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 192 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

E-000312/12 by Marian-Jean Marinescu to the Commission
Subject: Single European Sky Implementing Rules on Aircraft Identification and Surveillance Performance
Versiunea în limba română 13
Suomenkielinen versio 15
English version 17

E-012452/11 by Eija-Riitta Korhola to the Commission
Subject: Single European Sky implementing rules on aircraft identification and surveillance performance
Suomenkielinen versio 15
English version 17

E-012513/11 by Johannes Cornelis van Baalen to the Commission
Subject: Blocking of NATO membership for Macedonia
Nederlandse versie 19
English version 21

E-000025/12 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: The issue of Macedonia
Nederlandse versie 19
Slovenské znenie 20
English version 21

E-012644/11 by Dan Jørgensen to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the EU Timber Regulation (EUTR)
Dansk udgave 22
English version 24

E-012655/11 by Georgios Papanikolaou and Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Priority projects in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση 26
English version 27

E-012660/11 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: New arrests by the Israeli occupations forces since release of the first 477 political prisoners
Version française 28
English version 29

P-012686/11 by Maria Eleni Koppa to the Commission
Subject: Revealing statements by the former Turkish Prime Minister, Mr Yilmaz
Ελληνική έκδοση 30
English version 31

E-000036/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Revelations by Mesut Yilmaz concerning arson attacks on Greek forests and coup in Azerbaijan
Ελληνική έκδοση 30
English version 31

E-004381/12 by Vilija Blinkevičiūtė to the Commission
Subject: Combating telephone fraud and compulsory SIM card registration
Tekstas lietuvių kalba 32
English version 33

E-004382/12 by Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė to the Commission
Subject: Reducing the amount of landfilled waste
Tekstas lietuvių kalba 34
English version 35

E-004383/12 by Mariya Nedelcheva to the Commission
Subject: Support for the beekeeping sector at a time of crisis
българска версия 36
English version 37

E-004385/12 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: Administrative burden in the hospitality industry
Deutsche Fassung 38
English version 40

E-004388/12 by Raimon Obiols to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Hunger strike by Palestinian prisoners in Israel
Versión española 42
English version 43

E-004389/12 by Jürgen Creutzmann to the Commission
Subject: Restricted utilisation of the OPAL gas transmission line due to EU requirements
Deutsche Fassung 44
English version 46

E-004390/12 by Dimitar Stoyanov to the Commission
Subject: Patients' rights violations
българска версия 47
English version 48

E-004391/12 by Dimitar Stoyanov to the Commission
Subject: Control over online commerce
българска версия 49
English version 50

E-004392/12 by Mojca Kleva, Tanja Fajon, Romana Jordan, Zofija Mazej Kukovič, Jelko Kacin, Alojz Peterle, Ivo Vajgl and Milan Zver to the Commission
Subject: Ensuring multilingualism in communication with European citizens
Slovenska različica 51
English version 52

E-004393/12 by Petru Constantin Luhan to the Commission
Subject: Glycerine recovery
Versiunea în limba română 53
English version 54

E-004395/12 by Georgios Papastamkos to the Commission
Subject: Public investments and the economic crisis
Ελληνική έκδοση 55
English version 57

E-004396/12 by Georgios Papastamkos to the Commission
Subject: SME financing
Ελληνική έκδοση 58
English version 60

E-004397/12 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Court rules against residence permit charges in the Netherlands
Nederlandse versie 61
English version 62

E-004398/12 by Claudio Morganti to the Commission
Subject: Prospect of abandoning the euro
Versione italiana 63
English version 64

E-004399/12 by Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou to the Commission
Subject: Appeal by European leaders for growth
Ελληνική έκδοση 65
English version 66

E-004400/12 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: European Court of Justice (ECJ) judgment: special rights for Turkish immigrants
Deutsche Fassung 67
English version 68

E-004401/12 by Monica Luisa Macovei to the Commission
Subject: Investigations into official complaints concerning illegal state aid in Romania
Versiunea în limba română 69
English version 70

E-004402/12 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Trade bans on sheepmeat
Versiunea în limba română 71
English version 72

E-004403/12 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Switzerland's availing of the safeguard clause in the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons
Versiunea în limba română 73
English version 74

E-004404/12 by Franck Proust to the Commission
Subject: Europe in schools
Version française 75
English version 76

E-004406/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Spanish Government's delay in drawing up and adopting river basin management plans
Versión española 77
English version 78

E-004407/12 by Mikael Gustafsson to the Commission
Subject: Mutual recognition of qualifications for pharmacists
Svensk version 79
English version 80

E-004408/12 by Jarosław Kalinowski to the Commission
Subject: Poverty in the EU
Wersja polska 81
English version 82

E-004409/12 by Sergej Kozlík to the Commission
Subject: Air transport
Slovenské znenie ... 83
English version ... 84

E-004411/12 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission
Subject: Climate change experts
Versiunea în limba română ... 85
English version ... 86

E-004412/12 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission
Subject: Rights of cross-border workers
Versiunea în limba română ... 87
English version ... 88

P-004414/12 by Jens Rohde to the Commission
Subject: Residence Directive
Dansk udgave ... 89
English version ... 90

E-004415/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Auditing and accountability of pre-accession funding for Croatia
English version ... 91

E-004416/12 by James Nicholson to the Commission
Subject: Air passenger rights
English version ... 92

E-004417/12 by James Nicholson to the Commission
Subject: Work by the Commission to minimise area aid disallowances
English version ... 93

E-004418/12 by James Nicholson to the Commission
Subject: Work by the Commission to promote succession planning in fisheries
English version ... 94

E-004419/12 by James Nicholson to the Commission
Subject: Drawdown of FP7 funding
English version ... 95

E-004420/12 by James Nicholson to the Commission
Subject: Measuring the success of Commission proposals for 'greening' Pillar I of the CAP
English version ... 96

E-004422/12 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: Amendments to Council Regulation (EC) No 1185/2003 on the removal of fins of sharks on board vessels
Versão portuguesa ... 97
English version ... 98

E-004423/12 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion — Increase in poverty, social exclusion and inequalities
Versão portuguesa ... 99
English version ... 100

E-004424/12 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: The fight against malaria — developments and needs
Versão portuguesa ... 101
English version ... 102

E-004425/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Mortgage arrangements for over-indebted households
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 103
English version ... 104

E-004426/12 by Philip Claeys to the Commission
Subject: Call from ENAR, supported by the EU, for national Member States to apply Internet censorship
Nederlandse versie ... 105
English version ... 106

E-004427/12 by Lambert van Nistelrooij and Heinz K. Becker to the Commission
Subject: Continuation of Ambient Assisted Living Joint Programme (AAL JP) after 2013
Deutsche Fassung ... 107
Nederlandse versie ... 109
English version ... 111

E-004429/12 by Michel Dantin to the Commission
Subject: Emergency measures ensuring compliance with Directive 1999/74/EC on the welfare of laying hens
Version française ... 112
English version ... 113

P-004430/12 by Alejandro Cercas to the Commission
Subject: Spanish public health cuts
Versión española ... 114
English version ... 116

E-004432/12 by Elisabeth Köstinger to the Commission
Subject: Quality seals for labelling leather goods and certification methods for the import of leather goods into the EU
Deutsche Fassung ... 117
English version ... 118

E-004433/12 by Georgios Papastamkos to the Commission
Subject: Contraction of farm income in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 119
English version ... 120

E-004434/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Utilisation of the Progress Microfinance Facility in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 121
English version ... 122

E-004435/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Utilisation of EU resources by Greece for educational infrastructure and schools
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 123
English version ... 124

E-004436/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Increase in the capital of the European Investment Bank and the Commission's position
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 125
English version ... 126

E-004437/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Initiatives and timetable of actions for the youth action team in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 127
English version ... 128

E-004439/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Fees paid by EU citizens to validate qualifications (Hague Apostille)
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 129
English version ... 130

E-004440/12 by Geoffrey Van Orden to the Commission
Subject: Parliament officials' pensions
English version ... 131

E-004441/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Watermelon sector
Versione italiana ... 132
English version ... 133

E-004442/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Cyber-attacks
Versione italiana 134
English version 135

E-004443/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Uterine fibroids
Versione italiana 136
English version 137

E-004444/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Fungal and microbial diseases
Versione italiana 138
English version 139

E-004446/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Solar chimney power plants
Versione italiana 140
English version 141

E-004447/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Open-source software costs
Versione italiana 142
English version 143

E-004448/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Use of radio frequency identification (RFID) technology with children
Versione italiana 144
English version 145

E-004450/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Flight safety
Versione italiana 146
English version 147

E-004452/12 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information on the implementation of the Services Directive
Versione italiana 148
English version 149

E-004453/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Ethical consumers — recording a tendency
Ελληνική έκδοση 150
English version 151

E-004454/12 by Evelyn Regner and Klaus-Heiner Lehne to the Commission
Subject: Plans by the Commission for the establishment of the profession of 'European judicial officer' on a uniform basis throughout the EU
Deutsche Fassung 152
English version 153

E-004455/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Competitiveness, salary cuts and 'the working poor'
Ελληνική έκδοση 154
English version 155

E-004456/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Dramatic fall in real incomes in Greece in 2011
Ελληνική έκδοση 156
English version 157

E-004457/12 by Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the latest directive on e-money in Poland
Wersja polska 158
English version 159

E-004458/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński and Adam Bielan to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — The case of José Daniel Ferrer García
Wersja polska 160
English version 161

P-004461/12 by Søren Bo Søndergaard to the Commission
Subject: Particulate pollutant emissions at airports
Dansk udgave 162
English version 163

E-004462/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Cross-border energy in Italy: increase in access fees
Versione italiana 164
English version 166

E-004463/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Syria: violence and the humanitarian issue
Versione italiana 168
English version 169

E-004464/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Safety at work: prospects for the future
Versione italiana 170
English version 171

E-004466/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: 2012 Olympics and sustainable development
Versione italiana 172
English version 173

E-004467/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Marine pollution and government responsibilities
Versione italiana 174
English version 175

E-004469/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: The passive house: an energy source for electric cars
Versione italiana 176
English version 177

E-004470/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Sunscreens harmful to health
Versione italiana 178
English version 179

E-004471/12 by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission
Subject: The cost of administering EU aid
English version 180

P-004472/12 by Paul Murphy to the Commission
Subject: Necessity of amending Article 136 of the TFEU
English version 181

E-004473/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Developments in relation to traditional-style books
Ελληνική έκδοση 182
English version 183

E-004477/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Member States' compliance with Commission recommendation concerning social inclusion and combating poverty
Ελληνική έκδοση 184
English version 185

P-004480/12 by Tiziano Motti to the Commission
Subject: Animal welfare and the size of the European stray animal population
Versione italiana 186
English version 187

E-004481/12 by Jens Rohde to the Commission
Subject: Follow-up question to Question P-003149/2012
Dansk udgave 188
English version 189

E-004482/12 by Corien Wortmann-Kool to the Commission
Subject: NAIADES
Nederlandse versie 190
English version 192

E-004483/12 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Forced disappearance of Hernán Henry Díaz, leader of Colombian peasant farmers: media campaign to stigmatise the 'patriotic march'
Versión española 193
English version 194

E-004484/12 by Nikos Chrysogelos to the Commission
Subject: Mass dismissals of workers by Arcelor Mittal Construction Hellas S.A. (formerly KONTI Steel Hellas S.A.) and the social responsibility of Arcelor Mittal
Ελληνική έκδοση 195
English version 197

E-004486/12 by Antigoni Papadopoulou to the Commission
Subject: Illegal exploration and drilling by Turkey to locate hydrocarbon deposits in Cyprus
Ελληνική έκδοση 199
English version 201

E-004710/12 by Georgios Koumoutsakos to the Commission
Subject: Illegal drilling by Turkey in the occupied part of the Republic of Cyprus
Ελληνική έκδοση 199
English version 201

E-004487/12 by Lorenzo Fontana to the Commission
Subject: Use of ESF funds by the Emilia-Romagna Region to monitor the regional governance system
Versione italiana 203
English version 204

E-004488/12 by Niccolò Rinaldi to the Commission
Subject: Case of Ms M.I.: a failure of justice
Versione italiana 205
English version 206

E-004491/12 by Tiziano Motti to the Commission
Subject: Legal consequences of zooerastia in Europe
Versione italiana 207
English version 208

E-004492/12 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: A new antioxidant?
Versione italiana 209
English version 210

E-004493/12 by Jim Higgins to the Commission
Subject: Recycling of ink cartridges
English version 211

E-004494/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in Algeria
English version 212

E-004495/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Deadline for establishment of Market Access Teams
English version ... 212

E-004496/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Establishment of Market Access Teams
English version ... 212

E-004497/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Duties of Market Access Teams
English version ... 212

E-004498/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Placement of Market Access Teams
English version ... 213

E-004499/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Funding of Market Access Teams
English version ... 213

E-004500/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Teams and diplomatic functions
English version ... 213

E-004827/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: The establishment of a market access team in Argentina
English version ... 213

E-004867/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in Argentina
English version ... 214

E-004868/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in Chile
English version ... 214

E-004869/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in Colombia
English version ... 214

E-004870/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team composition
English version ... 214

E-004912/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in Mexico
English version ... 215

E-004913/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in Hong Kong
English version ... 215

E-004914/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in Kazakhstan
English version ... 215

E-004915/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in Morocco
English version ... 215

E-004951/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in South Korea
English version ... 216

E-004952/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in the United States
English version 216

E-004954/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in Turkey
English version 216

E-005083/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: Market Access Team in New Zealand
English version 216

E-004502/12 by Emma McClarkin to the Commission
Subject: Fire safety
English version 218

E-004503/12 by Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Site of Community importance ES6120032: Estrecho Oriental
English version 219

E-004505/12 by Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Swappable re-chargeable electric batteries
English version 220

E-004506/12 by Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: RoHS Directive and metal whiskering
English version 221

E-004507/12 by Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Vessels under 10 metres
English version 222

E-004508/12 by Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Airport noise pollution
English version 223

P-004512/12 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Shortcomings of the democratic system in Ukraine
Versión española 224
English version 225

E-004513/12 by Marina Yannakoudakis to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Kazakh authorities and minority religious communities
English version 226

P-004517/12 by Janusz Wojciechowski to the Commission
Subject: Situation faced by cucumber and tomato producers — supplementary question
Wersja polska 227
English version 228

E-004522/12 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission
Subject: The microcredit debt trap
Deutsche Fassung 229
English version 231

E-004523/12 by Andreas Mölzer to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Rocket testing in India
Deutsche Fassung 232
English version 233

E-004525/12 by Barry Madlener to the Commission
Subject: Turkey prefers the OIC to the EU
Nederlandse versie 234
English version 235

P-004526/12 by Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu to the Commission
Subject: Authorisation requirements for homeopathic medicinal products
Versiunea în limba română 236
English version 237

E-004527/12 by Judith Sargentini and Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Reform of the Criminal Code in Spain II
Versión española 238
Nederlandse versie 239
English version 240

E-004528/12 by Cornelis de Jong to the Commission
Subject: VAT liability of worldshops — consequences of implementation of Directive 2006/69/EC for non-profit-making small enterprises
Nederlandse versie 241
English version 242

E-004529/12 by Cornelis de Jong to the Commission
Subject: Compensation for flights operated by air carriers from third (non-EU) countries in connection with Regulation (EC) No 261/2004
Nederlandse versie 243
English version 244

E-004531/12 by Ole Christensen to the Commission
Subject: Refusal of access to documents on mussel dredging in Limfjord
Dansk udgave 245
English version 246

E-004533/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: The euro has only four ways to die
Versione italiana 247
English version 248

E-004534/12 by Paul Rübig to the Commission
Subject: Wireless broadband communications for European public safety organisations
Deutsche Fassung 249
English version 251

E-004535/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Electric cars
Versione italiana 253
English version 254

E-004538/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Juvenile diabetes
Versione italiana 255
English version 256

E-004539/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Mass pelican deaths
Versione italiana 257
English version 258

E-004540/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Clashes in Cairo
Versione italiana 259
English version 261

E-004712/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Protests and violence in Egypt
Versione italiana 259
English version 261

E-004541/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Sierra Leone
Versione italiana 263
English version 264

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-000312/12
adresată Comisiei
Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE)
(19 ianuarie 2012)

Subiect: Norme de punere în aplicare a Cerului unic european privind performanța identificării şi a supravegherii aeronavelor

Două regulamente de stabilire a unor norme noi de punere în aplicare a Cerului unic european privind SESAR (sistemul european de nouă generație pentru gestionarea traficului aerian) au fost publicate în Jurnalul Oficial al UE:

— Norme de punere în aplicare a Cerului unic european privind identificarea aeronavelor în scopul supravegherii [Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1206/2011)]. Acestea solicită furnizorilor de servicii de navigație aeriană (FSNA) să utilizeze funcția de identificare a aeronavelor printr-un semnal de răspuns până la 2 ianuarie 2020. Aeronavele care survolează spațiul aerian al UE au fost deja modificate până în 2003. Acest lucru înseamnă că li se va solicita tuturor FSNA să utilizeze această tehnologie veche în sistemele lor de la sol, 17 ani mai târziu decât mandatul corespunzător de modernizare a aeronavelor.

— Norme de punere în aplicare a Cerului unic european privind performanța şi interoperabilitatea funcției de supraveghere [Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1207/2011)]. Acesta este un alt mandat aferent SESAR care solicită modernizarea aeronavelor până la 7 decembrie 2017 cu așa-numita tehnologie ADS-B (supraveghere automată dependentă-radioemisie). Noile aeronave trebuie să fie dotate până la 8 ianuarie 2015. În acelaşi timp, nu există un mandat pentru FSNA ca aceştia să utilizeze această tehnologie în sistemele lor de la sol.

Prin urmare, adresez următoarele întrebări Comisiei:

1. Poate Comisia să explice de ce au fost ignorate opiniile utilizatorilor AEA/IATA/spațiului aerian, având în vedere faptul că SESAR ar trebui conceput astfel încât să îmbunătățească eficiența liniilor aeriene?

2. De ce nu au fost sincronizate cerințele pentru FSNA cu mandatele echipajelor aeronavelor? Care este analiza economică pentru mandatul ADS-B în absența unei cerințe pentru toți FSNA de a utiliza acele capacități noi ale aeronavelor?

3. Ce măsuri va adopta Comisia pentru a preveni eşecul SESAR, ca urmare a mandatelor necoordonate, precum cele sus-menționate? Există posibilitatea de a revizui normele de punere în aplicare eronate care au fost publicate în JO?

Răspuns comun dat de dl Kallas în numele Comisiei
(24 februarie 2012)

Pentru a asigura o tranziție fără dificultăți, introducerea de noi tehnologii de supraveghere ar trebui să ia în considerare infrastructura existentă. Două tehnologii de supraveghere prin cooperare pentru poziționarea aeronavelor coexistă în prezent, una se bazează pe radare secundare de supraveghere (SSR — *secondary surveillance radars*), iar cea mai nouă se bazează pe emisiunea (radio) de supraveghere automată dependentă (ADS-B — *Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast)* ([1]). ADS-B este o parte esențială a planului de îmbunătățire a performanțelor de supraveghere și va asigura o mai bună vizibilitate a aeronavelor, cu costuri mai mici. Introducerea tehnologiei ADS-B necesită o modernizare/reînnoire progresivă a sistemelor de bord și a celor de la sol. Termenele limită din 2015 și 2017 au fost stabilite pentru aeronavele existente și pentru cele noi. Pentru echipamentele de la sol, obligația de a le dota începe în 2015, cu un termen limită în 2020.

Această abordare a fost elaborată în urma consultării tuturor părților interesate, inclusiv a utilizatorilor spațiului aerian. Comisia consideră că aceste cerințe sunt echilibrate și coerente.

În ceea ce privește utilizarea noilor capacități ale aeronavelor ([2]), furnizorii de servicii de navigație aeriană trebuie să ia în considerare capacitățile utilizatorilor spațiului aerian înainte de punerea în funcțiune a oricăror sisteme noi de supraveghere.

([1]) SSR măsoară direct distanța și relevmentul unei aeronave cu ajutorul unui radar la sol. Relevmentul este măsurat prin poziția antenei radar rotative atunci când primește un răspuns la interogarea trimisă aeronavei, iar distanța este măsurată prin timpul necesar pentru ca radarul să primească răspunsul la interogare. În schimb, ADS-B creează și ascultă semnalele pentru poziționarea periodică și rapoartele de intenție din partea aeronavelor. Aceste rapoarte sunt generate pe baza sistemului de navigație al aeronavei și sunt distribuite prin intermediul unuia sau mai multor legături de date ADS-B (așa-numitele ADS-B out).

([2]) Articolul 5 alineatul (8) din Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1207/2011 privind supravegherea.

În ceea ce privește identificarea aeronavelor ([3]), în special utilizarea funcției de identificare a aeronavelor printr-un semnal de răspuns, este necesară o capacitate operațională la sol pentru 50 % dintre zborurile din spațiul aerian european ([4]). Această prevedere a intrat deja în vigoare. Termenul limită reprezentat de anul 2020 pentru toate zborurile se bazează pe timpul necesar pentru finalizarea instalării rețelei terestre.

Dispozițiile regulamentului privind supravegherea trebuie considerate punctul de referință pentru dezvoltarea de noi sisteme de supraveghere în cadrul SESAR și sunt conforme cu Planul general ATM. Comisia va continua să elaboreze regulamentele necesare pentru a asigura introducerea coordonată a echipamentelor de bord și a celor de la sol necesare pentru punerea în aplicare a programului SESAR, cu consultarea tuturor părților interesate.

([3]) Articolul 4 alineatul (1), Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1206/2011, JO L 305, 23.11.2011, p. 23.
([4]) Se face referire aici la „nucleul" spațiului aerian al UE, și anume spațiul aerian din centrul și vestul UE, cel mai aglomerat în materie de management al traficului aerian (ATM).

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-012452/11
komissiolle
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(10. tammikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Lentokoneiden tunnistamista ja valvonnan suorituskykyä koskevat säännöt yhtenäisessä eurooppalaisessa ilmatilassa

EU:n virallisessa lehdessä on julkaistu kahdet uudet SESAR-järjestelmään liittyvät yhtenäisen eurooppalaisen ilmatilan toteuttamista koskevat säännöt (SES IR).

Nämä säännöt, jotka koskevat ilma-alusten tunnistamista valvontatarkoituksessa (EU:n asetus 1206/2011), edellyttävät lennonvarmistuspalveluiden tarjoajien käyttävän ilma-alusten valvontajärjestelmälle lähettämää tunnistetta 2. päivään tammikuuta 2020 mennessä. EU:n ilmatilan kautta lentäviä koneita mukautettiin jo ennen vuotta 2003. Näin kaikkien lennonvarmistuspalveluiden tarjoajien on käytettävä maajärjestelmissään vanhaa tekniikkaa vielä 17 vuotta vastaavan lentokoneita koskevan jälkiasennusvaatimuksen jälkeen.

Valvonnan suorituskykyä ja yhteentoimivuutta koskevat eurooppalaisen ilmatilan toteutussäännöt (EU:n asetus 1207/2011) merkitsevät jälleen yhtä SESARiin liittyvää vaatimusta, joka edellyttää niin kutsutun ADS-B Out -tekniikan jälkiasennusta lentokoneisiin 7. joulukuuta 2017 mennessä. Uudet lentokoneet on varusteltava näin 8. päivään tammikuuta 2015 mennessä. Samalla lennonvarmistuspalveluiden tarjoajia ei kuitenkaan vaadita käyttämään samaa tekniikkaa maajärjestelmissään.

1. Voiko komissio selittää, miksi AEA:n, IATA:n ja ilmatilan käyttäjien näkemykset jätettiin huomiotta etenkin, kun SESAR-järjestelmän on tarkoitus parantaa tehokkuutta lentoyhtiöiden kannalta?

2. Miksi lennonvarmistuspalveluiden tarjoajille asetettavia vaatimuksia ei ole sovitettu lentokoneiden varusteita koskeviin vaatimuksiin? Onko ADS-B Out -vaatimus perusteltu tilanteessa, jossa kaikkien lennonvarmistuspalveluiden tarjoajien ei tarvitse hyödyntää tällaisia uusia lentokoneiden ominaisuuksia?

3. Mihin toimiin komissio ryhtyy estääkseen SESAR-järjestelmän epäonnistumisen tällaisten epäyhtenäisten vaatimusten seurauksena? Onko virallisessa lehdessä julkaistuja puutteellisia täytäntöönpanosääntöjä mahdollista tarkistaa?

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-000312/12
komissiolle
Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE)
(19. tammikuuta 2012)

Aihe: Lentokoneiden tunnistamista ja valvonnan suorituskykyä koskevat säännöt yhtenäisessä eurooppalaisessa ilmatilassa

EU:n virallisessa lehdessä on julkaistu kaksi asetusta, joissa on kahdet uudet SESAR-järjestelmään liittyvät yhtenäisen eurooppalaisen ilmatilan toteuttamista koskevat säännöt.

— Kyse on SES IR -säännöistä, jotka koskevat lentokoneiden tunnistamista valvontatarkoituksessa (EU:n asetus 1206/2011). Ne edellyttävät lennonvarmistuspalveluiden tarjoajien käyttävän satelliittiperusteista lentokoneiden tunnistusta 2. päivään tammikuuta 2020 mennessä. EU:n ilmatilan kautta lentäviä ilma-aluksia mukautettiin jo ennen vuotta 2003. Näin kaikkien lennonvarmistuspalveluiden tarjoajien on käytettävä tällaista vanhaa tekniikkaa maajärjestelmissään 17 vuotta vastaavan ilmajärjestelmien jälkiasennusta koskevan vaatimuksen jälkeen.

— Valvonnan suorituskykyä ja yhteentoimivuutta koskevat SES IR -säännöt (EU:n asetus 1207/2011) ovat jälleen yksi SESARiin liittyvä vaatimus, joka edellyttää niin kutsutun ADS-B Out -tekniikan jälkiasennusta ilma-aluksiin 7. joulukuuta 2017 mennessä. Uudet ilma-alukset on varusteltava näin 8. päivään tammikuuta 2015 mennessä. Samalla lennonvarmistuspalveluiden tarjoajia ei kuitenkaan vaadita käyttämään samaa tekniikkaa maajärjestelmissään.

Kysyn siksi komissiolta seuraavaa:

1. Voiko komissio selittää, miksi AEA:n, IATA:n ja ilmatilan käyttäjien näkemykset on jätetty huomiotta etenkin, kun SESARin on tarkoitus parantaa tehokkuutta lentoyhtiöiden kannalta?

2. Miksi lennonvarmistuspalveluiden tarjoajille asetettavia vaatimuksia ei ole sovitettu lentokoneiden varusteita koskeviin vaatimuksiin? Onko ADS-B Out -tekniikkaa koskeva vaatimus perusteltu tilanteessa, jossa kaikkien lennonvarmistuspalveluiden tarjoajien ei tarvitse käyttää tällaisia ilma-alusten uusia ominaisuuksia?

3. Mihin toimiin komissio ryhtyy estääkseen SESARin epäonnistumisen edellä kuvatun kaltaisten epäyhtenäisten vaatimusten seurauksena? Onko mahdollista tarkistaa virallisessa lehdessä julkaistuja puutteellisia täytäntöönpanosääntöjä?

Siim Kallasin komission puolesta antama yhteinen vastaus

(24. helmikuuta 2012)

Otettaessa käyttöön uusia valvontateknologioita olisi nykyinen infrastruktuuri otettava huomioon, jotta siirtyminen tapahtuisi ongelmitta. Tällä hetkellä käytetään ilma-alusten aseman määrittämisessä kahta yhteistoiminnallista järjestelmää. Niistä toinen perustuu toisiovalvontatutkatekniikkaan (SSR) ja niistä uudempi automatiikkaan perustuvan valvonnan lähetyksiin (ADS-B) ([1]).

ADS-B on merkittävässä asemassa suunnitellussa valvonnan tehostamisessa, ja sillä parannetaan ilma-alusten näkyvyyttä alhaisemmin kustannuksin. ADS-B-järjestelmän käyttöönotto edellyttää sekä ilma-aluksissa että maassa olevien järjestelmien asteittaista parantamista tai uudistamista. Uusien ilma-alusten määräajaksi vahvistettiin vuosi 2015, ja nykyisten ilma-alusten määräajaksi vuosi 2017. Velvollisuus varustaa maassa toimivat laitteet alkaa vuonna 2015, ja tämän on tapahduttava vuoteen 2020 mennessä.

Tällaiseen lähestymistapaan päädyttiin sidosryhmien (myös ilmatilan käyttäjien) kanssa käytyjen konsultaatioiden perusteella. Komissio pitää näitä vaatimuksia tasapainoisina ja johdonmukaisina.

Uuden ilma-aluskapasiteetin käytön ([2]) osalta lennonvarmistuspalvelun tarjoajien on ennen uusien valvontajärjestelmien käyttöönottoa otettava huomioon ilmatilankäyttäjien valmiudet.

Ilma-alusten tunnistamiseen ([3]) ja erityisesti ilma-alusten valvontajärjestelmälle lähettämän tunnisteen käyttöön liittyen jäsenvaltioilla on oltava maajärjestelmävalmiudet tunnistaa 50 prosenttia Euroopan ilmatilan lennoista ([4]). Tämä säännös on jo tullut voimaan. Kaikkia lentoja koskeva vuoden 2020 määräaika perustuu tarpeeseen varata riittävästi aikaa maaverkon käyttöönotolle.

Valvonta-asetuksen säännösten on katsottava luovan perustan SESAR-järjestelmälle uusien valvontajärjestelmien kehittämiseksi. Ne ovat myös johdonmukaiset ATM-yleissuunnitelman kanssa. Komissio jatkaa tarvittavien säännösten kehittämistä varmistaakseen, että sellaiset ilma-aluksissa ja maassa toimivat laitteet otetaan koordinoidusti käyttöön, jotka ovat välttämättömiä SESAR-järjestelmän täytäntöönpanemiseksi. Tämä tapahtuu kaikkia sidosryhmiä kuullen.

([1]) SSR määrittää suoraan ilma-aluksen etäisyyden ja suunnan maassa sijaitsevasta tutkasta. Suunta määritetään pyörivän tutka-antennin asemasta, kun ilma-aluksesta vastataan sille, kun taas etäisyys määritetään siitä, kuinka kauan vastauksen saaminen kestää. ADS-B-järjestelmä sen sijaan saa ilma-aluksilta säännölliset sijainti- ja suuntatiedot. Tiedot perustuvat ilma-aluksen suunnistusjärjestelmään, ja ne lähetetään yhden tai useamman ADS-B-datayhteyden kautta (ns. ADS-B Out).

([2]) Valvonta-asetuksen (EU) N:o 1207/2011 5 artiklan 8 kohta.

([3]) Asetuksen (EU) N:o 1206/2011 4 artiklan 1 kohta (EUVL L 305, 23.11.2011, s. 23).

([4]) Asetuksen (EU) N:o 1206/2011 4 artiklan 1 kohta (EUVL L 305, 23.11.2011, s. 23).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012452/11
to the Commission
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(10 January 2012)

Subject: Single European Sky implementing rules on aircraft identification and surveillance performance

Two new Single European Sky implementing rules (SES IR) related to SESAR have been published in the EU Official Journal.

The SES IR on aircraft identification for surveillance (Regulation (EU) No 1206/2011) requires ANS Providers to make use of the downlinked aircraft identification by 2 January 2020. Aircraft flying through EU airspace were already modified by 2003. This means all Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) will be required to make use of this old technology in their ground systems, 17 years later than the corresponding airborne retrofit mandate.

