeção, a Comissão em conjunto com os serviços do BCE e do FMI discute predominantemente os planos de financiamento e de capital dos bancos portugueses que englobam as visões prospetivas das instituições financeiras quanto à sua posição de capital, situação de liquidez, rendibilidade e em geral a evolução em matéria de demonstração de resultados e balanço financeiro. Os bancos também apresentam as suas projeções correntes, passadas e futuras sobre a evolução dos depósitos e do crédito, um contributo essencial para a meta indicativa de 120 % do rácio empréstimos/depósitos definida no início do programa de modo a reequilibrar a situação de financiamento. Os planos de financiamento e de capital são baseados nas projeções macroeconómicas do Banco de Portugal e são revistos trimestralmente. Estes dados também servem de base aos testes de esforço regulares realizados pelo Banco de Portugal de modo a quantificar a capacidade do setor para suportar os choques económicos. Os bancos também partilham os seus pontos de vista sobre a evolução da situação económica com a delegação da Comissão, do BCE e do FMI.

Nos últimos dois anos, os bancos portugueses registaram, de forma consistente, perdas importantes, refletindo o difícil quadro macroeconómico a nível nacional e no Sul da Europa. Estas perdas resultam sobretudo à subida do aumento das imparidades decorrentes do crédito em risco. Os bancos também têm que gerir uma difícil situação de financiamento com margens de juro baixas devido à indexação da carteira de empréstimos hipotecários à taxa Euribor. Nos anos que antecederam a crise, a maioria dos bancos portugueses dependia fortemente do financiamento a retalho (ou empréstimos obtidos nos mercados internacionais de crédito), que desde meados de 2010 permanecem praticamente fechados a qualquer banco domiciliado em Portugal, tornando todo o setor extremamente dependente do financiamento do BCE.

Em complemento da ajuda aos bancos portugueses, as medidas tomadas rumo a uma união bancária deverão enfraquecer os efeitos de retroação negativa entre os bancos e os Estados, bem como ajudar a restabelecer o financiamento da economia real em toda a área do euro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002334/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Financing the economy

There is a general consensus that banks have not done enough to finance the economy during these times of crisis. This week in Portugal, the Troika will meet with eight banks, some of which have resorted to temporary and refundable state recapitalisation measures.

What will these meetings cover?

Does the Commission not feel that banks must find a way of financing the economy, now that many of them have been stabilised using state aid?

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

The Commission together with ECB and IMF staff discusses during the review missions predominantly the Portuguese banks' funding and capital plans (FCP), which comprise the financial institutions forward-looking views on their capital position, liquidity situation, profitability and in general income statement and balance sheet developments. Banks also present their current, past and future projection on deposit and credit developments, a key input also for the indicative target of 120% loan-to-deposits ratio set at the outset of the programme to rebalance the funding situation. The FCPs are based on Banco de Portugal macroeconomic projections and are revised on a quarterly basis. The data also serve as basis for the regular stress tests by Banco de Portugal to gauge the sector's ability to withstand economic shocks. Banks also share with the Commission, ECB and IMF delegation their views on economic developments.

In past two years, Portuguese banks registered sustained heavy losses reflecting the difficult macroeconomic picture at home and in Southern Europe. These losses are mostly to rising impairment charges on non-performing credit. Banks also have to manage a difficult funding position with thin interest margins because the mortgage loans portfolio is indexed to the Euribor rate. In pre-crisis years most Portuguese banks relied heavily on wholesale funding (or borrowing on international credit markets), which since mid-2010 remains practically shut for any Portugal domiciled bank, making the whole sector heavily dependent on ECB funding.

Beyond help to Portuguese banks, steps towards a banking union should weaken negative feedback loops between banks and sovereigns and help restore funding to the real economy across the euro area.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002335/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Descida da despesa pública em Portugal

Considerando o seguinte:

É unânime que o nível da carga fiscal em Portugal chegou ao seu limite. Só a descida sustentada da despesa do Estado será eficaz para o cumprimento das metas previstas no memorando de entendimento assinado.

Pergunta-se:

Que ajuda tem prestado ao Governo português para serem encontradas soluções do lado da despesa para a concretização dos objetivos acordados aquando do memorando de entendimento?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(11 de abril de 2013)

O programa de ajustamento orçamental para Portugal tem por objetivo colocar as finanças públicas numa trajetória sustentável, assegurando um equilíbrio entre a despesa e a consolidação baseada na receita de modo a gerar um ajustamento orçamental orientado para as despesas e favorável ao crescimento a médio prazo.

Em 2012, mais de 60 % das medidas orçamentais implementadas visavam a redução das despesas. Em 2013, a maioria das medidas incluídas no orçamento — cerca de 80 % — destinava-se a aumentar as receitas. Com vista a restaurar o equilíbrio entre a despesa e a consolidação baseada na receita, as autoridades deram início a uma análise abrangente da despesa pública de modo a identificar medidas que representem cerca de 2,5 % do PIB para o período compreendido entre 2013 e 2015. A análise tem por objetivo reduzir as duplicações nas funções e entidades do setor público, reafetar os recursos a domínios de despesas que favorecem o crescimento e assegurar a sustentabilidade das finanças públicas. No seguimento de uma ampla consulta junto dos parceiros sociais e políticos com vista a obter um consenso em torno destas reformas, o Governo vai adotar e publicar, até ao final de abril, um quadro orçamental de médio prazo (de 2013 a 2017) contendo medidas de redução da despesa inteiramente especificadas.

Embora a Comissão incentive os esforços das autoridades no sentido de reorientar a consolidação orçamental para medidas de redução da despesa em 2014 e para além desta data, os serviços da Comissão, não prestaram, contudo, assistência técnica na identificação de medidas de redução da despesa específicas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002335/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Drop in public spending in Portugal

There is a general consensus that Portugal's tax burden has reached its limit. Only a sustained decrease in public spending will effectively achieve the goals set out in the memorandum of understanding concluded.

What support has the Commission provided to the Portuguese Government as regards public spending to help achieve the goals set out in the memorandum of understanding concluded?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)

The Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal aims at putting public finances on a sustainable path ensuring a balance between expenditure and revenue-based consolidation so as to create a medium-term growth friendly fiscal adjustment.

In 2012, more than 60% of the fiscal measures implemented were expenditure-reducing. In 2013, most of the measures — about 80% — included in the budget are revenue increasing. In view of restoring the balance between expenditure and revenue-based consolidation, the authorities have embarked on a comprehensive public expenditure review to identify measures worth about 2.5% of GDP for the period 2013-2015. The review aims at addressing redundancies across the public sector functions and entities, reallocating resources toward growth-friendly spending areas and ensuring sustainability of public finances. Following a broad-based consultation with social and political partners with a view to building consensus around these reforms, the government will adopt and publish, by end-April, a medium-term (2013-17) fiscal framework, with fully specified expenditure-reducing measures.

While the Commission is encouraging authorities' efforts to reorient fiscal consolidation towards expenditure-reducing measures in 2014 and beyond, Commission services have, however, not provided technical assistance with respect to identifying individual expenditure-reducing measures.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002336/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Modelos econométricos

Considerando o seguinte:

Tem sido noticiado em Portugal que a Comissão Europeia considera que a recessão económica não é suficiente para explicar o aumento do défice, pois o défice estrutural também aumentou. Este indicador económico é um fator chave, imposto pelo Tratado Europeu, que permite medir o ritmo da consolidação das contas públicas. A Comissão Europeia alterou as previsões para Portugal, e a expectativa do défice é agora de 4,9 %. Simon O'Connor, o porta-voz do Comissário europeu Olli Rehn, explicou que os peritos europeus também irão analisar as variações do PIB e quedas inesperadas nas receitas.

Pergunta-se:

O que pensa a Comissão dos modelos econométricos que têm vindo a ser utilizados para as sucessivas previsões, erradas, dos principais indicadores económicos portugueses?

Pensa a Comissão rever esses modelos?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(7 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão avalia regularmente a sua própria capacidade de apresentar previsões, com o objetivo de melhorar os seus instrumentos e os resultados das previsões.

Na mais recente avaliação, efetuada no ano passado ([1]), as previsões da Comissão Europeia foram consideradas razoavelmente exatas. O historial da Comissão é considerado bom, tanto medido por indicadores estatísticos como em comparação com outras instituições internacionais e as previsões consensuais. Os resultados são semelhantes para as previsões feitas para Portugal: tanto as previsões para a produção como o saldo do setor público administrativo são considerados imparciais segundo níveis habituais de significância estatística. Além disso, não se verifica uma persistência dos erros de previsão para essas variáveis. Não existem provas das «sucessivas previsões, erradas, dos principais indicadores económicos portugueses».

Na atual conjuntura, as incertezas são obviamente muitas, dado que a volatilidade de vários indicadores aumentou significativamente desde o início da crise e, por conseguinte, muitos fatores imprevistos podem conduzir a revisões relativamente significativas das previsões. A mais recente revisão da previsão para Portugal deveu-se, em grande medida, a uma deterioração inesperada das previsões para os mercados de exportação em Portugal, suscetível de conduzir a um crescimento económico mais reduzido e que, através dos efeitos secundários negativos, pode pesar também sobre o emprego e as receitas fiscais.

Por último, convém igualmente referir que as previsões da Comissão baseiam-se no pressuposto de políticas inalteradas e, por conseguinte, a introdução de novas medidas políticas geralmente também conduz a revisões das previsões.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/economic_paper/2012/pdf/ecp476_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002336/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Econometric models

According to Portuguese reports, the Commission does not believe that the deficit increase is down to the economic recession alone, since the structural deficit has also increased. This economic indicator is a key factor, imposed by the European Treaty, which enables the pace of fiscal consolidation to be measured. The Commission has altered its outlook for Portugal, with the deficit now expected to be 4.9%. Simon O'Connor, the spokesperson for Commissioner Olli Rehn, has said that European experts will also analyse variations in GDP and unexpected drops in revenue.

What is the Commission's opinion regarding the econometric models that have been used to make successive incorrect predictions on the main Portuguese economic indicators?

Will it review these models?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2013)

The Commission is regularly assessing its own forecasting performance with the aim of improving its tools and its forecasting results.

The European Commission forecasts are reported to be reasonably accurate in the most recent assessment carried out last year ([1]). The Commission's track record is found to be good both measured by statistical indicators as well as in comparison with other international institutions and the consensus forecast. Similar results hold true for the specific forecasts made for Portugal: both the forecasts for output and the general government balance are found to be unbiased at usual statistical significance levels. Moreover, no significant persistence can be found in the forecast errors for these variables. There is no evidence for 'successive incorrect predictions on the main Portuguese economic indicators'.

Obviously, uncertainties are large at the current juncture as the volatility of various indicators has significantly increased since the beginning of the crisis and therefore many unexpected factors can lead to relatively large revisions in the forecast. The most recent revision in the forecast for Portugal was driven to a large extent by an unexpected deterioration of the outlook in Portugal's export markets which is likely to lead to lower economic growth and, via negative second-round effects may weigh on employment and fiscal revenues as well.

Finally, it should also be noted that the Commission forecasts are based on the 'no-policy-change' assumption and hence the introduction of new policy measures also normally leads to forecast revisions.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/economic_paper/2012/pdf/ecp476_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002337/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Taxas de juros mais baixas para Portugal

Considerando que:

Keith Wade, economista da Schroders, afirma que a «Zona Euro está a melhorar a sua situação económica em vários setores. O Euro está forte, mas as taxas de juros ainda têm que cair, a fim de facilitar o financiamento dos países. Portugal está no caminho correto mas ainda não chegou ao fim da estrada, portanto o país vai precisar de exigir que o BCE intervenha para baixar os juros».

Pergunta-se:

Concorda com a necessidade da redução das taxas de juros para que Portugal possa reiniciar um processo de crescimento económico e afastar-se da espiral recessiva que atravessa?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(11 de abril de 2013)

Taxas de juro reais elevadas não conduzem a um crescimento dinâmico do investimento se a eficiência marginal do capital for baixa. Para que os investimentos possam produzir um impacto duradouro no crescimento é importante que revertam para os setores mais dinâmicos e competitivos da economia.

Portugal usufruiu de taxas de juro baixas e de taxas de investimento elevadas no período compreendido entre o final dos anos 90 e meados dos anos 2000, mas o impacto no crescimento foi bastante limitado — a taxa de crescimento média entre 1999 e 2008 atingiu apenas 1,6 %, sendo a segunda mais baixa da União Europeia. Tal deve-se sobretudo ao facto de os investimentos se terem concentrado em infraestruturas e em setores não orientados para a exportação tais como as indústrias de rede e os serviços. Os retornos macroeconómicos sobre estes investimentos foram bastante modestos, tal como é evidenciado pela quebra da produtividade total dos fatores durante este período. Remeto o Senhor Deputado para a próxima edição de abril de 2013 do relatório trimestral sobre a área do euro, para uma análise mais detalhada destas questões ([1]).

As estratégias adotadas para baixar a taxa de juro em Portugal encontram-se limitadas pelo elevado e continuado risco do país associada à posição frágil da dívida soberana, o que, num futuro previsível, manterá a probabilidade de riscos relativamente elevada. Por conseguinte, um modelo de crescimento sustentável a médio prazo para Portugal necessita, acima de tudo, de se basear numa elevada eficácia dos investimentos, isto é, o investimento tem que reverter para os setores mais dinâmicos e orientados para a exportação. É por esta razão que o programa de ajustamento económico incluiu uma série de medidas destinadas a canalizar o crédito para as PME nos setores orientados para a exportação, reforçando ao mesmo tempo as forças competitivas na economia, particularmente no setor de bens não transacionáveis.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/qr_euro_area/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002337/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Lower interest rates for Portugal

Keith Wade, the Chief Economist at Schroders, has said that the euro area's economic situation is improving in some sectors. He added that the euro is strong, but interest rates still need to fall to help finance the countries. According to Wade, Portugal is on the right track but has not yet reached the end of the road; as such, the country will need to request that the ECB intervene and lower interest rates.

Does the Commission agree that lower interest rates are needed for Portugal to restart a process of economic growth and to escape from the downward spiral it finds itself in?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)

High real interest rates are not conducive to dynamic investment growth if the marginal efficiency of capital is low. For investments to have a lasting impact on growth it is important that they flow into the most dynamic and competitive sectors of the economy.

Portugal enjoyed low interest rates and high investment rates over the period between the late 1990s and the mid-2000s but the impact on growth was very limited — the average growth rate during 1999 and 2008 amounted to 1.6%, the second lowest in the EU. This is mainly due to the fact that investments were concentrated in infrastructure and in non-export oriented sectors such as network industries and services. The macro-economic returns on these investments were very modest as evidenced by the fall in total factor productivity during this period. The Honourable Member of Parliament is referred to the forthcoming April 2013 edition of the Quarterly Report on the Euro Area for a more detailed analysis of these issues (http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/qr_euro_area/index_en.htm).

Strategies to lower interest rates in Portugal are constrained by the continued high country risk linked to the fragile position of the sovereign, which will keep risk spreads relatively high in the foreseeable future. As a consequence, a sustainable medium-term growth model for Portugal needs to be based first and foremost on high investment efficiency, i.e. investment needs to flow into the most dynamic and export-oriented sectors. It is for this reason that the Economic Adjustment Programme has included a number of measures to channel credit into SMEs in the export-oriented sector while strengthening competitive forces in the economy, particularly in the non-tradable sector.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002338/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Alterações ao memorando de entendimento português

Considerando o seguinte:

Na sequência da revelação dos dados económicos mais recentes para Portugal, o Comissário europeu dos Assuntos Económicos, Olli Rehn, admitiu a sua surpresa pelo facto de, apesar dos esforços de ajustamento, o processo continuar a ter um peso considerável na economia, que contraiu mais do que o esperado no último trimestre do ano passado. As previsões de inverno da Comissão Europeia revelaram que Portugal está entre os países mais penalizados, registando um «declínio» e uma «queda do emprego maiores que o esperado» e «receitas da segurança social mais baixas que o esperado». Com base nestas, novas, previsões o Governo português vai solicitar alterações ao memorando de entendimento.

Pergunta-se:

Está a Comissão disposta a analisar uma melhoria das condições do memorando de entendimento que atualmente está a ser aplicado em Portugal?

Que tipo de alterações podem vir a ser equacionadas?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(11 de abril de 2013)

Aquando da 7.ª revisão do Programa de Ajustamento Económico para Portugal, a Comissão Europeia, enquanto parte da chamada «Troika», propôs uma revisão dos objetivos orçamentais de 4,5 %, 2,5 % e 2 % do PIB para 5,5 %, 4,5 % e 2,5 % do PIB durante o período compreendido entre 2013 e 2015. Esta revisão da trajetória de ajustamento orçamental foi completamente justificada à luz da deterioração significativa das perspetivas económicas e a par dos bons resultados obtidos por Portugal na implementação do programa. Considerada juntamente com a anterior flexibilização dos objetivos aquando da 5.ª revisão, foi dado a Portugal substancialmente mais tempo para corrigir os seus desequilíbrios orçamentais em comparação com os objetivos iniciais do programa.

Além da revisão da trajetória de ajustamento orçamental, a Comissão está a apoiar uma iniciativa com vista a suavizar/prolongar o reembolso dos empréstimos concedidos a Portugal pelo Mecanismo Europeu de Estabilização Financeira (MEEF) e pelo Fundo Europeu de Estabilidade Financeira (FEEF). Em virtude das expectativas de prolongamento do prazo de vencimento dos empréstimos e da revisão da trajetória de ajustamento orçamental, a agência de notação *Standard & Poor's* reviu recentemente a sua perspetiva de notação de negativa para estável. É provável que esta revisão seja sustentada e seguida por outras agências de notação, pelo que melhorará significativamente as perspetivas de regresso ao mercado da dívida soberana portuguesa, condição prévia essencial para a conclusão do programa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002338/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Amendments to the Portuguese Memorandum of Understanding

Following the publication of Portugal's latest economic data, Olli Rehn, the Commissioner for Economic and Monetary Affairs, expressed his surprise that despite adjustment efforts the process continues to have a considerable impact on the economy, which contracted more than expected in the fourth quarter of last year. The Commission's winter forecasts revealed that Portugal is among the most penalised countries, recording a decline, a higher than expected fall in employment and lower than expected social security revenue. Based on these new forecasts, the Portuguese Government will request amendments to the memorandum of understanding.

Is the Commission willing to consider improving the terms of the memorandum of understanding currently in force in Portugal?

What type of amendments may be considered?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)

During the 7th review of the Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal, the European Commission, as part of the so-called 'Troika', proposed a revision of the fiscal targets from 4.5%, 2.5% and 2% of GDP to 5.5%, 4.5% and 2.5% of GDP over the period 2013-2015. This revision of the budgetary adjustment path was fully justified in view of the significant deterioration in the economic outlook, in conjunction with Portugal's good track record of programme implementation. Taken together with the earlier relaxation of the targets during the 5th review, Portugal has now been given substantially more time to correct its budgetary imbalances as compared with the initial programme targets.

In addition to the revision of the budgetary adjustment path, the Commission is supporting an initiative to smoothen/lengthen the redemption of the loans from the EFSM and the EFSF to Portugal. In expectation of the maturity lenghtening and the revised budgetary adjustment path, the rating agency Standard & Poor's has recently reviewed its rating outlook from negative to stable. This, if sustained and followed by other rating agencies, is likely to significantly improve the Portuguese sovereign's prospects of a return to the market, which is an essential pre-condition for a graduation from the programme.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002340/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Programa nuclear Iraniano

Considerando que:

— Realizou-se no dia 26 de fevereiro o primeiro encontro, desde junho de 2012, entre as potências ocidentais e o Irão, para debater o programa nuclear deste país. Deste último ciclo de negociações não resultou qualquer progresso sobre o programa iraniano de enriquecimento de urânio.

— A ronda de negociações do grupo 5+1 (China, EUA, Franca, Reino Unido e Rússia + Alemanha) foi liderada pela chefe da diplomacia da UE, que afirmou esperar que «as negociações sejam produtivas e que progressos concretos possam ser feitos para uma solução negociada que venha ao encontro das preocupações da comunidade internacional sobre o programa nuclear iraniano».

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

Que conclusões saíram deste encontro?

Que novas medidas serão tomadas para dissuadir o Irão de continuar com o seu programa nuclear?

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

A AR/VP e o grupo UE3+3 tiveram discussões proveitosas com o Irão em 26 e 27 de fevereiro, em Almaty. O objetivo da reunião consistia em relançar as conversações com o Irão sobre as preocupações da comunidade internacional quanto à natureza exclusivamente pacífica do programa nuclear deste país. Em Almaty, os países UE3+3 entregaram uma nova proposta que se destina a instaurar um clima de confiança e aborda as grandes preocupações relativamente à questão do enriquecimento do urânio a 20 %.

Além disso, o grupo UE3+3 chegou a acordo com o Irão sobre o processo de acompanhamento, tanto a nível de peritos como a nível político. Espera-se que o Irão analise cuidadosamente a proposta apresentada e dê início a um processo de negociações aprofundado, conducente a uma solução a longo prazo.

O grupo UE3+3 continua plenamente empenhado em encontrar uma solução diplomática para a questão nuclear iraniana com base numa abordagem a duas vertentes (negociações e sanções).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002340/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Iranian nuclear programme

On 26 February the first meeting since June 2012 took place between the Western powers and Iran to discuss the latter's nuclear programme. This latest round of negotiations did not yield any progress with regard to the Iranian programme for uranium enrichment.

The negotiating round by the 5+1 group (China, USA, France, United Kingdom and Russia + Germany) was led by the head of the EU's diplomatic staff, who expressed the hope that 'the negotiations will be productive and make tangible progress towards a negotiated settlement that meets the concerns felt by the international community about the Iranian nuclear programme.'

In the light of the above facts, the Vice-President/High Representative is called upon to answer the following questions:

What conclusions emerged from the abovementioned meeting?

What new measures will be taken to dissuade Iran from continuing with its nuclear programme?

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

The HR/VP, together with the E3+3 countries had useful discussions with Iran on the 26 and 27 February in Almaty. The meeting was aimed at re-engaging Iran in talks about the international community's concerns regarding the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme. In Almaty the E3/EU+3 handed over a revised confidence building proposal which addresses the key concerns on 20% enrichment issue.

In addition the E3/EU+3 reached agreement with Iran on a follow-up process, both at experts and political level. It is expected that Iran will seriously consider the presented proposal and engage in a full-fledged negotiating process leading to a long term solution.

The E3/EU+3 remains fully committed to seek a diplomatic solution to the Iranian nuclear issue on the basis of the dual track approach (negotiations and sanctions).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002341/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Energia de ondas subaproveitada

Considerando que:

— Portugal apresenta uma costa ocidental longa e muito bem estruturada, em termos de rede elétrica, de transporte e com um bom número de portos e estaleiros navais;

— A área litoral de Portugal chega quase aos 1800 quilómetros e a sua Zona Económica Exclusiva é a terceira maior da Europa;

— Portugal possui ainda boas condições de clima e não possui correntes marítimas particularmente intensas;

— Estima-se que, apenas na costa ocidental de Portugal Continental, se possa produzir cerca de 20 % da energia elétrica que atualmente consumimos;

— A tecnologia dedicada à exploração das ondas só agora vai dando os seus primeiros passos. Além de uma central de ondas localizada no Pico, nos Açores, apenas existe uma outra a cerca de 900 metros ao largo de Peniche, a força das ondas já produz eletricidade graças a um instrumento plantado no fundo do mar.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Grande parte dos projetos e protótipos chegam a Portugal fruto de uma cooperação a nível europeu. Tendo em consideração o elevado potencial de Portugal para utilização desta energia limpa e sem riscos, que financiamento comunitário está equacionado para esta área?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(16 de abril de 2013)

O diálogo informal com as autoridades portuguesas sobre o futuro período de programação está ainda a decorrer e as negociações formais ainda não começaram. Por conseguinte, a Comissão não dispõe ainda de qualquer indicação sobre o financiamento do setor da energia.

No entanto, a Comissão considera que há margem para explorar o elevado potencial em matéria de fontes de energia renováveis (solar, eólica, hidroelétrica, da biomassa e do mar). Deverá ser prestado apoio, depois de considerados os mecanismos alternativos de sustentabilidade financeira, a projetos que envolvam tecnologias renováveis inovadoras, em especial tecnologias mencionadas no Plano Estratégico para as Tecnologias Energéticas e no Roteiro para a Energia 2050.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002341/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Underutilised wave energy

— The long west coast of Portugal has an excellent infrastructure in terms of electricity supply, transport and the number of ports and shipyards.

— Portugal's coastline stretches almost 1800 kilometres and its Exclusive Economic Zone is the third largest in Europe.

— Portugal also has an amenable climate and relatively calm sea currents.

— It is estimated that Portugal's west coast alone could generate around 20% of the electricity currently consumed.

— Wave power technology is still in its infancy. Besides the wave power plant in Pico, in the Azores, there is only one other plant, located around 900 metres off the coast of Peniche, where the force of the waves generates electricity using a device implanted in the seabed.

Most designs and prototypes reach Portugal as a result of EU-wide cooperation. Given the considerable potential for Portugal to use this clean and risk-free energy, what EU funding is the Commission considering allocating to this area?

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

The informal dialogue with the Portuguese authorities on the future programming period is still ongoing and the formal negotiations have not yet started. Therefore, the Commission does not yet have any indication on the financing of energy area.

However, the Commission considers that there is room to exploit further the high potential capacities in renewable energy sources (solar, wind, hydro, biomass and ocean). Support should be provided, after taking into proper consideration alternative financial sustainability mechanisms, to projects involving innovative renewable technologies, in particular technologies mentioned in the Strategic Energy Technology Plan and in the energy roadmap 2050.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-002342/13
till kommissionen
Åsa Westlund (S&D), Marita Ulvskog (S&D), Anna Hedh (S&D), Olle Ludvigsson (S&D), Göran Färm (S&D) och Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(28 februari 2013)

Angående: Utsläpp av bly i nya vattenkranar

Tester av vattenkranar har gjorts på uppdrag av Boverket i Sverige. I dessa tester uppdagades det att flera av de nya kranarna släppte ut mer bly än det högst tillåtna gränsvärdet i Sverige på 20 mikrogram.

Forskning visar att barn får sänkt kognitiv förmåga på grund av bly. Blyexponering sänker barns IQ. Internationellt kan exponeringen av bly vara högre än den är i Sverige. I Europa utsätts individer dagligen för bly, och därmed för skada.

Mot denna bakgrund vill vi ställa följande frågor till kommissionen:

1. Vilka gränsvärden för bly i kranar finns i andra länder?

2. Vet kommissionen hur situationen ser ut i andra länder? Hur stor andel bly från kranvatten utsätts Europas invånare faktiskt för i sin vardag?

3. På grund av byggmaterialens fria rörlighet: hur upplever kommissionen behovet av gemensamma EU-regler i frågan kring bly i vattenkranar?

Svar från Janez Potočnik på kommissionens vägnar
(7 maj 2013)

Enligt direktivet om dricksvatten ([1]) är gränsvärdet för bly i kranar 10µg/l. Medlemsstaterna tillåts dock tillämpa ett mellanliggande parametervärde på 25 µg/l till den 25 december 2013 ([2]).

Kommissionen håller för närvarande på att utvärdera medlemsstaternas rapporter om bly i dricksvatten och kommer att lägga fram sina resultat senare i år (uppgifter från 2008–2010). Den tidigare rapporten (med uppgifter från 2005–2007) visade att gränsvärdena för bly då överskreds i sex medlemsstater.

I enlighet med förordning (EU) 305/2011 om byggprodukter ([3]) (bilaga I) håller Europeiska standardiseringsorganisationen CEN ([4]) för närvarande på att fastställa harmoniserade provmetoder för utsläpp av metaller från byggprodukter i dricksvatten (kommissionens mandat M/136rev2 ([5])). Kommissionen anser det dock inte nödvändigt att utveckla några ytterligare gemensamma bestämmelser eller harmoniserade instrument. Detta beror på att de harmoniserade provmetoderna kommer att ge samma konkurrensvillkor för alla produkter, samtidigt som tröskelvärdena i direktivet om dricksvatten beaktas.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31998L0083:EN:NOT
([2]) Bilaga I del B, Kemiska parametrar, anmärkning 4.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:088:0005:0043:SV:PDF
([4]) http://www.cen.eu/cen/Products/Pages/default.aspx
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/standards_policy/mandates/database/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002342/13
to the Commission
Åsa Westlund (S&D), Marita Ulvskog (S&D), Anna Hedh (S&D), Olle Ludvigsson (S&D), Göran Färm (S&D) and Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Discharge of lead from modern taps

Tests on water taps have been commissioned by the Swedish National Housing Board. The tests revealed that many modern taps were discharging more lead than the Swedish maximum permitted limit of 20 micrograms.

Research shows that children's cognitive ability is lowered through exposure to lead. Exposure to lead reduces children's IQ. Exposure to lead may be higher internationally than it is in Sweden. In Europe individuals are exposed daily to lead and are thus at risk of harm.

1. What are the limits for lead in taps in other countries?

2. Does the Commission know what the situation is in other countries? How much lead from water taps are Europe's inhabitants really exposed to in their daily lives?

3. In view of the free movement of building materials, how does the Commission view the need for common EU rules on the question of lead in water taps?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2013)

According to the Drinking Water Directive (DWD) ([1]), the limit value for lead at the tap is 10µg/l. However, an intermediate parametric value of 25 µg/l was granted to Member States until 25 December 2013 ([2]).

As regards the situation of lead contamination in drinking water, the Commission is currently assessing the reports submitted by Member States and intends to publish its findings later this year (data from 2008-2010). The previous report (data from 2005-2007) showed that lead exceedences occurred in six Member States.

In accordance with Regulation (EU) 305/2011 on Construction Products ([3]) (Annex I), the European Standardisation Organisation CEN ([4]) is currently finalising harmonised test methods for the release of metals from construction products into drinking water (Commission's mandate M/136rev2 ([5])). Beyond this activity, the Commission does not consider the development of further common rules or harmonised instruments as necessary. This is because the harmonised test methods will provide a level playing field for products while taking into account the threshold values in the DWD).

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31998L0083:EN:NOT.
([2]) Annex I, Part B, Chemical parameters, note 4.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:088:0005:0043:EN:PDF.
([4]) http://www.cen.eu/cen/Products/Pages/default.aspx.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/standards_policy/mandates/database/.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002343/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Número europeu de contribuinte

Considerando que:

— Integrado num amplo plano de combate à fraude e evasão fiscal, anunciado pela Comissão Europeia em dezembro de 2012, consta a criação de um número de identificação fiscal (NIF) europeu;

— O plano de criação do NIF europeu resulta das crescentes dificuldades para identificar corretamente os contribuintes, devido à maior mobilidade das pessoas e ao número cada vez maior de operações transfronteiriças;

Pergunto à Comissão:

De que forma está prevista a criação deste número de identificação fiscal europeu, de forma a sejam assegurados os direitos e deveres de contribuintes e autoridades?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(4 de abril de 2013)

A ação 22 do Plano de Ação adotado pela Comissão em 6 de dezembro de 2012 (COM(2012) 722) menciona a eventual criação de um número europeu de identificação fiscal. O plano de ação reconhece que, embora o conceito de um número de identificação fiscal da UE seja simples, a sua implementação merece uma preparação cuidadosa. Será necessário explorar muitos aspetos diferentes antes de a proposta poder ser apresentada, e a questão dos direitos e deveres dos contribuintes e das administrações fiscais estará certamente no âmago dessa análise.

Ao levar esta ação por diante, a Comissão gostaria de proceder a uma vasta consulta a todas as partes interessadas. Como primeiro passo, foi lançada, em 25 de fevereiro de 2013, uma consulta pública ([1]) no sentido de recolher informações sobre o eventual âmbito de um número de identificação fiscal da UE (em termos de operações e contribuintes abrangidos), determinados aspetos práticos, conceção e funcionamento, bem como diversas considerações legais (p. ex. proteção de dados). As opiniões expressas pelos participantes serão utilizadas pelos serviços da Comissão para apoiar um estudo de viabilidade destinados a analisar os prós e os contras de um número de identificação fiscal da UE tendo em vista o desenvolvimento de uma resposta política adequada.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/consultations/tax/2013_eutin_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002343/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: European Taxpayer Identification Number

The European Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) has been established as part of a broad plan announced by the European Commission in December 2012 to combat tax fraud and tax evasion.

The plan to establish the European TIN has been devised in response to the fact that correctly identifying taxpayers is proving increasingly difficult, owing to the greater mobility of the population and the growing number of cross-border transactions.

In the light of these facts, will the Commission answer the following question?

Will the European Taxpayer Identification Number be established in such a way as to ensure that taxpayers' and the authorities' rights are safeguarded and that those taxpayers and authorities fulfil their obligations?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2013)

Action 22 of the action plan adopted by the Commission on 6.12.2012 (COM(2012)722) mentions the possible creation of a European Tax Identification Number (EU TIN). The action plan acknowledges that although the concept of an EU TIN is simple, its implementation deserves careful preparation. Many different aspects will need to be explored before a proposal can be made and the question of the rights and obligations of taxpayers and tax authorities will certainly be at the heart of the analysis.

In taking forward this action, the Commission would like to consult widely with all interested stakeholders. As a first step, a public consultation ([1]) was launched on 25 February 2013 with a view to collecting information on the possible scope of an EU TIN (in terms of operations and taxpayers covered), certain practical aspects, design and functioning, as well as various legal considerations (e.g. data protection). The views expressed by the contributors will be used by the Commission services to support a feasibility study aimed at further analysing the pros and cons of an EU TIN with a view to developing the appropriate policy response.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/consultations/tax/2013_eutin_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002344/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Carne contaminada com bactérias de fezes

Considerando que:

— A carne picada vendida em talhos, supermercados e hipermercados, analisada num estudo de uma revista portuguesa de Defesa do Consumidor, revela que continha bactérias indicadoras de contaminação fecal e microrganismos que podem ser fatais, como E.coli, a salmonela e a listeria.

— A contaminação fecal da carne pode ser reveladora de falta de higiene de quem a manuseou. No entanto, a contaminação microbiológica poderá ocorrer ao longo do processo de tratamento do alimento;

— O autor do estudo considera preocupante a presença de salmonelas e listeria na carne que, dependendo da quantidade da carne consumida e da saúde da pessoa, pode levar à morte;

— Foram também detetados conservantes proibidos na carne picada (sulfitos).

— Os sulfitos são usados para restaurar a cor primitiva da carne e dar uma aparência de frescura ao produto, quando esse pode já não ser o caso.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que considerações tece acerca do assunto descrito?

2. Não considera estar em causa um problema de saúde pública?

3. Num clima de pânico, como se direciona a ação da Comissão no sentido de intensificar os esforços de fiscalização?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(30 de abril de 2013)

1. As conclusões, como indicadas na pergunta, dizem respeito a uma violação da legislação da UE. É importante adotar uma abordagem que garanta a segurança de todos os alimentos do produtor ao consumidor e, em especial, dos alimentos altamente perecíveis como a carne picada. No anexo III do Regulamento (CE) n.° 853/2004 ([1]), estão estabelecidas regras específicas destinadas a impedir a contaminação fecal desde o abate até à transformação da carne proveniente de todas as espécies, complementadas por uma secção V específica sobre a carne picada, os preparados de carne e a carne separada mecanicamente.

Além disso, foram estabelecidos critérios microbiológicos nos termos do Regulamento (CE) n.° 2073/2005 ([2]). Este regulamento impõe restrições à carne picada respeitantes à *Listeria* (se colocada no mercado sob a forma de alimentos prontos para consumo), à *Salmonella*, à *Escherichia coli* e ao número de colónias aeróbias (indicador de frescura).

Os sulfitos só são autorizados na carne para hambúrgueres com um teor mínimo de 4 % de vegetais e/ou de cereais misturados com a carne.

2. A violação dos critérios acima, relativos à *Listeria* e à *Salmonela*, exige a retirada do mercado. A não conformidade com os restantes critérios supracitados implica obrigatoriamente uma ação corretiva imediata do processo, mas não tem consequências para o lote em causa.

3. As inspeções destinadas a verificar o cumprimento dos critérios da UE competem às autoridades nacionais. O Serviço Alimentar e Veterinário da Direção-Geral da Saúde e dos Consumidores da Comissão é responsável pelo controlo da correta aplicação da legislação da UE pelos Estados-Membros.

([1]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 853/2004 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 29 de abril de 2004, que estabelece regras específicas de higiene aplicáveis aos géneros alimentícios de origem animal (JO L 226 de 25.6.2004, p. 22).

([2]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 2073/2005 da Comissão, de 15 de novembro de 2005, relativo a critérios microbiológicos aplicáveis aos géneros alimentícios (JO L 338 de 22.12.2005, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002344/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Meat contaminated with faecal bacteria

According to a study by a Portuguese consumer watchdog magazine, an analysis of minced meat sold in butcher's shops, supermarkets and hypermarkets has revealed that it contained bacteria indicating contamination with potentially fatal faecal matter and micro-organisms, such as E.coli, salmonella and listeria.

Faecal contamination of meat can indicate poor hygiene standards on the part of the person handling it. However, microbiological contamination could occur at any stage of the food-preparation process.

The author of the study was concerned at the presence of salmonella and listeria in the meat, which — depending on the amount of meat consumed and the state of health of the person concerned — could be fatal.

Banned preservatives (sulphites) were also detected in the minced meat.

Sulphites are used to restore colour to the meat and give the impression that it is fresh — whereas this may no longer be the case.

In view of the above facts, will the Commission answer the following questions?

1. What is its opinion on the matter described above?

2. Does it not consider this to constitute a public health problem?

3. In a climate of panic, what action is the Commission taking in order to ensure that more inspections are carried out?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

1. The findings as indicated in the question concern a breach in EU legislation. A farm to fork food safety approach must be applied to all food and is of major importance for highly perishable foods such as minced meat. In Annex III to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 ([1]) specific rules to prevent faecal contamination from slaughter to processing are laid down for meat of all species, supplemented by a specific Section V on minced meat, meat preparations and mechanically separated meat.

In addition, microbiological criteria in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005 ([2]) are laid down. Restrictions on minced meat apply as regards Listeria (if placed on the market as ready to eat food), Salmonella, Escherichia coli and aerobic colony count (indicator of freshness).

Sulphites are only authorised in burger meat with a minimum vegetable and/or cereal content of 4% mixed within the meat.

2. Non-compliance with the above Listeria and Salmonella criteria requires the withdrawal from the market. Non-compliance with the other abovementioned requirements must result in immediate corrective action of the process but has no consequences for the batch concerned.

3. Inspections on the verification of EU requirements are the competence of national authorities. The Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate General audits the proper enforcement by the Member States of EU legislation.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific hygiene for food of animal origin (OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 55, Corrected in OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 22).

([2]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005 of 15 November 2005 on microbiological criteria in foodstuffs (OJ L 338, 22.12.2005, p. 1).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002345/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Eixo 1 do Proder 2012

Considerando que o fundo comunitário de apoio para o desenvolvimento rural 2007-2013 é um instrumento de apoio fundamental, a que os países da UE podem aceder, pergunto à Comissão se, no que diz respeito ao eixo 1 do Proder, já foram perdidas definitivamente algumas verbas à data de dezembro de 2012. Em caso afirmativo, tê-lo-ão sido em que medidas?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002346/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Eixo 2 do Proder 2012

Considerando que o fundo comunitário de apoio para o desenvolvimento rural 2007-2013 é um instrumento de apoio fundamental, a que os países da UE podem aceder, pergunto à Comissão se, no que diz respeito ao eixo 2 do Proder, já foram perdidas definitivamente algumas verbas à data de dezembro de 2012. Em caso afirmativo, tê-lo-ão sido em que medidas?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002347/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Eixo 3 do Proder 2012

Considerando que o fundo comunitário de apoio para o desenvolvimento rural 2007-2013 é um instrumento de apoio fundamental, a que os países da UE podem aceder, pergunto à Comissão se, no que diz respeito ao eixo 3 do Proder, já foram perdidas definitivamente algumas verbas à data de dezembro de 2012. Em caso afirmativo, tê-lo-ão sido em que medidas?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002354/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Agricultura verbas perdidas no segundo pilar no ano de 2012

Tendo em conta a execução das verbas do quadro comunitário de apoio 2007-2013 para o desenvolvimento rural, tanto no que diz respeito ao primeiro pilar onde não existe cofinanciamento do Estado-Membro, como no segundo pilar onde é necessária comparticipação.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Das verbas disponíveis no segundo pilar para Portugal, quais foram definitivamente perdidas no ano de 2012 por não execução?

Resposta conjunta dada por Dacian Cioloș em nome da Comissão
(15 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão gostaria de informar o Senhor Deputado de que, até dezembro de 2012, não foram perdidas verbas no que diz respeito aos eixos 1, 2 e 3 do Proder.

Em relação ao segundo pilar, a Comissão informa que não foram perdidos fundos em 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002345/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Axis 1 of Proder [Rural Development Programme for Mainland Portugal] 2012

The 2007-2013 Community support fund for rural development is a key assistance instrument available to Member States. Will the Commission say, with reference to Proder Axis 1, whether any appropriations were lost for good in the period up to December 2012? If any were, which measures were affected?

Question for written answer E-002346/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Axis 2 of Proder [Rural Development Programme for Mainland Portugal] 2012

The 2007-2013 Community support fund for rural development is a key assistance instrument available to Member States. Will the Commission say, with reference to Proder Axis 2, whether any appropriations were lost for good in the period up to December 2012? If any were, which measures were affected?

Question for written answer E-002347/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Axis 3 of the Rural Development Programme for Mainland Portugal (Proder) 2012

The 2007-2013 Community support fund for rural development is a key assistance instrument available to Member States. Will the Commission say, with reference to Proder Axis 3, whether any appropriations were lost for good in the period up to December 2012? If any were, which measures were affected?

Question for written answer E-002354/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Agriculture: loss of appropriations under the second pillar in 2012

With regard to the execution of appropriations under the Community support framework for 2007-2013 for rural development, under both the first pillar, for which there is no Member State co-financing, and the second pillar, for which joint funding is obligatory:

Which of the appropriations available under the second pillar did Portugal lose in 2012 due to a failure to execute them?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(15 April 2013)

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that no appropriations were lost up to December 2012 as regards Proder axis 1, 2 and 3.

In relation to the 2nd pillar the Commission informs that no funds were lost in 2012.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002348/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Correções financeiras a Portugal desde 2007

Tendo em conta a utilização e execução das verbas do fundo comunitário de apoio para o desenvolvimento rural, tanto no que diz respeito ao primeiro Pilar, onde não existe cofinanciamento dos Estados-Membros, como no segundo Pilar, onde é necessária comparticipação, pergunto à Comissão:

Que correções financeiras foram efetuadas a Portugal desde 2007 até à data?

Quais os montantes específicos e os motivos das correções?

Que correções financeiras — e quais os respetivos montantes — é que já foram saldadas?

Estes montantes foram saldados diretamente pelo Ministério das Finanças português ou por intermédio de reduções nos fundos da PAC?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002349/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Correções financeiras a Portugal — 2011

Tendo em conta a utilização e execução das verbas do fundo comunitário de apoio para o desenvolvimento rural, tanto no que diz respeito ao primeiro Pilar, onde não existe cofinanciamento dos Estados-Membros, como no segundo Pilar, onde é necessária comparticipação, pergunto à Comissão se, no âmbito desse mesmo fundo comunitário de apoio para 2007-2013, e em relação ao primeiro Pilar para o ano de 2011, existem algumas correções financeiras a fazer a Portugal.

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002350/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Correções financeiras a Portugal — 2012

Tendo em conta a utilização e execução das verbas do fundo comunitário de apoio para o desenvolvimento rural, tanto no que diz respeito ao primeiro Pilar, onde não existe cofinanciamento dos Estados-Membros, como no segundo Pilar, onde é necessária comparticipação, pergunto à Comissão se, no âmbito desse mesmo fundo comunitário de apoio para 2007-2013, e em relação ao primeiro Pilar para o ano de 2012, existem algumas correções financeiras a fazer a Portugal.

Resposta conjunta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(24 de abril de 2013)

Todas as correções relativas ao Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Garantia (FEAGA) e ao Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural (Feader) na sequência do procedimento de apuramento da conformidade e impostas a Portugal a partir de 2007, bem como os motivos das correções, constam de Decisões da Comissão ([1]).

([1]) 2007/243/CE (Jornal Oficial da UE: L 106 de 24.4.2007), 2007/647/CE (L 261 de 6.10.2007), 2008/68/CE (L 18 de 23.1.2008), 2008/321/CE (L 109 de19.4.2008), 2008/960/CE (L 340 de 19.12.2008), 2009/721/CE (L 257 de 30.9.2009), 2010/152/UE (L 63 de 12.3.2010), 2010/668/UE (L 288 de 5.11.2010), 2011/244/UE (L 102 de 16.4.2011), 2011/689/UE (L 270 de 15.10.2011), 2012/89/UE (L 43 de 16.2.2012), 2012/336/UE (L 165 de 26.6.2012), 2012/500/UE (L 244 de 8.9.2012).

Nos termos do artigo 11.° do Regulamento (CE) n.° 885/2006 ([2]), com a redação que lhe foi dada pelo Regulamento de Execução (UE) n.° 375/2012 da Comissão de 2 de maio de 2012 ([3]), as deduções do financiamento da União são efetuadas pela Comissão sobre os pagamentos mensais relativos à despesa efetuada no segundo mês, no respeitante ao FEAGA, e sobre o pagamento trimestral seguinte para o qual o Estado-Membro apresente a declaração de despesas após a tomada da decisão, no respeitante ao Feader.

No entanto, até 30 de abril de 2014, Portugal beneficia da decisão de diferimento C(2012) 8645 de 27 de novembro de 2012, que autoriza o diferimento por 18 meses da execução das deduções supramencionadas e a execução subsequente do montante total objeto do diferimento em três prestações anuais idênticas. Até à data, a decisão de diferimento cobriu 105,5 milhões de euros.

([2]) JO L 171 de 23.6.2006, p. 90.
([3]) JO L 118 de 3.5.2012, p. 4.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002348/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Financial adjustments imposed on Portugal since 2007

With regard to the use and execution of EAFRD funding, both under the first pillar (where there is no co-financing by Member States) and under the second pillar (where this is required), will the Commission say:

What financial adjustments have been imposed on Portugal between 2007 and the present?

What were the specific amounts and reasons for those adjustments?

What financial adjustments — and in respect of what amounts — have already been settled?

Were the amounts settled directly by the Portuguese Ministry of Finance or in the form of cuts in Portugal's CAP funding?

Question for written answer E-002349/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Financial adjustments imposed on Portugal — 2011

With regard to the use and execution of EAFRD funding, both under the first pillar (where there is no co-financing by Member States) and under the second pillar (where this is required), will the Commission say whether, in the context of this Community support fund for the period 2007-2013, and for 2011 as far as the first pillar is concerned, there are any financial adjustments that Portugal will be required to make?

.

Question for written answer E-002350/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Financial adjustments imposed on Portugal — 2012

With regard to the use and execution of EAFRD funding, both under the first pillar (where there is no co-financing by Member States) and under the second pillar (where this is required), will the Commission say whether, in the context of this Community support fund for the period 2007-2013, and for 2012 as far as the first pillar is concerned, there are any financial adjustments that Portugal will be required to make?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

All corrections for European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) and European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) following the conformity clearance procedure and imposed on Portugal as from 2007 with the reasons for the correction can be found in Commission Decisions ([1]).

([1]) 2007/243/EC (Official Journal of the EU: L 106, 24.4.2007), 2007/647/EC (L 261, 6.10.2007), 2008/68/EC (L 18, 23.1.2008), 2008/321/EC (L 109, 19.4.2008), 2008/960/EC (L 340, 19.12.2008), 2009/721/EC (L 257, 30.9.2009), 2010/152/EU (L 63, 12.3.2010), 2010/668/EU (L 288, 5.11.2010), 2011/244/EU (L 102, 16.4.2011), 2011/689/EU (L 270, 15.10.2011), 2012/89/EU (L 43, 16.2.2012), 2012/336/EU (L 165, 26.6.2012), 2012/500/EU (L 244, 8.9.2012).

According to Article 11 of Regulation (EC) No 885/2006 ([2]), as amended by Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 375/2012 of 2 May 2012 ([3]), the deductions from Union financing are made by the Commission from the monthly payment relating to the expenditure effected in the second month with regards to EAGF and from the next quarterly payment for which the declaration of expenditure is submitted by the Member State after the decision has been adopted with regards to EAFRD.

However, Portugal benefits from deferral decision, C(2012) 8645 of 27/11/2012, until 30 April 2014, which allows for a deferral of the execution of the abovementioned deductions by 18 months and for the repayment of the total amount under deferral in three equal annual instalments. Until now EUR 105.5 million have been covered by the deferral decision.

([2]) OJ L 171/90, 23.6.2006.
([3]) OJ L 118/4, 3.5.2012.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002351/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Alterações ao Proder II

O Proder é um instrumento estratégico e financeiro de apoio ao desenvolvimento rural do continente, para o período 2007-2013, aprovado pela Comissão Europeia, Decisão C (2007) 6159.

O Proder visa aumentar a competitividade dos setores agrícolas e florestal, promover a sustentabilidade dos espaços rurais e dos recursos naturais e ainda a revitalização económica e social das zonas rurais.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Até à data de dezembro de 2012, foram pedidas por Portugal algumas alterações ao Proder?

Em caso afirmativo, quais, e se estas foram ou não aceites pela Comissão?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(8 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão convida o Senhor Deputado a consultar a resposta à pergunta escrita com a ref.ª E-005903/2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002351/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Amendments to the Rural Development Programme II

The Rural Development Programme (Proder) is a strategic and financial instrument for supporting the rural development of mainland Portugal during the period 2007-2013; it was approved by the Commission in Decision C(2007)6159 of 4 December.

The Proder aims to increase the competitiveness of the agricultural and forestry sectors and to promote the sustainability of rural areas and natural resources as well as the economic and social revitalisation of rural areas.

Has Portugal requested any amendments to the Proder up to December 2012?

If so, what were they and did the Commission approve them?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005903/2010.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002352/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Agricultura: verbas perdidas por Portugal no ano de 2010

Tendo em conta a execução das verbas do quadro comunitário de apoio 2007-2013 para o desenvolvimento rural, tanto no que diz respeito ao primeiro pilar onde não existe cofinanciamento do Estado-Membro, como no segundo pilar onde é necessária comparticipação.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Das verbas disponíveis no primeiro pilar para Portugal, quais foram definitivamente perdidas no ano de 2010 por não execução?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002353/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Agricultura: verbas perdidas no primeiro pilar no ano de 2012

Tendo em conta a execução das verbas do quadro comunitário de apoio 2007-2013 para o desenvolvimento rural, tanto no que diz respeito ao primeiro pilar onde não existe cofinanciamento do Estado Membro, como no segundo pilar onde é necessária comparticipação.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Das verbas disponíveis no primeiro pilar para Portugal, quais foram definitivamente perdidas no ano de 2012 por não execução?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002355/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Agricultura: verbas perdidas por Portugal no ano de 2011

Tendo em conta a execução das verbas do quadro comunitário de apoio 2007-2013 para o desenvolvimento rural, tanto no que diz respeito ao primeiro pilar onde não existe cofinanciamento do Estado-Membro, como no segundo pilar onde é necessária comparticipação.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Das verbas disponíveis no primeiro pilar para Portugal, quais foram definitivamente perdidas no ano de 2011 por não execução?

Resposta conjunta dada por Dacian Cioloș em nome da Comissão
(24 de abril de 2013)

Os relatórios anuais sobre o Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Garantia ([1]) contêm informações pormenorizadas sobre a execução orçamental por Estado-Membro. O relatório anual para 2012 estará disponível no outono de 2013; assim, atualmente, os dados relativos à execução orçamental de 2012 são provisórios.

([1]) Os relatórios podem ser consultados no sítio Web: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/financial-reports/index_en.htm

Para as despesas relacionadas com o mercado, os atos de base não estabelecem uma afetação predeterminada para Portugal, exceto no caso do programa de apoio ao setor vitivinícola e do apoio ao POSEI, cujas dotações foram já quase plenamente utilizadas por Portugal.

No respeitante às ajudas diretas, Portugal pagou 92,8 % da sua dotação (tendo em conta a modulação) no exercício de 2010. A execução aumentou para 99,8 % e 98,8 % nos exercícios de 2011 e de 2012, em parte devido à aplicação do apoio específico ao abrigo do artigo 68.° do Regulamento (CE) n.° 73/2009 ([2]).

([2]) JO L 30 de 31.1.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002352/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Agriculture: Portugal — loss of appropriations in 2010

With regard to the execution of appropriations under the Community support framework for 2007-2013 for rural development, under both the first pillar, for which there is no Member State co-financing, and the second pillar, for which joint funding is obligatory:

Which of the appropriations available under the first pillar did Portugal lose in 2010 due to a failure to execute them?

Question for written answer E-002353/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Agriculture: loss of appropriations under the first pillar in 2012

With regard to the execution of appropriations under the Community support framework for 2007-2013 for rural development, under both the first pillar, for which there is no Member State co-financing, and the second pillar, for which joint funding is obligatory:

Which of the appropriations available under the first pillar did Portugal lose in 2012 due to a failure to execute them?

Question for written answer E-002355/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Agriculture: Portugal — loss of appropriations in 2011

With regard to the execution of appropriations under the Community support framework for 2007-2013 for rural development, under both the first pillar, for which there is no Member State co-financing, and the second pillar, for which joint funding is obligatory:

Which of the appropriations available under the first pillar did Portugal lose in 2011 due to a failure to execute them?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The annual reports for the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund ([1]) include detailed information on the budget execution by Member State. The annual report for 2012 will be available in autumn 2013 and so at present the 2012 budget execution figures are provisional.

For market-related expenditure, no pre-determined allocation for Portugal is established in the basic acts, except for the wine support programme and the POSEI support for which Portugal is close to a full utilisation of the envelopes.

As regards direct aids, Portugal paid 92.8% of its envelope (taking into account modulation) in financial year 2010. The execution improved to 99.8% and 98.8% in financial years 2011 and 2012, partially due to the implementation of the specific support under Article 68 of Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 ([2]).

([1]) The reports are available on this website: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-funding/financial-reports/index_en.htm
([2]) OJ L 30, 31.1.2009.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002356/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Apoio aos Jovens Agricultores III

Em Portugal, o apoio à instalação de jovens agricultores tem como teto máximo, e para esta medida do Proder, 40 mil euros. Este montante afigura-se-me manifestamente insuficiente para quem pretende dar início a tal atividade.

Pode a Comissão indicar qual foi a dotação financeira unitária atribuída aos jovens agricultores para este efeito, por Estado-Membro, até dezembro de 2012?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(23 de abril de 2013)

O quadro anexo mostra a afetação indicativa do Feader para a medida 112, «Instalação de jovens agricultores», bem como a soma dos pedidos de pagamento relacionados com esta medida recebidos pela Comissão até fins de 2012.

É de notar que o pagamento máximo por beneficiário está limitado a 70 000 euros e consiste, no máximo, num prémio único de 40 000 euros e bonificação de juros. Dentro desses limites, os Estados-Membros podem orientar melhor o apoio. Além disso, os jovens que se instalem como agricultores podem beneficiar de uma série de outras medidas, nomeadamente de uma maior intensidade de auxílio para investimentos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002356/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Support for young farmers III

In Portugal, support of up to EUR 40 000 is available for the setting up of young farmers under the Rural Development Programme (Proder). I believe that this is a clearly inadequate amount for those who wish to begin farming.

Can the Commission indicate how much each Member State allocated to the setting up of young farmers up to December 2012?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)

The table in the annex shows the indicative EAFRD allocation to measure 112 'setting up of young farmers' as well as the sum of the payment requests related to this measure as received by the Commission by the end of 2012.

It has to be noted that the maximum payment per beneficiary is limited to EUR 70 000, consisting of a maximum single premium of EUR 40 000 and interest rate subsidy. Within these ceilings, Member States may further target the support. In addition, young setting up farmers may benefit from a number of other measures, notably from an increased aid intensity for investments.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002357/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Apoio aos Jovens Agricultores IV

Em Portugal, o apoio à instalação de jovens agricultores tem como teto máximo, e para esta medida do Proder, 40 mil euros. Este montante afigura-se-me manifestamente insuficiente para quem pretende dar início a tal atividade.

1. Considera a Comissão que Portugal poderia aumentar a dotação por jovem agricultor para esta medida e, em caso afirmativo, quais os procedimentos a adotar?

2. Pode a Comissão indicar qual a verba utilizada por Portugal até dezembro de 2012?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(8 de abril de 2013)

1. A Comissão constata que esta pergunta é exatamente igual à pergunta escrita com a ref.ª E-5900/2010 que o Senhor Deputado apresentou anteriormente, pelo que o convida a consultar a resposta dada a essa pergunta.

2. Os fundos do Feader utilizados por Portugal até dezembro de 2012 ascendem a um total de 2 099 197 371 euros, dos quais 116 671 105 euros respeitantes à medida 112 — Instalação de jovens agricultores.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002357/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Support for young farmers IV

In Portugal, support of up to EUR 40 000 is available for the setting up of young farmers under the Rural Development Programme (Proder). I believe that this is a clearly inadequate amount for those who wish to begin farming.

1. Does the Commission believe that Portugal could increase the budget for the setting up of young farmers and, if so, what procedures should it adopt?

2. Can it indicate the amount of funds Portugal used up to December 2012?

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

1. The Commission would point out that this question is exactly the same as the Honourable Member's previous Written Question E-5900/2010 and would therefore refer the Honourable Member to the corresponding answer already given.

2. The funds (EARDF) used up by Portugal up to December 2012 amount to a total of EUR 2.099.197.371 of which EUR 116.671.105 in measure 112 — Setting up of young farmers.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002358/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Trabalho infantil na pecuária

Foi recentemente divulgado um relatório da Organização das Nações Unidas para a Alimentação e a Agricultura (FAO), intitulado «Trabalho infantil na pecuária», que revela que 60 % das crianças envolvidas em trabalho infantil estão na agricultura. Este é tido como um dos setores mais perigosos, e há crianças a partir dos 5 anos a trabalhar no pastoreio.

Apesar da participação na agricultura poder ser considerada um fator normal do crescimento, a FAO sublinha neste relatório que muito do trabalho das crianças na pecuária pode ser categorizado como trabalho infantil, uma vez que pode representar riscos para a saúde, e «em muitas situações, a natureza do trabalho das crianças na pecuária dificulta a frequência da escola formal e os riscos e as condições envolvidos tornam-no a pior forma de trabalho infantil».

Como avalia a Comissão o recente relatório da FAO?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(25 de abril de 2013)

O relatório da FAO sobre trabalho infantil no setor da pecuária é um estudo útil que contribui para o nosso entendimento da natureza do problema e que informará as nossas políticas quando se tratar de ajudar governos nossos parceiros a prepararem e aplicarem medidas relativas ao trabalho infantil na agricultura.

A União Europeia está empenhada em erradicar o trabalho infantil a nível mundial e, em particular, as suas piores formas, que envolvem trabalho perigoso. A UE aborda esta questão de uma forma holística, congregando diálogo político, cooperação para o desenvolvimento, educação, a promoção da «responsabilidade social das empresas» e políticas de comércio. Para o efeito, a UE colabora com a sociedade civil, o setor privado e organizações internacionais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002358/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Children's work in the livestock sector

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) recently published a report entitled 'Children's work in the livestock sector' which reveals that 60% of children involved in child labour work in agriculture. This is considered one of the most dangerous sectors and children as young as five years old are working with livestock.

Although involvement in agriculture may be considered a normal part of growing up, this FAO report stresses that much of children's work in the livestock sector can be categorised as child labour since it may pose health risks and 'in many situations, the nature of the work of children in the livestock sector makes it difficult for children to attend formal school, or the hazards and conditions involved make it a worst form of child labour.'

What is the Commission's assessment of the FAO's recent report?

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

The FAO report on tackling child labour in the livestock sector is a useful study that contributes to our understanding of the nature of the problem and will inform our policies when it comes to helping partner governments to develop and implement actions regarding child labour in the agriculture sector.

The EU is committed to eradicating child labour at global level and in particular the worst forms of child labour which include hazardous work. The EU addresses this issue through a holistic approach bringing together political dialogues, development cooperation, education, the promotion of Corporate Social Responsibility and trade policies. To this end, the EU works with civil society, the private sector and international organisations.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002414/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(28 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Uova falsamente «biologiche»

Il settimanale tedesco *Der Spiegel* rivela che 150 imprese produttrici di uova sono sotto inchiesta, accusate di produrre uova «bio» false. Infatti, sul mercato venivano immesse uova dichiarate biologiche ma che tali non erano, poiché i parametri produttivi indispensabili per fregiarsi della ricercatissima «etichetta» non sarebbero stati rispettati.

Fra le violazioni del protocollo per ottenere uova biologiche, il numero degli animali raccolti insieme nei pollai e il trattamento stesso delle galline ovaiole.

Il portavoce del ministero dell'Agricoltura tedesco ha confermato che «l'autorità giudiziaria della Bassa Sassonia ha aperto un'inchiesta su un sospetto di frode da parte dei produttori che vendono le uova dichiarandole biologiche», ipotizzando una truffa ai danni dei consumatori che colpisce però anche molti agricoltori onesti del settore dei prodotti biologici.

Secondo la stampa tedesca, inoltre, le indagini coinvolgerebbero anche altri Länder del paese, come la Renania settentrionale-Vestfalia e il Meclemburgo-Pomerania anteriore. Lo scandalo potrebbe estendersi ad altri paesi europei.

Come intende la Commissione intervenire per prevenire che questo ennesimo caso scandaloso «contagi» altri Stati membri, con riferimento alla tutela dei consumatori e dei produttori che rispettano le regole?

Risposta congiunta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(15 aprile 2013)

Ai sensi dell'articolo 27 del regolamento (CE) n. 834/2007 ([1]), gli Stati membri istituiscono un sistema di controllo e designano una o più autorità competenti responsabili dei controlli. La Commissione è in attesa dei risultati dell'indagine che le autorità tedesche competenti stanno svolgendo sul caso di sospetta frode relativo alle uova biologiche.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 834/2007 del Consiglio, del 28 giugno 2007, relativo alla produzione biologica e all'etichettatura dei prodotti biologici e che abroga il regolamento (CEE) n. 2092/91 (GU L 189 del 20.7.2007).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002359/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Suspeita de fraude em ovos «biológicos»

Durante uma conferência de imprensa, o porta-voz do Ministério da Agricultura alemão, Holger Eichele, referiu que «As autoridades judiciárias da Baixa-Saxónia (norte) estão a investigar as explorações suspeitas de fraude na venda de ovos biológicos e de ar livre». Dezenas de explorações agrícolas alemãs são suspeitas de ter vendido ovos como «biológicos» ou de galinhas criadas ao ar livre sem cumprirem as especificações para esse tipo de denominação.

1. Tem a Comissão conhecimento de recentes exportações dos referidos ovos no espaço comunitário?

2. Pode a Comissão indicar se está prevista alguma investigação por parte da UE às explorações em causa?

Resposta conjunta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(15 de abril de 2013)

De acordo com o artigo 27.° do Regulamento (CE) n.° 834/2007 ([1]), os Estados-Membros devem estabelecer um sistema de controlo e designar uma ou várias autoridades competentes responsáveis pelos controlos. A Comissão está atualmente a aguardar os resultados do inquérito que as autoridades alemãs competentes estão a realizar no caso de suspeita de fraude relativa aos ovos biológicos.

([1]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 834/2007 do Conselho, de 28 de junho de 2007, relativo à produção biológica e à rotulagem dos produtos biológicos e que revoga o Regulamento (CE) n.° 2092/91 (JO L 189 de 20.7.2007, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002359/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Suspected fraud concerning 'organic' eggs

During a press conference, Holger Eichele, the spokesperson for the German Ministry of Agriculture, said that judicial authorities in Lower Saxony, in the north of the country, are investigating farms suspected of fraudulently selling organic and free-range eggs. Dozens of German farms are suspected of having sold eggs labelled as 'organic' and 'free-range' without meeting the specifications governing these kinds of products.

1. Is the Commission aware of recent exports of these eggs within the EU?

2. Does the EU plan to investigate the farms in question?

Question for written answer E-002414/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Eggs falsely labelled as 'organic'

The German weekly magazine, *Der Spiegel*, has revealed that 150 egg producers are being investigated for producing eggs falsely labelled as organic. In fact, eggs declared to be organic were placed on the market; they were, however, not organic since it appears that the production criteria required to display the much sought-after label had not been respected.

The violations of the protocol to obtain organic eggs include the number of animals kept together in hen-houses and how the hens were actually treated.

The spokesperson for the German Ministry of Agriculture confirmed that 'the judicial authority of Lower Saxony has launched an investigation into suspected fraud by producers who sell eggs, declaring them to be organic'. It is assumed that this concerns consumer fraud which, however, also affects many honest farmers of organic products.

Furthermore, according to the German press, the investigations also involve other German *Länder*, such as North Rhine-Westphalia and Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania. The scandal may also extend to other EU countries.

What action does the Commission intend to take to prevent the latest in a long line of cases from 'contaminating' other Member States, with reference to the protection of consumers and producers who comply with the rules?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(15 April 2013)

According Article 27 of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 ([1]), Member states shall set up a system of controls and designate one or more competent authorities responsible for controls. The Commission is currently waiting for the results of the investigation that the German competent authorities are carrying out in the case of the suspected fraud concerning organic eggs.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 (OJ L 189, 20.7.2007).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002361/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Mali: Envio de uma missão de treino da UE

Realizou-se no passado dia 5 de fevereiro uma reunião convocada pela Alta Representante da União Europeia para os Assuntos Externos, Catherine Ashton, na sequência dos «mais recentes desenvolvimentos» naquele país africano, onde decorria na altura uma intervenção militar francesa de apoio ao governo maliano na luta contra os rebeldes islamitas.

Entre outros pontos, estava em discussão, já há meses, o envio pela UE de uma missão de treino e aconselhamento do exército maliano. Esta grande missão militar, que irá contar com 500 soldados e que tem um mandato de 15 meses para moldar o exército do Mali, está já no terreno e é tida como um elemento fulcral.

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

De que forma tem decorrido a referida missão militar de treino da UE?

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

A EUTM Mali conta já com cerca de 200 formadores, mais os elementos do QG da Missão, de apoio logístico e da força de proteção, num total de cerca de 500 pessoas. O centro de formação está localizado em Koulikoro (60 km a norte de Bamako) e o QG da Missão em Bamako. A missão tem uma duração prevista de 15 meses, incluindo uma fase de transferência da autoridade. Atualmente, 23 países contribuem para esta missão.

A missão tem por objetivo responder às necessidades operacionais das forças armadas malianas através de:

— formação para aumento das capacidades das unidades das forças armadas malianas;

— formação e aconselhamento em matéria de comando e controlo, cadeia logística e recursos humanos, bem como em direito humanitário internacional, proteção dos civis e direitos humanos.

A missão não participará em operações de combate.

O pilar da missão respeitante ao aconselhamento e aos conhecimentos especializados iniciou-se em 18 de fevereiro, enquanto o pilar respeitante à formação deverá ser lançado a partir de 2 de abril, com o início da formação de um primeiro agrupamento tático maliano (650 elementos). A escolha dos militares envolvidos permanecerá responsabilidade das forças armadas do Mali.

A formação incidirá sobre a preparação militar individual de base, complementada por ações de formação estratégica ao nível do pelotão ou da companhia. Serão ainda ministrados determinados cursos específicos, nomeadamente versando a C-IED, a artilharia, a engenharia militar e os direitos humanos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002361/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Sending an EU training mission to Mali

On 5 February the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs — Catherine Ashton — called a meeting in response to the 'most recent developments' in Mali, where a French military force was at that time intervening in support of the Malian Government's fight against Islamist rebels.

The points discussed included the idea raised several months earlier of the EU's sending a mission to train and advise the Malian army. This great mission is seen as a key element, with 500 soldiers already on the ground and a 15-month mandate to mould the Malian army.

Will the Vice-President/High representative answer the following question:

In what form has the EU military training mission in question gone ahead?

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

EUTM Mali is up to 200 trainers plus the Mission HQ, Logistic support and Force Protection elements for a total of around 500 personnel. The Training site is located in Koulikoro (60 km North from Bamako) and the Mission HQ in Bamako. The mission is planned for 15 months including a hand-over phase. Currently 23 countries contribute to the mission.

The Mission's objective is to respond to the operational needs of the Malian Armed Forces through the provision of:

— training for the benefit of the Malian Armed Forces unit capabilities;

— training and advice in command and control, logistical chain and human resources as well as on international humanitarian law, the protection of civilians and human rights.

The mission will not be involved in combat operations.

The expertise and advice pillar of the mission has started 18 February, while the training one is expected for the 2 April with the training of a first Malian Battle group (650 personnel). The selection of the personnel remains the responsibility of the Malian Armed Forces.

Training will focus on Individual basic military trainings, plus platoon and company level trainings and manoeuvre. In addition some specific courses will be implemented such as C-IED, artillery, engineers, and human rights.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002362/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Programa Pol-Primett

Considerando que:

— A Comissão Europeia financia um projeto trienal, Pol-Primett, que se destina a melhorar a colaboração entre o setor privado e as agências de aplicação da lei na luta contra o furto de metais;

— A parceria Pol-Primett inclui representantes de cinco países, nomeadamente, do Reino Unido, da Espanha, da Itália, da Grécia e da Bulgária.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Sabendo que Portugal é um dos países com um elevado registo de furto de metais, não considera importante do ponto de vista estratégico a inclusão de Portugal nesta parceria?

2. Está previsto o prolongamento do financiamento deste projeto pela Comissão?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(6 de maio de 2013)

A Comissão financia atualmente o projeto Pol-Primett que tem efetivamente proporcionado resultados positivos durante a primeira fase em curso.

1. A escolha de ações e parceiros específicos fica ao critério do requerente no momento da apresentação da proposta. Por conseguinte, a Comissão não pode exigir que Portugal esteja incluído.

2. A Comissão atribuiu recentemente uma subvenção a favor da segunda fase do projeto Pol-Primett com base num pedido de financiamento. Portugal faz parte do consórcio do projeto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002362/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Pol-PRIMETT Programme

Whereas:

— the Commission is funding Pol-PRIMETT, a three-year project intended to improve cooperation between the private sector and law-enforcement agencies in the fight against metal theft,

— the partners in Pol-PRIMETT represent five countries: the UK, Spain, Italy, Greece and Bulgaria,

will the Commission answer the following two questions:

1. Since Portugal is one of the countries with a high rate of metal theft, is it not important from the strategic point of view for Portugal to be included in this partnership?

2. Does the Commission plan to extend the funding of this project?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)

The Commission is funding the Pol-Primett project which indeed has brought valuable results so far during the first phase.

1. The choice of specific actions and partners remains within the discretion of the applicant when submitting the proposal. The Commission cannot therefore demand that Portugal is included.

2. A request for funding for a second phase of the Pol-Primett project has just been awarded a grant by the Commission. Portugal is part of the project consortium.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002363/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Novo incidente nuclear em Almaraz

Segundo notícia veiculada pelo jornal «Correio da Manhã», o presidente da associação ambientalista Quercus alertou recentemente o Governo português para um novo incidente na central nuclear de Almaraz (Cáceres, Espanha), a 150 quilómetros de Portugal.

O presidente da associação ambientalista refere que: «É uma situação que nos preocupa, porque a central devia ter encerrado há dois anos, depois de ter trabalhado durante 25, mas o governo espanhol acabou por prolongar a atividade por mais 10 anos».

Considerando que:

— Já em 2011 a central espanhola de Almaraz registou uma avaria numa bomba de refrigeração, tendo inclusivamente o Conselho de Segurança Nuclear espanhol decidido parar a produção de energia elétrica de um dos reatores perante as altas temperaturas registadas;

— Uma explosão na central obrigaria à retirada das populações dos distritos portugueses de Castelo Branco e Portalegre, para além das consequências ambientais previsíveis e para a saúde das populações.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento deste novo incidente na central nuclear de Almaraz?

Como avalia os sucessivos incidentes registados na referida central?

Resposta dada por Günther Oettinger em nome da Comissão
(17 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão não foi informada sobre este incidente na central nuclear de Almaraz. De acordo com as informações disponibilizadas publicamente pela autoridade para a segurança nuclear espanhola, o incidente foi classificado a título provisório no nível 0 («sem significado para a segurança») da Escala Internacional de Ocorrências Nucleares (INES). Não existe qualquer obrigação de informar a nível internacional sobre incidentes deste nível.

A decisão de encerrar ou de prolongar a licença de exploração de uma central nuclear constitui uma responsabilidade nacional. O artigo 5.° da Diretiva 2009/71/Euratom do Conselho ([1]) estabelece que o quadro nacional a nível jurídico, regulamentar e organizacional definido pelos Estados-Membros deve assegurar que a autoridade reguladora nacional competente dispõe da competência para exigir ao titular da licença a demonstração do cumprimento dos requisitos nacionais em matéria de segurança nuclear, bem como da competência para levar a cabo ações de execução regulamentar, incluindo a suspensão da exploração da instalação nuclear ([2]).

A Comissão está presentemente a preparar uma nova proposta sobre segurança nuclear de modo a garantir que está ao mais alto nível possível.

([1]) Diretiva 2009/71/Euratom do Conselho de 25 de Junho de 2009 que estabelece um quadro comunitário para a segurança nuclear das instalações nucleares, JO L 172 de 2.7.2009.

([2]) Além disso, de acordo com a diretiva, os Estados-Membros estão obrigados a assegurar que o seu quadro nacional exija que os titulares das licenças analisem, verifiquem e melhorem continuamente a segurança das suas instalações nucleares, sob a supervisão da autoridade reguladora competente, tal como dispõe o seu artigo 6.°, n.°2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002363/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Another nuclear incident at Almaraz

According to a report in the *Correio da Manhã* newspaper, the chairman of the environmental association Quercus recently alerted the Portuguese Government to a further incident at the Almaraz nuclear power station (in Caceres, Spain), located 150 kilometres from Portugal.

The chairman of the association said the following: 'This worries us, because the power station should have been closed two years ago, after 25 years' service, but in the end the Spanish Government extended its working life for a further 10 years'.

Whereas:

— even the Spanish Nuclear Safety Council decided to halt electricity production using one of the reactors at the Spanish nuclear power station at Almaraz, in view of the high temperatures recorded when a cooling pump broke down in 2011;

— an explosion at the power station would oblige the populations of the Portuguese districts of Castelo Branco and Portalegre to be evacuated, in addition to having foreseeable consequences for the environment and public health;

Will the Commission answer the following question:

Is the Commission aware of this further incident at the Almaraz nuclear power station?

How does it view the series of incidents recorded at the nuclear power station in question?

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

The Commission has not been informed about this incident at the Almaraz nuclear power station. According to publicly available information by the Spanish nuclear safety authority, the incident has provisionally been rated at level 0 ('No safety significance') on the International Nuclear Event Scale (INES). There is no requirement to inform internationally about events of this level.

The decision to shut down or to extend the operating licence of a nuclear power plant is a national responsibility. Article 5 of Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom ([1]) requires that the national legislative, regulatory and organisational framework laid down by the Member States shall ensure that the national competent regulatory authority is given the power to require demonstration of compliance of the license holder with the national nuclear safety requirements as well as the power to carry out enforcement actions, including suspending the operation of a nuclear installation ([2]).

The Commission is currently preparing a new proposal on nuclear safety to ensure it is at the highest level possible.

([1]) Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations; OJ L 172, 2.7.2009.
([2]) In addition, according to the directive, it is an obligation of the Member States to ensure that their national framework requires license holders to regularly assess, verify and improve the safety of their nuclear installations, under the supervision of the national competent authority; Article 6 paragraph 2.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002364/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Execução Proder Eixo 1 em 2012

O Fundo Comunitário de apoio 2007-2013 para o desenvolvimento rural é um instrumento de apoio fundamental, a que os países podem aceder na UE.

No que diz respeito ao Eixo 1 do Proder, pode a Comissão indicar o que já está executado à data de dezembro de 2012, e quanto falta executar, para não serem perdidas verbas, obedecendo à regra N+2?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002365/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Execução Proder Eixo 2 em 2012

O Fundo Comunitário de apoio 2007-2013 para o desenvolvimento rural é um instrumento de apoio fundamental, a que os países podem aceder na UE.

No que diz respeito ao Eixo 2 do Proder, pode a Comissão indicar o que já está executado à data de dezembro de 2012, e quanto falta executar, para não serem perdidas verbas, obedecendo à regra N+2?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002366/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Execução do Eixo 3 do programa Proder em 2012

Considerando que o Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural 2007-2013 é um instrumento de apoio fundamental, a que os países da UE podem aceder;

Pergunto à Comissão:

No que diz respeito ao Eixo 3 do programa Proder, o que é que já estava executado à data de dezembro de 2012, e quanto falta executar, para não serem perdidas verbas, obedecendo à regra N+2?

Resposta conjunta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(23 de abril de 2013)

Os montantes totais utilizados pelo Programa de Desenvolvimento Rural (Proder) até ao final de 2012 para os eixos 1, 2 e 3 e os correspondentes montantes remanescentes no plano financeiro são os seguintes:

Continente	Despesas totais incorridas pelo Proder em 31 de dezembro de 2012, em milhões de euros	Montante total remanescente em 31 de dezembro de 2012, em milhões de euros
Eixo 1	793,80	753,39
Eixo 2	1 139,28	412,01
Eixo 3	21,29	20,77

Não é possível estimar na presente fase o montante das verbas perdidas em virtude da aplicação da regra n+2 durante os três últimos anos (2013, 2014 e 2015) de execução do atual programa de desenvolvimento rural. As autorizações orçamentais relativas a um programa de desenvolvimento rural que não sejam utilizadas para pré-financiamento ou pagamentos intermédios até ao final do segundo ano seguinte ao da autorização são automaticamente anuladas. Por conseguinte, a aplicação da regra n+2 depende da capacidade de cada programa de desenvolvimento rural de utilizar as verbas durante os três anos seguintes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002364/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Execution of Axis 1 (Rural Development Programme) in 2012

The 2007-2013 Community fund for rural development is a fundamental support instrument available to EU countries.

Can the Commission say how much funding has already been executed under Axis 1 of the Rural Development Programme (Proder) up to December 2012, and how much still remains to be executed in order to ensure that appropriations are not lost under the N+2 rule?

Question for written answer E-002365/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Execution of Axis 2 (Rural Development Programme) in 2012

The 2007-2013 Community fund for rural development is a fundamental support instrument available to EU countries.

Can the Commission say how much funding has already been executed under Axis 2 of the Rural Development Programme (Proder) up to December 2012, and how much still remains to be executed in order to ensure that appropriations are not lost under the N+2 rule?

Question for written answer E-002366/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Execution of Axis 3 (Rural Development Programme) in 2012

The European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development 2007-2013 is a fundamental support instrument available to EU countries.

Can the Commission say how much funding has already been executed under Axis 3 of the Rural Development Programme (Proder) up to December 2012, and how much still remains to be executed in order to ensure that appropriations are not lost under the N+2 rule?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)

The total amounts consumed by the rural development programme (Proder) by the end of year 2012 for axes 1, 2 and 3 and the corresponding remaining amounts in the financial plan are the following:

Continent	Total expenditure incurred by Proder on 31 December 2012 (million EUR)	Total amount remaining on 31 December 2012 (million EUR)
Axis 1	793.80	753.39
Axis 2	1 139.28	412.01
Axis 3	21.29	20.77

It is not possible to estimate at this state how much funds may be lost due to the application of the n+2 rule during the 3 final years (2013, 2014 and 2015) of implementation of the current rural development programme. If budget commitments for a rural development programme are not used for pre-financing or intermediate payments by the end of the 2nd year following that of the commitment, they will be automatically de-committed. Therefore, the application of the n+2 rule depends on the ability of the individual rural development programme to consume funds during the following 3 years.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002367/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Proder regra N+2 no ano de 2012

1. Pode a Comissão indicar se o Fundo Comunitário de apoio 2007-2013 para o desenvolvimento rural é um instrumento de apoio fundamental, a que os países podem aceder na UE?

2. No que diz respeito ao Proder e tendo em consideração a regra N+2, Portugal já perdeu definitivamente verbas à data de dezembro de 2012? Em caso afirmativo, é possível especificar em que anos e em que rubricas?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloşon em nome da Comissão
(15 de abril de 2013)

1. No período 2007-2013, o Fundo Europeu Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural (Feader) constitui um instrumento fundamental de apoio no âmbito da política agrícola comum. É o instrumento através do qual é implementada a política de desenvolvimento rural da UE. Os programas de desenvolvimento rural nacionais ou regionais do Feader são implementados sob a responsabilidade conjunta da UE e dos Estados-Membros.

2. A Comissão remete para a sua resposta às anteriores questões idênticas sobre a potencial perda de fundos do Proder (o programa de desenvolvimento rural para Portugal Continental) devido à aplicação da regra «N+2», apresentadas pelo Senhor Deputado: E-002345; E-002346, E-002347 e E-002357/2013 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002367/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Rural Development Programme N+2 rule in 2012

1. Can the Commission say whether the 2007-2013 Community fund for rural development is a fundamental support instrument available to EU countries?

2. Has Portugal already lost appropriations under the Rural Development Programme (Proder) and the N+2 rule up to December 2012? If so, in which years and in which categories?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(15 April 2013)

1. In the period 2007-2013 the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) is a fundamental support instrument within the common agricultural policy. It is the instrument through which the EU's rural development policy is implemented. National or regional EAFRD rural development programmes are implemented in shared responsibility between EU and Member States.

2. The Commission refers to its answer to the previous identical questions on the potential loss of Funds by Proder (the rural development programme for the Portuguese mainland) due to the application of the N+2 rule, put forward by the Honourable Member: E-002345; E-002346, E-002347 and E-002357/2013 ([1]).

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-002368/13
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(28 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Desarrollo del telepeaje europeo y otros servicios de transporte inteligente

La prensa española ha recogido recientemente unas declaraciones del Comisario de Transporte en las que se asegura que las infraestructuras y tecnología necesarias para construir una verdadera red europea de telepeaje estarán disponibles en 2014. En los planes de trabajo sobre la materia publicados por la Comisión se señalaron, como medidas prioritarias para ir avanzando en la construcción de este servicio, las operaciones de cooperación a nivel regional entre operadores transfronterizos.

La puesta en marcha de este servicio está lógicamente vinculada al resto de las prestaciones que ofrecerán los servicios de transporte inteligente que se diseñan en la Directiva 2010/40/UE de 7 de julio de 2010. En ella se establecen algunas acciones prioritarias cuya entrada en servicio es imprescindible para el funcionamiento de todos estos servicios. Entre ellas destacan el suministro en abierto y tiempo real de datos sobre desplazamientos intermodales y otros como la información universal sobre seguridad vial, o el suministro de servicios de información sobre disponibilidad y reservas de plazas de aparcamiento seguras y protegidas para camiones y vehículos comerciales.

A la vista de la complejidad y la importancia que la materia tiene para la competitividad del transporte:

1. ¿En qué estado se encuentran las experiencias de cooperación transfronteriza regional en materia de telepeaje? ¿En qué zonas están desarrollándose las experiencias más exitosas y por qué razones?

2. ¿Estima la Comisión que podrán cumplirse los plazos previstos para poner en marcha este servicio con cobertura europea en 2014?

3. ¿Cuál o cuáles de los servicios derivados de las acciones prioritarias que se citan en el artículo 3 de la citada Directiva espera la Comisión que estén accesibles antes al usuario a nivel europeo en los próximos años?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión es consciente de las posibles sinergias entre las diferentes aplicaciones STI ([1]), y en su Decisión de 2009 ([2]) recomienda que el equipo de a bordo del Servicio Europeo de Telepeaje (SET) permita la ampliación a otros servicios.

Ya existen sistemas de telepeaje en carreteras transfronterizas entre Dinamarca, Suecia, Noruega y Austria ([3]), así como entre Alemania y Austria ([4]). Varios prestadores de servicios ofrecen una unidad única a bordo que cubre Francia, España y Bélgica. Su interoperabilidad se basa en las comunicaciones por microondas ([5]). La interoperabilidad entre sistemas por satélite requiere un acuerdo sobre el contenido exacto de la información que deben intercambiarse los operadores de carreteras y los prestadores de servicios. Se está ultimando una norma sobre este tema .

Varios Estados miembros están trabajando en la puesta en marcha de un servicio de peaje interoperable entre ellos que utilizará tanto la tecnología por microondas como por satélite. Estas iniciativas deben abarcar todas las infraestructuras sujetas a telepeaje en la EU en una fase posterior. La Comisión espera que el SET esté disponible antes de 2014.

([1]) Sistemas de transporte inteligentes.
([2]) Decisión 2009/750/CE de la Comisión, de 6 de octubre de 2009, relativa a la definición del Servicio Europeo de Telepeaje y sus elementos técnicos, DO L 268 de 13.10.2009.
([3]) El sistema de peaje «EasyGo +».
([4]) El sistema TOLL2GO permite a las unidades a bordo alemanas operar en Austria.
([5]) DSRC: Comunicaciones Especializadas de Corto Alcance.

Con respecto a otros servicios STI que podrían funcionar en una unidad de a bordo SET conforme a las normas, la Comisión está fomentando la rápida implantación de eCall y de servicios que ofrecen aparcamiento seguro y protegido para camiones, así como de servicios que proporcionan información sobre el viaje y el tráfico en tiempo real. La Comisión prevé que antes de 2015 podrá ponerse en marcha el servicio eCall basado en el número 112 en todos los automóviles nuevos homologados y en los vehículos comerciales ligeros. Este servicio se basará en un enfoque normativo que abarque los sistemas a bordo de vehículos, telecomunicaciones y centros de llamadas de emergencia. Los trabajos actuales en virtud de la Directiva STI ([6]) también se centran en servicios interoperables de viaje en tiempo real y en servicios de información sobre el tráfico.

([6]) Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 7 de julio de 2010, por la que se establece el marco para la implantación de los sistemas de transporte inteligentes en el sector del transporte por carretera y para las interfaces con otros modos de transporte, DO L 207 de 6.8.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002368/13
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Development of the European interoperable toll system and other intelligent transport systems

The Spanish press has recently quoted the Commissioner for Transport as promising that the infrastructure and technology needed to establish a genuine trans-European highway toll collection system will be available in 2014. The Commission's relevant work plans identify regional cooperation between cross-border stakeholders as important steps in paving the way to such a system.

It stands to reason that establishing such a system is connected to the provision of the other services provided by intelligent transport systems, as defined in Directive 2010/40/EU of 7 July 2010. This directive lays down priority actions which are essential to the functioning of these services, including the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services, road safety information, as well as reservation services for safe and secure parking places for trucks and commercial vehicles.

In view of the complexity of this matter, and its importance for the competitiveness of the transport sector:

1. How far advanced are cross-border regional cooperation experiments on highway tolls? Which regions' experiments have been the most successful, and why?

2. Does the Commission think that the planned deadlines can be met for the service to be up and running across Europe by 2014?

3. Which of the services referred to in the priority actions listed in Article 3 of the directive does the Commission expect to be available to consumers in Europe in the coming years?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2013)

The Commission is aware of the possible synergies between various ITS ([1]) applications, and recommends in its 2009 Decision ([2]) that European Electronic Toll Service (EETS) on-board equipment should allow the implementation of other services.

Cross-border road toll systems already exist between Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Austria ([3]), as well as between Germany and Austria ([4]). A single on-board unit covering France, Spain and Belgium is offered by several service providers. Their interoperability is based on microwave communications ([5]). Interoperability between satellite-based systems needs an agreement on the precise content of the information to be exchanged between road operators and service providers. A norm on this subject is being finalised.

Several MS are working on the implementation of an interoperable road tolling service between themselves that will use both microwave and satellite technologies. These initiatives should cover all the electronically tolled infrastructures in the EU at a later stage. The Commission expects that EETS will be available by 2014.

For other ITS services that could run on an EETS-compliant on-board unit, the Commission is promoting the rapid deployment of e-Call and of services pertaining to safe and secure parking for trucks, as well as of services providing real-time travel and traffic information. The Commission foresees the introduction by 2015 of the 112-based eCall service in all new type-approved cars and light commercial vehicles. This service will be based on a regulatory approach covering in-vehicle systems, telecommunications and emergency call centres. Current works under the ITS Directive ([6]) are also focused on real-time interoperable travel and traffic information services.

([1]) Intelligent Transport Systems.
([2]) Decision 2009/750/EC of 6 October 2009 on the definition of the European Electronic Toll Service and its technical elements, OJ L 268, 13.10.2009.
([3]) The tolling system 'EasyGo+'.
([4]) The system TOLL2GO allows German on-board units to operate in Austria.
([5]) DSRC: Dedicated Short Range Communications.
([6]) Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2010 on the framework for the deployment of Intelligent Transport Systems in the field of road transport and for interfaces with other modes of transport, OJ L 207, 6.8.2010.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002370/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(28 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Omisión de conservación, protección y calidad del medio ambiental por la administración ambiental andaluza según la Directiva 92/43/CEE

Para la autorización de un proyecto de urbanización basado en reformas y construcciones de 13 grandes edificaciones, en período de exposición pública por el Ayuntamiento de Tarifa (Cádiz), esta administración local solicita un informe técnico ambiental a la Delegación Territorial en Cádiz de la Consejería de Agricultura, Pesca y Medio Ambiente de la Junta de Andalucía (Capyma), responsable de la Red Natura 2000 en la región. Esta administración emite dicho informe técnico con fecha de 5 de noviembre de 2012 con el n° 112311, pero este documento omite que el proyecto se desarrollará en un espacio perteneciente a la Red Natura 2000 así como que en la finca en la que se ubica este proyecto existen cuatro hábitats que están incluidos en la Directiva 92/43/CEE sobre hábitats ([1]). Siendo además fundamental este espacio para la conservación de los hábitats 1230 y 2250, igualmente obvian las disposiciones del artículo 6 de la mencionada Directiva.

El proyecto se pretende desarrollar en el lugar Estrecho ES0000337 ([2]) que es LIC, ZEPA y ZEC ([3]), y todos estos aspectos son omitidos y obviados igualmente en el informe emitido por la Capyma.

El proyecto de construcción, a pesar de las indicaciones de diversos alegantes en el período de exposición pública sobre la omisión entre otras de la Directiva 92/43/CEE, concluye con una autorización de obra, determinado así por el pleno municipal del Ayuntamiento de Tarifa ([4]), basada dicha autorización principalmente en el informe técnico que remitió la administración responsable y sin que además dicha resolución contenga respuestas razonadas a las apreciaciones efectuadas por los alegantes ([5]).

¿Considera la Comisión admisible que la propia autoridad ambiental que gestiona la custodia y la protección de los espacios protegidos de la Red Natura 2000 pueda obviar en sus informes ante otras administraciones los grados de conservación y legislación que amparan a estos espacios?

¿Qué medidas adoptará la Comisión para el cumplimiento de la directiva por parte de las administraciones en un futuro cercano?

¿Qué medidas adoptará la Comisión para este proyecto que no cumple las prescripciones legales de la Directiva 92/43/CE?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión está al corriente del proyecto para la construcción de un Centro de Migración y Cambio Global en el sitio Natura 2000 ES0000337 Estrecho, al que hace referencia Su Señoría.

En enero de 2012, el Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Medio Rural y Marino emitió una Resolución ([6]) por la que se aprobaba la adopción de estas medidas como parte de las medidas medioambientales previstas para el proyecto de un segundo circuito de la interconexión eléctrica entre España y Marruecos. Según dicha resolución, se habían evaluado las posibles repercusiones de la construcción y funcionamiento del Centro de Migración y Cambio Global.

No ha sido posible identificar ninguna infracción de la Directiva sobre hábitats ([7]) relacionada con este proyecto. Por lo tanto, la Comisión no tiene intención de adoptar ninguna medida al respecto.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1992L0043:20070101:ES:PDF
([2]) http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/temas/red-natura-2000/ES0000337_tcm7-153452.pdf
([3]) http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/eboja/2012/200/BOJA12-200-00029-16202-01_00014480.pdf?lr=lang_es
([4]) http://www.tarifaaldia.com/index.php?opcion=39&id_new=7924
([5]) http://cocn.tarifainfo.com/spip/IMG/pdf/anexo002.pdf
([6]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/01/09/pdfs/BOE-A-2012-340.pdf
([7]) 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-002370/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Andalusian environmental authority omits provisions on the conservation, protection and quality of the environment set out in Directive 92/43/EEC

During a public exhibition period, to authorise an urbanisation project based on the refurbishment and construction of 13 large buildings, Tarifa City Council (Cadiz) requested an environmental technical report from CAPYMA (the Cadiz territorial delegation to the Regional Government of Andalusia's Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and the Environment), the organisation responsible for the region's Natura 2000 network. This authority issued the technical report (number 112311) on 5 November 2012. However, this report fails to mention that the project will be carried out on a site belonging to the Natura 2000 network and that the farm on which the project is located is home to four habitats included in Directive 92/43/EEC on habitats ([1]). Moreover, this site is fundamental for the conservation of habitats 1230 and 2250, and the report also fails to include the provisions of Article 6 of the directive.

The project will be carried out on the 'Estrecho ES0000337' site ([2]) which is an SCI, SPA and SAC ([3]); all these aspects are also omitted and ignored in the report issued by CAPYMA.

Although the omission of Directive 92/43/EEC, among others, was brought up during the public exhibition period, the construction project was authorised by the plenary assembly of Tarifa City Council ([4]) on the basis of the technical report issued by the responsible authority, although this decision did not contain reasoned answers to opponents' reservations ([5]).

Does the Commission consider it acceptable that the very environmental authority that manages the custody and protection of Natura 2000 network protected areas can omit conservation steps and legislation that protect these sites in reports it issues to other authorities?

What measures will it adopt to ensure that authorities comply with the directive in the near future?

What measures will it adopt for this project, which does not meet the legal requirements of Directive 92/43/EEC?

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

The Commission is aware of the project for the construction of a Migration and Global Change Centre within the Natura 2000 site ES0000337 'Estrecho', to which the Honourable Member refers.

In January 2012, the Ministry of Environment and Rural and Marine Affairs issued a Resolution ([6]) approving the adoption of these measures as part of the environmental measures foreseen for the project for a second circuit of the electrical interconnection between Spain and Morocco. According to this Resolution, possible impacts, due to the construction and functioning of the Migration and Global Change Centre, have been assessed.

It has not been possible to identify any breach of the Habitats Directive ([7]) concerning this project. Therefore, the Commission does not intend to adopt any measures on this matter.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri= CONSLEG:1992L0043:20070101:ES:PDF
([2]) http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/temas/red-natura-2000/ES0000337_tcm7-153452.pdf
([3]) http:// www.juntadeandalucia.es/eboja/2012/200/BOJA12-200-00029-16202-01_00014480.pdf?lr=lang_es
([4]) http:// www.tarifaaldia.com/index.php?opcion=39&id_new=7924
([5]) http:// cocn.tarifainfo.com/spip/IMG/pdf/anexo002.pdf
([6]) http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/01/09/pdfs/BOE-A-2012-340.pdf
([7]) 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).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002371/13
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(28 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Especificaciones para los sistemas de transporte inteligente

La Directiva 2010/40/UE sobre implantación de sistemas inteligentes de transporte prevé que los Estados miembros deberán haber puesto en marcha todas las acciones legales reglamentarias y administrativas para dar cumplimiento a esta disposición legislativa antes del 27 de febrero de 2012.

Igualmente la señalada Directiva, en su artículo 6, apartado 2, prevé que la Comisión fijará especificaciones para las acciones prioritarias señaladas en esta Directiva a más tardar el 27 de febrero de 2013. A la vista de la importancia que tienen estas actuaciones para la competitividad, interoperabilidad y seguridad del transporte, quisiéramos saber:

1. ¿Hay algún Estado miembro que no haya traspuesto a día de hoy la citada Directiva a su ordenamiento interno?

2. ¿Cómo valora la Comisión las aportaciones y avances de los Estados miembros en este campo básicos para el funcionamiento transfronterizo de estos sistemas inteligentes de transporte?

3. ¿Ha cumplido la Comisión los plazos previstos en la Directiva a efectos de elaboración de especificaciones?

4. En tal caso, ¿sobre cuál o cuáles de los seis ámbitos prioritarios establecidos en el artículo 3 se han fijado ya las correspondientes especificaciones?

5. ¿Hasta qué punto eventuales retrasos en el despliegue de la red Galileo pueden afectar al desarrollo de productos y servicios para estos sistemas inteligentes de transporte?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de abril de 2013)

1. Hasta la fecha, cinco Estados miembros no han comunicado todavía sus medidas nacionales de ejecución a la Comisión: Bélgica, Alemania, Finlandia, Portugal y Suecia.

2. Los Estados miembros debían presentar a la Comisión, a más tardar el 27 de agosto de 2011, un informe sobre sus actividades y proyectos nacionales en los ámbitos prioritarios, y facilitarle, a más tardar el 27 de agosto de 2012, información sobre las medidas nacionales previstas en el campo de los sistemas de transporte inteligente (STI) para el siguiente periodo de cinco años ([1]). Ambos informes ofrecen una buena visión de conjunto de las prácticas de los Estados miembros y muestran, en particular, un buen nivel de actividad y desarrollo en los ámbitos prioritarios I y II ([2]). Los ámbitos prioritarios III ([3]) y IV ([4]) aparecen en menor medida en los informes nacionales, bien por los progresos ya realizados en la aplicación o porque todavía deben realizarse actividades básicas en el ámbito de la investigación.

3. y 4. Estaba previsto que la Comisión «se fijará el objetivo de adoptar especificaciones para cualquiera de las acciones prioritarias» enumeradas en el artículo 3 a más tardar el 27 de febrero de 2013.

Las especificaciones relativas a la acción prioritaria d), es decir, el suministro armonizado de un número de llamada de emergencia en toda la Unión (eCall), se adoptaron mediante el Reglamento Delegado (UE) n° 305/2013 de la Comisión, de 26 de noviembre de 2012, y se publicaron el 3 de abril de 2013 ([5]). La adopción formal de los respectivos Actos Delegados para las acciones prioritarias c) información mínima sobre el tráfico universal en relación con la seguridad vial, y e) servicios de información sobre plazas de aparcamiento seguras y protegidas para los camiones y vehículos comerciales, está prevista para abril de 2013.

5. El despliegue de la infraestructura de Galileo está progresando y está previsto prestar servicios iniciales a partir de octubre de 2014. Muchas aplicaciones de STI utilizan ya las capacidades de posicionamiento de sistemas de navegación por satélite existentes, como GPS y EGNOS.

([1]) Artículo 17 de la Directiva 2010/40/UE.
([2]) I: Utilización óptima de los datos sobre la red viaria, el tráfico y los desplazamientos; II: Continuidad de los servicios de STI para la gestión del tráfico y del transporte de mercancías.
([3]) Aplicaciones de STI para la seguridad y la protección del transporte por carretera.
([4]) Conexión del vehículo a las infraestructuras de transporte.
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:091:0001:0004:ES:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002371/13
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Specifications for Intelligent Transport Systems

Directive 2010/40/EU on the deployment of Intelligent Transport Systems foresees that Member States shall have brought into force all legal and administrative actions necessary to comply with these legal provisions by 27 February 2012.

Article 6(2) of the abovementioned Directive also stipulates that the Commission shall adopt specifications for the priority actions set out in this directive by 27 February 2013. Given the importance of these actions for competitiveness, interoperability and transport safety:

1. Has any Member State not yet transposed the abovementioned Directive into their national legislation?

2. How does the Commission assess the contributions and progress made by Member States in this area, which is fundamental to the cross-border operation of these Intelligent Transport Systems?

3. Has the Commission complied with the deadlines for drawing up the specifications?

4. If yes, which of the six priority areas established in Article 3 has/have been used to draw up the specifications?

5. To what extent could possible delays in the deployment of the Galileo network affect the development of products and services for these Intelligent Transport Systems?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)

1. At present, five Member States (MS) have not yet notified their national measures of execution to the Commission: Belgium, Germany, Finland, Portugal and Sweden.

2. MS were required to submit to the Commission a report on their national activities and projects in the priority areas laid down in the directive by 27 August 2011 and to provide the Commission by 27 August 2012 with information on national ITS actions envisaged over the following five year period ([1]). Both reports provide a good overview of the MS practices, and show notably a general good level of activity and development in priority areas 1 and 2 ([2]) . Priority area 3 ([3]) and Priority area 4 ([4]) appear to a less extent in the national reports either because of progress already achieved in the implementation or because of core activities still in the research domain.

3 and 4. The Commission was expected to 'aim at adopting specifications for one or more of the six priority actions' listed in Article 3 of the directive by 27 February 2013.

The specifications on priority action (d), i.e. for the harmonised provision of an interoperable EU-wide eCall, were adopted through the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 305/2013 of 26 November 2012 and published on 3 April 2013 ([5]). Formal adoption of the respective Delegated Acts for priority actions (c) — road safety minimum universal traffic information — and (e) — information services for safe and secure parking places for trucks and commercial vehicles — is expected in April 2013.

5. The deployment of the Galileo infrastructure is progressing and early services are planned to be delivered as of October 2014. Many ITS applications already use the positionning capabilities of existing satellite navigation systems, like GPS and EGNOS.

([1]) Article 17 of Directive 2010/40/EU.
([2]) Optimal use of road, traffic and travel data — Continuity of traffic and freight management ITS services.
([3]) ITS road safety and security applications.
([4]) linking the vehicle with the transport infrastructure.
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:091:0001:0004:EN:PDF.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002372/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(28 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Energía eléctrica en España

Varias empresas eléctricas españolas, como Endesa ([1]) o Red Eléctrica ([2]), tuvieron beneficios millonarios en 2012, concretamente 2 034 y 492, 3 millones de euros respectivamente. En los últimos seis años el precio de la electricidad ha aumentado en España un 60 % (más IVA) ([3]), el mayor aumento de la UE (variación entre 2006 y 2011) y se prevén nuevos aumentos en 2013 ([4]). Mientras el precio del KW/h era en 2011 de 0,1597 en España, la media europea era de 0,1286 euros. En el ranking europeo de precios eléctricos antes de impuestos para consumo doméstico, España es el tercer país más caro, según datos de Eurostat ([5]). Según la Comisión Nacional de la Energía (CNE) ([6]) la situación es aún más grave en España si se tiene en cuenta el déficit estructural de la tarifa, un precio que los consumidores pagan de forma aplazada con un interés de hasta el 6 %. De incluirse, según la CNE, España se colocaría sin ninguna duda como el país más caro de la Unión Europea ([7]).

Cruz Roja está advirtiendo que el aumento del paro y de la factura de la luz está disparando la pobreza energética en España y calcula que hay 4 millones de españoles que ya son «pobres energéticos» ([8]) con las consecuencias para su salud que eso conlleva.

1. ¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre este tema?

La situación no es solamente negativa para el uso doméstico, sino que la situación para los consumidores industriales tampoco es mucho mejor, lo que perjudica a la competitividad de las empresas españolas, según el regulador energético.

2. ¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre este tema?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de abril de 2013)

1. Los costes cada vez más elevados de las materias primas en un contexto internacional y el gran esfuerzo en inversiones realizado en los últimos años en el sector de las energías renovables son las principales causas del incremento del coste de la electricidad en España ([9]).

El componente de esos otros costes que más rápidamente ha aumentado es la anualidad del déficit ([10]), que podría desnaturalizar elementos fundamentales del mercado y la sostenibilidad económica del sector eléctrico. En este sentido, la Comisión apoya la oportuna adopción por las autoridades españolas de medidas adecuadas que reduzcan y limiten ese déficit.

La Comisión, por su parte, está trabajando en la elaboración de directrices sobre los regímenes de ayuda a las fuentes de energía renovables para, entre otros fines, evitar en el futuro ese tipo de efectos colaterales negativos. Además, es preciso señalar que, a escala de la UE, en los últimos cuatro años los precios al por mayor de la electricidad han aumentado considerablemente menos que los precios mundiales al por mayor de las materia primas con las que se produce electricidad. Ello obedece en parte a una mayor integración de los mercados de la electricidad como resultado, entre otras cosas, del acoplamiento actual de los mercados de 17 Estados miembros ([11]).

([1]) http://www.europapress.es/economia/noticia-economia-empresas-amplendesa-redujo-beneficio-2012-2034-millones-cambios-regulatorios-20130227085804.html
([2]) http://www.eldiario.es/economia/Red-Electrica-ciento-subio-ingresos_0_105689498.html
([3]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2012/06/28/actualidad/1340910349_730091.html
([4]) http://www.expansion.com/2012/12/19/empresas/energia/1355917917.html
([5]) http://www.expansion.com/2011/11/21/empresas/energia/1321897927.html
([6]) http://www.cne.es/cne/Home
([7]) http://www.cincodias.com/articulo/empresas/cne-alerta-riesgo-altos-precios-electricos-economia/20120313cdscdiemp_1/
([8]) http://www.cadenaser.com/sociedad/articulo/millones-espanoles-pobres-energeticos/csrcsrpor/20130124csrcsrsoc_7/Tes
([9]) Según Eurostat, entre 2008 y 2011, se incrementaron en un 3,58 % los precios de la energía, progresó más del doble la ayuda a las FER (alcanzando el 15 % del precio total final de la electricidad) y aumentaron también mucho (un 54,25 %) otros costes regulados.
([10]) Se trata de la parte de las tarifas de red que sirve para recuperar los déficits de años anteriores.
([11]) COM(2012) 663 final.

La normativa de la UE exige a los Estados miembros que protejan a los consumidores vulnerables y luchen contra la pobreza energética allí donde se constate ([12]). La Comisión está realizando un estudio para comprobar la incorporación de la normativa en el ordenamiento español.

2. Los precios de la energía también son importantes para los consumidores industriales, pues afectan a su competitividad. Es fundamental que la autoridad reguladora del sector (CNE) se implique plenamente para que las medidas tendentes a reducir el déficit tarifario del sector energético no recaigan de manera desproporcionada en ningún grupo de consumidores, incluido el de los consumidores industriales.

([12]) Artículo 3 de las Directivas sobre la electricidad y el gas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002372/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Electricity in Spain

Various Spanish electrical companies, such as Endesa ([1]) and Red Eléctrica ([2]) (Electric Network), made millions in profits in 2012 — EUR 2 034 million and EUR 492.3 million respectively, to be precise. In the past six years the price of electricity has increased by 60% in Spain (plus VAT) ([3]), the biggest increase in the EU (between 2006 and 2011) and the price is expected to increase again in 2013 ([4]). While the price per kWh was EUR 0.1597 in Spain in 2011, the European average price was EUR 0.1286. Looking at pre-tax consumer electricity prices, Spain is the third most expensive country in Europe, according to Eurostat data ([5]). According to the Spanish National Energy Commission (CNE) ([6]), the situation is even more serious if the structural deficit of the rate is taken into account, whereby consumers postpone payments, at up to 6% interest. If this were included, Spain would undoubtedly be the EU's most expensive country, according to the CNE ([7]).

The Red Cross is warning that increases in unemployment and electricity bills are to blame for sky-rocketing levels of fuel poverty in Spain and estimates that four million Spaniards are already 'fuel poor' ([8]) with the corresponding health effects that this has.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of this issue?

Not only is the situation bad for households, but the situation for industrial customers is not much better, and is impacting upon the competitiveness of Spanish companies, according to the energy regulator.

2. What is the Commission's assessment of this issue?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

1. The increased costs of raw materials in an international context together with the great efforts in investment in renewable technologies in recent years are the main drivers for the increases in the electricity cost in Spain ([9]).

The fastest growing component of these other costs is the deficit annuity ([10]), which risks distorting market fundamentals and the economic sustainability of the electricity sector. In this sense, the Commission supports the Spanish authorities endeavour to adopt timely and accurate measures to reduce and contain such a deficit.

For its part, the Commission is working on guidelines for renewable energy support schemes with i.a. the aim to avoid such negative side-effects in the future. Moreover, it should be noted that at EU level in the last four years, wholesale electricity prices have increased significantly less than the global wholesale prices of the raw materials of which electricity is produced. This is partly thanks to a deeper integration of the electricity markets, for example as a result of market coupling in 17 Member States today ([11]).

EU legislation puts the requirement on Member States to protect vulnerable consumers and to address energy poverty where identified ([12]). The Commission is currently conducting a compliance check to verify the transposition of the legislation in Spain.

([1]) http://www.europapress.es/economia/noticia-economia-empresas-amplendesa-redujo-beneficio-2012-2034-millones-cambios-regulatorios-20130227085804.html
([2]) http://www.eldiario.es/economia/Red-Electrica-ciento-subio-ingresos_0_105689498.html
([3]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2012/06/28/actualidad/1340910349_730091.html
([4]) http://www.expansion.com/2012/12/19/empresas/energia/1355917917.html
([5]) http://www.expansion.com/2011/11/21/empresas/energia/1321897927.html
([6]) http://www.cne.es/cne/Home.
([7]) http://www.cincodias.com/articulo/empresas/cne-alerta-riesgo-altos-precios-electricos-economia/20120313cdscdiemp_1/.
([8]) http://www.cadenaser.com/sociedad/articulo/millones-espanoles-pobres-energeticos/csrcsrpor/20130124csrcsrsoc_7/Tes.
([9]) According to Eurostat, between 2008 and 2011, energy prices have increased by 3.58%, RES support has more than doubled (becoming 15% of the total final price of electricity) and other regulated costs have greatly increased as well (by 54.25%).
([10]) The part of the grid tariffs that serves to recover the deficit of previous years.
([11]) COM(2012) 663 final.
([12]) Article 3 of the Electricity and Gas Directives.

2. Energy prices are equally important for industrial consumers as they affect their competitiveness. The full involvement of the energy regulator (CNE) is key in order to ensure that the measures to reduce the tariff deficit of the energy sector do not fall disproportionately on any consumer group, including industrial consumers.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002373/13
a la Comisión
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(28 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Suspensión de la cofinanciación para el Fondo de Ayuda Europea para los Más Necesitados

Según un reciente informe publicado por Eurostat, el porcentaje de menores europeos con riesgo de caer en la pobreza ha pasado del 19 % en 2008 al 27 % en 2011. Inevitablemente, la crisis económica y financiera y los ajustes presupuestarios han agravado estos porcentajes, que entre los adultos de 18 a 64 años es del 24 % y entre los mayores de 65 años es del 21 %. En el caso de España, las cifras son alarmantes: el 30,6 % para los menores, 27,2 % para los adultos y 22,3 % para los mayores. Pero en otros países, como Bulgaria, Rumania y Letonia, el porcentaje de menores con riesgo de caer en la pobreza alcanza la dramática cifra del 50 %.

La Unión Europea —que lleva desde 1987 ejecutando el programa de distribución de alimentos— se ha fijado como objetivo reducir en al menos 20 millones el número de personas en situación o en riesgo de pobreza o exclusión social de aquí a 2020. En octubre de 2012, la Comisión presentó un nuevo instrumento, el Fondo de Ayuda Europea para los Más Necesitados, que combatirá la privación de alimentos, la carencia de vivienda y la privación material infantil, al tiempo que fomentará la adopción de medidas de acompañamiento destinadas a la reintegración social de las personas más necesitadas. El nuevo reglamento, que contará con 2 500 millones de euros, propone fijar un nivel máximo de cofinanciación con cargo al Fondo para los programas operativos con el objetivo de que se produzca un efecto multiplicador de los recursos de la Unión.

¿No cree la Comisión que la crisis económica y los ajustes presupuestarios han mermado seriamente la capacidad de muchos Estados miembros para apoyar a las personas en riesgo de pobreza y exclusión social y que hoy, más que nunca, es imprescindible la ayuda de la Unión? ¿No cree la Comisión que es insuficiente prever un incremento de los pagos para Estados miembros con dificultades presupuestarias temporales y que la mejor forma de garantizar la utilización de este instrumento y de apoyar las políticas de los Estados miembros es la supresión de la cofinanciación?

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

Los porcentajes de cofinanciación propuestos para el futuro Fondo de Ayuda Europea para los Más Necesitados constituyen un elemento importante de la política de cohesión que garantiza el compromiso de los Estados miembros y aumenta los recursos disponibles para los programas. La Comisión propone establecer el porcentaje de cofinanciación de la UE para todos los Estados miembros al mismo nivel que se aplica a las regiones menos desarrolladas en los Fondos Estructurales y el Fondo Europeo de Inversiones. El Reglamento propuesto prevé asimismo un aumento del 10 % en el pago a los Estados miembros con dificultades presupuestarias temporales. En este caso, los Estados miembros solo tendrán que aportar el 5 % como cofinanciación.

Además, los Estados miembros podrán recibir una prefinanciación del 11 % en cuanto se adopte su programa operativo. Gracias a esta prefinanciación tan importante, se reducirá de forma considerable la necesidad de los Estados miembros de gestionar el efectivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002373/13
to the Commission
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Suspension of co-financing for the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived

According to a recent report published by Eurostat, the percentage of European children at risk of falling into poverty has increased from 19% in 2008 to 27% in 2011. Inevitably, the economic and financial crisis and resulting budgetary adjustments have had an adverse effect on these percentages, with 24% of adults aged 18 to 64 and 21% of people over 65 also at risk. In Spain, the figures are alarming: 30.6% of children, 27.2% of adults and 22.3% of elderly people are at risk of poverty. In other countries however, such as Bulgaria, Romania and Latvia, the percentage of children at risk of falling into poverty has reached a shocking 50%.

The European Union — which has been running its food distribution programme since 1987 — has set the objective of reducing the number of people either in or at risk of poverty and social exclusion by at least 20 million by 2020. In October 2012, the Commission introduced a new instrument, the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived, which will combat food deprivation, lack of housing and the material deprivation of children, while promoting the adoption of related methods aimed at the social reintegration of those most in need. The new regulation, which will have a budget of EUR 2.5 billion, proposes to set a maximum level of co-financing under the Fund for operational programmes with the aim of multiplying the Union's resources.

Does the Commission not believe that the economic crisis and the resulting budgetary adjustments have seriously reduced the capacity of many Member States to support those at risk of poverty and social exclusion and that today, more than ever, the Union's help is essential? Does it not believe that providing increased payments to Member States facing temporary budgetary difficulties does not go far enough and that the best way to guarantee that this instrument is used and that Member States' policies are supported is to suspend co-financing?

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

The co-financing rates, which are proposed for the future Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived (FEAD), are an important element of Cohesion Policy which ensures the commitment of Member States and increases the resources available for the programmes. The Commission proposes to set the EU co-financing rate for all MS at the level applied to the less developed regions for the European Structural and Investment Funds. The proposed regulation also foresees an increase by 10% for payments to Member States with temporary budget difficulties. In that case, the Member States would only have to bring in 5% as co-financing.

In addition, the Member States would receive a pre-financing of 11% upon adoption of their operational programme. This substantial pre-financing will considerably reduce the cash management needs of the Member States.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002374/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(28 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Transporte de animales — Número de animales inspeccionados durante el transporte en España: seguimiento de las preguntas escritas E-008550/2012 y E-011148/2012

Mi pregunta escrita E-008550/2012 aportó una prueba irrefutable de que el porcentaje de controles físicos efectuados por las autoridades españolas en los animales durante el transporte (en 2010, tan solo el 0,21 % de los animales transportados fueron sometidos a controles físicos ([1])) es, a todas luces, insuficiente para garantizar un nivel aceptable de protección animal durante el transporte, especialmente teniendo en cuenta que, en el mismo año, el 40,67 % de los vehículos que transportaban animales y que fueron sometidos a controles en carretera en España infringían el Reglamento (CE) n° 1/2005.

En su respuesta, la Comisión afirmó que, de conformidad con el artículo 26 del Reglamento (CE) n° 882/2004 relativo a los controles oficiales, los Estados miembros tienen el cometido de garantizar que se encuentren disponibles los recursos adecuados para estos controles[1]. Además, la Comisión afirmó que, de conformidad con el artículo 4, apartado 2, letra a), del mismo Reglamento, los controles oficiales de los animales vivos, entre otros, deben ser eficaces y apropiados.

Habida cuenta de que España no ha aplicado los artículos mencionados relativos a los controles del bienestar animal durante el transporte, ¿qué medidas tiene intención de adoptar la Comisión para velar por que España aumente significativamente el número de inspecciones efectuadas durante el transporte de animales en el futuro, con el fin de salvaguardar el bienestar de los animales durante el transporte?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión ha cerrado un procedimiento de infracción ([2]) sobre la posibilidad de que España no garantizara adecuadamente el cumplimiento del Reglamento (CE) n° 1/2005, relativo a la protección de los animales durante el transporte ([3]). El procedimiento se inició en 2005 y se cerró en febrero de 2012. Durante ese período, la Oficina Alimentaria y Veterinaria (OAV) de la Dirección General de Salud y Consumidores de la Comisión realizó una serie de inspecciones en España que comprendían el bienestar de los animales durante el transporte ([4]).

En respuesta a las recomendaciones formuladas por la Comisión a raíz de dichas inspecciones, las autoridades competentes españolas introdujeron una serie de mejoras relativas a la vigilancia del cumplimiento de dicho Reglamento.

A la luz de lo anterior, la Comisión no considera necesario por ahora adoptar medida alguna en relación con el número de controles efectuados por las autoridades españolas durante el transporte de animales [la frecuencia de los controles la deciden las mencionadas autoridades competentes en función de los criterios establecidos en el artículo 4 del Reglamento (CE) n° 882/2004 ([5])]. No obstante, la Comisión seguirá vigilando la aplicación del Reglamento (CE) n° 1/2005 en España y adoptará cualquier medida que sea necesaria.

([1]) Artículo 26: «Los Estados miembros velarán por que existan los recursos económicos adecuados para facilitar los recursos personales y de otro tipo necesarios para efectuar los controles oficiales por cualesquiera medios que se consideren oportunos, incluida la imposición general o el establecimiento de tasas o gravámenes».
([2]) 2005/4355-2007/4819.
([3]) DO L 3 de 5.1.2005, p. 1.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm
([5]) DO L 191 de 28.5.2004, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002374/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Transport of animals — number of animals inspected during transport in Spain: follow-up question to Written Questions E-008550/2012 and E-011148/2012

My Written Question E-008550/2012 provided clear evidence that the percentage of physical checks carried out by the Spanish authorities on animals during transport (in 2010 only 0.21% of animals transported were physically checked) is entirely insufficient to guarantee an acceptable level of animal protection during transport, especially given that in the same year 40.67% of vehicles transporting animals checked on the road in Spain were found to be in violation of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

In its answer, the Commission stated that according to Article 26 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls, the Member States have to ensure that adequate resources are available for such controls ([1]). Furthermore, the Commission stated that according to Article 4 (2)(a) of the same regulation, official controls on, *inter alia*, live animals have to be effective and appropriate.

Given that Spain has failed to implement the abovementioned articles relating to animal welfare checks during transport, what measures is the Commission intending to take in order to make sure that Spain significantly increases the number of inspections carried out during the transport of animals in future, in order to safeguard the welfare of animals during transport?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 April 2013)

The Commission has closed an infringement procedure ([2]) regarding the alleged failure of Spain to properly enforce Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport ([3]). The procedure was opened in 2005, and closed in February 2012. During this time period, the Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate General (FVO) carried out a number of audits to Spain, where welfare during transport was included ([4]).

In response to the recommendations made by the Commission on the basis of such audits, the competent authorities of Spain made a number of improvements in relation to the enforcement of that regulation.

In light of the above, the Commission does not consider necessary for the time being to take any measures in relation to the number of controls carried out by the Spanish authorities during the transport of animals (the frequency of controls is decided by those competent authorities having regard to the criteria provided for in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 ([5])). However, the Commission will continue to monitor the application of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 in Spain and take action where appropriate.

([1]) Article 26: 'Member States shall ensure that adequate financial resources are available to provide the necessary staff and other resources for official controls by whatever means considered appropriate, including through general taxation or by establishing fees or charges'.
([2]) 2005/4355-2007/4819.
([3]) OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm
([5]) OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002375/13
to the Commission
Seán Kelly (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Aquaculture licensing guidance following Case C-418/04

Can the Commission confirm whether it has issued guidance to the Government of Ireland to aid in addressing the requirement for appropriate assessment in aquaculture licensing under both the Habitats and Birds Directives following the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union in Case C-418/04?

As licensing for aquaculture developments has stagnated in Ireland since the aforementioned judgment — curtailing an area of potential economic growth and development in many parts of coastal Ireland — can the Commission give details of any progress in addressing the issues concerned?

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

The Commission has developed guidelines aimed at promoting sustainable aquaculture activities compatible with the protection of areas of high biodiversity value in the Natura 2000 network ([1]). These guidelines should assist Ireland in complying with the EUCJ judgment in Case C-418/04 in relation to appropriate assessments for aquaculture projects in Natura 2000 sites.

In order to ensure compliance with the judgment Ireland has agreed to a set of measures that involves the assessment of marine Natura 2000 sites and adoption of conservation objectives for them. On the basis of these, Appropriate Assessments will be carried out before any licensing decisions can be taken. The discussion between the Commission and Ireland on the regulatory regime and the necessary safeguards in respect of issuing licenses for aquaculture developments in compliance with the judgment in Case C-418/04 are still ongoing.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Aqua-N2000%20guide.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002376/13
to the Commission
Seán Kelly (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Criteria used in trade defence proceedings

Can the Commission outline its policy, in relation to trade defence proceedings, in determining criteria for the selection of enterprises for investigation in anti-dumping Case AD580, particularly its motivations for selecting companies which were not in possession of direct knowledge of the final destination of their products?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

Companies were selected on the basis of their replies to the notice of initiation. In these replies, US bioethanol producers reported export sales to the Union and the sample was based on that information.

During the on-site investigations of the selected US producers, it became clear that they did not export themselves but sold to unrelated traders/blenders in the USA. Sales to these unrelated parties covered all possible destinations: USA, the European Union and the rest of the world.

In varying degrees, the US producers had knowledge of the final destination of the bioethanol sold domestically to the unrelated traders/blenders. One party was largely aware of sales to the EU because of the attestations it made that the bioethanol corresponded to the criteria of the Renewable Energy Directive, although even there the trader/blender could still alter the destination if a sale to the intended client did not go through. Other parties obtained (partial) information from the traders/blenders to which they sold or worked under the hypothesis that all low moisture bioethanol was intended for the EU market, although those quantities can equally be sold in any other market (such as Brazil) or blended with other origin and/or types of bioethanol.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002377/13
to the Commission
Seán Kelly (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Methodology used to determine duties on bioethanol

Can the Commission outline the methodology used, in its proposal to impose definitive anti-dumping duties on imports of bioethanol following the trade defence proceedings initiated in relation to anti-dumping Case AD580, to set the duty at EUR 63.20 per tonne?

Can it further explain the underlying economic rationale for selecting this methodology, and outline whether other methodologies were considered?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(29 April 2013)

The methodologies that can be used for the calculation of anti-dumping duties are laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 ([1]), in line with the World Trade Organisation Anti-dumping agreement.

In this case, it was considered most appropriate to set a fixed amount per tonne, as the measure is not only applicable to bioethanol, denatured or undenatured and with a water content of less than 0.3% but also to certain blends containing more than 10% bioethanol.The customs authorities of the Member States will multiply the weight in tonnes of the bioethanol content of the cargo by the fixed amount of EUR 62.3 per tonne in order to arrive at the anti-dumping amount due at the Union frontier.

The anti-dumping duty will not apply to products that are for uses other than fuel.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 of 30 November 2009 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community, OJ L 343, 22.12.2009.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-002378/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(28 februari 2013)

Angående: Brist på offentliga samråd om kommissionens politiska strategi om icke-diskriminering och kostnadsberäkningsmetoder för befintliga bredbandsnät i grossistledet

Kommissionen publicerade i december 2012 ett förslag till rekommendation om enhetliga krav på icke-diskriminering och kostnadsberäkningsmetoder för att främja konkurrens och förbättra miljön för bredbandsinvesteringar. Offentliggörandet av förslaget hade inte till syfte att inleda ett offentligt samråd utan endast att inhämta ett yttrande från Berec (Organet för europeiska regleringsmyndigheter för elektronisk kommunikation), inom ramen för det förfarande som anges i artikel 19 i direktiv 2002/21/EG.

I förslaget lyfts viktiga aspekter fram avseende kommissionens tillvägagångssätt vad gäller tillgång till befintliga äldre telekommunikationsnät och nästa generations nät. I synnerhet tycks inte den mindre omfattande kontrollen av grossistpris och bindandet av kopparnätspriser till nuvarande nivåer på ett effektivt sätt uppvägas av de otillräckliga krav på icke-diskriminering som anges i förslaget.

Enligt de senaste siffrorna från kommissionen innehar etablerade operatörer i Europa fortfarande mer än 50 % av marknadsandelarna för bredbandsåtkomst i slutkundsledet. Vid flera tillfällen under det senaste årtiondet har kommissionen konstaterat att en eller flera etablerade europeiska telekomoperatörer har missbrukat sin dominerande position. Den mest konkurrenskraftiga marknaden för bredbandsåtkomst i Europa är den i Storbritannien, den enda medlemsstat där den nationella regleringsmyndigheten har beslutat att etablerade operatörer funktionellt ska åtskilja sin grossistverksamhet från sin verksamhet i slutkundsledet och även tillhandahålla grossisttjänster på en fullt likvärdig basis till alla sina grossistkunder, inbegripet det egna detaljistledet.

Öppenhet är en viktig aspekt i kommissionens strategi för bättre reglering. GD CONNECT rådfrågade allmänheten om principerna för icke-diskriminering och kostnadsorientering i oktober 2011, men har inte genomfört någon allmän rådfrågning om den föreslagna politiska strategi som tillkännagavs den 12 juli 2012 och i förslaget till rekommendation. GD COMP har å sin sida genomfört två offentliga samråd avseende sina förslag under 2011 och 2012, före det att riktlinjerna för allmän finansiering av bredbandsnät antogs. Synpunkterna från viktiga berörda parter, inbegripet konsumenter, nationella regleringsmyndigheter och medlemsstater, antyder att kommissionens förslag är mycket omtvistat.

Varför efterfrågar kommissionen inte synpunkter från alla berörda parter om det nuvarande förslaget?

Svar från Neelie Kroes på kommissionens vägnar
(16 april 2013)

Rekommendationen har, som parlamentsledamoten mycket riktigt påpekar, genomgått ett offentligt samråd i oktober och november 2011. Det offentliga samrådet gav kommissionen värdefulla uppgifter och åsikter från ett brett spektrum av berörda aktörer. Dialogen har sedan dess fortgått, bland annat genom särskilda samråd med berörda aktörer och två oberoende studier om metoder för kostnadsberäkning och icke-diskrimineringsskyldigheter för bredbandstillgång. Utkastet till rekommendation offentliggjordes på kommissionens webbplats i december 2012, och berörda parter har tagit tillfället i akt att lämna synpunkter på utkastet, såväl skriftliga som muntliga, till kommissionen. Vi har tagit hänsyn till dessa synpunkter. Dessutom kommer medlemsstaterna ha möjlighet att genom kommunikationskommittén lämna synpunkter på rekommendationen innan den antas.

Grossistmarknaderna för bredband (4 och 5) är kvardröjande flaskhalsar, och mot bakgrund av den pågående övergången från äldre nätverk till nästa generations accessnät anser kommissionen, Berec och marknadens aktörer att en stabil och förutsägbar rättslig vägledning i form av den föreslagna rekommendationen behövs omgående. Det nuvarande förslaget främjar både konkurrens och investeringar genom strikta regler om icke-diskriminering samtidigt med en flexibilitet i prissättningen under vissa omständigheter för att verksamhetsutövare ska kunna utforska olika prissättningssystem och därigenom bättre uppfylla konsumenternas behov och främja spridningen av höghastighetsbredband.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002378/13
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Lack of public consultations on Commission policy approach in non-discrimination and costing methods for incumbent and wholesale broadband networks

The Commission published, in December 2012, a draft recommendation on consistent non-discrimination obligations and costing methodologies to promote competition and enhance the broadband investment environment. The publication of this draft was aimed not at opening a public consultation, but only at seeking the opinion of BEREC (the Body of European Regulators of Electronic Communications) under the procedure set out in Article 19 of Directive 2002/21/EC.

The draft raises important questions on the approach taken by the Commission with respect to access to existing legacy telecommunications networks and next-generation networks. Particularly, the relaxation of wholesale price controls and the tying of copper access prices to the existing levels do not seem to be effectively balanced by the poor non-discrimination obligations provided in the draft text.

According to recent Commission figures, incumbent operators in Europe still enjoy more than a 50% market share in retail broadband access. On several occasions in the last decade, one or more European incumbent telecom operators have been found by the Commission to have abused their dominant position. The most competitive market for broadband access in Europe is the UK, the only Member State where the national regulator has decided that the incumbent operator should functionally separate its wholesale and retail businesses and also provide wholesale services on a fully equivalent basis to all of its wholesale customers including its own retail arm.

Transparency is an important aspect of the Commission's strategy for better regulation. DG CONNECT consulted the public on the principles of non-discrimination and cost-orientation in October 2011, but has not carried out the public consultation on its proposed policy approach announced on 12 July 2012 and in the draft text of the recommendation. DG COMP, by contrast, consulted the public twice on its draft, in 2011 and 2012, before adopting guidelines on public funding to broadband networks. The views of key stakeholders including consumers, national regulators and Member States seem to suggest there is considerable controversy over the Commission's proposal.

Why is the Commission not seeking the views of all stakeholders on the current draft text?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

The recommendation has, as the Honourable Member rightly points out, been subject to a public consultation in October and November 2011. The public consultation provided the Commission with valuable information and views from a wide variety of stakeholders. The dialogue has since been ongoing, including specific stakeholder consultations and two independent studies on costing methodologies and non-discrimination obligations for broadband access. The draft recommendation has been published on the Commission's website since December 2012 and stakeholders have taken the opportunity to comment on the draft, orally and in writing, to the Commission and we have taken account of their views. Further, prior to adoption, Member States will have the opportunity to give comments on the recommendation through the communications Committee.

The broadband wholesale markets (4 and 5) are persistent bottlenecks and in the light of the current transition from legacy to NGA networks, the Commission, BEREC and market parties are of the view that stable and predictable regulatory guidance in form of the proposed recommendation is urgently needed. The current proposal promotes both competition and investment by including strict non-discrimination rules, while allowing for pricing flexibility under certain circumstances in order for operators to explore different pricing schemes and as such better meet consumer needs and foster high speed broadband take-up.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002379/13
to the Commission
Vicky Ford (ECR)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Proposed ban on imports of citrus fruits contaminated with *Guignardia citricarpa* or 'citrus blackspot'

Is there a proposal to implement an EU-wide ban on imports of citrus fruits contaminated with *Guignardia citricarpa* or 'citrus blackspot'? If so, what evidence is there to justify the proposal, given the importance of citrus fruit to a balanced and healthy diet?

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

The introduction into the EU of citrus fruits contaminated with citrus black spot caused by *Guignardia citricarpa* is prohibited. Citrus fruit is a regulated commodity in Council Directive 2000/29/EC ([1]) that provides for special requirements for the imports of citrus fruits from third countries, including specific measures against the introduction into and spread within the EU of citrus black spot. These measures are in place since many years.

Citrus black spot is a regulated harmful organism with quarantine status in the EU. The territory of the EU is free of citrus black spot and if the organism were introduced into the EU, it would pose a serious threat to the EU's citrus producing areas. It is known to have devastating impacts on citrus production in other continents. This policy does not contradict at all the diet advice to eat fruits, in the framework of a balanced diet.

([1]) OJ L 169, 10.7.2000, p. 1.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002380/13
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(28 février 2013)

Objet: Baisse des restitutions à l'exportation: l'avenir de la filière avicole européenne

La filière avicole européenne et ses producteurs sont aujourd'hui en état d'alerte. La baisse des restitutions à l'exportation pour le secteur de la volaille, décidée en janvier dernier, menace la filière tout entière. Intervenant après une première réduction en octobre 2012, cette nouvelle diminution pourrait en effet avoir des conséquences dramatiques pour nos volaillers et nos éleveurs.

L'industrie avicole emploie près de 673 000 personnes en Europe, pour une production annuelle d'environ 11 millions de tonnes. Cette décision de la Commission européenne, équivalente à une coupe de près de 50 % dans les subventions, est très mal reçue par les principaux acteurs. En France, premier producteur avicole de l'Union, de nombreux industriels ont déjà décidé de répercuter le manque à gagner sur les éleveurs. Or, ces derniers, déjà fragilisés, ne peuvent absorber une telle baisse des prix. Ce sont près de 5 000 emplois directs qui pourraient disparaître dans le grand ouest français, sans compter un grand nombre d'emplois indirects.

Les restitutions à l'exportation sont un outil de régulation crucial du secteur de la volaille. La décision de la Commission ne tient compte que de la hausse de la consommation mondiale, sans prendre en considération d'autres facteurs qui font grimper les coûts de production. Ces changements de cap brutaux placent nos producteurs en situation de désavantage compétitif. Il faudrait au contraire maintenir les restitutions à l'exportation à des niveaux raisonnables, et aider la filière avicole à s'adapter.

Alors que l'Europe s'inquiète du scandale de la viande de cheval, il est vital qu'elle n'abandonne pas ses agriculteurs et ses éleveurs, seuls capables de garantir des produits de qualité. Nos éleveurs ont le droit de vivre décemment de leur travail.

Quelles mesures la Commission compte-t-elle prendre pour aider la filière avicole européenne à s'adapter à ces changements et à rester compétitive?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(23 avril 2013)

La décision de baisser les restitutions à l'exportation pour la viande de volaille a été prise par la Commission sur la base de l'état du marché, qui associe prix élevés, coûts stables des aliments pour animaux et augmentation des exportations de produits sans restitutions. La filière avicole européenne en général est donc compétitive et n'exige pas un recours aux restitutions aussi important que par le passé.

En outre, le maintien de restitutions élevées pourrait donner une fausse indication aux entreprises de la filière avicole qui doivent s'adapter aux besoins du marché, ce qui retarderait le processus de restructuration nécessaire.

Avec la proposition pour la nouvelle PAC, la Commission maintient le principe d'orientation en fonction du marché. Des mécanismes flexibles et efficaces en cas de crise ou de perturbation du marché sont nécessaires, mais la valeur des aides ne devrait pas influencer les décisions des agriculteurs ou entraîner une perte d'efficacité.

Enfin, les restitutions à l'exportation ne peuvent être considérées comme des mesures de soutien au revenu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002380/13
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Reducing export refunds: the future of the European poultry sector

The European poultry sector and poultry producers are currently on the alert. The reduction in export refunds for the poultry sector, a decision made in January 2013, is threatening the entire industry. Following an initial reduction in October 2012, this new cut could have dramatic consequences for our poultry farmers and breeders.

In Europe, the poultry industry employs nearly 673 000 people, producing around 11 million tonnes annually. This decision by the Commission, which virtually halves subsidies, has been very badly received by key stakeholders. In France, the EU's main poultry producer, many producers have already decided to pass their loss of earnings on to breeders. However, breeders, who are already in a precarious position, cannot absorb such a drop in prices. Nearly 5 000 direct jobs are at risk of disappearing in western France, not to mention a large number of indirect jobs.

Export refunds are a crucial regulatory tool in the poultry sector. The Commission's decision only takes account of the increase in global consumption, without considering other factors which add to production costs. These abrupt turnarounds put our producers at a competitive disadvantage. Export refunds should instead be maintained at reasonable levels, and the poultry sector should be helped to adapt.

While Europe is worrying about the horsemeat scandal, it is vital that it does not abandon its farmers and breeders, the only ones capable of guaranteeing quality products. Our breeders are entitled to make a decent living from their work.

What measures does the Commission intend to take to help the European poultry sector adapt to these changes and stay competitive?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)

The decision to reduce the export refunds for poultrymeat was taken by the Commission following the market situation which combines high prices, stable feed costs and growing exports of the products without refunds. Thus, the EU poultrymeat sector as a whole is competitive and the use of refunds is not needed to the extent as it was required in the past.

On the contrary, the prolongation of high refunds may give a wrong signal to the companies in the poultrymeat sector that need to adapt to the market needs, delaying the necessary restructuring process.

With the proposal for the new CAP the Commission maintains the principle of market orientation. Mechanisms that are flexible and responsive when there is a crisis or market disturbance are necessary but support should be available at a level that does not influence farmers' decisions or lead to a loss of efficiency.

Moreover, the export refunds cannot be considered as income support.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002383/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Unasul — União de Nações Sul-Americanas

Considerando que:

— o Tratado Constitutivo da União de Nações Sul-Americanas tem como objetivo construir, de maneira participativa e consensual, um espaço de integração e união entre os seus povos no âmbito cultural, social, económico e político;

— a maioria dos signatários do Tratado Constitutivo da Unasul é membro do Mercado Comum do Sul (Mercosul) ou da Comunidade Andina de Nações e que, destes dois blocos económicos, estão excluídos a República do Chile, a República Cooperativa da Guiana e a República do Suriname;

— ambos os blocos económicos têm a UE como um dos seus principais parceiros económico, sendo que, para a Comunidade Andina de Nações, o comércio com a UE representa 14,3 % do total do comércio desse bloco, ao passo que o comércio com a UE representa 20 % do total do comércio do Mercosul, o que faz da União o seu principal parceiro comercial;

— ambos os blocos económicos constituem verdadeiras oportunidades de investimento para os agentes económicos europeus, sendo essas mesmas oportunidades potenciadas por uma maior integração económica regional naquela área do globo;

— um dos objetivos últimos da Unasul é a criação de um mercado comum que envolva todos os países da América do Sul e, aliado a isto, a formalização da cidadania sul-americana (à semelhança do que ocorreu na UE);

— as diferentes iniciativas de integração e coordenação regional que se registam na América do Sul evidenciam um esforço conjunto dos países em se apresentarem perante a comunidade internacional como um bloco coeso nas diferentes políticas.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Há alguma perspetiva de desenvolvimento de uma parceria bilateral entre a UE e a Unasul? Em caso afirmativo, em que termos e em que domínios, tendo em conta as diferentes áreas que estão sujeitas a integração na Unasul?

2. Existe algum estudo relativamente ao impacto económico que a integração regional almejada pela Unasul terá no mercado interno europeu e no comércio internacional da UE?

Resposta dada por De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(15 de maio de 2013)

Enquanto grupo, todos os países da América Latina e das Caraíbas — incluindo os membros da União das Nações Sul-Americanas (Unasul) — decidiram prosseguir as suas relações entre blocos económicos com a UE através da Comunidade dos Estados Latino-Americanos e das Caraíbas (CELAC). A primeira Cimeira UE-CELAC (7.ª Cimeira UE-América Latina e Caraíbas) realizou-se em Santiago, Chile, entre 26 e 27 de janeiro.

A UE tem estreitos laços bilaterais, incluindo, em muitos casos, acordos de associação ou acordos comerciais vigentes ou em fase de negociação, com os diferentes países membros da Unasul. A UE reconhece que a Unasul é uma iniciativa importante e uma prioridade para os países em causa. A UE está a acompanhar de perto o seu desenvolvimento e o seu impacto em termos de integração e cooperação nesta dinâmica e importante região. Neste momento existem contactos *ad hoc* informais com a própria Unasul, contudo sem diálogo institucionalizado.

A Unasul até agora tem concentrado os seus esforços na cooperação política, em detrimento da integração económica. Consequentemente, a Comissão não aprofundou a possibilidade de estabelecer uma parceria com a Unasul enquanto bloco comercial, nem estudou o impacto económico que o processo de integração do bloco da Unasul poderia vir a ter no mercado doméstico europeu e no comércio internacional da UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002383/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Unasur — The Union of South American Nations

Whereas:

— the objective of the Constitutive Treaty of the Union of South American Nations is to build, in a participatory and consensual manner, an integration and union among its peoples in the cultural, social, economic and political fields;

— the majority of the signatories of the Unasur Constitutive Treaty are members of either the common market of the South (Mercosur) or the Andean Community of Nations. The Republic of Chile, the Cooperative Republic of Guyana and the Republic of Suriname are outside these two economic blocks;

— both economic blocks have the EU as one of their main economic partners. While trade with the EU represents 14.3% of the Andean Community of Nations' total trade, it represents 20% of total trade with Mercosur, making the EU its main trading partner;

— there are real opportunities for investment by European economic bodies in both economic blocks, and their increased regional economic integration is strengthening these opportunities;

— one of Unasur's most recent objectives is to create a common market that includes all South American countries, and to formalise South American citizenship (similar to that in the EU);

— the different regional integration and coordination initiatives seen in South America demonstrate the countries' combined effort to present themselves to the international community as a cohesive block in a range of policy areas.

I ask the Commission:

1. Is there potential for a bilateral partnership between the EU and Unasur? If so, under what terms and in which domains, given the different areas that are being integrated with Unasur?

2. Has there been any study of the potential economic impact of the regional integration that Unasur aims to achieve on the European domestic market and EU international trade?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)

As a group, all the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean — including the members of the Union of South American Nations (Unasur) — have chosen to pursue their region-to-region relationship with the EU through the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC). The first EU-CELAC summit (7th EU-Latin America and Caribbean summit) was held in Santiago, Chile, on 26-27 January.

The EU has very close bilateral ties, including in many cases association or trade agreements in force or under negotiation, with the individual member countries of Unasur. The EU recognises that Unasur is a significant initiative and a priority for the countries concerned. The EU is closely monitoring its development and its impact in terms of integration and cooperation in this important and dynamic region. There currently are ad hoc informal contacts with Unasur itself but no institutionalised dialogue.

Unasur has until now concentrated its efforts on political cooperation rather than economic integration. Consequently, the Commission has not pursued the possibility of establishing a partnership with Unasur as a bloc in the field of trade, nor has it carried out studies on the potential economic impact that Unasur's regional integration process may have on the European domestic market and EU international trade.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002384/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Unasul — União de Nações Sul-Americanas II

Considerando que:

— o Tratado Constitutivo da União de Nações Sul-Americanas tem como objetivo construir, de maneira participativa e consensual, um espaço de integração e união entre os seus povos no âmbito cultural, social, económico e político;

— a maioria dos signatários do Tratado Constitutivo da Unasul é membro do Mercado Comum do Sul (Mercosul) ou da Comunidade Andina de Nações e que, destes dois blocos económicos, estão excluídos a República do Chile, a República Cooperativa da Guiana e a República do Suriname;

— ambos os blocos económicos têm a UE como um dos seus principais parceiros económico, sendo que, para a Comunidade Andina de Nações, o comércio com a UE representa 14,3 % do total do comércio desse bloco, ao passo que o comércio com a UE representa 20 % do total do comércio do Mercosul, o que faz da União o seu principal parceiro comercial;

— ambos os blocos económicos constituem verdadeiras oportunidades de investimento para os agentes económicos europeus, sendo essas mesmas oportunidades potenciadas por uma maior integração económica regional naquela área do globo;

— um dos objetivos últimos da Unasul é a criação de um mercado comum que envolva todos os países da América do Sul e, aliado a isto, a formalização da cidadania sul-americana (à semelhança do que ocorreu na UE);

— as diferentes iniciativas de integração e coordenação regional que se registam na América do Sul evidenciam um esforço conjunto dos países em se apresentarem perante a comunidade internacional como um bloco coeso nas diferentes políticas.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Como encara o aprofundamento do movimento a que assistimos de um aumento das organizações de integração na América do Sul? Considera que isso possa ser benéfico para a UE e para as relações comerciais que estabelece com os países que as constituem?

2. Não poderá ocorrer uma sobreposição ou um efeito s*paghetti bowl* (efeito «emaranhado») no que diz respeito aos acordos comerciais assinados? Que perspetivas tem quanto a um possível acordo comercial em bloco ou conjuntamente com o Mercosul e a Comunidade Andina de Nações?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(22 de abril de 2013)

1. A Comissão apoia todas as iniciativas de integração regional na América do Sul, tal como noutras regiões. Cada organização de integração tem as suas próprias especificidades e dinâmica interna. Do ponto de vista comercial, cada um dos blocos regionais na América Latina realizou progressos em relação a determinadas questões, ao passo que outras áreas importantes para a integração económica regional devem continuar a ser desenvolvidas se estes blocos pretendem tornar-se verdadeiras uniões aduaneiras ou desenvolver mercados internos. A UE está interessada em estabelecer relações comerciais mais estreitas com todos os blocos regionais e quanto mais integrados economicamente estes blocos estiverem, melhor.

2. A UE assinou acordos comerciais com vários parceiros na América Latina. Não existe, aparentemente, qualquer risco de sobreposição entre os diferentes regimes comerciais na medida em que a perspetiva de um acordo comercial coletivo entre a UE, por um lado, e o Mercosul e a Comunidade Andina, por outro, não parece ser realista na fase atual. O Mercosul e a Comunidade Andina não constituem um único bloco comercial e existem atualmente diferenças consideráveis nas políticas económicas entre os países nestes dois blocos regionais, incluindo a sua predisposição para a liberalização do comércio e do investimento.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002384/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Unasur — The Union of South American Nations II

Whereas:

— the objective of the Constitutive Treaty of the Union of South American Nations is to build, in a participatory and consensual manner, an integration and union among its peoples in the cultural, social, economic and political fields;

— the majority of the signatories of the Unasur Constitutive Treaty are members of either the common market of the South (Mercosur) or the Andean Community of Nations. The Republic of Chile, the Cooperative Republic of Guyana and the Republic of Suriname are outside these two economic blocks;

— both economic blocks have the EU as one of their main economic partners. While trade with the EU represents 14.3% of the Andean Community of Nations' total trade, it represents 20% of total trade with Mercosur, making the EU its main trading partner;

— there are real opportunities for investment by European economic bodies in both economic blocks, and their increased regional economic integration is strengthening these opportunities;

— one of Unasur's most recent objectives is to create a common market that includes all South American countries, and to formalise South American citizenship (similar to that in the EU);

— the different regional integration and coordination initiatives seen in South America demonstrate the countries' combined effort to present themselves to the international community as a cohesive block in a range of policy areas.

I ask the Commission:

1. What is its assessment of the progress being made by the South American integration organisations? Does it believe that this could be of benefit to the EU and to the trade relations established with the countries within these blocks?

2. Could there be an overlap or spaghetti bowl effect from the trade agreements that have been signed? What is the outlook for a possible block or collective trade agreement with Mercosur and the Andean Community of Nations?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

1. The Commission supports all regional integration initiatives, in South America as in other regions. Each integration organisation has its own specificity and internal dynamics. From a trade point of view, each of the regional blocs in Latin America have made progress on certain issues, while other areas important for regional economic integration need to be further developed if these blocs want to become true customs unions or develop internal markets. The EU is interested in establishing closer trade relations with all regional blocs and the more economically integrated these blocs are, the better.

2. The EU has signed trade agreements with several partners in Latin America. There is no apparent risk of overlap among the different trade arrangements as the prospect of a collective trade agreement between the EU on one side and Mercosur and the Andean Community on the other side does not seem realistic at this juncture. Mercosur and the Andean Community do not constitute a single trading bloc and there currently are considerable differences in the economic policies between the countries in these two regional blocs, including their willingness to engage in trade and investment liberalisation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002385/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Rota Europeia das Catedrais

A herança cultural europeia e a compreensão adequada da sua história não são possíveis sem a preservação, divulgação e estudo do seu património material e imaterial.

As catedrais da Europa constituem um sinal estruturante da identidade europeia, marcaram decisivamente a sua população e o seu território durante muitos séculos e possuem inestimável valor religioso, histórico, artístico, cultural, turístico, simbólico e patrimonial.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Admite promover o estabelecimento de uma Rota Europeia das Catedrais?

Resposta dada por António Tajani em nome da Comissão
(24 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão não promove o estabelecimento de rotas culturais específicas. No entanto, apoia direta e indiretamente o desenvolvimento de iniciativas de base que utilizem o património cultural e industrial para diversificar a oferta turística ([1]).

Um novo convite à apresentação de propostas deverá ser lançado antes do verão de 2013. Será anunciado, em especial, no sítio Internet (http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/contracts-grants/calls-for-proposals/index_en.htm). Às melhores propostas será concedido apoio financeiro direto por um período máximo de 18 meses. O programa «Cultura» (2007-2013) prevê também oportunidades de cofinanciamento para projetos culturais transnacionais ([2]).

Além disso, a Comissão apoia financeiramente o «Instituto Europeu de rotas culturais» para certificar as «rotas culturais europeias», monitorizar a sua qualidade e prestar assistência técnica a gestores de rotas (http://www.culture-routes.lu/php/fo_index.php?lng=en).

As catedrais da Europa constituem claramente uma parte importante do património espiritual, histórico e cultural europeu, facto que lhes atribui um evidente valor turístico. Algumas iniciativas que envolvem catedrais específicas já foram apoiadas financeiramente, tais como o Caminho de Santiago, que termina em Santiago de Compostela.

Os gestores de uma futura Rota Europeia das Catedrais poderiam, por conseguinte, responder aos convites à apresentação de propostas e/ou apresentar um pedido para esta se tornar uma rota cultural europeia certificada. Como sempre, a Comissão tomará todas as medidas necessárias para garantir uma concorrência leal e a igualdade de tratamento das muitas propostas originais e de qualidade de que venha a tomar conhecimento.

([1]) Se a salvaguarda do património cultural europeu é da maior importância para a Comissão, a preservação, a proteção, a conservação e a renovação do património cultural são, antes de mais, uma responsabilidade nacional.

([2]) Desde 2007, o programa «Cultura» apoiou projetos relativos ao património cultural, com mais de 32 milhões de euros. A lista de todos os projetos apoiados está disponível em: (http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/projects-and-actions-supported_en.htm). São atribuídos ainda prémios da UE ao património cultural a realizações extraordinárias nas áreas da conservação, da investigação, do serviço específico e da educação, da formação e da sensibilização no domínio do património cultural.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002385/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: European Cathedral Route

Europe's cultural heritage and the proper understanding of its history are not possible without the preservation, promotion and study of its material and spiritual history.

Europe's cathedrals are the foundations of European identity; they marked its population and territory for many centuries, and have an inestimable religious, historical, artistic, cultural, touristic, symbolic and economic value.

Will the Commission agree to endorse the establishment of a European Cathedral Route?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The Commission does not endorse the establishment of specific cultural routes. However it supports directly and indirectly the development of grassroots initiatives using the cultural and industrial heritage to diversify the tourism offer ([1]).

A new open call for proposals should be launched before the summer 2013. It will be advertised in particular on http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/contracts-grants/calls-for-proposals/index_en.htm. The best proposals will get direct financial support for a period of maximum 18 months. The Culture Programme (2007-2013) also provides co-funding opportunities for transnational cultural projects ([2]).

Besides, the Commission supports financially the 'European Institute of Cultural Routes' to certify 'European Cultural Routes', monitor their quality and provide technical aid to Route managers (http://www.culture-routes.lu/php/fo_index.php?lng=en).

Europe's cathedrals are clearly an important part of the European spiritual, historical and cultural heritage. This gives them a clear touristic value. Some initiatives involving specific cathedrals have already been financially supported such as the Way of St. James ending in Santiago de Compostela.

The managers of a future European Cathedral Route could therefore respond to calls for proposals and/or apply to become a certified European Cultural Route. As always, the Commission will take all necessary measures to ensure fair competition and equal treatment of the many original and quality proposals it comes to know.

([1]) If the safeguarding of European cultural heritage is of utmost importance for the Commission, the upkeep, protection, conservation and renovation of cultural heritage are primarily a national responsibility.

([2]) Since 2007, the Culture Programme has supported cultural heritage projects with more than EUR 32 million. The list of all supported projects is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-programmes-and-actions/projects-and-actions-supported_en.htm EU Prizes for cultural heritage are also awarded for extraordinary achievements in the field of conservation, research, dedicated service and education, training and awareness raising in the field of cultural heritage.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002386/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Relações entre a UE e a África do Sul: Fórum Estruturado de Diálogo

Considerando que:

O Conselho da União Europeia adotou em 2001 as orientações relativas ao diálogo sobre direitos humanos, as quais foram revistas em 2008, e reconheceu, em 19 de novembro de 2012, a importância de reforçar a relação existente entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul, de forma a melhorar a cooperação e o diálogo entre as Partes e a aprofundar as suas relações na área dos direitos humanos;

Neste contexto, foi estabelecido, em novembro de 2012, um Fórum Estruturado de Diálogo entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul («Structured Dialogue Fórum») na área dos direitos humanos, com vista a melhorar a cooperação entre as Partes em questões relacionadas com os direitos humanos e o direito humanitário através de fóruns internacionais regionais e multilaterais;

Aquando do estabelecimento deste novo Fórum foram definidos o seu âmbito de intervenção e as várias metas a atingir, bem como o seu formato (de caráter intergovernamental), a sua organização e modo de funcionamento;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual é a relação entre este instrumento e o Acordo de Cooperação e Desenvolvimento entre a União Europeia e a República da África do Sul?

2. Está prevista uma maior institucionalização deste instrumento no quadro das relações bilaterais entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul?

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

1. O Acordo de Comércio, Desenvolvimento e Cooperação (ACDC) de 1999 e a Parceria Estratégica UE-África do Sul de 2007 visam reforçar o diálogo político e a cooperação no domínio socioeconómico. A Parceria Estratégica proporciona um quadro estratégico único e coerente para as relações bilaterais que permite prosseguir a cooperação política e os objetivos comuns no que respeita às questões regionais, africanas e mundiais. Nas suas conclusões de 17 de outubro de 2006, o Conselho sublinhou que, através da Parceria Estratégica e do respetivo Plano de Ação, a África do Sul e a UE desenvolveriam, designadamente, uma cooperação económica mais forte e sustentável e aplicariam integralmente as disposições do ACDC em todos os domínios da cooperação. Tendo também em conta este novo contexto, o ACDC foi alterado em 2009. Por conseguinte, tanto o ACDC revisto como a Parceria Estratégica assentam expressamente nos princípios e obrigações universais em matéria de direitos humanos.

2. Ao institucionalizarem o Fórum Estruturado de Diálogo UE-África do Sul sobre os direitos humanos, a União Europeia e a África do Sul responderam ao convite da Quarta Cimeira UE-África do Sul, realizada em 2011, tendo consolidado, aprofundado e diversificado as suas relações no domínio dos direitos humanos. Por conseguinte, esta institucionalização reforça a dimensão dos direitos humanos no diálogo político entre África do Sul e a UE. Não está prevista uma maior institucionalização do instrumento.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002386/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: EU-South Africa relations: Structured Dialogue Forum

Whereas:

In 2001, the Council adopted the European Union Guidelines on human rights dialogues, which were revised in 2008. On 19 November 2012, it recognised the importance of strengthening the existing relationship between the European Union and South Africa with a view to enhancing cooperation and dialogue between both parties and deepening their relations in the area of human rights;

In November 2012, the Council endorsed the establishment of a Structured Dialogue Forum between the parties on the issues of human rights and humanitarian law through international, regional and multilateral forums;

When establishing this new Forum, its sphere of influence and its various goals were also defined, together with its intergovernmental nature, organisation and operating procedures.

1. What is the relationship between this instrument and the Cooperation and Development Agreement between the European Union and South Africa?

2. Is greater institutionalisation of this instrument envisaged in relations between the European Union and South Africa?

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

1. The 1999 Trade, Development and Cooperation agreement (TDCA) and the 2007 EU-South Africa Strategic Partnership aim both at enhanced political dialogue and stronger cooperation in socioeconomic matters. The Strategic Partnership provided a single coherent strategic framework for the bilateral relations, pursuing through it political cooperation and shared objectives with regard to regional, African and global issues. In its Conclusions of 17 October 2006 the Council emphasised that through the Strategic Partnership and the corresponding Action Plan South Africa and the EU would *inter alia* develop stronger and sustainable economic cooperation and fully implement the TDCA provisions in all areas of cooperation. Also in light of this new context the TDCA has been amended in 2009. Both the revised TDCA and the Strategic Partnership are therefore explicitly rooted on international human rights universal principles and obligations.

2. With the formalisation of the EU-South Africa Structured Dialogue Forum on Human Rights the EU and South Africa responded to the invitation of the 4th EU-South Africa Summit in 2011 and consolidated, deepened and diversified their relations in the human rights area. Such formalisation thus reinforces the human rights dimension of the South Africa-EU political dialogue. No greater insitutionalisation of the instrument is foreseen.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002387/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Relações entre a UE e a África do Sul na área do comércio internacional

Considerando que:

A República da África do Sul é o maior parceiro comercial da União Europeia em África, o 13.° maior parceiro comercial da UE no mundo, e que a União Europeia contribui para um terço da balança comercial da África do Sul, estando o valor total das trocas comerciais entre estas cifrado num valor da ordem dos 39 mil milhões de euros em 2010;

O Acordo de Comércio, Cooperação e Desenvolvimento celebrado em outubro de 1999 entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul, e que entrou em vigor em 2000, criou uma zona de comércio livre que cobre cerca de 90 % do comércio bilateral entre as duas Partes;

A liberalização do comércio entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul, tal como prevista nos termos do Acordo de Comércio, Cooperação e Desenvolvimento de 1999, foi concluída em 2012;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Como vê os resultados da liberalização do comércio entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul até agora alcançados?

2. Quais as perspetivas futuras no que respeita às relações entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul, nomeadamente ao nível das relações comerciais, uma vez que esta é atualmente considerada a quinta potência mundial emergente a par dos BRIC (Brasil, Rússia, Índia, China) e a maior à escala de África?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(7 de maio de 2013)

Desde a entrada em vigor do acordo (2000), o comércio bilateral entre a UE e a África do Sul aumentou mais de 120 %. Além disso, o Investimento Direto Estrangeiro (IDE) também cresceu substancialmente. O investimento direto estrangeiro na África do Sul foi multiplicado por cinco e o investimento da África do Sul na Europa triplicou (a base inicial era pouco elevada). O comércio entre as duas partes é diversificado, sólido e sustentado por novos investimentos.

As negociações relativas aos acordos de parceria económica regional (APE) com o Grupo do APE da SADC estão em curso e irão, quando concluídas, ancorar mais ainda o comércio UE-África do Sul no comércio entre a UE e a África Austral em geral. O APE irá fortalecer a integração regional e tornar os investimentos mais atrativos, uma vez que criará um quadro regulamentar previsível e harmonizado. Irá trazer uma nova dimensão ao comércio UE-África do Sul.

As negociações entre a União Aduaneira da África Austral (SACU), da qual a África do Sul é membro, e a Índia ainda não estão terminadas. Qualquer acordo será provavelmente aplicado apenas a bens selecionados. Esta linha de raciocínio também se aplica ao acordo comercial entre a SACU e o Mercosul — que inclui o Brasil — que ainda irá ser ratificado. Neste contexto, e na ausência de preferências comerciais da África do Sul para os países do BRIC, a UE dispõe atualmente de um instrumento adequado com o ACDC existente e, possivelmente, com os APE da SADC, no futuro, em termos de acesso preferencial ao mercado Sul-Africano.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002387/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: International trade relations between the EU and South Africa

Whereas:

South Africa is the European Union's largest trading partner in Africa and its 13th largest trading partner worldwide. The EU accounts for a third of South Africa's trade balance, with two-way trade amounting to EUR 39 billion in 2010;

The Trade, Development and Cooperation Agreement between the EU and South Africa that was signed in October 1999 and came into force in 2000 established a free-trade area that covers approximately 90% of bilateral trade between the two parties;

Trade liberalisation between the European Union and South Africa, as set out in the 1999 Trade, Development and Cooperation Agreement, ended in 2012.

1. What is the Commission's view of the results of trade liberalisation achieved to date between the European Union and South Africa?

2. What are the future prospects for EU-South Africa relations in terms of trade, considering South Africa is currently considered the fifth largest power in the developing world alongside the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China) and the largest in Africa?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2013)

Since the entry into force of the agreement (2000), two-way trade between the EU and South Africa has increased by more than 120%. What is more, Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) has increased substantially too. EU FDI into South Africa has increased five-fold. South African investment in Europe has increased three-fold (albeit coming from a low base). Trade between the two parties is diversified, solid and underpinned by fresh investment.

Negotiations for a regional Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) with the SADC EPA Group are currently ongoing and will, when agreed, anchor EU-South African trade much more into the southern African region. The EPA will foster regional integration, make investment more attractive because of a predictable and harmonised regulatory framework. It will bring a new dimension to EU-South African trade.

Negotiations between the Southern African Customs Union (SACU), of which South Africa is a member, and India have not been completed yet. Any agreement is likely to apply only to selected goods. This reasoning also applies to the trade agreement between SACU and Mercosur — which includes Brazil — that is still to be ratified. In this context and in the absence of trade preferences from South Africa to BRIC countries, the EU is well served through the TDCA today and possibly the SADC EPA in the future in terms of preferential access into the South African market.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002388/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: Relações entre a UE e a África do Sul na área da investigação e da inovação

Tendo em conta que:

A Comissão Europeia adotou a 14 de setembro de 2014 uma nova estratégia para a cooperação internacional no âmbito da investigação e da inovação, com o objetivo de criar e de explorar oportunidades de cooperação nesta área entre a Europa e o resto do mundo, a qual pode ser considerada como a dimensão externa do Programa Horizonte 2020;

O Programa Horizonte 2020 entrará em vigor em 2014 e será o instrumento principal para a execução da estratégia internacional de cooperação da União Europeia junto de países terceiros. O referido instrumento estará aberto a participantes de todos os países e apoiará ações de cooperação específicas, sendo de esperar que este Programa contribua para garantir uma maior abordagem estratégica na seleção e definição das ações a desenvolver com os parceiros internacionais;

A estratégia da UE para a cooperação internacional inclui a cooperação com as economias emergentes, como a África do Sul, colocando, nesses casos, o enfoque na competitividade, acesso ao conhecimento e aos mercados do parceiro internacional;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais os princípios e regras comuns para a cooperação internacional na área da investigação e da inovação entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul?

2. Como serão os direitos de propriedade intelectual regulamentados no contexto dessa cooperação internacional na área da investigação e da inovação entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul?

3. Qual o lugar do Espaço Europeu de Investigação na cooperação internacional referida e como será tida em conta a dimensão internacional deste Programa no contexto dessa mesma cooperação?

Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(16 de abril de 2013)

1. Os princípios e regras comuns para a cooperação internacional no domínio da ciência e da tecnologia entre a África do Sul e a União Europeia foram estabelecidos no artigo 3.° do Acordo de Cooperação ([1]), assinado em 1996 e em vigor desde 1997.

2. Os direitos de propriedade intelectual são regulamentados com base no anexo ao acordo de cooperação a que se refere a pergunta 1 ([2]). Quando a cooperação se processa através da participação de entidades da África do Sul no Programa-Quadro de Investigação e Inovação Horizonte 2020 (2014-2020), são aplicáveis as regras relativas aos direitos de propriedade intelectual previstas para este programa de financiamento. Estas disposições relativas aos direitos de propriedade intelectual fazem parte das Regras de Participação do Programa-Quadro Horizonte 2020. A Estratégia de Cooperação Internacional em investigação e inovação adotada pela Comissão em setembro de 2012 é um documento político que reforça a base da cooperação entre a UE e a África do Sul sem alterar as modalidades da sua aplicação, que continuam a ser as definidas no Acordo de Cooperação.

3. A dimensão internacional do Espaço Europeu da Investigação é definida pela Estratégia de Cooperação Internacional em investigação e inovação adotada pela Comissão em setembro de 2012. Esta estratégia constituirá a base para o estabelecimento de prioridades para a cooperação internacional no domínio da ciência e da tecnologia entre a África do Sul e a União Europeia.

([1]) JO L 313 de 15.11.1997 (pp. 26-43).
([2]) JO L 313 de 15.11.1997 (pp. 31-32).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002388/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Relations between the EU and South Africa in the area of research and innovation

Given that:

On 14 September 2012, the Commission adopted a new strategy for international cooperation in research and innovation with a view to creating and exploiting opportunities for cooperation in this area between the EU and the rest of the world, which is considered as the external dimension of the Horizon 2020 programme;

The Horizon 2020 programme comes into operation in 2014 and will be the main instrument for implementing the international cooperation strategy between the EU and third countries. This instrument will be open to participants from all over the world and will support specific cooperation activities. It is hoped that the programme will contribute to ensuring a broader strategic approach to selecting and defining activities with international partners;

The EU strategy for international cooperation includes cooperation with emerging economies such as South Africa. In such cases, it will focus on competitiveness, access to sources of knowledge and access to the international partner's markets.

I ask the Commission:

1. What are the common principles and rules for international cooperation between the EU and South Africa in the area of research and innovation?

2. How will intellectual property rights be regulated in the context of this international cooperation between the EU and South Africa in the area of research and innovation?

3. What role will the European Research Area play in this international cooperation and how will the international dimension of this programme be taken into account in the context of this cooperation?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

1. The common principles and rules for international cooperation in the area of science and technology between South Africa and the European Union are set out in Article 3 of the cooperation agreement ([1]), which was signed in 1996 and entered into force in 1997.

2. Intellectual Property Rights are regulated on the basis of the annex to the cooperation agreement referred to in question 1 ([2]). Where the cooperation is implemented through the participation of South African entities in Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), the Intellectual Property Rights rules established for this funding programme will apply. These IPR provisions are part of the Horizon 2020 Rules for Participation. The International Cooperation Strategy in research and innovation adopted by the Commission in September 2012 is a policy document that reinforces the basis of the cooperation between the EU and South Africa without modifying the modalities of its application which remain the domain of the cooperation agreement.

3. The international dimension of the European Research Area is set out by the International Cooperation Strategy in research and innovation adopted by the Commission in September 2012. This strategy will be the basis for priority setting in international cooperation in the area of science and technology between South Africa and the European Union.

([1]) OJ L 313, 15.11.1997 (pp. 26-43).
([2]) OJ L 313, 15.11.1997 (pp. 31-32).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002390/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Relações entre a UE e a África do Sul: Fórum Estruturado de Diálogo

Considerando que:

O Conselho da União Europeia adotou em 2001 as orientações relativas ao diálogo sobre direitos humanos, as quais foram revistas em 2008, e reconheceu, em 19 de novembro de 2012, a importância de reforçar a relação existente entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul, de forma a melhorar a cooperação e o diálogo entre as Partes e a aprofundar as suas relações na área dos direitos humanos.

Neste contexto, foi estabelecido, em novembro de 2012, um Fórum Estruturado de Diálogo entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul (*Structured Dialogue Forum*) na área dos direitos humanos, com vista a melhorar a cooperação entre as Partes em questões relacionadas com os direitos humanos e o direito humanitário através de fóruns internacionais regionais e multilaterais.

Aquando do estabelecimento deste novo fórum, foram definidos o seu âmbito de intervenção e as várias metas a atingir, bem como o seu formato (de caráter intergovernamental), a sua organização e modo de funcionamento.

Pergunta-se à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

1. Quais os resultados que até agora foram alcançados no contexto deste recém-criado fórum?

2. Como tem a sociedade civil colaborado e contribuído para o reforço do diálogo pretendido entre as Partes?

3. Qual a relação possível entre este instrumento e o Acordo de Cooperação e Desenvolvimento entre a União Europeia e a República da África do Sul? Está prevista uma maior institucionalização deste instrumento?

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

No que respeita ao Fórum de Diálogo Estruturado entre a União Europeia e a África do Sul sobre direitos humanos, remetemos o Senhor Deputado para a resposta da Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente à pergunta E-2386/2013 ([1]).

A primeira reunião formal do Fórum está prevista para finais de maio na África do Sul. Em conformidade com as modalidades aprovadas para o diálogo ([2]) e aproveitando uma longa colaboração com organizações da sociedade civil sobre a questão, é intenção da UE compilar contributos da sociedade civil para o diálogo nas formas prescritas (por exemplo, seminários conjuntos da sociedade civil antes e depois do diálogo).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pt/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm
([2]) Anexo às conclusões do Conselho sobre o estabelecimento de um diálogo com a África do Sul sobre direitos humanos, 19 de novembro de 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002390/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU-South Africa relations: Structured Dialogue Forum

In 2001, the Council of the European Union adopted guidelines on human rights dialogues, which were revised in 2008. On 19 November 2012 it recognised the importance of strengthening the existing relationship between the European Union and South Africa, in view of enhancing cooperation and dialogue between the parties and to deepen their relations in the area of human rights.

In this context, in November 2012 an EU-SA Structured Dialogue Forum was established on human rights, with the view to enhancing practical cooperation between the parties on issues pertaining to international human rights and humanitarian law as advanced through regional and multilateral fora.

Once established, this new forum's scope of intervention, various targets, intergovernmental format, organisation and mode of operation were defined.

1. What results have been achieved so far in the context of this newly created forum?

2. How has civil society collaborated and helped to enhance dialogue between the parties?

3. What is the possible relationship between this instrument and the Development and Cooperation Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of South Africa? Is further institutionalisation of this instrument planned?

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

With regard to the EU -South Africa Structured Dialogue Forum on Human Rights the Honourable Member is kindly referred to the answer provided by HR/VP Ashton to Question E-2386/2013 ([1]).

The first formal meeting of the Forum is scheduled to take place at the end of May in South Africa. In accordance with the agreed Modalities for the Dialogue ([2]) and also building on long standing collaboration with civil society organisations on the matter it is the EU intention to gather civil society input for the dialogue in the prescribed forms (e.g joint civil society seminars preceding/following the dialogue).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm
([2]) Annex to the Council Conclusions on the establishment of a Human rights Dialogue with South Africa, 19 November 2012.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002740/13
a la Comisión
Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE) y Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE)
(8 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: El procedimiento de la Corporación de Internet para la Asignación de Nombres y Números (ICANN) para la creación de nuevos nombres de dominios de alto nivel

A principios de 2012, la Corporación para la Asignación de Nombres y Números de Internet (ICANN) puso en marcha un proceso para conceder los derechos de gestión de nuevos nombres de dominio de alto nivel. Este importante paso también tiene por objetivo mejorar la visibilidad y la identificación de diferentes marcas, actividades de servicios o incluso ciudades (como «.auto», «.hotel» o «.paris»).

En este proceso, es imprescindible que se apliquen los siguientes principios:

1. Garantizar un acceso no discriminatorio para todos los hoteles del mundo al nuevo nombre (o a los nuevos nombres) «.hotel»;

2. Asignar los nombres de dominio bajo «.hotel» y afines tan solo a la comunidad hotelera, ya que esta palabra representa a un sector bien definido. Esto permitiría generar confianza en los consumidores de que realmente existe un servicio hotelero detrás de un nombre o nombres de dominio «.hotel».

Estos principios son esenciales para el sector hotelero europeo y tan solo pueden garantizarse mediante una «solicitud comunitaria» a ICANN.

Por las razones expuestas:

¿Qué acciones prevé tomar la Comisión Europea en relación con el procedimiento de la ICANN con el fin de garantizar el acceso no discriminatorio de todos los hoteles al nuevo nombre (o nuevos nombres) de domino de alto nivel, es decir, la aplicación de las normas y principios de competencia leal?

Respuesta conjunta de la Sra. Kroes en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión, que es miembro de pleno derecho del Comité Asesor Gubernamental (GAC) de la ICANN, sigue muy de cerca todo lo relacionado con el programa de nuevos dominios genéricos de primer nivel desde sus comienzos. La Comisión se coordina además con los Estados miembros de la UE para asegurarse de que se defienden adecuadamente los derechos e intereses de los ciudadanos y empresas de la UE.

La Comisión es plenamente consciente de que algunas partes han solicitado nuevos dominios genéricos de primer nivel que pretenden utilizar de modo exclusivo.

Se está examinando si esta pretensión es aceptable según las normas aprobadas por la propia ICANN a través de la «Guía para solicitantes de nuevos dominios genéricos de primer nivel». El Consejo de administración de la ICANN, que es quien toma las decisiones finales dentro de ella, debe pronunicarse sobre ello, pero no se ha fijado un plazo. La Comisión ya ha informado de su posición, y seguirá haciéndolo, tanto en el GAC como hablando directamente con la ICANN y las demás partes, según convenga.

Dado que, por ahora, es imposible evaluar los efectos reales de asignar un dominio genérico de primer nivel, resulta prematuro que la Comisión incoe un procedimiento basándose en sus atribuciones en materia de competencia. Si, posteriormente, una evaluación lo justifica, la Comisión velará por que se aplique en su totalidad la legislación de la UE, incluida la relativa a las condiciones de competencia, mediante los procedimientos adecuados.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002740/13
an die Kommission
Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE) und Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE)
(8. März 2013)

Betrifft: „Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)" — Verfahren für die Zuweisung von Top-Internet-Domain-Namen

Anfang 2012 hat die „Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)" für die Zuweisung von Top-Level-Domain-Namen und Zahlen ein Verfahren eingeführt, mit dem Verwaltungsrechte für Top-Level-Domains vergeben werden. Mit diesem wichtigen Schritt wurde beabsichtigt, die Sichtbarkeit und Identifizierung verschiedener Marken, Dienstleistungsbereiche und sogar Städte zu erhöhen (so zum Beispiel „.auto, .hotel, .paris)").

Im Rahmen dieses Registrierungsverfahrens muss sichergestellt werden, dass

1. allen Hotels auf der Welt absolut gleichberechtigter Zugang zu den neuen Domain-Namen „.hotel" gewährt wird;

2. „.hotel)" und ähnliche Domain-Namen auch wirklich nur in der Hotelleriebranche vergeben werden, da das Wort „hotel" sich auf eine klar umrissene Sparte bezieht; dadurch würde das Vertrauen der Verbraucher darin aufgebaut, dass hinter den auf „.hotel)" endenden oder ähnlichen Domain-Namen auch wirklich ein Hotel steht.

Diese Grundprinzipien sind wichtig für das europäische Hotelleriegewerbe und können nur gewährleistet werden, wenn bei den Anträgen an die ICANN vom Antragsteller nachgewiesen wird, dass er der jeweiligen Branche (oder Region) angehört.

Welche Maßnahmen plant die Kommission daher in Bezug auf das ICANN-Registrierungsverfahren zu unternehmen, um sicher zu stellen, dass allen Hotels ohne jegliche Diskriminierung Zugang zu diesen neuen Top-Level-Domains (TLD) gewährt wird und die Bestimmungen und Grundsätze zur Wahrung eines fairen Wettbewerbs zur Anwendung kommen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission
(5. April 2013)

Als Vollmitglied des ICANN-Beratungsausschusses der Regierungen (GAC) hat die Kommission die Entwicklungen im Zusammenhang mit dem Programm für neue generische Top-Level-Domains seit dessen Einführung sehr aufmerksam verfolgt. Die Kommission stimmt sich außerdem mit den EU-Mitgliedstaaten ab, um sicherzustellen, dass die Interessen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger sowie der Unternehmen der EU angemessen geschützt werden.

Die Kommission ist sich durchaus der Tatsache bewusst, dass neue generische Top-Level-Domains (TLD) zur ausschließlichen Nutzung beantragt worden sind.

Derzeit wird die Frage geprüft, ob dies nach dem von der ICANN selbst verabschiedeten Regelwerk — „New gTLD Applicant Guidebook" — zulässig ist. Eine Entscheidung des für die endgültige Beschlussfassung bei der ICANN zuständigen ICANN-Vorstands in dieser Sache wird erwartet, allerdings wurde diesbezüglich keine Frist festgesetzt. Die Kommission hat über den GAC bzw. durch direkte Kontaktaufnahme mit der ICANN und anderen Beteiligten zu dieser Frage Stellung genommen und wird dies gegebenenfalls auch in Zukunft tun.

Da die tatsächlichen Auswirkungen der Vergabe einer generischen TLD zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt noch nicht beurteilt werden können, ist es für die Kommission noch zu früh, ein Verfahren auf der Grundlage ihrer wettbewerbsrechtlichen Befugnisse einzuleiten. Sollte das Ergebnis einer nachträglichen Prüfung es erforderlich machen, wird die Kommission durch einschlägige Verfahren gewährleisten, dass das EU-(Wettbewerbs-)Recht in vollem Umfang Anwendung findet.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-002392/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(28 février 2013)

Objet: Extension des noms de domaine sur internet et secteur de l'hôtellerie

Depuis 2012, les entreprises et organismes spécialisés peuvent demander à l'ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) l'attribution d'une nouvelle extension de domaine sur internet. Cette innovation vise à améliorer la visibilité et l'identification d'une marque, d'un secteur ou d'une ville (exemple: «auto»,«hôtel», «paris», etc.)

Il existe 3 types de candidatures: ouvertes, «community share» (réservées à une communauté partageant un même intérêt) et «exclusives».

Cette dernière catégorie suscite l'inquiétude des organisations professionnelles de l'hôtellerie et des propriétaires d'hôtels, car des agents de voyage en ligne ont demandé que des extensions génériques, telles que «hôtel» ou «hôtels», leur soient exclusivement attribuées, rendant ainsi leur utilisation impossible par un hôtel ou un syndicat professionnel.

À ce jour, la Commission ne s'est pas emparée de cette question, alors que les agents de voyage en ligne captent une part croissante de la valeur ajoutée de l'hôtellerie, sans que cela contribue à une création de richesses ou d'emplois en Europe. Il y a lieu aussi de craindre une violation des droits de propriété intellectuelle des propriétaires d'hôtels sur leur marque.

Au regard de ces éléments:

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission sur cette situation préoccupante pour les professionnels de l'hôtellerie, à l'heure où le tourisme est l'une des industries les plus dynamiques en Europe?

2. La Commission entend-elle prendre part à la consultation publique lancée dernièrement par l'ICANN, afin de s'assurer que les intérêts des acteurs du secteur soient dûment respectés et protégés?

3. La Commission va-t-elle lancer des initiatives au niveau européen pour éviter tout détournement de cette innovation majeure pour le monde numérique et aux conséquences économiques considérables?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002740/13
à la Commission
Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE) et Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE)
(8 mars 2013)

Objet: Procédure ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) pour attribuer de nouveaux noms de domaines de haut niveau

Début 2012, l'ICANN a lancé un processus visant à attribuer les droits de gestion de nouveaux noms de domaines de haut niveau. Cette étape décisive est également destinée à améliorer la visibilité et l'identification d'un éventail de marques, de services, voire de villes (comme «auto», «hôtel», «paris»).

Dans le cadre de cette procédure, il est essentiel que:

1. tous les hôtels dans le monde aient l'assurance d'accéder sans discrimination aux nouveaux noms de domaine «hôtel»;

2. que les noms de domaine «hôtel» et des noms similaires ne soient attribués qu'à la communauté hôtelière, puisque le mot «hôtel» renvoie à un secteur bien défini. De la sorte, les consommateurs s'accoutumeraient à accorder leur confiance à un service hôtelier réellement couvert par un nom de domaine «hôtel» ou similaire.

Ces principes sont essentiels pour l'industrie hôtelière européenne et ne peuvent être garantis que par une «candidature de la communauté» à l'ICANN.

À la lumière de ces arguments, que compte entreprendre la Commission en ce qui concerne la procédure de l'ICANN pour assurer l'accès sans discrimination de tous les hôtels au(x) nouveau(x) nom(s) de domaine, c'est-à-dire l'application des règles et des principes d'une concurrence équitable?

Réponse commune donnée par M^me^ Kroes au nom de la Commission
(5 avril 2013)

Depuis le lancement du programme de nouveaux noms de domaine générique de premier niveau, la Commission, qui est membre à part entière du comité consultatif des gouvernements (GAC) de l'Icann, surveille très attentivement l'évolution de la situation. Elle se concerte également avec les États membres pour veiller à la sauvegarde des droits et des intérêts de la population et des entreprises de l'Union européenne.

La Commission n'ignore pas que certaines parties ont sollicité l'obtention de nouveaux domaines génériques de premier niveau qu'elles projettent d'exploiter sur une base exclusive.

L'acceptabilité de ce procédé au regard des règles adoptées par l'Icann elle-même dans le nouveau «Guide de candidature gTLD» est en cours d'examen. Le conseil d'administration de l'Icann, qui est l'organe de décision ultime de cette organisation, devrait trancher cette question, sans qu'un délai précis ait toutefois été fixé. Ainsi qu'elle l'a toujours fait, la Commission continuera de faire connaître sa position par l'intermédiaire du GAC ou en interpelant directement l'Icann ou d'autres parties, selon le cas.

Comme il n'est pas encore possible à l'heure actuelle de déterminer les effets réels de l'attribution d'un gTLD, il est trop tôt pour que la Commission engage une procédure au titre de ses compétences en matière de concurrence. S'il apparaît ultérieurement qu'une intervention s'impose, la Commission veillera à l'application pleine et entière de la législation de l'Union, y compris en matière de concurrence, par les voies appropriées.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002740/13
alla Commissione
Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE) e Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE)
(8 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Procedura dell'Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) per la concessione di nuovi nomi di dominio di primo livello

All'inizio del 2012 l'Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) ha dato il via a una procedura per l'assegnazione dei diritti di gestione per i nuovi nomi di dominio di primo livello. Questa tappa decisiva ha inoltre lo scopo di aumentare la visibilità e il riconoscimento di diversi marchi, attività di servizio e persino città (come .auto, .hotel o .paris).

Nel quadro di questa procedura, è fondamentale che:

1. a tutti gli alberghi del mondo venga garantito un accesso non discriminatorio ai nuovi nomi di dominio «.hotel»;

2. «.hotel» e nomi di dominio analoghi siano assegnati esclusivamente al settore alberghiero, poiché la parola «hotel» indica un'industria ben definita. Ciò rafforzerà la fiducia dei consumatori, dando loro la sicurezza che dietro al dominio «.hotel» o a un nome analogo sia realmente offerto un servizio alberghiero.

Tali principi risultano essenziali per l'industria alberghiera europea e possono essere garantiti solo mediante presentazione di una «domanda comunitaria» all'ICANN.

Alla luce di quanto suesposto, quali azioni intende intraprendere la Commissione in merito alla procedura ICANN al fine di assicurare a tutti gli alberghi un accesso non discriminatorio al nuovo nome (o ai nuovi nomi) di dominio, ovvero l'applicazione delle norme e dei principi della concorrenza leale?

Risposta congiunta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(5 aprile 2013)

La Commissione, che è membro a pieno titolo del Comitato consultivo dei governi (GAC) dell'ICANN, ha seguito da vicino e fin dall'inizio gli sviluppi relativi al programma di nuovo dominio generico di primo livello. La Commissione opera inoltre di concerto con gli Stati membri per garantire un'adeguata tutela dei diritti e degli interessi dei cittadini e delle imprese dell'UE.

La Commissione è pienamente consapevole del fatto che determinate parti hanno presentato domanda di nuovi domini generici di primo livello che intendono utilizzare su base esclusiva.

La questione se questo approccio sia accettabile sulla base delle norme adottate dall'ICANN tramite il «new gTLD Applicant Guidebook» è attualmente oggetto di esame. Il consiglio di amministrazione dell'ICANN, cui incombe la responsabilità di adottare decisioni definitive in seno a tale organismo, dovrebbe pronunciarsi in materia, anche se non è stata indicata una data precisa in tal senso. La Commissione ha reso nota la propria posizione, e continuerà a farlo, tramite il GAC e/o, a seconda delle circostanze, direttamente presso l'ICANN o altre parti.

Poiché non è possibile valutare in questa fase gli effetti reali dell'assegnazione di un dominio generico di primo livello, la Commissione ritiene prematuro avviare un procedimento sulla base delle sue competenze in materia di concorrenza. Tuttavia, qualora una valutazione ex-post evidenzi tale necessità, la Commissione garantirà una piena e completa applicazione del diritto UE, anche nell'ambito della concorrenza, mediante le opportune procedure.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002740/13
à Comissão
Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE) e Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE)
(8 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Procedimento ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) para a atribuição de novos nomes de domínios de topo

No início de 2012, o ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) lançou um processo para a atribuição dos direitos de gestão de novos nomes de domínios de topo. Com este importante passo procura-se também melhorar a visibilidade e a identificação de diferentes marcas, serviços ou, inclusive, cidades (como «auto», «hotel» ou «paris»).

No quadro deste processo, é essencial garantir:

1. O acesso não discriminatório de todos os hotéis do mundo ao novo nome de domínio «hotel»;

2. A atribuição dos nomes de domínio «hotel» e afins exclusivamente à comunidade hoteleira, uma vez que a palavra «hotel» remete para um setor claramente definido. Os consumidores acostumar-se-iam, deste modo, a confiar na existência de um verdadeiro serviço de hotelaria por detrás de um nome de domínio «hotel» ou outro nome semelhante.

Estes princípios são essenciais para o setor hoteleiro europeu e só poderão ser garantidos através de uma «candidatura comunitária» ao ICANN.

Tendo em conta o anteriormente aduzido, que ações tenciona empreender a Comissão no tocante ao procedimento do ICANN para garantir o acesso não discriminatório de todos os hotéis ao(s) novo(s) nome(s) de domínio de topo, ou seja, a aplicação das normas e princípios de concorrência leal?

Resposta conjunta dada por Neelie Kroes em nome da Comissão
(5 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão, que é um membro de pleno direito do Comité Consultivo Governamental (CCG) da ICANN, tem acompanhado de muito perto a evolução verificada no que diz respeito ao programa de novos domínios de topo genéricos, desde o seu início. A Comissão está igualmente a trabalhar em coordenação com os Estados-Membros da UE para assegurar que os direitos e interesses dos cidadãos e empresas da UE são devidamente preservados.

A Comissão está plenamente ciente do facto de que algumas partes solicitaram novos domínios genéricos de topo que tencionam utilizar em exclusividade.

Está a ser analisada a questão da legitimidade desta pretensão nos termos das regras adotadas pela própria ICANN, através do guia destinado aos requerentes de novos domínios genéricos de topo. O Conselho de Administração da ICANN, que tem o poder de decisão final na ICANN, deverá adotar uma decisão sobre esta questão, embora não tenha sido fixado um prazo concreto. A Comissão fez conhecer o seu ponto de vista, e continuará a fazê-lo, através do CCG e/ou contactando diretamente a ICANN ou outras partes, conforme adequado.

Uma vez que os efeitos reais da atribuição de um domínio genérico de topo não podem ser avaliados nesta fase, não é ainda oportuno a Comissão abrir um processo com base nos seus poderes em matéria de concorrência. Se, posteriormente, uma avaliação o justificar, a Comissão garantirá que a legislação da UE é plenamente aplicada, nomeadamente no domínio da concorrência, através dos procedimentos adequados.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002392/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Internet domain name extensions and the hotel industry

Since 2012, specialised companies and organisations have been able to ask the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) to assign them a new Internet domain name extension. This innovation is aimed at improving the visibility and identification of a brand, a sector or a town (e.g. '.auto', '.hotel', '.paris', etc.).

There are three types of applications: open, 'community share' (reserved for a community sharing the same interest) and 'exclusive'.

This last category is causing concern for the hotel industry's professional organisations and hotel owners, as online travel agents have asked that generic extensions, such as '.hotel' or '.hotels' be exclusively assigned to them, making it impossible for a hotel or trade association to use them.

To date, the Commission has not dealt with this issue, even though online travel agents are taking an increasing share of the hotel industry's added value, without contributing to the creation of wealth or jobs in Europe. There are also fears that hotel owners' intellectual property rights over their brand could be violated.

1. What is the Commission's position on this worrying situation for hotel industry professionals, at a time when tourism is one of the most dynamic industries in Europe?

2. Does the Commission intend to take part in the public consultation launched recently by ICANN, to ensure that the interests of the sector's stakeholders are duly respected and protected?

3. Will the Commission launch any EU-level initiatives to avoid any distortion of this major innovation for the digital world, which has considerable economic consequences?

Question for written answer E-002740/13
to the Commission
Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Dominique Vlasto (PPE), Nuno Teixeira (PPE), Hubert Pirker (PPE), Jim Higgins (PPE) and Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE)
(8 March 2013)

Subject: Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) procedure for granting new top-level domain names

In early 2012, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) launched a process for awarding management rights for new top-level domain names. This major step is also intended to improve the visibility and identification of different brands, service activities and even cities (such as .auto, .hotel, .paris).

As part of this process, it is crucial to ensure that:

1. all hotels around the world are guaranteed non-discriminatory access to the new '.hotel' domain names;

2. '.hotel' and similar domain names are allocated to the hotel community only, as the word 'hotel' refers to a well-defined industry. This would build up consumers' trust that there is really a hotel service behind a '.hotel' or similar domain name.

These principles are essential for the European hotel industry and can only be ensured by making a 'community application' to the ICANN.

In the light of the above, what action is the Commission planning to take in relation to the ICANN procedure in order to ensure non-discriminatory access for all hotels to the new top-level domain name(s), i.e. the application of the rules and principles of fair competition?

Joint answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(5 April 2013)

The Commission, which is a full member of the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of ICANN, has been following very closely the developments related to the new generic Top-Level Domain programme since its inception. The Commission is also coordinating with EU Member States to ensure the rights and interests of EU citizens and business are well defended.

The Commission is fully aware of the fact that certain parties have applied for new generic Top-Level Domains which they plan to use on an exclusive basis.

The issue whether this approach is acceptable pursuant to the rules adopted by ICANN itself via the 'new gTLD Applicant Guidebook' is being examined. The Board of Directors of ICANN, which has the final decision-making responsibility within ICANN, is expected to take a decision on this matter, although no precise timeline has been fixed. The Commission has made and will make its views known via the GAC and/or by directly engaging with ICANN or other parties, as appropriate.

Since the actual effects of assigning a gTLD cannot be assessed at this point in time it is premature for the Commission to open procedure on the basis of its competition powers. Should an *ex post* assessment so warrant, the Commission will ensure full and complete application of EC law, including on competition grounds, through the appropriate procedures.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002394/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Drohendes Aus für den Euribor

Ermittlungen im Rahmen der Aufsicht ergaben im Vorjahr, dass mehrere Finanzkonzerne jahrelang den Londoner Interbanken-Zinssatz Libor zu ihrem eigenen Vorteil manipuliert haben. Der Euribor wird als Basis für die Berechnung der Spar- und Kreditzinsen benutzt. Seit dem Zinsskandal beteiligen sich viele Banken nicht mehr an der täglichen Umfrage, die zur Feststellung des Euribor notwendig ist. Der Ausstieg aus dem Euribor-Gremium wird oft mit der abnehmenden Bedeutung des Interbankenmarktes begründet. Indes müssten in Europa bei einem Aus für den Referenz-Zinssatz Millionen von Kreditverträgen und die Konditionen von Sparbüchern umgeschrieben werden.

1. Wird seitens der Kommission tatsächlich — wie von den Medien kolportiert — überlegt, die Großbanken zur Teilnahme an der (bisher freiwilligen) Umfrage zu verpflichten?

2. Falls ja: Ist zeitgleich ein Ausbau der Kontrollmechanismen auf EU-Ebene geplant, um künftige Zinsmanipulationen zu verhindern?

3. Welche Überlegungen gibt es auf EU-Ebene hinsichtlich neuer Berechnungsmethoden für den Libor bzw. den Euribor, damit diese bei längeren Laufzeiten nicht mehr auf Schätzungen beruhen und dadurch manipulationsanfällig sind?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(2. Mai 2013)

Das allgemeine politische Ziel des künftigen Kommissionsvorschlags zu Benchmarks besteht darin, die Integrität bei der Erstellung und Nutzung von Benchmarks und Indizes zu verbessern, was dem Vertrauen des Marktes und der Effizienz zu Gute kommen und den Anlegerschutz verbessern dürfte. Zwischen September und November 2012 holte die Kommission im Rahmen einer öffentlichen Konsultation die Meinung von Interessengruppen zu einer Reihe von Optionen ein, mit denen diese Ziele erreicht werden könnten. Zu den vorgeschlagenen Optionen zählten eine erhöhte Transparenz und verstärkte Kontrollmechanismen, um z. B. Interessenkonflikte zu beheben. Um den repräsentativen Charakter der Basisdaten zu gewährleisten, umfassten diese Optionen die alleinige Nutzung der Transaktionsdaten, die Verbindung von Transaktionsdaten und überprüfbaren Schätzungen sowie die Möglichkeit einer obligatorischen Beteiligung an Benchmark-Panels.

Als Teil ihrer vorbereitenden Arbeiten zum Benchmark-Vorschlag erstellt die Kommission eine Folgenabschätzung, in der die verschiedenen Optionen zur Erhöhung der Integrität bei der Benchmark-Berechnung geprüft werden. Dies erfolgt in enger Abstimmung mit den laufenden Arbeiten der ESMA ([1]) und der EBA ([2]) sowie der IOSCO ([3]) auf dem Gebiet der Benchmark-Reform.

([1]) Europäische Wertpapier- und Marktaufsichtsbehörde.
([2]) Europäische Bankenaufsichtsbehörde.
([3]) International Organisation of Securities Commissions.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002394/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Imminent abolition of the Euribor

Financial supervision investigations revealed last year that several financial groups have manipulated Libor, the London interbank interest rate, for their own benefit for years. The Euribor is used as the basis for calculating savings and loan interest rates. Since the interest rate scandal, many banks have stopped participating in daily surveys that are necessary to establish the Euribor. Withdrawal from the Euribor Steering Committee is often justified by the declining importance of the interbank market. However, in Europe, millions of credit agreements and the terms and conditions of savings accounts would have to be rewritten if this reference interest rate were to be abolished.

1. Is the Commission actually considering — as has been rumoured in the media — making participation in the (previously voluntary) survey a requirement for major banks?

2. If so, is it planning to extend the control mechanisms at EU level at the same time, in order to prevent future interest rate manipulations?

3. What considerations are there at EU level in terms of new methods for calculating the Libor or Euribor so that, in the case of long maturity periods, they will no longer be based on estimates and thus be susceptible to manipulation?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2013)

The overall policy objective of the Commission's forthcoming proposal on benchmarks is to enhance the integrity of the production and use of benchmarks and indices, which will enhance market confidence and efficiency and improve investor protection. Between September and November 2012, the Commission's public consultation sought the views of interested parties on a number of options to achieve these objectives. Options discussed in the consultation included reinforcing transparency and extending control mechanisms, for example to address conflicts of interest. In relation to ensuring the representativeness of underlying data, options outlined included the use of transaction data only, combining transaction data and verifiable estimates and the possibility of mandatory participation in benchmark panels.

As part of its preparatory work for its forthcoming proposal on benchmarks, the Commission is preparing an impact assessment which considers the different options for enhancing the integrity of the calculation of benchmarks, in close cooperation with the ongoing work of ESMA ([1]) and the EBA ([2]) as well as IOSCO ([3]) on benchmark reform.

([1]) European Securities and Markets Authority.
([2]) European Banking Authority.
([3]) International Organisation of Securities Commissions.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002395/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Unterbesetzung Datenschutzbehörden

In Österreich ist die Datenschutzkommission (DSK), die zuständig für die Einhaltung, Überprüfung und Kontrolle des Gesetzes zum Schutz der Bürgerdaten ist, chronisch unterbesetzt. Daher können die Behörden Beschwerde- oder Ombudsmannverfahren nur dürftig wahrnehmen. Aber auch auf EU-Ebene sollen dem Vernehmen nach die Datenschutzbehörden unterbesetzt sein.

1. Welche Behörden sind auf EU-Ebene für welche Bereiche des Datenschutzes zuständig?

2. Wie viele Mitarbeiter kümmern sich dort um wie viele Akten bzw. um welche Datenmengen?

3. Wurde hinsichtlich des kritisierten Mangels an hochwertigem Datenschutz im Rahmen der PNR-, SWIFT-Abkommen usw. auf EU-Ebene eine Personalaufstockung vorgenommen?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(17. April 2013)

Der Kommission sind die Personalprobleme der österreichischen Datenschutzkommission und auch anderer Datenschutzbehörden in Europa bekannt. Daher heißt es im Vorschlag Kommission für eine Datenschutz-Grundverordnung: „Jeder Mitgliedstaat stellt sicher, dass die Aufsichtsbehörde mit angemessenen personellen, technischen und finanziellen Ressourcen, Räumlichkeiten und mit der erforderlichen Infrastruktur ausgestattet wird, um ihre Aufgaben und Befugnisse […] effektiv wahrnehmen zu können“ ([1]).

Während der Europäische Datenschutzbeauftragte dafür Sorge zu tragen hat, dass die Organe und Einrichtungen der Union das Recht auf Schutz der Privatsphäre achten, ist es Aufgabe der nationalen Datenschutzbehörden, die Durchführung der Datenschutzrichtlinie 95/46/EG ([2]) in ihrem Hoheitsgebiet zu überwachen. Diese Befugnis nehmen sie unbeschadet der Verantwortung der Kommission als Hüterin der Verträge wahr.

([1]) Artikel 47 des Vorschlags für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zum Schutz natürlicher Personen bei der Verarbeitung personenbezogener Daten und zum freien Datenverkehr (Datenschutz-Grundverordnung), KOM(2012)11 vom 25.1.2012.

([2]) Richtlinie 95/46/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zum Schutz natürlicher Personen bei der Verarbeitung personenbezogener Daten und zum freien Datenverkehr; ABl. L 281 vom 23.11.1995, S. 31.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002395/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Understaffing of data protection authorities

In Austria, the Austrian Data Protection Commission (DSK), which is responsible for compliance, review and monitoring in connection with the Act on the protection of citizens' data, is chronically understaffed. The authorities are therefore not able to handle appeal or ombudsman procedures adequately. However, the data protection authorities are reported to be understaffed at EU level, too.

1. Which authorities at EU level are responsible for which areas of data protection?

2. How many members of staff there deal how many files or what quantities of data?

3. Was there an increase in staffing levels at EU level following the criticism concerning the lack of high-quality data protection in connection with the PNR agreement and the SWIFT agreement etc.?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(17 April 2013)

The Commission is aware of the staffing issue in the Austrian Data Protection Commission and also in other data protection supervisory authorities in Europe. Therefore the Commission proposed in its draft General Data Protection Regulation that 'each Member State shall ensure that the supervisory authority is provided with the adequate human, technical and financial resources, premises and infrastructure necessary for the effective performance of its duties and powers' ([1]).

While the European Data Protection Supervisor is in charge of ensuring that the right to privacy is respected by the Union institutions and bodies, it is the data protection supervisory authorities of the Member States which are responsible for the monitoring of the application of the Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC ([2]) within their territory. They exercise this competence without prejudice of the power of the Commission as guardian of the Treaty.

([1]) Article 47 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.

([2]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data; Official Journal, 1995, L 281, p. 31.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002396/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28. Februar 2013)

Betrifft: Notrufabfragestelle und Notrufnummern

Seit einigen Jahren ist es EU-weit geregelt, dass die einheitliche Notrufnummer 112 zur Notrufabfragestelle hinführt. Die Notrufe werden entgegengenommen und die wichtigen Notfallinformationen an den entsprechenden Rettungsdienst weitergeleitet. Die Notrufabfragestelle gehört entweder zu einem der wichtigen Rettungsdienste (Sanitäter, Feuerwahr, Polizei usw.) oder ist eine Schnittstelle zwischen den Anrufern und dem Rettungsdienst.

In Österreich fungiert die Notrufnummer 122 als direkter Anlaufpunkt zur Feuerwehr, während Anrufe bei 112 direkt zur Polizei dirigiert werden. Nun gibt es Bedenken dagegen, dass die Feuerwehr auch in Österreich bald über die Notrufnummer 112 in die zentrale Leitstelle integriert wird und die Nummer 112 wegfällt. Klarheit ist hier zum Zweck derzeitiger Planungsarbeiten notwendig, und daher ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Gibt es seitens der Kommission Bestrebungen, die Notrufnummer 112 auf der Ebene der Mitgliedstaaten verbindlich für die „Rettungsdienste" einzuführen — wie es z. B. in Deutschland der Fall ist?

2. Ist seitens der Kommission geplant, die Polizei in den Mitgliedstaaten verbindlich mit der Verwaltung der Notrufnummer 112 zu betrauen?

3. Ist es im Moment angedacht, die anderen Notrufnummern — z. B. im Fall Österreichs die 112, die 133 und die 144 — auch weiterhin für die anderen Blaulichtorganisationen zuzulassen?

4. Welche möglichen anderen Änderungen zum Thema Notrufabfragestelle sind derzeit von der Kommission angedacht?

Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission
(24. April 2013)

Nach EU-Vorschriften, insbesondere gemäß der Universaldienstrichtlinie, sind die Mitgliedstaaten verpflichtet, den unentgeltlichen Zugang zu Notrufdiensten über die europäische Notrufnummer 112 sowie über sonstige von ihnen festgelegte nationale Notrufnummern sicherzustellen. Diese Vorschriften enthalten die Verpflichtung, ein bestimmtes Ziel zu erreichen, überlassen den Mitgliedstaaten jedoch die Entscheidung über die ihnen geeignet erscheinende Organisation der Notrufdienste. Ihre Fragen möchte ich daher wie folgt beantworten:

1) Die Kommission überwacht die Einhaltung dieser EU-Vorschriften durch die Mitgliedstaaten und ergreift gegebenenfalls Maßnahmen, um sicherzustellen, dass die einheitliche europäische Notrufnummer 112 in allen Mitgliedstaaten verfügbar ist. Nach aktuellen Meldungen sind die Notrufdienste in allen Mitgliedstaaten — teilweise per Weiterleitung — über die Nummer 112 erreichbar. Der Rechtsrahmen gestattet es den Mitgliedstaaten jedoch, neben der Nummer 112 auch nationale Notrufnummern beizubehalten.

2) Die derzeitigen Regelungen sehen kein bestimmtes Verwaltungssystem für Notrufe über die Nummer 112 vor. Solange alle Notrufe angemessen bearbeitet werden, können die Mitgliedstaten daher für die Verwaltung eines zentralen Anrufübermittlungssystems einen beliebigen Betreiber auswählen.

3) Nach dem bestehenden Rechtsrahmen können andere Notrufnummern parallel zur einheitlichen europäischen Notrufnummer 112 angeboten werden.

4) Im Rechtsrahmen ist nicht vorgesehen, dass die Kommission regulatorische Maßnahmen hinsichtlich der Organisation der Notrufdienste, einschließlich der Notrufabfragestellen, trifft.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002396/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Public safety answering point and emergency call numbers

For a number of years there have been EU-wide rules stipulating that the single emergency call number 112 must direct calls to the public safety answering point. The emergency calls must be taken and the important emergency information forwarded to the appropriate emergency service. The public safety answering point is either part of one of the vital emergency services (ambulance, fire service, police, etc.) or an interface between callers and the emergency service.

In Austria, the emergency call number 122 acts as a direct means of access to the fire service, whereas calls to 112 are directed straight to the police. Concerns are now being raised about the fact that, in Austria too, the fire service will soon be integrated into the central coordination centre via the emergency number 112 and use of the number 112 [*sic*] will cease. Clarity is needed here for the purposes of the current planning work, and therefore the following questions arise:

1. Are any efforts being made by the Commission to introduce the mandatory use of the emergency call number 112 for the emergency services at the level of the Member States — as is the case in Germany, for example?

2. Is the Commission planning to make it mandatory in the Member States for the police to manage the 112 emergency call number?

3. Is permitting the other blue light organisations to continue to use the other emergency call numbers — for example, in Austria the numbers 112 [*sic*], 133 and 144 — currently being considered?

4. What other possible changes with regard to the public safety answering point is the Commission currently considering?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

EU rules and in particular, the Universal Service Directive obliges Member States to ensure free call access to emergency services using the European Emergency Number 112 as well as any national emergency call number specified by Member States. These provisions contain obligations on the Member States to achieve a result but leave it to them to determine how best to organise their emergency services. In response to your questions, therefore:

1. The Commission monitors the application by the Member States of this obligation under EC law, and takes action where necessary to ensure that access to the Single European Emergency Number 112 is available in all Member States. At present, all Member States report that their emergency services are accessible through the 112 number, including by means of redirecting the call. However, the regulatory framework allows Member States to maintain national emergency numbers besides 112.

2. Under the current rules no one type of management system for emergency calls to the 112 number is mandated. Therefore, a centralised system of call dispatching could be operated by any agency determined by the Member State, provided that all emergency calls are adequately handled.

3. The current regulatory framework allows for the use of other emergency numbers in parallel with the Single European Emergency Number 112.

4. The regulatory framework does not mandate the Commission to engage in regulatory action concerning the organisation of emergency services, including the Public Safety Answering Points.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002397/13
alla Commissione
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(28 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Istituzione di zone franche nel territorio della Sardegna

Premesso che:

— l'articolo 12 dello Statuto speciale per la Regione Sardegna, approvato con legge costituzionale n. 3 del 26 febbraio 1948, prevede l'istituzione di punti franchi nell'isola;

— il decreto legislativo n. 75 del 10 marzo 1998 dispone, conformemente alle prerogative individuate dai regolamenti (CEE) n. 2913/92 e 2454/93, e in attuazione dell'articolo 12 dello Statuto sardo, la creazione di zone franche in Sardegna nei porti di «*Cagliari, Olbia, Oristano, Porto Torres, Portovesme e Arbatax, nonché in altri porti e aree industriali ad essi funzionalmente collegate o collegabili*»;

nelle ultime settimane si è sviluppato un approfondito dibattito sull'opportunità di istituire una zona franca integrale in Sardegna, dibattito che ha catalizzato l'interesse dell'opinione pubblica sarda determinando il rapido coinvolgimento di tutti i livelli istituzionali.

La mobilitazione scaturita da tale dibattito ha spinto oltre 240 comuni sardi a chiedere alla Regione la delimitazione territoriale delle zone franche indicate dal decreto legislativo 75/98 e l'avvio di tutte le possibili iniziative in favore dell'istituzione di una zona franca integrale. La Giunta regionale della Sardegna ha di conseguenza sollecitato i vertici comunitari al riconoscimento di un regime doganale di zona franca esteso a tutto il territorio regionale.

La tempistica con cui le autorità isolane hanno rivendicato il diritto alla creazione delle zone franche non è casuale. È infatti diffusa la convinzione che l'entrata in vigore del nuovo Codice doganale comunitario, prevista per il prossimo 24 giugno 2013, disponendo l'abrogazione del precedente Codice doganale comunitario di cui al regolamento (CEE) n. 2913/92, faccia venir meno il diritto del popolo sardo a vedere istituite zone franche sull'isola, così come stabilito dal decreto legislativo 75/98.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione:

1. chiarire ufficialmente che l'entrata in vigore del nuovo Codice doganale, determinando la soppressione del regolamento (CEE) n. 2913/92, non impedisce l'istituzione delle zone franche nel territorio della Sardegna così come previsto dal decreto legislativo 75/98;

2. valutare se, alla luce della gravissima crisi economica e sociale che interessa l'isola, sia possibile procedere alla creazione di una zona franca integrale in Sardegna al fine di promuovere crescita e occupazione e compensare lo svantaggio connesso alla natura insulare e periferica del territorio?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(5 aprile 2013)

Ai sensi dell'articolo 166 del codice doganale ([1]), le zone franche sono parti del territorio doganale dell'Unione. Devono essere intercluse e sono soggette a sorveglianza da parte dell'autorità doganale.

La Commissione non può essere coinvolta in richieste riguardanti la designazione di zone franche. In effetti spetta agli Stati membri (articolo 167, paragrafo 1, del codice doganale) designare tali zone franche.

Né il codice doganale attuale, né il codice doganale aggiornato ([2]) impediscono agli Stati membri di designare nuove zone franche ai sensi del codice doganale attuale. Il 20 febbraio 2012 la Commissione ha adottato una proposta di rifusione del codice doganale aggiornato ([3]). Tale proposta non pregiudica le norme riguardanti la designazione delle zone franche.

([1]) Regolamento (CEE) n. 2913/92 del Consiglio, del 12 ottobre 1992, che istituisce un codice doganale comunitario (GU L 302 del 19.10.1992, pag. 1).
([2]) Regolamento n. 450/2008/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 23 aprile 2008, che istituisce il codice doganale comunitario (Codice doganale aggiornato) (GU L 145 del 4.6.2008, pag. 1).
([3]) COM(2012)64 definitivo. Il testo della proposta è disponibile sulla pagina web seguente: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=EN&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2012&nu_doc=64

A norma dell'articolo 802 delle disposizioni d'applicazione del codice doganale ([4]), le autorità doganali degli Stati membri sono tenute a comunicare alla Commissione l'elenco delle zone franche esistenti e operanti. L'elenco delle zone franche esistenti è disponibile sulla seguente pagina web:
http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/customs/procedural_aspects/imports/free_zones/list_freezones.pdf

([4]) Regolamento (CEE) n. 2454/93 della Commissione, del 2 luglio 1993, che fissa talune disposizioni d'applicazione del regolamento (CEE) n. 2913/92 del Consiglio che istituisce il codice doganale comunitario (GU L 253 dell'11.10.1993, pag. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002397/13
to the Commission
Giommaria Uggias (ALDE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Establishment of free zones in Sardinia

Given that:

— Article 12 of the Special Statute of the Region of Sardinia, adopted by Constitutional Law No 3 of 26 February 1948, provides for the establishment of free zones on the island;

— in accordance with the prerogatives identified by Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 and Regulation (EEC) No 2454/93, and in accordance with Article 12 of the Sardinian Statute, Legislative Decree No 75 of 10 March 1998 provides for the creation of free zones in Sardinia in the ports of 'Cagliari, Olbia, Oristano, Porto Torres, Portovesme and Arbatax, as well as in other ports and industrial areas that are functionally connected or connectable to them';

in recent weeks, there has been an intense debate as to whether a free zone should be established across the whole of Sardinia. This debate has stirred Sardinian public opinion and led to all institutional levels quickly becoming involved.

The mobilisation triggered by this debate has prompted over 240 municipalities in Sardinia to ask the regional government to determine the boundaries of the free zones referred to in Legislative Decree No 75/98, and to implement all potential initiatives in favour of the establishment of a free zone across the whole of Sardinia. Consequently, the regional council of Sardinia has urged EU leaders to recognise a customs free zone arrangement that extends to the entire region.

The timing with which the island's authorities are demanding the right to create free zones is not accidental. There is in fact a widespread belief that the entry into force of the new Union Customs Code, planned for 24 June 2013, which will repeal the previous Community Customs Code provided for in Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92, will extinguish the right of the Sardinian people to create free zones on their island, as established by Legislative Decree No 75/98.

In light of the above, can the Commission:

1. officially clarify that the entry into force of the new Customs Code, which will repeal Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92, will not prevent the establishment of free zones in Sardinia, in accordance with Legislative Decree No 75/98;

2. examine whether, given the severe economic and social crisis affecting the island, it is possible to create a free zone across the whole of Sardinia, in order to promote growth and employment and to offset the disadvantage of being an outlying, island region?

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

Within the meaning of Article 166 of the Customs Code ([1]), free zones are part of the customs territory of the Union. They must be enclosed and subject to supervision by the customs authorities.

The Commission can have no involvement with requests regarding the designation of free zones. Indeed it is up to the Member States (Article 167(1) of the Customs Code) to designate free zones.

Neither the current Customs Code nor the Modernised Customs Code ([2]) prevents Member States from designating new free zones within the meaning of the current Customs Code. The Commission adopted on 20.2.2012 a proposal recasting the Modernised Customs Code ([3]). This proposal does not affect the rules regarding the designation of free zones.

([1]) Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 of 12 October 1992 establishing the Community Customs Code (OJ L 302, 19.10.1992, p. 1).
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 450/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2008 laying down the Community Customs Code (Modernised Customs Code) (OJ L 145, 4.6.2008, p. 1).
([3]) COM(2012)64 final. This text is available on this web page:. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=EN&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2012&nu_doc=64

The list of free zones in existence and in operation must be communicated to the Commission by the customs authorities of the Member States (Article 802 of the implementing provisions of the Customs Code ([4])). The list of existing free zones is available on the following web page:
http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/customs/procedural_aspects/imports/free_zones/list_freezones.pdf

([4]) Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2454/93 of 2 July 1993 laying down provisions for the implementation of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92 establishing the Community Customs Code (OJ L 253, 11.10.1993, p. 1).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002398/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(28 februari 2013)

Betreft: Turken vernietigen Grieks-Cypriotisch erfgoed (vervolgvraag)

Op 27 februari 2013 heeft de heer Füle namens de Commissie antwoord gegeven op schriftelijke vraag E-000105/2013. Daarin schrijft hij onder andere:

„De problemen die het geachte Parlementslid aan de orde stelt, onderstrepen eens te meer dat de leiders van de Grieks-Cypriotische en de Turks-Cypriotische gemeenschap onder auspiciën van de VN snel tot een alomvattende oplossing moeten komen voor de kwestie-Cyprus."

1. Welke „partij" kiest de Commissie in de kwestie-Cyprus? Is de Commissie ertoe bereid zich luid en duidelijk vóór de Grieks-Cyprioten uit te spreken en de Turkse bezetting op Cyprus te veroordelen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Voorts schrijft de heer Füle:

„Omdat de Commissie het behoud van het culturele erfgoed in Cyprus van groot belang acht, heeft zij in het kader van het hulpprogramma voor de Turks-Cypriotische gemeenschap in 2012 voor 2 miljoen euro steun verleend voor activiteiten van het onder beide gemeenschappen ressorterende Technisch Comité voor het culturele erfgoed, dat onder auspiciën van de Verenigde Naties werkt. De Commissie zal in het kader van het hulpprogramma voor 2013 opnieuw voor 2 miljoen euro steun verlenen aan het werk van dit comité van beide gemeenschappen."

2. Acht de Commissie het, op z'n zachtst gezegd, niet merkwaardig dat zij 2 miljoen euro per jaar verstrekt voor het behoud respectievelijk het herstellen van het Cypriotisch cultureel erfgoed dat door de Turken simpelweg wordt vernietigd? Erkent de Commissie dat deze financiële ondersteuning niet noodzakelijk zou zijn als de Turken hun bezetting zouden staken en het eiland zouden verlaten? Is de Commissie ertoe bereid dit geld op de Turken te verhalen?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(23 april 2013)

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar mededeling „Uitbreidingsstrategie en voornaamste uitdagingen 2012-2013" ([1]) van oktober 2012, waarin zij Turkije aanmaant om zich op concrete wijze sterker in te zetten voor en een grotere bijdrage te leveren tot deze besprekingen, onder auspiciën van de secretaris-generaal van de VN, over een definitieve regeling van de kwestie-Cyprus.

Daarnaast verwijst zij het geachte Parlementslid naar de conclusies van de Raad van december 2011 waarin de Raad herhaalt dat Turkije zich ondubbelzinnig dient in te zetten voor betrekkingen van goed nabuurschap en waarin hij er bij Turkije op aandringt af te zien van elke soort bedreiging of maatregel tegen een lidstaat en elke bron van wrijvingen of maatregel die afbreuk kan doen aan de betrekkingen van goed nabuurschap of de vreedzame regeling van geschillen kan bemoeilijken.

Wat de financiële steun van de Commissie voor cultureel erfgoed betreft, steunt de Commissie de werkzaamheden van het onder beide gemeenschappen ressorterende Technisch Comité voor het culturele erfgoed. Dit VN-comité heeft een lijst opgesteld van 11 prioritaire monumenten op heel Cyprus waarvoor de EU dringende maatregelen voor monumentenzorg zou financieren. Het gaat onder meer om kerken, moskeeën en niet-religieuze monumenten aan beide kanten van de groene lijn. De monumenten maken deel uit van een omvangrijkere lijst van 40 monumenten die door beide leiders is vastgesteld. Deze zijn als prioritair aangemerkt gezien de staat waarin zij verkeren en de noodzaak dringend in te grijpen om verder verval te voorkomen. De projecten worden uitgevoerd door het UNDP (het ontwikkelingsprogramma van de VN).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002398/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: The Turks destroying Greek Cypriot heritage (follow-up question)

On 27 February 2013, Mr Füle answered Written Question E-000105/2013 on behalf of the Commission. In his reply he wrote, *inter alia*:

'The issues raised by the Honourable Member once again underline the need for a rapid comprehensive settlement in Cyprus between the leaders of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities under the auspices of the United Nations.'

1. Which side does the Commission support over the Cyprus issue? Will the Commission express support for the Greek Cypriots loud and clearly and condemn Turkey's occupation of Cyprus? If not, why not?

Mr Füle also writes:

'The Commission attributes great importance to the preservation of cultural heritage in Cyprus. Under the Aid Programme for the Turkish Cypriot community it has provided EUR 2 million in 2012 for the support of activities of the bi-communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage operating under United Nations (UN) auspices. Under the 2013 Aid Programme, the Commission is committed to continue supporting the work of the bi-communal committee with a further contribution of EUR 2 million.'

2. Does the Commission not, to say the least, find it strange that it is providing EUR 2 million per annum to preserve or restore the Cypriot cultural heritage, which is simply being destroyed by the Turks? Does the Commission acknowledge that this financial support would not be necessary if the Turks ended their occupation and left the island? Will the Commission recover this money from the Turks?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its October 2012 Communication Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013 ([1]), in which it encourages Turkey to increase in concrete terms its commitment and contribution to the talks under the good offices of the UN Secretary General to find a comprehensive settlement to the Cyprus issue.

It further refers the Honourable Member to the December 2012 Council Conclusions in which the Council reiterates that Turkey needs to commit itself unequivocally to good neighbourly relations and urges Turkey to avoid any kind of threat or action directed against a Member State, or source of friction or actions, which could damage good neighbourly relations and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Regarding the Commission's funding for cultural heritage, the Commission supports the work of the bi-communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage. This UN committee has already identified a list of 11 priority monuments, in the whole island of Cyprus, for which the EU would fund emergency conservation measures. These include churches, mosques and non-religious monuments on both sides of the Green Line and are part of a wider list of 40 monuments agreed by both leaders. They have been prioritised based on their state of conservation and the need for urgent intervention to avoid further deterioration. The projects are implemented by UNDP (United Nations Development Programme).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/strategy-and-progress-report/index_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002399/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(28 februari 2013)

Betreft: Turkse minister: „Christendom is geen religie meer." (vervolgvraag)

Op 28 februari 2013 heeft de heer Füle namens de Commissie antwoord gegeven op schriftelijke vraag E-000040/2013. Daarin schrijft hij:

„Turkije is een kandidaat-lidstaat die met de EU over toetreding onderhandelt en moet derhalve voor al zijn burgers, ook de christenen, de mensenrechten waarborgen, met inbegrip van het recht op vrijheid van gedachte, geweten en godsdienst, zoals bepaald in het Europees Verdrag tot bescherming van de rechten van de mens en de jurisprudentie van het Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens. De Commissie volgt de ontwikkelingen van nabij. De Commissie acht het niet nuttig of gepast om commentaar te geven op elke verklaring die in Turkije wordt afgelegd."

1. Wanneer acht de Commissie het wél en wanneer acht zij het níet nuttig of gepast om commentaar te geven op een verklaring die in Turkije wordt afgelegd? Welke criteria hanteert zij hierbij?

2. Impliceert de Commissie dat zij het niet nuttig of gepast vindt om commentaar te geven op de uitspraak van de Turkse minister Bayraktar dat het christendom geen religie meer zou zijn? Zo ja, waarom? Zo neen, kan de Commissie dan alsnog een inhoudelijk commentaar geven?

3. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het antichristelijke Turkije niet in de EU, met haar christelijke traditie en historie, thuishoort? Is de Commissie derhalve ertoe bereid de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije te verbreken?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(24 april 2013)

De Commissie baseert zich op de officiële standpunten en verbintenissen van de Turkse regering en vanzelfsprekend ook op de acties op het terrein. Zoals reeds uitgebreid in het voortgangsverslag van de Commissie is vermeld, heeft de Turkse regering een aantal positieve stappen ondernomen en positieve gebaren gesteld tegenover de niet-islamitische gemeenschappen in Turkije. De Commissie wil eraan herinneren dat Turkije, samen met Spanje, de initiatiefnemer was van de Alliantie der beschavingen voor de bevordering van de interculturele en interreligieuze dialoog, die nu onder auspiciën van de Verenigde Naties (VN) staat. Tegelijkertijd heeft de Commissie met klem gewezen op de onopgeloste kwesties en belemmeringen waar deze gemeenschappen mee worden geconfronteerd. De Commissie verwacht dat Turkije deze kwesties en belemmeringen aanpakt om de volledige eerbiediging van de vrijheid van godsdienst in de praktijk te waarborgen. Dit is de prioriteit in het toezicht van de Commissie op de ontwikkelingen in Turkije in het licht van de toetredingscriteria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002399/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Turkish Minister: 'Christianity is no longer a religion' (follow-up question)

On 28 February 2013, Mr Füle answered Written Question E-000040/2013 on behalf of the Commission. In his reply, he wrote:

'Turkey, as a country negotiating its accession to the EU, needs to guarantee human rights, including the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, according to the European Convention of Human Rights and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights for all its citizens, including those of Christian faith. The Commission follows developments closely.

The Commission does not deem it necessary or appropriate to comment on each and every statement made in Turkey.'

1. When does the Commission consider it necessary or appropriate to comment on a statement made in Turkey, and when does it not?

2. Does the Commission mean to imply that it does not consider it necessary or appropriate to comment on a statement by Turkey's Minister Bayraktar that Christianity is no longer a religion? If so, why? If not, can the Commission now make a substantive comment?

3. Does the Commission agree that Turkey, as an anti-Christian country, has no place within the EU, with its Christian tradition and history? Will the Commission therefore break off the accession negotiations with Turkey?

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

The Commission relies on the official positions and commitments of the Turkish Government and obviously on action on the ground. In this context, as extensively reported in the Commission's Progress Report, a number of positive steps and gestures of the Turkish Government have been noted towards the non-Muslim communities in Turkey, and the Commission would like to recall that Turkey was the initiator, together with Spain, of the Alliance of Civilisations to promote intercultural and interreligious dialogue, now under the aegis of the United Nations (UN). At the same time, the Commission also highlighted the outstanding issues and obstacles faced by these communities which it expects to be addressed in order to guarantee full respect of freedom of religion in practice. This is the priority in the Commission's monitoring of developments in Turkey, in the light of the accession criteria.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002400/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 de fevereiro de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Gulags e campos de detenção na Coreia do Norte

Fotografias de satélite indicam que a Coreia do Norte tem estado a expandir os seus campos de detenção para prisioneiros políticos, nos quais são desrespeitados os mais básicos direitos humanos.

Assim, pergunto à Alta Representante:

1. Tem conhecimento da situação atual dos campos de detenção e gulags na Coreia do Norte? Tem conhecimento de dados que indiquem que esses campos estão a ser aumentados ou que o número de prisioneiros tem aumentado?

2. O que fez ou pondera fazer quanto a esta situação?

3. Que ação política tem a UE exercido no sentido de haver um maior respeito dos direitos humanos na Coreia do Norte?

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

A UE continua profundamente apreensiva com a situação dos direitos humanos na Coreia do Norte.

A UE é defensora e promotora dos direitos humanos em todo o mundo, pelo que tem vindo a atuar sobre a RPDC, onde a situação é deplorável e sem indícios de melhoria.

À luz da gravidade e da natureza crónica das violações na RPDC e da recusa aturada das autoridades em cooperarem com o relator especial das Nações Unidas, a UE, juntamente com o Japão, apresentou na sessão em curso do Conselho de Direitos Humanos da ONU uma resolução sobre a criação de uma comissão de inquérito para investigar as violações graves e persistentes dos direitos humanos na RPDC. A resolução foi adotada por maioria absoluta em Genebra, a 21 de março, pelo Conselho de Direitos Humanos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002400/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Gulags and prison camps in North Korea

Satellite photographs show that North Korea has been expanding its political prison camps, which violate the most basic human rights.

1. Is the High Representative aware of the current situation regarding prison camps and gulags in North Korea? Is she aware of any information that suggests these camps are being expanded or that the number of prisoners has increased?

2. What action has she taken or does she intend to take in respect of this situation?

3. What political action has the EU taken to increase respect for human rights in North Korea?

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

The EU remains deeply concerned about the human rights situation in North Korea.

The EU is a defender and promoter of human rights around the world and is therefore taking action on DPRK where the situation is appalling without signs of improvement.

In the light of the gravity and chronic nature of the violations in the DPRK and the persistent refusal of its authorities to cooperate with the UN Special Rapporteur, the EU, together with Japan, has presented a resolution concerning the establishment of a Commission of Inquiry to investigate the grave and persistent violations of human rights in the DPRK to the current session of the UN Human Rights Council. The resolution was adopted by consensus on 21 March in Geneva in the Human Rights Council.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-002401/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(28 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Azioni del Servizio esterno in Kazakistan

Gli addetti al servizio esterno dell'Unione in Kazakistan si fanno abitualmente carico di seguire, anche in udienza, i processi a carico di persone accusate di reati politici e di visitare coloro che per tali motivi sono stati incarcerati, al fine valutare il rispetto dei diritti umani nei loro confronti?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(12 aprile 2013)

L'AR/VP segue da vicino la situazione dei diritti umani nel paese, anche tramite la delegazione dell'UE ad Astana che si occupa, fra l'altro, di partecipare alle udienze e di visitare le persone incarcerate. Garantire processi equi è una delle priorità dell'UE. La delegazione dell'UE coordina le proprie attività in stretta collaborazione con gli Stati membri dell'UE e con le organizzazioni internazionali competenti, in particolare l'ONU e l'OSCE.

In una serie di occasioni il capo della delegazione dell'UE in Kazakistan ha affermato pubblicamente la necessità di processi equi. A tale riguardo, i rappresentanti della delegazione dell'UE hanno visitato, tra l'altro, Vladimir Kozlov durante la custodia cautelare e hanno altresì partecipato alle udienze del caso Kozlov al tribunale regionale del Mangistau ad Aktau, nonché ad altri processi svoltisi ad Aktau connessi agli avvenimenti di Zhanaozen.

Rappresentanti della delegazione dell'UE e diplomatici degli Stati membri dell'UE hanno visitato il noto difensore dei diritti umani Evguenyi Zhovtis durante la sua carcerazione a Ust-Kamenogorsk e hanno sorvegliato il suo processo svoltosi dinanzi al tribunale regionale della provincia di Almaty a Taldikorgan.

La delegazione dell'UE collabora strettamente con l'Ufficio internazionale del Kazakistan per i diritti umani, fondato da Evguenyi Zhovtis, e con altre ONG operanti nel settore dei diritti umani per seguire i procedimenti giudiziari su una serie di casi in materia.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002401/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Francesco Enrico Speroni (EFD)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Activities of the External Action Service in Kazakhstan

Does the European External Action Service in Kazakhstan follow as a matter of course the trials of people accused of political crimes, even attending court hearings, and do its officials visit people who are imprisoned on these grounds, in order to assess whether their human rights are being respected?

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

The HR/VP, including through the EU Delegation to Astana, follows closely the human rights situation in the country. This includes attending court hearings and visits to individuals in detention. Ensuring fair trials is one of the priorities of the EU. The EU Delegation coordinates its activities closely with EU Member States and relevant international organisations, notably the UN and the OSCE.

The Head of the EU Delegation in Kazakhstan spoke publicly on a number of occasions of the need for fair trials. In this respect, representatives of the EU Delegation visited, among others, Vladimir Kozlov during his pre-trial detention. They also attended the court hearings of the Kozlov case in the Mangistau Regional Court in Aktau, as well as other trials in Aktau, related to the Zhanaozen events.

The EU Delegation's representatives, together with diplomats from EU Member States, visited the well known human rights defender Mr Evguenyi Zhovtis during his detention in Ust-Kamenogorsk and monitored his trial at the Almaty Regional Court in Taldikorgan.

The EU Delegation cooperates closely with the Kazakh International Bureau on Human Rights, founded by Mr Zhovtis, and other NGOs active in the field of human rights, in following court proceedings on a number of relevant cases.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002402/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(28 de febrero de 2013)

Asunto: Cuentas financieras sin auditar

Bankia ha presentado las cuentas para el año 2012 y lo ha hecho sin que ninguna empresa haya auditado las cifras ([1]). Estas cuentas presentan unas pérdidas de 21 238 millones de euros, una cantidad récord en el estado español ([2]).

En 2011, Bankia también presentó unas cuentas sin auditar en que afirmó tener beneficios por valor de 309 millones. Posteriormente tuvo que admitir que las pérdidas eran equivalentes a 2 979 millones ([3]) y la entidad fue nacionalizada. En fechas próximas, la entidad recibirá un nuevo tramo de la ayuda europea para su recapitalización, con respecto a la cual ya ha sido beneficiaria de 17 959 millones. Esta ayuda está ligada al cumplimiento de las condiciones que se exponen en el MoU.

A la luz de lo anterior,

1. ¿No cree la Comisión que Bankia no debería recibir fondos públicos europeos mientras no presente sus cuentas con la firma de una empresa auditora que las respalde?

2. ¿Cree la Comisión que esta práctica perjudica la credibilidad de Bankia y del sector bancario español en general?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de abril de 2013)

Bankia fue incluida en las pruebas de resistencia de carácter desagregado (*bottom-up*) realizadas por el consultor externo Oliver Wyman y cuyos resultados se publicaron a finales de septiembre de 2012. En el escenario adverso, las pruebas de resistencia pusieron de manifiesto una insuficiencia significativa de capital de Bankia. Según lo previsto en el Memorándum de Acuerdo celebrado entre la Comisión Europea (en nombre de los prestamistas) y España, la Comisión Europea aprobó los planes de reestructuración de las entidades bancarias del Grupo 1 (entre las que se cuenta Bankia) a finales de noviembre de 2012. Tras la aprobación de su plan de reestructuración, Bankia se recapitalizó con la ayuda de un préstamo concedido por el MEDE en diciembre de 2012. No obstante, la aportación de ayuda pública a Bankia se vincula a un exhaustivo proceso de reestructuración, que se prolongará durante un período de cinco años, con el objetivo de restablecer su viabilidad. Este plan de reestructuración prevé una significativa reducción del tamaño del banco y la concentración de sus actividades en lo que constituye su su principal línea de negocio. No se prevé actualmente ninguna otra ayuda pública.

([1]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/02/27/bankia-presenta-sus-cuentas-sin-auditar-por-el-retraso-de-deloitte-115817/
([2]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/02/28/bfabankia-sufre-una-perdida-de-21238-millones-la-mayor-de-la-historia-de-espana-115884/
([3]) http://www.cincodias.com/articulo/mercados/bankia-reformula-cuentas-admite-perdidas-2979-millones-2011/20120525cdscdsmer_19/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002402/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Non-audited financial accounts

Bankia has published its accounts for 2012, without any company having audited its figures ([1]). These accounts show losses of EUR 21 238 million, a Spanish record ([2]).

In 2011, Bankia also presented unaudited accounts, showing profits of EUR 309 million. Later, it was forced to admit that its losses were equivalent to EUR 2 979 million ([3]) and the organisation was nationalised. The organisation is soon to receive more European financial assistance for recapitalisation, on top of the EUR 17 959 million it has already received. This assistance is tied to conditions set out in the MoU.

In light of the above:

1. Does the Commission not believe that Bankia should not receive European public money until its accounts have been signed off by an auditing firm able to vouch for them?

2. Does it believe that this practice is detrimental to the credibility of Bankia and of the Spanish banking sector in general?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)

Bankia was included in the bottom-up stress test exercise perfomed by the external consultant Oliver Wyman and published at the end of September 2012. Under the adverse scenario, the stress test identified that Bankia had a significant capital shortfall. As foreseen in the memorandum of understanding between the European Commission, acting on behalf of the Lenders, and Spain, the restructuring plans of Group 1 banks (which also includes Bankia) were approved by the European Commission at the end of November 2012. Following the approval of its restructuring plan, Bankia was recapitalised with the help of a loan by the ESM in December 2012. The injection of public support in Bankia is linked, however, to a thorough restructuring process spanning over a five years period with the aim to restore its viability. This restructuring plan foresees a significant downsizing of the bank and the concentration of its activities on core business. No further state aid is currently foreseen.

([1]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/02/27/bankia-presenta-sus-cuentas-sin-auditar-por-el-retraso-de-deloitte-115817/.
([2]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/02/28/bfabankia-sufre-una-perdida-de-21238-millones-la-mayor-de-la-historia-de-espana-115884/.
([3]) http://www.cincodias.com/articulo/mercados/bankia-reformula-cuentas-admite-perdidas-2979-millones-2011/20120525cdscdsmer_19/.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002403/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ειδική εισφορά αλληλεγγύης για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας

Με την αιτιολογία την αντιμετώπισης του τεράστιου προβλήματος της ανεργίας στην Ελλάδα που μετά την εφαρμογή των Μνημονιακών πολιτικών έχει φτάσει σε εκρηκτικά επίπεδα για κράτος εν καιρώ ειρήνης, αφού η επίσημη ανεργία ανέρχεται σε περίπου 30% και περίπου 56% στους νέους, θεσπίστηκε με τον νόμο 3986/2011 «Επείγοντα μέτρα εφαρμογής μεσοπρόθεσμου πλαισίου δημοσιονομικής στρατηγικής» η «ειδική εισφορά αλληλεγγύης για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας».

Συγκεκριμένα, σύμφωνα με το Μεσοπρόθεσμο «Η εισφορά αυτή υπολογίζεται σε ποσοστό δύο τοις εκατό (2%) επί των τακτικών αποδοχών και πρόσθετων αμοιβών και αποζημιώσεων όλων των μισθοδοτούμενων υπαλλήλων του Δημοσίου, ΝΠΔΔ, ΟΤΑ, καθώς και των υπαλλήλων όλων ανεξαιρέτως των Δημοσίων Επιχειρήσεων και Οργανισμών και των ΝΠΙΔ».

Σημειώνω ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή στο 2ο Πρόγραμμα Δημοσιονομικής Προσαρμογής, τον Μάρτιο του 2012, έγραφε στο κεφάλαιο «Δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή και κοινωνική ισότητα» ότι «μια σειρά φορολογικών μέτρων έκανε το φορολογικό σύστημα πιο προοδευτικό. Συγκεκριμένα το καλοκαίρι του 2011, η Βουλή αποφάσισε την επιβολή μιας εισφοράς αλληλεγγύης στα εισοδήματα».

Με κοινή απόφαση όμως των Υπουργών Οικονομικών και Εργασίας (ΦΕΚ 1853/11) «το ποσό της ανωτέρω εισφοράς αποτέλεσε έσοδο του Κρατικού Προϋπολογισμού», εξομοιώθηκε δηλαδή με οποιονδήποτε άλλο φόρο, που προορίζεται να καλύψει από κοινωνικές ανάγκες μέχρι την εξόφληση των δανείων της Ελλάδας.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή: Μπορεί να με πληροφορήσει για το ύψος των εσόδων του ελληνικού κράτους από την εισφορά αλληλεγγύης για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας κατά τα έτη 2011-12 και τι ποσό προϋπολογίζεται για το 2013; Μπορεί να με ενημερώσει τι ποσό διατέθηκε στην καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας από τα ποσά που συγκέντρωσε το κράτος, παρακρατώντας το 2% των εισοδημάτων των ανωτέρω προσώπων; Πώς, δημοσιονομικά, θα πρέπει να διασφαλιστεί ότι η «ειδική εισφορά αλληλεγγύης για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας» τιμά την ονομασία της;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(18 Απριλίου 2013)

Συνολικά το μέτρο αυτό απέδωσε το ποσό των 423 εκατ. ευρώ το 2011 και των 438 εκατ. το 2012. Το ίδιο αποτέλεσμα με αυτό του 2012 (438 εκατ. ευρώ) προβλέπεται και για τα επόμενα έτη. Από τα ανωτέρω ποσά, 289 εκατ. ευρώ το 2011 και 270 εκατ. ευρώ το 2012 εισπράχθηκαν από το δημόσιο ως έσοδα ενώ παράλληλα 134 εκατ. ευρώ το 2011 και 168 εκατ. ευρώ το 2012 εισπράχθηκαν από το ΤΠΔΥ (ταμείο πρόνοιας των δημοσίων υπαλλήλων) και τον ΟΑΕΔ. Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει λεπτομερή στοιχεία για το κατά πόσο τα κεφάλαια αυτά προορίζονταν συγκεκριμένα για ειδικά προγράμματα με στόχο την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας. Εφόσον οι εν λόγω εισφορές αλληλεγγύης καταγράφονται ως έσοδα συνεισφέρουν στη χρηματοδότηση των τρεχουσών δραστηριοτήτων του κρατικού προϋπολογισμού και του ΟΑΕΔ στον τομέα των παροχών ανεργίας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002403/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Special solidarity surcharge to combat unemployment

Unemployment is a huge problem in Greece: following the implementation of the Memorandum policies, it has reached explosive levels for a State in peacetime, since the official unemployment rate is approximately 30% and approximately 56% for young people. Supposedly in order to address this problem, a 'special solidarity surcharge to combat unemployment' was established by Law 3986/2011 on 'Urgent measures to implement the medium-term fiscal strategy framework.'

Specifically, according to this Law: 'This surcharge is calculated at the rate of two percent (2%) of regular salaries and bonuses and allowances for all employees of the State, public law entities, local authorities and the employees of all public enterprises and organisations and private law entities, without exception.'

It should be noted that, in the Second Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece of March 2012, the Commission had stated in the chapter 'Economic Adjustment Programme and Social Equity' that: 'A number of changes in the rates made the tax system more progressive. In particular, in the summer 2011, the Parliament decided a solidarity surcharge levied on income.'

However, a joint decision by the Ministers of Economics and Labour (Gov. Journal 1853/11) provided that: 'This surcharge constituted State budget revenue', thereby equating it with any other tax which was intended to cover social needs until Greek loans are paid off.

In view of the above, will the Commission provide information on the amount of Greek State revenue derived from the solidarity surcharge to combat unemployment during the years 2011-12 and state what amount is budgeted for 2013? What amount was allocated to combat unemployment out of the amount collected by the State, which deducted 2% of the income of the persons concerned? What budgetary measures should be taken to ensure that the 'special solidarity surcharge to combat unemployment' is used for its intended purpose?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

Overall this measure yielded EUR 423 million in 2011 and EUR 438 in 2012. The same outturn of 2012 (EUR 438 million) is assumed and projected over the following years. Of the above amounts, EUR 289 million in 2011 and EUR 270 million in 2012 were collected by the State as revenue while EUR 134 million in 2011 and EUR 168 million in 2012 were collected by ΤΠΔΥ (Public Employees Welfare Fund) and by OAED. The Commission does not have detailed information whether those funds were specifically earmarked for specific programmes to combat unemployment. As long as they are recorded as revenue these solidarity contributions contribute to finance the current activities of the State budget and OAED in the field of unemployment benefits.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002404/13
προς το Συμβούλιο
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ελληνικά Ομόλογα της ΕΚΤ και βιωσιμότητα του Χρέους της Ελλάδας

Σύμφωνα με το Δελτίο Τύπου της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας στις 21.2.2013 με τίτλο «Ετήσιοι λογαριασμοί της ΕΚΤ για τη χρήση που έληξε στις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2012», η Κεντρική Τράπεζα της Ευρωζώνης κατέγραψε συνολικά κέρδη ύψους περίπου 1 δις ευρώ (998 εκατ. ευρώ), κυρίως λόγω του προγράμματος αγοράς κρατικών ομολόγων (Securities Markets Programme), το οποίο απέδωσε έσοδα από τόκους 1,1 δις ευρώ, εκ των οποίων τα 555 εκατ ευρώ, προέρχονται από την αγορά, στη δευτερογενή αγορά, σε τιμή πολύ χαμηλότερη της ονομαστικής αξίας, ελληνικών ομολόγων.

Τα συνολικά αυτά κέρδη, σύμφωνα με την ανακοίνωση της ΕΚΤ, θα διανεμηθούν σε δύο δόσεις στους μετόχους της, δηλαδή στις Εθνικές Κεντρικές Τράπεζες του Ευρωσυστήματος, σύμφωνα με το καταβληθέν αρχικό κεφάλαιο κάθε Τράπεζας (άρθρο 33 Καταστατικού της ΕΚΤ).

Στην απόφαση του Eurogroup στις 21.2.2012, πίσω από ορισμένες διατυπώσεις, καλλιεργήθηκε η προσδοκία, σε ορισμένους, ότι τα κέρδη αυτά που αποκομίζουν η ΕΚΤ και οι Εθνικές Κεντρικές Τράπεζες από την αγοραπωλησία κρατικών ομολόγων, θα επιστραφούν στην Ελλάδα.

Με βάση τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο:

1. Ποια είναι τα ποσά που έλαβε κάθε Εθνική Κεντρική Τράπεζα, από τη διανομή των κερδών της ΕΚΤ;

2. Με ποιο τρόπο υλοποιήθηκε από τα κράτη μέλη η απόφαση του Eurogroup στις 21.2.2012, στην οποία αναφέρεται ότι «τα κράτη μέλη μπορούν να διαθέτουν μέρος των δημόσιων εσόδων τους από τα κέρδη των οικείων ΕθνΚΤ στο πλαίσιο του Προγράμματος για τις Αγορές Τίτλων (σ.σ. SMP) για την περαιτέρω βελτίωση της βιωσιμότητας του δημόσιου χρέους της Ελλάδας».

Απάντηση
(28 Μαΐου 2013)

Το Συμβούλιο εφιστά την προσοχή του αξιότιμου κ. βουλευτή στις Ετήσιες Εκθέσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας (ΕΚΤ) για τα έτη 2011 και 2012. Η ΕΚΤ κατέγραψε έσοδα από τόκους ύψους 1,1 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ το 2012 και 1 δισεκατομμυρίου ευρώ το 2011, προερχόμενα από την κατοχή κρατικών χρεωστικών τίτλων αξίας 208 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ (λογιστική αξία) που εκδόθηκαν από την Ιταλία, την Ελλάδα, την Ισπανία, την Πορτογαλία και την Ιρλανδία. Εξ αυτών, 555 εκατομμύρια το 2012 και 654 εκατομμύρια το 2011 προήλθαν από ελληνικά κρατικά ομόλογα. Τα ομόλογα αγοράστηκαν στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος αγορών κινητών αξιών (SMP).

Στη δήλωση της 21ης Φεβρουαρίου 2012, η Ευρωομάδα συμφώνησε ότι τα κράτη μέλη (ΚΜ) μπορούν να επιστρέψουν στην Ελλάδα μέρος των δημόσιων εσόδων τους από τα κέρδη των οικείων Εθνικών Κεντρικών Τραπεζών (ΕθνΚΤ) στο πλαίσιο του SMP. Τα κέρδη επί των ομολόγων που εκδίδονται από άλλα ΚΜ τυγχάνουν ίδιας μεταχείρισης με οποιοδήποτε άλλο είδος κέρδους που μπορούν να καταγράψουν οι κεντρικές τράπεζες.

Επιπλέον, τα καθαρά κέρδη και απώλειες της ΕΚΤ κατανέμονται στις ΕθνΚΤ της ευρωζώνης σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 33 του καταστατικού του ευρωπαϊκού συστήματος κεντρικών τραπεζών και της ΕΚΤ, στο οποίο ορίζεται ότι:

«33.1. Τα καθαρά κέρδη της ΕΚΤ μεταβιβάζονται με την ακόλουθη σειρά:

α) ένα ποσό το οποίο καθορίζεται από το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο και δεν μπορεί να υπερβαίνει το 20% του καθαρού κέρδους, μεταβιβάζεται στα γενικά αποθεματικά με ανώτατο όριο το 100% του κεφαλαίου,

β) το υπόλοιπο καθαρό κέρδος διανέμεται μεταξύ των μεριδιούχων της ΕΚΤ, κατ' αναλογία προς τα καταβεβλημένα μερίδιά τους.

33.2. Σε περίπτωση ζημίας της ΕΚΤ, η ζημία αυτή μπορεί να καλυφθεί από το γενικό αποθεματικό της ΕΚΤ και, εφόσον κρίνεται αναγκαίο, μετά από απόφαση του Διοικητικού Συμβουλίου της ΕΚΤ, από το νομισματικό εισόδημα του αντίστοιχου οικονομικού έτους, κατ' αναλογία και μέχρι το ύψος των ποσών που κατανέμονται στις εθνικές κεντρικές τράπεζες σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 32.5».

Γενικότερα, το Συμβούλιο εφιστά τη προσοχή του αξιότιμου κ. βουλευτή στις συνεισφορές των ΕθνΚΤ στα κεφάλαια της ΕΚΤ, όπως καταγράφονται στην Ετήσια Έκθεση της ΕΚΤ για το 2012 (σ. 202-203).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002404/13
to the Council
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Greek bonds purchased by the ECB and the sustainability of Greece's public debt

According to the European Central Bank's press release of 21 February 2013 entitled 'Annual Accounts of the European Central Bank for the year ending 31 December 2012', the eurozone Central Bank posted total profits of approximately EUR 1 billion (EUR 998 million). This was mainly because of the Securities Markets Programme, which yielded interest revenue of EUR 1.1 billion: EUR 555 million of this derived from the purchase of Greek bonds on the secondary market at a price much lower than nominal value.

These total profits, according to the ECB's announcement, will be distributed in two tranches to its shareholders, namely the National Central Banks of the Eurosystem, according to principal paid by each Bank (Article 33 of the ECB Statutes).

The Eurogroup's decision of 21 February 2012 generated the expectation, in some quarters, that the profits of the ECB and the National Central Banks from trading in sovereign bonds would be returned to Greece.

In view of the above, will the Council say:

1. What amount did each National Central Bank receive from the distribution of ECB profits?

2. How have Member States implemented the Eurogroup's decision of 21 February 2012, which states that 'certain government revenues that emanate from the SMP profits disbursed by NCBs may be allocated by Member States to further improving the sustainability of Greece's public debt'?

Reply
(28 May 2013)

The Council draws the attention of the Honourable Member to the 2011 and 2012 Annual Reports of the European Central Bank (ECB). The ECB earned EUR 1.1 billion in 2012 and EUR 1 billion in 2011 in interest income from its share of a EUR 208 billion (book value) portfolio of sovereign debt issued by Italy, Greece, Spain, Portugal and Ireland, of which EUR 555 million in 2012 and EUR 654 million in 2011 were from the ECB's holdings of Greek Government bonds. The bonds were bought under the Securities Market Programme (SMP).

In its statement of 21 February 2012, the Eurogroup agreed that certain government revenues that emanate from the SMP profits disbursed by National Central Banks (NCBs) may be returned by Member States (MS) to Greece. Profits on the bonds issued by other MS will be treated like any other central bank profit.

Moreover, net profits and losses of the ECB are allocated among the euro area NCBs in accordance with Article 33 of the Statute of the European System of Central Banks and of the ECB which states that:

'33.1. The net profit of the ECB shall be transferred in the following order:

(a) an amount to be determined by the Governing Council, which may not exceed 20% of the net profit, shall be transferred to the general reserve fund subject to a limit equal to 100% of the capital;

(b) the remaining net profit shall be distributed to the shareholders of the ECB in proportion to their paid-up shares.

33.2. In the event of a loss incurred by the ECB, the shortfall may be offset against the general reserve fund of the ECB and, if necessary, following a decision by the Governing Council, against the monetary income of the relevant financial year in proportion and up to the amounts allocated to the national central banks in accordance with Article 32.5.'

More generally, the Council also draws the attention of the Honourable Member to the NCB's contributions to the capital of the ECB in the 2012 ECB's annual report (pp 202-203).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002405/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Απάντηση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής P-011701/2012

Σε ερώτησή μου (P-011701/2012) προς την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, έθετα το θέμα της μη καταβολής φόρου μεταβίβασης ακινήτων από ιδιωτική ελληνική εταιρεία, κατά τη διαδικασία μεταβίβασης σε αυτήν συγκεκριμένων περιουσιακών στοιχείων άλλης εταιρείας. Στην απάντησή της, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή δηλώνει ότι:

«Ο φορολογικός χειρισμός των μεταβιβάσεων ακίνητης περιουσίας στο πλαίσια της εξυγίανσης τραπεζών εμπίπτει στην αρμοδιότητα των ελληνικών φορολογικών αρχών».

Ίσως η εσωτερική «διανομή», στο πλαίσιο των Γενικών Διευθύνσεων της Επιτροπής, της ερώτησής μου, η οποία αφορούσε θέμα για διερεύνηση έμμεσης κρατικής ενίσχυσης, δεν βοήθησε στην διατύπωση εκ μέρους της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, ουσιαστικής απάντησης στο ερώτημά μου.

Η ουσία της ερώτησής μου αφορούσε στην εφαρμογή του άρθρου 107 της Συνθήκης Λειτουργίας της ΕΕ, αφού ενδεχόμενη μη εφαρμογή της πάγιας φορολογικής νομοθεσίας κράτους μέλους μπορεί να «νοθεύσει τον ανταγωνισμό δια της ευνοϊκής μεταχείρισης ορισμένων επιχειρήσεων …».

Κατόπιν των ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Γνωρίζουν οι υπηρεσίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής εάν καταβλήθηκε ο συγκεκριμένος φόρος ακίνητης περιουσίας στο ελληνικό δημόσιο;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Μαΐου 2013)

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή δεν έχει ενημερωθεί για τη φορολογική μεταχείριση που επιφυλάσουν οι ελληνικές φορολογικές αρχές σε τυχόν μεταβιβάσεις ακινήτων που ενδέχεται να έχουν λάβει χώρα στο πλαίσιο της απόφασης της Αγροτικής Τράπεζας της Ελλάδας (ATE Bank) και της επιλεκτικής ενσωμάτωσης των περιουσιακών στοιχείων και του παθητικού της στην Τράπεζα Πειραιώς (Piraeus Bank). Εάν το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου έχει ουσιαστικές πληροφορίες εκ των οποίων συνάγει ότι δεν έχουν καταβληθεί στο Ελληνικό Δημόσιο τυχόν οφειλόμενοι φόροι και ότι ενδεχομένως παραβιάστηκε η απαγόρευση της καταβολής κρατικών ενισχύσεων που προβλέπεται στο άρθρο 107 παράγραφος 1 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, παρακαλείται να διαβιβάσει τις σχετικές πληροφορίες στην Επιτροπή.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002405/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Commission answer to Question P-011701/2012

My Question P-011701/2012 to the Commission raised the issue of the failure of a private Greek company to pay real estate transfer tax as part of the process of the transfer to that company of certain assets of another company. In its reply, the Commission stated that:

'Tax treatment of real estate transfers under resolution scenarios falls under the responsibility of Hellenic tax authorities.'

Perhaps the internal 'delivery' within the Commission DGs of my question, which concerned an investigation into indirect state aid, made it difficult for the Commission to formulate a substantive answer to my question.

The essence of my question concerned the application of Article 107 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, since any non-application of the established tax legislation of a Member State may 'distort competition by favouring certain undertakings …'.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Do the Commission services know whether the specific property tax has been paid to the Greek State?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)

The European Commission has not been informed of the tax treatment applied by the Hellenic tax authorities to any real estate transfers that may have taken place in the context of the resolution of the Agricultural Bank of Greece (ATE Bank) and the integration of its selected assets and liabilities into Piraeus Bank. If the Honourable Member of the European Parliament has substantive information leading him to believe that any due taxes have not been paid to the Greek State and that the prohibition of state aid laid down in Article 107 (1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union may have been infringed, he is invited to provide such information to the Commission.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002406/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(28 Φεβρουαρίου 2013)

Θέμα: Συγχρηματοδοτούμενο οδικό έργο

Με απόφαση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης η ανάδοχος κοινοπραξία της Ολυμπίας Οδού θα λάβει από το Πρόγραμμα Δημοσίων Επενδύσεων ποσό 25,2 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ, ως «αποζημίωση» για «γεγονότα ευθύνης Δημοσίου» και κυρίως για μειωμένα έσοδα λόγω μη εγκατάστασης σταθμών διοδίων. Στην ίδια απόφαση και προκειμένου να αιτιολογηθεί η κατεπείγουσα καταβολή του ανωτέρω ποσού, αναφέρεται η ανάγκη «διασφάλισης της κατ' ελάχιστον απαιτούμενης ρευστότητας προς διατήρηση της βιωσιμότητας του παραχωρησιούχου (πληρωμή τόκων, δανείων και swaps)» και ότι «παρίσταται η ανάγκη να καλυφθούν οι ανελαστικές δαπάνες του παραχωρησιούχου για την πληρωμή swaps, προκειμένου να αποφευχθεί πτωχευτικό γεγονός …».

Δεδομένου ότι, σε απάντησή της (E-009554/2012) η Επιτροπή τόνιζε ότι «τα προβλήματα που προκύπτουν σε σχέση με τις παραχωρήσεις των 4 αυτοκινητοδρόμων (της Ολυμπίας Οδού συμπεριλαμβανομένης)» οφείλονται στην «επιδείνωση της οικονομικής και χρηματοπιστωτικής κατάστασης», στην «έλλειψη ρευστότητας από τις τράπεζες» και στη «μείωση της κυκλοφορίας των οχημάτων και των εσόδων», ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιος είναι ο προϋπολογισμός του συγχρηματοδοτούμενου έργου; Ποιο είναι το χρονοδιάγραμμα κατασκευής του; Ποια είναι η πρόοδος του φυσικού αντικειμένου;

2. Τι συνολικό ποσό έχει εισπράξει μέχρι σήμερα η ανάδοχος κοινοπραξία; Τι ποσά έχει εισπράξει συγκεκριμένα από α) τα διόδια, β) τη δωρεάν χρηματοδότηση από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, γ) από το Ελληνικό Κράτος; Τι έχει εισπράξει από τις Τράπεζες που συμμετέχουν; Τι ποσοστό ήταν από την Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων;

3. Το έργο το οποίο έχει μέχρι σήμερα ολοκληρωθεί, δικαιολογεί την εγκατάσταση των σταθμών διοδίων, που προβλέπονταν από την Σύμβαση; Αν όχι, γιατί αποφασίσθηκε η αποζημίωση της κοινοπραξίας;

4. Επειδή η διερεύνηση της νομιμότητας των πληρωμών τέτοιων μεγάλων συμβάσεων, όπου αντισυμβαλλόμενος είναι το Δημόσιο, είναι και αρμοδιότητα του Ελεγκτικού Συνεδρίου (Άρθρο 98 του Συντάγματος), έχει ελέγξει αν η απόφαση αυτή ελήφθη κατόπιν της σύμφωνης γνώμης του Ελεγκτικού Συνεδρίου; Αν όχι, σκοπεύει να τη ζητήσει;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Απριλίου 2013)

1. Το συνολικό κόστος του έργου της Ολυμπίας Οδού για την περίοδο 2000-2006 ανέρχεται σε 193 εκατ. ευρώ. Από το εν λόγω ποσό, 98 εκατ. ευρώ αντιστοιχούν σε δημόσιες δαπάνες, ενώ η συνεισφορά του ΕΤΠΑ ανέρχεται σε 54 εκατ. ευρώ. Όσον αφορά την κατασκευή της Ολυμπίας Οδού (καθώς και οποιαδήποτε άλλη παραχώρηση αυτοκινητοδρόμου), η Ελληνική Δημοκρατία γνωστοποίησε τις προβλέψεις της κατά την προηγούμενη περίοδο προγραμματισμού, καθώς και το τμήμα του έργου που επρόκειτο να συγχρηματοδοτηθεί κατά την προαναφερθείσα περίοδο. Ωστόσο, οι προβλέψεις για την παρούσα περίοδο έχουν μεταβληθεί σημαντικά λόγω της οικονομικής κρίσης.

Οι διαπραγματεύσεις για την εύρεση λύσης και για την επανέναρξη των έργων βρίσκονται σε εξέλιξη. Μετά τη λήξη των εν λόγω διαπραγματεύσεων, οι ελληνικές αρχές αναμένουν ότι, βάσει της συμφωνίας επαναδιαπραγμάτευσης, το έργο θα ολοκληρωθεί έως το τέλος του 2015. Η πρόοδος που έχει σημειωθεί έως τώρα, σύμφωνα με τις πλέον πρόσφατες διαθέσιμες πληροφορίες, ανέρχεται κατά προσέγγιση σε 30%.

2. Δεδομένου ότι η Επιτροπή δεν είναι συμβαλλόμενο μέρος, οποιαδήποτε πληροφορία αναφορικά με το ερώτημα 2 του αξιότιμου μέλους θα πρέπει να απευθυνθεί στις ελληνικές αρχές. Η Επιτροπή αντιλαμβάνεται ότι η ΕΤΕπ δεν έχει χρηματοδοτήσει έως σήμερα το έργο, αλλά έχει υπογράψει συμφωνία για διευκόλυνση χρηματοδότησης, η οποία θα επιτρέψει τη χρηματοδότησή του, όταν η παραχώρηση του έργου της Ολυμπίας Οδού επαναδιαπραγματευθεί επιτυχώς.

3. Δεδομένου ότι η Επιτροπή δεν είναι συμβαλλόμενο μέρος του έργου, τυχόν απόφαση για ενδεχόμενη αποζημίωση λαμβάνεται από τα συμβαλλόμενα μέρη.

4. Η διασφάλιση της νομιμότητας και της κανονικότητας των συμβάσεων εναπόκειται στις ελληνικές αρχές. Οι ελληνικές αρχές ενημέρωσαν την Επιτροπή ότι το ελληνικό Ελεγκτικό Συνέδριο έχει δώσει τη συγκατάθεσή του.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002406/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Co-funded road project

By decision of the Greek Government, the contractor consortium for the Olympia Highway will receive the sum of EUR 25.2 million from the Public Investment Programme as 'compensation' for 'events for which the government bears the responsibility' and in particular for lower revenue due to a failure to install toll booths on the Highway. In order to justify the urgent payment of the above sum, the same decision indicates the need to 'ensure the minimum required liquidity to maintain the viability of the concession holder (payment of interest, loans and swaps)' and 'to meet the fixed costs of the concession holder to pay swaps, in order to avoid bankruptcy …'

Since in its answer to Written Question E-009554/2012 the Commission had stated that: 'The problems faced by the four motorway concessions in Greece (including the Olympia Highway) are mainly a result of the worsening of the economic and financial situation and …a lack of liquidity from banks (and) the drop in traffic and toll-related income', will the Commission say:

1. What is the budget of the co-funded project? What is its construction schedule? What progress has it made to date?

2. What overall amount has the contractor consortium received so far? What amounts has it received specifically from: a) toll charges; b) free funding from the European Union; c) the Greek State? What sum has it received from the banks involved? What percentage thereof was from the European Investment Bank?

3. Does the work completed to date justify the installation of toll booths, as provided for in the contract? If not, why was it decided to compensate the consortium?

4. Because the investigation of the legality of payments for such large contracts, where the counterparty is the State, is a matter for the Court of Auditors (Article 98 of the Constitution), has it verified whether this decision was taken after receiving the assent of the Court of Auditors? If not, does it intend to seek it?

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

1. The overall cost of the Olympia Odos project for the 2000-2006 period is EUR 193 million. Out of this amount public expenditure is EUR 98 million while the ERDF contribution is EUR 54 million. Concerning the construction of Olympia Odos (as well as any other motorway concession), the Hellenic Republic submitted its forecasts on the previous programming period along with the part of the project that was to be co-financed on that period. However the forecasts for the present period have been substantially altered because of the financial crisis.

The negotiations for a solution to be found and for the projects to restart are continuing. Following the conclusion of these negotiations, the Greek authorities expect that, on the basis of the reset agreement, the project will be completed by end of 2015. The progress so far according to the latest available information stands at approximately 30%.

2. As the Commission is not a contracting party, any information in relation to question 2 of the Honourable Member should be addressed to the Greek authorities. The Commission understands that the EIB has not yet funded the project, but has a financing facility signed which will enable to fund it once the Olympia Odos concession is successfully reset.

3. As the Commission is not a contracting party of the project, any potential decision on eventual compensation belongs to the contracting parties.

4. It falls upon the Greek authorities to ensure the legality and regularity of the contracts. The Greek authorities have informed the Commission that the Greek Court of Auditors has given its assent.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-002407/13
adresată Comisiei
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(28 februarie 2013)

Subiect: Necesitatea unor date standardizate privind epilepsia în statele membre

Studii recente au relevat faptul că rezultatele cercetărilor în domeniul epilepsiei în statele membre sunt foarte contradictorii. Acest fapt se datorează lipsei datelor din anumite state membre, în special din Europa de Est și din zona de est a Mediteranei. Datele despre epilepsie disponibile sunt limitate, înregistrând variații de la țară la țară, mai ales datorită metodelor diferite utilizate, precum și definițiilor și tehnicilor de estimare diferite.

Intenționează Comisia să contribuie la standardizarea metodologiei folosite în statele membre în studiile despre epilepsie, astfel încât să se poată efectua comparații valide între seturile diferite de date disponibile în UE?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(16 aprilie 2013)

În cadrul politicii UE în domeniul sănătății, principalul instrument al Comisiei în vederea sprijinirii unor acțiuni și activități îl constituie Programul UE în domeniul sănătății. Domeniile prioritare pentru finanțare în cadrul programului în domeniul sănătății sunt stabilite anual în planul de lucru. Actualul plan de lucru ([1]) nu are în vedere măsuri specifice în ceea ce privește datele și informațiile referitoare la epilepsie. Cu toate acestea, activitățile relevante pot fi incluse în cadrul altor inițiative, cum ar fi, de exemplu, în cadrul politicii în materie de boli cronice sau de boli rare.

Datele periodice privind epilepsia la nivelul UE (Eurostat) sunt incluse într-o listă restrânsă privind diagnosticele la externarea pacienților (inclusiv *status epilepticus* ([2])), care respectă clasificarea internațională a indicatorilor de morbiditate în spitale. Această listă restrânsă pentru analiza activităților din spitale a fost adoptată în 2005 de către Eurostat, Organizația pentru Cooperare și Dezvoltare Economică și de către Organizația Mondială a Sănătății, prin intermediul rețelei responsabile de „familia” de clasificări internaționale ale OMS.

În plus, Eurostat colectează date privind cauzele de deces din statele membre ale UE și din alte câteva țări europene ([3]), în conformitate cu Clasificarea internațională a bolilor ([4]). Cifrele privind decesele din cauza epilepsiei nu sunt disponibile în mod direct pe site-ul internet al Eurostat, dar pot fi furnizate la cerere.

([1]) Acesta este disponibil la: http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/docs/wp2013_ro.pdf

([2]) În ceea ce privește epilepsia, status epilepticus (G40_G41) în Externările pacienților în funcție de diagnostic (ISHMT), pacienți internați în spital, statistici pentru 100 000 de locuitori [Hospital discharges by diagnosis (ISHMT), in-patients, per 100,000 inhabitants], a se vedea: http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_co_disch2&lang=en

([3]) Regulamentul (UE) nr. 328/2011 al Comisiei din 5 aprilie 2011 de punere în aplicare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1338/2008 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului privind statisticile comunitare referitoare la sănătatea publică, precum și la sănătatea și siguranța la locul de muncă, în ceea ce privește statisticile privind cauzele de deces (JO L 90, 6.4.2011).

([4]) http://www.who.int/classifications/icd/en/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002407/13
to the Commission
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Need for standardised data on epilepsy in the Member States

Recent studies have shown that the findings of academic research on epilepsy in the Member States are highly contradictory. This is mainly due to a lack of data from some Member States, in particular in Eastern Europe and the Eastern Mediterranean. The available data on epilepsy are limited, and vary significantly from country to country, mainly because different countries use different methods, definitions and estimation techniques.

Does the Commission have any plans to help standardise the methodology used by the Member States in their research studies on epilepsy, so that valid comparisons can be made between the different data sets available in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

In the framework of the EU health policy the main instrument of the Commission to support actions and activities is the EU Health Programme. Priority areas for funding under the Health programme are set out each year in a work plan. The current work plan ([1]) does not envisage specific actions in the area of epilepsy data and information. However, relevant activities may be included within the framework of other initiatives, such as for example in the framework of chronic or rare diseases policy.

Regular data on epilepsy at EU level (Eurostat) are included in a dissemination shortlist on Hospital Discharges (including status epilepticus ([2])), which follows the International Classification for Hospital Morbidity Tabulation. This shortlist for hospital activity analysis was adopted in 2005 by Eurostat, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and the World Health Organisation — Family of International Classifications Network.

In addition, Eurostat collects data on causes of death from the EU Member States and some other European countries ([3]) according to the International classification of diseases ([4]). Figures on deaths due to epilepsy are not directly available on Eurostat's website but can be provided on request.

([1]) Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/docs/wp2013_en.pdf
([2]) For Hospital discharges by diagnosis (ISHMT), in-patients, per 100,000 inhabitants; for Epilepsy, status epilepticus (G40_G41) see: http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_co_disch2&lang=en.
([3]) Commission Regulation (EU) No 328/2011 of 5 April 2011 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1338/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on Community statistics on public health and health and safety at work, as regards statistics on causes of death, OJ L 90, 6.4.2011.
([4]) http://www.who.int/classifications/icd/en/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002408/13
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Food labelling

In light of the latest food scandal concerning horsemeat, can the Commission outline what specific action it will be taking to ensure that the actual content of EU food is effectively marked on the labelling, to ensure that EU consumers are informed about what they are eating?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2013)

Under existing rules ([1]), the labelling of foods must not mislead the consumer as to their nature, origin and content. All food ingredients must be labelled. The labelling of foods containing meat must also indicate the animal species concerned. Moreover, if an ingredient is mentioned in the name of the food, its quantity expressed as percentage has to be provided in the list of ingredients.

These rules have been recently reviewed and strengthened by the Parliament and the Council ([2]).

Furthermore, Regulation (EU) 1169/2011 in the case of meat products or meat preparations containing added proteins as such, including hydrolysed proteins, of a different animal origin, requires that the name of the food shall bear an indication of the presence of those proteins and of their origin.

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.

The Commission has recently adopted a recommendation on a coordinated control plan ([3]) 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 is allowed only in non-food producing animals. A summary of all findings will be available by April 2013. Depending on the assessment of the findings, the Commission will decide on an appropriate course of action. The plan is co-financed by the Union at a rate of 75%.

([1]) 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.

([2]) 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. Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 enters into application on 13 December 2014.

([3]) Commission Recommendation of 19 February 2013 on a coordinated control plan with a view to establish the prevalence of fraudulent practices (2013/99/EU), OJ L 48, 21.2.2013, p. 28.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002409/13
to the Commission
Catherine Stihler (S&D)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: EU funding in Scotland

1. How much funding has Scotland received through the EU's Seventh Framework Programme for Research? Can the funding be broken down into recipient sectors, such as universities, private organisations and other public bodies?

In the current funding programme, how much funding has Scotland received through:

2. The common agricultural policy?

3. The common fisheries policy?

4. The Structural Fund programme?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

As of 26 February 2013, under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013), more than EUR 481 million have been earmarked ([1]) for 1 229 Scottish participations in 1 030 research projects ([2]). A detailed breakdown by beneficiaries' legal status is annexed to this reply.

During the period 2007-2012, the total of EUR 3 615.5 million ([3]) was paid to beneficiaries by the Scottish paying agency (SGRPID) out of the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) for the measures on Interventions in Agricultural Markets and Direct aids (CAP Pillar 1). During the same period, Scotland received more than EUR 476 million under the Rural Development Programme of the common agricultural policy (CAP Pillar 2).

For the period 2007-2013, the United Kingdom (UK) has been allocated almost EUR 138 million through the European Fisheries Fund. Formally there is a single budget for one UK-wide Operational Programme. However, an indicative allocation for Scotland is EUR 55 million.

With regard to structural funds for the period 2007-2013, Scotland benefits from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Social Fund (ESF). Specifically, under the regional Competitiveness and Employment Objective, the Lowlands and Uplands of Scotland benefit from EUR 376 million of ERDF contribution of which EUR 138 million has been paid and EUR 270 million of ESF contribution of which EUR 143 million has been paid. Under the Convergence objective, the Highlands and Islands of Scotland benefit from EUR 122 million of ERDF contribution of which EUR 65 million has been paid and EUR 52 million of ESF contribution of which 28 million has been paid. ([4]).

([1]) It should be noted that as FP7 grant agreements involve multi-partner and multi-annual research projects, the abovementioned amount refer to commitments for future payments over the lifetime of the projects, rather than actual payments.
([2]) Excluding possible funding to Scottish participations in research projects funded under the Joint Technology Initiatives.
([3]) It should be noted that the total includes relatively small amounts that the Scottish paying agency pays to UK beneficiaries outside Scotland. In the same way, beneficiaries in Scotland receive relatively small amounts of EAGF funds via other UK paying agencies.
([4]) Scotland is also part of the new ERDF cross-border programme under the European Territorial Cooperation Objective together with Ireland and Northern Ireland and is eligible to four transnational programmes. Since these are cooperation programmes, there is no subdivision of funds between the participating countries.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002410/13
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly: follow-up to report on the inclusion of persons with disabilities in developing countries

At its session in Lomé in November 2011, the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly (JPA) adopted a report on the inclusion of persons with disabilities in developing countries. Paragraph 24 of that report provides for a progress review of the action taken, to be carried out two years after its adoption. It reads: 'Calls on the ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly to report on, review and highlight good practices and progress on inclusion in ACP countries on a two-yearly basis'. This progress review should therefore take place at the second JPA in 2013.

How does the Commission intend to conduct this review jointly with the relevant ACP institutions?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)

The Commission is fully aware of the commitment to report on, review and highlight good practices and progress on inclusion in ACP countries on a two-yearly basis set out in the follow-up report where the Commission identified four key actions, all of which have been implemented:

— disability is regularly included among cross-cutting issues of financing proposals;

— a guidance note on disability for EU staff has been published on Internet for a wider audience;

— a training was held in Brussels in November 2012, involving experts in disability and development cooperation, disabled speakers and attended by Commission and ACP Delegation staff;

— an Internet platform has been established on Capacity for Development ([1]).

Regarding the specific questions raised by the Honourable Member, the Commission intends to conduct jointly with the relevant ACP institutions the following actions for the period May 2012-September 2013:

— an analysis of results and sustainability of projects funded by the Commission in ACP countries through various financial instruments;

— an assessment of the degree of mainstreaming in the EU-ACP bilateral cooperation;

— a stock-taking of ACP countries that have signed and ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, have analysed the situation of people with disabilities and have incorporated the analysis in country poverty assessments, demonstrating how disability is included in relevant programmes.

The Commission is fully committed to the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities including in the development cooperation area. Besides, the report on the initial plan of the European Disability Strategy will take into consideration the progress achieved in this area.

([1]) http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002411/13
to the Commission
Roger Helmer (EFD)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Lowering European energy costs

Commissioner Oettinger recently mentioned the United States and commended it for making low-cost energy a priority for economic recovery.

However, in real terms the Commission's energy policy — the Emissions Trading Scheme, the subsidising of wind and solar energy, the large combustion plant directive, the emission ceilings directive, investment in carbon capture and storage, and many additional environmental directives — makes energy more expensive.

— What action is the Commission taking to deliver a low-cost energy environment in the EU?

— Can the Commission list the specific measures it has taken to help lower energy costs?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

The Commission is actively contributing to making energy in the EU more affordable, in particular through the completion of the internal market for energy which keeps prices at the wholesale level in check. Also, EU policies on research and development and energy efficiency have a positive impact on the energy bills for households and industry alike. Moreover the Commission is actively engaged in the continued diversification of supply sources and routes. Finally, the Commission is preparing new guidelines to ensure that support at Member State level for renewable energy is cost-efficient.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002412/13
à la Commission
François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE)
(28 février 2013)

Objet: Mise en œuvre de la stratégie adriatico-ionienne

Le Conseil européen des 13 et 14 décembre 2012 a demandé à la Commission européenne de présenter une stratégie macrorégionale de l'UE relative à la région adriatique et ionienne.

La commission REGI du Parlement européen avait proposé, le 1er septembre dernier, qu'une action préparatoire (amendement 6775) soit décidée pour notamment financer «la phase de réalisation de la stratégie macrorégionale adriatico-ionienne».

La DG REGIO a fait alors savoir qu'elle ne soutenait pas cette action préparatoire, manifestant par là qu'elle n'avait pas besoin de ce soutien financier pour exercer la responsabilité que lui a confié le Conseil.

1. Quels sont les moyens humains et budgétaires que la DG REGIO a mis à disposition de ce projet pour qu'il progresse dans les meilleurs délais?

2. Quel est le calendrier de travail qui sera mis en œuvre?

3. Qui sont les interlocuteurs qualifiés au sein de la DG REGIO?

Réponse donnée par M Hahn au nom de la Commission
(23 avril 2013)

1. La Commission est en train de constituer une équipe ad hoc afin de préparer la stratégie relative à la région adriatique et ionienne. Pour ce faire, la Commission a demandé aux États membres et non membres participants de proposer gratuitement les services d'experts nationaux détachés pour aider à la mise en œuvre de ce projet. Aucune ressource budgétaire supplémentaire n'a été allouée à la Commission dans le cadre de ce projet.

2. La Commission est en train de préparer un calendrier comportant des échéances. Un plan d'action sera mis en place. Il s'agit de faire adopter la stratégie par la Commission d'ici la mi-2014. Au printemps 2013, deux réunions sont prévues entre les points de contact nationaux en cours de désignation par les pays concernés et ceux qui sont responsables des questions de programmation pour la période 2004-2020 (accords et programmes de partenariat). L'objectif de ces réunions sera de faire en sorte que la stratégie macrorégionale trouve son expression dans les documents relatifs à la période 2014-2020.

3. Le Centre de compétence Macro-Régions et Coopération territoriale européenne de la direction générale de la politique régionale et urbaine est chargé de la coordination de ce dossier.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002412/13
to the Commission
François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the Adriatic-Ionian strategy

The European Council of 13 and 14 December 2012 asked the Commission to set out an EU macro-regional strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian region.

On 1 September 2012, Parliament's Committee on Regional Development (REGI) tabled a preparatory action (Amendment 6775) to finance 'the implementation phase of the Adriatic-Ionian macro-regional strategy'.

The Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy (DG REGIO) made it clear at that time that it did not support this preparatory action, indicating that it did not need this financial support in order to fulfil the responsibilities assigned to it by the Council.

1. What human and budgetary resources has the DG REGIO made available to ensure that this project can progress as quickly as possible?

2. What will be the schedule for this project?

3. Who are the designated contacts within the DG REGIO?

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

1. The Commission is constituting an ad hoc team to prepare the strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian region. For that purpose, the Commission asked the participating EU Member States and non-Member States to offer cost-free seconded national experts to assist with the work. No additional budgetary resources have been allocated to the Commission for this work.

2. A timeframe with milestones is now being prepared by the Commission. An Action Plan will be developed. The plan is to have the strategy adopted by the Commission by mid-2014. In spring 2013, two meetings are planned between the National Contact Points currently being appointed by the countries involved and those responsible for 2004-2020 programming matters (partnership agreements and programmes). The purpose of these meetings will be to ensure that the macro-regional strategy is reflected in the documents of the 2014-2020 period.

3. The Competence Centre for 'Macro-regions and European Territorial Cooperation' in the Directorate-General for Regional and Urban Policy is coordinating this file.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002413/13
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(28 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Centrale termoelettrica Repower di Pistoia: possibile violazione delle norme a tutela della salute e dell'ambiente e mancata consultazione dei cittadini

Nel 2010 la Regione Toscana, la Provincia e il Comune di Pistoia hanno firmato un protocollo d'intesa per la realizzazione di una centrale termoelettrica a metano a ciclo combinato nell'area del vecchio stabilimento Radicifil di Pistoia. Nel 2011 la società svizzera Repower ha presentato la documentazione per la costruzione dell'impianto e nel dicembre 2012 la Regione Toscana ha approvato la VIA. Tuttavia, i cittadini sono preoccupati. Nel raggio di circa due km dal luogo dove è previsto l'insediamento della centrale da 245 MW esistono numerose frazioni (Bottegone, Ponte alla Pergola, Badia a Pacciana, Chiazzano, Canapale) con circa 10 000 abitanti e il centro di Pistoia dista meno di 4 km. La costruzione del nuovo impianto brucerà annualmente metano in una quantità pari a sei volte la popolazione di Pistoia, scaricando in aria circa 180 tonnellate all'anno di ossidi d'azoto che si trasformeranno per la maggior parte in polveri sottili e ozono. L'OMS afferma che non si può fissare una soglia minima al di sotto della quale certamente le PM 10, PM 2,5 e PM 0,1 non esercitino degli effetti negativi sulla salute. Pertanto si temono ripercussioni sulla salute, sull'ambiente e sulle attività produttive, dato che nel territorio vi sono molte aziende agricole ed agriturismi con migliaia di famiglie impiegate in tali settori. Infine, nell'area contigua a quella in cui è prevista la costruzione è già presente un centro per il trattamento di rifiuti liquidi pericolosi, che ha già reso l'intera area fortemente compromessa.

Ciò premesso, e considerato che la cittadinanza non è mai stata adeguatamente consultata né formalmente coinvolta nel processo decisionale secondo le dovute procedure, come previsto dall'art. 2 della direttiva 2003/35/CE, può la Commissione far sapere:

— se sono state rispettate le disposizioni dell'articolo 168 del TFUE e dell'articolo 35 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea;

— se è stata correttamente esperita la procedura di valutazione d'impatto ambientale preventiva e se esistono o meno le condizioni previste dalla direttiva 2011/92/UE;

— se sono state svolte le procedure obbligatorie di pubblicità e informazione alla cittadinanza (VIA e VAS);

— se è stato previsto un piano di bonifica e riqualificazione dell'intera area interessata, come prevede la direttiva 2004/35/CE sulla responsabilità ambientale in materia di prevenzione e riparazione del danno ambientale;

— se nell'ambito della realizzazione della centrale termoelettrica, la società Repower o altri soggetti coinvolti nella realizzazione abbiano ricevuto o richiesto fondi comunitari diretti o indiretti.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(25 aprile 2013)

Il trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea ([1]) e la Carta dei diritti fondamentali stabiliscono i principi generali del diritto dell'Unione. Il legislatore europeo ha adottato una normativa più specifica e più consona a valutare l'impatto ambientale delle centrali termoelettriche.

Per quanto riguarda la direttiva 2011/92/UE (direttiva sulla valutazione dell'impatto ambientale o direttiva VIA) ([2]), la Commissione ha già ottenuto la decisione pertinente dell'autorità nazionale competente (Regione Toscana) ([3]). La Commissione chiederà alle autorità italiane ulteriori informazioni sulla consultazione pubblica avviata per il progetto specifico.

La direttiva 2004/35/CE (direttiva sulla responsabilità ambientale) ([4]) si applica in caso di minaccia imminente di danno e quando si è già verificato un danno ambientale. Non vi è alcuna indicazione né in un senso né nell'altro in relazione alla centrale in questione.

([1]) Trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea.
([2]) GU L 26 del 28.1.2012, pag. 1; si tratta di una codificazione che comprende la direttiva 2003/35/CE, GU L 156 del 25.6.2003.
([3]) Delibera n. 1144. del 17.12.2012, Giunta Regionale, Regione Toscana.
([4]) GU L 143 del 30.4.2004.

In linea con il principio della gestione condivisa della politica di coesione, la selezione e l'attuazione dei progetti FESR ([5]) è di competenza delle autorità nazionali. L'autorità di gestione del programma operativo del FESR per la Toscana ([6]) ha confermato che non sono stati concessi finanziamenti del FESR per la costruzione della centrale elettrica a Pistoia.

([5]) Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale.
([6]) http://www.regione.toscana.it/por-creo/cos-e

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002413/13
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Repower thermoelectric power plant in Pistoia: possible violation of human health and environmental legislation and failure to consult citizens.

In 2010, the Tuscany Region signed a memorandum of understanding with the Province and Municipality of Pistoia for the construction of a combined cycle natural gas thermoelectric power plant on the site of the former Radicifil plant in Pistoia. In 2011, the Swiss company Repower presented the plant construction documents and, in December 2012, the Tuscany Region approved the EIA. Citizens are nevertheless concerned. Within a radius of approximately two kilometres around the site where the 245 MW power plant is to be built, there are a number of communities (Bottegone, Ponte alla Pergola, Badia a Pacciana, Chiazzano, Canapale) with some 10 000 inhabitants. The centre of Pistoia lies less than 4 km away. Once constructed, the new plant will burn an annual quantity of natural gas equal to six times the population of Pistoia, emitting some 180 tonnes of nitrogen oxides into the atmosphere every year, most of which will be transformed into particulate matter and ozone. The WHO claims that it is impossible to set a minimum threshold, below which PM10, PM2.5 and PM0.1 would definitely not have negative effects on human health. Therefore it is feared that there may be repercussions for human health, the environment and production activities, since there are many farms and agritourism businesses in the local area, with thousands of families employed in these sectors. Finally, in the area which borders that of the potential construction site, there is already a hazardous liquid waste processing plant, which has already seriously compromised the whole area.

In light of the above, and considering that the citizens were never properly consulted nor formally involved in the decision-making process in accordance with due process, pursuant to Article 2 of Directive 2003/35/EC, can the Commission state:

— whether the provisions of Article 168 of the TFEU and Article 35 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights have been complied with;

— whether the preventive environmental impact procedure was correctly carried out and whether the conditions stipulated in Directive 2011/92/EU have been fulfilled or not;

— whether the mandatory publicity and information procedures for citizens have been followed (EIA and SEA);

— whether there is a plan to reclaim and redevelop the area in question, as per Directive 2004/35/EC on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage;

— whether, in the context of constructing the thermoelectric power plant, the company Repower or other individuals involved in its creation have received or requested direct or indirect Community funding.

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

The TFEU ([1]) and the Charter of Fundamental Rights establish the general principles of EC law. The EU legislator has adopted more specific legislation appropriate for assessing the environmental impacts of thermoelectric power plants.

With regard to Directive 2011/92/EU (the Environmental Impact Assessment or EIA Directive) ([2]), the Commission has already obtained the relevant Decision from the competent national authority (Tuscany Region) ([3]). The Commission will ask the Italian authorities for further information on the public consultation undertaken for this specific project.

Directive 2004/35/EC (the Environmental Liability Directive) ([4]) applies to cases of imminent threat of damage and where environmental damage has already occurred. There is no indication in either direction in relation to this power plant.

([1]) Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.
([2]) OJ L 28.1.2012, p.1; this is a codification which includes Directive 2003/35/EC, OJ L 156, 25.6.2003.
([3]) Delibera N.1144, 17.12.2012 Regione Toscana Giunta Regionale.
([4]) OJ L 143, 30.4.2004.

In line with the shared management principle of the Cohesion Policy, selection and implementation of ERDF ([5]) projects is the responsibility of the national authorities. The Managing Authority of the ERDF operational programme for Tuscany ([6]) has confirmed that no ERDF funding has been granted for the construction of the power plant in Pistoia.