The SES IR on performance and interoperability of surveillance (Regulation (EU) No 1207/2011) is a further SESAR-related mandate requiring aircraft retrofits by 7 December 2017 with so-called ADS-B Out technology. New aircraft need to be equipped by 8 January 2015. At the same time, there is no mandate for ANSPs to make use of this technology in their ground systems.

1. Could the Commission explain why the AEA/IATA/airspace users' views were ignored, bearing in mind the fact that SESAR should be designed to improve efficiency for the airlines?

2. Why have the requirements for ANS providers not been synchronised with the aircraft equipage mandates? What is the business case for the ADS-B Out mandate in the absence of a requirement for all ANS providers to make use of those new aircraft capabilities?

3. Which actions will the Commission undertake to prevent the failure of SESAR as a result of uncoordinated mandates such as the ones described above? Is there a possibility to review those flawed implementing rules which were published in the Official Journal?

Question for written answer E-000312/12
to the Commission
Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE)
(19 January 2012)

Subject: Single European Sky Implementing Rules on Aircraft Identification and Surveillance Performance

Two regulations laying down new Single European Sky Implementing Rules (IR) related to SESAR have been published in the EU Official Journal:

— SES IR on Aircraft Identification for Surveillance (Regulation (EU) No 1206/2011).This requires Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) to make use of the downlinked aircraft identification by 2 January 2020. Aircraft flying through EU airspace were already modified by 2003. This means all ANSPs will be required to make use of this old technology in their ground systems, 17 years later than the corresponding airborne retrofit mandate.

— SES IR on Performance and Interoperability of Surveillance (Regulation (EU) No 1207/2011). This is a further SESAR-related mandate requiring aircraft retrofits by 7 December 2017 with so-called ADS-B out technology. New aircraft need to be equipped by 8 January 2015. At the same time, there is no mandate for ANSPs to make use of this technology in their ground systems.

Therefore following questions to the Commission:

1. Could the Commission explain why the AEA's/IATA's/airspace users' views were ignored, bearing in mind the fact that SESAR should be designed to improve efficiency for airlines?

2. Why have the requirements for ANSPs not been synchronised with the aircraft equipage mandates? What is the business case for the ADS-B out mandate in the absence of a requirement for all ANSPs to make use of those new aircraft capabilities?

3. Which actions will the Commission take to prevent SESAR from failing as a result of uncoordinated mandates such as those described above? Is there a possibility of reviewing the flawed implementing rules which were published in the OJ?

Joint answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission

(24 February 2012)

The introduction of new surveillance technologies should take account of existing infrastructure to ensure a smooth transition. Two cooperative surveillance technologies for tracking of aircraft coexist today, one based on secondary surveillance radars (SSR), and the newest based on Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast (ADS-B) ([1]). ADS-B is an essential part of the planned surveillance performance improvement and will create better aircraft visibility at lower cost. The introduction of ADS-B requires a gradual upgrading/renewal of both airborne and ground systems. The deadlines of 2015 and 2017 were fixed for new and existing aircraft. For ground equipment the obligation to equip starts in 2015 with a 2020 deadline.

This approach has been devised in consultation of all stakeholders, including airspace users. The Commission considers these requirements balanced and consistent.

Concerning the use of new aircraft capabilities ([2]), air navigation service providers are required to take into account airspace users' capabilities before putting into service any new surveillance system.

Concerning the aircraft identification ([3]), in particular the use of down linked aircraft identification, a ground capability for 50 % of the flights of the European airspace is required ([4]). This provision has already entered into force. The 2020 deadline for all flights is based on the necessary time to complete the deployment of the ground network.

The provisions of the surveillance Regulation have to be considered as the baseline for SESAR to develop new surveillance systems and are consistent with the ATM Master Plan. The Commission will continue to develop the necessary regulations to ensure coordinated introduction of airborne and ground equipment necessary for the implementation of SESAR in full consultation of stakeholders.

([1]) SSR directly measures the range and bearing of an aircraft from a ground-based radar. Bearing is measured by the position of the rotating radar antenna when it receives a response to its interrogation from the aircraft, and range is measured by the time it takes for the radar to receive the interrogation response. In contrast, ADS-B creates and listens for periodic position and intent reports from aircraft. These reports are generated based on the aircraft's navigation system, and distributed via one or more of the ADS-B data links (the so called ADS-B out).

([2]) Article 5(8) of the surveillance Regulation (EU) No 1207/2011.

([3]) Article 4(1), Regulation (EU) No 1206/2011, OJ L 305, 23.11.2011, p. 23.

([4]) Referring to the 'core' EU airspace, the western-central EU airspace, the most congested in terms of air traffic management (ATM).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-012513/11
aan de Commissie
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)
(9 januari 2012)

Betreft: Blokkering NAVO-lidmaatschap Macedonië

Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het feit dat het Internationaal Gerechtshof te Den Haag een vonnis heeft gewezen waarin het blokkeren van het NAVO-lidmaatschap van Macedonië door Griekenland vanwege de naamkwestie als onrechtmatig wordt beoordeeld?

Is zij met de vraagsteller van mening dat dit vonnis ook consequenties heeft voor de blokkade van de toetredingsonderhandelingen tot de EU?

Indien zij de mening van ex-2 van de vragensteller deelt, is zij bereid deze positie aan de Griekse regering mede te delen? Zo niet, kan zij in dat geval haar antwoord op deze vragen met argumenten onderbouwen?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-000025/12
aan de Commissie
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 januari 2012)

Betreft: De kwestie Macedonië

Het Internationale Hof van Justitie heeft onlangs de uitspraak gedaan dat Griekenland door een veto uit te spreken over het NAVO-lidmaatschap van Macedonië een bilateraal akkoord uit 1995 heeft geschonden waarin een clausule was opgenomen dat als Macedonië, in afwachting van de beslechting van het geschil tussen de twee landen, de naam Voormalige Joegoslavische Republiek Macedonië zou gebruiken Griekenland geen bezwaar zou maken tegen haar lidmaatschap van internationale organisaties. De naam Macedonië wordt officieel erkend door alle EU-lidstaten behalve Griekenland. Macedonië streeft ook naar lidmaatschap van de Europese Unie en is sinds 1995 kandidaat-lidstaat voor toetreding. Officieel is er nog geen begin gemaakt met de toetredingsonderhandelingen.

Zal de uitspraak van het Internationale Hof van Justitie enige invloed hebben op de verdere stappen die de Commissie zal zetten met betrekking tot Macedonië als kandidaat-lidstaat van de Europese Unie?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(20 februari 2012)

De Commissie heeft nota genomen van de uitspraak van het Internationaal Gerechtshof inzake de toepassing van de Interimovereenkomst. Op 5 december 2011 heeft het Gerechtshof geoordeeld dat „… de verweerder (Griekenland), door zich op de Top van Boekarest te verzetten tegen de toetreding van de eiser tot de NAVO, de krachtens artikel 11, lid 1, van de Interimovereenkomst op hem rustende verplichting niet is nagekomen”.

Op 14 oktober 2009 heeft de Commissie haar aanbeveling bekendgemaakt om toetredingsonderhandelingen te openen met de Voormalige Joegoslavische Republiek Macedonië. In 201. en 2011 heeft zij haar aanbeveling herhaald. Het besluit om onderhandelingen te openen, moet door de Raad worden genomen met eenparigheid van stemmen. Het is dan ook aan de Raad om rekening te houden met de gevolgen van de uitspraak van het Internationaal Gerechtshof.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-000025/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. januára 2012)

Vec: Problematika Macedónska

Medzinárodný súdny dvor vydal nedávno rozsudok, v ktorom konštatoval, že Grécko blokovaním prijatia Macedónska do NATO porušilo bilaterálnu dohodu z r. 1995, v ktorej sa zaviazalo, že ak bude Macedónsko používať názov Bývalá juhoslovanská republika Macedónsko až do vyriešenia ich vzájomného sporu, nebude mu brániť v členstve v medzinárodných organizáciách. Názov Macedónsko pritom oficiálne uznávajú všetky členské štáty EÚ okrem Grécka. Macedónsko sa tiež snaží o členstvo v Európskej únii, štatút kandidátskej krajiny získalo ešte v roku 2005. Prístupové rokovania však stále neboli oficiálne otvorené.

Bude mať rozsudok Medzinárodného súdneho dvora nejaký vplyv na ďalšie kroky Komisie voči Macedónsku ako kandidátskej krajine Európskej únie?

Spoločná odpoveď pána Füleho v mene Komisie
(20. februára 2012)

Komisia zobrala na vedomie rozsudok Medzinárodného súdneho dvora o vykonávaní Dočasnej dohody. Dňa 5. decembra 2011 súdny dvor skonštatoval, že: „odporca (Grécko) nesplnil svoju povinnosť podľa článku 11 ods. 1 Dočasnej dohody tým, že na bukureštskom samite vzniesol námietky voči prijatiu uchádzača do NATO.“

Komisia vydala odporúčanie začať rokovania o pristúpení s bývalou Juhoslovanskou republikou Macedónsko 14. októbra 2009 a opäť ho zopakovala v rokoch 2010 a 2011. Rozhodnutie o začatí rokovaní musí na základe jednomyseľnosti prijať Rada, a preto je na nej, aby zvážila dôsledky rozsudku Medzinárodného súdneho dvora.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012513/11
to the Commission
Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)
(9 January 2012)

Subject: Blocking of NATO membership for Macedonia

Is the Commission aware that the International Court in The Hague has handed down a judgment in which it rules that Greece's blocking of NATO membership for Macedonia on account of the issue of its name is illegal?

Does it agree that this judgment also has implications for the blocking of the EU accession negotiations?

If it agrees with the latter point, will it inform the Greek Government of this position? If not, can it give reasons for its reply to these questions?

Question for written answer E-000025/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: The issue of Macedonia

The International Court of Justice has recently issued a ruling which stated that Greece, by preventing Macedonia from joining NATO, was in violation of a bilateral accord of 1995, in which there was an undertaking that if Macedonia used the name former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, pending resolution of their dispute, it would not object to the Republic's membership in international organisations. The name Macedonia is officially recognised by all EU Member States except for Greece. Macedonia is also endeavouring to join the European Union, having been a candidate for accession since 1995. Accession negotiations have still not been officially opened.

Will the International Court of Justice ruling have any influence over the further steps made by the Commission in respect of Macedonia as a candidate country of the European Union?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(20 February 2012)

The Commission has taken note of the judgment of the International Court of Justice concerning the Application of the Interim Agreement. On 5 December 2011, the Court concluded that '… the Respondent (Greece) failed to comply with its obligation under Article 11, paragraph 1, of the Interim Accord by objecting to the Applicant's admission to NATO at the Bucharest Summit'.

The Commission issued its recommendation to start accession negotiations with the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia on 14 October 2009. It re-iterated the recommendation in 2010 and 2011. The decision to start negotiations needs to be taken by the Council, on the basis of unanimity. Therefore it is for the Council to consider the implications of the judgment of the International Court of Justice.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-012644/11
til Kommissionen
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(11. januar 2012)

Om: Gennemførelse af EU's forordning om ulovligt træ (EUTR)

Der er blevet udtrykt bekymring om gennemførelsen af EU's forordning om ulovligt træ (EUTR), som skal gennemføres fra den 3. marts 2013. Der er bekymringer om, at gennemførelsen af EUTR vil blive svag, og at håndhævelsen ikke vil ske på lige vilkår i alle medlemsstater.

Et af de store spørgsmål er Kina. Kina er en af de største eksportører af træprodukter til EU, men landet importerer næsten alle råmaterialerne til denne produktion, og fordi Kinas træindustri er fragmenteret og primitiv med lange og komplekse forsyningskæder, vil det være meget svært for Kina at overholde bestemmelserne i EUTR. Det er ikke usandsynligt, at træprodukter fra Kina, afhængigt af hvordan EUTR vil blive håndhævet, i realiteten vil blive udelukket fra markedet i EU.

Dette er selvfølgelig bekymrende, for man kan have sine tvivl om, hvorvidt EU er parat til at udelukke alle kinesiske træprodukter fra EU, eller om EU er parat til at svække håndhævelsen af EUTR, for at kinesiske træprodukter fortsat kan tillades i EU.

EUTR kunne potentielt repræsentere et stort skridt hen imod at undgå ulovligt træ, og nogle i træindustrien investerer en masse i at kunne overholde EUTR-kravene for at være klar til den 3. marts 2013. Desværre gælder dette dog muligvis ikke alle i sektoren, hvilket vil resultere i ulige konkurrencevilkår afhængigt af, hvordan EUTR vil blive håndhævet.

Bekymringerne kan udtrykkes i følgende spørgsmål:

1. Hvordan vil Kommissionen sikre, at alle operatører i træindustrien er bekendt med EUTR og forordningens indvirkning på branchen?

2. Hvordan vil Kommissionen sikre en ensartet gennemførelse i alle medlemsstater?

3. Er EU parat til at håndhæve EUTR, selv om dette er ensbetydende med et forbud mod næsten enhver import af træprodukter fra et land som Kina?

4. Hvis træindustrien hævder ikke at være klar til den 3. marts 2013, vil gennemførelsen af EUTR så blive udsat, som det skete i tilfældet med CE-mærkning af træprodukter?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Janez Potočnik
(2. marts 2012)

1. Kommissionen ajourfører løbende informationerne på sin webside. I 2011 udgav Kommissionen en informationsfolder, som bliver distribueret ved enhver given lejlighed, ligesom EU-forordningen om tømmer (EUTR) ([1]) bliver præsenteret ved talrige arrangementer på både EU-plan og nationalt plan. Kommissionen samarbejder med ansvarlige myndigheder i medlemsstaterne om udarbejdelsen af en fælles kommunikationsstrategi. Kommissionen har til hensigt at udstikke retningslinjer, som skal bidrage til udbredelsen af kendskabet til EUTR, og den er endvidere i løbende kontakt med kinesiske producenter og eksportører for aktivt at udbrede informationer om forordningen.

2. Selvom selve håndhævelsen af forordningen er medlemsstaternes ansvar, vil Kommissionen gøre sit bedste for at sikre en ensartet gennemførelse i hele EU, lige fra at skabe effektiv kommunikation mellem de ansvarlige myndigheder til at iværksætte traktatbrudsprocedurer, hvor det måtte være nødvendigt.

3. Det er hensigten med EUTR at fremme ansvarlig indkøbsadfærd i EU og derved tilskynde leverandørerne til at sikre, at de træprodukter, de ønsker at sælge på det europæiske marked, er lovlige. EUTR indeholder ikke importforbud mod produkter fra bestemte lande, men forbyder omsætning af træprodukter fremstillet af ulovligt fældet træ. Det forventes imidlertid, at det enkelte land vil gå over til at købe træ fra mere sikre kilder.

([1]) Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning (EU) nr. 995/2010 af 20. oktober 2010 om fastsættelse af krav til virksomheder, der bringer træ og træprodukter i omsætning (EUT L 295, af 12.11.2010).

4. Kommissionen er ikke orienteret om, hvorvidt industrien vil stille krav om udsættelse. EUTR skal anvendes fra den 3. marts 2013, og Kommissionen har ikke beføjelse til at ændre denne dato. Kommissionen påbegynder behandlingen af ansøgninger om anerkendelse af overvågningsorganer i 2012. Senest per 1. marts 2013 skal virksomhederne være i stand til at leve op til EUTR-kravene, enten på egen hånd eller ved hjælp af overvågningsorganerne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012644/11
to the Commission
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: Implementation of the EU Timber Regulation (EUTR)

Concerns have been raised about the implementation of the EU Timber Regulation (EUTR), which is due to be implemented from 3 March 2013. There are concerns that the implementation of the EUTR will be weak, and that enforcement will not be equal in all Member States.

One of the big issues is China. China is one of the largest exporters of timber products to the EU, but it imports almost all its raw materials for this production, and because the timber industry in China is fragmented and primitive, with long and complex supply chains, it will prove very difficult for China to comply with the EUTR. It is not unlikely that, depending on the enforcement of the EUTR, wood products from China will in reality be excluded from the EU market place.

This is of course worrying, because one may doubt whether the EU is prepared to exclude all Chinese timber products from the EU, or if the EU is prepared to weaken the enforcement of the EUTR in order to allow continued access for Chinese timber products to the EU.

The EUTR could potentially represent a great step towards eliminating illegal timber, and some in the timber sector are investing a lot in meeting the EUTR requirements in order to be ready for 3 March 2013. Unfortunately, however, this may not be true of the entire sector, resulting in an uneven playing field depending on the enforcement of the EUTR.

The concerns can be summarised in the following questions:

1. How will the Commission ensure that all operators in the timber industry are aware of the EUTR and its impact on trade?

2. How will the Commission ensure uniform implementation in all Member States?

3. Is the EU prepared to enforce the EUTR even if this means banning almost all imports of wood products from a country such as China?

4. If the industry claims not to be ready for 3 March 2013, will implementation of the EUTR then be postponed, as happened in the case of CE marking of timber products?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(2 March 2012)

1. The Commission updates the information on its webpage; it issued an information leaflet in 2011 which it disseminates at every occasion; it presents the EU Timber Regulation (EUTR) ([1]) at various events at EU and national level. The Commission works with competent authorities in Member States (MS) to develop a common communication strategy. The Commission will issue guidelines to help a better understanding of the EUTR. It engages actively with producers and exporters in China to disseminate information about the EUTR.

2. While the enforcement of the regulation is the responsibility of the MS the Commission will make all efforts to ensure uniform implementation throughout the EU, from facilitating an effective communication between competent authorities to initiating infringement procedures where necessary.

3. The EUTR's goal is to stimulate responsible purchasing behaviour in the EU and thereby to influence suppliers to ensure the legality of the timber products they seek to place on the EU market. The EUTR does not provide for import bans of products from particular countries, but prohibits the placing on the market of timber products derived from illegally logged timber. However, it is to be expected that purchases within a given country shift to the more reliable sources.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 995/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 2010 laying down the obligations of operators who place timber and timber products on the market, OJ L 295, 12.11.2010.

4. The Commission is not aware of claims to this effect from the industry. The EUTR is applicable from March 2013 and the Commission has no mandate to amend that date. The Commission will start to recognise applicants for 'monitoring organisations' in 2012; by March 2013 operators will be able to meet the EUTR requirements either using their own resources or the services of a monitoring organisation.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-012655/11
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE) και Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Έργα προτεραιότητας στην Ελλάδα

Η Ελλάδα έχει καταθέσει κατάλογο 181 έργων προτεραιότητας, η υλοποίηση των οποίων συνδέεται με την ανάθεση σε έναν φορέα ώστε να υπάρχει συγκεκριμένη αρμοδιότητα και ευθύνη. Τα έργα προτεραιότητας ακολουθούν επίσης αυστηρές διαδικασίες και χρονοδιαγράμματα ώστε να προωθηθεί η ταχεία υλοποίησή τους.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει κατατεθεί στην Επιτροπή ένα σαφές χρονοδιάγραμμα από την ελληνική πλευρά σχετικά με την ολοκλήρωση και το κόστος των 181 έργων προτεραιότητας; Ποιο είναι το ύψος της κοινοτικής συμμετοχής, ποιο της εθνικής και πότε αναμένεται να ολοκληρωθούν τα έργα αυτά;

2. Καθώς η εθνική συμμετοχή μειώνεται στο 5 %, ποιος είναι ο λόγος που αρκετά ελληνικά έργα, παρότι προβλέπονται, δεν προχωρούν και δεν υλοποιούνται;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(17 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Ο κατάλογος των 181 σχεδίων προτεραιότητας εκπονήθηκε ως αποτέλεσμα ενέργειας παρακολούθησης που πραγματοποιήθηκε σε στενή συνεργασία μεταξύ των ελληνικών αρχών και της Επιτροπής. Όλα τα έργα θα πρέπει να ολοκληρωθούν και να καταστούν επιχειρησιακά έως το τέλος του 2015. Πλήρη λεπτομερή στοιχεία σχετικά με το χορνοδιάγραμμα ολοκλήρωσης και τις επιλέξιμες δαπάνες για κάθε έργο δημοσιεύτηκαν στους ακόλουθους δικτυακούς τόπους:
ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/newsroom/detail.cfm?id=150
ec.europa.eu/ellada/index_el.htm
www.espa.gr

Η πληρωμή από την Επιτροπή της συνεισφοράς της ΕΕ καθορίζεται από το ποσοστό συγχρηματοδότησης που ορίζεται στην απόφαση σχετικά με τα ελληνικά προγράμματα· η συγχρηματοδότηση αυτή μπορεί να ανέλθει έως το 85% με πρόσθετο ποσοστό 10% συμπληρωματικής πληρωμής η οποία διατίθεται κατόπιν αίτησης, όπως προβλέπεται στον κανονισμό (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1311/2011 ([1]).

Οι καθυστερήσεις δεν αποδίδονται μόνο στη μη διαθεσιμότητα των πόρων. Άλλα ζητήματα, όπως οι μακροχρόνιες δικαστικές διαδικασίες (π.χ. απαλλοτριώσεις) εμποδίζουν την εφαρμογή των συγχρηματοδοτούμενων έργων. Η Ειδική Ομάδα (Task Force) για την Ελλάδα επικουρεί τις ελληνικές αρχές στον προσδιορισμό μέτρων για τη μείωση της δυσκίνητης και χρονοβόρου γραφειοκρατίας, καθώς και στη χρησιμοποίηση τεχνικής βοήθειας για τη διευκόλυνση της εφαρμογής των σχεδίων όποτε απαιτηθεί.

([1]) Κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1311/2011 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 13ης Δεκεμβρίου 2011, για την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου όσον αφορά ορισμένες διατάξεις σχετικά με τη χρηματοοικονομική διαχείριση για ορισμένα κράτη μέλη που αντιμετωπίζουν ή απειλούνται από σοβαρές δυσκολίες όσον αφορά τη χρηματοοικονομική τους σταθερότητα.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012655/11
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE) and Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: Priority projects in Greece

Greece has filed a list of 181 priority projects, the implementation of which has been awarded to one operator, which will have specific competence and responsibility. The priority projects are also subject to strict procedures and timetables, so that they can be implemented swiftly.

I would like to ask the Commission:

1. Has Greece filed a clear completion timetable and costs for the 181 priority projects? How much is the Community contribution, how much is the national contribution and when are these projects expected to be completed?

2. As the national contribution has been reduced to 5 %, why do numerous Greek projects never proceed beyond the drawing board to implementation?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(17 February 2012)

The list of 181 priority projects was prepared as a result of a monitoring exercise carried out in close collaboration between the Greek authorities and the Commission. All projects should ultimately be completed and operational by the end of 2015. Full details concerning the completion timetable and eligible expenditure for each project have been published on the following websites:

ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/newsroom/detail.cfm?id=150
ec.europa.eu/ellada/index_el.htm
www.espa.gr

The payment by the Commission of the EU contribution is determined by the co-financing rate laid down in the decision on the Greek programmes which can go up to 85 % with an additional 10 % top-up available upon application as provided for by Regulation (EU) No 1311/2011 ([1]).

Delays are not only attributed to the unavailability of resources. Other considerations, such as lengthy legal procedures (e.g. expropriations) impede the implementation of co-financed projects. The Task Force for Greece is assisting the Greek authorities in identifying measures to reduce cumbersome and time-consuming bureaucracy as well as using technical assistance to facilitate project implementation whenever required.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1311/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 as regards certain provisions relating to financial management for certain Member States experiencing or threatened with serious difficulties with respect to their financial stability.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-012660/11
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(11 janvier 2012)

Objet: Nouvelles arrestations par les forces de l'occupation israélienne depuis la libération des premiers 477 prisonniers politiques

Depuis l'échange de prisonniers conclu par le gouvernement israélien et les autorités du Hamas — avec la libération, en échange du soldat Shalit, le 18 octobre dernier, de 477 prisonniers politiques palestiniens — pas moins de 470 Palestiniens ont été arrêtés à ce jour.

Parmi ces 470 Palestiniens arrêtés entre le 18 octobre et le 12 décembre, figurent soixante-dix enfants et onze femmes. La majorité de ces soixante-dix enfants vivait dans les camps de réfugiés de Shuafat (Jérusalem) et Dheisheh (Bethléem). Rien qu'au cours des deux dernières semaines, onze enfants ont été kidnappés à Shuafat, et dix à Dheisheh.

Deux des onze femmes arrêtées au cours des deux derniers mois sont toujours en détention. Six autres ont été arrêtées pendant une manifestation devant la prison de Hasharon, alors qu'elles demandaient la libération des prisonnières non incluses dans la première phase de l'échange de prisonniers.

Les militants politiques ont été particulièrement visés pendant cette période. Depuis le 18 octobre, environ 150 arrestations ont été effectuées au motif d'une affiliation politique supposée au Front Populaire de Libération de la Palestine et au Hamas, avec pour certains, une inculpation directe et pour d'autres, des ordres de détention administrative. Six députés élus au Conseil Législatif palestinien ont vu leurs ordres de détention administrative renouvelés, deux ont été arrêtés et un a été condamné à trente ans de prison.

L'article 2 de l'accord d'association UE-Israël mentionne que les relations entre l'UE et Israël se fondent sur le respect des Droits de l'homme et des principes démocratiques, qui inspire leurs politiques internes et internationales et qui constitue un élément essentiel du présent accord.

1. La Commission n'envisage-t-elle pas de reformuler ledit accord d'association au vu des violations flagrantes des Droits de l'homme et des principes démocratiques qu'Israël inflige impunément aux citoyens Palestiniens?

2. Quelle procédure la Commission doit-elle suivre en cas de violation de l'article 2 d'un accord d'association conclu entre un pays et l'Union européenne? Les mesures sont-elles égales pour tous les pays?

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

La Commission n'a pas la compétence de «reformuler» l'accord d'association UE-Israël. L'introduction de modifications dans les accords de l'UE avec les pays tiers est une procédure législative complexe dont la décision en dernier ressort dépend du Conseil de l'UE et du Parlement.

L'accord d'association UE-Israël prévoit une clause standard dans son article 2 (communément appelée la clause Droits de l'homme) qui est insérée dans tous les accords-cadres de l'UE avec les pays tiers depuis le début des années 1990. Le but de cette clause est d'affirmer clairement pour les deux parties que le respect des Droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales est un élément essentiel de l'accord. L'article 79 de l'accord fournit un champ de réaction pour les Parties dans le cas où elles observeraient un manquement de l'une des Parties à l'une des obligations de l'accord, notamment au respect des Droits de l'homme. Selon l'article 79 (2) et (3), des mesures prises par l'une des Parties en vue de faire respecter l'accord dans un cas particulier, devraient viser à rechercher une solution acceptable aux deux parties, tout en donnant la priorité aux mesures qui perturbent le moins le fonctionnement de l'accord.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-012660/11
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(11 January 2012)

Subject: New arrests by the Israeli occupations forces since release of the first 477 political prisoners

Since the exchange of prisoners concluded by the Israeli government and the Hamas authorities with the release of 477 Palestinian political prisoners in exchange for the soldier Shalit, not less than 470 Palestinians have been arrested to date.

Among these 470 Palestinians arrested between 18 October and 12 December, there are seventy children and eleven women. The majority of these seventy children were living in the Shuafat (Jerusalem) and Dheisheh (Bethlehem) refugee camps. Just in the course of the two last weeks, eleven children were kidnapped in Shuafat, and ten in Dheisheh.

Two of the eleven women arrested in the course of two last months are still in custody. Six others were arrested during a demonstration in front of the Hasharon prison, while they called for the release of the prisoners not included in the first phase of the exchange of prisoners.

Political activists were particularly targeted during this period. Since 18th October, approximately 150 arrests were made on the grounds of an assumed affiliation with the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and with Hamas, for some of them, with a direct accusation and for others, orders for administrative arrest. Six deputies elected to the Palestinian Legislative Council saw their orders for administrative arrest renewed, two were arrested and one was condemned to thirty years in prison.

In view of Article 2 of the EU-Israeli Association Agreement which mentions that the relationship between the EU and Israel will be based on respect for human rights and democratic principles which guide their internal and external policies as an essential element of the Agreement,

1. Does the Committee not plan to reformulate the aforementioned association agreement in view of flagrant violations of human rights and democratic principles which Israel inflicts with impunity on the Palestinians citizens?

2. What procedure must the Committee follow in the event of violation of Article 2 of an association agreement concluded between a country and the European Union? Are the measures equal for all countries?

(Version française)

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

La Commission n'a pas la compétence de «reformuler» l'accord d'association UE-Israël. L'introduction de modifications dans les accords de l'UE avec les pays tiers est une procédure législative complexe dont la décision en dernier ressort dépend du Conseil de l'UE et du Parlement.

L'accord d'association UE-Israël prévoit une clause standard dans son article 2 (communément appelée la clause Droits de l'homme) qui est insérée dans tous les accords-cadres de l'UE avec les pays tiers depuis le début des années 1990. Le but de cette clause est d'affirmer clairement pour les deux parties que le respect des Droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales est un élément essentiel de l'accord. L'article 79 de l'accord fournit un champ de réaction pour les Parties dans le cas où elles observeraient un manquement de l'une des Parties à l'une des obligations de l'accord, notamment au respect des Droits de l'homme. Selon l'article 79 (2) et (3), des mesures prises par l'une des Parties en vue de faire respecter l'accord dans un cas particulier, devraient viser à rechercher une solution acceptable aux deux parties, tout en donnant la priorité aux mesures qui perturbent le moins le fonctionnement de l'accord.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-012686/11
προς την Επιτροπή
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(10 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αποκαλυπτικές δηλώσεις του πρώην πρωθυπουργού της Τουρκίας, κ. Γιλμάζ

Ο πρώην πρωθυπουργός της Τουρκίας, Μεσούτ Γιλμάζ, δήλωσε εμμέσως πλην σαφώς πως οι τουρκικές μυστικές υπηρεσίες και το παρακράτος είχαν συμμετοχή στις καταστροφικές πυρκαγιές που ξέσπασαν σε δάση της Ελλάδας μεταξύ του 1995 και του 1997, όταν πρωθυπουργός της Τουρκίας ήταν η Τανσού Τσιλέρ.

Λαμβάνοντας λοιπόν σοβαρά υπόψη τις αποκαλυπτικές αυτές δηλώσεις του πρώην πρωθυπουργού ερωτάται η Επιτροπή αν προτίθεται να διερευνήσει σε βάθος τις καταγγελίες αυτές που στρέφονται εναντίον κράτους μέλους;

Προτίθεται να πιέσει την υποψήφια χώρα, σε περίπτωση που αποδειχτούν οι καταγγελίες, να ζητήσει δημόσια συγγνώμη;

Θα υπάρξουν επιπτώσεις στην ενταξιακή της πορεία;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-000036/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(24 Ιανουαρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αποκαλύψεις για εμπρησμούς ελληνικών δασών και πραξικοπήματος στο Αζερμπαϊτζάν από τον Μεσούτ Γιλμάζ

Στις 24 Δεκεμβρίου 2011, στην τουρκική εφημερίδα «Μπιργκιούν», ο πρώην Πρωθυπουργός της Τουρκίας, με τρόπο απολύτως κατηγορηματικό, παραδέχτηκε ότι, με χρηματοδότηση από κρατικά μυστικά κονδύλια, τουλάχιστον την εποχή της Πρωθυπουργίας Τσιλέρ (1995-1997), έγινε απόπειρα πραξικοπήματος στο Αζερμπαϊτζάν, αλλά και τούρκοι πράκτορες έκαιγαν τα δάση της Ελλάδας προκαλώντας ανυπολόγιστες καταστροφές.