([5]) European Regional Development Fund.
([6]) http://www.regione.toscana.it/por-creo/cos-e.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002415/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Lotta alla criminalità informatica

Sono oggetto di commenti e di timori le varie notizie che in queste recenti settimane parlano di criminalità informatica, vista come una minaccia complessa e pervasiva. Le ricadute che potrebbero realizzarsi a seguito di attacchi convenzionali possono incidere sull'esercizio delle libertà essenziali per il sistema democratico. In una relazione presentata al Parlamento italiano si afferma che questa minaccia è la sfida più impegnativa per il Paese perché interessa molteplici aspetti: «dai sistemi complessi e strutturati dello Stato e delle grandi aziende, ai computer e agli smartphone dei singoli cittadini». Pare che la soluzione del problema non sia di facile individuazione, poiché gli attori, le tecniche usate e i bersagli mutano più velocemente delle contromisure.

La Commissione

1. è consapevole di questa nuova minaccia che incombe anche sulle istituzioni europee e su vasti settori dell'attività dei suoi organi, nonché sul mondo produttivo e sui cittadini?

2. Può dirci quante intrusioni, tentate o riuscite, sono provenute dai server cinesi?

3. Di fronte a questi rischi qual è la funzione che può svolgere l'Enisa, l'Agenzia incaricata della sicurezza delle reti e dell'informazione? Ha la competenza necessaria per la prevenzione e la scelta di sistemi che blocchino la minaccia rappresentata dalla criminalità informatica?

4. L'Europol svolge un ruolo in questo ambito?

5. Chi coordina e gestisce, eventualmente, l'azione di contromisura nell'Unione europea?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(24 aprile 2013)

La Commissione europea è consapevole della minaccia informatica che incombe sull'Europa e sul mondo in forme sempre diverse. Determinare la provenienza e il grado di gravità degli attacchi è difficile ma deve restare una priorità per tutti i soggetti coinvolti.

Per rispondere a questa minaccia la Commissione europea ha elaborato una politica coordinata, in collaborazione con gli Stati membri e con altre istituzioni e agenzie dell'UE. Nel febbraio 2013 la Commissione ha adottato una comunicazione sulla strategia per la cibersicurezza ([1]) che descrive come l'Unione intende aumentare la sicurezza nel ciberspazio, le azioni necessarie a garantire la resilienza a livello nazionale e dell'Unione, le funzioni attribuibili ai partner interessati e le modalità per assicurare una risposta coordinata. In parallelo, ha proposto una direttiva sulla sicurezza delle reti e dell'informazione (SRI) ([2]) con l'obiettivo di potenziare la capacità del settore pubblico e privato di contrastare le minacce e gli incidenti informatici, di aumentare la cooperazione nell'Unione europea e introdurre l'obbligo di segnalare gli incidenti gravi alle autorità nazionali competenti.

L'Agenzia europea delle reti e dell'informazione (ENISA) svolge il ruolo fondamentale di assistere gli Stati membri nello sviluppare la capacità di resilienza a livello nazionale, organizzare esercitazioni e accrescere la consapevolezza della necessità di una solida cultura della sicurezza delle reti e dell'informazione a vantaggio di cittadini, consumatori, imprese e istituzioni pubbliche nell'UE.

Il Centro europeo per la lotta alla criminalità informatica all'interno di Europol (EC3) funge da piattaforma di scambio di informazioni e competenze sulla cibercriminalità nell'Unione europea, offrendo sostegno operativo e analitico agli Stati membri nelle indagini sulla criminalità informatica e promuovendo la cooperazione tra pubblico e privato. Il consiglio di direzione dell'EC3 riunisce i rappresentanti dei principali partner (tra cui l'ENISA, l'Accademia europea di polizia, Eurojust e il servizio europeo per l'azione esterna) e riveste un ruolo fondamentale nel coordinamento e nella supervisione dell'azione dell'UE.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=JOIN:2013:0001:FIN:IT:PDF.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0048:FIN:IT:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002415/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Combatting cybercrime

The various reports in recent weeks of cybercrime, viewed as a complex and pervasive threat, are the subject of debate and concern. The possible consequences following conventional attacks may affect the exercise of freedoms essential to the democratic system. A report tabled to the Italian Parliament states that this threat is the most demanding challenge for Italy since it has manifold aspects: 'from the complex, structured systems of the State and major firms to the computers and smartphones of individual citizens'. It would appear that it is not easy to find a solution to the problem since those responsible, their techniques and their targets change more quickly than the countermeasures.

1. Is the Commission aware of this new threat which also hangs over the European institutions and over vast areas of the activities carried out by its bodies, as well as over the manufacturing sector and European citizens?

2. Can it state how many cases of hacking, whether attempted or successful, have come from Chinese servers?

3. Faced with these risks, what function can be performed by ENISA, the European Network and Information Security Agency? Does it have the power necessary to prevent, and choose systems to block, the threat posed by cybercrime?

4. Is Europol playing a role in this area?

5. Who is coordinating and overseeing any countermeasures that the EU is implementing?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The EC is aware of the ever-evolving cyber threat facing Europe and the world. Attribution of sources and level of seriousness of attacks is difficult and should remain a focus for all concerned.

In response to the threat, the EC has designed a coordinated policy in cooperation with EU Member States and other institutions and agencies. In February 2013, the EC adopted a communication on a cyber security strategy ([1]), which outlines the EU vision on how to enhance security in cyberspace and sets out actions required to ensure resilience at national and EU level as well as the suggested roles for stakeholders and how the response could be coordinated. The accompanying proposal for a directive on Network and Information Security (NIS) ([2]) aims at enhancing both public and private sector capabilities to counter cyber threats and incidents, to increase cooperation across the EU and to require that serious incidents are reported to the competent national authorities.

The European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA) is playing a key role in assisting MS in the development of national resilience capabilities, organising training exercises and raising awareness of the need for robust NIS for the benefit of citizens, consumers, business and public sector organisations in the EU.

Europol's newly-established Cybercrime Centre (EC3) serves as the EU cybercrime information and expertise hub, providing operational and analytical support to MS' cybercrime investigations and promoting public-private cooperation. The EC3 Programme Board includes representatives from key stakeholders (including ENISA, the European Police College, Eurojust and the European External Action Service) and thus plays an important role in coordinating and overseeing EU measures.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/organised-crime-and-human-trafficking/cybercrime/docs/join_2013_1_en.pdf
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0048:FIN:EN:PDF.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002416/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Organi umani con stampante 3D

Usando una stampante 3D e cellule staminali come «inchiostro», pochi giorni fa è stato prodotto all'Università di Edimburgo un tessuto tridimensionale. A distanza di un giorno l'85 per cento delle cellule erano rimaste «vive e totipotenti, cioè ancora capaci di differenziarsi in tutti i tipi di cellule del corpo umano». Pare che la ricerca possa avere importanti sviluppi, per esempio creare tessuti per condurre test sui farmaci senza utilizzare gli animali, o addirittura creare organi da trapiantare, senza più ricorrere a donazioni con rischi di rigetto. Si tratta evidentemente di obiettivi a lungo termine, ma se l'esperimento attuale è corretto, non c'è dubbio che le conseguenze che ne derivano saranno molto importanti per la salute umana. All'Università di Sheffield sono in corso esperimenti di trapianto di cellule nervose, ottenute sempre con una stampante 3D, per ripristinare l'udito di alcuni roditori. All'Università del Missouri hanno invece prodotto tessuto cardiaco di roditore con battiti simili a quelli di un cuore vero. Anche l'istituto di ricerca tedesco Fraunhofer ha usato una stampante 3D per creare vasi sanguigni, utilizzando biomateriali sintetici, mentre il Laser Center di Hannover ha stampato in 3D pelle artificiale. Esperienze analoghe sono in corso in altri centri di ricerca, tanto da far pensare ad una svolta scientifica epocale rispetto ai protocolli usati fino ad ora.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è al corrente di questi risultati e delle possibili conseguenze per la salute umana;

2. se figurano progetti simili nei programmi di ricerca dell'UE in corso e eventualmente quali;

3. se esiste il rischio che questi esperimenti giungano a produrre la vita artificiale;

4. se ha un'opinione sulle conseguenze che si potrebbero produrre per la società umana;

5. può garantire che gli esperimenti saranno proseguiti solo per migliorare la qualità di vita e non eventualmente per produrre una vita artificiale?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(16 aprile 2013)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza di questi risultati. Essi riflettono gli sforzi di ricerca nel campo dell'ingegneria dei tessuti e della medicina rigenerativa e offrono potenzialità per agevolare la cura di malattie e per migliorare la qualità di vita dei pazienti.

2. Attraverso il Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013), l'UE ha sostenuto questo settore su vasta scala. Un esempio di progetto simile a quelli citati è il progetto ArtiVasc 3D ([1]), che intende coltivare pelle vascolarizzata per impiegarla su pazienti con lesioni o ustioni e per testare i prodotti farmaceutici; l'UE vi contribuisce con un finanziamento di 7,8 milioni di euro.

3. I progetti di ricerca menzionati prelevano cellule preesistenti, normalmente dal paziente o da un donatore, per rigenerare il tessuto. Il fine di questa tecnologia non è la creazione di vita artificiale, ma la coltura di cellule già esistenti per generare tessuti vivi da impiegarsi in terapie di riparazione o sostituzione.

4. La Commissione ritiene che la medicina rigenerativa migliorerà la qualità di vita dei pazienti, offrendo una speranza contro malattie incurabili o potenzialmente letali e possibilità di affrontare i problemi sanitari connessi all'invecchiamento della popolazione. Le conseguenze per la società di tali nuove tecnologie, considerando anche il sottile discrimine tra impieghi medici e non medici, sono oggetto di analisi di una serie di pareri del Gruppo europeo per l'etica delle scienze e delle nuove tecnologie: aspetti etici della nano medicina (parere n. 21 ([2])), aspetti etici di dispositivi TIC nel corpo umano (parere. 20 ([3])) e di etica della biologia di sintesi (parere n.25 ([4])).

([1]) www.artivasc.eu
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/bepa/european-group-ethics/docs/publications/opinion_21_nano_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/bepa/european-group-ethics/docs/avis20_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/bepa/european-group-ethics/docs/opinion25_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002416/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Human organs from a 3D printer

A few days ago, three-dimensional tissue was produced at the University of Edinburgh using a 3D printer and stem cells as 'ink'. One day later, 85% of the cells were still 'alive and totipotent, that is, still capable of differentiating into any human cell type'. It appears that the research could lead to important developments, for example, the creation of tissue to test drugs without using animals, or even the creation of transplant organs, without having to rely on donated organs with the risk that they will be rejected. These are clearly long-term objectives, but if the current experiment is correct, there is no doubt that it will have very important consequences for human health. At the University of Sheffield, scientists are carrying out experiments to transplant nerve cells, again obtained using a 3D printer, to restore the hearing of certain rodents. At the University of Missouri, scientists have produced rodent heart tissue which beats like a real heart. The Fraunhofer research institute in Germany has also used a 3D printer to create blood vessels, using synthetic biomaterials, while the Laser Centre in Hannover has 3D-printed artificial skin. Similar experiments are under way in other research centres, suggesting that we are looking at an historic scientific breakthrough compared with the protocols used until now.

Can the Commission state:

1. whether it is aware of these results and of the possible consequences for human health;

2. whether similar projects are included in ongoing EU research programmes and if so, which ones;

3. whether there is a risk that these experiments could end up creating artificial life;

4. whether it has an opinion on the consequences this could have for human society;

5. whether it can guarantee that the experiments will be carried out only to improve quality of life and not to create artificial life?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of these results. They reflect research efforts in the field of tissue engineering and regenerative medicine and they offer potential for aiding the treatment of disease and for improving the quality of life of patients

2. Through its Seventh Framework Programme for research and technological development (FP7, 2007-2013), the EU has supported this field extensively. An example of a project similar to the ones mentioned is the ArtiVasc 3D project ([1]), which aims to cultivate vascularised skin for use in patients with injuries or burns and for testing pharmaceuticals, and to which the EU makes a financial contribution of EUR 7.8 million.

3, 5. The research projects mentioned take pre-existing cells, normally from the patient or a donor, with the aim of regenerating tissue. This technology is not about creating artificial life but about culturing already existing cells to generate living tissue for repair or replacement therapy.

4, 5. It is the Commission's view that by offering hope for untreatable and life-threatening disease, and possibilities for addressing health problems of an ageing population, regenerative medicine will improve the quality of life of patients. The consequences for human society of similar new technologies, including consideration of the fine line between medical and non-medical uses, is examined in a series of Opinions of the European Group on Ethics of Science and New Technologies: ethical aspects of nanomedicine (Opinion No 21 ([2])), ethical aspects of ICT implants in the human body (Opinion No 20 ([3])), and ethics of synthetic biology (Opinion No 25 ([4])).

([1]) www.artivasc.eu
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/bepa/european-group-ethics/docs/publications/opinion_21_nano_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/bepa/european-group-ethics/docs/avis20_en.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/bepa/european-group-ethics/docs/opinion25_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002417/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Il Brasile in Africa

«Dal primo giorno alla presidenza — dichiara Celso Amorin, Ministro degli esteri brasiliano dal 2003 al 2011 — il Presidente Lula da Silva chiarì: la nostra priorità sarà la cooperazione Sud-Sud e l'Africa è un tassello centrale di questo cambiamento strategico». Alle parole sono seguiti i fatti: nel 2002 l'interscambio commerciale tra Africa e Brasile era di 3,5 miliardi di euro, dieci anni dopo ha raggiunto la cifra di 22,5 miliardi. Dopo il rallentamento del 2009 causato dalla crisi finanziaria americana, nel 2012 per espressa volontà della presidente Roussef (che è già stata in Angola, Mozambico e Sud Africa) i flussi commerciali hanno raggiunto 25 miliardi di euro. Non avendo un passato coloniale, al summit dell'Unione Africana a Sirte, Lula aveva sostenuto l'esistenza di molti tratti comuni tra Brasile e Africa e aveva lanciato l'idea di una nuova «rivoluzione verde» per l'Africa, ora sostenuta con un programma di trasferimento tecnologico in campo agricolo. La presenza del Brasile è tuttavia ben consolidata anche in settori strategici e assai redditizi come quello minerario, energetico e delle infrastrutture per decine di miliardi euro (Mozambico, Angola, Nigeria, Benin, Gabon, Libia, Tanzania e Algeria). Pur considerando che maggiori sono gli investimenti meglio è per lo sviluppo dell'economia,

la Commissione:

1. non ritiene che uno sforzo maggiore dovrebbe essere fatto anche dall'UE non solo per contribuire allo sviluppo del Sud, ma anche per garantire una presenza profittevole per le imprese europee?

2. Non ritiene utile la definizione di una politica globale per l'Africa che tenga conto dei suoi sforzi per non cadere vittima del terrorismo fondamentalista e della sua assoluta necessità di uno sviluppo economico che combatta la miseria e assicuri il diffondersi della tutela della salute?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(24 aprile 2013)

Nel 2007 è stata adottata a Lisbona la strategia comune Africa-UE, un partenariato strategico globale fondato su valori e interessi comuni nel cui ambito l'UE e l'Africa collaborano per promuovere una crescita sostenibile e inclusiva a vantaggio di entrambi i continenti. Questo significa garantire un contesto politico e socioeconomico stabile attraverso la pace, la sicurezza e sistemi di governance democratici e responsabili, stimolando nel contempo la crescita per creare occupazione attraverso gli investimenti, il commercio, l'integrazione regionale e il sostegno a fattori di sviluppo fondamentali quali la salute, l'istruzione o le infrastrutture. Questi obiettivi comuni sono definiti e realizzati anche attraverso il Programma di cambiamento e si riflettono nelle priorità adottate dalla Commissione dell'Unione africana, presieduta da Dlamini-Zuma.

L'UE si compiace del ruolo sempre più incisivo svolto da economie emergenti come il Brasile sul territorio africano e nei rapporti con questo continente. Poiché la situazione economica e finanziaria è tuttora fragile, i partner internazionali devono unire i loro sforzi e utilizzare meglio le risorse disponibili per favorire una crescita sostenibile e inclusiva, ridurre la povertà e promuovere la pace e la stabilità in Africa. L'UE rimane di gran lunga il primo partner dell'Africa in termini di commercio, investimenti e aiuti allo sviluppo. L'UE e l'Africa hanno valori comuni ed è di fondamentale importanza che i partner africani possano fornire un quadro politico adeguato e permettere a tutti i partner di operare in condizioni di parità.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002417/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Brazil in Africa

Celso Luiz Nunes Amorim, Brazilian Minister for Foreign Affairs from 2003 to 2011, said that from his first day in office, President Lula da Silva confirmed that their priority would be south-south cooperation and that Africa was a key part of this strategic change. These words were followed by action: in 2002, trade between Africa and Brazil was worth EUR 3.5 billion; 10 years later, it has grown to EUR 22.5 billion. Following the slowdown in 2009 caused by the financial crisis in the US, thanks to the express intention of President Rousseff (who has already visited Angola, Mozambique and South Africa), trade flows reached EUR 25 billion in 2012. At the African Union summit in Sirte, since Brazil does not have a colonial past, President Lula da Silva maintained that Brazil and Africa had many features in common, and launched the idea of a new 'green revolution' for Africa. This is currently supported by a technology-transfer programme in the agricultural sector. Brazil's presence is nevertheless well established also in strategic sectors that are highly profitable such as mining, energy and infrastructure, amounting to tens of billions of euro (in Mozambique, Angola, Nigeria, Benin, Gabon, Libya, Tanzania and Algeria). While bearing in mind that the greater the investment, the more the economy will develop,

1. Does the Commission believe that the EU should make greater efforts, not only to contribute to the development of the south, but also to ensure a profitable presence for European businesses?

2. Does it believe that it would be appropriate to establish a global policy for Africa that takes account of its efforts to avoid falling victim to fundamentalist terrorism and its absolute need for economic development that will tackle poverty and provide widespread health protection?

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

In Lisbon 2007, the EU and Africa adopted a holistic strategic partnership called the Joint Africa-EU Strategy (JAES). This partnership is based on common values and joint interest. Within this framework, the EU and Africa work closely together to ensure sustainable and inclusive growth to the benefit of both continents. This means ensuring a stable political, social and economic environment through peace and security, democratic and accountable governance systems and the stimulation of growth to create jobs through investments, trade, regional integration as well as support to key development factors such as health, education or infrastructures. These shared objectives are also defined and implemented through the Agenda for Change and are reflected in the priorities adopted by the new African Union (AU) Commission headed by Ms Dlamini-Zuma.

The EU welcomes the increasing role emerging economies such as Brazil play in and with Africa. As the economic and financial situation remains fragile, there is in fact a greater need for all international partners to join their efforts and use resources more efficiently to contribute to sustainable and inclusive growth, poverty alleviation and promoting peace and stability in Africa. This being said, the EU remains by far Africa's first partner for trade, investments or development aid. The EU and Africa share common values and it is crucial that African partners are able to provide the right policy framework and an adequate level playing field to ensure that all partners operate within the same conditions.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002418/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Continua la repressione in Tibet

La repressione di Pechino non conosce soste in Tibet. Nelle regione orientale, dove è avvenuta la maggior parte delle autoimmolazioni (che hanno ormai raggiunto il numero di 80, nella totale indifferenza dei governi e delle opinioni pubbliche delle maggiori democrazie del mondo), le punizioni d'ora in poi saranno collettive. Sono presi di mira quelli del «gruppo del Dalai».

Una circolare del partito comunista elenca una serie di misure che saranno prese immediatamente per cancellare ogni tipo di beneficio statale per i familiari di chi si è immolato. Anche i funzionari pubblici sono ritenuti responsabili di non aver saputo prevenire le autoimmolazioni ritenute «nocive all'armonia sociale» e le località in cui esse hanno avuto luogo saranno private di fondi governativi per tre anni. Un altro punto della circolare prevede che debbano essere colpiti tutti quegli individui che decidono di recarsi dalle famiglie di chi si è autoimmolato per dare offerte, presentare condoglianze o anche solo esprimere rispetto. Sono individui da «educare» perché le loro azioni sono «sbagliate e avranno serie conseguenze.» La repressione serve per evitare che chi sceglie il suicidio di protesta possa essere celebrato come un eroe. Pare incredibile che a distanza di qualche decennio le democrazie dimentichino le tragedie e i milioni di vittime causate dal terrore staliniano e da quello di Mao perché volevano «educare» l'uomo nuovo e correggere coloro che sbagliavano. La storia in Tibet si ripete e tutti rimangono zitti.

Può la Commissione confermare che è certamente al corrente della situazione e far sapere:

1. quale iniziativa ha intrapreso per tutelare la sicurezza dei tibetani e per far loro comprendere che qualcuno al mondo non dimentica la loro tragedia e si batte per alleviarla;

2. se la diplomazia europea dispone di strumenti per esercitare pressioni sui governanti comunisti cinesi;

3. se teme di pagar caro questa continua arrendevolezza di fronte alle dittature politiche, militari o ideologiche che siano?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(25 aprile 2013)

L'Unione europea ha sollevato pubblicamente la questione del Tibet in numerose occasioni. Per esempio, il 12 giugno 2012 l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Ashton ha parlato della situazione tibetana di fronte al Parlamento europeo, il 14 dicembre 2012 ha rilasciato una dichiarazione a nome dell'UE27 sulle autoimmolazioni in Tibet e, da ultimo, il 13 marzo 2013, si è espressa sulla questione nel corso del dibattito sull'adozione della relazione del Parlamento europeo sui rapporti tra l'Unione europea e la Cina. Il Tibet viene anche menzionato sistematicamente nelle dichiarazioni dell'Unione europea presso il Consiglio per i diritti umani delle Nazioni Unite e, da ultimo, è stato citato durante la sessantesima riunione dell'Assemblea generale delle Nazioni Unite.

L'Unione europea esprime preoccupazione per le restrizioni alle espressioni d'identità tibetana imposte dalle autorità cinesi, che sembrano provocare un'ondata di malcontento nella regione. L'Unione ha ripetutamente esortato le autorità cinesi ad affrontare le cause profonde della frustrazione della popolazione tibetana e a garantire che in Tibet siano rispettati i diritti civili, politici, economici, sociali e culturali, tra cui il diritto di godere della propria cultura, di praticare la propria religione e di esprimersi nella propria lingua. Inoltre, l'Unione europea esorta le autorità cinesi a rilasciare tutte le persone detenute per aver partecipato a manifestazioni pacifiche e a consentire il libero accesso a tutte le regioni del Tibet. L'UE chiede agli stessi tibetani di astenersi da forme estreme di protesta e ai dirigenti delle comunità e ai leader religiosi di avvalersi della propria influenza per contribuire a porre fine a questa tragica perdita di vite umane.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002418/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Ongoing repression in Tibet

There has been no let-up in Beijing's repression of Tibet. In the eastern region, which has seen the greatest number of self-immolations (there have now been a total of 80, to the complete indifference of governments and public opinion in the world's largest democracies) punishments will now be collective. Those targeted belong to the 'Dalai Lama Group'.

A circular issued by the communist party lists a series of measures which will be imposed immediately in order to withdraw all types of state benefits from the families of those who self-immolate. State officials are also held responsible for not having managed to prevent the self-immolations, which are deemed to be 'harmful to social harmony' and the municipalities where they have taken place will be deprived of government funding for three years. The circular also states that anyone who decides to visit the families of those who have self-immolated, to make offerings, express condolences or even just pay their respects, must be punished. These individuals must be 'educated' because their actions are 'wrong and will have serious consequences'. The repression is intended to stop those who choose suicide from being celebrated as heroes. It seems incredible that in just a few decades democratic nations have forgotten the tragedies and millions of victims of the reigns of terror of Stalin and Mao, who wanted to 'educate' a new breed of men and correct those who erred. History is repeating itself in Tibet and we are all remaining silent.

Could the Commission confirm that it is certainly aware of the situation and state:

1. what initiatives it has undertaken to protect the safety of Tibetans and make them understand that there are people around the world who have not forgotten their tragedy and are fighting to alleviate it;

2. whether European diplomacy has instruments at its disposal to exert pressure on the Chinese communist leadership;

3. whether it fears paying a heavy price for continuing to yield in the face of political, military and ideological dictatorships?

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

The EU has publicly raised the situation in Tibet on many occasions. For example, on 12 June 2012, HR/VP Ashton addressed the Tibetan situation before the European Parliament; on 14 December 2012, HR/VP Ashton delivered a statement on behalf of the EU-27 on Tibetan self-immolations; and most recently on 13 March 2013 during the debate on the adoption of the European Parliament's report on EU-China relations. Tibet is also mentioned systematically in EU statements at the UN Human Rights Council, most recently during the 60th session of the UN General Assembly.

The EU is concerned by the restrictions imposed by the Chinese authorities on expressions of Tibetan identity, which appear to be giving rise to a surge of discontent in the region. The EU has repeatedly called upon the Chinese authorities to address the deep-rooted causes of the frustration of the Tibetan people and ensure that their civil, political, economic and social and cultural rights are respected, including their right to enjoy their own culture, to practice their own religion and to use their own language. The EU also calls upon the Chinese authorities to release all individuals detained for taking part in peaceful demonstrations, allow free access to all TARs. It calls on Tibetans themselves to refrain from resorting to extreme forms of protest and on their community and religious leaders to use their influence to help stop this tragic loss of life.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002419/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Tutela dei delfini nel Mediterraneo

Quattordici istituti europei (di Italia, Francia e Regno Unito) coordinati dall'Acquario di Genova hanno effettuato una ricerca su due popolazioni di delfini, dalla quale risulta che 550 delfini vivono sulle rotte del versante italiano del mar Tirreno settentrionale, da Imperia all'isola d'Elba, mentre 450 si spostano dalla costa francese, fra Monaco e Tolone, alla costa della Corsica, dalla sua punta settentrionale fino ad Ajaccio. L'eccezione singolare è rappresentata da un solo delfino che «sconfina» in perfetta solitudine da Saint Tropez alla costa ligure di Levante e ritorno. Questi cetacei sono costantemente seguiti attraverso studi seri e scientificamente corretti e beneficiano di un controllo scientifico e naturalistico mirato alla loro tutela e all'approfondimento della conoscenza del loro modo di vivere, di crescere e di allevare i piccoli. Ciò nonostante, quarantacinque carcasse di delfini dall'inizio dell'anno sono finite sulle spiagge del Tirreno forse per colpa del batterio photobacterium damselae, che può portare a sindrome emolitica e lesioni ulcerative.

Può la Commissione precisare:

1. se conosce i risultati di questa ricerca;

2. se se le indagini del Ministero dell'Ambiente italiano confermano le cause della moria dei 45 delfini;

3. se sono state effettuate ricerche anche in altre zone del Mediterraneo e/o per altre popolazioni di cetacei e pesci;

4. se esistono programmi UE per la tutela dell'ambiente marino e la salvaguardia delle varie specie;

5. se è in grado di comunicare quali azioni preventive sono possibili per evitare altre morie?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(13 maggio 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della singolare moria di stenelle striate lungo le coste italiane del Tirreno. Pur non essendo al corrente dello studio citato dall'onorevole deputato, la Commissione ha avviato diversi progetti di ricerca, nell'ambito del 7° programma di ricerca, sul funzionamento degli ecosistemi marini e sull'impatto delle attività dell'uomo. Tuttavia, non è stato condotto alcuno studio specifico sui contaminanti e le altre sostanze, come ad esempio le alghe tossiche o i batteri che colpiscono le stenelle striate.

L'ambiente marino è protetto sia dalla direttiva Habitat (1992/43/CE) ([1]) che dalla direttiva quadro sulla strategia per l'ambiente marino (2008/56/CE) ([2]). La prima impone agli Stati membri di attuare le misure stabilite dall'articolo 12 per la rigorosa tutela delle specie elencate nella direttiva. In base alla seconda, gli Stati membri sono tenuti a monitorare le condizioni dei mammiferi marini nelle rispettive (sotto)regioni e adottare le misure necessarie per conseguire un buono stato ecologico entro il 2020.

Inoltre, nell'ambito della politica comune della pesca sono state adottate misure di gestione della pesca per mitigare l'impatto negativo sulle popolazioni di cetacei nel corso delle operazioni di pesca. Vanno ricordate infine le norme UE che regolano l'impiego delle reti da posta derivanti ([3]) e le misure adottate di recente dalla Commissione generale per la pesca nel Mediterraneo (GFCM), su iniziativa dell'Unione europea, per ridurre le catture accidentali di cetacei nella regione GFCM ([4]).

Fino a quando non saranno state valutate le cause della moria di delfini, la Commissione non è in grado di dire se sia possibile adottare altre misure per evitare ulteriori decessi.

([1]) GU L 206 del 22.7.1992, pag. 7.
([2]) GU L 164 del 25.6.2008, pagg. 19-40.
([3]) GU L 171 del 17.6.1998, pag. 1.
([4]) Raccomandazione GFCM/36/2012/2.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002419/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Protection of dolphins in the Mediterranean Sea

Fourteen European institutes (in Italy, France and the United Kingdom), coordinated by the Geneva Aquarium, have carried out a study on two dolphin populations which has shown that 550 dolphins live along the travel routes on the Italian side of the northern Tyrrhenian Sea, between Imperia and the island of Elba, while 450 move between the French coast (between Monaco and Toulon) and the coast of Corsica, from its northern tip down as far as Ajaccio. An odd exception is the single dolphin which crosses these 'borders', completely alone, from Saint Tropez to the Levante Riviera on the Ligurian coast and back again. These cetaceans are constantly subject to serious, scientifically sound studies, and scientific and naturalistic monitoring seeks to protect them and increase knowledge of their way of life and how they bring up their young. Despite this, the remains of 45 dolphins have washed up on Tyrrhenian beaches since the start of the year, possibly due to the photobacterium damselae bacterium, which can lead to haemolytic syndrome and ulcerative lesions.

Can the Commission state:

1. whether it is aware of the findings of this study;

2. whether investigations by the Italian Ministry of the Environment confirm the cause of death of the 45 dolphins;

3. whether research has also been carried out in other areas of the Mediterranean and/or on other cetacean and fish populations;

4. whether there are any EU programmes to protect the marine environment and to safeguard its various species;

5. whether it is able to say which preventive actions can be taken to prevent more deaths?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)

The Commission is aware of unusual death of striped dolphin stranded along the Italian coast of the Tyrrhenian Sea. Even if the Commission is not aware of the study described by the Honourable Member, the Commission has launched several research projects under the 7th Research Programme on the functioning of marine ecosystems and on impact of human activities. However, no research is specifically carried out on contaminants/and other substances such as toxic algae or bacteria potentially affecting striped dolphin.

The marine environment is protected both by the Habitat Directive (1992/43/EC) ([1]), and the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MFSD) (2008/56/EC) ([2]). Under the former, Member States have to implement measures laid down in Article 12 for the strict protection of the species listed in the directive. Moreover, within the framework laid down by the MFSD, Member States shall monitor the status of the marine mammals within their (sub) regions and take action to achieve good environmental status by 2020.

Furthermore, fisheries management measures have been taken under the common fisheries policy with a view to mitigate negative impacts on cetaceans' populations during fishing operations. It is worth mentioning the EU rules regulating the use of driftnets fisheries ([3]) and measures recently taken by the General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM), under instigation by the European Union, on mitigation of incidental catches of cetaceans in the GFCM Region ([4]).

Until the causes for the dolphins deaths have been assessed, the Commission is not in a position to say whether any actions could be taken to prevent more deaths.

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992, p. 7.
([2]) OJ L 164, 25.6.2008, p. 19-40.
([3]) OJ L 171, 17.6.1998, p. 1.
([4]) Recommandation GFCM/36/2012/2.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002420/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Acciaio sovvenzionato cinese

In un dispaccio della Reuters del 15 gennaio scorso si afferma che la Commissione europea è arrivata alla conclusione che la Cina sovvenziona illegalmente i produttori d'acciaio e — secondo fonti commerciali non meglio specificate — vuole che gli Stati membri dell'UE applichino tariffe punitive che potrebbero fare arrabbiare il secondo partner commerciale.

Anche se la notizia non è chiara, può la Commissione riferire:

1. quali sono esattamente le conclusioni a cui è giunta a proposito del sovvenzionamento cinese alla produzione dell'acciaio;

2. se sono in vigore misure provvisorie antidumping sull'acciaio e eventualmente di quale entità;

3. su quali ipotesi di dumping cinese, oltre all'acciaio, sta indagando;

4. quale è la bilancia commerciale UE/Cina nel settore dell'acciaio per il 2012;

5. cosa c'è di vero sulle tariffe punitive che dovrebbero applicare gli Stati membri dell'UE?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(14 maggio 2013)

In seguito ad indagini approfondite la Commissione ha constatato che le esportazioni di acciaio sovvenzionato a rivestimento organico oggetto di dumping e originario della Cina causano un notevole pregiudizio all'industria dell'Unione. In base a una proposta della Commissione il Consiglio ha imposto dazi compensativi definitivi e dazi antidumping su tali prodotti in data 15 marzo 2013. I regolamenti con cui si prendono i due tipi di provvedimento sono pubblicati nella Gazzetta ufficiale dell'Unione europea (GU L 73 del 15.3.2013, pagg. 1 e 16). I dazi suddetti non costituiscono provvedimenti punitivi; costituiscono invece una compensazione del pregiudizio causato dalle sovvenzioni sleali a norma delle normative dell'Unione e dell'OMC.

Nel 2012 l'Unione europea ha importato prodotti di ghisa e di acciaio dalla Cina per un valore totale di 3,5 miliardi di euro, quota che supera del 60 % circa il valore delle esportazioni UE dei medesimi prodotti in Cina.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002420/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Subsidised Chinese steel

On 15 January, a Reuters dispatch stated that the Commission had come to the conclusion that China was illegally subsidising steel producers and — according to unspecified commercial sources — that it wanted EU Member States to apply punitive tariffs which could anger our second most important trading partner.

Even though the news may not be clear, can the Commission state:

1. what were the exact conclusions it arrived at concerning Chinese subsidies for steel production;

2. whether temporary anti-dumping measures are in force for steel and, if so, what is their extent;

3. which possible Chinese dumping practices it is investigating, apart from steel;

4. what was the EU/China trade balance in the steel sector for 2012;

5. what truth is there in the story about the punitive tariffs which the EU Member States should apply?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)

After thorough investigations the Commission found that dumped and subsidised exports from China of organic coated steel cause material injury to the EU industry. Based on a Commission proposal, the Council therefore imposed definitive countervailing and anti-dumping duties on such imports on 15 March 2013. Both regulations are published in the *Official Journal of the European Union* (OJ L 73, 15.3.2013, p. 1 and p. 16). The duties in question are not punitive measures but are intended to offset the injurious effect of unfair subsidies and dumping, in accordance with EU and WTO rules.

In 2012 the European Union imports of iron and steel manufactures from China amounted to EUR 3.5 billion, a bit more than 60% above the value of the EU exports of such products to China.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002421/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 febbraio 2013)

Oggetto: Lana di pecora per l'edilizia

Dalla pastorizia passa all'edilizia. È noto che la crisi dell'allevamento delle pecore dipendeva in gran parte dai costi elevati per produrla e da quelli della lana da smaltire, perché considerata rifiuto speciale. Ora invece, anziché smaltirla, un'azienda sarda la usa per coibentare le case e gli appartamenti esposti temporaneamente all'Expo 2015 di Milano. Il vello, infatti, (quello delle pecore sarde è eccellente) è un ottimo isolante termico, evita i fenomeni di condensa, è antimuffa e battericida, è una barriera contro il rumore, migliora l'acustica dell'ambiente, non attira né accumula polvere, è ignifugo, prende fuoco con difficoltà, sviluppa poco calore e poco fumo. L'azienda in questione ne ha fatto dei cuscinetti isolanti, facili da collocare ed ecosostenibili. Il suo uso si estende anche ad altri settori «green», come un particolare geotessile di lana di pecora, specifico per i pannelli solari che consente un incremento di produzione energetica. Sono allo studio anche soluzioni per l'agricoltura, in alternativa ai teli di plastica, e per l'arredamento (imbottitura di poltrone e divani).

Può la Commissione precisare:

1. se è al corrente di questa innovazione;

2. se ritiene che risolva i problemi di molti settori legati all'ecosostenibilità;

3. se pensa che l'utilizzo del vello, eliminando il suo smaltimento a costi elevati e risolvendo in parte il problema dei rifiuti speciali, possa produrre un'economia di spesa e contribuire alla tutela dell'ambiente in quanto materiale non inquinante;

4. se ritiene di incentivare questa pratica innovativa?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(11 aprile 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'esistenza di prodotti come quelli menzionati dall'onorevole deputata. Un numero ridotto degli stessi è stato valutato quasi dieci anni fa e reca la marcatura CE valida per i prodotti per isolamento termico in forza della direttiva 89/106/CEE sui prodotti da costruzione.

L'uso della lana quale materia prima per i prodotti per isolamento termico può ridurre il flusso di rifiuti e contribuire così, in certa misura, alla sostenibilità ambientale, determinando risparmi in relazione ai costi di smaltimento di tali rifiuti.

La Commissione è sempre favorevole alle soluzioni ecologiche. Tuttavia, al fine di assicurare condizioni di equità nel settore, la Commissione non intende promuovere l'uso di certi tipi di prodotti a detrimento di altri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002421/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Sheep's wool for the construction sector

Wool is moving from sheep farming to the construction sector. It is a well-known fact that the crisis in sheep farming was largely due to the high costs to produce wool, and to dispose of it, since it is classed as special waste. Now however, instead of disposing of it, a Sardinian company is using it to insulate houses and flats on temporary display at Expo 2015 in Milan. Indeed, fleece (that produced by Sardinian sheep is top quality) is an excellent heat insulator. It prevents condensation, has anti-mould and bactericidal properties, acts as a sound barrier, improves room acoustics, does not attract or accumulate dust, is fire retardant, is slow to catch fire and does not give off much heat or smoke. The company in question has made insulating pads out of fleece that are easy to fit and are environmentally sustainable. Its use also extends to other green sectors, such as a special geotextile made from sheep's wool, specifically for use in solar panels to increase energy production. Products are also being developed for agriculture, as an alternative to plastic sheets, and for furniture (armchair and settee padding).

Can the Commission state:

1. whether it is aware of this innovation;

2. whether it believes that this solves the problems of many sectors connected to environmental sustainability;

3. whether it believes that, by eliminating the costly disposal of fleece and resolving in part the problem of special waste, the use of fleece can lead to savings and help protect the environment since it is not a pollutant;

4. whether it intends to encourage this innovative practice?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)

The Commission is aware of the existence of products like those mentioned by the Honourable Member. A small number of them has been assessed almost 10 years ago and bear the CE marking as thermal insulation products under the Construction Products Directive 89/106/EEC.

The use of wool as a raw material for thermal insulation products can reduce the waste stream and can therefore contribute, to a certain extent, to environmental sustainability and can result in cost savings related to the disposal of such waste.

The Commission is always in favour of environmental friendly solutions. However, in the interest of a level-playing field in the sector, the Commission does not intend to promote the use of certain kinds of products to the detriment of others.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002422/13
to the Commission
Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Marketing ban under Directive 2003/15/EC

Commissioner Borg has clarified that the timetables contained in Article 1 of Directive 2003/15/EC ([1]), updated by Article 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 ([2]), will come into effect on 11 March 2013. The marketing of cosmetics will thereby be prohibited in the EU where, 'to meet the requirements of this directive', the final product and ingredients have been tested on animals. The ban will apply for all tests used. The words 'to meet the requirements of this directive' are being interpreted differently by different Member States.

The marketing ban under Directive 2003/15/EC, which Parliament has been calling for over the past 20 years, was designed specifically to ensure that companies could not evade controls on the marketing of cosmetic products by exporting their testing of products on animals to third countries. Allowing companies to market products tested on animals in third countries, under other regulatory regimes, will defeat the purpose of the regulation. It will also be impossible to establish why a company was testing on animals, as the answer will always be that it was done in accordance with another regulatory regime, thus rendering the marketing ban meaningless.

Can the Commission confirm that, after 11 March 2013, companies who wish to market their cosmetics products in the EU will not be able to do so if these products or their ingredients have been tested on animals, regardless of where these products or ingredients have been tested, and regardless of why these products or their ingredients have been tested?

If this is not the case, can the Commission state how it will establish the intent of a company which has tested its cosmetic product or ingredients on animals and, thus, whether the company in question is in breach of the regulation?

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

The Commission recognises the importance of a coherent implementation of the marketing ban by Member States. It has therefore outlined its understanding of the scope of the ban in the recent Commission Communication on the animal testing and marketing ban and on the state of play in relation to alternative methods in the field of cosmetics ([3]), acknowledging that only the Court of Justice of the European Union can provide a legally binding interpretation.

Results of cosmetic-specific testing performed outside the Union cannot be used to support the marketing of a cosmetic product in the Union. This will prevent that such testing is simply exported. The Commission considers however that animal testing that is clearly demonstrated to have been motivated by compliance with non-cosmetics related legislative frameworks should not be considered to have been carried out 'in order to meet the requirements of this directive/Regulation'. In this case the animal testing should not trigger the marketing ban and the resulting data could subsequently be relied on in the cosmetics safety assessment.

The communication also outlines the existing enforcement mechanisms. The product information file is the key tool for Member States to verify which data is relied on in the safety assessment and whether there is an infringement of the marketing ban. The file must allow verification on whether the testing was carried out in order to meet the requirements of the directive/Regulation or for other purposes. Where needed, the Commission will work with Member States on guidance for the application of the 2013 marketing ban based on practical experiences and concrete case studies.

([1]) OJ L 66, 11.3.2003, p. 26.
([2]) OJ L 342, 22.12.2009, p.71.
([3]) COM(2013)135 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-002423/13
adresată Comisiei
Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE)
(28 februarie 2013)

Subiect: Modificarea Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1083/2006

La punctul 87 din concluziile Consiliului European din 7-8 februarie 2013, Comisia este invitată să analizeze, în cazul României și al Slovaciei, soluții practice pentru reducerea dezangajării automate a fondurilor din pachetul financiar național pentru perioada 2007-2013, inclusiv modificarea Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1083/2006.

Aceste prevederi ar trebui puse în aplicare înainte de a se ajunge la un acord privind viitorul cadru financiar multianual (CFM), având în vedere faptul că poziția în ceea ce privește CFM depinde în mare parte de măsurile prevăzute în vederea asigurării modificării rapide a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1083/2006.

1. A instituit Comisia mecanismele necesare pentru inițierea procedurii de modificare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1083/2006?

2. A convenit Comisia asupra unui calendar pentru transmiterea propunerii de modificare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1083/2006 Parlamentului și Consiliului?

Răspuns dat de dl Hahn în numele Comisiei
(2 aprilie 2013)

În conformitate cu cerințele cuprinse în concluziile Consiliului European, Comisia analizează în prezent toate soluțiile practice pentru reducerea dezangajării automate a fondurilor din alocările pentru perioada 2007-2013 pentru România și Slovacia și a purtat deja discuții cu statele membre în cauză.

În ultimii ani, Comisia a folosit deja mai multe posibilități, conform cadrului juridic actual, pentru a ajuta statele membre să accelereze absorbția. Comisia este dispusă să discute utilizarea în continuare a opțiunilor disponibile pentru accelerarea absorbției, dar subliniază că acest lucru trebuie să respecte cadrul bunei gestiuni financiare și să nu creeze riscuri suplimentare de corecție financiară.

Este, de asemenea, extrem de important ca România și Slovacia să depună, în continuare, eforturi politice și operaționale pentru a îmbunătăți absorbția și a accelera punerea în aplicare. Punerea în aplicare a programelor din cadrul politicii de coeziune constituie responsabilitatea primară și prioritară a statelor membre respective. Nu a fost adoptată până în prezent nicio decizie cu privire la o eventuală propunere de modificare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1083/2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002423/13
to the Commission
Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE)
(28 February 2013)

Subject: Amendment of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006

In paragraph 87 of the European Council conclusions of 7-8 February 2013, the Commission is invited to explore, for Romania and Slovakia, practical solutions for reducing the automatic de-commitment of funds from the 2007-2013 national envelope, including the amendment of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006.

These provisions should be implemented before an agreement on the future multiannual financial framework (MFF) is reached, given that the position on the MFF agreement is heavily contingent on the measures envisaged in order to ensure the swift amendment of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006.

1. Has the Commission set up the necessary mechanisms to initiate the procedure for amending Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006?

2. Has the Commission agreed on a timetable for sending the proposal to amend Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 to Parliament and the Council?

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

As requested in the European Council conclusions, the Commission is currently exploring all practical solutions for reducing the automatic decommitment of funds from the 2007-2013 allocations for Romania and Slovakia, and has already held discussions with those Member States.

During the past years, the Commission has already made use of many possibilities within the current legal framework to help Member States accelerate absorption. The Commission is willing to discuss further use of the options available to accelerate absorption, but underlines that this must be within the framework of sound financial management and should not create additional financial correction risks.

It is also of utmost importance that Romania and Slovakia continue political and operational efforts to improve the absorption and speed up the implementation. The implementation of cohesion policy programmes is first and foremost their responsibility. No decision has yet been taken on whether to propose an amendment of Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002425/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(1 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Divergencias en el cómputo del déficit público

Mariano Rajoy, Presidente del Gobierno central del Estado español, ha declarado que el déficit de España para el año 2012 es del 6,7 % ([1]). Por el contrario, el Comisario Rehn considera que el déficit del Estado ha sido del 10,2 % teniendo en cuenta el impacto del rescate bancario en las finanzas públicas ([2]).

Por otro lado, la subasta de Catalunya Caixa significará un aumento de 1 600 millones adicionales al déficit público, pues el FROB ha otorgado finalmente una serie de garantías a los interesados sobre el crédito fiscal que acumula la entidad catalana que se consideran como ayudas de Estado ([3]).

Finalmente cabe remarcar que en el caso de Grecia, Portugal e Irlanda, que también han recibido ayuda europea para sanear sus finanzas o su sector bancario, el importe del préstamo otorgado ha sido computado cómo déficit y deuda.

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿Mantiene la Comisión que el déficit del Estado español para el año 2012 ha sido del 10,2 % del PIB?

¿Cree la Comisión que el impacto del rescate bancario debe ser contado cómo déficit para el año 2012 así como en el cómputo de la deuda total del Estado español y el cálculo de la sostenibilidad de sus finanzas?

¿Tendrá en cuenta la Comisión el impacto añadido de la subasta de Catalunya Caixa?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002531/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Aplicación del capítulo V del Reglamento (UE) n° 1173/2011

Mariano Rajoy, Presidente del Gobierno central del Estado español, ha declarado que el déficit de España para el año 2012 es del 6,7 % ([4]). Por el contrario, el Comisario Rehn considera que el déficit del Estado ha sido del 10,2 % teniendo en cuenta el impacto del rescate bancario en las finanzas públicas ([5]).

El capítulo V del Reglamento (UE) n° 1173/2011 se titula «Sanciones por manipulación de estadísticas». En su artículo 8.1, el texto dice literalmente: «1. El Consejo, sobre la base de una recomendación de la Comisión, podrá decidir la imposición de una multa a un Estado miembro que intencionalmente o por negligencia grave tergiverse datos relativos al déficit y a la deuda que sean pertinentes para la aplicación de los artículos 121 ó 126 del TFUE y del Protocolo sobre el déficit excesivo anejo al TUE y al TFUE.»

A la luz de lo anterior,

¿Mantiene la Comisión que el déficit del Estado español para el año 2012 ha sido del 10,2 % del PIB?

¿Piensa emitir la Comisión una recomendación en los términos enunciados por el artículo 8.1 del Reglamento (UE) n° 1173/2011?

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/02/27/actualidad/1361953992_490905.html
([2]) http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-22/spain-s-deficit-widened-to-10-2-on-bank-rescue-cost-eu.html
([3]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/02/28/la-subasta-de-catalunyacaixa-anadira-otros-1600-millones-al-deficit-publico-115840/
([4]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/02/27/actualidad/1361953992_490905.html
([5]) http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-22/spain-s-deficit-widened-to-10-2-on-bank-rescue-cost-eu.html

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de abril de 2013)

En las previsiones de invierno de 2013 de los servicios de la Comisión, que incluía la información disponible hasta el 15 de febrero, el déficit de las administraciones públicas en 2012 se estimó en el 10,2 % del PIB. Esta cifra se basó en el supuesto de que las recapitalizaciones de entidades bancarias tendrían una incidencia en el déficit cifrada en 33,5 millones de euros (3,2 % del PIB). Excluidos los efectos de las recapitalizaciones de esas entidades, el déficit se estima en el 7,0 %. El Gobierno español ha confirmado recientemente esta última estimación. La Comisión no considera que la comunicación por el Gobierno español de la cifra de déficit, excluidas las recapitalizaciones de entidades bancarias, justifique la aplicación del artículo 8, apartado 1, del Reglamento (UE) n° 1173/2011. Según las normas de la UE, las autoridades españolas notificaron oficialmente a Eurostat los resultados presupuestarios de 2012 a finales de marzo y Eurostat validará estas cuentas a más tardar el 22 de abril. Los datos validados se tendrán en cuenta en las previsiones de primavera de 2013 de los servicios de la Comisión. Siguiendo los principios establecidos, Eurostat decide caso por caso hasta qué punto afecta la recapitalización de una entidad bancaria determinada al déficit de las administraciones públicas.

En relación con la pregunta específica sobre Catalunya Caixa, la venta (subasta) no se ha celebrado todavía, por lo que es demasiado pronto para hacer comentarios sobre esta operación en concreto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002425/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Inconsistencies in calculations of Spain's public deficit

The Spanish Prime Minister, Mariano Rajoy, has declared that Spain's deficit for 2012 is 6.7% of the GDP ([1]). In contrast, Commissioner Rehn believes Spain's 2012 deficit figure to be 10.2% of GDP, having taken into account the impact of the bank bailout on public finances ([2]).

In addition, the auction of Catalunya Caixa would add EUR 1.6 billion to the budget deficit, since the Fund for Orderly Bank Restructuring (FROB) has finally given interested buyers a number of guarantees under which tax allowances accumulated by the Catalan bank will be regarded as state aid ([3]).

Finally, in the cases of Greece, Portugal and Ireland, which have also received European aid to improve the state of their public finances or banking sectors, the loan granted was taken into account in the deficit and debt figures.

In the light of the above:

Does the Commission still maintain that Spain's debt for 2012 was 10.2% of GDP?

Does the Commission consider that the impact of the banking sector bailout should be included in the figures for the deficit for 2012, as well as in the calculation of Spain's total debt and when determining the sustainability of its finances?

Will the Commission take into account the added impact of the Catalunya Caixa auction?

Question for written answer E-002531/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Application of Chapter V of Regulation (EU) No 1173/2011

Spanish Prime Minister Mariano Rajoy has said that Spain's deficit for 2012 was 6.7% ([4]). Commissioner Rehn, however, believes that the country's deficit was 10.2% given the impact of the bank bailout on public finances ([5]).

Chapter V of Regulation (EU) No 1173/2011 is entitled 'Sanctions Concerning the Manipulation of Statistics'. Article 8.1 of the regulation states that: '1. The Council, acting on a recommendation by the Commission, may decide to impose a fine on a Member State that intentionally or by serious negligence misrepresents deficit and debt data relevant for the application of Articles 121 or 126 TFEU, or for the application of the Protocol on the excessive deficit procedure annexed to the TEU and to the TFEU.'

Does the Commission maintain that the Spanish deficit for 2012 was 10.2% of GDP?

Does it intend to issue a recommendation under the terms set out in Article 8.1 of Regulation (EU) No 1173/2011?

([1]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/02/27/actualidad/1361953992_490905.html
([2]) http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-22/spain-s-deficit-widened-to-10-2-on-bank-rescue-cost-eu.html
([3]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/02/28/la-subasta-de-catalunyacaixa-anadira-otros-1600-millones-al-deficit-publico-115840/.
([4]) http://economia.elpais.com/economia/2013/02/27/actualidad/1361953992_490905.html
([5]) http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-22/spain-s-deficit-widened-to-10-2-on-bank-rescue-cost-eu.html

Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

In the 2013 Commission services' winter forecast, which included information available up to the date of 15 February, the 2012 general government deficit was estimated at 10.2% of GDP. This was based on the assumption that bank recapitalisations would have an impact on the deficit of EUR 33.5 billion (or 3.2% of GDP). Excluding impact of bank recapitalisations, the deficit was estimated at 7.0%. This latter estimate was confirmed recently by the Spanish Government. The Commission does not consider that the communication by the Spanish Government on the deficit figure excluding the impact of bank recapitalisations is a matter for application of Article 8.1 of Regulation (EC) No 1173/2011. According to EU rules, the Spanish authorities have notified officially Eurostat about the 2012 fiscal outcome at the end of March and Eurostat will validate these accounts by 22 April. The validated data will be reflected in the 2013 Commission services' spring forecast. Following established principles, Eurostat decides on a case-by-case basis to what extent a given bank recapitalisation affects the general government deficit.

Concerning the specific question about Catalunya Caixa, the sale (auction) has not yet taken place. It is therefore too early to comment on this specific transaction.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002426/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(1 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Nacionalización de autopistas

El Gobierno español se propone la nacionalización de nueve autopistas que se encuentran cerca de la quiebra ([1]). Este rescate de las concesiones con problemas será pactado con las entidades financieras acreedoras, los socios de las empresas y las constructoras. Según la información de Expansión, esta medida tendría impacto por un valor inferior a 4 000 millones de euros.

Esto sucede porque una gran parte de la red de carreteras de vía rápida del Estado español no son de pago. Esta sobreoferta quita incentivos a los consumidores para utilizar las vías de pago.

Por otro lado, el libro blanco de la CE apunta que se debería de hacer obligatoria la implantación de la euroviñeta para los vehículos pesados antes del 2016 y extenderla a la totalidad de los vehículos antes del 2020.

A la luz de todo lo anterior,

¿Cree la Comisión que la quiebra de las autopistas demuestra la ineficacia del modelo dual actual?

¿Cree la Comisión que el Estado español debe acelerar la transición hacia un modelo de euroviñeta?

¿Qué impacto calcula la Comisión que pueda tener esta medida para las finanzas del Estado español?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de abril de 2013)

1. Cuando se ofrece a los usuarios la posibilidad de elegir entre una autopista de peaje y una gratuita que transcurre en paralelo, es razonable suponer que algunos de ellos elegirán la solución gratuita, en la medida en que esta última no esté demasiado congestionada y tenga una calidad comparable. Muchos Estados miembros (por ejemplo, Polonia, Alemania, Portugal y próximamente Francia) han ampliado sus sistemas de peaje existentes, con el fin de evitar tales desviaciones del tráfico y de financiar el mantenimiento de la red. Sin embargo, otros Estados miembros (por ejemplo, España y Reino Unido) han decidido que una parte o la totalidad de su red de vías rápidas sea gratuita.

La Comisión no está en condiciones de iniciar una investigación para determinar si el sistema español de carreteras de peaje y gratuitas es «eficaz». Las autoridades españolas serían más adecuadas para llevar a cabo esta tarea.

2. El Libro Blanco sobre los transportes de 2011 ([2]) preconiza ampliar la aplicación del principio de pago por utilización y del principio de quien contamina paga. Los peajes basados en la distancia recorrida son la herramienta más eficaz para imponer gravámenes a los vehículos pesados por los costes de las infraestructuras, así como para las externalidades locales, como la contaminación acústica y atmosférica y la congestión del tráfico.

Por consiguiente, la Comisión acoge favorablemente y promueve una amplia implantación de los sistemas de tarificación para vehículos pesados de transporte de mercancías en función de la distancia recorrida, tal como ha indicado en su reciente Comunicación relativa a la imposición de tasas nacionales a los vehículos particulares ligeros por el uso de la infraestructura vial ([3]).

Esta implantación debería cumplir la legislación pertinente de la UE, en particular las Directivas 1999/62/CE ([4]) y 2004/52/CE ([5]).

3. La Comisión no dispone de medios para evaluar el impacto de medidas hipotéticas.

([1]) http://www.expansion.com/2013/02/28/empresas/inmobiliario/1362052269.html?a=e6b3992b95f0b8cf4a0e84d5a1abc18c&t=1362053425
([2]) Libro Blanco — Hoja de ruta hacia un espacio único europeo de transporte: por una política de transportes competitiva y sostenible, COM(2011) 144 final.
([3]) COM(2012) 199 final.
([4]) Directiva 1999/62/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 17 de junio de 1999, relativa a la aplicación de gravámenes a los vehículos pesados de transporte de mercancías por la utilización de determinadas infraestructuras (DO L 187 de 20.7.1999).
([5]) Directiva 2004/52/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 29 de abril de 2004, relativa a la interoperabilidad de los sistemas de telepeaje de las carreteras de la Comunidad (DO L 166 de 30.4.2004).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002426/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Nationalisation of motorways in Spain

The Spanish Government is planning to nationalise nine motorway concessions which are close to bankruptcy ([1]). A rescue plan for the struggling concessions will be finalised in agreement with financial lending institutions, motorway concession shareholders and construction companies. According to information on the *Expansión* newspaper website, this step would cost less than EUR 4 billion of public funds.

This situation has arisen because large sections of Spain's fast road network are not toll roads. The many options available to road users mean that there is no incentive to take the toll roads.

The Commission White Paper suggests that the eurovignette should be made obligatory for heavy vehicles by 2016 and for all vehicles by 2020.

In the light of the above:

Does the Commission agree that the fact that some motorway concessions are on the brink of bankruptcy proves that the current system of toll and non-toll roads is ineffective?

Does the Commission agree that Spain should move more quickly towards a eurovignette system?

What financial impact does the Commission estimate that this measure could have on Spain's public finances?

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

1. When users are offered the choice between a tolled motorway and a toll-free highway running in parallel, it can reasonably be expected that a number of them will choose the toll-free solution, as long as it is not too congested and the quality of the road is comparable. Many Member States (e.g. Poland, Germany, Portugal and soon France) have widened their tolling schemes in order to prevent such traffic diversion and to finance the maintenance of the network. However, other Member States (e.g. Spain, the United Kingdom) have decided to leave all or part of their high-capacity network toll-free.

The Commission is not in a position to undertake research to establish whether the Spanish system of toll and non-toll roads is 'effective'. This would best be done by the Spanish authorities.

2. The 2011 White Paper on transport ([2]) calls for a wider application of the 'user-pays' and 'polluter-pays' principles. Distance-based tolls are the most efficient tool for charging heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) for the infrastructure costs, as well as for local externalities such as noise, air pollution and congestion.

The Commission would therefore welcome and encourage the wider deployment of distance-based charging for HGVs as outlined in its recent Communication on the application of national road infrastructure charges levied on light private vehicles ([3]). Such a deployment, would have to comply with relevant EU legislation, in particular with Directives 1999/62/EC ([4]) and 2004/52/EC ([5]).

3. The Commission does not have the resources to estimate the impact of hypothetical measures.

([1]) http://www.expansion.com/2013/02/28/empresas/inmobiliario/1362052269.html?a=e6b3992b95f0b8cf4a0e84d5a1abc18c&t=1362053425
([2]) White Paper Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area — Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system, COM(2011)0144 final.
([3]) COM(2012) 199 final.
([4]) Directive 1999/62/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 1999 on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures, OJ L 187, 20.7.1999.
([5]) Directive 2004/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the interoperability of electronic road toll systems in the Community, OJ L 166, 30.4.2004.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002427/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(1 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Distribución del déficit

Cristóbal Montoro, Ministro de Hacienda del Gobierno español, ha anunciado que Cataluña ha tenido un déficit equivalente al 1,96 % de su PIB ([1]). Para el año 2013 exige un objetivo de déficit del 0,7 % a pesar de la recesión prevista por la CE. Cataluña gestiona la sanidad, la educación y el bienestar social, y este objetivo de déficit y el ajuste que acarreará repercutirán negativamente en su cohesión social. El objetivo de déficit para España en 2013 es del 4,5 %, y, si se redistribuyera internamente con criterios proporcionales al gasto, correspondería a un objetivo del 1,5 % para Cataluña.

Finalmente, cabe recordar que el pasado mes de diciembre, el Parlamento Europeo aprobó el informe Pallone sobre finanzas públicas en la Unión en el que se decía textualmente: «28. Notes that fiscal consolidation efforts should be shared between the different administrations in a fair way, taking into account the services they provide;» y «30. Calls on Member States with budgetary problems to give priority to fiscal consolidation measures aimed at reducing unnecessary defence expenditures such as purchases of new and expensive military equipment;»

A la luz de todo lo anterior,

¿Qué opina la Comisión del principio enunciado en el punto 28 del informe Pallone? ¿Y del 30?

¿Está de acuerdo la Comisión en que el gasto de defensa se mantenga ([2]) mientras se imponen recortes en los servicios sociales?

¿No cree la Comisión que recortar de nuevo en servicios sociales será perjudicial para el crecimiento?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión hace hincapié en que, a fin de encontrar una solución a sus efectos negativos en el empleo y el crecimiento a corto plazo, los saneamientos presupuestarios deben llevarse a cabo de forma diferenciada y favorable al crecimiento, dando prioridad a los gastos en sectores de la investigación y desarrollo y la educación, así como a proyectos concretos y bien enfocados que tengan las mayores probabilidades de mejorar la capacidad de crecimiento. La Comisión también considera importante que el saneamiento sea justo para proteger a las capas más débiles de la población.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20130228/54367240260/1-96-deficit-catalunya-2012.html
([2]) http://www.centredelas.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=965%3Alas-trampas-del-presupuesto-militar-del-ano-2013&catid=42%3Aeconomia-de-defensa&Itemid=63&lang=es

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002427/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Distribution of the deficit

The Minister of Finance of the Spanish Government, Cristóbal Montoro, has announced that Catalonia has a deficit equivalent to 1.96% of its GDP ([1]). A deficit target of 0.7% has been set for the year 2013, in spite of the recession forecast by the Commission. Catalonia manages health, education and social welfare, and this deficit target and the resulting adjustment will have a negative impact on Catalonia's social cohesion. The 2013 deficit target for Spain is 4.5% and, if it is redistributed internally in proportion to spending, the target for Catalonia would be 1.5%.

Lastly, it should be recalled that in December 2012, Parliament approved the Pallone report on public finances in the EU which stated: '28. Notes that fiscal consolidation efforts should be shared between the different administrations in a fair way, taking into account the services they provide;' and '30. Calls on Member States with budgetary problems to give priority to fiscal consolidation measures aimed at reducing unnecessary defence expenditures such as purchases of new and expensive military equipment;'

In light of the above:

What is the Commission's opinion of the principle described in point 28 of the Pallone report? What is its opinion of point 30?

Does the Commission agree that defence expenditures should be maintained ([2]) while cuts are being applied to social services?

Does the Commission not believe that cutting social services again will be harmful for growth?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

The Commission stresses that in order to assuage the negative effects on employment and growth in the short term, fiscal consolidations should be conducted in a differentiated, growth-friendly manner by prioritising expenditure areas such as R&D, education and specific, well-targeted investment projects which have the largest probability of increasing growth potential. The Commission also considers it important that the consolidation is fair, in order to protect the weaker part of the population.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20130228/54367240260/1-96-deficit-catalunya-2012.html
([2]) http://www.centredelas.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=965%3Alas-trampas-del-presupuesto-militar-del-ano-2013&catid=42%3Aeconomia-de-defensa&Itemid=63&lang=es.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002428/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(1 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Distribución del déficit

Cristóbal Montoro, Ministro de Hacienda del Gobierno español, ha anunciado que Cataluña ha hecho un déficit equivalente al 1,96 % sobre su PIB ([1]). Para el año 2013 exige un objetivo de déficit del 0,7 % a pesar de la recesión prevista por la CE. Cataluña gestiona la sanidad, la educación y bienestar social, y este objetivo de déficit y el ajuste que acarreará repercutirá negativamente en su cohesión social. El objetivo de déficit para España en 2013 es 4,5 %, si se redistribuyera internamente con criterios proporcionales al gasto (las comunidades tienen el 33 % del gasto total), se traduciría en un objetivo del 1,5 % para Cataluña. Mientras tanto, a una misiva del Consejero de Economía de Cataluña, el Comisario Rehn ha respondido que el reparto del déficit entre las autonomías es un asunto interno de España.

Por otro lado, la Comisión ha trabajado y trabaja con objetivos de déficit flexibles para los Estados, que se ajustan a las circunstancias de cada momento. Así, por ejemplo, se solicitaba a España que el déficit para 2011 fuera el 6 %, para 2012 el 4,5 % y para 2013 el 3 % ([2]). Cabe señalar que la caída máxima del déficit que se contemplaba era del 33 %, aunque finalmente también estos objetivos han sido relajados con posterioridad. En cambio el Gobierno español exige a Cataluña una disminución interanual mayor del 50 %. Se sobreentiende, pues, que si la Comisión no ha exigido nunca disminuciones interanuales tan bruscas es porque serían contraproducentes para el desarrollo de la economía.

A la luz de todo lo anterior, ¿ha propuesto la Comisión en el pasado a algún Estado miembro disminuciones interanuales del objetivo de déficit superiores al 60 % en un entorno económico recesivo? En caso afirmativo, ¿qué razones motivaron dichas recomendaciones?

¿Cuáles serían los efectos multiplicadores para el crecimiento de un ajuste por valor de más del 60 % del déficit en España en 2013?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(3 de mayo de 2013)

Sobre la cuestión del reparto del ajuste presupuestario entre los distintos niveles de la administración, la Comisión no tiene nada que añadir a la respuesta enviada por el Miembro de la Comisión responsable de los Asuntos Económicos y Monetarios al «Conseller» catalán de Economía y Conocimiento.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20130228/54367240260/1-96-deficit-catalunya-2012.html
([2]) http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704506004576174231121973572.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002428/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Distribution of the deficit

Spain's Finance Minister, Cristóbal Montoro, has announced that Catalonia has a deficit equivalent to 1.96% of its GDP ([1]). A deficit target of 0.7% has been set for 2013, in spite of the recession forecast by the Commission. The Catalonian Government is responsible for health, education and social welfare, and this deficit target and the resulting adjustment will have a negative impact on social cohesion in Catalonia. Spain's deficit target for 2013 is 4.5%. If that were to be redistributed internally in proportion to spending (the Autonomous Communities account for 33% of total spending), the target for Catalonia would be 1.5%. Commissioner Rehn, in his reply to a letter from Catalonia's Economy Minister, stated that dividing the deficit between the Autonomous Communities is an internal matter for Spain.

However, the Commission has worked and continues to work with flexible deficit targets for Member States that can be adjusted to suit the prevailing situation. For instance, Spain was asked to meet a deficit target of over 6% in 2011, 4.5% in 2012 and 3% in 2013 ([2]). The maximum deficit reduction considered was 33%, although ultimately these objectives too had to be relaxed. In contrast, the Spanish Government is calling on Catalonia to make a year-on-year reduction of more than 50%. The implication here is that the Commission did not call for such abrupt year-on-year reductions because they would be counter-productive where economic development is concerned.

In the light of the foregoing, can the Commission state whether it has ever recommended that a Member State in recession make year-on-year deficit target reductions of over 60%? If so, what were the reasons behind its recommendations?

What domino effects would there be on growth as a result of an adjustment of more than 60% of the deficit in Spain in 2013?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2013)

On the matter of the distribution of the fiscal adjustment amongst government levels, the Commission does not have anything to add to the reply sent by the Member of the Commission responsible for Economic and Monetary Affairs to Catalonia's Minister of Economy and Knowledge.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/economia/20130228/54367240260/1-96-deficit-catalunya-2012.html
([2]) http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704506004576174231121973572.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002429/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(1 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Asentamientos Israel

Con fecha de 28 de febrero de 2013 se publicó en diversos medios de comunicación que los jefes de las misiones diplomáticas de la Unión Europea en Jerusalén habían enviado a Bruselas el informe anual interno sobre la situación del conflicto en la ciudad efectuando sus propias recomendaciones.

En este sentido parece que se recomienda a los países miembros que se aseguren de que sus Gobiernos y empresas no invierten fondos ni participen en transacciones comerciales o financieras con los asentamientos de colonos judíos en Cisjordania y Jerusalén Este, que, según su interpretación del Derecho internacional, son ilegales.

No se refería a un «boicot directo» sino a la obligación de que esos productos cumplan con las «normas de origen y etiquetado» y a que «no se beneficien de aranceles prioritarios» para respetar el derecho de los ciudadanos europeos a estar informados de los productos que deciden comprar.

En este sentido,

1. ¿Podría indicar la Alta Representante si ha recibido dicha carta y exactamente si las afirmaciones arriba indicadas son correctas?

2. ¿Se ha notificado a los Estados miembros el contenido de la carta?

3. ¿Piensa instar la Alta Representante a los Estados miembros a que tomen alguna medida conjunta o individual en consonancia con el contenido de la carta?

4. ¿En el supuesto de que no exista la documentación referida y teniendo en cuenta la problemática de los asentamientos piensa la UE tomar alguna medida al respecto?

Respuesta de la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de mayo de 2013)

El informe de 2012 de los jefes de misión de la UE sobre Jerusalén Este es un informe anual dirigido al Comité Político y de Seguridad de la UE acerca de la situación sobre el terreno. Este informe interno está destinado a servir como fuente de información para la UE y como aportación para su proceso de elaboración de políticas. Como tal, debe ayudar a la UE a determinar cuál es el mejor modo de realizar el objetivo de una solución con dos Estados para el proceso de paz de Oriente Próximo. Es lamentable que, una vez más, el informe se haya filtrado.

De conformidad con las conclusiones de los Consejos de Asuntos Exteriores de la UE de 14 de mayo y 10 de diciembre de 2012 sobre el Proceso de Paz de Oriente Próximo, se está aplicando plenamente la legislación de la UE vigente pertinente. La UE ha mantenido de forma sistemática que el ámbito geográfico de aplicación del Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Israel se limita al Estado de Israel dentro de sus fronteras de 1967. Por consiguiente, todos los productos originarios de los asentamientos están sujetos a tipos de derecho no preferenciales cuando se despachan a libre práctica en la EU.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002429/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Israeli settlements

On 28 February 2013, various media sources published the story that the heads of EU diplomatic missions in Jerusalem had sent the annual internal report on the conflict in the city to Brussels, making their own recommendations.

In this regard, the report seems to recommend that Member States ensure that their governments and companies do not invest funds or participate in commercial or financial transactions with the Jewish settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, which, according to the report's interpretation of international law, are illegal.

It did not refer to a 'direct boycott' but to the fact that these products must comply with 'rules of origin and labelling' and that they should 'not benefit from preferential tariffs' in order to respect European citizens' right to make an informed decision about the products they buy.

In this regard,

1. Could the High Representative indicate whether she has received this report and whether the above statements are correct?

2. Have the Member States been notified of the content of the report?

3. Does the High Representative intend to encourage the Member States to take any joint or individual measures in accordance with the content of the report?

4. If the aforementioned documentation did not exist, and taking into account the problem of the settlements, would the EU consider taking any measures with regard to this matter?

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

The 2012 EU Heads of Mission report on East Jerusalem is an annual report to the EU's Political and Security Committee of the situation on the ground. This internal report is intended to serve as a source of information for the EU and as an input to its policy-making process. As such, it should assist the EU in determining how best to achieve the objective of a two-state solution to the Middle East peace process. It is regrettable that the report has once again been leaked.

As a follow-up to the EU Foreign Affairs Council conclusions on the Middle East Peace Process of 14 May and 10 December 2012, a mapping of existing relevant EU legislation is ongoing. The EU has consistently maintained that the geographical scope of application of the EU/Israel Association Agreement is limited to the State of Israel within its 1967 borders. All products originating in settlements are thus subject to non-preferential duty rates upon release for free circulation in the EU.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002430/13
an die Kommission
Michael Theurer (ALDE)
(1. März 2013)

Betrifft: Finanzierung des Bahnhofs Stuttgart 21

In einem Zeitungsartikel vom 26.02.2013, erschienen in der Stuttgarter Zeitung ([1]), wird die Rentabilität des Bauprojekts Stuttgart 21 infrage gestellt.

Nach Angaben der Deutschen Bahn steht das Projekt kurz vor der „Unwirtschaftlichkeit". Des Weiteren hat laut einem Zeitungsbericht ([2]) die für das Europäische Transport-Netzwerk zuständige Exekutivagentur (Tentea) einen der zwei Vorteile des neuen Bahnhofs von der Internetseite der EU-Kommission gestrichen.

Die EU hat für das Projekt Stuttgart 21 für den Zeitraum 2007-2014 114,47 Mio. EUR zur Verfügung gestellt.

Hierzu richte ich an Sie folgende Fragen:

1. Wurden die 114 Mio. EUR EU-Mittel bereits ausgezahlt? Wenn ja, in welche konkreten Bereiche wurden die Mittel investiert?

2. Welche waren die ursprünglich entscheidungsrelevanten Bedingungen für die Bezuschussung des Projekts durch EU-Mittel?

3. Hing die Zusage der EU-Mittel für das Projekt von den ursprünglichen Zielzusagen ab (doppelte Kapazitätssteigerung gegenüber dem „alten" Bahnhof, sowie Reduzierung der Fahrtzeit der Strecke Paris-Bratislava), und hat eine Reduzierung oder ein Wegfall einer der Zielzusagen Konsequenzen für die Unterstützung des Projekts durch EU-Mittel?

4. Was passiert mit den EU-Mitteln, bei einem möglichen Ausstieg aus dem Projekt Stuttgart 21?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(18. April 2013)

1. Von den gesamten TEN-V-Mitteln für die Maßnahme 2007-DE-17200-P wurden 69 451 419 EUR bereits ausgezahlt. Das Tempo der Zahlungen hängt von dem tatsächlichen technischen Fortschritt ab, der vom Finanzhilfeempfänger gemeldet und von der Kommission geprüft wird. Die laufenden Zahlungen umfassen auch Vorauszahlungen, deren Höhe anhand des geplanten technischen Fortschritts berechnet wird. Es liegt in der Verantwortung des Empfängers zu entscheiden, wie die Mittel innerhalb der geförderten Maßnahme aufgeteilt werden; dabei sind die Bedingungen und Rahmenvorgaben des Finanzierungsbeschlusses der Kommission zu beachten.

2. Die Maßnahme wurde von unabhängigen Sachverständigen bewertet und gemäß den allgemeinen TEN-V-Bedingungen für die Finanzierung von Projekten, einschließlich des EU-Umweltrechts, als förderfähig befunden.

3. Die zugewiesenen EU-Mittel werden entsprechend den Fortschritten des Projekts im Vergleich zu den im Finanzierungsbeschluss der Kommission vorgesehenen Fortschritten bereitgestellt. Würden einige der in diesem Beschluss festgelegten Ziele nicht erreicht, würden die entsprechenden Mittel nicht ausgezahlt und der Beschluss würde entsprechend angepasst.

4. Je nach dem Status der jeweiligen Mittelbindungen bei Abbruch eines Projekts fließen die Mittel in den entsprechenden TEN-V-Haushalt oder in den Gesamthaushalt der Europäischen Union zurück.

([1]) Abrufbar unter: http://www.stuttgarter-zeitung.de/inhalt.stuttgart-21-mehrkosten-kann-sich-die-bahn-nicht-leisten.3446957f-0241-4a42-9ae0-9e2554b6b329.html

([2]) http://m.stuttgarter-zeitung.de/inhalt.eu-foerderung-fuer-stuttgart-21-bruesseler-eiertanz-um-den-tiefbahnhof.d2e7c634-20c1-4095-8be2-98088a56b211.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002430/13
to the Commission
Michael Theurer (ALDE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Funding for the Stuttgart 21 railway project

The cost-effectiveness of the Stuttgart 21 railway project was called into question in a newspaper article which appeared in the *Stuttgarter Zeitung* ([1]) on 26 February 2013.

According to the German railway company, Deutsche Bahn, the project is close to being 'uneconomical'. Furthermore, according to a newspaper report ([2]), the Trans-European Transport Network Executive Agency (TEN-T EA) has deleted the reference to one of the two advantages of the new train station from the European Commission's Internet site.

For the period 2007-2014, the EU has made EUR 114.47 million available for the Stuttgart 21 project.

I would like to ask the following questions in this regard:

1. Has the EUR 114 million of EU funds already been paid? If so, in which particular areas was this money invested?

2. What were the original conditions on which the decision to subsidise the project with EU funds was based?

3. Was the commitment of EU funds for the project subject to achieving the original targets (doubling capacity of the 'old' train station and a reduction in the travel time on the Paris-Bratislava route), and will reducing those targets or indeed removing one of them have consequences for the support the project receives from EU funds?

4. Should support for the Stuttgart 21 project be dropped, what will happen to the EU funds?

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

1. Out of the total TEN-T funding for Action 2007-DE-17200-P, EUR 69 451 419 have already been paid. The pace of payments depends on the actual technical progress declared by the beneficiary and is checked by the Commission. The amount of current payments also includes advance payments calculated on the basis of foreseen technical progress. It is up to the beneficiary to decide how to allocate the funding to the supported Action within the conditions and the framework set out in the funding Decision adopted by the Commission.

2. The Action was evaluated by external experts and was found eligible according to the general TEN-T conditions for financing projects, including due respect of the EU environmental legislation.

3. The allocated EU funds are committed according to the progress shown by the project in relation to the progress foreseen in the funding Decision adopted by the Commission. In case some of the objectives set out in this decision were not achieved, the corresponding funds would not be committed and the decision would be adapted accordingly.

4. Depending on the status of the corresponding commitments, if a project is cancelled the funds come back to the specific TEN-T budget, or to the general budget of the European Union.

([1]) Accessible under http://www.stuttgarter-zeitung.de/inhalt.stuttgart-21-mehrkosten-kann-sich-die-bahn-nicht-leisten.3446957f-0241-4a42-9ae0-9e2554b6b329.html

([2]) http://m.stuttgarter-zeitung.de/inhalt.eu-foerderung-fuer-stuttgart-21-bruesseler-eiertanz-um-den-tiefbahnhof.d2e7c634-20c1-4095-8be2-98088a56b211.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002431/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(1 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των επιβατών στις πτήσεις μετεπιβίβασης

Στο πλαίσιο της ελεύθερης διακίνησης προσώπων στο εσωτερικό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και του μεγάλου αριθμού πτήσεων που πραγματοποιούνται καθημερινά, η ΕΕ έχει θεσπίσει νομοθεσία σύμφωνα με την οποία προστατεύονται τα δικαιώματα των επιβατών. Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη το γεγονός ότι τα αεροπορικά ταξίδια συχνά περιλαμβάνουν μετεπιβιβάσεις, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Προβλέπεται ελάχιστος χρόνος μεταξύ των πτήσεων, από τη στιγμή της άφιξης της πρώτης πτήσης έως ότου ο επιβάτης φθάσει στην πύλη από όπου θα αναχωρήσει η επόμενη πτήση του;

— Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη ότι οι πύλες άφιξης και αναχώρησης μπορεί να βρίσκονται σε μεγάλη απόσταση μεταξύ τους, πώς διασφαλίζονται και προστατεύονται τα δικαιώματα του επιβάτη που δεν έχει αρκετό χρόνο να φτάσει στην πύλη αναχώρησης, πριν την προβλεπόμενη ώρα έναρξης της επιβίβασης στη νέα πτήση;

— Θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι η παροχή βοήθειας από την αεροπορική εταιρεία και η αλλαγή πορείας (rerouting) συνιστούν επαρκή προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των επιβατών, όταν η σχέση χρόνου και απόστασης μεταξύ των δύο σημείων στο αεροδρόμιο είναι ανεπαρκής για την έγκαιρη επιβίβαση;

— Έχει στη διάθεσή της η Επιτροπή στοιχεία σχετικά με τον αριθμό των πτήσεων μετεπιβίβασης που «χάνονται» κάθε χρόνο;

— Έχει στη διάθεσή της η Επιτροπή το οικονομικό κόστος που αυτό συνεπάγεται από πλευράς απώλειας χρόνου των μετεπιβιβαζόμενων επιβατών, ανατροπής προγραμματισμένων συναντήσεων κ.λπ., ιδίως με δεδομένο ότι η χρήση της επιλογής της αερομεταφοράς γίνεται κυρίως για λόγους ταχύτερης μεταφοράς;

— Θεωρεί η Επιτροπή ότι θα έπρεπε να υπάρχει επαρκής χρόνος για τους επιβάτες που μετεπιβιβάζονται ώστε να βρίσκονται στην πύλη επιβίβασης στη νέα πτήση πριν την ώρα έναρξης της νέας επιβίβασης, και να μην τίθεται εν αμφιβόλω το δικαίωμά τους να επιβιβαστούν στην συγκεκριμένη πτήση;

Απάντηση του κ. Kallas εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(16 Απριλίου 2013)

Η συμφωνία για την υπηρεσία μεταφοράς επιβατών της Διεθνούς Ένωσης Αεροπορικών Μεταφορών (IATA) προβλέπει έναν ελάχιστο χρόνο μεταξύ πτήσεων μετεπιβίβασης προβλέποντας επαρκή χρόνο για μετεπιβίβαση για τους επιβάτες και τις αποσκευές τους στις πτήσεις με ανταπόκριση ([1]). Οι επιβάτες θα πρέπει να ενημερώνονται σχετικά με τον ελάχιστο αυτό χρόνο μετεπιβίβασης από τους αερομεταφορείς ή τους πράκτορές τους κατά την αγορά των εισιτηρίων. Ωστόσο, δεν υπάρχει ενωσιακή νομοθεσία σχετικά με το εν λόγω θέμα.

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο έχει επιβεβαιώσει ότι ο κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 261/2004 ([2]) για τα δικαιώματα των επιβατών αεροπορικών μεταφορών ισχύει για τους επιβάτες πτήσεων με ανταπόκριση ([3]). Σύμφωνα με τις απαιτήσεις που πρέπει να πληρούνται για την εφαρμογή του εν λόγω κανονισμού, ο επιβάτης που δεν γίνεται δεκτός για επιβίβαση ενώ έχει κάνει έγκυρη κράτηση, δικαιούται αποζημίωση λόγω άρνησης επιβίβασης. Ομοίως, ο επιβάτης που έχει κάνει έγκυρη κράτηση και χάνει την πτήση ανταπόκρισης λόγω καθυστέρησης της πρώτης πτήσης του δικαιούται αποζημίωση λόγω μεγάλης καθυστέρησης. Η αποζημίωση αυτή αποτελεί συμπληρωματικό δικαίωμα του επιβάτη μαζί με το δικαίωμα παροχής συνδρομής, όπως η περίθαλψη και η μεταφορά με αλλαγή πορείας και παρέχει συνεπώς στοιχειώδη προστασία στους επιβάτες.

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει στατιστικά στοιχεία σχετικά με τον αριθμό των πτήσεων μετεπιβίβασης που χάνονται κάθε έτος ή το οικονομικό κόστος με το οποίο επιβαρύνονται οι επιβάτες που χάνουν τις ανταποκρίσεις αυτές.

([1]) Ψήφισμα 785.
([2]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 261/2004 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου της 11ης Φεβρουαρίου 2004 για τη θέσπιση κοινών κανόνων αποζημίωσης των επιβατών αεροπορικών μεταφορών και παροχής βοήθειας σε αυτούς σε περίπτωση άρνησης επιβίβασης και ματαίωσης ή μεγάλης καθυστέρησης της πτήσης και την κατάργηση του Κανονισμού (ΕΟΚ) αριθ. 295/91, ΕΕ L 46 της 17.2.2004.
([3]) Βλ. ιδίως την απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου της 26ης Φεβρουαρίου 2013, Air France κατά Folkerts, υπόθεση C-11/11, μη δημοσιευμένη ακόμα.

Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι με τον υπολογισμό ελάχιστου χρόνου μετεπιβίβασης, οι αεροπορικές εταιρείες πρέπει να παρέχουν στους επιβάτες επαρκή χρόνο ώστε να φθάνουν στο σημείο αναχώρησης πριν από την επιβίβαση. Σε περίπτωση που αυτό δεν συμβαίνει, η προστασία των επιβατών εξασφαλίζεται μέσω του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 261/2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002431/13
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Protection of rights of transit passengers

Within the framework of freedom of movement within the European Union and given the large number of daily flights, the EU has enacted legislation to protect passengers' rights. Bearing in mind that air travel often includes transfers, will the Commission say:

— Is there any provision for a minimum time between flights, from the arrival of the inbound flight to the passenger's arrival at the gate from which he is to board his outbound flight?

— Bearing in mind that arrival and departure gates are often a long way apart, how are the rights of passengers with too little time to reach the departure gate before the scheduled boarding time for their outbound flight safeguarded and protected?

— Does the Commission consider that help from the airline and rerouting provide adequate protection for passengers' rights, when there is too little time to get to the next gate before it closes?

— Does the Commission have any statistics on the number of transfer flights missed each year?

— Does the Commission have any information on the financial cost to transfer passengers caused by wasted time, missed appointments etc., especially in light of the fact that air travel is usually chosen because it is the fastest means of travel?

— Does the Commission consider that transfer passengers should be allowed sufficient time to reach the gate from which they will board their outbound flight before boarding commences and that their right to board that flight should not be challenged?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

The International Air Transport Association (IATA) Passenger Service Conference Agreement provides for a minimum connecting time allowing passengers and their baggage sufficient time to transfer between connecting flights ([1]). Passengers should be advised of this minimum connecting time by air carriers or their agents during the course of purchasing their tickets. However, there is no EU legislation in this respect.

The European Court of Justice has confirmed that regulation (EC) No 261/2004 ([2]) on air passenger rights applies to passengers on connecting flights ([3]). Subject to the qualifying requirements of that regulation a passenger holding a valid reservation that is refused carriage is entitled to compensation for denial of boarding. Similarly a passenger holding a valid reservation who misses his connecting flight because his outbound flight was late is entitled to compensation for long delay. Such compensation is additional to the passenger's right to assistance, such as care and rerouting, and provides therefore some protection to passengers.

The Commission has no statistics on the number of transfer flights missed each year or of the financial cost borne by passengers who missed connections.

The Commission considers that in calculating the minimum connecting time airlines should allow sufficient time for passengers to reach the departure point before boarding. If this is not the case, the protection of passengers is provided through Regulation (EC) No 261/2004.

([1]) Resolution 785.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights, and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 295/91, OJ L46, 17.2.2004.
([3]) See in particular Judgment of the Court of 26 February 2013, Air France v Folkerts, Case C-11/11, yet unpublished.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002432/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(1. März 2013)

Betrifft: Informationen über die Haltungsformen bei der Fleischerzeugung

Nach dem Pferdefleischskandal ist klar, dass viele Verbraucher besser darüber informiert werden wollen, wie das von ihnen gekaufte Fleisch erzeugt wird. Informationen über die Haltung von Tieren, deren Fleisch gewonnen wird, sind insofern wichtig, als sie Aufschluss über den Nährwert und den Geschmack des Fleischs, dessen Auswirkungen auf die Umwelt und das Wohlergehen der Tiere geben.

Obwohl die Kommission sich das Ziel gesetzt hat, die Transparenz zu erhöhen und Verbrauchern mehr Informationen über Lebensmittel tierischen Ursprungs zur Verfügung zu stellen, lehnt sie alle Vorschläge dafür, die Verbraucher darüber zu informieren, wie die Tiere, deren Fleisch in den Regalen der Supermärkte angeboten wird, gehalten werden, immer wieder ab. Um den Verbrauchern jedoch zu ermöglichen, eine sachkundigere Entscheidung zu treffen, könnte die Kennzeichnung von Fleisch je nach Haltungsform (Intensiv-, Freiland- oder Stallhaltung unter guten Bedingungen) langfristig mehr Transparenz und mehr Nachhaltigkeit bei der Fleischerzeugung schaffen.

1. Aus welchem Grund ist die Kommission weiterhin nicht bereit, ein System zur Kennzeichnung der Haltungsform von Tieren einzuführen?

2. Warum werden Verbraucher über die Haltungsformen bei der Fleischerzeugung imUngewissen gelassen?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(24. April 2013)

Der Rechtsrahmen für verlässliche Verbraucherinformationen im Bereich der Lebensmittelkennzeichnung — einschließlich Fleisch — ist in der Richtlinie 2000/13/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Angleichung der Rechtsvorschriften der Mitgliedstaaten über die Etikettierung und Aufmachung von Lebensmitteln sowie die Werbung hierfür ([1]) festgelegt. Die genannte Richtlinie wurde vor kurzem überarbeitet und wird mit Wirkung vom 13. Dezember 2014 durch die Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates betreffend die Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel ([2]) aufgehoben und ersetzt. Weder die Richtlinie 2000/13/EG noch die Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 sehen eine verbindliche Kennzeichnung von Lebensmitteln, die Fleisch enthalten, hinsichtlich der Haltungsform der Tiere vor.

Es wurden jedoch eine ganze Reihe freiwilliger Regelungen zur Fleischkennzeichnung eingeführt, mit denen über die Haltungsform der Tiere informiert wird.

Darüber hinaus sollen durch die kürzlich verabschiedete Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1151/2012 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über Qualitätsregelungen für Agrarerzeugnisse und Lebensmittel die Erzeuger dabei unterstützt werden, die Verbraucher über die Eigenschaften von Erzeugnissen und über Bewirtschaftungsmerkmale zu informieren. Die Haltungsform von Tieren für die Fleischerzeugung fällt in den Anwendungsbereich dieser Verordnung.

Es gibt jedoch innerhalb der EU — in Abhängigkeit zahlreicher Faktoren wie Traditionen oder klimatische und geografische Gegebenheiten — eine Vielzahl landwirtschaftlicher Methoden. Ein EU-weit abgestimmter erschöpfender Katalog aller Bewirtschaftungsmethoden wäre weder technisch machbar noch gerechtfertigt.

([1]) ABl. L 109 vom 6.5.2000.

([2]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 25. Oktober 2011 betreffend die Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel und zur Änderung der Verordnungen (EG) Nr. 1924/2006 und (EG) Nr. 1925/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 87/250/EWG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 90/496/EWG des Rates, der Richtlinie 1999/10/EG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 2000/13/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates, der Richtlinien 2002/67/EG und 2008/5/EG der Kommission und der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 608/2004 der Kommission, ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002432/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Information on meat production farming methods

Following the horsemeat scandal, it is clear that many consumers want to be better informed on how the meat they buy is produced. Information on how an animal which provides meat was reared is crucial as it gives an insight into the meat's nutritional quality and taste, its impact on the environment and the animal's welfare.

Despite its aim to increase transparency and to provide more information to consumers about animal-derived food, the Commission consistently opposes any suggestion that consumers should be informed as to how animals that provide the meat on the supermarket shelf were reared. However, in order to enable consumers to make a more informed choice, the labelling of meat according to farming method (intensive, free-range or a good indoor system) could create more transparency and more sustainability in the production of meat in the long term.

1. Why is the Commission still not willing to introduce a labelling system on how animals have been farmed?

2. Why keep consumers in the dark about meat production farming methods?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The legal framework to ensure reliable food labelling information to consumers- including meat — is laid down in Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and the Council on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs. ([1]) The latter Directive has been recently revised and will be repealed and replaced as of 13 December 2014 by Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and Council on the provision of food information to consumers ([2]). Neither Directive 2000/13/EC, nor Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 provide for a mandatory labelling system on foods containing meat relating to the applicable farming methods.

However, a whole range of voluntary meat label schemes have been put in place with the view to give information on the farming methods under which animals were reared.

Furthermore, the recently adopted Regulation (EU) No 1151/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs aims to help producers to communicate the product characteristics and farming attributes to consumers. Farming methods to produce meat fall within the scope of this regulation.

There is, nevertheless, a multitude of farming methods that exist within the EU depending on numerous characteristics such as tradition or climatic and geographic factors. An EU-harmonised and comprehensive catalogue of all farming methods would be neither technically feasible nor justified.

([1]) OJ L 109, 6.5.2000.

([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 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.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002434/13
à la Commission
Karim Zéribi (Verts/ALE)
(1er mars 2013)

Objet: Résultats de l'enquête dans le domaine de l'eau en France

En vertu de l'article 101 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, vos services ont ouvert, le 18 janvier 2012, à l'encontre de la France une procédure d'enquête sur une éventuelle entente entre trois entreprises dans le domaine de l'eau: les groupes Suez, Veolia et La Saur. Vous déclariez alors dans votre communiqué de presse de l'époque que la Commission examinerait dans les mois à venir le comportement des entreprises ainsi que celui de la fédération professionnelle des entreprises de l'eau. Cette ouverture fait suite à des inspections surprises menées en France en avril 2010. À cette époque, la Lyonnaise des Eaux (détenue par Suez) s'est vu infliger une amende de 8 millions d'euros pour avoir brisé un scellé posé par la Commission européenne.

Un an plus tard, nous n'avons toujours pas de retour de votre part concernant cette enquête. À l'heure où les collectivités locales s'engagent sur le renouvellement de leur contrat de gestion d'eau ou de la mise en régie publique, il leur serait dangereux de repartir dans des contrats de longue durée avec des entreprises internationales manquant aux règles d'éthique les plus élémentaires. Il est ainsi du devoir de l'Europe de permettre aux autorités publiques locales de prendre leur responsabilité et leurs décisions en toute intelligence.

Compte tenu de ces éléments, à quelle date la Commission pense-t-elle nous faire part, dans la plus grande transparence, des résultats de cette enquête?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(11 avril 2013)

Le 18 janvier 2012, la Commission a ouvert une procédure à l'encontre de Saur, Suez Environnement/Lyonnaise des eaux et Veolia, ainsi que de leur fédération professionnelle FP2E. La Commission finalise actuellement son enquête approfondie et entend se prononcer au premier semestre 2013 sur la nécessité ou non d'envoyer aux entreprises soumises à l'enquête une communication des griefs sur la base des éléments de preuve récoltés.

La durée d'une enquête en matière d'ententes dépend de nombreux facteurs, notamment la complexité du dossier, le degré de coopération des entreprises soumises à l'enquête et la manière dont celles-ci exercent leur droit à la défense.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002434/13
to the Commission
Karim Zéribi (Verts/ALE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Findings of the investigation into the water sector in France

On 18 January 2012, under Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, your services opened an investigation procedure against France on a possible cartel between three companies in the water sector: the Suez, Veolia and La Saur groups. You then announced in your press release at the time that the Commission would examine the companies' behaviour over the months to come, as well as the behaviour of the professional federation of water companies. This procedure was opened after surprise inspections took place in France in April 2010. At that time, the company Lyonnaise de Eaux (owned by Suez) was fined EUR 8 million by the Commission for the breach of a seal.

One year later, we have still not heard anything from you regarding this investigation. At a time when local authorities are in the process of renewing their water management contracts or considering making water management public, it would be dangerous for them to again enter into lengthy contracts with international companies which do not respect the most basic ethical rules. It is therefore Europe's duty to allow local public authorities to take responsibility and make decisions in full knowledge of the facts.

Bearing this in mind, when does the Commission plan to make us aware of the findings of this investigation in the most transparent manner possible?

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

The Commission opened proceedings on 18 January 2012 against SAUR, Suez Environnement/Lyonnaise des Eaux and Veolia, and their professional association FP2E. The Commission is currently finalising the in-depth investigation and aim to take a view during the first half of 2013 as to whether or not to send the companies under investigation a Statement of Objections on the basis of the evidence gathered.

The duration of an antitrust investigation depends on many factors, including the complexity of the case, the degree of cooperation received from the companies under investigation and the manner in which they exercise their rights of defense.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002435/13
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(1er mars 2013)

Objet: Réévaluation de l'aspartame

Le 9 janvier, l'Autorité pour la sécurité des aliments (EFSA) a lancé une consultation publique pour finaliser son avis attendu en mai 2013 sur l'aspartame.

La consultation porte sur les conclusions du pré-avis rendu par les experts de l'EFSA. Dans ce pré-avis, l'EFSA considère que l'aspartame «ne présente aucun risque pour la santé avec les niveaux aujourd'hui autorisés en Europe».

Selon l'Organisation non gouvernementale Réseau environnement santé (RES), l'avis de l'EFSÀ présente de graves manquements aux règles de la déontologie de l'expertise.

Les reproches sont nombreux: études académiques récentes ignorées, confiance inconditionnelle à des travaux non publiés dans des revues scientifiques et financés par les industriels, paragraphes directement inspirés par une publication de consultants de l'industrie, conflits d'intérêts, etc.

1. Sur la base des informations apportées par le RES, l'avis de l'EFSA, annoncé pour mai 2013, ne deviendrait-il pas caduc?

2. La Commission ne pourrait-elle pas envisager une contre-évaluation de l'avis de l'EFSA?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(9 avril 2013)

La Commission considère l'opinion exprimée par le Réseau environnement santé comme une contribution à la consultation publique lancée par l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) sur l'avis scientifique préliminaire de l'Autorité relatif à l'aspartame.

L'EFSA a programmé une réunion scientifique le 9 avril 2013, afin de discuter avec les parties prenantes et les autres intéressés des contributions recueillies dans le cadre de la consultation publique.

La Commission prendra une décision de gestion des risques lorsque l'avis scientifique aura été officiellement adopté; à ce stade, toute autre considération serait prématurée.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002435/13
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Re-evaluation of aspartame

On 9 January 2013, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) launched a public consultation to finalise its opinion on aspartame, expected to be published in May 2013.

The consultation deals with the conclusions of the draft opinion issued by EFSA experts. In this draft opinion, the EFSA found that aspartame 'poses no health risks at the levels authorised in Europe today'.

According to the non-governmental organisation Environment Health Network (RES), the EFSA's opinion presents serious shortcomings with regard to the experts' ethical standards.

There are many criticisms: ignoring recent academic studies, unconditional trust in works which have not been published in scientific journals and which have been financed by industrialists, paragraphs taken directly from a publication written by industry consultants, conflicts of interest, etc.

1. Does the information provided by the RES not render the EFSA's opinion, to be presented in May 2013, null and void?

2. Could the Commission not prepare a counter evaluation of the EFSA's opinion?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(9 April 2013)

The Commission considers the views of the Environment Health Network as a contribution to the public consultation by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) on its preliminary scientific opinion on aspartame.

EFSA scheduled a scientific meeting on 9 April 2013, to discuss with all contributing stakeholders and other relevant parties the comments received during the public consultation.

The Commission will make its risk management decision once the scientific opinion is formally adopted; any further considerations would be premature at this stage.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002436/13
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(1er mars 2013)

Objet: Absence d'une législation européenne sur les nanomatériaux

Le 3 octobre 2012, la Commission européenne a adopté hier une communication sur le deuxième examen réglementaire relatif aux nanomatériaux.

Le document — le premier sur le sujet depuis 2008 — écarte l'idée d'une règlementation spécifique aux nanomatériaux et à l'évaluation de leurs risques.

Les nanoparticules présentent des risques particuliers, encore mal connus, pour la santé et l'environnement. Leur taille infinitésimale, qui leur donne des propriétés remarquables (résistance, souplesse, conductivité, adhérence…), les rend aussi extrêmement réactives. Or elles sont susceptibles de pénétrer sous la peau ou dans les poumons, et de se disperser dans l'air, le sol ou l'eau.

La Commission estime que la réglementation générale appliquée aux produits chimiques au sein de l'Union — le système d'enregistrement, d'évaluation et d'autorisation REACH — est «le cadre le plus adapté à la gestion des nanomatériaux».

Dans la pratique, les nanoparticules passent à travers les mailles du filet sanitaire de REACH. Car ce règlement ne s'applique qu'aux productions chimiques de plus d'une tonne par an, seuil loin d'être atteint pour beaucoup de nanomatériaux.

1. La Commission peut-elle préciser les raisons pour lesquelles elle n'envisage pas, à ce stade, une règlementation spécifique sur les nanomatériaux?

2. Dans le cadre de la révision du règlement REACH, la Commission prévoit-elle un renforcement du traitement et du contrôle des nanoparticules?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(30 avril 2013)

La Commission estime qu'il convient d'appliquer aux nanomatériaux les mêmes principes d'évaluation des risques que pour les produits chimiques. Le règlement REACH le permet, même si des exigences spécifiques pour les nanomatériaux se sont révélées nécessaires dans ce cadre. La Commission envisage de modifier certaines des annexes du règlement REACH et encourage l'ECHA à élaborer de nouvelles orientations pour les enregistrements postérieurs à 2013. L'objectif est de garantir une plus grande clarté quant à la manière dont les nanomatériaux doivent être pris en considération et dont leur sécurité doit être démontrée dans les dossiers d'enregistrement et, le cas échéant, de présenter un projet d'acte d'exécution d'ici à décembre 2013.

La Commission a l'intention de renforcer le traitement et le contrôle des nanomatériaux en exigeant des précisions sur plusieurs questions: les nanoformes d'une substance sont-elles couvertes par un enregistrement? Si oui, quelles sont-elles? Comment les nanomatériaux ou nanoformes ont-ils été évalués et comment les conditions d'essai ont-elles été documentées? Enfin, comment leur sécurité d'utilisation a-t-elle été garantie? Par ailleurs, la Commission lancera une évaluation d'impact afin de définir et d'élaborer les moyens les mieux appropriés pour accroître la transparence et assurer un contrôle réglementaire.

Les résultats du deuxième examen réglementaire par rapport aux questions de l'Honorable Parlementaire sont les suivants:

— malgré quelques questions en suspens, les connaissances sur la toxicité des nanomatériaux s'améliorent. Les informations disponibles sur les substances enregistrées dans le cadre de REACH indiquent que de nombreux nanomatériaux ne sont pas dangereux à faible dose, alors que d'autres le sont;

— dans son avis de 2009 ([1]), le CSRSEN ([2]) a conclu que «les données publiées ne permettent pas d'étayer l'hypothèse selon laquelle une particule plus petite serait plus réactive et donc plus toxique»;

— la plupart des nanomatériaux qui font l'objet d'un débat scientifique sont fabriqués ou importés en volumes d'une tonne ou plus par an.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_risk/committees/04_scenihr/docs/scenihr_o_023.pdf, p. 10.
([2]) Comité scientifique des risques sanitaires émergents et nouveaux.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002436/13
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Lack of EU legislation on nanomaterials

On 3 October 2012, the Commission adopted a communication on the second regulatory review on nanomaterials.

The document — the first to be published on the subject since 2008 — dismisses the idea of a specific regulation on nanomaterials and the assessment of their risks.

Nanoparticles pose particular risks to health and the environment which are still largely unknown. Their small size, which gives them remarkable properties (resistance, flexibility, conductivity, adhesion, etc.), also makes them extremely reactive. Yet they are able to penetrate beneath the skin or in the lungs and be dispersed through the air, earth or water.

The Commission believes that the general regulation applied to chemical products within the EU — the REACH registration, evaluation and authorisation system — is 'the best possible framework for the risk management of nanomaterials'.

In practice, nanoparticles slip between the cracks in the REACH health system. This is because this regulation only applies to chemical products of more than one tonne per year, a threshold which many nanomaterials are far from reaching.

1. Can the Commission state the reasons why it does not intend to draw up a specific regulation on nanomaterials at this stage?

2. Does the Commission intend to strengthen the handling and control of nanoparticles within the framework of the revision of the REACH regulation?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

The Commission considers that for nanomaterials the same risk assessment principles as for chemicals can and must be applied. This is possible pursuant to the REACH Regulation even if more specific requirements for nanomaterials within the framework have proven necessary. The Commission envisages modifications in some of the REACH Annexes and encourages ECHA to further develop guidance for registrations after 2013. The objective is to ensure further clarity on how nanomaterials are addressed and safety demonstrated in registration dossiers and, if appropriate, to come forward with a draft implementing act by December 2013.

The Commission intends to strengthen the handling and control of nanomaterials through requiring clarity on whether and which nanoforms of a substance are covered by registration dossiers, how the nanomaterials or nanoforms have been assessed and test conditions documented and how their safe use has been ensured. Moreover, the Commission will launch an impact assessment to identify and develop the most adequate means to increase transparency and ensure regulatory oversight.

The Second Regulatory Review findings in relation to the Honourable Member's questions were:

— Despite some open questions, toxicological knowledge about nanomaterials is improving. Available information for substances registered under REACH suggests that many nanomaterials are non-hazardous at moderate doses while others are hazardous.

— In its 2009 opinion ([1]), SCENIHR ([2]) concluded that 'the hypothesis that smaller means more reactive and thus more toxic cannot be substantiated by the published data.'

— Most nanomaterials which are subject to a scientific debate are manufactured or imported in volumes of 1 tonne per year or more.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_risk/committees/04_scenihr/docs/scenihr_o_023.pdf, p. 10
([2]) Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002437/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) et Katarína Neveďalová (S&D)
(1er mars 2013)

Objet: Mongolie et reconnaissance européenne

Pays de 2,8 millions d'habitants enclavé entre la Chine et la Russie, ancien satellite de l'Union soviétique, la Mongolie a organisé ses premières élections pluralistes en 1992. C'est un pays qui a fait un trajet non négligeable vers une démocratie saine, appuyée en cela par des dirigeants intéressés par l'élévation du niveau de vie de leur peuple. Mais plus important encore, la Mongolie est devenue une démocratie vivante et stable dans une région où les conflits et les conquêtes ont été légion à travers les âges.

Les Mongols sont actifs dans la participation au processus démocratique qui contribue grandement à la stabilité politique d'un pays qui fait le nécessaire pour améliorer ses relations internationales et ainsi s'intégrer au reste du monde.

Autre preuve de leurs progrès et de leur ouverture, le dernier rapport du programme commun des Nations unies sur le VIH/sida (Onusida) qui salue les récentes réformes de la loi en Mongolie qui ont supprimé toutes les restrictions de voyage et autres dispositions discriminatoires pour les personnes vivant avec le VIH.

Les réformes de la Mongolie ont également supprimé les restrictions à l'emploi qui empêchaient les personnes vivant avec le VIH d'exercer certains métiers, notamment dans l'industrie alimentaire. La nouvelle loi a également encouragé la création d'un organe multisectoriel composé de représentants du gouvernement, de la société civile et du secteur privé pour aider à mettre en place ces réformes.

1. A l'heure où la Commission propose de nouveaux accords commerciaux avec de nombreux pays asiatiques, de nouvelles transactions, accords bilatéraux ou échanges sont-ils prévus avec la Mongolie?

2. Afin de confirmer la bienveillance de l'Europe vis-à-vis de la Mongolie, pour toutes les raisons évoquées plus haut, la Commission compte-t-elle établir une représentation permanente à Oulan Bator ou une quelconque présence officielle plus soutenue?

Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(27 mai 2013)

L'UE renforce ses relations dans toute l'Asie par l'intermédiaire d'une série de dialogues, mécanismes et accords régionaux, infrarégionaux et bilatéraux. La Mongolie ne fait pas exception. L'année 2013 sera caractérisée par un développement sensible de la coopération politique, économique et sectorielle entre les deux parties. L'accord de partenariat et de coopération UE-Mongolie a été signé le 30 avril 2013 lors de la visite officielle de la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante en Mongolie (du 28 au 30 avril 2013). Il s'agit d'une étape importante car l'APC fournit un nouveau cadre pour le renforcement du dialogue et de la coopération bilatérale.

Les questions relatives à la Mongolie sont actuellement traitées par la délégation de l'UE à Pékin et un membre du personnel de l'UE est basé à Oulan-Bator pour assurer la liaison. Quatre États membres (la République tchèque, l'Allemagne, la France et le Royaume-Uni) sont présents sur le terrain. Le service européen pour l'action extérieure souhaiterait ouvrir ultérieurement une délégation de l'UE européenne à Oulan-Bator, lorsque le contexte budgétaire le permettra.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-002437/13
Komisii
Marc Tarabella (S&D) a Katarína Neveďalová (S&D)
(1. marca 2013)

Vec: Mongolsko a uznávanie na európskej úrovni

Mongolsko, krajina s 2,8 milióna obyvateľmi obklopená Čínou a Ruskom, bývalý satelitný štát Sovietskeho zväzu, usporiadalo v roku 1992 svoje prvé pluralistické voľby. Je to krajina, ktorá prešla náročnou cestou k zdravej demokracii podporovanej vodcami, ktorých zaujímalo zvýšenie životnej úrovne ich ľudu. Dôležitejšie však je, že Mongolsko sa stalo živou a stabilnou demokraciou, a to v regióne, ktorý v priebehu vekov zažil množstvo konfliktov a výbojov. Mongoli sa aktívne podieľajú na demokratickom procese, ktorý výrazne prispieva k politickej stabilite krajiny, ktorá robí všetko, čo je potrebné, aby zlepšila svoje medzinárodné vzťahy a začlenila sa tak k zvyšku sveta.

Ďalším dôkazom ich pokroku a otvorenosti je posledná správa zo Spoločného programu OSN pre HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), ktorá víta nedávne reformy mongolského zákona, ktorými sa zrušili všetky obmedzenia cestovať a ďalšie ustanovenia diskriminujúce osoby postihnuté HIV.

Mongolskými reformami sa tiež zrušili pracovné obmedzenia, ktoré bránili osobám postihnutým HIV vykonávať určité povolania, a to najmä v potravinárskom priemysle. Nový zákon podporil aj vytvorenie multisektorového úradu, ktorý tvoria predstavitelia vlády, občianskej spoločnosti a súkromného sektora a ktorý má pomôcť tieto reformy uskutočňovať.

1. V čase, keď Komisia navrhuje nové obchodné dohody s mnohými ázijskými krajinami, pripravujú sa nové transakcie, bilaterálne dohody alebo výmeny s Mongolskom?

2. So zámerom potvrdiť Mongolsku priazeň Európy na základe všetkých vyššie uvedených dôvodov počíta Komisia so zriadením stáleho zastúpenia v Ulanbátare alebo s nejakou trvalejšou oficiálnou prítomnosťou?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(27. mája 2013)

EÚ posilňuje svoje vzťahy s Áziou prostredníctvom kombinácie regionálnych, subregionálnych a bilaterálnych dialógov, mechanizmov a dohôd. V tomto ohľade nie je výnimkou ani Mongolsko. V roku 2013 dôjde k výraznému posilneniu spolupráce oboch strán na politickej a hospodárskej úrovni, ako aj na úrovni jednotlivých sektorov. Počas oficiálnej návštevy vysokej predstaviteľky/podpredsedníčky v Mongolsku (28. – 30. apríla 2013) došlo k podpísaniu dohody o partnerstve a spolupráci medzi EÚ a Mongolskom (30. apríla 2013). Ide o dôležitú dohodu, ktorá vytvára nový rámec pre prehĺbenie vzájomného dialógu a spolupráce.

V súčasnosti využíva Mongolsko služby delegácie EÚ v Pekingu, pričom v Ulanbátare pôsobí styčný dôstojník EÚ. Priamo na mieste majú zastúpenie štyri členské štáty – Česká republika, Nemecko, Francúzsko a Spojené kráľovstvo. Európska služba pre vonkajšiu činnosť by v budúcnosti chcela zriadiť delegáciu EÚ v Ulanbátare, pokiaľ to stav rozpočtu umožní.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002437/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D) and Katarína Neveďalová (S&D)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Mongolia and European recognition

A country with 2.8 million inhabitants landlocked between China and Russia, a former satellite of the Soviet Union, Mongolia held its first pluralist elections in 1992. It is a country which has made a significant journey towards healthy democracy, with the support of leaders interested in improving the quality of life of their people. However, even more importantly, Mongolia has become a vibrant and stable democracy in a region where conflicts and conquests have been widespread across the ages.

The Mongolian people are active participants in the democratic process, which contributes greatly to the political stability of a country that does what is needed to improve its international relations and thereby integrate with the rest of the world.

As further proof of their progress and openness, the last report by the United Nations Joint Programme on HIV/Aids (UNAIDS) welcomes the recent law reforms in Mongolia that have removed all travel restrictions and other discriminatory provisions for people living with HIV.

Mongolia's reforms also removed employment restrictions that prevented people living with HIV from undertaking certain jobs, particularly in the food industry. The new law has also encouraged the creation of a multi-sectorial body comprised of government, civil society and private sector representatives to help put in place the reforms.

1. At a time when the Commission is proposing new trade agreements with various Asian countries, does it intend to enter into new transactions, bilateral agreements or exchanges with Mongolia?

2. In order to consolidate Europe's benevolence towards Mongolia, for all of the reasons mentioned above, is the Commission considering establishing a permanent representation to Ulan Bator or any greater official presence?

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

The EU is strengthening its relations across Asia through a mix of regional, sub-regional and bilateral dialogues, mechanisms and agreements. Mongolia is no exception. 2013 will see a significant increase in political, economic and sectoral cooperation between the two sides. During the official visit of the HR/VP to Mongolia (28-30 April 2013), the EU-Mongolia Partnership and Cooperation Agreement was signed (30 April 2013). The PCA is an important agreement that provides new framework for strengthening the bilateral dialogue and cooperation.

Currently Mongolia is served by the EU Delegation in Beijing with an EU liaison-officer based in Ulan Bator. Four Member States — the Czech Republic, Germany, France and the United Kingdom — are present on the ground. The European External Action Service would like to establish an EU Delegation in Ulan Bator in the future when budgetary conditions permit.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002438/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1er mars 2013)

Objet: Émission de gaz à effet de serre par les vaches — Gembloux

Comme tous les ruminants, les vaches jouent un rôle qui est loin d'être négligeable dans la production de gaz à effet de serre, particulièrement de méthane. Pour réduire cet impact négatif, on peut certes jouer sur la sélection génétique ou sur l'alimentation. Encore faut-il disposer d'une méthode fiable, harmonisable à très vaste échelle et financièrement accessible aux éleveurs et à l'industrie laitière. Un pas décisif dans ce sens vient d'être accompli par les chercheurs de Gembloux Agro-Bio Tech en partenariat avec le CRA-W. Ceux-ci utilisent en effet l'ensemble des informations fournies par l'analyse infrarouge du lait des vaches pour estimer de manière précise et fiable les émissions de méthane.

La mise au point de cette méthode survient à un moment stratégique.

1. Dans la mesure où les autorités européennes s'attèlent actuellement à définir une méthodologie harmonisée de quantification des émissions de méthane, la Commission compte-telle apporter sa contribution à cette initiative?

2. Quelle est la position de la Commission sur cette démarche?

3. Envisage-t-elle, dans le cadre de la législation européenne sur l'étiquetage «carbone» des aliments, de faire intervenir cette nouvelle équation?

4. Dans le cadre de cette labellisation, il pourrait être injuste, pour certains éleveurs, de voir leur production laitière échapper à un étiquetage favorable, faute d'avoir été identifiée comme peu émettrice par une méthode suffisamment fine et individuelle. La Commission entend-elle en tenir compte?

Réponse donnée par Mme Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(25 avril 2013)

La Commission soutient activement la mise au point de méthodes et d'outils permettant aux agriculteurs d'évaluer leur empreinte carbonique, y compris celle de leur production laitière. Un projet pilote ([1]) demandé par le Parlement européen et géré par le Centre commun de recherche permettra d'évaluer le cycle de vie des émissions de gaz à effet de serre de l'exploitation (et du produit), et notamment la fermentation entérique. Ce projet est actuellement en phase d'expérimentation pilote et sera mené à terme d'ici la fin de 2013.

Une méthode de mesure directe telle qu'une analyse du rayonnement infrarouge moyen, pour autant qu'elle réponde aux normes internationales, pourrait contribuer à l'utilisation à grande échelle de ce type de calculateur. Elle pourrait également fournir des données d'observation supplémentaires permettant d'améliorer les facteurs d'émission nationaux dans les inventaires ou les études d'évaluation portant sur les gaz à effet de serre, tels que le projet intitulé «*European Greenhouse Gases Emissions from Livestock Production Systems*» (Émissions de gaz à effet de serre générées par les systèmes d'élevage de l'UE).

Actuellement, la Commission ne prévoit pas de présenter une proposition législative relative à l'introduction de systèmes d'étiquetage ou de certification des émissions de carbone afin de remédier aux problèmes soulevés par l'Honorable Parlementaire. Ce type d'étiquetage peut être mis au point par le secteur privé. Le fait d'informer les consommateurs des effets de leur mode de consommation alimentaire sur le changement climatique pourrait contribuer à réorienter la consommation et la production vers des choix plus respectueux du climat. Cependant, il est également nécessaire de garantir la cohérence et la fiabilité des systèmes d'étiquetage, en tenant compte de la complexité de la chaîne alimentaire, des effets sur l'environnement au sens plus large et de la nécessité de communiquer un message clair aux consommateurs.

La Commission collabore actuellement avec la table ronde européenne sur la consommation et la production durables pour élaborer le «protocole Envifood», méthode permettant d'évaluer dans l'ensemble l'empreinte écologique des aliments et des boissons ([2]).

([1]) Projet intitulé «Establishing a carbon calculator to promote low carbon farming practices in the EU» (Mise au point d'un calculateur de carbone en vue de promouvoir des pratiques agricoles à faible émission de CO2 dans l'Union européenne).

([2]) Cette méthode est actuellement en phase de consultation publique et d'évaluation. Pour davantage de détails, voir le document: figurant à l'adresse suivante: https://colloque4.inra.fr/var/lcafood2012/storage/fckeditor/file/Presentations/Keynote-Bligny-LCA%20Food%202012.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002438/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Greenhouse gas emissions from cows — Gembloux

Like all ruminants, cows play a significant part in the production of greenhouse gases, particularly methane. There are of course ways of reducing this negative impact, such as genetic selection or choice of feedingstuffs. Yet what is also needed is a reliable method that can be harmonised on a vast scale and that is affordable for farmers and the dairy industry. Researchers at Gembloux Agro-Bio Tech, working in partnership with CRA-W, have now made a decisive step towards this goal. By using all of the information obtained from an infrared analysis of cow's milk, they are able to obtain an accurate and reliable estimate of methane emissions.

This method has been developed at a strategically important time.

1. Given that the European authorities are currently working to define a harmonised methodology for quantifying methane emissions, does the Commission plan to contribute in any way to this initiative?

2. What is the Commission's opinion on this initiative?

3. Does it plan to incorporate this new equation into European legislation on the 'carbon labelling' of food?

4. It would be unfair if certain farmers were to miss out on a low-carbon label for their dairy produce because it has not been identified as such by a sufficiently precise and individualised method. Does the Commission intend to take this into account?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2013)

The Commission has been active in supporting the development of methods and tools which farmers can use for assessing their carbon-footprint, including that of dairy production. A pilot action ([1]) requested by the EP and being managed by the Joint Research Centre will allow life cycle assessment of farm (and product) level greenhouse gas emissions including enteric fermentation. It is currently in pilot-testing and will be finished by the end of 2013.

A direct measurement method such as mid-infrared analysis, if validated to international standards, could support the widespread implementation of such a calculator. It could also provide additional observational data to improve national emission factors in greenhouse gas inventories or assessment studies such as the 'European Greenhouse Gases Emissions from Livestock Production Systems' (GGELS) project.

Currently, the Commission does not plan to propose legislation on carbon labelling or certification schemes to address the issues raised by the Honourable Member. Such labels may be developed by private sectors. Consumer information on climate change implications of their food consumption patterns may help to re-orientate consumption and production towards more climate friendly choices. However, it is also necessary to ensure coherence and reliability of labelling schemes, taking into account the complexity of the food chain, broader environmental effects, and the need to convey clear messages to consumers.

The Commission has been working with the European Food Sustainable Consumption and Production Round Table to develop the 'ENVIFOOD protocol', a methodology for the overall assessment of the environmental footprint of food and drink products ([2]).

([1]) Project 'Establishing a carbon calculator to promote low carbon farming practices in the EU'.
([2]) This methodology is now in public consultation and testing phase. Further details can be found here: https://colloque4.inra.fr/var/lcafood2012/storage/fckeditor/file/Presentations/Keynote-Bligny-LCA%20Food%202012.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002439/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1er mars 2013)

Objet: L'or tunisien s'évapore en Europe

Près de 1 800 lingots d'or pour une valeur de 72 millions d'euros sont sortis illégalement, en toute impunité, de Tunisie entre janvier 2011 et avril 2012. Selon une enquête publiée par le journal français *Nice Matin*, cet or illégal a transité par quatre aéroports (Nice, Marseille, Orly et Roissy) «sans que les douaniers ne reçoivent l'ordre d'intervenir».

Une sorte d'omerta entoure toujours cette histoire d'exfiltration entre la Tunisie et la France puisque l'affaire n'existe pas pour les autorités françaises, douanes en tête, alors que ses agents font état de transit d'or. Les douaniers reçoivent même l'ordre de ne jamais intervenir lorsque des passagers tunisiens viennent déclarer des dizaines de kilos en lingots.

«En effet, pendant plus d'un an et demi et jusqu'en avril 2012, des "passeurs" tunisiens ont bel et bien fait transiter par plusieurs aéroports français — Nice, Marseille, Orly, Roissy Charles-de-Gaulle — des quantités d'or extravagantes sans que nul ne s'y oppose», révèle *Corse Matin*. Et cet or, on ne sait pas vers où il a transité.

Si le trafic a cessé pendant dix mois, mercredi dernier, un «passeur», en provenance de Djerba, a atterri à Nice et fait passer douze kilos en lingots d'or.

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission concernant cet or sorti illégalement de Tunisie?

2. La Commission considère-t-elle que l'or est une marchandise comme une autre, simplement soumise à une obligation déclarative, même si son origine et surtout sa destination sont plus que douteuses du point de vue de l'éthique ou de la morale?

Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(24 avril 2013)

D'après l'article mentionné dans la question, l'or tunisien aurait été importé uniquement via des aéroports français. Par conséquent, l'Honorable Parlementaire devrait peut-être s'adresser également aux autorités françaises à ce sujet.

En ce qui concerne la question plus générale de la récupération des avoirs tunisiens gelés à l'étranger, l'UE n'est pas compétente pour la confiscation et le rapatriement de ces fonds. Cette compétence revient aux États membres, dans le respect des procédures nationales. Depuis l'adoption de mesures restrictives en 2011, l'UE a tout intérêt à ce que le recouvrement d'avoirs détournés progresse, comme le demandent les autorités tunisiennes. Ainsi, pour faciliter ce processus, le SEAE a organisé, conjointement avec la Banque mondiale et l'Office des Nations unies contre la drogue et le crime (ONUDC), un séminaire d'experts à l'intention des autorités tunisiennes, qui s'est tenu en juin 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002439/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: The disappearance of Tunisian gold in Europe

Between January 2011 and April 2012, close to 1 800 gold bars worth EUR 72 million were removed from Tunisia illegally and with complete impunity. According to an investigation published by the French newspaper *Nice Matin*, this illegal gold passed through four airports (Nice, Marseille, Orly and Roissy) 'without any orders being given for customs officials to intervene'.

Something resembling a code of silence appears to have been agreed between Tunisia and France over this exfiltration, since the French authorities, and in particular the customs authorities, deny any knowledge of it, despite the fact that customs agents have reported these movements of gold. Customs officials have been ordered to take no action even if Tunisian passengers declare dozens of kilos of bars.

'For a period of 18 months up until April 2012, Tunisian "mules" were in fact able to transport massive quantities of gold through several French airports — Nice, Marseille, Orly and Roissy Charles-de-Gaulle — without anyone stopping them', according to *Corse Matin*. No one knows where this gold was heading.

Although the movements of gold stopped for 10 months, last Wednesday a 'mule' from Djerba landed in Nice with 12 kilos of gold bars in transit.

1. What is the Commission's position on this gold, which has been removed illegally from Tunisia?

2. Does the Commission believe that the gold is just another commodity that merely needs to be declared, even if its origin and above all its destination are more than questionable in ethical and moral terms?

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

According to the allegations in the article referred to in the question, the imports of Tunisian gold would have taken place via French airports only. The Honourable Member may therefore wish to question also the French authorities about this issue.

With regards to the more general question of recovery of frozen Tunisian assets abroad, the EU has no competence for the confiscation and repatriation of these funds. This is a competence of Member States, subject to national proceedings. Following the imposing of EU restrictive measures in 2011, the EU has a clear interest in progress being made in the recovery of misappropriated assets, as requested by the Tunisian authorities. In order to facilitate this process, in June 2012 the EEAS has for instance co-organised to the benefit of the Tunisian authorities an expert seminar together with the World Bank and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002441/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1º marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Tabacco per narghilè: quali controlli e tutela per i giovani

Fumare una pipa a acqua, chiamata e conosciuta da tutti come narghilè, è un antico rituale tipico di Paesi come Turchia, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh e alcune regioni della Cina. In questi Paesi il narghilè è una tradizione che appartiene soprattutto alle fasce più adulte, mentre, per effetto della globalizzazione, nei paesi occidentali si registra un boom del consumo tra i più giovani che restano affascinati dal momento di socializzazione e di relax che si crea nel fumare pipe a acqua.

A rendere gradevole questa pratica è soprattutto il «sapore». Infatti, il tabacco usato per queste pipe è aromatizzato per soddisfare ogni gusto: mela, cappuccino, fragola, cocco ecc. Così, il tabacco risulta più delicato e non induce a tossire soprattutto i fumatori inesperti, quali i giovani, che sono iniziati «piacevolmente» al fumo. La composizione del narghilè, in realtà, contiene tutti gli elementi nocivi tipici delle sigarette, in quantità anche maggiore: i livelli di nicotina contenuta nel tabacco per narghilè, ad esempio, sono del 2-4 % contro la media dell'1-3 % delle sigarette e creano maggiore dipendenza. Studi scientifici hanno dimostrato che le pipe a acqua contengono nicotina, monossido di carbonio e prodotti cancerogeni, come arsenico, cromo, nichel e piombo, nonché quantità di catrame e metalli pesanti superiori a quelle delle sigarette. Credenza erronea è che l'utilizzo di acqua nel narghilè lo renda innocuo: il fumo passa attraverso l'acqua, viene raffreddato e non filtrato. Inoltre, fumare narghilè richiede tempi lunghi: per fumare una sigaretta occorrono 5 minuti, mentre una sessione di narghilè dura dai 20 agli 80 minuti, il che equivale a 100 sigarette fumate in un giorno. Ricordo alla Commissione che la saliva può contenere agenti patogeni e impiegando lo stesso bocchino tra più persone può verificarsi la trasmissione di agenti patogeni da una bocca all'altra, con la possibilità che si contraggano patologie di non facile trattamento.

Può la Commissione far sapere per quale motivo non vengano pubblicate note informative anche sul tabacco per narghilè e non ci siano controlli mirati e adeguata informazione in quei locali che ne favoriscono la pratica, offrendo il narghilè ai loro clienti e se intenda promuovere campagne informative sui rischi aggiunti per tutelare i giovani e tutti coloro che si apprestano a fumare narghilè?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(3 aprile 2013)

Per assicurare che i consumatori siano consapevoli dei rischi sanitari associati al tabacco per narghilè, tutte le confezioni di tabacco per narghilè devono recare avvertimenti sanitari scritti conformemente al disposto della vigente direttiva sui prodotti del tabacco (direttiva 2001/37/CE) ([1]). La proposta di rivedere la direttiva sui prodotti del tabacco ([2]), che è attualmente in discussione in seno al Parlamento e al Consiglio, comprende la possibilità di aumentare le dimensioni dell'avvertimento sanitario e di introdurre avvertenze illustrate sulle confezioni del tabacco per narghilè se si registrasse un aumento sostanziale delle vendite di tabacco per narghilè o della sua prevalenza tra i giovani.

Per monitorare l'uso dei narghilè nell'UE la Commissione ha inserito un quesito nel merito nell'ultima indagine Eurobarometro sul tabacco (2012) ([3]) e intende continuare su tale linea nelle prossime indagini Eurobarometro. Anche se la Commissione incoraggia gli Stati membri ad informare i consumatori sugli effetti nocivi di tutti i prodotti del tabacco, compreso quello fumato con il narghilè, per il momento la Commissione non prevede di condurre campagne mirate di informazione relativamente ai narghilè.

([1]) GU L 194 del 18.7.2001, pagg. 26-35.
([2]) COM(2012)788 final.
([3]) Speciale Eurobarometro 385.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002441/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Hookah tobacco: what monitoring and protection for young people?

Water pipes, which are known as hookahs or shishas, are an ancient ritual typical of countries such as Turkey, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and some regions of China. In those countries, the hookah is the tradition of older people, above all; however, because of globalisation, Western countries are seeing a boom in consumption among young people who are fascinated by the sociable and relaxed atmosphere that is created when smoking water pipes.

What makes this practice pleasant is above all its 'flavour', since the tobacco used for these pipes is flavoured to suit every taste: apple, cappuccino, strawberry, coconut, etc. This makes the tobacco more delicate and it does not cause coughing in inexperienced smokers such as young people, who thus have a 'soft' introduction to smoking. Hookahs, however, contain all the harmful ingredients that are typical of cigarettes, in even greater quantities: hookah tobacco, for example, has levels of nicotine of 2-4% against an average of 1-3% for cigarettes and has greater addictive qualities. Scientific studies have shown that water pipes contain nicotine, carbon monoxide and carcinogens, such as arsenic, chromium, nickel and lead, as well as amounts of tar and heavy metals that are higher than those contained in cigarettes. It is wrongly believed that the use of water in the hookah makes it harmless, whereas the smoke passes through the water, is cooled and remains unfiltered. Moreover, it takes a long time to smoke a hookah — smoking a cigarette takes just five minutes, while a hookah session lasts from 20 to 80 minutes, which is equivalent to smoking 100 cigarettes a day. It is also worth pointing out that saliva may contain pathogens and, with several people using the same mouthpiece, they could be transmitted from mouth to mouth and people could catch diseases that are not easy to treat.

Can the Commission say why it does not publish briefing notes on hookah tobacco, too, and why there is no targeted monitoring and appropriate information in those places that encourage such smoking by offering hookahs to their customers? Will it promote information campaigns on the additional risks, in order to protect young people and all those who want to smoke hookah pipes?

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

In order to ensure that consumers are aware of the health risks associated with water-pipe tobacco, all packages of water-pipe tobacco must carry textual health warnings according to the current Tobacco Products Directive 2001/37/EC ([1]). The proposal to revise the Tobacco Products Directive ([2]), which is currently being discussed in the Parliament and the Council, includes a possibility to increase the size of the health warning and to introduce picture warnings on the packages of water-pipe tobacco if there is a substantial increase in the sale of water-pipe tobacco or in its prevalence among young people.

To monitor the use of water-pipes in the EU, the Commission included a question on this in the latest Eurobarometer survey on tobacco (2012) ([3]) and intends to continue to do so in coming Eurobarometer surveys. While the Commission encourages Member States to inform consumers about the harmful effect of all tobacco products, including water-pipes, at this stage, the Commission does not plan any targeted information campaign on water-pipes.

([1]) OJ L 194, 18.7.2001, p 26-35.
([2]) COM(2012) 788 final.
([3]) Special Eurobarometer 385.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002442/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1º marzo 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Attacco a Camp Liberty: quale protezione davanti al fallimento dell'operato della rappresentanza europea

Almeno sei persone sono morte il 9 febbraio nell'attacco con razzi e 35 colpi di mortaio contro Camp Liberty e oltre 50 sono stati i feriti. Inoltre, è stato colpito il generatore di corrente della clinica del campo, impedendo di fornire le cure e l'assistenza necessarie per i sopravvissuti. Un bilancio drammatico e un atto di violenza ingiustificato dato che Camp Liberty ospita circa 3000 appartenenti all'organizzazione dei mojahedin del popolo, un gruppo di oppositori del governo iraniano. Già nell'aprile 2011, truppe irachene avevano attaccato Camp Ashraf con uso eccessivo della forza e anche munizioni letali contro chi opponeva resistenza. Anche allora furono uccise 36 persone e vi furono oltre 300 feriti, cui venne impedito di lasciare il campo per ricevere cure mediche. Dopo aver vissuto per 25 anni nel Camp Ashraf, nel corso del 2012 i residenti erano stati trasferiti a Camp Liberty subendo, durante la fase del trasferimento, attacchi da parte delle forze irachene.

Considerato che:

— i residenti di Camp Liberty sono richiedenti asilo nei cui confronti è in corso il procedimento di determinazione dello status di rifugiati e che, come tali, hanno diritto alla protezione internazionale;

— le misure necessarie per proteggere l'incolumità dei residenti di Camp Liberty avrebbero dovuto già essere adottate sotto la responsabilità della comunità internazionale e europea;

— hanno subito angherie, violenze e attacchi dell'esercito iracheno (ossequiente agli ordini della dittatura di Ahmadineyad) con più di 50 vittime: più di 3200 uomini e donne sono stati trasferiti a Camp Liberty, con la promessa di un'emigrazione assistita nel nome delle trattative internazionali;

— è evidente che tali promesse sono state deluse e il rischio per la vita di migliaia di iraniani è diventato ancora più alto;

— l'UE non deve tollerare che un regime come quello iraniano che nega i diritti umani, continui a interferire perseguitando i dissidenti.

Può l'Alto Rappresentante Ashton:

1. chiarire soprattutto il fallimento dell'operato della rappresentanza europea e delle forze di sicurezza irachene prima e durante l'attacco contro Camp Liberty del 9 febbraio 2013 che ha causato morti e feriti, e adottare tutte le misure necessarie a garantire che le persone rimaste ferite ricevano cure mediche adeguate;

2. spiegare perché la diplomazia europea non sia riuscita a impedirlo;

3. indagare e riferire con urgenza sull'attacco?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(24 aprile 2013)

L'Unione europea segue da vicino la questione del reinsediamento degli ex residenti di Camp Ashraf e sostiene gli sforzi volti a trovare una soluzione pacifica ed efficace a una vera e propria questione umanitaria.

Per questo motivo l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha sottolineato ripetutamente il suo pieno sostegno al processo in atto, agevolato dalle Nazioni Unite, e all'azione del Rappresentante speciale del Segretario generale, Martin Kobler. L'Alta Rappresentante ritiene che un programma di reinsediamento in paesi terzi sia l'unica strada percorribile. L'Ufficio dell'Alto Commissario delle Nazioni Unite per i rifugiati (UNHCR) sta procedendo come previsto alla determinazione dello status di rifugiato dei residenti giunti nel sito temporaneo di Camp Hurriya. L'UE ha erogato il contributo maggiore in questo processo, versando 12 milioni di euro per finanziare le operazioni delle agenzie dell'ONU coinvolte, l'UNHCR e l'UNOPS.

Tuttavia, il fatto che l'UE sostenga questo processo non significa che è responsabile di introdurre misure intese a proteggere la sicurezza dei residenti di Camp Hurriya. Questo compito incombe al governo iracheno, in conformità del protocollo d'intesa che ha concluso del 25 dicembre 2011 con le Nazioni Unite. Va osservato che la situazione della sicurezza in tutto l'Irak, e non solo a Camp Hurriya, continua a destare preoccupazione.

Gli attentati del 9 febbraio a Camp Hurriya sono stati pubblicamente condannati dall'UE. Gli attentati sono stati rivendicati da Jaish al-Mukhtar, un'ala militante di Hezbollah attiva in Irak. Il governo iracheno ha reagito prontamente inviando squadre per ripristinare la sicurezza intorno al campo e aiutare con il trasporto dei feriti. Il Primo ministro ha costituito una commissione per indagare sull'incidente. Gli attentati mettono in evidenza l'urgente necessità di accelerare il processo di reinsediamento, con la collaborazione sia dei residenti che dei paesi terzi disposti ad accoglierli.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002442/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Attack on Camp Liberty — what protection in the wake of the failure of EU diplomacy?

At least six people were killed on 9 February in an attack on Camp Liberty with rockets and 35 mortars and more than 50 were injured. The power generator for the field hospital was also hit, preventing survivors from receiving the necessary care and assistance. This is a tragic toll and an act of unjustified violence given that Camp Liberty accommodates around 3000 members of the People's Mojahedin organisation, a group which opposes the Iranian Government. As far back as April 2011, Iraqi troops had attacked Camp Ashraf with an excessive use of force, even using lethal ammunition against those who resisted. Then, too, 36 people had been killed and more than 300 injured; the latter had been prevented from leaving the field to receive medical treatment. After living in Camp Ashraf for 25 years, in 2012 the residents were moved to Camp Liberty and, during the transfer, were attacked by Iraqi forces.

Given that:

— the residents of Camp Liberty are asylum-seekers who are undergoing a process to determine their refugee status and, as such, are entitled to international protection;

— the necessary measures to protect the safety of Camp Liberty residents should already have been taken under the responsibility of the international and EU community;

— these people have suffered hardship, violence and attacks by the Iraqi army (who are obeying the orders of the Ahmadinejad dictatorship), with more than 50 casualties, and more than 3200 men and women were moved to Camp Liberty with the promise of assisted emigration in the name of international negotiations;

— it is clear that those promises have been dashed and the risk to the lives of thousands of Iranians has become even higher;

— the EU should not tolerate the continued interference of a regime like Iran, which denies human rights and persecutes dissidents;

Can High Representative Ashton:

1. provide explanations, first and foremost, as to the failure of the work of the EU mission and Iraqi security forces, both before and during the attack on Camp Liberty on 9 February 2013 which caused deaths and injuries, and take all necessary measures to ensure that those injured receive adequate medical care;

2. explain why EU diplomacy failed to prevent it from happening;

3. carry out an investigation and issue a report on the attack as a matter of urgency?

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

The EU follows the issue of resettlement of the former residents of Camp Ashraf very closely and supports efforts to find a peaceful and orderly solution to what is a humanitarian rights issue.

This is why the HR/VP has repeatedly stressed her full support to the ongoing process facilitated by the UN and to Special Representative Martin Kobler. She believes that resettlement to third countries is the only viable solution. The UNHCR is proceeding as foreseen with the 'refugee status determination' of the residents who are staying at the temporary transit location Camp Hurriya. The EU has been the biggest contributor to this process, with 12 million euro provided to help the UN agencies involved — notably the UNHCR and UNOPS — to finance their operations.

The EU support to this process however does not imply responsibility for introducing measures to protect the safety of Camp Hurriya residents. The safety at Camp Hurriya is the responsibility of the Iraqi government, in accordance with the memorandum of understanding of 25 December 2011 between the Iraqi Government and the UN. It should be noted that the security situation everywhere in Iraq, not just at Camp Hurriya, is a matter of concern.

The attacks of 9 February on Camp Hurriya were condemned publicly by the EU. Jaish al-Mukhtar, a militant wing of Hezbollah in Iraq, claimed responsibility. The Iraqi Government responded rapidly by dispatching teams to secure the area around the camp and assisting with medical transportation of the wounded. The Prime Minister formed a committee to investigate the incident. The attacks remind us of the urgency to accelerate the resettlement process, with the cooperation of both the residents and third countries that are ready to receive them.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002443/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1º marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Il decentramento politico o federalismo fiscale può contribuire ad aumentare l'efficacia della politica di coesione e dei fondi strutturali?

I fondi strutturali sono il principale strumento della politica di coesione dell'UE e rappresentano una fonte di finanziamento rilevante per le politiche di sviluppo. Le regioni hanno assunto un ruolo centrale nella politica di coesione, dalla fase di programmazione a quella di attuazione, fino alla valutazione. Il governo della politica di coesione si basa su un sistema multilivello (*multi-level governance*). Un recente studio evidenzia proprio l'impatto della spesa regionale pro-capite dei fondi strutturali sulla crescita del Pil pro-capite in 158 regioni europee per il periodo di programmazione 2000-2006. Lo studio si concentra su due dimensioni dei governi regionali: la loro qualità e il grado di decentramento politico. La qualità dei governi locali è stata elaborata sulla base di un sondaggio condotto dal *Quality of Government Institute* attraverso la distribuzione di un questionario a 37mila abitanti delle regioni interessate, contenente una serie di domande circa la capacità dei governi locali di erogare servizi pubblici. Dai dati emergono differenze importanti tra paesi, ma ancora più interessanti differenze tra le regioni all'interno dei paesi. La seconda dimensione considerata è il livello di decentramento politico. Anche in questo caso si tratta di un indicatore composto che cerca di catturare l'effettiva autorità regionale. Emergono minori differenze all'interno dei paesi, con le regioni degli Stati federali (Austria e Germania) o molto decentrati (Spagna) che risultano quelle con maggiori poteri.

I risultati mostrano che, in generale, la spesa pro-capite regionale nel periodo di programmazione comunitario 2000-2006 (fino al 2008) non è associata a una crescita del Pil pro-capite nello stesso periodo. Se però si prende in considerazione il ruolo dei governi locali, i risultati cambiano. Nelle regioni con elevata qualità dei governi locali e maggiore decentramento politico, la spesa in fondi strutturali mostra un impatto positivo sulla crescita del reddito pro-capite. Il fattore decentramento sembra essere più pervasivo rispetto alla qualità istituzionale. Nel gruppo di regioni a maggiore decentramento emerge una relazione diretta tra qualità istituzionale e crescita economica. Questo suggerisce un effetto positivo delle istituzioni sulla crescita economica che agisce con meccanismi diversi, non mediato dall'efficacia della spesa dei fondi strutturali.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. perché nelle regioni con bassa qualità dei governi e scarso decentramento i fondi non sembrano essere efficaci?

2. se l'aumento della responsabilità nella gestione dei fondi strutturali oppure il decentramento politico (o federalismo fiscale) possono rafforzare le capacità dei governi locali tramite processi di apprendimento?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(8 aprile 2013)

La Commissione ritiene che la capacità amministrativa nazionale e regionale riveste un'importanza critica per l'efficace attuazione della politica di coesione. Pertanto, per il periodo 2014-2020, la Commissione ha proposto di aumentare le possibilità di utilizzare i finanziamenti della politica di coesione per investire in tali capacità.