Οι αποκαλύψεις αυτές, που γίνονται τώρα και από επίσημα χείλη, διασταυρώνονται με πληροφορίες και αποκαλύψεις, όπως αυτές των στελεχών των Γκρίζων Λύκων, που είχαν δικαστεί για δολοφονίες στην Κωνσταντινούπολη και είχαν ομολογήσει ενώπιον της τουρκικής δικαιοσύνης ότι είχαν προκαλέσει εμπρησμούς σε ελληνικά νησιά. Παρόμοιες αποκαλύψεις, άλλωστε, έχουν γίνει και μέσα από το βιβλίο του γνωστού Τούρκου δημοσιογράφου Εμίλ Τσολασάν.

Με δεδομένο ότι ένας από τους κυριότερους όρους συνέχισης των διαπραγματεύσεων ΕΕ-Τουρκίας είναι η βελτίωση των σχέσεων της Τουρκίας με τους γείτονές της, και τυχόν μη διερεύνηση αυτών των αποκαλύψεων θα επηρεάσουν αρνητικά τις σχέσεις της Τουρκίας με τους γείτονές της, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Τι γνωρίζει για τις κατά καιρούς αποκαλύψεις, όπως οι εμπρησμοί ελληνικών δασών και πραξικοπήματος στο Αζερμπαϊτζάν, από κρατικές και παρακρατικές ομάδες της Τουρκίας;

Θα απαιτήσει από την Τουρκία την έναρξη δικαστικών και ανακριτικών διαδικασιών, ούτως ώστε να διαλευκανθεί πλήρως η υπόθεση της διάθεσης κρατικών μυστικών κονδυλίων της τουρκικής κυβέρνησης για δολιοφθορές σε άλλες χώρες, και μάλιστα της ΕΕ;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(8 Φεβρουαρίου 2012)

Αρμόδιες για τη διερεύνηση των καταγγελιών του πρώην πρωθυπουργού της Τουρκίας είναι οι τουρκικές αρχές. Από πλευράς της, η Επιτροπή δεν επιθυμεί να σχολιάσει τις καταγγελίες αυτές.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-012686/11
to the Commission
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(10 January 2012)

Subject: Revealing statements by the former Turkish Prime Minister, Mr Yilmaz

The former Turkish Prime Minister, Mesut Yilmaz, has stated indirectly, but clearly, that the Turkish secret services and rogue elements were involved in the devastating fires which broke out in forests in Greece between 1995 and 1997, when the Turkish Prime Minister was Tansu Ciller.

Given the serious nature of these revealing statements by the former Prime Minister, does the Commission intend to thoroughly investigate these accusations against a Member State?

In the event that the accusations are proven to be true, will it urge the candidate country to make a public apology?

Will its progress towards accession be affected?

Question for written answer E-000036/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(24 January 2012)

Subject: Revelations by Mesut Yilmaz concerning arson attacks on Greek forests and coup in Azerbaijan

On 24 December 2011, the former Turkish Prime Minister openly admitted to the Turkish newspaper *Birgün* that secret state funds had been used to finance an attempted coup in Azerbaijan at least once, when Tanso Chiller was Prime Minister (1995-97), and that Turkish agents had set fire to forests in Greece, causing incalculable damage.

These revelations, which have now come from an official source, tally with information and disclosures such as those obtained from officers of the Grey Wolves sentenced on murder charges in Istanbul, who admitted before the Turkish courts that they had committed arson on Greek islands. Similar revelations have also been made in a book by the well-known Turkish journalist Emil Tsolasan.

Given that one of the main preconditions for continuing negotiations between the EU and Turkey is improved relations between Turkey and its neighbours and that failure to investigate the above revelations will adversely affect them:

What does the Commission know about these intermittent disclosures concerning arson attacks on Greek forests and a coup in Azerbaijan by Turkish state and parastate organisations?

Will it call on Turkey to investigate the matter and initiate legal proceedings in order to throw light on secret state funding by the Turkish Government for acts of sabotage in other countries, including EU Member States?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(8 February 2012)

The competence to investigate the allegations made by the former Turkish Prime Minister lies with the Turkish authorities. For its part the Commission does not wish to comment on such allegations.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-004381/12
Komisijai
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(2012 m. balandžio 26 d.)

Tema: Kova su sukčiavimu telefonu ir privaloma SIM kortelių registracija

Pastaruoju metu mūsų piliečiai itin dažnai nukenčia nuo telefoninių sukčių. Tačiau atliekant baudžiamąjį tyrimą neįmanoma nustatyti šiais nusikaltimais įtariamų asmenų tapatybės, nes jie naudojasi anoniminėmis išankstinio mokėjimo SIM kortelėmis, kurių registracija neprivaloma.

Atsižvelgdamos į tai, kad galimybė gauti reikalingus duomenis yra viena iš pagrindinių baudžiamojo tyrimo priemonių, kurias taikydamos teisėsaugos institucijos gali išaiškinti minėtuosius nusikaltimus, šešios Europos Sąjungos valstybės narės savo nacionalinėje teisėje jau yra nustačiusios reikalavimą registruoti išankstinio mokėjimo SIM korteles. Kaip ir kitos valstybės narės, jos pritaria, kad ES lygmeniu būtų nustatytas reikalavimas iš anksto pagal privalomą tvarką registruoti iš anksto apmokėtų telefoninių paslaugų naudotojų tapatybę.

— Ar Komisija nemano, kad turėtų būti priimtas atitinkamas ES teisės aktas dėl tokių prevencinių priemonių taikymo kovojant su telefoniniais sukčiais visoje Europos Sąjungoje?

C. Malmström atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. liepos 5 d.)

Komisija paprašė valstybių narių, kuriose išankstinio mokėjimo SIM kortelių registracija privaloma, pateikti įrodymų, kad tokia priemonė veiksminga ir kad ji būtų naudinga saugumo požiūriu, jei būtų taikoma visoje ES. Kol kas negauta informacijos, kuri patvirtintų, kad reikia imtis ES lygmens priemonių. Todėl, kaip nurodyta Duomenų saugojimo direktyvos vertinimo ataskaitoje (COM(2011) 225 galutinis), šiuo metu Komisija neturi pagrindo manyti, kad šioje srityje reikėtų imtis ES lygmens priemonių.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004381/12
to the Commission
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Combating telephone fraud and compulsory SIM card registration

Recently our citizens have often been the victims of telephone fraudsters. However, when carrying out a criminal investigation it is impossible to determine the identities of the people suspected of perpetrating these crimes because they use anonymous pre-paid SIM cards, the registration of which is not compulsory.

Given that the opportunity to obtain the required data is one of the main tools of a criminal investigation, the use of which can enable law enforcement agencies to solve aforementioned crimes, six European Union Member States have already laid down a requirement in their national law for the registration of pre-paid SIM cards. Like other Member States, they agree that a requirement should be established at EU level for the advance compulsory registration of the identity of the users of pre-paid telephone services.

— Does the Commission believe that relevant EU legislation should be adopted on the application of such preventative measures to combat telephone fraudsters throughout the European Union?

Answer given by Mme Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2012)

The Commission has invited Member States to provide evidence of the effectiveness of mandatory registration of pre-paid SIM cards, where such a measure is in place, and of the potential security benefit were the EU to adopt a similar approach. To date, no evidence has been forthcoming to justify action at EU level. Therefore, and as stated in the evaluation report on the Data Retention Directive (COM(2011)225 final), the Commission is not convinced of the need for action in this area at an EU level at this stage.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-004382/12
Komisijai
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(2012 m. balandžio 26 d.)

Tema: Atliekų, šalinamų į sąvartynus, kiekio mažinimas

Pagal atliekų hierarchiją, įtvirtintą Atliekų direktyvoje, šalinimas į sąvartynus laikytinas paskutiniąja iš galimų priemonių. Tiek teisėkūros priemonės, tiek įvairios ekonominės priemonės (ir mokestinės priemonės, ir sankcijos) yra pasitelkiamos tam, kad šis principas būtų tinkamai įgyvendintas. Vis dėlto, kaip matyti iš 2012 m. balandžio 16 d. EK paskelbtos ataskaitos, kai kuriose valstybėse į sąvartynus šalinamų atliekų kiekis visiškai nemažėja, o taikomos ekonominės priemonės nėra efektyvios.

— Ar Komisija galėtų patvirtinti, kad, rengdama ataskaitas dėl į sąvartynus šalinamų atliekų kiekio, ji nuosekliai taiko tą pačią metodiką ir kad ataskaitose pateikiami duomenys nėra iškraipyti dėl ataskaitose taikytų skirtingų skaičiavimo metodikų?

— Ar Komisija nemano, jog kai kurių valstybių neveiklumas mažinant į sąvartynus šalinamų atliekų kiekį, pradeda kelti grėsmę visos ES atliekų tvarkymo politikos įgyvendinimui?

— Kokių priemonių Komisija planuoja imtis, kad valstybės narės parengtų atliekų tvarkymo planus bei atliekų prevencijos programas, kurias įgyvendinant būtų realiai mažinamas į sąvartynus šalinamų atliekų kiekis, ir kad būtų efektyviai užtikrinamas šių planų ir programų laikymasis?

J. Potočniko atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. birželio 22 d.)

1. Ataskaitoje naudojamus duomenis apie tai, kiek atliekų išvežama į sąvartynus, pateikė Eurostatas ir peržiūrėjo valstybės narės.

2. Iš tiesų Komisija mano, kad dėl tam tikrų valstybių narių neveikimo gali kilti pavojus, kad ES atliekų teisės aktai bus įgyvendinti nepakankamu mastu. Komisija keletą kartų išreiškė susirūpinimą ir ėmėsi priemonių (nuo informuotumo didinimo ir mokymo iki politinio spaudimo ir teisinių veiksmų) padėčiai gerinti.

3. Valstybės narės yra teisiškai įpareigotos sudaryti ir atnaujinti atliekų tvarkymo planus ir atliekų prevencijos programas; joms to nepadarius, Komisija imasi veiksmų. 2013 m. Komisija atliks atliekų valdymo planų, apie kuriuos pranešta, turinio kokybės patikrą ir, jei bus nustatyta trūkumų, atitinkamoms valstybėms narėms bus rekomenduota pagerinti padėtį. Be to, ji išnagrinės nacionalines atliekų prevencijos programas, kai tik jos bus pateiktos (iki 2013 m. pabaigos).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004382/12
to the Commission
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Reducing the amount of landfilled waste

According to the waste hierarchy in the Waste Framework Directive, landfilling is considered a last resort. Both legislative instruments and various economic instruments (fiscal instruments and sanctions) are used to ensure that this principle is properly implemented. Despite this, as can be seen from the report published by the European Commission on 16 April 2012, in certain countries the amount of landfilled waste is not being reduced at all and the economic instruments applied are not effective.

— Could the Commission confirm that it consistently uses the same methodology when preparing reports on the amount of landfilled waste and that the data provided in reports is not distorted due to different calculation methodologies being used in the reports?

— Does the Commission believe that the inaction of certain countries in terms of reducing the amount of landfilled waste is beginning to threaten the implementation of the whole EU waste management policy?

— What measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that Member States draw up waste management plans and waste prevention programmes, the implementation of which would genuinely reduce the amount of landfilled waste, and to effectively guarantee compliance with these plans and programmes?

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

1. The data used in the report on the amount landfilled are originating from Eurostat and have been reviewed by the Member States.

2. The Commission indeed is of the opinion that the inaction of some Member States risks resulting in a lack of implementation of EU waste legislation. The Commission has expressed its concerns on several occasions and has taken a number of measures — ranging from awareness raising and training, through political pressure, to legal action — to improve the situation.

3. Drawing up and updating waste management plans and waste prevention programmes is a legal obligation for Member States, the Commission takes action in case of their absence. In 2013, the Commission will undertake a quality check of the content of notified waste management plans and, in case of deficiencies, recommendations will be given to the relevant Member States to improve the situation. It will also examine national waste prevention programmes as soon as they become available (by end 2013).

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-004383/12
до Комисията
Мария Неделчева (PPE)
(26 април 2012 г.)

Относно: Подпомагане на сектора на пчеларството в кризисна ситуация

Пчеларският сектор в България е изправен пред редица предизвикателства — висока смъртност на пчелите, финансови затруднения, липса на директни плащания, регламенти, които да определят статута на пчеларите, както и недостиг на правна информация.

В сега действащото законодателство на ЕС не се предвиждат директни плащания конкретно за пчеларството — нито в България, нито в другите държави от ЕС, което има негативни и демотивиращи последици за сектора. Средствата, които пчеларите получават в рамките на Националните програми, са твърде малко в сравнение със средствата, които се предоставят на останалите сектори в земеделието и животновъдството.

Високата смъртност на пчелите е един от основните проблеми, които секторът среща. По данни на българските пчелари 250 000 пчелни семейства от общо около 600 000 са загинали през последната година вследствие на тежката зима и други неблагоприятни фактори.

— В тази връзка съществува ли според ЕК възможност пчеларският сектор в България да бъде подпомогнат като сектор, намиращ се в кризисна ситуация?

— Кой европейски фонд би могъл да предостави финансова подкрепа на сектора на пчеларството и при какви условия?

Отговор, даден от г-н Чолош от името на Комисията
(14 юни 2012 г.)

Редица мерки в подкрепа на сектора на пчеларството са залегнали в Регламент (ЕО) № 1234/2007 за установяване на обща организация на селскостопанските пазари и относно специфични разпоредби за някои земеделски продукти („Общ регламент за ООП“) ([1]).

Тези мерки могат да бъдат заложени в изготвените от държавите членки програми в областта на пчеларството, като в случай че бъдат счетени за допустими, въпросните разходи могат да бъдат частично финансирани от ЕС. Мерките включват профилактика на вароатозата и подновяване на пчелните семейства в пчелините, като целта е да се реши проблемът с разпадането на пчелните семейства.

В допълнение българската Програма за развитие на селските райони (2007-2013 г.) по линия на Европейския земеделски фонд за развитие на селските райони обхваща редица мерки, в чиито рамки може да се предоставя подпомагане на сектора на пчеларството. Това включва Мярка 121 „Модернизиране на земеделските стопанства“, която дава възможност за инвестиционна подкрепа за пчеларите (при спазване на някои ограничения във връзка с горепосочената програма в областта на пчеларството), и Мярка 214 „Агроекологични плащания“, която съдържа специфична подмярка за насърчаване на биологичното пчеларство.

([1]) ОВ L 299, 16.11.2007 г., стр. 1, член 106 от него.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004383/12
to the Commission
Mariya Nedelcheva (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Support for the beekeeping sector at a time of crisis

The beekeeping sector in Bulgaria is facing a number of challenges: a high bee mortality rate, financial difficulties, an absence of direct payments, regulations defining the status of beekeepers, and a shortage of legal information.

Current EU legislation does not provide for direct payments specifically for beekeeping — neither in Bulgaria, nor in the other EU Member States — and this has negative and demotivating consequences for the sector. By comparison with other agriculture and animal husbandry sectors, beekeepers receive too little funding under the country's national programmes.

The high death rate among bees is one of the main problems encountered by the sector. According to Bulgarian beekeepers' data, 250 000 bee colonies out of a total of approximately 600 000 have perished in the last year as a result of the severe winter and other adverse factors.

— Does the Commission see any scope for the beekeeping sector in Bulgaria to be supported as a sector in crisis?

— Which European fund could provide financial assistance to the beekeeping sector, and under what conditions?

Answer given by Mr Ciolos on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2012)

A series of measures to support the beekeeping sector are set down in Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 establishing a common organisation of agricultural markets and on specific provisions for certain agricultural products (Single CMO Regulation) ([1]).

These measures may be included in the apiculture programmes drawn up by Member States and if considered eligible the expenditure concerned can be part-financed by the EU. Included in the measures are varroasis prevention and the restocking of hives which are specifically intended to address the problem of colony collapse.

In addition, the Bulgarian Rural Development Programme 2007-2013 under the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development includes a number of measures under which the bee-keeping sector is also eligible for support. This includes Measure 121 -farm modernisation where investment support for bee keepers is possible (subject to certain demarcations with the beekeeping programme indicated above), and Measure 214 -agri-environment payments, which has a specific sub-measure to promote organic apiculture.

([1]) OJ L 299, 16.11.2007 p. 1, Article 106 thereof.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004385/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(26. April 2012)

Betrifft: Dokumentationspflichten im Gastgewerbe

Viele österreichische kleine und mittelständische Betriebe aus den Branchen Hotel, Tourismus und Gastronomie üben heftige Kritik an den bereits vorhandenen und auch an den von der EU zusätzlich in Aussicht gestellten Dokumentations- und Kostenpflichten. Gerade in Klein- und Familienbetrieben fehlt es an finanziellen Mitteln, um dafür mehr Personal einzustellen. Die Liste der bisherigen Aufzeichnungspflichten von den Finanzen bis hin zur Lebensmittelhygiene ist lang, und die den Gastronomiebetrieben von der EU in Aussicht gestellte Pflicht zur genauen Dokumentation der Herkunft einzelner Produkte, inklusive der Zutaten in der Speisekarte, lässt zusätzlich aufhorchen. Eine ausufernde Verwaltung und überzogene Kontrolle behindern zunehmend die Produktivität der Arbeitnehmer und der Arbeitgeber. Durch überzogene Gebühren für diese kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen wird verhindert, dass neue Investitionen getätigt werden.

1. Die kleinen und mittelständischen Unternehmen sind für das Beschäftigungswachstum und die regionale Entwicklung von entscheidender Bedeutung, heißt es seitens der EU — die Europäische Union will die KMU mit dementsprechenden Programmen zur Wachstumsförderung und Steigerung der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit unterstützen. Ist das oben angesprochene Vorgehen daher nicht kontraproduktiv? Wie steht die Kommission zu der Kritik der kleinen und mittelständischen Betriebe?

2. Wie beurteilt die Kommission die Zukunft dieser kleinen Unternehmer, Hoteliers und Gastwirte, und wie könnte man diese Branche als KMU besser unterstützen?

3. Welche konkreten Lebensmittelkennzeichnungsvorschriften sind noch für die Gastronomiebranche geplant, und bis wann sollen diese Vorschriften in Kraft treten?

4. Wie will man die Bedenken der Konsumenten zerstreuen und den Vorwurf an die Europäische Union entkräften, dafür verantwortlich zu sein, dass sich die Speisekarte in Gasthäusern und Restaurants in Bälde wie „Beipackzettel von Medikamenten" lesen wird?

5. Erachtet es die Kommission nicht als sinnvoller, die Kennzeichnungspflicht im Handel auf der Ebene der Zulieferbetriebe zu optimieren, als die KMU durch massive Zusatzpflichten im täglichen Geschäft zu hemmen?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(27. Juni 2012)

1. Der Kommission ist sehr daran gelegen, dass der Grundsatz „Zuerst in kleinem Maßstab denken" in allen großen unternehmensbezogenen Vorschlägen wirksam umgesetzt wird, indem nicht nur die Auswirkungen auf Kleinbetriebe bewertet werden, sondern auch dafür gesorgt wird, dass die Interessenvertreter von KMU, insbesondere von Mikrounternehmen, eng in den Entscheidungsprozess eingebunden werden.

2. Einer der Wettbewerbsvorteile des Tourismus in Europa gegenüber neuen Reisezielen liegt in der Zuverlässigkeit und Sicherheit der hiesigen Dienstleistungen, auch in Bezug auf Angebot und Verarbeitung von Lebensmitteln. Alle Initiativen werden mit Blick auf ihre Auswirkungen auf die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der KMU besonders aufmerksam geprüft. Die Kommission unterstützt die KMU tatkräftig mit dem Ziel, Angebot und Nachfrage im Tourismus zu steigern, indem sie übergreifende Maßnahmen anregt, um die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der Touristikunternehmen in Europa zu fördern.

3. Auf EU-Ebene sind derzeit keine einschlägigen Verordnungen zur Kennzeichnung von Lebensmitteln im Restaurantsektor geplant.

4. Für die Verbraucherinnen und Verbraucher ist es im Hinblick auf ihre Gesundheit sehr wichtig, Informationen über Allergene zu erhalten. Nachgewiesenermaßen treten 70 % der anaphylaktischen Reaktionen in Restaurants oder anderen Orten auf, an denen Lebensmittel zum Verzehr angeboten werden ([1]). Der EU-Gesetzgeber hat festgestellt, dass der Gesundheitsschutz der Verbraucher eingeschränkt würde, wenn die Regeln zur Information über Allergene auf einzelne Bereiche nicht angewendet würden. Gemäß der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 ([2]) können die Mitgliedstaaten nationale Vorschriften darüber erlassen, auf welche Weise Informationen über Allergene bereitzustellen sind. Demzufolge sind Lösungen möglich, die eigens auf die Merkmale der betreffenden Betriebe zugeschnitten sind.

5. Gemäß der vorgenannten Verordnung müssen die einzelnen Betriebe die verpflichtenden Informationen weiterleiten. Demnach müßten die Zulieferer allergenbezogene Informationen ohne weiteres von den Erzeugern und Großhändlern und die Restaurants entsprechende Angaben wiederum von ihren Zulieferern erhalten.

([1]) Impact Assessment Reports on the Commission proposal on the Regulation on the provision of food information to consumers (Berichte über Folgenabschätzungen des Vorschlags der Kommission zur Verordnung über die Bereitstellung von Informationen für Verbraucher) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/foodlabelling/publications/ia_general_food_labelling.pdf.

([2]) ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004385/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Administrative burden in the hospitality industry

Many small and medium-sized enterprises in the hotel, tourism and restaurant sectors in Austria are extremely critical of the administrative burden they already face, and of EU plans to increase this burden in terms of documentation and costs. Small enterprises and family-run businesses in particular lack the financial resources to employ more staff to meet these requirements. The list of reporting requirements is already long, ranging from financial information to food-hygiene data. Hence, the prospect of further stringent documentation requirements from the EU, demanding that menus should contain precise details of the origin of individual products, including ingredients, is sounding alarm bells. Excessive administration and controls are increasingly hampering the productivity of workers and their employers. The disproportionately high charges faced by these small and medium-sized enterprises are preventing new investment.

1. According to the EU, small and medium-sized enterprises are of key importance for growth in employment and regional development; the European Union seeks to support SMEs with corresponding programmes to promote growth and increase competitiveness. Is the procedure outlined above not therefore counter-productive? What is the Commission's view of the criticism expressed by small and medium-sized enterprises?

2. How does the Commission assess the future of these small businessmen, hoteliers and restaurant owners and how could SMEs be offered better support?

3. What specific food labelling regulations are still in the pipeline for the restaurant sector, and when can we expect these to come into force?

4. How is it possible to allay consumers' concerns while also refuting criticism that the EU is causing restaurant menus to read like medical information leaflets?

5. Does the Commission not believe that it would make more sense to optimise labelling requirements in the retail sector on the supplier side, rather than impeding the day-to-day running of SMEs with burdensome additional duties?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

1. The Commission is strongly committed to ensuring that the 'Think Small First' principle is effectively implemented in all its major business-relevant proposals, not only by assessing impacts on small business but also by ensuring that SME stakeholders, in particular micro-enterprises, are closely involved in policymaking.

2. One of the competitive advantages of European tourism against emerging destinations is the safety and security of its services, including its food supply and catering. All initiatives are assessed with particular attention to their effects on the competitiveness of SMEs. The Commission intensely supports SMEs to enhance both the tourism supply and demand, as well as by introducing cross-cutting measures to boost-the competitiveness of European tourism enterprises.

3. At EU level, there are no specific food labelling regulations under preparation for the restaurant sector.

4. Provision of information on allergens is very important to consumers' health. There is evidence that 70% of the anaphylactic events happen in restaurants or other places when eating out ([1]). The co-legislators agreed that excluding any sector from the scope of the rules on allergen information would undermine the protection of consumers' health. Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 ([2]) provides that Member States may adopt measures concerning the means to make allergen information available. This approach allows for solutions tailored to the characteristics of the businesses concerned.

([1]) Impact Assessment Reports on the Commission proposal on the regulation on the provision of food information to consumers, http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/labellingnutrition/foodlabelling/publications/ia_general_food_labelling.pdf

([2]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011.

5. The regulation requires transmission of the mandatory information from business to business. Thus, allergen information would be readily available from the producers and wholesalers to retailers selling loose food, and for restaurants from their suppliers.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004388/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(26 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Huelga de hambre de prisioneros palestinos en Israel

Recientemente ha sido liberado el preso palestino Khader Adnan que fue detenido por Israel en uso de su denominada «detención administrativa», una legislación que permite encarcelar indefinidamente a sospechosos sin ser acusados de ningún delito.

Tras ser detenido sin cargos, Adnan inició una huelga de hambre que ha durado 66 días y que ha llamado la atención internacional después que el pasado 17 de abril, coincidiendo con el llamado Día del Prisionero palestino, más de 1 200 presos políticos palestinos detenidos en Israel decidieran también hacer huelga de hambre.

Este mismo lunes, el representante de la Autoridad Nacional Palestina ante la ONU, Riyad Mansour, afirmó que después del canje de prisioneros entre israelíes y palestinos de finales de 2011, se han producido cerca de 2 000 nuevas detenciones, muchas de ellas de prisioneros palestinos recién liberados.

— ¿Ha adoptado la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante alguna iniciativa para favorecer el fin de esta huelga de hambre de los presos palestinos e interesarse por sus condiciones?

— ¿Se están haciendo gestiones para que Israel permita la entrada de organismos internacionales a sus centros de detención?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Sra. Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de julio de 2012)

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta acoge con satisfacción el acuerdo alcanzado el 14 de mayo de 2012, que pone fin a la huelga de hambre de los detenidos palestinos y de los presos bajo custodia israelí. La AR/VP insta a todas las partes implicadas a que apliquen el acuerdo con prontitud y de buena fe, y felicita, asimismo, a Egipto por el papel decisivo que ha desempeñado en las negociaciones del acuerdo.

Anteriormente, el 14 de mayo de 2012, tras el Consejo de Asuntos Exteriores, la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta realizó las siguientes declaraciones a la prensa:

«Hemos examinado también, durante los debates, la huelga de hambre de los presos palestinos. Hemos seguido este tema muy de cerca y seguimos unidos a los esfuerzos actuales por encontrar una solución, incluso a través de nuestra Delegación. Nuestros Jefes de Misión (en Jerusalén) ya se pronunciaron sobre esta cuestión la semana pasada.

Estamos muy preocupados por el estado de salud crítico de los palestinos detenidos por el gobierno israelí que llevan en huelga de hambre más de dos meses. Existen indicios positivos sobre una posible solución, e insto a Israel y a todas las partes a que hagan todo lo necesario por encontrar una solución inmediata a la situación actual».

La Unión Europea trata con frecuencia la cuestión de la detención administrativa y las condiciones en las prisiones de Israel, en el marco del diálogo político UE-Israel y en otros contextos apropiados. La amplia utilización, por parte de Israel, de la detención administrativa sin cargo formal alguno es un tema que preocupa desde hace tiempo a la UE. Los detenidos tienen derecho a ser informados acerca de los cargos que se les imputan y a recibir un juicio justo. Israel permite que el CICR tenga acceso a los presos palestinos detenidos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004388/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Hunger strike by Palestinian prisoners in Israel

The Palestinian prisoner Khader Adnan has recently been released. He was detained by Israel under its so-called 'administrative detention' legislation, which permits suspects to be imprisoned indefinitely without charge.

After being detained without charge, Adnan began a hunger strike that lasted 66 days and has drawn international attention since 17 April 2012, when, to mark 'Palestinian Prisoners' Day', more than 1 200 Palestinian political prisoners detained in Israel also went on hunger strike.

This Monday, the Palestinian National Authority representative to the UN, Riyad Mansour, stated that, since the exchange of Israeli and Palestinian prisoners at the end of 2011, around 2 000 new detentions have occurred, many involving recently released Palestinian prisoners.

— Has the Vice-President/High Representative taken any initiative to the end this hunger strike by Palestinian prisoners and to find out about their conditions?

— Are steps being taken for Israel to permit international organisations to enter its detention centres?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President welcomes the agreement reached on 14 May 2012 to end the hunger strike by Palestinian detainees and prisoners in Israeli custody. She urges all concerned to implement the agreement swiftly and in good faith. She commends Egypt for its key role in brokering the agreement.

Earlier on the 14 May 2012, following the Foreign Affairs Council, the High Representative/Vice-President made the following remarks to the press:

'In the course of our discussions we have also looked at the hunger strike by Palestinian prisoners. We have been following this issue very closely and remained engaged, including through our Delegation, in the ongoing efforts to find a solution. Our Heads of Missions [in Jerusalem] already issued a statement on this issue last week.

We are very concerned about the critical health condition of the Palestinians held in Israeli administrative detention who have been on hunger strike for more than two months. There are positive signals about a possible solution and I urge Israel and all sides to do everything possible to find an immediate solution to the current situation.'

The European Union regularly raises the question of administrative detention and prison conditions with Israel in the framework of the EU-Israel political dialogue and in other appropriate settings. The EU has longstanding concern about the extensive use by Israel of administrative detention without formal charge. Detainees have the right to be informed about the charges underlying any detention and be subject to a fair trial. Israel allows the ICRC access to Palestinian prisoners in detention.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004389/12
an die Kommission
Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)
(26. April 2012)

Betrifft: Eingeschränkte Auslastung der Erdgasfernleitung OPAL durch EU-Vorgaben

Vor dem Hintergrund der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit, Nachhaltigkeit und Versorgungssicherheit im Energiebereich muss der Infrastrukturausbau in Europa in Zukunft vorangetrieben werden. Die Investitions- und Planungssicherheit spielt dabei eine große Rolle, denn Infrastrukturprojekte werden nur realisiert, wenn der Rechtsrahmen und seine Auslegung klar und voraussehbar sind. Insbesondere ist daher eine gute Abstimmung zwischen nationalen Aufsichtsbehörden und der Europäischen Kommission wichtig.

Am Beispiel der Erdgasfernleitung OPAL, mit der die durch die Ostsee verlaufende Erdgasfernleitung North Stream an das europäische Erdgasfernleitungsnetz angebunden wird, zeigt sich, dass Regulierungsentscheidungen auf europäischer und nationaler Ebene unterschiedlich ausfallen können. In diesem konkreten Fall erteilte die deutsche Bundesnetzagentur (BNetzA) der OPAL eine Teilfreistellung gemäß § 28a EnWG. Dieser Beschluss wurde jedoch von der Kommission im Laufe des Verfahrens um zusätzliche, strikte Auflagen erweitert, womit im Ergebnis bis heute nur 50 % der Kapazität der Erdgasfernleitung genutzt werden können und praktisch auch nur genutzt werden, da es keine potenziellen Drittnutzer gibt.

1. Wie erklärt die Kommission, dass die Kapazität der Erdgasfernleitung bis heute nicht ausgeschöpft wird? Wäre mit Blick auf die Versorgungssicherheit Europas eine Vollauslastung nicht wünschenswert?

2. Worin lagen die konkreten Gründe für eine Verweigerung einer Ausnahme ohne weitere Auflagen, da es an potenziellen Dritten, die die Erdgasfernleitung nutzen könnten, offenbar fehlt?

3. Wird die Kommission ihre Entscheidung revidieren, falls sich abzeichnet, dass auch auf lange Sicht keine weiteren Nutzer der Erdgasfernleitung OPAL absehbar sind?

4. Wurde bei der Entscheidung berücksichtigt, dass damit die Investitions- und Planungssicherheit von Unternehmen gefährdet wird und zukünftige Investoren in der Folge abgeschreckt werden könnten?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(26. Juni 2012)

2009 hat die Bundesnetzagentur, in Zusammenarbeit mit der Kommission, den Beschluss angenommen, der die Erdgasfernleitung OPAL unter bestimmten Bedingungen vom Zugang Dritter und der Tarifregelung ausnimmt.