Dagli studi e dalle valutazioni effettuati dalla Commissione emerge che l'esperienza legata all'attuazione di un programma di politica di coesione può migliorare la capacità amministrativa complessiva di un'amministrazione locale.

Gli Stati membri devono porre in atto un sistema di gestione e controllo efficace suscettibile di verifica ad opera della Commissione. La decisione di decentrare certe mansioni e responsabilità all'interno di un paese rientra però nelle competenze esclusive degli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002443/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Can political decentralisation or fiscal federalism help improve the effectiveness of cohesion policy and the Structural Funds?

The Structural Funds are the main instrument of EU cohesion policy and are a significant source of financing for development policies. The regions have taken on a central role in cohesion policy, from the programming stage to implementation and evaluation. Cohesion policy is governed by a multi-level system (multi-level governance). A recent study showed precisely what impact Structural Fund regional spending per capita had on per capita GDP growth in 158 European regions in the programming period 2000-2006. The study focused on two aspects of regional government: its quality and its degree of political decentralisation. The quality of local government was assessed on the basis of a survey conducted by the Quality of Government Institute, whereby a questionnaire was sent to 37 000 inhabitants of the regions concerned, including a range of questions about the ability of local governments to deliver public services. The data show that there are substantial differences between countries, but — even more interesting — there are also differences between regions within the same country.

The second aspect considered was the level of political decentralisation. In this case too, it is a composite indicator that seeks to capture the true situation of regional authority. Minor differences emerged within countries, while the regions of federal states (such as Austria and Germany) or of highly decentralised countries (Spain) were those with the greatest powers.

The results show that, in general, regional per capita expenditure in the EU programming period 2000-2006 (up to 2008) was not associated with an increase in GDP per capita over the same period. However, if the role of local government is taken into account, the results change. In regions with a high quality of local government and greater political decentralisation, Structural Fund expenditure had a positive impact on the growth of per capita income. The decentralisation factor appears to be more pervasive than the institutional quality factor. In the group of regions which were more decentralised, a direct relationship emerged between institutional quality and economic growth. This suggests that the institutions have a positive effect on economic growth, which acts through different mechanisms and is not mediated by the effectiveness of Structural Fund spending.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Why, in regions with low-quality government and little decentralisation, funds do not seem to be effective?

2. Can greater responsibility in the management of the Structural Funds or political decentralisation (or fiscal federalism) improve the ability of local governments through learning processes?

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

The Commission considers the national and regional administrative capacity of critical importance for the effective implementation of cohesion policy. Therefore, for the 2014-2020 period, the Commission has proposed to increase the possibilities of using cohesion policy funding to invest in these capacities.

The Commission's studies and evaluations show that the experience of implementing a cohesion policy programme can improve the overall administrative capacity of a sub-national level of government.

Member States need to set up an effective management and control system which is subject to examination by the Commission. The decision to decentralise certain tasks and responsibilities within a country is however purely for to the Member State.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002444/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1º marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Incentivi per la riduzione dell'uso di combustibili e scarico sulle bollette del gas: un danno per il consumatore e per la competitività delle imprese italiane

In Italia è stato recentemente presentato il testo di un decreto per incentivare la coibentazione degli edifici, le pompe di calore, i collettori solari termici e altri simili interventi intesi a ridurre l'uso di combustibili per la generazione di calore. Si prevede che l'incentivo copra il 40 % del costo. La spesa complessiva annua è fissata in 200 milioni per interventi delle amministrazioni pubbliche e 700 milioni per investimenti di privati. Poiché gli incentivi sono diluiti per lo più su cinque anni, una spesa annua di 900 milioni implica che si siano concessi incentivi per circa 4,5 miliardi. L'intervento verrà dunque finanziato scaricando il costo sulle bollette del gas a carico dei consumatori finali.

Il decreto suscita molti profili critici, sia sul metodo che sul merito. Ad esempio, se la spesa fosse sottoposta all'approvazione del Parlamento, il merito verrebbe correttamente valutato nel confronto con altre possibili destinazioni di 900 milioni l'anno, ed emergerebbe anche l'implicito ulteriore aumento della pressione tributaria. Con l'escamotage di addossare i costi degli incentivi alle bollette, come già avvenuto per la disastrosa vicenda del fotovoltaico, si creano in sostanza «gestioni fuori bilancio» senza trasparenza dei costi per la collettività e senza valutazione delle priorità nella spesa pubblica.

Considerato che i singoli investimenti possono essere anche di importi minimali, si potrà avere un grandissimo numero di richieste con conseguente aumento delle procedure amministrative e relativi costi. Tuttavia, tali costi elevati in rapporto a piccoli investimenti vengono coperti dall'incentivo, al 100 per cento per le amministrazioni pubbliche e al 50 per cento per i privati, pertanto il costo a carico del Gse può salire ben oltre il 40 per cento dell'investimento.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. ritiene compatibili con il mercato interno e con la normativa a tutela del consumatore simili incentivi, dal momento che non vi è alcun beneficio reale per la collettività?

2. ritiene che l'aumento del costo del gas contribuirà invece a ridurre la competitività delle imprese italiane, già molto penalizzate dagli enormi sussidi concessi al fotovoltaico e alle altre energie rinnovabili, che hanno accresciuto del 50 per cento il costo dell'energia prodotta in Italia?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(29 aprile 2013)

1. La Commissione, in base alle informazioni attualmente in suo possesso, non è in grado di stabilire se il provvedimento menzionato sia conforme alla legislazione dell'UE in materia di mercato interno dell'energia, e rileva come non sia tuttavia insolito che gli Stati membri ricorrano a meccanismi di questo tipo in modo analogo. Ciò non significa che la Commissione concordi con l'onorevole deputato sul fatto che non via sia alcun beneficio reale per la collettività.

2. In linea di principio qualsiasi aumento dei costi a carico delle imprese rischia di intaccarne la posizione concorrenziale. D'altro canto, però, le misure in questione concorrono a ridurre il consumo di energia e di conseguenza, a lungo andare, anche i costi. Per questo motivo la Commissione è del parere che l'introduzione di misure strategiche debba essere preceduta da un'analisi finalizzata a valutare se i costi economici complessivi delle misure sono superiori ai benefici previsti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002444/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Incentives to reduce fuel use, with cost to be added to gas bills, harming consumers and the competitiveness of Italian companies

In Italy the text of a decree was recently submitted with a view to promoting building insulation, heat pumps, solar thermal collectors and other similar measures to reduce the use of fuel for heat generation. The incentive is expected to cover 40% of the cost. Total annual expenditure has been set at EUR 200 million for measures by the public authorities and EUR 700 million for investments by private individuals. As the incentives are to be largely spread out over five years, an annual expenditure of EUR 900 million means that the incentives will cost around EUR 4.5 billion. The measure will be financed through gas bills paid by the final consumers.

The decree has been the subject of much criticism, regarding both the method and the substance. For example, if the expenditure were to be submitted to Parliament for approval, the substance of the matter would be properly assessed, by comparing it with other possible uses of EUR 900 million a year, and the implicit additional tax burden would also emerge. By using the ploy of shifting the costs of the incentives onto bills, as was previously done for the disastrous solar panel affair, the government is managing its finances 'off the balance-sheet', without any transparency as to the cost to the public and without any assessment of public spending priorities.

Considering that individual investments can also be for minimal amounts, there could be a large number of applications resulting in increased administrative procedures and costs. However, such high costs in relation to small investments are covered by the incentive — 100% for the public authorities and 50% for private citizens, which means that the cost to the GSE (energy service authority) could climb to well over 40% of the investment.

Can the Commission therefore say whether:

1. it considers such incentives to be compatible with the internal market and with consumer protection laws, given that there is no real benefit to the community;

2. it does not agree that the rising cost of gas will, conversely, reduce the competitiveness of Italian firms, which are already heavily penalised by the huge subsidies granted for solar energy and other renewable energies, which have increased the cost of energy produced in Italy by 50%?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(29 April 2013)

1. On the basis of the information available at present, the Commission is not in the position to comment on the conformity of the described measure with EU legislation on the internal energy market. It is however not unusual that Member States implement such mechanisms in a similar way. This does not mean that the Commission agrees with your statement that there's no real benefit to the community.

2. In principle, any increase of costs faced by enterprises risks impacting their competitive position. But on the other hand the measures in question also help reducing energy consumption and therefore cost over time. The Commission therefore advocates that introduction of policy measures should be preceded by an analysis assessing whether the overall economic costs of the measures in question outweigh their benefits.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002445/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1º marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Radiazioni da campi elettromagnetici ad alta frequenza: quali misure preventive per i cittadini?

La ricerca scientifica si è da sempre attivata per scoprire se l'esposizione alle radiazioni di campi elettromagnetici ad alta frequenza comporti rischi per la salute, in particolar modo se possa provocare l'insorgenza di tumori. I risultati di tutte le ricerche non consentono, a oggi, di affermare o escludere con assoluta certezza, l'esistenza di tali rischi. Qualsiasi cosa generi o utilizzi elettricità, come le linee di corrente e gli elettrodomestici, produce un campo elettromagnetico. I rilevatori di sicurezza nell'ultimo decennio sono proliferati in uno scenario mondiale, senza alcuna regola a tutela della salute. I metal detector di aeroporti, banche e istituzioni pubbliche, fissi e portatili, funzionano con onde elettromagnetiche a bassa frequenza o a raggi X e le persone sono, spesso, costrette giornalmente a essere irradiate. Generalmente, considerato il basso livello di campo emesso da un metal detector impiegato per controllare la persona, si considera che l'esposizione non sia pericolosa per nessuno, incluse le donne incinte. Per contro, molti ginecologi prescrivono alle proprie pazienti in dolce attesa di non sottoporsi ai controlli al metal detector, poiché potrebbero danneggiare lo sviluppo del feto. In merito, anche il rilevamento epidemiologico di un'aumentata incidenza di neoplasie infantili, conseguente all'esposizione ai campi magnetici, ha indotto autorevoli organismi internazionali come la IARC (Agenzia internazionale di ricerca sul cancro) a classificare tali campi come «possibilmente cancerogeni per l'uomo», inserendoli così nella categoria 2B del sistema di classificazione della IARC.

Considerato che:

— le donne in gravidanza e i bambini devono essere tutelati da possibili fonti di radiazioni;

— è necessario porre la massima cautela e cercare di prevenire i rischi per la salute di diversi «soggetti sensibili»;

può la Commissione far sapere se intende:

1. sviluppare studi di impatto sulla salute umana, poiché la mancanza di conoscenze scientifiche certe non deve rappresentare un alibi per rinviare le misure di prevenzione;

2. predisporre misure preventive secondo il principio di precauzione, in base al quale si possono adottare subito provvedimenti per la protezione dalle onde elettromagnetiche, specie per le esposizioni a lungo termine cui sono sottoposte le persone che quotidianamente sono controllate da apparecchi che emettono radiazioni?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(23 aprile 2013)

1. Oltre alle ricerche effettuate in passato l'attuale programma quadro di ricerca dell'UE ha stanziato fondi per due progetti multinazionali che studiano le conseguenze dei campi elettromagnetici sulla salute: ARIMMORA ([1]), che indaga sull'esposizione ai campi magnetici a frequenze estremamente basse (tra le quali si annoverano le linee ad alta tensione) e sull'aumento del rischio di contrarre la leucemia durante l'infanzia, e MOBI-KIDS ([2]), che studia la possibile correlazione tra il cancro dell'encefalo nei bambini e negli adolescenti e l'uso dei telefoni cellulari. Al momento è inoltre aperto un invito a partecipare ad un progetto su vasta scala mirante a colmare le lacune conoscitive in materia e a ridurre l'esposizione ai campi elettromagnetici.

2. Il Comitato scientifico dei rischi sanitari emergenti e recentemente identificati (CSRSERI) dispone di un mandato permanente a valutare i rischi derivanti dall'esposizione ai campi elettromagnetici. Secondo quanto affermato nell'ultima opinione del 2009 del Comitato ([3]), tre linee di ricerca indipendenti (studi epidemiologici, in vivo e in vitro) dimostrano che l'esposizione alle frequenze radio dei campi elettromagnetici non determina un aumento dell'incidenza del cancro negli esseri umani. La Commissione chiede periodicamente un aggiornamento sui dati scientifici disponibili al fine di valutare i rischi derivanti dall'esposizione ai campi elettromagnetici e stabilisce se tale aggiornamento conferma i valori limite dell'esposizione di cui alla raccomandazione del Consiglio sui limiti di esposizione ai campi elettromagnetici (1999/519/EC) ([4]). Il comitato scientifico pubblicherà una nuova opinione in proposito entro fine giugno 2013.

([1]) http://arimmora-fp7.eu
([2]) http://www.mbkds.com
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_risk/committees/04_scenihr/docs/scenihr_o_022.pdf
([4]) GU L 199 del 30.07.1999, pag. 59.

Le disposizioni di cui agli articoli 168 e 169 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea non conferiscono all'UE la competenza a legiferare riguardo alla protezione della popolazione dagli effetti potenzialmente nocivi dei campi magnetici e ne lasciano la responsabilità principale agli Stati membri. Il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio adotteranno a breve una direttiva riguardo all'esposizione ai campi elettromagnetici sul posto di lavoro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002445/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Radiation from high-frequency electromagnetic fields — what preventive measures for citizens?

Scientific research has always been active in attempting to discover whether exposure to radiation from high-frequency electromagnetic fields poses any risk to health, in particular whether it can cause cancer. The results of all the research done to date do not enable us to establish or rule out with absolute certainty whether or not such risks exist. Whatever generates or uses electricity, such as power lines and household appliances, produces an electromagnetic field. Security detectors have proliferated over the past decade throughout the world, without any rules to protect health. Metal detectors, both fixed and mobile, in airports, banks and public institutions work with low-frequency electromagnetic waves or X-rays and people are often forced to be irradiated daily. In general, given the low level of radiation emitted by metal detectors used to check people, it is considered that the exposure is not dangerous for anyone, including pregnant women. However, many gynaecologists tell their pregnant patients not to undergo metal detector checks, because they could damage the developing foetus. In this regard, it has been noted epidemiologically that there is an increased incidence of childhood cancer following exposure to magnetic fields. This has prompted authoritative international bodies such as the IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer) to classify these fields as 'possibly carcinogenic to humans', placing them in Group 2B of the IARC classification system.

Given that:

— pregnant women and children should be protected from possible sources of radiation;

— the utmost care should be taken to try to prevent risks to the health of vulnerable people;

will the Commission:

1. develop studies on the impact on human health, because the lack of proven scientific knowledge should not be an excuse for postponing preventive measures;

2. introduce preventive measures in accordance with the precautionary principle, according to which immediate action can be taken to protect people from electromagnetic radiation, especially with regard to the long-term exposure of people who are checked by radiation-emitting devices every day?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)

1. In addition to research conducted in the past, the current EU research Framework Programme is funding two multinational projects looking at health impacts of electromagnetic fields (EMF): ARIMMORA ([1]), focused on exposure to extremely low frequency fields, such as those emitted by high power lines, and increased risk of childhood leukaemia, and MOBI-KIDS ([2]), exploring a possible link between brain cancer in children and adolescents and mobile phone use. Moreover, a call for applications for a large-scale project focused on closing gaps of knowledge and reducing exposure to EMF is currently open.

2. The independent Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks has a standing mandate to evaluate EMF risks. According to its latest Opinion of 2009 ([3]), three independent lines of evidence (epidemiological, *in vivo* and *in vitro* studies) show that exposure to radiofrequency EMF is unlikely to lead to an increase of cancer incidence in humans. The Commission requests periodically an update of the scientific evidence available to evaluate the risks from EMF and checks whether it still supports the exposure limits of the Council Recommendation on EMF exposure limits (1999/519/EC) ([4]). The Scientific Committee is due to release a new opinion on this by the end of June 2013.

([1]) http://arimmora-fp7.eu/.
([2]) http://www.mbkds.com/.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/archive/ph_risk/committees/04_scenihr/docs/scenihr_o_022.pdf
([4]) *Official Journal of the European Communities*, L 199/59, 30 July 1999.

Regarding preventive measures, Articles 168 and 169 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union do not confer the EU competence to legislate in the area of protection of the general public from the potential effects of EMF and leaves the primary responsibility with the Member States. As regards exposure to EMF at work, a directive regarding the exposure of workers to electromagnetic fields will be adopted shortly by the European Parliament and the Council.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002446/13
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1º marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Sangue infetto — un fenomeno senza dati in Europa: quale tutela per i pazienti vittime di errori medici e quali gli ostacoli all'armonizzazione delle misure in Europa?

A volte basta un refuso per riaprire il dolente capitolo delle trasfusioni di sangue infetto. Prendere albumina per immunoglobulina, scambiare proteina e anticorpo: è così che di recente si è riaperto un nuovo caso di errore medico denunciato dalla Lega italiana dei diritti dell'uomo (LIDU onlus). Riguarda un paziente cui è stato disconosciuto il rapporto causale tra la profilassi con l'emoderivato antitetanico ricevuta nel 1982 presso un noto ospedale e l'epatite cronica constatata nel 2009. Un classico caso d'infezione esploso 27 anni dopo, purtroppo senza colpevoli e senza risarcimento. Il primo diniego dell'indennizzo al paziente è arrivato dalla Commissione medica ospedaliera nel 2011. Il diniego era accompagnato dalla motivazione che «l'albumina è priva di rischio per la trasmissione di agenti infettivi conosciuti». Un errore grossolano, perché l'antitetanica si somministra attraverso immunoglobulina e non albumina. Dopo la denuncia del paziente, la Commissione si riunisce nuovamente e nega ancora l'indennizzo sulla base di un parere dell'Istituto superiore di Sanità del 1995 sul rischio da immunoglobuline, con il riferimento a trattamenti di inattivazione «recenti»; ma quel parere era del '95 mentre il paziente aveva subito l'antitetanica nel 1982 e non può aver beneficiato dei progressi di inattivazione virale arrivati solo 13 anni più tardi.

Il rischio peggiore è che tale negligenza medica, unita all'assoluta mancanza di chiarezza e di statistiche aggiornate sul fenomeno da parte del ministero della Salute in Italia, nasconda in realtà una totale mancanza di tutela dei pazienti e del loro diritto alla salute. I processi in corso in Italia denunciano migliaia di cartelle cliniche rimaste «sigillate». Solo l'operato di diverse associazioni ha fatto emergere anche vicende inedite, come la spregiudicata sperimentazione dei prodotti antivirali direttamente sull'uomo, infettando cavie del tutto inconsapevoli.

Può la Commissione far sapere, nel rispetto del principio di sussidiarietà:

1. se può indicare dati statistici aggiornati sul fenomeno descritto riguardanti tutta l'Europa;

2. quali azioni urgenti, anche in vista di una possibile armonizzazione, intende adottare per contrastare tale fenomeno?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(26 aprile 2013)

Gli standard di sicurezza e di qualità del sangue e delle componenti del sangue sono definiti nella direttiva 2002/98/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio e nella legislazione che vi dà attuazione. Questi standard comprendono analisi obbligatorie del sangue per individuare la presenza di epatite B e C. La legislazione risale al 2002 ed è quindi successiva al caso menzionato nell'interrogazione dell'onorevole deputato, e la sua corretta attuazione è di responsabilità delle autorità nazionali competenti. Per il momento la Commissione non dispone di statistiche in merito a persone che abbiano sviluppato un'epatite cronica in seguito alla trasfusione di componenti del sangue o di prodotti derivati dal sangue.

La Commissione desidera ribadire che, in forza del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea e del trattato sull'Unione europea, essa dispone di poteri limitati nel settore dell'assistenza sanitaria e non ha affatto poteri per intervenire in casi individuali. Gli indennizzi richiesti agli Stati membri nell'ambito di una causa per danni rientrano nelle competenze delle istanze nazionali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002446/13
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Tainted blood — no figures available in Europe: protection for patients who are victims of medical error and obstacles to Europe-wide harmonisation

Sometimes all it takes is a misprint to reopen the painful chapter of tainted blood transfusions. Mistaking immunoglobulin for albumin, confusing protein with antibodies — that is how a new case of medical error, reported by the Italian League of Human Rights (LIDU, a non-profit organisation), recently arose. The patient concerned received a blood product-derived tetanus vaccine in 1982 from a well-known hospital and was diagnosed with chronic hepatitis in 2009, but no one has been willing to admit the causal relationship between the two events. This is a typical case in which an infection breaks out with a 27-year time-lag, but, unfortunately, there are no culprits and no compensation. The first refusal to grant compensation to the patient came from the hospital medical board in 2011. The grounds were that 'albumin poses no risk for the transmission of known infectious agents'. This was a real blunder, given that the tetanus vaccine is administered through immunoglobulin, not albumin. After the patient had complained, the medical board met again and still refused to grant compensation, citing a 1995 opinion of the Institute of Health (*Istituto Superiore di Sanità*) on the risk posed by immunoglobulins, with reference to 'recent' inactivation treatments. However, that opinion was from 1995, whereas the patient had been given the tetanus vaccine in 1982 and could not, therefore, have benefited from the advances in viral inactivation which arrived only 13 years later.

The worst risk is that such medical negligence — combined with a total lack of clarity and updated statistics from the Ministry of Health in Italy — actually conceals a situation in which patients and their right to health have no protection whatsoever. Court cases currently under way in Italy have shown that there are thousands of medical records which are left 'sealed'. It is only thanks to the work of representative organisations that some unusual events have come to light, such as the unscrupulous testing of antiviral products directly on humans, in which the infected human guinea pigs were totally unaware of what was going on.

Without infringing the subsidiarity principle:

1. Can the Commission provide any updated statistics on the phenomenon described above, covering Europe as a whole?

2. Can it say what urgent measures it will take, not least with a view to possible harmonisation, in order to combat this phenomenon?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 April 2013)

Standards of safety and quality of blood and blood components are laid down in Directive 2002/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, and in its implementing legislation. These standards include the mandatory testing of blood for Hepatitis B and C. The legislation dates from 2002, i.e. from after the case described in the question of the Honourable Member and the correct implementation falls under the responsibility of the national competent authorities. At this stage the Commission has no statistics on persons who have developed chronic hepatitis following transfusion of a blood component or a blood derived product.

The Commission would like to highlight that, under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and under the Treaty on the European Union, it has limited powers in the healthcare sector and no powers to intervene in individual cases. Compensations sought from the Member State in the course of actions for damages fall into the competence of national law.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002447/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Philip Claeys (NI)
(1 maart 2013)

Betreft: VP/HR — Het uitwissen van vaak eeuwenoude cultuurhistorische stads-, dorps- en straatnamen van Europese oorsprong in Zuid-Afrika

In Zuid-Afrika is reeds eeuwen een aanzienlijke aanwezigheid van mensen van Europese afkomst: Afrikaners en Engelstaligen. Uit hun aanwezigheid is een hele reeks stads-, dorps- en straatnamen voortgevloeid die deel vormt van de cultureel-historische identiteit van Zuid-Afrika en van de volkeren die er leven.

De ANC — regering onderneemt stappen om vele van deze stads-, dorps- en straatnamen uit te wissen. Ook namen die duidelijk dateren van honderden jaren voor de apartheidsperiode worden geviseerd en uitgewist.

Deze problematiek is voor ons in de EU niet nieuw, gelet op gebieden die door oorlogsomstandigheden van staat veranderd zijn.

1. Is de Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger van mening dat het uitwissen van stads-, dorps- en straatnamen van Europese oorsprong in Zuid-Afrika aanvaardbaar is?

2. Is de Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger van mening dat dit getuigt van respect voor de cultureel-historische erfenis van Europese oorsprong die in Zuid-Afrika aanwezig is?

3. Werd dit door de Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger reeds besproken met de Zuid-Afrikaanse regering? Zo neen, zal zijn dit doen?

4. Is de Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger van mening dat Zuid-Afrika integendeel stappen moet ondernemen om de bescherming en bevordering van diversiteit en cultuuruitingen te waarborgen?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(13 mei 2013)

Elk land heeft het soevereine recht zijn geografische namen te standaardiseren. Dit is in overeenstemming met VN-resolutie 4 van de 1e Conferentie van de Verenigde Naties voor de Standaardisering van Geografische Namen.

Het besluit van de Zuid-Afrikaanse Raad voor geografische namen van 1998 had tot doel om historische onevenwichtigheden weg te werken en zo een nationale identiteit te creëren die door alle Zuid-Afrikanen kan worden onderschreven. In dit verband heeft de Waarheids- en verzoeningscommissie van Zuid-Afrika in 1998 aanbevolen om de geografische namen te wijzigen als een vorm van symbolische herstelbetalingen voor het onrechtvaardige verleden en de schendingen van de mensenrechten.

Uit hoofde van het besluit adviseert de Zuid-Afrikaanse Raad voor geografische namen (*South African Geographical Names Council* — SAGNC), de minister van Kunst en Cultuur op basis van voorstellen van groepen burgers of gemeentebesturen over de standaardisering en verandering van geografische namen.

Het wijzigen van plaatsnamen is overal per definitie een controversieel proces. Om die reden zijn in de Zuid-Afrikaanse wetgeving uitvoerige raadplegingsprocedures vastgesteld om de volledige gemeenschap bij elke overwogen wijziging te betrekken. In het licht van deze uitdaging en omdat sommige groepen van de samenleving zich van de procedures uitgesloten voelden, is de Zuid-Afrikaanse regering gestart met uitgebreide provinciale hoorzittingen waar een aantal bezwaren is vastgesteld. De EU is ervan overtuigd dat de regering daar met de nodige gevoeligheid, verantwoordelijkheid en in een geest van eensgezindheid mee zal omspringen om zo de samenhang van de Zuid-Afrikaanse maatschappij te vergroten en tegelijkertijd nieuwe breekpunten te vermijden.

De EU volgt dit langetermijnproces en maatschappelijke debat aandachtig vanwege het grote belang ervan voor de vorming van een natie en voor verzoening.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002447/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Philip Claeys (NI)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Wiping-out of names of towns, villages and streets of European origin in South Africa which are of significance for cultural history and in many cases are centuries old

For centuries, many people of European origin have lived in South Africa: Afrikaners and English-speakers. Their presence has given rise to a whole series of names of towns, villages and streets which form part of the cultural and historical identity of South Africa and of the peoples who live there.

The ANC government is taking steps to wipe out many of these names of towns, villages and streets. Even names which clearly date from hundreds of years before the apartheid era are being targeted and wiped out.

This problem is not a new one for us in the EU, bearing in mind territories which have been transferred between States as a result of wars.

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative consider that wiping out names of towns, villages and streets of European origin in South Africa is acceptable?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative consider that this shows respect for the cultural heritage of European origin which exists in South Africa?

3. Has the Vice-President/High Representative raised this matter with the South African Government? If not, will she do so?

4. Does the Vice-President/High Representative consider that South Africa ought, on the contrary, to take steps to protect and promote diversity and expressions of culture?

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

Each country has the sovereign prerogative to standardise its geographical names. This is in accordance with UN Resolution 4 of the First United Nations Conference on the Standardisation of Geographical Names.

The 1998 South African Geographical Names Council Act intended to redress historical imbalances contributing towards establishing a national identity to which all South Africans can ascribe. In this respect the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa recommended in 1998 the renaming of geographical features as a form of symbolic reparations to address the country's unjust past and human rights abuses.

Under the act the South African Geographical Names Council (SAGNC) advises the Minister of Arts and Culture on the standardisation and transformation of geographical names on the basis of proposals by groups of citizens, or by municipal authorities

The changing of place names is everywhere an inherently controversial process. For this reason in South Africa the law made provision for comprehensive consultative processes to ensure integral involvement of the public in any contemplated change. In light of this challenge combined with some perceived exclusion from the process of certain sectors of society the Government of South Africa has embarked on extensive provincial hearings that have allowed to identify a number of constraints. The EU is confident that these are being addresed by the Government with the necessary sensitivity, responsibility and in a spirit of unity so to enhance the cohesion of the South African society while avoiding creating new points of fracture.

The EU is following with attention this long-term process and societal debate that is instrumental for nation-building and reconciliation purposes.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002448/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(1 marca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Pozycja Arcelor Mittal na rynku stali w Europie

Firma Arcelor Mittal jest potentatem na rynku stali w Europie. Swoje zakłady posiada między innymi we Francji, Belgii, Włoszech, Polsce, Czechach, Luksemburgu, Rumunii i Niemczech. W ostatnim czasie zamknęła huty i stalownie w Hiszpanii (Gijon). W samej Polsce kontroluje 70 % produkowanej stali oraz wyrobów stalowych.

Jednocześnie, aby zwiększyć swój zysk, stosuje politykę nacisków na rząd w celu uzyskania preferencyjnych warunków działalności.

1. Jak Komisja ocenia aktualną pozycję koncernu Arcelor Mittal na rynku stali w Europie? Czy nie zaburza ona konkurencyjności rynku poprzez stworzenie w Europie monopolu na dostawy stali?

2. Jakie działania podejmuje Komisja, aby zapewnić i zabezpieczyć interesy klientów, w szczególności zapobiec próbom zmowy cenowej?

3. Czy działania władz Hiszpanii, które przyznały Arcelor Mittal preferencyjne stawki na energię elektryczną oraz zwolnienia podatkowe, nie łamią przepisów unijnych dotyczących wsparcia państwa dla prywatnych przedsiębiorców?

4. Jakie działania podjęła Komisja, aby wzmocnić rynek stali w Europie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Joaquina Almunię w imieniu Komisji
(30 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Artykuł 102 TFUE zakazuje przedsiębiorstwom nadużywania pozycji dominującej na rynku wewnętrznym lub jego istotnej części, o ile może to w znacznym stopniu wpłynąć na handel między państwami członkowskimi. Nawet jeśliby uważać, że przedsiębiorstwo ArcelorMittal posiada pozycję dominującą, sytuacja taka nie ma sama w sobie cech nielegalności, o ile przedsiębiorstwo tej pozycji nie nadużywa.

Artykuł 101 TFUE zakazuje porozumień między przedsiębiorstwami, decyzji związków przedsiębiorstw i praktyk uzgodnionych, które mogą wpływać na handel między państwami członkowskimi i których celem lub skutkiem jest zapobieżenie, ograniczenie lub zakłócenie konkurencji wewnątrz rynku wewnętrznego. Na tym etapie Komisja nie posiada informacji o praktykowaniu przez przedsiębiorstwo ArcelorMittal ustalania cen.

W odniesieniu do stosowanych przez rząd hiszpański środków, wobec których wysuwane są zarzuty, Komisja nie dysponuje wystarczającymi informacjami, aby ocenić, czy mają one szczególny charakter w stosunku do przedsiębiorstwa ArcelorMittal, a jeśli tak, to czy stanowią pomoc państwa w rozumieniu art. 107 ust. 1 TFUE.

Komisja świadoma jest wyzwań, przed jakimi stoi unijny przemysł stalowy. W lipcu 2012 r. Komisja zwołała obrady okrągłego stołu na wysokim szczeblu poświęcone przyszłości przemysłu stalowego UE. W dniu 12 lutego 2013 r. przyjęto podczas obrad okrągłego stołu szczegółowe zalecenia polityczne dla Komisji.

W czerwcu 2013 r. Komisja planuje realizację tych zaleceń w formie planu działań dla przemysłu stalowego UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002448/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: ArcelorMittal's position on Europe's steel market

ArcelorMittal is a major player on Europe's steel market. It owns steelworks in France, Belgium, Italy, Poland, the Czech Republic, Luxembourg, Romania, Germany and other countries. It has recently closed smelters and steelworks in Gijón, Spain. In Poland alone it accounts for 70% of all steel and steel products produced.

At the same time, it is trying to increase profits by pursuing a policy of pressurising the government in order to secure preferential treatment.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of the ArcelorMittal conglomerate's position on Europe's steel market? Does it not disrupt competition on the market by establishing a monopoly on the supply of steel?

2. What steps is the Commission taking to ensure and safeguard the interests of customers, with specific reference to preventing attempts at price-fixing?

3. Are the actions of the Spanish Government in awarding ArcelorMittal preferential rates for electricity and tax exemptions not a breach of EU provisions concerning state aid for private entrepreneurs?

4. What steps has the Commission taken to strengthen the steel market in Europe?

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

Article 102 TFEU prohibits undertakings from abusing a dominant position in 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 dominant, if it does not abuse this position.

Article 101 TFEU prohibits agreements between undertakings, decisions by associations of undertakings and concerted practices which may affect trade between Member States and which have as their object or effect the prevention, restriction, or distortion of competition within the internal market. The Commission does not at this stage possess indications that ArcelorMittal engages in price fixing.

In relation to the alleged measures by the Spanish Government, the Commission does not have sufficient information to assess whether they are specific to ArcelorMittal and, if so, whether they constitute state aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) TFEU.

The Commission is aware of the challenges faced by the EU steel industry. In July 2012, the Commission convoked a High Level Roundtable on the future of the EU Steel Industry. On 12 February 2013 the Roundtable adopted specific policy recommendations to the Commission.

By June 2013, the Commission plans to respond to these Recommendations with an Action Plan for the EU steel industry.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002449/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(1 marca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Prawa człowieka w Kazachstanie

Ostatnie wydarzenia w Kazachstanie pokazują, że sytuacja w zakresie praw człowieka w tym kraju nadal się nie poprawia. Wobec opozycji toczą się politycznie motywowane procesy, zamykane są niezależne media, delegalizowane są partie niezgadzające się z działalnością prezydenta Nazarbajewa.

W dniu 22 lutego 2013 r. Sąd Apelacyjny z Almaty podtrzymał wyrok w sprawie „jednego wspólnego środka masowego przekazu »Respublika«". Gazeta „Respublika" oraz inne środki masowego przekazu, które zostały przez prokuraturę włączone pod tę samą nazwę, pozostaną zamknięte. Ponadto, po raz pierwszy publicznie, prokurator oznajmił, że dziennikarze tych mediów nie mają prawa do wykonywania własnego zawodu, tym bardziej razem. Wyrok ten oznacza odcięcie Kazachów od niezależnej informacji. Jest to jeden z przykładów łamania zasad demokracji, do jakich na co dzień dochodzi w Kazachstanie.

W związku z powyższym pragnę zapytać Wiceprzewodniczącą/Wysoką Przedstawiciel, jakie działania w kwestii praw człowieka i wolności słowa w Kazachstanie są podejmowane przez ESDZ.

1. Czy ESDZ ma kontakt z uwięzionymi opozycjonistami? Czy prowadzone są rozmowy dotyczące ich uwolnienia?

2. Czy ESDZ podejmie działania zmierzające do pomocy niezależnym mediom w Kazachstanie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(7 maja 2013 r.)

Wolność prasy w Kazachstanie jest bardzo ważną kwestią dla UE. W dniu 13 grudnia 2013 r. na forum OBWE UE wyraziła zaniepokojenie rozwojem sytuacji w ostatnim czasie w zakresie wolności mediów, wzywając Kazachstan „by w pełni przestrzegał swoich zobowiązań międzynarodowych, w tym jego zobowiązań w ramach OBWE oraz przyjętych przez ten kraj zobowiązań jako wybranego niedawno członka Rady Praw Człowieka Organizacji Narodów Zjednoczonych".

Delegatura UE w Kazachstanie monitoruje uważnie sytuację w zakresie praw zawodowych dziennikarzy w tym kraju i regularnie podnosi kwestie związane z wolnością mediów i wolnością wypowiedzi w kontaktach z rządem Kazachstanu.

Broniąc wolne media, delegatura UE ściśle współpracuje z obrońcami praw człowieka, między innymi z członkami MediaNet, Adil Soz i innych wyspecjalizowanych organizacji pozarządowych. Współpracuje również z ONZ i OBWE w zakresie propagowania międzynarodowych norm.

W ciągu ostatnich miesięcy władze kazachskie podjęły kroki w celu wdrożenia orzeczeń sądowych o delegalizacji kilku mediów informacyjnych i obiektów, które rzekomo należą do uchodźców z Kazachstanu mieszkających za granicą i są przez nich finansowane. Sąd miejski w Ałmaty odrzucił apelację przedstawicieli mediów i utrzymał w mocy uprzednią decyzję o zakazie wydawania i rozpowszechniania prasy przez grupę medialną Respublica.

Delegatura UE przeprowadziła szereg prezentacji w odniesieniu do działań podejmowanych przez władze w odniesieniu do pracowników i pomieszczeń grupy medialnej Respublica. Delegatura UE monitoruje również trudną sytuację uwięzionych działaczy i udziela im wsparcia w możliwej formie i zakresie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002449/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Human rights in Kazakhstan

Recent events in Kazakhstan show that that country's human rights situation has failed to improve. Politically motivated trials are being brought against the opposition, independent media outlets are being closed down, and parties that disagree with President Nazarbayev's actions are being banned.

On 22 February 2013, the Almaty appeals court upheld a sentence handed down in a case concerning mass media outlet *Respublika*. The *Respublika* newspaper and other mass media outlets lumped together under the same banner by the public prosecutor are to be closed down. Furthermore, the public prosecutor stated — and for the first time in public — that the journalists affiliated with those media outlets had no right to exercise their profession, and even less right to do so together. This sentence effectively deprives Kazakhs of access to independent information. It is just one example of the abuses of the principles of democracy that occur daily in Kazakhstan.

I should like to put the following questions to the Vice-President/High Representative: what action is being taken by the EEAS on the issue of human rights and freedom of expression in Kazakhstan?

1. Is the EEAS in contact with imprisoned members of the opposition? Are negotiations being held regarding their release?

2. Will the EEAS take steps to assist the independent media in Kazakhstan?

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

Freedom of the press in Kazakhstan is a major concern for the EU. On 13 December 2013 at the OSCE, the EU expressed its concern about recent developments in media freedom, calling on Kazakhstan 'to fully uphold its international obligations, including its OSCE commitments and its pledges as a recently elected member of the United Nations Human Rights Council'.

The EU Delegation to Kazakhstan monitors attentively the situation with regards to professional rights of journalists in the country and regularly brings up issues relating to freedom of the media and freedom of expression in its contacts with the government.

While defending free media, the EU Delegation cooperates closely with human rights defenders such as the members of MediaNet, Adil Soz and other specialized NGOs. It also works with the UN and the OSCE in promoting international standards.

In recent months the Kazakh authorities undertook steps to implement court decisions about the ban of several news outlets and sites that allegedly belong to and are financed by fugitive Kazakh citizens, living abroad. The Almaty City Court rejected the appeal of media outlets' representatives and upheld a previous court decision to ban the issuance and dissemination of the Respublica media group.

The EU Delegation has made several presentations in relation to actions by the authorities against the staff and premises of Respublica. The EU Delegation also monitors the plight of imprisoned activists and renders them support in the form and to the extent possible.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002450/13
to the Commission
Robert Sturdy (ECR)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Request by Least Developed Countries for extension of deadline for implementing the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights

Can the Commission explain its position on the flexibility provided to the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) under the World Trade Organisation's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and share its views on the request made on 5 November 2012 by Haiti on behalf of the LDC Group to the WTO TRIPS Council for an extension of the deadline for TRIPS implementation until a member ceases to be a LDC?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(12 March 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-000828/13 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002451/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(1. März 2013)

Betrifft: Konzessionsrichtlinie — Wassersektor

Kommissar Barnier hat nun aufgrund des anhaltenden öffentlichen Drucks das Eingeständnis gemacht, die „80 %-Regel" alleine auf die Wassersparte des Versorgers zu beziehen. Nach wie vor wird aber, trotz des massiven öffentlichen Protestes, das Trinkwasser als essentielles Lebensmittel dem Anwendungsbereich einer Dienstleistungskonzessionsrichtlinie unterstellt.

Kommunale Geldknappheit oder Druck von oben könnte die optional dargestellte Privatisierung schnell real machen, was aus Sicht vieler Bürger eine Seite der Gefahr ist. Ergänzt wird dies durch die Sorge des Vordringens internationaler Großkonzerne in die ausgezeichnet funktionierende und oftmals kleinstrukturierte Wasserversorgung einiger Mitgliedstaaten. Keine Identifikation mit den örtlichen Ressourcen, Gewinnmaximierung und Vernachlässigung der Versorgungseinrichtungen sind da natürliche Bedenken der Bürger. Umso mehr, da sie de facto als letztendlicher Nutzer keine wirkliche Wahlmöglichkeit hätten: Sie können den Wasserhahn aufdrehen oder nicht, sie können wegziehen oder nicht. Aufgrund der fehlenden Wahlmöglichkeiten sind somit die üblichen Marktregeln hier nicht anwendbar.

1. Sind angesichts vieler weiterhin besorgter Bürger weiter gehende Anpassungen der Richtlinie vonseiten der Kommission geplant?

2. Wieso wird vonseiten der Kommission die Wasserversorgung aus der Gesetzesinitiative nicht komplett ausgenommen, um auf die Bedenken der Bürger voll einzugehen?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(2. Mai 2013)

Durch den Vorschlag der Kommission für eine Richtlinie über die Konzessionsvergabe wird in keiner Weise eine direkte oder indirekte Privatisierung der Wasserversorgung oder anderer Dienstleistungen in den Mitgliedstaaten angestrebt oder eingeleitet.

Nationalen und lokalen Behörden steht es in jedem Fall frei, zu entscheiden, ob sie Dienstleistungen direkt oder über einen Dritten anbieten möchten.

Wenn Konzessionsverträge mit einem Dritten, wie zum Beispiel mit privaten Dienstleistern, abgeschlossen werden, soll durch die vorgeschlagene Richtlinie gewährleistet werden, dass der Abschluss von Verträgen auf eine transparente und nicht diskriminierende Art und Weise erfolgt. Diese Grundsätze sind entscheidend, um unabhängig vom jeweiligen Sektor gleiche Wettbewerbsbedingungen zwischen europäischen Unternehmen und einen effizienten Einsatz von Steuergeldern sowie die Verhinderung von Günstlingswirtschaft und Korruption zu gewährleisten.

Über den Richtlinienentwurf wird gegenwärtig im Rat und im Europäischen Parlament verhandelt. In diesem Zusammenhang wird die Kommission aktiv dazu beitragen, dass ein Kompromiss über einen für alle beteiligten Seiten zufriedenstellenden endgültigen Wortlaut erreicht wird, und Bedenken bezüglich der Bereitstellung von Wasserdienstleistungen angemessen Rechnung getragen wird.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002451/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Directive on Concessions — water sector

Commissioner Barnier, yielding to continued public pressure, has now admitted that the '80% rule' applies only to a service provider's water-related activities. Nevertheless, despite intense public protest, drinking water — an essential foodstuff — is still going to be included in the scope of a directive on service concessions.

Privatisation of services is presented in this directive as optional; shortages of funds at local level or pressure from above could quickly make it a reality, however, and many people see this as one of the risks arising in connection with the directive. In addition, there are concerns about large multinationals gaining control of the water supply sector in some Member States, where it currently functions extremely well and where services are often provided by small local firms. People are naturally worried that this would result in a reluctance to safeguard local resources, a drive to maximise profits and a lax approach to the maintenance of supply infrastructure. These worries are exacerbated by the fact that the de facto end-users would have no real choice in the matter: they can turn on the tap or not; they can move away or not. In other words, the usual market rules do not apply.

1. Given the continuing widespread public concern, does the Commission intend to make more substantial changes to the directive?

2. Why will the Commission not remove the provision of water services completely from the scope of the legislative proposal in order to fully address public misgivings?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2013)

The Commission's proposal for a directive on the award of concession contracts does not aim at or lead in any way to the direct or indirect privatisation of water services or of any other services in Member States.

National and local authorities remain in every case free to choose whether they provide the services directly themselves or via a third party.

If concession contracts are concluded with third parties, such as private service providers, the proposed Directive aims at ensuring that the conclusion of contracts is done in a transparent and non-discriminatory manner. These principles are crucial to ensure a level playing field between European businesses and efficient spending of tax payer's money and to prevent favouritism or even corruption, regardless of the sector concerned.

The draft Directive is presently being negotiated by the Council and the European Parliament. In this context the Commission will actively help finding a compromise on a final text which is satisfactory to all parties concerned, and adequately addresses concerns raised with regard to the provision of water services.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002452/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D)
(1 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Σκάνδαλο εντοπισμού αλογίσιου κρέατος σε συσκευασμένα προϊόντα

Το πρόσφατο σκάνδαλο εντοπισμού αλογίσιου κρέατος σε συσκευασμένα προϊόντα — έτοιμα γεύματα — αποτελεί ίσως το μεγαλύτερο διατροφικό σκάνδαλο στην Ευρώπη. Αναδεικνύει τη ανάγκη υιοθέτησης νέων κανόνων για την ενίσχυση της ασφάλειας, την παρακολούθηση και την ιχνηλασιμότητα των προϊόντων. Η τοποθέτηση ετικετών που δεν ανταποκρίνονται στην πραγματικότητα αποτελεί κατάφορη παραπλάνηση των καταναλωτών, τους οποίους εμείς πρέπει να προστατεύσουμε. Οφείλουμε να αποκαταστήσουμε την εμπιστοσύνη των καταναλωτών μας.

Οι αυστηρότεροι έλεγχοι, η επιβολή αυστηρών ποινών στους παραγωγούς, εμπόρους και μεταποιητές, καθώς επίσης και η υποχρεωτική σήμανση της χώρας προέλευσης των προϊόντων κρέατος αποτελούν μέτρα τα οποία θα βοηθήσουν στην αποφυγή τέτοιων σκανδάλων στο μέλλον.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Πώς θα διασφαλιστεί η εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας από όλα τα κράτη μέλη; Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να προβαίνει σε ελέγχους εφαρμογής της νομοθεσίας σε τακτά χρονικά διαστήματα;

Υπάρχει δυνατότητα δημιουργίας κέντρου ελέγχου-συντονισμού των κρατών μελών για την αποφυγή μελλοντικά τέτοιων περιστατικών;

Προτίθεται να επιβάλει κυρώσεις στα κράτη μέλη που αποτυγχάνουν να εφαρμόσουν τη νομοθεσία, και, αν ναι, ποιες θα είναι αυτές;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Απριλίου 2013)

Η αρμοδιότητα για την εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας για την τροφική αλυσίδα ανήκει στα κράτη μέλη ([1]), από τα οποία απαιτείται να δημιουργήσουν σύστημα επισήμων ελέγχων για την επαλήθευση της συμμόρφωσης των επιχειρηματιών με τις απαιτήσεις που απορρέουν από αυτή και να επιβάλλουν κυρώσεις σε περίπτωση μη συμμόρφωσης. Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί τακτικά τις επιδόσεις των κρατών μελών στο πλαίσιο των ελεγκτικών καθηκόντων τους, μεταξύ άλλων και με ελέγχους επιτόπου. Η Επιτροπή, ως θεματοφύλακας των Συνθηκών, λαμβάνει τα κατάλληλα μέτρα μόλις λάβει γνώση ότι ένα κράτος μέλος δεν εφαρμόζει συστηματικά τις διατάξεις της ΕΕ, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της κίνησης διαδικασιών επί παραβάσει σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 258 της ΣΛΕΕ.

Όσον αφορά την περίπτωση στην οποία αναφέρεται ο κ. βουλευτής, τα κράτη μέλη είχαν τη δυνατότητα, μέσω των συστημάτων επισήμων ελέγχων που κατάρτισαν, να εντοπίσουν γρήγορα τις παραβάσεις των εφαρμόσιμων κανόνων. Παρ' όλα αυτά, η προσεχής πρόταση σχετικά με τους επίσημους ελέγχους θα αποσκοπεί στην περαιτέρω ενίσχυση του υφιστάμενου συστήματος, συμπεριλαμβανομένων των κυρώσεων.

Η Επιτροπή εξετάζει σήμερα τον τρόπο με τον οποίο θα μπορούσε να ανταποκριθεί στην ανάγκη για την αποκατάσταση της εμπιστοσύνης του καταναλωτή με την ενίσχυση των εργαλείων και μηχανισμών για την καταπολέμηση της απάτης με τρόφιμα και την επιβολή των κανόνων για την αλυσίδα τροφίμων. Ένα σχέδιο δράσης που καταγράφει τις πρωτοβουλίες σε πέντε βασικούς τομείς (απάτη με τρόφιμα, προγράμματα δοκιμών, διαβατήρια για άλογα, επίσημοι έλεγχοι, επισήμανση προέλευσης) έχουν διαβιβαστεί πρόσφατα στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και στα κράτη μέλη.

([1]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 882/2004 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 29ης Απριλίου 2004, για τη διενέργεια επισήμων ελέγχων της συμμόρφωσης προς τη νομοθεσία περί ζωοτροφών και τροφίμων και προς τους κανόνες για την υγεία και την καλή διαβίωση των ζώων, ΕΕ L 165 της 30.4.2004, σ. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002452/13
to the Commission
Sophocles Sophocleous (S&D)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Scandal of horsemeat found in processed products

The recent scandal of horsemeat found in processed products/ready meals is perhaps the most serious food scandal Europe has ever seen. It highlights the need for new rules to improve the safety, monitoring and traceability of products. Inaccurate labelling is blatantly misleading to consumers, whom we have a duty to protect. We need to restore consumer confidence.

Stricter controls, harsh penalties for producers, traders and manufacturers and compulsory labelling of the country of origin of meat products are all measures that will help to prevent such scandals in the future.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

How does it intend to ensure that legislation is applied by all the Member States? Does the Commission intend to verify the application of legislation at regular intervals?

Could a control/coordination centre be set up between the Member States to prevent such occurrences in future?

Does it intend to penalise Member States which fail to apply the legislation and, if so, how?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 April 2013)

The responsibility for enforcing food chain legislation lies with Member States ([1]), which are required to establish a system of official controls to verify compliance by operators with requirements deriving therefrom and sanction non-compliances. The Commission regularly monitors delivery by the Member States of their control duties, including through on-the-spot audits. As the guardian of the Treaties, the Commission will take appropriate measures when it becomes aware of a failure by a Member State to systematically enforce EU provisions, including the launching of infringement procedures in accordance with Article 258 TFEU.

In the case referred to by the Honourable Member, the official controls systems established by the Member States have allowed them to quickly identify violations of applicable rules. Notwithstanding this, the forthcoming proposal on official controls will aim at further strengthening the existing system, including as regards sanctions.

The Commission is currently considering how best to address the need to restore consumer confidence by strengthening tools and mechanisms for the fight against food fraud and the enforcement of food chain rules. An action plan mapping initiatives in five key areas (food fraud, testing programmes, horse passports, official controls, origin labelling) has recently been shared with the European Parliament and the Member States.

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

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-002453/13
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2013. gada 1. marts)

Temats: Eiropas garantija jauniešiem

Nodarbinātības, sociālās politikas, veselības un patērētāju tiesību aizsardzības (*EPSCO*) padome 2013. gada 28. februārī pieņēma garantiju jauniešiem. Tiek saprasts, ka Eiropas garantiju jauniešiem finansēs Eiropas Sociālais fonds saskaņā ar daudzgadu finanšu shēmu 2014.–2020. gadam.

Vai Komisija var norādīt, kad tā plāno uzsākt šīs garantijas īstenošanu?

Vai Komisija var iesniegt šīs garantijas darba kārtību vai plānu, vai norādīt, kad tā ir paredzējusi šādu darba kārtību vai plānu izstrādāt?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Lāslo Andors
(2013. gada 25. aprīlis)

Komisija pieņēma priekšlikumu par jaunatnes garantijas shēmu 2012. gada 5. decembrī, un 2013. gada 28. februārī to ātri atbalstīja Nodarbinātības, sociālās politikas, veselības un patērētāju tiesību aizsardzība padome (*EPSCO*). Šīs shēmas īstenošana jāveic dalībvalstīm.

Ieteikuma 27. punktā Padome iesaka dalībvalstīm īstenot shēmu pēc iespējas drīzāk. Tomēr dalībvalstīs ar vislielākajām budžeta grūtībām un lielāko tādu jauniešu skaitu, kuri nav iesaistīti ne izglītībā, ne nodarbinātībā, nedz arī apmācībā (*NEET* ([1])), vai augstāko jauniešu bezdarbu varētu apsvērt pakāpenisku īstenošanu.

Lai gan dalībvalstis var tieši finansēt savas jaunatnes garantijas shēmas, tostarp ar ESF atbalstu, tie, kas ir atbilstīgi, varētu arī izmantot EUR 6 miljardu summu, kas paredzēta Jaunatnes nodarbinātības iniciatīvai, kā nolēmusi Eiropadome 7.–8. februāra samitā. Joprojām notiek likumdošanas process, lai pieņemtu praktisko kārtību, un tai būtu jādarbojas attiecībā uz 2014. gadu.

Komisija Eiropas pusgada ietvaros uzraudzīs jaunatnes garantijas shēmu īstenošanu ar Nodarbinātības komitejas palīdzību, kura veiks daudzpusēju uzraudzību, un vajadzības gadījumā dalībvalstīm sniegs konkrētai valstij adresētus ieteikumus, pamatojoties uz dalībvalstu nodarbinātības politikas pamatnostādnēm.

([1]) *Not in Employment, Education or Training* – jaunieši, kas nav iesaistīti ne izglītībā, ne nodarbinātībā, nedz arī apmācībā.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002453/13
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: European Youth Guarantee

On 28 February 2013, the Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council (EPSCO) adopted the youth guarantee. It is understood that the European Youth Guarantee will be financed by the European Social Fund within the framework of the Multiannual Financial Framework for 2014-2020.

Can the Commission advise when it plans to start implementing the Guarantee?

Can the Commission provide the agenda or plan for implementing the Guarantee, or advise when it intends to draft that agenda or plan?

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

The Commission adopted its proposal for Youth Guarantee on 5 December 2012, and it was swiftly agreed by the EPSCO of 28 February 2013. It is for Member States to implement the scheme.

In paragraph 27 of the recommendation the Council recommends that Member States implement the schemes as soon as possible. In the case of most severe budgetary difficulties and higher rates of NEET ([1])s or youth unemployment, gradual implementation could be considered.

While Member States can finance directly their Youth Guarantee schemes including with the support of the ESF, those eligible could also use the amount of EUR 6 billion dedicated for Youth Employment Initiative as decided by the European Council at its Summit of 7-8 February. The legislative process to adopt the practical modalities is ongoing and they should be operational for 2014.

The Commission will monitor the implementation of Youth Guarantee schemes through the multi-lateral surveillance of the Employment Committee within the framework of the European Semester, and address, where appropriate, country-specific recommendation to Member States.

([1]) Not in Employment, Education or Training.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-002454/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(1 mars 2013)

Angående: Kommissionens bedömning av risken att dess nya rekommendation om icke-diskriminering försenar utvecklingen av fiber till bostaden inom EU

I december 2012 offentliggjorde kommissionen ett förslag till rekommendation om enhetliga krav på icke-diskriminering och kostnadsberäkningsmetoder för att främja konkurrens och förbättra miljön för bredbandsinvesteringar. Offentliggörandet av detta förslag till rekommendation hade inte till syfte att inleda ett offentligt samråd utan endast att inhämta ett yttrande från Organet för europeiska regleringsmyndigheter för elektronisk kommunikation (Berec), inom ramen för det förfarande som anges i artikel 19 i direktiv 2002/21/EG.

Kommissionen genomförde ingen konsekvensbedömning av de föreslagna åtgärderna avseende slutkundsmarknader för bredband, men under en presskonferens den 18 december 2012 meddelade vice ordförande Kroes att bredbandspriserna kommer att öka i vissa länder. Den europeiska konsumentorganisationen (BEUC) har ifrågasatt kommissionens tillvägagångssätt, inte bara med tanke på att priserna kommer att stiga eller åtminstone stabiliseras till nuvarande nivåer, utan också på att kommissionen – genom att anamma ett vid första anblicken teknikneutralt tillvägagångssätt utan att beakta de stora inneboende skillnaderna i kapacitet, kostnad och investeringsrisk för olika typer av nästa generations åtkomstteknik (i synnerhet fiber till lokal spridningspunkt och fiber till bostaden) – kommer att uppmuntra utvecklingen av hybridkoppar-/fibernät, vilket kommer att försena övergången till framtidssäkrade nät för fiber till bostaden.

Varför anser kommissionen att det är nödvändigt att fastställa grossistpriser till nuvarande nivåer utan att uppmuntra till investeringar i fullständigt öppna och konkurrenskraftiga åtkomstnät för fiber till bostaden?

Svar från Neelie Kroes på kommissionens vägnar
(12 april 2013)

Målen för den digitala agendan kommer inte att uppnås genom en enda teknik eller typ av operatör. Syftet med den här rekommendationen är att tillhandahålla en stabil och förutsägbar lagstiftningsmiljö för att främja den konkurrens och de investeringar som är nödvändiga för utbyggnaden av nästa generations åtkomstnät. Kommissionens mål är att skapa ett lagstiftningssystem som säkerställer lika villkor för alternativa operatörer och fokuserar regleringsbördan till de områden där den är mest nödvändig.

Som förberedelse av rekommendationen har kommissionen analyserat vilken inverkan förslaget kommer att få på slutkundsmarknaden, samt på operatörer och investerare. Förutsägbara och stabila åtkomstpriser är lika viktiga både för de etablerade operatörernas och de alternativa operatörernas incitament att investera. Kommissionen anser att konsumenterna kommer att gynnas vad gäller kvalitet, mångfald och priser på bredbandstjänster om man balanserar strängare icke-diskrimineringsregler med prisflexibilitet.

Konsekvensbedömningen av rekommendationen kommer att offentliggöras tillsammans med rekommendationen, när den är antagen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002454/13
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Commission's assessment of the risk of its new recommendation on non-discrimination delaying fibre-to-the-home (FTTH) deployment in Europe

In December 2012, the Commission published a draft recommendation on consistent non-discrimination obligations and costing methodologies with a view to promoting competition and enhancing the broadband investment environment. The publication of this draft recommendation was not aimed at opening a public consultation but only at seeking the opinion of the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC), under the procedure set out in Article 19 of Directive 2002/21/EC.

While the Commission did not carry out an assessment of the impact of the proposed measures on retail broadband markets, in a press conference on 18 December 2012 Vice-President Kroes stated that broadband prices would rise in some countries. The European Consumer Organisation (BEUC) has questioned the Commission's approach, given not only that prices will rise, or at least stabilise at current levels, but that the Commission — by taking a prima facie technology-neutral approach and disregarding the great inherent differences in the capability, costs and investment risk of different next-generation access technologies (most notably fibre-to-the-kerb (FTTK) and FTTH) — will incentivise the development of hybrid copper/fibre networks, which will delay the transition to future-proof FTTH.

Why does the Commission feel it necessary to fix wholesale prices at current levels without providing incentives for investments in fully open and competitive FTTH access networks?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(12 April 2013)

No single technology or type of operator will deliver the Digital Agenda targets. The aim of the forthcoming recommendation is to provide a stable and predictable regulatory environment in order to foster competition and investments necessary for rolling-out Next Generation Access (NGA) networks. The goal of the Commission is to create a regulatory ecosystem that ensures a level playing field for alternative operators and focuses regulatory burden where it is most necessary.

In preparation of the recommendation, the Commission has analysed the impact of the policy proposal at retail level as well as on operators and investors. Predictable and stable access prices are equally important for incumbents and alternative operators' incentives to invest. The Commission believes that by balancing stricter non-discrimination rules with pricing flexibility, the consumers will benefit in terms of quality, diversity and prices of broadband services.

The impact assessment of the recommendation will be published alongside the recommendation, once adopted.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002455/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Importing energy

Data recently published by Eurostat has shown that many European countries are heavily dependent on imported energy. Ireland only generated 11.1% of the total amount of energy it used in 2011. In comparison, Denmark was a net exporter of energy in 2011.

1. What does the Commission intend to do to reduce the dependence of Member States on imported energy?

2. What does the Commission deem to be a suitable replacement for imported energy?

3. Does the Commission believe that Member States should strive to become self-sufficient in energy? If so, how does the Commission propose they do this?

4. What is the Commission doing to promote renewable energy and green energy as a replacement for imported energy?

5. Does the Commission believe that Denmark could act as a model case for other Member States?

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

1–2. EU policies to reduce dependence are set out in the Energy 2020 strategy ([1]), the communication on security of energy supply and international cooperation ([2]) and the regulation on Guidelines for trans-European energy infrastructure ([3]) recently adopted by the Parliament. Key initiatives include strengthening energy efficiency, boosting indigenous renewable energy, promoting low-carbon technologies and improving supply networks.

3. The Commission respects Member States' choice of energy sources and sovereignty over primary energy sources. While excessive dependence on individual foreign suppliers can be problematic, the Commission does not believe that Member States should strive to become self-sufficient regarding their energy supply. Rather, an integrated and open Internal Energy Market is key to achieving the established energy objectives: security of energy supply, competitiveness and sustainability.

4. The Renewable Energy Directive ([4]) effectively promotes renewable energies by setting binding national targets for the share of renewable energies as part of the overall energy consumption and requiring Member States to establish national action plans to achieve these targets.

5. In 2010, renewables had the second largest share in the Danish energy mix and the share of cogeneration in electricity production was 49.2% which reflects the commitment of this Member State to energy efficiency.

Diverging national conditions prevent the Commission from presenting one Member State as a model for other Member States in the energy sector. It is however acknowledged that a high share of renewables in the energy mix and strong energy efficiency measures are particularly suitable to achieve the abovementioned energy objectives.

([1]) COM(2010) 0639 final.
([2]) COM(2011) 539 final.
([3]) COM(2011) 658 final.
([4]) 2009/28/EC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002456/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Mutual legal assistance

The system of mutual legal assistance between countries is very important when it comes to tackling crime affecting those in different countries. However, while the Council Act of 29 May 2000 made the system for mutual assistance between Member States much stronger, it could be further improved.

1. As a general rule, requests for mutual legal assistance are made in writing; does the Commission believe that a common or centralised system to correspond between the relevant authorities in the Member States on the issue would be more efficient? If not, why not?

2. Could the Commission provide information on the number of requests for mutual legal assistance made by Member States to one another since the Act came into force in 2005?

3. Could the Commission provide information on how many requests for mutual legal assistance were made by Member States to non-EU countries?

4. Would the Commission agree that it may be possible to make the system more efficient in the way it works and in the length of time it takes? If so, how would the Commission propose to do this?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

The Commission shares the opinion of the Honourable Member that to effectively fight cross-border crime within the EU, the regime applying to requests for mutual legal assistance between Member States can be further improved and should in future be based on the principle of mutual recognition while paying particular attention to the respect of fundamental rights.

As regards the more specific questions raised by the Honourable Member, the Commission can also confirm that such improvements should contribute to reducing the administrative burdens in this field. A system based on a harmonised multilingual certificate, which is already common practice for other mutual recognition instruments, seems more appropriate.

The Commission is not in possession of statistics related to the number of requests for mutual legal assistance made between Member States. However, we know that in 2011, 1441 requests for mutual legal assistance were transferred to Eurojust.

As regards requests between Member States and third countries, the Commission is in possession of data, for example, in the context of the agreements on Extradition and on Mutual Legal Assistance between the European Union and the United States of America, signed on 25 June 2003. This data is available and the Commission will make it available to the Honourable Member.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002457/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Poverty rates

Figures from the Central Statistics Office (CSO) in Ireland have shown that the 'at risk of poverty rate' increased from 14.7% in 2010 to 16% in 2011. Someone who is at risk of poverty is defined by the CSO as having 'an equivalised income of less than 60% of the median'.

The number of people experiencing enforced deprivation also rose, from 22.6% in 2010 to 24.5% in 2011, and the 2011 consistent poverty rate was 6.9%.

1. Could the Commission provide figures on poverty rates for all Member States?

2. What is the Commission doing to ensure that EU citizens are not forced to live in poverty?

3. What is the Commission doing to reduce poverty rates and counteract the trend of rising poverty rates and enforced deprivation throughout the EU?

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

1. The requested data are available on the web ([1]). The EU employment and social situation quarterly review published on 26 March 2013 also shows that the situation of many households keeps deteriorating ([2]).

2. Tackling poverty is one of the five EU headline targets of the Europe 2020 strategy. The Commission coordinates with Member States and relevant stakeholders on achieving the Europe 2020 poverty and social exclusion targets through the European Semester following up on the European platform against poverty and social exclusion was launched. European Funds such as the ESF, ERDF, PROGRESS, Progress Microfinance, and the EGF promote access to labour markets and social inclusion thus helping to reduce poverty

3. In April 2012, the Commission adopted an Employment package ([3]) identifying the necessary policies to foster job creation in the Member States. In February 2013 the Commission adopted a Social Investment Package ([4]) that sets a new agenda for social policies to help Member States modernise their social systems, address increasing poverty and social exclusion, and emerge from the crisis stronger, more cohesive and more competitive in the long run. It is intended that the Social Investment Package, implemented through the European Semester and the European Structural and Investment Funds, will help to counteract the rising trend of poverty and enforced deprivation throughout Europe. Moreover, the Package contains a specific proposal on the use of reference budgets to help ensure the adequacy of income support.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tessi010&plugin=1
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=fr&catId=89&newsId=1852&furtherNews=yes
([3]) COM(2012) 173 final.
([4]) COM(2013) 83 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002458/13
al Consiglio
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(1º marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Conseguenze sull'agricoltura e sull'industria agroalimentare europea della soppressione del 55 % dei dazi sull'importazione di agrumi dal Marocco

Il 15 febbraio 2012 il Parlamento europeo ha ratificato un accordo col Regno del Marocco per l'abbattimento del 55 % dei dazi doganali sugli agrumi importati dal Marocco nell'UE.

Ciò porta a un abbattimento del prezzo delle arance marocchine, che vengono a costare all'importatore 17-18 centesimi al chilogrammo, a fronte del costo precedente di 30-35 centesimi al chilogrammo, costo che risultava allineato a quello delle arance prodotte sul territorio italiano o spagnolo.

Considerato che il minor costo del lavoro, l'assenza di controlli e la possibilità di utilizzare fitofarmaci e pesticidi proibiti dall'UE abbattono drasticamente il costo di produzione delle arance in Marocco e consentono, seppur a prezzo di una minore qualità del prodotto e di possibili rischi per la salute dei consumatori, di mantenere un margine di profitto pur vendendo a prezzi inferiori a quello che sarebbe il puro costo di produzione dei medesimi agrumi sul suolo italiano e nel rispetto delle leggi europee, può il Consiglio far sapere:

1. quali sono stati e quali saranno in futuro gli effetti della forte riduzione dei dazi sugli agrumi del Marocco sull'agricoltura e sull'industria agroalimentare europea ed italiana legate alla produzione e alla lavorazione degli agrumi;

2. se, considerati gli effetti nefasti di questa decisione sulle imprese sopra citate, non sarebbe auspicabile ridiscuterne i termini con gli Stati membri in sede di Consiglio al fine di riportare la questione all'attenzione della Commissione europea?

Risposta
(7 maggio 2013)

L'accordo UE-Marocco in merito a misure di liberalizzazione reciproche per i prodotti agricoli, i prodotti agricoli trasformati, il pesce e i prodotti della pesca è entrato in vigore il 1° ottobre 2012. Il Consiglio ha deciso di concludere l'accordo dopo che il Parlamento europeo ha espresso la sua approvazione.

Il Consiglio è attento al buon funzionamento dell'accordo e al suo impatto sul mercato europeo e ha discusso in materia da ultimo il 28 novembre 2012.

In tale occasione la Commissione, che è responsabile del monitoraggio della situazione sulla base dei dati forniti da ciascun Stato membro, ha rassicurato il Consiglio sul fatto che sta seguendo con grande attenzione la situazione del mercato ed è pronta a prendere misure se necessario. Ai sensi dell'articolo 218 del TFUE la Commissione può presentare raccomandazioni al Consiglio sull'avvio dei negoziati per un nuovo accordo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002458/13
to the Council
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(1 March 2013)

Subject: Consequences for European agriculture and agro-food industries of the removal of 55% of the duties on imports of citrus fruit from Morocco

On 15 February 2012 the European Parliament ratified an agreement with the Kingdom of Morocco for the removal of 55% of customs duties on citrus fruit imported from Morocco to the EU.

This leads to a reduction in the price of Moroccan oranges, which now cost the importer 17-18 cents per kilogram, compared with the previous cost of 30-35 cents per kilogram — a cost that was in line with that of oranges produced in Italy or Spain.

Lower labour costs, the absence of controls and the freedom to use chemicals and pesticides banned by the EU drastically lower the cost of orange production in Morocco. These factors also make it possible — albeit at the expense of lower product quality and possible risks to consumer health — to maintain a profit margin while selling at prices below the raw cost of producing the same citrus fruit in Italy, while complying with European laws.

Can the Council answer the following:

1. What impact has the significant reduction in duties on citrus fruit from Morocco had on European and Italian agriculture and agro-food industries associated with the production and processing of citrus fruit? What will the future impact be?

2. Given the adverse effects of this decision on the businesses mentioned above, would it not be desirable to renegotiate its terms with the Member States in the Council with a view to bringing the issue to the attention of the Commission once again?

Reply
(7 May 2013)

The EU-Morocco agreement concerning reciprocal liberalisation measures on agricultural products, processed agricultural products, fish and fishery products entered into force on 1 October 2012. The Council decided to conclude the agreement after the European Parliament gave its consent.

The Council is attentive to the well-functioning of the Agreement and to its impact on the European market and held its latest meeting on this subject on 28 November 2012.

On that occasion the Commission, which is responsible for monitoring the situation on the basis of the data provided by each Member State, reassured the Council that it was following the market situation very closely and was ready to take action if required. Pursuant to Article 218 TFEU it is open to the Commission to submit recommendations to the Council on the opening of negotiations for a new agreement.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002459/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Ski tour companies in France

I have been contacted by a constituent who runs a small ski tour company in Megève, France. He currently employs a team of nine British ski instructors, and has encountered many issues over the years with the French authorities regarding the ski instruction and his right to freely teach his guests.

My constituent tells me that he had a petition read out regarding this issue in the European Parliament in 2003, which was successful. He also tells me that in 2006, after several visits to the court in Bonneville, he finally won a decision from the judges, who stated that they could not see a clear difference between his work and that of the official French Ski Schools (ESF).

He informs me that the French authorities have now brought in a rule stating that his school is required to have 10 instructors with full diplomas in order to be awarded 'stagiaire' (trainee) status. He tells me that even if he had 10 instructors, they would all have to be French nationals for that status to be awarded.

My constituent tells me that he has carried on teaching and now faces a three-month prison sentence. He also tells me that the French authorities have started to adopt aggressive policies against his school.

He claims that on Wednesday, 27 February 2013 the French gendarmes arrested one of his instructors and that an 18-year-old girl who took out her phone to take a picture of this incident was pushed to the ground and pinned there by a French policeman. He says that this caused her a lot of pain and distress and resulted in her being taken to the local doctor's surgery.

My constituent tells me that this action by the French is preventing visitors from learning at his school and is consequently affecting his business.

Given the urgency of this case, can the Commission state:

1. if the French authorities are in breach of single market rules?

2. if it believes that my constituent should be allowed to continue teaching with his nine British ski instructors?

3. if it can take any swift action to ensure that the French authorities allow my constituent to continue teaching at his school, without any hindrance or intimidation, until this issue is resolved in the French courts?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The Commission takes the view that Articles 45 (2), 49 and 56 TFEU rule out any direct or indirect discrimination on the grounds of nationality or any other form of unequal treatment by the host Member State in the context of the free movement of workers, the freedom of establishment and the free provision of services.

It would appear that in the case at issue the French authorities relied upon national regulations adopted on 11 April 2012 applicable to ski schools set up in France, which are entitled to supervise trainees. According to these rules, in order to be recognised, a ski school must employ a minimum of ten ski instructors who hold a state diploma in Alpine skiing. Moreover, at least 60% of the school's staff must possess a diploma issued by the competent French ministry.

The Commission notes that the facts referred to by the Honourable Member relate to an individual case. It would appear that it is at present not clear if, and to what extent, the requirements mentioned above would affect ski instructors holding equivalent diplomas issued in other Member States in a more general manner. Consequently, the Commission will request further information from the French authorities. After receiving a reply, the Commission will inform the Honourable Member of the follow-up given to this issue.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-002460/13
aan de Commissie
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(4 maart 2013)

Betreft: Fenylbutazon en clenbuterol in paardenvlees uit Canada

In juli 2012 hebben de Belgische autoriteiten de Commissie ingelicht over een partij gekoeld en diepgevroren paardenvlees uit Canada waarin bij officiële controles in een niet-lidstaat sporen van fenylbutazon en clenbuterol zijn aangetroffen. Volgens de melding in de RASFF-gegevensbank (systeem voor snelle waarschuwingen voor levensmiddelen en diervoeders) heeft deze partij een fysisch/chemische behandeling ondergaan, voordat het vlees verder is gedistribueerd in België, Frankrijk, Duitsland, Italië, Luxemburg en Nederland.

De ontdekking van deze stoffen werpt een slaglicht op de in bredere kring bestaande bezorgdheid over de invoer van paardenvlees uit Noord-Amerika. Ik heb ook uit betrouwbare bron vernomen dat het in de Verenigde Staten niet verplicht is om voor daar gefokte paarden een veterinair-medische administratie bij te houden en dat ook daar overal stoffen als fenylbutazon worden gebruikt. Het is uiterst verontrustend dat de auditonderzoeken die het Voedsel- en Veterinair Bureau (VVB) van de EU tussen 2010 en 2012 zowel in Canada als in Mexico heeft uitgevoerd, de conclusie hebben opgeleverd dat niet kan worden gegarandeerd dat de beëdigde verklaringen van verkopers over de medische behandeling van paarden uit de VS betrouwbaar en waar zijn. Toch mag dit vlees nog steeds in de EU worden ingevoerd.

Kan de Commissie uitleggen:

1. waarom de invoer en distributie van deze partij paardenvlees uit Canada zijn toegestaan, ondanks de ontdekking van residuen van stoffen die niet mogen worden gebruikt in voedselproducerende dieren;

2. wat voor fysisch/chemische behandeling deze partij paardenvlees heeft ondergaan om de invoer en verdere distributie ervan in zes EU-landen te rechtvaardigen;

3. of er aanwijzingen zijn dat het betrokken paardenvlees afkomstig was van paarden uit de VS die in Canada zijn ingevoerd met als enig doel de paarden te slachten en het vlees naar de EU uit te voeren;

4. waarom zij geen actie heeft ondernomen naar aanleiding van de audits van het VVB in Canada en Mexico, om te voorkomen dat in de EU uit Noord-Amerika ingevoerd paardenvlees wordt verkocht dat niet voldoet aan de invoervoorschriften van de EU?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(10 april 2013)

1. In juli 2012 hebben de Canadese autoriteiten de Commissie laten weten dat bij aselecte officiële controles in een Canadees bedrijf sporen van fenylbutazon en clenbuterol in weefsels van paarden waren aangetroffen. Het vlees was afkomstig van een geslacht dier dat per ongeluk naar de EU was uitgevoerd voordat de resultaten van de laboratoriumtest beschikbaar waren.

2. Aangezien de partij reeds in de EU was binnengebracht, is het systeem voor snelle waarschuwingen voor levensmiddelen en diervoeders geactiveerd, het vlees getraceerd en in de zes lidstaten waar het was gedistribueerd in beslag genomen.

3. De Commissie kan niet uitsluiten dat het betrokken vlees afkomstig is van paarden uit de VS. Volgens de door de Canadese autoriteiten afgegeven gezondheidsverklaring voldeed het vlees echter aan de EU-voorschriften.

4. Wat de op verzoek van de Commissie in Mexico uitgevoerde audits betreft, hebben de Mexicaanse autoriteiten een actieplan opgesteld met maatregelen om de in het auditverslag gesignaleerde tekortkomingen te verhelpen. Bovendien geldt voor paardenvlees uit Mexico al sinds 2006 een vrijwaringsmaatregel, op grond waarvan elke partij op de grensinspectieposten wordt gecontroleerd op de aanwezigheid van sporen van diergeneesmiddelen alvorens zij op het grondgebied van de EU wordt binnengebracht.

Op de grensinspectieposten worden ook steekproeven genomen van partijen paardenvlees uit Canada. De enige partij die tot nog toe in negatieve zin is opgevallen, is die waarom het in deze vraag gaat. Na deze testuitslag zijn partijen paardenvlees uit Canada op grond van de EU-regelgeving strenger gecontroleerd en zijn de Canadese autoriteiten hiervan op de hoogte gebracht.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002460/13
to the Commission
Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Phenylbutazone and clenbuterol in Canadian horsemeat imports

In July 2012, the Belgian authorities notified the Commission regarding a consignment of chilled and frozen horsemeat from Canada in which residues of phenylbutazone and clenbuterol were found during official controls in a non-member country. According to the notification in the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed database (RASFF), this consignment underwent physical/chemical treatment before being further distributed in Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

The discovery of these substances highlights a greater concern about horsemeat imports from North America. I am also reliably informed that there is no mandatory veterinary medical record-keeping for horses bred in the United States and that the use of substances such as phenylbutazone is ubiquitous there too. It is of grave concern that audits carried out by the EU's Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) in both Canada and Mexico between 2010 and 2012 concluded that the reliability and veracity of vendor affidavits with respect to the medical treatment history of US origin horses cannot be guaranteed and yet their meat is still accepted for import to the EU.

Could the Commission explain:

1. why the import and distribution of this consignment of horsemeat from Canada was permitted despite the discovery of residues of substances banned for use in food-producing animals;

2. what kind of physical/chemical treatment this consignment of horsemeat underwent in order to justify its import and further distribution to six EU Member States;

3. whether there is any indication that the horsemeat concerned derived from horses of US origin imported to Canada for the sole purpose of slaughter and export to the EU;

4. why it has not taken action to act on the FVO audits in Canada and Mexico to preclude the sale of horsemeat imports from North America that do not meet EU import requirements?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(10 April 2013)

1. In July 2012 the Canadian authorities informed the Commission that residues of phenylbutazone and clenbuterol were found in horse tissues during random official controls carried out in a Canadian establishment. The meat originated from a carcase which was exported, by accident, to the EU before the results of the laboratory test were available.

2. As the consignment had already been introduced in the EU, the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed was activated and the meat was traced back and seized in the six Member States where it had been distributed.

3. The Commission cannot exclude that the concerned meat originates from horses of US origin. However, the Canadian authorities declared in the health attestation that the meat was in conformity with EU requirements.

4. In relation to the audits in Mexico, at the Commission's request, the Mexican Authorities provided an action plan with the measures intended to rectify the deficiencies identified in the audit report. Furthermore, horse meat coming from Mexico is, since 2006, already subject to a safeguard measure, whereby every consignment is tested for residues of veterinary drugs at the Border Inspection Post (BIPs) before entering into the EU territory.

Consignments of horsemeat from Canada are also randomly sampled at BIPs. The only unfavourable case up-to-now is the one referred to in this question. Following this unfavourable result, in application of the EU rules, consignments of horsemeat from Canada were submitted to reinforced checks and the Canadian authorities were informed accordingly.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002461/13
til Kommissionen
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(4. marts 2013)

Om: Tredjelandsstatsborgeres immigration i EU

EU-førerattester udstedes på baggrund af EU-forordning (EF) nr. 1072/2009 og anvendes typisk af ikke-EU-chauffører ved international kørsel inden for EU. For at ansætte en tredjelandsstatsborger på en førerattest kræves der imidlertid et Schengenvisum.

De Danske Godschauffører under fagforbundet 3F i Danmark rapporterer den 22. februar 2013, at op mod 100 tredjelandsstatsborgere fra Filippinerne har fået udstedt kørekortvisum i en EU-medlemsstat til at køre international transportkørsel i andre EU-medlemsstater.

Ifølge de danske visumregler er et væsentligt kriterium for opholds- og arbejdstilladelse imidlertid, om der er tilgængelig dansk eller i Danmark boende udenlandsk arbejdskraft eller arbejdskraft inden for EU, som på kvalificeret vis vil kunne varetage det pågældende arbejde ([1]).

Mellem 2008 og 2010 faldt beskæftigelsen i den danske transportbranche med 8 000 personer, hvilket svarer til 22 %. Det har skabt et stort overskud af national arbejdskraft i den danske transportbranche, hvor mange arbejdsløse chauffører er i fare for at havne i langtidsledighed ([2]).

Det må derfor vurderes, at der i forhold til ovennævnte kriterium for udstedelse af opholds- og arbejdstilladelser i øjeblikket findes tilgængelig national arbejdskraft, som på kvalificeret vis vil kunne varetage det arbejde, som tredjelandschaufførerne i den konkrete sag har fået opholdstilladelse til at udføre.

Vil Kommissionen på baggrund af ovenstående tage stilling til, om det er i overensstemmelse med EU's visumregler, at der udstedes visum til udførelse af arbejde, selv om der i forvejen er tilstrækkelig arbejdskraftdækning på det nationale arbejdsmarked?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Cecilia Malmström
(13. maj 2013)

Transportvirksomheder i EU skal have en fællesskabstilladelse og ansøge om en førerattest til førere, der er statsborgere i tredjelande. Sidstnævnte attesterer, at føreren ([3]) er lovligt beskæftiget af eller står til rådighed for virksomheden i henhold til betingelserne for beskæftigelse og erhvervsmæssig uddannelse i medlemsstaten, der udsteder førerattesten (artikel 5, forordning 1072/2009).

Unionen er i gang med at udvikle en fælles indvandringspolitik i overensstemmelse med artikel 79 i TEUF. Dette indebærer foranstaltninger, som fastlægger betingelser for indrejse og ophold, samt definition af rettighederne for tredjelandsstatsborgere ([4]). Lastbilchauffører er imidlertid ikke specifikt dækket af EU's indvandringsregler.

Medlemsstaterne har som hovedregel ret til at fastlægge antallet af tredjelandsstatsborgere, der kan indrejse fra tredjelande på deres område for at søge arbejde som lønmodtager eller selvstændig erhvervsdrivende (artikel 79, stk. 5, i TEUF). Det er derfor de enkelte medlemsstater, der giver arbejdstagere fra tredjelande adgang til arbejde under hensyntagen til arbejdsmarkedssituationen i den pågældende medlemsstat. Dette indebærer ofte kontrol af, hvorvidt ledige stillinger i en medlemsstat ikke kan besættes af nationale arbejdstagere eller EU-arbejdstagere, som har fast bopæl i denne medlemsstat, og som allerede befinder sig på medlemsstatens lovlige arbejdsmarked (princippet om EU-præference).

([1]) http://www.nyidanmark.dk/da-dk/Ophold/arbejde/arbejdsophold.htm
([2]) http://www.dtl.eu/~/media/Files/Webnyheder/Cabotagekoersel%20i%20Danmark%203.ashx.
([3]) Der hverken er statsborger i en medlemsstat eller fastboende udlænding i henhold til Rådets direktiv 2003/109/EF af 25. november 2003 om tredjelandsstatsborgeres status som fastboende udlænding.
([4]) Danmark har et fuldt forbehold inden for området med frihed, sikkerhed og retfærdighed, hvilket også indebærer en undtagelse fra foranstaltninger med henblik på at gennemføre en fælles indvandringspolitik.

I forbindelse med kortvarige ophold (3 måneder inden for en 6-måneders periode) skal tredjelandsstatsborgeren have et Schengenvisum — hvis dette er et krav i forordning (EF) nr. 539/2001 — som udstedes af den enkelte medlemsstat i overensstemmelse med forordning (EF) nr. 810/2009 (visumkodekset). Principielt giver et Schengenvisum i sig selv ikke adgang til arbejdsmarkedet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002461/13
to the Commission
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Immigration of third-country nationals into the EU

EU driver attestations are issued on the basis of Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 and are typically used by non-EU drivers in connection with international journeys within the EU. A Schengen visa is required, however, in order to include a third-country national on a driver attestation.

Danish Hauliers within the trade union 3F (United Federation of Danish Workers) in Denmark reported on 22 February 2013 that up to 100 third-country nationals from the Philippines have been issued with a visa in a Member State entitling them to use the roads in other Member States for international transport.

According to Danish visa rules, however, an essential criterion for obtaining residence and work permits is whether or not there are Danish workers, foreign workers living in Denmark or workers within the EU available who are qualified to carry out the work in question ([1]).

Between 2008 and 2010, the number of people working in the Danish transport industry fell by 8 000, representing a 22% decrease. This has created a large surplus of national workers in the Danish transport industry, with many unemployed drivers at risk of ending up in long-term unemployment ([2]).

Therefore, with regard to the aforementioned criterion for the granting of residence and work permits, there must be considered to be national workers currently available who are qualified to carry out the work for which, in this particular case, drivers from third countries have been granted residence permits to carry out.

On the basis of the above, will the Commission establish whether issuing a visa to carry out work even though there is already a sufficient number of workers on the national labour market is compatible with EU visa rules?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)

For third-country national drivers in road transport in the EU, the haulier company needs to have a Community licence and apply for a driver attestation. The latter certifies that the driver ([3]) is either lawfully employed by or lawfully put at the disposal of the company in accordance with the conditions of employment and vocational training in the Member State that issues the driver attestation (Article 5, Regulation 1072/2009).

The EU is developing a common immigration policy in line with Article 79 TFEU. This includes measures establishing the conditions of entry and residence, as well as the definition of rights of third-country nationals ([4]). Truck drivers are however not covered specifically by the EU immigration *acquis*.

As a general rule, Member States retain the right to determine volumes of admission of third-country nationals coming from third countries to their territory in order to seek work, whether employed or self-employed (Article 79.5 TFEU). Thus, access to employment for third-country workers is accorded by individual Member States, taking into account the labour market situation in the Member State concerned, which often entails checking whether vacancies in a Member State cannot be filled by national and EU manpower or by non-EU manpower resident on a permanent basis in that Member State and already forming part of that Member State's regular labour market (principle of Union preference).

For short-term stays (3 months within a 6-month period), the third-country national will need a Schengen visa — if required under Regulation (EC) No 539/2001 — which is issued by the individual Member State in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 810/2009 (Visa Code). In principle, the Schengen visa *per se* does not grant access to the labour market.

([1]) http://www.nyidanmark.dk/da-dk/Ophold/arbejde/arbejdsophold.htm
([2]) http://www.dtl.eu/~/media/Files/Webnyheder/Cabotagekoersel%20i%20Danmark%203.ashx
([3]) Who is neither a national of a Member State nor a long-term resident within the meaning of Council Directive 2003/109/EC of25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents.
([4]) Denmark exercises a full opt out from the area of freedom, security and justice, which also excludes it from measures aimed at implementing a common migration policy.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002462/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4. marts 2013)

Om: Design af euromønternes nationale side

I overensstemmelse med traktaterne bidrager Den Europæiske Union og dens institutioner til, at medlemsstaternes kulturer kan udfolde sig. I forbindelse med Slovakiets design af den nationale side af euromønterne var der flere medlemsstater, som havde indvendinger herimod. Begrundelsen herfor var, at den slovakiske jubilæumsmønt udtrykte religiøse overbevisninger. I mellemtiden har Slovakiet fået sit genindsendte designforslag godkendt, og de oprindelige indvendinger er trukket tilbage.

Vil Kommissionen oplyse, hvilke oprindelige indvendinger der er trukket tilbage, og på hvilket grundlag det er sket?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Olli Rehn
(22. april 2013)

Når medlemsstater udformer et designudkast til en euromønt, skal de tage i betragtning, at den pågældende mønt ikke længere blot er et nationalt anliggende. En euromønt cirkulerer i samtlige eurozonens medlemsstater, som har meget forskellige traditioner og baggrunde. Indsigelserne mod det slovakiske møntdesign skyldtes, at personer med en anden religiøs overbevisning kan opfatte det som upassende at blive tvunget til at acceptere eller benytte en mønt (selve definitionen på deres status som gyldigt betalingsmiddel) med tydelige religiøse elementer. Sidstnævnte er problematisk i lande, hvor sekularisme udgør et fundamentalt grundlag for den nationale lovgivning, af og til endog af forfatningsmæssig karakter.

Godkendelsen eller afvisningen af det nationale design på en euromønt fra en medlemsstat i eurozonen er en beføjelse, som udelukkende er tillagt Rådet, jf. artikel 1i, stk. 6 og 7, Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 975/98. Derfor skal spørgsmål angående beslutningstagning stiles til Rådet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002462/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Design of the national side of euro coins

In accordance with the Treaties, the European Union and its institutions contribute to the flourishing of the cultures of the Member States. Several Member States objected to Slovakia's design of the national side of its euro coins on the grounds that the Slovak jubilee coin expressed religious beliefs. Slovakia has since had its proposed design approved and the original objections have been withdrawn.

Can the Commission say which original objections have been withdrawn and on what basis?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

Member States have to take into account when preparing a draft design for a euro coin that this coin is no longer a mere national matter. A euro coin circulates in all euro area Member States. The latter have very different traditions and backgrounds. The objections raised against the Slovak coin design referred to the fact that persons of different religious belief may find it inappropriate to be forced to accept or use a coin (the very definition of their legal tender) with clear religious elements, while the latter are problematic in countries where secularism is a fundamental building block of national public law, sometimes even of constitutional nature.

The approval or rejection of the national design of a euro coin from a euro area Member State lies exclusively with the Council pursuant to Article 1i (6) and (7) of Council Regulation 975/1998. Therefore, questions on the decision-making would have to be addressed to the Council.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002464/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4. marts 2013)

Om: Manglende miljømæssige gevinster af EU's energiprojekter

EU's energieffektiviseringsprojekter, hvormed målet er at reducere energiforbruget og derigennem tage hensyn til miljøet, har meget lange udsigter, når det kommer til rentabilitet.

Kun Tjekkiet har opnået et tilfredsstillende resultat. Generelt står det dårligt til, og helt galt er det med Italien. Nogle af de projekter, der er iværksat i Italien, forventes først at give bonus efter mellem 288 og 444 år ([1]), hvilket nok kan betegnes som et langsigtet projekt. Alene Tjekkiet, Italien og Litauen har modtaget over en milliard EUR til disse projekter. Dertil kommer, at afskrivningerne på nogle af foranstaltningerne ganske enkelt er ophørt, lang tid før de er tjent ind.

Vil Kommissionen oplyse, om den ser det som et problem at bruge penge på projekter, som reelt aldrig når målsætningerne?

Vil Kommissionen endvidere oplyse, hvorfor der ikke stilles større og mere realistiske målkrav til medlemsstater, som modtager store støttebeløb til energiprojekter?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Johannes Hahn
(30. april 2013)

Revisionsrettens beretning »Omkostningseffektiviteten af investeringer i energieffektivitet under samhørighedspolitikken« var baseret på revision af fire programmer i tre medlemsstater, herunder en stikprøve på 24 projekter om investeringer i energieffektivitet i offentlige bygninger. Beretningens konklusion var, at alle de projekter, revisionen omfattede, resulterede i de planlagte fysiske output, såsom udskiftede vinduer og døre eller isolerede mure og tage, men omkostningerne var høje i forhold til energibesparelserne. Den gennemsnitlige planlagte tilbagebetalingsperiode for investeringerne var ca. 50 år, men i 18 af de 24 projekter kunne de faktiske energibesparelser ikke verificeres, fordi de ikke var blevet målt pålideligt.

Imidlertid mener Kommissionen, at samhørighedspolitikken med sine mange mål, der bidrager til økonomisk, social og territorial samhørighed, kræver en integreret tilgang og bør bruges til støtte for mere omfattende renovationer af bygninger for at opfylde målene for energieffektivitet i 2020 og senere. Derfor er det ikke passende udelukkende at fokusere på en tilbagebetalingsperiode i forbindelse med langsigtede investeringer i energieffektivitet.

Projektfinansiering er underlagt en række regler og betingelser, der er fastsat dels på EU-niveau, dels af medlemsstaterne. Der sættes strenge kriterier i EU-lovgivningen i direktivet om bygningers energimæssige ydeevne og det nye direktiv om energieffektivitet, der vil have stor betydning for investeringer på området, særlig for støtteperioden 2014-2020. Samhørighedspolitikken er underlagt delt forvaltning, hvilket vil sige, at forvaltningsmyndighederne på nationalt, regionalt eller lokalt niveau vælger projekter og overvåger implementeringen af dem.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/enviroment/118734.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002464/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Lack of environmental benefits of EU energy projects

The paybacks from the EU's energy efficiency projects aimed at reducing energy consumption and thereby benefiting the environment are not expected for a very long time.

Only the Czech Republic has achieved a satisfactory result. In general, things are not going well, and where Italy is concerned the situation is really poor. Some of the projects that have been implemented in Italy are not expected to yield results for between 288 and 444 years ([1]), something that can definitely be referred to as a long-term project. The Czech Republic, Italy and Lithuania alone have received over EUR 1 billion for these projects. In addition, the provision for depreciation of some of the measures will quite simply have run out long before any payback will have been seen.

Can the Commission say whether it views it as a problem to spend money on projects that, in reality, will never achieve their objectives?

Can the Commission also explain why higher and more realistic requirements in terms of objectives were not imposed on Member States receiving large amounts in subsidies for energy projects?

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

The European Court of Auditors' report 'Cost-effectiveness of Cohesion Policy Investments in Energy Efficiency' was based on audits of four programmes in three Member States, including a sample of 24 energy efficiency investment projects in public buildings. It found that all the audited projects produced the planned physical output, such as replaced windows and doors or insulated walls and roofs, but considered that the audited projects did not generate a good ratio between energy savings and the corresponding investment cost. The average planned payback period was around 50 years, although in 18 out of the 24 projects actual energy savings could not be verified as they had not been reliably measured.

However, the Commission considers that the multi-objective nature of cohesion policy, contributing to economic, social and territorial cohesion, requires an integrated approach and should be used in support of more comprehensive renovation of buildings in order to meet the energy efficiency targets for 2020 and beyond. As such, the sole focus on a simple payback period is not appropriate in the context of long-term energy efficiency investments.

Project funding is subject to certain rules and conditions laid down partly at EU and partly at Member State level. Stringent criteria are being set in EU legislation, under the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive and the new Energy Efficiency Directive, which will be important for investments in this area, in particular for the 2014-2020 funding period. Cohesion policy is subject to shared management, meaning that the managing authorities at national, regional or local levels select projects and monitor their implementation.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/enviroment/118734.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002465/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4. marts 2013)

Om: Usund mad med sundhedsanprisninger

EU's liste over godkendte sundhedsanprisninger trådte i kraft den 14. december 2012. Herefter er det tilladt fødevareproducenter at oplyse om varens sundhedsmæssige egenskaber på emballagen. Dette udnyttes nu af flere virksomheder som et smuthul, hvor produkter, der indeholder store mængder sukker og fedt, markedsføres som sunde.

Finder Kommissionen i lighed med spørgeren, at dette er et problem, og er den enig i, at EU-reglerne bør stille krav om, at et fødevareprodukt, der sundhedsanprises, også samlet set er sundt?

Er Kommissionen i stand til at vurdere problemets omfang, samt hvad det kan komme til at betyde for antallet af overvægtige, der i forvejen er stigende?

Hvad agter Kommissionen konkret at foretage sig for at tage fat på dette problem?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(16. april 2013)

Kommissionen er klar over, at ernærings- og sundhedsanprisninger kan tilskynde forbrugerne til at vælge produkter, der har direkte indvirkning på deres samlede indtagelse af næringsstoffer som mættet fedt, salt og sukker, hvis overdrevne indtagelse kan være sundhedsskadelig. Da forordning (EF) nr. 1924/2006 ([1]) om ernærings- og sundhedsanprisninger blev vedtaget, aftalte Europa-Parlamentet og Rådet at anmode Kommissionen om at fastsætte ernæringsprofiler for at forhindre en sådan situation.

Kommissionen er meget opmærksom på udviklingen i overvægt og fedme i Europa. Der er mange årsager til fedme, og de er ikke begrænset til kostfaktorer, men omfatter også andre faktorer som fysisk aktivitet. Kommissionen er ikke i stand til at vurdere, hvilken del af fedmeepidemien der skyldes brugen af ernærings- og sundhedsanprisninger.

Kommissionen overvejer stadig, hvordan ernæringsprofiler skal fastsættes.

([1]) EUT L 404 af 30.12.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002465/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Unhealthy food for which health claims are made

The EU list of authorised health claims entered into force on 14 December 2012. Accordingly, food producers are permitted to provide information on the packaging concerning the product's health-related properties. This is now being exploited by several undertakings as a loophole to market products containing large quantities of sugar and fat as healthy.

Like me, does the Commission see this as a problem, and does it agree that the EU rules should require a food product for which health claims are made to also be healthy overall?

Is the Commission in a position to assess the extent of the problem and what it could mean in terms of the number of people who are overweight, a figure which is already rising?

What does the Commission intend to do in specific terms to address this problem?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

The Commission recognises that nutrition and health claims may encourage consumers to make choices which directly influence their total intake of nutrients such as saturated fat, salt, and sugars, the excess of which may be detrimental to health. When adopting Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 ([1]) on nutrition and health claims, the European Parliament and the Council agreed to request the Commission to set nutrient profiles in order to prevent such situation.

The Commission is very much aware of the trends in the prevalence of overweight and obesity in Europe. Obesity determinants are multiple and not limited to dietary factors but also include other factors such as physical activity. The Commission is not in a position to assess the part of the obesity epidemic that is due to the use of nutrition and health claims.

The Commission is still reflecting on the way forward concerning the setting of nutrient profiles.

([1]) OJ L 404, 30.12.2006.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002466/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4. marts 2013)

Om: Ny kriminel niche i form af matchfixing i international fodbold

Kriminelle har tilsyneladende opdaget en ny niche, nemlig matchfixing i international fodbold.

Det er tilsyneladende bander, som man kender fra andre dele af den kriminelle verden, der står bag, og Europol er opmærksom på problemet. Strafferammen er imidlertid betydeligt lavere for matchfixing end for f.eks. narkokriminalitet. Dette har medført, at bl.a. tidligere narkodømte nu er gået ind i matchfixing.

Hvordan forholder Kommissionen sig til denne problematik?

Hvad agter Kommissionen konkret at foretage sig for at komme dette problem til livs, og finder Kommissionen endvidere, at den nuværende strafferamme for denne type af grov kriminalitet er passende?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Androulla Vassiliou
(14. maj 2013)

Kommissionen har gennem medierne og kontakter med relevante berørte parter fået kendskab til forekomsten af aftalt spil. Kommissionen henviser det ærede medlem til sine svar på skriftlig forespørgsel E-010132/2012, E-000964/2013, E-001039/2013 og E-001981/2013 ([1]), som giver et overblik over de foranstaltninger, der er planlagt for at beskytte sportens integritet på EU-plan.

I EU-undersøgelsen om aftalt spil inden for sport ([2]) fremhæves det, at aftalt spil er omfattet af forskellige retlige bestemmelser i EU's medlemsstater: Visse lande behandler aftalt spil som almindelige lovovertrædelser som f.eks. bestikkelse eller svig, mens andre har indført særlige bestemmelser om lovovertrædelser inden for sport for at løse problemerne vedrørende aftalt spil ved hjælp af straffeloven, lovgivning om sport eller særlige strafferetlige bestemmelser. Sanktioner og straffe for overtrædelser vedrørende aftalt spil varierer også meget fra medlemsstat til medlemsstat. En detaljeret liste over de mulige sanktioner findes i bilag 2 til ovennævnte undersøgelse.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/sport/news/documents/study-sports-fraud-final-version_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002466/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: New criminal niche in the form of match-fixing in international football

It appears that criminals have found a new niche in the form of match-fixing in international football.

Gangs that are known from other areas of the criminal world appear to be behind this, and Europol is aware of the problem. However, the penalty for match-fixing is considerably lower than it is for drug-related crime, for example. This has led to people previously convicted of drug-related crime being among those now getting involved in match-fixing.

What is the Commission's position as regards this problem?

What, in specific terms, does the Commission intend to do in order to tackle this problem, and does it also consider the current penalty for this type of serious crime to be appropriate?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)

The Commission is aware of episodes of match-fixing by way of media reports and contacts with relevant stakeholders. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-010132/2012, E-000964/2013, E-001039/2013 and E-001981/2013 ([1]) for an overview of planned measures to protect the integrity of sport at EU level.

The EU Study on match-fixing in sport ([2]) notes that match-fixing is covered by different legal provisions in the EU Member States: while some countries address the issue in the context of general offences such as corruption or fraud, others have implemented specific sport offences to cope with match-fixing contained either in their criminal codes, sports laws or special criminal laws. Sanctions and penalties for offences related to match-fixing also vary greatly across Member States. A detailed list of available sanctions is available in Annex 2 of the abovementioned Study.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/sport/news/documents/study-sports-fraud-final-version_en.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002467/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4. marts 2013)

Om: Danmarks EU-rabat og bidrag til EU

Den danske regering har i dansk presse meddelt, at Danmark har fået en rabat fra EU's fremadrettede budget.

Vil Kommission oplyse, hvilken betydning dette får for Danmarks bruttobidrag til EU?

Spørgeren ønsker således belyst, hvad Danmark skulle have betalt brutto til EU, såfremt de nu vedtagne forudsætninger for det kommende MFF lægges ned over det danske budgetår 2012?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Janusz Lewandowski
(22. april 2013)

Ifølge konklusionerne fra Det Europæiske Råd af 8. februar 2013 modtager Danmark en bruttonedsættelse af sit årlige BNI-bidrag på 130 mio. EUR (i 2011-priser) om året i perioden 2014-2020. Da Danmark deltager i finansieringen af sin egen korrektion i forhold til sin andel af EU's samlede BNI, udgør nettonedsættelsen ca. 127,5 mio. EUR (i 2011-priser) om året, idet Danmarks andel af EU's samlede BNI udgør ca. 1,90 %.

Nettonedsættelsen for det enkelte år vil afhænge af den reelle inflation (for at omregne bruttobeløbet på 130 mio. EUR til løbende priser) og Danmarks reelle andel af EU's samlede BNI (for at udregne Danmarks bidrag til finansieringen af sin egen korrektion).

Havde Danmark modtaget denne nedsættelse allerede i 2012, ville bruttonedsættelsen af det årlige BNI-bidrag have beløbet sig til 132,6 mio. EUR i løbende priser. Det betyder, at landets BNI-bidrag ville være blevet nedsat med 130 mio. EUR efter indregning af landets bidrag til finansieringen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002467/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Denmark's EU rebate and contribution to the EU

The Danish Government has announced in the Danish press that Denmark has obtained a rebate on its contribution to the forthcoming EU budget.

Can the Commission say what this will mean for Denmark's gross contribution to the EU?

What would Denmark's gross contribution to the EU have been if the conditions that have now been adopted for the next multiannual financial framework were to have been applied over the 2012 financial year in Denmark?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

According to the European Council conclusions of 8 February 2013 Denmark should receive a gross reduction in its own resources payment of EUR 130 million (in 2011 prices) per year for the years 2014-2020. Since Denmark will participate in financing its own correction according to its share in EU GNI, the net amount of the correction should be approximately EUR 127,5 million (in 2011 prices) per year given that the DK share in EU GNI is about 1,90%.

The net amount of the correction each year will depend on the actual inflation (to recalculate the gross amount of EUR 130 million to current prices) and on the actual share of DK in EU GNI (to calculate its part of financing its correction).

If Denmark would have benefitted from this reduction already in 2012, its gross GNI reduction would have amounted to EUR 132,6 million in current prices which means that its GNI contribution would have been reduced by EUR 130 million after taking into account its share in the financing.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002468/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4. marts 2013)

Om: Overvågning af EU-kritik på internettet

Forud for Europa-parlamentsvalget i 2014 vil EU bruge mere end 3 mio. USD (2,3 mio. EUR) på overvågning af internettet. Dette skal ske for at monitorere EU-skeptiske røster, idet målet ikke mindst er lande, som har oplevet en stigende EU-skepsis.

Er Kommissionen enig i, at det er et demokratisk problem at bruge penge på at forhindre EU-kritik, og finder Kommissionen i forlængelse heraf, at det er problematisk at agere så normativt, som det her er tilfældet?

Kan Kommissionen forestille sig, at denne EU-kritik kunne være berettiget?

Forventer Kommissionen, at denne overvågning vil have nogen form for effekt og i givet fald hvilken?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Viviane Reding
(17. april 2013)

Kommissionen henviser det ærede medlem til sit svar på de tidligere skriftlige forespørgsler E-001295/2013 og E-001181/2013 af hr. Mario Borghezio og hr. Oreste Rossi om samme emne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002468/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Monitoring of criticism of the EU on the Internet

Prior to the European Parliament elections in 2014, the EU will spend more than USD 3 million (EUR 2.3 million) on monitoring the Internet. This is to be done in order to monitor Eurosceptic voices, with the main targets being countries which have seen a rise in Euroscepticism.

Does the Commission agree that it is problematic from a democratic point of view to spend money on preventing criticism of the EU, and in this same regard does it view it as problematic to act in such a normative fashion, as is this case here?

Could the Commission envisage this criticism of the EU being justified?

Does it expect this monitoring to have any form of effect and, if so, what sort of effect?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(17 April 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to previous similar written questions E-001295/2013 and E-001181/2013 by Mr Mario Borghezio and Mr Oreste Rossi.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002469/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4. marts 2013)

Om: Manglende effekt af EU-støtteprojekter

Revisionsretten har i en række rapporter undersøgt effekten af EU-støtten, og her konkluderet, at mange midler bruges planløst og uden tilstrækkelige klare kriterier for støttens reelle effekt.

Der henvises i den forbindelse bl.a. til det danske medlem af revisionsretten der til Berlingske Tidende har udtalt: »Når man internt i EU overfører mange flere penge fra den fælles kasse til medlemslande, så er resultatkravene få, små og har sjældent noget at gøre med de reformer, der er så nødvendige at få gennemført i de enkelte lande«, og fortsætter: »Det jeg siger, baserer sig på det arbejde, vi har lavet. Det er fagligt begrundet« .

Vil Kommissionen svare på, hvorfor der ikke opstilles klare kriterier for støttens langsigtede effekt og herunder oplyse, om den ikke finder, at der er brug for at arbejde langt mere med kriterierne for tildeling og ikke mindst succes for disse støtteprojekter?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Johannes Hahn
(14. maj 2013)

Samhørighedspolitikken er en investeringspolitik, som støtter jobskabelse og økonomisk vækst og tager sigte på at reducere de økonomiske, sociale og territoriale forskelle. Den gennemføres med delt forvaltning, som indebærer, at medlemsstaterne udvælger projekter og fastlægger deres detaljerede målsætninger. Også overvågningen og evalueringen gennemføres primært som led i det regionale og nationale tilsyn. Kommissionen støtter de programmer, herunder de målsætninger, som ligger til grund for projekternes gennemførelse.

Kommissionen er imidlertid enig i, at de nuværende programmer — med meget store variationer mellem dem — alt for ofte har målsætninger, der ikke er tilstrækkeligt fokuserede eller robuste nok til at danne grundlag for projektudvælgelse eller til at muliggøre meningsfulde evalueringer af programmets virkninger. Dette er grunden til, at Kommissionen har foreslået en streng resultatorienteret tilgang for de programmer, der påbegyndes i 2014. Det vigtigste element er definition af specifikke målsætninger med dertil hørende resultatindikatorer i programmerne. En resultatramme og fælles indikatorer vil skabe incitamenter til at gennemføre programmerne som planlagt.

Kommissionen er også enig i, at det er af afgørende betydning for en vellykket gennemførelse af et projekt, at visse retlige forudsætninger opfyldes, og reformer gennemføres, før der træffes afgørelse om investeringer. Derfor har Kommissionen foreslået såkaldte forhåndsbetingelser for 2014-2020. Kommissionen søger desuden at skabe overensstemmelse mellem det europæiske semester med de landespecifikke henstillinger vedrørende politiske reformer og udformningen af fremtidige samhørighedspolitiske programmer. Til dette formål benyttede Kommissionen i 2012 positionspapirer til at oplyse medlemsstaterne om Kommissionens tjenestegrenes synspunkter vedrørende de største udfordringer for 2014-2020 og at fastlægge en ramme for dialog.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002469/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Ineffectiveness of EU aid projects

In a number of reports, the European Court of Auditors examined the effect of EU aid and concluded that many resources are being used with no plan and without sufficiently clear criteria for establishing the actual impact of the aid.

In this regard, reference is made to the Danish member of the Court of Auditors among others, who told the *Berlingske Tidende*: 'Whenever a great deal of money is transferred within the EU from the common pot to Member States, the requirements in terms of results are very few, low and rarely have anything to do with the reforms that are so desperately needed in the individual countries'. He continued: 'What I am saying is based on the work we have done. It is based on professional knowledge'.

Can the Commission explain why no clear criteria are established for the long-term effect of the aid and state whether it considers there to be a need for a lot more work to be done on the criteria for awarding the aid and, in particular, for the success of these aid projects?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)

Cohesion policy is an investment policy, supporting jobs and economic growth which aims to reduce economic, social and territorial disparities. It is delivered under shared management, where Member States select projects and decide their detailed objectives. Also monitoring and evaluation primarily under regional and national supervision. The Commission endorses programmes, including their objectives, under which the projects are delivered.

However, the Commission agrees that current programmes — with wide variations across them — too often objectives are set that are insufficiently focused or robust enough to guide project selection or to facilitate meaningful evaluations of programme impacts. This is why the Commission has proposed a rigorous results-orientation approach for programmes starting in 2014. The most important element is the definition in the programmes of specific objectives with result indicators attached. A performance framework and common indicators will create incentives to deliver programmes as planned.

The Commission also agrees that it is essential for the success of a project that certain legal preconditions and reforms are met before investments are decided. This is why the Commission has proposed so called *ex-ante* conditionalities for 2014-2020. In addition, the Commission seeks to align the European Semester with its country specific recommendations for policy reforms with the design of future cohesion policy programmes. For this purpose, the Commission used position papers in 2012 to inform Member States of the Commission services' views on the main challenges for 2014-2020 and to establish a framework for dialogue.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002471/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4. marts 2013)

Om: Østeuropæere på det danske og vesteuropæiske arbejdsmarked

Ifølge tal fra Arbejdsmarkedsstyrelsen er antallet af østeuropæere i arbejde i Danmark steget med 43 % siden 2008. I tredje kvartal 2012 var der 47.459 beskæftigede fra 10 østeuropæiske lande. Østeuropæerne arbejder imidlertid ikke kun midlertidigt, idet mere end tredjedel er forblevet i Danmark siden 2008 eller tidligere. Østarbejderne kom således til Danmark, da der var højkonjunktur, men er altså ikke rejst hjem igen under den nuværende lavkonjunktur. Arbejdsmarkedsforsker Søren Kaj Andersen, der er i gang med en stor undersøgelse af danske virksomheders brug af østeuropæisk arbejdskraft, siger således: »Det lader til, at østeuropæerne har bidt sig fast på det danske arbejdsmarked gennem kriseårene. Vi kan i hvert fald konstatere, at det ikke har været dem, der stod forrest i køen til at miste jobbet«.

Hvilke konsekvenser finder Kommissionen ovenstående har i forhold til overholdelse af løn- og arbejdsvilkår i Vesteuropa?

Hvilken betydning for denne udvikling tillægger Kommissionen østeuropæernes ret til sociale ydelser i Danmark?

Vil Kommissionen vurdere, hvorvidt niveauet af østeuropæere er højere eller lavere end forventet?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor
(3. maj 2013)

Kommissionen har analyseret, hvordan mobiliteten efter udvidelsen har påvirket arbejdsmarkedet i værtslandene i rapporterne fra 2008 og 2011 om funktionsmåden for overgangsordningerne ([1]), som var baseret på grundige analyser, der blev offentliggjort i rapporten *Employment in Europe* fra 2008 og undersøgelsen *Employment and social developments in Europe* fra 2011. Overordnet tyder det på, at udvidelsens påvirkning af lokale arbejdstageres løn- og arbejdsvilkår er meget begrænset.

Generelt set konkluderer de fleste undersøgelser, at mobilitet for det meste styres af jobmuligheder og ikke af graden af socialsikringsydelser. For eksempel har en undersøgelse af hele EU ([2]) konkluderet, at årsagsforbindelsen mellem udgifter til social velfærd og mobilitetsstrømme inden for EU statistisk set ikke er væsentlig, og at der ikke er beviser på en »velfærdsmagnet«. Derudover sker adgangen til socialsikringsydelser ikke automatisk, men er underlagt præcise bestemmelser i henhold til EU-reglerne.

Endvidere boede der ifølge officielle befolkningsstatistikker ca. 55 000 borgere fra EU-12 ([3]) i Danmark i 2012, hvilket udgør blot 1 % af den samlede befolkning.

Kommissionen har ikke for nylig udarbejdet prognoser for mobilitetsstrømme, som kan bruges som sammenligningsgrundlag til at bestemme, om antallet af borgere fra øst- og centraleuropæiske medlemsstater er højere eller lavere end forventet. Kommissionen vil dog gerne påpege, at antallet af EU-12-borgere, der er bosiddende i en anden medlemsstat end deres egen, steg hurtigt efter udvidelsen (fra 1,8 millioner i 2004 til 4,7 millioner i 2009), men det er gået meget langsommere, siden krisen begyndte (til 6,1 millioner i 2012) ([4]).

([1]) KOM(2011)0729 og SEK(2011)1343 og KOM (2008)0765.
([2]) Undersøgelse (2012) fra IZA og ESRI om aktiv inklusion af migranter: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=750&newsId=1160&furtherNews=yes
([3]) De 12 medlemsstater der blev optaget i EU i 2004 og 2007.
([4]) Se også undersøgelsen Employment and social developments in Europe fra 2011, s. 254.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002471/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Eastern Europeans in the Danish and western European labour market

According to figures released by the Danish National Labour Market Authority, the number of eastern Europeans working in Denmark has risen by 43% since 2008. In the third quarter of 2012, 47 459 people from 10 eastern European countries were employed. These eastern Europeans are not simply working on a temporary basis, as more than a third have been in Denmark since 2008 or earlier. The eastern Europeans thus came to Denmark during favourable economic conditions, but they have not returned home during the current downturn. The labour market researcher, Søren Kaj Andersen, who is carrying out a large study on the use of eastern European labour by Danish companies, says: 'It appears that eastern Europeans have gained a firm hold in the Danish labour market throughout the crisis years. At least we can confirm that these people have not been first in line to lose their jobs'.

What impact does the Commission think the above will have in relation to compliance with wage and working conditions in Western Europe?

How important does the Commission consider the right of eastern Europeans to social services in Denmark to be for this development?

Will the Commission determine whether the level of eastern Europeans is higher or lower than expected?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2013)

The impact of post-enlargement mobility on the labour markets of destination countries has been analysed by the Commission in its 2008 and 2011 Reports on the functioning of the transitional arrangements ([1]), which were based on detailed analysis published in the 2008 *Employment in Europe* report and 2011 *Employment and social developments in Europe* review. Overall, it appears that the effects of post-enlargement on wages and employment of local workers are very small.

Generally, most studies and surveys conclude that mobility is mainly driven by employment opportunities and not by the level of social security benefits. For instance, a recent EU-wide study ([2]) has concluded that the causal effect between social welfare spending and intra-EU mobility flows is statistically insignificant and that there is no evidence of a 'welfare magnet hypothesis'. In addition, access to social security benefits is not automatic but subject to precise conditions under EU rules.

Moreover, according to official population statistics, there were in 2012 around 55 thousands EU-12 ([3]) citizens residing in Denmark, representing only 1% of the total population.

The Commission has not recently produced forecasts of mobility flows against which it could determine whether the number of citizens from Eastern and Central European Member States is higher or lower than expected. Nevertheless, the Commission would like to point out that the number of EU-12 citizens residing in other Member States than their own has increased quickly following the enlargement (from 1.8 million in 2004 to 4.7 million in 2009) but at a much slower pace since the onset of the crisis (to 6.1 million in 2012) ([4]).

([1]) COM(2011) 729 and SEC(2011) 1343 and COM(2008) 765.
([2]) 2012 study by IZA and ESRI on Active inclusion of migrants: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=750&newsId=1160&furtherNews=yes
([3]) The 12 Member States that joined the EU in 2004 and 2007.
([4]) See also 2011 Employment and social developments in Europe review, page 254.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002473/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Possible consequences of a UK withdrawal from the European Union

I have been contacted by a constituent who would like to know how a UK withdrawal from the European Union would affect the country's trade and economic arrangements.

Could the Commission confirm:

1. what tariffs the United Kingdom would face from the European Union were it to exit the Union without an interim agreement;

2. whether, if the UK left the Union, it would continue to enjoy the free trade agreements negotiated as part of the EU;

3. whether it is legally possible for the United Kingdom to leave the European Union through Article 50 of the Treaty of Lisbon but remain a member of the European Economic Area as an independent signatory to the 1994 EEA agreement;

4. whether Article 127 of the 1994 European Economic Area Agreement allows continued free trade and movement for 12 months between a withdrawing state and the EEA, after a Member State signals its withdrawal?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Question E-000232/2013.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-002474/13
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2013. gada 4. marts)

Temats: Viedrobežu sistēma

Viedrobežu sistēma, kurā ietilpst reģistrēto ceļotāju programma (RCP) un ieceļošanas/izceļošanas sistēma (IIS), ir paredzēta, lai atvieglotu, paātrinātu un pastiprinātu trešo valstu valstspiederīgo robežkontroles procedūras pie ES ārējām robežām.

Tomēr šis priekšlikums ietver augstas ieguldījumu izmaksas: lai aprīkotu 1800 ES ārējo robežu šķērsošanas punktus, būs vajadzīgs vismaz EUR 1,1 miljards.

Līdzīga neveiksmīga iniciatīva bija ASV. Ņemot vērā pašreizējo ekonomisko un politisko krīzi, viedrobežu sistēma, kurā vēl ir daudz trūkumu, šķiet kā nacionālistu kustību atbilde vairākās dalībvalstīs.

Kā Komisija nodrošinās, ka nelegālie migranti, kas izmanto nelikumīgus līdzekļus ieceļošanai ES, ievēro šos noteikumus?

Kā Komisija nodrošinās, ka dalībvalstis neizmantos ļaunprātīgi šo jauno sistēmu ar iespēju noteikt naudas soda apjomu vai sankcijas bardzību?

Ņemot vērā kibernoziedzības palielināšanos, kādi konkrēti pasākumi ir jau veikti, lai garantētu personas datu aizsardzību?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Sesīlija Malmstrēma
(2013. gada 24. aprīlis)

Viedrobežu sistēma veicinās Šengenas zonas stiprināšanu, atvieglojot robežšķērsošanu tiem trešo valstu valstspiederīgajiem, kam iepriekš veikta personas padziļināta drošības pārbaude, izmantojot reģistrēto ceļotāju programmu (RCP), un uzraugot visu to trešo valstu valstspiederīgo ieceļošanas/izceļošanas plūsmu, kuri uzņemti īstermiņa uzturēšanās nolūkā, izmantojot ieceļošanas/izceļošanas sistēmu (IIS). Abas sistēmas atvieglos apstākļus regulāri ceļojošām personām un nodrošinās turpmāku Eiropas atvērtību pret pārējo pasauli.

IIS palīdzēs dalībvalstīm atklāt personas, kas pārsniegušas atļauto uzturēšanās termiņu, un ievērojami uzlabos to nelikumīgo migrantu identifikāciju, kuri atrodas ES teritorijā. Šī sistēma tomēr nemaina spēkā esošo tiesisko regulējumu, piemēram, Atgriešanas direktīvu, ko dalībvalstis piemēro nelikumīgās migrācijas jautājuma risināšanā.

RCP un IIS būs saskaņā ar attiecīgajiem tiesību aktiem par personas datu aizsardzību. Dati jāvāc un jāapstrādā vienīgi norīkotām kompetentām iestādēm, ciktāl tas nepieciešams šo iestāžu uzdevumu izpildei. Turklāt tiks ieviesti pasākumi labojumu veikšanai, lai ceļotāji var izlabot jebkurus datus savā reģistrētā ceļotāja pieteikumā un/vai savā ieceļošanas/izceļošanas ierakstā.

Kas attiecas uz izmaksu aplēsēm, tās atbilst visaptverošām atsevišķām sistēmām. Ietaupījumus var panākt, paralēli attīstot abas sistēmas. Jebkurā gadījumā izmaksas būtu jāskata attiecībā pret to, kāda ir šo sistēmu pievienotā vērtība Šengenas zonai.

Sistēma "US-Visit" balstās uz atšķirīgu pieeju robežu pārvaldībai un nav salīdzināma ar ierosinātajām ES sistēmām.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002474/13
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Smart border package

The smart border package, which consists of a Registered Traveller Program (RTP) and an Entry/Exit System (EES), is meant to facilitate, speed-up and reinforce border check procedures at the EU's external borders for third-country nationals.

However, this proposal entails high investment costs: at least EUR 1.1 billion will be needed to equip 1 800 EU external border crossing points with the relevant technology.

A similar initiative was a failure in the US. Taking into consideration the current economic and political crisis, the 'smart border package', which still has a lot of gaps, seems to be a response to nationalist movements in certain Member States.

How will the Commission ensure that illegal migrants who use non-legitimate means to enter the EU comply with these rules?

How will the Commission ensure that the Member States do not abuse the new system by having an option to determine the amount of the fine or the severity of the sanction?

With the increase in cyber crime, what concrete steps have already been taken to guarantee the protection of personal data?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The smart borders package will contribute to strengthening the Schengen area by facilitating border crossings for pre-vetted third-country national via the Registered Traveller Programme (RTP) and by monitoring entry/exit movements of all third-country national admitted for a short stay via the Entry/Exit System (EES). Both systems will simplify life for regular travellers and ensure Europe remains open towards the rest of the world.

The EES will help Member States to detect overstayers and will significantly improve the identification of irregular migrants found within the EU territory. This system does not, however, change the existing legal framework, such as the Return Directive, to be applied by the Member States when tackling irregular migration.

The RTP and EES will comply with the relevant legislation on the protection of personal data. Data is to be collected and handled only by the designated competent authorities as far as necessary for the performance of their tasks. Moreover, measures for redress will be in place so that travellers can rectify any data contained in their Registered Traveller application and/or their Entry/Exit record.

As far as costs estimations are concerned, these correspond to all-inclusive separate systems. Savings can be achieved by developing the two systems in parallel. In any case, costs should be seen in proportion to the added value that such systems represent to the Schengen area.

The US-Visit system is based on a different approach to border management and is not comparable with the proposed EU systems.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002475/13
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Blacklisting of workers

Illegally accessing and misusing employees' personal data is a gross breach of their fundamental rights. The practice of blacklisting employees remains a problem throughout the EU and especially in my own Member State, the UK, where it has ruined livelihoods, reputations and families.

In the UK alone, there have been reports that 44 major construction companies have blacklisted over 3 000 workers for their trade union affiliation and activities. The practice of blacklisting is not restricted to the UK, with key players operating across Europe, including in Sweden, Ireland, France and the Netherlands.

Framework Directive 89/391/EEC includes the provision that the Commission must undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the EU Directives on health and safety. The Commission has stated that it may consider looking at blacklisting as a part of this evaluation. Given that it is evident that the practice of blacklisting employees is widespread, could the Commission state whether it plans to investigate blacklisting activities as part of the evaluation mechanism mentioned above, or through any other procedure?

The Commission has also stated that, should blacklisting remain a problem and Member States fail to effectively enforce national provisions, it will take the necessary measures to ensure that the provisions are implemented and that penalties are applied in the event of infringements. Could the Commission indicate whether it has considered developing policies at any EU level that would actively outlaw blacklisting and ensure that it is made a criminal offence throughout the EU?

Compensation for both material and non-material damage must be assured for all employees whose data has been used to vet and/or bar them from current or future employment. Could the Commission indicate if it is possible to introduce EU legislation to guarantee victims of blacklisting the right to compensation?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to Question E-4999/2012.

Its forthcoming five-yearly evaluation of the EU Directives on health and safety at work will cover the provisions of Framework Directive 89/391/EEC ([1]) on ensuring that workers and workers' representatives with special responsibility for health and safety are not put at a disadvantage, and will also include blacklisting.

The type of practices referred to is an unlawful processing of personal data. Article 23 of Directive 95/46/EC ([2]), requires Member States to provide that any person who has suffered damage as a result of an unlawful processing operation or of any act incompatible with the national transposing provisions is entitled to receive compensation from the controller. The national courts are competent to decide on the damages.

The draft data protection Regulation ([3]) introduces reinforced and harmonised administrative fines for data controllers, up to 2% of their turnover, in case of unlawful processing.

As regards health and safety at work, existing measures include the provisions of the framework Directive. Its Article 4(2) requires Member States to ensure there are adequate controls and supervision. The report based on the abovementioned evaluation will, where necessary, make recommendations to improve the way the regulatory framework functions, including as regards blacklisting.

([1]) Council Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work, OJ L 183, 29.6.1989, p. 1.
([2]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, p. 31-50.
([3]) COM(2012) 11.

In line with the settled case-law of the EU Court of Justice ([4]), the Member States must ensure that infringements of EC law are subject to effective, proportionate and dissuasive penalties, although the choice of penalties is for them to decide.

In the field of health and safety at work, issues of compensation fall exclusively within the Member States' competence.

([4]) In particular, see Case 68/88 *Commission* v *Greece* [1989] ECR 2965.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002476/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(4 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Προκλητική δήλωση του Egemen Bağış έναντι της Γερμανίας και της Κύπρου

Σύμφωνα με την τουρκική Daily News, ο Υπουργός Ευρωπαϊκών Υποθέσεων της Τουρκίας, Egemen Bağış, προκάλεσε τη γερμανίδα Καγκελάριο Angela Merkel ως προς το Πρωτόκολλο της Άγκυρας, λέγοντας ότι η Άγκυρα είναι έτοιμη να ανοίξει τα λιμάνια και τον εναέριο χώρο της στους «Ελληνοκυπρίους» (όπως αποκαλεί τους υπηκόους της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας) αν η γερμανική αεροπορική εταιρεία Lufthansa ξεκινήσει πτήσεις προς το αεροδρόμιο της Τύμπου (που αποκαλείται παρανόμως «αεροδρόμιο Ercan» από την τουρκική πλευρά), που βρίσκεται στην κατεχόμενη ζώνη της Κύπρου. Ο Bağış συνέχισε λέγοντας ότι το άνοιγμα των τουρκικών λιμανιών στους «Ελληνοκυπρίους» δεν θα σήμαινε επίσημη αναγνώριση της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας.

Ερωτάται επομένως η Επιτροπή:

1. Γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή τις νέες προκλητικές δηλώσεις στις οποίες προέβη η Τουρκία, ένα υποψήφιο κράτος μέλος, έναντι της Γερμανίας και της Κύπρου;

2. Γιατί η Επιτροπή εξακολουθεί να ανέχεται την παράλογη επιμονή μιας υποψήφιας χώρας να μην αναγνωρίζει την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία, ένα κράτος μέλος της ΕΕ, κατά παράβαση των ευρωπαϊκών της υποχρεώσεων;

3. Τέλος, πώς αντιμετωπίζει η Επιτροπή το γεγονός ότι η Τουρκία προσπαθεί ουσιαστικά να εκβιάσει τη Γερμανία να επιτρέψει στον εθνικό της αερομεταφορέα να ξεκινήσει πτήσεις προς ένα παράνομο αεροδρόμιο ευρισκόμενο στο έδαφος ενός αποσχιστικού καθεστώτος που δεν αναγνωρίζεται από καμιά άλλη χώρα στον κόσμο εκτός από την Τουρκία;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(29 Μαΐου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή αναφέρεται στα συμπεράσματα του Συμβουλίου της 11ης Δεκεμβρίου 2012, στα οποία το Συμβούλιο, υπενθυμίζοντας τα συμπεράσματά του της 11ης Δεκεμβρίου 2006 και τη δήλωση της 21ης Σεπτεμβρίου 2005, σημειώνει με βαθιά λύπη ότι η Τουρκία, παρά τις επανειλημμένες εκκλήσεις, συνεχίζει να αρνείται να εκπληρώσει την υποχρέωσή της για την πλήρη και χωρίς διακρίσεις εφαρμογή του πρόσθετου πρωτοκόλλου της συμφωνίας σύνδεσης προς όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Κάτι τέτοιο θα μπορούσε να δώσει σημαντική ώθηση στην πορεία των ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων της Τουρκίας. Ελλείψει προόδου στο θέμα αυτό, το Συμβούλιο θα διατηρήσει τα μέτρα του 2006, τα οποία θα έχουν μόνιμη επίδραση στη συνολική πρόοδο των διαπραγματεύσεων. Επιπλέον, η Τουρκία — δυστυχώς — δεν σημείωσε ακόμη πρόοδο όσον αφορά την απαραίτητη εξομάλυνση των σχέσεών της με τη Δημοκρατία της Κύπρου. Το Συμβούλιο επανέλαβε την έκκλησή του για πρόοδο χωρίς καμία περαιτέρω καθυστέρηση.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002476/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Provocative statement by Egemen Bağış towards Germany and Cyprus

According to *The Turkish Daily News*, Turkey's Minister for EU affairs, Egemen Bağış, has challenged German Chancellor Angela Merkel over the Ankara Protocol by saying that Ankara is ready to open its ports and airspace to 'Greek Cypriots' (as he calls nationals of the Republic of Cyprus) if the German airline Lufthansa starts flights to Tymvou Airport (illegally called 'Ercan Airport' by the Turkish side), which is situated in the occupied area of Cyprus. Bağış continued by saying that letting 'Greek Cypriots' into Turkish ports would not constitute official recognition of the Republic of Cyprus.

We therefore ask the Commission:

1. Is the Commission aware of the new provocative statements made by Turkey, a candidate Member State, towards Germany and Cyprus?

2. Why does the Commission continue to tolerate the irrational persistence of a candidate country in not recognising the Republic of Cyprus, an EU Member State, in breach of its European obligations?

3. Finally, how does the Commission view the fact that Turkey is in effect attempting to blackmail Germany into allowing its national air carrier to start flights towards an illegal airport in the territory of a breakaway regime that is not recognised by any other country in the world besides Turkey?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(29 May 2013)

The Commission refers to the Council Conclusions of 11 December 2012, in which the Council, recalling its conclusions of 11 December 2006 and the declaration of 21 September 2005, notes with deep regret that Turkey, despite repeated calls, continues refusing to fulfil its obligation of full, non-discriminatory implementation of the Additional Protocol to the Association Agreement towards all Member States. This could provide a significant boost to Turkey's EU accession negotiation process. In the absence of progress on this issue, the Council will maintain its measures from 2006, which will have a continuous effect on the overall progress of the negotiations. Furthermore, Turkey has regretfully still not made progress towards the necessary normalisation of its relations with the Republic of Cyprus. The Council reiterated its call for progress without any further delay.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002477/13
alla Commissione
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(4 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Scandalo in relazione alla carne di cavallo

Spesso i consumatori sono al centro di truffe, in questo caso alimentari, che possono metterne a repentaglio la salute. È il caso che da qualche giorno sta facendo parlare le testate giornalistiche a livello europeo, ossia la presenza di carne di cavallo nei prodotti alimentari.

Il caso è nato dalla denuncia nei confronti della Findus, nota ditta inglese di prodotti alimentari per la grande distribuzione, in relazione alla presenza di carne equina malgrado sull'etichetta comparisse «carne di manzo». Da questo caso singolo è emerso un sempre maggiore numero di casi riguardanti grandi nomi del settore alimentare che utilizzavano carne di cavallo, omettendo di fornire al consumatore informazioni sul prodotto acquistato.

In seguito anche il colosso Nestlé, che controlla la Buitoni, ha ritirato dal mercato i tortellini per compiere dei controlli accurati alla ricerca di possibili tracce di carne equina. È notizia recente, infatti, che anche il grande colosso Ikea ha ritirato polpette di carne dalla rete dei suoi negozi in seguito ai risultati dei test effettuati che hanno riscontrato la presenza di carne equina.

Dal caso singolo e isolato, quindi, si è passati a un susseguirsi di denunce che hanno colpito diversi paesi dell'UE: Italia, Regno Unito, Svezia, Repubblica ceca, Belgio, Portogallo e Paesi Bassi sono alcuni degli Stati membri coinvolti in questa truffa ai danni del consumatore, i cui eventuali danni potranno ripercuotersi sulla salute dei consumatori a causa dei farmaci utilizzati per dopare i cavalli sportivi.

In questo contesto, è evidente la mancanza di controlli da parte degli enti volti alla tutela del consumatore e soprattutto la mancanza di una fonte di informazione che permetta loro di essere al corrente di ciò che stanno acquistando, per evitare di incorrere in problemi di salute.

A tale proposito, si chiede alla Commissione quanto segue:

1. quali mezzi può offrire l'UE per garantire ai consumatori maggiore trasparenza sul processo alimentare, in modo da immettere sul mercato un prodotto proveniente da fonti sicure e che non sia nocivo alla salute?

2. in che modo l'UE intende rafforzare il lavoro di enti incaricati del controllo sulla catena di produzione in modo da evitare il protrarsi di situazioni simili?

3. intende la Commissione proporre una legislazione vincolante in materia di etichettatura, contenente informazioni chiare sul luogo di nascita, il luogo di allevamento e il luogo di macellazione onde evitare il propagarsi di simili truffe ai danni del consumatore?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(18 aprile 2013)

1. A tutt'oggi non vi sono indicazioni in merito al presente caso che sollevino un problema di sicurezza poiché la carne equina può essere destinata al consumo umano. Tuttavia la presenza non dichiarata di carne equina nei prodotti alimentari venduti come prodotti contenenti carne bovina inganna i consumatori quanto al contenuto degli alimenti e configura quindi una frode nell'etichettatura degli stessi. In effetti, in forza delle norme esistenti ([1]), l'etichettatura degli alimenti non deve trarre in inganno i consumatori quanto alla loro natura, origine e contenuto e vi devono essere indicati tutti gli ingredienti. Inoltre, l'etichettatura degli alimenti contenenti carne deve indicare anche la specie animale in questione.

2. Agli operatori del settore alimentare incombe la responsabilità precipua di assicurare che i prodotti immessi sul mercato siano conformi alle disposizioni della normativa alimentare dell'Unione, mentre le autorità competenti nazionali sono responsabili di farla rispettare mediante opportuni controlli ed irrogando sanzioni dissuasive ed efficaci.

([1]) Direttiva 2000/13/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 20 marzo 2000, relativa al ravvicinamento delle legislazioni degli Stati membri concernenti l'etichettatura e la presentazione dei prodotti alimentari, nonché la relativa pubblicità, GU L 109 del 6.5.2000, pag. 29.

La Commissione coordina attivamente le indagini in corso negli Stati membri interessati. Essa ha adottato di recente una raccomandazione relativa a un piano coordinato di controllo ([2]), cofinanziato dall'Unione a un tasso del 75 %, con cui sollecita controlli su scala unionale degli alimenti commercializzati quali contenenti carni bovine per individuare le etichettature fraudolente nonché delle carni equine destinate al consumo umano per individuare la presenza di residui di fenilbutazone, un medicinale veterinario il cui uso è consentito soltanto negli animali non destinati alla produzione alimentare. Una sintesi di tutte le risultanze sarà disponibile entro la metà di aprile 2013. L'imminente proposta della Commissione sui controlli ufficiali mira a rafforzare ulteriormente il sistema attuale, anche mediante l'irrogazione di sanzioni.

3. Per quanto concerne le intenzioni della Commissione quanto all'etichettatura d'origine degli alimenti contenenti carne, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputata alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta P-001731/2013 ([3]).

([2]) 2013/99/UE: raccomandazione della Commissione, del 19 febbraio 2013, relativa a un piano coordinato di controllo volto a stabilire la prevalenza di pratiche fraudolente nella commercializzazione di determinati prodotti alimentari, GU L 48 del 21.2.2013, pag. 28.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002477/13
to the Commission
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Horsemeat scandal

Consumers are often the victims of scams, in this case concerning food, which can endanger their health. The presence of horsemeat in food products, which has made the headlines all over Europe in the past few days, is one of these cases.

The affair began when Findus, a well-known British food producer supplying major retailers, was reported for having horsemeat in products that were labelled as 'beef'. An increasing number of other cases have subsequently emerged in which some of the biggest names in the food industry have been found to be using horsemeat while failing to provide consumers with information about the product purchased.

As a result, even food giant Nestlé, the parent company of Buitoni, has withdrawn tortellini from the market in order to carry out detailed tests to check for any traces of horsemeat. We have recently learned that Ikea, another huge company, has withdrawn its meatballs from sale in its network of stores following the results of tests which detected the presence of horsemeat.

This isolated case has therefore led to a string of reports involving several EU countries: Italy, the United Kingdom, Sweden, the Czech Republic, Belgium, Portugal and the Netherlands are just some of the Member States caught up in this scam, which is harmful to consumers and may have consumer health implications, because of the drugs used to dope racehorses.

There is clearly a failure on the part of the authorities in charge of protecting consumers and above all a lack of information that would allow consumers to know what they are buying and avoid endangering their health.

In this respect, can the Commission state:

1. which resources it can offer the EU in order to ensure greater transparency of the food process for consumers, so that the products placed on the market come from safe sources and are not harmful to health;

2. how the EU intends to bolster the work of bodies responsible for carrying out checks along the production chain, so that similar situations do not occur in future;

3. whether it intends to propose binding legislation concerning labelling, requiring clear information about the place of birth, rearing and slaughter, in order to prevent similar scams from harming consumers in future?

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

1. To date, there is no indication on the subject which raises a safety issue, as horse meat can be destined for human consumption. However, undeclared presence of horse meat in food products sold as containing beef misleads the consumers as regards the content of foods and therefore constitutes fraud in food labelling. Indeed, under existing rules ([1]), the labelling of foods must not mislead the consumer as to their nature, origin and content and all ingredients must be labelled. Finally, the labelling of foods containing meat must also indicate the animal species concerned.

2. 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.

([1]) 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.

The Commission is actively coordinating the pending investigations in the Member States concerned. It has recently adopted a recommendation on a coordinated control plan ([2]), which is co-financed by the Union at a rate of 75%, 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 residues, a veterinary drug whose use is allowed only in non-food producing animals. A summary of all findings will be available by mid-April 2013. The forthcoming Commission proposal on official controls will aim at further strengthening the existing system, including the provisions on sanctions.

3. As regards the Commission's intentions on the origin of foods containing meat, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question P-001731/2013 ([3]).

([2]) Commission Recommendation of 19 February 2013 on a coordinated control plan with a view to establish the prevalence of fraudulent practices (2013/99/EU), OJ L 48, 21.2.2013, p. 28.

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-002478/13
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D) şi Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(4 martie 2013)

Subiect: Sprijin pentru agricultori

Uniunea Europeană numără 27 de state membre și aproape 500 de milioane de locuitori. Devenite membre ale Uniunii Europene, statele nu mai au competențe exclusive în domenii precum agricultura, comerțul, energia, transportul, educația, protecția mediului, afacerile interne, finanțele. Aceasta este esența așa-numitei metode comunitare.

Având în vedere faptul că, în mai multe state membre, în sectoare precum zootehnia, avicultura și industria alimentară, producătorii afirmă că există o discrepanță foarte mare între costurile de producție și prețul final de vânzare al produselor finite, ce măsuri are în vedere Comisia pentru a sprijini producătorii europeni care sunt grav afectați de aceste pierderi?

Are în vedere Comisia o strategie pentru a-i putea ajuta pe producătorii în domeniu să facă față competiției pe piață în spațiul comunitar?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloş în numele Comisiei
(6 mai 2013)

Propunerea de reformare a PAC este menită să aducă în sprijinul agriculturii Uniunii un set de instrumente moderne, pentru ca aceasta să poată răspunde noilor provocări.

Obiectivul cheie al acestei reforme este orientarea către piață. Uniunea va putea să intervină, în continuare, pe piață în vremuri de criză sau în cazul unor perturbări. În același timp, agricultorii sunt încurajați să coopereze în cadrul organizațiilor de producători sau interprofesionale pentru a avea mai multă putere de negociere și pentru a-și ameliora poziția în lanțul alimentar.

Sprijinul decuplat pentru venit rămâne un element principal al PAC care, alături de propunerile de ecologizare, va asigura o dezvoltare mai durabilă a exploatațiilor agricole. În unele cazuri bine definite, pentru a face față nevoilor unui anumit sector, va putea fi menținut ajutorul cuplat.

În plus, în cadrul celui de al doilea pilon, la capitolul așa-numitelor măsuri de gestionare a riscurilor (sisteme de asigurări, fonduri mutuale, etc.), sunt prevăzute mai multe măsuri preventive și anticipative cu privire la veniturile agricultorilor.

De asemenea, Comisia a urmărit creșterea puterii de cumpărare a agricultorilor în lanțul alimentar propunând facilitarea recunoașterii organizațiilor de producători în cadrul propunerilor de reformare a PAC. În cadrul Forumului la nivel înalt pentru îmbunătățirea funcționării lanțului de aprovizionare cu alimente, se depun în continuare eforturi pentru a obține o mai mare transparență a prețurilor și pentru eliminarea practicilor neloiale de la nivelul lanțului alimentar. Forumul a elaborat un Cod de conduită care va fi pus în practică în cursul acestui an, pe bază voluntară, de către unii reprezentanți ai lanțului alimentar. O evaluare a impactului cu privire la practicile neloiale lansată recent de către Comisie va include rezultatele acestui exercițiu în analiza destinată modalităților de abordare a practicilor neloiale în relațiile contractuale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002478/13
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D) and Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Agricultural support

Membership of the European Union with its 27 Member States and a population of around 500 million means abandonment of sole competence in areas such as agriculture, trade, energy, transport, education, environmental protection, internal affairs and finance. This is the essence of what is known as the Community method.