Die im Beschluss zu OPAL festgelegten Bedingungen stellen kein Hindernis für die volle Nutzung der Erdgasfernleitung dar. Sie sind notwendig und angemessen, um zu vermeiden, dass die Ausnahme aufgrund ihrer Dauer von 22 Jahren einen negativen Einfluss auf den Wettbewerb auf dem tschechischen Markt hat. Die Obergrenze von 50 % für Unternehmen, die eine beherrschende Stelle im tschechischen Markt innehaben, schließt andere Unternehmen nicht von der Nutzung der verbleibenden Kapazitäten aus. Selbst für die marktbeherrschenden Unternehmen ist die Nutzung der Erdgasleitung OPAL nicht unbedingt auf 50 % der Kapazität beschränkt. Die Kapazitätsobergrenze darf überschritten werden, wenn die Unternehmen dem Markt eine Gasmenge von 3 Mrd. m^3 pro Jahr anbieten.

Während die Kommission nicht in der Lage ist, das Verhalten der Marktteilnehmer vorherzusehen, ist sie doch davon überzeugt, dass die festgelegten Auflagen realistisch und unter den derzeitigen Marktbedingungen umsetzbar sind. Das geforderte Programm zur Freigabe einer kleinen Menge der Kapazität ist bisher noch nicht getestet worden. Die Kommission sieht keinen sachlichen Grund, ihre Entscheidung zu revidieren.

Die Kommission unterstützt Investitionen in Energieinfrastrukturen durch verschiedene Finanzinstrumente. Im Rahmen der Förderung von Risikoinvestitionen, vor allem für grenzüberschreitende Erdgasfernleitungen, ist es außerdem möglich, eine Ausnahme vom Zugang Dritter, der Tarifregelung und/oder den Entflechtungsvorschriften zu beantragen. Ausnahmen von regulatorischen Auflagen sind in bestimmten Fällen möglich, können jedoch zur Gewährleistung des Wettbewerbs und der Versorgungssicherheit eventuell nur für Teilbereiche oder unter Auflagen gewährt werden. Die Entscheidungen werden von den nationalen Regulierungsbehörden getroffen und der Kommission mitgeteilt, welche überprüft, ob die Bedingungen erfüllt sind.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004389/12
to the Commission
Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Restricted utilisation of the OPAL gas transmission line due to EU requirements

It is necessary to press forward with the expansion of Europe's future infrastructure against a background of competitiveness, sustainability and security of supply in the energy sector. Certainty of investment and planning play a significant role as infrastructure projects will only be implemented if the legal framework and its interpretation are clear and predictable. For this reason, it is particularly important that there should be effective coordination between national supervisory authorities and the European Commission.

The OPAL gas transmission line that connects the Nord Stream gas pipeline, running under the Baltic Sea, to the European gas transmission network is an example of how regulatory decisions at European and national level can diverge. In this specific case, the German Federal Network Agency (BNetzA) granted OPAL a partial derogation according to Article 28a Energiewirtschaftsgesetz (EnWG) (Law on the energy industry). However, this decision was extended by the Commission during the course of the proceedings to include additional stringent rules, so that only 50% of the capacity of the gas transmission line can be and, in practice, is used, because there is no potential third user.

1. How does the Commission explain that the capacity of the gas transmission line has not been fully used to date? Would not full utilisation be desirable in the interests of security of supply in Europe?

2. As there are clearly no potential third parties who could use the gas transmission line, what were the specific reasons for refusing a derogation without further conditions?

3. Will the Commission revise its decision if it becomes evident that there is no long-term prospect of finding other users for the OPAL gas transmission line?

4. In making its decision, did the Commission consider that this move would threaten investment and planning certainty among undertakings, thereby possibly frightening off future investors?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2012)

In 2009, Bundesnetzagentur, in cooperation with the Commission, adopted the decision exempting the Opal pipeline from third party access and tariff regulation, subject to certain conditions.

The conditions attached to the Opal decision are not an obstacle for the full utilisation of the pipeline. They are necessary and proportionate to avoid the exemption, for its duration of 22 years, having a negative impact on competition in the Czech market. A 50% capacity cap for companies with a dominant position in the Czech market does not preclude other companies from using the remaining capacity. Even the dominant companies are not necessarily limited to the use of the Opal pipeline up to the 50% of its capacity. The capacity cap can be exceeded if they offer a gas release of 3 bcm/y.

While the Commission is not able to predict behaviour of market actors, the Commission is convinced that the imposed conditions are realistic and can be implemented under current market conditions. The requested gas release programme for a small amount of the capacity has not been tested yet on the markets. The Commission sees no objective reason to modify its decision.

The Commission promotes investments in energy infrastructure through various financial instruments. Moreover, in order to encourage risky investments, particularly in cross-border gas pipelines, it is possible to apply for an exemption from third party access, tariff regulation and/or unbundling provisions. Exemptions from regulatory obligations are available in specific cases but may be partial or subject to conditions to safeguard competition and security of supply. Decisions are taken by national regulatory authorities and notified to the Commission, which verifies if these conditions are met.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-004390/12
до Комисията
Димитър Стоянов (NI)
(26 април 2012 г.)

Относно: Нарушаване на правата на пациентите

Съгласно Европейската харта за правата на пациентите и по-специално член 10 от нея, всеки гражданин на държава членка има право на достъп до иновации в областта на здравните процедури, включително диагностични процедури, според международните стандарти и независимо от икономическите или финансови съображения. За съжаление България е една от страните с „ниско качество“ на здравеопазването поради липсата на средства за използването на нови методи и процедури, улесняващи значително грижата за пациента.

Последният факт довежда до сериозно застаряване на населението в страната поради високата смъртност на по-младото население, което е изключително тревожно по отношение на националната и европейската статистика. Освен това сериозен проблем е нарушаването на естествените човешки права, а именно правото на живот като основополагащо европейско право, защото поради липсата именно на тези иновации пациентите много често, и то в най-добрия случай, изгубват нормалния си начин на живот.

1. Какви мерки би могла да предложи Комисията, които да имат за цел еднаквия достъп на гражданите, независимо от финансовото състояние на държавата членка, в която живеят, до последните достижения на медицината?

Отговор, даден от г-н Дали от името на Комисията
(22 юни 2012 г.)

Европейската харта за правата на пациента е документ, изготвен от неправителствена организация в сътрудничество с организациите на пациентите с цел да насърчи държавите членки да разработят свои национални стратегии или законодателство в областта на правата на пациентите. Тази харта, обаче, не е документ на Европейския съюз, приет или официално одобрен от институциите на ЕС.

Съгласно член 35 от Хартата на основните права на Европейския съюз всеки гражданин на ЕС има право да ползва медицински грижи при условията, установени от националните законодателства и практики. Член 168 от Договора за функционирането на Европейския съюз предвижда, освен това, че единствено държавите членки са отговорни за управлението на своите здравни услуги и медицински грижи. Поради това Комисията не разполага с компетентност да предложи мерки, с които да гарантира, че гражданите в България имат достъп до най-новите постижения в медицината.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004390/12
to the Commission
Dimitar Stoyanov (NI)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Patients' rights violations

Under the European Charter of Patients' Rights, in particular Article 10 thereof, every citizen of a Member State has the right of access to innovative health procedures, including diagnostic procedures, according to international standards and independently of economic and financial considerations. Unfortunately, Bulgaria is one of the Member States with a 'low quality' healthcare system due to a lack of funds for the use of new methods and procedures to facilitate patient care significantly.

This is resulting in a serious ageing of Bulgaria's population, due to the high death rate among younger segments of the population, which is statistically extremely alarming at both Bulgarian and European level. A further serious problem here is the violation of basic human rights, in particular the right to life as a fundamental European right, because it is specifically the lack of these innovative procedures that in very many cases, and indeed in best-case scenarios, is depriving patients of their normal way of life.

1. What measures could the Commission propose so as to ensure equal access for citizens, regardless of the financial position of the Member State in which they live, to the latest advances in medicine?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The European Charter of Patients' Rights is a document prepared by a non-governmental organisation, in collaboration with patients' organisations, to encourage Member States to build their national strategies or legislation on patients' rights. However, this document is not a European Union text adopted or formally endorsed by the EU institutions.

According to Article 35 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, every EU citizen has the right to benefit from medical treatment under the conditions established by national laws and practices. Article 168 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, further stipulates that Member States alone are responsible for the management of their health services and medical care. The Commission therefore has no competence to propose measures to guarantee that citizens in Bulgaria have access to the latest developments in medicine.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-004391/12
до Комисията
Димитър Стоянов (NI)
(26 април 2012 г.)

Относно: Контрол върху онлайн търговията

Според Директивата за електронната търговия, насочена главно към сайтовете за колективно пазаруване, всички уеб търговци в Европа трябва да предоставят на потребителите информация за себе си под формата на име на фирмата, пощенски и имейл адрес, както и телефони. Европейските търговци са длъжни също и да изпращат потвърждение за получаването на конкретната поръчка до потребителите. За съжаление през последните месеци в България са получени редица сигнали, в които потребителите се оплакват от забавяне в доставките, от стоки, които не работят, не съответстват на поръчаното или изобщо не пристигат. При онлайн търговията потребителят е затруднен да упражнява правата си, като например да върне поръчания артикул на търговеца и да получи обратно сумата, заплатена за него.

1. При така изложения проблем, смята ли Комисията да предложи по-сериозни мерки за по-добра защита на правата на потребителя при онлайн търговия?

2. Не счита ли Комисията, че развитието на онлайн търговията ще повлияе отрицателно на заетостта?

Отговор, даден от г-жа Рединг от името на Комисията
(6 юли 2012 г.)

Понастоящем в законодателни актове на ЕС, например директивите относно продажбите от разстояние ([1]), продажбата на потребителски стоки ([2]), нелоялните търговски практики ([3]) и електронната търговия ([4]), вече са предвидени редица юридически права за потребителите, които пазаруват онлайн, по-специално правото на отказване от договор, сключен онлайн.

Директивата относно правата на потребителите ([5]) ще подобри допълнително защитата на потребителите. Например с нея се въвеждат общоевропейски правила за доставката и преминаването на риска за стоките, изпратени от търговеца на потребителя.

Комисията предприе по-нататъшни действия, целящи да опростят онлайн и трансграничните сделки, да изградят у потребителите доверие в електронната търговия и да насърчат електронната търговия като източник на растеж и работни места. Тя предложи регламент за общо европейско право за продажбите ([6]). В неотдавнашното си Съобщение относно електронната търговия ([7]) Комисията идентифицира пречките за развитието на електронната търговия и на онлайн услугите и предложи план за действие, за да се ускори и задълбочи развитието на икономическите дейности.

По отношение на прилагането на достиженията на правото на Съюза в областта на защитата на потребителите Комисията би искала да насочи вниманието на уважаемия член на Парламента към своите отговори на писмени въпроси E-0123/2012 и E-7524/2011 ([8]), както и към информационните кампании по E-315/2012 ([9]).

Балансът между положителните и отрицателните ефекти на електронната търговия върху заетостта е сложен и може да се различава по отношение на отделните промишлени сектори, вида работа и други характеристики на работещия. При все това няма съмнение, че използването на информационните технологии и електронната търговия създава работни места.

([1]) Директива 97/7/ЕО на Европейския парламент и на Съвета от 20 май 1997 г. относно защитата на потребителя по отношение на договорите от разстояние, ОВ L 144, 4.6.1997 г.
([2]) Директива 1999/44/ЕО на Европейския парламент и на Съвета от 25 май 1999 г. относно някои аспекти на продажбата на потребителски стоки и свързаните с тях гаранции, ОВ L 171, 7.7.1999 г.
([3]) Директива 2005/29/ЕО на Европейския парламент и на Съвета от 11 май 2005 г. относно нелоялни търговски практики от страна на търговци към потребители на вътрешния пазар, ОВ L 149, 11.6.2005 г.
([4]) Директива 2000/31/ЕО на Европейския парламент и на Съвета от 8 юни 2000 г. за електронната търговия, ОВ L 178, 17.7.2000 г.; следва да бъде транспонирана от държавите членки до 13 декември 2013 г.
([5]) Директива 2011/83/ЕС на Европейския парламент и на Съвета от 25 октомври 2011 г. относно правата на потребителите, ОВ L 304, 22.11.2011 г.
([6]) Предложение за Регламент на Европейския парламент и на Съвета за общо европейско право за продажбите, COM(2011) 635 окончателен.
([7]) Съобщение „Съгласувана уредба за повишаване на доверието в цифровия единен пазар за електронната търговия и интернет услугите“, COM(2011) 942 окончателен.
([8]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=BG.
([9]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004391/12
to the Commission
Dimitar Stoyanov (NI)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Control over online commerce

According to the Electronic Commerce Directive, aimed primarily at collective shopping sites, all web vendors in Europe must provide consumers with information about themselves, consisting of the company name, telephone numbers and postal and e-mail addresses. European vendors are also obliged to send consumers confirmation of receipt for a specific order. Unfortunately, there have been reports in Bulgaria in recent months of consumers complaining of delays in delivery, and of goods that do not work, do not correspond to the order or do not arrive at all. In online commerce, consumers find it difficult to exercise their rights, for example by returning an item they ordered to the vendor and being reimbursed for the amount they paid.

1. Given the problem set out here, does the Commission intend to propose more serious measures to protect online consumers' rights more effectively?

2. Does the Commission not think that the development of online commerce will negatively affect employment?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(6 July 2012)

Already today, EU legislative acts such as the directives on Distance Selling ([1]), Consumer Sales ([2]), Unfair Commercial Practices ([3]) and e-commerce ([4]) provide a number of legal rights for consumers going online, in particular the right to withdraw from a contract concluded online.

The Consumer Rights Directive ([5]) will further improve the protection of consumers. It will, e.g., introduce EU-wide rules on delivery and the passing of risk for dispatched goods.

The Commission has taken further action aimed at making online and cross-border transactions straightforward, at building consumers' confidence in e-commerce and at boosting the e-commerce as source of growth and jobs. It has proposed a regulation on a Common European Sales law ([6]). It has identified, in its recent Communication on e-commerce ([7]), the obstacles to the development of e-trade and online services and proposed an action plan to speed up and strengthen the development of economic activities.

As to the enforcement of the consumer acquis, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to the Written Questions E-0123/2012 and E-7524/2011 ([8]), as to information campaigns to E-315/2012 ([9]).

The balance between the positive and the negative effects of e-commerce on employment is complex and can vary by industry sector, job type and other employee characteristics. However, it is clear that the application of ICT tools and e-commerce creates jobs.

([1]) Directive 97/7/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 20 May 1997 on the protection of consumers in respect of distance contracts, OJ L 144, 4.6.1997.
([2]) Directive 1999/44/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 25 May 1999 on the sale of consumer goods and associated guarantees, OJ L 171, 7.7.1999.
([3]) 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, OJ L 149, 11.6.2005.
([4]) Directive 2000/31/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2000 on electronic commerce, OJ L 178, 17.7.2000; to be transposed by Member States by 13 December 2013.
([5]) Directive 2011/83/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on consumer rights, OJ L 304, 22.11.2011.
([6]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Common European Sales Law, COM(2011)635 final.
([7]) Communication 'A coherent framework to boost confidence in the Digital Single Market of e-commerce and other online services', COM(2011)942 final.
([8]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.
([9]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-004392/12
za Komisijo
Mojca Kleva (S&D), Tanja Fajon (S&D), Romana Jordan (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jelko Kacin (ALDE), Alojz Peterle (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE) in Milan Zver (PPE)
(26. april 2012)

Zadeva: Zagotavljanje večjezičnosti v komuniciranju z evropskimi državljankami in državljani

Jezikovna in kulturna raznolikost je del evropske identitete. Je naša skupna dediščina, bogastvo, izziv in prednost Evrope. Pomembnost tega horizontalnega področja ter specifično tudi manj razširjenih evropskih jezikov je Svet EU izpostavil v svoji resoluciji z dne 21. novembra 2008. Podobne ideje je Komisija leta 2008 zagovarjala v svojem sporočilu Večjezičnost: prednost Evrope in skupna zaveza; v akcijskem načrtu iz leta 2005 pa poudarila, da mora biti komuniciranje o evropskih politikah in aktivnostih podano na takšen način, da ga bodo razumele vse Evropejke in Evropejci.

Spletna prevajalska enota generalnega direktorata za prevajanje v Evropski komisiji je tako nastala prav zaradi zavedanja o demokratičnem primanjkljaju evropskih institucij. Evropska komisija je s tem izpolnila politično zavezo, da bo državljane o svojem delu obveščala v njihovem jeziku, in za to izbrala najbolj razširjeni sodobni medij, internet. Spletna enota si je s svojimi metodami dela in tehnološkim razvojem ustvarila ime znotraj in zunaj Komisije. Komisija je z njo postala zgled drugim mednarodnim in državnim organizacijam, ki so prav tako želele zagotoviti večjezičnost in demokratičnost svojih spletišč.

Prav v času, ko je sporazumevanje z državljani še kako pomembno se z reorganizacijo ukinja dobro delujočo enoto. Vključitev spletnih prevajalcev v jezikovne oddelke (prevodi zakonodajnih besedil), bo neposredno ogrozila kakovost, doslednost in količino spletnih strani, namenjenih državljanom Unije. Opozarjamo, da generalni direktor svojega predloga ni utemeljil z analizo stroškov in učinka, oblikovanje novih oddelkov pa bo namesto poenostavitve prineslo nepotrebne dodatne postopke in stroške.

Komisijo prosimo za pojasnitev razlogov za reorganizacijo zadevne enote.

— Ali lahko Komisija zagotovi, da zaradi ukinitve spletne prevajalske enote slovenščina in drugi manjši evropski jeziki ne bodo izgubili položaja enakovredne zastopanosti na spletnih straneh EU?

— Ali se Komisija strinja s stališčem, da so vsebine, objavljene na spletnih straneh EU, tako pomembne za državljane vseh držav članic EU, da si zaslužijo kvaliteten in korekten prevod, česar si državljani sami z uporabo spletnih prevajalnikov ne bodo mogli zagotoviti?

Odgovor Androulle Vassiliou v imenu Komisije
(20. junij 2012)

Komisija želi spoštovanim poslancem zagotoviti, da reorganizacija Generalnega direktorata za prevajanje (DGT) ne bo vplivala na kakovost prevodov spletnih vsebin niti ogrozila položaja slovenščine ali katerega koli drugega uradnega jezika Evropske unije. Generalni direktorat se bo z reorganizacijo osredotočil na svojo osnovno dejavnost, tj. zagotavljanje visokokakovostnih prevodov, tudi za splet.

Komisija se strinja, da so pravilni in kakovostni prevodi spletišč Evropske unije izredno pomembni za državljane vseh držav članic, ter spoštovanim poslancem zagotavlja, da bosta sedanja raven in kakovost storitev ohranjeni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004392/12
to the Commission
Mojca Kleva (S&D), Tanja Fajon (S&D), Romana Jordan (PPE), Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE), Jelko Kacin (ALDE), Alojz Peterle (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE) and Milan Zver (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Ensuring multilingualism in communication with European citizens

Linguistic and cultural diversity is part and parcel of the European identity: it is a shared heritage, a source of wealth, a challenge and an asset for Europe. The Council emphasised the importance of this cross-cutting area and, specifically, of Europe's less widely used languages in its resolution of 21 November 2008. The Commission advocated similar ideas in its 2008 communication entitled 'Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and a shared commitment', and its 2005 action plan stressed that European policies and activities must be communicated in such a way that they are understood by all European citizens.

The online translation unit of the Commission's Directorate-General for Translation was set up precisely in response to a democratic deficit within the European institutions. The Commission thereby fulfilled its political commitment to informing citizens of its work in their own language, selecting the most widely used modern medium, the Internet, for this task. Through its working methods and technological development, the online unit has made a name for itself within and outside the Commission, enabling the Commission to set an example to other national and international organisations that also wish to give their websites a multilingual and democratic dimension.

Just when mutual understanding between the European Union and the citizens of Europe is more important than ever, the Commission has embarked on a reorganisation abolishing this effective unit. Absorbing online translators into language departments (translations of legislative texts) will directly threaten the quality, consistency and quantity of websites aimed at EU citizens. The Director-General has not based his proposal on a cost-benefit analysis, and the formation of new departments will, rather than simplifying matters, entail unnecessary additional procedures and costs.

We therefore ask the Commission to explain the reasons for the reorganisation of the unit in question.

— Can the Commission give an assurance that the abolition of the online translation unit will not deprive Slovene and other smaller European languages of their status guaranteeing equal representation on EU websites?

— Does the Commission agree that the content published on EU websites is of such importance to the citizens of all Member States that they are entitled to high-quality and accurate translations — something which they will be unable to obtain themselves by using online translation tools?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2012)

The Commission would like to assure the Honourable Members that the reorganisation of the Directorate-General for Translation (DGT) will neither undermine the quality of translation for the web nor diminish the status of Slovene or any other of the official European Union languages. On the contrary, the reorganisation will focus the Directorate-General on its core business of producing translations of the highest quality, including for the web.

The Commission agrees that the availability of high-quality, accurate translations of EU websites is of the utmost importance for citizens of all Member States, and would like to reassure the Honourable Members that the current level and quality of service will be maintained.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004393/12
adresată Comisiei
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(26 aprilie 2012)

Subiect: Valorificarea glicerolului

Politicile europene de substituție cu biodiesel a carburanților fosili sunt afectate de stagnarea impusă de acumularea glicerolului ca subprodus, care este ieftin și în exces.

În conformitate cu Directiva 2009/28/CE din 23 aprilie 2009 privind promovarea utilizării energiei din surse regenerabile, de modificare și ulterior de abrogare a Directivelor 2001/77/CE și 2003/30/CE, controlul consumului de energie în Europa și intensificarea utilizării energiei din surse regenerabile, împreună cu economiile de energie și creșterea eficienței energetice constituie componente importante ale pachetului de măsuri necesare pentru reducerea emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră și pentru respectarea Protocolului de la Kyoto la Convenția-cadru a Organizației Națiunilor Unite.

— Poate impune Comisia noi măsuri și noi Directive pentru ca producătorii de biodiesel să găsească modalități clare de valorificare a glicerolului, produs secundar de la obținerea biodieselului care, dacă este în exces, are impact negativ asupra mediului?

Glicerolul subprodus de la fabricarea biodieselului ar putea fi promovat pentru a putea fi folosit ca sursă de carbon prin procese fermentative cu ajutorul unor drojdii, izolate din zone reci, în vederea obținerii de fracții lipidice care pot fi folosite la rândul lor pentru obținerea de biocombustibili.

— Poate Comisia să elaboreze măsuri pregătitoare care să ducă la creșterea competitivității economice în sectorul energetic prin lansarea unor programe noi în domeniul biotehnologiei, noi platforme cu privire la valorificarea glicerolului, și care să fie în concordanță cu Directiva 2009/28/CE?

Răspuns dat de dl Oettinger în numele Comisiei
(20 iunie 2012)

1. Comisia nu intenționează să introducă cerințe privind recuperarea glicerolului de la producătorii de biodiesel, considerând că piața oferă producătorilor suficiente stimulente de natură economică în vederea recuperării tuturor subproduselor.

2. Comisia sprijină dezvoltarea tehnologiilor inovatoare de producere a produselor și a serviciilor energetice din subproduse, inclusiv din glicerol. De exemplu, în cadrul proiectului INTESUSAL din PC7 se produc alge utilizând glicerolul ca sursă de carbon ([1]).

([1]) http://www.eurec.be/en/Activities/Ongoing-Projects/InteSusAl/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004393/12
to the Commission
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Glycerine recovery

European policies for replacing fossil fuels with biodiesel are being stymied by its cheap but excess by-product, glycerine.

Under Directive 2009/28/EC of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC, the monitoring of European energy consumption and the increased use of energy from renewable sources, together with energy savings and increased energy efficiency, are key elements of the package of measures needed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and comply with the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention.

— Can the Commission impose new measures and directives on biodiesel producers to ensure they introduce reliable techniques for recovering glycerine as a by-product of the production of biodiesel, since excess glycerine has an adverse impact on the environment?

Glycerine as a by-product of biodiesel production could be promoted for use as a source of carbon through fermentation processes using yeasts isolated from cold areas, in order to obtain lipid fractions which can be used in turn to obtain biofuels.

— Can the Commission draw up preparatory measures aimed at increasing economic competitiveness in the energy sector by launching new programmes in the biotechnology sector and new platforms for glycerine recovery which are consistent with Directive 2009/28/EC?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2012)

1. The Commission has no plans to introduce requirements for glycerine recovery from biodiesel producers as it is of the view that the market provides sufficient economic incentives for such producers to recover all by-products.

2. The Commission supports the development of innovative technologies that can produce energy products and services from by-products including glycerine. For instance, in the FP7 project INTESUSAL, algae are produced using glycerine as a carbon source (1).

(1) http://www.eurec.be/en/Activities/Ongoing-Projects/InteSusAl/.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004395/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(26 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Δημόσιες επενδύσεις και οικονομική κρίση

Στην υπ' αρ. P-001797/12 (14 Φεβρουαρίου 2012) ερώτησή μου προς την Επιτροπή είχα υπογραμμίσει την αναγκαιότητα λήψης στοχευμένων μέτρων με προφανή και μετρήσιμη αναπτυξιακή αξία, προκειμένου να επιτευχθεί η έξοδος από τον circulus vitiosus της λιτότητας-ύφεσης που πλήττει βαρύτατα τόσο την Ελλάδα, όσο και τις λοιπές χώρες της ευρωζώνης.

Αποτελεί γενική παραδοχή στην οικονομική επιστήμη ότι ατμομηχανή της οικονομικής ανάπτυξης και της απασχόλησης αποτελούν οι δημόσιες επενδύσεις, ιδίως σε έργα υποδομής, όπως ενδεικτικά η κατασκευή αυτοκινητοδρόμων, αεροδρομίων, σχολείων. Δεδομένης δε της αλληλεξάρτησης μεταξύ των δημόσιων και ιδιωτικών επενδύσεων είναι προφανές ότι η ενίσχυση των πρώτων θα πυροδοτήσει συνακολούθως και την επανεκκίνηση των δεύτερων με απώτερο στόχο την αύξηση της παραγωγικότητας.

Υπό το πρίσμα όμως του παρόντος δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου και των αυστηρών-ανελαστικών ορίων για το εθνικό δημόσιο χρέος που περιλαμβάνονται σ' αυτό, οι δημόσιες επενδύσεις κάθε άλλο παρά ενθαρρύνονται. Αντιθέτως, αποτελούν τον περισσότερο ευάλωτο τομέα σε πολιτικές περιστολής των δημοσίων δαπανών, δεδομένου του μικρότερου κοινωνικού κόστους που συνεπάγεται για τις εθνικές κυβερνήσεις η περικοπή τους, σε αντίθεση με αυτή των τρεχουσών δαπανών (άλλως «δαπανών δημόσιας κατανάλωσης»), όπως η καταβολή μισθών, συντάξεων, κοινωνικών παροχών.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Προτίθεται να προβεί σε τροποποίηση των υφιστάμενου δημοσιονομικού κανονιστικού πλαισίου, ώστε να εξαιρούνται οι δημόσιες επενδύσεις από το σύνολο των δαπανών οι οποίες λαμβάνονται υπ' όψη για τη μέτρηση των στόχων και των ορίων του δημοσίου ελλείμματος;

2. Θεωρεί ορθή την όμοια δημοσιονομική μεταχείριση μεταξύ των τρεχουσών δαπανών και των δαπανών δημοσίων επενδύσεων, παρά το γεγονός ότι μόνον οι τελευταίες, αφ' ενός, διαθέτουν μια αναπτυξιακή δυναμική με άμεσο αντίκτυπο στην πραγματική οικονομία και την απασχόληση και, αφ' ετέρου, συνεπάγονται τη ροή εσόδων σε μεσο-μακροπρόθεσμο χρονικό ορίζοντα;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Ιουνίου 2012)

Οι τιμές αναφοράς για το δημόσιο έλλειμμα και το δημόσιο χρέος οι οποίες καθορίζονται από τη Συνθήκη και το Πρωτόκολλο περί της διαδικασίας υπερβολικού ελλείμματος δεν προβλέπουν τον αποκλεισμό κανενός είδους δαπάνης. Η Επιτροπή δεν σκοπεύει να προτείνει τροποποίηση του πλαισίου αυτού προκειμένου να εισαχθεί περαιτέρω διαφοροποίηση μεταξύ των δημοσίων δαπανών.

Μολονότι η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει θερμά την επίτευξη των στόχων της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020», ιδίως χάρη στις έξυπνες επενδύσεις, αυτό δεν σημαίνει ότι οι δημόσιες επενδύσεις δεν πρέπει να τύχουν επαρκούς χρηματοδότησης. Όντως, μακροπρόθεσμα, η βιωσιμότητα των δημοσίων οικονομικών μπορεί να διαφυλαχθεί μόνον εάν ο ρυθμός αύξησης των συνολικών δημοσίων δαπανών, χωρίς καμία εξαίρεση, δεν υπερβαίνει την αύξηση των εσόδων, τα οποία με τη σειρά τους εξαρτώνται από τον ρυθμό οικονομικής μεγέθυνσης. Η ειδική μεταχείριση των δημοσίων επενδύσεων είναι πιθανόν να οδηγήσει σε ανάλογες απαιτήσεις χειρισμού και άλλων στοιχείων δαπανών, εξίσου σημαντικών, κατά γενική παραδοχή, για την οικονομική ανάπτυξη (π.χ. οι δαπάνες για την παιδεία). Το στοιχείο αυτό τονίζει περαιτέρω το γεγονός ότι, παρά το όφελος για το σύνολο της οικονομίας, οι δημόσιες δαπάνες δεν μπορούν να χρηματοδοτούνται επ' αόριστον από ελλείμματα.

Υπάρχουν συνεπώς ισχυροί λόγοι να μην αφαιρεθεί μερίδιο των επενδύσεων από τον υπολογισμό του διαθρωτικού ισοζυγίου ή του δημοσίου χρέους.

Ωστόσο, οι δαπάνες για επενδυτικά έργα τυγχάνουν ειδικής μεταχείρισης δυνάμει του νέου κανόνα περί δαπανών του προληπτικού σκέλους του Συμφώνου Σταθερότητας και Ανάπτυξης, καθώς λαμβάνεται υπόψη ο μέσος όρος για μια σειρά ετών προκειμένου να αποφευχθεί η δυσμενής μεταχείριση κρατών μελών, ιδίως των μικρότερων, λόγω των ετήσιων ανωτάτων ορίων αύξησης των επενδύσεων ([1]). Παράλληλα, σύμφωνα με τις ίδιες διατάξεις το ΣΣΑ, οι οποίες εφαρμόζονται σε κράτη μέλη που έχουν εξέλθει της διαδικασίας υπερβολικού ελλείμματος, και υπό ορισμένες προϋποθέσεις, τα προγράμματα δημοσίων επενδύσεων δύνανται να τύχουν προσωρινής παρέκκλισης από τον μεσοπρόθεσμο δημοσιονομικό στόχο ή από την πορεία προσαρμογής που οδηγεί στην επίτευξή του.

([1]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) 1466/97 άρθρο 5 και αναθεωρημένες λεπτομερείς ρυθμίσεις για την εφαρμογή του Συμφώνου Σταθερότητας και Ανάπτυξης, σ. 5-7.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004395/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Public investments and the economic crisis

In my Question P-001797/12 (14 February 2012) to the Commission, I emphasised the need to take targeted measures which manifestly and measurably stimulate growth in order to escape the vicious circle of austerity and recession that is affecting Greece and other Member States in the euro area.

It is generally accepted in economic science that public investments, especially infrastructure projects such as building roads, airports and schools, drive economic growth and employment. Given the interdependence between public and private investment, it is clear that enhancing public investment will then stimulate private investment with the ultimate aim of increasing productivity.

In the current fiscal framework, and given the strict restrictions it places on the national public deficit, public investments are being anything but encouraged. Equally, such investments are more vulnerable to political initiatives to reduce public expenditure, given the smaller social costs that such reductions entail for national governments compared to the cuts in current expenditure (otherwise known as 'expenditure on public consumption'), such as the cuts to wages, pensions and social benefits.

In view of this:

1. Does the Commission intend to change the existing fiscal framework to exempt public investments from expenditure included in the measurement of the aims and conditions of the public deficit reduction plan?

2. Does it think that the similar fiscal treatment of current expenditure and expenditure on public investments is correct, despite the fact that only the latter will a) provide the economic power to have an immediate impact on the real economy and on employment, and b) generate income in the medium to long term?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2012)

The reference values for government deficit and debt set by the Treaty and the Protocol on the excessive deficit procedure do not envisage an exclusion of any type of expenditure. It is not in the intention of the Commission to propose amendments to this framework in order to introduce further differentiation amid government expenditure.

If the Commission strongly supports the achievement of Europe 2020 goals, thanks in particular to smart investment, this does not mean that public investment should not be financed adequately. Indeed, in the long-run, the sustainability of public finances can only be safeguarded if the pace of increase of total government expenditure, no item excluded, does not exceed revenue developments, in turn linked to the rate of economic growth. A special treatment afforded to public investment would likely lead to analogous demands being made on behalf of other expenditure items, arguably no less important for economic growth (e.g. education). This further underscores the point that, however beneficial for the economy as a whole, public expenditure cannot be indefinitely finance by deficits.

There are therefore strong reasons not to subtract a share of investment from the computation of the structural balance or of government debt.

However, expenditure on investment projects receive a special treatment under the new expenditure rule of the preventive arm of the Stability and Growth Pact, as it is averaged over a number of years in order to avoid Member States, particular smaller Member States, to be penalised by annual peaks in investment ([1]). Moreover, according to the same SGP provisions, which apply to Member States that have exited the excessive deficit procedure, and under certain conditions, public investment programmes may qualify for a temporary deviation from the medium-term budgetary objective or the adjustment path towards it ([1]).

([1]) Regulation (EC) 1466/97 Art. 5 and revised Specifications on the implementation of the Stability and Growth Pact p. 5-7.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004396/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(26 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Χρηματοδότηση Μικρομεσαίων Επιχειρήσεων

Με βάση τη συμφωνία που υπεγράφη στις 22.3.2012 μεταξύ της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων («ΕΤΕπ») και του Ελληνικού Υπουργείου Ανάπτυξης, συστάθηκε το Ταμείο Εγγυήσεων, του οποίου αποστολή είναι η παροχή πρόσθετης ρευστότητας στις ελληνικές τράπεζες για τη στήριξη των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων («ΜΜΕ»). Συγκεκριμένα, όπως προβλέπεται στην εν λόγω σύμβαση, οι τράπεζες θα έχουν την διακριτική ευχέρεια να καθορίζουν τους όρους και τις προϋποθέσεις για την χρηματοδότηση των ΜΜΕ και θα αποφασίζουν εν τέλει για τη χορήγηση ή μη των δανείων.

Σημειώνεται δε ότι αντίστοιχος μηχανισμός χρηματοδότησης των ΜΜΕ είχε λειτουργήσει ξανά στην Ελλάδα μέσω του Ταμείου Εγγυοδοσίας Μικρών και Πολύ Μικρών Επιχειρήσεων («ΤΕΜΠΜΕ») που χρηματοδοτήθηκε από πόρους του ΕΣΠΑ. Ωστόσο, από την αξιολόγηση των αποτελεσμάτων του Ταμείου που έλαβε η χώρα, κατά το διάστημα από τον Ιούλιο του 2010 μέχρι το Μάρτιο του 2011, προέκυψε ότι οι πόροι του είχαν πολύ μικρή απορρόφηση (είχαν δοθεί συνολικά μόλις 262 δάνεια), ενώ, με βάση καταγραφείσες καταγγελίες σημειώθηκαν πολλά φαινόμενα κακοδιαχείρισης και καταχρηστικών πρακτικών από την πλευρά των τραπεζών, με τη μορφή είτε αδικαιολόγητης άρνησης χορήγησης δανείων ή επιβολής επαχθών όρων χρηματοδότησης, είτε με τη χορήγηση δανείων για σκοπούς τελείως διαφορετικούς από την ενίσχυση της ρευστότητας των ΜΜΕ. Σύμφωνα με τα ανωτέρω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιά μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει, προκειμένου να διασφαλίσει ότι οι ελληνικές τράπεζες θα χορηγούν αδιακρίτως δάνεια στις ΜΜΕ, χωρίς να επιβάλλουν δυσμενείς και επαχθείς όρους σε βάρος «ευπαθών» κατηγοριών μικρομεσαίων επιχειρηματιών;

2. Συναφώς, ποιους ελεγκτικούς μηχανισμούς προτίθεται να θέσει σε ισχύ, προκειμένου να αποφευχθούν φαινόμενα κακοδιαχείρισης των πόρων του Ταμείου Εγγυήσεων από τις ελληνικές τράπεζες, παρόμοια με αυτά των πόρων του ΤΕΜΠΜΕ;

3. Θα εξέταζε τη σύσταση ενός αυτοτελούς φορέα ειδικού σκοπού, με αποστολή τη χρηματοδότηση των ΜΜΕ, ως μέτρο για τη διασφάλιση της άμεσης και ακώλυτης παροχής ρευστότητας στη μικρομεσαία επιχειρηματικότητα, η οποία αποτελεί αναγκαία συνιστώσα για την έξοδο από τον κυκεώνα της κρίσης, που πλήττει βαρύτητα την ελληνική οικονομία;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(29 Ιουνίου 2012)

1. Το νέο ταμείο εγγυήσεων έχει ως στόχο την παροχή συγκεκριμένης πιστωτικής προστασίας μέσω εγγυήσεων υπέρ της ΕΤΕπ, ώστε να διευκολυνθεί η έμμεση χρηματοδότηση μέσω ενδιάμεσων χρηματοοικονομικών οργανισμών (τράπεζες) για δανειοδοτήσεις επιλέξιμων ΜΜΕ. Οι ενδιάμεσοι χρηματοοικονομικοί οργανισμοί θα επιλέγονται και τα κριτήρια για τις δικαιούχους ΜΜΕ θα καθορίζονται χρησιμοποιώντας τους συνήθεις εσωτερικούς κανόνες της ΕΤΕπ. Εγγυήσεις θα χορηγούνται μόνο για έμμεση χρηματοδότηση, σε ενδιάμεσους χρηματοοικονομικούς οργανισμούς που ορίζονται από την ΕΤΕπ την ημερομηνία σύναψης της συμφωνίας (21 Μαρτίου 2012) ή μετά. Επομένως, η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει δικαιοδοσία για το θέμα που αφορά η επερώτηση.

2. Οι διατάξεις περί εποπτείας και ελέγχου καθορίζονται στη συμφωνία χρηματοδότησης μεταξύ της ΕΤΕπ και των ελληνικών αρχών. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτηση E-003328/2012.

Όσον αφορά το ΤΕΜΠΜΕ, 3780 επιχειρήσεις που αξιοποίησαν το ταμείο για την υλοποίηση επιχειρηματικών δραστηριοτήτων τους έλαβαν εγγυήσεις 194 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ, που αντιστοιχούσαν σε δάνεια ύψους 290 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ. Το ΤΕΜΠΜΕ επιδότησε επίσης το επιτόκιο δανείων που είχαν υλοποιήσει 26 τράπεζες, με τη δημόσια δαπάνη να ανέρχεται σε 47 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Οι ελληνικές αρχές ανέφεραν ότι, από έρευνα που ανατέθηκε σε ανεξάρτητη λογιστική εταιρεία, διαπιστώθηκε ότι η τήρηση από το ΤΕΜΠΜΕ των όρων για τη χορήγηση εγγυήσεων ήταν «επί της ουσίας, ικανοποιητική».

3. Οι ελληνικές αρχές εξετάζουν τα οφέλη από τη σύσταση ενός νέου Οργανισμού Ανάπτυξης, σε στενή συνεργασία με την Επιτροπή, την ΕΤΕπ και άλλους χρηματοοικονομικούς εταίρους όπως η KfW. Σύντομα θα διενεργηθούν μελέτες σκοπιμότητας και αναγκών, ενώ εκκρεμεί ο προσδιορισμός των τομέων δραστηριότητας, στους οποίους μπορεί να περιλαμβάνεται η χρηματοδότηση των ΜΜΕ και η μικροχρηματοδότηση.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004396/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: SME financing

The agreement signed on 22 March 2012 between the European Investment Bank (EIB) and the Greek Ministry for Development established the Guarantee Fund, the aim of which is to supply additional liquidity to the Greek banks in order to support small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). More specifically, as set out in the above agreement, the banks will have the independence to set the terms and prerequisites for the financing of SMEs and will decide whether to grant loans or not.

It should be noted that a related instrument for financing SMEs had been operating in Greece via the Credit Guarantee Fund for Small and Very Small Enterprises (TEMPME), which is funded by the NSRF. Nevertheless, from an analysis of the Fund's results carried out by Greece, during the period from July 2010 to March 2011, it seems that the resources were used very sparingly (only 262 loans were granted) while, based on the complaints recorded, there were many instances of mismanagement and improper conduct by the banks, in the form of unfair rejections of loan proposals, the imposition of burdensome terms of funding or the granting of loans for purposes wholly different to supporting SMEs' liquidity. In view of this:

1. What measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure that Greek banks will grant loans to SMEs indiscriminately, without imposing unfavourable, burdensome terms on 'fragile' categories of small and medium-sized enterprises?

2. Similarly, what control mechanisms will it put in place to avoid mismanagement of guarantee fund resources by the Greek banks similar to what has occurred with TEMPME resources?

3. Will it look into the creation of an independent body with a special remit to fund SMEs as a measure to ensure the immediate and unhindered supply of liquidity for entrepreneurship at SME level, this being a necessary measure to escape the chaos being caused by the crisis that is heavily affecting the Greek economy?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

1. The new Guarantee Fund aims to provide a designated credit protection through guarantees in favour of EIB to facilitate indirect financing through financial intermediaries (banks) for on-lending to eligible SMEs. Financial intermediaries shall be selected and the criteria for beneficiary SMEs shall be established using standard EIB internal rules. Guarantees shall only be granted in respect of intermediated financing to financial intermediaries entered into by the EIB on or after the Agreement date (21 March 2012). The Commission therefore has no jurisdiction to deal with the question asked.

2. Monitoring and control provisions are set out in the funding agreement between the EIB and the Greek authorities. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-003328/2012.

Regarding TEMPME, 3 780 enterprises used the fund for the realisation of their businesses, received guarantees for EUR 194 million corresponding to loans amounting to EUR 290 million. TEMPME also subsidised interest for loans which were implemented by 26 banks, with public expenditure of EUR 47 million. The Greek authorities reported that an investigation by a chartered accountancy firm found TEMPME's respect of conditions for awarding guarantees to be 'satisfactory, from every substantial point of view'.

3. The Greek authorities are considering the merits of establishing a new Institution for Growth in close collaboration with the Commission, the EIB and other financial partners such as KfW. Feasibility and needs assessment studies will be launched shortly; the fields of activity remain to be defined but may include SME financing and micro-financing.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004397/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(26 april 2012)

Betreft: Hof zet streep door Nederlandse leges voor verblijfsvergunning

Het Europese Hof van Justitie zet een streep door de leges die Nederland rekent voor het krijgen van een verblijfsvergunning. Volgens het Hof zijn de Nederlandse leges „overdreven en onredelijk hoog" en vormen ze daarmee een belemmering voor personen uit niet EU-landen om zich in Nederland te vestigen.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Europees Hof verbiedt hoge leges verblijfsvergunning" ([1])?

2. Is de Commissie ervan op de hoogte dat voornoemde leges volgens de Nederlandse wet kostendekkend mogen zijn en dat in Nederland, na de verhoging, ook daadwerkelijk zijn ([2])? Kan de Commissie uitleggen waarom de leges níet kostendekkend zouden mogen zijn?

3. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat het onterecht is om de leges onder de kostprijs te houden, waardoor het verkrijgen van een verblijfsvergunning gesubsidieerd zal moeten worden? Hoe gaat de Commissie Nederland in dezen compenseren?

4. Is de Commissie voornemens stappen te ondernemen tegen de uitspraak van het Hof? Zo ja, welke? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(21 juni 2012)

In het kader van artikel 258 VWEU heeft de Europese Commissie bij het Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie een zaak tegen Nederland aanhangig gemaakt met betrekking tot de leges voor verblijfsvergunningen voor langdurig ingezetenen.

In zijn arrest in zaak C-508/10 oordeelt het Hof van Justitie dat de leges overdreven en onevenredig hoog zijn en als zodanig een belemmering kunnen vormen voor de uitoefening van de bij Richtlijn 2003/109/EG toegekende rechten. Door deze leges van onderdanen van derde landen te vragen, is Nederland de krachtens Richtlijn 2003/109/EG op hem rustende verplichtingen niet nagekomen. De betrokken lidstaat is op grond van het EU-recht verplicht om onverwijld uitvoering te geven aan het arrest van het Hof.

([1]) http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/665111-1204/eu-hof-verbiedt-hoge-leges-verblijfsvergunning?visited=true.
([2]) http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/nieuws/2011/06/27/leges-immigratie-meer-kostendekkend.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004397/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Court rules against residence permit charges in the Netherlands

The European Court of Justice has ruled against the charges that the Netherlands levies for granting a residence permit. According to the Court, the Netherlands' charges are 'excessive and unreasonably high' and therefore pose an obstacle to persons from non-EU countries, preventing them from settling in the Netherlands.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report concerning the European Court's ban on high residence permit charges ([1])?

2. Is the Commission aware that, under Dutch law, the abovementioned charges should cover costs and that, after the increase, this actually remains the case in the Netherlands ([2])? Can the Commission explain why the charges should not cover costs?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that it is wrong to keep the charges below cost price, which means that obtaining a residence permit will have to be subsidised? How is the Commission going to compensate the Netherlands for this?

4. Does the Commission intend to take action against the Court's ruling? If so, what action? If not, why not?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2012)

The European Commission, under Article 258 TFEU, brought the matter of the administrative charges for long-term residence permits in the Netherlands before the Court of Justice of the European Union.

In its judgment in Case C-508/10, the Court of Justice holds that the charges are excessive and disproportionate and as such are liable to create an obstacle to the exercise of the rights conferred by Directive 2003/109/EC. Consequently, by applying them to third-country nationals, the Netherlands failed to fulfil its obligation under Directive 2003/109/EC. Under EC law, it is the obligation of the Member State concerned to comply with the Court's judgment without delay.

([1]) http://fd.nl/economie-politiek/665111-1204/eu-hof-verbiedt-hoge-leges-verblijfsvergunning?visited=true.
([2]) http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/nieuws/2011/06/27/leges-immigratie-meer-kostendekkend.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004398/12
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(26 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Possibilità di uscita dall'Euro

In questi giorni è emerso un acceso dibattito sul fatto che la Banca Europea per gli Investimenti (BEI) abbia previsto una sorta di clausola di salvaguardia per i suoi finanziamenti in Grecia, per tutelarsi nel caso di un ritorno alla dracma come moneta del Paese; questa misura, che implicherebbe quindi le possibilità di un ritorno alle monete nazionali, sarebbe poi da estendere ad altri Stati europei attualmente in difficoltà finanziarie, come il Portogallo e l'Irlanda. Alcuni esponenti della BEI hanno smentito questa notizia, ma la questione che sta alla base è un'altra: il Trattato sull'Unione europea prevede chiaramente (articolo 50) che uno Stato possa abbandonare l'Unione, ma nulla è specificato circa le possibilità di abbandono della sola moneta unica europea.

Alla luce di tutto questo, non ritiene la Commissione doveroso proporre una modifica per inserire nei trattati anche le modalità per l'uscita dall'Euro da parte di uno Stato membro?

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

L'irrevocabilità dell'adesione alla zona euro è parte integrante del trattato e la Commissione, in qualità di custode dei trattati dell'UE, intende rispettare pienamente questo principio. La Commissione non intende proporre la modifica suggerita dall'onorevole parlamentare ed è dell'opinione che rafforzare l'Unione economica e monetaria (UEM), piuttosto che frammentarla, sia il modo migliore per aumentare la resistenza degli Stati membri della zona euro alle possibili crisi finanziarie ed economiche. Per migliorare il futuro funzionamento dell'UEM, la Commissione si sta impegnando, in stretta collaborazione con altri soggetti interessati tra cui il Parlamento, a rafforzare la governance economica e la stabilità finanziaria della zona euro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004398/12
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Prospect of abandoning the euro

In the last few days, there has been a heated debate over the fact that the European Investment Bank (EIB) may have provided some sort of safety clause in its funding to Greece in order to protect itself should the country decide to return to the drachma as its national currency. This measure, which would therefore imply the prospect of a return to national currencies, could then be extended to other European states currently in financial difficulty, such as Portugal and Ireland. Some leading figures in the EIB have denied this news, but in fact the underlying issue is: the Treaty on European Union clearly stipulates (Article 50) that a Member State can leave the Union, but makes no provision with regard to the possibility of abandoning the single European currency.

In view of the above, does the Commission not consider it necessary to propose an amendment for inclusion in the Treaties to regulate also the procedures for exit from the euro by a Member State?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The irrevocability of membership in the euro area is an integral part of the Treaty framework and the Commission, as a guardian of the EU Treaties, intends to fully respect it. The Commission does not intend to propose the amendment the Honourable Member suggests. The Commission is of the opinion that reinforcing the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), rather than fragmenting it, is the best way going forward in order to increase the resilience of euro area Member States to potential economic and financial crises. In order to underpin the functioning of EMU for the future, the Commission is working closely with other stakeholders, including the Parliament, to enhance economic governance and financial stability in the euro area.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004399/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(26 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Έκκληση Ευρωπαίων ηγετών για ανάπτυξη

Στις 20 Φεβρουαρίου 2012, δώδεκα Ευρωπαίοι ηγέτες με επιστολή τους ζήτησαν από τον πρόεδρο του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου Χέρμαν Βαν Ρομπέι την υιοθέτηση μίας στρατηγικής για να επανέλθει η ανάπτυξη. Συγκεκριμένα, ζήτησαν μία στρατηγική που θα ανοίξει τις αγορές των χωρών — μελών μεταξύ τους, που θα επιφέρει επιχειρηματική κινητικότητα και ανάπτυξη.

Στην επιστολή επισημαίνεται ότι οι ενέργειες πρέπει να εστιάσουν σε οκτώ προτεραιότητες για την ενίσχυση της ανάκαμψης, μεταξύ των οποίων στους τομείς της ενέργειας, των υπηρεσιών και της έρευνας καθώς και στην ανάπτυξη εμπορικών δεσμών με χώρες όπως η Κίνα και Ρωσία ([1]). Παράλληλα, ο Επίτροπος Εσωτερικής Αγοράς Μισέλ Μπαρνιέ τόνισε, στις 6 Μαρτίου 2012, σε συνέδριο στο Παρίσι, την επιτακτική ανάγκη για μία συντονισμένη «ευρωπαϊκή πρωτοβουλία ανάπτυξης» ([2]).

Η Επιτροπή ερωτάται:

1. Κατά πόσο η στρατηγική της ΕΕ για την έξοδο από την δημοσιονομική και οικονομική κρίση έχει λάβει υπόψη τις προτάσεις των 12 Ευρωπαίων ηγετών και τις αναπτυξιακές ανάγκες των κρατών μελών και της Ένωσης συνολικά;

2. Σε ποιες από τις οκτώ προτεραιότητες που θέτουν οι 12 Ευρωπαίοι ηγέτες παρατηρείται πρόοδος και σε ποιες διαπιστώνονται καθυστερήσεις;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Ιουνίου 2012)

Οι οχτώ τομείς προτεραιότητας που περιλαμβάνονται στην κοινή επιστολή των 12 πρωθυπουργών συνάδουν πλήρως με την στρατηγική της ΕΕ για την έξοδο από την δημοσιονομική και οικονομική κρίση σύμφωνα με την Ετήσια Επισκόπηση της Ανάπτυξης το 2012 της Επιτροπής ([3]), η οποία προηγείται της επιστολής, και στη Δήλωση για τον εορτασμό της Ημέρας της Ευρώπης ([4]).

Πράγματι, η Επιτροπή έχει ήδη λάβει μέτρα που υπερβαίνουν τις προτάσεις της κοινής επιστολής. Παραδείγματα αποτελούν οι προτάσεις της Επιτροπής για βελτιωμένη εστίαση των Διαρθρωτικών Ταμείων της ΕΕ στην ανταγωνιστικότητα και τη σύγκλιση ή οι προσπάθειες της Επιτροπής για τη στήριξη της χρηματοδότησης των ΜΜΕ με πρωτοβουλίες όπως το διαβατήριο επιχειρηματικού κεφαλαίου, καθώς και το σημαντικό έργο της Επιτροπής όσον αφορά τις συνοδευτικές πολιτικές για τη στήριξη της ανάπτυξης όπως είναι η επικείμενη επανεξέταση των κανόνων ανταγωνισμού. Υπάρχουν ορισμένοι τομείς στην προαναφερόμενη κοινή επιστολή όπου τα κράτη μέλη θα μπορούσαν να πετύχουν περισσότερα, κυρίως στην πλήρη υλοποίηση των μέτρων για την απελευθέρωση των βιομηχανιών δικτύου — όχι απλώς του αερίου και της ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας που αναφέρονται στην κοινή επιστολή, αλλά και των υποδομών των σιδηροδρομικών και οδικών μεταφορών και των τηλεπικοινωνιών — καθώς και η μεταρρύθμιση των συστημάτων απονομής δικαιοσύνης.

Στις 8 Ιουνίου 2012, η Επιτροπή υπέβαλε επίσης προτάσεις για την περαιτέρω αξιοποίηση των δυνατοτήτων της ενιαίας αγοράς μέσω καλύτερης διακυβέρνησης της ενιαίας αγοράς και με τη βελτίωση του τρόπου λειτουργίας του κλάδου των υπηρεσιών. Θα προτείνει επίσης νέα μέτρα προτεραιότητας για την ανάπτυξη, την απασχόληση και την εμπιστοσύνη σε ένα δεύτερο κεφάλαιο της Πράξης για την Ενιαία Αγορά που πρόκειται να παρουσιαστεί το φθινόπωρο. Η πλέον πρόσφατη επικαιροποιημένη σύνοψη της κατάστασης στους οχτώ τομείς προτεραιότητας είναι διαθέσιμη στην ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής που δημοσιεύτηκε στο τέλος Μαΐου με τίτλο «Δράση για τη σταθερότητα, την ανάπτυξη και την απασχόληση» ([5]).

([1]) http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/joint-letter-to-president-van-rompuy-and-president-barroso/.
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/12/161&format=HTML&aged=0&language=FR&guiLanguage=en.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2012_en.pdf
([4]) http://www.europa-eu-un.org/articles/en/article_12160_en.htm.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/eccomm2012_en.pdf.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004399/12
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Appeal by European leaders for growth

On 20 February 2012, 12 European leaders wrote to the President of the European Council Herman Van Rompuy urging the implementation of a strategy to restimulate growth. More specifically, they called for a plan that will open up Member States' markets to each other, thus creating business activity and growth.

The letter makes clear that the action involved must focus on eight priorities to support recovery, including these areas: energy, services and research, as well as the development of commercial relations with countries such as China and Russia ([1]). Concurrently, the Commissioner for Internal Market and Services Michel Barnier stated on 6 March 2012 at the Paris summit the urgent need for a coordinated 'European growth initiative' ([2]).

I would like to ask the Commission:

1. To what extent has the EU's strategy for solving the fiscal and economic crisis taken into account the proposals made by the 12 European leaders and the growth needs of Member States and the EU in general?

2. In which of the eight priority areas specified by the 12 European leaders is progress being made and in which areas are there delays?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

The eight priority areas to be found in the joint letter from the 12 Prime Ministers are fully in line with the EU's strategy for solving the fiscal and economic crisis as set out in the Commission's Annual Growth Survey 2012 ([3]), which predates the letter, and in its Schuman Day Statement ([4]).

Indeed, the Commission is already going further than the proposals in the joint letter. Take, for example, the Commission's proposals to better target EU Structural Funds on competitiveness and convergence or the Commission's efforts to support SME financing with initiatives such as the venture capital passport, not to mention the important work being done by the Commission on flanking policies to support growth such as the forthcoming review of key competition rules. There are also a number of areas unmentioned in the joint letter where the Member States could do more, notably the full implementation of packages to liberalise network industries — not just gas and electricity as covered in the joint letter, but also rail, road and telecom infrastructure — as well as reform of judicial systems.

On 8 June 2012, the Commission also made proposals to further exploit the single market growth potential though a better single market governance and by improving the way the service sector works. It will also propose new priority measures for growth, employment and confidence in a second chapter of the Single Market Act to be presented in the autumn. The most up to date summary of the situation in the eight priority areas can be found in the Commission's end-May communication, 'Action for stability, growth and jobs' ([5]).

([1]) http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/joint-letter-to-president-van-rompuy-and-president-barroso/.
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/12/161&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2012_en.pdf
([4]) http://www.europa-eu-un.org/articles/en/article_12160_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/eccomm2012_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004400/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(26. April 2012)

Betrifft: EuGH-Urteil: Sonderrechte für türkische Einwanderer

Mit dem EuGH-Urteil C-256/11 werden Türken, die mit Staatsbürgern von EU-Mitgliedstaaten verheiratet sind, sowie deren Kindern Sonderrechte eingeräumt. Präzedenzfall ist die Klage eines in Österreich lebenden Türken namens Murat Dereci. Mit dem Urteil werden alle seit dem EU-Beitritt Österreichs 1995 getroffenen Fremdenrechtsbestimmungen für türkische Angehörige von Österreichern für ungültig erklärt. Ungeachtet dessen, ob es sich um autochthone Österreicher oder eingebürgerte Türken handelt, werden deren türkische Angehörige damit de facto von allen Integrationspflichten befreit.

Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Wie beurteilt die Kommission das gegenständliche Urteil?

2. Untergräbt das Urteil in den Augen der Kommission die Integrationsanstrengungen der Mitgliedstaaten mit hohem Anteil türkischer Einwanderer?

3. Aus welchen Gründen erhalten nach Auffassung der Kommission Türken eine Sonderstellung gegenüber anderen Einwanderergruppen?

4. Wäre es nicht sinnvoller, den Mitgliedstaaten mehr Spielraum für die rechtlichen Rahmenbedingungen in Integrationsfragen zu gewähren, damit für die jeweiligen Gegebenheiten (Herkunft, Grad der Integration, Sprachnähe, Religion, Ausbildungsgrad usw. der Mehrheit der Migranten) optimale und maßgeschneiderte Maßnahmen in den verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten getroffen werden können?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(27. Juni 2012)

In der Rechtssache C 256/11, *Dereci,* hat der Gerichtshof der Europäischen Union sein Urteil in der Rechtssache C 34/09, *Zambrano,* präzisiert. Wie der Gerichtshof erneut bestätigt hat, findet die Freizügigkeitsrichtlinie 2004/38/EG nicht in Fällen Anwendung, in denen es um Drittstaatsangehörige geht, die Familienangehörige eines EU-Bürgers sind, der in dem Mitgliedstaat seiner Staatsangehörigkeit wohnt. Die Mitgliedstaaten können solchen Familienangehörigen den Aufenthalt in ihrem Hoheitsgebiet verweigern, sofern eine solche Weigerung nicht dazu führt, dass dem Unionsbürger der tatsächliche Genuss des Kernbestands der Rechte, die der Unionsbürgerstatus verleiht, verwehrt wird. Dies zu prüfen, ist Sache der nationalen Gerichte.

Die Bestimmungen über die Freizügigkeit von EU-Bürgern und ihren Familienangehörigen gelten ungeachtet der Staatsangehörigkeit der Familienangehörigen.

Zu den Grenzen des Assoziierungsabkommens mit der Türkei stellt der Gerichtshof fest, dass sich die Stillhalteverpflichtung auf jedes neue Hindernis erstreckt, das eine Verschärfung der zu einem bestimmten Zeitpunkt bestehenden Bedingungen darstellt, und dass sich ein Mitgliedstaat demzufolge nicht von dem mit den Stillhalteklauseln verfolgten Ziel entfernen darf, indem er Bestimmungen ändert, die er nach Inkrafttreten des Zusatzprotokolls zugunsten der Freizügigkeit türkischer Staatsangehöriger erlassen hat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004400/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: European Court of Justice (ECJ) judgment: special rights for Turkish immigrants

ECJ Judgment C-256/11 grants special rights both to Turks married to EU Member State citizens, and their children. The precedent for this is the action brought by Murat Dereci, a Turk living in Austria. This judgment declares invalid all provisions under foreign national legislation, established since the accession of Austria to the EU in 1995, which relate to Turkish dependants of Austrian citizens. Irrespective of whether native Austrians or naturalised Turks are involved, any Turkish dependants are thereby de facto exempt from any duty of integration.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of this judgment?

2. In the Commission's opinion, does the judgment undermine integration efforts in Member States with a high percentage of Turkish immigrants?

3. In the Commission's opinion, for what reasons could Turks be seen as a special case compared with other immigrant groups?

4. Would it not be more sensible to give Member States more leeway in their legal frameworks for integration matters, to ensure that measures can be implemented that are optimal and tailored to the respective conditions in each Member State (the origin, level of integration, language affinity, religion, level of training, etc. of the majority of migrants)?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

In Case C-256/11 *Dereci,* the European Court of Justice clarified its judgment in Case C-34/09 *Zambrano*. The Court reiterates that in cases related to third-country national family members of an EU citizen residing in his country of nationality the free movement Directive 2004/38/EC does not apply. Member States may refuse to allow such family member to reside on its territory, provided that the EU citizen is not denied the genuine enjoyment of the substance of the rights conferred by virtue of his status as an EU citizen by this refusal. This is to be verified by national courts.

The rules on free movement of EU citizens and their family members apply regardless of the nationality of the family members.

In relation to the issue of the limits of the Association Agreement with Turkey, the European Court of Justice held that the standstill obligation extends to any new obstacle that makes more stringent the conditions at any given time, so that a Member State cannot depart from the objective of the standstill clauses by reversing measures that they have adopted in favour of the free movement of Turkish workers subsequent to the entry into force of the Additional Protocol.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004401/12
adresată Comisiei
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(26 aprilie 2012)

Subiect: Anchete cu privire la reclamațiile oficiale în legătură cu ajutorul de stat ilegal din România.

În 2011, DG Concurență a primit mai multe reclamații oficiale (inclusiv din partea lui Franklin Templeton, în numele Fondului Proprietatea din România, din partea sindicatului Hidrosind și din partea cetățenilor obișnuiți) privind ajutorul de stat ilegal acordat de către o companie de stat, Hidroelectrica S.A. Aceste reclamații au fost înregistrate cu numerele de cauze SA.32491, SA.33451, SA.33475 și SA.33581.

Acestea se referă la practica actuală a Hidroelectrica S.A., un producător de energie aflat în proprietatea statului român, care vinde energie electrică la prețuri sub nivelul pieței producătorilor de oțel și aluminiu (Arcelor Mittal, ALRO) și comercianților (Energy Holding, Alpiq, EFT Romania etc.). Discrepanța dintre prețurile de pe piață și prețul prevăzut în aceste contracte constituie, de facto, o subvenție de la o companie de stat pentru parteneri privați, reprezentând un avantaj competitiv neloial și un ajutor de stat ilegal. Evaluările Băncii Mondiale situează valoarea ajutorului de stat ilegal între 226 de milioane de euro și 338 de milioane de euro pe an pentru toate contractele în cauză, valoarea totală fiind astfel de peste 1 miliard de euro de la aderarea României la UE.