In a number of Member States, producers in the livestock, poultry and food sectors are expressing concern at what they describe as a major disparity between production costs and the final sale prices. In view of this, what measures are being envisaged by the Commission to assist European producers who are being severely affected by resulting losses?

Is the Commission envisaging a strategy to help producers in this sector compete on EU markets?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)

The proposed CAP reform is intended to provide a modernised set of tools to support Union agriculture to meet new challenges.

The key objective of this reform is market orientation. The possibility for the Union to intervene in the market in times of crises or market disturbances will remain possible. Moreover, farmers are encouraged to cooperate through producers and interbranch organisations in order to increase their bargaining power and improve their position in the food chain.

Decoupled income support remains a cornerstone of the CAP, which, combined with the proposals for greening, would ensure farm holdings to develop in a more sustainable way. In well-defined cases some coupled support can be maintained in order to address specific needs for a sector.

Additionally, more preventive and anticipatory measures as regards to farmers' income are foreseen within the second pillar under the so-called risk management measures (insurance schemes, mutual funds, etc.).

Furthermore, the Commission aimed at improving the bargaining power of farmers in the food chain by proposing facilitated recognition of producer organisations in its CAP reform proposals. Work on a better price transparency and the elimination of unfair practices in the food chain is ongoing in the framework of the High Level Forum for a Better Functioning Food Supply Chain. The Forum has developed a Code of conduct, which will be put in practice on a voluntary basis by some food chain representatives during this year. A recently launched Commission Impact Assessment on unfair practices will integrate the available results of this exercise when looking at options to address unfair practices in contractual relations.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-002479/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(4 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ταξιδιωτική οδηγία που δημιουργεί κλίμα φόβου και ανασφάλειας

Με βάση δημοσιεύματα του ελληνικού τύπου η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή εξέδωσε οδηγία η οποία απευθύνεται στους υπαλλήλους της που πρόκειται να ταξιδέψουν στην Ελλάδα. Η οδηγία εφιστά την προσοχή των υπαλλήλων σχετικά με την ασφάλεια τους αφού εμφανίζει την Ελλάδα ως μια επικίνδυνη χώρα στην οποία θα υπάρξουν σοβαρές κοινωνικές αναταραχές, ακόμα και «νεκροί».

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη λοιπόν τα παραπάνω ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

1. Επιβεβαιώνει την ύπαρξη της οδηγίας αυτής;

2. Αποδέχεται όλα αυτά που αναφέρονται μέσα στο κείμενο αυτό, δηλαδή τα περί ανεξέλεγκτης κοινωνικής έκρηξης και τα περί έλλειψης ασφάλειας, σαν να πρόκειται για μια χώρα που βρίσκεται σε περίοδο πολέμου;

3. Πώς είναι δυνατόν να δημιουργεί κλίμα φόβου στους υπαλλήλους της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής που ταξιδεύουν στην Ελλάδα;

4. Πώς είναι δυνατόν η ίδια η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να εκδίδει μια τέτοια οδηγία για μια χώρα που βρίσκεται σε κρίση και ο λαός της, παρότι υποφέρει κάνει μια υπεράνθρωπη προσπάθεια εξόδου από την κρίση αυτή, ενώ ο ρόλος της θα έπρεπε να είναι ακριβώς ο αντίθετος, να δημιουργεί δηλαδή κλίμα σταθερότητας και ως προς την οικονομική πλευρά του ζητήματος αλλά και ως προς την εσωτερική ασφάλεια;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-002518/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(5 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Οδηγίες ασφαλείας προς το προσωπικό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης

Ο ελληνικός λαός με καρτερία και πολιτική ωριμότητα αντιμετωπίζει τις δυσάρεστες γι' αυτόν οικονομικές συνθήκες που διαμορφώνονται από το Μνημόνιο και από τις επιταγές της τρόικας. Όλες οι αντιδράσεις μέχρι σήμερα κινούνται στα πλαίσια της δημοκρατικής νομιμότητας και του ήπιου προβληματισμού.

Δεν μπορεί λοιπόν παρά να θεωρείται τουλάχιστον υποβολιμαίο το γεγονός ότι, σύμφωνα με κείμενο που δημοσιοποιήθηκε στην έγκριτη εφημερίδα «το Βήμα», της Κυριακής 3 Μαρτίου, η Επιτροπή έχει εκδώσει εμπιστευτικές οδηγίες προς το προσωπικό της για την ασφαλειά του κατά τις επισκέψεις στην Ελλάδα, εμφανίζοντας την χώρα σαν προάστιο της Δαμασκού στα πρόθυρα συρράξεως.

Επειδή από κανένα εμφανές στοιχείο δεν προκύπτει πιθανή διατάραξη της εσωτερικής τάξης και ασφαλείας ούτε υπήρξε περιστατικό άσκησης βίας ή απειλής ασκήσεως βίας κατά ευρωπαίου αξιωματούχου ή αξιωματούχου οποιασδήποτε άλλης χώρας από Έλληνες πολίτες,

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Αληθεύει ή όχι το εν λόγω δημοσίευμα;

2. Εάν ναι, ποια τα στοιχεία της Επιτροπής και ποιες οι πηγές πληροφόρησής της σχετικά με τις εικαζόμενες εσωτερικές αναταραχές στην χώρα;

3. Συνδέονται άμεσα τέτοιες πληροφορίες με τις ευθύνες της τρόικας για την επιβολή της αποτυχημένης και αδιέξοδης οικονομικής πολιτικής στην Ελλάδα;

4. Έχει ενημερωθεί για το ενδεχόμενο αυτό η ελληνική κυβέρνηση;

5. Υπάρχει ανάμειξη ξένων κέντρων και ποίων στην διαμόρφωση και ανάπτυξη τέτοιων σεναρίων;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Šefčovič εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Απριλίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή επιθυμεί να κάνει σαφές ότι δεν συμμερίζεται σε καμιά περίπτωση τη δήλωση που δημοσιεύτηκε στην εφημερίδα «Το Βήμα» όπου προβάλλεται ο ισχυρισμός ότι βίαια επεισόδια είναι πιθανό να λάβουν χώρα στην Αθήνα κατά τον μήνα Μάρτιο και τα οποία θα μπορούσαν να έχουν ως αποτέλεσμα θανάτους.

Το πρώτο μέρος του εγγράφου που δημοσιεύτηκε στο «Βήμα» παρέχει μια εντελώς εσφαλμένη εντύπωση αναφορικά με την αντίληψη της Επιτροπής όσον αφορά την κατάσταση της ασφάλειας στην Ελλάδα και δεν προέρχεται από τις υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής.

Το δεύτερο μέρος του δημοσιευμένου κειμένου αποτελεί τυπική οδηγία ασφαλείας που υπαγορεύει η κοινή λογική, η οποία δίδεται από την διεύθυνση ασφαλείας της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής προς υπαλλήλους οι οποίοι εργάζονται ή ταξιδεύουν σε προορισμούς όπου υπάρχει ενδεχόμενο να παρουσιαστεί κάποιος κίνδυνος σχετικός με διαδηλώσεις. Σ' αυτή τη συγκεκριμένη περίπτωση, οι εν λόγω συστάσεις αφορούσαν την πόλη της Αθήνας — και όχι την Ελλάδα συνολικά — και δόθηκαν για τη συγκεκριμένη διάρκεια της αποστολής υπαλλήλων που συμμετέχουν σε συζητήσεις με την ελληνική κυβέρνηση.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002479/13
to the Commission
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Fear and uncertainty arising from travel advice

On the basis of Greek press reports, the Commission has published a guide for its staff members travelling to Greece, drawing their attention to safety issues and depicting Greece as a dangerous country in which serious social unrest and even 'fatalities' can be expected.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission confirm the existence of this travel guide?

2. Does it endorse the entire content thereof, including references to uncontrolled outbreaks of social unrest and an unsafe environment, creating the impression that Greece ressembles a country at war?

3. How can it be admissible to create a climate of fear among Commission staff travelling to Greece?

4. How can it be admissible for the Commission itself to publish such a travel guide in respect of a country in the midst of a crisis, whose people are, despite all hardships, making massive efforts to overcome it, while it should in fact be doing exactly the opposite, that is to say helping to create a climate of stability in not only economic terms but also in terms of internal security?

Question for written answer P-002518/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Security guidelines for EU staff

The Greek people are facing the difficult economic conditions created by the Memorandum and the requirements of the Troika with forbearance and political maturity. All protests so far have taken place within the framework of democratic legitimacy and orderly differences of opinion.

However, according to an article published in the reputed newspaper 'To Vima' on Sunday, 3 March, the Commission has issued confidential guidelines to its staff regarding their security during visits to Greece, in which it presents the country like suburb of Damascus on the verge of conflict. At the very least, it is tendentious to present the country in this light.

Since domestic order and security are not visibly threatened from any quarter and there have been no incidents of violence or threats of violence by Greek citizens against any EU official or official of any other country, will the Commission say:

1. Is the content of this article correct?

2. If so, what are the Commission's sources of information about alleged domestic unrest in Greece?

3. Is information of this kind directly related to the Troika's responsibility for imposing the failed economic policy in Greece which has lead to an impasse?

4. Has the Greek Government been advised about this matter?

5. Are any foreign circles involved in creating and developing scenarios of this kind? If so, which ones?

Joint answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)

The Commission wishes to make clear that it does not in any way endorse the statement published in 'To Vima' newspaper which claims that violent riots are likely to take place in Athens in the month of March and that these may give rise to fatalities.

This first part of the document published in 'To Vima' gives an entirely false impression of the Commission's perception of the security situation in Greece, and was not produced by the Commission's services.

The second part of the published text constitutes standard, common-sense security advice, recommended by the European Commission's Security Directorate to officials who work in or travel to destinations where a specific, protest-related risk might be encountered. In this particular case, these recommendations concerned the city of Athens — and not Greece as a whole — and were provided for the specific duration of a mission of officials participating in discussions with the Greek Government.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-002480/13
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(4 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Utilizzo indebito di fondi comunitari in Veneto

In questi giorni, i mezzi di informazione italiani riservano grande spazio alle notizie relative ad una vasta indagine della Guardia di Finanza incentrata su alcuni presunti illeciti che coinvolgerebbero alcuni imprenditori privati ma anche alcuni enti della Regione del Veneto.

Si sospetta che, dietro la costruzione di importanti infrastrutture realizzate in Veneto negli ultimi dieci anni, vi sia in realtà una perversa organizzazione malavitosa mirante a garantire illeciti proventi a favore di alcuni privati, ma soprattutto a beneficio di alcuni politici i quali, coprendo e favorendo numerose azioni illecite, avrebbero garantito a se stessi e ad alcuni soggetti privati il trasferimento indebito di ingenti somme di denaro.

Leggendo quanto riportato da numerosi mezzi di informazione italiani, sembrerebbe che il metodo del Project Financing fosse stato utilizzato per gonfiare il costo delle opere pubbliche pagate con i soldi della collettività e per garantire l'assegnazione degli appalti, attraverso l'utilizzo di metodi altamente soggettivi e discrezionali, ad aziende compiacenti che avrebbero poi stornato una parte dei proventi, utilizzando il metodo «estero su estero», accreditando ingenti somme a beneficio dei prestanome di alcuni noti esponenti politici.

Premesso ciò, può dire la Commissione:

— se intende verificare l'ipotesi che in Veneto siano stati indebitamente utilizzati fondi comunitari per la realizzazione di opere infrastrutturali e che parte di questi fondi siano stati utilizzati per finanziare azioni illecite da parte di alcuni privati, di alcuni amministratori regionali e di alcuni personaggi che avrebbero dato disposizioni e copertura politica affinché questi illeciti potessero essere commessi;

— se, a prescindere dall'attività di indagine in corso da parte delle autorità italiane, non intende attivare una propria indagine ispettiva per accertare eventuali responsabilità da parte degli autori di queste azioni illecite, soprattutto nella parte riguardante l'eventuale utilizzo distorto delle risorse comunitarie?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(10 aprile 2013)

La Commissione è venuta a conoscenza, per il tramite della stampa regionale, dell'indagine della Guardia di Finanza nella regione Veneto. Per accertare se siano in causa fondi dell'UE o se ne sia stato fatto un uso improprio, in particolare per quanto concerne il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale, la Commissione ha chiesto all'autorità di gestione di fornirle maggiori informazioni in merito alle presunte violazioni menzionate dall'onorevole deputato. Nella misura in cui sono interessati il Fondo europeo agricolo per lo sviluppo rurale e il Fondo sociale europeo, la Commissione non ha ricevuto informazioni in merito a un eventuale uso improprio dei fondi UE.

Per quanto concerne l'indagine della Guardia di Finanza, in assenza di informazioni più precise la Commissione non è in grado di formulare commenti. La Commissione desidera tuttavia ribadire che i suoi servizi e l'Ufficio europeo per la lotta anti-frode hanno compiuto e continueranno a compiere tutti gli sforzi possibili per individuare gli eventuali usi illeciti dei fondi UE.

Se l'onorevole deputato fosse in grado di fornire informazioni più dettagliate, soprattutto per quanto concerne le affermazioni relative specificamente a un uso improprio di fondi UE nella regione Veneto, la Commissione vi darà il dovuto seguito al fine di tutelare gli interessi finanziari dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002480/13
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Improper use of EU funds in Veneto

Over the past few days, the Italian media have been devoting a lot of time and space to news concerning a wide-ranging investigation by the *Guardia di Finanza* police relating to alleged wrongdoing involving not only private entrepreneurs but also authorities of the Veneto Region.

It is suspected that behind the construction of major infrastructure built in the Veneto region over the last 10 years is a pernicious underworld organisation whose aim is to secure illegal proceeds for certain private individuals, but especially for certain politicians who, by covering up for and facilitating numerous illegal activities, have apparently provided themselves and the private individuals in question with huge, undue sums of money.

According to numerous Italian media reports, it would appear that the method of 'project financing' was used to inflate the cost of public works paid for with taxpayers' money and to ensure that contracts were awarded, using highly subjective and discretionary methods, to compliant companies. Those companies then diverted a portion of the proceeds through overseas transactions and credited large sums to the front men of certain well-known politicians.

Can the Commission therefore say:

— if it will ascertain whether, in Veneto, EU funds have been improperly used for the construction of infrastructure and that part of those funds have been used to finance illegal activities by certain private individuals, regional administrators and other leading figures, who apparently gave instructions and political cover to enable those offences to be committed;

— whether, in addition to the investigation being carried out by the Italian authorities, it will not launch its own investigation to ascertain any liability on the part of those who committed these unlawful activities, especially with regard to any misuse of EU resources?

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

The Commission is aware, via regional newspapers, of the Guardia di Finanza investigation in the Veneto region. In order to verify if there has been any involvement or improper use of EU funds, in particular the European Regional Development Fund, the Commission has asked the managing authority to provide more information about the alleged facts mentioned by the Honourable Member. Insofar as the European Agricultural Rural Development Fund and the European Social Fund are concerned, the Commission has not received any information about possible improper use of EU funds.

As for the Guardia di Finanza investigation, in the absence of more precise information, the Commission is not in a position to comment. Nevertheless, the Commission wishes to point out that its services, and the European Anti-Fraud Office, have made and will continue to make all possible efforts to tackle any illegal use of EU funds.

If the Honourable Member were able to provide more detailed information, especially as regards the extent to which the allegations relate specifically to improper use of EU funds in the Veneto region, the Commission will of course ensure the appropriate follow up in order to protect the financial interests of the EU.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002481/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(4 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Εσωτερική ενημέρωση — «ταξιδιωτική οδηγία» της Επιτροπής για την Ελλάδα

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα του ελληνικού τύπου, η Επιτροπή φέρεται να ενημέρωσε τους υπαλλήλους της σχετικά με ζητήματα ασφάλειας κατά την άφιξη και παραμονή τους στην Αθήνα. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, το μήνυμα αναφέρεται σε πληροφορίες που έχουν συλλεχθεί σχετικά με βίαιες ταραχές στην Αθήνα τον Μάρτιο, κάνοντας λόγο ακόμη και για αριθμό νεκρών, το ύψος των οποίων όμως δεν αναφέρεται. Μάλιστα, επισημαίνεται ότι οι εν λόγω πληροφορίες έχουν γνωστοποιηθεί και στις υπηρεσίες του ΔΝΤ. Στη συνέχεια, παρατίθεται σειρά αναλυτικών οδηγιών για το πώς οι υπάλληλοι της Επιτροπής μπορούν να αποφύγουν ή και να αντιμετωπίσουν περιστατικά αναρχίας και συγκρούσεων.

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα ανωτέρω και υπογραμμίζοντας ότι η ενημέρωση-οδηγία αυτή κοινοποιήθηκε λίγους μόνο μήνες πριν την έναρξη της τουριστικής περιόδου στην Ελλάδα, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Επιβεβαιώνει την ύπαρξη της εσωτερικής αυτής ενημέρωσης εν είδει ταξιδιωτικής οδηγίας; Εάν ναι, ζητάμε να ενημερωθούμε σχετικά με τη βάση και την πηγή αυτών των πληροφοριών.

2. Έχουν εκδοθεί στο παρελθόν ανάλογες οδηγίες και για άλλα κράτη μέλη, ποια και με τι περιεχόμενο;

3. Θεωρεί ότι τέτοιες ανακοινώσεις υποστηρίζουν την προσπάθεια ενός κράτους μέλους που υφίσταται δυσβάσταχτες θυσίες, προκειμένου να ανακάμψει και να επανέλθει σε τροχιά ανάπτυξης και σταθερότητας, ειδικά όταν πρόκειται για κράτος μέλος που η οικονομία του εξαρτάται σε μεγάλο βαθμό από τον τουρισμό;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002861/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(12 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ταξιδιωτική οδηγία για το προσωπικό της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής

Μεγάλη συζήτηση προκλήθηκε στην Ελλάδα μετά την δημοσιοποίηση ταξιδιωτικής οδηγίας της Επιτροπής για το προσωπικό της που έρχεται στην Αθήνα. Η Επιτροπή ανταποκρίθηκε άμεσα σε επιστολή που απέστειλα και με την οποία ζητούσα σχετικές διευκρινίσεις. Στην απάντησή του (6.3.2013) ο αρμόδιος Επίτροπος κ. Šefčovič, διευκρίνισε ότι το πρώτο μέρος της ταξιδιωτικής οδηγίας που δημοσιεύθηκε στον Τύπο, το οποίο έκανε λόγο για επερχόμενες μεγάλες αναταραχές στην Αθήνα τον Μάρτιο, δεν παράχθηκε από τις υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής, και δήλωσε άγνοια για την προέλευσή του. Για το υπόλοιπο κείμενο, ο Επίτροπος επιβεβαιώνει ότι έχει πράγματι παραχθεί από την Επιτροπή και δήλωσε ότι «τέτοιες συμβουλές, βασισμένες σε ανησυχίες για την ασφάλεια, μπορεί να παραχθούν για κάθε προορισμό, περιλαμβανομένων των πρωτευουσών χωρών μελών».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Έχουν αυξηθεί το τελευταίο διάστημα οι ανησυχίες της Επιτροπής για την ασφάλεια των υπαλλήλων της εντός της ΕΕ; Μπορεί να ενημερώσει για ποιες άλλες πρωτεύουσες κρατών μελών έχει εκδώσει ταξιδιωτικές οδηγίες την τελευταία διετία; Μπορεί να ενημερώσει αν υπάρχουν διαθέσιμες και δημοσιευμένες αυτές οι ταξιδιωτικές οδηγίες;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Šefčovič εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(23 Απριλίου 2013)

1. Η Επιτροπή επιβεβαιώνει ότι παρασχέθηκαν οδηγίες σχετικά με ζητήματα ασφάλειας σε ορισμένους υπαλλήλους της που ταξιδεύουν στην Αθήνα. Ωστόσο, θα πρέπει να σημειωθεί ότι αυτές οι οδηγίες ασφάλειας ίσχυσαν μόνο για τη συγκεκριμένη διάρκεια και τις περιστάσεις μίας συγκεκριμένης αποστολής. Όπως επισημαίνεται στην απάντησή της στην ερώτηση P-002479/2013, η Επιτροπή υπογραμμίζει ότι οι αναφορές σε πιθανές βίαιες ταραχές που επρόκειτο να πραγματοποιηθούν στην Αθήνα τον Μάρτιο, όπως αναφέρθηκε από ορισμένα ελληνικά μέσα ενημέρωσης, δεν εντάσσονταν στις οδηγίες για την ασφάλεια που καταρτίστηκαν από τις υπηρεσίες της. Συνεπώς, η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει την πηγή των πληροφοριών αυτών και δεν μπορεί να αναλάβει καμία ευθύνη για αυτές.

2. Η Επιτροπή καταρτίζει οδηγίες για ζητήματα ασφάλειας όποτε ενδέχεται να θιγεί η ασφάλεια του προσωπικού της στον χώρο εργασίας. Όπως στην προαναφερόμενη περίπτωση, οι οδηγίες αυτές περιορίζονται πάντα σε συγκεκριμένες αποστολές μελών του προσωπικού της Επιτροπής. Έτσι, δεν προορίζονται να αποτελέσουν γενικότερες ταξιδιωτικές οδηγίες ούτε και καλύπτουν ένα κράτος μέλος καθεαυτό.

3. Οι οδηγίες ασφάλειας της Επιτροπής προορίζονται αποκλειστικά και μόνον για χρήση από μεμονωμένα μέλη του προσωπικού που μεταβαίνει σε συγκεκριμένες αποστολές εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής και, συνεπώς, προορίζονται αποκλειστικά για εσωτερική χρήση.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002481/13
to the Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Internal memorandum — Commission 'travel advice' about Greece

According to Greek press reports, the Commission has apparently given security advice to its officials arriving and staying in Athens. More specifically, the memorandum in question contains information about riots in Athens in March, and even mentions a number of deaths, without however specifying how many. This advice has also been issued to IMF staff. It also contains a set of detailed instructions on how Commission officials can best avoid or, if necessary, deal with incidents of lawlessness and conflict.

Bearing in mind the above and noting that this memorandum has been issued only a few months before the start of the tourist season in Greece, will the Commission say:

1. Can it confirm the existence of this internal memorandum containing travel advice? If so, can it indicate the basis and source of such information?

2. Have guidelines of this kind been issued in respect of any other Member States? If so, which Member States were concerned and what was the content of the guidelines?

3. Does it believe that such announcements are likely to prove helpful to a Member State that is making enormous sacrifices in order to recover and get back on track for growth and stability, especially since this is a Member State whose economy depends heavily on tourism?

Question for written answer E-002861/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(12 March 2013)

Subject: Travel guidelines for European Commission staff

The Commission's travel guidelines for staff visiting Athens have provoked serious debate in Greece. The Commission responded immediately to my letter requesting clarification. In his answer dated 6 March 2013, Commissioner Šefčovič clarified that the first part of the travel guidelines published in the press, referring to serious forthcoming disruptions in Athens in March, had not been issued by the Commission services and that he was unaware of its origin. The Commissioner confirmed that the rest of the text had indeed been produced by the Commission and stated that such advice, based on safety concerns, may be produced for any destination, including the capital cities of Member States.

Have the Commission's concerns about the safety of its staff within the EU increased recently? Which other capital cities of Member States have been the subject of travel guidelines over the past two years? Have these travel guidelines been published and are they available?

Joint answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)

1. The Commission confirms that security advice was provided to some of its officials travelling to Athens. However, it should be noted that this security advice only applied to the specific duration and circumstances of one particular mission. As indicated in its reply to Question P-002479/2013, the Commission underlines that the references to potential violent riots to take place in Athens in March, as reported by some Greek media, were not part of the security advice produced by its services. Hence, the Commission is not aware of the source of this information, and cannot assume any responsibility for it.

2. The Commission produces security advice whenever the security of its staff at the working place may be affected. As in the abovementioned case, such advice is always limited to specific missions of Commission staff members. Hence, it is never intended as generic travel advice, nor does it cover a Member State as such.

3. The Commission's security advice is intended solely for the use by individual staff going on particular missions on behalf of the Commission, and therefore, intended strictly for internal use.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-002482/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(4 mars 2013)

Angående: Vilka granskninguppgifter använde kommissionen för att i sitt förslag till rekommendation av den 7 december 2012 kunna fastställa att insatserna för kopparnät är oproportionerliga?

Kommissionen offentliggjorde i december 2012 ett förslag till en rekommendation om enhetliga icke-diskriminerande krav och metoder för kostnadsberäkning för att främja konkurrens och förbättra miljön för bredbandsinvesteringar ([1]). Offentliggörandet av detta förslag till rekommendation hade inte till syfte att inleda en offentlig rådfrågning utan att få synpunkter från Organet för europeiska regleringsmyndigheter för elektronisk kommunikation (Berec), inom ramen för det förfarande som anges i artikel 19 i direktiv 2002/21/EG.

Förslaget till rekommendation väcker dock viktiga frågor om kommissionens strategi för befintliga telekommunikationsnät av den gamla typen och nästa generations nät. Att släppa efter på grossistpriskontrollen och fixera priserna för kopparaccessnätet till nuvarande nivåer verkar inte stå i proportion till de svaga icke-diskrimineringskrav som fastställs i förslaget till rekommendation.

Enligt de senaste siffrorna från kommissionen har befintliga operatörer i Europa fortfarande mer än 50 % av marknadsandelarna för bredbandsåtkomst i slutkundsledet. Kommissionen har vid flera tillfällen under det senaste årtiondet konstaterat att en eller flera etablerade europeiska telekomoperatörer har utnyttjat sin dominerande position. Den mest konkurrenspräglade marknaden för bredbandsåtkomst i Europa är den i Förenade kungariket, den enda medlemsstat där den nationella regleringsmyndigheten har beslutat att den befintliga operatören funktionellt ska åtskilja sin grossistverksamhet från sin verksamhet i slutkundsledet och även tillhandahålla grossisttjänster på en fullt likvärdig basis till alla sina grossistkunder inbegripet det egna detaljistledet.

I förslaget till rekommendation utgår kommissionen från antagandet att likvärdiga insatser beträffande kopparnät med största sannolikhet skulle bli oproportionerliga. Bygger detta antagande på en certifierad granskning som utförts av en tredje part eller bygger det på siffror från etablerade operatörer? Kan kommissionen uppge den exakta källan för den granskning som utförts av tredje part, eller den etablerade operatören?

Svar från Neelie Kroes på kommissionens vägnar
(30 april 2013)

Enligt regelverket måste varje regleringsåtgärd som en nationell regleringsmyndighet inför grunda sig på proportionalitetsprincipen, dvs. den måste vara nödvändig för att målet för åtgärden ska uppnås och den får införas endast om det inte finns något mindre betungande sätt att uppnå målet. I det utkast till rekommendation som parlamentsledamoten hänvisar till finner kommissionen att effektiv icke-diskriminering bäst uppnås genom tillämpning av *equivalence of inputs* (EOI, likvärdiga villkor i fråga om produktionselement). I linje med regelverket anges dock i utkastet till rekommendation att nationella regleringsmyndigheter bör göra en proportionalitetsbedömning innan de kräver att operatörer med betydande inflytande på marknaden ska tillhandahålla vissa produktionselement (*wholesale inputs*, grossist-produktionselement) på EOI-basis.

Enligt utkastet till rekommendation kan en reglerad operatörs kostnader för att tillhandahålla äldre, kopparbaserade grossistproduktionselement på EOI-basis bli höga, på grund av att operatören kan bli tvungen att anpassa sina system (t.ex. IT-system). Det är osannolikt att sådana kostnader för att fullgöra en skyldighet att tillämpa EOI som uppkommer till följd anpassningar enligt ovan är förhanden i samma utsträckning i fall där det rör sig om att tillhandahålla grossistproduktionselement som helt eller delvis utgörs av optiska element, vilka ofta löper över nya system. Merkostnaderna för att utforma nya system för ett nästa-generations-accessnät (*NGA network*) som är förenliga med EOI är därför troligtvis låga. Mot bakgrund av detta bör nationella regleringsmyndigheter enligt utkastet till rekommendation överväga huruvida kostnaderna för att fullgöra en skyldighet att tillämpa EOI (t.ex. kostnaderna för anpassning av befintliga system) uppväger de potentiella fördelarna i konkurrenshänseende, med beaktande av den omständigheten att merkostnaderna för att fullgöra en skyldighet att tillämpa EOI troligtvis är låga vid utformning av nya system.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=1254.

Uppmaningen till nationella regleringsmyndigheter att göra en bedömning av om tillämpning av EOI är proportionellt (dvs. förenligt med proportionalitetsprincipen) och införa tillämpning av EOI där det bedöms vara proportionellt gäller i lika hög grad för båda typerna av accessnät (dvs. äldre accessnät och nästa-generations-accessnät).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002482/13
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: What audit data did the Commission use to establish disproportionate input on copper networks in its draft Recommendation of 7 December 2012?

In December 2012, the Commission published a draft Recommendation on consistent non-discrimination obligations and costing methodologies to promote competition and enhance the broadband investment environment ([1]). The publication of the draft recommendation was not intended to launch a public consultation but to seek the opinion of the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC), under the procedure set out in Article 19 of Directive 2002/21/EC.

The draft recommendation does, however, raise important questions about the Commission's approach regarding access to existing legacy telecommunications networks and next-generation networks. In particular, the relaxation of wholesale price controls and the fixation of copper access prices to existing levels do not seem to be effectively balanced by the poor non-discrimination obligations laid down in the draft recommendation.

According to recent Commission figures, incumbent operators in Europe still enjoy more than 50% of the market share of retail broadband access. On several occasions in the last decade, one or more European incumbent telecom operators were found by the Commission to have abused their dominant position. The most competitive market for broadband access in Europe is the UK, the only Member State where the national regulator has decided that the incumbent operator should functionally separate its wholesale and retail businesses and also provide wholesale services on a fully equivalent basis to all of its wholesale customers, including to its own retail arm.

In the draft recommendation, the Commission presumes that equivalence of input on copper networks would most likely be disproportionate. Is this assumption based on a certified audit carried out by a third party or does it rely on figures provided by incumbent operators? Could the Commission specify the exact source of the third party audit or, alternatively, the incumbent operator?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

The regulatory framework states that any regulatory remedy imposed by NRAs ([2]) must be based on the principle of proportionality, i.e. it must be necessary to achieve the aim, and there cannot be any less onerous way of doing it. The draft recommendation considers that Equivalence of Input (EoI) as a non-discrimination remedy is the most appropriate way to achieve effective non-discrimination. However, in line with the Regulatory Framework, it asks NRAs to undertake a proportionality assessment before requiring operators with SMP ([3]) to provide their inputs on an EoI basis.

In this respect, the draft recommendation states that the costs of providing the legacy copper-based wholesale inputs on an EoI basis might be high because, for example, the regulated operator might have to re-design its existing IT systems. Such compliance costs of EoI resulting from such retrofitting process are unlikely to exist to the same extent regarding the provision of wholesale inputs consisting wholly or partly of optical elements, which often run over new systems. As a result, the incremental costs to design new systems for a new next generation access (NGA) network compliant with EoI are likely to be low. Against this background the current text of the draft recommendation requires NRAs to consider whether the compliance costs (e.g. through the redesign of existing systems) are outweighted by the envisaged competition benefits, taking into account the fact that incremental costs of compliance with EoI are likely to be low when new systems are being designed.

The request to NRAs to assess the proportionalty of EoI and to impose it where proportionate applies equally to both types of access networks.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=1254.
([2]) National regulatory authorities.
([3]) Significant market power.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-002483/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(4 mars 2013)

Angående: Varför har kommissionen ändrat marginalpresstest på förhand till marginalpresstest i efterhand i sin telekomrekommendation av den 7 december 2012?

Kommissionen offentliggjorde i december 2012 ett förslag till rekommendation om enhetliga icke-diskriminerande krav och metoder för kostnadsberäkning för att främja konkurrens och förbättra miljön för bredbandsinvesteringar ([1]). Offentliggörandet av detta förslag till rekommendation hade inte till syfte att inleda en offentlig rådfrågning utan att få synpunkter från Organet för europeiska regleringsmyndigheter för elektronisk kommunikation (Berec), inom ramen för det förfarande som anges i artikel 19 i direktiv 2002/21/EG.

Förslaget till rekommendation väcker dock viktiga frågor om kommissionens strategi för befintliga telekommunikationsnät av den gamla typen och nästa generations nät. Att släppa efter på grossistpriskontrollen och fixera priserna för kopparaccessnätet till nuvarande nivåer verkar inte stå i proportion till de svaga icke-diskrimineringskrav som fastställs i förslaget till rekommendation.

Enligt de senaste siffrorna från kommissionen har befintliga operatörer i Europa fortfarande mer än 50 % av marknadsandelarna för bredbandsåtkomst i slutkundsledet. Kommissionen har vid flera tillfällen under det senaste årtiondet konstaterat att en eller flera etablerade europeiska telekomoperatörer har utnyttjat sin dominerande position. Den mest konkurrenspräglade marknaden för bredbandsåtkomst i Europa är den i Förenade kungariket, den enda medlemsstat där den nationella regleringsmyndigheten har beslutat att den befintliga operatören funktionellt ska åtskilja sin grossistverksamhet från sin verksamhet i slutkundsledet och även tillhandahålla grossisttjänster på en fullt likvärdig basis till alla sina grossistkunder inbegripet det egna detaljistledet.

Varför har GD CONNECT föreslagit att marginalpresstest ska utföras i efterhand, i stället för på förhand, som kommissionens vice ordförande Neelie Kroes meddelade den 12 juli 2012 ([2])?

Svar från Neelie Kroes på kommissionens vägnar
(2 maj 2013)

Det föreslagna ekonomiska replikerbarhetstestet är en av konkurrensskyddsåtgärderna för att möjliggöra prisflexibilitet för nästa generations accessnät och överensstämmer med uttalandet den 12 juli. Syftet med testet är att se till att alternativa operatörer klarar att reproducera de mest relevanta av de slutkundsprodukter som den dominerande operatören tillhandahåller, på grundval av det identifierade grossistledet för nästa generations accessnät. Den behöriga nationella tillsynsmyndigheten ska fastställa och offentliggöra innehållet i det ekonomiska replikerbarhetstestet i den antagna åtgärden efter en marknadsanalys. De parametrar som används vid testet kommer att vara kända i förväg för både dominerande och alternativa operatörer. Testet måste genomföras senast tre månader efter det att den aktuella slutkundsprodukten har lanserats, och om testet misslyckas kommer de nationella regleringsmyndigheterna att använda sina genomförandeinstrument enligt ramlagstiftningen för att kontrollera att reglerna efterlevs.

Det rekommenderade testet skiljer sig från marginalpresstest i efterhand, som tillämpas i enlighet med konkurrenslagstiftningen, då man undersöker om en marginalpress har förekommit under en viss tidsperiod, som kan vara när som helst efter det att en produkt har lanserats och som kan tillämpas på alla produkter på marknaden.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=1254
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-554_sv.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002483/13
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Why did the Commission change *ex-ante* tests on margin squeeze to *ex-post* tests in its telecoms recommendation of December 7 2012?

In December 2012, the Commission published a draft Commission Recommendation on consistent non-discrimination obligations and costing methodologies to promote competition and enhance the broadband investment environment ([1]). The publication of the draft was not intended to launch a public consultation but to seek the opinion of the Body of European Regulators of Electronic Communications (BEREC), under the procedure set out in Article 19 of Directive 2002/21/EC.

The draft recommendation does, however, raise important questions about the Commission's approach regarding access to existing legacy telecommunications networks and next-generation networks. In particular the relaxation of wholesale price controls and the fixation of copper access prices to existing levels do not seem to be effectively balanced by the poor non-discrimination obligations laid down in the draft recommendation.

According to recent Commission figures, incumbent operators in Europe still enjoy more than 50% of the market shares of retail broadband access. On several occasions in the last decade, one or more European incumbent telecom operators were found by the Commission to have abused their dominant position. The most competitive market for broadband access in Europe is the UK, the only Member State where the national regulator has decided that the incumbent operator should functionally separate its wholesale and retail businesses and also provide wholesale services on a fully equivalent basis to all of its wholesale customers, including to its own retail arm.

Why has DG CONNECT proposed an *ex-post* margin squeeze test contradicting Vice-President Kroes' announcement on 12 July 2012 of an *ex-ante* margin squeeze test ([2])?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2013)

The proposed economic replicability test is one of the competitive safeguards required to allow pricing flexibility for NGA networks and is in line with the 12 July statement. The test will ensure that alternative operators are able to replicate the most relevant retail products which the incumbent operator provides on the basis of the identified NGA-wholesale layer. The relevant National Regulatory Authority (NRA) should specify and make public the details of the economic replicability test in the adopted measure following a market analysis. As such, the parameters included in the test will be known to both incumbents and alternative operators in advance. The test may be run no later than three months after the launch of the relevant retail product and if the test is failed the NRA will use its enforcement tools provided under the Regulatory Framework to ensure compliance.

The recommended test is different from *ex post* margin squeeze tests, which are applied under competition law, where an investigation is made in whether a margin squeeze has occurred in a particular time period in the part which can be done at any time after a product has been launched and which might be applied to any product offered in the market.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/newsroom/cf/dae/document.cfm?doc_id=1254.
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-554_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002484/13
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Sale of Coillte harvesting rights

Is the Commission aware of the Irish Government's plans to sell the harvesting rights of Coillte, a commercial semi-state company?

Has the Commission examined the effects this may have on the biodiversity and sustainability of Irish forests and the future development of existing Coillte projects funded by the EU, e.g. the restoration of bog and priority native woodland?

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

Decisions relating to the sale of harvesting rights of state owned or managed forests, as well as the terms of such arrangements are a matter for each Member State concerned.

The Commission has not examined the effects this might have on the biodiversity and sustainability of Irish forests. However, the normal rules for EU-funded projects would apply, including provisions relating to environmental legislation.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002485/13
an die Kommission
Othmar Karas (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE) und Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)
(4. März 2013)

Betrifft: Grenzüberschreitender Pensionsfonds gemäß Richtlinie 2003/41/EG — Fall UBIT-Trianon

Der Fall UBIT-Trianon betrifft einen niederländischen Pensionsfonds — eine sogenannte „Premium Pension Institution" (nachfolgend „PPI") —, die in Österreich in Zusammenarbeit mit einem spezialisierten Pensionskassenverwalter als externem Partner ein Pensionsinstrument für Mitglieder des österreichischen Fachverbands „Unternehmensberatung und Informationstechnologie" (UBIT) anbieten will. Gemäß Artikel 19a des für die UBIT geltenden Kollektivvertrags könnte dieses spezielle, mit Steuervorteilen verbundene Angebot 40 000 Arbeitnehmern in 4 300 Betrieben zur Verfügung gestellt werden.

Der für das Projekt verantwortliche Marketingberater beantragte bei der Finanzmarktaufsicht (FMA) in Wien (Österreich) die Einleitung eines Notifizierungsverfahrens. Er erhielt aber einen ablehnenden Bescheid mit der folgenden Begründung:

1. eine PPI sei nicht berechtigt, Pensionen auszuzahlen;

2. die FMA argumentierte, dass Artikel 20 Absätze 2 und 4 der Richtlinie 2003/41/EG vorsieht, dass „jede grenzüberschreitende Tätigkeit" der Aufsichtsbehörde einzeln mitzuteilen ist.

Die Richtlinie sieht eine grenzüberschreitende Genehmigung von Vorsorgeeinrichtungen ohne Hindernisse vor. Ein gesunder Wettbewerb und wettbewerbsfähige Finanzmärkte in Europa zählen zu den Hauptzielen der Kommission, um mit Asien, den USA und anderen Ländern und Regionen mithalten zu können.

Kann die Kommission dazu Stellung nehmen:

— ob die Entscheidung der österreichischen FMA im Einklang mit dem Sinn und Zweck der Richtlinie 2003/41/EG steht und

— ob ihre Einwände berechtigt sind oder ob sie sowohl aus technischen Gründen als auch angesichts der legitimen Interessen der Begünstigten sowie der Behörden angefochten werden können?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(18. April 2013)

Der Kommission ist dieser Fall bekannt, und sie wurde von der betreffenden Unternehmensberatung kontaktiert. Eine Einrichtung zur betrieblichen Altersversorgung, die die Trägerschaft durch einen Träger mit Standort im Hoheitsgebiet eines anderen Mitgliedstaats akzeptieren will, hat die vorherige Genehmigung der zuständigen Behörden ihres Herkunftsmitgliedstaats einzuholen, in diesem Fall von „De Nederlandsche Bank", und nicht von den zuständigen Behörden des Tätigkeitsmitgliedstaats. Dies ergibt sich aus Artikel 20 der Richtlinie 2003/41/EG. Bei der zuständigen Behörde des Tätigkeitsmitgliedstaats handelt es sich um die „Finanzmarktaufsicht (FMA)" in Österreich.

In Artikel 6 der Richtlinie 2003/41/EG ist die Möglichkeit vorgesehen, dass das „Trägerunternehmen" mehrere Arbeitgeber umfasst. Dies lässt darauf schließen, dass eine einzige Mitteilung an die zuständige Behörde des Herkunftsmitgliedstaats, in der die einzelnen Arbeitgeber aufgeführt sind, die gemeinsam als Träger auftreten, ausreichend ist.

Vor diesem Hintergrund sei darauf hingewiesen, dass die Kommission derzeit die Richtlinie 2003/41/EG überarbeitet, um grenzüberschreitende Tätigkeiten weiter zu erleichtern.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002485/13
à la Commission
Othmar Karas (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE) et Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)
(4 mars 2013)

Objet: Fonds de pension transfrontalier au regard de la directive 2003/41/CE, affaire UBIT-Trianon

L'affaire UBIT-Trianon porte sur un fonds de pension néerlandais, à savoir une institution de pension à primes, qui entend proposer en Autriche, en collaboration avec un service de gestion technique de fonds de pension sous-traitant, un régime de retraite aux salariés relevant de l'association professionnelle UBIT, qui représente le secteur du conseil en gestion d'entreprise et des technologies de l'information. Conformément au paragraphe 19*bis* de la convention collective applicable à UBIT, cette proposition, assortie d'avantages fiscaux, pourrait concerner 40 000 salariés de 4 300 entreprises.

Le conseiller en techniques commerciales chargé du projet a soumis une demande d'ouverture de procédure de notification à l'autorité de surveillance financière à Vienne (Autriche). La demande lui a été refusée pour les motifs suivants:

1. une institution de pension à primes n'est pas autorisée à verser des pensions;

2. l'autorité de surveillance financière a fait valoir qu'en vertu de l'article 20, paragraphes 2 et 4, de la directive 2003/41/CE, «chaque activité transfrontalière» doit être déclarée séparément auprès de l'autorité de surveillance.

La directive prévoit qu'un agrément transfrontalier est délivré sans restriction aux fonds de pension. La Commission a notamment pour objectifs clés de parvenir à une concurrence saine et d'établir des marchés financiers compétitifs en Europe afin de faire face à la concurrence en provenance d'Asie, des États-Unis et d'ailleurs.

La Commission est invitée à répondre aux questions ci-après.

— La décision de l'autorité de surveillance financière autrichienne est-elle conforme à l'esprit et à la finalité de la directive 2003/41/CE?

— Les objections de ladite autorité sont-elles légitimes ou peuvent-elles être réfutées à la fois du point de vue technique et sur la base des intérêts légitimes des bénéficiaires et des autorités de réglementation?

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(18 avril 2013)

La Commission est au courant de cette affaire et elle a été contactée par la société de consultance en question. Une institution de retraite professionnelle (IRP) souhaitant fournir des services à une entreprise d'affiliation établie sur le territoire d'un autre État membre doit obtenir un agrément préalable de la part des autorités compétentes de son État membre d'origine, en l'occurrence «De Nederlandsche Bank», et non de la part des autorités compétentes de l'État membre d'accueil. Cela découle de l'article 20 de la directive 2003/41/CE. La «Finanzmarktaufsicht (FMA)» en Autriche est l'autorité compétente de l'État membre d'accueil.

L'article 6 de la directive 2003/41/CE prévoit la possibilité que l'«entreprise d'affiliation» soit constituée d'un groupe d'employeurs. Cela donne à penser qu'une seule notification aux autorités compétentes de l'État membre d'origine, indiquant les différents employeurs agissant en tant que groupe comme entreprise d'affiliation, est suffisante.

De manière plus générale, la Commission est en train de revoir la directive 2003/41/CE en vue de faciliter encore davantage l'activité transfrontalière.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002485/13
aan de Commissie
Othmar Karas (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE) en Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)
(4 maart 2013)

Betreft: Grensoverschrijdend pensioenfonds overeenkomstig Richtlijn 2003/41/EG — zaak UBIT-Trianon

De zaak UBIT-Trianon betreft een Nederlands pensioenfonds — een premiepensioeninstelling (hierna PPI) — die samen met een technische pensioenfondsmanager als externe partner in Oostenrijk een pensioenplanregeling wil aanbieden voor de leden van de Oostenrijkse beroepsvereniging voor bedrijfsconsultancy en informatietechnologie (UBIT). Volgens artikel 19, onder a), van de collectieve overeenkomst waarbij UBIT is aangesloten, zouden 40 000 werknemers in 4 300 bedrijven in aanmerking komen voor dit specifieke aanbod, waaraan ook belastingvoordelen zijn verbonden.

De voor het project verantwoordelijke marketingdeskundige heeft bij de Oostenrijkse Autoriteit financiële markten (AFM) in Wenen een aanvraag ingediend met het oog op het inleiden van de kennisgevingsprocedure. Hij heeft een negatief antwoord ontvangen, waarin de volgende redenen worden opgegeven:

1. een PPI mag geen pensioenen uitkeren;

2. volgens de AFM bepaalt artikel 20, leden 2 en 4, van Richtlijn 2003/41/EG dat „elke grensoverschrijdende activiteit" afzonderlijk bij de toezichthoudende autoriteit moet worden gemeld.

Volgens de richtlijn moeten pensioenfondsen zonder belemmeringen een vergunning voor grensoverschrijdende werkzaamheden kunnen krijgen. Een gezonde mededinging en concurrerende financiële markten in Europa behoren tot de centrale doelstellingen van de Commissie om met succes met Azië, de VS en andere landen te kunnen concurreren.

Kan de Commissie beoordelen:

— of het besluit van de Oostenrijkse AFM wel strookt met de geest en het doel van Richtlijn 2003/41/EG?

— of haar bezwaren legitiem zijn dan wel van de hand kunnen worden gewezen, zowel op technische gronden als in het licht van de gewettigde belangen van begunstigden en regelgevers?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(18 april 2013)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van deze zaak en is reeds door het adviesbureau in kwestie benaderd. Een instelling voor bedrijfspensioenvoorziening (IBPV) die bijdragen wenst te ontvangen van een bijdragende onderneming die op het grondgebied van een andere lidstaat is gevestigd, moet vooraf toestemming krijgen van de autoriteiten in de lidstaat van herkomst, in dit geval „De Nederlandsche Bank", en dus niet van de bevoegde autoriteiten van de lidstaat van ontvangst. Dit vloeit voort uit artikel 20 van Richtlijn 2003/41/EG. De Oostenrijkse Autoriteit financiële markten (Finanzmarktaufsicht — FMA) is de bevoegde autoriteit van de lidstaat van ontvangst.

In artikel 6 van Richtlijn 2003/41/EG is voorzien in de mogelijkheid dat de bijdragende onderneming bestaat uit een groep werkgevers. Dit blijkt erop te wijzen dat één kennisgeving aan de bevoegde autoriteiten van de lidstaat van herkomst voldoende is indien de werkgevers die samen optreden, erin zijn vermeld als bijdragende onderneming.

Meer in het algemeen werkt de Commissie aan de herziening van Richtlijn 2003/41/EG om grensoverschrijdende activiteiten verder te vergemakkelijken.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002485/13
to the Commission
Othmar Karas (PPE), Heinz K. Becker (PPE), Astrid Lulling (PPE) and Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Cross-border pension fund under Directive 2003/41/EC — UBIT-Trianon case

The UBIT-Trianon case concerns a Dutch pension fund — a premium pension institution (hereinafter PPI) — which, together with a technical pension fund manager as an outsourcing partner, is seeking to provide a pension plan scheme in Austria for members of the Austrian Professional Association for Management Consultancy and Information Technology (UBIT). Pursuant to Article 19(a) of the UBIT associated collective agreement, this specific offer, coupled with tax advantages, could be made available to 40 000 employees in 4 300 firms.

The marketing consultant responsible for the project made a request to the Financial Market Authority (FMA) in Vienna, Austria, regarding the initiation of a notification procedure. He received a negative response giving the following reasons:

1. a PPI is not allowed to pay out pensions;

2. the FMA argued that Article 20(2) and (4) of Directive 2003/41/EC stipulates that 'each cross-border business' is to be individually declared to the supervisory authority.

The directive provides for cross-border authorisation of pension funds without any obstacles. Healthy competition and competitive financial markets in Europe are among the Commission's key objectives with a view to competing successfully with Asia, the USA and elsewhere.

Can the Commission assess:

— whether the Austrian FMA's decision is at all consistent with the spirit and purpose of Directive 2003/41/EC?

— whether its objections are legitimate, or whether they can be refuted both on technical grounds and in the light of the legitimate interests of both the beneficiaries and the regulators?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

The Commission is aware of this case and has been approached by the consulting company in question. An institution for occupational retirement provision (IORP) wishing to accept sponsorship from a sponsoring undertaking located within the territory of another Member State must receive prior authorisation by the competent authorities of its home Member State, in this case 'De Nederlandsche Bank', and not by the competent authorities of the host Member State. This results from Article 20 of Directive 2003/41/EC. The 'Finanzmarktaufsicht (FMA)' in Austria is the competent authority of the host Member State.

Article 6 of Directive 2003/41/EC foresees the possibility that the 'sponsoring undertaking' is constituted of a group of employers. This would suggest that one notification to the competent authorities of the home Member State is sufficient, including in that notification the individual employers acting as a group as the sponsoring undertaking.

More generally, the Commission is in the process of reviewing Directive 2003/41/EC with the aim of further facilitating cross-border activity.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-002486/13
Komisi
Pavel Poc (S&D), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE) a Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(4. března 2013)

Předmět: Dobré životní podmínky dojnic

Komise uvedla, že nemá v úmyslu navrhnout žádné zvláštní právní předpisy pro ochranu dojnic. V současné době se neplánuje stanovení požadavků konkrétně pro dojnice v obecném legislativním rámci navzdory skutečnosti, že konkrétně v mlékárenském průmyslu existuje řada problémů týkajících se dobrých životních podmínek zvířat.

Namísto toho Komise hodlá změřit své úsilí na lepší prosazování obecné směrnice 98/58/ES.

Komise však ve své strategii pro dobré životní podmínky zvířat uznává, že směrnice 98/58/ES obsahuje ustavení, která jsou „příliš obecná, než aby mohla mít praktický přínos".

Může Komise v této souvislosti sdělit, která ustanovení směrnice 98/58/ES pokládá za vhodná pro řešení:

— vysokého výskytu pohybových postižení u mléčného skotu, s ohledem na závěry Evropského úřadu pro bezpečnost potravin (EFSA), který uvedl, že vady končetin a zhoršená pohyblivost představují největší problém v oblasti dobrých životních podmínek zvířat, pokud jde o výskyt a rozsah negativních účinků;

— skutečnosti, že mléčný skot často nemá přístup na pastviny, s ohledem na vyjádření EFSA, že „pokud dojnice nejsou část roku chovány na pastvině, tj. jsou stále v režimu bez pastvy, existuje zvýšené riziko pohybových postižení, problémů s kopyty, poranění struků kopnutím, mastitidy, dystokie, ketózy, zadržené placenty a některých bakteriálních infekcí?"

Jaké další kroky Komise zamýšlí pro zlepšení prosazování směrnice 98/58/ES?

Odpověď Tonia Borga jménem Komise
(24. dubna 2013)

Komise by chtěla poukázat na svoji odpověď E-1910/2012 ([1]) týkající se stejné věci.

Problematika dobrých životních podmínek zvířat týkající se dojnic spadá do oblasti působnosti článku 3 směrnice 98/58/ES o ochraně zvířat chovaných pro hospodářské účely ([2]), který stanoví, že „členské státy přijmou opatření k tomu, aby vlastníci nebo držitelé přijali všechna vhodná opatření s cílem zajistit dobré životní podmínky zvířat, která jsou v jejich péči, a aby tato zvířata nebyla vystavena žádné zbytečné bolesti, utrpení nebo poškození".

Členské státy to proto musí zajistit prostřednictvím vnitrostátních předpisů v souladu s požadavky článku 10 této směrnice.

V této souvislosti provádějí odborníci z Komise v členských státech pravidelný audit týkající se provádění směrnice 98/58/ES. Jelikož oblast působnosti této směrnice zahrnuje velké množství druhů zvířat a výroby, soustředí Komise své zdroje na priority, které jsou každoročně přezkoumávány.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/cs/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Úř. věst. L 221, 8.8.1998.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002486/13
an die Kommission
Pavel Poc (S&D), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE) und Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(4. März 2013)

Betrifft: Artgerechte Haltung von Milchkühen

Die Kommission hat erklärt, dass sie nicht beabsichtigt, spezifische Rechtsvorschriften zum Schutz von Milchkühen vorzuschlagen. Gegenwärtig liegen keine Pläne vor, den allgemeinen Rechtsrahmen um sektorspezifische Anforderungen für Milchkühe zu erweitern, obgleich es eine Reihe schwerwiegender Tierschutzprobleme gibt, die dem Milchsektor eigen sind.

Stattdessen will die Kommission sich auf eine verbesserte Durchsetzung der allgemeinen Richtlinie 98/58/EG konzentrieren.

Allerdings räumt die Kommission in ihrer Tierschutzstrategie ein, dass die Richtlinie 98/58/EG Bestimmungen enthält, die „zu allgemein sind, um praktische Wirkung zu erzielen".

Kann die Kommission angesichts dieses Sachverhalts darlegen, welche Bestimmung(en) der Richtlinie 98/58/EG ihrer Meinung nach verwendet werden können, um folgende Aspekte anzugehen:

— die häufig auftretende Lahmheit bei Milchvieh, zumal die Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) zu dem Schluss gekommen ist, dass Erkrankungen der Gliedmaßen und Störungen des Bewegungsapparats sowohl in Bezug auf die Häufigkeit als auch auf das Ausmaß der schädlichen Auswirkungen ein erhebliches Gesundheitsproblem für Milchvieh darstellen;

— die Tatsache, dass Milchvieh oftmals keinen Weidegang hat, zumal die EFSA ebenfalls festgestellt hat, dass bei Milchkühen, die übers Jahr nicht zeitweise auf Weideflächen, d. h. ohne jede Möglichkeit zum Grasen gehalten werden, ein erhöhtes Risiko für Lahmen, Klauenprobleme, Trittverletzungen an den Zitzen, Mastitis, Metritis, Dystokie, Ketose, Plazentaverhaltung und einige bakterielle Infektionen besteht.

Welche weiteren Schritte will die Kommission ergreifen, um eine verbesserte Durchsetzung der Richtlinie 98/58/EG zu gewährleisten?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(24. April 2013)

In diesem Zusammenhang verweist die Kommission auf ihre Antwort E-1910/2012 ([1]) zum selben Thema.

Das Wohlergehen von Tieren und damit von Milchkühen fällt unter Artikel 3 der Richtlinie 98/58/EG des Rates vom 20. Juli 1998 über den Schutz landwirtschaftlicher Nutztiere ([2]), in dem es heißt: „Die Mitgliedstaaten treffen Vorkehrungen dahin gehend, dass der Eigentümer oder Halter alle geeigneten Maßnahmen trifft, um das Wohlergehen seiner Tiere zu gewährleisten und um sicherzustellen, dass den Tieren keine unnötigen Schmerzen, Leiden oder Schäden zugefügt werden".

Die Mitgliedstaaten müssen dies durch nationale Maßnahmen gemäß Artikel 10 dieser Richtlinie sicherstellen.

In diesem Zusammenhang führen Sachverständige der Kommission in Bezug auf die Umsetzung der Richtlinie 98/58/EG regelmäßig Audits in den Mitgliedstaaten durch. Während eine große Zahl von Arten und Produktionen in den Anwendungsbereich dieser Richtlinie fällt, konzentriert die Kommission ihre Ressourcen auf Prioritäten, die jedes Jahr überprüft werden.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) ABl. L 221 vom 8.8.1998.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002486/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Pavel Poc (S&D), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE) και Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(4 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Καλή διαβίωση των αγελάδων γαλακτοπαραγωγής

Η Επιτροπή έχει δηλώσει ότι δεν σκοπεύει να προτείνει ειδική νομοθεσία για την προστασία των αγελάδων γαλακτοπαραγωγής. Προς το παρόν δεν έχει προγραμματιστεί η καθιέρωση συγκεκριμένων απαιτήσεων για τις αγελάδες γαλακτοπαραγωγής στο γενικό νομοθετικό πλαίσιο, παρά το γεγονός ότι ορισμένα σοβαρά προβλήματα σε σχέση με την καλή διαβίωση των ζώων αφορούν συγκεκριμένα τον τομέα της γαλακτοπαραγωγής.

Αντιθέτως, η Επιτροπή σκοπεύει να επικεντρώσει τις προσπάθειές της στη βελτίωση της εφαρμογής της γενικής οδηγίας 98/58/ΕΚ.

Εντούτοις, η στρατηγική της ΕΕ για την καλή διαβίωση των ζώων αναγνωρίζει ότι η οδηγία 98/58/ΕΚ περιέχει ορισμένες διατάξεις οι οποίες είναι πολύ γενικές για να εφαρμοστούν στην πράξη.

Υπό το πρίσμα των ανωτέρω, μπορεί η Επιτροπή να αναφέρει ποια διάταξη/ποιες διατάξεις της οδηγίας 98/58/ΕΚ θεωρεί ότι μπορούν να αξιοποιηθούν για την αντιμετώπιση:

— της υψηλής συχνότητας εμφάνισης χωλότητας στα γαλακτοφόρα βοοειδή, δεδομένου ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή για την Ασφάλεια των Τροφίμων (ΕΑΑΤ) έχει συμπεράνει ότι οι παθήσεις των ποδιών και οι κινητικές διαταραχές αποτελούν σημαντικό πρόβλημα για την καλή διαβίωση των γαλακτοφόρων βοοειδών, σε σχέση με τη συχνότητα εμφάνισης και το μέγεθος των δυσμενών επιπτώσεων;

— του γεγονότος ότι πολλά γαλακτοφόρα βοοειδή δεν έχουν πρόσβαση σε βοσκότοπους, δεδομένου ότι η ΕΑΑΤ έχει επίσης συμπεράνει ότι «αν οι αγελάδες γαλακτοπαραγωγής δεν διατηρούνται στους βοσκοτόπους ορισμένες περιόδους του έτους, ήτοι υπόκεινται μονίμως σε σύστημα διατροφής χωρίς βοσκή, υπάρχει αυξημένος κίνδυνος χωλότητας, προβλημάτων στις χηλές, τραυμάτων θηλών, μαστίτιδας, μητρίτιδας, δυστοκίας, κέτωσης, κατακράτησης πλακούντα και ορισμένων βακτηριακών λοιμώξεων»;

Ποια άλλα μέτρα σκοπεύει να λάβει η Επιτροπή για να διασφαλίσει τη βελτιωμένη εφαρμογή της οδηγίας 98/58/ΕΚ;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Απριλίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να παραπέμψει στην απάντησή της E-1910/2012 ([1]) σχετικά με το ίδιο θέμα.

Τα θέματα καλής διαβίωσης των ζώων για τις αγελάδες γαλακτοπαραγωγής εμπίπτουν στο πεδίο εφαρμογής του άρθρου 3 της οδηγίας 98/58/ΕΚ σχετικά με την προστασία των ζώων στα εκτροφεία ([2]) στο οποίο προβλέπεται ότι «τα κράτη μέλη θεσπίζουν διατάξεις ώστε οι κύριοι ή κάτοχοι να λαμβάνουν όλα τα ενδεδειγμένα μέτρα για να εξασφαλίσουν την καλή διαβίωση των ζώων τους και προκειμένου να εξασφαλίσουν ότι τα εν λόγω ζώα δεν υφίστανται κανένα περιττό πόνο, ταλαιπωρία ή βλάβη».

Συνεπώς, τα κράτη μέλη πρέπει να εξασφαλίσουν την καλή διαβίωση μέσω εθνικών μέτρων, όπως απαιτείται στο άρθρο 10 της εν λόγω οδηγίας.

Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, εμπειρογνώμονες από την Επιτροπή ελέγχουν τακτικά τα κράτη μέλη όσον αφορά την εφαρμογή της οδηγίας 98/58/ΕΚ. Μολονότι το πεδίο εφαρμογής της εν λόγω οδηγίας καλύπτει μεγάλο αριθμό ζωικών ειδών και παραγωγών ζωικών προϊόντων, η Επιτροπή επικεντρώνει τους πόρους της στις προτεραιότητες οι οποίες αναθεωρούνται ετησίως.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) ΕΕ L 221 της 8.8.1998.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002486/13
alla Commissione
Pavel Poc (S&D), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE) e Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(4 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Benessere delle vacche da latte

La Commissione ha dichiarato che non intende proporre una legislazione specifica sulla protezione delle vacche da latte. Attualmente non ci sono piani per introdurre requisiti specifici di settore per le vacche da latte nel quadro normativo generale, nonostante il fatto che una serie di gravi problemi di benessere sono specifici per il settore lattierocaseario.

Invece la Commissione intende concentrare i propri sforzi sul miglioramento dell'applicazione della direttiva generale 98/58/CE del Consiglio.

Tuttavia la strategia della Commissione in materia di benessere degli animali riconosce che la direttiva 98/58/CE contiene disposizioni che sono «troppo generali per poter avere effetti pratici». Alla luce di ciò, quali disposizioni della direttiva 98/58/CE ritiene la Commissione possano essere utilizzate per affrontare:

— L'alta incidenza delle zoppie nei bovini da latte, dato che l'European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) ha concluso che i disturbi alle zampe e i disordini della locomozione sono un «problema di benessere tra i più importanti per i bovini da latte, in termini di incidenza e di entità degli effetti negativi».

— Il fatto che molti capi di bestiame da latte non hanno accesso al pascolo, dato che l'EFSA ha concluso che: «Se le vacche da latte non sono tenute al pascolo per parte dell'anno, vale a dire che sono permanentemente in un sistema a zero pascolo, vi è un aumento del rischio di zoppia, di problemi agli zoccoli, di calpestamento dei capezzoli, di mastite, metrite, distocia, chetosi, ritenzione della placenta e di alcune infezioni batteriche».

Quali altri passi intende effettuare la Commissione per garantire la migliore applicazione della direttiva 98/58/CE?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(24 aprile 2013)

In proposito la Commissione rimanda alla sua risposta alla E-1910/2012 ([1]).

La questione del benessere degli animali e nello specifico delle vacche da latte rientra nell'ambito di applicazione dell'articolo 3 della direttiva 98/58/CE riguardante la protezione degli animali negli allevamenti ([2]) la quale dispone che «gli Stati membri provvedono affinché i proprietari o i custodi adottino le misure adeguate per garantire il benessere dei propri animali e per far sì che a detti animali non vengano provocati dolori, sofferenze o lesioni inutili».

Occorre quindi che gli Stati membri prendano provvedimenti a livello nazionale a tale riguardo secondo quanto disposto nell'articolo 10 della direttiva sopra menzionata.

In proposito alcuni esperti della Commissione verificano regolarmente se gli Stati membri rispettano la direttiva 98/58/CE. Ancorché l'ambito di applicazione della direttiva sopracitata comprenda numerose specie e produzioni, la Commissione concentra le proprie risorse su obiettivi fissati ogni anno.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) GU L 221 del 8.8.1998.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002486/13
to the Commission
Pavel Poc (S&D), Andrea Zanoni (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE) and Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Welfare of dairy cows

The Commission has stated that it does not intend to propose any specific legislation on the protection of dairy cows. There are currently no plans to introduce sector-specific requirements for dairy cows in the general legislative framework, despite the fact that a number of serious welfare problems are specific to the dairy sector.

Instead, the Commission intends to concentrate its efforts on improving enforcement of the General Directive 98/58/EC.

However, the Commission's Strategy on Animal Welfare acknowledges that Directive 98/58/EC contains provisions that are 'too general to have practical effects'.

In light of this, can the Commission state which provision(s) of Directive 98/58/EC it believes can be used to address:

— the high incidence of lameness in dairy cattle, given that the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has concluded that leg and locomotion disorders are a 'major welfare problem for dairy cattle, in terms of incidence and magnitude of adverse effect';

— the fact that many dairy cattle do not have access to pasture, given that EFSA has also concluded that 'if dairy cows are not kept on pasture for parts of the year, i.e. they are permanently on a zero-grazing system, there is an increased risk of lameness, hoof problems, teat tramp, mastitis, metritis, dystocia, ketosis, retained placenta and some bacterial infections'?

What other steps does the Commission plan to take to secure improved enforcement of Directive 98/58/EC?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The Commission would like to refer to its reply to E-1910/2012 ([1]) on the same subject.

Animal welfare issues on dairy cows falls within the scope of Article 3 of Directive 98/58/EC on the protection of animals kept for farming purposes ([2]) which provides that 'Member States shall make provision to ensure that the owners or keepers take all reasonable steps to ensure the welfare of animals under their care and to ensure that those animals are not caused any unnecessary pain, suffering or injury'.

Member States have therefore to ensure this through national measures as required by Article 10 of this directive.

In this context, experts from the Commission regularly audit Member States on the implementation of Directive 98/58/EC. While the scope of this directive covers a large number of species and productions, the Commission focuses its resources on priorities that are reviewed every year.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) OJ L 221, 8.8.1998.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002488/13
à la Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(4 mars 2013)

Objet: Filière caprine

La filière de l'élevage caprin et de la production de lait de chèvre connaît en France de grandes difficultés, particulièrement dans l'Ouest et en Pays de la Loire.

La production a déjà baissé de 25 % et les producteurs, dont les rémunérations ont chuté, abandonnent cette filière en raison de la crise qui les touche et de l'augmentation conséquente des coûts de production. Les organisations de producteurs estiment qu'une revalorisation du prix du lait de 120 euros pour 1 000 litres permettrait de sauver les éleveurs de chèvres.

1. Dans le contexte de la réforme de la politique agricole commune, comment la Commission va-t-elle défendre les producteurs de lait de chèvre pour qu'ils puissent vivre décemment de leur travail?

2. Que compte faire la Commission pour garantir des relations équitables entre les producteurs de lait, les intermédiaires commerciaux et les distributeurs, notamment en assurant une répartition plus juste des marges?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(30 avril 2013)

Les propositions de réforme de la Commission prévoient de nombreuses mesures de développement rural dont les producteurs de lait de chèvre peuvent bénéficier. Celles-ci visent un développement commercial continu, un meilleur accès aux systèmes de qualité, une restructuration des exploitations, un plus grand soutien en matière de transformation et de commercialisation, et une diversification facilitée des produits. Des taux d'aide plus élevés sont proposés pour les investissements collectifs, et la proposition offre aussi explicitement la possibilité de soutenir le développement de chaînes d'approvisionnement courtes et de marchés locaux. Une nouvelle série de mesures de gestion des risques destinée à apporter une compensation aux producteurs et à stabiliser leurs revenus en cas de pertes financières et/ou de volatilité des prix est également proposée.

La proposition de réforme de la Commission pour les régimes d'aide directe offre aux États membres la possibilité d'octroyer des aides couplées lorsque des secteurs agricoles spécifiques, notamment la filière laitière, rencontrent certaines difficultés et qu'ils sont particulièrement importants sur les plans économique, social et/ou environnemental. La proposition prévoit aussi un paiement de base, un paiement consacré à l'écologisation et un paiement pour les jeunes agriculteurs. Les États membres peuvent verser une aide aux zones soumises à des contraintes naturelles. En outre, les États membres peuvent décider d'appliquer le paiement de base et le paiement consacré à l'écologisation sur un plan régional, répondant ainsi plus efficacement aux besoins de régions spécifiques.

Tandis que ces propositions sont examinées au Parlement européen et au Conseil, des mesures spécifiques incluses dans les propositions globales dans le secteur du lait ([1]) sont déjà entrées en vigueur en octobre 2012. Elles offrent aux producteurs de lait, dont les producteurs de lait de chèvre, la possibilité de négocier collectivement les conditions contractuelles via les organisations de producteurs reconnues afin de rééquilibrer le pouvoir de négociation des producteurs de lait face aux grands transformateurs.

([1]) Règlement (UE) n° 261/2012 relatif aux relations contractuelles dans le secteur du lait et des produits laitiers. voir: http//eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:094:0038:0048:FR: PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002488/13
to the Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Goat farming sector

The goat farming and goat's milk production sectors are facing major difficulties in France, particularly in the west and in the Loire Region.

Production has already dropped by 25% and incomes have plummeted for producers, who are abandoning the sector due to the effects of the crisis and the resulting increase in production costs. Producer organisations believe that raising the price of milk by EUR 120 per 1 000 litres would make it possible for goat farmers to survive.

1. In the context of the common agricultural policy reform, how does the Commission intend to protect goat's milk producers so that they can make a decent living from their work?

2. What does the Commission intend to do to guarantee fair relations between milk producers, commercial intermediaries and distributors, in particular with a view to ensuring a fairer distribution of profits?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

The Commission reform proposals provide numerous rural development measures that goat's milk producers may benefit from. These are aimed at further business development, better access to quality schemes, farm restructuring, widened support for processing and marketing, facilitating product diversification. Higher support rates are proposed for collective investments and the proposal also explicitly offers support for the development of short supply chains and local markets. A new risk management toolkit that aims at compensating producers and stabilising their incomes when affected by economic losses and/or price volatility is also proposed.

The Commission reform proposal for direct support schemes provides for the possibility for Member States to grant coupled aids where specific agricultural sectors, notably the dairy sector, undergo certain difficulties and are particularly important for economic, social and/or environmental reasons. The proposal also provides for a basic payment, a greening payment, a payment for young farmers and Member States can grant a payment in areas with natural constraints. Furthermore, Member States may decide to apply the basic payment and a greening payment at regional level, thus better addressing the needs of specific regions.

While above proposals are currently being discussed in the European Parliament and the Council, specific measures in the Milk Package ([1]), have already entered into force in October 2012. They offer to milk producers, including goat milk producers, the possibility to negotiate contract terms collectively via recognised producer organisations in a way as to balance the bargaining power of milk producers relative to major processors.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 261 as regards contractual relations in the milk and milk products sector (see http//eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:094:0038:0048:FR: PDF).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002489/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(4 mars 2013)

Objet: Publicités intempestives sur les sites internet des chaînes privées de télévision en France

Les chaînes privées de la télévision française proposent la rediffusion de leurs programmes sur internet, ouverts à tous sans abonnement.

Une publicité, d'une durée variable de quelques secondes à une minute, précède chaque programme, et se met automatiquement en pause dès que l'internaute ouvre d'autres fenêtres ou onglets dans son navigateur internet. Il doit alors revenir sur la page de la vidéo et se voit obligé de regarder le contenu de la publicité afin de pouvoir accéder à la vidéo demandée. Cette modalité est appliquée à tous les programmes de ces chaînes, aussi bien les émissions de divertissement que les informations.

Cette façon de procéder empêche les internautes de surfer librement sur internet, et de visionner plusieurs contenus en même temps. Ce problème n'a pour le moment pas trouvé d'écho au niveau européen.

La Commission envisagerait-elle de mettre au point une libre circulation des internautes sur les sites internet légaux?

Celle-ci leur assurerait la possibilité de se déplacer sans entrave sur tout site internet légal pour un accès à tout contenu, à tout moment de façon simultanée.

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(2 mai 2013)

En principe, les citoyens sont déjà en mesure d'accéder aux sites web sous réserve des limitations prévues par la loi ou par décision commerciale. Dans la situation décrite par l'Honorable Parlementaire, le programme est disponible après la publicité. Or, ce seul fait n'empêche pas les citoyens d'accéder librement au contenu de ces sites web ni d'avoir accès à plus d'un site web à la fois. Nous aimerions informer l'Honorable Parlementaire que la Commission compte lancer un Livre vert sur la convergence dans le monde de l'audiovisuel dans lequel il sera notamment prévu d'obtenir des informations sur les défis que pourraient poser les nouvelles techniques publicitaires.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002489/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Inappropriate advertisements on the websites of French privately-owned television channels

French privately-owned television channels broadcast repeats of their programmes online. This is a freely available service that does not require a subscription.

An advertisement lasting from anywhere between a few seconds to a minute is played before each programme and is automatically paused when the user opens other windows or tabs in their web browser. The user must then return to the programme page and has no choice but to watch the advertisement in order to access the desired programme. These channels apply this system to all of their programmes, including entertainment shows and the news.

This system prevents Internet users from browsing freely online and from viewing different content at the same time. This problem has not yet been addressed at European level.

Does the Commission plan to develop the right of Internet users to browse legal websites freely?

This would ensure that they were able to navigate any legal website freely in order to access different content simultaneously at any given time.

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2013)

As a matter of principle, citizens can already access websites subject to limitations provided by law or by commercial decision. In the case described by the Honourable Member the content become accessible following the commercial communication. This alone, however, does not deprive citizens from freely accessing the content of such websites or freely accessing more than one website at the same time. We would like to inform the Honourable Member that the Commission is planning to launch a Green Paper on convergence in the audiovisual world where it will also be envisaged to seek feedback on possible challenges from new advertising techniques.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002490/13
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(4 mars 2013)

Objet: Quelles perspectives pour réduire les inégalités salariales entre femmes et hommes

La troisième journée européenne pour l'égalité salariale est venue hélas nous rappeler que de grands écarts de rémunération persistent entre femmes et hommes. Selon les dernières statistiques disponibles, à travail égal les Européennes continuent de gagner en moyenne 16,2 % de moins que les hommes. Cette situation est inacceptable. Elle déshonore l'Union et ses valeurs d'égalité et de respect des droits. Des instruments juridiques existent pourtant pour combattre ce phénomène. Cependant, ils semblent n'avoir qu'une efficacité limitée, comme l'a souligné le Parlement dans sa résolution du 24 mai 2012.

Si la refonte de 2006 des règles relatives à l'égalité des chances et à l'égalité de traitement entre hommes et femmes en matière d'emploi et de travail a constitué un progrès, les sanctions sont peu appliquées et les législations nationales dans ce domaine ont peu évolué. La directive (2006/54/CE) elle-même dans son article 32 faisait obligation à la Commission de procéder à un examen de son application et à d'éventuelles modifications au plus tard le 15 février 2013. Le Parlement européen avait également formulé des recommandations en ce sens. Pourtant, la Commission annonce maintenant que l'adoption d'un tel rapport n'est prévue que pour l'été 2013.

Or, il y a urgence à agir. L'inégalité des rémunérations entre genres pour un travail de même valeur est une violation intolérable des droits de la personne et des traités qui fondent l'Union européenne. Alors que dans l'Union 59 % des diplômés de l'université sont des femmes, la persistance de telles discriminations est un fardeau pour l'économie européenne. Elles privent l'Europe d'un énorme potentiel, notamment dans les secteurs où les femmes sont sous-représentées. Les Européennes, tout comme leurs collègues masculins, ont droit à ce que la valeur de leur travail soit reconnue!

Je souhaiterais donc demander à la Commission quelles sont les raisons du retard affiché pour l'évaluation de la directive (2006/54/CE) en vigueur, prévue de longue date, et si elle envisage que cette évaluation puisse déboucher sur une révision de la législation, comme le préconise le Parlement?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(3 mai 2013)

Le principe de l'égalité des rémunérations est inscrit dans les traités depuis 1957 et intégré dans la directive 2006/54/CE ([1]). L'une des priorités de la Commission pour les années à venir sera de veiller à la bonne application et au respect des dispositions de cette directive en matière d'égalité des rémunérations et de soutenir les États membres et les autres parties prenantes en ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre et l'application correctes de la réglementation en vigueur. Dans cet esprit, la Commission est en train de préparer un rapport sur l'application de la directive 2006/54/CE.

([1]) Directive 2006/54/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 5 juillet 2006 relative à la mise en œuvre du principe de l'égalité des chances et de l'égalité de traitement entre hommes et femmes en matière d'emploi et de travail (refonte), JO L 204 du 26.7.2006, p. 23.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002490/13
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Outlook for reducing pay inequality between women and men

The third European Equal Pay Day has unfortunately served to remind us of the large pay gap that continues to exist between women and men. According to the latest statistics, European women still earn an average of 16.2% less than men for the same work. This is unacceptable. It is a disgrace to the EU and its values of equality and respect for rights. Although legal instruments have been adopted to combat this problem, they appear to be of only limited effectiveness, as emphasised by Parliament in its resolution of 24 May 2012.

Although progress was made in 2006 with the overhaul of the rules on equal opportunities and equal treatment for men and women in matters of employment and occupation, sanctions are rarely imposed and national legislation in this area has changed little. Article 32 of Directive 2006/54/EC obliged the Commission to review the operation of the directive and propose any amendments deemed necessary by 15 February 2013 at the latest. The European Parliament also put forward recommendations to this effect. Yet the Commission has now announced that it does not plan to adopt a report of this kind until summer 2013.

Action is urgently needed. Unequal pay for women and men for work of the same value is an intolerable violation of human rights and of the Treaties which underpin the European Union. Given that 59% of university graduates in the EU are women, the fact that such discrimination continues places a burden on the European economy. It deprives Europe of enormous potential, particularly in sectors where women are under-represented. European women are entitled to have the value of their work recognised in the same way as their male colleagues.

I would therefore like to ask the Commission to explain the reasons for this delay in the long-planned review of the currently binding Directive 2006/54/EC, and whether it considers that this review could result in amendments to the legislation, as recommended by Parliament?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2013)

The principle of equal pay has been enshrined in the Treaties since 1957 and is also incorporated in Directive 2006/54/EC ([1]). One of the Commission's priorities for the coming years will be to monitor the correct application and enforcement of the equal pay provisions of this directive and to support Member States and other stakeholders with the proper enforcement and application of the existing rules. In that vein, the Commission is currently preparing a report on application of the directive 2006/54/EC.

([1]) Directive 2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation (recast); OJ L 204, 26.7.2006, p. 23-36.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002491/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(4 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Revisione della regolamentazione del settore della raffinazione dello zucchero di canna

Le associazioni di categoria denunciano con preoccupazione che, nella revisione della regolamentazione del settore della raffinazione dello zucchero greggio di canna, contenuta nella riforma della Politica agricola comune, non si sia tenuto conto delle istanze, sollevate dai raffinatori europei, volte ad ottenere garanzie sull'approvvigionamento minimo di materie prime, pur avendo mantenuto le garanzie delle quote per i produttori di zucchero da bietola.

Non ritiene la Commissione che questa revisione della regolamentazione possa creare una distorsione del mercato interno per il settore industriale della raffinazione dello zucchero di canna, impedendo a tali imprese di poter operare in condizioni di equilibrio di mercato con i produttori dello zucchero da bietola?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(15 aprile 2013)

Nell'ambito della riforma della politica agricola comune annunciata il 12 ottobre 2011, la Commissione non ha proposto di prorogare il regime delle quote zucchero oltre il 1° ottobre 2015, ritenendo che la sua abolizione rappresenti l'opzione più idonea per fornire al settore dello zucchero una prospettiva a lungo termine. L'equilibrio tra la produzione saccarifera dell'UE (zucchero di barbabietola) e quella dei paesi ACP/paesi meno sviluppati (zucchero di canna) dipenderà dalla competitività relativa di entrambe le industrie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002491/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Review of regulations governing the cane sugar refining sector

Trade associations have expressed their concern that the review of regulations governing the raw cane sugar refining sector, contained in the reform of the common agricultural policy, has not taken into account the demands made by European refiners for guarantees regarding a minimum supply of raw materials, although quota guarantees for sugar beet producers have been maintained.

Does the Commission not believe that this review of regulations may lead to a distortion of the internal market for the industrial cane sugar refining sector, preventing businesses from being able to operate under market conditions equal to those of beet sugar producers?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(15 April 2013)

In the context of the common agricultural policy reform announced on 12 October 2011, the Commission has not proposed to prolong the sugar quota regime beyond 1st October 2015. For the Commission the end to the quota system is the most appropriate option for providing the sugar sector with a long-term perspective. The balance between EU (beet) sugar production and ACP/LDCs (cane) sugar will depend on the relative competitiveness of both industries.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002492/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(4 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Procedure di infrazione per l'Italia: chiarimenti

Con riferimento alla risposta E-008760/2012, può chiarire la Commissione:

— quante procedure sono attualmente operanti contro l'Italia e per quali settori;

— quante procedure sono state chiuse, quante aperte e per quali settori, rispetto alla precedente interrogazione;

— qual è il costo sostenuto finora dall'Italia in seguito ai procedimenti di infrazione cui è stata sottoposta;

— qual è il caso oggetto della decisione di adire la Corte di Giustizia ai sensi dell'articolo 260, paragrafo 2, del TFUE;

— quali sono le procedure arrivate a sentenza definitiva della Corte, ex articolo 260 TFUE, e quale somma è stata condannata l'Italia a pagare?

Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2013)

1. La Commissione rimanda l'onorevole deputato al paragrafo 3 della risposta all'interrogazione E-008760/2012. Risultano aperti 110 casi di infrazione, di cui 29 relativi all'ambiente, 13 al mercato interno, 12 ai trasporti, 10 alle imposte, 10 all'occupazione, 7 alla salute, 6 alla giustizia, 5 all'energia, 3 alla concorrenza, 3 alle imprese e 2 nell'ambito della salute, degli affari interni e degli affari marittimi.

2. La Commissione invita l'onorevole deputato a consultare i dati relativi alle decisioni della Commissione in materia di applicazione del diritto dell'Unione europea, pubblicati dalla Commissione sul sito EUROPA al seguente indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/infringements/infringements_decisions_it.htm

3. La Commissione non dispone di elementi che consentano di valutare il costo dei procedimenti di infrazione a carico dell'Italia. Per quanto riguarda le spese alle quali è condannata la parte soccombente a norma dell'articolo 138 del regolamento di procedura della Corte di giustizia, è consuetudine, tra le istituzioni e gli Stati membri, non reclamare di fatto il pagamento di queste spese.

4. Il caso oggetto della decisione di adire la Corte di giustizia a norma dell'articolo 260, paragrafo 2, del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, del 28 ottobre 2010, riguarda la mancata esecuzione della sentenza del 1° giugno 2006 nella causa C-207/05 (Commissione contro Repubblica italiana).

5. Rimandiamo l'onorevole deputato alla causa C-496/09 (Commissione contro Repubblica italiana) ([1]).

([1]) In ottemperanza alla sentenza del 17 novembre 2011 pronunciata dalla Corte di giustizia in questa causa:.
La Repubblica italiana è condannata a versare alla Commissione europea, sul conto «Risorse proprie dell'Unione europea», la somma forfettaria di EUR 30 milioni. Questo importo era dovuto nel gennaio 2012 ed è stato versato dalla Repubblica italiana sul conto «Risorse proprie».
La Repubblica italiana è condannata a versare alla Commissione europea, sul conto «Risorse proprie dell'Unione europea», una penalità di importo corrispondente alla moltiplicazione dell'importo di base di EUR 30 milioni per la percentuale degli aiuti illegali incompatibili il cui recupero non è ancora stato effettuato o non è stato dimostrato al termine del periodo di cui trattasi, calcolata rispetto alla totalità degli importi non ancora recuperati alla data della pronuncia della presente sentenza, per ogni semestre di ritardo nell'attuazione dei provvedimenti necessari per conformarsi alla sentenza 1° aprile 2004, causa C-99/02, Commissione/Italia, a decorrere dalla presente sentenza e fino all'esecuzione di detta sentenza 1° aprile 2004. L'importo della penalità dovuta è valutato periodicamente dai servizi della Commissione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002492/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Infringement procedures against Italy: clarifications

With reference to answer E-008760/2012, can the Commission clarify:

— how many procedures are currently open against Italy and for which sectors;

— how many procedures have been closed, how many opened and for which sectors, compared with the previous written question;

— what has been the cost borne by Italy thus far as a result of the infringement procedures to which it has been subjected;

— which case was the subject of the decision to bring proceedings before the Court of Justice in accordance with Article 260, paragraph 2 of the TFEU;

— which procedures have had a final judgment from the Court of Justice, pursuant to Article 260 of the TFEU, and what sums has Italy been ordered to pay?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barroso au nom de la Commission
(22 avril 2013)

1. La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire de se référer au paragraphe 3 de la réponse à la question E-008760/2012. 110 cas sont ouverts. Parmi ces cas 29 relèvent de l'environnement, 13 du marché intérieur, 12 des transports, 10 des taxes, 10 de l'emploi, 7 de la santé, 6 de la justice, 5 de l'énergie, 3 de la concurrence, 3 de l'entreprise, 2 respectivement dans les domaines de la santé, des affaires intérieures et des affaires maritimes.

2. La Commission prie l'Honorable Parlementaire de consulter les données relatives aux décisions de la Commission dans le domaine de l'application du droit de l'Union européenne telles que publiées par la Commission sur son site Europa à l'adresse suivante: (http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/infringements/infringements_decisions_fr.htm).

3. La Commission ne dispose pas d'éléments lui permettant d'évaluer le coût des procédures d'infraction pour l'Italie. En ce qui concerne les dépens auxquels toute partie qui succombe est condamnée conformément à l'article 138 du règlement de procédure de la Cour de justice, il existe une coutume entre les institutions et les États membres de ne pas réclamer effectivement le paiement de ces dépens.

4. Le cas ayant fait l'objet d'une décision de saisine au titre de l'article 260, paragraphe 2 TFUE en date du 28 octobre 2010 concerne la non-exécution de l'arrêt du 1er juin 2006 dans l'affaire C-207/05 (Commission contre République italienne).

5. L'Honorable Parlementaire voudra bien se référer à l'affaire C-496/09 (Commission contre République italienne) ([1]).

([1]) Selon l'arrêt du 17 novembre 2011 rendu par la Cour de Justice dans cette affaire:
La République italienne est condamnée à payer à la Commission européenne, sur le compte «Ressources propres de l'Union européenne», une somme forfaitaire de 30 millions d'euros. Ce montant était dû en janvier 2012 et a été payé par la République italienne sur le compte «Ressources propres».
La République italienne est condamnée à payer à la Commission européenne, sur le compte «Ressources propres de l'Union européenne», une astreinte d'un montant correspondant à la multiplication du montant de base de 30 millions d'euros par le pourcentage des aides illégales incompatibles dont la récupération n'a pas encore été effectuée ou n'a pas été prouvée à l'issue de la période concernée, calculé par rapport à la totalité des montants non encore récupérés à la date du prononcé du présent arrêt, et ce par semestre de retard dans la mise en œuvre des mesures nécessaires pour se conformer à l'arrêt du 1er avril 2004, Commission/Italie (C 99/02), à compter du présent arrêt et jusqu'à l'exécution dudit arrêt du 1er avril 2004. Le montant de l'astreinte due est évalué périodiquement par les services de la Commission.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002493/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(4 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Migliaia di profughi dal Nord Africa dipendono dalle amministrazioni locali

A partire dal 2011, in seguito ai moti di rivolta della primavera araba, le coste italiane sono state raggiunte da oltre 62 000 profughi provenienti dall'Africa, di cui almeno 28 123 dalla Tunisia, 28 431 dalla Libia e altri 6 000 dalle regioni del Mediterraneo orientale.

Per far fronte alla situazione, il 2 febbraio 2011 è stato dichiarato lo stato di emergenza umanitaria su territorio nazionale al fine di supportare i comuni, le associazioni e le strutture alberghiere che si sono fatte carico dell'accoglienza dei profughi.

Considerando che:

— lo stato di emergenza è cessato il 28 febbraio;

— attualmente in Italia ci sono ancora circa 13 000 profughi che vivono in situazione di precarietà affidandosi al sistema welfare del nostro Paese;

— moltissime amministrazioni comunali, anche in Veneto, non hanno ricevuto per intero i rimborsi previsti a questo titolo da parte dello Stato italiano: emblematico il caso di Padova, che attende ancora 234 000 euro sugli 800 000 euro anticipati;

— nella risposta alla mia interrogazione E-005022/2012, la Commissione afferma «che per far fronte al fenomeno in modo strutturale sia essenziale che l'Unione europea si impegni in un dialogo con le autorità […] per migliorare la loro gestione delle frontiere e della migrazione e sostenere la loro azione in questo ambito»;

— sarà impossibile, per le amministrazioni locali italiane, far fronte alle spese di mantenimento di cittadini stranieri senza ulteriori supporti economici esterni;

potrebbe la Commissione far sapere come intende agire per sostenere i nostri territori?

È stato aperto un dialogo con le autorità dei Paesi dai quali è partito questo flusso migratorio nel tentativo di cercare delle soluzioni concrete? Quali risultati sono stati ottenuti?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(13 maggio 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della decisione del governo italiano di porre fine allo stato di emergenza, dichiarato il 2 febbraio 2011, per dare una protezione umanitaria ai cittadini extra-UE provenienti dal Nord Africa a seguito dei moti di rivolta della primavera araba. Sono in corso contatti con le autorità italiane per discutere delle conseguenze pratiche di tale decisione.

La Commissione sostiene finanziariamente gli sforzi del governo italiano. Nel 2011 e nel 2012 l'Italia ha ricevuto aiuti d'emergenza aggiuntivi attraverso il Fondo europeo per i rifugiati (17,1 milioni di euro), il Fondo europeo per i rimpatri (2,5 milioni di euro) e il Fondo per le frontiere esterne (9,2 milioni di euro).

Inoltre, nell'ambito dell'approccio globale in materia di migrazione e mobilità, l'UE ha avviato dialoghi strutturati sulla migrazione, la mobilità e la sicurezza con diversi paesi di origine e di transito nel Mediterraneo meridionale. L'obiettivo è sviluppare partenariati per la mobilità, garantire che la circolazione delle persone tra i paesi dell'UE e i loro partner sia gestita in maniera efficiente e avvenga in condizioni di sicurezza. L'UE e il Marocco hanno raggiunto un accordo politico su un partenariato per la mobilità. Sono inoltre in corso negoziati con la Tunisia. Il dialogo è stato avviato anche con la Giordania e verrà probabilmente esteso anche ad altri paesi.

In Libia l'UE è impegnata ad attuare cinque programmi, a livello bilaterale e regionale, avviati prima della rivoluzione con un contributo complessivo di 19 milioni di euro per aiutare il governo a gestire i flussi migratori e dare assistenza ai migranti. Un altro programma (10 milioni di euro) è iniziato nel 2011 per stabilizzare le comunità a rischio e migliorare la gestione dei flussi migratori. Anche la Tunisia beneficia di programmi regionali (15,3 milioni di euro) per il potenziamento delle capacità e la gestione dei flussi migratori.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002493/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Thousands of North African refugees dependent on local authorities

Since 2011, following the Arab Spring uprisings, over 62 000 African refugees have reached the Italian coast, at least 28 123 of whom are from Tunisia, 28 431 from Libya and another 6 000 from the eastern Mediterranean regions.

In order to tackle this situation, a humanitarian state of emergency was declared on 2 February 2011 across the country in order to support the municipalities, associations and hotels which have taken responsibility for receiving the refugees.

Given that:

— the state of emergency ended on 28 February;

— there are still around 13 000 refugees currently in Italy, living in a state of uncertainty and relying on the Italian welfare system;

— many municipal authorities, including in Veneto, have not received the full amount of the reimbursements provided for this purpose by the Italian State: a typical case being that of Padua, which is still waiting for EUR 234 000 of the EUR 800 000 expected;

— in its answer to my written question E-005022/2012, the Commission stated that 'in order to address this phenomenon in a structural manner, it will be very important for the EU to engage in a dialogue with the … authorities … to improve their border and migration management, and support them in this endeavour';

— it will be impossible for Italian local authorities to meet the costs of supporting foreign nationals without further external economic assistance;

could the Commission state what action it intends to take to support our municipalities?

Has a dialogue been established with the authorities of the countries from which this flow of migrants began in order to seek concrete solutions? What has been achieved?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)

The Commission is aware of the decision taken by the Italian Government to end the state of emergency, declared on 2 February 2011, to grant humanitarian protection to third-country nationals coming from North Africa following the Arab Spring uprisings. Contacts are ongoing with the Italian authorities on the practical consequences of that decision.

The Commission is financially supporting the Italian efforts. In 2011 and 2012, Italy received additional emergency support under the European Refugee Fund (EUR 17.1 million), the Return Fund (EUR 2.5 million) and the External Borders Fund (EUR 9.2 million).

Moreover, within the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility, the EU has launched structured dialogues on migration, mobility and security with several countries of origin and transit in the Southern Mediterranean. The goal is to develop Mobility Partnerships, ensuring that the movement of persons between the EU and its partner countries is well managed and takes place in a secure environment. The EU and Morocco have reached a political agreement on a Mobility Partnership. Negotiations are ongoing with Tunisia. The dialogue with Jordan has started too, and other countries may follow suit.

In Libya, the EU is implementing five programmes, bilateral and regional, which started pre-revolution for a total of EUR 19 million to support the government in dealing with migration flows and assistance to the migrants. An additional programme (EUR 10 million) started in 2011 to stabilise communities at risk and enhance migration management. Tunisia is also benefitting from regional programmes on capacity building and migration management to the order of EUR 15.3 million.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002494/13
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(4 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Proroga delle concessioni demaniali marittime in Italia e compatibilità con la direttiva «Servizi»

Con l'articolo 34 duodecies del decreto-legge n. 179 del 18 ottobre 2012, convertito successivamente nella legge n. 221 del 17 dicembre 2012, il governo italiano ha introdotto la proroga fino al 31.12.2020 delle concessioni demaniali marittime in scadenza e aventi finalità turistico-ricreative, come ad esempio gli stabilimenti balneari e i punti di ormeggio.

La Legge di stabilità 2013 approvata con la legge 24 dicembre 2012 n. 228, pubblicata sulla Gazzetta ufficiale n. 302 del 29 dicembre 2012, ha esteso la portata della proroga anche alle concessioni demaniali marittime, lacuali e fluviali aventi finalità sportive e di nautica da diporto.

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei fatti sopra descritti? Il governo italiano si è fatto carico di comunicare ufficialmente alla Commissione il provvedimento normativo approvato e i suoi contenuti, per agevolarne la verifica della compatibilità con i disposti della direttiva 2003/126/CE nota come direttiva «Servizi»? Se sì, quando è stata fatta la comunicazione? Qual è la posizione della Commissione in merito alla concessione di tale proroga?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(24 aprile 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza del fatto che la Legge di stabilità 2013 ha esteso la portata della proroga delle concessioni alle concessioni demaniali marittime, lacuali e fluviali aventi finalità sportive e di nautica da diporto.

Spetta agli Stati membri, e non alla Commissione, stabilire la durata adeguata di dette autorizzazioni, qualora il loro numero sia limitato per via della scarsità delle risorse naturali o delle capacità tecniche utilizzabili (articolo 12, paragrafo 1, della direttiva Servizi). Ai sensi dell'articolo 12, paragrafo 2, della direttiva, le autorizzazioni 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 inoltre agli Stati membri stabilire la procedura di rilascio delle autorizzazioni ai sensi degli articoli 9 e 10 e dell'articolo 12, paragrafo 1, della direttiva Servizi.

Il governo italiano non ha ancora comunicato ufficialmente alla Commissione il provvedimento normativo approvato.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002494/13
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Extension of state owned maritime property concessions in Italy and compatibility with the 'Services' Directive

In Article 34(xii) of Decree-Law No 179 of 18 October 2012, converted subsequently into Law No 221 of 17 December 2012, the Italian Government extended state-owned maritime property concessions until 31 December 2020. These were due to expire and are held for recreational and tourism purposes. They include seaside bathing establishments and mooring berths.

The Stability Law of 2013, approved by Law No 228 of 24 December 2012, published in the Official Journal of the Italian State No 302 of 29 December 2012, increased the scope of the extension to state-owned maritime, lakeside and riverside property, used for sports and nautical leisure activities.

Is the Commission aware of these facts? Has the Italian Government undertaken to notify the Commission officially of any approved regulatory measure and its content in order to facilitate verification of its compatibility with the provisions of Directive 2003/126/EC, known as the 'Services' Directive? If so, when was this notification provided? What is the Commission's position regarding this extension?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The Commission is aware that the Stability Law of 2013 increased the scope of the extension of concessions to state-owned maritime, lakeside and riverside property, used for sports and nautical leisure activities.

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(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 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.

The Italian Government has not officially notified the Commission of any approved regulatory measure.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-002495/13
à la Commission
Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(4 mars 2013)

Objet: Instauration d'un délit de négationnisme ou de révisionnisme dans l'Union européenne

La résurgence des mouvements d'extrême droite aux thèses ouvertement racistes, xénophobes et antisémites, la banalisation de leur discours et actes de haine, mais aussi leur entrée fracassante dans certains Parlements nationaux, comme en Hongrie et en Grèce, exigent des instances européennes non seulement une vigilance accrue mais aussi une réponse légale à cette menace pour la démocratie et l'état de droit dans l'Union européenne. L'Union ne peut rester sans réaction face à la multiplication de faits politiques incitant ouvertement à la haine et à la violence. Ces actes vont des propos abjects tenus en mai 2012 par le leader politique du mouvement néo-nazi «Aube dorée» niant la réalité de la Shoah, à la proposition annoncée en novembre 2012 d'un député hongrois membre du parti Jobbik visant à ficher les «citoyens-dirigeants» hongrois de confession juive. Et plus récemment, en février 2013, on peut citer le dépôt d'affiches publicitaires sur les grands boulevards d'Athènes montrant une étoile de David avec une croix gammée placée en son centre. Autant de signes extérieurs d'antisémitisme qui ont suscité l'indignation générale dans l'Union européenne mais qui sont restés impunis. Cela est en parfaite contradiction avec la décision-cadre du Conseil adoptée le 19.4.2007, censée harmoniser au niveau de l'Union européenne les sanctions pénales contre le racisme et la xénophobie, qui laisse à l'évidence trop de marge d'interprétation aux États membres quant à la pénalisation des discours de haine.

Sur la base de ces faits, la Commission a-t-elle l'intention de proposer d'urgence un renforcement de la décision-cadre de 2007 du Conseil concernant la lutte contre le racisme et la xénophobie, afin qu'aucun discours négationniste et d'incitation publique à la violence ou à la haine n'échappe dorénavant à la sanction judiciaire sur le territoire communautaire? La Commission pense-t-elle que le délit de négation de l'holocauste ou d'autres génocides, instauré seulement dans cinq États membres (l'Allemagne, l'Autriche, la Belgique, la France et le Luxembourg), constitue un modèle pénal à généraliser au niveau de l'Union européenne?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(4 avril 2013)

La Commission condamne toutes les formes et manifestations de racisme et de xénophobie, y compris l'antisémitisme, car elles sont incompatibles avec les valeurs sur lesquelles se fonde l'Union européenne. La Commission utilise tous les instruments à sa disposition, dans le respect des pouvoirs conférés à l'Union par les traités, pour lutter contre le racisme et la xénophobie.

Les comportements décrits par l'Honorable Parlementaire sont déjà interdits en vertu du droit de l'Union européenne. La décision-cadre 2008/913/JAI du Conseil ([1]) sur la lutte contre le racisme et la xénophobie oblige tous les États membres de l'UE à rendre passible de sanctions pénales effectives, proportionnées et dissuasives l'incitation publique intentionnelle à la violence ou à la haine visant un groupe de personnes ou un membre d'un tel groupe, défini par exemple par référence à la religion. En outre, cette décision-cadre impose spécifiquement aux États membres de rendre punissables l'apologie, la négation ou la banalisation grossière publiques intentionnelles des crimes dits nazis, y compris la négation de l'holocauste, lorsque le comportement est exercé d'une manière qui risque d'inciter à la violence ou à la haine à l'égard d'un groupe de personnes ou d'un membre d'un tel groupe.

Les États membres étaient tenus de transposer cette décision-cadre dans leur législation nationale au plus tard le 28 novembre 2010. La Commission analyse actuellement les mesures nationales d'exécution communiquées par les États membres et présentera à la fin de cette année un rapport évaluant le respect par ceux-ci de la législation de l'UE en la matière.

Il appartient aux autorités nationales, y compris aux tribunaux, d'examiner tout cas concret de discours de haine fondée sur la religion ou de négation de l'holocauste pour déterminer s'il constitue une incitation à la violence ou à la haine.

([1]) Décision-cadre 2008/913/JAI du Conseil du 28 novembre 2008 sur la lutte contre certaines formes et manifestations de racisme et de xénophobie au moyen du droit pénal, JO L 328 du 6.12.2008, p. 55.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002495/13
to the Commission
Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Making denial or revisionism a crime in the European Union

The resurgence of extreme right-wing movements with openly racist, xenophobic and anti-Semitic philosophies, the trivialisation of their hate speech and hateful behaviour, and their spectacular electoral breakthroughs, for example in Hungary and Greece, require the EU authorities not only to be more vigilant, but also to come up with a legal response to this threat to democracy and the rule of law in the European Union. The EU cannot stand idly by while more and more politicians make statements which openly incite people to racial or religious hatred and violence. Examples include the despicable remarks made by the political leader of the neo-Nazi movement 'Golden Dawn' in May 2012 denying that the Shoah took place and the Jobbik party MP's call to compile a list of prominent citizens in Hungary who are Jews. Most recently, in February 2013 posters featuring a Star of David intertwined with a swastika were displayed along the main streets of Athens. All these overt expressions of anti-Semitism have sparked outrage across the EU, but those responsible have not yet been punished. This is at odds with the Council Framework Decision adopted on 28 November 2008, which is intended to harmonise criminal-law penalties for racism and xenophobia throughout the European Union, but which evidently leaves Member States too wide a margin of interpretation when it comes to punishing hate speech.

In the light of these incidents, does the Commission intend to propose as a matter of urgency a tightening-up of the 2008 Council Framework Decision on combating racism and xenophobia so that any statement denying the Holocaust or inciting racial or religious hatred is henceforth punishable by law in the European Union? Does the Commission agree that the crime of denying the Holocaust or other genocides, which has thus far been introduced in only five Member States (Germany, Austria, Belgium, France and Luxembourg), constitutes a model for a criminal law which should be enacted at EU level?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(4 April 2013)

The Commission condemns all forms and manifestations of racism and xenophobia, including anti-Semitism, as they are incompatible with the values on which the EU is founded. The Commission uses all the instruments at its disposal, in line with the powers conferred to the Union by the Treaties, to fight against racism and xenophobia.

The behaviour referred to by the Honourable Member is already prohibited under the European Union law. Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA ([1]) on combating racism and xenophobia obliges all EU Member States to make punishable by effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred directed against a group of persons or a member of such a group defined for instance by reference to religion. Furthermore, this framework Decision specifically obliges Member States to make punishable the intentional public condoning, denial or gross trivialisation of the so called Nazi crimes, including the Holocaust denial, when the conduct is carried out in a manner likely to incite violence or hatred against a group or a member of such a group.

Member States were obliged to transpose this framework Decision into their national laws by 28 November 2010. The Commission is currently analysing the national implementing measures notified by Member States and it will present its assessment on Member States' compliance with this EC law in a report at the end of this year.

It is for national authorities, including courts, to investigate any concrete situations of religious hate speech or Holocaust denial and to determine whether they represent incitement to violence or hatred.

([1]) Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OJ L 328, p. 55.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002496/13
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(4. marts 2013)

Om: Regelsættet for sø-radioer i Europa

En borger har rettet henvendelse til mig vedrørende typegodkendelser af radioer til søs. Borgeren giver udtryk for, at der er mange forskellige standarder for radioer til søs. Det er der ikke noget problem med, men borgeren fortæller i samme forbindelse, at det ikke i Danmark er tilladt at bruge andre sø-radioer, end dem der er godkendt i Danmark. Det skulle således være ulovligt at bruge en tysk godkendt sø-radio på et dansk skib eller en dansk båd.

Mit indtryk fra arbejdet i Europa-Parlamentets Udvalg for Indre Marked og Forbrugerbeskyttelse (IMCO) er, at vi som udgangspunkt har en gensidig anerkendelse af produkter. Det betyder, at hvis et produkt er godkendt i Tyskland, skullle det også kunne bruges i Danmark.

Mit spørgsmål er derfor følgende:

Kan Kommissionen svare på, hvad regelsættet for sø-radioer er i EU, og om det er korrekt, at der findes sø-radioer godkendt i et medlemsland, der ikke er lovligt i et andet medlemsland?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Siim Kallas
(30. april 2013)

Skibsradioer om bord på skibe, der fører en EU-medlemsstats flag, skal være typegodkendt i overensstemmelse med kravene i direktiv 96/98/EF ([1]). En sådan typegodkendelse udføres af et bemyndiget organ, som er godkendt til at løse opgaven, og som handler på vegne af en medlemsstat. Hvis udstyret er i overensstemmelse med kravene, udsteder det bemyndigede organ et certifikat, og udstyret »ratmærkes« (hvilket svarer til CE-mærkningen, men gælder specifikt for udstyr på skibe).

Radioudstyr, der er godkendt i overensstemmelse med nævnte direktiv, kan anbringes om bord på ethvert EU-skib. Derfor skal radioudstyr, som er godkendt af et bemyndiget organ i Tyskland, og som er forsynet med ratmærket, accepteres, hvis det er anbragt om bord på skibe, der fører en hvilken som helst EU-medlemsstats flag.

([1]) Rådets direktiv 96/98/EF af 20. december 1996 om udstyr på skibe — EFT L 46 af 17.2.1997.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002496/13
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Rules on shipboard radios in Europe

A constituent has asked me a question about type approval for radios used at sea. He says there are many different standards for radios in use at sea. That is not a problem, but in this connection he tells me that in Denmark it is not permissible to use shipboard radios other than those which are type-approved in Denmark. So it would be illegal to use a German type-approved shipboard radio on a Danish vessel

I have the impression, from my work in Parliament's Committee on the internal market and Consumer Protection, that our basic principle is mutual recognition of products. In other words, if a product is approved in Germany it should also be possible to use it in Denmark.

My question is therefore this:

Can the Commission state what the rules are for shipboard radios in the EU, and whether it is true that some shipboard radios approved in one Member State are not legal in another?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

Shipboard radios placed on board ships flying the flag of an EU Member State have to be type approved in accordance with the requirements laid down in Directive 96/98/EC ([1]). Such type approval is carried out by a Notified Body who is accredited to do so and who acts on behalf of a Member State. If the equipment complies with the requirments a certificate will be issued by the Notified Body and the equipment will be 'wheelmarked' (which is similar to CE marking but specifically for marine equipment).

Radio equipment approved in accordance with the said Directive can be placed on board any EU ship. Therefore, radio equipment which is certified by a Notified Body in Germany and bears the wheelmark must be accepted if installed on a ship flying the flag of any other Member State.

([1]) Council Directive 96/98/EC of 20 December 1996 on marine equipment, OJ L 46, 17.2.1997.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002497/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(4. März 2013)

Betrifft: Reform der GAP — Ausrichtung der Fördersummen

Die Pläne zur Reform der gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik (GAP) sehen im Moment eine obere Grenze für die Zahlungen pro Betrieb von 300 000 EUR vor. Zudem soll die Degressivität der Subventionen bei 100 000 EUR beginnen. Durch diese recht hoch angesetzte Obergrenze von 300 000 EUR wäre nur ein sehr kleiner Anteil der europäischen Betriebe betroffen.

Ein Alternativvorschlag sieht vor, diese Obergrenze für die jährlichen Zahlungen pro Betrieb bei 100 000 EUR anzusetzen und die Degressivität der Zahlungen bei 20 000 EUR beginnen zu lassen. Auf diese Weise wären die möglichen Einsparungen weitaus größer, wobei dieses Geld nun, dem Alternativvorschlag zufolge, mehr den kleinen Betrieben zugutekommen soll.

Aus dem Originalplan (Obergrenze bei 300 000 EUR) entsteht der Eindruck, dass die Kommission eigentlich nicht will, dass sich wirklich etwas am Verteilungsverhältnis ändert — trotz aller Ankündigungen. Die von der Kommission initiierte intensive und erfolgreiche Debatte zum Thema der GAP-Reform ließ deutlich werden, dass die Förderung insbesondere kleinerer, familiärer Betriebe im Fokus der GAP stehen sollte. Der Originalplan wirkt aber vielmehr wie ein Zugeständnis an die Lobbyarbeit der Großbetriebe.

1. Ist der Kommission der Alternativplan bekannt?

2. Wieso sieht der Originalplan nur bestenfalls als marginal zu bezeichnende Änderungen der Ausgestaltung und Deckelung der Fördersummen für landwirtschaftliche Betriebe vor?

3. Was hält die Kommission von den Vorschlägen des Alternativplans?

4. Ist die Kommission der Auffassung, dass kleinere Betriebe durch die Reform mehr profitieren sollten oder dass das Verteilungsverhältnis wenig Änderung erfahren sollte?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(22. April 2013)

Die Kommission verweist auf ihre im Oktober 2011 angenommenen Reformvorschläge, die von Europäischem Parlament und Rat im ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren erlassen werden.

Nach Ansicht der Kommission sollte die Reform allen landwirtschaftlichen Betrieben zugutekommen, zumal alle zu der Bereitstellung öffentlicher Güter beitragen. Andererseits wird auch davon ausgegangen, dass größere Betriebe aufgrund größenbedingter Kostenvorteile weniger Einkommensförderung benötigen, weshalb die Obergrenze vorgeschlagen wurde. Die Obergrenze sollte jedoch nicht die laufende Strukturanpassung in dem Sektor beeinträchtigen oder zur Aufspaltung landwirtschaftlicher Betriebe aus rein beihilfetechnischen Gründen führen, um die Bestimmungen zu umgehen. Daher wurde der Mechanismus so konzipiert, dass er schrittweise angewendet wird und dem Beschäftigungsniveau Rechnung trägt, das die in den Mitgliedstaaten unterschiedlichen Betriebsstrukturen widerspiegelt.

Eine Obergrenze und die schrittweise Herabsetzung der Direktzahlungen sind nur einige der Instrumente, um die Unterstützung besser und gezielter zu verteilen. Die Reformvorschläge enthalten auch spezifische Bestimmungen für Kleinbetriebe in Bezug auf Direktzahlungen und die Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums, insbesondere die vereinfachte Regelung für Kleinlandwirte. Darüber hinaus haben sowohl das Parlament als auch der Rat eine Aufstockung für die ersten Hektar vorgeschlagen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002497/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: CAP reform: targeting of subsidies

Under current plans to reform the common agricultural policy (CAP) it is proposed that the ceiling for payments per farm should be EUR 300 000. Furthermore, subsidies would start to be digressive from EUR 100 000. This very high ceiling of EUR 300 000 would affect only a very small proportion of European farms.

An alternative proposal is to set this upper limit for annual per-farm payments at EUR 100 000 and the point after which the payments become digressive at EUR 20 000. This would make the potential savings considerably greater, and under the alternative plan more of this money would benefit small farms.

The original plan, with its EUR 300 000 ceiling, gives the impression that the Commission, despite what it has said, does not really want the distribution ratio to change. The intensive and fruitful debate launched by the Commission on the CAP reform made it clear that the CAP should focus in particular on aiding small family farms. However, the original plan looks more like a concession to the big farm lobby.

1. Is the Commission aware of the alternative plan?

2. Why does the original plan confine itself to making changes to the structure of farm subsidies, and the extent of their cover, that can at best be described as marginal?

3. What is the Commission's view of the proposals in the alternative plan?

4. Does the Commission consider that small farms should benefit more from the reform, or that the distribution ratio should stay largely the same?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

The Commission refers to its reform proposals adopted in October 2011 which will be adopted in the ordinary legislative procedure by the Council and the European Parliament.

The Commission considers that all farms should benefit from the reform, especially since they all contribute to the provision of public goods. On the other hand, it is also considered that bigger holdings need less public support to their income due to the economy of scale which is the reason why the capping was proposed. However, capping should not impede the ongoing structural adjustment in the sector or incite the artificial splitting of farms to circumvent the provisions. Hence, the mechanism was designed to apply in a progressive manner and to take into account employment levels reflecting the different farm structures across Member States.

Capping and progressive reduction of direct payments is only part of a number of elements aimed at improving the distribution and targeting of support. The reform proposals contain also specific provisions aimed at small farms, both in direct payments and in rural development, notably the simplified scheme for small farmers. Both the Parliament and the Council have further proposed to provide a top-up for the first hectares.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002499/13
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Air pollution in London

A study released on 22 January 2013 by King's College London showed that on-road application of dust suppressants was largely ineffective in reducing PM^{10} pollution (with some exceptions).

This method of pollution management was championed by the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, who hailed it as a 'wonderful contraption that tackles air quality head-on', at the expense of more conventional pollution reduction schemes.

As the ineffectiveness of this scheme has been conclusively proven, can the Commission please:

— explain why it has closed its infringement procedure against the UK with respect to PM^{10} pollution in London?

— state whether any subsequent infringement procedure against the UK with respect to PM^{10} pollution will have to commence again at the letter of formal notice stage, or whether it can commence at a later stage in order to save time in respect of enforcement?

— indicate the current status of the EU pilot project, which took over the complaint made to the EU, in a letter dated 15 January 2012, by Clean Air in London?

— give details of the Commission's powers to require the UK to adopt more effective and proven methods of pollution reduction within London by set deadlines?

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

The Commission closed its infringement procedure against the UK with respect of PM^{10} pollution in London because the monitoring data provided by the UK authorities for 2011 showed that the zone was compliant with the requirements of Directive 2008/50/EC ([1]) on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe. If there are future breaches of the directive, these will have to be dealt with under a new procedure.

Experience shows that dust suppressants work well in complex industrial and waste sites or construction sites. The Commission has discussed the results of the dust suppressants trials with the UK authorities that have found them to be of limited effectiveness as far as on-road application was concerned. The Commission has yet to conclude its final assessment of the Clean Air in London complaint.

([1]) OJ L 152, 11.6.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002500/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Water label

The Commission has ambitious plans to improve water efficiency in commercial and private buildings. However, there is growing concern that some of the proposed measures fail to bring actual savings, have not been sufficiently followed up, and overlap with national legislation. With this in mind, could the Commission consider the following questions?

1. Now that Water Using Products have been identified under the recent announcement of the Ecodesign work programme for the coming period, what data exist that ascertain the actual savings to be made in terms of water, energy and carbon reduction from behaviour studies (there are many reports offering theoretical savings, but consumers do not use products to their full capacity [flow or volume]: for example, taps are rarely turned on to full flow as the user will get drenched due to splashing)?

2. Given the effort put into the development of the Ecolabel for taps and showers, as well as for WCs and urinals, can the Commission confirm that the Ecolabel truly represents the top 15% of products on the European market?

3. Industry has its own voluntary scheme which is now gathering widespread backing, not just via the manufacturing base but also via the supply chain. With this in mind, what efforts is the Commission making in support of voluntary initiatives which allow industry to lead on such measures?

4. Within the current parliamentary term, where does the Commission see Ecodesign measures for Water Using Products falling in the delivery timeframe?

5. Currently the proposed Ecolabel overlaps significantly with some national legislative measures on materials in contact, under the Drinking Water Directive. This causes major concern and confusion for manufacturers attempting to comply with a rapidly expanding set of EU requirements. Can the Commission explain how to ensure that there is consistency between existing legislative acts such as RoHS, REACH, Hazardous Substances in the CPR and the Drinking Water Directive and those covered in Ecolabel and, potentially, Ecodesign?

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

1. There are several studies on water related products to estimate possible savings. Some of those carried out by the Commission are available online ([1]). The Commission will also launch new preparatory studies on water related products which will seek to add to the evidence already available.

2. The Ecolabel Regulation ([2]) indicates that criteria 'shall correspond indicatively to the best 10-20% of the products available'. The Ecolabel criteria set for water related products aim, as much as possible, to follow such indication.

3. The Commission services have met with the various industry associations developing such voluntary schemes. They have also encouraged dialogue amongst the different scheme in an effort to provide clearer and more consistent communication to European consumers.

4. The Commission services are about to launch preparatory studies based on the Ecodesign Working Plan 2012-2014. The studies are expected to deliver final results in 18 to 24 months. If the Commission decided to introduce any new policies (mandatory labelling and/or mandatory ecodesign and/or voluntary agreements), the political process to develop a proposal, discuss with stakeholders and Member States would take about an additional 12 months, followed by the scrutiny by Council and European Parliament.

([1]) Available at, for example, http://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ecotapware/; http://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/toilets/index.html
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/quantity/water_efficiency.htm#buildings
http://www.ecodesign-wp2.eu/documents.htm

([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32010R0066:EN:NOT

5. The Ecolabel criteria for water related products have been thoroughly discussed with all stakeholders including industry. The preparatory studies for water related products under the Ecodesign Working Plan and the possible legislative process thereafter will also consider the issue of consistency across various legislations, as relevant.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002501/13
to the Commission
Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Food packaging

Does the Commission have any plans to revise Directive 94/62/EC on packaging and packaging waste in order to:

1. Ensure that manufacturers are limiting the weight and volume of packaging to the minimum required in order to satisfy safety and hygiene standards?

2. Look at the possibility of setting a maximum level of packaging for some products?

3. Prevent manufacturers from misleading consumers through the use of unnecessary packaging?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2013)

The Commission does not currently have plans to review Directive 94/62/EC on packaging and packaging waste ([1]) with respect to the weight, volume and level of packaging. These aspects are covered by the essential requirements set out in Article 9 and Annex II of the directive. Nevertheless it does intend to consider the recycling targets in the directive as part of a review of waste legislation foreseen in 2014.

On a more general note, it is worth recalling that, as laid down in the Commission Work Programme for 2013[1], the Commission is undertaking an *ex-post* examination ('fitness check') of five waste stream Directives, including Directive 94/62/EC.

Directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices ([2]), prevents trader from deceiving consumers on the main characteristics of the product, its price and on its overall presentation, including the packaging when this can influence the economic behaviour of consumers. Any alleged breach of the directive should be brought to the attention of national authorities and courts which are primarily responsible for its enforcement.

([1]) OJ L 365, 31.12.1994; p.10-23.
([2]) Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market and amending Council Directive 84/450/EEC, Directives 97/7/EC and 2002/65 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council (Unfair Commercial Practices Directive).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002502/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Equatorial Guinea and lawyer Ponciano Mbomnio Nvo

Ponciano Mbomnio Nvo has been a lawyer in Equatorial Guinea since 1992, teaching law at the Universidad Española a Distancia in Malabo. He is a member of the Equatorial Guinea Bar Association and has been a strong critic of government interference with the judiciary.

In April 2012 Ponciano Mbomnio Nvo was suspended for two years from the Equatorial Guinea Bar Association for alleged misconduct, and he was given no information concerning any charge against him.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of Ponciano Mbomnio Nvo's case?

2. What representations, if any, have been made to the Equatorial Guinea authorities with regard to his status?

3. What steps are being taken by the Vice-President/High Representative and by the Union as a whole to support an independent judiciary within Equatorial Guinea?

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

The HR/VP has been made aware of the situation of Mr Ponciano Mbomio Nvo since he received a suspension from the Bar after the trial of Dr Wenceslao Masongo, the opposition member and human rights activist whose situation the EU had already been following closely.

Mr Mbomnio Nvo has had personal contact with EU representatives and also attended the civil society dialogue organised by the Spanish local Presidency in December 2012 where he had the opportunity to present his case.

There have been contacts with the Equatorial Guinean authorities in Brussels who have shown openness towards discussing the issue. From the information currently available, the suspension of his lawyer licence is being dealt with before the national authorities by the International Bar Association, of which he is a member.

The overall human rights' situation in Equatorial Guinea remains of concern to the EU and it continues to be monitored it, in particular the case of Mr Ponciano Mbomio Nvo which is addressed through contacts with the authorities.

Since Equatorial Guinea did not ratify the revised Cotonou Agreement, possibilities of cooperation with the country are limited. Programmes of the 9th EDF which targeted the judicial police capacity building are now closed.

Much, however, remains to be done with regard to the separation of powers. The EU will therefore monitor the reforms introduced by the new constitution very closely. The reforms, including the creation of an Ombudsman position, are due to be introduced after the next legislative elections which are scheduled for 26 May 2013.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-002503/13
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2013. gada 4. marts)

Temats: Austrumu partnerības papildinstruments

Gruzijā 2013. gada 12. februārī notika neoficiālā Austrumu partnerības dialoga otrā sanāksme, kur ar Gruzijas Eiropas un eiroatlantiskās integrācijas valsts ministru *A. Petriashvili* tika parakstīts finanšu nolīgums ar mērķi atbalstīt reformu procesu Gruzijā.

Šo instrumentu, kas papildina Austrumu partnerību, 2012. gada jūnijā aizsāka komisārs Štefans File.

Vai neoficiālais Austrumu partnerības dialogs ir sniedzis kādus konkrētus rezultātus attiecībā uz Ukrainu?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Štefans File
(2013. gada 8. maijs)

Iesakām godātajam deputātam iepazīties ar vēstulēm, ko komisārs File nosūtīja Ārlietu komitejas (*AFET*) priekšsēdētājam, Eiropas Parlamenta deputātam Broka kungam pēc neoficiālā partnerības dialoga pirmās sanāksmes 2012. gada jūnijā Kišiņevā un otrās sanāksmes 2013. gada februārī Tbilisi. Abās vēstulēs ir sniegts lietderīgs kopsavilkums par apspriedēm, kas notika abu neoficiālo Austrumu partnerības dialogu ietvaros.

Neoficiālie Austrumu partnerības dialogi tiek rīkoti divreiz gadā, lai dotu iespēju neformāli apspriest jaunākos notikumus visās partnervalstīs un apmainīties ar viedokļiem par partnervalstu progresu, kas panākts, īstenojot saskaņoto reformu politiku. Īpaši ņemot vērā to neformālo atmosfēru, kas ļauj izveidot personiskus kontaktus ministru līmenī, šādi dialogi tādējādi papildina ikgadējās Austrumu partnerības ministru sanāksmes un oficiālās sadarbības padomes.

Šos neoficiālos Austrumu partnerības dialogus veido trīs elementi: vispārējs dialogs, Austrumu partnerības rīcības plāna īstenošanas uzraudzība un vajadzības gadījumā nozaru formāta dialoga sanāksmes, lai pārskatītu sadarbību. Līdz ar to neoficiālais dialogs ir iespēja iesaistīties padziļinātā dialogā ar visām sešām partnervalstīm un palīdz mums labāk izprast to politiskās prioritātes un attīstības tendences.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002503/13
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Complimentary tool to the Eastern Partnership

On 12 February 2013, the second meeting of the Informal Eastern Partnership Dialogue took place in Georgia, where a financial agreement was signed with Georgian Minister for European and Euro-Atlantic integration Alexander Petriashvili to support the reform process in Georgia.

This complimentary tool to the Eastern Partnership was launched by Commissioner Füle in June 2012.

Has the Informal Eastern Partnership Dialogue produced any concrete results with regard to Ukraine?

Answer given by Mr Fuele on behalf of the Commission
(8 May 2013)

The Honourable Member is referred to the letters that Commissioner Fuele sent to Member of the European Parliament Brok, Chair of the AFET Committee, after the first meeting of the Informal Partnership Dialogue in Chisinau in June 2012 and the second meeting in Tbilisi in February 2013. Both letters provide a useful record of the discussions held at both Eastern Partnership Informal Dialogues.

The informal Eastern Partnership Dialogues are held twice a year to provide an opportunity informally to discuss the latest developments in all partner countries and to exchange views on the progress made by partners in implementing agreed reform policies. Notably given their informal nature allowing for personal contacts to be developed at Ministerial level, the Dialogues therefore complement the annual Eastern Partnership Ministerial meetings and formal Cooperation Councils.

These informal Eastern Partnership Dialogues consist of three elements: general dialogue, monitoring implementation of the Eastern Partnership Road Map and, when appropriate, dialogue meetings in sectoral formats to review cooperation. Consequently, the Informal Dialogue provides the opportunity to engage in a deeper dialogue with all six partner countries and helps us to understand better their political priorities and trends.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002504/13
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Free trade ageement with the United States and GMOs

A free trade agreement (FTA) between the European Union and the United States could help deliver a EUR 190 billion increase in the EU's gross domestic product.

The European Union currently has rules which reflect public sentiment on the use of genetically modified organisms (GMOs). However, the United States has a far weaker GMO regulatory system which assumes that GM foods are no different from non-GM foods and so do not require special regulatory oversight or safety tests.

What assurances can the Commission provide that current EU rules on GMOs will not be weakened by any FTA with the United States?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2013)

The Commission considers the protection of health and the environment as a top priority and is committed to ensuring that genetically modified (GM) seed, food and feed are allowed only when it has been established, on the basis of a thorough examination, that they do not have adverse effects on human health, animal health or the environment.

When presenting the EU-US trade and investment agreement at a press conference on the 13 February 2013, the Commission stated the following: 'These negotiations are not about compromising the health of our consumers for commercial gains. We will not negotiate changes of the basic rules that we do not want on either side, be it on hormones or GMOs. Basic regulations, like those relating to GMOS will not be part of the negotiations.'

Consequently, the EU regulatory system for GMOs, which is considered the strictest in the world for the approval of GMOs, will continue to operate as normal.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002505/13
à la Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(4 mars 2013)

Objet: Affichage des prix des carburants lisible depuis la voie publique pour les consommateurs

L'affichage des prix des carburants destiné à informer le consommateur à l'entrée des stations d'essence ne fait pas l'objet d'une réglementation européenne.

En France, un arrêté de 1988 sur la publicité des prix de vente des carburants rend obligatoire l'affichage du prix, lisible depuis la voie publique, pour une identification précise de chaque produit et de son prix. En ce qui concerne les stations-service d'autoroutes, le prix doit être signalé à l'avance, sous forme de panneaux implantés entre 500 et 1 000 mètres avant l'entrée de l'aire. Cette réglementation permet une information complète du consommateur, qui peut librement décider de rester sur l'autoroute ou d'en sortir pour prendre son carburant. Le non-affichage des prix à l'entrée des stations-service dans beaucoup de pays européens empêche ce libre choix du consommateur.

Le droit d'information des consommateurs est de ce fait inégal sur le territoire européen.

La Commission envisage-t-elle d'uniformiser au niveau européen l'affichage des prix du carburant dans les stations d'essence pour une meilleure information du consommateur?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(17 mai 2013)

Conformément à la directive 2005/29 ([1]) relative aux pratiques commerciales déloyales des entreprises et dans le cas d'une invitation à l'achat, les professionnels doivent fournir aux consommateurs des informations substantielles concernant les produits offerts à la vente, notamment le prix toutes taxes comprises, pour leur permettre de prendre une décision d'achat en connaissance de cause.

En ce qui concerne les carburants — un marché important pour les consommateurs, sur lequel le prix est une préoccupation majeure — les différents pays ont pris des mesures supplémentaires pour aider les consommateurs à faire des choix éclairés. À cet égard, la Commission a été informée que des observatoires des prix en ligne sont disponibles pour les consommateurs en France et en Italie. De plus, dans ces deux pays et au Portugal, les meilleurs prix des carburants sont aussi affichés au bord des autoroutes.

La Commission n'envisage pas actuellement de prendre une initiative législative pour harmoniser l'affichage des prix des carburants sur les autoroutes. Cependant, la Commission a entrepris une étude de marché approfondie sur les carburants des véhicules en 2012, suite aux résultats du sixième tableau de bord des marchés de consommation, dans lequel le marché des carburants était placé en avant-dernière position parmi les marchés des biens. En particulier, l'étude de marché (qui devrait être achevée fin 2013) évaluera si les consommateurs sont en mesure de faire des choix éclairés et inclura des aspects relatifs à la compréhension du consommateur et à la transparence de l'information.

([1]) JO L 149 du 11.6.2005, article 2, point i), et article 7, paragraphe 4, point c).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002505/13
to the Commission
Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Displaying fuel prices clearly

There are currently no EU rules governing the way fuel prices are displayed at the entrance to service stations.

In France, a 1998 decree on advertising fuel prices requires service stations to ensure that road users can clearly see what products are on sale and what prices are being charged. In the case of motorway service stations, prices must be displayed on a billboard positioned between 500 and 1 000 metres ahead of the entrance to the service station. This rule ensures that consumers are given all the information they need so that they can decide whether to keep driving or stop for fuel. In many European countries fuel prices are not displayed at the entrance to service stations, preventing road users from making an informed choice.

Consumers' access to information thus varies from one Member State to another.

Does the Commission have any plans to standardise the way fuel prices are displayed at service stations across Europe so that road users can make more informed decisions?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(17 May 2013)

Under the Unfair Commercial Practices (UCP) Directive 2005/29 ([1]) and in the case of an invitation to purchase, traders have to provide consumers with material information, including the price, inclusive of taxes, of the products offered for sale, in order to enable them to make an informed purchase decision.

Concerning fuels — an important market for consumers, in which prices are a key concern — different countries have taken supplementary measures to assist consumers in making informed choices. In this respect, the Commission was informed that in France and Italy online price observatories are available to consumers. Additionally, in these two countries and in Portugal the cheapest fuel prices are also displayed along motorways.

At this moment, the Commission is not planning to initiate legislation on harmonising the display of fuel prices on motorways. However, the Commission initiated an in-depth market study on vehicle fuels in 2012, following the findings from the 6th Consumer Markets Scoreboard, where the fuels market was ranked by EU consumers the second lowest amongst the goods markets. In particular, the market study (expected to be concluded in late 2013) will assess whether consumers are able to make informed choices and will include issues related to consumer understanding and transparency of information.

([1]) OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, Articles 2(i) and 7(4)(c).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002506/13
al Consiglio
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(4 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Richiesta di maggiori informazioni al Consiglio sulla valutazione dell'IMU in Italia da parte dell'UE

In risposta all'interrogazione P-000155/2013 la Commissione ha espresso la seguente precisa affermazione secondo la quale la tassazione della proprietà e quindi dei beni immobili, se definita in maniera adeguata, sarebbe meno dannosa sugli obiettivi di lungo termine di crescita e quindi preferibile a quella sul lavoro e sul capitale, come specificamente raccomandato dal Consiglio dell'UE all'Italia nel luglio 2012, su raccomandazione della Commissione stessa. Si riporta qui di seguito un estratto della risposta della Commissione: «For this reason, in July 2012, the Council[1], under recommendation by the Commission, recommended Italy to "(…) Take further action to shift the tax burden away from capital and labour to property and consumption as well as environment."»

Potrebbe il Consiglio far sapere su quali precisi elementi, dati ed analisi economiche sia possibile fare una tale importante affermazione sulla politica fiscale ed economica?

Il Consiglio si è basato unicamente sulla raccomandazione della Commissione o ha effettuato una sua analisi?

Si contesta tale raccomandazione che non tiene conto in maniera adeguata della situazione italiana dove la proprietà della prima casa (colpita nel caso specifica dall'imposta IMU) rappresenta un elemento fondamentale dell'economia reale e che dovrebbe essere oggetto di tutela e non di preferenza di una politica nazionale fiscale che non rallenti la crescita come suggerito dal Consiglio nella sua raccomandazione. L'impatto dell'imposta IMU in Italia ha avuto evidenti ripercussioni sull'intero sistema economico, dallo stallo del settore delle costruzioni e dei relativi servizi a quello della compravendita di immobili ed irrigidimento del credito ipotecario da parte delle banche a quello della riduzione del potere di acquisto dei cittadini oggetto della tassazione e quindi di una generale riduzione dei consumi.

Su quali basi è possibile affermare che una tale tassazione della proprietà e dei consumi sia preferibile a una tassazione dei capitali? Si chiede una precisa presa di posizione del Consiglio e una valutazione di impatto ex post delle proprie raccomandazioni.

Risposta
(28 maggio 2013)

A norma dell'articolo 2-bis ter, paragrafo 2, del regolamento (CE) n. 1466/1997 del Consiglio per il rafforzamento della sorveglianza delle posizioni di bilancio nonché della sorveglianza e del coordinamento delle politiche economiche ([1]), si presume che il Consiglio di norma segua le raccomandazioni e le proposte della Commissione o esponga la propria posizione pubblicamente.

Le raccomandazioni all'Italia proposte dalla Commissione sono state esaminate dal Consiglio, il quale ha seguito la Commissione sui provvedimenti raccomandati adottando sei raccomandazioni all'Italia ([2]) e ha modificato quanto al merito una sola delle raccomandazioni.

Nella quinta raccomandazione — non modificata — il Consiglio raccomanda all'Italia di proseguire la lotta contro l'evasione fiscale, perseguire l'economia sommersa e il lavoro non dichiarato, ad esempio intensificando verifiche e controlli, adottare misure per ridurre la portata delle esenzioni fiscali, le indennità e le aliquote IVA ridotte e semplificare il codice tributario, nonché intraprendere ulteriori azioni per spostare il carico fiscale dal lavoro e dal capitale verso i consumi e i patrimoni nonché l'ambiente.

([1]) Modificato dal regolamento (UE) n. 1175/2011 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 16 novembre 2011, GU L 306 del 23.11.2011, pag. 12.
([2]) Doc. 11259/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002506/13
to the Council
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Request for further information from the Council regarding the EU's assessment of the IMU property tax in Italy

In reply to Question P-000155/2013, the Commission takes the view that the taxation of immovable property, if properly aligned to their market values, would be less harmful to long-term growth and hence preferable to the taxation of capital and labour. This dovetails with the Council's specific recommendation to Italy in July 2012, on the proposal of the Commission, worded as follows: 'For this reason, in July 2012, the Council [1], under recommendation by the Commission, recommended Italy to "(…) take further action to shift the tax burden away from capital and labour to property and consumption as well as environment"'.

Can the Council indicate what specific elements, data or economic findings could justify such a bold financial and economic policy statement?

Did the Council make its recommendation on the basis of information supplied by the Commission alone, or did it carry out its own analysis?

This recommendation is questionable, in so far as it fails to take account sufficiently of the situation in Italy, where first home ownership (affected by the IMU property tax) is of fundamental importance to the real economy and should therefore be protected rather than singled out under a national taxation policy in a bid to avoid slowing down growth, as recommended by the Council. The IMU property tax in Italy has had a manifest effect on the entire economic situation, including stagnation of the construction and related sectors, the purchase and sale of properties and the bank mortgage freeze, a reduction in the individual buying power of taxpayers and hence a general fall in consumption.

On what basis can it reasonably be stated that the taxation of property and consumption is preferable to the taxation of capital? Can the Council state its position in detail and give an *ex post* impact assessment in respect of its recommendations?

Reply
(28 May 2013)

Pursuant to Article 2-ab(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1466/1997 on the strengthening of the surveillance of budgetary positions and the surveillance and coordination of economic policies ([1]) the Council is expected to, as a rule, follow the recommendations and proposals of the Commission or explain its position publicly.

The recommendations to Italy proposed by the Commission were examined within the Council, which followed the Commission on the recommended action by adopting six recommendations to Italy ([2]) and modified the content of only one of the recommendation.

In Recommendation number five — which was not modified — the Council recommended that Italy pursue the fight against tax evasion, the shadow economy and undeclared work, for instance by stepping up checks and controls, take measures to reduce the scope of tax exemptions, allowances and reduced VAT rates and simplify the tax code and take further action to shift the tax burden away from capital and labour to property and consumption as well as environment.

([1]) As amended by Regulation 1175/12 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011, OJ L 306, 23.11.2011, p. 12.
([2]) 11259/12.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002507/13
alla Commissione
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(4 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Richiesta di maggiori informazioni alla Commissione sulla valutazione dell'IMU in Italia da parte dell'UE

La risposta all'interrogazione P-000155/2013 la Commissione ha espresso la seguente precisa affermazione secondo la quale «la tassazione della proprietà e quindi dei beni immobili, se definita in maniera adeguata, sarebbe meno dannosa sugli obiettivi di lungo termine di crescita e quindi preferibile a quella sul lavoro e sul capitale», come specificamente raccomandato dal Consiglio dell'UE all'Italia, su raccomandazione della Commissione stessa.

Potrebbe la Commissione far sapere su quali precisi elementi, dati ed analisi economiche sia possibile fare una tale affermazione che è relativa a una tematica strettamente di politica fiscale ed economica degli Stati membri e che ricade nella sfera di competenza di altri Commissari dell'UE rispetto, all'autore della risposta?

Nella stessa interrogazione, in relazione alla richiesta di valutazione dell'imposta sugli immobili IMU applicata anche alle prime case di proprietà, la Commissione ammette tuttavia che la relazione cui viene fatto riferimento nell'interrogazione è basata sui soli dati disponibili e quindi non aggiornati alla specifica situazione italiana, il che conferma la non appropriatezza di una tale affermazione di politica fiscale ed economica che non tiene conto in maniera adeguata della situazione italiana dove la proprietà della prima casa rappresenta un elemento fondamentale dell'economia reale, che dovrebbe essere oggetto di tutela e non di preferenza di una politica di tassazione che non rallenti la crescita, come suggerito dalla Commissione. L'impatto dell'IMU ha evidenti ripercussioni sull'intero sistema economico, dallo stallo del settore delle costruzioni e relativi servizi, alle compravendite del settore immobiliare, a quello della riduzione del potere di acquisto dei cittadini soggetti al pagamento dell'IMU e quindi di una conseguente riduzione dei consumi.

Può la Commissione fornire una più attenta e adeguata valutazione?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(3 maggio 2013)

Il capitolo 4 della rassegna del 2012 *Occupazione e sviluppi sociali in Europa* ([1]) analizza i fattori specifici, i dati e le analisi economiche che hanno consentito di pervenire alle risultanze nel capitolo relativo agli impatti occupazionali e distributivi di diverse forme di tassazione.

Un'analisi della tassazione della proprietà immobiliare e una base per la raccomandazione della Commissione di trasferire la tassazione dall'imposizione diretta sul lavoro e sul capitale a imposte periodiche sui beni immobili figurano anche nel capitolo 5 della relazione *Tax reforms in EU Member States 2012, European Economy 6:2012.* ([2])

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=7315.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-6_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002507/13
to the Commission
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Request for additional information from the Commission regarding the EU's assessment of IMU property tax in Italy

In reply to Question P-000155/2013, the Commission expressed the opinion that the taxation of property, if properly conceived, is less harmful to long-term growth objectives and hence preferable to tax on labour and capital. This view is also contained in a Council proposal based on the Commission's own recommendation.

Can the Commission indicate the specific factors, data and economic analyses on which it based its assessment relating directly to the financial and economic policies of the Member States, that is to say matters falling within the remit of EU Commissioners other than the author of the reply?

With regard to IMU property tax on first homes, the Commission is forced to concede that that its information has not been updated to take account of current developments in Italy, automatically throwing doubt on its financial and economic assessments, given that in Italy first home ownership is of fundamental importance in economic terms and should therefore be protected rather than taxed in preference to other areas in order, as the Commission suggests, to avoid slowing down growth. IMU property tax is clearly having an impact across the entire economic spectrum, with the construction sector and related activities as well as the property market currently in the doldrums, and consumption figures further reduced as result of the erosion of purchasing power of those forced to pay the tax in question.

In view of this, can the Commission give a more carefully considered and accurate assessment of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2013)

Chapter 4 of the 2012 *Employment and Social Developments in Europe* review ([1]) elaborates on the specific factors, data and economic analyses which have served as bases for the Chapter's findings concerning the employment and distributional impacts of various forms of taxation.

An analysis of immovable property taxation and a basis for the Commission's recommendation to shift taxation from direct taxes on labour and capital to recurrent taxes on immovable property is also available in Chapter 5 of the *Tax reforms in EU Member States 2012, European Economy 6:2012* ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=7315
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-6_en.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002508/13
aan de Commissie
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(4 maart 2013)

Betreft: Brusselse voorstellen voor opsplitsen spoor negatief voor Nederland

De Europese Commissie heeft voorgesteld ([1]) het binnenlands passagiersvervoer op het spoor open te stellen voor concurrentie. Bij het goederenvervoer en het internationaal vervoer op het spoor is concurrentie nu al wel verplicht, maar bij de passagiers nog niet. Volgens de berichtgeving betekent dit dat Nederland wordt opgedeeld in meerdere delen (meerdere vervoersaanbieders) ([2]).

1. De Commissie denkt dat de geplande liberalisering zal leiden tot lagere prijzen. Hoe denkt de Commissie dat met de opsplitsing van de spoorsystemen de kwaliteit en veiligheid op het spoor behouden kunnen blijven, en binnen deze randvoorwaarden ook nog lagere prijzen gerealiseerd kunnen worden? Is de Commissie net als de PVV van mening dat dat een illusie is?

2. Is de Commissie net als de PVV van mening dat voor een product als spoorvervoer voor passagiers concurrentie geen noodzaak is om toch een goed systeem te hebben en dat concurrentie geen doel op zich moet zijn? Zo nee, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie met de PVV eens dat de rampzalige scheiding tussen Nederlandse Spoorwegen en ProRail in Nederland aantoont dat een opsplitsing van Nederland in vervoersdelen met meerdere aanbieders een uitermate slecht idee is? Deelt de Commissie de mening van de PVV dat deze ontwikkeling niet bevorderlijk is voor het Nederlandse spoorwegvervoer en al helemaal niet voor de reiziger? Zo nee, waarom niet?