Potrivit unui comunicat de presă emis la 25 aprilie 2012, Comisia a deschis cinci anchete aprofundate distincte pentru a evalua dacă Hidroelectrica S.A. a achiziționat sau a vândut energie electrică la tarife preferențiale.

1. Care sunt concluziile anchetelor efectuate în urma reclamațiilor din anul 2011 care au dus la deschiderea anchetelor aprofundate?

2. Când vă așteptați să recuperați cele 226-338 de milioane de euro reprezentând ajutorul de stat și care sunt măsurile propuse pentru a vă asigura în legătură cu rezilierea contractelor în cauză?

Răspuns dat de dl Almunia în numele Comisiei
(7 iunie 2012)

Comisia Europeană a inițiat cinci investigații aprofundate distincte pentru a evalua dacă Hidroelectrica S.A., producător român de hidroenergie controlat de stat, a achiziționat sau a vândut energie electrică la tarife preferențiale mai multor comercianți de energie electrică, clienți industriali și producători de energie electrică, cu scopul de a favoriza beneficiarii prin reducerea costurilor lor de funcționare, prin creșterea veniturilor acestora sau printr-o combinație a celor două elemente, încălcând normele UE în materie de ajutoare de stat. ([1])

În ceea ce privește cuantumul potențialului ajutor, scopul actualei investigații întreprinse de Comisie este de a examina dacă într-adevăr a fost acordat un ajutor incompatibil și, în caz afirmativ, în ce măsură a fost acordat ajutorul respectiv. Deschiderea unei investigații aprofundate permite României și părților terțe interesate să își prezinte observațiile cu privire la posibila încălcare a normelor privind ajutoarele de stat, astfel încât Comisia să adopte o poziție finală bazată pe deplina cunoaștere a faptelor și a argumentelor prezentate de părțile interesate. Cu toate acestea, deschiderea investigației nu anticipează rezultatul final al investigației aprofundate, care se află într-o fază inițială, în așteptarea observațiilor părților interesate.

([1]) Comunicatul de presă IP/12/397.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004401/12
to the Commission
Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Investigations into official complaints concerning illegal state aid in Romania

In 2011, DG Competition received several official complaints (including from Franklin Templeton on behalf of Romania's Fondul Proprietatea, the Hidrosind trade union and ordinary citizens) concerning illegal state aid granted by a state-owned company, Hidroelectrica S.A. These complaints were recorded under the case numbers SA.32491, SA.33451, SA.33475 and SA.33581. They concern the current practice of Hidroelectrica S.A., a Romanian state-owned power producer, which sells electricity at below-market prices to steel and aluminium producers (Arcelor Mittal, ALRO) and to traders (Energy Holding, Alpiq, EFT Romania, etc.). The gap between market prices and the price stipulated in these contracts constitutes a de facto subsidy from a state-owned company to private partners, representing an unfair competitive advantage and illegal state aid.

World Bank assessments put the amount of the illegal state aid at between EUR 226 million and EUR 338 million per year for all the contracts in question, thus totalling in excess of EUR 1 billion since Romania's accession to the EU.

According to a press release issued on 25 April 2012, the Commission has opened five distinct in-depth investigations in order to assess whether Hidroelectrica S.A. purchased or sold electricity at preferential tariffs.

1. What are the findings of the investigations conducted following the 2011 complaints which led to the opening of the in-depth investigations?

2. When do you expect to recover the EUR 226-338 million of state aid and what are the measures proposed in order to make sure the contracts in question are terminated?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2012)

The Commission has opened five distinct in-depth investigations to assess whether the Romanian state-controlled hydropower producer Hidroelectrica S.A. purchased or sold electricity at preferential tariffs to several electricity traders, industrial clients and electricity producers, in order to favour beneficiaries by lowering their operating costs, increasing their revenues, or a combination of the two, in breach of EU state aid rules ([1]).

As regards the size of the potential aid, the Commission will seek to ascertain during the current investigation whether indeed incompatible aid was provided, and if yes, to what extent it was provided. The opening of an in-depth investigation allows Romania and interested third parties to comment on the possible breach of state aid rules, so that the Commission adopts a final position in full knowledge of the facts and arguments brought forward by stakeholders. However the opening does not prejudge the final outcome of the in-depth investigation, which is at an initial stage, pending the submissions of interested parties.

([1]) Press release IP/12/397.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004402/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 aprilie 2012)

Subiect: Interdicții comerciale privind carnea de ovine

Din 2002, Turcia a interzis importul de carne de ovine din România pe teritoriul național, argumentând existența unui număr important de cazuri de scrapie. Mai mult, de la 1 ianuarie 2012, Turcia a interzis și tranzitul de animale și de carne de oaie din România pe teritoriul ei, prin această măsură fiind blocat accesul spre piețele arabe. Conform datelor Autorității Naționale Sanitare Veterinare și pentru Siguranța Alimentelor, în perioada 2002-2011, scrapia a fost depistată la un număr de doar 256 de ovine. Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă, având în vedere regulile OIE, această interdicție nu ar putea fi privită ca excesivă.

Răspuns dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei
(22 iunie 2012)

Turcia permite tranzitul pe teritoriul său exclusiv de animale și produse de origine animală care îndeplinesc condițiile de import ale acestei țări; UE aplică același principiu.

Comisia este pe deplin conștientă de dificultățile cu care se confruntă exportatorii din UE și acest subiect se află în prezent pe agenda de discuții cu Turcia. Comisia consideră că unele condiții de import impuse în prezent de Turcia sunt nejustificate și dorește obținerea unor condiții armonizate pentru toate statele membre ale UE care doresc să exporte în Turcia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004402/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Trade bans on sheepmeat

Turkey has banned imports of sheepmeat from Romania since 2002, arguing that a significant number of cases of scrapie have occurred. Moreover, since 1 January 2012, Turkey has also banned the transit through its territory of sheep and sheepmeat originating from Romania. This means that access to Arab markets has been blocked. According to data from the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority, scrapie was only detected in 256 sheep in the period 2002-2011.

Can the Commission state whether, in view of the rules adopted by the World Organisation for Animal Health, it does not view this ban as excessive?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

Turkey only allows transit through its territory of animals and animal products that comply with its import conditions; this principle is also applied by the EU.

The Commission is fully aware of the difficulties encountered by EU exporters and discussions with Turkey are ongoing on this issue. The Commission considers that some current Turkish import conditions are not justified and aims to obtain harmonised conditions for all EU Member States wishing to export to Turkey.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004403/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 aprilie 2012)

Subiect: Activarea de către Elveția a clauzei de salvgardare din Acordul privind libera circulație a persoanelor

Guvernul elvețian a decis, la data de 18 aprilie a.c., reintroducerea, timp de un an, a permiselor de muncă pentru cetățenii din Estonia, Ungaria, Letonia, Lituania, Polonia, Slovacia, Slovenia și Cehia, prin activarea unei clauze de salvgardare prevăzută în Acordul privind libera circulație a persoanelor. Comisia este rugată să precizeze ce măsuri are în vedere, în cadrul dialogului cu această țară, pentru a asigura respectarea Acordului și a drepturilor cetățenilor europeni.

Răspuns dat de dna Ashton în numele Comisiei
(27 iunie 2012)

Comisia consideră că reinstituirea limitelor cantitative pentru resortisanții celor opt state membre menționate de distinsul membru este o încălcare a obligațiilor care îi revin Elveției în temeiul Acordului privind libera circulație a persoanelor. Comisia intenționează să ridice această chestiune în cadrul următoarei reuniuni a Comitetului mixt, mecanismul pentru soluționarea litigiilor instituit prin acordul menționat .

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004403/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Switzerland's availing of the safeguard clause in the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons

On 18 April 2012, the Swiss Government decided to reintroduce, for one year, work permits for citizens of Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia and the Czech Republic by invoking a safeguard clause in the Agreement on the Free Movement of Persons.

Can the Commission state what measures it plans to take, within the framework of its dialogue with Switzerland, to ensure respect for that Agreement and the rights of European citizens?

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

The Commission considers the re-establishment of quantitative limits for nationals of the eight Member States mentioned by the Honourable Member as being in breach of Switzerland's obligations under the Agreement on the free movement of persons. The Commission has the intention to raise this issue at the next meeting of the Joint Committee, the mechanism established by the Agreement for the settlement of disputes.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004404/12
à la Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(26 avril 2012)

Objet: L'Europe dans les écoles

L'Europe entre de plus en plus dans nos écoles, collèges et lycées. Je constate qu'il y a encore des efforts à fournir, notamment dans les programmes, mais le résultat est palpable: l'Union européenne fait partie du vocabulaire commun.

1. De manière générale, quels outils la Commission met-elle à disposition en faveur des structures scolaires?

2. Quel type de matériels celles-ci peuvent-elles obtenir de la part de la Commission, gratuitement ou moyennant une petite contribution?

3. Enfin, à quel(s) intermédiaire(s) doivent-elles s'adresser?

Réponse donnée par Mme Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(9 juillet 2012)

La Commission a entrepris des actions visant à stimuler la recherche et à élaborer de nouveaux contenus pédagogiques, en vue d'élever le niveau de connaissance et de compréhension des questions européennes dans l'enseignement primaire et secondaire. L'initiative «Learning Europe at School: a strategy to improve communication on the EU with schools and young people» (Apprendre l'Europe à l'école: une stratégie pour améliorer la communication sur l'UE auprès des écoles et des jeunes) a été lancée en 2011 dans le cadre du programme pour l'apprentissage tout au long de la vie. Elle a cofinancé environ 65 projets menés par des établissements d'enseignement supérieur. Ces projets visent à élaborer des contenus et des outils éducatifs pour les élèves et les étudiants, ainsi que des activités de formation des enseignants sur les questions européennes.

La liste des projets sélectionnés en 2011 est publiée sur le site web de l'Agence exécutive pour l'éducation, l'audiovisuel et la culture (EACEA) ([1]).

([1]) http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/funding/2011/selection/selection_jean_monnet_ka1_2011school_en.php.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004404/12
to the Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Europe in schools

Europe is increasingly present in our primary schools and secondary-level schools of all types. There is still some way to go, particularly in terms of curricula, but the result is palpable: the European Union has become part of everyday vocabulary.

1. In general, what teaching materials does the Commission provide for schools?

2. What types of material can schools request from the Commission for no charge or for a nominal fee?

3. Lastly, whom should they contact?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

The Commission has undertaken activities aiming to boost research and to elaborate new educational content with a view to raising the knowledge and understanding of EU matters in primary and secondary education. The initiative 'Learning Europe at School: a strategy to improve communication on the EU with schools and young people' was launched in 2011 in the framework of the Lifelong Learning Programme. It has co-financed some 65 projects organised by Higher Education institutions. Projects have the aim of producing content and tools for the education of pupils and students and to develop specific teacher training activities on European Union issues.

The list of projects selected in 2011 is available on the EACEA website ([1]).

([1]) http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/funding/2011/selection/selection_jean_monnet_ka1_2011school_en.php.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004406/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(26 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: Retraso del Estado español en la elaboración y aprobación de los planes hidrológicos de cuenca

Se trata de las respuestas de la Comisión a las preguntas E-001047/11, E-5592/09, E-4005/10, E-4006/10, E-4007/10 y E-002229/2012, sobre el retraso del Estado español en la elaboración y aprobación de los planes hidrológicos de cuenca.

Los proyectos de planes se deberían haber presentado para su consulta pública en diciembre de 2008. Sin embargo, el Estado español lleva un retraso considerable en la publicación de los planes y, a día de hoy, aún no los ha presentado públicamente, a pesar de que, tal y como constató la Comisión en su respuesta del 29 de septiembre, España incumple la Directiva 2000/60/CE en su artículo 3, apartados 2 y 7.

El Consejo del Agua de la Demarcación del Ebro se constituyó el 25 de abril de 2012, en la sede de la Confederación Hidrográfica del Ebro, organismo dependiente del Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente (Magrama), para conocer y dar trámite a la propuesta del proyecto de nuevo Plan Hidrológico de la Demarcación del Ebro. Con este paso se puede autorizar la salida a información pública de este documento, que se iniciará con la publicación en el Boletín Oficial del Estado en los próximos días y prolongará su consulta durante seis meses, que podrá realizarse a través de la web del organismo www.chebro.es. Se pretende evitar que su aplicación acumule mayores retrasos, ya que los planes de demarcación deberían haber entrado en vigor en el año 2010 ([1]).

Según se publica en La Vanguardia, el Gobierno español da vía libre a la sobreexplotación del río Ebro con esta propuesta ([2]).

El Consejo del Agua de la Demarcación del Ebro ha determinado que, en la desembocadura del río, se debe reservar un caudal permanente de 106,9 metros cúbicos por segundo (media anual), la mitad que pedían las autoridades catalanas. Según los expertos, este caudal propuesto no será suficiente para retener la regresión del Delta, el avance de la cuña salina y para poder cumplir los objetivos de un buen estado ecológico de las masas de agua.

— ¿Qué medidas piensa tomar la Comisión para garantizar que el caudal ecológico que presenten los Estados miembros para el cumplimiento de la Directiva 2000/60/CE sea realmente el necesario en cada caso y no inferior?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de junio de 2012)

La Comisión está al corriente de la consulta pública en curso sobre el proyecto de plan hidrológico de la cuenca del Ebro. La Comisión ha insistido reiteradamente en la importancia de fijar un caudal ecológico que garantice la consecución de los objetivos medioambientales de la Directiva 2000/60/CE en lo relativo a los programas de seguimiento del estado de las aguas (Directiva marco del agua ([3])); véase, por ejemplo, la respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-5592/09 de Oriol Junqueras Vies. La Comisión evaluará el tenor de los planes hidrológicos de cuenca españoles tan pronto como se aprueben y notifiquen. De detectarse casos de ejecución incorrecta, la Comisión estudiará recurrir a los mecanismos jurídicos del Tratado para velar por la correcta aplicación de la DMA.

([1]) http://www.chebro.es/contenido.visualizar.do?idContenido=30079
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/vida/20120426/54285841802/el-gobierno-da-via-libre-a-la-sobreexplotacion-del-ebro.html
([3]) Directiva 2000/60/CE (DO L 327 de 22.12.2000).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004406/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Spanish Government's delay in drawing up and adopting river basin management plans

This question refers to the Commission's answers to Questions E-001047/11, E-5592/09, E-4005/10, E-4006/10, E-4007/10 and E-002229/2012, on the Spanish Government's delay in drawing up and adopting river basin management plans.

The draft plans should have been submitted for public consultation in December 2008. However, the Spanish Government is considerably behind schedule in publishing them and, to date, has not made them public, despite Spain being, according to the Commission's answer of 29 September 2011, in breach of Article 3(2) and (7) of Directive 2000/60/EC.

The Ebro District Water Council was established on 25 April 2012 at the headquarters of the Ebro Water Management Board, which reports to the Spanish Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment. The Council was established to examine and move forward with the proposed draft of a new River Management Plan for the Ebro District. With this step, the draft can be authorised for public release, which will begin with its publication in Spain's Official Gazette in the next few days. The document will remain available for consultation for six months and will be accessible via the Board's website, www.chebro.es. Efforts are being made to prevent any further delay in the implementation of the plan, since the district plans should have taken effect in 2010 ([1]).

According to *La Vanguardia*, with this proposal, the Spanish Government is preparing to over-exploit the Ebro River ([2]).

The Ebro District Water Council has determined that, at the mouth of the river, a constant flow of 106.9 cubic metres per second (annual average) should be maintained. This figure is half that requested by the Catalonian authorities. According to experts, this proposed flow will not be sufficient to halt erosion of the Delta or the advance of the salt wedge, nor will it meet the environmental objectives of the water bodies.

— What measures does the Commission plan to take in order to ensure that the ecological flow submitted by Member States to comply with Directive 2000/60/EC is in fact the flow required in each case, and no less?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of the ongoing public consultation of the Ebro draft river basin management plan. The Commission has repeatedly stated the importance of setting an ecological flow that ensures the attainment of the environmental objectives of Directive 2000/60/EC on programmes for monitoring of water status (Water Framework Directive) ([3]) (see e.g. reply to Written Question E-5592/09 by Oriol Junqueras Vies). The Commission will assess the contents of the Spanish river basin management plans as soon as they are adopted and reported. In case instances of bad implementation are identified the Commission will consider using the legal mechanisms in the Treaty to ensure that the WFD is properly implemented.

([1]) http://www.chebro.es/contenido.visualizar.do?idContenido=30079.
([2]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/vida/20120426/54285841802/el-gobierno-da-via-libre-a-la-sobreexplotacion-del-ebro.html
([3]) Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-004407/12
till kommissionen
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(26 april 2012)

Angående: Ömsesidigt erkännande av kvalifikationer för apotekare

Är kommissionen medveten om följande problem som förhindrar samstämmighet mellan EU:s medlemsstater vad gäller ömsesidigt erkännande av kvalifikationer för apotekare på Irland?

Bakgrund:

1985 infördes två direktiv som fastställde systemet för ömsesidigt erkännande av kvalifikationer för apotekare mellan EU:s medlemsstater. Dessa direktiv tillät automatiskt erkännande av kvalifikationer för apotekare som uppfyllde de minimikrav på minst fem års utbildning som avtalats (minst fyra års akademiska studier vid universitet eller motsvarande samt minst sex månaders praktik). Direktiven från 1985 innehöll ett undantag som utnyttjades av Storbritannien, vilket innebar att kvalifikationer för apotekare erkändes efter en utbildning på totalt fyra år (dvs. tre års akademiska studier och ett års praktik).

Direktiven från 1985 ersattes av direktiv 2005/36/EG som nu utgör ett system för ömsesidigt erkännande av yrkeskvalifikationer mellan EU:s medlemsstater. Det undantag som tillät erkännande av fyraåriga kvalifikationer för apotekare överfördes inte till direktivet från 2005.

Rådande situation:

Det problem som uppstår i samband med erkännandet av Storbritanniens fyraåriga kvalifikationer för apotekare är inte unikt för Irland utan gäller även erkännandet av dessa kvalifikationer i alla andra medlemsstater inom ramen för direktivet från 2005.

— Hur arbetar kommissionen med att finna rättsliga medel för att kunna registrera drabbade personer som apotekare på Irland?

— Vad skulle kommissionen föreslå för handlingsplan för dem som har registrerats hos Nordirlands apotekareförbund och som önskar flytta och starta verksamhet i syd?

Svar från Michel Barnier på kommissionens vägnar
(21 juni 2012)

År 2005 antog Europaparlamentet och rådet direktiv 2005/36/EG om erkännande av yrkeskvalifikationer som upphävde direktiven 85/432/EEG och 85/433/EEG. Medlagstiftarna beslutade att undantaget i artikel 2.4 a i direktiv 85/432/EEG som ger medlemsstaterna rätt att upprätthålla fyraåriga utbildningar inte skulle fortsätta att gälla, och ingen bestämmelse infördes om att fortsätta det automatiska erkännandet av dessa utbildningar.

Trots det är erkännande av kvalifikationerna i fråga fortfarande möjligt.

Om den fyra år långa utbildningen påbörjats före referensdatumet i bilaga V, punkt 5.6.1 i direktiv 2005/36/EG, kan farmaceuten omfattas av automatiskt erkännande baserat på förvärvade rättigheter i enlighet med artikel 23.1 i samma direktiv om han/hon kan bevisa att han/hon har nödvändig yrkesmässig erfarenhet.

Om utbildningen har påbörjats efter detta referensdatum kommer, beroende på den ansökandes yrkeserfarenhet, den generella ordningen i direktiv 2005/36/EG eller artikel 49 i fördraget om Europeiska unionens funktionssätt [1] att gälla. I båda fallen ska värdmedlemsstaten fortsätta att erkänna utbildningarna i fråga och, om så krävs under exceptionella förhållanden, införa kompensationsåtgärder.

---

[1] Enligt EU-domstolens rättspraxis (se mål C-31/00 Dreessen) är erkännande fortfarande möjligt enligt artikel 49 i fördraget om Europeiska unionens funktionssätt, om direktiv 2005/36/EG inte är tillämpligt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004407/12
to the Commission
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Mutual recognition of qualifications for pharmacists

Is the Commission aware of the following issue, which is preventing the coherent functioning of mutual recognition of pharmacist qualifications between EU Member States on the island of Ireland?

Background:

In 1985, two directives were put in place which established the system for mutual recognition of pharmacist qualifications between EU Member States. These directives allowed the automatic recognition of pharmacist qualifications which met agreed minimum training requirements for pharmacists, consisting of training of at least 5 years' duration (comprising a minimum of 4 years' academic study at university or equivalent and a minimum of 6 months' practical in-service training). The 1985 directives contained a derogation, which was availed of by the United Kingdom, providing for the recognition of pharmacist qualifications which were obtained after training for a total of 4 years (i.e. 3 years' academic study and 1 year's practical in-service training).

The 1985 directives were replaced by Directive 2005/36/EC, which now provides a system for the mutual recognition of professional qualifications between EU Member States. The derogation which allowed for the recognition of 4-year pharmacist qualifications was not carried forward into the 2005 directive.

Current situation:

The difficulty that arises in relation to the recognition of UK 4-year pharmacist qualifications is not unique to Ireland, but applies to the recognition of those qualifications in all other Member States under the framework of the 2005 directive.

— How is the Commission working to find a legal means by which affected individuals can be registered as pharmacists in Ireland?

— What would the Commission suggest as a course of action for those who are registered with the Pharmaceutical Society of Northern Ireland and who wish to move and set up business in the South?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2012)

In 2005 the European Parliament and the Council adopted Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications which repealed Directives 85/432/EEC and 85/433/EEC. The co-legislators decided that the derogation in Article 2(4)(a) of Directive 85/432/EEC allowing Member States to maintain four-year long trainings would not be carried forward, and no provision was included to continue the automatic recognition of these trainings.

Nevertheless, the recognition of the qualifications in question is still possible.

If the training of four year duration begun before the reference date in Annex V, point 5.6.1 of Directive 2005/36/EC the pharmacist can benefit from automatic recognition based on acquired rights in accordance with Article 23(1) of the same Directive if he/she can prove that he/she has the necessary professional experience.

In case the training begun after this reference date, depending on the applicant's professional experience, the general system of Directive 2005/36/EC or Article 49 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU ([1]) will apply. In both cases, the host Member State shall continue to recognise the qualifications in questions and imposing, if necessary under exceptional circumstances, compensation measures.

([1]) According to the ECJ's case law (see Case C-31/00 Dreessen), if Directive 2005/36/EC is not applicable, recognition is still possible under Article 49 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004408/12
do Komisji
Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)
(26 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Ubóstwo w UE

W ubiegłym miesiącu Eurostat ogłosił, że w UE, w 2010 r. ok. 115 milionów mieszkańców, czyli ok. 23 % populacji, znajdowało się na granicy biedy. Osoby te były zagrożone ryzykiem niedostatku, pozbawione środków materialnych, gwarantujących minimalny standard życia oraz znajdujące się w dłuższym lub krótszym okresie bezrobocia. Proporcjonalnie najgorsze sytuacje wykluczenia z czynnego życia społecznego i zagrożenie stanem biedy odnotowano w Bułgarii (42 %) i Rumunii (41 %), a następnie na Łotwie (38 %).

W lepiej rozwiniętych krajach Unii europejskiej, najlepsza sytuację odnotowano w Republice Czeskiej (14 %), następnie w Szwecji i Holandii (15 %) oraz ponad 20 % w Belgii. Najbardziej charakterystyczną miarą badania niedostatku był brak środków finansowych na opłacenie podstawowych rachunków, np. za gaz, prąd czy wodę.

Oznacza to, że warunki tej części społeczności, odbiegały od ogólnie przejętych standardów poziomu życia. Dochody finansowe były równocześnie poniżej określonej granicy niedostatku. Za główną przyczynę zjawiska wykluczenia podaje się długotrwałe pozostawanie bez pracy, bez jakichkolwiek perspektyw na zmianę tej sytuacji.

— W jaki sposób Komisja zamierza walczyć z zagrożeniem wykluczenia z życia społecznego dużej części obywateli i jak realizuje literę Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej, zwłaszcza Art. 3 punkty 3 i 5?

— Czy są wdrażane programy pobudzenia rynku pracy i tworzenia nowych miejsc pracy, zwłaszcza dla najbiedniejszych państw w UE?

— W jakim okresie czasu Komisja zamierza poprawić sytuacje ludzi biednych, których definicje podaje Eurostat?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(22 czerwca 2012 r.)

Strategia Europa 2020, poprzez główny cel zmniejszenia o co najmniej 20 milionów liczby osób zagrożonych ubóstwem lub wykluczeniem społecznym, ma istotny wymiar społeczny. Również w rocznej analizie wzrostu gospodarczego 2012 podkreślono znaczenie zwalczania bezrobocia i społecznych skutków kryzysu. We wniosku dotyczącym zaleceń dla poszczególnych krajów na rok 2012 zwrócono uwagę na wyzwania społeczne w konkretnych państwach członkowskich, takie jak np. wysoki poziom ubóstwa i wykluczenia społecznego w Bułgarii i na Łotwie.

Komisja poczyniła konkretny krok w kierunku przeciwdziałania wzrostowi liczby bezrobotnych w Europie, opracowując pakiet dotyczący zatrudnienia ([1]). Określono w nim szereg środków mogących wspierać tworzenie nowych miejsc pracy, na przykład w takich dziedzinach jak zielona gospodarka, usługi zdrowotne i technologie informacyjno-komunikacyjne. Realizacja projektów wspierających wzrost sprzyjający tworzeniu nowych miejsc pracy może być współfinansowana z funduszy strukturalnych. Wnioski Komisji dotyczące finansowania w przyszłości polityki spójności przewidują wykorzystanie tych funduszy do położenia większego nacisku na włączenie społeczne w obszarach o niekorzystnej sytuacji. Komisja zainicjowała w 2010 r. europejski instrument mikrofinansowy Progress służący tworzeniu lub rozwijaniu małych przedsiębiorstw. Unijne ramy dla krajowych strategii integracji Romów stanowią wezwanie państw członkowskich UE do poprawy ekonomicznej i społecznej integracji Romów.

Komisja uważnie obserwuje rozwój społeczny w państwach członkowskich. Wspólne osiągnięcie celów strategii Europa 2020, w tym celu walki z ubóstwem, oznaczałoby istotny krok w kierunku poprawy warunków życia wielu uboższych Europejczyków.

([1]) COM(2012) 173 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004408/12
to the Commission
Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Poverty in the EU

Last month, Eurostat announced that in the EU in 2010, some 115 million citizens — approximately 23% of the population — were on the verge of poverty. These people were at risk of privation and lacked the material resources to guarantee a minimum standard of living, or found themselves facing short- or long-term unemployment. Proportionately the worst examples of exclusion from an active social life and the risk of poverty were in Bulgaria (42%) and Romania (41%), followed by Latvia (38%).

In the more developed EU countries, the Czech Republic had the least poverty (14%); followed by Sweden and the Netherlands (15%); and Belgium, with just over 20%. The most common measure for assessing poverty was the lack of financial resources to pay basic bills, e.g. gas, electricity and water.

This means that conditions in this section of the community differed from generally accepted living standards. In financial terms, income was also below the established poverty line. The main cause of exclusion is identified as long-term unemployment without any prospects for change.

— How does the Commission intend to fight the risk of exclusion from social interaction for this large sector of the population, and how is it implementing the laws of the Treaty on European Union, in particular Article 3(3) and (5)?

— Are programmes being implemented to stimulate the employment market and to create new jobs, with particular reference to the poorest EU countries?

— Within what time period does the Commission intend to improve the situation for these poor people, as defined by Eurostat?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The Europe 2020 strategy through the headline target of reducing by at least 20 million the number of people living at risk of poverty or social exclusion has a strong social dimension. The 2012 Annual Growth Survey has also highlighted the importance of tackling unemployment and the social consequences of the crisis. The proposal for country specific recommendations 2012 has raised the attention on social challenges in specific Member States, like high levels of poverty and social exclusion in Bulgaria and Latvia among others.

As a concrete step towards tackling the growing number of unemployed Europeans, the Commission undertook the Employment Package ([1]). It identifies a number of measures that can support job creation, for example in areas such as the green economy, health services and ICT, The Structural Funds can provide financial support to implement projects which support job friendly growth. The Commission's proposals for the future Cohesion Policy funding envisage the use of these funds to put bigger emphasis on social inclusion in the disadvantaged areas. The Commission launched in 2010 the European Progress Microfinance Facility for setting up or developing a small business. The EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies calls for EU Member States to improve the economic and social integration of Roma.

The Commission is carefully following the social development in Member States. Achieving jointly the Europe 2020 targets including the poverty target would mean a significant step forward in improving the living conditions of many poorer Europeans.

([1]) COM(2012) 173 final.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-004409/12
Komisii
Sergej Kozlík (ALDE)
(26. apríla 2012)

Vec: Letecká doprava.

Táto otázka nadväzuje na moju otázku z 10.11.2011 týkajúcu sa postupu leteckej spoločnosti Air Berlin voči klientke s nesnímateľnou dlahou na ruke, keď jej pri odlete umožnili vstup na palubu a pri návrate jej zabránili vstúpiť na palubu, ku ktorej Európska komisia zaujala stanovisko, že letecká spoločnosť použila dvojkoľajný prístup ku klientovi.

Klientka Air Berlin dostala odpoveď na svoju sťažnosť od Luftfahrt-Bundesamt (LBA):

With regard to your complaint concerning AB 8130Y from Karlsruhe (FKB) to Wien (VIE) with the air carrier Air Berlin PLC&Co. Luftverkehrs KG on 2.9.2011we would like to inform you as follows: As a result of the examination of your complaint, we will not continue proceedings for administrative offences against the a.m. air carrier and conclude your complaint.

— Považuje Európska komisia takúto odpoveď za dostatočnú a korektnú, alebo za arogantný a povýšenecký prejav postoja ku klientovi, keďže ani jedným slovom sa neunúvali klientke ospravedlniť alebo vysvetliť svoje konanie?

Odpoveď pána Kallasa v mene Komisie
(8. júna 2012)

Komisia sa v nadväznosti na svoju odpoveď zo 16. decembra 2011 v súvislosti s prípadom spomenutej cestujúcej a v nadväznosti na najnovšiu otázku váženého pána poslanca opäť obrátila na spolkový úrad pre leteckú dopravu (Luftfahrt-Bundesamt – LBA), aby získala viac informácií.

LBA podal vysvetlenie, že prípad cestujúcej sa napokon neriešil v súlade s nariadením (ES) 1107/2006, ([1])pretože LBA uzavrel, že cestujúca nebola ani zdravotne postihnutá ani jej mobilita nebola obmedzená nosením nesnímateľnej dlahy na ruke. Jej sťažnosť sa preto riešila v súlade s nariadením (ES) 261/2004, ([2])ako prípad odmietnutého nástupu do lietadla. LBA preskúmal prípad a dospel k záveru, že letecký prepravca bol oprávnený odmietnuť nástup cestujúcej do lietadla zo zdravotných a bezpečnostných dôvodov, pretože cestujúca nepredložila zdravotné potvrdenie vyžadované podľa všeobecných podmienok leteckého prepravcu ako dôkaz, že zdravie ani bezpečnosť cestujúcej nie sú ohrozené.

Komisia súhlasí, že odpoveď LBA cestujúcej v súvislosti s uzavretím sťažnosti mala byť komplexnejšia. Komisia upozornila LBA na túto skutočnosť a LBA prisľúbil, že v citlivých prípadoch, akým je uvedený prípad, v budúcnosti uplatní náležitý tón a podľa možnosti poskytne viac informácií o dôvodoch uzavretia prípadu.