4. Deelt de Commissie de mening van de PVV dat, gezien de negatieve ervaringen met de scheiding van Nederlandse Spoorwegen en ProRail, Nederland het beste zelf kan uitmaken op welke wijze zij haar spoorwegvervoer wil organiseren? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(30 april 2013)

1. De Commissie beschouwt liberalisering (of de openstelling van de markten) niet als een doel op zichzelf. De Commissie is echter van mening dat alle voorgestelde maatregelen van het spoorwegpakket, met inbegrip van de openstelling van de binnenlandse markt, noodzakelijk zijn om de spoorwegsector in de EU nieuw leven in te blazen.

2. De Commissie suggereert niet dat de voorgestelde maatregelen noodzakelijk tot lagere prijzen zullen leiden. Uit haar effectbeoordeling van de voorstellen voor de openstelling van de markt ([3]), concludeert de Commissie dat de liberalisering van de markt en de concurrentiedruk die hieruit voortvloeit, de efficiëntie van spoorwegexploitanten zullen vergroten, de kwaliteit van de spoorwegdiensten zullen verbeteren en geen negatieve effecten op de veiligheid op het spoor zullen hebben. Om effectieve concurrentie te bevorderen, bevat het voorstel van de Commissie ([4]) drempels voor het maximale aantal overheidsopdrachten voor dienstverlening. De voorstellen leiden echter niet tot een opdeling van de nationale spoorwegnetwerken. Dankzij de coördinerende taken van de bevoegde autoriteiten en van de spoorinfrastructuurbeheerder in hun respectieve bevoegdheidsgebieden blijft de integriteit ervan behouden.

3-4. Institutionele scheiding blijft de meest eenvoudige en de beste manier om niet-discriminerende toegang voor alle spoorwegondernemingen te garanderen. Indien lidstaten de geïntegreerde structuren wensen te behouden, zijn zij uit hoofde van het voorstel van de Commissie betreffende het beheer van de spoorweginfrastructuur ([5]) verplicht om strenge voorzorgsmaatregelen te treffen om de onafhankelijkheid van de infrastructuurbeheerder te garanderen.

([1]) COM(2013)0025.
([2]) http://www.nu.nl/politiek/3351689/voorstellen-brussel-slopen-nederlands-spoor.html
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/rail/packages/2013_en.htm
([4]) Voorstel voor een verordening van het Europees Parlement en de Raad tot wijziging van Verordening (EG) nr. 1370/2007 met betrekking tot openstelling van de markt voor het binnenlands passagiersvervoer per spoor, COM(2013) 28 final.
([5]) Voorstel voor een richtlijn van het Europees Parlement en de Raad tot wijziging van Richtlijn 2012/34/EU van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 21 november 2012 tot instelling van één Europese spoorwegruimte met betrekking tot de openstelling van de markt voor het binnenlands passagiersvervoer per spoor en het beheer van de spoorweginfrastructuur, COM(2013) 029 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002508/13
to the Commission
Patricia van der Kammen (NI)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Adverse impact on the Netherlands of proposals from Brussels for breaking up rail services

The Commission has proposed ([1]) opening up domestic rail passenger transport to competition. Competition is already compulsory in rail freight and international rail transport, but not for passenger transport by rail. According to reports, this means that the Netherlands will be divided into several parts (with several transport service providers) ([2]).

1. The Commission thinks that the planned liberalisation will result in lower fares. How does the Commission expect that it will be possible to maintain quality and safety if rail systems are broken up, and that lower fares will also be achievable under these conditions? Does the Commission agree with the PVV that this is an illusion?

2. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that, in the case of a product like rail passenger transport, competition is not necessary in order to have a good system and that competition should not be an end in itself? If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the disastrous separation between Netherlands Railways and ProRail in the Netherlands demonstrates that dividing the Netherlands up into transport sections with multiple providers is an extremely bad idea? Does the Commission agree with the PVV that this development will not benefit rail transport in the Netherlands, especially not from the point of view of passengers? If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that, in view of the adverse experiences with the separation of Netherlands Railways and ProRail, it would be best for the Netherlands to decide for itself how it wishes to organise its railways? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

1. The Commission does not see liberalisation (or opening of the markets) as a goal *per se*. The Commission considers however that all proposed measures of the railway package including domestic market opening are necessary to revitalise the EU railway sector.

2. The Commission does not suggest that the proposed measures would necessarily result in lower fares. From its impact assessment of the market opening proposals ([3]) the Commission concluded that market opening and ensuing competitive pressures would increase the efficiency of railway operators, lead to improvements of the quality of railway services and have no negative effects on rail safety. To facilitate effective competition the Commission proposal ([4]) contains thresholds for the maximum volume of public service contracts. This however would not lead to a break-up of the national rail networks as the coordinating functions of competent authorities and of the rail infrastructure manager in the respective areas of responsibility allow to maintain their integrity.

3 and 4. Institutional separation remains the simplest and best way to guarantee non-discriminatory access for all rail operators. If the Member States want to keep integrated structures, the Commission proposal on governance ([5]) foresees the obligation for Member States to introduce strong safeguards to ensure the independence of the infrastructure manager.

([1]) COM(2013)0025.
([2]) http://www.nu.nl/politiek/3351689/voorstellen-brussel-slopen-nederlands-spoor.html
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/rail/packages/2013_en.htm
([4]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 concerning the opening of the market for domestic passenger transport services by rail, COM(2013) 28 final.
([5]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2012/34/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 establishing a single European railway area, as regards the opening of the market for domestic passenger transport services by rail and the governance of the railway infrastructure, COM(2013) 029 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002509/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(4 maart 2013)

Betreft: Nieuwe moskeeën in Turkije (vervolgvraag)

Op 1 maart 2013 heeft de heer Füle namens de Commissie antwoord gegeven op schriftelijke vraag E-000182/2012.

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven waarom zij géén van de gestelde subvragen concreet van antwoord heeft voorzien? Impliceert de Commissie daarmee dat zij geen mening heeft óf dat zij deze niet wil / kan geven?

De heer Füle schrijft: „Als land dat onderhandelt over toetreding tot de EU, moet Turkije vooruitgang boeken op het vlak van onder andere de stabiliteit van de democratische instellingen, de rechtsstaat, de mensenrechten en respect voor en bescherming van minderheden. Deze inspanningen moeten Turkije in staat stellen het vreedzaam samenleven van verschillende levenswijzen en overtuigingen te garanderen, met respect voor religieuze en niet-religieuze gevoeligheden."

2. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat de bouw van een grote moskee op het Taksimplein in Istanbul, „het plein van de seculiere republiek" van Atatürk, zonder inspraak van de Turkse bevolking, enerzijds de islamiseringsagenda van de huidige Turkse regering en anderzijds het ondemocratische karakter van Turkije aantoont? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat dit in strijd is met de door de heer Füle aangehaalde, voor toetreding tot de EU noodzakelijke „stabiliteit van de democratische instellingen"? Is de Commissie er dan ook toe bereid concreet uit te spreken dat Turkije, op dit vlak, géén vorderingen maakt resp. almaar verder afglijdt? Zo neen, waarom sluit de Commissie haar ogen hiervoor?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(24 april 2013)

Het antwoord van de Commissie op de vraag van het geachte Parlementslid geeft de verplichtingen van Turkije als kandidaat-lidstaat voor toetreding tot de EU weer.

In dit verband heeft de Commissie geen verder commentaar bij haar antwoord op de eerdere schriftelijke vraag ([1]) van het geachte Parlementslid.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002509/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: New mosques in Turkey (follow-up question)

On 1 March 2013, Mr Füle answered Written Question E-000182/2013 on behalf of the Commission.

1. Can the Commission indicate why it did not give a specific answer to a single one of the sub-questions asked? Does this mean that the Commission has no opinion or that it is unwilling or unable to state it?

Mr Füle writes: 'As a country negotiating its accession to the EU, Turkey needs to make progress on issues including the stability of its democratic institutions, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities. These efforts should enable Turkey to ensure the peaceful co-existence of different lifestyles and beliefs, respecting both religious and secular sensitivities.'

2. Does the Commission agree that building a large mosque on Taksim Square in Istanbul, 'the square of [Ataturk's] secular republic', without any opportunity being given for the public to express their views on the matter, demonstrates on the one hand the Islamisation agenda of the present Turkish Government and on the other hand the undemocratic character of Turkey? Does the Commission agree that this is incompatible with the 'stability of (…) democratic institutions' mentioned by Mr Füle as being needed for accession to the EU? Will the Commission therefore specifically state that Turkey is not making any progress in this respect or is constantly regressing? If not, why does the Commission choose to turn a blind eye to the fact?

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

The Commission's answer to the Honourable Member's questions reflects Turkey's obligations as a candidate country negotiating its accession to the EU.

In this respect, the Commission has no additional comment to add further to its response to the Honourable Member's previous Written Question E-000182/2013 ([1]).

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

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-002510/13
komissiolle
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(4. maaliskuuta 2013)

Aihe: EU:n urheiluohjelma

Parhaillaan käynnissä olevissa Erasmus for All -kolmikantaneuvotteluissa muokataan myös EU:n tulevan urheiluohjelman sisältöä. Lisäksi kuluvan kevään aikana vahvistetaan tulevien ohjelmien budjettikoot. Urheiluun suunnattavat määrärahat ovat tärkeitä, ja niiden tulee pysyä vähintään komission esittämien lukujen tasolla. On tietysti muistettava, että urheiluohjelma itsessään ei ole ainoa EU-ohjelma, josta urheilujärjestöt voivat hakea EU-tukea. Hakumahdollisuuksia tulee olemaan useita, mikä on hyvä asia, mutta samalla tämä ohjelmien monimutkaisuus voi myös vaikeuttaa erityisesti ruohonjuuritason toimijoiden hakuintoa.

Miten komissio tulee asemoimaan ja markkinoimaan EU-rahoituksen mahdollisuuksia urheiluseuroille niin, että hakuprosessista ei tule liian vaikea?

Mitä komissio aikoo tehdä saadakseen mahdollisimman monen ruohonjuuritason toimijan hakemaan EU-rahoitusta?

Komission jäsenen Androulla Vassilioun komission puolesta antama vastaus
(17. huhtikuuta 2013)

Ehdotetun koulutus-, nuoriso- ja urheiluohjelman (Yhteinen Erasmus) urheilua käsittelevässä luvussa keskitytään lähinnä ruohonjuuritason urheiluun. Ohjelmalla tuetaan muun muassa kansainvälisiä yhteistyökumppanuuksia ja annetaan ruohonjuuritason järjestöille tilaisuus hakea hankerahoitusta.

Useat ruohonjuuritason urheilujärjestöt ovat viime vuosina jo hyötyneet EU:n rahoituksesta urheilualan valmistelutoimien ansiosta. Hankkeiden määrä ylitti huomattavasti saatavilla olevan rahoituksen määrän.

Komissio tekee kaikkensa varmistaakseen, että ruohonjuurisektorin mahdolliset tuensaajat saavat asianmukaisesti tietoa tulevasta ohjelmasta. Tiedotus- ja viestintätoimia ollaan parhaillaan valmistelemassa. Tätä helpottaa se, että urheilusektori on yleensä hyvin organisoitunut. Lisäksi aiotaan pitää huolta siitä, että hakuprosessi on mahdollisimman yksinkertainen ja helppokäyttöinen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002510/13
to the Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: EU sport programme

The 'Erasmus for All' trialogue, which is just getting under way, will determine the substance of the EU's future sport programme. In addition, the volume of the individual programme budgets will be finalised during the coming spring. Funding for sport is important and should not be reduced below the figures being proposed by the Commission. The sport programme is not, of course, the only EU programme under which sports organisations can seek EU support. There will be several channels through which to apply, and that is a good thing, but the complexity of the programmes could dampen the enthusiasm for applying, especially among stakeholders at grass-roots level.

How will the Commission position and market the EU funding opportunities open to sports clubs while making sure that the application process will not become too difficult?

What will it do to persuade as many grass-roots stakeholders as possible to apply for EU funding?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(17 April 2013)

The Sport Chapter of the proposed Programme for Education, Training, Youth and Sport (Erasmus for All) will mainly focus on grassroots sport. The Programme will support *inter alia* transnational collaborative partnerships, giving grassroots organisations the occasion to apply for project funding.

In recent years, many grassroots sport organisations have already benefited from EU funding through the Preparatory Actions in the field of sport. Project applications considerably exceeded available funding.

The Commission will take great care to ensure that potential beneficiaries from the grassroots sector have proper access to information about the future Programme. Information and communication activities are currently being prepared. They will be facilitated by the fact that the sport sector is generally well-organised. Care will equally be taken to ensure that the application process is as simple and accessible as possible.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002511/13
a la Comisión
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(4 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Acta Europea de Accesibilidad

Por «accesibilidad» se entiende el acceso de las personas con discapacidad, en las mismas condiciones que el resto de la población, al entorno físico, al transporte, a las tecnologías y los sistemas de la información y las comunicaciones (TIC), y a otras instalaciones y servicios.

Considerando que, desde que en mayo de 2000 se publicara la Comunicación de la Comisión «Hacia una Europa sin barreras para las personas con discapacidad», la accesibilidad universal y el enfoque «diseño para todos» se han convertido en uno de los principales retos de la UE,

Considerando que el artículo 3 de la Convención de Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad reconoce la accesibilidad como uno de sus principios generales,

Considerando que la accesibilidad es una de las prioridades de la Estrategia 2010-2020,

Considerando que la Estrategia Europea sobre Discapacidad 2010-2020 menciona que la Comisión propondrá un Acta Europea de Accesibilidad para 2012. En palabras de la propia Comisión «este acta podría englobar el desarrollo de normas específicas para determinados sectores, de modo que se mejore sustancialmente el funcionamiento del mercado interior de productos y servicios accesibles»,

Considerando que entre diciembre de 2011 y febrero de 2012 se abrió un periodo de consulta pública para la preparación del Acta Europea de Accesibilidad,

1. ¿Podría indicarnos la Comisión en qué estado se encuentra el Acta Europea de Accesibilidad?

2. ¿Qué procedimiento piensa utilizar la Comisión en la elaboración del Acta? ¿Considera la Comisión oportuno conceder carácter vinculante a las disposiciones del Acta?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de abril de 2013)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a la respuesta dada a la pregunta escrita E-001879/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002511/13
to the Commission
Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: European Accessibility Act

'Accessibility' is understood as meaning that people with disabilities have access, on an equal basis with others, to the physical environment, transportation, information and communications technologies and systems (ICT), and other facilities and services.

Whereas accessibility for all and the 'design for all' focus have become key challenges for the EU since the publication in May 2000 of the Commission Communication 'Towards a barrier-free Europe for people with disabilities';

Whereas Article 3 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities recognises accessibility as one of the general principles;

Whereas accessibility is one of the priorities of the 2010-2020 Strategy;

Whereas the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 states that the Commission will propose a European Accessibility Act for 2012 which, in the words of the Commission, 'could include developing specific standards for particular sectors to substantially improve the proper functioning of the internal market for accessible products and services';

Whereas between December 2011 and February 2012 a public consultation was held to prepare for the European Accessibility Act:

1. At what stage is the European Accessibility Act?

2. What procedure does the Commission intend to use to draw up the Act? Does the Commission think it a good idea to make the Act's provisions binding in nature?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-001879/2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002512/13
an die Kommission
Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)
(4. März 2013)

Betrifft: Verstoß des Landes Rheinland-Pfalz gegen die FFH-Richtlinie 92/43/EWG

Die Regierung des Bundeslandes Rheinland-Pfalz sieht in ihrem Landesentwicklungsplan (LEP IV) vor, 2 % der Landesfläche und mindestens 2 % der Waldfläche für die Windenergienutzung zur Verfügung zu stellen.

Das Biosphärenreservat Pfälzer Wald ist nach Maßgabe der Fauna-Flora-Habitat-Richtlinie (92/43/EWG, FFH-Richtlinie) ein Natura-2000-Schutzgebiet. Durch die Errichtung von Windturbinen wird dieses gefährdet.

Aufgrund des Artikels 6 Absatz 2 der FFH-Richtlinie dürfen solche Windanlagen das Gebiet nicht beeinträchtigen. Die Errichtung dieser Anlagen ist jedoch eine erhebliche Beeinträchtigung.

Damit findet auch ein Verstoß gegen Artikel 2 Absatz 2 der FFH-Richtlinie statt, weil der günstige Erhaltungszustand der natürlichen Lebensräume nicht bewahrt bleibt.

Das Biosphärenreservat Pfälzer Wald hat eine hohe Bedeutung für die Erfüllung der Schutzzwecke von Natura-2000-Gebieten. Das Biosphärenreservat Pfälzer Wald ist ein FFH-Gebiet mit hohem Konfliktpotenzial und ein Europäisches Vogelschutzgebiet (Richtlinie 79/409/EWG) mit hohem Konfliktpotenzial. In beiden Fällen können Windenergieanlagen nur errichtet werden, wenn die gebiets- und artspezifischen Erhaltungszustände nicht erheblich beeinträchtigt werden.

1. Wie beurteilt die Kommission die Situation?

2. Wurde bereits eine FFH-Verträglichkeitsprüfung durch das Land Rheinland-Pfalz durchgeführt? Falls ja: Hat die Kommission eine Unverträglichkeit mit der FFH-Richtlinie festgestellt? Falls nicht: Wird eine Prüfung stattfinden?

3. Hält die Kommission einen Verstoß des LEP IV gegen die FFH-Richtlinie oder das EU-Vogelschutzgebiet für gegeben?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(25. April 2013)

1. Der Aufbau von Windturbinen in Natura-2000-Gebieten stellt nicht notwendigerweise einen Verstoß gegen die FFH-Richtlinie dar. Die Kommission hat Leitlinien ([1]) zu Windenergie und Natura 2000 herausgegeben, um dazu beizutragen, dass der Bau von Windkraftanlagen in vollem Umfang mit den Schutzvorschriften sowohl der Vogelschutz- ([2]) als auch der FFH-Richtlinie ([3]) vereinbar ist. Landnutzungspläne wie der LEP IV können ein geeigneter Weg sein, um mögliche Risiken für die Natur zu einem frühen Zeitpunkt zu erkennen und so z. B. prioritäre oder Schutzgebiete festzulegen, in denen keine Windkraftanlagen gebaut werden dürfen. Offensichtlich haben die deutschen Behörden in Bezug auf den Bau von Windkraftanlagen im Pfälzer Wald Kernzonen und Rahmengebiete festgelegt ([4]).

([1]) Europäische Kommission (2010): Leitfaden zur Entwicklung der Windenergie und Natura 2000. Link: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf (nur Englisch).
([2]) Richtlinie 2009/147/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 30. November 2009 über die Erhaltung der wildlebenden Vogelarten (Kodifizierung der Richtlinie 79/409/EWG); ABl. L 20 vom 26.1.2010, S. 7.
([3]) Richtlinie 92/43/EG des Rates vom 21. Mai 1992 zur Erhaltung der natürlichen Lebensräume sowie der wildlebenden Tiere und Pflanzen, ABl. L 206 vom 22.7.1992.
([4]) http://www.mwkel.rlp.de/File/09-10-12-Entwurf-LEP-IV-FAQs-pdf/_1/

2. Für den rheinland-pfälzischen LEP wurde eine strategische Umweltprüfung durchgeführt ([5]). Laut Artikel 4 Absatz 2 und Anhang II der Richtlinie über die Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung ([6]) bestimmen die Mitgliedstaaten, ob Windenergieprojekte einer solchen Prüfung unterzogen werden müssen ([7]). Nach Artikel 6 Absatz 3 der FFH-Richtlinie müssen Pläne oder Projekte, die sich auf Natura-2000-Gebiete als solche auswirken könnten, einer angemessenen Prüfung unterzogen werden.

3. Die Europäische Kommission kann anhand der ihr vorliegenden Informationen nicht feststellen, dass mit dem LEP IV gegen die betreffenden europäischen Richtlinien verstoßen wird.

([5]) http://www.mwkel.rlp.de/File/SUP-Kap-1-Einleitung-pdf/

([6]) Richtlinie 2011/92/EU des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über die Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung bei bestimmten öffentlichen und privaten Projekten (Kodifizierung der Richtlinie 85/337/EWG); ABl. L 26 vom 28.1.2012.

([7]) http://www.gesetze-im-Internet.de/bundesrecht/uvpg/gesamt.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002512/13
to the Commission
Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Infringement of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) by the federal state of Rhineland-Palatinate

In its state development plan (LEP IV), the government of the German federal state of Rhineland-Palatinate has stated that it intends to make 2% of the area of the state and at least 2% of the wooded area available for wind energy generation.

Under the terms of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC), the Palatinate Forest (Pfälzer Wald) biosphere reserve is a Natura 2000 conservation area. Erecting wind turbines will put this area at risk.

In accordance with Article 6(2) of the Habitats Directive, wind turbines of this kind must not have an effect on the area. However, the construction of these turbines will have a significant effect.

This represents an infringement of Article 2(2) of the Habitats Directive, because the favourable conservation status of the natural habitats will not be maintained.

The Palatinate Forest biosphere reserve plays a very important role in achieving the conservation objectives of Natura 2000 areas. The reserve is a fauna, flora and habitat area with major potential for conflict and a European site for the protection of birds (Directive 79/409/EEC) also with major potential for conflict. In both cases, wind turbines can only be built if there is no significant effect on the specific conservation status of the area and the species found there.

1. What is the Commission's opinion of the situation?

2. Has an impact assessment already been carried out by the state of Rhineland-Palatinate? If so, has the Commission found the situation to be incompatible with the Habitats Directive? If not, will an assessment be taking place?

3. Does the Commission believe that the LEP IV represents an infringement of the Habitats Directive or of the European site for the protection of birds?

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

1. Erecting wind turbines in Natura 2000 sites does not necessarily constitute a breach of the Habitats Directive. The Commission has issued guidelines ([1]) on wind energy and Natura 2000 to assist with ensuring that wind farm developments are fully compatible with the protection requirements of both the Birds ([2]) and Habitats Directive ([3]). Land use plans such as the LEP IV can be an appropriate way to identify potential risks to nature at an early stage and determine for example priority or exclusion areas where wind energy plants are not allowed to be built. It seems that the core and the buffer zones of the Palatinate Forest have been identified by the German authorities as such exclusion areas for wind energy developments ([4]).

2. The Strategic Environmental Assessment for the state development plan for Rhineland-Palatinate was carried out ([5]). According to art 4(2) and Annex II of the 'Environmental Impact Assessment Directive' ([6]), it falls in the competence of the Member States whether wind energy projects are subject to an environmental impact assessment ([7]). According to Article 6.3 of the Habitats Directive, an appropriate assessment has to be carried out for any plan or project likely to affect the integrity of Natura 2000 sites.

([1]) European Commission (2010): Guidance document on wind energy developments and Natura 2000. Link: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/management/docs/Wind_farms.pdf
([2]) Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the conservation of wild birds, codifying Directive 79/409/EEC, OJ L 020, 26.1.2010, p. 7.
([3]) Council Directive 92/43/EC of 21 May 1992, on the protection of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([4]) http://www.mwkel.rlp.de/File/09-10-12-Entwurf-LEP-IV-FAQs-pdf/_1/
([5]) http://www.mwkel.rlp.de/File/SUP-Kap-1-Einleitung-pdf/
([6]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, codifying Directive 85/337/EEC, OJ L 026, 28.1.2012.
([7]) http://www.gesetze-im-Internet.de/bundesrecht/uvpg/gesamt.pdf

3. On the basis of available information, the European Commission cannot identify any breach by the LEP IV concerning European Directives.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002513/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Καθυστερήσεις στα έργα του Μετρό Αθήνας

Στην ερώτησή μου E-004789/2011 σχετικά με τις καθυστερήσεις των έργων του Μετρό στην Αθήνα, η Επιτροπή μού είχε απαντήσει, μεταξύ άλλων, ότι «γνωρίζει την κατάσταση της υλοποίησης και τον πιθανό κίνδυνο απώλειας της συγχρηματοδότησης από την ΕΕ λόγω των καθυστερήσεων στην υλοποίηση, οι οποίες, μεταξύ άλλων, συνδέονται με την έρευνα που πραγματοποιείται για τη Siemens».

Νεότερες πληροφορίες αναφέρουν ότι η Επιτροπή μελετά πλέον ενδεχόμενη ανάκτηση της χρηματοδότησης, ύψους περίπου 600 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ από την Ελλάδα, λόγω καθυστερήσεων στο εν λόγω έργο.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Σε ποιο στάδιο βρίσκονται τα έργα του εν λόγω προγράμματος; Ποιο μέρος του φυσικού αντικειμένου και ποια είδη εργασιών απομένουν για την ολοκλήρωσή του;

2. Επιβεβαιώνει τις ανωτέρω πληροφορίες περί ανάκτησης χρηματοδοτήσεων λόγω καθυστερήσεων; Εάν ναι, ποια είναι η αιτία των καθυστερήσεων; Συνδέονται οι καθυστερήσεις στην τρέχουσα φάση με τις έρευνες για τη Siemens, όπως μας είχε επισημάνει στην απάντησή της η Επιτροπή, αλλά και με τον αμφιλεγόμενης νομιμότητας εξωδικαστικό συμβιβασμό της Siemens με την ελληνική κυβέρνηση;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Απριλίου 2013)

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ) και το Ταμείο Συνοχής έχουν συγχρηματοδοτήσει διάφορα στάδια της κατασκευής του μετρό Αθηνών κατά τη διάρκεια των διαφόρων περιόδων προγραμματισμού. Σύμφωνα με τις ελληνικές αρχές, όλα τα συχρηματοδοτούμενα από το ΕΤΠΑ έργα κατά την περίοδο 2000-2006, τα οποία αφορούν το μετρό Αθηνών, προβλέπεται να ολοκληρωθούν έως το τέλος του 2013. Αναφορικά με το έργο του Ταμείου Συνοχής «Επέκταση του Μετρό Αθηνών στο Παλαιό Αεροδρόμιο Ελληνικού», η Επιτροπή έχει ενημερωθεί από τις ελληνικές αρχές ότι οι εργασίες που αφορούν τα υποέργα 6, 7 και 8 (παροχή και λειτουργία τροχαίου υλικού, σηματοδότηση, αυτόματος έλεγχος αμαξοστοιχίας) αναμένεται να ολοκληρωθούν έως τον Ιούνιο του 2013.

Με την απόφαση της Επιτροπής C(2013)1215, της 8ης Μαρτίου 2013, οι «Κατευθυντήριες γραμμές για την περάτωση της συνδρομής (2000-2006) των Διαρθρωτικών Ταμείων» τροποποιήθηκαν ώστε να χορηγούν, υπό ορισμένους όρους και σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη, μεταξύ των οποίων η Ελλάδα, παράταση της προθεσμίας έως τις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2013, προκειμένου να ολοκληρώσουν ή να θέσουν σε λειτουργία, με δικές τους δαπάνες, όλα τα έργα που δηλώνονται ημιτελή ή/και μη λειτουργικά κατά το κλείσιμο της περιόδου 2000-2006.

Συνεπώς, στο παρόν στάδιο, η Επιτροπή δεν είναι σε θέση να γνωρίζει αν θα ανακτηθούν κονδύλια, καθώς τα έργα δεν έχουν ακόμη ολοκληρωθεί.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002513/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Delays in work on the Athens Metro

In reply to my Question E-004789/2011 on delays in work on the Athens Metro, the Commission advised me, among other things, that it was aware of the implementation delays and of the potential risk of co-financing from the EU being lost due to those delays, some of which had to do with the investigation into Siemens.

According to more recent information, the Commission is now considering the possibility of recovering financing of approximately EUR 600 million from Greece, due to delays with this project.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What stage have works reached in this project? What part of the physical object and what particular works have yet to be completed in order to complete the project?

2. Can it confirm the above information that financing is to be recovered due to the delays and, if so, the causes of those delays? Do the delays have anything to do with the current phase of the investigation into Siemens, as noted by the Commission in its reply, and with the dubious out-of-court settlement between Siemens and the Greek government?

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

The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the Cohesion Fund have been co-financing different stages of the construction of the Athens metro during different programming periods. According to the Greek authorities, all ERDF operations from the 2000-2006 period concerning the Athens metro are planned to be completed by the end of 2013. In relation to the Cohesion Fund project 'Extension of Athens Metro to Elliniko Old Airport', the Commission has been informed by the Greek authorities that works related to subprojects 6, 7 and 8 (provision and operation of rolling stock, signaling, automatic train control) are expected to be completed by June 2013.

By Commission Decision C(2013)1215 of 8 March 2013, the 'Guidelines on closure of assistance (2000-2006) from the Structural Funds' were amended so as to grant, under certain conditions, to certain Member States, including Greece, an extension until 31 December 2013 in order to complete or render operational at their own expense, all operations declared unfinished and/or non-functional at the closure of the 2000-2006 period.

Therefore, at this stage, the Commission cannot evaluate whether any funds will be recovered as the deadline for the completion of the projects has not yet been reached.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002514/13
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(4 maart 2013)

Betreft: Een illegale belasting?

Op 14 februari 2013 is in de Financial Times een artikel ([1]) verschenen waarin stond dat een coalitie van Amerikaanse ondernemingsgroepen, aangevuld met de Amerikaanse Kamer van Koophandel en het Financial Services Forum, in een brief aan de Commissie bezwaar heeft aangetekend tegen „de eenzijdige invoering van een mondiale belasting op financiële transacties (FTT)". Zij stellen dat „deze nieuwe, eenzijdige theorieën over fiscale jurisdictie zonder precedent zijn en op gespannen voet staan met de bestaande voorschriften van het internationaal fiscaal recht en aloude verdragsverplichtingen" en dat „er een groot risico bestaat dat goedkeuring ervan zal leiden tot dubbele en meervoudige belastingheffing, een verslechtering van de internationale fiscale samenwerking en handelsprotectionisme".

Kan de Commissie in het licht van het voorgaande de volgende vragen beantwoorden:

1. Kan zij bevestigen dat deze brief bestaat?

2. Zijn deze uitspraken naar haar mening correct?

3. Zo ja, hoe kan zij een voorstel met een te verwachten extraterritoriale werkingssfeer indienen en daarmee zowel voorbijgaan aan de bevoegdheden van de lidstaten die voor een „opt-out" hebben gekozen, als internationale investeerders schade berokkenen door het „uitgiftebeginsel" te hanteren?

4. Zo ja, kan zij bevestigen dat het ingediende voorstel in strijd is met de fundamentele vereisten die gelden voor nauwere samenwerking, namelijk dat zulke samenwerking geen afbreuk mag doen aan de interne markt, geen belemmering of discriminatie in de handel tussen de lidstaten mag vormen en de mededinging tussen de lidstaten niet mag verstoren (artikel 326 VWEU)?

5. Zo ja, kan zij bevestigen dat de nauwere samenwerking verder gaat dan waarvoor dit instrument bedoeld is?

6. Zo niet, kan zij bewijzen dat met de voorgestelde FTT niet eenzijdig een mondiale FTT wordt ingevoerd?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(22 april 2013)

1. De Commissie is op de hoogte van deze brief.

2.-6. Het voorstel van de Commissie voor een richtlijn van de Raad tot uitvoering van de nauwere samenwerking op het gebied van belasting op financiële transacties (COM(2013) 71) bevat een ontwerp voor een belastingstelsel dat de verschuiving van belastbare transacties van belastingjurisdicties zoveel mogelijk vermijdt en dat tegelijkertijd het internationale publiekrecht, en in het bijzonder de territorialiteitsbeginselen, respecteert. Elk van de voorziene configuraties bevat voldoende aanknoping met het grondgebied van de lidstaten die aan de nauwere samenwerking deelnemen. Daarnaast is een „veiligheidsnet" voor alle belastbare transacties voorgesteld, d.w.z. een algemene regel die de persoon die de belasting op financiële transactie (financial transaction tax — FTT) verschuldigd is, de mogelijkheid biedt om te bewijzen dat er geen verband bestaat tussen de transactie en het grondgebied van een deelnemende lidstaat.

In het voorstel worden het Verdrag betreffende de Europese Unie en het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie in acht genomen. Aangezien het voorstel is gericht op de harmonisatie van de FTT op het grondgebied van de lidstaten, zou het in het bijzonder de werking van de eengemaakte markt moeten verbeteren, ook al zal dat niet meteen of volledig het geval zijn voor alle 27 lidstaten. Binnen de nauwere samenwerking zou het risico op dubbele heffing verdwijnen. In vergelijking met een situatie zonder dergelijke samenwerking zou de werking van de eengemaakte markt op het niveau van de 27 lidstaten veeleer verbeterd worden dan dat er afbreuk aan wordt gedaan. Ten slotte zouden ook de desbetreffende voorschriften voor administratieve samenwerking tussen de lidstaten van toepassing zijn, net zoals voor elke nationale FTT.

([1]) Brussels proposes EUR 30 billion „Tobin Tax", http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/d1b16f7a-7601-11e2-8eb6-00144feabdc0.html# axzz2MaNrdGvb

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002514/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: An illegal tax?

On 14 February 2013, *Financial Times* published an article ([1]) stating that a coalition of US business groups, including the US Chamber of Commerce and the Financial Services Forum, have written to the Commission objecting to 'the unilateral imposition of a global financial transaction tax (FTT)'. They claim that 'these novel and unilateral theories of tax jurisdiction are both unprecedented and inconsistent with existing norms of international tax law and longstanding treaty commitments' and that 'there is a high risk that their adoption could lead to double and multiple taxation, a deterioration of international tax cooperation and trade protectionism'.

In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Can it confirm that this letter exists?

2. Does it consider these statements to be correct?

3. If so, how can it table a proposal which has an expected extraterritorial reach, thus both overriding the competences of those Member States which have opted out and harming international investors by means of the 'issuance principle'?

4. If so, can it confirm that the tabled proposal breaches the fundamental requirements of enhanced cooperation, namely that such cooperation shall neither undermine the internal market, constitute a barrier to or discrimination in trade between Member States, or distort competition between them (Article 326 TFEU)?

5. If so, can it confirm that enhanced cooperation has overreached its purpose?

6. If not, can it prove that the proposed FTT will not amount to a unilateral imposition of a global FTT?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of this letter.

2-6. In its proposal for a Council Directive implementing enhanced cooperation in the area of financial transaction tax (COM(2013)71) the Commission provides for a tax design which avoids as much as possible relocation of taxable transactions from taxing jurisdictions, while at the same time respecting international public law and in particular territoriality principles. Sufficient links to the territory of the Member States participating in the enhanced cooperation are provided for in each of the configurations envisaged. Additionally, a 'safety net' for all taxable transactions has been proposed, i.e. a general rule allowing the person liable to pay the Financial Transaction Tax (FTT) to prove the absence of a link between the transaction and the territory of any participating Member State.

The proposal respects the Treaties on European Union and on the Functioning of the European Union. In particular, it would improve the functioning of the Single Market, in that it aims at harmonisation of FTT in the territory of a group of Member States, even if those advantages would not accrue, both immediately and fully, at the scale of all 27 Member States. Risks of double taxation would be eliminated within the scope of the enhanced cooperation. Compared to a situation without such cooperation, the functioning of the Single Market at the level of the 27 Member States would be improved rather than undermined. Finally, as for any national FTT, the relevant rules on administrative cooperation between States would apply.

([1]) Brussels proposes EUR 30 billion 'Tobin Tax', http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/d1b16f7a-7601-11e2-8eb6-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2MaNrdGvb

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002515/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(4 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Envolvimento e participação na preparação da proposta relativa à pesca de espécies de profundidade

Diversas organizações profissionais do setor da pesca, a par de alguns Conselhos Consultivos Regionais (CCR), expressaram o seu descontentamento com o que consideram ser o reduzido envolvimento destas organizações na preparação da proposta de Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho que estabelece condições específicas para a pesca de espécies de profundidade no Atlântico Nordeste e disposições aplicáveis à pesca em águas internacionais do Atlântico Nordeste e que revoga o Regulamento (CE) n.° 2347/2002 (COM(2012)0371). Consideram estas organizações que a Comissão Europeia conduziu o processo com algum secretismo, num procedimento contrário ao necessário aprofundamento do clima de transparência e do envolvimento do setor nas políticas que lhe dizem respeito.

Independentemente do conteúdo da proposta em questão, que se encontra atualmente em discussão no Parlamento Europeu, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Qual o envolvimento das organizações acima mencionadas, dos CCR e de outras organizações na fase preparatória de elaboração desta proposta?

2. Concretamente, qual a participação das organizações acima mencionadas, dos CCR e de outras organizações na consideração das cinco opções alvo de avaliação de impacto?

3. Tendo em conta o processo de elaboração desta proposta, no seu conjunto, que organizações nele participaram e em que momentos?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão
(22 de abril de 2013)

Foi com toda a transparência que a Comissão conduziu o processo que levou à sua proposta de revisão do Regulamento (CE) n.° 2347/2002 do Conselho. Este processo começou com a publicação da Comunicação da Comissão relativa à avaliação do regime de gestão em 2007 ([1]), relativamente à qual o Parlamento Europeu emitiu o seu parecer em 2008 ([2]). À luz dos resultados do exercício de avaliação, a Comissão lançou um processo de avaliação de impacto, a fim de analisar as várias opções para melhorar o regime de gestão.

O processo de avaliação de impacto da Comissão prevê uma fase de consulta obrigatória das partes interessadas sobre as opções possíveis. Para o efeito, em dezembro de 2009 a Comissão apresentou um documento de consulta a todos os seus conselhos consultivos regionais (CCR), — exceto o CCR para o mar Mediterrâneo, uma vez que não tem ligação com as pescarias em causa — e aos Estados-Membros. Foram recebidas respostas de dois CCR, a saber, o CCR para as Águas Ocidentais Norte e o CCR para as Águas Ocidentais Sul. Essas respostas estão disponíveis em linha, no sítio Web dos CCR ([3]).

A Comissão dá grande importância às reações das partes interessadas. Foram realizadas reuniões *ad hoc* com ONG e representantes do setor, embora a participação oficial das partes interessadas tivesse sido canalizada essencialmente através dos CCR. A Comissão está preparada para prosseguir o diálogo sobre esta proposta com todas as partes interessadas e com os Estados-Membros em causa. mas é a única responsável, por força do seu direito de iniciativa, pelos textos finais apresentados sob forma de propostas legislativas.

([1]) COM(2007) 30final.
([2]) PG_TA(2008)0196.
([3]) http://www.nwwrac.org/admin/publication/upload/NWWRAC_ADVICE_Deepsea_Access_Regime_010410_EN.pdf
http://www.ccr-s.eu/EN/avis.asp?53

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002515/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: Involvement and participation in preparing the proposal on deep-sea fishing

Several organisations from the fisheries sector alongside some Regional Advisory Councils (RACs) have expressed their discontent with what they consider to be the lack of involvement by their organisations in preparing the proposal for a European Parliament and Council Regulation to establish specific conditions for deep-sea fishing in the North East Atlantic and for provisions applicable to fishing in international waters in the same region, and which repeals EC Regulation No 2347/2002 (COM(2012)0371). These organisations believe that the European Commission has been secretive in its handling of the process, which is in contrast to the requisite transparency and involvement of the sector in the policies concerning it.

Regardless of the content of the proposal in question, which is currently under discussion in the European Parliament, I ask the Commission:

1. To what extent have the abovementioned organisations, RACs and other organisations been involved in this preliminary draft proposal?

2. More specifically, how are these organisations and RACs involved in dealing with the five options whose impact is being studied?

3. Which organisations have taken part in drafting this proposal as a whole and at what points?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

The Commission has conducted the process leading to its proposal for a revision of Council Regulation 2347/2002 in full transparency. This process started with the publication of the Commission Communication on the evaluation of the management regime in 2007 ([1]). The European Parliament gave its opinion on this evaluation in 2008 ([2]). In the light of the results of the evaluation exercise, the Commission launched an impact assessment process in order to consider various options to improve the management regime.

The Commission's impact assessment process includes a phase where it is mandatory to consult stakeholders on possible options. The Commission followed this procedure by submitting a consultation paper on December 2009 to all its Regional Advisory Councils (except the Mediterranean RAC which is not concerned by the fisheries at stake here) and the Member States. Responses were received from two Councils, namely the North Western Waters RAC and the South Western Waters RAC. These responses are publicly available online on the RACs websites ([3]).

The Commission values the feedback from stakeholders. There were *ad hoc* meetings with NGOs and industry representatives though stakeholder's official participation has been mainly channelled through the RACs. The Commission has remained ready to continue the dialogue on this proposal with all the stakeholders and Member States concerned. It remains, however, solely responsible, by virtue of its right of initiative, for the texts that are ultimately tabled as legislative proposals.

([1]) COM(2007) 30 final.
([2]) PG_TA(2008)0196.
([3]) http://www.nwwrac.org/admin/publication/upload/NWWRAC_ADVICE_Deepsea_Access_Regime_010410_EN.pdf
http://www.ccr-s.eu/EN/avis.asp?53.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002516/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(4 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Financiamento pela UE de investigação relacionada com aviões não tripulados (drones)

A Escola de Gestão de Portsmouth (Grã-Bretanha) abriu um concurso para a elaboração de um programa doutoral relacionado com aviões não tripulados (drones), que têm vindo a ser utilizados em bombardeamentos e assassinatos seletivos em várias regiões, nomeadamente na Ásia Central, no Médio Oriente e em África.

O programa refere que o objetivo é estender a pesquisa sobre a «cobertura dos aviões não tripulados» com um possível foco nas suas «capacidades» e no «exercício de cobertura».

A equipa de supervisão do programa doutoral trabalhou no projeto Seabilla, financiado pelo 7.° Programa Quadro da UE, cujos projetos incluíram já a investigação sobre «otimização» das missões dos aviões não tripulados, tendo como parceiros alguns dos maiores grupos do complexo militar-industrial da UE.

Perguntamos à Comissão:

1. Confirma que a UE está a financiar a «otimização» de uma tecnologia que tem vindo a ser utilizada para matar milhares de pessoas, muitas delas inocentes, violando a soberania de muitos Estados e a Carta da ONU?

2. Que montantes estão envolvidos no financiamento destes e de outros projetos do mesmo âmbito?

3. Considera a possibilidade de reorientar os fundos que financiam estes projetos para investigação pública em áreas de genuíno interesse público, em lugar de financiar o complexo industrial-militar, ou seja a indústria da guerra?

Resposta dada por António Tajani em nome da Comissão
(22 de abril de 2013)

A natureza de todas as atividades do tema «Investigação sobre Segurança» do 7.° PQ é exclusivamente civil.

A segurança das fronteiras é uma área de missão identificada. A vigilância das fronteiras marítimas implica a capacidade de detetar, identificar, seguir e intercetar navios, como em casos de migração irregular e criminalidade transfronteiriça. As autoridades estão a estudar diferentes tecnologias destinadas a aumentar a cobertura da vigilância espacial, incluindo os drones que podem permanecer no ar mais tempo do que as aeronaves tripuladas.

A Comissão apresentou a sua proposta legislativa do Eurosur com o objetivo de:

— reduzir o número de migrantes irregulares que atravessam as fronteiras externas da UE sem serem detetados;

— prevenir a criminalidade transfronteiriça, tais como o tráfico de seres humanos e o contrabando de drogas;

— reduzir consideravelmente o número inaceitável de migrantes que morrem afogados quando tentam alcançar as costas europeias em embarcações inadequadas à navegação marítima.

Os projetos de investigação como o Seabilla ([1]) inscrevem-se neste contexto político e são executados em coordenação com a Agência Frontex.

O Seabilla tem planeado um ensaio ([2]) com uma aeronave tripulada para simular o desempenho de uma plataforma não tripulada. Os ensaios de outras soluções não tripuladas só serão realizados em ambiente virtual. O objetivo é analisar a forma como estas tecnologias podem salvar vidas no mar, graças à deteção precoce.

([1]) O projeto de vigilância das fronteiras marítimas Seabilla (Sea border surveillance) pretende definir uma arquitetura de sistemas que integre os aspetos espaciais, terrestres, aéreos e marítimos. O projeto teve início em 1 de junho de 2010 e prolonga-se por 45 meses. A contribuição da UE orça os 9,9 milhões de euros.

([2]) No Canal da Mancha.

De modo algum se pode falar de um financiamento da UE para «otimizar» uma tecnologia destinada a matar pessoas. As atividades de I&D são totalmente destinadas a domínios de interesse público, como a vigilância das fronteiras e a análise dos efeitos das catástrofes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002516/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(4 March 2013)

Subject: EU research funding for drones

Portsmouth Business School (Great Britain) launched a tender for a doctoral programme related to drones, some of which have been used in bombings and assassinations in several regions of Central Asia, the Middle East and Africa.

The programme's aim is to further research on 'drone coverage', focusing on 'capacity' and 'performance'.

The doctoral programme's supervisory team worked on the SEABILLA project, financed by the 7th EU Framework Programme, whose projects also included research on the 'optimisation' of drone missions, in partnership with some of the largest groups from the EU industrial and military complex.

We ask the Commission:

1. Will it confirm that the EU is financing the 'optimisation' of a technology that is being used to kill thousands of people, many of whom are innocent, and is therefore violating the sovereignty of many States and the UN Charter?

2. What sums are involved in financing these and other similar projects?

3. Will it consider redirecting funding for these projects towards public research in areas of genuine public interest, instead of financing the industrial and military complex, and more specifically the war industry?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

The nature of all activities of the FP7 Security Research Theme is exclusively civilian.

Border security is an identified mission area. Surveillance of the maritime border implies capability to detect, identify, track and intercept vessels, as used for irregular migration and cross-border crime. To increase situational awareness, authorities are looking at different technologies, including remotely piloted aircraft, which have the potential to fly for periods longer than piloted planes.

The Commission presented its Eurosur legislative proposal with the objective to:

— reduce the number of irregular migrants crossing EU external borders undetected;

— prevent cross-border crime, such as human trafficking and drug smuggling;

— considerably reduce the unacceptable death toll of migrants drowning when trying to reach EU shores in unseaworthy boats.

Research projects such as SEABILLA ([1]) are set into this policy context and implemented in coordination with Frontex.

SEABILLA plans a trial ([2]) with a manned aircraft simulating the performance of an unmanned platform. Other unmanned solutions will be simulated in virtual environment only. The goal is to investigate how these technologies can save life at sea by early detection.

In no way is the EU financing the 'optimisation' of a technology being used to kill people. R&D activities are fully directed to areas of genuine public interest, such as EU border surveillance and post-disaster damage analysis.

([1]) SEABILLA stands for 'Sea border surveillance', aiming at defining the architecture for systems integrating space, land, sea and air assets. The project started on 1 June 2010 and will run for 45 months. The EU contribution is EUR 9.9 million.
([2]) In the English Channel.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-002519/13
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(5 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Proroga delle concessioni demaniali marittime

Nello scorso dicembre, il Parlamento italiano ha approvato una legge che proroga la scadenza delle attuali concessioni demaniali marittime aventi finalità turistico-ricreative fino al 31 dicembre 2020, rispetto all'attuale limite stabilito al 31 dicembre 2015, posticipando di fatto la piena applicazione della Direttiva servizi per questo settore.

Si tratta sicuramente di un provvedimento utile per permettere di ammortizzare, almeno in parte, gli investimenti già intrapresi dalle imprese balneari e, nel contempo, favorire una eventuale ricollocazione dei lavoratori del settore. Secondo molti osservatori, inoltre, questa misura è indispensabile per la sopravvivenza stessa delle attuali imprese balneari e per il rilancio dell'economia turistica nazionale, soprattutto in un periodo di crisi.

Da più parti si sottolinea, tuttavia, come l'arco temporale aggiuntivo sia ancora limitato rispetto ad un ottimale periodo di rientro per gli investimenti già intrapresi.

Ritiene la Commissione che questa norma sia compatibile con le disposizioni comunitarie vigenti?

Ritiene che tale periodo di proroga sia congruo o potrebbe eventualmente valutare la necessità di stabilire un orizzonte temporale più esteso?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(24 aprile 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei problemi connessi alla proroga delle concessioni demaniali marittime in Italia.

Come spiegato nella risposta data di recente all'interrogazione E-01198/2013, spetta agli Stati membri, e non alla Commissione, stabilire la durata adeguata delle autorizzazioni, tenuto conto dell'esigenza di garantire al prestatore l'ammortamento degli investimenti e una remunerazione equa.

La Commissione è cosciente della complessità della situazione. Da un lato, uniformando il termine di scadenza per tutte le concessioni in essere, si rischia che non tutti i titolari di concessioni riescano ad ammortizzare i loro investimenti; dall'altro, prorogando la validità delle concessioni attuali fino al 2020, si ritarda di 11 anni l'applicazione della direttiva Servizi nel settore delle concessioni marittime. Occorre tuttavia fissare una data per l'introduzione di una nuova procedura di attribuzione delle concessioni.

La Commissione ritiene pertanto che occorra esaminare in modo pragmatico le disposizioni transitorie proposte in vista dell'introduzione della corretta procedura per l'attribuzione delle autorizzazioni.

Prima di esprimersi in modo definitivo, la Commissione intende esaminare la situazione in modo approfondito e seguirne l'evoluzione.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002519/13
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Extension of state maritime concessions

Last December, the Italian Parliament passed a law extending existing state maritime concessions for tourist and recreational purposes until 31 December 2020, as against the current deadline of 31 December 2015, effectively delaying the full implementation of the Services Directive in this sector.

It is certainly a useful measure to enable beachside companies to recoup, at least in part, the investments already made whilst at the same time facilitating the possible relocation of workers. According to many observers, moreover, this measure is vital for the very survival of existing beachside businesses and to boost the national tourism economy, especially at a time of crisis.

Many, however, have pointed out that the additional time frame granted is still limited in terms of being able to recoup the investments already made in an optimal manner.

Does the Commission believe that this law is compatible with existing EU rules?

Does it consider the extension in question to be appropriate, or would it consider the need to extend the deadline still further?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The Commission is aware of the problems concerning the extension of State maritime concessions in Italy.

As the Commission explained in its recent reply to Question E-01198/2013, it is for the Member States and not for the Commission to set the appropriate duration of such authorisations taking into consideration the need to enable the provider to recoup the cost of investment and to generate a fair return.

The Commission is aware of the complexity of the situation. On the one hand, a unique termination date for all existing concessions may be unsatisfactory since it might not allow each concession holder to recoup his/her investment. On the other hand, the extension of the validity of existing concessions until 2020 is equally unsatisfactory since it delays the application of the Services Directive in maritime concessions by 11 years. Yet, a date needs to be set for the introduction of the new concession award process.

The Commission considers, therefore that the proposed 'transitory period' prior to the introduction of a proper procedure for the award of the authorisations, should be examined in a pragmatic way.

The Commission is closely monitoring the situation, and will follow its evolution, before taking any definite stance.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-002520/13
aan de Commissie
Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(5 maart 2013)

Betreft: Ongevallenstatistieken 2012

In 2001 stelde de Europese Commissie als doelstelling om tegen 2010 het aantal verkeersslachtoffers te halveren. In 2010 werd het aantal dodelijke slachtoffers teruggebracht naar 30.800, een daling van 43 % ten opzichte van 2001. Een aanzienlijke vermindering, ook al werd de doelstelling niet gehaald. Daarom bevestigde de Commissie in 2011 opnieuw het voornemen om tegen 2020 het aantal verkeersslachtoffers te halveren. Op termijn wil de Commissie het aantal slachtoffers zelfs tot nul reduceren.

1. Heeft de Commissie cijfers over het aantal verkeersslachtoffers in 2012 voor de Europese Unie in zijn geheel en cijfers per lidstaat?

2. Indien ja, kan de Commissie aangeven welke lidstaten in de juiste richting evolueren en welke landen minder goed scoren?

3. Beschikt de Commissie over cijfers met betrekking tot het aantal slachtoffers jonger dan 18 jaar en het aantal bij ongevallen betrokken voetgangers en fietsers?

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

Op 19 maart heeft de Commissie de eerste voorlopige cijfers voor 2012 voorgesteld. De volledige aantallen en voorlopige cijfers per lidstaat zijn te vinden op de website van de Commissie. Volgens de voorlopige cijfers was er in 2012 in de meeste lidstaten een daling van het aantal verkeersslachtoffers. Precieze cijfers zijn te vinden op de volgende website: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-236_nl.htm.

Volgens de meest recente statistieken was 6 % van alle verkeersdoden jonger dan 18 jaar. 21 % van de verkeersdoden waren voetgangers en 7 % fietsers.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002520/13
to the Commission
Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Accident statistics for 2012

In 2001, the Commission adopted the objective of halving the number of road accident victims by 2010. By 2010, the number of deaths on the roads had been cut to 30 800, a reduction of 43% in relation to 2001. It was a substantial reduction, even if the objective was not attained. In 2011, the Commission therefore reaffirmed its intention of halving the number of road deaths, this time by 2020. Ultimately, the Commission even aims to reduce the number of road accident victims to zero.

1. Does the Commission have any figures on the number of road accident victims in 2012 for the European Union as a whole and per Member State?

2. If so, can the Commission indicate which Member States are moving in the right direction and which have been less successful?

3. Does the Commission have any figures on numbers of road accident victims aged under 18 and the numbers of pedestrians and cyclists involved in accidents?

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

The first provisional figures for 2012 were presented by the Commission on 19th March. The total numbers and provisional figures for each Member State can be found on the Commission website. According to the provisional figures, most Member States have seen a reduction of the number of road fatalities in 2012. For exact figures, see the above linked website: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-13-236_en.htm.

According to latests statistics, the young under 18 years age made up 6% of all road fatalities. Pedestrians were the victims in 21% of all fatal road accidents and cyclists in 7%.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-002521/13
до Комисията
Iliana Malinova Iotova (S&D)
(5 март 2013 г.)

Относно: Проблеми с Програмата за развитие на селските райони в Република България

Европейският съюз е в процес на приемане на новата Многогодишна финансова рамка (МФР) за следващия програмен период 2014—2020 г. Един от обсъжданите критерии за разпределение на финансите между държавите членки е досегашното изпълнение и усвояване на европейските пари по подадените и одобрени проекти.

Особено тревожна е ситуацията в новите държави членки и все още се допускат грешки при оформянето на проектите във връзка с работата на държавната администрация.

От особено значение за Република България е Програмата за развитие на селските райони, която в предишния бюджетен период възлизаше 3 231 293 532 EUR. Напоследък зачести тревожната информация за забавяне на проекти, което лиши България от евросредства по някои от осите на програмата.

В тази връзка моля да ме информирате какви са договорените и усвоени средства по Програмата и има ли опасност от нови окончателни загуби.

Отговор, даден от г-н Чолош от името на Комисията
(22 април 2013 г.)

Ситуацията по отношение на изпълнението на Програмата за развитие на селските райони (ПРСР) за България през 2007—-2013 г. е следната:

Общ пакет на ЕЗФРСР за целия програмен период: 2 603 млн. EUR;

Междинни плащания, заявени от България (45 % от пакета): 1 178 млн. EUR;

Общо с автоматичните авансови плащания от 7 % по ПРСР (52 % от пакета): 1 361 млн. EUR

При заявени 45 %, българската програма е с най-ниския процент на усвояване за ЕЗФРСР сред 27-те членки на ЕС. Първата отмяна по правилото n+2 в размер на 39 млн. EUR (средства от ЕЗФРСР) бе извършена през 2012 г. поради недостатъчно равнище на разходите, декларирани от България пред Комисията. По програмата за 2013 г. се очаква отмяната на не по-малко от 51 млн. EUR. Рискът по програмата да бъде извършена още една голяма отмяна през следващата година е значителен, тъй като през 2013 г. ще трябва да бъдат усвоени още около 400 млн. EUR.

Към днешна дата са проведени редица срещи с българските органи, за да се проучат възможностите за ускоряване на изпълнението на ПРСР. Обменена е информация и с бившия български министър на земеделието. През 2012 г. България изготви план за действие, който да допринесе за ускоряване на изпълнението на ПРСР.

Предложението на Комисията в изпълнение на член 69 от Регламент (ЕО) № 1698/2005 на Съвета ([1]), което е включено и в предложението за регламент за подпомагане на развитието на селските райони от ЕЗФРСР за периода 2014—2020 г., не се отнася до предишното изпълнение, а до предишните пакети, разпределени на държавите членки. По този начин равнището на текущите разходи или процентът на усвояване няма непременно да окаже въздействие върху разпределените средства за развитие на селските райони за следващия период.

([1]) ОВ L 277, 21.10.2005 г.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002521/13
to the Commission
Iliana Malinova Iotova (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Problems with the rural development programme in Bulgaria

The European Union is in the process of adopting a new multiannual financial framework (MFF) for the 2014-2020 programming period. One of the criteria being considered for the allocation of financial resources among the Member States is the utilisation and take-up to date of EU funding in projects submitted and approved.

The situation in the new Member States is particularly alarming in this regard, and problems at national administrative level are still resulting in mistakes being made in the finalisation of projects.

Of particular importance to Bulgaria is the rural development programme, which accounted for EUR 3 231 293 532 in the previous programming period. Recently there have been more and more alarming reports of projects being delayed, thus depriving Bulgaria of EU funding under some axes of the programme.

Can the Commission therefore indicate the level of funding approved under the programme and the level of take-up, and whether there is a danger of further funding ultimately being lost?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

The situation is as follows with regard to implementation of the Rural Development Programme (RDP) for Bulgaria 2007-2013:

Total EAFRD envelope for the whole programming period: EUR 2 603 million;

Interim payments claimed by Bulgaria (45% of the envelope): EUR 1.178 million;

Total with the 7% automatic advance on the RDP (52% of the envelope): EUR 1.361 million.

At 45%, the Bulgarian programme has the lowest absorption rate for EAFRD in the EU-27. A first 'n+2' de-commitment of EUR 39 million (EAFRD funds) took place in 2012 due to insufficient level of expenditure declared by Bulgaria to the Commission. An amount of at least EUR 51 million is expected to be de-committed under the programme in 2013. The risk that the programme faces another important de-commitment next year is considerable, as some further EUR 400 million will need to be absorbed in 2013.

To date, a series of meetings has taken place with the Bulgarian authorities to explore the means of accelerating RDP implementation. Several exchanges with the former Bulgarian Minister of Agriculture have also taken place. An Action Plan was prepared by Bulgaria in 2012 to help speed up the RDP implementation.

The Commission's performance in Article 69 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 ([1]), which is also included in the proposal for EAFRD Regulation 2014-2020 did not relate to the past execution but to the past envelopes allocated to Member States. Thus current expenditure level or absorption rate will not necessarily have an effect on rural development allocations for the next period.

([1]) OJ L 277, 21.10.2005.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002522/13
à la Commission
François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE)
(5 mars 2013)

Objet: Accord de pêche avec la Mauritanie

Rapporteur pour avis au sein de la commission des budgets sur l'accord de pêche UE-Mauritanie, j'ai proposé d'approuver l'accord tel que négocié.

En effet, un refus n'aurait eu que des conséquences négatives:

— pour la Mauritanie qui bénéficie d'un concours financier indispensable pour elle;

— pour les pêcheurs européens qui trouvent là une ressource qui leur permet de maintenir l'activité et l'emploi;

— pour la ressource halieutique puisque cet accord prévoit une baisse globale de l'effort de pêche.

Cependant je suis interrogé sur l'absence totale de quotas pour la pêche du poulpe dans ce nouvel accord, alors que cette pêche spécifique est une activité cruciale pour certains ports, notamment en Galice et qu'elle était, jusqu'alors, prise en compte.

Quelles sont les raisons qui expliquent l'interdiction de cette pêche spécifique, alors que pour les autres espèces l'accord prévoit simplement de baisser le niveau des captures quand le renouvellement de l'espèce n'est plus assuré?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Maria Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(17 mai 2013)

Jusqu'à présent et pendant toute la durée des négociations, la Mauritanie a clairement exprimé son intention de conserver toutes ses ressources de céphalopodes pour sa propre flotte et a décidé de n'accorder aucune possibilité de pêche pour ce stock à aucune flotte étrangère. Par conséquent, aucun quota pour les céphalopodes n'était prévu dans le nouveau protocole; la Commission a néanmoins réussi à obtenir que cette catégorie soit mentionnée, avec un volume de captures autorisé égal à zéro.

Lors de la dernière réunion du comité mixte qui s'est tenue à Paris (19 et 20 février 2013), les deux parties ont convenu de convoquer une réunion du comité scientifique conjoint (CSC, du 2 au 5 avril 2013 à Rennes) en vue d'actualiser l'état de tous les stocks halieutiques, y compris les céphalopodes, et, le cas échéant, d'établir l'existence d'un éventuel excédent.

En ce qui concerne les céphalopodes, même si des signes de reconstitution des stocks ont été constatés, le CSC a conclu que le stock de poulpes de Mauritanie restait surexploité. Néanmoins, le CSC a convenu qu'une étude devait être menée par des scientifiques de l'IEO en vue de valider un modèle de gestion qui permettrait d'augmenter de manière assez significative les futurs rendements de cette pêcherie. Des scientifiques de l'UE et de Mauritanie devraient se réunir prochainement pour conclure les travaux scientifiques et valider un modèle. Sur cette base, la Commission sera en mesure d'examiner à nouveau avec les autorités mauritaniennes l'allocation possible d'un excédent à l'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002522/13
to the Commission
François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Fisheries agreement with Mauritania

As the rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Budgets on the EU-Mauritania Fisheries Agreement, I proposed that the agreement should be adopted as negotiated.

Rejecting the agreement would have nothing but adverse consequences:

— for Mauritania, which enjoys vitally important financial support;

— for European fishers, who are given access to a resource which allows them to sustain their activities and keep their jobs;

— for fisheries resources, since this agreement provides for an overall reduction in fishing effort.

However, I have been asked why this new agreement contains no fishing quotas at all for octopus, given that this specific form of fishing is a crucial activity for certain ports, in particular in Galicia, and given that it was previously included in the agreement.

What are the reasons behind the ban on this specific form of fishing, given that the agreement provides for a simple reduction in catches for other species whose replenishment is no longer guaranteed?

Answer given by Ms Maria Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(17 May 2013)

Until now and during the whole negotiations, Mauritania made clear its intention to keep all cephalopods resources for its own fleet and decided not to grant any fishing opportunities for this stock to any foreign fleet. Therefore, there was no quota for cephalopods included in the new Protocol; the Commission nevertheless succeeded in having this category mentioned, with zero volume of authorised catches.

During the last Joint Committee in Paris (19-20 February 2013), both parties agreed to convene a Joint Scientific Committee (JSC, 2-5 April 2013 in Rennes, France) with the aim of updating the status of all fish stocks, including cephalopods and possibly identify the existence of a potential surplus.

Concerning cephalopods, even if some signs of recovery were noted, the JSC concluded that the octopus stock of Mauritania remains overexploited. Nevertheless, the JSC agreed on a study to validate a management model carried out by IEO scientists that could allow for quite significant increases of future yields of this fishery. As a next step, scientists from the EU and Mauritania should meet in the near future to complete the scientific work and validate a model. On that basis, the Commission will be in a position to discuss again with the Mauritanian authorities the possible allocation of a surplus to the EU.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002523/13
a la Comisión
Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL), Carmen Romero López (S&D), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) y Sylvie Guillaume (S&D)
(5 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Acceso de las organizaciones no gubernamentales (ONG) y de los medios de comunicación a los centros de retención y derecho a la información

Los diputados al Parlamento Europeo tienen derecho a visitar los centros de retención para extranjeros en la EU. El ejercicio de este derecho ha confirmado la necesidad de un acceso abierto a estos centros y de transparencia sobre su funcionamiento y el respeto de los derechos de los detenidos. En 2012, la campaña «Open Access Now» tenía como objetivo comprobar el acceso a la información de las ONG y de los medios de comunicación, que se les denegó en España, Bélgica, Bulgaria, Polonia, Francia e Italia. Italia llegó incluso a denegar el acceso a una organización especializada en Derecho de extranjería. Algunas peticiones no recibieron respuesta alguna o fueron denegadas sin motivo real: «no se puede atender a su petición» o «la petición se ha trasladado a las autoridades competentes». Otras fueron denegadas por motivos disparatados: «periodo electoral» y «deber de reserva» en Francia o «riesgo de revuelta» en Italia. En Bélgica, se rechazó la petición de una organización acreditada de acceder con periodistas porque «los residentes no pueden ser expuestos a la curiosidad del público» (ahora bien, la legislación belga prevé este supuesto si los residentes prestan su consentimiento). Tan solo se permitió una visita de la sociedad civil en Rumanía.

1. ¿Considera la Comisión satisfactoria la contribución de los Estados miembros a la aplicación del Reglamento (CE) n° 862/2007? ¿Cómo tiene intención de mejorarla?

2. ¿Cómo tiene previsto la Comisión mejorar la libertad de expresión y de información (artículo 11 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales), en relación con la aplicación de la Directiva 2008/115/CE, a fin de permitir la transparencia y el control parlamentario?

3. ¿Cómo piensa evaluar la Comisión la aplicación del artículo 16, apartado 4, de la Directiva 2008/115/CE, ineficaz en la práctica debido al requisito de autorización previa?

4. ¿Qué propuesta podría adoptar la Comisión con el fin de responder a la demanda del Parlamento Europeo, que en su informe (2007/2145) sobre la situación de los derechos fundamentales en la Unión Europea (2004-2008) se pronuncia a favor del derecho de acceso de las ONG especializadas, de manera que su presencia en los centros de retención esté prevista legalmente y no dependa solamente de la buena voluntad?

Respuesta del Sr. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de mayo de 2013)

1. Remitimos a Sus Señorías al reciente informe de la Comisión relativo a la aplicación del Reglamento (CE) n° 862/2007 sobre las estadísticas comunitarias en el ámbito de la migración y la protección internacional (COM(2012) 528 de 20.9.2012) y a las conclusiones del mismo.

2.-4. El artículo 16, apartado 4, de la Directiva 2008/115/CE relativa al retorno consagró en la legislación el derecho de las organizaciones y los organismos nacionales, internacionales y no gubernamentales pertinentes y competentes a visitar los centros de internamiento previos a la expulsión. Estas visitas podrán estar sujetas a autorización.

El objetivo del artículo 16, apartado 4, es permitir que las ONG puedan verificar la situación de internamiento previo a la expulsión de los nacionales de terceros países y su conformidad con los derechos humanos, independientemente de que exista o no una invitación específica de los detenidos. El derecho que reconoce el artículo 16, apartado 4, a los Estados miembros a que estas visitas estén «sujetas a autorización» es un requisito de procedimiento que debe ser aplicado por los Estados miembros respetando el «efecto práctico» de la Directiva. Una reiterada negativa de los Estados miembros a visitar los centros de internamiento sin justificación objetiva socavaría, por lo tanto, el derecho de las ONG consagrado en el artículo 16, apartado 4, y podría considerarse una infracción.

La Comisión está evaluando actualmente la forma en que los Estados miembros han incorporado las disposiciones de la Directiva 2008/115/CE a sus ordenamientos jurídicos nacionales. En este contexto, se presta también atención específica a la correcta transposición del artículo 16, apartado 4. La Comisión presentará al Parlamento Europeo y al Consejo una Comunicación sobre el retorno para finales de 2013 y pondrá en marcha, si fuera necesario, procedimientos de infracción.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002523/13

an die Kommission

Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL), Carmen Romero López (S&D), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) und Sylvie Guillaume (S&D)

(5. März 2013)

Betrifft: Zugang von nichtstaatlichen Organisationen und Medien zu Einrichtungen für den Gewahrsam und Anspruch auf Informationen

Die Europaabgeordneten haben in den Einrichtungen für den Gewahrsam von Drittstaatsangehörigen in der Europäischen Union ein Besuchsrecht. Um dieses Recht ausüben zu können, benötigen sie freien Zugang zu diesen Einrichtungen und die Betriebsabläufe und die Ausübung der Rechte der in Gewahrsam befindlichen Personen müssen transparent sein. Es war Ziel der Kampagne „Open Access Now" (2012), den Zugang von nichtstaatlichen Organisationen und Medien zu überprüfen und Informationen zu erlangen. Der Zugang wurde ihnen in Spanien, Belgien, Bulgarien, Polen, Frankreich und Italien verwehrt. Italien hat sogar einer Organisation den Zugang verweigert, die sich auf die Rechte von Ausländern spezialisiert hat. Einige Anträge wurden überhaupt nicht beantwortet oder ohne triftigen Grund abgelehnt: „Wir können Ihrem Antrag nicht stattgeben." oder „Wir haben Ihren Antrag den zuständigen Behörden weitergeleitet." In anderen Fällen wurden ganz unterschiedliche Gründe genannt: „bevorstehende Wahlen" und „Amtsverschwiegenheit" in Frankreich und „Gefahr einer Revolte" in Italien. In Belgien wurde der Antrag einer akkreditierten Organisation auf Zugang mit Journalisten mit der Begründung abgelehnt, dass die in Gewahrsam befindlichen Personen der Neugierde der Öffentlichkeit nicht ausgesetzt werden könnten (nun ist dies aber im belgischen Recht vorgesehen, wenn die in Gewahrsam befindlichen Personen zustimmen). Allein in Rumänien wurde ein Besuch von Vertretern der Zivilgesellschaft gestattet.

1. Erachtet die Kommission den Beitrag der Mitgliedstaaten zur Umsetzung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 862/2007 als zufriedenstellend? Wie gedenkt sie, diesen zu verbessern?

2. Wie wird die Kommission dazu beitragen, die Freiheit der Meinungsäußerung und die Informationsfreiheit (Artikel 11 der Grundrechtecharta) in Verbindung mit der Umsetzung der Richtlinie 2008/115/EG zu verbessern, um Transparenz und parlamentarische Kontrolle zu ermöglichen?

3. Wie wird die Kommission zur Umsetzung von Artikel 16 Absatz 4 der Richtlinie 2008/115/EG, der in der Praxis durch vorherige Genehmigungsverfahren ausgehöhlt wird, beitragen?

4. Welchen Vorschlag kann die Kommission annehmen, um der Anfrage des Europäischen Parlaments zu entsprechen, das sich in seinem Bericht (2007/2145) über die Lage der Grundrechte in der Europäischen Union (2004-2008) für ein Zugangsrecht spezialisierter nichtstaatlicher Organisationen ausspricht, damit ihre Präsenz in den Einrichtungen rechtlich verankert wird und nicht mehr lediglich vom guten Willen abhängt?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission

(13. Mai 2013)

1. Die Damen und Herren Abgeordneten werden auf den jüngsten Bericht der Kommission zur Umsetzung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 862/2007 zu Gemeinschaftsstatistiken über Wanderung und internationalen Schutz (KOM(2012)528 vom 20.9.2012) und die darin gezogenen Schlussfolgerungen verwiesen.

2.-4. In Artikel 16 Absatz 4 der Rückkehrrichtlinie 2008/115/EG ist das Recht einschlägig tätiger zuständiger nationaler und internationaler Organisationen sowie nicht-staatlicher Organisationen verankert, Hafteinrichtungen zu besuchen. Solche Besuche können von einer Genehmigung abhängig gemacht werden.

Ziel des Artikels 16 Absatz 4 ist es, NRO die Möglichkeit zu geben, den Status der Abschiebungshaft von Drittstaatsangehörigen und ihrer Übereinstimmung mit den Menschenrechten unabhängig von einer konkreten Aufforderung durch die Häftlinge zu kontrollieren. Das Recht der Mitgliedstaaten gemäß Artikel 16 Absatz 4, solche Besuche „von einer Genehmigung abhängig" zu machen, ist eine Verfahrensvorschrift, die von den Mitgliedstaaten gemäß der praktischen Wirksamkeit der Richtlinie anzuwenden ist. Die wiederholte Verweigerung des Besuchs von Hafteinrichtungen durch die Mitgliedstaaten ohne objektive Begründung würde also das in Artikel 16 Artikel 4 niedergelegte Recht der NRO unterminieren und könnte als Vertragsverletzung angesehen werden.

Die Kommission prüft derzeit, wie die Mitgliedstaaten die Bestimmungen der Richtlinie 2008/115/EG in ihr nationales Recht umgesetzt haben. In diesem Zusammenhang wird der ordnungsgemäßen Umsetzung von Artikel 16 Absatz 4 besondere Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet. Ende 2013 wird die Kommission dem Europäischen Parlament und dem Rat eine Mitteilung zur Rückkehr vorlegen und gegebenenfalls Vertragsverletzungsverfahren einleiten.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002523/13
à la Commission
Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL), Carmen Romero López (S&D), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) et Sylvie Guillaume (S&D)
(5 mars 2013)

Objet: Accès des organisations non gouvernementales (ONG) et des médias aux centres de rétention et droit à l'information

Les eurodéputés disposent d'un droit de visite dans les centres de rétention pour étrangers dans l'Union européenne. L'exercice de ce droit a confirmé la nécessité d'un accès ouvert à ces centres et d'une transparence sur leur fonctionnement et l'exercice des droits des détenus. En 2012, la campagne «Open Access Now» visait à tester l'accès des ONG et des médias et à récolter des informations. L'accès leur a été refusé en Espagne, Belgique, Bulgarie, Pologne, France, Italie. L'Italie a même refusé l'accès à une organisation spécialisée dans le droit des étrangers. Certaines demandes sont restées sans réponse ou sans réel motif de refus: «il ne peut être fait droit à votre demande» ou «la demande a été transférée aux autorités compétentes». D'autres ont obtenu des motifs de refus disparates: «période électorale» et de «devoir de réserve» en France, «risque de révolte» en Italie. En Belgique, une demande d'une organisation accréditée d'accéder avec des journalistes a été rejetée parce que «les résidents ne peuvent pas être exposés à la curiosité du public» (or, la loi belge le prévoit si les résidents y consentent). Seule une visite de la société civile en Roumanie a été permise.

1. La Commission juge-t-elle satisfaisante la contribution des États membres à la mise en œuvre du règlement (CE) nº 862/2007? Comment entend-elle l'améliorer?

2. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle améliorer la liberté d'expression et d'information (article 11 de la charte des droits fondamentaux), en lien avec la mise en œuvre de la directive 2008/115/CE pour permettre transparence et contrôle parlementaire?

3. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle évaluer la mise en œuvre de l'article 16, paragraphe 4, de la directive 2008/115/CE, rendue inopérante dans les faits en raison de mesures d'autorisations préalables?

4. Quelle proposition la Commission pourrait-elle adopter afin de répondre à la demande du Parlement européen qui, dans son rapport (2007/2145) sur la situation des droits fondamentaux dans l'Union européenne (2004-2008), se prononce en faveur d'un droit d'accès des ONG spécialisées afin que leur présence dans les centres soit inscrite en droit et pas seulement le fait de la bonne volonté?

Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(13 mai 2013)

1. Les Honorables Parlementaires sont invités à consulter le récent rapport de la Commission sur la mise en œuvre du règlement (CE) n° 862/2007 relatif aux statistiques communautaires sur la migration et la protection internationale [COM(2012) 528 final du 20 septembre 2012] ainsi que ses conclusions.

2 et 4. L'article 16, paragraphe 4, de la directive «retour» (2008/115/CE) consacre dans la loi le droit des organisations et instances nationales, internationales et non gouvernementales compétentes à visiter les centres de rétention. Ces visites peuvent être soumises à une autorisation.

L'article 16, paragraphe 4, vise à permettre aux ONG de contrôler, indépendamment de toute demande concrète d'une personne en rétention, la situation en matière de rétention des ressortissants de pays tiers pendant la période précédant l'éloignement et de s'assurer que les Droits de l'homme sont respectés. Le droit qu'ont les États membres, en vertu de l'article 16, paragraphe 4, de soumettre ces visites à une autorisation est une règle de procédure que les États membre doivent appliquer conformément à l'effet utile de la directive. Le refus répété, sans justification objective, d'autoriser les visites de centres de rétention porterait donc atteinte au droit des ONG consacré par l'article 16, paragraphe 4, et pourrait être considéré comme une violation.

La Commission examine actuellement la transposition par les États membres des dispositions de la directive 2008/115/CE dans leur ordre juridique national. Dans ce cadre, la transposition correcte des dispositions de l'article 16, paragraphe 4, fait également l'objet d'une attention particulière. La Commission présentera au Parlement européen et au Conseil une communication sur la directive «retour» d'ici la fin 2013 et lancera, s'il y a lieu, des procédures d'infraction.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002523/13
to the Commission
Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE), Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL), Carmen Romero López (S&D), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE) and Sylvie Guillaume (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Access to detention centres for non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the media and the right to information

MEPs have the right to visit detention centres for third-country nationals in the European Union. Attempts to exercise this right have confirmed the need for open access to these centres and for transparency as regards their operation and the rights of detainees. The 'Open Access Now' campaign was launched in 2012 to find out how easy it was for NGOs and the media to access these centres, and to gather information. Access was refused in Spain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Poland, France and Italy. Even an organisation specialising in the rights of third-country nationals was refused access in Italy. No response was received to some of the requests for access, and some were refused for no real reason: 'it will not be possible to meet your request' or 'your request has been transferred to the competent authorities'. Other requests were refused for a variety of reasons: 'upcoming elections' and a 'duty of confidentiality' in France, or 'risk of revolt' in Italy. In Belgium, a request from an accredited organisation to gain access with journalists was refused because 'residents may not be exposed to public curiosity' (provision for this is made in Belgian law if the consent of residents is obtained). Only one visit by civil society was permitted in Romania.

1. Does the Commission believe that the Member States are making adequate efforts to implement Regulation (EC) No 862/2007? How does it intend to bring about improvements in this area?

2. How does the Commission intend to improve freedom of expression and information (Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights) in connection with the implementation of Directive 2008/115/EC, with a view to allowing transparency and parliamentary scrutiny?

3. How does the Commission intend to evaluate the implementation of Article 16(4) of Directive 2008/115/EC, which has been rendered ineffective in practice by the approach taken to granting prior authorisations?

4. What proposal could the Commission adopt in order to respond to the European Parliament's request in its report on the situation of fundamental rights in the European Union 2004-2008 (2007/2145(INI)) for a right of access for specialised NGOs, so that their access to these centres is enshrined in law rather than merely a matter of good will?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)

1. The Honourable Members is referred to the recent Commission report on the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection (COM(2012) 528 of 20.9.2012) and the conclusions drawn therein.

2-4. Article 16(4) of the Return Directive 2008/115/EC enshrined in law a right of relevant and competent national, international and non-governmental organisations and bodies to visit pre-removal detention facilities. Such visits may be subject to authorisation.

The objective of Article 16(4) is to allow NGOs to control the status of pre-removal detention of third-country nationals and its conformity to human rights independently of a concrete invitation from detainees. The right of Member States under Article 16(4) to make these visits 'subject to authorisation' is a procedural requirement, which must be applied by Member States in accordance with the 'effet utile' of the directive. Member State's repeated refusal to visit detention facilities without objective justification would therefore undermine NGOs right enshrined in Article 16(4) and could be considered as an infringement.

The Commission is currently assessing how Member States have transposed the provisions of Directive 2008/115/EC into their national legal orders. In this context, specific attention is also given to a proper transposition of Article 16(4). The Commission will present to the European Parliament and the Council a communication on Return by the end of 2013 and it will launch — if necessary — infringement procedures

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002524/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(5 maart 2013)

Betreft: „Global Forum Alliance of Civilizations"

Op 27 en 28 februari vond in Wenen het vijfde „Global Forum" van de „UN Alliance of Civilizations" plaats.

1. Namen er vertegenwoordigers van de Commissie deel aan dit gebeuren?

2. Waren er waarnemers van de Commissie aanwezig?

3. Zo ja, in welke hoedanigheid?

4. Wat was de kostprijs van de aanwezigheid van vertegenwoordigers van de Commissie?

5. Verleende de Europese Unie op welke manier dan ook steun aan het Forum? Zo ja, van welke aard?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(2 mei 2013)

De EU was vertegenwoordigd door het hoofd van de EU-delegatie bij de internationale organisaties te Wenen. Ook het EU-contactpunt voor de Alliantie van beschavingen (EDEO), de coördinator voor kwesties met betrekking tot de Alliantie in de Commissie en een medewerker van de EU-delegatie in Wenen maakten deel uit van de EU-delegatie op het Forum. De vertegenwoordigers van de EU namen actief deel aan de vergadering op ministerieel niveau van de Groep vrienden van de Alliantie. Op deze vergadering zijn de resultaten van het forum overeengekomen. Op 26 februari hebben de vertegenwoordigers eveneens deelgenomen aan de vergadering van de contactpunten bij de Alliantie, die elke staat of organisatie die lid is van de Alliantie, vertegenwoordigen. Tijdens deze vergadering werd op werkniveau de Verklaring van Wenen overeengekomen. Hierover was vooraf eveneens een EU-vergadering georganiseerd. De EU-vertegenwoordigers hebben tijdens het forum ook deelgenomen aan de parallelle thematische en regionale sessies die aan de belangrijkste thematische vakgebieden van de Alliantie waren gewijd. De EU is geen waarnemer, maar neemt op gelijke voet met de andere leden van de Groep vrienden deel. De dienstreizen van de twee deelnemers uit Brussel hebben ongeveer 800 euro per persoon gekost. De EU heeft geen enkele vorm van financiële steun verleend aan het forum, dat door Oostenrijk werd georganiseerd.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002524/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: UN Alliance of Civilizations Global Forum

On 27 and 28 February this year the Fifth Global Forum of the UN Alliance of Civilizations took place in Vienna.

1. Did the Commission's representatives participate in this event?

2. Were the Commission's observers present?

3. If so, in what capacity?

4. How much did the Commission's representatives' presence cost?

5. Did the European Union support the Forum in any way? If so, with what kind of support?

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

The EU was represented by the Head of the EU Delegation to the International Organisations in Vienna. The EU's delegation to the Forum was also composed of the EU Focal Point for the Alliance of Civilisations (EEAS) and the coordinator for issues related to the Alliance in the Commission, as well as a staff member from the EU Delegation in Vienna. The EU's representatives took active part in the Ministerial level meeting of the Group of Friends of the Alliance which agreed the Forum's outcome, and the meeting of the Focal Points of the Alliance that represent each State and Organisation that is part of the Alliance on the 26 February, and which at working level agreed the Vienna Declaration (also organising an EU meeting prior to this). The EU representatives also participated in the parallel thematic and regional sessions devoted to the main thematic areas of the Alliance throughout the Forum. The EU is not an observer, but participates on an equal footing with other members of the Group of Friends. The mission cost of the two participants from Brussels was around EUR 800 each. The EU did not provide any financial support to the Forum, which was hosted by Austria.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002525/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Philip Claeys (NI)
(5 maart 2013)

Betreft: VP/HR — Uitblijven beveiligd communicatiesysteem EEAS

Uit het verslag „Organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service: achievements, challenges and opportunities" blijkt onder meer dat de dienst voor externe actie, twee jaar na zijn lancering, nog altijd niet over een beveiligd elektronisch platform beschikt om vlot een veilig informatie uit te wisselen.

1. Kan de Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger dit bevestigen?

2. Hoe verklaart de Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vvertegenwoordiger dit probleem?

3. Welke stappen werden ondernomen om het installeren van een beveiligd elektronisch communicatiesysteem te bespoedigen?

4. Hoeveel geld werd al gespendeerd aan een dergelijk systeem? Welk bedrag wordt verder voorzien om het systeem effectief op poten te zetten?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(15 mei 2013)

De EDEO beschikt over verschillende platformen voor het beheer van gerubriceerde informatie die beantwoorden aan de verschillende behoeften inzake rubriceringsniveau (Restreint-UE/EU-Restricted of Confidentiel-UE/EU-Confidential en Secret-UE/EU-Secret), aard (zoals GBVB, GVDB, inlichtingen, missierapporten) of gebruikerscategorie van de informatie (bijvoorbeeld andere instellingen, lidstaten, internationale organisaties). De elektronische uitwisseling van gerubriceerde gegevens met lidstaten verloopt via het Cortesy-systeem, dat door het secretariaat-generaal van de Raad (SGR) wordt beheerd. Andere R-UE/EU-R-informatie wordt voor de lidstaten beschikbaar gesteld via Extranet-R, dat eveneens door het SGR wordt beheerd.

De verschillende interne platformen die voor de uitwisseling van gerubriceerde gegevens bestaan, zijn van het SGR en de Europese Commissie overgedragen. Hoewel de EDEO verantwoordelijk is voor de platformen, worden de systemen die van het SGR zijn overgedragen, nog steeds door het SGR beheerd in het kader van een dienstverleningsovereenkomst. Het beheer van deze systemen wordt geleidelijk van het SGR overdragen aan de EDEO.

De EDEO is bezig met de integratie, upgrade en, ingeval ze verouderd zijn, de vervanging van de verschillende platformen en houdt daarbij rekening met de verschillen inzake veiligheidsvoorschriften en zakelijke behoeften. Op dit moment wordt een nieuw systeem ingevoerd voor de uitwisseling van gerubriceerde gegevens tussen de ambassades van de lidstaten en de EU-delegaties in de hoofdsteden van derde landen.

De EDEO heeft in 2011 en 2012 respectievelijk 6 812 777 en 5 677 533 euro aan zijn beveiligde informatie- en communicatiesystemen uitgegeven. Het grootste deel van dat geld is rechtstreeks door het SGR beheerd in het kader van de dienstverleningsovereenkomst.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002525/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Philip Claeys (NI)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Failure of the EEAS Security of Information System

It would seem from the report 'Organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service: achievements, challenges and opportunities' that the European External Action Service still does not have a secure electronic platform for the smooth exchange of secure information — two years after its launch.

1. Can the Vice-President/High Representative confirm this?

2. How does the Vice-President/High Representative explain this problem?

3. What steps have been taken to speed up the installation of a secure electronic communication system?

4. How much money has already been spent on such a system? What additional amount will be provided in order to actually get the system up and running?

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

The EEAS has several platforms for managing classified information catering to different needs in terms of classification level (Restreint-UE/EU-Restricted or Confidentiel-UE/EU-Confidential and Secret-UE/EU-Secret), nature (such as CFSP, CSPD, intelligence, mission reports) or user category of the information (such as other institutions, Member States, international organisations). The electronic exchange of classified information with Member States is channelled through the Cortesy system, managed by the General Secretariat of the Council (GSC). Other R-UE/EU-R information is made available to Member States via Extranet-R, also managed by the GSC.

The several platforms that exist internally for the exchange of classified information were transferred from the GSC and the European Commission. Although the responsibility lies with the EEAS, the systems transferred from the GSC are still managed by the GSC under a Service level agreement. A gradual shift in the management of these systems from the GSC to the EEAS is taking place.

The EEAS is working to integrate, upgrade and, if outdated, replace the different platforms, taking into account differences in terms of security requirements and business needs. A new system for the exchange of classified information between Member States Embassies and EU Delegations in third country capitals is being rolled out.

The EEAS spent EUR 6 812 777 and EUR 5 677 533 in 2011 and 2012 respectively, on its secure information and communication systems. Most of these amount have been directly managed by the GSC under the service level agreement.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002526/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Legal basis for EU legislating over bankers' bonuses or terms and conditions of pay

There has been widespread criticism in the UK, voiced in the press and by the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, following the recent announcement that under the package agreed at the trilogue on the Capital Requirements Directive an amendment was adopted by Parliament and Council restricting bankers' bonuses to a 1:1 ratio of base salary (exceptionally by shareholder special resolution to 2:1). It was also reported that this will apply to all EU banks operating in third countries, as well to third-country banks operating within the EU. Switzerland has just passed a similar package following a referendum, restricting executive pay and bonuses on a wider basis and not just in the banking sector. Christopher Booker, writing in his column in the UK's *Sunday Telegraph*, has alleged that the EU has no legal competence to legislate on matters of conditions of pay and employment for private companies such as banks, and that this curb on bankers' pay has no legal basis and is merely indicative to Member States.

Can the Commission confirm or deny the allegation made in the *Sunday Telegraph*? If the newspaper is wrong, can it state in its legal interpretation on what legal basis, by virtue of the Treaty or current EU legislation, such a restriction on executives' bonuses can be imposed throughout the EU banking system?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-8077/2012, which addresses, in substance, the question asked.

It can be added that the legal basis for the proposed Capital Requirements Directive IV (also known as CRD IV ([1])) is Article 53(1) TFEU. Indeed, the main objective and subject-matter of this proposal is to coordinate national provisions concerning the access to the activity of credit institutions and investment firms, the modalities for their governance and their supervisory framework. More specifically, the principles and rules on remuneration address excessive risk-taking behaviour which can undermine sound and effective risk management of credit institutions and investment firms.

([1]) COM(2011) 453 final — 2011/0203 (COD) — Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the access to the activity of credit institutions and the prudential supervision of credit institutions and investment firms and amending Directive 2002/87/EC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002527/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: The British public's fear of a mass migratory movement of EU citizens from Romania and Bulgaria following the end of the freedom of movement derogation in January 2014

There has been a recent large surge in support for the UK Independence Party (UKIP), and one of the reasons for this is the alarmist campaign in the British press and by UKIP itself claiming that in January 2014 very large numbers — possibly in the millions — of Bulgarians and Romanians will seek to settle in the UK once official restrictions on their right to freedom of movement under the EU Treaties (granted by way of derogation following EU accession) cease to apply on 1 January 2014. This analysis is based on the previous experience of the vastly underestimated predictions for eastern European migrants to the UK: although only 10 000-20 000 migrants were expected, in fact from 2004 to 2005 approximately 1 million central and eastern European EU citizens arrived in the UK in a short space of time, placing an enormous strain on public resources, although also providing a vital source of hardworking employment for the UK's economy.

One of the global migratory attractions of the UK is the English language, and the other is its generous non-contributory social security system; as UK benefits are often more than the average wage in countries like Romania and Bulgaria, it is understandable why the UK and its social security system should exert such a strong pull on immigrants.

Has the Commission conducted any studies to model the predicted movement of Romanians and Bulgarians to other EU Member States, including the UK, after January 2014?

Can the Commission confirm that EU Member States including the UK can still suspend freedom of movement rights to any or all EU Member State citizens after 1 January 2014 under emergency powers if, by virtue of *force majeure*, there were a serious disruption to the labour market or social security system due to very large numbers of new arrivals?

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

The Commission has not made an estimate of the impact that the ending of restrictions on the free movement of Bulgarian and Romanian workers may have on mobility flows to other Member States, including the UK. Nevertheless, it would refer the Honourable Member to the November 2011 Commission report on the functioning of the transitional arrangements on free movement of workers from Bulgaria and Romania ([1]).

As from 1 January 2014 Bulgarian and Romanian nationals will enjoy the full benefit of the EC law provisions on the free movement of workers in the same way as other EU citizens.

There is no possibility under EC law to unilaterally suspend EC law on free movement of EU citizens which, moreover, already provides sufficient safeguards to protect public funds by ensuring that only those EU citizens who have a job or sufficient resources can stay.

([1]) COM(2011) 729 final of 11 November 2011.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002528/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD) oraz Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD)
(5 marca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Polityka unijna, a wyhamowanie globalnego ocieplenia

Jak twierdzą naukowcy z Met Office – brytyjskiej organizacji badającej klimat – globalne ocieplenie wyhamowało. Badacze doszli do wniosku, że wzrost temperatury zatrzyma się na poziomie niższym niż w 1998 r. Wyniki te uzyskano mimo zanotowanego wzrostu emisji CO_2 i gazów cieplarnianych w Ameryce i Azji. Uznali, że zmiany klimatyczne nie wiążą się ściśle z działalnością człowieka, a mają charakter cykliczny.

W związku z tym prosimy o odpowiedź:

1. Jak Komisja ocenia badania prowadzone przez Met Office?

2. Czy Komisja zamierza zweryfikować badania, na podstawie których przyjęła założenia dotyczące obniżki emisji CO_2 i gazów cieplarnianych przyjętych w pakiecie energetyczno-klimatycznym?

3. Kiedy ostatni raz Komisja zleciła przeprowadzenie badań dotyczących postępów w ociepleniu Ziemi? Jakie instytuty otrzymały to zlecenie?

4. Jakie instytuty, zajmujące się zmianami klimatu, finansuje Komisja i na podstawie jakich programów?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Connie Hedegaard w imieniu Komisji
(24 kwietnia 2013 r.)

Temperatura na świecie wykazuje naturalne wahania w poszczególnych latach i dekadach, jednak zmiana klimatu została udokumentowana na podstawie wieloletnich obserwacji. Z analiz przeprowadzonych przez Met Office Hadley Centre wynika, że ostatnie dziesięciolecie było najcieplejsze od 1850 r. oraz że każda z ostatnich trzech dekad była znacznie cieplejsza niż poprzednia, zaś lata 1998, 2005 i 2010 były najcieplejszymi latami.

Komisja opiera swoją politykę w dziedzinie klimatu na najlepszych dostępnych wynikach badań naukowych i bieżącym konsensusie ekspertów w dziedzinie zmiany klimatu, przedstawionych w sprawozdaniach z oceny Międzyrządowego Zespołu ds. Zmian Klimatu. Komisja nie zamierza zatem analizować tych badań.

Komisja wspiera obecnie dwa ważne projekty badawcze ([1]) skupiające się na prognozach klimatycznych w ramach siódmego programu ramowego w zakresie badań, rozwoju technologicznego i demonstracji. Projekt COMBINE jest koordynowany przez Instytut Meteorologii im. Maxa Plancka i uczestniczy w nim 23 beneficjentów z dwunastu państw członkowskich UE, jednego państwa stowarzyszonego i jednego państwa trzeciego. SPECS jest koordynowany przez hiszpański instytut IC3 (Fundacio Istitut Catala de Ciencies del Clima) i obejmuje 20 beneficjentów z siedmiu państw członkowskich UE, jednej organizacji międzynarodowej i jednego państwa trzeciego. Met Office jest zaangażowane w oba projekty. Szczegółowy wykaz partnerów naukowych i zadań można znaleźć na stronach internetowych projektów ([2]).

([1]) Projekt COMBINE (kompleksowe modelowanie systemu ziemskiego na rzecz lepszego przewidywania i prognozowania klimatu) i projekt SPECS (prognozy klimatu w ujęciu od sezonowego do dziesięcioletniego na rzecz poprawy europejskich usług w dziedzinie klimatu).
([2]) http://www.combine-project.eu/ i http://www.specs-fp7.eu/SPECS/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002528/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Jacek Włosowicz (EFD) and Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: EU policy and halting global warming

According to scientists from the Met Office, a British organisation conducting climate research, global warming has decelerated. Researchers reached the conclusion that rising temperatures will come to a halt at levels below those of 1998. These results were obtained in spite of a marked growth in emissions of CO_2 and greenhouse gases in America and Asia. The scientists have ascertained that climate change is not closely linked to human activity, but rather that it has a cyclical nature.

In this connection:

1. What is the Commission's assessment of the Met Office study?

2. Does the Commission intend to investigate the studies upon which it based its assumptions concerning CO_2 and greenhouse gas emission reductions, which were then adopted in the climate and energy package?

3. When did the Commission last commission studies on the advance of global warming? What institutes won these commissions?

4. What climate-change institutes is the Commission funding, and under what programmes is this funding provided?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

Global temperatures exhibit natural interannual and decadal fluctuations but climate change trends are derived from long-term records. Analyses by the Met Office Hadley Centre show that the last decade was the warmest since 1850 and that each of the last three decades has been significantly warmer than the previous one, with 1998, 2005 and 2010 being the warmest individual years.

The Commission bases its climate policies on the best available current science and on the scientific consensus of experts in the field of climate change, which is presented in the assessment reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The Commission therefore does not intend to investigate these studies.

The Commission is currently supporting two major research projects ([1]) focusing on climate projections under the 7th Framework Programme for Research. COMBINE is coordinated by the Max-Planck-Institute for Meteorology and involves 23 beneficiaries from twelve EU Member States, one Associated State and a Third Country. SPECS is coordinated by the Spanish institute IC3 (Fundacio Istitut Catala de Ciencies del Clima) and involves 20 beneficiaries from seven EU Member States, one international organisation and a Third Country. The Met Office is involved in both projects. A detailed list of research partners and tasks can be found on the project websites ([2]).

([1]) The project COMBINE 'Comprehensive Modelling of the Earth System for Better Climate Prediction and Projection' and the project SPECS 'Seasonal-to-decadal climate Predictions for the improvement of European Climate Services'.
([2]) http://www.combine-project.eu/ and http://www.specs-fp7.eu/SPECS/

(An t-eagrán Gaeilge)

Ceist i gcomhair freagra scríofa E-002529/13
chuig an gCoimisiún
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(5 Márta 2013)

Ábhar: Easnaimh an AE i dtaca le saincheist an titimis

De réir an Pháipéir Bháin Eorpaigh ar an titimeas — *Call to Action* — tá an titimeas ar 6 mhilliún duine san AE agus beidh taom titimis ag 15 mhilliún duine uair amháin ina shaol. Anuas air sin, níl aitheantas a dhóthain ann i mBallstáit áirithe ar an ngalar seo mar neamhord inchinne. Chuige sin, an bhféadfadh an Coimisiún roinnt eolais a thabhairt maidir leis na hiarrachtaí straitéiseacha atá ar bun chun dul i ngleic leis an bhfadhb agus chun breis airde a tharraingt ar an tsaincheist seo ar fud na hEorpa?

Meastar nach ndéantar fáthmheas ar thart ar 40 % dóibh siúd san Eoraip a bhfuil an titimeas orthu agus mar sin ní chuirtear cóir leighis ar fáil do na daoine sin. Mar sin, agus ós rud é go bhfuil dul chun cinn déanta ar ghnáth-thaighde agus ar thaighde cliniciúil san Eoraip le scór bliain nó mar sin anuas, an bhféadfadh an Coimisiún sonraí a thabhairt i dtaca leis na tionscnaimh taighde agus forbartha atá ar bun faoi láthair chun go mbeidh fáil ag muintir na hEorpa ar uirlisí speisialta fáthmheasa cosúil le EEG agus MRI?

D'fhormhór na ndaoine san AE a bhfuil titimeas orthu ní hé an titimeas an rud is measa ach na deacrachtaí a eascraíonn as ó thaobh oideachais agus scolaíochta, tiomána, fostaíochta agus a bheith ag iompar clainne de. Is minic gurb é an stiogma a bhaineann leis an titimeas a chruthaíonn strus agus ní hé an tinneas féin faoi deara an strus; agus is minic gurb é an t-aineolas sa phobal a bhíonn mar chúis leis sin. Chuige sin, an bhféadfadh an Coimisiún eolas a thabhairt maidir lena bhfuil á dhéanamh faoi láthair chun eolas an phobail ar an tsaincheist seo a fheabhsú agus chun dul i ngleic leis an stiogma a bhaineann leis an titimeas?

Freagra ón gCoimisinéir Borg thar ceann an Choimisiúin
(2 Bealtaine 2013)

Aithníonn an Coimisiún gur neamhord tromchúiseach inchinne é an titimeas, a chuireann isteach ar na milliúin Eorpach agus a bhfuil tionchar nach beag aige ar a saol agus ar a gcaighdeán maireachtála. Tá an Coimisiún ar an eolas faoi na meastacháin faoina mbeadh 6 milliún duine ag fulaingt le titimeas san Eoraip. Ach le mórstaidéar ó 2011 ar leitheadúlacht neamhoird mheabhracha agus neamhoird eile inchinne ([1]), thángthas ar mheastachán níos ísle de 2.64 milliún duine san Eoraip a bhfuil an galar seo ag cur isteach orthu.

Is faoi na Ballstáit go heisiach atá sé seirbhísí sláinte agus cúram leighis a eagrú agus a sholáthar, lena n-áirítear uirlisí diagnóiseacha, ar nós Leictreinceifileagraim agus Íomháú Athshondais Mhaighnéadaigh, a úsáid chun titimeas a bhrath.

Maidir le gníomhaíocht i dtaca le titimeas ar leibhéal Eorpach, tagraíonn an Coimisiún don fhaisnéis a tugadh sa fhreagra ar Cheist Scríofa E-001967/2013 ([2]). I dtaca leis na gníomhaíochtaí a luaitear sa fhreagra sin, lena n-áirítear maoiniú taighde ar thitimeas faoin Seachtú Creatchlár le haghaidh Taighde agus Forbartha Teicniúla (2007-2013, CC7), Mí Eorpach na hInchinne i mí Bealtaine 2013, agus an comhchistiú ar an bhFóram Taighde um Thitimeas i mí Bealtaine 2013, is cabhair iad chun níos mó airde a tharraingt ar an titimeas agus chun deireadh a chur leis an stiogma a bhaineann leis an ngalar sin.

([1]) H.U. Wittchen et al: *The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010* ('Méid agus ualach neamhoird mheabhracha agus neamhoird eile inchinne san Eoraip 2010'), European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002529/13
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: EU's inadequate response in relation to epilepsy

According to the European White Paper on Epilepsy — *Call to Action* — 6 million people in the EU have epilepsy and 15 million people will have an epileptic attack once in their life. In addition, there is insufficient recognition in certain Member States of epilepsy as a brain disorder. Could the Commission give some information on the strategic efforts that are being made to tackle the problem and to draw more attention to this issue across Europe?

It is estimated that 40% of people in Europe who have epilepsy are undiagnosed and as a result do not receive treatment for the disorder. In light of the progress in research to date, could the Commission give details of initiatives currently underway so that the people in Europe will have access to specialised diagnostic tools such as EEG and MRI?

For the majority of people in the EU suffering from epilepsy, the condition itself is not the worst thing. However normal life experiences such as education and schooling, driving, employment and being pregnant pose serious challenges for sufferers. It is the stigma associated with the disorder and not the disorder in itself that distresses sufferers and this stigma is most often a result of people's ignorance. Could the Commission give information about what is currently being done to improve public awareness of this issue and to combat the stigma associated with epilepsy?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2013)

The Commission acknowledges that epilepsy is a serious disorder of the brain, which affects millions of Europeans and has significant consequences for their health and quality of life. The Commission is aware of the estimations according to which 6 million people would live with epilepsy in Europe. However, a major study from 2011 on the prevalence of mental disorders and other brain disorders ([1]) resulted in the lower estimation of 2.64 million people affected by this disease in Europe.

The organisation and delivery of health services and medical care, including the use of diagnostic tools such as EEG and MRI to detect epilepsy, is a matter which falls under the exclusive responsibility of the Member States.

As regards European level action on epilepsy, the Commission refers to the information provided in the response to Written Question E-001967/2013 ([2]). The activities mentioned in this response, including funding research on epilepsy under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (2007-2013, FP7), the European Month of the Brain in May 2013, and the co-funding of the Epilepsy Research Forum in May 2013, help to raise awareness about epilepsy and to remove the stigma associated with this disease.

([1]) H.U. Wittchen et al: The size and burden of mental disorders and other disorders of the brain in Europe 2010, European Neuropsychopharmacology (2011) 21, 655-679.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html .

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002530/13
to the Commission
Linda McAvan (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Mechanically separated meat and Baader meat

Following an inspection by the EU Food and Veterinary Office, the Commission recently clarified that a technique used in the UK to mechanically scrape meat off the bone (to produce so-called 'desinewed meat') should be classified as mechanically separated meat (MSM).

This means that desinewed meat must be labelled as MSM rather than meat. The technique is banned altogether for cattle, sheep and goat bones. Desinewed meat can only be produced from poultry and pig bones.

There have been press reports that other countries are using very similar techniques to mechanically separate meat from the bone and that this meat is being exported to the UK. The example commonly given is Baader meat which is reportedly produced in Germany. The BBC recently reported an EU spokesperson saying that as far as the EU is concerned Baader meat is MSM.

Could the Commission clarify whether Baader meat is classified as MSM and what action it intends to take if this meat is indeed MSM?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 April 2013)

A product is considered as mechanically separated meat (MSM) when it complies with the three following criteria, as laid down in point 1(14) of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council lying down specific rules for food of animal origin ([1]):

— it must be obtained by removing meat from flesh-bearing bones after boning;

— it must be obtained with the aid of mechanical means; and

— these mechanical means must result in the loss or modification of the muscle fibre structure.

According to this, Baader meat is to be classified as MSM.

In April last year, the UK reported to the Commission about exports from certain Member States of Baader meat type products which were not labelled MSM. The Commission has contacted immediately the Member States concerned which have taken appropriate corrective actions.

([1]) OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 22.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002532/13
a la Comisión
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(5 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Fondos de la Iniciativa por el Empleo de los Jóvenes para España

El Consejo Europeo aprobó en febrero destinar 6 000 millones de euros, dentro del marco presupuestario de la UE para 2014-2020, para luchar contra el paro juvenil en las regiones más afectadas que registren una tasa superior al 25 %. Esta financiación cubrirá también la recientemente aprobada Garantía Juvenil, que persigue que los Estados miembros ofrezcan a los menores de 25 años una oferta de trabajo o de prácticas durante los cuatro meses posteriores al término de su educación o desde que empiezan a estar desempleados.

¿Qué porcentaje de estos recursos se destinarán a España, y por ende a sus regiones, que cuenta con una media de desempleo juvenil cercana al 56,5 %, según datos de Eurostat? ¿Cómo se garantizará la participación de las autoridades locales y regionales, los agentes sociales y las organizaciones no gubernamentales en las medidas y programa financiados por el nuevo fondo de 6 000 millones de euros?

En respuesta a una pregunta (E-011144/2012) formulada el pasado mes de diciembre sobre la reasignación en España de partidas comprometidas de los Fondos Estructurales pendientes de asignación a proyectos ligados al desempleo juvenil, la Comisión informó que en 2012 se reasignaron 294,2 millones de euros de recursos españoles del FSE para apoyar la empleabilidad de los jóvenes y los servicios públicos de empleo.

¿Puede confirmar la Comisión si en la ejecución de estos fondos se han producido retrasos debido a la demora de la aportación del Gobierno español, tal y como ha sucedido en la iniciativa «Tu primer empleo» del programa Eures? ¿Prevé la Comisión nuevas reasignaciones en 2013 de los Fondos Estructurales a proyectos ligados con el desempleo?

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

El cálculo de la asignación a cada Estado miembro para la Iniciativa sobre Empleo Juvenil se basará en datos estadísticos de Eurostat que se espera estén disponibles en abril de 2013 ([1]). Dado que se ha propuesto que esta iniciativa quede plenamente integrada en la programación del Fondo Social Europeo (FSE), todas las disposiciones vinculadas a la asociación en el marco del FSE también serán aplicables a la programación de la Iniciativa.

La Comisión no dispone de información oficial sobre retrasos en la ejecución de las acciones para las que se reasignaron fondos en 2012. Los fondos han sido reasignados en siete de los programas operativos españoles que tienen por objeto el empleo juvenil: Adaptabilidad y Empleo, Asistencia Técnica, Murcia, Baleares, Navarra, Asturias y Melilla.

Hasta la fecha, la Comisión no ha recibido ninguna solicitud oficial de nuevas reasignaciones de fondos por parte de las autoridades españolas. Tras las próximas reuniones de los comités de seguimiento de cada programa pueden esperarse nuevas solicitudes de reasignación de fondos en respuesta a la evolución del mercado laboral.

([1]) COM(2013) 145 final y COM(2013) 146 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002532/13
to the Commission
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Youth Employment Initiative Funds for Spain

In February, the European Council agreed to allocate EUR 6 billion within the EU's budgetary framework for 2014-2020 to combating youth unemployment in the worst affected regions with youth unemployment rates of over 25%. This funding will also cover the recently approved Youth Guarantee, which aims to have Member States provide an offer of employment or work experience to young people under 25 within four months of them leaving education or becoming unemployed.

What percentage of these resources will go to Spain, and therefore to its regions, which has an average youth unemployment rate of close to 56.5% according to Eurostat? How will the participation of local and regional authorities, social partners and non-governmental organisations be ensured in the measures and programme financed by the new fund of EUR 6 billion?

In answer to a written question (E-011144/2012) submitted last December concerning the reallocation in Spain of earmarked portions of the Structural Funds pending allocation to projects related to youth unemployment, the Commission reported that, in 2012, Spanish ESF resources worth EUR 294.2 million were rechanneled into supporting young people's employability and public employment services.

Can the Commission confirm whether there have been any delays in implementing these funds due to delays in contributions by the Spanish Government, as was the case in the Your First Job initiative under the EURES programme? Does it envisage further reallocations of the Structural Funds in 2013 to projects related to unemployment?

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

The calculation of the allocation per Member State for the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) will be based on the Eurostat statistical data which is scheduled to become available in April 2013 ([1]). As it is proposed that this initiative will be fully integrated in ESF programming, all arrangements related to partnership under the ESF will also apply for programming the YEI.

The Commission has no official information about delays in the implementation of the actions for which funds were re-allocated in 2012. Funds were reallocated in seven of the Spanish Operational Programmes to address youth unemployment: Adaptabilidad y Empleo, Technical Assistance, Murcia, Baleares, Navarra, Asturias and Melilla.

At present the Commission has not received any official request for further reallocation of funds from the Spanish authorities. Following the upcoming meetings of the Monitoring Committees of each programme further demands for funds reallocation can be expected in response to the developments in the labour market.

([1]) COM(2013) 145 final, COM(2013) 146 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002533/13
an die Kommission
Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE)
(5. März 2013)

Betrifft: Mutmaßlicher Missbrauch von EU-Mitteln im serbischen Gesundheitswesen

Nach Angaben der serbischen Nichtregierungsorganisation „Doctors against Corruption" (DAC) hat die Europäische Investitionsbank (EIB) der serbischen Regierung eine zweckgebundene Kreditfazilität für das Gesundheitswesen in Höhe von 50 Mio. EUR bereitgestellt. Die Mittel wurden im Rahmen eines Sanierungsprojekts mit dem Namen „Emergency Health Project Reconstruction of 20+1 hospitals in Serbia" verwendet. Nach Angaben von DAC wurde bei den Mitteln (teilweise) betrogen, die Organisation reichte beim Europäischen Amt für Betrugsbekämpfung (OLAF) eine Betrugsmeldung ein. Dieses lehnte jedoch ab, den Fall zu untersuchen.

Daher wird die Kommission gebeten, folgende Fragen zu beantworten:

1. Aus welchem Grund hat OLAF entschieden, den mutmaßlichen Missbrauch von EU-Mitteln in diesem Fall nicht zu untersuchen?

2. Wie wird die Kommission die von DAC in diesem Fall erhobenen Betrugs- und Korruptionsvorwürfe bewerten?

3. Ist sie der Auffassung, dass Korruption im serbischen Gesundheitswesen ein besonderes Problem darstellt? Welche Rolle spielt dieses Thema im Prozess des serbischen EU-Beitritts?

4. Ist sie der Auffassung, dass ausreichend Mechanismen vorhanden sind, um dem Missbrauch von EU-Mitteln in EU-Bewerberländern und möglichen Bewerberländern vorzubeugen und bei Bedarf Untersuchungen einzuleiten und Sanktionen zu verhängen?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(7. Mai 2013)

Die NRO „Doctors against Corruption" (DAC) hat in einem Schreiben an die Kommission und die Dienststellen der EIB auf den mutmaßlichen Missbrauch von EU-Mitteln im Rahmen des Sanierungsprojektes „Emergency Health Project Reconstruction for 20+1 hospitals in Serbia" hingewiesen, das aus einer von der Europäischen Investitionsbank eingerichteten und mit 50 Mio. EUR ausgestatteten Kreditfazilität finanziert wurde. Die Beschwerde wurde an das Amt für Betrugsbekämpfung (OLAF) übermittelt, das dafür zuständig ist, ihren Inhalt zu prüfen und zu entscheiden, ob eine Untersuchung eingeleitet wird. Nach Analyse der von der NRO bereitgestellten Angaben gelangte OLAF zu dem Schluss, dass kein Grund für die Einleitung einer Untersuchung besteht. Die Beschwerde wurde daher abgewiesen und der NRO „DAC" diese Entscheidung von der EIB im September 2012 mitgeteilt.

Wie im Fortschrittsbericht 2012 ([1]) dargelegt, ist der Gesundheitssektor in Serbien nach wie vor besonders anfällig für Korruption. Die serbische Regierung plant daher die Annahme einer nationalen Strategie und eines Aktionsplans zur Korruptionsbekämpfung in der ersten Jahreshälfte 2013. Zu den wichtigsten in dem Strategieentwurf genannten Bereichen zählt die Verhütung und Bekämpfung von Korruption im Gesundheitswesen.

Die Kommission macht im Rahmen der bestehenden Präventions-, Untersuchungs- und Sanktionierungsmechanismen, die zur Bekämpfung des Missbrauchs von EU-Mitteln dienen, in vollem Umfang Gebrauch von ihrer Betrugsbekämpfungsstrategie aus dem Jahr 2011, mit dem Ziel, die Betrugspräventions-, Ermittlungs- und Untersuchungstechniken zu verbessern und zu aktualisieren, einen höheren Anteil der aufgrund von Betrug entgangenen Mittel einzuziehen und künftige Betrugsfälle durch angemessene Sanktionen zu unterbinden. Sie wird dabei von OLAF unterstützt, das mutmaßliche Fälle des Missbrauchs von EU-Mitteln untersucht sowie Daten aus seiner eigenen operativen Arbeit und aus einer Vielzahl anderer Quellen erfasst, darunter Prüfungen der Kommission, Berichte des Rechnungshofs, nationale Partnerbehörden, offene und kommerzielle Quellen.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/sr_rapport_2012_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002533/13
to the Commission
Franziska Katharina Brantner (Verts/ALE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Alleged misuse of EU funds in the Serbian healthcare sector

According to the Serbian non-governmental organisation Doctors against Corruption (DAC), the European Investment Bank (EIB) has provided the Serbian Government with a dedicated credit facility for the healthcare sector amounting to EUR 50 million. The funds were used in a reconstruction project called 'Emergency Health Project Reconstruction of 20+1 hospitals in Serbia'. DAC claims that these funds have (partly) been subject to fraud; it lodged a complaint with the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF), which declined to investigate the case.

I therefore ask the Commission to answer the following:

1. Why has OLAF decided not to investigate the alleged misuse of EU funds in this particular case?

2. How will the Commission assess the claims of fraud and corruption made in this particular case by DAC?

3. Does it consider that corruption is a particular problem in the Serbian healthcare sector? What role does this issue play in Serbia's EU accession process?

4. Does it consider that there are sufficient mechanisms in place to prevent, and if need be investigate and sanction, the misuse of EU funds in EU candidate and potential candidate countries?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2013)

The NGO Doctors against Corruption (DAC) sent to the Commission and to the EIB services a letter on alleged misuse of EU funds in the project financed by the European Investment Bank, 'Emergency Health Project Reconstruction for 20+1 hospitals in Serbia', which is a credit facility for a total amount of EUR 50 million. The complaint has been sent to the Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) which has the responsibility to assess its content and decide whether or not to conduct an investigation. Based on the analysis of the elements provided by this NGO, OLAF decided that there was no ground to open an investigation. The case has been therefore dismissed, and this decision communicated to the NGO DAC by the EIB in September 2012.

As indicated in the 2012 Progress Report ([1]), the health sector remains particularly vulnerable to corruption. The Serbian Government is planning to adopt a national anti-corruption strategy and action plan in the first half of 2013. One of the key areas identified by the draft strategy is the prevention and combating of corruption in the health sector.

Regarding the mechanisms in place to prevent, investigate and sanction the misuse of EU funds the Commission makes full use of its 2011 Anti-Fraud Strategy, aiming to improve and update fraud prevention, detection and investigation techniques, recover a higher proportion of funds lost due to fraud, and deter future fraud through appropriate penalties. It relies on the assistance of OLAF which pursues investigations on allegations of misuse of EU funds as well as gathers data from its own operational experience and a variety of other sources, including Commission audits, Court of Auditors reports, national partner authorities, open and commercial sources.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/sr_rapport_2012_en.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002534/13
au Conseil
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(5 mars 2013)

Objet: Réhabilitation de Miklos Horthy, allié d'Hitler

Le maire de Kunhegyes, dans l'est de la Hongrie, vient de décider de donner le nom d'Horthy à une rue de sa ville. Pour rappel, Horthy est directement responsable de la mort de plusieurs dizaines de milliers de Juifs hongrois. Il a gouverné en Hongrie de 1920 à 1944 et fut allié à l'Allemagne nazie pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

Toutefois, Hitler le déposa, craignant qu'il ne signât un traité de paix avec les Alliés. Il a adopté plusieurs lois anti-juives avant son éviction et était à la tête du pays lorsque 500 000 Juifs — hongrois et sous autorité hongroise — ont commencé à être déportés vers les camps d'extermination nazis.

L'an dernier, une statue d'Horthy a été érigée à Kereki, dans le sud-ouest de la Hongrie, ainsi qu'à Csokako, un village situé dans le nord du pays. Une plaque en son honneur a également été dévoilée à Debrecen, la deuxième ville de Hongrie, et en avril dernier, un square a aussi été baptisé à son nom à Gyomro, près de Budapest.

Cette situation nous inquiète d'autant plus que la Cour constitutionnelle hongroise vient d'invalider une loi, votée il y a une vingtaine d'années, qui interdisait d'utiliser des symboles faisant référence au communisme ou au nazisme. Cette loi n'existe plus aujourd'hui. La Cour constitutionnelle a jugé que le texte était trop flou.

1. Quelle est la position du Conseil quant à l'utilisation et à la promotion d'un allié d'Hitler?

2. Le Conseil ne trouve-t-il pas que les principes fondamentaux des institutions sont bafoués?

3. Le Conseil compte-t-il user de toute son influence vis-à-vis du gouvernement et du parlement hongrois afin qu'ils ne laissent pas une ville du pays rendre hommage à Miklos Horthy, l'allié d'Hitler pendant la Shoah?

Réponse
(10 juin 2013)

Le Conseil n'a pas débattu de cette question.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002534/13
to the Council
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Rehabilitation of Miklos Horthy, an ally of Hitler

The mayor of Kunhegyes in eastern Hungary has recently decided to name one of the streets in his town after Horthy. It should not be forgotten that Horthy was directly responsible for the death of tens of thousands of Hungarian Jews. He ruled Hungary between 1920 and 1944 and was an ally of Nazi Germany during the Second World War.

Hitler deposed him for fear that he might sign a peace treaty with the Allies, but he adopted several anti-Jewish laws before his eviction and was in charge of the country when 500 000 Jews — either Hungarian or under Hungarian control — began to be deported to the Nazi extermination camps.

Last year statues of Horthy were erected in Kereki, in south-eastern Hungary, and in Csokako, a village in the north of the country. A plaque in his honour was also unveiled in Debrecen, the second-largest city in Hungary, and last April a square was named after him in Gyomro, near Budapest.

What makes this situation all the more worrying is the fact that the Hungarian Constitutional Court has recently invalidated a law, adopted around 20 years ago, which prohibited the use of Communist or Nazi symbols. This law no longer exists. The Constitutional Court decided that the text was too vague.

1. What is the Council's position on the use and the promotion of the name of one of Hitler's allies?

2. Does the Council not believe that the fundamental principles of the institutions have been flouted?

3. Is the Council planning to bring all its influence to bear on the Hungarian Government and Parliament to ensure that they do not allow a town in their country to pay tribute to Miklos Horthy, one of Hitler's allies during the Holocaust?

Reply
(10 June 2013)

The Council has not discussed this issue.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002535/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(5 mars 2013)

Objet: Réhabilitation de Miklos Horthy, allié d'Hitler

Le maire de Kunhegyes, dans l'est de la Hongrie, vient de décider de donner le nom d'Horthy à une rue de sa ville. Pour rappel, Horthy est directement responsable de la mort de plusieurs dizaines de milliers de Juifs hongrois. Il a gouverné en Hongrie de 1920 à 1944 et fut allié à l'Allemagne nazie pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

Toutefois, Hitler le déposa, craignant qu'il ne signât un traité de paix avec les Alliés. Il a adopté plusieurs lois anti-juives avant son éviction et était à la tête du pays lorsque 500 000 Juifs — hongrois et sous autorité hongroise — ont commencé à être déportés vers les camps d'extermination nazis.

L'an dernier, une statue d'Horthy a été érigée à Kereki, dans le sud-ouest de la Hongrie, ainsi qu'à Csokako, un village situé dans le nord du pays. Une plaque en son honneur a également été dévoilée à Debrecen, la deuxième ville de Hongrie, et en avril dernier, un square a aussi été baptisé à son nom à Gyomro, près de Budapest.

Cette situation nous inquiète d'autant plus que la Cour constitutionnelle hongroise vient d'invalider une loi, votée il y a une vingtaine d'années, qui interdisait d'utiliser des symboles faisant référence au communisme ou au nazisme. Cette loi n'existe plus aujourd'hui. La Cour constitutionnelle a jugé que le texte était trop flou.

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission quant à l'utilisation et à la promotion d'un allié d'Hitler?

2. La Commission ne trouve-t-elle pas que les principes fondamentaux des institutions sont bafoués?

3. La Commission compte-t-elle user de toute son influence vis-à-vis du gouvernement et du parlement hongrois afin qu'ils ne laissent pas une ville du pays rendre hommage à Miklos Horthy, l'allié d'Hitler pendant la Shoah?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003965/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(9 avril 2013)

Objet: Réhabilitation de Miklós Horthy, allié d'Hitler

Le maire de la ville de Kunhegyes, à l'est de la Hongrie, vient de décider de donner le nom de Horthy à une rue de sa ville. Pour rappel, Horthy est directement responsable de la mort de plusieurs dizaines de milliers de Juifs hongrois. Il a gouverné en Hongrie de 1920 à 1944 et fut allié à l'Allemagne nazie pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale.

Toutefois, Hitler le déposa, craignant qu'il ne signe un traité de paix avec les alliés. Horthy a adopté plusieurs lois anti-juives avant son éviction et était à la tête du pays lorsque 500 000 Juifs — hongrois et sous autorité hongroise — ont commencé à être déportés vers les camps d'extermination nazis. L'an dernier, une statue de Horthy a été érigée à Kereki, dans le sud-ouest de la Hongrie, ainsi qu'à Csókakö, un village dans le nord du pays.

Une plaque en son honneur a également été dévoilée à Debrecen, deuxième ville du pays, et, en avril dernier, un square a aussi été nommé à son nom à Gyömrő, près de Budapest.

Cette situation nous inquiète d'autant plus que la Cour constitutionnelle hongroise vient d'invalider une loi, votée il y a une vingtaine d'années, qui interdisait d'utiliser des symboles faisant référence au communisme ou au nazisme. Cette loi n'existe plus aujourd'hui. La Cour constitutionnelle a jugé que le texte était trop flou.

1. Quelle est la position de la Commission quant à l'utilisation et à la promotion d'un allié d'Hitler?

2. La Commission ne trouve-t-elle pas que les principes fondamentaux des institutions sont bafoués?

3. La Commission compte-t-elle peser de tout son poids sur le gouvernement et le parlement hongrois afin de bloquer l'hommage qu'une ville du pays veut rendre à Miklós Horthy, allié d'Hitler pendant la Shoah?

Réponse commune donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(7 juin 2013)

La Commission européenne a rejeté et condamné à maintes reprises toutes les manifestations de racisme, de xénophobie et d'antisémitisme, quel qu'en soit l'auteur, ces phénomènes étant incompatibles avec les valeurs et les principes sur lesquels repose l'UE. La Commission utilise tous les instruments à sa disposition, dans le respect des pouvoirs conférés à l'Union par les traités, pour lutter contre le racisme et la xénophobie.

La décision-cadre 2008/913/JAI sur la lutte contre certaines formes et manifestations de racisme et de xénophobie au moyen du droit pénal impose à tous les États membres de l'UE de rendre punissables l'apologie, la négation ou la banalisation grossière publiques intentionnelles des crimes nazis lorsque le comportement est exercé d'une manière qui risque d'inciter à la violence ou à la haine à l'égard d'un groupe de personnes ou d'un membre d'un tel groupe défini par référence à la race, la couleur, la religion, l'ascendance ou l'origine nationale ou ethnique.

Les États membres étaient tenus de transposer cette décision-cadre dans leur législation nationale au plus tard le 28 novembre 2010. La Commission suit de près la transposition et l'exécution de la décision-cadre par les États membres, dont la Hongrie, et elle présentera un rapport sur la mise en œuvre dans le courant de l'année.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002535/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Rehabilitation of Miklos Horthy, an ally of Hitler

The mayor of Kunhegyes in eastern Hungary has recently decided to name one of the streets in his town after Horthy. It should not be forgotten that Horthy was directly responsible for the death of tens of thousands of Hungarian Jews. He ruled Hungary between 1920 and 1944 and was an ally of Nazi Germany during the Second World War.

Hitler deposed him for fear that he might sign a peace treaty with the Allies, but he adopted several anti-Jewish laws before his eviction and was in charge of the country when 500 000 Jews — either Hungarian or under Hungarian control — began to be deported to the Nazi extermination camps.

Last year statues of Horthy were erected in Kereki, in south-eastern Hungary, and in Csokako, a village in the north of the country. A plaque in his honour was also unveiled in Debrecen, the second-largest city in Hungary, and last April a square was named after him in Gyomro, near Budapest.

What makes this situation all the more worrying is the fact that the Hungarian Constitutional Court has recently invalidated a law, adopted around 20 years ago, which prohibited the use of Communist or Nazi symbols. This law no longer exists. The Constitutional Court decided that the text was too vague.

1. What is the Commission's position on the use and the promotion of the name of one of Hitler's allies?

2. Does the Commission not believe that the fundamental principles of the institutions have been flouted?

3. Is the Commission planning to bring all its influence to bear on the Hungarian Government and Parliament to ensure that they do not allow a town to pay tribute to Miklos Horthy, one of Hitler's allies during the Shoah?

Question for written answer E-003965/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(9 April 2013)

Subject: Rehabilitation of Miklós Horthy, an ally of Hitler

The mayor of Kunhegyes in eastern Hungary has recently decided to name one of the streets in his town after Horthy. It should not be forgotten that Horthy was directly responsible for the death of tens of thousands of Hungarian Jews. He ruled Hungary between 1920 and 1944 and was an ally of Nazi Germany during the Second World War.

Hitler, however, deposed him for fear that he might sign a peace treaty with the Allies. Horthy adopted several anti-Jewish laws before he was ousted and was in charge of the country when 500 000 Jews — either Hungarian or under Hungarian control — began to be deported to Nazi extermination camps. Last year, statues of Horthy were erected in Kereki, in south-eastern Hungary, and in Csókakö, a village in the north of the country.

A plaque in his honour was also unveiled in Debrecen, Hungary's second-largest city, and last April a square was named after him in Gyömrő, near Budapest.

What makes this situation all the more worrying is the fact that the Hungarian Constitutional Court has recently invalidated a law, adopted around 20 years ago, which prohibited the use of Communist or Nazi symbols. This law no longer exists. The Constitutional Court decided that the text was too vague.

1. What is the Commission's position on the use and the promotion of the name of one of Hitler's allies?

2. Does the Commission not believe that the fundamental principles of the institutions have been flouted?

3. Is the Commission planning to bring all its influence to bear on the Hungarian Government and Parliament in order to block the tribute which a town wishes to pay to Miklós Horthy, one of Hitler's allies during the Shoah?

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2013)

The European Commission has repeatedly rejected and condemned all manifestations of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism regardless of who they come from, as these phenomena are incompatible with the values and principles the EU is founded on. The Commission uses all the instruments at its disposal, in line with the powers conferred to the Union by the Treaties, to fight against racism and xenophobia.

The framework Decision 2008/913/JHA on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law obliges all EU Member States to make punishable the intentional public condoning, denial or gross trivialisation of the Nazi crimes when the conduct is carried out in a manner likely to incite to violence or hatred against a group of persons or a member of such a group defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin.

Member States were obliged to transpose this framework Decision into their national laws by 28 November 2010. The Commission is closely monitoring the transposition and implementation of the framework Decision by Member States, including Hungary, and it will deliver an implementation report later in the year.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002536/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(5 mars 2013)

Objet: Plafonner le salaire des grands patrons

Les citoyens suisses ont choisi ce week-end, par un vote d'initiative populaire, de mettre fin à certains excès salariaux de patrons de grandes entreprises, une décision que partagent beaucoup de décideurs face caméra mais nettement moins quand il s'agit de voter des textes législatifs en ce sens.

1. Comment se positionne la Commission par rapport à ce vote?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle encourager les États en ce sens?

3. En cas de réponse affirmative à la question précédente, comment compte-t-elle s'y prendre; et dans la négative, pourquoi?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(2 mai 2013)

L'initiative populaire en Suisse «contre les rémunérations abusives» montre l'importance politique de la question de la rémunération des dirigeants d'entreprises. Des développements politiques et législatifs sont également à signaler dans plusieurs États membres (dont l'Allemagne, la France et le Royaume-Uni).

S'agissant des banques, la Commission vient de saluer l'accord politique survenu sur de nouvelles règles imposant des exigences prudentielles plus strictes, lesquelles vont renforcer sensiblement le cadre réglementaire européen en matière de gouvernance et de structure des politiques de rémunération des banquiers. En effet, la «CRD (Capital Requirements Directive) 4» introduit un ratio maximal entre les composantes fixe et variable de la rémunération de 1:1, ainsi que la possibilité pour les actionnaires d'augmenter ce ratio jusqu'à 1:2 avec une majorité qualifiée.

S'agissant des sociétés cotées, suite au Livre vert de 2011 et à la consultation publique de 2012, la Commission a publié un Plan d'action sur le droit européen des sociétés et la gouvernance d'entreprise en décembre 2012. Comme annoncé par ce Plan, la Commission proposera en 2013 une initiative, éventuellement sous la forme d'une modification de la directive sur les droits des actionnaires, afin d'améliorer la transparence des politiques de rémunération et d'accorder aux actionnaires, de façon obligatoire, le droit de se prononcer sur la rémunération des dirigeants.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002542/13
aan de Commissie
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL)
(5 maart 2013)

Betreft: Strenge aanpak bonussen bedrijfsleven

Gisteren heeft de Zwitserse bevolking in een referendum haar onvrede geuit over de graaicultuur, de excessieve salarissen en de bonussen in het bedrijfsleven. Zij roept het Zwitserse parlement op om een strenge wet op te stellen die, naast bonussen en salarissen van managers inperkt, ook gouden handdrukken en startpremies verbiedt. Aandeelhouders mogen voortaan over de bonussen van de bedrijfstop stemmen.

Gezien de huidige economische crisis en tijden van economische en financiële versobering in alle lidstaten van de EU, heb ik de volgende vragen aan de Commissie:

1. Steunt de Commissie de geest van dit voorstel van wetgeving in Zwitserland? Zo nee, waarom niet?

2. Op welke wijze zal dit wetsvoorstel impact hebben op de interne markt van de Europese Unie?

3. In hoeverre acht de Commissie een wetsvoorstel haalbaar voor de Europese Unie, dan wel voor de lidstaten afzonderlijk, waarin bonussen voor bedrijven en stichtingen, zoals goede doelen, aan banden worden gelegd?

4. Is de Commissie van plan ook zulk een wetsvoorstel voor de Europese Unie op te stellen?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(2 mei 2013)

Het burgerinitiatief tegen buitensporige vergoedingen in Zwitserland wijst op het politieke belang van de beloning van bedrijfsleiders. Ook in andere lidstaten (waaronder Duitsland, Frankrijk en het Verenigd Koninkrijk) worden er politieke en wetgevende initiatieven op dit gebied genomen.

Tot tevredenheid van de Commissie is onlangs een politiek akkoord bereikt over nieuwe regelgeving waarbij strengere prudentiële voorschriften worden opgelegd die het Europese wettelijke kader voor de governance en de structuur van het beloningsbeleid voor bankiers aanzienlijk zullen versterken. De vierde RKV (richtlijn kapitaalvereisten) schrijft een maximumratio van 1:1 tussen de vaste en variabele componenten van de beloning voor. De aandeelhouders beschikken over de mogelijkheid om deze ratio met een gekwalificeerde meerderheid nog te verhogen tot 1:2.

Naar aanleiding van het Groenboek van 2011 en de openbare raadpleging van 2012, heeft de Commissie in december 2012 een actieplan voor vennootschapsrecht en corporate governance opgesteld voor genoteerde vennootschappen. Zoals reeds in dit plan is aangekondigd, stelt de Commissie in 2013, mogelijk in de vorm van een wijziging van de richtlijn betreffende de uitoefening van bepaalde aandeelhoudersrechten, een initiatief voor om het beloningsbeleid transparanter te maken en het verplicht te stellen aandeelhouders het recht te geven zich over de beloning van bestuurders uit te spreken.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002536/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Salary cap for top bosses

At the weekend, Swiss citizens voted in a referendum to put a stop to the excessive salaries paid to certain top company executives. Many policy-makers are in favour of this decision in front of the cameras, but significantly fewer want to vote through the relevant legislative texts.

1. What is the Commission's position on this vote?

2. Does the Commission intend to encourage the Member States to follow suit?

3. If so, how? If not, why not?

Question for written answer E-002542/13
to the Commission
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Cracking down on corporate bonuses

Yesterday, the people of Switzerland expressed their dissatisfaction with the culture of greed and the excessive salaries and bonuses in the corporate world via a referendum. They are calling on the Swiss Parliament to draw up a stringent new law that will, in addition to restricting managers' bonuses and salaries, also ban golden handshakes and start premiums. From now on, shareholders will be able to vote on bonuses for top executives.

Given the current economic crisis and times of economic and financial austerity in all EU Member States, I have the following questions for the Commission:

1. Does the Commission support the spirit of this Swiss legislative proposal? If not, why not?

2. How will this legislative proposal affect the European Union's single market?

3. To what extent does the Commission consider a legislative proposal which would impose restraints on bonuses for companies and foundations, such as charities, feasible for the European Union or the individual Member States?

4. Is the Commission planning to draw up a similar legislative proposal for the European Union?

(Version française)

Réponse commune donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(2 mai 2013)

L'initiative populaire en Suisse «contre les rémunérations abusives» montre l'importance politique de la question de la rémunération des dirigeants d'entreprises. Des développements politiques et législatifs sont également à signaler dans plusieurs États membres (dont l'Allemagne, la France et le Royaume-Uni).

S'agissant des banques, la Commission vient de saluer l'accord politique survenu sur de nouvelles règles imposant des exigences prudentielles plus strictes, lesquelles vont renforcer sensiblement le cadre réglementaire européen en matière de gouvernance et de structure des politiques de rémunération des banquiers. En effet, la «CRD (Capital Requirements Directive) 4» introduit un ratio maximal entre les composantes fixe et variable de la rémunération de 1:1, ainsi que la possibilité pour les actionnaires d'augmenter ce ratio jusqu'à 1:2 avec une majorité qualifiée.

S'agissant des sociétés cotées, suite au Livre vert de 2011 et à la consultation publique de 2012, la Commission a publié un Plan d'action sur le droit européen des sociétés et la gouvernance d'entreprise en décembre 2012. Comme annoncé par ce Plan, la Commission proposera en 2013 une initiative, éventuellement sous la forme d'une modification de la directive sur les droits des actionnaires, afin d'améliorer la transparence des politiques de rémunération et d'accorder aux actionnaires, de façon obligatoire, le droit de se prononcer sur la rémunération des dirigeants.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002537/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(5 mars 2013)

Objet: Mesures dissuasives à l'encontre des importateurs d'ivoire

Chaque année, entre 10 000 et 30 000 éléphants d'Afrique sont abattus au Nigeria, au Mozambique, au Gabon, au Cameroun, en RDC, etc., et ce, pour leur ivoire, à destination du marché asiatique, dont la Thaïlande, premier consommateur mondial d'ivoire.

Une pétition a été remise ce mardi à l'ambassade de Thaïlande. Celle ci a été signée par 20 000 Belges et 500 000 personnes dans le monde en un seul mois.

Le nombre d'éléphants chassés et le volume d'ivoire exporté illégalement vers l'Asie n'a jamais été aussi élevé. Chaque jour, 12 éléphants sont tués en Afrique centrale. L'inaction de pays comme le Congo ou le Nigeria est déplorable, car l'argent du braconnage alimente aussi les guerres: il sert à acheter des armes. En 2012, on a encore dû constater l'incursion au Cameroun d'une milice tchadienne lourdement armée qui, en un jour, a abattu 300 éléphants. Acheter l'ivoire, c'est cautionner cette économie de la violence.

Profitant d'une législation trop permissive en Thaïlande, les braconniers s'engouffrent dans la brèche, écoulant l'or blanc de contrebande par centaines de tonnes. La Thaïlande autorise le commerce d'ivoire «domestique». Cela signifie que l'ivoire d'éléphant thaïlandais est permis. Les contrebandiers n'ont donc qu'à estampiller leur ivoire comme thaïlandais pour l'écouler.

1. La Commission compte-t-elle user de toute son influence pour exiger l'arrêt pur et simple de toute forme d'importation de l'ivoire en Thaïlande?

2. Pour rappel, la vente des défenses d'éléphants et de leur peau, en babioles et en tapis, entretient les guerres. Le commerce illégal d'espèces sauvages est d'ailleurs le quatrième commerce illégal dans le monde, après la drogue, la contrefaçon et la traite d'êtres humains. Il pèse 19 milliards de dollars par an. Quels moyens la Commission compte-t-elle utiliser pour faire pression sur les pays les plus impliqués dans le trafic d'ivoire, comme la Thaïlande, la RDC et le Nigeria?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(26 avril 2013)

L'Union européenne joue un rôle majeur dans la Convention sur le commerce international des espèces de faune et de flore menacées d'extinction (CITES). Le commerce de l'ivoire est interdit en vertu de cette convention, et les autorités de la CITES ont formulé des recommandations adressées à la Thaïlande, à la République démocratique du Congo et au Nigeria (ainsi qu'à d'autres pays pratiquant le trafic de l'ivoire) afin de faire en sorte qu'ils mettent tout en œuvre pour faire cesser le trafic de l'ivoire. Le cas de la Thaïlande a fait l'objet d'un examen approfondi par les services de surveillance de la CITES ([1]).

En outre, l'Union européenne attire l'attention sur les problèmes liés à la mise en œuvre de la CITES, notamment en ce qui concerne le trafic de l'ivoire, dans le cadre de ses contacts bilatéraux avec les pays concernés. L'Union européenne entend également aborder la mise en œuvre d'accords multilatéraux majeurs sur l'environnement, dont la CITES, lors des négociations sur un éventuel accord de libre-échange entre l'Union européenne et la Thaïlande, qui ont récemment été entamées.

([1]) Voir http://www.cites.org/eng/com/sc/63/E-SC63-18-A6.pdf et http://www.cites.org/eng/com/sc/63/E-SC63-18-Addendum.pdf

L'Union européenne apporte également un soutien financier important (10 millions d'euros pour les dix dernières années) au programme MIKE (Suivi de l'abattage illicite d'éléphants), géré par le secrétariat de la CITES. Par ailleurs, l'Union européenne est le plus premier bailleur de fonds du Consortium international sur la lutte contre la criminalité environnementale (ICCWC), qui a récemment été créé et dont l'objectif est de combattre la criminalité environnementale sur le plan international, dont le commerce illégal de l'ivoire ([2]).

En ce qui concerne l'Afrique centrale, l'Union européenne a soutenu l'organisation, en mars 2013, d'une conférence ministérielle de la Communauté économique des États de l'Afrique centrale (CEEAC) en vue de l'adoption d'un plan d'urgence contre le braconnage. Les aides dont l'Afrique centrale bénéficie à l'heure actuelle dans le domaine des ressources naturelles, notamment via le programme Ecofac (Ecosystèmes fragilisés d'Afrique centrale), contribueront à la mise en œuvre de ce plan d'urgence.

([2]) Il rassemble le Secrétariat de la CITES, Interpol, l'Organisation mondiale des douanes (OMD), l'Office des Nations unies contre la drogue et le crime (ONUDC) et la Banque mondiale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002537/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Deterrents for importers of ivory

Between 10 000 and 30 000 African elephants are slaughtered in Nigeria, Mozambique, Gabon, Cameroon and the DRC every year so that their ivory can be sold on the Asian market, particularly in Thailand, which is the world's leading consumer of ivory.

On Tuesday a petition was submitted to the Thai embassy, signed by 20 000 Belgians and 500 000 people from the rest of the world in just one month.

The number of elephants hunted and the volume of ivory illegally exported to Asia has never been higher. Twelve elephants are killed in Central Africa every day. The failure of countries such as Congo or Nigeria to take action is deplorable, since money from poaching is used to buy arms and thus fuels wars. In 2012, a heavily-armed militia group from Chad entered Cameroon and slaughtered 300 elephants in one day. Buying ivory means supporting an economy based on violence.

Overly permissive legislation in Thailand allows the poachers to take advantage of the opportunity to sell hundreds of tonnes of the contraband white gold. Thailand allows the sale of 'domestic' ivory, which means that only ivory from Thai elephants may be sold. All the smugglers therefore need to do to sell their ivory is to label it as Thai.

1. Is the Commission intending to bring all its influence to bear to demand that a complete stop is put to any kind of ivory imports into Thailand?

2. It is worth remembering that wars are fuelled by sales of elephant tusks and skins as trinkets and rugs. The illegal trade in wild animals is the fourth-largest illegal trade in the world, after drugs, counterfeiting and human trafficking, and is worth USD 19 billion a year. What methods is the Commission intending to use to exert pressure on the countries which are most involved in the ivory trade, such as Thailand, the DRC and Nigeria?

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

The EU plays a key role in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). Ivory trade is prohibited pursuant to this Convention and the CITES instances have provided recommendations to Thailand, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Nigeria (as well as to other countries involved in ivory trafficking) in order to make sure that they do everything necessary to stop ivory trafficking. Thailand has been subject to specific scrutiny from the CITES monitoring bodies ([1]).