([1]) Nariadenie Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (ES) č. 1107/2006 z 5. júla 2006 o právach zdravotne postihnutých osôb a osôb so zníženou pohyblivosťou v leteckej doprave (Ú. v. EÚ L 204, 26.7.2006, s. 1).

([2]) Nariadenie Európskeho parlamentu a Rady (ES) č. 261/2004 z 11. februára 2004, ktorým sa ustanovujú spoločné pravidlá systému náhrad a pomoci cestujúcim pri odmietnutí nástupu do lietadla, v prípade zrušenia alebo veľkého meškania letov a ktorým sa zrušuje nariadenie (EHS) č. 295/91 (Ú. v. EÚ L 46, 17.2.2004, s. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004409/12
to the Commission
Sergej Kozlík (ALDE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Air transport

This question follows on from my question of 10 November 2011 regarding the actions of Air Berlin towards a customer who had a non-removable splint on her arm, when the airline allowed her to board the outbound flight but denied her boarding for the return flight. In respect of this case, the Commission took the view that the airline had used a double-tracked approach towards the customer.

The Air Berlin customer received the following response to her complaint from Luftfahrt-Bundesamt (LBA):

With regard to your complaint concerning AB 8130Y from Karlsruhe (FKB) to Wien (VIE) with the air carrier Air Berlin PLC&Co. Luftverkehrs KG on 2.9.2011 we would like to inform you as follows: as a result of the examination of your complaint, we will not continue proceedings for administrative offences against the a.m. air carrier and conclude your complaint.

— Does the Commission consider this response to be adequate and fair, or an expression of an arrogant and haughty attitude towards the customer, given that not a single word of apology or explanation was offered for the airline's actions?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(8 June 2012)

Further to its answer of 16 December 2011 on the case of the abovementioned passenger and to the latest question by the Honourable Member the Commission contacted again the Luftfahrt-Bundesamt (LBA) to obtain more information.

The LBA explained that, eventually, the case of the passenger has not been treated under Regulation (EC) 1107/2006 ([1]) since the LBA considered that the passenger was neither disabled nor was her mobility reduced by wearing the non-removable splint. Her complaint was therefore dealt with under Regulation (EC) 261/2004 ([2]) is a case of denied boarding. The LBA examined the case and came to the conclusion that the air carrier was entitled to deny boarding to the passenger on the basis of health and safety reasons since she was not able to produce the medical certificate required by the General Terms and Conditions of the air carrier to prove that the health and safety of the passenger was not at risk.

The Commission agrees that the response from the LBA to the passenger regarding the conclusion of the complaint should have been more comprehensive. The Commission has drawn the attention of the LBA to this issue, and the LBA promised to adopt the right tonality in sensitive cases such as this one in the future and where possible to provide more information on the reasons for closing the case.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 concerning the rights of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility when travelling by air, OJ L 204, 26/7/2006, p. 1.

([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 L 46, 17/2/2004, p. 1.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004411/12
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(26 aprilie 2012)

Subiect: Experți în domeniul schimbărilor climatice

Uniunea Europeană şi-a propus să fie un actor important la nivel mondial în lupta împotriva schimbărilor climatice. Aplicarea măsurilor de combatere a schimbărilor climatice şi punerea în aplicare a Directivei privind evaluarea strategică de mediu impun existenţa unui corp de experţi la nivel naţional şi european specializaţi în domeniile respective, care să poată realiza evaluările adecvate şi să elaboreze documente de orientare.

În plus, sunt necesare evaluări comune ale statelor Uniunii pentru eventuale evenimente transfrontaliere care pot afecta regiuni diferite din UE în vederea stabilirii unor acţiuni comune de îndepărtare a efectelor unor catastrofe naturale sau create de om.

Cum intenţionează Comisia să sprijine capacităţile statelor membre de recrutare şi formare a experţilor de care au nevoie pentru a permite o aplicare eficientă a măsurilor vizate în cele două domenii?

Răspuns dat de dl Potočnik în numele Comisiei
(28 iunie 2012)

Directiva 2001/42/CE ([1]), cunoscută ca Directiva privind evaluarea strategică de mediu (SEA), prevede că dacă se efectuează o evaluare strategică de mediu pentru un plan/program, raportul de mediu ține seama de efectele acestuia asupra factorilor climatici și asupra obiectivelor de mediu la nivel internațional, la nivelul UE și la nivel național, inclusiv asupra schimbărilor climatice.

Directiva SEA constituie baza consultărilor transfrontaliere. Mai mult, în 2008, UE a ratificat *Protocolul privind evaluarea strategică de mediu la Convenția privind evaluarea impactului asupra mediului în context transfrontalier*, care stabilește cerințe clare privind consultările transfrontaliere.

În vederea aplicării practice a cerințelor Directivei SEA referitoare la schimbările climatice, Comisia pregătește în prezent orientări specifice care urmează să fie publicate în lunile următoare.

În sfârșit, Comisia gestionează Grupul de experți pentru evaluarea impactului de mediu/evaluarea strategică de mediu, format din experți naționali, în cadrul căruia se discută, printre altele, toate aspectele legate de implementarea SEA.

Mecanismul de protecție civilă al Uniunii ([2]) a stabilit un program de formare pentru a consolida și a facilita cooperarea în ceea ce privește intervențiile cu scop de asistență în domeniul protecției civile. Acest program include cursuri de specialitate cu privire la anumite aspecte ale misiunilor (de exemplu, coordonarea internațională și evaluările comune).

Un sistem de schimburi între experții din domeniul protecției civile permite detașarea experților naționali (inclusiv a experților în evaluarea riscurilor) în administrațiile altor state participante pentru toate aspectele intervențiilor de urgență.

([1]) JO L 197, 21.7.2001.
([2]) 2007/779, CE, Euratom, JO L 314/9, 1.12.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004411/12
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Climate change experts

The European Union aims to be a major international player in the combating of climate change. The implementation of measures to combat climate change, and the application of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive mean that a body of national and European experts specialising in the relevant fields is needed to carry out the appropriate assessments and draw up guidelines.

Moreover, joint assessments by the EU Member States are needed in the event of cross-border events that may affect various different regions of the EU, with a view to planning joint actions to counter the effects of natural or man-made disasters.

How does the Commission intend to bolster the capacities of Member States to recruit and train the experts they need in order to effectively implement the measures contemplated in those two areas?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

Directive 2001/42/EC ([1]), known as Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), provides that if an SEA is carried out for a plan/program, the environmental report considers the effects on climatic factors and the environmental objectives at international, EU and national levels, including climate change.

The SEA Directive provides the basis for transboundary consultations. Moreover, in 2008, the EU ratified the Protocol on SEA to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context, which sets clear requirements for transboundary consultations.

For the practical application of the requirements of the SEA Directive as regards climate change, the Commission is preparing a specific guidance due in the next few months.

Finally, the Commission manages the Environmental Impact Assessment/Strategic Environmental Assessment Expert Group consisting of national experts, who discuss, among others, all issues related to implementation of the SEA.

The Community Mechanism for civil protection ([2]) has established a training programme to reinforce and facilitate cooperation in civil protection assistance interventions. It includes specialist courses for particular aspects of missions (e.g. international coordination and joint assessments).

An exchange system for civil protection experts allows for the secondment of national experts (including risk assessment experts) to administrations of other participating states on all aspects of emergency intervention.

([1]) OJ L 197, 21.7.2001.
([2]) 2007/779, EC, Euratom, OJ L 314/9, 1.12.2007.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-004412/12
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(26 aprilie 2012)

Subiect: Drepturile lucrătorilor transfrontalieri

Libera circulație a persoanelor, unul dintre drepturile fundamentale ale cetățenilor europeni, permite și o mobilitate însemnată a lucrătorilor. Astfel, cetățenii europeni pot să lucreze oriunde în Uniunea Europeană, ceea ce reprezintă un instrument esențial pentru dezvoltarea unei piețe a locurilor de muncă la nivel european.

În plus, la nivel transfrontalier, există o mobilitate a lucrătorilor din ce în ce mai accentuată. Potrivit estimărilor, numărul lucrătorilor transfrontalieri este de circa 1,2 milioane de persoane. Numai în 2010, salariile plătite lucrătorilor transfrontalieri și sezonieri au totalizat circa 46,9 miliarde de euro.

Există însă cazuri în care statele membre fac diferențe între proprii lor cetățeni și cetățenii din alte state membre care lucrează ocazional pe teritoriul lor în ceea ce privește dreptul de deducere a cheltuielilor, aplicarea unor rate de impozitare diferite, alocațiile pentru copii, precum și în ceea ce privește asigurările de sănătate sau prestațiile de șomaj.

Ce măsuri intenționează să ia Comisia pentru a proteja interesele și drepturile lucrătorilor transfrontalieri, inclusiv pentru ca aceștia să poată beneficia de dreptul la o pensie adecvată la finalul carierei?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(27 iunie 2012)

Regulamentele (CE) nr. 883/2004 ([1]) și 987/2009 ([2]) protejează prestațiile de securitate socială, inclusiv prestațiile pentru copii, asigurările de sănătate și prestațiile de șomaj ale cetățenilor UE care își exercită dreptul la liberă circulație în temeiul tratatelor. Articolul 4 din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 883/2004 este menit, în conformitate cu articolul 45 din TFUE, să garanteze egalitatea de tratament în domeniul securității sociale, fără deosebire de naționalitate, a persoanelor cărora li se aplică regulamentul respectiv prin interzicerea unei astfel de discriminări care poate decurge din legislația națională a statelor membre ([3]). Cu toate acestea, o persoană detașată într-un alt stat membru rămâne sub incidența sistemului de securitate socială al statului membru din care este detașată, în conformitate cu articolul 12 din regulamentul menționat.

Principiul egalității de tratament se aplică discriminării indirecte, precum și discriminării directe din motive de naționalitate. Principiile nediscriminării și egalității de tratament sunt componente-cheie ale regulilor de coordonare, în sensul în care împiedică punerea într-o poziție dezavantajoasă a persoanelor care își exercită dreptul la liberă circulație și trebuie respectate de autoritățile, instanțele și tribunalele naționale în momentul aplicării legislației naționale. În calitate de gardian al tratatului, Comisia trebuie să se asigure că legislația UE se aplică în mod corect. Comisia a inițiat o serie de proceduri de constatare a neîndeplinirii obligațiilor împotriva statelor membre atunci când nu a fost aplicat principiului egalității de tratament.

Cu toate acestea, statele membre au libertatea de a decide cine este asigurat în temeiul legislației lor, ce prestații se acordă și în ce condiții, cum se calculează prestațiile respective și care sunt contribuțiile care trebuie plătite. Legislația UE prevede numai coordonarea sistemelor naționale de securitate socială. Prin urmare, regulamentele privind coordonarea securității sociale stabilesc doar norme și principii generale, cum ar fi cele privind cumularea perioadelor de asigurare pentru acumularea de drepturi de pensie.

([1]) Regulamentul (CE) nr. 883/2004 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 29 aprilie 2004 privind coordonarea sistemelor de securitate socială, JO L 166, 30.4.2004, p. 1.
([2]) Regulamentul (CE) nr. 987/2009 al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului din 16 septembrie 2009 de stabilire a procedurii de punere în aplicare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 883/2004 privind coordonarea sistemelor de securitate socială, JO L 284, 30.10.2009, p.1.
([3]) Cauza C-332/05 Celozzi [2007], Rep., p. I-563, punctul 22.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004412/12
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Rights of cross-border workers

The free movement of people, which is a fundamental right of European citizens, also permits considerable mobility for workers. This means that European citizens can work anywhere in the European Union, which is a vital instrument for developing the labour market across Europe.

Furthermore, cross-border worker mobility is becoming more and more pronounced. According to estimates, there are now approximately 1.2 million cross-border workers. In 2010 alone, salaries paid to cross-border and seasonal workers totalled around EUR 46.9 billion.

However, there have been cases of Member States differentiating between their own citizens and occasional workers from other Member States in terms of claims for expenses, variable tax rates, child allowances, health insurance and unemployment benefits.

What measures does the Commission intend to take to protect the interests and rights of cross-border workers, including with regard to their right to receive a suitable pension at the end of their careers?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

Regulations (EC) Nos 883/2004 ([1]) and 987/2009 ([2]) protect the social security benefits, including child benefit, health insurance and unemployment benefit, of EU citizens exercising their right of free movement under the Treaties. Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 seeks, in accordance with Article 45 TFEU, to guarantee equal treatment in matters of social security, without distinction based on nationality, of the persons to whom that regulation applies by outlawing such discrimination deriving from the Member States' national legislation ([3]). However, a person posted to another Member State remains subject to the social security system of the Member State of sending, pursuant to Article 12 of that regulation.

The principle of equal treatment applies to indirect discrimination as well as direct discrimination on the basis of nationality. The principles of non-discrimination and equal treatment are key components of the coordination rules in so far as they prevent people from being put at a disadvantage when exercising their right of free movement, and must be observed by the national authorities, courts and tribunals when applying national law. As guardian of the Treaty, the Commission must ensure that EC law is correctly applied. The Commission has initiated a number of infringement procedures against Member States when equal treatment principle was not applied.

However, the Member States are free to decide who is to be insured under their own legislation, what benefits are to be granted and on what conditions, how those benefits are to be calculated and what contributions are to be paid. The EU legislation provides solely for the coordination of the national social security systems. The regulations on social security coordination therefore lay down general rules and principles, such as on the aggregation of insurance periods for the accrual of pension rights.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems OJ L 166, 30.4.2004, p. 1.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 laying down the procedure for implementing Regulation (EC) No 883/2004on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 284, 30.10.2009, p. 1.
([3]) Case C-332/05 Celozzi [2007] ECR I-563, paragraph 22.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-004414/12
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(26. april 2012)

Om: Opholdsdirektiv

Det danske dagblad Jyllands-Posten fremlagde d. 26/4 kopier af en brevkorrespondance mellem den danske justitsminister og kommissæren for retlige anliggender Viviane Reding. Justitskommissæren fremsendte i januar 2012 på vegne af Kommissionen en skrivelse til den danske justitsminister, hvori den gav udtryk for bekymring for, om nye danske regler for udvisning af kriminelle udlændinge er i overensstemmelse med reglerne i EU's opholdsdirektiv.

Det fremgår endvidere af den danske dagspresse, at den danske justitsminister i sit svar til Kommissæren oplyste, at den danske regering ønskede at ændre loven. Bl.a. skulle den danske justitsminister angiveligt have svaret Kommissæren følgende:

»Dette vil blandt andet indebære, at den eksisterende ordlyd »med sikkerhed« vil blive slettet for at give en forbedret beskyttelse mod udvisning«.

Kan Kommissæren bekræfte, at Kommissionen har sendt den danske justitsminister ovennævnte brev i januar 2012, og kan Kommissæren i givet fald bekræfte, at Kommissionen i brevet udtrykte en bekymring over de danske regler?

I bekræftende fald bedes Kommissæren oplyse, om brevet fra den danske justitsminister har haft som konsekvens, at Kommissæren ikke længere har grund til bekymring over de danske regler for udvisning af kriminelle udlændinge.

Kan Kommissionen i så fald bekræfte, at fjernelsen af ordlyden »med sikkerhed« er at betragte som en substantiel ændring af loven?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Viviane Reding
(25. juni 2012)

Kommissionen bekræfter, at der har været korrespondance mellem næstformand Viviane Reding og den danske justisminister om, hvorvidt de danske regler om betinget udvisning i udlændingeloven er i overensstemmelse med EU's regler om fri bevægelighed ([1]).

Retten til fri bevægelighed er en grundlæggende ret, som alle EU-borgere er garanteret. Enhver begrænsning af denne ret skal fortolkes snævert og ledsages af klare retsgarantier, som fastsat i EU-retten. I henhold til direktivet er det kun muligt at udsende en EU-borger, hvis vedkommende ikke længere opfylder betingelserne for udøvelse af retten til ophold, eller af hensynet til den offentlige orden, sikkerhed eller sundhed. En afgørelse om at udsende en EU-borger skal dog i alle tilfælde respektere de retsgarantier, der er fastsat i direktivet. Afgørelsen om udsendelse af EU-borgere kan kun træffes fra sag til sag, den skal være i overensstemmelse med proportionalitetsprincippet og må udelukkende begrundes i den pågældendes personlige adfærd og situation.

Næstformand Viviane Reding bad de danske myndigheder om at træffe de nødvendige foranstaltninger for at sikre, at de ovennævnte danske regler stemmer overens med direktiv 2004/38/EF.

De danske myndigheder forpligtede sig på hurtigt at ændre deres lov, således at den bringes i overenstemmelse med de relevante EU-regler. Folketinget vedtog den nye lov den 13. juni 2012. Kommissionen vil foretage en grundig gennemgang af den nye lov.

([1]) Direktiv 2004/38/EF om unionsborgeres og deres familiemedlemmers ret til at færdes og opholde sig frit på medlemsstaternes område.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004414/12
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(26 April 2012)

Subject: Residence Directive

On 26 April 2012, the Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* published copies of correspondence between the Danish Minister for Justice and the Justice Commissioner Viviane Reding. In January 2012, the Justice Commissioner wrote on behalf of the Commission to the Danish Minister for Justice, expressing concerns as to whether new Danish rules on the deportation of foreign nationals convicted of criminal offences were in accordance with the EU's Residence Directive.

The Danish press further reports that, in his reply to the Commissioner, the Danish Minister for Justice stated that the Danish Government was seeking to change the law. He is reported to have included the following:

'This will mean, amongst other things, that the existing wording "with certainty" will be removed to provide a better safeguard against deportation.'

Can the Commission confirm that the above letter was sent to the Danish Minister of Justice in January 2012 and, if so, can the Commission confirm that it expressed concern in the letter with regard to the Danish rules?

If so, have the Commission's concerns regarding the Danish rules on the deportation of foreign nationals convicted of criminal offences been allayed as a result of the letter from the Danish Minister for Justice?

If so, can the Commission confirm that the removal of the wording 'with certainty' is to be considered a substantial change to the law?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2012)

The Commission confirms that correspondence has taken place between Vice-President Reding and the Danish Justice Minister regarding the compatibility with EU rules on free movement ([1]) of the Danish rules on conditional expulsion in the Aliens Act.

The right to free movement is a fundamental right guaranteed to all EU citizens. Any restriction to this right must be interpreted strictly and be accompanied by clear safeguards, as provided for by EC law. Under the directive, it is only possible to remove an EU citizen who no longer meets the conditions attached to the right of residence or on grounds of public policy, public security or public health. However, in all cases, a decision to remove an EU citizen must respect the safeguards provided for by the directive. Expulsion of EU citizens is only possible on a case by case basis, respecting the principle of proportionality and based exclusively on the personal conduct and circumstances of the person concerned.

Vice-President Reding asked the Danish authorities to take any measures necessary to ensure compliance of the abovementioned Danish rules with Directive 2004/38/EC.

The Danish authorities committed to swiftly amend their law to bring it in line with the relevant EU rules. The Danish parliament adopted the new law on 13 June 2012. The Commission will analyse the new law in detail.

([1]) Directive 2004/38/EC on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004415/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Auditing and accountability of pre-accession funding for Croatia

Will the Commission outline the auditing and accountability measures which aim to ensure proper and appropriate use of monies made available as pre-accession funding for Croatia?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2012)

In Croatia, implementation of pre-accession assistance is decentralised to national authorities, as the Commission has conferred management powers after the management and control systems have been thoroughly assessed. Primary and secondary controls ensuring the legality and regularity of individual tenders, contracts and payments are carried out by accredited Croatian authorities. Each year the national authorising officer makes a management declaration concerning a confirmation of the effective functioning of the management and control systems, a confirmation regarding legality and regularity of underlying transactions and information concerning any changes in systems and controls. Furthermore, an audit authority in Croatia (compliant with internationally accepted audit standards) verifies the effective and sound functioning of the management and control systems.

The pre-accession programmes and functioning of the management system are subject to monitoring and supervision by the Commission, including joint monitoring arrangements, to the Commission's and the EU Delegation's own regular monitoring (including sample checks of documents and on-the-spot checks) and to *ex post* controls. The Commission carries out audits of the national (sub) systems. Findings detected by the auditors are followed up by the national authorities under the supervision of the Commission.

Croatia has made progress in preparing for the next phase of decentralisation of management powers, namely the necessary waiver of the EU Delegation's *ex ante* controls for the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) by the date of accession.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004416/12
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Air passenger rights

What future legislation might the Commission initiate in order to strengthen the rights of air passengers denied access to their flight due to overbooking by the airline?

Is there any legislation forthcoming which would ban overbooking, or at least limit the amount of overbooking airlines can undertake on each flight?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 ([1]) requires an air carrier that denies boarding to a passenger holding a valid ticket without justifiable cause to either provide a full refund, or if the passenger still wishes to travel assistance with rerouting, communication and appropriate welfare (such as refreshments and accommodation) according to their waiting time. In addition, such passengers are also entitled to specified mandatory compensation if agreement cannot be reached voluntarily.

Whilst the Commission appreciates the inconvenience caused to individual passengers who have been denied boarding as a consequence of an air carrier overbooking a flight, there are occasions when overbooking can be in the collective of interests of consumers. Such situations can occur on flights where a majority of the tickets sold are of a flexible nature, allowing a passenger the convenience of being able to select their flight at a late stage, but which can result in seats being left empty.

On balance the Commission therefore considers that the existing legislation provides adequate protection to affected passengers and has no current plans to extend its scope.

([1]) 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 L 46, 17.2.2004, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004417/12
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Work by the Commission to minimise area aid disallowances

Costly and protracted audits and disallowances result in funds being diverted from their intended purpose and it is vital that they are minimised, particularly as the CAP is currently undergoing reform.

— In light of the fact that many Member States have had area aid payments disallowed, could the Commission detail the extent, level and nature of proactive engagement it has entered into with all Member States, regions and paying agencies to help ensure that issues such as this no longer arise in the future?

— In particular, has the Commission identified best practice, particularly in terms of farm mapping, and how has it engaged with Member States, regions and paying agencies to communicate recommendations in terms of the preferred systems, processes and staff training to be used?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(11 June 2012)

The Commission is regularly issuing recommendations to Member States' paying agencies on the improvement of their management and control systems in the context of more than 150 audit missions which it is carrying out every year. Moreover, it participates in the three conferences with the directors of paying agencies and coordinating bodies which are taking place every year, two organised by the sitting Presidency of the Council and one by the Commission itself. In these conferences, the most common audit findings are presented, best practices identified and exchanged and guidance and advice given.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004418/12
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Work by the Commission to promote succession planning in fisheries

Attracting and retaining young people is key to the long-term sustainability of any industry and the fisheries industry is no exception. Ensuring that the industry attracts and retains people for work off shore is not only key to the future of our fleets but also for securing many jobs throughout the processing supply chain on shore.

— Given that the common fisheries policy is currently in a period of reform, what engagement has the Commission had with Member States, regions and the industry to help ensure that the sector can attract and retain the staff it needs to remain sustainable in the future?

— Furthermore, has the Commission engaged with the external fisheries industry to identify models of best practice in terms of succession planning and, if so, what lessons can the EU learn from these examples?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2012)

Over the last decade, the fisheries sector has decreased significantly, by some estimates, by 30% in volume. To encourage younger people to enter the sector, working conditions need to improve but also the fisheries sector more generally needs to become more profitable. The Commission, through its proposed reform of the common fisheries policy, has tabled a series of measures designed to restore profitability in the sector. Indeed, the overall objective of the reform is to ensure that fishing and aquaculture activities contribute to increased productivity, a fair standard of living for the fisheries sector, stable markets, ensure the availability of resources, and that supplies reach consumers at reasonable prices. To this end, the proposed European Maritime and Fisheries Fund contains a number of provisions designed to foster growth in the sector by creating jobs and promoting sustainable fish stocks. These measures including support for eco-innovations linked to the environment; partnerships with scientists including feasibility studies of new ideas/products; on board investments to improve product quality and selectivity of gears to limit impacts on ecosystems. The Commission’s view is that sustainable fishing will lead to higher profits and employment in the sector, including for younger entrants in all stages of the production chain.

The Commission proposal does not include specific provisions on succession planning. This is addressed by investing in growth-enhancing measures to make the fisheries sector a more vibrant, dynamic and profitable activity and will attract more professionals to the sector. Furthermore, the proposal for the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund foresees a number of measures designed to facilitate diversification and job creation outside fishing to help support the wider fishing community and the transition towards a more sustainable sector.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004419/12
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Drawdown of FP7 funding

On behalf of the Commission, the Maastricht Economic and Social Research Institute recently published its 'Innovation Union Scoreboard 2011', which uses 25 indicators to assess how successfully the Member States foster research and development and how quickly this is then translated into products and services in the marketplace.

— Given the global nature of competition, it is essential that the EU as a whole strives to become a leader in innovation, particularly as the rate of change is increasing. Is there any correlation between how successfully a Member State is deemed to innovate and its success in drawing down EU funds from programmes specifically designed to increase innovation and global competitiveness within the EU, such as FP7?

— To that end, can the Commission detail the level of FP7 funding drawn down by each Member State and region in terms of overall drawdown and drawdown per capita? Can it also provide a breakdown of the number of applications for FP7 funding made by each Member State and region as well as the number of successful applications per Member State and region?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2012)

The innovation capacity of a country depends on multiple factors summarised in the Innovation Union Scoreboard (IUS). The capacity to invest in R & D is an important one but not the sole. The R & D intensity is indeed largely correlated to the economic development of a country, directly and through spill-overs in an integrated economic area like the European Union.

The impact on innovation performance of participating in an R & D programme like the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) depends to a large extent on the capacity of a country's R & D and innovation system to create bridges and synergies between public research actors and the business sector, and to offer appropriate conditions for patents filing and exploitation. This capacity varies across countries. In addition, the link between R & D investments and innovation performance varies across economic sectors and therefore also depends on the economic structure of a country ([1]).

The detailed levels of FP7 funding requested by the Honourable Member are in annex, sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat. There is a high correlation between the IUS index, as a proxy to measure innovation performance, and success rate in FP7, which measures success in drawing down funds from FP7. It is important to note that the proposal made by the Commission for Horizon 2020 places stronger emphasis on innovation and demonstration projects, an evolution which should strengthen this correlation.

([1]) This is explored in more details in the Innovation Union Competitiveness Report 2011 (http://www.ec.europea.eu/iuc2011).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004420/12
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Measuring the success of Commission proposals for 'greening' Pillar I of the CAP

The agri-environment schemes funded through the Rural Development Programme allow Member States and regions to tailor schemes to address local issues. The mandatory 'greening' measures proposed by the Commission in October 2011 are designed to address specific issues identified in some Member States and regions; many of these issues do not apply to Northern Ireland.

— How does the Commission intend to measure the success of these one-size-fits-all measures in their current form?

— What outcomes does it propose to measure and to what extent are these outcomes expected to change if the measures as proposed are adopted and implemented across the EU?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(8 June 2012)

For the Honourable Member's first question, the Commission draws the attention to Article 110 of the proposal of a regulation on the financing, management and monitoring of the CAP ([1]). This provision establishes a common monitoring and evaluation framework with a view to measuring the performance of the CAP. The same provision sets the obligation that the impacts of the common agricultural policy shall be measured, amongst other, against the objective of sustainable management of natural resources to which the greening measures are related. In this context appropriate indicators will be developed that should facilitate the assessment and allow for measuring the effect of specific instruments against their objectives, including the greening obligations.

As for the Honourable Member's second question, the precise indicators will be defined in implementing acts. One may however already assume that for a measure related to biodiversity such as Ecological Focus Area the indicator will tackle the question of biodiversity. But also other environmental issues related to the greening obligations, such as water quality or carbon sequestration, should be assessed.

([1]) COM(2011) 628 final/2.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004422/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(27 de abril de 2012)

Assunto: Alterações ao Regulamento (CE) n.° 1185/2003 relativo à remoção das barbatanas de tubarões a bordo dos navios

Relativamente à proposta de Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1185/2003 relativo à remoção das barbatanas de tubarões a bordo dos navios, solicito à Comissão Europeia que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que avaliação do impacto socioeconómico das alterações contidas nesta proposta foi efetuada? Quais os seus resultados?

2. Concretamente, que embarcações, de que Estados-Membros, serão afetadas?

3. Quais as espécies de tubarão envolvidas nestas pescarias e qual o respetivo estatuto de conservação?

4. De que evidências da ocorrência de «finning» dispõe a Comissão?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão
(13 de junho de 2012)

1. A Comissão realizou uma avaliação de impacto integral em que baseou o seu relatório e posteriormente a sua proposta de alteração do Regulamento (CE) n.° 1185/2003. A partir da informação recolhida, nomeadamente a que foi apresentada pelo setor, tanto por escrito como durante um grande número de reuniões ao longo de um período de dois anos, a Comissão concluiu que a sua proposta não teria um impacto socioeconómico significativo, tal como indicado no relatório de avaliação de impacto ([1]).

2. De acordo com as informações apresentadas pelo setor e pelas autoridades nacionais (de Espanha e de Portugal, em particular), a remoção das barbatanas de tubarões a bordo só é praticada em navios congeladores e não em navios que desembarcam tubarão fresco. As mesmas fontes informaram a Comissão de que, devido a estas práticas, apenas os navios congeladores utilizam autorizações especiais que lhes permitem, excecionalmente, remover barbatanas de tubarões a bordo.

3. As duas principais espécies de tubarão capturadas pelos palangreiros de superfície da UE são o tubarão azul e o tubarão-anequim. Estas espécies constituem cerca de 90 a 97 % das capturas de tubarões desta frota. O seu estado de conservação varia de acordo com a localização, tal como descrito no relatório de avaliação de impacto. Há outras espécies que também são capturadas, muitas das quais estão estritamente protegidas ao abrigo de várias normas — nacionais, da UE e da ORGP — devido ao seu mau estado de conservação.

4. As autoridades dos Estados-Membros comunicaram à Comissão vários casos de infração do Regulamento (CE) n.° 1185/2003, através dos relatórios anuais apresentados em conformidade com o presente regulamento. Estes relatórios sugerem que, a certo nível, a remoção de barbatanas de tubarões continua a ocorrer. Podem ser consultadas mais informações que podem ser consultadas nos anexos do relatório de avaliação de impacto.

([1]) SEC(2011)1392 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004422/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Amendments to Council Regulation (EC) No 1185/2003 on the removal of fins of sharks on board vessels

In relation to the draft amendment of Regulation (EC) No 1185/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the removal of fins of sharks on board vessels, can the Commission answer the following:

1. What assessment has been made of the socioeconomic impact of the proposed changes? What conclusions were drawn?

2. Specifically, which fishing vessels from which Member States would be affected?

3. What species of shark are affected by this type of fishing and what is their conservation status?

4. What evidence does the Commission have that shark finning is being carried out?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2012)

1. The Commission carried out a thorough Impact Assessment on which it based its Report and subsequently its proposal to amend Regulation 1185/2003. Drawing from the information collected, notably that submitted by the sector, both in writing and during numerous meetings over a two-year period, the Commission concluded that its proposal would not have a significant socioeconomic impact, as stated in the impact assessment Report ([1]).

2. According to the information submitted by the sector and by national authorities (Spain and Portugal in particular), the practice of removing fins from sharks on board is only carried out by freezer vessels, and not by vessels which land fresh sharks. The same sources have informed the Commission that due to these practices, only freezer vessels make use of special permits allowing them, by exemption, to remove the fins of sharks on board.

3. The two shark species mainly caught by EU surface longliners are blue shark and shortfin mako. These species make up approximately 90 to 97% of the shark catch of this fleet. Their conservation status varies according to location, as described in the impact assessment Report. Other species are also caught, many of which are strictly protected under various national, EU and RFMO rules, due to their poor conservation status.