In addition, the EU raises issues related to the implementation of the CITES, including with regard to ivory trafficking, in the context of its bilateral contacts with concerned countries. The EU intends to also address the implementation of core Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), including CITES, in the recently launched negotiations of an EU-Thailand Free Trade Agreement.

The EU also provides significant financial support (10 million euro over the last decade) to the MIKE programme (Monitoring of Illegal Killing of Elephants), which is carried out by the CITES Secretariat. The EU is also the biggest donor to the recently created International Consortium for Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC), which is tasked to tackle transnational wildlife crime, such as the illegal ivory trade ([2]).

Concerning Central Africa, the EU has supported the organisation in March 2013 of a ministerial conference of ECCAS (Economic Community of Central Africa States) for the adoption of an emergency plan against poaching. The current supports in Central Africa in the area of natural resources, and notably the programme ECOFAC (Ecosystèmes fragilisés d'Afrique centrale), will contribute to this emergency plan.

([1]) see http://www.cites.org/eng/com/sc/63/E-SC63-18-A6.pdf and http://www.cites.org/eng/com/sc/63/E-SC63-18-Addendum.pdf
([2]) ICCWC is composed of the Secretariat of the CITES Convention, Interpol, the World Customs Organisation (WCO), the UN Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the World Bank.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002539/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(5 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Stoccaggio abusivo e scriteriato di rifiuti speciali pericolosi nel fatiscente complesso di edifici di un'ex impresa a Pernumia (PD), a ridosso di una ZPS

A Pernumia (Padova) si trovano i fabbricati fatiscenti della ex C&C, impresa ora cessata, dedita in passato allo svolgimento di attività di recupero di scarti industriali, ma successivamente implicata in un traffico illecito di rifiuti tossici, vicenda che ha portato al sequestro dell'intera area nel 2005 da parte del Nucleo investigativo del Corpo forestale dello Stato. Da allora non è stato posto in essere alcun intervento di bonifica e di messa in sicurezza della struttura, all'interno della quale sono a tutt'oggi stivate in modo incontrollato e non autorizzato 52 000 tonnellate di fanghi pericolosi, contenenti idrocarburi e metalli pesanti di vario genere: piombo, mercurio, cadmio, cromo, nichel, arsenico, antimonio, cobalto, alluminio e altri.

Tali edifici versano, infatti, in uno stato di totale abbandono e degrado, e presentano numerose aperture nel tetto (in amianto) e nella struttura portante che consentono al materiale tossico di disperdersi nell'ambiente circostante grazie all'azione di vento e pioggia, compiendo quindi un'incessante attività di contaminazione ambientale. La struttura è ubicata in un'area sita a ridosso di una ZPS e rischia di contaminare direttamente i territori di ben tre comuni della provincia di Padova (il già citato Pernumia, Battaglia Terme e Due Carrare), con zone residenziali e zone agricole di pregio (radicchio bianco di Maserà, radicchio variegato di Castelfranco IGP); dista, inoltre, appena trenta metri dal canale Vigenzone (utilizzato per l'irrigazione) e si trova in prossimità del bacino delle Terme euganee (il più esteso d'Europa) e di alcune «ville venete», edifici di alto valore storico e culturale (di grande interesse turistico). Occorre segnalare la sussistenza del rischio che si verifichi una vera e propria catastrofe ambientale: l'area è a rischio di incendio (principio di incendio già accaduto nel 2007), di alluvione (rischio sfiorato nel 2010 e 2011), di subire trombe d'aria (eventi importanti si sono verificati in una zona limitrofa nel 2010 e 2012) e di terremoto (visti gli eventi sismici che hanno colpito la vicina regione dell'Emilia Romagna nel 2012), accadimenti che sicuramente porterebbero a una massiccia dispersione nell'ambiente dei rifiuti tossici così approssimativamente stoccati.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione effettuare delle verifiche presso le autorità locali utili a monitorare il rispetto della normativa comunitaria in materia di rifiuti/discariche, acqua e aria, al fine di scongiurare pericoli imminenti per la salute dei cittadini e per l'ambiente?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(25 aprile 2013)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza della situazione descritta dall'onorevole parlamentare e chiederà alle autorità italiane di fornire ulteriori informazioni, compreso sulle eventuali misure che intendono adottare per risolvere il problema cui si fa riferimento nell'interrogazione scritta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002539/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Improper and excessive storage of hazardous waste in the run-down complex of buildings of a former company located in Pernumia (PD), next to a special protection area (SPA)

There are run-down buildings in Pernumia (Padua) belonging to the former company C&C. This company, which has now ceased operating, focused specifically in the past on activities involving the recovery of industrial waste, but was subsequently involved in an illicit trade in toxic waste. This matter led to the entire area being seized by the investigation unit of the National Forest Rangers in 2005. Since then, there has been no action to clean up and make the structure safe. It still has stored in it today in uncontrolled and unauthorised conditions 52 000 tonnes of hazardous sludge containing hydrocarbons and various types of heavy metals: lead, mercury, cadmium, chromium, nickel, arsenic, antimony, cobalt, aluminium and others.

These buildings are actually in a state of complete abandon and disrepair and have numerous holes in the (asbestos) roof and in the support structure, allowing toxic material to escape into the surrounding environment due to the action of the wind and rain, thereby causing non-stop environmental contamination. The structure is located in an area next to an SPA and threatens to contaminate directly the territory of at least three municipalities in the province of Padua (Pernumia, already mentioned, Battaglia Terme and Due Carrare), containing residential areas and prime agricultural land (producing *Maserà white radicchio* and *radicchio variegato di Castelfranco* PGI [protected geographical indication]). It is also only 30 metres away from the Vigenzone Canal (used for irrigation) and is in the vicinity of the Terme Euganee spa resort (the largest in Europe) and of some 'Veneto villas', buildings which are of great historical and cultural value (and tourist sites of great interest). It should be pointed out that there is a risk of a genuine environmental disaster occurring. The area is at risk of fire (a fire already broke out in 2007), flooding (near-miss in 2010 and 2011), whirlwinds (major incidents occurred in a nearby area in 2010 and 2012) and earthquake (as we saw, earthquakes hit the neighbouring region of Emilia Romagna in 2012). These are incidents which could definitely cause the toxic waste stored in such close proximity to be discharged into the environment on a massive scale.

In light of the above, can the Commission carry out checks with the local authorities to monitor compliance with EU regulations in terms of waste/landfills, water and air in order to avert the imminent dangers to the local inhabitants' health and the environment?

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

The Commission is not aware of the situation described by the Honorouable Member and will ask Italian authorities for further information, including on any measures they may plan to take to address the problem referred to in the written question.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002540/13
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(5 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Indagine sull'erogazione di mutui bancari

Una recente indagine condotta dalla polizia municipale di Prato nell'ambito della lotta all'evasione fiscale e contributiva ha dimostrato come negli ultimi anni si sia verificato in città un fenomeno singolare, ovvero il proliferare di mutui concessi dalle banche pratesi a cittadini cinesi, senza che questi presentassero le normali garanzie richieste.

Negli ultimi 8 anni sono stati infatti elargiti circa 200 milioni di euro attraverso un migliaio di mutui, erogati a cittadini cinesi che dichiaravano redditi ben inferiori ai 10 mila euro lordi all'anno, riuscendo però a pagare rate mensili stabilite mediamente in 1 500 euro.

Tutto questo non può che significare che vi sia qualche garante occulto cinese, o piuttosto una rete, che utilizza gli enormi profitti illegali per coprire e aiutare i propri connazionali.

Accanto a questo fenomeno ce n'è un altro sul quale sta indagando anche la procura, che si ricollega all'ormai celebre vicenda della banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena: a Prato molti mutui sarebbero stati infatti utilizzati dai cinesi sia per acquistare prime case, spesso per l'intero valore dell'immobile, ma anche per titoli e obbligazioni emesse dalla stessa MPS. In molti casi, poi, i beneficiari dei mutui sarebbero rientrati in Cina senza estinguere il mutuo, e questo avrebbe portato nella disponibilità di MPS un patrimonio immobiliare di scarso valore, con conseguente perdita di bilancio ed erosione di liquidità.

In un periodo in cui risulta molto difficoltoso ottenere un credito per qualsiasi cittadino dotato delle normali garanzie, pare molto strana questa improvvisa «generosità», che sembrerebbe nascondere un grosso giro di riciclaggio di denaro.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza di questi fatti?

2. Quali misure sono previste come garanzia per prevenire fenomeni di riciclaggio di denaro legato al sistema e alle attività bancarie?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(8 maggio 2013)

1. La Commissione non è a conoscenza dei fatti specifici riguardanti il caso cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato. La direttiva antiriciclaggio (2005/60/CE) introduce diversi obblighi, ad esempio in materia di identificazione, verifica, segnalazione delle operazioni sospette, a carico degli enti finanziari e prevede poteri di controllo rafforzati per le autorità competenti nazionali, inclusa la facoltà di effettuare ispezioni sul posto.

2. La direttiva antiriciclaggio è una direttiva di armonizzazione minima, che impone agli Stati membri e alle banche di dotarsi di misure antiriciclaggio efficaci. È responsabilità degli Stati membri assicurare che le banche applichino correttamente le norme nazionali di attuazione del diritto dell'UE.

Il 5 febbraio 2013, la Commissione ha adottato una proposta di revisione della direttiva antiriciclaggio, al fine di rendere più efficace il quadro giuridico vigente. La proposta pone maggiormente l'accento su un approccio basato sui rischi per gli enti interessati, incluse le banche, e prevede un rafforzamento dei poteri sanzionatori delle autorità competenti.

Nell'ambito del ciclo programmatico dell'UE 2011-2013 per contrastare la criminalità organizzata e le forme gravi di criminalità internazionale, che definisce le priorità in materia di contrasto, il riciclaggio è stato individuato come una questione orizzontale da affrontare in via prioritaria.

In conformità con la nota interpretativa del Gruppo di azione finanziaria internazionale (GAFI) relativa alla raccomandazione 30 ([1]), la relazione finale sul quinto ciclo di valutazioni reciproche — «Criminalità finanziaria e indagini finanziarie» del Consiglio ([2]) raccomanda agli Stati membri di rafforzare le indagini finanziarie in tutti i casi di forme gravi di criminalità organizzata, al fine di lottare contro il riciclaggio.

([1]) http://www.fatf-gafi.org/media/fatf/documents/recommendations/pdfs/FATF_Recommendations.pdf
([2]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/it/12/st12/st12657-re02.it12.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002540/13
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Investigation into bank lending

A recent Prato municipal police investigation aimed at combating tax and contribution evasion has highlighted a peculiar trend that has emerged in the town within the last few years, namely the increasing number of loans granted by Prato banks to Chinese nationals, even when they fail to provide the guarantees normally required.

About EUR 200 million has been granted in the last eight years in the form a thousand or so loans to Chinese nationals, who declared their annual gross income to be far less than EUR 10 000, while managing to pay average monthly instalments of EUR 1 500.

The only possible explanation is that there are a few hidden Chinese guarantors, or rather a network, using the huge illegal profits to shield and help their fellow countrymen.

In addition to this development, there is another matter being investigated by the Public Prosecutor's Office, related to the now notorious Banca Monte dei Paschi di Siena (MPS) scandal. The Prato loans have, in many cases, allegedly been used by the Chinese not only to purchase their first homes, often for the entire value of the property, but also for securities and bonds issued by the MPS itself. Many of the loan recipients are said to have later returned to China without paying off their loans. As a result, MPS has apparently been left holding low-value property, with the corresponding balance sheet deficit and erosion of liquidity.

At a time when it has been extremely difficult for any citizen to obtain credit on the strength of the normal guarantees, this unexpected 'generosity' appears very odd and would seem to be covering up a large-scale money-laundering operation.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above facts?

2. What measures will be taken to prevent money laundering linked to banks and banking?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(8 May 2013)

1. The Commission is not aware of the particular facts in the context of the case referred to by the Honourable Member. The Anti-Money Laundering Directive (AMLD) 2005/60/EC sets up several obligations on the financial institutions, such as identification, verification, reporting of suspicious transactions etc., and foresees enhanced supervisory powers for the national supervisory authorities, including the possibility to conduct on-site inspections.

2. The AMLD is a minimum harmonisation directive requiring Member States and banks to have effective AML measures in place. It is for the Member States to ensure that banks apply correctly the national legislation implementing EC law.

On 5 February 2013, the Commission adopted a proposal to review the AMLD with a view to increasing the effectiveness of the current framework. The proposal places greater emphasis on a risk-based approach for the covered entities, including banks, and foresees a reinforcement of the sanctioning powers of the competent authorities.

Within the EU policy cycle 2011-2013 for organised and serious international crime, which sets out law enforcement priorities, money laundering has been identified as a horizontal issue to be tackled as a priority.

In compliance with the Financial Action Task Force's interpretative note to the recommendation 30 ([1]), the Council's final report on the 5th round of mutual evaluations on financial crime and financial investigations ([2]) recommends Member States to reinforce their actions in the area of financial investigations with a view to fight against money laundering in all cases of serious and organised crime.

([1]) http://www.fatf-gafi.org/media/fatf/documents/recommendations/pdfs/FATF_Recommendations.pdf
([2]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st12/st12657-re02.en12.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002541/13
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(5 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Criteri di selezione ai sensi dell'art. 12 della direttiva Servizi

Con riferimento all'applicazione dei principi sanciti dall'articolo 12, paragrafo 1, della direttiva 2006/123/CE relativa ai servizi del mercato interno, come giudica la Commissione la possibilità che uno Stato membro inserisca tra i criteri premianti per un'eventuale selezione il riconoscimento di una maggiore professionalità acquisita, riferibile all'anzianità di esercizio dell'impresa e all'esperienza determinata dallo svolgimento pregresso di una medesima attività inerente l'oggetto della selezione?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(2 maggio 2013)

Come già spiegato recentemente dalla Commissione nella sua risposta all'interrogazione P-002519/2013, spetta agli Stati membri stabilire la procedura per il rilascio delle autorizzazioni ai sensi degli articoli 9, 10 e 12 della direttiva 2006/123/CE (la direttiva Servizi).

L'articolo 12 della direttiva stabilisce che «gli Stati membri applicano una procedura di selezione tra i candidati potenziali, che presenti garanzie di imparzialità e di trasparenza». L'autorizzazione non dovrebbe conferire vantaggi al prestatore uscente o a persone che con tale prestatore abbiano particolari legami. L'articolo 12 della direttiva Servizi stabilisce inoltre che gli Stati membri possono tener conto, nello stabilire le regole della procedura di selezione, di considerazioni di salute pubblica, di obiettivi di politica sociale, della salute e della sicurezza dei lavoratori dipendenti ed autonomi, della protezione dell'ambiente, della salvaguardia del patrimonio culturale e di altri motivi imperativi d'interesse generale conformi al diritto comunitario.

Alla luce di tale principio, anche se l'esperienza professionale non possa essere esclusa come criterio, può essere presa in considerazione solo quando risulta pertinente ai fini dell'esercizio dell'attività e deve essere proporzionale all'importanza che tale criterio potrebbe rivestire per il rilascio dell'autorizzazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002541/13
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Selection criteria pursuant to Article 12 of the Services Directive

With reference to the application of the principles set out by Article 12(1) of Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market, how does the Commission view the possibility of a Member State including among the award criteria for making a selection recognition of a higher level of professional skills acquired, relating to the company's length of period of operation and to the experience obtained from previous involvement in an identical activity related to the subject of the selection?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2013)

As the Commission explained in its recent reply to Question P-002519/2013, it is for the Member States to determine the procedure for granting authorisations in accordance with Articles 9, 10 and 12 of Directive 2006/123/EC (the Services Directive).

Art. 12 of the Services Directive sets out that 'Member States shall apply a selection procedure to potential candidates which provides full guarantees of impartiality and transparency'. The authorisation shall not confer any advantage on a provider whose authorisation has just expired or on any person having any links with that provider. Art. 12 of the Service Directive also provides that, in establishing the rules for the selection procedure, Member States may take into account considerations of public health, social policy objectives, the health and safety of employees or self-employed persons, the protection of the environment, the preservation of cultural heritage and other overriding reasons relating to the public interest, in conformity with Community law.

In the light of such provision, even if considering professional experience as a criterion cannot be excluded, it can be taken into consideration only when is relevant for the exercise of the activity and it has to be proportionate to the importance that such criteria might have in granting the authorisation.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-002543/13
au Conseil
Catherine Trautmann (S&D)
(5 mars 2013)

Objet: Libéralisation des pièces détachées visibles en Europe

Suite à une proposition de la Commission en 2004 et à un vote en décembre 2007, le Parlement européen est toujours en attente d'une position du Conseil sur la proposition de création d'un marché unique européen pour les pièces détachées dites visibles.

En effet, alors que cela est rendu possible par une libéralisation du marché des pièces de rechange dans certains États membres, d'autres n'offrent pas cette option, au détriment des consommateurs européens qui se voient limités dans leurs choix. Ce monopole des constructeurs automobiles a pour conséquence des coûts de réparation et d'entretien plus élevés que nécessaires pour le consommateur et conduit les ménages les plus modestes à reporter ces démarches considérées comme secondaires, au risque de diminuer la fiabilité de la flotte automobile en circulation.

1. Le Conseil peut-il faire état d'un avancement de ses travaux à ce jour?

2. Dans le cas contraire, et compte tenu d'un contexte de crise où chaque dépense supplémentaire représente un effort important pour le consommateur, pour quelle raison le Conseil se range-t-il derrière le statut quo, faisant fi des délais légaux qui lui imposaient de commencer ses travaux au plus tard en juin 2008?

3. Considérant les distorsions de concurrence causées par cette absence de législation, le Conseil peut-il désormais s'engager à inscrire ce point à l'ordre du jour de ses travaux ou peut-il justifier de manière rationnelle ce choix de différer l'ouverture du marché des pièces de rechange à la concurrence?

Réponse
(22 avril 2013)

Le Conseil n'est pas encore parvenu à un accord sur sa position en première lecture concernant la proposition de directive et il n'est à ce stade pas en mesure de préciser la date à laquelle cette question sera inscrite à l'ordre du jour.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002543/13
to the Council
Catherine Trautmann (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Liberalisation of visible spare parts in Europe

Following a proposal from the Commission in 2004 and a vote in December 2007, the European Parliament is still awaiting a Council position on the proposal to create a single European market for so-called visible spare parts.

While this has been made possible by a liberalisation of the replacement parts market in certain Member States, other Member States do not offer this option for European consumers, whose choices are therefore reduced. This vehicle manufacturers' monopoly has resulted in higher repair and maintenance costs than necessary for the consumer, which means that the poorest households postpone having such work done because they see it as a secondary consideration, at the risk of reducing the reliability of the vehicles on the road.

1. Could the Council give an up to date progress report on its work in this area?

2. If not, and taking into account the crisis where every extra expense is a major effort for the consumer, why is the Council committed to maintaining the status quo, while ignoring the legal deadlines that obliged it to begin its work no later than June 2008?

3. Given the distortions of competition caused by this lack of legislation, could the Council now commit itself to put this point on its agenda? Or can it rationally justify postponing the opening to competition of the market in vehicle spare parts?

Reply
(22 April 2013)

The Council has not yet reached an agreement on its position at first reading regarding the proposal for a directive and cannot say at this stage when this item will be put on its agenda.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002544/13
aan de Commissie
Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE)
(5 maart 2013)

Betreft: Ryanair boekingssite voor vliegtickets

De Europese richtlijn (Verordening (EG) nr. 1008/2008, art 23) bepaalt het volgende: „Facultatieve prijstoeslagen worden op duidelijke, transparante en ondubbelzinnige wijze aan het begin van elk boekingsproces medegedeeld en moeten door de passagier op een „opt-in"-basis worden aanvaard". Dit betekent dat boekingssites transparant en duidelijk moeten zijn en dat extra's niet al aangevinkt mogen staan.

Bij het boeken van een vliegticket op de website van de luchtvaartmaatschappij Ryanair stond maandenlang de reisverzekering standaard aangevinkt. In diverse landen en in diverse talen werden de vliegreizen op deze wijze aangeboden door Ryanair. De klant kon slechts deze optie uitzetten door bij de landkeuze te kiezen voor „Zonder verzekering reizen". Ryanair heeft dit nu iets aangepast, maar nog steeds moet de klant bij de landkeuze kiezen voor „zonder verzekering reizen" waarbij het pulldown menu over de instructie kan vallen. Ryanair verkoopt hiermee zijn tickets via een ingewikkelde „opt-out" wijze en lijkt in strijd te handelen met de Europese regelgeving.

Het boekingsproces bij Ryanair is erg onduidelijk en niet transparant te noemen. De reisverzekering schiet automatisch aan bij het boeken van een vliegticket, en het uitzetten is lastig te vinden op de website.

1. Is de Commissie van mening dat deze wijze van aanbieden van een verzekering bij een ticket in overeenstemming is met de Verordening (EG) nr. 1008/2008, art. 23, waarin helder is gesteld dat facultatieve prijstoeslagen op duidelijke, transparantie en ondubbelzinnige wijze moeten worden mede gedeeld en door de passagier slechts op een „opt-in" wijze moeten worden aanvaard?

2. Indien de EU van mening is dat sprake is van een overtreding, kan de Commissie dan uitleggen waarom hiertegen niet wordt opgetreden door de NEB's?

3. Wie is precies bevoegd bij grensoverschrijdende overtredingen in geval van een overtreding van artikel 23 van de Verordening (EG) nr. 1008/2008?

4. Wat is er geregeld in Verordening (EG) nr. 2006/2004 in geval NEB's onderling van opvatting verschillen?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(30 april 2013)

In Verordening (EG) nr. 1008/2008 inzake luchtdiensten ([1]) is bepaald dat luchtvaartmaatschappijen vrij hun prijzen mogen vaststellen en zijn de eisen vastgelegd waaraan ze in hun prijsstellingbeleid moeten voldoen. Wanneer luchtvaartmaatschappijen en reisbureaus hun tarieven aanbieden of bekendmaken, in eender welke vorm, zijn ze uit hoofde van deze verordening verplicht om ook de vervoersvoorwaarden bij te voegen. De facultatieve prijstoeslagen moeten reeds aan het begin van elk boekingsproces op duidelijke, transparante en ondubbelzinnige wijze worden medegedeeld. De passagier kiest vervolgens zelf welke toeslagen hij wenst te betalen („opt-in").

Krachtens artikel 24 van de verordening inzake luchtdiensten is het de taak van de nationale autoriteiten van de lidstaten die zijn belast met het toezicht op de handhaving van Verordening (EG) nr. 1008/2008 — en dus niet de taak van de Europese Commissie — om te bepalen of de prijzen overeenkomstig Verordening (EG) nr. 1008/2008 zijn aangegeven en om passende actie te ondernemen. Aangezien Ryanair in Ierland is geregistreerd, is het de taak van de nationale consumentendienst (*National Consumer Agency* — NCA) van Ierland om toe te zien op de handhaving van de verordening. Deze organisatie is zowel bevoegd voor nationale als voor grensoverschrijdende zaken.

Verordening (EG) nr. 2006/2004 voorziet in een kader voor de samenwerking tussen handhavinginstanties met betrekking tot zestien EU-richtlijnen en -verordeningen. De uitvoering van Verordening (EG) nr. 1008/2008, die niet in de bijlage bij Verordening 2006/2004 is opgenomen, valt daar echter niet onder. Deze wordt apart uitgevoerd.

([1]) Verordening (EG) nr. 1008/2008 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 24 september 2008 inzake gemeenschappelijke regels voor de exploitatie van luchtdiensten in de Gemeenschap, PB L 293 van 31.10.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002544/13
to the Commission
Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Ryanair's airline tickets booking site

The European Directive (Council Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008, Article 23) contains the following provision: 'Optional price supplements shall be communicated in a clear, transparent and unambiguous way at the start of any booking process and their acceptance by the customer shall be on an "opt-in" basis'. This means that booking sites should be clear and transparent and that optional supplements may not be selected by default.

However, if you want to book a ticket on the airline Ryanair's website, you might not necessarily notice that the travel insurance option is selected by default. This has been the case for months. Ryanair has been offering flights in this way in various countries and in various languages. Customers have only been able to disable this option by choosing their country and selecting the 'Without travel insurance' option. Ryanair has now slightly changed this process, but customers still have to select the 'Travel without insurance' option when choosing their country, at a stage when the drop-down menu is likely to cover the instructions. Therefore, Ryanair is selling its tickets through a complicated 'opt-out' and seems to be acting against European legislation.

Ryanair's booking process is pretty unclear and it is not transparent. Travel insurance is automatically activated when you book an airline ticket and the website does not make it easy for you to find out how to disable this option.

1. Does the Commission believe that this method of providing insurance for air travel is in accordance with Regulation (EG) No 1008/2008, Article 23, which clearly states that optional price supplements should be communicated in a clear, transparent and unambiguous way and that passengers should only accept them on an opt-in basis?

2. If the EU believes that this constitutes a breach, can the Commission then explain why no action is being taken against this by NEBs?

3. Who exactly is responsible for cross-border violations in the event of a violation of Article 23 of the regulation (EG) No 1008/2008?

4. What does Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 provide in the event of differences of opinion among NEBs?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

The Air Services Regulation (EC) 1008/2008 ([1]) states the pricing freedom of airlines and prescribes what requirements air carriers have to meet in their pricing policies. The regulation orders airlines and travel agents to include the terms and conditions of carriage when offered or published in any form. The optional price supplements have to be communicated clearly, transparently and in an unambiguous way already at the start of any booking process and shall be accepted by the customer on an 'opt-in' basis.

According to Art. 24 of the Air Services Regulation, it is up to the national authorities of the Member States in charge of the enforcement of Regulation (EC) 1008/2008 and not the European Commission to determine whether prices are displayed according to Regulation (EC) 1008/2008 and take appropriate action. Ryanair is registered in Ireland and it is the National Consumer Agency (NCA) of Ireland that is tasked for enforcement of the regulation. This organisation covers both national and cross-border cases.

Regulation (EC) 2006/2004 provides a framework of cooperation of enforcement bodies in case of sixteen EU Directives and Regulation, but it does not include the implementation of Regulation (EC) 1008/2008 (not incorporated in its annex) which is carried out separately.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 September 2008 on common rules for the operation of air services in the Community, OJ L 293, 31.10.2008.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-002545/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(5 mars 2013)

Angående: Skydd för de mänskliga rättigheterna i de djupgående och omfattande frihandelsavtalen med Ukraina och Armenien

I Europeiska datatillsynsmannens yttrande över kommissionens meddelande *Att frigöra de molnbaserade datortjänsternas potential i Europa* hänvisas i punkt 102 till den lämpliga rättsliga grunden för överföring av uppgifter i fallet rättsvårdande myndigheter. Det rekommenderas också att specifika bestämmelser och skyddsåtgärder på detta område systematiskt ska införas i de internationella avtal (inklusive handelsavtal) som EU ingår med länder utanför EES.

Kan kommissionen ange vilka åtgärder som har vidtagits beträffande rättsvårdande myndigheter som lämnar in begäranden om uppgiftsöverföringar till företag som genomför sådana överföringar enligt artikel 133 i frihandelsavtalet med Armenien och 129.2 i frihandelsavtalet med Ukraina, särskilt med hänsyn till de människorättskränkningar och förföljelser av politiska aktivister som vi vet har ägt rum i Armenien och Ukraina?

Svar från den höga representanten/vice ordföranden Catherine Ashton på kommissionens vägnar
(8 maj 2013)

De slutliga texterna till Ukrainas respektive Armeniens associeringsavtal med EU, som båda innehåller bestämmelser om djupgående och omfattande frihandelsområden, är ännu inte offentliggjorda eftersom inget av dessa avtal har undertecknats.

EU ser det som väldigt viktigt att i alla sina avtal med tredjeländer garantera en hög nivå av skydd av personuppgifter och strävar efter samarbete för att säkerställa skyddet av personuppgifter i enlighet med europeiska och internationella standarder, och även relevanta rådsbestämmelser och europeiska bestämmelser. De avtal som ledamoten nämner ska bevara Europeiska unions rätt att anta och verkställa de åtgärder som är nödvändiga för att säkerställa att lagar om andra författningar följs när det gäller skydd av den personliga integriteten i samband med behandling av personuppgifter.

Avtalen medför inte något fritt dataflöde mellan EU och de berörda länderna och innebär alltså inte att en adekvat skyddsnivå konstateras i den mening som avses i artikel 25.6 i direktiv 95/46/EG ([1]). Skyddsåtgärderna enligt detta direktiv kommer att gälla och varje överföring måste genomföras i enlighet med den nationella lagstiftning som genomför direktivet. Med andra ord omfattas alla personuppgifter som överförs från EU helt av EU:s dataskyddsbestämmelser.

([1]) Europaparlamentets och rådets direktiv 95/46/EG av den 24 oktober 1995 om skydd för enskilda personer med avseende på behandling av personuppgifter och om det fria flödet av sådana uppgifter (EGT L 281, 23.11.1995).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002545/13
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Introducing safeguards for human rights into the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreements (DCFTA) with Ukraine and Armenia

The opinion of the European Data Protection Supervisor on the Commission's communication entitled 'Unleashing the Potential of Cloud Computing in Europe' made reference in point 102 to the 'appropriate legal basis allowing for the transfer of data' in the case of law enforcement agencies, and recommended that specific provisions and safeguards on this issue be systematically integrated into the international agreements (including trade agreements) that the EU enters into with countries that are not part of the European Economic Area (EEA).

Can the Commission explain what measures have been taken regarding law enforcement agencies presenting such requests to the companies that undertake data transfers under Articles 133 of the DCFTA with Armenia and 129(2) of the DCFTA with Ukraine, particularly with respect to human rights violations and the persecution of political activists, which we know have occurred in Armenia and Ukraine?

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

The final texts of the EU-Ukraine and EU-Armenia Association Agreements, both of which contain provisions for Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas (DCFTAs), are not in the public domain at the present time, neither of these agreements having been signed.

The EU attaches considerable importance to guaranteeing a high level of protection of personal data in all its external agreements, and aims at cooperation to ensure protection of personal data in accordance with European and international standards, including the relevant Council of Europe instruments. The agreements to which the Honourable Member refers shall preserve the right of the European Union to adopt and enforce measures necessary to secure compliance with laws or regulations relating to the protection of the privacy of individuals in connection to the processing personal data.

The agreements do not imply free flow data between the EU and the relevant countries, i.e. they do not imply a finding of adequacy within the meaning of Article 25(6) of Directive 95/46/EC ([1]). The safeguards provided under this directive will be applicable and any transfer will have to take place in accordance with national laws implementing the directive. In other words, any personal data to be transferred from the EU remains fully subject to EU data protection rules.

([1]) Directive 95/46/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-002546/13
Komisijai
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(2013 m. kovo 5 d.)

Tema: Kovos su žmonių išnaudojimu ES valstybėse narėse priemonės

Pastaruoju metu tenka sulaukti nemažai skundų iš Lietuvos piliečių, dirbančių kitose ES valstybėse narėse. Jie skundžiasi dėl išnaudojimo darbo vietoje. Įsidarbinant žmonėms nenurodomas darbo valandų per savaitę skaičius, darbo laikas ar atlygis, todėl žmonės dirba daug ilgesnes, nei priklauso pagal tos valstybės narės įstatymus, darbo valandas ir negauna tinkamo užmokesčio ar gauna mažiau, nei jiems teisėtai priklauso. Be to, yra įmonių, kurios užsiima darbo jėgos nuoma fabrikams ir kitokioms įmonėms, tačiau darbininkui nesumokamas jam priklausantis atlygis.

Dažnai darbuotojai priverčiami pasirašyti sutartis, kuriose paliekama daug galimybių darbdaviui piktnaudžiauti savo padėtimi, pvz., nustatoma baudų sistema. Nukentėjusiems asmenims, bandantiems apginti savo teises, labai dažnai sunku tai padaryti dėl vietos įstatymų neišmanymo, kalbos nežinojimo ir baimės prarasti darbo vietą.

Norėjau sužinoti, kokiomis priemonėmis Europos Sąjungoje kovojama su darbuotojų, ypač ES šalių piliečių emigrantų, išnaudojimu ES valstybėse narėse?

Kokios sudaromos galimybės ES piliečiams, dirbantiems kitose ES valstybėse narėse, apginti savo teises ir apsiginti nuo darbdavių išnaudojimo?

L. Andoro atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. gegužės 2 d.)

Judėjimo laisvės principu, įtvirtintu SESV 45 straipsnyje, kiekvienam ES piliečiui suteikiama teisė laisvai persikelti į kitą valstybę narę dirbti ir tuo tikslu joje apsigyventi; pagal šį principą jie apsaugomi nuo diskriminavimo, susijusio su užimtumu, darbo užmokesčiu ir kitomis darbo sąlygomis, palyginti su tos valstybės narės piliečiais.

Kalbant apie darbo teisės laikymosi užtikrinimą, Komisija norėtų pažymėti, kad valstybėje narėje įsisteigusios bendrovės turi laikytis ES ir nacionalinės teisės normų. Kad tokių normų būtų laikomasi deramai, privalo užtikrinti kompetentingos nacionalinės institucijos.

Kitoje valstybėje narėje dirbantys ES piliečiai turi tokias pačias galimybes ginti savo teises kaip ir tos valstybės narės piliečiai. Jie gali kreiptis į valstybinę darbo inspekciją arba prašyti teisinės pagalbos gindami savo teises nacionaliniuose teismuose.

Komisija netrukus pateiks sprendimus, kuriais bus užtikrinta, kad ES laisvą darbuotojų judėjimą reglamentuojantys teisės aktai būtų taikomi visapusiškai ir kad būtų panaikintas atotrūkis tarp ES suteikiamų teisių ir praktikos. Be kita ko, bus pasiūlyta direktyva, kuria siekiama padėti ES piliečiams visapusiškai naudotis savo judumo teisėmis ir užtikrinti, kad būtų taikomas vienodo požiūrio principas. Pagal ją, *inter alia*, nacionaliniu lygmeniu būtų steigiamos įstaigos, kurios padėtų ES darbuotojams migrantams ir propaguotų, analizuotų bei stebėtų jiems ir jų šeimos nariams ES teisės aktais suteikiamas teises.

Be to, kad būtų geriau užtikrintos komandiruotųjų darbuotojų teisės, 2012 m. kovo mėn. Komisija pasiūlė direktyvą dėl paslaugų teikimo sistemos darbuotojų komandiravimui taikomų nuostatų vykdymo užtikrinimo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002546/13
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Measures to combat exploitation of people in EU Member States

Recently, many complaints have been received from Lithuanian citizens working in other EU Member States. They complain about exploitation in the workplace. When they take up employment, people are not shown the number of hours they will work per week or the working hours or wages. Therefore, people work much longer hours than they are supposed to under those Member States' laws and do not receive proper wages, or receive less that they are legally entitled to. Furthermore, there are companies which are engaged in hiring labour for factories and other enterprises, but do not pay the workers the wages they are due.

Workers are often forced to sign contracts which provide employers with many opportunities to abuse their position, for example, by establishing a system of fines. It is often very difficult for victims to defend their rights because they do not know local laws or speak the language, and are afraid of losing their job.

I want to know, what measures are being used to combat the exploitation of workers in the European Union, particularly citizens of EU Member States who have emigrated?

What opportunities are there for EU citizens working in other EU Member States to defend their rights and defend themselves against being exploited by employers?

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

The principle of freedom of movement enshrined in Article 45 TFEU gives every EU citizen the right to move freely to another Member State to work and reside there for that purpose, and protects them against discrimination in employment, remuneration and other working conditions in comparison to nationals of that Member State.

As far as the enforcement of labour law is concerned, the Commission would point out that companies established in a Member State have to comply with the standards set by EU and national law. Ensuring that such standards are properly enforced is the responsibility of the competent national authorities.

EU citizens working in another Member State have the same possibilities of defending themselves as the nationals of that Member State. They can turn to the national labour inspectorate or seek legal assistance in defending their rights before the national courts.

The Commission will soon present solutions to give full effect to the application of EC law on free movement of workers and to bridge the gap between EU rights and practice. This includes a proposal for a directive, aiming to help EU citizens to fully enjoy their rights to mobility and ensure that the equal treatment principle applies. This would imply, *inter alia*, the setting up of bodies at national level in support of EU migrant workers and promote, analyse and monitor the rights conferred on them and the members of their families by EC law.

Moreover, in order to strengthen the enforcement of the rights of posted workers, the Commission has proposed in March 2012 a directive concerning the enforcement of the provision applicable to the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-002547/13
Komisijai
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(2013 m. kovo 5 d.)

Tema: Maisto saugos užtikrinimas ES

Europos Sąjungos institucijos, atsižvelgdamos į pastaraisiais metais Europoje kilusius maisto klastočių skandalus ir pagausėjusius virusų ir kitų sveikatai ir gyvybei pavojingų medžiagų paplitimo atvejus, sugriežtino maisto produktų saugos reglamentavimą, patobulino maisto kontrolės sistemas, tačiau ES ir toliau aptinkama nesaugių maisto produktų.

Dažniausia pasikartojantys atvejai susiję su maisto produktų iš trečiųjų šalių sauga. Europos Komisija maisto produktų saugos srityje priima sprendimus ir teisės aktus vadovaudamasi nepriklausomu rizikos vertinimu. Tačiau pasikartojantys nesaugių maisto produktų nustatymo atvejai rodo, kad esama maisto krizių valdymo spragų, todėl neužtikrinama veiksminga visuomenės sveikatos apsauga, vartotojai nesijaučia saugūs ir nepasitiki Europos maisto kontrolės sistema.

Nors Europoje veikia dar 1979 m. įkurta Skubių pranešimų apie nesaugų maistą ir pašarus sistema (RASFF), kurios paskirtis – informuoti kitas valstybes nares apie nustatytą nesaugų maistą ir pašarus, tačiau labai dažnai apie problemas sužinoma pavėluotai, kai produktas jau suvartotas ar buvo vartojamas ilgą laiką. Taip atsitiko ir su žiurkių nuodais užterštais lenkiškais saldumynais ir kitais konditerijos gaminiais.

1. Ar Komisija nemano, kad būtina imtis priemonių griežtinant, visų pirma, maisto produktų iš trečiųjų šalių kontrolę ir modernizuojant ES veikiančią kontrolės sistemą?

2. Ar Komisija nemano, jog būtina įkurti ES lygiu su maistu susijusių krizių valdymo centrą, parengti maisto krizių valdymo planą ir procedūras ir užtikrinti griežtesnį bendrą maisto kontrolės koordinavimą Europoje, taip pat ir efektyvesnį valstybių narių maisto kontrolės institucijų veiksmų koordinavimą?

T. Borgo atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. balandžio 18 d.)

1. Atsakomybė už maisto grandinės srities teisės aktų vykdymo užtikrinimą tenka valstybėms narėms ([1]), iš kurių reikalaujama sukurti oficialios kontrolės sistemą, kad būtų tikrinama, kaip veiklos vykdytojai laikosi iš šių teisės aktų kylančių reikalavimų, ir nesilaikymo atveju būtų taikomos sankcijos. Komisija reguliariai stebi, taip pat – ir atlikdama auditą vietoje, kaip valstybės narės vykdo savo kontrolės pareigas. Gerbiamo parlamentaro nurodytu atveju valstybių narių sukurtos oficialios kontrolės sistemos veikė gerai ir leido joms nustatyti atitinkamų taisyklių pažeidimus. Nepaisant to, numatomu pasiūlymu dėl oficialios kontrolės bus siekiama dar labiau sustiprinti esamą sistemą, taip pat ir sankcijų atžvilgiu.

2. Šiuo metu Komisija svarsto, kaip geriausiai spręsti būtinybės atkurti vartotojų pasitikėjimą klausimą, stiprinant priemones ir mechanizmus kovai su sukčiavimu maisto srityje ir užtikrinant maisto grandinės srities teisės aktų vykdymą.

([1]) 2004 m. balandžio 29 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamentas (EB) Nr. 882/2004 dėl oficialios kontrolės, kuri atliekama siekiant užtikrinti, kad būtų įvertinama, ar laikomasi pašarus ir maistą reglamentuojančių teisės aktų, gyvūnų sveikatos ir gerovės taisyklių, OL L 165, 2004 4 30, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002547/13
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Ensuring food safety in the EU

Taking into account the recent food fraud scandals in Europe and the increase in cases of the spread of viruses and other substances posing a danger to health and life, European Union institutions have tightened food safety regulations and have improved food control systems, but unsafe foodstuffs continue to be found in the EU.

The most commonly occurring cases concern the safety of foodstuffs from third countries. The Commission adopts decisions and legislation in the field of food safety based on an independent risk assessment. However, repeated cases of identifying unsafe foodstuffs show that there are shortcomings in food crisis management and effective protection of public health is therefore not guaranteed. Consumers do not feel safe and do not trust the European food control system.

Although the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF) was established back in 1979, the purpose of which is to inform other Member States about unsafe food and feed that has been identified, problems still appear very often at a late stage, when the product is already being used or has been used for a long time. This was also the case with Polish sweets and other confectionery that were contaminated with rat poison.

1. Does the Commission think that we do not need to take steps to tighten, above all, the control of foodstuffs from third countries and to modernise the control system operating in the EU?

2. Does the Commission think that we do not need to establish a food-related crisis management centre at EU level, or draw up a food crisis management plan and procedures to ensure more stringent general coordination of food control in Europe, as well as more effective coordination of the actions of the Member States' food control institutions?

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

1. The responsibility for enforcing food chain legislation lies with Member States ([1]), which are required to establish a system of official controls to verify compliance by operators with requirements deriving therefrom and sanction non-compliances. The Commission regularly monitors delivery by the Member States of their control duties, including through on-the-spot audits. In the case referred to by the Honourable Member, the official controls systems established by the Member States have worked well and have allowed them to identify violations of applicable rules. Notwithstanding this, the forthcoming proposal on official controls will aim at further strengthening the existing system, including as regards sanctions.

2. The Commission is currently considering how best to address the need to restore consumer confidence by strengthening tools and mechanisms for the fight against food fraud and the enforcement of food chain legislation.

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

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-002548/13
Komisijai
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(2013 m. kovo 5 d.)

Tema: Produktų kilmės šalies nurodymas pakuotėse

Europos Sąjungos teisės aktuose privalomai reikalaujama produktų etiketėse pateikti informaciją apie kilmės vietą, bet tai taikoma tik medui, šviežiems vaisiams ir daržovėms, alyvuogių aliejui, žuviai, jautienai ir jos produktams. Europos vartotojai neturi galimybės sužinoti apie kitos rūšies mėsos kilmę.

Be to, vartotojai turi gauti išsamią informaciją apie maisto žaliavų, kurios daugiausia importuojamos iš trečiųjų šalių: Indijos, Kinijos, Turkijos ir kitų, kilmę, tačiau ant maisto produktų pakuočių dažniausiai nurodomas ES gamintojas.

Valstybių narių maisto kontrolės institucijos dėl reglamentavimo trūkumo negali priversti nurodyti tikros produktų kilmės. Todėl vartotojai klaidinami, kadangi iš informacijos, pateikiamos ant pakuotės, neįmanoma nustatyti, ar parduodamas produktas yra pagamintas iš nurodytos šalies užaugintų žaliavų, ar tik joje pagamintas ar supakuotas.

Ar Komisija nemano, kad būtina persvarstyti esamas nuostatas dėl maisto produktų ženklinimo ir atsekamumo, suteikiant vartotojams kuo daugiau informacijos apie gyvūninių ir negyvūninių produktų žaliavas ir jų kilmę?

T. Borgo atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. balandžio 17 d.)

Sąjungos lygmeniu jau veikia visapusiška maisto saugos taisyklių sistema ([1]), įskaitant nuostatas dėl maisto produktų verslo operatorių atsakomybės bei gyvūninės kilmės maisto atsekamumo reikalavimus ([2]). Būtent dėl šios sistemos buvo greitai nustatyta aptariamų sukčiavimo veiksmų kilmė ir apimtis.

Esamas maisto ženklinimo teisinis reguliavimas ES ([3]) neseniai buvo peržiūrėtas ir sustiprintas. Reglamente (ES) Nr. 1169/2011 dėl informacijos apie maistą teikimo vartotojams ([4]), kuris bus pradėtas taikyti 2014 m. gruodžio 13 d., išlaikomas esamas principas, kad maisto kilmė turi būti nurodoma visais atvejais, kai jos nenurodymas galėtų suklaidinti vartotoją. Reglamentu taip pat, be esamų taisyklių, kurios taikomos jautienai ir jos produktams, įvedamas privalomas kiaulienos, avienos, ožkienos ir paukštienos kilmės ženklinimas ([5]). Juo taip pat nustatoma, kad, kai nurodoma maisto kilmė ir ji skiriasi nuo jo pagrindinės sudedamosios dalies kilmės, taip pat turi būti nurodyta šios dalies kilmė. Galiausiai reglamentu reikalaujama, kad Komisija pateiktų ataskaitas dėl galimybės kilmės ženklinimą taikyti ir kitiems produktams: kitoms nei jautienos, kiaulienos, avienos, ožkienos ir paukštienos mėsos rūšims; pienui; pienui, kuris naudojamas kaip sudedamoji pieno gaminių dalis; mėsai, kuri naudojama kaip sudedamoji dalis; neperdirbtiems maisto produktams; produktams, sudarytiems iš vienos sudedamosios dalies; ir sudedamosioms dalims, sudarančioms daugiau nei 50 proc. maisto produkto. Visos ataskaitos turi būti pateiktos iki 2014 m. gruodžio 13 d., išskyrus ataskaitą dėl mėsos, naudojamos kaip sudedamoji dalis, kuri turi būti pateikta iki 2013 m. gruodžio 13 d. Komisija visomis išgalėmis sieks pateikti ją 2013 m. rudenį.

([1]) 2002 m. sausio 28 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamentas (EB) Nr. 178/2002, nustatantis maistui skirtų teisės aktų bendruosius principus ir reikalavimus, įsteigiantis Europos maisto saugos tarnybą ir nustatantis su maisto saugos klausimais susijusias procedūras, OL L 31, 2002 2 1, p. 1.

([2]) 2011 m. rugsėjo 19 d. Komisijos įgyvendinimo reglamentas (ES) Nr. 931/2011 dėl atsekamumo reikalavimų, nustatytų Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamentu (EB) Nr. 178/2002 dėl gyvūninės kilmės maisto produktų, OL L 242, 2011 9 20, p. 2.

([3]) 2000 m. kovo 20 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyva 2000/13/EB dėl valstybių narių įstatymų, reglamentuojančių maisto produktų ženklinimą, pateikimą ir reklamavimą, derinimo, OL L 109, 2000 5 6, p. 29.

([4]) Reglamentas (ES) Nr. 1169/2011 dėl informacijos apie maistą teikimo vartotojams, kuriuo iš dalies keičiami Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamentai (EB) Nr. 1924/2006 ir (EB) Nr. 1925/2006 bei kuriuo panaikinami Komisijos direktyva 87/250/EEB, Tarybos direktyva 90/496/EEB, Komisijos direktyva 1999/10/EB, Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyva 2000/13/EB, Komisijos direktyvos 2002/67/EB ir 2008/5/EB bei Komisijos reglamentas (EB) Nr. 608/2004, OL L 304, 2011 11 22, p. 18.

([5]) 2000 m. liepos 17 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos reglamentas (EB) Nr. 1760/2000, nustatantis galvijų identifikavimo bei registravimo sistemą, reglamentuojantis jautienos bei jos produktų ženklinimą (OL L 204, 2000 8 11, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002548/13
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Indication of origin of produce on packaging

In European Union legislation, it is compulsory for product labels to provide information about the place of origin, but this only applies to honey, fresh fruit and vegetables, olive oil, fish, beef and beef products. European consumers do not have the opportunity to learn about the origin of other types of meat.

Furthermore, consumers must obtain detailed information about the origin of raw materials for food, which are mainly imported from third countries (India, China, Turkey and other countries), but foodstuff packaging usually only indicates the EU manufacturer.

Due to lack of regulation, the Member States' food control institutions are unable to force manufacturers to indicate the true origin of products. Consumers are therefore misled, because it is impossible to establish from the information provided on the packaging whether the product on sale is produced from raw materials grown in the country indicated, or only produced and packed in it.

Does the Commission think that we do not need to review the existing provisions on the labelling and traceability of foodstuffs, thereby giving consumers as much information as possible about the raw materials of animal and non-animal products and their origin?

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

A comprehensive system of food safety rules is already in place at Union level ([1]), including provisions on responsibilities of food business operators and traceability requirements for foods of animal origin ([2]). It is because of this system that the origin and the extent of the fraudulent actions in question were quickly identified.

The existing EU legislation on food labelling ([3]) has been recently reviewed and strengthened. Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers ([4]), which will enter into application on 13 December 2014, maintains the existing principle that the origin of a food should be provided in all cases where its omission could mislead the consumer. It also introduces mandatory origin labelling for meat of swine, sheep, goat and poultry, in addition to the existing rules for beef and beef products ([5]). It also provides that when the origin of a food is given and it is not the same as that of its primary ingredient, the origin of that main ingredient must also be given. Finally, it requires the Commission to submit reports on the possibility to extend mandatory origin for other foods: types of unprocessed meat other than beef, swine, sheep, goat and poultry meat; milk; milk used as an ingredient in dairy products; meat used as an ingredient; unprocessed foods; single ingredient products; and, ingredients that represent more than 50% of a food. All reports are required by 13 December 2014, with the exception of the report on the meat used as an ingredient which is required by 13 December 2013. The Commission will do its utmost to deliver it in autumn 2013.

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

([2]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 931/2011 of 19 September 2011 on the traceability requirements set by Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council for food of animal origin, OJ L 242, 20.9.2011, p. 2.

([3]) 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.

([4]) 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.

([5]) Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 July 2000 establishing a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals and regarding the labelling of beef and beef products, OJ L 204, 11.8.2000, p. 1.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002549/13
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(5 mars 2013)

Objet: Effets des combinaisons d'antibiotiques et de médicaments dans l'élevage industriel sur la santé humaine

Les animaux d'élevage en Europe font l'objet d'une administration d'antibiotiques et de médicaments très importante. Une étude de 2011 montre ainsi la présence d'antibiotiques, de bêta-bloquants et d'anti-inflammatoire dans le lait. Si la prise d'antibiotiques et de médicaments par les animaux d'élevage est assez bien encadrée, aucune étude n'est menée sur les effets combinés de ces médicaments sur la santé humaine.

Le 3 août 2012, une étude menée par l'université britannique Aston et publiée dans la revue «PLoS One» démontre que la combinaison de trois fongicides très employés dans l'agriculture provoque des effets inattendus sur les cellules du système nerveux de l'homme. L'association de ces fongicides exerce sur les cellules gliales du stress oxydant, phénomène qui joue un rôle important dans la maladie d'Alzheimer, et ces effets ont été observés avec des concentrations proches de celles trouvées dans nos aliments.

1. La Commission compte-t-elle mener d'urgence les études qui s'imposent en ce qui concerne les dangers de la surconsommation et de la combinaison d'antibiotiques et de médicaments chez les animaux destinés à la consommation humaine?

2. La Commission a-t-elle l'intention de proposer une législation plus stricte relative à l'encadrement de l'élevage industriel et de son utilisation d'antibiotiques et de médicaments?

3. Comment la Commission va-t-elle lutter contre la résistance aux antibiotiques de bactéries comme le SARM chez les animaux d'élevage? La consommation de ces animaux malades serait à l'origine des maux d'un nombre inconnu, mais en hypothèse élevé, de malades en Europe. En l'occurrence, la Commission va-t-elle demander une nouvelle enquête sur les taux d'animaux d'élevage touchés par cette maladie étant donné que les chiffres avancés par certains pays lors de la dernière enquête de l'EFSA de 2008 semblent assez peu réalistes?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(6 mai 2013)

Le 15 novembre 2011, la Commission a publié un plan d'action pour combattre les menaces croissantes de la résistance aux antimicrobiens ([1]). Celui-ci comprend 12 actions, parmi lesquelles le développement de l'utilisation appropriée des antimicrobiens dans tous les États membres. La Commission a récemment demandé un avis scientifique à l'Agence européenne des médicaments (EMA) sur l'incidence de l'administration d'antibiotiques aux animaux sur la santé publique et la santé animale. En guise de préparation à la révision de la législation sur les médicaments vétérinaires, les effets des mesures qui pourraient contribuer à diminuer la résistance aux antimicrobiens sont en cours d'évaluation. La Commission élabore actuellement, sur la base de l'avis de l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA), une proposition législative pour une surveillance harmonisée de la résistance aux antimicrobiens des bactéries zoonotiques et commensales dans l'Union européenne.

La Commission soutient activement la recherche et l'innovation dans le domaine de la résistance aux antimicrobiens.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0748:FIN:FR:PDF

Le thème 2 du septième programme-cadre de recherche ([2]) comprenait un vaste projet de recherche sur «l'écologie des bactéries résistantes aux médicaments et la propagation de la résistance aux antimicrobiens tout au long de la chaîne alimentaire» (*ecology of drug resistant bacteria and transfer of antimicrobial resistance throughout the food chain*). Le projet retenu devrait déterminer les facteurs de risques. Il ne concerne pas nécessairement la combinaison de médicaments, mais évaluera les risques de la transmission de la résistance aux antimicrobiens au sein de la chaîne alimentaire. Chez les animaux, les médicaments doivent être utilisés conformément à l'autorisation de mise sur le marché. Concernant le staphylocoque doré résistant à la méthicilline, le projet de recherche «Pilgrim» ([3]) porte tant sur les aspects vétérinaires que sur ceux liés à la santé publique. Quant au futur programme-cadre («Horizon 2020»), la Commission, dans sa proposition de programme spécifique ([4]), a prévu des activités de recherche et d'innovation en matière de résistance aux antimicrobiens dans le cadre des défis intitulés «Agriculture et sylviculture durables» et «Des aliments et des régimes alimentaires sains et sûrs pour tous».

([2]) Commission européenne C(2012) 4536 du 9 juillet 2012.
([3]) http://www.fp7-pilgrim.eu/fp7/project.html
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0811:FIN:FR:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002549/13
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Effects on human health of combining antibiotics and other medications in industrial livestock farming

Significant quantities of antibiotics and other medications are administered to livestock in Europe. A study carried out in 2011 found that milk contained antibiotics, beta blockers and anti-inflammatories. Although the use of antibiotics and other medications in livestock is quite closely supervised, there have not yet been any studies into the combined effects of these medications on human health.

A study carried out by the UK's Aston University and published in the 'PLoS One' journal on 3 August 2012 showed that the combination of three fungicides widely used in agriculture gives rise to unexpected effects on human nervous system cells. The combination of these fungicides exerts oxidative stress on glial cells, a phenomenon which plays a key role in Alzheimer's disease, and these effects have been observed at levels close to those found in our foods.

1. Is the Commission intending to carry out the urgently necessary studies into the risks of over-consumption and the combination of antibiotics and other medications in animals intended for human consumption?

2. Is the Commission intending to propose more stringent legislation on the supervision of industrial livestock production and its use of antibiotics and other medications?

3. How does the Commission intend to combat the antibiotic resistance of bacteria such as MRSA in livestock? Consumption of animals infected with such bacteria is alleged to be the cause of illness in an unknown, but probably high, number of individuals in Europe. With this in mind, is the Commission intending to request a new survey into the numbers of livestock affected by this disease, given that the figures provided by certain countries during the last EFSA survey in 2008 do not appear to be very realistic?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)

The Commission issued an action plan against the rising threats from antimicrobial resistance ([1]) on 15 November 2011. This action plan contains 12 measures including strengthening the promotion of appropriate use of antimicrobials in all Member States. Recently the Commission requested scientific advice from the European Medicines Agency (EMA) on the impact on public health and animal health of the use of antibiotics in animals. In preparation of the revision of the legislation on veterinary medicines the impact of measures that could contribute to a reduction of antimicrobial resistance is being evaluated. The Commission is preparing, based on advice of EFSA, a legislative proposal for the harmonised monitoring of antimicrobial resistance in zoonotic and commensal bacteria in the EU.

The Commission actively supports research and innovation in antimicrobial resistance.

The framework Programme 7 for Research, Theme 2 ([2]), contained a topic for a large research project on the 'ecology of drug resistant bacteria and transfer of antimicrobial resistance throughout the food chain'. The project to be selected should identify risk factors. It will not necessarily cover the combination of drugs, but will assess risk for transmission of AMR throughout the food chain. Drugs in animals have to be used according to the marketing authorisation. As regards MRSA, the Pilgrim ([3]) research project addressed both the veterinary and the public health aspects. As regards the future Framework Programme (Horizon 2020), the Commission, in its Proposal for the Specific Programme ([4]), has included research and innovation activities on antimicrobial resistance as part of 'Sustainable agriculture and forestry' and 'Healthy and safe food and diets for all' challenges.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0748:FIN:EN:PDF.
([2]) European Commission C(2012) 4536 of 9 July 2012.
([3]) http://www.fp7-pilgrim.eu/fp7/project.html
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/pdf/proposals/proposal_for_a_council_decision_establishing_the_specific_programme_implementing_horizon_2020_-_the_framework_programme_for_research_and_innovation_(2014-2020).pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002551/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Quindicenne delle Maldive condannata alla fustigazione

Alla fine di febbraio 2013, diverse fonti mediatiche hanno riferito che una giovane quindicenne delle Maldive è stata condannata a 100 frustrate per aver avuto rapporti sessuali prematrimoniali, benché fosse stata violentata dal suo patrigno.

La ragazza è stata condannata da un tribunale dei minori e sarà detenuta per otto mesi presso un istituto minorile. Le frustate le saranno inflitte al raggiungimento del 18° anno di età, o prima a sua scelta.

Navi Pillay, Alto Commissario delle Nazioni Unite per i diritti umani, ha chiesto al governo delle Maldive di porre fine a questa crudele punizione prevista dalla sharia. Il governo ha tuttavia dichiarato di non essere in grado di affrontare le autorità giudiziarie, conservatrici e favorevoli alla legge della sharia. Nel 2011 il 90 % dei condannati per rapporti sessuali prematrimoniali alle Maldive era composto da donne.

Secondo *The Times*, Navi Pillay ha dichiarato che la fustigazione è «una delle forme di violenza contro le donne più inumane e degradanti.» Ciò ha suscitato proteste da parte di gruppi islamici e del ministro per gli Affari islamici dello stesso governo.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante in merito alla sentenza emessa nei confronti della quindicenne delle Maldive?

2. È il VP/HR disposto ad unire la propria voce a quella dell'Alto Commissario delle Nazioni Unite per i diritti umani nel chiedere al governo delle Maldive di far decadere la sentenza nei confronti della ragazza e di intraprendere azioni affinché siano abrogate le leggi che prevedono punizioni crudeli quali la fustigazione?

3. Qual è la valutazione dei funzionari dell'UE competenti per le Maldive in merito alla crescente importanza dei gruppi islamici e al loro controllo del potere giudiziario?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante / Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(30 aprile 2013)

La posizione dell'Alta Rappresentante è stata chiarita dalla dichiarazione del portavoce, rilasciata il 1° marzo 2013. Gli onorevoli parlamentari sono invitati a consultare il link seguente:
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/135784.pdf.

L'Alta Rappresentante ha già invitato il governo delle Maldive a rinunciare alla condanna e annullare la sentenza. Sono stati ricevuti segnali positivi in proposito.

Le denunce della crescente influenza islamica sulla politica sociale nelle Maldive hanno un certo fondamento: ne risulta un aumento dell'intolleranza e della xenofobia. La fustigazione pubblica figura ancora nel corpus legislativo del paese e alcuni giudici si baserebbero sulla sharia invece che sulla costituzione del 2008. Per l'UE, il sistema giuridico delle Maldive, e in particolare il potere giudiziario, destano preoccupazioni. L'Unione europea è pronta a fornire assistenza in questo settore, così come lo sono le Nazioni Unite (ONU) e il Commonwealth, se il governo delle Maldive è disposto a chiederla, così come lo era l'ultimo governo nazionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002551/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — 15-year-old Maldivian girl given flogging sentence

In late February 2013, a number of news sources reported that a 15-year-old Maldivian girl had been sentenced to 100 lashes for having premarital sex, even though her stepfather raped her.

The girl was convicted by a juvenile court, and will be detained for 8 months in a children's home. She will receive the flogging once she turns 18, or earlier if she chooses.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Navi Pillay, has asked the Maldivian Government to drop this cruel Sharia punishment. However, the Government has claimed it is unable to confront the judiciary which is conservative and sympathetic to Sharia law. In 2011, 90% of those convicted in the Maldives of premarital sexual intercourse were women.

According to *The Times*, Navi Pillay said the flogging was 'one of the most inhumane and degrading forms of violence against women'. This caused protests by Islamic groups and the Government's own Ministry for Islamic Affairs.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative regarding the sentencing of this 15-year-old Maldivian girl?

2. Is the VP/HR prepared to lend her voice to that of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights in asking the Maldivian Government to drop the sentence against the girl and take steps to repeal laws which call for cruel punishments such as flogging?

3. What is the assessment of EU officials covering the Maldives regarding the rise in prominence of Islamist groups and its control of the judiciary?

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

The position of the HR/VP has been clearly spelt out in the Statement by her spokesperson, issued on 1 March 2013. The Honourable Members are invited to consult the following weblink:
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/135784.pdf.

The HR/VP has already urged the Government of Maldives to abandon the prosecution and retract the sentence. Positive indications have been received in this regard.

There is some validity to claims of rising Islamist influence on social policy which is making the Maldives less tolerant and more open to xenophobia. Public flogging continues to be on the statute book and some judges appear to be guided by Sharia law rather than by the 2008 Constitution.The EU considers the Maldivian legal system and in particular the judiciary as a matter of concern. The EU is ready to provide assistance in this domain, as the United Nations (UN) and the Commonwealth have also offered, if the Maldivian Government is ready, as the last government was, to request such support.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002553/13
alla Commissione
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Villaggi del cancro in Cina

Nel febbraio 2013, diverse fonti scientifiche e di informazione hanno riferito che il governo cinese avrebbe ammesso l'esistenza di «villaggi del cancro». Si tratta di città e villaggi con livelli insolitamente elevati di incidenza del cancro, che si ritiene possano derivare dalla contaminazione industriale e agricola dell'acqua potabile e irrigua.

Il 20 febbraio, il governo cinese ha emanato per la prima volta un piano quinquennale per la gestione ambientale delle sostanze chimiche. La relazione contenuta al suo interno stabilisce una connessione tra inquinamento dell'acqua e gravi problematiche di salute e sociali. Secondo quanto riportato dal periodico inglese *New Scientist*, il ministero cinese per la Protezione dell'ambiente avrebbe stilato un elenco di 58 prodotti chimici, inclusi agenti cancerogeni e interferenti endocrini, confermati o presunti, che verranno monitorati in un apposito registro.

In Cina vi sono numerose aree caratterizzate da un'elevata incidenza del cancro e i decessi associati sono aumentati dell'80 % tra il 1970 e il 2004.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza del problema della contaminazione agricola sul territorio cinese, in seguito al quale si sta verificando un aumento allarmante dei decessi per cancro?

2. Quali azioni sta intraprendendo per accertare che i prodotti agricoli importati nell'UE dalla Cina siano privi di sostanze cancerogene o altri agenti nocivi?

3. È la Commissione pronta a fornire sostegno pratico al governo cinese per aiutare a contrastare il problema della diffusione della contaminazione ambientale?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(30 aprile 2013)

1. La Commissione è al corrente degli effetti dell'inquinamento, anche a seguito dell'uso agricolo di prodotti chimici, sulla salute in Cina.

2. I prodotti agricoli, sia alimenti che mangimi, i quali arrivano sul territorio dell'UE dalla Cina devono rispettare i requisiti dell'UE o condizioni che l'UE riconosce essere almeno equivalenti agli stessi. Tuttavia, conformemente alle attuali regole OMC-SPS, è possibile imporre condizioni all'importazione soltanto per quanto concerne la dimensione «sicurezza alimentare» degli usi dei pesticidi.

In proposito e per ulteriori particolari la Commissione rinvia gli onorevoli deputati alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-001575/2013 ([1]).

3. La Commissione intrattiene un dialogo annuale consolidato a livello ministeriale per la cooperazione regolamentare e lo scambio di pareri sulle politiche ambientali in Cina e in Europa. La Commissione porta avanti progetti concreti di cooperazione attinenti a questioni come la partecipazione del pubblico al processo decisionale in tema ambientale, il miglioramento della gestione dei rifiuti, la riduzione dell'inquinamento delle acque e la riduzione dell'inquinamento da metalli pesanti. Questi progetti hanno contribuito notevolmente a configurare la politica ambientale in Cina visto che gli esperti unionali e cinesi lavorano fianco a fianco per trovare soluzioni concrete a tali problemi.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002553/13
to the Commission
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Cancer villages in China

In February 2013, a number of scientific and news sources reported that the Chinese government has admitted the existence of 'cancer villages'. These are towns and villages which have unusually high levels of cancer, which is believed to result from industrial and agricultural contamination of drinking and irrigation water.

On 20 February, the Chinese government released its first ever five-year plan for the environmental management of chemicals. In it, the report links water pollution to serious health and social problems. The UK periodical *New Scientist* says that China's Ministry for Environmental Protection has drawn up a list of 58 chemicals, including known and suspected carcinogens and endocrine disrupters, that will be tracked with a registry.

There are many cancer hotspots around China, and deaths from cancer increased by 80% between 1970 and 2004.

1. Is the Commission aware of the problem of agricultural contamination across China, which is causing an alarming rise in cancer deaths?

2. What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that agricultural products entering the EU from China are free from carcinogenic and other harmful agents?

3. Is the Commission prepared to give practical aid to the Chinese government in order to help combat the problem of environmental contamination spreading?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of the effects of pollution, including through agricultural use of chemicals, on health in China

2. Agricultural products, both food and feed, entering the EU from China, are required to comply with the EU requirements or conditions recognised by the EU to be at least equivalent thereto. However, in accordance with current WTO-SPS rules, import conditions are only possible on the food safety dimension of pesticide uses.

In this regard and for more details, the Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to Written Question E-001575/2013 ([1]).

3. The Commission has a well-established annual dialogue at ministerial level focusing on regulatory cooperation and on exchanging views on environmental policies in China and in Europe. The Commission has been implementing concrete cooperation projects focused on issues such as public participation in environmental decision making, improvement of waste management, reduction of water pollution, and reduction of heavy metal pollution. These projects have been hugely supportive in shaping environmental policy in China as the EU and Chinese experts work side-to-side to find solutions to concrete problems.

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

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-002554/13
Komisi
Pavel Poc (S&D) a Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(5. března 2013)

Předmět: Napájení zvířat během přepravy na dlouhé vzdálenosti (otázka navazující na otázku E-005724/2012)

V parlamentní otázce E-005724/2012 byla Komisi položena otázka, zda je podle Komise reálné se domnívat, že kontrolní úřady členských států jsou schopny přiměřeným způsobem ověřit, zda byla zvířata během přepravy na dlouhou vzdálenost skutečně napojena (např. pro napojení dobytka, ovcí a koz musí být mezi dvěma čtrnáctihodinovými intervaly přepravy poskytnut odpočinek v délce nejméně jedné hodiny, zatímco koně a osli musí být během 24hodinové doby přepravy napájeni každých osm hodin).

Dále byla Komisi položena otázka, jak jsou tyto kontroly v praxi prováděny.

V nařízení Rady (ES) č. 1/2005 není požadováno, aby tyto zastávky pro napojení byly prováděny na konkrétních místech, a tudíž není přítomen žádný kontrolní orgán. Pokud jsou tyto zastávky prováděny, děje se tak obvykle na čerpacích stanicích u dálnic nebo podobných místech.

Komise tyto otázky nezodpověděla a ve své odpovědi pouze uvedla , že kontrolní útvar Komise, Potravinový a veterinární úřad (FVO), „nezjistil konkrétní selhání příslušných orgánů zajistit školení pro ověřování, že zvířata byla během přepravy na dlouhé vzdálenosti napojena".

Po Komisi se proto nyní požaduje, aby odpověděla na níže uvedené otázky:

1. Co obnáší „školení za účelem ověřování, že zvířata byla během přepravy na dlouhé vzdálenosti napojena", tj. jak se v praxi předpokládá ověření účinného napojení měřitelným způsobem?

2. Ověřil FVO, kontrolní útvar Komise, během svých auditů/misí, zda bylo zajištěno samotné školení, nebo do jaké míry a jak často se tyto kontroly skutečně provádějí v praxi, tj. jaké procento dálkových transportů bylo zkontrolováno? Pokud ano, jaké byly výsledky?

Odpověď Tonia Borga jménem Komise
(22. dubna 2013)

1. Příslušný orgán může ověřit, zda jsou pravidla týkající se intervalů napájení zvířat ([1]) dodržována, prostřednictvím různých kontrol. To může zahrnovat ověření, že v napájecím systému je voda a že systém funguje, že napájecí zařízení vyhovují přepravovaným druhům zvířat a že všechna zvířata ve vozidle mají k zařízení přístup. Příslušný orgán může také zjistit, zda byl splněn účel daných pravidel, tj. zajistit, aby zvířata dostala vodu, prostřednictvím ověření, že zvířata nevykazují známky žízně, dehydratace nebo tepelného stresu. K provádění a vyhodnocování výsledků těchto kontrol musí být pracovníci vyškoleni. Toto školení je zmíněno v odpovědi Komise na otázku E-005724/2012 ([2]).

2. Během auditů prováděných Potravinovým a veterinárním úřadem Generálního ředitelství pro zdraví a spotřebitele Komise se systematicky přezkoumává školení zaměstnanců příslušného orgánu a jejich výsledky při plnění úkolů, jakož i četnost kontrol.

To zahrnuje pozorování kontrol, které příslušné orgány provádějí na silnicích členských států, při nichž byl stav zvířat a napájecí systémy ve vozidlech posouzeny zároveň i úřadem a případná následná donucovací opatření byla zaznamenána.

Výsledky těchto auditů jsou uvedeny ve zprávách o auditu týkajících se dobrých životních podmínek zvířat pro každý členský stát na stránce: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/index_en.cfm.

([1]) V souladu s požadavky bodu 1.4 kapitoly V přílohy I nařízení Rady (ES) č. 1/2005 o ochraně zvířat během přepravy a souvisejících činností. Úř. věst. L 3, 5.1.2005, s. 1.

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

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-002554/13
till kommissionen
Pavel Poc (S&D) och Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(5 mars 2013)

Angående: Tillgång till vatten för djur under långa transporter (uppföljning av fråga E-005724/2012)

I fråga E-005724/2012 fick kommissionen frågan om den var av uppfattningen att det är realistiskt att tänka sig att medlemsstaternas inspektionsmyndigheter ska kunna utföra tillräckliga kontroller av att djur verkligen har fått tillgång till vatten under långa transporter (t.ex. minst en timmes uppehåll för vatten för nötkreatur, får och getter mellan två transportperioder om 14 timmar, medan hästar och åsnor måste få vatten var åttonde timme under en transporttid på 24 timmar).

Vidare ombads kommissionen att svara på hur dessa kontroller genomförs i praktiken.

Enligt rådets förordning (EG) nr 1/2005 behöver dessa uppehåll för vatten inte ske på särskilda platser, och det finns alltså ingen inspektionsmyndighet närvarande. Om dessa vattenpauser alls görs sker det vanligen på bensinstationer längs motorvägen eller liknande platser.

Kommissionen besvarade inte dessa frågor utan genmälde bara att kommissionens egen inspektionstjänst, kontoret för livsmedels- och veterinärfrågor, inte hade lagt märke till att de behöriga myndigheterna skulle ha misslyckats med att tillhandahålla utbildning för att kontrollera att djur får tillgång till vatten under långa transporter.

Kommissionen ombes nu därför att svara på följande frågor:

1. Vad innebär ”utbildning för att kontrollera att djur får tillgång till vatten under långa transporter”, dvs. hur ska det i praktiken kunna kontrolleras på ett mätbart sätt att djuren verkligen får vatten?

2. Har kontoret för livsmedels- och veterinärfrågor, kommissionens inspektionstjänst, under sina revisioner/besök enbart kontrollerat om utbildning har tillhandahållits, eller i vilken utsträckning och hur ofta dessa kontroller verkligen genomförs i praktiken, dvs. hur stor procentandel av långdistanstransporterna som har kontrollerats? Om så är fallet, med vilket resultat?

Svar från Tonio Borg på kommissionens vägnar
(22 april 2013)

1. Den behöriga myndigheten kan kontrollera att reglerna för hur ofta djuren får vatten ([1]) följs genom att utföra olika kontroller. Dessa kan bestå av att kontrollera att det finns vatten i vattensystemet och att det fungerar, att vattenbehållarna är lämpliga för den djurart som transporteras och att de kan nås av alla djur i transporten. Myndigheten kan också kontrollera att regelns syfte, alltså att djuren får vatten, har uppfyllts genom att försäkra sig om att djuren inte visar tecken på törst, uttorkning eller värmestress. Personalen måste utbildas för att utföra och utvärdera resultatet av sådana kontroller. Detta är den utbildning som avses i kommissionens svar på fråga E-005724/2012 ([2]).

2. När kommissionens inspektionstjänst, kontoret för livsmedels- och veterinärfrågor, utför kontrollbesök hos medlemsländernas behöriga myndigheter undersöks om personalen har tillhandahållits utbildning, hur personalen utför sina uppgifter och hur ofta kontroller genomförs.

Detta innebär att kommissionens inspektörer följer med på kontroller som medlemsländernas behöriga myndigheter genomför längs vägarna där såväl djurens tillstånd som fordonens vattensystem kontrolleras och eventuella efterföljande verkställighetsåtgärder noteras.

Resultaten från kontrollbesöken hos myndigheterna i varje medlemsland återfinns i kontrollbesöksrapporterna om djurhälsa på följande webbplats: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/index_en.cfm (på engelska).

([1]) I enlighet med kapitel V punkt 1.4 i bilaga I till rådets förordning (EG) nr 1/2005 om skydd av djur under transport och därmed sammanhängande förfaranden (EUT L 3, 5.1.2005, s. 1).

([2]) Se http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/sv/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002554/13
to the Commission
Pavel Poc (S&D) and Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Watering of animals during long-distance transport (follow-up question to Question E-005724/2012)

In parliamentary Question E-005724/2012, the Commission was asked whether it is of the opinion that it is realistic to think that the inspection authorities of the Member States are in a position adequately to verify whether animals have in fact been watered during long-distance transport (e.g. a watering stop of at least one hour for cattle, sheep and goats in between two transport periods of 14 hours, while horses and donkeys must be given water every eight hours during a 24-hour transport period).

Furthermore, the Commission was asked how these checks are carried out in practice.

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 does not require these watering stops to be carried out in particular places and thus there is no inspection authority present. If these watering breaks are carried out, they usually take place at service stations along the motorway or similar places.

The Commission did not answer these questions but just replied by stating that the Commission's inspection service, the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO), had 'not identified particular failure of the competent authorities to provide training to verify that animals have been watered during long-distance transports'.

The Commission is therefore now asked to answer the following questions:

1. What does 'training to verify that animals have been watered during long-distance transports' consist of, i.e. in practice, how is effective watering supposed to be verified in a measurable manner?

2. Has the FVO, the Commission's inspection service, verified during its audits/missions whether training alone has been provided, or to what extent and with what frequency these checks are really carried out in practice, i.e. what percentage of long-distance transports have been checked? If so, what were the results?

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

1. The competent authority may verify that the rules on watering intervals ([1]) are respected by carrying out different checks. This can include checking that there is water in the system and that it is functioning, that the water devices are suitable for the species transported and that all animals on board can reach the water devices. The authority may also check that the purpose of the rule, to ensure that animals receive water, has been met, by checking that the animals do not show signs of thirst, dehydration or heat stress. Staff must be trained to perform, and evaluate the outcome of, such checks. This training is referred to in the Commission's reply to Question E-005724/2012 ([2]).

2. During audits carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission's Health and Consumers Directorate General, the provision of training to competent authority staff and their performance in carrying out their tasks, as well as the frequency of controls, is routinely examined.

This includes observing inspections performed at roadside by Member States' competent authorities where the condition of the animals and the vehicles' watering systems were both assessed by the authority, and any subsequent enforcement action was noted.

The results of these audits can be found in the animal welfare audit reports for each Member State at: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/index_en.cfm

---

([1]) As required by point 1.4, Chapter V of Annex I to Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations. OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.

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

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-002555/13
adresată Comisiei
Norica Nicolai (ALDE)
(5 martie 2013)

Subiect: Legislația UE versus legislația statelor membre

Având în vedere faptul că sistemele legislative sunt adaptate de statele membre individuale pentru a îndeplini standardele europene, există o diferență între puterea legislativă și/sau executivă și jurisdicție.

În cazul Belgiei, articolul 3 din Decretul regal nr.143 din 30 decembrie 1982 care restrânge dreptul de a opera laboratoare biologice la persoanele care au o diplomă în medicină, chimie sau biologie a fost modificat în 2005 de Parlamentul Belgiei. În ciuda acestor fapte, toate consecințele judiciare pentru persoanele condamnate în conformitate cu acest decret (care încalcă legislația UE, după spusele Comisiei) sunt încă în vigoare.

1. Cum afectează modificările legislative persoanele care sunt în curs de investigație sau în proces sau persoanele care au fost condamnate în conformitate cu o lege aplicată de un stat membru, dar care a fost declarată ca încălcând legislația UE?

2. Instanțele statelor membre nu ar trebui să dea un efect concret impunității introduse de decretele modificate prin noi decizii?

3. În cazul în care un cetățean al unui stat membru depune o petiție la Comisie pentru a solicita clarificări cu privire la compatibilitatea legislației UE și a legislației statului membru, în ce termen trebuie să răspundă Comisia?

Răspuns dat de dl Barroso în numele Comisiei
(15 aprilie 2013)

1 și 2 Potrivit unei jurisprudențe constante a Curții de Justiție ([1]), orice instanță națională are obligația de a aplica integral legislația direct aplicabilă a Uniunii Europene și de a proteja drepturile pe care aceasta le conferă persoanelor, prin neaplicarea vreunei dispoziții de drept intern care ar putea fi contrară, indiferent dacă aceasta este anterioară sau ulterioară normei de drept al Uniunii Europene. Cu toate acestea, ar trebui să se atragă atenția asupra importanței, atât pentru ordinea juridică a Uniunii Europene, cât și pentru sistemele juridice naționale, a principiului autorității de lucru judecat. Din jurisprudența constantă a Curții ([2]) reiese, de asemenea, că, pentru a se asigura stabilitatea dreptului și a raporturilor juridice, precum și buna administrare a justiției, este important ca hotărârile judecătorești care au devenit definitive să nu mai poată fi puse în discuție; în consecință, legislația Uniunii Europene nu impune unei instanțe naționale să înlăture aplicarea normelor interne de procedură care conferă caracterul definitiv al unei hotărâri judecătorești, chiar dacă acest lucru ar permite remedierea unei încălcări a legislației Uniunii Europene.

3. Orice persoană poate înainta Comisiei o plângere ([3]) împotriva unui stat membru pentru orice măsură sau practică imputabilă statului membru respectiv, pe care acea persoană le consideră contrare unor dispoziții sau principii de drept al Uniunii Europene. Comisia face tot posibilul pentru a lua o decizie pe fond referitoare la această plângere (inițierea unei proceduri de constatare a neîndeplinirii obligațiilor sau clasarea dosarului) în decurs de douăsprezece luni de la înregistrarea plângerii.

([1]) A se vedea, de exemplu, hotărârea din 6 septembrie 2012, cauza C-18/11, Philips Electronics, punctul 38.
([2]) A se vedea, de exemplu, hotărârea din 3 septembrie 2009, cauza C-2/08, Fallimento Olimpiclub, punctele 22-23.
([3]) A se vedea site-ul internet http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/your_rights/your_rights_ro.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002555/13
to the Commission
Norica Nicolai (ALDE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: EC law versus Member State legislation

Given that legislative systems are being adapted by individual Member States to meet European standards, there is a gap between legislative and/or executive power and jurisdiction.

In the case of Belgium, Article 3 of Royal Decree No 143 of 30 December 1982 restricting the right to run biological laboratories to those with a degree in medicine, chemistry or biology was amended in 2005 by the Belgian Parliament. Despite this, all judicial consequences for persons condemned under this decree (which the Commission says infringes EC law) are still in force.

1. How do changes in law affect those who are pending investigation or on trial, or people who have been sentenced under a law enacted by a Member State but which has been declared to infringe EC law?

2. Should the courts in the Member States not give concrete effect to the impunity introduced by the modified decrees through new decisions?

3. In the event that a citizen of a Member State petitions the Commission to demand clarification regarding the compatibility of EC law and Member State legislation, how long does the Commission have to answer?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(15 April 2013)

1 and 2. It is settled case-law of the Court of Justice ([1]) that any national court has the obligation fully to apply the directly applicable European Union law and to protect the rights which the latter confers upon individuals, disapplying any provision of national law which may be to the contrary, whether the latter is prior to or subsequent to the rule of European Union law. However, attention should be drawn to the importance, both for the European Union legal order and for the national legal systems, of the principle of *res judicata*. It follows equally from settled case-law of the Court ([2]) that, in order to ensure stability of the law and legal relations, as well as the sound administration of justice, it is important that judicial decisions which have become final can no longer be called into question; accordingly, European Union law does not require a national court to disapply domestic rules of procedure conferring finality on a judicial decision, even if to do so would make it possible to remedy an infringement of European Union law.

3. Any person may submit to the Commission a complaint ([3]) against a Member State for any measure or practice attributable to that Member State which he or she considers incompatible with a provision or a principle of European Union law. The Commission will endeavour to take a decision on the substance of the complaint (either to open infringement proceedings or to close the case) within twelve months of its registration.

([1]) See for example the judgment of 6 September 2012, Case C-18/11, Philips Electronics, paragraph 38.
([2]) See for example the judgment of 3 September 2009, Case C-2/08, Fallimento Olimpiclub, paragraphs 22-23.
([3]) Cf. the website page http://ec.europa.eu/eu_law/your_rights/your_rights_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002556/13
aan de Commissie
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(5 maart 2013)

Betreft: Bescherming consumenten op online verkoopplatforms tegen fraude en oplichterij

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van de praktijken van online verkoopplatform eBay, waarbij kopers enkel beschermd worden tegen fraude en oplichterij wanneer zij gebruik maken van de betaaloptie Paypal (tevens een dochteronderneming van eBay) maar niet wanneer zij gebruik maken van andere betaalopties?

2. Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat consumenten die gebruik maken van online verkoopplatforms zoals Ebay er van uit moeten kunnen gaan dat zij door deze platforms worden beschermd tegen fraude en oplichterij?

3. Zo ja, hoe is de Commissie van plan deze bescherming te realiseren? Is de Commissie bereid meer plichten vast te leggen voor online verkoopplatforms?

4. Wat is het oordeel van de Commissie over het opnemen van dergelijke plichten in het voorstel van de Commissie over een facultatief gemeenschappelijk Europees kooprecht?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(14 mei 2013)

Uit de eBay-website blijkt dat er wel degelijk een regeling voor de bescherming van de koper bestaat en dat die niet beperkt is tot gebruikers van PayPal. Ook blijkt dat kopers niet beter tegen misbruik van hun PayPal-account zijn beschermd dan tegen kredietkaartfraude, aangezien dit door het betalingsbedrijf wordt geregeld. Bovendien legt eBay sancties op aan verkopers die consumenten hebben misleid. Ze kunnen zelfs worden uitgesloten van de verkoperslijst van eBay.

Er bestaat EU-wetgeving die de consument beschermt tegen misleidende en andere oneerlijke handelspraktijken. Krachtens Richtlijn 2005/29/EG ([1]) zijn handelaren verplicht om te handelen met professionele toewijding en mogen zij de consument niet misleiden over, bijvoorbeeld, de voordelen, risico's en resultaten die hij van een aangeboden dienst kan verwachten. De richtlijn is van toepassing op transacties tussen bedrijven en consumenten, maar ook op veilingplatformen als eBay.

Iedere vermeende inbreuk op de richtlijn moet onder de aandacht van de nationale autoriteiten en rechtbanken worden gebracht. Zij zijn in eerste instantie verantwoordelijk voor de handhaving ervan.

Het voorstel van de Commissie voor een verordening betreffende een gemeenschappelijk Europees kooprecht is erop gericht grensoverschrijdende handel en aankopen te vergemakkelijken door met het overeenkomstenrecht verband houdende belemmeringen weg te nemen. Het voorstel voorziet in een aantal rechten voor de consument, waaronder het onvoorwaardelijke recht voor een consument die er door een verkoper op frauduleuze wijze toe is aangezet een contract te sluiten, om zijn geld terug te eisen en het contract te beëindigen.

Zodra het voorstel is aangenomen, is het de opdracht van de bevoegde nationale autoriteiten om te garanderen dat de consumentenrechten correct worden gehandhaafd. Tot slot is het voorstel niet bedoeld om te voorzien in strafrechtelijke of bestuursrechtelijke maatregelen, wat wellicht de meest doeltreffende instrumenten zijn om de strijd tegen frauduleuze handelaren aan te binden.

([1]) Richtlijn 2005/29/EG betreffende oneerlijke handelspraktijken, PB L 149 van 11.6.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002556/13
to the Commission
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Consumer protection against fraud and scams on online sales platforms

1. Is the Commission aware of the practice of eBay, an online sales platform, where buyers are only protected against fraud and scams when using the PayPal payment option (a subsidiary of eBay), but not when using other payment options?

2. Does the Commission agree with me that consumers who use online sales platforms like eBay should be able to take it for granted that they are protected against fraud and scams by these platforms?

3. If so, how does the Commission intend to put such protection in place? Is the Commission prepared to impose requirements on online sales platforms?

4. What position has the Commission taken on including such requirements in a Commission proposal for an optional Common European Sales Law?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)

From the Ebay website it appears that a buyer protection scheme exists and is not limited to paypal users. It also appears that buyers are not better protected from a fraudulent use of their paypal account than for their credit card, as it is a matter managed by the payment company. In addition, sellers who have been found misleading consumers would be imposed sanctions from Ebay up to exclusion from their sellers list.

There is Union legislation protecting consumers against misleading and other unfair trading practices. Directive 2005/29/EC ([1]) requires traders to act with professional diligence and not to mislead consumers, for instance, about the benefits, risks and results to be expected from a service offered. It applies to business to consumer transactions as well as to auction plateformes such as eBay.

Any alleged breach of the directive should be brought to the attention of national authorities and courts which are primarily responsible for its enforcement.

The Commission proposal for a regulation on a Common European Sales Law aims at facilitating cross-border trade and purchases by removing contract-law-related barriers. The proposal provides a set of rights for consumers. This includes the unconditional right for a consumer, who is induced to conclude a contract by a trader in a fraudulent manner, to claim his money back and to end the contract.

Once the proposal is adopted, it will be for competent national authorities to ensure that those consumer rights are properly enforced. Finally, the proposal is not designed to deal with criminal or administrative actions which might be the most effective tools in combating fraudulent traders.

([1]) Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair commercial practices OJ L 149, 11.6.2005.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002557/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(5 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επίπεδο των εκκρεμουσών αναλήψεων υποχρεώσεων (RAL) ανά κράτος μέλος από το 2007 ως το 2012

Το ακρωνύμιο RAL αναφέρεται σε όλες τις εκκρεμείς υποχρεώσεις που παραμένουν ανεξόφλητες σε δεδομένη χρονική στιγμή. Το διαρκώς αυξανόμενο ύψος αυτών συνιστά έναν από τους πλέον δικαιολογημένους λόγους ανησυχίας ως προς την εκτέλεση του προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ.

Απαντώντας στην ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000669/2013, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή υπέβαλε πίνακα με λεπτομερή ανάλυση των επιπέδων των RAL από την αρχή του τρέχοντος πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου (2007) έως τα τέλη του 2012, κατανεμημένων ανά τομέα.

Θα είχε την καλοσύνη η Επιτροπή να παράσχει επίσης πίνακα με αναλυτικά στοιχεία για το επίπεδο των RAL, κατανεμημένα ανά κράτος μέλος για την ίδια περίοδο (2007-2012);

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

Τα αναλυτικά στοιχεία για το επίπεδο των εκκρεμών αναλήψεων υποχρεώσεων (RAL) ανά κράτος μέλος από την αρχή του τρέχοντος πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου (2007) έως το τέλος του 2012 περιλαμβάνονται στο παράρτημα που αποστέλλεται απευθείας στο Αξιότιμο Μέλος και στη Γραμματεία του Κοινοβουλίου. Για λόγους σύγκρισης με τα αριθμητικά στοιχεία που παρασχέθηκαν στην απάντηση της ερώτησης E-671/2013, το παράρτημα περιλαμβάνει επίσης τα αριθμητικά στοιχεία από το 2000 έως το 2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002557/13
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Level of RALs from 2007 until 2012 by Member State

RALs refer to all outstanding commitments which remain to be paid at a given point in time and the rising level of these is one of the most pertinent issues of concern in the execution of the EU budget.

In its answer to Written Question E-000669/2013, the European Commission provided a table with a breakdown of the level of RALs from the beginning of the current multiannual financial framework (2007) until the end of 2012, by heading.

Could the Commission be so kind as to also provide a table with a detailed breakdown of the level of RALs by Member State as well for the same period (2007-2012)?

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

The detailed breakdown of the level of RALs by Member States from the beginning of the current multiannual financial framework (2007) until the end of 2012 is shown in the annex sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat. In order to facilitate comparison with the figures provided in the reply to Question E-671/2013, the annex also contains the figures from 2000 to 2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002558/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Anomalies in Spain's treatment of UK residents and non-residents

A London constituent has written to me complaining that although he owns a house in Spain and lives there for around 100 to 150 days per year, he spends the rest of his time in the UK, where he is therefore ordinarily resident under UK law.

He has now been told that he must exchange his UK driving licence for a new Spanish licence or face on-the-spot fines of EUR 100-200. However, if he changes his licence his UK insurance will become more expensive and he can no longer be a named driver on other insurance policies.

The constituent also wishes to know about the rights of UK citizens in Spain under EU non-discrimination rules with regard to Spain's right to continue to charge a non-resident property tax on UK citizens who have sold their UK homes and moved to live permanently in Spain. He alleges that UK citizens are being forced to pay this non-resident tax even though they have taken out Spanish residency and are subject to the new Spanish worldwide income tax laws.

Can the Commission explain the EU rules which apply as regards both the requirement to surrender a driving licence issued by one EU Member State and exchange it for one issued by another, and the continued application of non-resident taxes to foreigners who are EU citizens even though they have changed their tax residency from their home country to the host country?

Question for written answer E-003329/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(25 March 2013)

Subject: British driving licence holders in Spain

I have been contacted by a constituent who owns a house in Spain and resides there for around 100 to 150 days per year.

My constituent has now been told that he must change his British driving licence to a Spanish one or he faces a fine of EUR 100-200. He tells me that if he makes this change, his UK insurance will become more expensive and it will make any other insurance policy where he is a named driver invalid.

My constituent would also like to know if the Spanish authorities are entitled to charge a non-resident tax on British nationals who have sold their homes in the UK and moved to Spain. He is concerned that they are being forced to pay this tax even though they have taken out Spanish residency.

Could the Commission confirm:

1. whether the Spanish authorities are in breach of EC law by fining residents from other Member States who do not hold a Spanish driving licence?

2. whether the Spanish Government can charge foreign nationals a non-resident tax after they have been granted Spanish residency?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(18 April 2013)

According to the Driving licence Directive ([1]) the requirement to exchange the driving licence depends on where the card holder has his place of normal residence ([2]). Only in cases where the normal residence has been transferred to another Member State, may the authorities of the new Member State of residence request the exchange. However, since the 19 January 2013, this exchange can only be requested after two years of residence in that new Member State and only to licences with a longer validity period than provided for in the directive.

Directive 2006/126/EC became fully applicable on the 19 January 2013. The Commission is currently undertaking an in-depth assessment of the national legislations transposing the directive. Should there be any inconsistencies, the Commission will — in its function as guardian of the Treaty — undertake the necessary measures to ensure the correct transposition and application of the legislation in force.

Concerning the non-resident tax on property in Spain, the Commission is not aware of the existence of such a tax. For this reason, in order to fully assess the compatibility of any such tax with EU rules, the Commission would respectfully ask the Honourable Member to provide further information on the law and respective article providing for it.

In any respect, we refer the Honourable Member to the provisions of the Spanish tax legislation according to which both residents and non-residents are equally subject to income tax if they own a real estate property that does not constitute their permanent residence. The Commission considers that Spain is entitled to impose such taxes as there is no discrimination between residents and non-residents.

([1]) Directive 2006/126/EC, OJ L 403, 30.12.2006.
([2]) Article 12 of Directive 2006/126/EC defines normal residence as well as several ECJ court rulings, see *Alevizos* (C-392/05, paragraph 57).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002559/13
a la Comisión
Birgit Sippel (S&D), Jens Geier (S&D), Petra Kammerevert (S&D), Carmen Romero López (S&D) y Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(5 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Prevención y lucha contra la delincuencia 2007-2013, Ayudas para acciones 2012, Convocatoria de propuestas específicas

La Comisión ha publicado esta convocatoria de propuestas específicas antes de la adopción de la Directiva relativa a la utilización de datos del registro de nombres de los pasajeros para la prevención, detección, investigación y enjuiciamiento de delitos terroristas y delitos graves. Aunque esto no constituye en sí un incumplimiento del Derecho europeo, la publicación de la convocatoria de propuestas conlleva una serie de preguntas:

1. ¿Cómo justifica la Comisión su decisión de publicar una convocatoria de propuestas en una fase tan temprana de las negociaciones? Hasta la fecha no se ha alcanzado ningún acuerdo en el Parlamento, de modo que todavía no queda claro en qué condiciones funcionaría un posible registro de nombres de los pasajeros de la UE.

2. ¿Por qué eligió la Comisión utilizar el Programa «Prevención y lucha contra la delincuencia» (ISEC) en lugar del Fondo de Seguridad Interior (centrado en la lucha contra el terrorismo), que cuenta con unos recursos financieros mayores, como solicitó la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior en su Opinión 2011/0177 para la Comisión de Presupuestos?

3. ¿Cómo justifica la Comisión que el porcentaje de financiación de la UE pueda llegar hasta el 90 %?

4. ¿Cómo justifica la Comisión la cantidad total de 50 000 000 euros para la cofinanciación de ayudas en virtud de esta convocatoria, especialmente en el contexto de los problemas presupuestarios de la UE?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmström en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de mayo de 2013)

Sobre los motivos de la publicación de la convocatoria de propuestas específicas para crear Unidades de Información sobre Pasajeros de los Estados miembros destinadas a la utilización de datos del registro de nombres de los pasajeros [*Passenger Name Record* (PNR)], así como sobre las razones de hacerlo dentro del programa de financiación sobre la «Prevención y lucha contra la delincuencia» (ISEC), la Comisión remite a sus respuestas a las preguntas escritas P-343/2013 y E-385/2013.

Según los programas de trabajo anuales del Programa ISEC para 2011, 2012 y 2013 y en el caso de ayudas destinadas a acciones (convocatorias de propuestas generales y específicas), el porcentaje máximo de cofinanciación por parte de la Comisión es del 90 % del total de los costes subvencionables de los proyectos. Este porcentaje del 90 % se ha garantizado hasta ahora en todas las convocatorias de propuestas generales y específicas publicadas desde 2011, y se ha convertido de hecho en la tasa normal de cofinanciación de las ayudas destinadas a acciones desarrolladas dentro del Programa ISEC.

El importe total para la cofinanciación de las ayudas concedidas dentro del programa de trabajo anual en cada convocatoria de propuestas tiene en cuenta lo siguiente: la estimación de los costes derivados de los proyectos que aspiran a alcanzar los resultados previstos en la convocatoria, el presupuesto global disponible para proyectos dentro del marco del correspondiente programa de financiación y la pertinencia de los objetivos fijados en la convocatoria para las prioridades del Fondo. La cantidad total de 50 millones de euros destinada a la cofinanciación de ayudas en el marco de la convocatoria de propuestas específicas para crear Unidades de Información sobre Pasajeros se considera necesaria para alcanzar el doble objetivo de la convocatoria, a saber, fomentar el tratamiento de datos PNR como instrumento eficaz para luchar contra delitos graves y de terrorismo en la EU y, al mismo tiempo, supeditar este tratamiento a unas condiciones estrictas y unas salvaguardias efectivas que respeten la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales y la protección de los datos personales.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002559/13
an die Kommission
Birgit Sippel (S&D), Jens Geier (S&D), Petra Kammerevert (S&D), Carmen Romero López (S&D) und Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(5. März 2013)

Betrifft: Kriminalprävention und Kriminalitätsbekämpfung 2007-2013/Maßnahmenbezogene Zuschüsse 2012/Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen

Die Kommission hat die oben genannte Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen vor der Annahme der Richtlinie über die Verwendung von Fluggastdatensätzen zu Zwecken der Verhütung, Aufdeckung, Aufklärung und strafrechtlichen Verfolgung von terroristischen Straftaten und schwerer Kriminalität veröffentlicht. Obgleich diese Tatsache an sich keinen Verstoß gegen europäisches Recht darstellt, wirft die Veröffentlichung der Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen doch einige Fragen auf:

1. Wie rechtfertigt die Kommission ihre Entscheidung, eine Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen in einer derart frühen Verhandlungsphase zu veröffentlichen? Im Parlament ist bisher keine Einigung erzielt worden, so dass weiterhin unklar ist, unter welchen Bedingungen eine mögliche EU-Fluggastdatenspeicherung operieren würde.

2. Warum hat sich die Kommission entschieden, das Programm „Kriminalprävention und Kriminalitätsbekämpfung“ (ISEC) zu verwenden, anstatt den Fonds für die innere Sicherheit (dessen Schwerpunkt unter anderem auf Terrorismusbekämpfung liegt) mit mehr Finanzmitteln auszustatten, wie vom Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres in seiner Stellungnahme 2011/0177 an den Haushaltsausschuss gefordert?

3. Wie rechtfertigt die Kommission die EU-Finanzierungsquote von bis zu 90 %?

4. Wie rechtfertigt die Kommission den Gesamtbetrag für die Kofinanzierung von Zuschüssen im Rahmen dieser Ausschreibung in Höhe von 50 000 000 EUR, insbesondere vor dem Hintergrund der Haushaltsprobleme der EU?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(14. Mai 2013)

Die Gründe für die Veröffentlichung der gezielten Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen betreffend die Einrichtung von Stellen für die Verarbeitung von Fluggastdaten (PNR) in den Mitgliedstaaten und für die Einbeziehung in das Kofinanzierungsprogramm „Kriminalprävention und Kriminalitätsbekämpfung“ (ISEC) hat die Kommission in ihren Antworten auf die schriftlichen Anfragen P-343/2013 und E-385/2013 erläutert.

In Einklang mit dem ISEC-Arbeitsprogramm für die Jahre 2011, 2012 und 2013 beträgt der Höchstsatz für die Kofinanzierung durch die Kommission 90 % der gesamten förderfähigen Projektkosten im Falle maßnahmenbezogener Finanzhilfen (gezielte und allgemeine Aufforderungen zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen). Bisher ist der Satz von 90 % bei allen seit 2011 veröffentlichen gezielten und allgemeinen Aufforderungen zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen angewandt worden und hat sich de facto als Standardquote für die Kofinanzierung maßnahmenbezogener Finanzhilfen im Rahmen des ISEC-Programms etabliert.

Der im Jahresarbeitsprogramm für jede Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen eingestellte Gesamtbetrag für die Kofinanzierung von Finanzhilfen berücksichtigt sowohl die veranschlagten Kosten der Projekte, um die jeweiligen Zielvorgaben zu erreichen, als auch das verfügbare Gesamtbudget für Projekte im Rahmen des betreffenden Finanzierungsprogramms und die Relevanz der in der betreffenden Aufforderung vorgegebenen Ziele für die Prioritäten des Fonds. Der Gesamtbetrag von 50 Mio. EUR für die Kofinanzierung von Finanzhilfen im Rahmen der gezielten Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen für die Einrichtung von PNR-Stellen wird als notwendig erachtet, um das zweifache Ziel der Aufforderung zu erreichen, d. h. die Verarbeitung von PNR-Daten als wirksames Instrument zur Bekämpfung von schwerer Kriminalität und Terrorismus in der EU zu fördern und sicherzustellen, dass für die Verarbeitung in Einklang mit der Grundrechtecharta und dem Schutz personenbezogener Daten strenge Auflagen und hinreichende Garantien gelten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002559/13
to the Commission
Birgit Sippel (S&D), Jens Geier (S&D), Petra Kammerevert (S&D), Carmen Romero López (S&D) and Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Prevention of and Fight against Crime 2007-2013, Action Grants 2012, Targeted Call for Proposals

The Commission has published the abovementioned call for proposals before the adoption of the directive on the use of Passenger Name Record data for the prevention, detection, investigation and prosecution of terrorist offences and serious crime. Although this in itself does not constitute a breach of European law, the publication of the call raises a number of questions.

1. How does the Commission justify its decision to publish a call for proposals at such an early stage of the negotiations? No agreement has been reached in Parliament so far, so that it is still unclear under what conditions a possible EU Passenger Name Record would operate.

2. Why did the Commission choose to use the Programme for the Prevention of and Fight against Crime (ISEC) instead of providing the Internal Security Fund (which has a focus on the fight against terrorism) with greater financial resources, as demanded by the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home affairs in its Opinion 2011/0177 for the Committee on Budgets?

3. How does the Commission justify the EU funding rate of up to 90%?

4. How does the Commission justify the total amount for co-financing of grants under this call of EUR 50 000 000, especially against the background of the EU's budgetary problems?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2013)

With regard to the reasons for publishing the targeted call for proposals to set up Passenger Information Units in Member States for the processing of passenger name record (PNR) data, and the reasons for doing this as part of the funding programme on the 'Prevention of and Fight against Crime' (ISEC), the Commission refers to its answers to written questions P-343/2013 and E-385/2013.

According to the ISECAnnual Work Programmes for 2011, 2012 and 2013, the maximum rate of co-financing by the Commission is 90% of the total eligible costs of projects in case of action grants (targeted and general calls for proposals). This rate of 90% has so far been confirmed for all targeted and general calls for proposals published since 2011, and has become the de-facto standard rate of co-financing of actions grants under the ISECProgramme.

The total amount for co-financing of grants allocated in the Annual Work Programme under each call for proposals takes into account the estimated costs stemming from projects that aim to achieve the expected results of the call for proposal, the global budget available for projects under the relevant funding programme and the relevance of the objectives set by the call for proposals to the priorities of the Fund. The total amount of EUR 50 million for co-financing of grants under the targeted call for proposals to set up Passenger Information Units is considered necessary in order to achieve the dual objectives of the call for proposals, namely to foster the processing of PNR data as an effective tool to fight serious crime and terrorism in the EU, while making this processing subject to strict conditions and effective safeguards in compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights and the protection of personal data.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002560/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(5 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Tecnología RIOT

En el marco del debate en torno a la reforma de la Directiva sobre protección de datos y de la propuesta de la Comisión de elaborar una nueva legislación en materia de protección de datos, la comisaria Reding ha manifestado repetidas veces el compromiso de la Comisión con la protección de la privacidad de los ciudadanos europeos. Existen gigantes de Internet que están constantemente socavando la privacidad en línea de los ciudadanos mediante la modificación de los términos y condiciones de sus servicios, publicando información que los usuarios creían privada. Esta circunstancia, que constituye en sí misma una práctica engañosa, adquiere una nueva dimensión si consideramos los usos potencialmente perjudiciales de las tecnologías de recogida y extracción de datos.

En diciembre de 2012, la compañía Raytheon, dedicada a la defensa y a la ciber seguridad y que opera en Alemania, Francia, Reino Unido y España, registró un nuevo producto denominado RIOT. De acuerdo con información filtrada publicada en el periódico británico *The Guardian*, el RIOT de Raytheon recoge información personal disponible públicamente en Internet y tiene la capacidad de crear perfiles de individuos que incluyen fotos o información sobre a dónde van o qué están haciendo. También puede predecir hacia dónde se dirige una determinada persona o qué hará en el futuro.

Por lo tanto, planteamos las siguientes cuestiones a la Comisión:

1. ¿Es la tecnología RIOT de Raytheon compatible con las normas de la UE sobreprotección de datos?

2. ¿De qué manera abordará la nueva legislación sobre protección de datos las prácticasengañosas de las redes sociales y cómo pondrá fin a la extracción y a la recogida de datosno autorizadas?

3. ¿Ha comprado la Comisión o cualquiera de los Estados miembros el RIOT de Raytheon oalgún producto similar? En caso negativo, ¿está considerando la Comisión o cualquierade los Estados miembros adquirir uno de estos productos?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de mayo de 2013)

La Comisión es consciente de los riesgos que para la protección de datos entraña el incesante incremento del uso de sistemas tales como RIOT ([1]), que, de acuerdo con la información aparecida en la prensa, puede crear perfiles detallados de las personas a partir de los datos personales existentes en Internet.

Cuando utilicen sistemas de elaboración de perfiles, los responsables del tratamiento de los datos de la UE, tanto públicos como privados, deben observar la legislación nacional de protección de datos por la que se aplique la Directiva 95/46/CE ([2]). En particular, las personas tienen «derecho a no verse sometidas a una decisión con efectos jurídicos sobre ellas o que les afecte de manera significativa, que se base únicamente en un tratamiento automatizado de datos destinado a evaluar determinados aspectos» de su persona (artículo 15 de la Directiva).

Sin perjuicio de las potestades de la Comisión como guardiana de los Tratados, la supervisión y el control de la observancia de la legislación sobre la protección de datos es competencia de las autoridades nacionales y, más concretamente, de las autoridades de supervisión responsables de la protección de datos.

La Comisión abundó en los principios aplicables a la protección de datos en su paquete de medidas de reforma de la protección de datos ([3]), con la intención de garantizar que los datos personales de los individuos gocen de una protección efectiva, sea cual sea la tecnología utilizada para el tratamiento de esos datos. En particular, dicho paquete de medidas refuerza y aclara las disposiciones vigentes de la Directiva 95/46/CE por lo que respecta a la elaboración de perfiles, y potencia los poderes coercitivos de las autoridades responsables de la protección de datos.

([1]) Rapid Information Overlay Technology.
([2]) Directiva 95/46/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 24.10.1995, relativa a la protección de las personas físicas en lo que respecta al tratamiento de datos personales y a la libre circulación de estos datos (DO L 281 de 23.11.1995, p. 31).
([3]) COM(2012) 0011 y COM(2012) 0012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002560/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: RIOT technology

In the framework of the debate on the reform of the Data Protection Directive and the Commission's proposal for a new data protection regulation, Commissioner Reding has repeatedly stated that the Commission is committed to protecting the privacy of European citizens. Internet giants constantly undermine European citizens' online privacy by changing the terms and conditions of their services, making information that their users thought was private public. This, which in itself constitutes a deceptive practice, acquires a new dimension when and if we consider the potentially prejudicial uses of data collection and data mining technology.

In December 2012 the defence and cyber-security company Raytheon — which has operations in Germany, France, the UK and Spain — registered a new product called RIOT. According to leaked information published by *The Guardian*, a British newspaper, Raytheon's RIOT collects personal information publicly available on the Internet and is able to build a profile of individuals that includes where they go, what they do, or their photos. It is also able to predict where individuals are going to be or what they are going to do.

We therefore ask the Commission:

1. Is Raytheon's RIOT technology compatible with EU standards of data protection?

2. What is the proposed data protection regulation going to do to tackle the deceptive practices of social networks and stop unauthorised data mining and collection?

3. Has the Commission, or any Member State, bought Raytheon's RIOT or similar products? If not, is the Commission or any of the Member States considering buying such products?

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

The Commission is aware of the data protection risks arising with ever-growing availability of systems such as 'RIOT ([1])' which according to press reports are capable of building detailed profiles of individuals on the basis of personal data available on the Internet.

When deploying profiling systems, public or private controllers in the EU must respect national data protection legislation implementing Directive 95/46/EC ([2]). In particular, individuals have the right not to be subject to a decision which produces legal effects concerning them or significantly affecting them and which is based solely on automated processing of data intended to evaluate certain personal aspects relating to him (Article 15 of the directive).

Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection legislation falls under the competence of national authorities, in particular data protection supervisory authorities.

The Commission further clarified the data protection principles in its data protection Reform package ([3]), in a bid to ensure that individuals' personal data are effectively protected, regardless of the technology used to process their data. In particular, the Reform package strengthens and clarifies the existing provisions of Directive 95/46/EC as regards profiling and strengthens the enforcement powers of the national data protection authorities.

([1]) Rapid Information Overlay Technology.
([2]) 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, 23.11.1995, p. 31.
([3]) COM(2012) 0011 and COM(2012) 0012).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002561/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(5 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Spese militari in Grecia

Fonti di stampa rivelano che il Presidente Hollande, durante la sua ultima visita in Grecia, ha sbloccato l'intesa per la vendita alla Grecia di due fregate, ossia due navi «multimissione» Fremm, prodotte dai francesi con l'industria Finmeccanica. Tale accordo sarà ratificato alla fine del mese di marzo.

Si apprende che la Grecia, vista l'entità della commessa, potrà avere le navi in leasing, ma si specifica anche che la marina greca ha già imbarcazioni simili, però ferme perché non ci sono soldi per il carburante.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Tenendo presente che la Grecia ha ottenuto dall'UE e dall'FMI 244 miliardi di euro, può la Commissione far sapere se monitora come vengono spesi questi soldi?

2. È la Commissione a conoscenza dell'esatta entità della commessa di queste due navi?

3. Come crede la Commissione che la Grecia possa coprire il leasing delle due fregate?

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(27 maggio 2013)

I servizi della Commissione controllano l'esecuzione del bilancio su base mensile e le proiezioni delle entrate e delle spese per il settore delle amministrazioni pubbliche fino al 2016 su base trimestrale a seguito di ciascun riesame del programma di risanamento economico per la Grecia. Tuttavia, non rientra tra gli obiettivi della Commissione disporre di informazioni dettagliate su ciascuna voce di spesa.

Il programma in materia di appalti pubblici della difesa rientra nella linea di bilancio specifica relativa alle spese per la difesa. Questa linea di bilancio è soggetta ai massimali di spesa stabiliti nel bilancio annuale, conformemente alla legge finanziaria organica.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002561/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Military spending in Greece

According to press sources, President Hollande, during his last visit to Greece, cleared the agreement for the sale of two frigates to Greece. These are FREMM 'multi-mission' vessels, built in France under a joint venture with Finmeccanica. This agreement will be ratified at the end of March.

We are told that because of the size of the order, Greece will be able to take the ships on a leasing basis. However, it is also stated that the Greek navy already has similar vessels, but that these are at a standstill because there is no money for fuel.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. Bearing in mind that Greece has received EUR 244 billion from the EU and the IMF, is the Commission monitoring how this money is spent?

2. Is the Commission aware of the precise value of the order for these two vessels?

3. How does the Commission think Greece can cover the leasing of the two frigates?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(27 May 2013)

The Commission services monitor the budget execution on a monthly basis and the revenue and expenditure projections for the general government sector until 2016 on a quarterly basis following each review of the Economic adjustment programme for Greece. The Commission however does not seek to have detailed information on each single item of the expenditure.

The defence procurement programme is recorded in the specific budget line labelled 'Spending on defence'. This budget line is subject to expenditure ceilings established in the annual budget according to the organic budget law.

.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002562/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(5 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Adozioni in Kirghizistan

Una trentina di coppie italiane sono rimaste coinvolte in una truffa sulle adozioni internazionali in Kirghizistan. Il centro italiano cui si erano rivolte è L'Airone di Bergamo: questo centro però non ha adeguatamente tutelato le coppie, non agendo nei confronti dei suoi «referenti» kirghizi, al centro del caso. La Commissione per le adozioni internazionali (Cai), ente pubblico da cui dipendono autorizzazioni e revoche per i centri adozioni, finora non ha preso provvedimenti.

Tra il 2011 e il 2012 molte famiglie che si erano rivolte all'Airone erano state indirizzate a un'adozione in Kirghizistan: per questo ogni coppia ha pagato 11 mila euro (escluse le spese di viaggio). Lo scorso giugno, atterrati nella capitale kirghiza, gli italiani sono stati presi in carico dal referente locale dell'Airone. Costui ha incassato le ultime quote per poi condurre le coppie in un lungo, inconcludente tour fra il tribunale e l'orfanotrofio.

Alcuni bimbi, inoltre, hanno rivelato gravi condizioni di salute e così il referente locale dell'Airone ha proposto pratiche illecite, a pagamento, come l'affitto di uteri o «l'acquisto» di minorenni diversi da quelli per i quali il centro, in Italia, aveva consegnato ad alcune coppie una documentazione comunque incompleta, poiché accanto al nome dell'adottando non compariva nemmeno il nome dei futuri genitori.

È il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante a conoscenza di queste adozioni-truffa?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(8 maggio 2013)

La delegazione dell'UE segue le azioni legali intentate in Kirghizistan nel 2012-2013 contro l'ex ministro per lo Sviluppo sociale, condannato da un tribinale locale per corruzione in relazione al rilascio di licenze a dieci centri di adozione stranieri (inclusi italiani) per operare nel paese.

L'adesione del Kirghizistan alla Convenzione dell'Aja sulle adozioni internazionali nel 2012 apre nuove prospettive per i bambini in situazioni difficili.

Più in generale, l'UE sostiene l'impegno del Kirghizistan nella riforma dello Stato di diritto. Il Kirghizistan partecipa attivamente alle attività nell'ambito dell'iniziativa dell'UE in materia di Stato di diritto in Asia centrale. Lo Stato di diritto è uno dei settori fondamentali in cui l'UE presta assistenza al paese nel periodo 2011-2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002562/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Adoptions in Kyrgyzstan

About 30 Italian couples have been caught up in an international adoption fraud in Kyrgyzstan. The Italian agency to which the couples had turned for help was Airone, based in Bergamo. However, this agency has failed to protect the couples in the proper way and has not taken any steps in relation to its Kyrgyz 'contacts', who are at the heart of the case. The Italian Commission for International Adoption (CAI), the public body responsible for issuing and withdrawing licences for adoption agencies, has taken no action to date.

In 2011 and 2012, many of the families who approached Airone were referred to an adoption service in Kyrgyzstan. For this, each couple paid EUR 11 000 (excluding travel expenses). In June of last year, after the Italians had landed in the Kyrgyz capital, Airone's local contact took charge. This man collected the final payments before leading the couples on a long fruitless tour between the court and the orphanage.

Furthermore, because some of the children had serious medical conditions, the Airone contact offered illegal practices — in return for payment — for example surrogacy arrangements or the 'purchase' of children other than the ones specified in the documentation which the agency in Italy had supplied to some of the couples. The documentation was, however, incomplete, as the future parents were not even named alongside the adoptee.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of these bogus adoptions?

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

The EU Delegation has been monitoring the legal proceedings in 2012-2013 in Kyrgyzstan against former Minister for Social Development who was found guilty by a local court on taking bribes in order to license ten foreign adoption companies (including Italian) to operate in the country.

Kyrgyzstan's adherence in 2012 to the Hague Convention on international adoptions opens new perspectives for children in difficult situation.

More generally, the EU supports Kyrgyzstan advancing the Rule of Law reform. Kyrgyzstan actively participates in the activities under the EU's Rule of Law Initiative for Central Asia. Rule of Law is one of the focal sectors for EU assistance to the country in 2011-2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002563/13
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(5 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Reintroduzione e utilizzo delle farine animali in acquacoltura

Dal 1° giugno 2013 le farine animali, bandite nel 2001 dall'alimentazione degli animali a seguito della Bse, saranno reintrodotte (di suino e di pollo), per nutrire i pesci di allevamento.

Il motivo di tale reintroduzione pare sia economico, ovvero che le farine animali costano meno delle farine di soia e di aringhe di cui si nutrono i pesci allevati.

La Commissione assicura che le farine proverranno solo da parti di animali adatte anche all'alimentazione umana e che saranno escluse le farine provenienti dai ruminanti.

Inoltre, sembra che dal 2014 le farine animali saranno utilizzate anche per maiali e volatili.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Come intende essa monitorare l'uso effettivo di farine che non possano procurare danni alla salute dei consumatori?

2. Può essa fornire dati circa le differenze di costo tra le farine animali e quelle di soia e di aringhe attualmente utilizzate?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2013)

Il regolamento (UE) n. 56/2013 della Commissione ([1]) ha il fine di riautorizzare l'uso di proteine animali trasformate (PAT) ricavate da animali d'allevamento non ruminanti (per l'essenziale da suini e pollame) nei mangimi destinati ai pesci d'allevamento e ad altri animali d'acquacoltura. Il regolamento è applicabile dal 1° giugno 2013 ed è in linea con i più recenti pareri scientifici.

1. Il regolamento (UE) n. 56/2013 prevede requisiti estremamente rigorosi sulla tracciabilità e sui controlli analitici che gli Stati membri devono assicurare lungo l'intera filiera alimentare al fine di prevenire la contaminazione incrociata e quindi il cannibalismo. La Commissione ritiene che l'attuazione corretta e l'enforcement di tali requisiti dovrebbero assicurare e mantenere un livello elevato di protezione dei consumatori. Il piano di lavoro dell'Ufficio alimentare e veterinario della Commissione comprenderà audit per verificare l'applicazione, da parte degli Stati membri, della pertinente normativa UE.

2. Un raffronto diretto dei prezzi tra PAT, farina di soia e farina di pesce, come ad esempio la farina di aringhe, indica che questi fluttuano a seconda della domanda e della disponibilità. Il solo prezzo non sarebbe determinante ai fini della scelta degli operatori del settore dei mangimi poiché va considerato anche il valore nutritivo che non è lo stesso per i tre tipi di prodotti.

([1]) GU L 21 del 24.1.2013, pag. 3.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002563/13
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Reintroduction and use of animal meal in aquaculture

From 1 June 2013 animal meal, banned from animal food in 2001 in the wake of BSE, will be reintroduced (from swine and poultry) for feeding farmed fish.

The reason for reintroducing this seems to be financial, which is because animal meal costs less than soya bean and herring meal which are used to feed farmed fish.

The Commission guarantees that the meal will come only from parts of animals which are also suitable for human consumption and that meal from ruminants will be excluded.

Furthermore, from 2014, animal meal will apparently also be used to feed pigs and poultry.

Could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. How does it intend to monitor the actual use of the meal to ensure that it cannot harm consumers' health?

2. Can it provide data showing the differences in cost between animal meal and the soya bean and herring meal currently being used?

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

Commission Regulation (EU) No 56/2013 ([1]) aims to reauthorise the use of processed animal proteins (PAPs) derived from non-ruminant farmed animals (i.e. mainly from pigs and poultry) in feed for farmed fish and other aquaculture animals. It is applicable from 1 June 2013 and is in line with latest scientific opinions.

1. Regulation (EU) No 56/2013 provides for very strict traceability requirements and analytical controls to be applied by the Member States all along the feed chain in order to prevent cross-contamination and subsequent cannibalism. The Commission believes that the correct implementation and enforcement of these requirements should ensure and maintain the high level of consumer protection. Audits on the Member States enforcement of applicable EC law will be part of the Commission Food and Veterinary Office working programme.

2. A direct comparison of prices between PAP, soybean meal and fish meal such as herring meal, fluctuate depending on demand and availability. Price alone would not determine choices of feed business operators since the nutritional value, which is not the same for the three feed materials, also needs to be considered.

([1]) OJ L21, 24.1.2013, p. 3.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002564/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Acordo de comércio livre entre a União Europeia e o Conselho de Cooperação do Golfo

Considerando que:

— O Conselho de Cooperação do Golfo é uma organização de integração económica que reúne seis estados do Golfo Pérsico (Omã, Emirados Árabes Unidos, Arábia Saudita, Catar, Barém e Koweit), criada a 25 de maio de 1981, cujos objetivos são a coordenação e a integração entre os seus Estados membros, reforçando os laços entre os respetivos povos e visando questões como a economia, as finanças, o comércio, a alfândega, o turismo, a legislação, a administração, bem como o progresso técnico nos domínios da indústria, da mineração, da agricultura, dos recursos de água e da pecuária, do estabelecimento de centros de pesquisa científica e da cooperação com o setor privado;

— Um Acordo de Cooperação entre a União Europeia e o Conselho de Cooperação do Golfo foi celebrado em 1988, o qual continha o compromisso de se abrir negociações com vista a um Acordo de Livre Comércio, que tiveram início em 1990;

— Porém, as negociações entre a União Europeia e o Conselho de Cooperação do Golfo foram suspensas em 2008 por esta organização, embora continuem a ter lugar contactos informais entre os negociadores de ambas as Partes;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Que tipo de contactos informais entre os negociadores da UE e do Conselho de Cooperação do Golfo tem tido lugar?

2. É possível prever uma reabertura das negociações? Quais os esforços que a União Europeia têm desenvolvido nesse sentido?

3. Quais os principais obstáculos à reabertura das negociações?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(22 de abril de 2013)

As negociações de um Acordo de Livre Comércio (ALC) entre a UE e o Conselho de Cooperação do Golfo (CCG) estão suspensas desde 2008. Por essa altura, as partes haviam já chegado a acordo sobre a maioria do texto do dito acordo e sobre as propostas de acesso ao mercado de bens, serviços e investimento e de contratos públicos. Em 2009, foi encontrado um compromisso sobre a suspensão e as cláusulas relativas aos direitos humanos, sendo a única questão pendente a introdução de disciplinas em matéria de direitos de exportação.

Em 2010, o CCG suspendeu todas as negociações do ALC em curso e lançou estudos sobre as vantagens dessas negociações. Até à data, o CCG não retomou negociações sobre qualquer uma destas questões.

Desde 2008 que são mantidos contactos informais, mas não foram obtidos quaisquer progressos nos debates sobre os direitos de exportação.

A UE está disposta a tentar concluir este acordo e negociar a questão dos direitos de exportação desde que o CCG esteja, por seu turno, pronto a retomar as negociações e a dar prova de maior flexibilidade, abandonando a sua posição expressa de não incluir no ALC disciplinas em matéria de direitos de exportação. A UE não pode aceitar um acordo que não comporte estas disciplinas em virtude do seu impacto no acesso a matérias-primas e das regras da Organização Mundial do Comércio. O CCG rejeitou todas as propostas de compromisso apresentadas pela UE desde 2007.

A Comissão considera que, para a conclusão deste acordo, é necessária vontade política por parte do CCG.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002564/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Free Trade Agreement between the EU and the Gulf Cooperation Council

The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) is an economic integration organisation comprising six Persian Gulf States (Oman, the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Bahrain and Kuwait), established on 25 May 1981 to promote coordination and integration between the Member States, to strengthen ties between their peoples and to address issues such as economics, finance, trade, customs, tourism, legislation, administration and technical progress in the areas of industry, mining, agriculture, water resources and animal husbandry, the establishment of scientific research centres and cooperation with the private sector.

The EU and the GCC entered into a cooperation agreement in 1988, which included the commitment to open negotiations on a Free Trade Agreement, which began in 1990.

The GCC suspended negotiations with the EU in 2008, however, although negotiators from both parties continue to have informal contact.

1. What type of informal contact has been taking place between negotiators from the EU and the GCC?

2. Are negotiations expected to resume? What measures is the EU taking to bring this about?

3. What are the main obstacles to resuming negotiations?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

The Free Trade Agreement (FTA) negotiations between the EU and the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) have been suspended since 2008. At that time, parties had already agreed on most of the FTA text and of the market access offers on goods, services and investment, and public procurement. A compromise was found on the suspension and human rights clauses in 2009. The only outstanding issue was the introduction of disciplines on export duties.

In 2010, the GCC suspended all its ongoing FTA negotiations and launched studies on the benefits of these negotiations. The GCC has not resumed any of these negotiations yet.

Informal contacts have continued since 2008 but no progress has been made on discussions regarding export duties.

The EU is ready to try to conclude this agreement and to negotiate on the issue of export duties, provided that the GCC side is also ready to reengage in the negotiations and to show more flexibility by n moving away from its established position to have no disciplines on export duties in the FTA. The EU cannot accept a deal which would not contain disciplines on export duties,because of its impact on access to raw materials, and because of the rules of theWorld Trade Organisation. The GCC has rejected all compromise proposals presented by the EU since 2007.

The Commission believes that political willingness on the GCC side is necessary in order to conclude this agreement.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002565/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Negociação de um Acordo de Livre Comércio entre a UE e países membros da ASEAN

Considerando que:

— A União Europeia está atualmente a encetar negociações com a Malásia, desde maio de 2010, e com o Vietname, desde junho de 2012, com vista à celebração de um Acordo de Livre Comércio com cada uma das Partes, e que tem vindo também a desenvolver negociações com Singapura, que é o principal parceiro da UE de entre os membros da ASEAN;

— A União Europeia mantém a «porta aberta» para encetar negociações com outros parceiros da ASEAN e tem a intenção de um dia vir a completar tais acordos bilaterais com um acordo de comércio de caráter birregional;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o estado das negociações com vista à celebração de um Acordo de Livre Comércio com a Malásia?

2. Qual o estado das negociações com vista à celebração de um Acordo de Livre Comércio com o Vietname?

3. Quais os membros da ASEAN que considera potenciais parceiros comerciais e com os quais pondera vir a abrir negociações com vista à celebração de novos acordos de livre comércio?

4. Consegue definir um horizonte no tempo para uma eventual parceria de caráter birregional entre a UE e a ASEAN no que respeita às relações comerciais?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(24 de abril de 2013)

1. A UE e a Malásia lançaram oficialmente as negociações sobre um Acordo de Comércio Livre (ACL), em outubro de 2010. As negociações encontram-se a meio caminho: até ao momento foram realizadas sete rondas de negociações sobre troca de propostas de acesso ao mercado relativas a bens, serviços e contratos públicos. A próxima ronda de negociações terá lugar após as eleições na Malásia, que se prevê venham a realizar-se o mais tardar em junho de 2013.

2. As negociações para um ACL entre a UE e o Vietname foram lançadas em junho de 2012. Desde então realizaram-se duas rondas de negociações: a primeira em Hanói (8-12 de outubro de 2012) e a segunda em Bruxelas (22-25 de janeiro de 2013). Estas duas primeiras rondas foram utilizadas para explorar os sistemas regulatórios e os enquadramentos jurídicos de ambas as partes e preparar o trabalho da terceira fase, que terá lugar no Vietname de 23 a 26 de abril de 2013.

3. Em dezembro de 2012, a UE e Singapura concluíram com êxito as negociações do seu ACL. Após a Malásia e o Vietname, foram também iniciadas negociações com a Tailândia em 6 de março de 2013 e estão em curso conversações de pré-negociação com a Indonésia e as Filipinas.

4. Os ACL bilaterais devem ser vistos como bases birregionais para um ACL entre a UE e a ASEAN, que continua a ser para a UE o objetivo final. Uma vez realizados os ACL com cada um dos países da ASEAN, e quando a ASEAN alcançar uma maior integração (possivelmente após a conclusão da comunidade económica ASEAN, até ao final de 2015), haverá uma reflexão sobre como «regionalizar» as relações entre a ASEAN e a UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002565/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Negotiations for a Free Trade Agreement between the EU and members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations

The EU has been in negotiations with Malaysia since May 2010 and with Vietnam since June 2012 with the aim of concluding Free Trade Agreements with each of these countries. It has also entered negotiations with Singapore, which is the EU's main partner amongst members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

The EU has left the door open for negotiations with other ASEAN partners and one day intends to complete these bilateral agreements with a bi-regional trade agreement.

1. What is the current state of negotiations between the EU and Malaysia on concluding a Free Trade Agreement?

2. What is the current state of negotiations between the EU and Vietnam on concluding a Free Trade Agreement?

3. Which ASEAN members does the Commission consider to be potential trade partners and with which will it consider opening negotiations on concluding new Free Trade Agreements?

4. Can it set a time frame for a possible bi-regional partnership on trade relations between the EU and ASEAN?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

1. The EU and Malaysia officially launched negotiations on a Free Trade Agreement (FTA) in October 2010. The negotiations are mid-way: seven negotiation rounds have taken place so far with market access offers exchanged on goods, services and public procurement. The next round of negotiations will be held after Malaysia's general elections, which are expected to take place at latest in June 2013.

2. Negotiations for an EU-Vietnam FTA were launched in June 2012. Since then two rounds of negotiations have taken place: the first in Hanoi (8-12 October 2012) and the second in Brussels (22-25 January 2013). These first two rounds were used to explore both parties' regulatory systems and legal frameworks and to prepare work to start in the third round, which will be held in Vietnam from 23 to 26 April 2013.

3. In December 2012, the EU and Singapore successfully concluded their FTA negotiations. After Malaysia and Vietnam, negotiations were also launched with Thailand on 6 March 2013, and pre-negotiating discussions are ongoing with Indonesia and the Philippines.

4. The bilateral FTAs should be seen as building blocks for a bi-regional FTA between the EU and ASEAN, which remains the EU's ultimate objective. Once a critical mass of bilateral FTAs with individual ASEAN countries is in place, and when ASEAN has achieved a greater integration — possibly after the completion of its ASEAN Economic Community by the end of 2015 — there will be a reflection on how to 'regionalise' the EU's ASEAN engagement.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002566/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Acordo de Livre Comércio entre a União Europeia e a Coreia do Sul

Considerando que:

— O Acordo de Livre Comércio entre a União Europeia e a Coreia do Sul entrou em vigor a 1 de julho de 2012, sendo o primeiro de uma nova geração de acordos de livre de comércio que visam aprofundar o estado das relações entre ambas as Partes, eliminando as barreiras comerciais e estreitando o relacionamento no domínio do comércio e dos negócios;

— O referido Acordo de Livre Comércio veio diminuir as tarifas de importação para os produtos da UE na Coreia do Sul, estimando-se que as empresas europeias conseguirão uma poupança na ordem dos 350 milhões de euros em apenas nove meses e a exportação de produtos de um leque abrangente, que vai desde os vinhos europeus até aos produtos de moda de elevada qualidade;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Quais os resultados de ordem económica até agora alcançados com a vigência deste Acordo, nomeadamente em termos de vantagens para os empresários da UE?

2. Quais o ponto desta parceria que devem ser melhorados e como pretende a Comissão desenvolvê-la e aprofundá-la no futuro?

3. Pode este tipo de parceria vir a influenciar futuras parcerias do género entre a UE e outros países terceiros na região?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(17 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para o seu Relatório Anual ao Parlamento Europeu e ao Conselho sobre a aplicação do acordo de comércio livre entre a UE e a Coreia (ACL), de 25 de fevereiro de 2013 ([1]), que inclui dados pormenorizados sobre a evolução dos fluxos comerciais entre a UE e a Coreia.

O ACL UE-Coreia constitui o acordo comercial mais ambicioso jamais celebrado pela UE e é igualmente o nosso primeiro acordo comercial com um país asiático. Constitui, por conseguinte, um exemplo.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/february/tradoc_150647.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002566/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: EU-South Korea Free Trade Agreement

The EU-South Korea Free Trade Agreement entered into force on 1 July 2012 and is the first of a new generation of free trade agreements that aims to enhance the state of relations between the two parties, lifting trade barriers and strengthening trade and business ties.

The Free Trade Agreement has seen a reduction in import tariffs for EU products in South Korea, with EU companies saving an estimated EUR 350 million in just nine months, and the export of a comprehensive range of products, from European wines to high quality fashion goods.

1. What economic results have been achieved to date following the entry into force of this agreement, particularly in terms of benefits for EU entrepreneurs?

2. Which sections of this partnership need to be improved and how will the Commission develop and enhance it in future?

3. Could this type of partnership influence future partnerships of this kind between the EU and other third countries in the region?

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

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its Annual Report to the European Parliament and the Council on the Implementation of the EU-Korea Free Trade Agreement (FTA), of 25 February 2013 ([1]), which contains detailed figures on the evolution of trade flows between the EU and Korea.

The EU-Korea FTA is the most ambitious trade agreement ever concluded by the EU and also our first trade deal with an Asian country. It therefore serves as an example.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/february/tradoc_150647.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002567/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Acordo de Livre Comércio entre a UE e Singapura

Considerando que:

— A República de Singapura é atualmente o maior parceiro comercial da União Europeia entre os países da ASEAN, correspondendo um terço do comércio entre a UE e a ASEAN apenas ao comércio entre a UE e Singapura, e que a República de Singapura é também o maior parceiro de investimento da UE na ASEAN, contribuindo para 80 % do investimento entre as regiões;

— Um Acordo de Livre Comércio entre a União Europeia e Singapura é uma porta de entrada na Ásia, propiciando inúmeras oportunidades de negócio para a União Europeia e de expansão dos mercados na região, e que as negociações com vista à celebração de um Acordo de Livre Comércio entre a UE e Singapura foram iniciadas em março;

— Até ao momento já tiveram lugar várias rondas de negociação, tendo a última ocorrido em novembro de 2012, e que estão já previstas futuras reuniões de caráter técnico, particularmente na área dos serviços, com o objetivo de terminar as negociações o mais brevemente possível;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o estado das negociações com vista a um Acordo de Livre Comércio entre a União Europeia e Singapura?

2. Quais os capítulos cujas negociações estão já encerradas e quais os temas em relação aos quais ainda não há acordo?

3. Para quando prevê a conclusão das negociações e a assinatura do acordo?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(24 de abril de 2013)

As negociações sobre um acordo de comércio livre (ACL) entre a UE e Singapura foram concluídas em 16 de dezembro de 2012. A Comissão do Comércio Internacional do Parlamento Europeu foi devidamente informada desse facto e recebeu os textos pertinentes. Podem ser consultadas todas as informações no sítio Web da Comissão: http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=855

Atualmente, as equipas jurídicas de ambas as partes estão a rever o texto do projeto de Acordo, com vista à sua rubrica na primavera ou no início do verão. No entanto, continuam as negociações entre ambas as partes no domínio da proteção do investimento. Estes debates têm por base uma nova competência da UE ao abrigo do Tratado de Lisboa e começaram após o início das negociações com vista a um ACL.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002567/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: EU-Singapore Free Trade Agreement

— Singapore is the EU's largest trading partner in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and trade between the EU and Singapore accounts for a third of all trade between the EU and ASEAN. Singapore is also the EU's largest investment partner in ASEAN, contributing to 80% of investment between the regions.

— An EU-Singapore Free Trade Agreement is a gateway to Asia, offering numerous business opportunities for the European Union and a chance to expand markets in the region. Negotiations to conclude an EU-Singapore Free Trade Agreement began in March.

— There have been several rounds of negotiations to date, with the latest held in November 2012. Future technical meetings are planned, particularly in the area of services, in an attempt to complete negotiations as soon as possible.

1. What is the state of negotiations on an EU-Singapore Free Trade Agreement?

2. Which chapters of negotiations are closed and which issues have the parties yet to agree on?

3. When does the Commission expect to complete negotiations and to conclude an agreement?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The negotiations on a free trade agreement (FTA) between the EU and Singapore were completed on 16 December 2012. Parliament's Committee on International Trade has been duly informed of this and has received the relevant texts. Details can be found on the Commission's website:
http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=855

Presently, legal teams from both sides are reviewing the text of the draft agreement, with a view to its initialling in spring or early summer. Negotiations between both sides are, however, continuing in the area of investment protection. These discussions are based on a new EU competence under the Lisbon Treaty, and began after the start of the FTA negotiations.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002568/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Negociação de um Acordo de Livre Comércio entre a UE e o Japão

Considerando que:

— O Japão é o segundo maior parceiro comercial da União Europeia na Ásia e que, numa análise de conjunto, a União Europeia e o Japão contribuem para mais de um terço do PIB à escala mundial;

— A 29 de novembro de 2013, os Estados-Membros da União Europeia conferiram um mandato à Comissão Europeia no sentido de abrir as negociações com o Japão com vista à celebração de um acordo de livre comércio;

— Um Acordo de Livre Comércio entre a União Europeia e o Japão contribuiria para aumentar o PIB da UE em cerca de 1 %, aumentar as exportações da UE para o Japão em cerca de um terço e criar 400 000 postos de trabalho adicionais na União Europeia;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Como serão tratadas no âmbito das negociações do referido acordo as questões relacionadas com a existência de barreiras não pautais no Japão? Pretende adiar as negociações, caso o Japão não prove a eliminação de tais barreiras?

2. Quais os resultados já alcançados no quadro desta liberalização?

3. Quais as prioridades para a União Europeia no âmbito das negociações? Quais os produtos que serão primeiramente visados pela liberalização comercial que será consagrada no acordo em curso de negociação?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(22 de abril de 2013)

As negociações para um acordo de comércio livre (ACL) com o Japão foram oficialmente iniciadas em 25 de março de 2013. A questão dos entraves não pautais ao comércio com o Japão é de grande interesse para a UE e será abordada nas negociações do ACL, tanto através da revisão periódica da situação dos compromissos japoneses assumidos antes das negociações, como da negociação de um capítulo ambicioso sobre os obstáculos técnicos ao comércio.

Um ano depois do início das negociações, a Comissão fará um balanço da aplicação dos compromissos do Japão relativamente à eliminação das barreiras não pautais. Se os progressos realizados não forem satisfatórios, a Comissão pode decidir suspender as negociações em conformidade com as disposições estabelecidas no mandato de negociação que recebeu dos Estados-Membros.

É de salientar que já foram alcançados progressos no que se refere a algumas destas barreiras não pautais: por exemplo, o Japão autorizou recentemente as importações de carne de bovino proveniente de animais com menos de 30 meses a partir de França e dos Países Baixos, concedeu licenças alcoólicas a alguns operadores europeus, aprovou dois aditivos alimentares solicitados pela UE e anunciou a sua intenção de aplicar mais quatro regulamentos ONU no setor automóvel.

As prioridades da UE nesta negociação incluem, entre outras, o setor automóvel, os produtos farmacêuticos, os dispositivos médicos, os produtos agroalimentares, os produtos químicos, os produtos elétricos e eletrónicos (incluindo os equipamentos de telecomunicações), o comércio de serviços, os contratos públicos, nomeadamente no setor ferroviário e dos transportes públicos, e os direitos de propriedade intelectual, incluindo as indicações geográficas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002568/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Negotiations for an EU-Japan Free Trade Agreement

— Japan is the EU's second largest trading partner in Asia and, together, the EU and Japan account for more than a third of world GDP.

— On 29 November 2013, the EU Member States approved a mandate for the Commission to start negotiations with Japan on concluding a free trade agreement.

— An EU-Japan Free Trade Agreement would increase EU GDP by around 1%, increase EU exports to Japan by around a third and create 400 000 additional jobs in the European Union.

1. How will issues related to Japan's non-tariff barriers be addressed in negotiations on this agreement? Will the Commission postpone negotiations if Japan fails to remove these barriers?

2. What progress has been made as regards this liberalisation?

3. What are the EU's priorities in these negotiations? Which products will be most affected by the trade liberalisation that will form a part of the agreement currently being negotiated?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

The negotiations for a Free Trade Agreement (FTA) with Japan were officially launched on 25 March 2013. The issue of Non-Tariff Barriers (NTB) with Japan is of key interest to the EU and will be addressed in the FTA negotiations both via the regular review of the state of play of Japanese commitments taken prior to the negotiations, as well as via the negotiation of an ambitious chapter on technical barriers to trade.

One year after the beginning of negotiations, the Commission will take stock of the implementation of Japan's commitments on the elimination of NTBs. If the progress achieved is not satisfactory, the Commission can decide to suspend the negotiations in accordance with the provisions set out in the negotiating mandate it received from Member States.

It must be noted that some progress has already been achieved with regard to some of the abovementioned NTBs: For example, Japan has recently allowed imports of beef from animals younger than 30 months from France and the Netherlands, granted liquor licenses to some European operators, approved two food additives requested by the EU and announced its intentions to apply four further UN Regulations in the automotive sector.

The EU's priorities in this negotiation include, among others, automotive, pharmaceuticals, medical devices, agri-food products, chemicals, electrical and electronic products (including telecommunications equipment), trade in services, public procurement, notably in the railway and public transport, and intellectual property rights including geographical indications.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002569/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Negociação de um acordo de livre comércio entre a UE e os países do sul do Mediterrâneo — Egito, Jordânia, Marrocos e Tunísia

Considerando que:

— Em dezembro de 2011, o Conselho adotou diretivas quanto à negociação de acordos com o Egito, a Jordânia, Marrocos e a Tunísia, com vista a estabelecer zonas de comércio livre entre a União Europeia e estes países terceiros e a aprofundar os atuais acordos de comércio já existentes entre as Partes;

— A 29 de novembro de 2012, o Conselho chegou a acordo sobre a concessão de um mandato à Comissão Europeia para iniciar negociações com Marrocos com vista à celebração de um acordo que institua uma zona de comércio livre, assim que possível;

— Em relação aos demais países do sul do Mediterrâneo referidos, ou seja, o Egito, a Jordânia e a Tunísia, ainda não foi atribuído qualquer mandato à Comissão Europeia para dar início às negociações com vista à celebração de um acordo que institua uma zona de comércio livre;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o estado das negociações entre a Comissão e Marrocos com vista a um acordo que institua uma zona de comércio livre? Há capítulos cuja negociação já esteja fechada? Em caso de resposta afirmativa, a que temas dizem respeito esses capítulos?

2. Para quando está previsto dar início às negociações com o Egito, a Jordânia e a Tunísia, com vista a um acordo que institua uma zona de comércio livre? Quais as prioridades da Comissão aquando da abertura das negociações com estes países terceiros e quais os temas em que será mais fácil obter um acordo em primeiro lugar?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(24 de abril de 2013)

Já existem Zonas de Comércio Livre entre a UE e a maioria dos parceiros do Sul do Mediterrâneo no âmbito dos acordos de associação euro-mediterrânicos.

Como parte da resposta da UE à primavera árabe, o Conselho adotou, em 14 de dezembro de 2011, diretrizes de negociação de zonas de comércio livre abrangente e aprofundado (ZCLAA) com o Egito, a Jordânia, Marrocos e a Tunísia. O principal objetivo das ZCLAA será a integração progressiva das economias dos parceiros no mercado único da UE. As ZCLAA serão acordos abrangentes e aprofundados sobre facilitação do comércio, obstáculos técnicos ao comércio, medidas sanitárias e fitossanitárias, direitos de propriedade intelectual, concorrência e proteção dos investimentos. Deverão igualmente melhorar o acesso ao mercado, nomeadamente em matéria de comércio de serviços e de contratos públicos.

Antes do início das negociações, a Comissão deve efetuar um processo preparatório com cada parceiro e elaborar um relatório. O processo preparatório foi concluído com Marrocos, em outubro de 2012, e está em curso com a Tunísia e a Jordânia, desde março de 2012. Uma reunião preparatória com o Egito teve lugar em novembro de 2012.

As negociações sobre uma ZCLAA entre a UE e Marrocos foram iniciadas em 1 de março de 2013 e a primeira ronda de negociações terá lugar em abril de 2013. As negociações com o Egito, a Jordânia e a Tunísia serão lançadas logo que o processo preparatório esteja concluído, podendo acontecer ainda em 2013 com os parceiros que já estejam prontos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002569/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Negotiations for a free trade agreement between the EU and the Southern Mediterranean countries (Egypt, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia)

— In December 2011 the Council adopted directives for negotiations with Egypt, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia on agreements establishing free trade areas between the EU and these third countries and enhancing current trade agreements between the parties.

— On 29 November 2012 the Council approved a mandate for the Commission to start negotiations with Morocco on concluding a free trade area agreement as soon as possible.

— The Commission did not receive a mandate to start negotiations with the other Southern Mediterranean countries — Egypt, Jordan and Tunisia — on concluding a free trade area agreement.

1. What is the state of negotiations between the Commission and Morocco on this agreement? Are any chapters of these negotiations complete? If so, which areas do these chapters cover?

2. When does the Commission expect to start negotiations with Egypt, Jordan and Tunisia on a free trade area agreement? What are its priorities as regards starting negotiations with these third countries and, initially, in which areas will it be easiest to reach an agreement?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

Free Trade Areas are already in place between the EU and most Southern Mediterranean partners under the Euro-Mediterranean Association Agreements.

As part of the EU's response to the Arab Spring, the Council adopted on 14 December 2011 negotiating directives for Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas (DCFTAs) with Egypt, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia. The main aim of the DCFTAs will be the progressive integration of the partners' economies into the EU single market. The DCFTAs will be comprehensive agreements covering trade facilitation, technical barriers to trade, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, intellectual property rights, competition and investment protection. They will also improve market access, notably in trade in services and public procurement.

Prior to the launch of negotiations, the Commission must carry out a preparatory process with each partner and produce a report. The preparatory process was concluded with Morocco in October 2012 and is ongoing with Tunisia and Jordan since March 2012. An exploratory meeting with Egypt took place in November 2012.

Negotiations on a EU-Morocco DCFTA were launched on 1 March 2013 and the first negotiating round will take place in April 2013. Negotiations with Egypt, Jordan and Tunisia will be launched once the preparatory process is completed, which could still happen during 2013 with partners which are ready.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002570/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Acordos de Livre Comércio entre a UE e países da PEV

Considerando que:

— A União Europeia está atualmente a desenvolver negociações com a Geórgia, a Arménia e a Moldávia, com vista à celebração de um Acordo de Livre Comércio aprofundado com cada uma das Partes;

— A Geórgia, a Arménia e a Moldávia são países terceiros do leste do continente abrangidos pela Política de Vizinhança da União Europeia e que a UE visa, ao abrigo desta política, uma maior aproximação e convergência das relações comerciais, políticas e geoestratégicas;

— No seio da Política Europeia de Vizinhança, a União Europeia tem vindo a desenvolver relações de várias ordens com países terceiros vizinhos e que, neste aspeto, as relações comerciais se revestem de grande importância económica e estratégica;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o estado das negociações entre a UE e a Geórgia com vista à celebração de um Acordo de Livre Comércio de caráter aprofundado?

2. Qual o estado das negociações entre a UE e a Arménia com vista à celebração de um Acordo de Livre Comércio de caráter aprofundado?

3. Qual o estado das negociações entre a UE e a Moldávia com vista à celebração de um Acordo de Livre Comércio de caráter aprofundado?

4. Com que outros países terceiros vizinhos, abrangidos pela Política Europeia de Vizinhança, tenciona a Comissão encetar negociações com vista à celebração de um Acordo de Livre Comércio aprofundado?

5. Como vê a Comissão a articulação entre os acordos celebrados ou a celebrar e os objetivos da Política Europeia de Vizinhança?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(29 de abril de 2013)

As negociações do Acordo de Comércio Livre global e aprofundado (ACLGA) com a Geórgia, a Moldávia e a Arménia avançam a um bom ritmo. A Comissão e os três países parceiros pretendem concluir as negociações a tempo da Cimeira da Parceria Oriental, que se realizará em novembro deste ano na cidade de Vílnius.

A celebração de um ACLGA com o Azerbaijão e a Bielorrússia não está prevista a curto prazo ou mesmo a médio prazo, já que a adesão destes países à OMC é uma pré-condição para encetar as negociações.

As reformas decorrentes do ACLGA celebrado com os parceiros orientais resultarão na adoção de grande parte do acervo da UE pelos países parceiros em causa. Essa aproximação irá garantir aos países parceiros um acesso substancial ao mercado da UE para a consecução do objetivo da sua integração económica na UE.

No que toca aos países no âmbito da Política Europeia de Vizinhança (PEV) do sul do Mediterrâneo, em dezembro de 2011, o Conselho autorizou a Comissão a encetar negociações bilaterais com o Egito, a Jordânia, Marrocos e a Tunísia sobre Zonas de Comércio Livre Aprofundadas e Abrangentes (ZCLAA).

Foram encetadas negociações com Marrocos em 1 de março de 2013, e o processo de preparação continua no que diz respeito aos outros três países.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002570/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Free Trade Agreements between the EU and the European Neighbourhood Policy countries

— The EU is currently in negotiations with Georgia, Armenia and Moldova with the aim of concluding Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreements with each of these countries.

— Georgia, Armenia and Moldova are third countries in Eastern Europe covered by the EU's European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). Through this policy, the EU aims to achieve closer and more convergent trade, political and geostrategic relations.

— The EU has been using the ENP to develop a range of relations with neighbouring third countries and such trade relations are of great economic and strategic importance.

1. What is the current state of negotiations between the EU and Georgia on a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement?

2. What is the current state of negotiations between the EU and Armenia on a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement?

3. What is the current state of negotiations between the EU and Moldova on a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement?

4. Does the Commission intend to negotiate Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreements with any other third countries covered by the ENP?

5. How does it view the link between the agreements already concluded or to be concluded and the ENP's objectives?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(29 April 2013)

Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) negotiations with Georgia, Moldova and Armenia are progressing well. The Commission and the three partner countries are aiming to conclude the negotiations in time for the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius in November this year.

DCFTAs with Azerbaijan and Belarus are not foreseen in the short- or even medium-term as the accession of these countries to the WTO is a precondition to starting negotiations.

The reforms brought about by the DCFTAs with Eastern Partners will result in the adoption of large parts of the EU *acquis* in the partner countries concerned. This approximation will ensure partner countries substantial access to the EU market and will contribute to the objective of economic integration with the EU.

As regards ENP countries of the Southern Mediterranean, in December 2011 the Council authorised the Commission to open bilateral negotiations of Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas with Egypt, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia.

Negotiations were launched with Morocco on 1 March 2013 and the preparatory process continues with the other three countries.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. P-002571/13
Komisijai
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(2013 m. kovo 5 d.)

Tema: Dujų jungties tarp Lenkijos ir Lietuvos projektas

Prieš keletą dienų Lenkijos užsienio reikalų ministras Radosławas Sikorskis viešai pareiškė, kad Lietuva turėtų pasirinkti vieną iš dviejų projektų – suskystintų dujų terminalą Klaipėdoje ar dujų jungties tiesimą į Lenkiją, nes abu projektai neatsipirktų.

Baltijos energijos rinkos jungčių plane, be kitų projektų, numatytas ir dujų jungties tarp Lenkijos ir Lietuvos tiesimas. Tai suteiktų galimybę Lietuvai pirkti dujas konkurencingesnėmis kainomis ir užsitikrinti energijos tiekimo saugumą. Atsižvelgdama į tai, jog šis projektas gali būti komerciškai nepatrauklus investuotojams, tačiau yra europinės svarbos, ES įsipareigojo finansiškai prisidėti prie šio projekto įgyvendinimo. Be to, Lietuva ir pati savo jėgomis didina savo energetinę nepriklausomybę – statomas nacionalinis suskystintų gamtinių dujų terminalas Klaipėdoje, nes numatyto Baltijos regiono suskystintų dujų terminalo statyba gali užtrukti dar 17 metų, t. y. iki 2030-ųjų.

Lenkijai jau buvo skirtas ES finansavimas Baltijos energijos dujų jungčių plane numatytiems projektams įgyvendinti ir tai šiandien leidžia jai už konkurencingą kainą pirkti reversiniu būdu tiekiamas dujas.

Baltijos energijos rinkos jungčių planas yra įtrauktas į visus strateginius Komisijos dokumentus ir numatytų projektų įgyvendinimas yra labai svarbus viso Baltijos regiono energetinio saugumo didinimui ir šio regiono integracijai į bendrąją ES energetikos rinką.

Norėčiau sužinoti, kokia šiuo metu padėtis dėl Lenkijos ir Lietuvos dujų jungties projekto ir kada numatoma pradėti šios jungties statybos darbus?

G. Oettingerio atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. balandžio 23 d.)

Dujų jungtis tarp Lenkijos ir Lietuvos (toliau – DJLL) yra vienas iš Baltijos energijos rinkos jungčių plano elementų. DJLL galimybė tapti bendros svarbos projektu vertinama pagal Reglamentu dėl transeuropinės energetikos infrastruktūros gairių, kuriuo panaikinamas Sprendimas Nr. 1364/2006/EB, nustatytus kriterijus. Šiuo metu vyksta DJLL planavimo etapas ir numatoma, kad projekto rengėjai sprendimus dėl statybos darbų priims 2013 m.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002571/13
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Gas interconnection project between Poland and Lithuania

Some days ago, Poland's Minister of Foreign Affairs Radosław Sikorski announced that Lithuania would have to choose between two projects — a liquid gas terminal in Klaipėda and a gas interconnection with Poland — as it was financially not possible to undertake both projects.

One of the projects in the Baltic Energy Market Interconnection Plan is the construction of a gas interconnection between Poland and Lithuania. This would enable Lithuania to purchase gas at more competitive prices and guarantee the security of its energy supply. Although the project might prove unattractive to investors, it is of European interest, and the EU has undertaken to provide financial support for its completion. In addition, the construction of a national liquefied natural gas terminal in Klaipėda with its own resources will enable Lithuania to increase its energy independence, as the construction of the planned liquefied petroleum gas terminal for the Baltic region might take another 17 years, i.e. until 2030.

Poland has received EU funding for projects included in the Baltic Energy Market Interconnection Plan, and as a result it is now able to purchase gas in a reverse-flow procedure at a competitive price.

The Baltic Energy Market Interconnection Plan has been adopted in all the Commission's strategic documents, and implementation of the planned projects is vital for increasing the security of the energy supply of the whole Baltic region and the region's integration into the EU's common energy market.

Will the Commission state what the current situation is regarding the project for a gas interconnection between Poland and Lithuania? When is construction work on the project expected to begin?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2013)

The gas interconnection between Poland and Lithuania (GIPL) is one of the elements of the Baltic Energy Market Interconnection Plan. GIPL's potential to become a Project of Common Interest is assessed against the criteria defined in the regulation on guidelines for trans-European energy infrastructure and repealing Decision No 1364/2006/EC. GIPL is currently in the planning phase, with decisions of the project promoters on construction works expected in the course of 2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002572/13
a la Comisión
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(5 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Control anisakis

Según la Fundación Española del Aparato Digestivo (FEAD), España se sitúa después de Japón como el país con mayor número de intoxicaciones por anisakis, un parásito que se transmite a los seres humanos a través de la ingestión de pescado o cefalópodos contaminados y que provoca trastornos gastrointestinales y alérgicos.

Cada año se producen en el mundo 20 000 casos de intoxicación por anisakis que cursan con trastornos digestivos o intestinales y alergia.

El anisakis está extendido por todos los mares del planeta e incluso está presente en el pescado de piscifactoría que ha sido alimentado con comida infectada.

Teniendo esto en cuenta, ¿tiene prevista la Comisión alguna acción para evitar o prevenir este tipo de intoxicación alimentaria, ya sea mediante las inspecciones de seguridad alimentaria, la concienciación ciudadana en el tipo de uso del pescado u otro tipo de medidas?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(22 de abril de 2013)

Algunos parásitos asociados con productos de la pesca pueden provocar infecciones en los seres humanos si se consumen vivos. Por consiguiente, los reglamentos en materia de higiene contienen disposiciones específicas para garantizar la muerte en las fases de larva viva de los parásitos en los productos de la pesca ([1]). Estas medidas legislativas se consideran adecuadas. También se ha proporcionado orientación sobre las disposiciones legislativas ([2]).

La alergia al parásito *Anisakis simplex* es relativamente común en algunas regiones de España, pero en otras partes de Europa no se comunican apenas casos. La Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria ([3]) estipula que la causa principal de esta alergia en seres humanos es la infección con larvas vivas de *Anisakis simplex*. La manera más eficaz de prevenir la sensibilización es controlando la infección por *Anisakis simplex*.

Los Estados miembros son los responsables de hacer aplicar las normas sobre seguridad de los alimentos, para lo que deben crear un sistema global de controles oficiales a fin de verificar el cumplimiento de la legislación alimentaria. La Comisión supervisa el cumplimiento por parte de los Estados miembros de sus obligaciones de control, incluido a través de auditorías *in situ* efectuadas por la Oficina Alimentaria y Veterinaria de la Dirección General de Salud y Consumidores.

La preparación, la manipulación y el almacenamiento domésticos de alimentos para el consumo doméstico privado no están incluidos en los reglamentos armonizados en materia de higiene, ya que son competencia de los Estados miembros.

([1]) Anexo III, sección VIII, capítulo III, punto D, del Reglamento (CE) n° 853/2004 (DO L 139 de 30.4.2004, p. 55).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biosafety/areas_cyprus/20111214_scfcah_guidance_parasites_en.pdf
([3]) Dictamen de la Comisión Técnica de Factores de Peligro Biológicos (BIOHAZ) sobre los parásitos en los productos de la pesca, adoptada el 11 de marzo de 2010. http://www.efsa.europa.eu/it/scdocs/doc/1543.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002572/13
to the Commission
Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Anisakis control

According to the Spanish Digestive Tract Foundation (FEAD), Spain is second only to Japan in the number of food poisoning cases caused by Anisakis, a parasite which humans contract by ingesting contaminated fish or cephalopods and which causes gastrointestinal and allergic disorders.

Each year there are 20 000 cases of Anisakis poisoning worldwide, which cause digestive or intestinal disorders and allergic reactions.

Anisakis is present throughout the world's seas and can even be found in farmed fish that have been fed on infected feed.

With this in mind, does the Commission plan to take action to avoid or prevent this type of food poisoning, either through food safety inspections, public awareness on the nature of the use of fish or other measures?

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

Some parasites associated with fishery products may cause infection in humans if consumed alive. Therefore, the hygiene Regulations contains specific provisions to ensure the killing of live larval stages of parasites in fishery products ([1]). These legislative measures are considered adequate. Guidance on the legislative provisions has also been provided ([2]).

Allergy to the parasite 'Anisakis simplex' is relatively common in some regions in Spain, but rarely reported in other parts of Europe. The European Food Safety Authority ([3]) stipulates that the primary initiator of such allergy in humans is infection by live 'Anisakis simplex' larvae. Prevention of sensitisation is most likely to be effective by control of A. simplex infection.

Responsibility for enforcing food safety rules lies with the Member States, which are required to establish a comprehensive system of official controls to verify compliance with the food law. The Commission monitors delivery by the Member States of their control duties, including through on-the-spot audits by the Food and Veterinary Office of the Health and Consumers Directorate General.

The domestic preparation, handling and storage of food for private domestic consumption is not included in the harmonised Hygiene Regulations, but is left to the Member States.

([1]) Annex III, Section VIII, Chapter III, Point D of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 (OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 55).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biosafety/areas_cyprus/20111214_scfcah_guidance_parasites_en.pdf
([3]) Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Biological hazards (BIOHAZ) on parasites in fishery products. adopted on 11 March 2010. http://www.efsa.europa.eu/it/scdocs/doc/1543.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002573/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(5 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ειδικός Φόρος Κατανάλωσης (ΕΦΚ) στο πετρέλαιο θέρμανσης στην Ελλάδα

Με τον νόμο 3986/2011 «Επείγοντα μέτρα εφαρμογής μεσοπρόθεσμου πλαισίου δημοσιονομικής στρατηγικής», προβλέφθηκε ότι «ο Ειδικός Φόρος Κατανάλωσης (ΕΦΚ) του πετρελαίου εσωτερικής καύσης (Diesel), καθώς και του φωτιστικού πετρελαίου, που χρησιμοποιούνται ως καύσιμα θέρμανσης, εξισώνεται με το ογδόντα τοις εκατό (80%) του ισχύοντος συντελεστή Ειδικού Φόρου Κατανάλωσης του πετρελαίου εσωτερικής καύσης».

Ταυτόχρονα ελήφθησαν μέτρα ανταπόδοσης υπέρ φτωχών οικογενειών, τα οποία όμως δεν απέδωσαν.

Η ρύθμιση για την εξίσωση του ΕΦΚ είχε ως αποτέλεσμα η τιμή του πετρελαίου θέρμανσης στην Ελλάδα να αυξηθεί από 1 ευρώ το λίτρο στο 1,25-1,35 ευρώ το λίτρο, και να μειωθεί η συνολική κατανάλωση πετρελαίου θέρμανσης κατά 60-70%. Οι κοινωνικές επιπτώσεις του μέτρου ήταν τεράστιες καθώς εκατοντάδες χιλιάδες νοικοκυριά έμειναν ουσιαστικά χωρίς θέρμανση γιατί ήταν αδύνατο να αγοράσουν πετρέλαιο, λαμβάνοντας φυσικά υπόψη και την ραγδαία πτώση των εισοδημάτων των Ελλήνων.

Με δεδομένα τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Τι έσοδα αναμένονταν από την ανωτέρω αύξηση του ΕΦΚ; Τι εισπράχθηκε τελικά από το κράτος;

2. Τι ποσό είχε προϋπολογιστεί ως ανταποδοτικό μέτρο επιδόματος πετρελαίου θέρμανσης για φτωχά νοικοκυριά και τι τελικά αποδόθηκε;

3. Θεωρεί αποδοτικό το μέτρο σε σχέση με τις κοινωνικές επιπτώσεις που επέφερε;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Μαΐου 2013)

Έως τον Οκτώβριο του 2011 ο συντελεστής του ειδικού φόρου κατανάλωσης του πετρελαίου θέρμανσης ήταν 21 ευρώ ανά 1 000 λίτρα, ενώ ο συντελεστής του ειδικού φόρου κατανάλωσης του πετρελαίου κίνησης ανερχόταν σε 412 ευρώ ανά 1 000 λίτρα. Ο συντελεστής του ΦΠΑ ήταν 23%.

Με τον νόμο 3986/2011 σχετικά με τα «Επείγοντα μέτρα εφαρμογής μεσοπρόθεσμου πλαισίου δημοσιονομικής στρατηγικής» προτάθηκε στη συνέχεια μια πιο σταδιακή αύξηση του συντελεστή για το πετρέλαιο θέρμανσης. Η απόδοση του μέτρου για την περίοδο 2011-14 εκτιμήθηκε σε 1 050 εκατ. ευρώ αφού αφαιρεθούν οι επιδοτήσεις. Η τελική αύξηση του συντελεστή για το πετρέλαιο θέρμανσης επισπεύσθηκε κατά ένα έτος, τον Οκτώβριο του 2012.

Ο προϋπολογισμός του 2012 προέβλεπε ένα ετήσιο ποσό ύψους 270 εκατ. ευρώ για επιδόματα σε άτομα με χαμηλό εισόδημα. Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι σε θέση να προβεί σε λεπτομερή αξιολόγηση των κοινωνικών επιπτώσεων του καθεστώτος επιδοτήσεων, λόγω του πολύ χαμηλού επιπέδου αξιοποίησής του.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002573/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Excise duties on heating oil in Greece

Law 3986/2011 on 'Emergency Measures to Implement the Medium-Term Fiscal Strategy Framework' provided that 'excise duties on diesel and kerosene, used as heating oil, shall be set at eighty percent (80%) of the current rate of excise duties on diesel and kerosene used for transport'.

At the same time, measures were taken to ease the burden for poor families, but they have not worked.

Setting the rate of excise duties in this way has resulted in a situation in which the price of heating oil in Greece has increased from EUR 1 per litre to between EUR 1.25 and 1.35 per litre and overall consumption of heating oil has fallen by 60-70%. The social impact of the measure has been immense, as hundreds of thousands of households have essentially been left without heating because it was virtually impossible for them to buy oil, taking into account, of course, the sharp decline in people's incomes in Greece.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What revenue was expected from the above increase in excise duties? How much did the State finally receive?

2. What amount was budgeted as a heating oil allowance to ease the burden for poor households and what amount was finally paid out?

3. Does it believe this measure to have been effective, compared to the social impact it has had?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2013)

Until October 2011 the excise duty rate on gas oil used for heating purposes was EUR 21 per 1000 litres, whereas the excise duty rate imposed on gas oil used for transportation purposes was EUR 412 per 1000 litres. The VAT rate was 23%.

Law 3986/2011 on 'Emergency Measures to Implement the Medium-Term Fiscal Strategy Framework' subsequently proposed a more gradual increase in the rate for gas oil used for heating. The yield of the measure for 2011-14 was estimated at EUR 1,050 million net of subsidies. The final increase of the rate for gas oil for heating purposes was brought forward by one year in October 2012.

The 2012 budget provided an annual amount of EUR 270 million for allowances to people with lower income. The Commission is unable to give a detailed assessment of the social impact of the subsidies scheme, given the very low level of take-up.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002574/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(5 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: ΧΥΤΑ/ΧΥΤΥ στη θέση Μ στο Δήμο Μακρακώμης Φθιώτιδας

Το 2011 εγκρίθηκε η Μελέτη Περιβαλλοντικών Επιπτώσεων (ΜΠΕ) για την κατασκευή ΧΥΤΑ/ΧΥΤΥ στη θέση Μαγδάρα κοντά στο χωριό Τρίλοφος του δήμου Μακρακώμης Φθιώτιδας. Η ΜΠΕ αναφέρεται στην ύπαρξη ρεμάτων (κύριο ρέμα και δύο παρακλάδια) εντός του χώρου κατασκευής αλλά δεν κάνει καμιά συγκεκριμένη πρόβλεψη προστασίας ή χωροθέτησης ή επίπτωσης στον υδροφόρο ορίζοντα αφού τα συγκεκριμένα ρέματα καταλήγουν στον Σπερχειό ποταμό. Επιπλέον, η περιοχή πλήττεται από κατολισθήσεις, γεγονός που αναγνωρίζει μεν η ΜΠΕ, αλλά το υποβιβάζει σε ήσσονος σημασίας ζήτημα. Με δεδομένα τα παραπάνω και ότι α) η περιοχή έχει κηρυχθεί αναδασωτέα β) 1 000 μόλις μέτρα από τον χώρο κατασκευής υπάρχουν ιαματικές πηγές, γ) ότι πρόκειται για άλλο ένα έργο που αποβλέπει στην ταφή σύμμικτων απορριμμάτων σε αντίθεση με τις συστάσεις του Ευρωπαϊκού Ελεγκτικού Συνεδρίου ότι «η Επιτροπή πρέπει να ορίσει ως προϋπόθεση για την συνεισφορά της ΕΕ τα κράτη μέλη να εστιάσουν στην εφαρμογή της χωριστής συλλογής, συμπεριλαμβανομένων βιοαποικοδομήσιμων αποβλήτων»;

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Αποτελούν η ύπαρξη ρεμάτων, ο κίνδυνος κατολισθήσεων ή η ύπαρξη σεισμικού ρήγματος αποτρεπτικούς παράγοντες για τη χωροθέτηση έργου σύμφωνα με την οδηγία 1999/31/ΕΚ Περί υγειονομικής ταφής των αποβλήτων και τις ειδικές απαιτήσεις που περιέχονται στο Παράρτημα Ι αυτής;

2. Σε περίπτωση διαπίστωσης ύπαρξης αυτών των αποτρεπτικών παραγόντων οφείλουν οι Αρχές είτε να αναζητήσουν εναλλακτική τοποθεσία χωροθέτησης του ΧΥΤΑ/Υ είτε να λάβουν τα αναγκαία «επανορθωτικά μέτρα» που θα παρέχουν την βεβαιότητα ότι η ύπαρξη κάποιας από τις ανωτέρω παραμέτρους δεν «συνιστά σοβαρό κίνδυνο για το περιβάλλον» πριν εγκρίνουν τον χώρο ταφής;

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

Σύμφωνα με την οδηγία 1999/31/ΕΚ περί υγειονομικής ταφής των αποβλήτων («οδηγία για την υγειονομική ταφή») ([1]), οι αρμόδιες αρχές πρέπει να λαμβάνουν υπόψη για την επιλογή της χωροθέτησης τους παράγοντες που αναφέρονται από το Αξιότιμο Μέλος (ύπαρξη ρεμάτων, κινδύνους κατολισθήσεων και ύπαρξη σεισμικού ρήγματος). Οι αρμόδιες αρχές εξετάζουν τους εν λόγω παράγοντες και, εάν κριθεί απαραίτητο, λαμβάνουν διορθωτικά μέτρα για την πρόληψη σοβαρού περιβαλλοντικού κινδύνου.

([1]) ΕΕ L 182 της 16.7.1999, σ. 1-19.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002574/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Construction of a landfill at Magdara in the municipality of Makrakomi (Fthiotida)

In 2011 the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was approved for the construction of a landfill at Magdara near the village of Trilofo in the municipality of Makrakomi (Fthiotida). This EIA refers to the existence of streams (main stream and two side-streams) within the designated construction site, but makes no specific provision about protecting or diverting these streams, even though it will affect the groundwater, since the streams in question flow into the River Sperchios. Furthermore, the area is subject to landslides: the EIA recognises this, but treats it as a minor issue. Given the above and the fact that a) the area has been earmarked for reafforestation; b) hot springs are located a mere 1 000 metres from the designated construction area; c) this is yet another project aimed at mixed waste landfill, contrary to the Court of Auditors' recommendation that the Commission should make it a condition for a EU contribution that Member States focus on separating waste, including biodegradable waste:

Will the Commission say:

1. Would the presence of streams, the risk of landslides and the existence of a seismic fault line constitute factors that that militate against the choice of a particular site for such a project, in accordance with Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste and the specific requirements contained in Annex I thereof?

2. If the existence of these adverse factors is established, are the relevant authorities obliged either to seek an alternative site for the landfill or take the necessary 'corrective measures' to ensure that the existence of any of these parameters does not 'create a potentially serious threat to the environment' before approving the landfill?

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

According to Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste (the 'Landfill Directive') ([1]) the competent authorities must take into account in the choice of landfill locations the factors mentioned by the Honourable Member (presence of streams, risk of landslides and existence of seismic fault lines).The competent authorities shall assess such factors and, if necessary, take corrective measures to prevent any serious environmental risk.

([1]) OJ L 182, 16.7.1999, p. 1-19.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002575/13
alla Commissione
Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(5 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Chiusura dello stabilimento Bridgestone a Bari

Il gruppo Bridgestone ha annunciato la chiusura dello stabilimento di pneumatici di Bari-Modugno. Il gruppo ha già avviato le procedure e prevede la cessazione delle attività non oltre la prima metà del 2014. Ciò comporterà il licenziamento di circa 950 lavoratori e di altri 1.000 che fanno parte dell'indotto, con gravissime conseguenze occupazionali e sociali per un territorio che è già in forte sofferenza.

Il gruppo Bridgestone non solo non ha mai dato alcun segnale di crisi ma, secondo alcune fonti di stampa, ha chiuso il 2012 con profitti più che raddoppiati rispetto all'anno prima — +66,7 % — e recentemente ha triplicato i propri utili per 171,6 miliardi di Yen. Inoltre, la società stima di aumentare l'utile netto del 36,9 % nel 2013. La chiusura dello stabilimento è motivata con la grave crisi del mercato dell'auto, ma il gruppo Bridgestone, mentre chiude un impianto in Italia, ne ha inaugurato uno in India e ha annunciato un accordo per aprirne un altro in Cina.

Inoltre, gli operai sono stati per decenni a stretto contatto con materiali tossici. Sempre secondo notizie stampa, circa 200 operai sono morti per cancro, asbestosi, melanoma e mesotelioma. Tutto ciò fa pensare alla chiusura dell'impianto di Bari non per una vera crisi dello stabilimento, ma piuttosto per la volontà di fuggire dalle proprie responsabilità. La Bridgestone, invece di rimodernare e di riqualificare, preferisce andare via dopo avere sfruttato e inquinato il territorio e i lavoratori.

1. Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere quali azioni intende adottare per garantire, nei confronti dei lavoratori dello stabilimento Bridgestone Bari-Modugno, il rispetto della direttiva 98/59/CE del Consiglio, del 20 luglio 1998, concernente il ravvicinamento delle legislazioni degli Stati membri in materia di licenziamenti collettivi e della direttiva 2002/14/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, dell'11 marzo 2002, che istituisce un quadro generale relativo all'informazione e alla consultazione dei lavoratori?

2. Quali azioni intende intraprendere per impedire l'impoverimento del sistema produttivo europeo, con le gravi conseguenze economiche e sociali che ne derivano, a causa dei sempre più frequenti processi di delocalizzazione nascosta, molto spesso neppure collegati a una reale situazione di crisi delle aziende coinvolte?

3. Quali azioni intende intraprendere per il mantenimento del livello occupazionale nella provincia di Bari? Ha intenzione di attivare il Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) a sostegno dei lavoratori di questo settore?

4. Come intende procedere per assicurare l'attuazione delle norme UE per il riconoscimento delle malattie correlate all'amianto e per il riconoscimento delle norme minime per il risarcimento?

Risposta di Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione
(23 aprile 2013)

1. La Commissione rammenta che spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti, compresi i tribunali, assicurare che la legislazione nazionale a recepimento delle direttive UE cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato sia applicata in modo corretto ed efficace dal datore di lavoro in questione, considerate le circostanze specifiche di ciascun caso.

2. La Commissione è consapevole dell'impatto potenzialmente negativo che le ristrutturazioni possono avere sui lavoratori e sulle regioni e incoraggia un approccio proattivo al fine di ridurre al minimo le conseguenze socioeconomiche. La Commissione si adopera inoltre per assicurare un futuro sostenibile all'industria e ai posti di lavoro ad essa legati, segnatamente con l'attuazione di una politica industriale proattiva finalizzata ad accrescere la competitività dell'Europa e a porre le basi per la sua reindustrializzazione ([1]).

3. La Commissione non è a conoscenza del fatto che l'Italia stia preparando una richiesta di finanziamento dal FEG ([2]) in relazione ai licenziamenti in questione. Consigliamo di rivolgersi alla persona di contatto del FEG responsabile per l'Italia ([3]) per chiedere se sia prevista una tale domanda.

([1]) Comunicazione della Commissione al Parlamento europeo, al Consiglio, al Comitato economico e sociale europeo e al Comitato delle regioni, «Un'industria europea più forte per la crescita e la ripresa economica — Aggiornamento della comunicazione sulla politica industriale», COM(2012)582 final.
([2]) Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it.

4. La raccomandazione 670/2003/CE ([4]) raccomanda, tra l'altro, agli Stati membri d'introdurre disposizioni in merito alle malattie riconosciute scientificamente di origine professionale che possono dar luogo ad indennizzo e che devono costituire oggetto di misure preventive, oltre a riconoscere al lavoratore il diritto all'indennizzo per malattia professionale.

La raccomandazione non è però legalmente vincolante e lascia liberi gli Stati membri di determinare i criteri per il riconoscimento di ciascuna malattia professionale e di regolamentare gli indennizzi.

La Commissione non prevede per ora di intraprendere ulteriori azioni in merito al riconoscimento e all'indennizzo.

([4]) Raccomandazione 2003/670/CE della Commissione, del 19 settembre 2003, sull'elenco europeo delle malattie professionali, GU L 238 del 25.9.2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002575/13
to the Commission
Salvatore Tatarella (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Closure of the Bridgestone factory in Bari

The Bridgestone Group has announced the closure of its tyre factory in Bari-Modugno. The group has already begun the necessary procedures and is planning to wind up its business no later than the first half of 2014. This will result in the layoff of about 950 workers in addition to another 1 000 that work in related economic activities, and will have dire employment and social repercussions on an area that is already suffering greatly.

Not only has the Bridgestone Group never shown any sign of crisis, but, according to some media reports, it ended 2012 with profits that had more than doubled compared to the previous year (+66.7%) and has recently tripled its profits to 171.6 billion yen. In addition, the company is expecting to increase its net profit by 36.9% in 2013. The reason being given for the closure of the plant is that of the crisis in the car market, but the Bridgestone Group, while closing one plant in Italy, has opened one in India and has announced an agreement to open another in China.

In addition, for decades workers have been placed in close contact with toxic materials. According to press reports, some 200 workers have died of cancer, asbestosis, mesothelioma and melanoma. All this would appear to suggest that the closure of the Bari plant is not due to a genuine crisis, but rather to the company's desire to flee its responsibilities. Bridgestone, instead of modernising and redeveloping, prefers simply to leave after having exploited and polluted the land and workers.

1. Can the Commission therefore say what action it will take to ensure, with regard to the workers of the Bridgestone factory in Bari-Modugno, compliance with Directive 98/59/EC of 20 July 1998 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies and Directive 2002/14/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2002 establishing a general framework for informing and consulting employees?

2. What action will it take to prevent the impoverishment of the European economy, with its serious economic and social consequences, due to the increasing number of spurious relocation processes, which are often not even related to a real crisis of the companies concerned?

3. What action does it intend to take to maintain the level of employment in the province of Bari? Will it activate the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) in support of the workers in this sector?

4. What action does it intend to take to ensure that EU rules on the recognition of asbestos-related diseases and the recognition of minimum compensation standards are implemented?

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

1. The Commission recalls that it is for the competent national authorities, including the courts, to ensure that the national legislation transposing the EU Directives referred to by the Honourable member is correctly and effectively applied by the employer concerned, having regard to the specific circumstances of each case.

2. The Commission is aware of the possible negative impact that restructuring operations can entail for the workers and the regions and it encourages early preparation in order to minimise the social and economic consequences. The Commission also acts for building a sustainable future for the industry and the jobs associated with it, notably through the implementation of a proactive industrial policy in order to raise Europe's competitiveness and lay the foundations to reindustrialise Europe ([1]).

3. The Commission is not aware of any application for funding from the EGF ([2]) being prepared by Italy related to the redundancies referred to in the question. The EGF Contact Person for Italy ([3]) can be contacted to enquire whether such an application is being planned.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, 'A Stronger European Industry for Growth and Economic Recovery — Industrial Policy Communication Update', COM(2012) 582 final.
([2]) European Globalisation Adjustment Fund.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it.

4. Recommendation 670/2003/EC ([4]) recommends *inter alia* to Member States to introduce provisions concerning scientifically recognised occupational diseases liable for compensation and subject to preventive measures, and the right of a worker to compensation in respect of occupational diseases.

However, the recommendation is not legally binding and allows Member States to determine the criteria for the recognition of each occupational disease and to regulate compensation.

The Commission does not envisage at this stage to take any further action on recognition and compensation issues.

([4]) Commission Recommendation 2003/670/EC of 19 September 2003 concerning the European Schedule of occupational diseases, OJ L 238, 25.9.2003.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-002576/13
alla Commissione
Giuseppe Gargani (PPE)
(5 marzo 2013)

Oggetto: Concessioni per la gestione delle autostrade in Italia e rispetto dei principi di concorrenza

Per superare le censure mosse dalla Commissione europea nell'ambito della procedura di infrazione C(2006)2006/2419, la disciplina sulle concessioni autostradali in Italia è stata modificata, disponendo in particolare che, per le tratte autostradali in concessione con scadenza entro il 31 dicembre 2014, il gestore della rete stradale e autostradale italiana Anas S.p.A. deve avviare le procedure a evidenza pubblica per l'individuazione dei nuovi concessionari entro il 31 marzo 2010. Il bando di gara indetto da Anas S.p.A. per il rinnovo della concessione autostradale del tratto dell'autostrada del Brennero, gestito da Autostrade Brennero S.p.A. per contratto di concessione fino al 31 dicembre 2014, è stato sospeso a causa del ricorso della stessa, e le pronunce del Tribunale amministrativo regionale del Lazio e del Consiglio di Stato hanno rigettato il ricorso dell'attuale concessionaria. Va sottolineato che gli enti pubblici partecipano per l'81,1788 % alla società Autostrade del Brennero S.p.A., con una partecipazione delle provincie Autonome di Trento e Bolzano pari al 12,9624 %.

Si osserva che il 15 febbraio 2013 è stato stipulato un accordo d'intesa tra la Provincia Autonoma di Trento e il Ministero delle Infrastrutture e dei Trasporti e il Ministero della Coesione Territoriale per la proroga della concessione autostradale, in scadenza al 2014, e la relativa realizzazione dell'infrastruttura ferroviaria attraverso il Brennero.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se questo accordo è compatibile con i principi di competitività sanciti dal Trattato di Lisbona agli articoli 101-106, e

2. laddove sussista un dubbio d'incompatibilità, quali azioni intende prendere la Commissione in forza dell'articolo106 del trattato di Lisbona?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(22 aprile 2013)

La procedura di infrazione riguardante il rinnovo della concessione dell'autostrada del Brennero è stata chiusa poiché le autorità italiane hanno ridimensionato notevolmente la durata della proroga e si sono impegnate ad avviare una procedura d'appalto equa e trasparente alla data di scadenza della proroga stessa (30 aprile 2014).

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'accordo del 15 febbraio 2013 stipulato tra il governo italiano e la Provincia di Trento. Sulla base delle informazioni disponibili, la Commissione comprende che tale accordo, riguardante l'utilizzo del fondo per l'infrastruttura ferroviaria del Brennero, non prevede un'ulteriore proroga della concessione esistente ed impegna il governo italiano a verificare con la Commissione le possibilità di un eventuale rinnovo.

Il prolungamento della durata o il rinnovo di un contratto pubblico equivalgono in genere all'affidamento diretto di un nuovo contratto non preceduto da procedure d'appalto, e ciò è contrario alla normativa UE in materia di appalti pubblici e concessioni.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, la Commissione sta monitorando da vicino la situazione per garantire il rispetto del diritto dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002576/13
to the Commission
Giuseppe Gargani (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Motorway management concessions in Italy and compliance with competition rules

In response to the points raised by the Commission in infringement proceedings C(2006) 2006/2419, Italian motorway concession rules were amended, which meant that the Anas S.p.A. corporation responsible for Italian roads and motorways, was required, by 31 March 2010, to launch a public tendering procedure for the renewal of motorway concessions expiring on or before 31 December 2014. The procedure initiated by it for renewal of the Brenner motorway concession, which is due to end on 31 December 2014, was suspended following an appeal by the current holder, Autostrade Brennero S.p.A., which was subsequently rejected by the Lazio Regional Administrative Tribunal and the Council of State. 81.1788% of Autostrade del Brennero S.p.A. is in public ownership, 12.9624%. being held by the Trento e Bolzano Autonomous Provincial Authorities.

On 15 February 2013, an agreement was concluded between the Trento Autonomous Provincial Authorities, the Ministry for Infrastructures and Transport and the Ministry for Territorial Cohesion regarding extension of the motorway concession due to end in 2014 and the Brenner rail link infrastructural project.

In this connection:

1. Does the Commission consider the agreement in question to be compatible with the principles of free competition enshrined in Articles 101-106 of the Lisbon Treaty?

2. If there is any doubt about the matter, what action will it take under Article 106 of the Lisbon Treaty?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

The infringement procedure concerning the renewal of the Brenner motorway concession was closed because the Italian authorities significantly shortened the duration of the extension and committed to organising a competitive and transparent tendering procedure at the prolongation end date (30 April 2014).

The Commission is aware of the agreement of 15 February 2013 between the Italian Government and the Province of Trento. On the basis of available information, the Commission understands that this agreement, which regards the use of the fund for the Brenner railway infrastructure, does not provide for a further extension of the existing concession. The agreement commits the Italian Government to verify with the Commission the possibilities for a renewal.

The extension of the duration or the renewal of a public contract generally amounts to the direct award of a new contract without prior tendering procedures, which is contrary to EC law on public procurement and concessions.

In the light of the foregoing, the Commission is closely monitoring the situation to ensure compliance with EC law.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002578/13
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(5. marts 2013)

Om: EUROSUR

Målet med fase 1 i etableringen af EUROSUR er, at medlemsstater skal sammenkoble og rationalisere de overvågningssystemer og -mekanismer, der findes på medlemsstatsplan. Medlemslandene vil gennem midler fra Fonden for De Ydre Grænser modernisere og udvide de nationale grænseovervågningssystemer og oprette nationale koordineringscentre for grænsekontrollen i medlemsstater ved EU's ydre grænser mod syd og øst. EUROSUR vil levere ydelser i forbindelse med den fælles anvendelse af overvågningsredskaber (artikel 12) ([1]).

Den 25. februar 2013 skrev Politiken, at EUROSUR vil betyde større brug af satellitter, droner og bevægelsesdetektorer, som fremover gør det muligt at identificere og stoppe immigranter, inden de når europæisk territorium. Immigranter, der er på vej mod Europa, vil dermed indirekte miste retten til at søge asyl. Retten til at søge asyl er en af FN's grundlæggende menneskerettigheder, og EUROSUR forårsager dermed et humanitært problem ([2]).

Kommissionen bedes på baggrund af overstående oplyse, om EUROSUR kan betyde, at medlemslande kan returnere immigranterne til samarbejdslande uden, at immigranterne får mulighed for at søge asyl?

Kommissionen bedes herunder oplyse, om den er bekendt med, at nogle medlemslande overtræder humanitære konventioner i deres håndtering af immigranter?

Kommissionen bedes oplyse, om den mener, at EUROSUR kan udgøre et humanitært problem?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Cecilia Malmström
(17. maj 2013)

EUROSUR's mål er at styrke informationsudvekslingen og det operationelle samarbejde mellem medlemsstaternes myndigheder og mellem disse og Frontex. EUROSUR vil give medlemsstaternes myndigheder og Frontex den infrastruktur og de redskaber, der er nødvendige for at forhindre ulovlig migration og grænseoverskridende kriminalitet, men også for at beskytte migranterne ved EU's ydre grænser og i nogle tilfælde at redde deres liv.

Kommissionen har altid understreget behovet for væsentligt at reducere det uacceptabelt høje antal migranter, der dør på havet under deres rejse med små både, der ikke er sødygtige. Det er målet ved en fælles anvendelse af overvågningsværktøjer at opdage sådanne små både.

Forsknings- og pilotprojekter viser, at den bedste metode til at opdage sådanne små både er at anvende små (bemandede) fly med radarsensorer i kombination med informationsudveksling mellem forskellige myndigheder i næsten-realtid. Anvendelsen af satellitter, droner og bevægelsessensorer er af begrænset operationel værdi og er ikke omkostningseffektivt.

I artikel 18 i udkastet til EUROSUR-forordningen forbydes informationsudveksling, hvorved et tredjeland forsynes med oplysninger, som kan anvendes til at identificere personer, der er i alvor risiko for at blive udsat for tortur eller anden form for krænkelse af de grundlæggende rettigheder. I EUROSUR-forordningen fremhæves det også, at medlemsstaterne skal leve fuldt op til de grundlæggende rettigheder på grundlag af EU-ret og international ret, når det drejer sig om migranter og flygtninge på havet, herunder de relevante FN-konventioner og -protokoller. Kommissionen er parat til at undersøge enhver påstået overtrædelse af de grundlæggende rettigheder.

([1]) http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/free_movement_of_persons_asylum_immigration/l14579_da.htm
([2]) http://politiken.dk/udland/ECE1907081/europa-opruster-for-at-sikre-graenser-mod-immigranter/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002578/13
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Eurosur

The aim of phase 1 in the establishment of Eurosur is for Member States to interconnect and rationalise border surveillance systems and mechanisms at national level. Using resources from the External Borders Fund, Member States will modernise and expand their national border surveillance systems and create national external border control coordination centres in the Member States forming the southern and eastern borders of the EU. Eurosur will provide services in connection with the common application of surveillance tools (Article 12) ([1]).

On 25 February 2013 the Danish daily *Politiken* wrote that Eurosur will entail a greater use of satellites, drones and motion detectors, which will in future make it possible to identify and stop immigrants before they reach European territory. Immigrants on their way to Europe will therefore indirectly lose their right to seek asylum. The right to seek asylum is one of the United Nations' fundamental human rights, and Eurosur will thus cause a humanitarian problem ([2]).

In the light of the above, can the Commission state whether Eurosur could mean that Member States are able to return immigrants to cooperating countries without the immigrants having the chance to seek asylum?

Is the Commission aware of any Member States contravening humanitarian conventions in their treatment of immigrants?

Does it believe that Eurosur could cause a humanitarian problem?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(17 May 2013)

Eurosur aims to strengthen information exchange and operational cooperation between Member States' authorities and with Frontex. It will provide the Member States' authorities and Frontex with the infrastructure and tools needed to prevent irregular migration and cross-border crime, but also to protect and save the lives of migrants at the external borders.

The Commission has consistently emphasised the need to considerably reduce the unacceptable death toll of migrants travelling in small and unseawhorthy boats. For this purpose, the common application of surveillance tools will be used to detect such small boats.

Research and pilot projects show that the best method to detect such small boats is the use of small (manned) planes with radar sensors, combined with near-real time information exchange between different authorities. The use of satellites, drones and motion detectors is of limited operational value and not cost-efficient.

Article 18 of the draft Eurosur regulation would prohibit any exchange of information which provides a third country with data that could be used to identify persons at serious risk of being subjected to torture or any other violation of fundamental rights. The Eurosur regulation will also reiterate that Member States need to fully comply with fundamental rights based on EU and international law when dealing with migrants and refugees at sea, including the relevant UN Conventions and Protocols. The Commission is ready to investigate any alleged violation of fundamental rights.

([1]) http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/free_movement_of_persons_asylum_immigration/l14579_da.htm
([2]) http://politiken.dk/udland/ECE1907081/europa-opruster-for-at-sikre-graenser-mod-immigranter/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002579/13
to the Commission
Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Enforcement of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 — Number of monetary sanctions issued and number of monetary sanctions paid

Under Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, each Member State is required to provide the Commission with an 'Annual report on the protection of animals during transport'. This report must contain the number of inspections carried out and the number of infringements found. The report is not, however, required to include information on the number of monetary fines issued, i.e. it is not clear how many of the infringements found resulted only in a warning or similar and how many resulted in a monetary fine. Furthermore, it is not clear from the reports how many of the monetary fines issued have been paid by the perpetrators.

This information is essential in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the enforcement of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 by the Member States.

1. Is the Commission able to provide information about the number of monetary fines issued in Member States (in addition to the number of infringements detected and published in the Member States' annual reports)?

2. Is the Commission able to provide information on the number of monetary fines that have been paid in each Member State?

3. If the answer to questions 1 and 2 is yes, is the Commission willing to publish this data on an ongoing basis?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2013)

The answer to the questions is no. Member States are not obliged to report to the Commission on the number of monetary fines, or other penalties, that have been issued due to non-compliance with the rules of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport ([1]).

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations, OJ L 3, 5.1.2005.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002580/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Iniciativas de promoção da indústria náutica I

Tendo em conta que:

— Apesar da crise que assola todas as atividades económicas na União, a indústria náutica europeia continua a liderar o mercado mundial, contando com 37 000 empresas, das quais 97 % são PME, e empregando diretamente 234 000 pessoas;

— A economia azul é um fator de diferenciação na União que deve ser impulsionado em todas as suas vertentes, tal como ficou claro na Comunicação da Comissão sobre o *Blue Growth* e na Estratégia para a Bacia do Atlântico;

— A atividade industrial do setor e as atividades de serviço associadas direta e/ou indiretamente proporcionam, não só uma mais-valia para os países marítimos, como também para os países continentais, podendo vir a ser um dos meios da diversificação das comunidades pesqueiras, tal como foi expresso num dos objetivos do FEAMP;

— O Mar Mediterrâneo concentra mais de 70 % do turismo náutico mundial, o que acarreta consequências para a preservação da biodiversidade, podendo, por isso, ser designado pela Organização Mundial Marítima, segundo o Anexo VI da Marpol, zona de controlo das emissões de óxido de enxofre;

— A procura dos mercados tradicionais de exportação da UE tem diminuído, tendo aumentado, ao invés, a procura dos mercados emergentes da Ásia e da América Latina;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Dada a contração da procura interna e dos mercados tradicionais, que ações pode a União desenvolver para facilitar o acesso das empresas da área da indústria náutica aos mercados da América Latina e da Ásia?

2. Estará a Comissão a par dos enormes obstáculos postos à marca CE, que obriga à homologação local, pondo em causa a proteção da propriedade intelectual da indústria, com custos excessivos que justificarão a deslocalização para aqueles mercados?

3. No sentido de potenciar o aumento da exportação da indústria náutica para fora do mercado europeu, qual o diálogo que a União tem mantido com parceiros como os EUA, o Brasil e a China para a promoção, a adoção e a utilização de normas internacionais já estabelecidas neste domínio?

Resposta dada por António Tajani em nome da Comissão
(30 de abril de 2013)

1. A UE abre mercados de exportação a nível mundial para a indústria náutica através de acordos comerciais bilaterais. Recentemente, foram assinados acordos com a América Central, Peru e Colômbia e celebrados com Singapura. Estão em preparação acordos de comércio livre com outros países como a Índia, a Malásia e o Vietname.

2. Um produto ostenta marcação CE se for colocado no mercado europeu, independentemente do país onde é fabricado, e se a legislação aplicável estabelecer a aposição da marcação CE. A marcação CE é aposta pelo fabricante que, ao fazê-lo, assume a responsabilidade pela conformidade do produto com a legislação da UE aplicável. A marcação CE não tem valor legal em países terceiros. Os produtos fabricados pela indústria náutica da UE e exportados para países terceiros devem ser conformes com a legislação em vigor nesses países e não com a legislação da UE aplicável a produtos da indústria náutica.

3. Em conformidade com a sua abordagem em matéria de normalização, a Comissão incentiva os parceiros comerciais a utilizarem normas internacionais, com vista à conformidade com exigências técnicas legais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002580/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Initiatives to promote the boating industry I

— Despite the crisis affecting all economic activity in the EU, the European boating industry continues to lead the global market, accounting for 37 000 companies, 97% of which are SMEs, and directly employing 234 000 people.

— The blue economy sets the EU apart and all aspects of it should be encouraged, as set out in the Commission Communication on Blue Growth and in the EU Maritime Strategy for the Atlantic Ocean Area.

— The sector's industrial activity and the service activities related directly and/or indirectly to it benefit both maritime and continental countries, and could help to diversify fishing communities, which is one of the EMFF objectives.

— The Mediterranean Sea accounts for over 70% of global marine tourism, which has an impact on biodiversity conservation; this led the International Maritime Organisation to deem it a sulphur oxide emission control area under Annex VI of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL).

— Demand from traditional EU export markets has decreased and, in turn, demand from emerging markets in Asia and Latin America has increased.

1. Given the fall in domestic demand and in demand from traditional markets, what measures can the Union take to help companies in the boating industry gain access to Latin American and Asian markets?

2. Is the Commission aware of the major obstacles caused by the CE mark, which requires local approval, jeopardising the protection of intellectual property in the industry and leading to excessive costs that justify outsourcing to these markets?

3. What dialogue has the EU maintained with partners such as the United States, Brazil and China on the promotion, adoption and use of international standards established in this area to help increase marine industry exports outside the European market?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

1. Through biletral trade agreements the EU opens global export-markets for the boating industry. Recently trade agreements were signed with Central America, Peru, Colombia and concluded with Singapore. Free trade agreements are in preparation with other countries such as India, Malaysia and Vietnam.

2. A product is CE-marked if it is placed on the European market, irrespective of the country where it is manufactured, and the applicable legislation provides for CE-marking. The CE-marking is affixed by the manufacturer who by doing so takes the responsibility for the conformity of the product to the applicable EU legislation. This CE-mark has no legal value in third countries. The products manufactured by the EU's boating industry and exported to third countries must comply with the applicable legislation in force in those third countries and not with the EU legislation on boating industry products.

3. In line with its approach towards standardisation, the Commission encourages trade partners to use international standards for compliance with technical regulation requirements.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002581/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Iniciativas de promoção da indústria náutica II

Tendo em conta que:

— Apesar da crise que assola todas as atividades económicas na União, a indústria náutica europeia continua a liderar o mercado mundial, contando com 37 000 empresas, das quais 97 % são PME, e empregando diretamente 234 000 pessoas;

— A economia azul é um fator de diferenciação na União que deve ser impulsionado em todas as suas vertentes, tal como ficou claro na Comunicação da Comissão sobre o *Blue Growth* e na Estratégia para a Bacia do Atlântico;

— A atividade industrial do setor e as atividades de serviço associadas direta e/ou indiretamente proporcionam, não só uma mais-valia para os países marítimos, como também para os países continentais, podendo vir a ser um dos meios da diversificação das comunidades pesqueiras, tal como foi expresso num dos objetivos do FEAMP;

— O Mar Mediterrâneo concentra mais de 70 % do turismo náutico mundial, o que acarreta consequências para a preservação da biodiversidade, podendo, por isso, ser designado pela Organização Mundial Marítima, segundo o Anexo VI da Marpol, zona de controlo das emissões de óxido de enxofre;

— A procura dos mercados tradicionais de exportação da UE tem diminuído, tendo aumentado, ao invés, a procura dos mercados emergentes da Ásia e da América Latina;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Se, para a promoção deste setor de atividade, pretende apresentar um Livro Verde, no qual, dentro das suas competências, possa apresentar iniciativas a nível europeu e nacional e, simultaneamente, permitir o envolvimento das partes interessadas através da abertura de uma consulta? Em caso de resposta afirmativa, já tem um prazo para a respetiva elaboração?

2. O que pretende a União fazer para aumentar o potencial de crescimento desta indústria e, simultaneamente, aumentar o número de participantes nas atividades e desportos náuticos? Uma vez que já há uniformização ao nível da segurança e do ambiente na construção das embarcações, será possível avançar na mesma direção no que diz respeito às condições de navegação e utilização?

Resposta dada por António Tajani em nome da Comissão
(6 de maio de 2013)

1. A Comissão tenciona abordar o setor da navegação (juntamente com o setor dos navios de cruzeiro e o setor náutico) no âmbito da comunicação sobre o turismo costeiro e marítimo, a adotar até novembro de 2013. No âmbito dos trabalhos desenvolvidos para a elaboração dessa comunicação, foi realizada uma consulta pública sobre os desafios e as oportunidades para o turismo marítimo e costeiro na Europa, que decorreu durante 12 semanas (14 de maio — 6 de agosto de 2012).

2. O turismo costeiro e marítimo foi identificado na Comunicação sobre o Crescimento Azul como uma da principais áreas de crescimento e emprego na Europa. A futura comunicação terá por objetivo promover o crescimento sustentável do turismo costeiro e marítimo e o reforço da sua competitividade global, bem como incentivar práticas responsáveis e o desenvolvimento de tecnologias mais ecológicas, seguras e respeitadoras do ambiente.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002581/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Initiatives to promote the boating industry II

— Despite the crisis affecting all economic activity in the EU, the European boating industry continues to lead the global market, accounting for 37 000 companies, 97% of which are SMEs, and directly employing 234 000 people.

— The blue economy sets the EU apart, and all aspects of it should be encouraged, as set out in the Commission Communication on Blue Growth and in the EU Maritime Strategy for the Atlantic Ocean Area.

— The sector's industrial activity and the service activities related directly and/or indirectly to it benefit both maritime and continental countries, and could help to diversify fishing communities, which is one of the EMFF objectives.

— The Mediterranean Sea accounts for over 70% of global marine tourism, which has an impact on biodiversity conservation; this led the International Maritime Organisation to deem it a sulphur oxide emission control area under Annex VI of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL).

— Demand from traditional EU export markets has decreased and, in turn, demand from emerging markets in Asia and Latin America has increased.

1. Will the Commission present a Green Paper on promoting this sector, which includes EU and national initiatives within its competences and enables stakeholders to be involved via an open consultation? If so, has it set a deadline for drafting this paper?

2. What will the EU do to increase the growth potential of this industry and, at the same time, to increase the number of participants in marine activities and water sports? Given that there are now uniform safety and environmental standards regulating the construction of vessels, will it also be possible to harmonise navigation and operating conditions?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(6 May 2013)

1. The Commission plans to address the boating (together with the cruise and nautical) sector in the framework of the communication on coastal and maritime tourism which it intends to adopt by November 2013. As part of the work developed towards this communication, a public consultation on Challenges and Opportunities for Maritime and Coastal Tourism in Europe was open for contributions for a 12-week period (14 May-6 August 2012).

2. Coastal and maritime tourism was identified in the Blue Growth Communication as one of the key areas for jobs and growth in Europe. The future communication will aim at promoting sustainable growth of coastal and maritime tourism and enhancing its overall competitiveness while encouraging responsible practices and the development of greener, safer and environmental-friendly technologies.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002582/13
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Iniciativas de promoção da indústria náutica III

Tendo em conta que:

— Apesar da crise que assola todas as atividades económicas na União, a indústria náutica europeia continua a liderar o mercado mundial, contando com 37 000 empresas, das quais 97 % são PME, e empregando diretamente 234 000 pessoas;

— A economia azul é um fator de diferenciação na União que deve ser impulsionado em todas as suas vertentes, tal como ficou claro na Comunicação da Comissão sobre o *Blue Growth* e na Estratégia para a Bacia do Atlântico;

— A atividade industrial do setor e as atividades de serviço associadas direta e/ou indiretamente proporcionam, não só uma mais-valia para os países marítimos, como também para os países continentais, podendo vir a ser um dos meios da diversificação das comunidades pesqueiras, tal como foi expresso num dos objetivos do FEAMP;

— O Mar Mediterrâneo concentra mais de 70 % do turismo náutico mundial, o que acarreta consequências para a preservação da biodiversidade, podendo, por isso, ser designado pela Organização Mundial Marítima, segundo o Anexo VI da Marpol, zona de controlo das emissões de óxido de enxofre;

— A procura dos mercados tradicionais de exportação da UE tem diminuído, tendo aumentado, ao invés, a procura dos mercados emergentes da Ásia e da América Latina;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Como inverter a situação de 70 % do turismo náutico mundial se concentrar no Mar Mediterrâneo? Não deverá haver um cuidado especial para que as outras bacias marítimas, como o Atlântico, não fiquem expostas aos mesmos perigos?

2. Uma vez que a indústria náutica considera que os outros modos de transportes são comparativamente beneficiados no que diz respeito ao acesso aos fundos europeus, como pensa a Comissão contribuir para lhe facilitar o acesso à informação e aos fundos europeus de investigação, desenvolvimento e inovação?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(25 de abril de 2013)

1. Em conformidade com a atenção prestada ao crescimento da economia azul na sua próxima comunicação sobre o turismo costeiro e marítimo, a Comissão terá em conta as especificidades das bacias marítimas. Procurará, por isso, apresentar ideias para uma promoção inovadora, acessível e sustentável das zonas costeiras menos desenvolvidas, como as do Atlântico. Em contrapartida, terá em consideração a necessidade de elaborar estratégias de reconversão/rejuvenescimento para certas zonas da região mediterrânica mais exangues. Esta abordagem irá incluir a promoção das estratégias macrorregionais e das bacias marítimas.

2. O programa Horizonte 2020 virá alterar o financiamento da UE e dar acesso simplificado aos participantes. Além disso, a Comissão criou a rede europeia de empresas (para informar as PME sobre os programas de investigação e inovação, para as apoiar nos seus pedidos de subvenções à UE e para as ajudar a expandir ao nível internacional e a encontrar parceiros de negócios e tecnologia, em especial no grupo do setor marítimo e dos serviços.

3. A investigação, o desenvolvimento tecnológico e a inovação constituem um importante espaço de intervenção dos Fundos Estruturais e de Investimento Europeus. Nas propostas da Comissão para o período de 2014-2020, os fundos preveem um montante significativo para o efeito. Este financiamento deve dar às autoridades de gestão dos Fundos nos Estados-Membros e nas regiões a possibilidade de fornecer incentivos e condições de enquadramento para estimular a inovação e a diversificação das indústrias, incluindo no setor marítimo, com base em estratégias de especialização inteligente a nível nacional/regional e numa ampla participação das partes interessadas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002582/13
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Initiatives to promote the boating industry III

— Despite the crisis affecting all economic activity in the EU, the European boating industry continues to lead the global market, accounting for 37 000 companies, 97% of which are SMEs, and directly employing 234 000 people.

— The blue economy sets the EU apart and all aspects of it should be encouraged, as set out in the Commission Communication on Blue Growth and in the EU Maritime Strategy for the Atlantic Ocean Area.

— The sector's industrial activity and the service activities related directly and/or indirectly to it benefit both maritime and continental countries, and could help to diversify fishing communities, which is one of the EMFF objectives.

— The Mediterranean Sea accounts for over 70% of global marine tourism, which has an impact on biodiversity conservation; this led the International Maritime Organisation to deem it a sulphur oxide emission control area under Annex VI of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL).

— Demand from traditional EU export markets has decreased and, in turn, demand from emerging markets in Asia and Latin America has increased.

1. What can be done to change the fact that 70% of global marine tourism is concentrated in the Mediterranean Sea? Should special care not be taken to ensure that other sea basins, such as the Atlantic basin, are not exposed to the same dangers?

2. Since consensus in the boating industry is that other modes of transport have greater access to EU funds, how will the Commission help facilitate access to information and to EU research, development and innovation funds?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2013)

1. In line with the Blue growth approach in its forthcoming Communication on Coastal and Maritime Tourism, the Commission will take into account sea-basins specificities. It will, therefore, outline ideas for an innovative, accessible and sustainable promotion of less developed coastal areas such as in the Atlantic. Conversely, it will take into consideration the need for reconversion/rejuvenation strategies for certain exhausted areas in the Mediterranean. Such an approach will include the promotion of macro-regional and sea-basin strategies.

2. Horizon 2020 will change EU funding with simplified access for participants. In addition, the Commission has put the Enterprise Europe Network in place to inform SMEs about research and innovation programmes and assist them in applying for EU grants and help SMEs to internationalise and find business and technology partners, especially within the maritime industry and services sector group.

3. Research, technological development and innovation are an important area for European Structural and Investment Fund interventions. In the Commission's proposals for the 2014-2020 period a significant amount of funds are intended for this purpose. These funds should allow ESIF managing authorities in the Member States and regions to provide incentives and framework conditions to stimulate innovation and diversification of industries, including in the maritime sector, based on national/regional smart specialisation strategies and broad stakeholder involvement.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002583/13

an die Kommission

Daniel Caspary (PPE)

(5. März 2013)

Betrifft: Veräußerung von Konversionsflächen

Aufgrund des Abzugs der US-Streitkräfte aus Deutschland sind viele Gemeinden mit dem damit verbundenen Konversionsprozess der frei werdenden Flächen betroffen. Zuständig für die Verwertung der nicht mehr benötigten Immobilien des Deutschen Bundes ist die Bundesanstalt für Immobilienaufgaben (BImA). Die BImA ist nach deutschem Gesetz dazu verpflichtet, die Flächen zum tatsächlichen Marktpreis zu veräußern. Bezug nehmend auf die schriftliche Anfrage P-010647/12 und die dazugehörende Antwort der Kommission vom 8. Januar 2013 wird um die Beantwortung folgender konkreter Nachfragen gebeten:

1. Wäre es nach geltendem europäischem Recht möglich, das BImA-Gesetz um eine sogenannte Öffnungsklausel zu erweitern, wonach bei der Veräußerung von ehemaligen militärischen Flächen die strukturpolitischen Ziele von Bund, Ländern und Kommunen berücksichtigt werden müssten? Wenn nein, warum nicht?

2. Könnte in Bezug auf den Beschluss über die Anwendung von Artikel 106 Absatz 2 AEUV auf staatliche Beihilfen in Form von Ausgleichleistungen zugunsten bestimmter Unternehmen, die mit der Erbringung von Dienstleistungen von allgemeinem wirtschaftlichem Interesse betraut sind (K(2011)9380), nicht nur sozialer Wohnungsbau, sondern auch bezahlbarer Wohnraum für Menschen mit durchschnittlichem Einkommen als Dienstleitung von allgemeinem Interesse definiert werden? Wenn nein, warum nicht?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission

(23. Mai 2013)

Die EU-Beihilfevorschriften finden nur dann Anwendung, wenn einem begünstigten Unternehmen ein Vorteil gewährt wird, d. h. dem Unternehmen ein wirtschaftlicher Vorteil entstünde, den es sich zu normalen Marktbedingungen nicht hätte sichern können. Verkauft der Staat Grundstücke zu einem Preis unter ihrem tatsächlichen Marktwert, so wird die Differenz zu dem Verkaufspreis als staatliche Beihilfe angesehen.

Der Staat kann Einschränkungen für die Stadt- oder Regionalplanung vorschreiben. Verlangt der Staat, dass der künftige Eigentümer besondere Verpflichtungen ([1]) erfüllt (was zu einem niedrigeren Verkaufspreis führt), so entsteht kein wirtschaftlicher Vorteil, wenn alle potenziellen Käufer diesen Verpflichtungen nachkommen müssten. Werden zusätzliche Verpflichtungen nur von bestimmten potenziellen Käufern verlangt, kann es sich um eine staatliche Beihilfe handeln ([2]).

Artikel 106 Absatz 2 AEUV ist auf staatliche Beihilfen in Form von Ausgleichszahlungen für die Erbringung öffentlicher Dienstleistungen anwendbar und setzt voraus, dass das betreffende Unternehmen mit einer Dienstleistung von allgemeinem wirtschaftlichem Interesse betraut wurde. Die Mitgliedstaaten verfügen über einen beachtlichen Ermessensspielraum im Hinblick auf die Bestimmung von Dienstleistungen von allgemeinem wirtschaftlichem Interesse (DAWI) ([3]). Die Aufgabe der Kommission beschränkt sich dabei darauf, diese auf offenkundige Fehler zu überprüfen. Die Kommission hat zum Beispiel keinen offenkundigen Fehler in Zusammenhang mit der sozialen Wohnraumbeschaffung für breite Bevölkerungsschichten, auf der Grundlage bestimmter objektiver Kriterien (z. B. u. a. Einkommensgrenze der Begünstigten), in einem Mitgliedstaat festgestellt, in dem es auch einen etablierten privaten Wohnungsmarkt gibt ([4]).

Beihilfen für sozialen Wohnungsbau sind mit dem Binnenmarkt vereinbar und nach dem Beschluss 2012/21/EU ([5]) der Kommission von der Anmeldepflicht befreit, sofern alle Bedingungen dieses Beschlusses erfüllt werden. Ansonsten müssten Beihilfen angemeldet werden (Artikel 108 Absatz 3 AEUV) und könnten nur durch eine Genehmigung nach einer Einzelbeurteilung wirksam werden.

([1]) Zum Beispiel einen öffentlichen Park auf einem Teil des Grundstücks anzulegen.

([2]) Wird die staatliche Beihilfe einem begünstigten Käufer gewährt, kann diese immer noch mit dem Binnenmarkt vereinbar sein, wenn die damit verbundene Tätigkeit von gemeinsamem Interesse ist und alle anderen Vereinbarkeitskriterien erfüllt werden.

([3]) Siehe z. B. Artikel 1 des Protokolls Nr. 26 im Anhang zu EUV und AEUV.

([4]) Siehe z. B. die Entscheidung K(2009)9963 endg. der Kommission vom 15. Dezember 2009 betreffend die Beihilfemaßnahmen E 2/2005 und N 642/2009 (Niederlande).

([5]) Beschluss der Kommission 2012/21/EU vom 20. Dezember 2011 über die Anwendung von Artikel 106 Absatz 2 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union auf staatliche Beihilfen in Form von Ausgleichsleistungen zugunsten bestimmter Unternehmen, die mit der Erbringung von Dienstleistungen von allgemeinem wirtschaftlichem Interesse betraut sind.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002583/13
to the Commission
Daniel Caspary (PPE)
(5 March 2013)

Subject: Sale of redevelopment areas

On account of the withdrawal of the US armed forces from Germany, many municipalities are having to deal with the associated process of redeveloping the land that is now being freed up. The Institute for Federal Real Estate (BImA) is responsible for the reclamation of the federal real estate that is no longer required. The BImA is obliged under German law to sell the land at its actual market value. With reference to Written Question P-010647/12 and its associated answer from the Commission of 8 January 2013, I would ask the Commission for an answer to the following specific additional questions:

1. Would it be possible under current European law to add an opening clause to the BImA Act to the effect that the structural objectives of the state, *Länder* and municipalities must be taken into account in connection with the sale of former military land? If not, why not?

2. With regard to the decision on the application of Article 106(2) TFEU to state aid in the form of public service compensation granted to certain undertakings entrusted with the operation of services of general economic interest (C(2011)9380), could not only social housing, but also accommodation that is paid for by people with average incomes be classed as a service of general interest? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2013)

EU State aid rules only apply if an advantage is conferred on a beneficiary undertaking, which means that the undertaking has to receive an economic benefit that it would not have obtained under normal market conditions. If the State sells land at a price below its actual market value, the difference to the sales price will be considered to constitute state aid.

The State can impose urban or regional planning restrictions. If the State requires the future owner to assume special obligations ([1]) (resulting in a lower sales price) there is no advantage if all potential buyers would have to meet those obligations. If additional obligations are required only from certain potential buyers, that may constitute state aid ([2]).

Article 106(2) TFEU applies to state aid in the form of public service compensation and requires that the undertaking has been entrusted with a public service obligation. Member States have considerable scope to define services of general economic interest (SGEI) ([3]). The Commission's role is limited to checking for manifest errors in their definitions. The Commission has for example found no manifest error concerning the provision of social housing to broad segments of the population of a Member State, in which there is also an established private housing market, based on certain objective criteria (income limit of the beneficiaries, among others) ([4]).

Aid for social housing is compatible and exempted from notification under Commission Decision 2012/21/EU ([5]) if it fulfils all conditions of that Decision. Otherwise, aid would be subject to notification (Article 108(3) TFEU) and may not be put into effect without authorisation after an individual assessment.

([1]) E.g. to construct a public park on part of the land.
([2]) If state aid is granted to a preferred purchaser, it may still be compatible with the internal market if the activity to which it is attached is in the 'common interest' and meets all the other compatibility requirements.
([3]) See e.g. Article 1 of Protocol 26 annexed to the TEU and TFEU.
([4]) See for example Commission Decision C(2009) 9963 final of 15 December 2009 concerning state aid E 2/2005 and N 642/2009 (NL).
([5]) Commission Decision 2012/21/EU of 20 December 2011 on the application of Article 106(2) TFEU to state aid in the form of public service compensation granted to certain undertakings entrusted with the operation of services of general economic interest.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-002584/13
προς το Συμβούλιο
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(6 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Φημολογίες περί κουρέματος των καταθέσεων στην Κύπρο

Δηλώσεις του προέδρου του Eurogroup, Jeroen Dijsselbloem, στις 13.2.2013, καθώς και του μέλους της ΕΚΤ, Benoit Coeure, στις 27.2.2013, άφησαν ανοικτό το ενδεχόμενο «κουρέματος» των καταθέσεων σε κυπριακές τράπεζες. Οι δηλώσεις αυτές, όπως θα έπρεπε να ήταν και αναμενόμενο, προκάλεσαν μέσα σε λίγες μόνο μέρες εκροή 2 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ από τις κυπριακές τράπεζες.

Πολλοί στην Κύπρο διερωτώνται αν τελικά αυτός ήταν και ο στόχος των δηλώσεων. Ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο και η Επιτροπή. Είναι οι δημόσιες δηλώσεις δικαίωμα υπεράνω κάθε δεοντολογίας; Υπάρχει τρόπος να αποκαθίσταται η τάξη όταν δημόσιες δηλώσεις τείνουν να καταστρέψουν την οικονομία ενός κράτους; Είναι αυτό κάτι που απασχόλησε ποτέ το Συμβούλιο;

Και τέλος, σε ποιές ενέργειες προτίθεται να προβεί η ΕΕ προκειμένου να επιβεβαιώσει πως η ΕΕ δεν συζητά οποιοδήποτε σενάριο κουρέματος καταθέσεων, καθώς κάτι τέτοιο θα συνέβαλε στην περαιτέρω οικονομική αστάθεια της Κύπρου, με απρόβλεπτες συνέπειες για την ευρωζώνη;

Απάντηση
(15 Μαΐου 2013)

Όπως αναφέρεται στη δήλωση της 16ης Μαρτίου 2013 και επιβεβαιώθηκε στις 25 Μαρτίου 2013, η Ευρωομάδα θεωρεί ότι, κατ' αρχήν, η οικονομική βοήθεια στην Κύπρο δικαιολογείται προκειμένου να διασφαλιστεί μέσω της παροχής οικονομικής βοήθειας ύψους 10 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ η χρηματοπιστωτική σταθερότητα τόσο στην Κύπρο όσο και στη ζώνη του ευρώ στο σύνολό της. Η Ευρωομάδα εξέφρασε ικανοποίηση σχετικά με τα σχέδια αναδιάρθρωσης του χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα που υπέβαλαν οι κυπριακές αρχές, σύμφωνα με το παράρτημα της δήλωσης της 25ης Μαρτίου 2013. Τα μέτρα αυτά θέτουν τη βάση για την αποκατάσταση της βιωσιμότητας του χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, διασφαλίζουν όλες τις καταθέσεις κάτω των 100 000 ευρώ, σύμφωνα με τις αρχές της ΕΕ.

Επιπλέον, η Ευρωομάδα εξέφρασε ικανοποίηση για τη δέσμευση των κυπριακών αρχών να λάβουν πρόσθετα μέτρα ενεργοποιώντας ιδίους πόρους. Στα μέτρα αυτά περιλαμβάνεται η αύξηση του φόρου επί των εσόδων των κεφαλαίων και αύξηση του νόμιμου φορολογικού συντελεστή για τα έσοδα των εταιριών.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002584/13
to the Council
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: Rumours about a 'haircut' of deposits in Cyprus

Statements made by Jeroen Dijsselbloem, President of the Eurogroup, and Benoît Coeuré, Member of the Executive Board of the European Central Bank, on 13 and 27 February 2013, respectively, suggested that there might be a 'haircut' of deposits in Cypriot banks. As was only to be expected, these statements prompted the withdrawal of EUR 2 billion from local banks in the space of a few days.

Many people in Cyprus are wondering whether this was in fact the true purpose of these statements. Will the Council and the Commission say: does the right to make public statements take precedence over ethical considerations? Is there any means of restoring order in the wake of public statements that sap the economy of a Member State? Has the Council ever addressed this issue?

Finally, what action will the EU take in order to confirm that the EU is not discussing any deposit 'haircut' scenario, as this would aggravate financial instability in Cyprus, with unpredictable consequences for the Eurozone?

Reply
(15 May 2013)

As indicated in the statement of 16 March 2013 and reconfirmed on 25 March 2013, the Eurogroup considered that, in principle, financial assistance to Cyprus was warranted to safeguard financial stability in Cyprus and the euro area as a whole by providing financial assistance for an amount up to EUR 10 billion. The Eurogroup welcomed the plans presented by the Cyprus authorities for restructuring the financial sector as specified in the annex to its statement of 25 March 2013. These measures will form the basis for restoring the viability of the financial sector. In particular, they safeguard all deposits below EUR 100 000 in accordance with EU principles.

The Eurogroup also welcomed the Cyprus authorities' commitment to take further measures mobilising internal resources. These measures include the increase of the withholding tax on capital income and of the statutory corporate income tax rate.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002585/13
to the Commission
Emma McClarkin (ECR)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EU funding for cancer research

I have understood that the total EU funding for cancer research in the FP7 Cooperation Programme is estimated to be over EUR 500 million. Could the Commission inform me if there is any other EU funding for cancer research in addition to this programme?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2013)

The Commission has made cancer research a constant priority throughout the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) ([1]), with some EUR 1.1 billion devoted to specific support for this particular area within the field of health research. Research efforts address in particular translational cancer research aimed at bringing basic knowledge through to ensure better diagnosis and more accurate and safer prevention and therapeutic approaches.

In addition, EUR 37 million have been devoted to industry-driven cancer research tackling the development of better tools for diagnosing and treating cancer through the MARCAR, PREDECT, ONCOTRACK and QUIC-CONCEPT ([2]) projects within the frame of the Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI) ([3]). A public-private partnership between the European Union and the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations ([4]), IMI is aiming to accelerate the development of new treatments by better prediction of safety and efficacy.

The Commission's proposal for Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([5]), will offer opportunities for research on cancer, amongst other, through the 'Health, Demographic Change and Well-being' societal challenge. It is yet premature to ascertain which could be the specific research issues addressed.

The EU Health Programme, although not funding research projects, is financing the joint action on European Partnership for Action Against Cancer (EPAAC).

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/health/home_en.html
([2]) http://www.imi.europa.eu/content/ongoing-projects
([3]) http://www.imi.europa.eu/
([4]) EFPIA : http://www.efpia.eu/
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002586/13
aan de Commissie
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(6 maart 2013)

Betreft: MTOW — startgewichten vliegtuigen

In haar antwoord op vraag E-000106/2013 over gewichtsfraude bij Ryanair, gaf de Europese Commissie aan dat verschillende luchtvaartmaatschappijen MTOW hebben opgegeven die in strijd zijn met Verordening (EG) nr. 1794/2006.

Graag enkele opvolgvragen aan de Commissie:

1. Kan de Commissie concreet aangeven welke luchtvaartmaatschappijen betrokken zijn?

2. Wat is de omvang van het probleem? Wat is het exacte bedrag van de ontweken heffingen?

3. Kan de Commissie concreet aangeven in welke lidstaten onregelmatigheden werden vastgesteld, of ze tijdig werden gesignaleerd en welke actie desgevallend werd genomen?

4. Zal de Commissie optreden tegen lidstaten die geen gepaste actie hebben ondernomen t.a.v. eventuele onregelmatigheden? Heeft zij hiertoe reeds aanwijzingen?

5. Heeft de Commissie zicht op de beweegredenen van de betrokken maatschappijen?

6. De Commissie geeft aan dat de ontwijking van de heffing geen impact heeft op de veiligheid. Kan zij dit meer omstandig motiveren, zeker gezien veilige dienstverlening ook vermeld wordt als doelstelling van de verordening bijvoorbeeld in overweging 3 *„Dit stelsel moet ook aanmoedigen tot het veilig, doeltreffend en doelmatig verlenen van luchtvaartnavigatiediensten aan de gebruikers van deze diensten, die het systeem financieren, en aanzetten tot een geïntegreerde dienstverlening”*.

7. Kan de Commissie aangeven wat het resultaat is van de bespreking in het bevoegde comité van Eurocontrol?

8. Wanneer verwacht de Commissie te kunnen beslissen of verdere maatregelen op EU-niveau nodig zijn? Wat zijn de opties terzake?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(25 april 2013)

De Commissie gaat momenteel na of de luchtvaartmaatschappijen Verordening (EG) nr. 1794/2006([1]) van de Commissie met betrekking tot de aangifte van de maximale startgewichten (MTOW([2])) hebben nageleefd. In dit stadium kan zij niet bevestigen of er sprake is van een schending of onjuiste interpretatie van de geldende voorschriften door sommige maatschappijen. Zij kan ook nog geen nauwkeurige informatie over de omvang van het probleem verschaffen.

Het CRCO([3]) van Eurocontrol, dat de heffingen int, heeft aan de Commissie meegedeeld dat uit een eerste controle van de aangiften van januari 2013 is gebleken dat bij 0,4 % van de geïnde heffingen (wat voor januari 2013 neerkomt op ongeveer 2,3 miljoen euro) sprake zou kunnen zijn van onjuiste startgewichten en dat hier verschillende luchtvaartmaatschappijen bij betrokken zouden zijn. Indien dit vermoeden wordt bevestigd, zal de geldigheid van de aangiften van sommige luchtvaartmaatschappijen ter discussie worden gesteld. Deze onregelmatigheden worden momenteel door het CRCO onderzocht.

Na de bespreking in het betreffende orgaan van Eurocontrol op 15 maart 2013, heeft de Commissie het CRCO gevraagd om de wettelijke, financiële en technische gevolgen van de situatie, met inbegrip van de haalbaarheid van facturering met terugwerkende kracht, te onderzoeken.

([1]) PB L 341 van 7.12.2006.
([2]) Maximum take-off weight.
([3]) Central Route Charges Office (Centraal Bureau voor routeheffingen).

Tegelijkertijd zal de Commissie bij de EU-lidstaten navragen hoe zij ervoor zorgen dat Verordening (EG) nr. 1794/2006 met betrekking tot de aangifte van de maximale startgewichten correct wordt toegepast. Op basis van de resultaten van deze navraag kan zij besluiten om op te treden tegen de lidstaten en/of de verordening te wijzigen indien blijkt dat de bepalingen moeten worden verduidelijkt.

Bovendien bevestigt de Commissie dat de lopende analyse van de aangifte van startgewichten voor de toepassing van heffingen geen verband houdt met veiligheid. Vliegtuigen kunnen verschillende startgewichten hebben. In Verordening (EG) nr. 1794/2006 is bepaald welke startgewichten moeten worden gebruikt voor de heffingen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002586/13
to the Commission
Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: MTOW — takeoff weight of aircraft

In its answer to Question E-000106/2013 on weight fraud by Ryanair, the Commission indicated that various airlines had reported MTOWs which breached Regulation (EC) No 1794/2006.

1. Can the Commission indicate exactly which airlines are involved?

2. What is the extent of the problem? What is the exact amount of levies evaded?

3. Can the Commission indicate specifically in which Member States irregularities have been observed, whether they were reported in time and what action, if any, was taken?

4. Will the Commission take action against Member States which have not taken any appropriate action on any irregularities? Does it already have information on the subject?

5. Does the Commission have an idea of the motives of the airlines concerned?

6. The Commission indicates that evasion of the levy does not affect safety. Can it substantiate this in greater detail, particularly bearing in mind that providing a safe service is also stated as an objective of the regulation, for example in Recital 3: 'The system should also encourage the safe, efficient and effective provision of air navigation services to the users of air navigation services that finance the system and stimulate integrated service provision.'

7. Can the Commission indicate the outcome of the talks in the competent Eurocontrol committee?

8. When does the Commission expect to be able to decide whether further measures are needed at EU level? What are the options in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2013)

The Commission is assessing the compliance with Commission Regulation (EC) No 1794/2006 ([1]) in respect to the declaration of MTOW ([2]) values by aircraft operators. At this stage it cannot confirm whether there was breach or misinterprepartion of applicable rules by some operators, nor can it provide precise information on the extent of the problem.

Eurocontrol's CRCO ([3]), which is collecting charges, informed the Commission that on the basis of an initial verification of January 2013 declarations, 0.4% of the charges collected (for January 2013 around EUR 2.3 million) may be subject to an incorrect application of weight values, involving several aircraft operators. If this situation is confirmed the validity of declarations by some operators would be put into question. CRCO is already treating these inacurracies.

Following the discussion in the relevant Eurocontrol body on 15 March 2013, the Commission invited CRCO to assess the legal, financial and technical consequences of the situation, including the feasibility of retroactive billing.

In parallel, the Commission will inquire EU Member States on how they ensure the correct application of Regulation 1794/2006 in respect to the declarations of weights and, based on the results of such inquiry, may decide to take actions against Member States and/or amend the regulation if there is a need for clarification of these provisions.

Furthermore, the Commission confirms that the ongoing analysis on weight values communicated for charging purposes has no connection to safety. Aircraft can operate under different MTOW values. Regulation 1794/2006 stipulates, which values should be used for charging purposes.

([1]) OJ L 341, 7.12.2006.
([2]) Maximum take-off weight.
([3]) Central Route Charges Office.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-002587/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(6 Μαρτίου 2013)

Θέμα: Φημολογίες περί κουρέματος των καταθέσεων στην Κύπρο

Δηλώσεις του προέδρου του Eurogroup, Jeroen Dijsselbloem, στις 13.2.2013 καθώς και του μέλους της ΕΚΤ, Benoit Coeure, στις 27.2.2013 άφησαν ανοικτό το ενδεχόμενο «κουρέματος» των καταθέσεων σε κυπριακές τράπεζες. Οι δηλώσεις αυτές, όπως θα έπρεπε να ήταν και αναμενόμενο, προκάλεσαν μέσα σε λίγες μόνο μέρες εκροή 2 δισεκατομμύριων ευρώ από τις κυπριακές τράπεζες.

Πολλοί στην Κύπρο διερωτώνται αν τελικά αυτός ήταν και ο στόχος των δηλώσεων. Ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο και η Επιτροπή: Είναι οι δημόσιες δηλώσεις δικαίωμα υπεράνω κάθε δεοντολογίας; Υπάρχει τρόπος να αποκαθίσταται η τάξη όταν δημόσιες δηλώσεις τείνουν να καταστρέψουν την οικονομία ενός κράτους; Είναι αυτό κάτι που απασχόλησε ποτέ την Επιτροπή;

Και τέλος, σε ποιες ενέργειες προτίθεται να προβεί η ΕΕ προκειμένου να επιβεβαιώσει πως η ΕΕ δεν συζητά οποιοδήποτε σενάριο κουρέματος καταθέσεων, καθώς κάτι τέτοιο θα συνέβαλε στην περαιτέρω οικονομική αστάθεια της Κύπρου με απρόβλεπτες συνέπειες για την ευρωζώνη;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Μαΐου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή δεν δύναται να απαντήσει εξ ονόματος του Προέδρου της Ευρωομάδας ή του μέλους του διοικητικού συμβουλίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας.

Η Ευρωομάδα στις 25 Μαρτίου εξέφρασε ικανοποίηση σχετικά με τα σχέδια αναδιάρθρωσης του χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα. Η άμεση εξυγίανση της Λαϊκής Τράπεζας — με την πλήρη συμμετοχή μετόχων, ομολογιούχων και ανασφάλιστων καταθετών — συμπεριέλαβε τον διαχωρισμό της σε «καλή» και «κακή» τράπεζα. Ενώ η «κακή» τράπεζα θα τεθεί εκτός λειτουργίας συν το χρόνω, η «καλή» τράπεζα ενσωματώνεται στην Τράπεζα Κύπρου (BoC). Η BoC θα ανακεφαλαιοποιηθεί μέσω μετατροπής των μη εγγυημένων καταθέσεων σε μετοχικό κεφάλαιο με πλήρη συμμετοχή μετόχων και ομολογιούχων. Η μετατροπή θα είναι τέτοια ώστε να έχει εξασφαλιστεί έως το τέλος του προγράμματος δείκτης κεφαλαιακής επάρκειας 9%. Όλες οι εγγυημένες καταθέσεις (ποσά κάτω των 100 000 ευρώ) σε όλες τις τράπεζες εξασφαλίζονται πλήρως σύμφωνα με τη σχετική νομοθεσία της ΕΕ. Τα μέτρα αυτά αποτελούν τη βάση για την αποκατάσταση της βιωσιμότητας του χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα ([1]).

Οι κυπριακές αρχές αποφάσισαν να θεσπίσουν διοικητικά μέτρα ώστε να αποφευχθεί η εκροή καταθέσεων. Η Επιτροπή, ως θεματοφύλακας των Συνθηκών, παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς τις επιπτώσεις τους και διασφαλίζει ότι παραμένουν σε ισχύ μόνο για το χρονικό διάστημα που κρίνονται απολύτως απαραίτητα.

Η Επιτροπή αναγνωρίζει τις σημαντικές προκλήσεις που καλείται να αντιμετωπίσει η Κύπρος και την στηρίζει στις προσπάθειές της για την αποκατάσταση της χρηματοπιστωτικής σταθερότητας και τη δημιουργία συνθηκών για βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη και δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας. Στις 27 Μαρτίου, η Επιτροπή αποφάσισε να συστήσει ομάδα στήριξης για την Κύπρο με την εφαρμογή του προγράμματος προσαρμογής. Η ομάδας στήριξης αξιοποιεί την εμπειρογνωμοσύνη από όλες τις υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής. Άμεση προτεραιότητα είναι ο εντοπισμός των σχετικών πόρων που είναι διαθέσιμοι από τα τρέχοντα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία.

([1]) Δήλωση της Ευρωομάδας σχετικά με την Κύπρο της 25ης Μαρτίου: http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/newsroom/news/2013/03/eg-statement-cyprus-25-03-13/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002587/13
to the Commission
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: Rumours about a 'haircut' of deposits in Cyprus

Statements made by Jeroen Dijsselbloem, President of the Eurogroup, and Benoît Coeuré, Member of the Executive Board of the European Central Bank, on 13 and 27 February 2013, respectively, suggest that there may be a 'haircut' of deposits in Cypriot banks. As was only to be expected, these statements prompted the withdrawal of EUR 2 billion from local banks in the space of a few days.

Many people in Cyprus are wondering whether this was in fact the true purpose of these statements. Will the Council and the Commission say: does the right to make public statements outweigh ethical considerations? Is there any means of restoring order in the wake of public statements that sap the economy of a Member State? Has the Commission ever addressed this issue?

Finally, what action will the EU take in order to confirm that the EU is not discussing any deposit 'haircut' scenario, as this would aggravate financial instability in Cyprus, with unpredictable consequences for the Eurozone?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2013)

The Commission cannot answer on behalf of the president of the Eurogroup or the Member of the Executive Board of the European Central Bank.

The Eurogroup on 25 March welcomed the plans for restructuring the financial sector. The immediate resolution of the Laiki Bank — with full contribution of equity shareholders, bond holders and uninsured depositors — involved a split into a good bank and a bad bank. While the bad bank will be run down over time, the good bank was folded into Bank of Cyprus (BoC). BoC will be recapitalised through a deposit/equity conversion of uninsured deposits with full contribution of equity shareholders and bond holders. The conversion will be such that a capital ratio of 9% is secured by the end of the programme. All insured depositors (below EUR 100 000) in all banks are fully protected in accordance with the relevant EU legislation. These measures form the basis for restoring the viability of the financial sector ([1]).

The Cypriot authorities decided to introduce administrative measures to avoid the flight of deposits. The Commission, as the guardian of the Treaties, is closely monitoring their impact and will make sure that they remain in place no longer than strictly necessary.

The Commission realises that significant challenges lie ahead and stands by Cyprus in helping to restore financial stability, and create conditions for sustainable growth and job creation. On 27 March the Commission decided to set up a Support Group for Cyprus with the implementation of the adjustment programme. The Support Group will rely on expertise from across the Commission services. An immediate priority is to identify the relevant resources available from the current structural funds.

([1]) Eurogroup Statement on Cyprus of 25 March: http://www.eurozone.europa.eu/newsroom/news/2013/03/eg-statement-cyprus-25-03-13/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002588/13
to the Council
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR I

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

What contingency planning has the Council begun or completed in order to ensure the peaceful transition of Greece from a functioning economy to a failed state?

Question for written answer E-002593/13
to the Council
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR II

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

What role does the Council anticipate for EUROGENDFOR in keeping order in Greece and/or Bulgaria?

Question for written answer E-002616/13
to the Council
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR III

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

There have been significant demonstrations against the political system and energy prices in Bulgaria.

How many EUROGENDFOR officers and men are available for deployment to Greece and/or Bulgaria within: a) 48 hours; b) 7 days; c) one month?

Question for written answer E-002619/13
to the Council
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR IV

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

What is the decision-making process for requesting, approving and implementing the deployment of EUROGENDFOR personnel? Does the Council have any formal or informal involvement in that process or with the individuals concerned?

Question for written answer E-002624/13
to the Council
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR V

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

There have been significant demonstrations against the political system and energy prices in Bulgaria.

In what circumstances would EUROGENDFOR be deployed to Greece and/or Bulgaria; which institutions and/or individuals would make that decision; and does or will the Council have any formal or informal involvement in that decision-making process?

Question for written answer E-002625/13
to the Council
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR VI

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

There have been significant demonstrations against the political system and energy prices in Bulgaria.

In the event of EUROGENDFOR being deployed to theatre in Greece and/or Bulgaria, what is the chain of command for determining its rules of engagement? Does the Council have any formal or informal involvement in such decisions or with the individuals concerned in respect thereof?

Question for written answer E-002628/13
to the Council
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR VII

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

Is EUROGENDFOR equipped with sufficient weaponry to maintain order in the event that the Greek police side with Golden Dawn against EUROGENDFOR?

Question for written answer E-002631/13
to the Council
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR VIII

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

What type and number of lethal weapons are at the disposal of EUROGENDFOR?

Question for written answer E-002634/13
to the Council
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR IX

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

To which EU institution is EUROGENDFOR accountable, and what frequency and form does that accountability take?

Question for written answer E-002637/13
to the Council
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR X

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

How does the Council propose to ensure the safety of the Troika on its visits to Greece, given that on the occasion of Chancellor Merkel's visit to Athens the Greek Government felt it necessary to flood the streets with more than 7 000 police officers?

Joint reply
(28 May 2013)

The European Gendarmerie Force is a multinational initiative launched outside the institutional framework of the European Union.

The Council has neither discussed nor taken a position on any of the issues raised by the Honourable Member.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002590/13
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR I

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order..

What contingency planning has the Commission begun or completed in order to ensure the peaceful transition of Greece from a functioning economy to a failed state?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(22 April 2013)

The Commission is fully aware of the difficult current economic and social situation in Greece, reflected in the very high unemployment rate, and it is supporting the Greek government's efforts to improve the competitiveness of the economy, thereby laying the foundations for sustainable economic growth and employment creation.

The Commission believes that effective implementation of the Second Economic Adjustment Programme for Greece contributes to this goal.

The programme has strengthened its focus on structural reforms to unlock growth and employment. It is important to highlight that the memorandum of understanding contains measures to support the unemployed, including by broadening the role of the public employment service, by introducing short-term public works programmes, promoting training schemes and enhancing unemployment benefits.

Further action is needed to limit long term unemployment through active labour market policies. An Action Plan to strengthen Youth Employment and Entrepreneurship was launched in January and other measures are in the pipeline, including a means-tested long-term unemployment assistance scheme. The Commission is also working with the Greek Government to increase the impact of structural and cohesion funds, with absorption rates already above EU averages. This is also contributing to job creation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002592/13
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR II

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

There have been significant demonstrations against the political system and energy prices in Bulgaria.

What role does the Commission anticipate for EUROGENDFOR in keeping order in Greece and/or Bulgaria?

Question for written answer E-002617/13
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR III

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

There have been significant demonstrations against the political system and energy prices in Bulgaria.

How many EUROGENDFOR officers and men are available for deployment to Greece and/or Bulgaria within: a) 48 hours; b) 7 days; c) one month?

Question for written answer E-002620/13
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR IV

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

What is the decision-making process for requesting, approving and implementing the deployment of EUROGENDFOR personnel? Does the Commission have any formal or informal involvement in that process or with the individuals concerned?

Question for written answer E-002623/13
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR V

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

There have been significant demonstrations against the political system and energy prices in Bulgaria.

In what circumstances would EUROGENDFOR be deployed to Greece and/or Bulgaria; which institutions and/or individuals would make that decision; and does or will the Commission have any formal or informal involvement in that decision-making process or with the individuals concerned?

Question for written answer E-002626/13
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR VI

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

There have been significant demonstrations against the political system and energy prices in Bulgaria.

In the event of EUROGENDFOR being deployed to theatre in Greece and/or Bulgaria, what is the chain of command for determining its rules of engagement? Does the Commission have any formal or informal involvement in such decisions or with the individuals concerned in respect thereof?

Question for written answer E-002629/13
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR VII

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

Is EUROGENDFOR equipped with sufficient weaponry to maintain order in the event that the Greek police side with Golden Dawn against EUROGENDFOR?

Question for written answer E-002632/13
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR VIII

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

What type and number of lethal weapons are at the disposal of EUROGENDFOR?

Question for written answer E-002635/13
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: EUROGENDFOR IX

On 24 January 2013, the *New Statesman* magazine reported that in Greece, during the past few weeks, offices of the governing parties and homes of pro-government journalists have been firebombed and the headquarters of the Prime Minister's conservative New Democracy party sprayed with machine-gun fire, and that, days later, a bomb exploded at a shopping mall belonging to the country's second wealthiest citizen.

A former Greek Ambassador, Leonidas Chrysanthopoulos, predicts that an 'explosion' of civil unrest will occur when retroactive and sizeable tax bills come due in the coming months.

The Greek army has reportedly promised not to intervene, and the Greek Government has turned to private security firms rather than trust the underpaid Greek police to keep order.

To which EU institution is EUROGENDFOR accountable, and what frequency and form does that accountability take?

Joint answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Questions E-003470/2012, E-003548/2012, E-003551/2012, E-003552/2012.

The European Gendarmerie Force (EUROGENDFOR) is not an EU body. EUROGENDFOR is not accountable to the Commission, nor, for that matter, to any other EU institution.

The Commission has no involvement in or competence for the missions, tasks, internal organisation, means or operations of EUROGENDFOR. The Commission is therefore not in a position to provide information on any aspect of possible EUROGENDFOR deployments, including any possible role of EUROGENDFOR in keeping order in Greece or Bulgaria, the number of personnel which could be deployed in those countries by EUROGENDFOR, in what circumstances such a deployment could occur and how the chain of command functions in determining the rules of engagement. For the same reason the Commission cannot provide information on the number and type of weaponry available to EUROGENDFOR.

The European Gendarmerie Force is an initiative of five EU Member States (France, the Netherlands, Spain, Portugal and Italy) and was established by a treaty between those countries on 18 October 2007. Their stated intention was for membership of the EUROGENDFOR to be open to those EU Member States which have a national police force with military status. In 2008 Romania jointed as the sixth member.

Further information on EUROGENDFOR can be found at its website: http://www.eurogendfor.eu

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002594/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Guiné-Bissau — reunião com o Representante Especial do SG ONU

O Representante Especial e Chefe do Gabinete Integrado das Nações Unidas para a Consolidação da Paz na Guiné-Bissau (Uniogbis) José Ramos-Horta esteve recentemente em Bruxelas, nomeadamente na Comissão dos Assuntos Externos do Parlamento Europeu, onde teve a oportunidade de dar conta aos deputados das suas impressões acerca da situação naquele país.

No decurso da sua intervenção, Ramos-Horta defendeu o estabelecimento de um «roteiro» com vista a eleições livres e democráticas naquele país, «em novembro ou dezembro» do presente ano, das quais resulte um «Governo inclusivo». O Representante Especial exortou também a União Europeia a continuar a prestar apoio ao país, por intermédio das Nações Unidas, de organizações não-governamentais ou das igrejas, no caso de considerar que as autoridades de facto não garantem uma gestão e aplicação adequada daqueles apoios.

Assim, pergunto à Alta Representante:

1. Que comentários lhe merecem as declarações do Representante Especial?

2. Que contactos mantém com as Nações Unidas, as organizações não-governamentais e as igrejas que atuam naquele país?

3. Atendendo a que existe um montante de fundos para o desenvolvimento atribuído à Guiné-Bissau cuja utilização não se mostra possível devido ao disposto no artigo 96.° do Acordo de Cotonu, estaria disponível para canalizar esses fundos para a ajuda humanitária e o apoio direto às populações carenciadas?

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

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente tem conhecimento das declarações do Representante Especial do Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas, José Ramos-Horta, e aprecia a sua vontade de cooperar com a UE para apoiar as populações carenciadas na Guiné-Bissau.

A UE mantém contactos muito estreitos com o Uniogbis e com a sociedade civil na Guiné-Bissau, incluindo as ONG e as igrejas.

A UE nunca suspendeu os seus programas de cooperação que prestam apoio direto à população e à sociedade civil da Guiné-Bissau. Atualmente estão em curso vários programas, estando outros a ser avaliados. A possibilidade de prestar ajuda humanitária em situações de emergência continua em aberto.

Alguns dos nossos projetos já foram executados por agências da ONU (Unicef e PAM, em especial). Caso venha a ser necessário, o SEAE e a Comissão estudarão esta possibilidade.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002594/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Guinea-Bissau: meeting with the UN Secretary-General's Special Representative

The UN Secretary-General's Special Representative and Head of the UN Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNIOGBIS), José Ramos-Horta, recently visited Brussels and, in particular, Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs, where he had the opportunity to give the Members his impressions on the situation in Guinea-Bissau.

During his speech, Mr Ramos-Horta advocated setting out a 'road map' towards free and democratic elections in Guinea-Bissau 'in November or December' of this year, resulting in an 'inclusive government'. The Special Representative also called on the EU to continue providing aid for the country and stated that, if the EU takes the view that the authorities are not ensuring adequate management and appropriate spending of this aid, it should provide such aid through intermediaries such as the United Nations, non-governmental organisations or churches.

1. What does the Vice-President/High Representative have to say about the Special Representative's statements?

2. What contact does she have with the United Nations operation, non-governmental organisations and churches in the country?

3. Since there are funds set aside for development in Guinea-Bissau which cannot be used under the provisions of Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement, would she be prepared to channel these funds into humanitarian aid and direct support for people in need?

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

The HR/VP is aware of SRSG Ramos-Horta statements and appreciates his willingness to cooperate with the EU to support people in need in Guinea-Bissau.

The EU maintains very close contacts with UNIOGBIS and with the civil society in Guinea-Bissau, including NGOs and churches.

The EU never suspended its cooperation programmes in direct support of the population and of the Guinea-Bissauan civil society. Several programmes are currently underway and others are being appraised. The possibility of humanitarian aid in emergencies remains open.

Some of our projetcs are already implemented by UN agencies (Unicef, PAM especially). Should the necessity still arise, the EEAS and the Commission will consider this option.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002595/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Guiné-Bissau — reunião com o Representante Especial do Secretário-Geral da ONU

O Representante Especial e Chefe do Gabinete Integrado das Nações Unidas para a Consolidação da Paz na Guiné-Bissau (Uniogbis), José Ramos-Horta, esteve recentemente em Bruxelas, nomeadamente na Comissão dos Assuntos Externos do Parlamento Europeu, onde teve a oportunidade de dar conta aos deputados das suas impressões acerca da situação naquele país.

Assim, pergunto à Alta Representante:

1. Recebeu José Ramos-Horta aquando dessa sua deslocação a Bruxelas?

2. Em caso positivo, que apreciação faz desse encontro?

3. Em caso negativo, por que motivo não recebeu o Representante Especial?

4. Tem agendadas reuniões com o Representante Especial?

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

A Alta Representante/Vice Presidente não teve a oportunidade de se reunir com o Representante Especial do Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas José Ramos-Horta, em virtude de compromissos assumidos anteriormente. No entanto, o SEAE organizou um intenso programa de reuniões com o Representante Especial, que teve a ocasião de trocar pontos de vista com o Presidente da Comissão, com o PE, com o Comité Político e de Segurança do Conselho da UE, com o Comissário Piebalgs, responsável pela cooperação, e com altos funcionários do SEAE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002595/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Guinea-Bissau: meeting with the UN Secretary-General's Special Representative

The UN Secretary-General's Special Representative and Head of the UN Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNIOGBIS), José Ramos-Horta, recently visited Brussels and, in particular, Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs, where he had the opportunity to give the Members his impressions on the situation in Guinea-Bissau.

1. Did the Vice-President/High Representative meet with José Ramos-Horta during his visit to Brussels?

2. If so, what is her view on the meeting?

3. If she did not meet with the Special Representative, why not?

4. Does she have meetings scheduled with the Special Representative?

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

The HR/VP could not meet with SRSG UN Ramos-Horta, due to previous commitments. Nevertheless, the EEAS organised an intense programme of meetings with the SRSG who had the opportunity to exchange views with the President of the Commission, with the EP, the Political and Security Committee of the Council of the EU, with Commissioner Piebalgs, in charge of Cooperation and high level officials of EEAS.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002596/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Riqueza pesqueira dos Açores — vantagens regionais e europeias

Em visita ao arquipélago dos Açores, a Senhora Comissária responsável pelos Assuntos Marítimos e pelas Pescas afirmou que «há muito e bom peixe e de alta qualidade aqui. É preciso tirar vantagem disso».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Em que medida pode a economia regional tirar mais vantagem desse recurso de excecional qualidade? Que medidas tomou ou prevê tomar nesse sentido, nomeadamente quanto ao objetivo de «produzir local para depois exportar»?

2. Em que medida podem os cidadãos e as empresas da União Europeia beneficiar da quantidade e qualidade do pescado açoriano?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão
(30 de abril de 2013)

A economia regional dos Açores tira agora melhores benefícios dos recursos pesqueiros em redor das ilhas. No entanto, há ainda margem para melhorar o contributo das pescas para a economia geral, através do seguinte:

— Melhor gestão dos recursos haliêuticos. O peixe de alta qualidade proveniente dos Açores é sobretudo de profundidade. A reforma da política comum das pescas (PCP) e a proposta da Comissão sobre a gestão de espécies de profundidade ([1]), atualmente em análise no Parlamento Europeu, constituem contributos importantes para este objetivo.

— Regime de acesso aos pesqueiros exclusivo para as frotas locais nas águas até 100 milhas náuticas a contar da linha de base das ilhas, assegurado pelo Regulamento (CE) n.° 1954/2003 ([2]) e mantido na reforma da PCP.

— Ajudas estatais ao setor das pescas, para compensar os custos extraordinários devidos à localização afastada das ilhas e melhorar a higiene e qualidade dos produtos da pesca e da sua transformação e comercialização, tal como previsto no Regulamento (CE) n.° 791/2007 ([3]) e no Regulamento (CE) n.° 1198/2006 ([4]).

— Continuação destas medidas com 100 % de financiamento, de forma melhorada, nos termos da proposta sobre o Fundo Europeu dos Assuntos Marítimos e da Pesca (FEAMP) ([5]). O Fundo inclui, além do mais, maior intensidade de ajudas relativamente a outras regiões do continente: a contribuição privada dos beneficiários dos Açores representa apenas 15 % to orçamento total das operações para medidas como a inovação, serviços de consultoria, formação, investimentos para melhorar a qualidade dos produtos e medidas de comercialização.

Dado que grande parte da produção pesqueira dos Açores, incluindo enlatados, se dirige aos mercados da Europa continental, e tais produtos mantêm alta qualidade e são obtidos em condições de sustentabilidade, os cidadãos da UE não podem deixar de dela beneficiar.

([1]) COM(2012) 571 final.
([2]) JO L 289 de 7.11.2003.
([3]) JO L 176 de 6.7.2007.
([4]) JO L 223 de 15.8.2006.
([5]) COM(2011) 804 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002596/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: Regional and EU-wide benefits of the Azores' rich fishery resources

In a visit to the Azores archipelago, the Commissioner for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries highlighted the need to take advantage of the region's plentiful supply of high quality fish.

1. How can the regional economy take greater advantage of this exceptionally high quality resource? What measures has the Commission taken or will it take in this regard, particularly in view of the aim to produce goods locally and export them?

2. How can EU citizens and companies benefit from the quantity and quality of Azorean fish?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2013)

The regional economy of the Azores is now benefitting better from fish resources around the isles. But, the contribution of fishing to the general economy can still be improved by the following:

— Improved fish stock management. Most of the high quality fish produced in Azores is deep-water fish. The reform of the common fisheries policy (CFP) and the Commission proposal on the management of deep-water fish ([1]), currently being examined by the European Parliament, are important contributions to that goal.

— A regime of access to fishing grounds for local fleets exclusively within 100 miles from the baselines of the isles guaranteed by Regulation No 1954/2003 ([2]) and continued in the CFP reform.

— Public aid to the fishing sector to compensate for extra costs from the remoteness of the isles and to improve the hygiene and quality of fish products, their processing and their marketing, as foreseen in Regulation No 791/2007 ([3]) and Regulation No 1198/2006 ([4]).

— Continuation of these measures with 100% funding, in an improved form, in the proposal for a European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) ([5]). Furthermore the fund includes an increased aid intensity compared to other regions in the continent: the private contribution of Azorean beneficiaries is only to 15% of the total budget of the operations for measures such as innovation, business advisory services, training, investments to improve product quality and marketing measures.

As a fair proportion of fish production of the Azores, including canned products, targets markets of continental Europe, and these products continue to be of high quality and obtained in conditions of sustainability, the EU citizen will undoubtedly benefit.

([1]) COM(2012)371final.
([2]) OJ L 289, 7.11.2003.
([3]) OJ L 176, 6.7.2007.
([4]) OJ L 223, 15.8.2006.
([5]) COM(2011)804 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002597/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Aeroportos — Loja do Passaporte — melhores práticas

O Aeroporto de Lisboa é o primeiro da Europa a contar com a Loja do Passaporte, balcão onde o cidadão pode requerer este documento. Segundo o diretor do Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras de Portugal (SEF) esta medida permitirá «agilizar e facilitar a vida de todos aqueles que pretendam viajar e queiram ter acesso a um passaporte».

A inclusão desta loja na área pública de uma aerogare, localizada na aérea das partidas internacionais, representa uma mais-valia, na perspetiva do serviço aos cidadãos.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Como avalia esta medida, nomeadamente do ponto de vista dos cidadãos e da sua mobilidade?

2. Considera que a mesma configura um caso de melhores práticas e que deveria ou poderia ser seguida pelos demais Estados-Membros?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(3 de maio de 2013)

De acordo com o direito da UE ([1]), os Estados-Membros são obrigados, nos termos da respetiva legislação, a emitir ou renovar aos seus nacionais um bilhete de identidade ou passaporte. Estes documentos podem ser utilizados como documentos de viagem no interior da UE.

Os procedimentos nacionais com vista à emissão de documentos de viagem são da responsabilidade dos Estados-Membros.

As medidas destinadas a facilitar a mobilidade no interior da UE são, em princípio, acolhidas com agrado.

([1]) Artigo 4.°, n.° 3, da Diretiva 2004/38/CE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002597/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: Airports: passport shop — best practice

Lisbon Airport is the first in Europe to feature a passport shop, a counter where citizens can apply for this document. According to the director of Portugal's Foreign Nationals and Border Service (SEF), this measure 'will make life easier for all those who intend to travel and want to get a passport'.

This shop, which is located in the public concourse of the airport's international departures terminal, provides an additional service to citizens.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of this measure, particularly as regards citizens' mobility?

2. Does it believe that it sets an example of best practice which should or could be followed by the other Member States?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2013)

According to EC law ([1]), Member States are obliged, acting in accordance with their laws, to issue to their own nationals, and renew, an identity card or passport. These documents can be used as travel documents within the EU.

National procedures for issuance of travel documents fall within the responsibility of Member States.

Measures aiming at making intra-EU mobility easier are in principle welcome.

([1]) Article 4(3) of Directive 2004/38/EC.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002598/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Irão — negação de acesso à base militar de Parchin

O Irão rejeitou recentemente o pedido da Agência Internacional de Energia Atómica para que lhe fosse dado acesso à base militar de Parchin.

Assim, pergunto à Alta Representante:

1. Tem conhecimento deste facto?

2. Contactou as autoridades iranianas a seu respeito?

3. Que respostas obteve?

4. Como avalia o atual estado do programa nuclear iraniano e a sua potencial apetência para produzir energia atómica com fins militares?

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

A questão nuclear iraniana permanece um dos problemas internacionais mais urgentes, contando-se entre as prioridades da Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente.

A falta de evolução na cooperação do Irão com a AIEA tem sido abordada regularmente nos contactos da Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente com o Irão. O Irão tem de cooperar com a AIEA para resolver todas as questões pendentes, incluindo as que apontam para uma possível dimensão militar do programa nuclear iraniano.

A atual expansão das atividades nucleares do Irão viola claramente as obrigações internacionais existentes. A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente, juntamente com os países E3+3, empreende esforços diplomáticos intensivos para encontrar uma solução negociada para a questão nuclear iraniana que permita restabelecer a confiança no caráter exclusivamente pacífico do programa nuclear iraniano.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002598/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Iran: IAEA denied access to the Parchin military base

Iran recently rejected the International Atomic Energy Agency's request for access to the Parchin military base.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this fact?

2. Has she contacted the Iranian authorities on this matter?

3. What answers has she received?

4. How does she assess the current state of Iran's nuclear programme and its potential desire to produce atomic energy for military purposes?

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

The Iranian nuclear issue remains one of the most urgent international problems and among the priorities of the HR/VP.

Iran's lack of progress in the cooperation with the IAEA has been regularly addressed by the HR/VP with Iran. Iran needs to cooperate with the IAEA to resolve all outstanding issues, including those pointing to a possible military dimension of the Iranian nuclear programme.

Iran's ongoing expansion of its nuclear activities is in clear violation of existing international obligations. The HR/VP, together with the E3+3 countries is engaged in intensive diplomatic efforts to find a negotiated solution on the Iranian nuclear issue that would restore confidence in the exclusive peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002599/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Populismo na União Europeia

O Movimento 5 Estrelas, liderado pelo comediante Beppe Grillo, que fez assentar toda a sua campanha numa retórica antipartidos e antiparlamentar, obteve um resultado significativo nas últimas eleições italianas.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Como avalia esta situação?

2. Tem conhecimento de situações semelhantes noutros Estados-Membros?

3. Que medidas tomou ou crê devem ser tomadas para procurar evitar o alastramento do populismo de pendor antidemocrático aos demais Estados-Membros?

4. Quais são os riscos que podem advir do seu eventual prevalecimento eleitoral?

Resposta dada por José Manuel Barroso em nome da Comissão
(25 de abril de 2013)

A Comissão Europeia não faz apreciações políticas sobre os resultados das eleições nos Estados-Membros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002599/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: Populism in the European Union

The Five Star Movement, led by comedian Beppe Grillo, who has built his entire campaign on anti-party and anti-parliamentary rhetoric, gained a significant result in the recent Italian elections.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of this situation?

2. Is it aware of similar situations in the other Member States?

3. What measures has it taken or does it believe should be taken to try and prevent the spread of anti-democratic populism to the other Member States?

4. What are the potential risks of an election victory for this movement?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2013)

The European Commission does not make political judgments on election outcomes in Member States.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002600/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Guiné-Bissau — abate de florestas

Notícias recentes dão conta que no sul da Guiné-Bissau, na região de Quinara, têm vindo a dar-se abates excessivos de florestas por parte de empresas madeireiras.

O secretário de Estado da Segurança e Ordem Pública do Governo de transição da Guiné-Bissau declarou estar preocupado com esta situação.

Teme-se que a exploração excessiva dos recursos florestais da Guiné-Bissau depaupere ainda mais este país e ponha em causa a sustentabilidade quer das populações quer dos ecossistemas diretamente afetados por aquela exploração.

Assim, pergunto à Alta Representante:

1. Tem conhecimento desta situação? Como a avalia?

2. Estaria disponível para promover junto das autoridades de transição e das futuras autoridades democráticas do país uma maior consciencialização para as questões ambientais?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(13 de maio de 2013)

1. A Comissão tem conhecimento desta situação, que é acompanhada de perto pela delegação da UE em Bissau. Nas últimas semanas, as populações locais das regiões de Quinara e Tombali manifestaram abertamente a sua indignação pelas operações irresponsáveis de desflorestação realizadas nos últimos meses por empresas estrangeiras, a coberto de licenças alegadamente concedidas pelas atuais autoridades de transição. Esta situação conduziu a ações diretas para impedir a continuação da exploração madeireira, bem como a um bloqueio de diversos contentores destinados a exportação no porto de Bissau. É crescente a indignação pública perante a atual exploração selvagem dos recursos naturais da Guiné-Bissau, tanto florestais como minerais ou pesqueiros, e as respostas das autoridades não têm sido claras a este propósito.

2. A Comissão atribui uma grande importância às questões ambientais, uma vez que a gestão sustentável dos recursos naturais e a proteção da biodiversidade representam setores essenciais para as políticas de desenvolvimento e ambientais da UE (quase 8 milhões de euros geridos na Guiné-Bissau).

Na Guiné-Bissau, o apoio específico proporcionado pela UE no domínio ambiental visa em especial:

A gestão sustentável dos recursos florestais (Parque Natural de Tarrafes-de-Cacheu);

A gestão sustentável dos sistemas das áreas protegidas (Parque de Cantanhez) e da biosfera do Arquipélago de Bijagós (áreas protegidas de Urok, Orango, Bubaque e João Vieira);

A proteção das espécies selvagens ameaçadas, como os chimpanzés e os peixes-serra, e a gestão sustentável dos recursos marinhos na eco região marinha da África Ocidental — WAMER.

É importante sublinhar que, graças ao envolvimento decidido da UE, em colaboração com as comunidades locais, não foi feito qualquer abate florestal, até à data, no interior das zonas protegidas do país.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002600/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Guinea-Bissau: logging

According to recent reports, logging companies have been overexploiting forests in the Quinara region of southern Guinea-Bissau.

The Secretary of State for Public Order and Security, a member of Guinea-Bissau's interim government, has expressed concern about this situation.

It is feared that the overexploitation of Guinea Bissau's forestry resources will further impoverish the country and will jeopardise the sustainability of the populations and ecosystems directly affected by this logging.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this situation? What is her assessment of it?

2. Would she be willing to promote greater awareness of environmental issues, alongside the country's interim and future democratic authorities?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(13 May 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of this situation, which is closely followed by the EU Delegation in Bissau. In the last weeks, local populations in the regions of Quinará and Tombali have openly expressed their anger at reckless deforestation practices carried out in the last months by foreign companies, under licences apparently granted by the current transitional authorities. This has led to direct actions to prevent the continuation of logging operations, as well as a blockade of a number of containers ready for export in the port of Bissau. Public outrage at the ongoing wild exploitation of Guinea-Bissau's natural resources, be it timber, minerals or fisheries, is mounting, whilst authorities are not providing clear answers.

2. The Commission attaches great importance to environmental issues, as sustainable management of natural resources and biodiversity protection represent key sectors for the EU's development and environmental policies (almost EUR 8 million managed in Guinea-Bissau).

In Guinea Bissau, the specific support provided by the EU for environmental issues targets especially:

— Sustainable management of forest resources (Tarrafes-de-Cacheu Natural Park);

— Sustainable management of protected areas systems (Cantanhez Park) and the Biosphere of Bijagos Archipelago (Urok, Orango, Bubaque and Joao Vieira protected areas);

— Protection of endangered wild species such as chimpanzees and sawfish, and sustainable management of marine resources in the West Africa marine ecoregion — WAMER.

It is important to highlight that, thanks to the strong involvement of the EU alongside the local communities, no logging has been done, to date, inside the protected areas of the country.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002601/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de março de 2013)

Assunto: Sistema de codificação de cores «ColorADD»

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-003106/2012, o senhor Comissário John Dalli declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «A Comissão não tem conhecimento do sistema de codificação de cores "ColorADD" e não tem experiência de aplicação do mesmo. Consequentemente, não pode avaliar se a inclusão de um tal sistema de codificação de cores constituiria uma melhoria significativa da qualidade de vida dos daltónicos e não considera a adoção do código "ColorADD" para uso interno.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Está disponível para conhecer o referido sistema, avaliar se a inclusão de um tal sistema de codificação de cores constituiria uma melhoria significativa da qualidade de vida dos daltónicos e considerar a adoção do código «ColorADD» para uso interno?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(22 de maio de 2013)

Os serviços da Comissão que lidam com a Internet e os meios de comunicação social já tiveram ocasião de proceder a uma troca de pontos de vista preliminar no que se refere ao sistema «*ColorAdd*». A Comissão gostaria de receber mais informações sobre o sistema de codificação de cores «*ColorAdd*».

A Comissão Europeia tem muito seriamente em conta a acessibilidade à Internet por parte das pessoas com deficiência, incluindo os deficientes visuais, e possui normas e orientações em vigor nesta matéria, que são obrigatórias para todos os sítios web Europa. As orientações em matéria de acessibilidade web estão disponíveis em http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/standards/accessibility/index_en.htm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002601/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: 'ColorADD' colour coding system

In answer to my written question E-003106/2012, Commissioner John Dalli, on behalf of the Commission, said that 'The Commission is not aware of the colour coding system "Code ColorAdd", and does not have experience with the applications of the system. The Commission cannot therefore judge whether or not the inclusion of such a colour coding system would make a significant improvement in the quality of life of colour-blind people. The Commission is not considering adopting the "Code colorADD" system for internal use.'

Is the Commission prepared to become familiar with this system, to judge whether or not the inclusion of such a colour coding system would make a significant improvement to the quality of life of colour-blind people and to consider adopting the 'ColorADD' code for internal use?

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

The Commission services dealing with the web and social media have already had a preliminary exchange of views with ColorAdd. The Commission would be pleased to receive further information on the 'Code ColorAdd' system.

The European Commission takes web accessibility for persons with disabilities, including visually impaired people, very seriously and has internal standards and guidelines in place in this regard which are mandatory for all Europa websites. The guidelines for web accessibility are available at:
http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/standards/accessibility/index_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002602/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — África do Sul — violência policial

Oito agentes da polícia sul-africana torturaram e mataram, no passado dia 27 de fevereiro, um motorista de táxi de nacionalidade moçambicana depois de uma alegada discussão sobre estacionamento numa praça de táxis nos arredores de Joanesburgo.

Os agentes de segurança algemaram o motorista na parte traseira de uma viatura da polícia, que foi arrastado pelas ruas de Daveyton.

Este incidente não é o primeiro envolvendo as forças de segurança sul-africanas e cidadãos moçambicanos.

Assim, pergunto à Alta Representante:

1. Tem conhecimento deste facto lamentável?

2. Dispõe de informações acerca de atos de violência desproporcionada praticados pela polícia sul-africana, nomeadamente contra cidadãos moçambicanos?

3. Este tipo de ações arriscam pôr em causa a paz e a estabilidade das relações entre os dois países?

4. Não considera que, no quadro das suas relações privilegiadas com a África do Sul, a União Europeia deveria procurar influenciar uma reforma do seu setor policial que tivesse no respeito pelos direitos humanos um dos seus principais pilares?

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

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente está ciente do deplorável incidente em Daveyton de que resultou a morte do taxista moçambicano Mido Macai. O Ministro sul-africano das Relações Internacionais, Nkoana Mashabane, deslocou-se a Moçambique em 5 de março para apresentar ao Presidente Guebuza uma mensagem de condolências e um pedido formal de desculpas.

No Dia Nacional dos Direitos Humanos, a 21 de março, o Presidente Zuma reafirmou o seu forte empenhamento em melhorar a conduta das forças policiais, nomeadamente pela observância mais estrita do código de conduta do Serviço de Polícia. O Presidente reconheceu a ocorrência de incidentes inaceitáveis com as forças da ordem, designadamente a tragédia de Marikana e outros casos de brutalidade policial no tratamento de suspeitos.

O Governo sul-africano suspendeu os agentes envolvidos e está em curso uma investigação criminal.

A conduta brutal da polícia ao lidar com os cidadãos, tanto estrangeiros como sul-africanos, é um problema crítico que o Governo sul-africano está a procurar resolver, como prevê expressamente o plano de desenvolvimento nacional. Este plano contém recomendações específicas para melhorar a segurança das comunidades locais, designadamente a profissionalização e desmilitarização do serviço de polícia e a sua dotação com pessoal especializado e bem treinado. Esta reforma deverá acompanhar-se de medidas para fazer cumprir o código de ética policial e da criação de um órgão regulador que defina as normas de conduta.

A UE apoia a determinação do Governo sul-africano em resolver este problema. No quadro da Parceria Estratégica UE-África do Sul, a UE mantém um diálogo político regular com Pretória, do qual fazem parte os direitos humanos. A UE irá continuar a aproveitar todas as oportunidades para advogar a consolidação dos passos já dados para combater as causas profundas da violência na sociedade sul-africana.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002602/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — South Africa: police violence

On 27 February 2013 eight South African police officers tortured and killed a Mozambican taxi driver after an alleged argument about parking in a taxi rank on the outskirts of Johannesburg.

The officers handcuffed the driver to the back of a police van and dragged him through the streets of Daveyton.

This is not the first incident involving the South African police and Mozambican citizens.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this regrettable fact?

2. Does she have information on disproportionate acts of violence committed by the South African police, particularly against Mozambican citizens?

3. Do such actions jeopardise peace and stability in relations between the two countries?

4. Given its special relations with South Africa, does she not believe that the EU should seek to influence police reform in the country, with respect for human rights as one of its main pillars?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the deplorable incident that resulted in the death of the Mozambican taxi-driver Mido Macai in Daveyton. South African Minister of International relations Nkoana Mashabane travelled to Mozambique on 5 March to present a message of condolences and formal apologies to President Guebuza.

President Zuma, on National Human Rights Day on 21 March reaffirmed a strong commitment in reforming police behaviour also through a more strict respect of the South African Police Service code of conduct. He acknowledged some unacceptable incidents involving the South African Police Service including the Marikana tragedy and other cases of police brutality against suspects.

In the meanwhile the Government has suspended the police officers involved and criminal investigations are underway.

Brutal police conduct vis à vis both foreigners and South African citizens is a critical issue that the South African Government is trying to address as clearly stated in the National Development Plan. The Plan endorsed by the Government makes specific recommendations for building safer communities, including through a more professional and demilitarised police service with highly trained and skilled personnel. Enforcing the police code of ethics combined with a standard setting body should complement these reform efforts.

The EU is supporting the determination of the South African Government in this respect. In the framework of the EU-South Africa Strategic Partnership, the EU is involved in a close political dialogue with Pretoria, which encompasses human rights. The EU will continue to use every opportunity to advocate for a consolidation of progress made against the underlying causes of violence in South Africa's society.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002603/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Crime organizado na África Ocidental — problemas e respostas

O UNODC divulgou recentemente o relatório «Transnational Organized Crime in West Africa: a Threat Assessment» no qual faz uma avaliação da ameaça que os mercados ilegais transnacionais representam para o desenvolvimento da África Ocidental. O relatório incide sobre 16 nações da África Ocidental com baixos índices de desenvolvimento, num território que compreende cerca de 325 milhões de pessoas.

As avaliações realizadas pelo UNODC revelam que o crime organizado transnacional representa uma ameaça para a estabilidade e desenvolvimento da região. O setor mais preocupante diz respeito ao tráfico de cocaína. Acrescem a este o contrabando de combustíveis, o tráfico de armas, o tráfico de seres humanos, de medicamentos contrafeitos e a pirataria.

O estudo conclui que os grupos criminosos da África Ocidental são cada vez mais autónomos dependendo cada vez menos das organizações da América do Sul.

Assim, pergunto à Alta Representante:

1. Tem conhecimento deste relatório?

2. Que apreciação faz do mesmo?

3. Como avalia as principais soluções para o problema que preconiza?

4. Em que medida está a União Europeia disponível para contribuir para uma resposta internacional duradoura e eficaz a este problema?

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

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente tem conhecimento do relatório do GDC (Gabinete para a Droga e a Criminalidade da ONU). A UE trabalha em estreita colaboração com o GDC e outros parceiros internacionais para combater a criminalidade transnacional na África Ocidental.

A UE partilha a opinião de que a criminalidade transnacional, e, em especial, o aumento significativo do tráfico de droga, constituem uma ameaça direta para a paz e a estabilidade na região. Estas atividades geram corrupção e, em última análise, minam as economias da região. Há provas de que o tráfico de droga na região está estreitamente ligado à instabilidade política e à violência.

A AR/VP partilha o ponto de vista de que têm de ser tomadas medidas dirigidas não só ao próprio tráfico, como também às deficiências estruturais, em especial no domínio da boa governação e do Estado de direito. A luta contra a criminalidade transnacional organizada tem de ser levada a cabo em estreita coordenação com outros parceiros internacionais, garantindo simultaneamente a sua plena apropriação pela região.

A UE é o maior contribuinte para o plano de ação regional da Comunidade Económica dos Estados da África Ocidental (Cedeao), que visa enfrentar o problema crescente do tráfico ilícito de estupefacientes, da criminalidade organizada e da toxicodependência na África Ocidental. Trata-se de um projeto importante, financiado pelo 10.° Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento (FED) em apoio ao plano de ação regional da Cedeao, destinado a combater o problema crescente do tráfico ilícito de estupefacientes, a criminalidade organizada, a toxicodependência na África Ocidental e o branqueamento de capitais. Além disso, a UE está a financiar o programa «rota da cocaína» ao abrigo do Instrumento de Estabilidade, que se destina, nomeadamente, a reforçar as capacidades de luta contra a droga em determinados aeroportos e portos marítimos da África Ocidental. Além disso, no âmbito dos 9.° e 10.° FED, a UE está a financiar diversos projetos de luta contra a droga em vários países da África Ocidental.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002603/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Organised crime in West Africa: problems and solutions

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) recently published a report entitled 'Organised Crime in West Africa: a Threat Assessment' which assesses the threat that transnational illegal markets pose to West African development. The report focuses on 16 West African nations with low levels of development, in an area encompassing around 325 million people.

The evaluations carried out by UNODC show that transnational organised crime poses a threat to the region's stability and development. The most worrying activity is cocaine trafficking. Other activities include fuel smuggling, arms trafficking, the trafficking of human beings and counterfeit medicines and piracy.

The study concludes that West African criminal groups are becoming increasingly independent and increasingly less dependent on South American organisations.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this report?

2. What is her assessment of it?

3. What is her view on the main solutions to the problem recommended by the report?

4. To what extent is the EU prepared to contribute towards a sustainable and effective international solution to this problem?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the UNODC report. The EU works closely with UNODC and other international partners to fight transnational crime in West Africa.

The EU shares the opinion that transnational crime, and in particular the significant increase in drug traffic, constitute a direct threat to peace and stability in the region. These illegal activies generate corruption and ultimately undermine the economies of the region. There is evidence in the region that drug trafficking is closely linked to political instability and violence

The HR/VP shares the view that measures need to target traffic itself but also structural shortcomings in particular in the area of good governance and the rule of law. Action in the fight against transnational organised crime needs to be undertaken in close coordination with other international partners while ensuring full ownership by the region.

The EU is the largest contributor to the Economic Community of West African States (Ecowas) regional action plan addressing the growing problem of illicit drug trafficking, organised crime and drug abuse in West Africa. This is a major project, funded under the 10th European Development Fund (EDF) in support to the Ecowas Regional Action Plan to address the growing problem of illicit drug trafficking, organised crime and drug abuse in West Africa, and the fight against money laundering. In addition, the EU is funding the 'Cocaine Route Programme' under the Instrument for Stability which aims *inter alia* to strengthen the anti-drugs capacities at selected airports and seaports in West Africa. Furthermore, the EU is funding, under the 9th and 10th EDF, several anti-drugs projects in various West African countries.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002604/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 de março de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Ucrânia — Reformas no setor judicial

No passado dia 25 de fevereiro, a União Europeia e os Estados-Membros exigiram à Ucrânia reformas na área da Justiça.

Assim, pergunto à Alta Representante:

1. Quais são os principais problemas que o setor judicial ucraniano apresenta?

2. Tem conhecimento de desenvolvimentos preliminares quanto a esta questão?

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

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente continua preocupada com as condenações por motivos políticos de membros do anterior governo na sequência de julgamentos que não respeitaram as normas internacionais no que diz respeito a um processo justo, transparente e independente. A UE espera que as autoridades examinem sem demora os casos de condenações por motivos políticos e que tomem novas medidas para reformar o sistema judicial a fim de evitar que tal volte a acontecer.

Foram tomadas várias medidas com vista à reforma do sistema judicial, nomeadamente a entrada em vigor de um novo Código de Processo Penal e da nova legislação relativa à Ordem dos Advogados. Contudo, é necessário que se tomem medidas adicionais no âmbito da reforma judicial, nomeadamente uma análise exaustiva, em estreita consulta com o Conselho da Europa/Comissão de Veneza, da lei sobre o funcionamento do Ministério Público, do Código Penal, do papel do Conselho Superior de Justiça, das leis do sistema judicial e o estatuto dos juízes, bem como a reforma da polícia. De modo a facilitar os progressos realizados pela Ucrânia nestas matérias, foi lançado um diálogo informal sobre o sistema judicial entre a UE (em conjunto com o Conselho da Europa) e a Ucrânia em 6 de fevereiro de 2013 em Kiev.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002604/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Ukraine: reforms in the justice sector

On 25 February 2013, the European Union and its Member States demanded that Ukraine implement reforms in its justice sector.

1. What are the main problems with the Ukrainian justice sector?

2. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of any preliminary developments in this regard?

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

The HR/VP remains concerned regarding the politically motivated convictions of members of the former Government after trials which did not respect international standards as regards fair, transparent and independent legal process. The EU expects the authorities to address the cases of politically motivated convictions without delay as well as to take further steps to reform the judiciary to prevent any recurrence.

A number of steps have been taken in the reform of the judiciary, notably the entry into force of a new Criminal Procedure Code, the new legislation on the Bar. However, further steps on judicial reform are needed, including a comprehensive review in close consultation with the Council of Europe/Venice Commission of the law on the functioning of the Prosecutor's Office, of the Criminal Code, of the role of the High Council of Justice, of the laws on the Judicial System and the Status of Judges as well as a reform of the Police. To facilitate Ukraine's progress on these matters, an informal dialogue on the judiciary was launched between the EU (together with Council of Europe) and Ukraine on 6 February 2013 in Kyiv.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002605/13
to the Commission
Fiona Hall (ALDE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: UK VAT court case

On 21 February 2013, the Commission referred the United Kingdom to the EU Court of Justice over its reduced VAT rate on the supply and installation of energy-saving materials. According to the Commission, this national policy is not compatible with the existing VAT Directive, which allows reduced VAT rates only if they form part of a social policy of a Member State.

In taking the UK Government to court, one of the arguments given by the Commission was that the 5% reduced rate is not being passed on to consumers in the form of lower prices. What is the precise evidence which leads the Commission to this conclusion?

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

The European Commission has decided to refer the United Kingdom to the EU Court of Justice for its reduced VAT rate on the supply and installation of energy-saving materials, because this measure is not in conformity with Articles 96 to 98 and Annex III of the VAT Directive which was agreed by the unanimity of Member States.

This decision has been taken on those legal grounds and the question of whether the 5% reduced rate is being passed on to consumers in the form of lower prices or not, is not an argument which can be taken into consideration in this respect and is in any event irrelevant for the decision taken by the Commission.

Besides the formal legal arguments, the Commission made some comments in the Press Release from an economic point of view. In particular, it mentioned that economic studies have shown that reduced VAT rates are often not the best way of achieving policy objectives or changing consumer choices and that it has been frequently shown that reduced rates are not fully passed on to consumers in the form of lower prices.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002606/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 de marzo de 2013)

Asunto: Productos financieros del Banco Sabadell que especulan sobre los precios de los alimentos

Diversos Estados miembros, como Dinamarca, Alemania, el Reino Unido o Austria, han obligado a sus bancos a retirar de las carteras de productos de las entidades financieras aquellos que permiten a los inversores especular sobre los precios de los alimentos. 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 (MoU) 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. En el MoU el Banco Sabadell se encuentra dentro del grupo 0 de los bancos ya que no requiere capital adicional, pero es uno de los bancos que continúa especulando con los precios de los alimentos en el mercado financiero.

Visto el papel que adquiriría el BCE en la supervisión de entidades de importancia sistémica para el sistema financiero europeo en el marco del supervisor bancario único y dada la importancia sistémica del Banco Sabadell y su responsabilidad social corporativa, ¿considera la Comisión que el Banco Sabadell debería eliminar su Fondo de Inversión de BS Commodities? En la propuesta de supervisor bancario único, ¿podrá limitar el BCE la creación de estos fondos?

Considerando que la Comisión sigue atentamente el proceso de reestructuración de la regulación del sistema financiero español, ¿piensa recomendar a España que limite la capacidad de sus bancos de especular con «commodities»? ¿Considera que el Banco de España actualmente y el supervisor bancario único en el futuro deben instar directamente al Banco Sabadell a retirar el fondo BS Commodities de su oferta comercial?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de mayo de 2013)

La Comisión considera muy prioritaria la necesidad de tratar la excesiva volatilidad de los precios en los mercados mundiales de productos básicos. Sus inquietudes no se limitan al caso de España ni están centradas en él, sino que se extienden a las actividades financieras que tienen lugar en todos los Estados miembros.

En su Comunicación de febrero de 2011 ([1]), la Comisión pidió que se adoptaran nuevas medidas para mejorar la integridad y la transparencia en estos mercados. En sintonía con los compromisos del G20, la Comisión ha lanzado una serie de iniciativas legislativas destinadas a aumentar la integridad y la transparencia de los mercados de derivados de productos básicos.

Entre estas iniciativas figuran propuestas para aclarar los tipos de negociación en los mercados de productos básicos que constituyen abuso de mercado ([2]), así como propuestas para exigir que la negociación de contratos de derivados de productos básicos se realice exclusivamente en centros de negociación regulados, que estas actividades de negociación sean transparentes y que se realice una supervisión más amplia de las posiciones de los derivados de productos básicos, incluida la imposición de límites de posición por los actores del mercado ([3]).

El texto transaccional (definitivo) del Reglamento del Consejo que atribuye funciones específicas al Banco Central Europeo en lo que respecta a las medidas relativas a la supervisión prudencial de las entidades de crédito confiará al BCE tareas y poderes fundamentales de supervisión prudencial para controlar los riesgos para la viabilidad de los bancos y exigirles que tomen las medidas correctoras necesarias. Sin embargo, las funciones pertenecientes al ámbito de la protección de los consumidores seguirán siendo responsabilidad de las autoridades nacionales competentes.

([1]) Abordar los retos de los mercados de productos básicos y de las materias primas, febrero de 2011, COM(2011) 25 final.

([2]) Propuesta de Reglamento sobre las operaciones con información privilegiada y la manipulación del mercado (abuso de mercado), COM(2011) 651 final, y propuesta de 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 propuesta de 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.

Además de todo esto, en el Memorándum de Entendimiento que menciona Su Señoría se establece que las autoridades deben reforzar los procedimientos de supervisión españoles. Las autoridades españolas han mejorado ya este marco en algunos ámbitos y trabajan actualmente en otros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002606/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 March 2013)

Subject: Banco Sabadell financial products which speculate on food prices

Several Member States, including Denmark, Germany, the United Kingdom and Austria, have obliged banks based in those countries to withdraw products which allow investors to speculate on food prices. 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 food price volatility and has devastating effects on hunger and poverty.

Following the signature of the memorandum of understanding (MoU) 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 MoU places Banco Sabadell in Group 0, which comprises the banks that do not require any additional capital, but this bank is one of a number that continue to speculate on food prices on the financial market.

Considering that as part of its planned role as single banking supervisor the ECB would acquire powers for supervising banks which have systemic relevance to the European financial sector, and given Banco Sabadell's systemic relevance and its corporate social responsibility, does the Commission agree that Banco Sabadell should withdraw its BS Commodities Investment Fund? Under the proposal for a single banking supervisor, will the ECB have the power to restrict the setting-up of these funds?

The Commission is closely following the restructuring of the Spanish financial system. Does it intend to recommend that Spain limit its banks' ability to speculate on commodities? Does the Commission agree that the Bank of Spain should now urge Banco Sabadell to withdraw the BS Commodities fund from its range of products, and that the single banking supervisor should do the same in the future?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 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 and are not limited to nor focused on the case of 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.

These include 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 ([3]).

The (final) compromise text of the Council Regulation conferring specific tasks on the European Central Bank concerning policies relating to the prudential supervision of credit institutions will entrust the ECB with key prudential supervisory tasks and powers in order to oversee risks for banks' viability and require them to take the necessary remedial action. Tasks in the area of consumer protection will however remain the responsibility of national competent authorities.

([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 regulation 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 directive on markets in financial instruments and amending Regulation [EMIR] on OTC derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories, COM(2011) 652 final, 20.10.2011.

In addition to this, the MoU mentioned by the Honourable Member establishes that the authorities had to strengthen the Spanish supervisory procedures. The Spanish authorities have improved this framework in some areas and they are currently working on some others.