4. Various instances of infringements of Regulation 1185/2003 have been reported to the Commission by Member States' authorities, via the annual reports submitted in line with this regulation. These reports suggest that finning is occurring to a certain extent. More information is available in the annexes of the impact assessment Report.

([1]) SEC(2011) 1392 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004423/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(27 de abril de 2012)

Assunto: Plataforma europeia contra a pobreza — Aumento da pobreza, da exclusão e das desigualdades

Uma das «ações emblemáticas» aprovadas em 2010, no âmbito da chamada Estratégia Europa 2020, a «Plataforma europeia contra a pobreza», visava (assim o afirmou a Comissão) «combater a pobreza, as desigualdades sociais e a exclusão, a fim de garantir que as pessoas possam viver com dignidade e participar ativamente na sociedade».

Quase dois anos transcorridos, a pobreza e a exclusão aumentaram, o mesmo sucedendo com as desigualdades sociais. Ao mesmo tempo, aumentou o número daqueles que se veem impedidos de «participar ativamente na sociedade», sendo milhões os que hoje se veem afetados pelo drama do desemprego. Esta evolução, profundamente negativa, é ainda mais pronunciada nos países, como Portugal, alvo dos programas FMI-UE, sendo indissociável do conteúdo antissocial das políticas contidas nestes programas.

Em face desta evolução, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que medidas concretas foram até à data tomadas no âmbito da «Plataforma europeia contra a pobreza»?

2. Que meios, designadamente no plano financeiro, foram atribuídos a esta ação? Qual a sua distribuição por cada um dos 27 Estados-Membros?

3. Que medidas tomou ou prevê tomar em face do falhanço manifesto desta «ação emblemática»?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(28 de junho de 2012)

A Plataforma Europeia contra a Pobreza e a Exclusão Social é um dos instrumentos concebidos para combater, de uma forma coerente e holística, a pobreza e a exclusão social na UE.

A Plataforma congrega 64 diferentes medidas da UE destinadas a apoiar o objetivo da estratégia Europa 2020 para tirar da pobreza 20 milhões de pessoas até 2020. O calendário para a maior parte das medidas varia de 2011 a 2013, mas existem igualmente ações que devem produzir efeitos por volta do ano 2015 e posteriormente. Por outras palavras, a Comissão ainda não está em condições de fazer uma avaliação completa sobre o êxito da Plataforma. No que se refere às ações previstas para 2011 e 2012, a maioria estão concluídas (Recomendação do Conselho sobre a luta contra o abandono escolar precoce, Nova Agenda Europeia para a Integração, Livro Branco sobre as pensões, Quadro da UE para as estratégias nacionais em prol dos ciganos, etc.) ou bem adiantadas (relatório sobre estratégias de inclusão ativa, Parceria Europeia de Inovação no domínio do envelhecimento ativo e saudável, etc.).

Não foram afetados fundos específicos, em especial para a Plataforma contra a Pobreza. No entanto, a proposta da Comissão relativa ao regulamento que estabelece o quadro estratégico comum para os Fundos para o período de 2014/2020 propõe que todos os fundos devem apoiar a promoção da inclusão social e o combate à pobreza. O atual FSE já está a ajudar os Estados-Membros a aplicarem um conjunto de ações que estão bem inseridas no âmbito da Plataforma.

Atualmente, a Comissão não pretende rever as ações no quadro da Plataforma. No entanto, essas ações são regularmente revistas, com a participação das partes interessadas, pela Comissão. Para o efeito, a Comissão organizou até agora quatro reuniões, a última das quais se realizou em maio de 2012. Os Estados-Membros e as partes interessadas estão também envolvidos na preparação da Convenção Anual de 2012, a realizar em dezembro, em que as ações serão revistas também à luz dos progressos insuficientes para cumprir as metas da UE e nacionais em matéria de combate à pobreza.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004423/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion — Increase in poverty, social exclusion and inequalities

One of the 'flagship initiatives' approved in 2010 as part of the Europe 2020 strategy, the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion was intended to 'combat poverty, social inequalities and exclusion', so that, in the words of the Commission, 'people experiencing poverty and social exclusion are enabled to live in dignity and take an active part in society'.

Nearly two years on, poverty and social exclusion have increased, as have social inequalities. There has also been a rise in the number of people unable to 'take an active part in society'; millions are currently affected by the scourge of unemployment. This profoundly harmful development is even more pronounced in Portugal and the other countries being subjected to IMF-EU programmes, and it is an inevitable consequence of the antisocial nature of those programmes.

In view of these developments:

1. What specific measures have been taken to date as part of the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion?

2. What resources, and in particular funds, have been allocated to this initiative? How have they been shared out among the 27 Member States?

3. What measures has the Commission taken or will it take, given the manifest failure of this 'flagship initiative'?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

The European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion is one of the instruments designed to address, in a coherent and holistic manner, poverty and social exclusion in the EU.

The Platform brings together 64 different EU measures to support the Europe 2020 target to lift 20 million people out of poverty by 2020. The timeframe for most measures ranges from 2011 to 2013 but there are also actions that should deliver around 2015 and beyond. In other words the Commission cannot give a full evaluation on the success of the Platform as of yet. As regards the actions planned for 2011 and 2012 most are either completed (Council Recommendation on combating early school leaving, New European Agenda on Integration, White Paper on Pensions, EU framework for National Roma Strategies, etc) or well underway (report on active inclusion strategies, Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy ageing etc).

No specific funds have been allocated especially for the Platform against Poverty. However, the Commission proposal for the regulation laying down the Common Strategic Framework Funds for the years 2014-2020 proposes that all these funds shall support promoting social inclusion and combating poverty. The current ESF is already helping the Member States to implement a variety of actions that fall well within the remit of the Platform.

At present, the Commission does not intend to review the Platform actions. However these actions are regularly reviewed within the Commission and with stakeholders. To this end the Commission has organised so far four meetings the latest being in May 2012. Member States and stakeholders are also involved in the preparation of the 2012 Annual Convention in December where actions will be reviewed also in the light of the insufficient progress towards the EU and national poverty targets.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004424/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(27 de abril de 2012)

Assunto: Luta contra a Malária — evolução e necessidades

A 25 de abril assinala-se o Dia Mundial de Luta contra a Malária. Segundo as Nações Unidas, a cada minuto, uma criança morre de malária no mundo.

Apesar da evolução positiva que se vem registando — desde 2000, as taxas de mortalidade da malária caíram mais de um quarto globalmente e mais de um terço em África — são necessários maiores progressos. Alcançar taxas de mortalidade próximas do zero é uma das prioridades fundamentais da ONU para os próximos cinco anos.

Um teste de diagnóstico rápido custa cerca de 50 cêntimos de dólar e as doses mínimas de tratamento custam apenas 1 dólar norte-americano. Uma rede mosquiteira que dura três anos e que pode proteger várias crianças custa cerca de 5 dólares. Estas são somas modestas, que poderão ser ainda mais reduzidas, caso se aposte na investigação para encontrar novas e melhores soluções. É necessário, além disso, investir mais na nova geração de tratamentos anti-malária para combater a crescente resistência do parasita e continuar a trabalhar para conseguir uma vacina.

No Dia Mundial de Luta contra a Malária, a ONU apelou a contributos para suprir a falta de cerca de 3,2 biliões de dólares de financiamento para alcançar e manter os cuidados universais anti-malária em África até 2015, bem como para alcançar o objetivo de derrotar esta doença.

Solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que apoios têm sido concedidos pela UE para a prevenção e tratamento da malária nos países em desenvolvimento (para além das verbas destinadas ao GFATM)?

2. Que contributo poderá ser dado pela UE para suprir a falta dos 3,2 biliões de dólares de financiamento para alcançar e manter os cuidados universais anti-malária em África até 2015?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(18 de junho de 2012)

1. A UE contribui para a luta contra doenças específicas (incluindo a malária), principalmente através de um amplo apoio ao fortalecimento dos sistemas de saúde a nível nacional. Esse apoio é complementado por apoio temático aos principais problemas no domínio da saúde. Entendemos que esta é a maneira mais eficaz e mais duradoura de a UE ajudar a vencer a guerra contra as doenças em geral e a malária em particular. Assim, em 2010, a UE afetou mais de 680 milhões de euros ao desenvolvimento do setor da saúde nos países em desenvolvimento e complementa a sua estratégia de luta contra a malária através do Fundo Mundial de luta contra a SIDA, a tuberculose e a malária (GFATM) e através do apoio à investigação e desenvolvimento ([1]).

A Comissão está estreitamente envolvida no GFATM e honrará cabalmente o compromisso assumido pela UE no valor de 330 milhões de euros para o atual período de 2011-2013. Uma vez aprovado o próximo Quadro Financeiro Plurianual, a Comissão preparará em 2013 o compromisso da UE para os três anos seguintes.

2. Em dezembro de 2011, a Comissão propôs um aumento da dotação do 11.° Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento (FED) e do próximo Instrumento de Cooperação para o Desenvolvimento (ICD) (34 e 23 mil milhões de euros respetivamente) incluindo uma proposta com um valor de referência de, pelo menos, 20 % para a saúde, a educação e a inclusão social.

([1]) A Comissão remete também o Senhor Deputado para a resposta à pergunta escrita E-002896/2012 de Filip Kaczmarek em: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp?language=fr

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004424/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: The fight against malaria — developments and needs

25 April is World Malaria Day. According to the United Nations, a child dies from malaria somewhere in the world every minute.

Despite positive developments — since 2000, mortality rates have fallen by more than a quarter globally and over a third in Africa — greater progress must be made. Reducing the mortality rate to almost zero is one of the UN's highest priorities for the next five years.

A rapid diagnosis test costs about USD 0.50 and a minimum treatment dose costs less than one US dollar. A mosquito net that will last three years and can protect several children costs around USD 5. These are modest sums, which could be reduced further still if research provides new and better solutions. It is also necessary to invest more in producing new anti-malaria treatments to combat the parasite's growing resistance, and continue work to find a vaccine.

On World Malaria Day, the UN is calling for contributions to close the funding gap of more than USD 3.2 billion needed to provide and continue universal anti-malaria treatment in Africa until 2015, as well as to achieve the aim of eradicating this sickness.

Can the Commission provide the following information:

1. What support has the European Union allocated for the prevention and treatment of malaria in developing countries (in addition to funds for the Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria)?

2. What contribution can the EU make towards covering the USD 3.2 billion shortfall in funding needed to provide and continue universal anti-malaria treatment in Africa until 2015?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2012)

1. The EU contributes to the fight against specific diseases (including malaria) mainly through comprehensive support to health systems strengthening at country level. Such support is complemented through thematic support addressing core health issues. This is perceived as the most effective and sustainable way for the EU to help win the war against diseases in general and malaria in particular. In this way, in 2010, the EU committed over EUR 680 million to health sector development in developing countries and complements its strategy to fight malaria through the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM) and through support to Research & Development ([1]).

The Commission is committed to the GFATM and will fully honour the EU pledge of EUR 330 million for the current pledging period 2011-2013. The Commission will prepare an EU pledge for the following three years in 2013 when the next EU Multiannual Financial Framework has been decided.

2. In December 2011, the Commission proposed an increase for the 11th European Development Fund (EDF) and for the next Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI), with a budget of EUR 34 and EUR 23 billion respectively, including a proposed benchmark of at least 20% for health, education and social inclusion.

([1]) The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to answer to Written Question E-002896/2012 by Filip Kaczmarek on: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp?language=fr.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004425/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Σχέδιο για τα στεγαστικά δάνεια υπερχρεωμένων νοικοκυριών

Σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα στον ελληνικό Τύπο, η Τρόικα σε συνεργασία με τις ελληνικές τράπεζες επεξεργάζεται σχέδιο με στόχο τη διευκόλυνση χιλιάδων υπερχρεωμένων νοικοκυριών με στεγαστικά δάνεια που δεν εξυπηρετούνται και κατ' επέκταση την προφύλαξη της αγοράς ακινήτων από πιθανό «κραχ» λόγω μαζικών πλειστηριασμών. Όπως αναφέρεται στα εν λόγω δημοσιεύματα, το σχέδιο προβλέπει την ενοικίαση για 3 χρόνια των κατασχεμένων ή υπό κατάσχεση σπιτιών και αναμένεται να είναι έτοιμο να **τεθεί σε εφαρμογή** μετά την ολοκλήρωση της ανακεφαλαιοποίησης των ελληνικών τραπεζών, προς το τελευταίο τρίμηνο του 2012. Η εφαρμογή του μέτρου θα αφορά μόνο τα δάνεια που δεν εξυπηρετούνται και θα οδηγήσει σε μερική διαγραφή του δανείου και σε άτυπη αναστολή των πλειστηριασμών για το συγκεκριμένο χρονικό διάστημα. Από την πλευρά των πιστωτών προτάθηκε, όπως αναφέρουν οι ίδιες πηγές, να υπάρξει σχέδιο αντιμετώπισης των περίπου 70 000 στεγαστικών δανείων που δεν αποπληρώνονται **ανάλογο με αυτά που υιοθετήθηκαν στις ΗΠΑ και στην Ισπανία,** προσαρμοσμένο στα ελληνικά δεδομένα.

Δεδομένης της εκρηκτικής αύξησης του αριθμού των υπερχρεωμένων νοικοκυριών που για αντικειμενικούς λόγους αδυνατούν να ανταποκριθούν στην πληρωμή των στεγαστικών τους δανείων και πλέον ανέρχονται σε χιλιάδες, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή ως συμβαλλόμενο μέρος της Τρόικα:

1. Επιβεβαιώνει την επεξεργασία του ανωτέρω σχεδίου σε συνεργασία με τις ελληνικές τράπεζες με στόχο την εξεύρεση λύσης για τα χιλιάδες υπερχρεωμένα ελληνικά νοικοκυριά; Εάν ναι, στο διάλογο συμμετέχει η ελληνική κυβέρνηση;

2. Με ποια κριτήρια προκρίνει ως την πιο αποτελεσματική τη λύση της ενοικίασης των κατασχεμένων ή υπό κατάσχεση σπιτιών;

3. Προβλέπονται επιπλέον μέτρα με στόχο την προστασία των ευπαθών ομάδων δανειοληπτών όπως η διαγραφή οφειλών ή η επιμήκυνση της προθεσμίας αποπληρωμής;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή ανέφερε ήδη στην απάντησή της στην ερώτηση E-003781/2012 ([1]) του Αξιότιμου Μέλους του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου κ. Κωνσταντίνου Πουπάκη, ότι: «όπως καθορίζεται στο μνημόνιο που συμφωνήθηκε μεταξύ της Ελλάδας και της Επιτροπής (εξ ονόματος των κρατών μελών της ζώνης του ευρώ) και του Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου (ΔΝΤ), οι τυχόν μεταβολές στο νομικό πλαίσιο της Ελλάδας για την αντιμετώπιση των μη εξυπηρετούμενων δανείων που οφείλουν τα νοικοκυριά και η αντίστοιχη αναδιάρθρωση (επί του παρόντος νόμος 3869/2010), θα πρέπει να διέπονται από διάφορες αρχές, συμπεριλαμβανόμενης της ανάγκης για στοχοθέτηση των παρεμβάσεων ανάλογα με την ικανότητα του χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα, της διαφύλαξης της νοοτροπίας που επικρατεί στο θέμα των πληρωμών, της αποφυγής στρατηγικών αθετήσεων δανείων και της μεγιστοποίησης της ανάκτησης περιουσιακών στοιχείων.».

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει ότι ένα νομοσχέδιο βρισκόταν σε στάδιο προετοιμασίας από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση πριν τις εκλογές, αλλά κανένα τέτοιο κείμενο δεν τέθηκε σε ψηφοφορία στο Κοινοβούλιο.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004425/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Mortgage arrangements for over-indebted households

According to articles in the Greek press, the Troika, in cooperation with Greek banks, is in the process of drawing up a plan to provide assistance for thousands of over-indebted households unable to service their mortgages hence to protect the property market from a possible crash as a result of mass auctions. According to these articles, the plan provides for the three-year rental of seized property or property placed under seizure and expects that it will be ready to be launched following the completion of the recapitalisation of Greek banks towards the end of the fourth quarter of 2012. The application of this measure will only concern unserviced loans and will lead to the partial write-off of the loan and the exceptional suspension of auctions for the period of time in question. The same sources report that a contingency plan has been proposed by creditors concerning around 70 000 unpaid mortgage loans, similar to the contingency plans adopted in the USA and Spain, which have been adapted to the situation in Greece.

Given the explosion in the number of over-indebted households (now in the thousands) which, for objective reasons, are unable to pay off their mortgages, will the Commission as a member of the Troika answer the following:

1. Does it confirm that the above plan is being drawn up in cooperation with Greek banks with the aim of finding a solution for the thousands of over-indebted Greek households? If so, is the Greek Government participating in the dialogue?

2. What criteria have led it to conclude that the rental of homes which have been seized or are under seizure is the most effective solution?

3. Are any further measures being planned with the aim of protecting vulnerable groups of borrowers such as writing off debts or extending repayment dates?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2012)

The Commission has already indicated in its response to the Question E-003781/2012 ([1]) by the Honourable Member of the European Parliament, Mr Konstantinos Poupakis, that: 'as established in the memorandum agreed between Greece and the Commission (on behalf of the euro area Member States) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), any changes to the legal framework of Greece for addressing non-performing loans owed by households and the respective restructuring (currently Law 3869/2010) should be guided by several principles, including the need to target interventions in line with the financial sector capacity, to preserve the payment culture, avoid strategic loan defaults and, maximise asset recovery'.

The Commission is aware that a draft law was under preparation by the Greek Government before the election, but that such a text was not put to a vote in Parliament.

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

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004426/12
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(27 april 2012)

Betreft: Oproep ENAR, gesteund door EU, tot toepassen van internetcensuur door nationale lidstaten

Onlangs sprak de Europese Commissie zich krachtig uit tegen internetcensuur, en in het bijzonder tegen landen en bedrijven die dat organiseren. De EU wil bedrijven die daarvoor software leveren zelfs straffen.

Amper een dag later riep het zogenaamde Europees netwerk tegen racisme (ENAR) België op om een website van de partij Vlaams Belang buiten werking te stellen. ENAR krijgt grote sommen subsidiegeld van de EU.

1. Is de oproep van ENAR volgens de Commissie verenigbaar met haar eigen standpunt inzake internetcensuur?

2. Is de Commissie van mening dat door haar gesubsidieerde initiatieven mogen oproepen tot internetcensuur in de EU?

3. Zal dit meegenomen worden in de evaluatie van de goede besteding van de ontvangen subsidies door ENAR? Door wie en wanneer wordt deze evaluatie uitgevoerd?

4. Welk bedrag ontving ENAR in 2011 aan subsidies van de EU?

5. Bij welke dienst werden daarvoor door ENAR een aanvraag, een verantwoording en eventuele bewijsstukken binnengebracht?

6. Over hoeveel personeelsleden wordt het personeelsbudget van bijna 500 000 euro verdeeld? Welk aandeel hiervan wordt door de EU betaald? Welke is de maximumwedde die jaarlijks aan een personeelslid van ENAR betaald wordt?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(19 juni 2012)

1.-2. De vrijheid van meningsuiting en van informatie is vastgelegd in het EU-Handvest van de grondrechten. De gebruikte technologische middelen of landsgrenzen spelen hierbij geen rol.

Bij de verwerking van persoonsgegevens moet ook het grondrecht op bescherming van persoonsgegevens worden geëerbiedigd. Deze twee grondrechten moeten derhalve met elkaar worden verzoend.

Krachtens kaderbesluit 2008/913/JBZ van de Raad dienen de lidstaten het opzettelijk en publiekelijk aanzetten tot geweld of haat op grond van ras, huidskleur, godsdienst, afstamming, dan wel dan wel nationale of etnische afkomst, strafbaar te stellen, ook wanneer dit gebeurt door het publiekelijk verspreiden of uitdelen van geschriften, afbeeldingen of ander materiaal ([1]). Het is aan de nationale rechtbanken om op grond van de context te bepalen of in een concrete situatie sprake is van aansporing tot vreemdelingenhaat, rassenhaat of geweld. Dit kader doet niets af aan de vrijheid van meningsuiting en van informatie, die niet absoluut is.

3.-5. ENAR werd samen met andere netwerken geselecteerd voor een subsidie overeenkomstig de voorschriften en procedures van het programma Progress, dat de daadwerkelijke toepassing van het non-discriminatiebeginsel moet ondersteunen ([2]). Deze subsidie wordt momenteel beheerd door DG Justitie en steunt het functioneren van ENAR als onafhankelijke organisatie. Het is de rol van de Commissie om bij de goedkeuring van de definitieve betaling na te gaan of de organisatie zich houdt aan de vastgelegde werkprogramma's.

Voor 2011 bedroeg de EU-subsidie voor ENAR 983 983,02 EUR (81,55 % van de totale kosten).

6. Het personeelsbudget van ENAR voor 2011 voorziet in 11 personeelsleden.

([1]) Kaderbesluit 2008/913/JBZ van de Raad van 28 november 2008 betreffende de bestrijding van bepaalde vormen en uitingen van racisme en vreemdelingenhaat door middel van het strafrecht, PB L 328 van 6.12.2008.

([2]) Besluit 1672/2006/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 24 oktober 2006 tot vaststelling van een communautair programma voor werkgelegenheid en maatschappelijke solidariteit — Progress, PB L 315 van 15.11.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004426/12
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Call from ENAR, supported by the EU, for national Member States to apply Internet censorship

The European Commission recently took a strong stand against Internet censorship and, in particular, against countries and companies which organise this. The EU even wants to punish companies which supply software for this purpose.

Barely a day later, the European Network Against Racism (ENAR) in Belgium called for a website belonging to the Vlaams Belang [Flemish Interest] party to be taken down. ENAR receives large amounts of subsidies from the EU.

1. Does the Commission think that the call from ENAR is compatible with its own view regarding Internet censorship?

2. Does the Commission think that initiatives which it subsidises should call for Internet censorship in the EU?

3. Will this be taken into account in the assessment of the proper use of the subsidies received by ENAR? By whom and when is this assessment being carried out?

4. How much did ENAR receive in subsidies from the EU in 2011?

5. To which department were an application, justification and any supporting documents submitted by ENAR for this?

6. Among how many members of staff is the staff budget of almost EUR 500 000 distributed? What proportion of it is paid by the EU? What is the maximum salary paid to an ENAR member of staff?

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

1-2. Freedom of expression and information, regardless by which technological means and regardless of frontiers, is a fundamental right enshrined in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Whenever personal data are processed then also the fundamental right to the protection of personal data has to be fully taken into account. Both fundamental rights have to be reconciled.

Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA obliges Member States to penalize **the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred** on the basis of race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin, including when committed by public dissemination or distribution of tracts, pictures or other material ([1]). It is for the national courts to determine, according to the surrounding circumstances and context, whether a given situation represents an incitement to xenophobic or racist hatred or violence. This instrument respects freedom of expression and information, which is not an absolute right.

3-5. Alongside other networks ENAR was selected as beneficiary of a grant according to the rules and procedures of the Progress programme ([2]), which aims to support the effective implementation of the principle of non-discrimination. This grant is currently managed by DG Justice. The grant aims to support ENAR's functioning as an independent organisation. The role of the Commission, when authorising the final payment, is to verify that it adheres to the work programmes it has committed to.

For 2011 the EU grant to ENAR was EUR 983 983,02 (81,55% of its total costs).

6. ENAR's budget for 2011 includes 11 staff members.

([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, 6.12.2008.

([2]) Decision 1672/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 establishing a Community Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity-Progress, OJ L 315, 15.11.2006.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004427/12
an die Kommission
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE) und Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(27. April 2012)

Betrifft: Weiterführung des gemeinsamen Programms „Umgebungsunterstütztes Leben“ (AAL) nach 2013

Das gemeinsame Programm „Umgebungsunterstütztes Leben“ bündelt und unterstützt die nationalen Forschungsbemühungen der 23 EU-Staaten, die darauf abzielen, für die IKT Wege zu finden, um die Lebensqualität älterer Menschen zu verbessern, und sie in die Lage zu versetzen, so lange wie möglich zu Hause zu leben. Nach vier wettbewerbsorientierten Aufforderungen zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen unterstützt das Programm derzeit etwa 80 marktnahe FEI-Projekte mit Beteiligung von Endnutzern. Die geförderten Projekte betreffen Unterstützungs- und AAL-Lösungen für die „Behandlung chronischer Erkrankungen“, „soziale Interaktionen“, „Teilhabe an und Unabhängigkeit in der Gesellschaft“ und „Mobilität“. Eine fünfte Aufforderung wurde Ende Februar 2012 gestartet. Die zu fördernden Projekte betreffen Unterstützungs- und AAL-Lösungen für die „Behandlung chronischer Erkrankungen“ und „soziale Interaktionen“. Das gemeinsame Programm „Umgebungsunterstütztes Leben“ wurde ursprünglich für den Zeitraum 2008 bis 2013 aufgesetzt.

1. Wird die Kommission einen Prozess für die Weiterführung des gemeinsamen Programms „Umgebungsunterstütztes Leben“ nach dem derzeitigen Ablaufdatum (2013) anstoßen?

2. Falls ja, wann wird die Kommission diesen Prozess voraussichtlich in Gang setzen?

3. Wie sieht die Kommission die Einbeziehung einer möglichen Weiterführung des gemeinsamen Programms AAL in den Kontext und in das Budget von Horizont 2020 vor?

4. In welchem Umfang wird die Kommission im Rahmen der Europäischen Innovationspartnerschaft (EIP) bereits unternommene Anstrengungen zu Aktivität und Gesundheit im Alter einbeziehen?

Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission
(14. Juni 2012)

Ausgehend davon, dass die Weiterführung des gemeinsamen Programms „Umgebungsunterstütztes Leben“ (AAL) mit den Zielen und Kriterien des Programms Horizont 2020 in Einklang steht und dass mit dem laufenden AAL-Programm innerhalb des 7. Rahmenprogramms erhebliche Fortschritte erzielt werden, hat die Kommission bereits die ersten Schritte für die Weiterführung des gemeinsamen Programms AAL eingeleitet. 2010 wurde eine Zwischenbewertung durchgeführt ([1]). Deren wichtigste Schlussfolgerung lautete, dass das AAL-Programm zu bemerkenswerten Ergebnissen führt, aber einen Follow-up erfordert, wenn seine Ziele (insbesondere, dass IKT-Lösungen für Gesundheit und Pflege zum festen Lebensbestandteil älterer Bürgerinnen und Bürger werden) in vollem Umfang erreicht werden sollen. Dies entspricht dem im Rahmen der Digitalen Agenda gesetzten Ziel, unabhängiges Wohnen im Alter bis spätestens 2015 zu verdoppeln.

In Reaktion auf die Mitteilung der Kommission über die Zwischenbewertung des gemeinsamen Programms hat der Rat die Kommission aufgefordert, gemäß Artikel 185 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union im Rahmen des Programms Horizont 2020 in Zusammenarbeit mit den teilnehmenden Ländern Optionen für den Follow-up des gemeinsamen Programms vorzuschlagen. Mit der Analyse dieser Optionen wurde in enger Zusammenarbeit mit den AAL-Leitungsgremien der Stellen der Mitgliedstaaten bereits begonnen. Auf dieser Grundlage führt die Kommission derzeit eine Folgenabschätzung durch. Allerdings kann der Vorschlag für den Beitrag der EU erst dann von der Europäischen Kommission angenommen werden, wenn die Mitgliedstaaten ihre gemeinsamen Programme (einschließlich der geplanten finanziellen Verpflichtungen und einer gemeinsam vereinbarten Forschungsagenda) vorgelegt haben. Vor jeder Entscheidung müssen erst die Beschlüsse zum Horizont-2020-Vorschlag und zum mittelfristigen Finanzrahmen für den EU-Haushalt abgewartet werden. Um Finanzierungslücken beim gemeinsamen Programm zu vermeiden, ist jedoch rasches Handeln geboten.

([1]) Siehe: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/information_society/evaluation/rtd/jti/aal_interim_evaluation_final_report.pdf

Der Vorschlag wird den Empfehlungen der Zwischenbewertung (z. B. für eine verstärkte Einbeziehung der Nutzer und eine enge Verbindung zum Markt) sowie der Europäischen Innovationspartnerschaft „Aktives und gesundes Altern“ und deren strategischem Durchführungsplan Rechnung tragen. Bei der Europäischen Investitionspartnerschaft wird das gemeinsame Programm AAL als bedeutsam eingestuft, weil es den Schwerpunkt auf das Innovationsstadium legt, in dem insbesondere KMU öffentliche Unterstützung benötigen, um Innovationen von der Forschung zur Marktreife zu führen.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004427/12
aan de Commissie
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE) en Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(27 april 2012)

Betreft: Voortzetting van het gemeenschappelijk programma Ambient Assisted Living (AAL) na 2013

Het gemeenschappelijk programma Ambient Assisted Living omvat en steunt de nationale inspanningen die op onderzoeksgebied zijn verricht door 23 EU-landen teneinde manieren te vinden waarop ICT de kwaliteit van leven van ouderen kan helpen verbeteren, en hen in staat te stellen zo lang mogelijk thuis te blijven wonen. In antwoord op vier oproepen tot het indienen van voorstellen steunt het programma momenteel ongeveer 80 marktgerichte projecten op het gebied van onderzoek, ontwikkeling en innovatie waarbij de eindgebruikers betrokken zijn. De gefinancierde projecten hebben betrekking op ondersteunende en AAL-oplossingen voor „het beheer van chronische aandoeningen", „sociale interacties", „deelname en onafhankelijkheid in de maatschappij" en „mobiliteit". Een vijfde oproep is onlangs, eind februari 2012, gedaan. De te financieren projecten hebben betrekking op ondersteunende en AAL-oplossingen voor „het beheer van chronische aandoeningen" en „sociale interacties". Het gemeenschappelijke AAL-programma is aanvankelijk opgezet voor de periode van 2008 tot 2013.

1. Is de Commissie voornemens een proces in gang te zetten voor de voortzetting van het gemeenschappelijk programma Ambient Assisted Living na de huidige vervaldatum (2013)?

2. Als dit het geval is, wanneer is de Commissie voornemens hiermee aan te vangen?

3. Hoe wil de Commissie een eventuele voortzetting van het gemeenschappelijk AAL-programma gaan opnemen in de context en de begroting van Horizon 2020?

4. In hoeverre zal de Commissie gebruik maken van de inspanningen die reeds gemaakt zijn in het kader van het Europees Innovatiepartnerschap (EIP) inzake actief en gezond ouder worden?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(14 juni 2012)

Ervan uitgaande dat voortzetting van het gemeenschappelijk AAL-programma beantwoordt aan de doelstellingen en criteria van Horizon 2020 en dat het huidige gemeenschappelijk programma AAL in het kader van het Zevende Kaderprogramma aanzienlijke vooruitgang laat zien, is de Commissie reeds gestart met het proces voor voortzetting van het gemeenschappelijk programma Ambient Assisted Living (GP AAL). In 2010 werd een tussentijdse evaluatie uitgevoerd ([1]). De voornaamste conclusie luidde dat het GP AAL weliswaar indrukwekkende resultaten oplevert, maar dat een follow-up nodig is om de doeleinden volledig te verwezenlijken, met name om ervoor te zorgen dat ICT-oplossingen voor gezondheid en zorg een integrerend onderdeel uitmaken van het dagelijks leven van bejaarden. Dit strookt met het DAE-streven dat erop gericht is het gebruik van regelingen voor zelfstandig leven door ouderen tegen 2015 te verdubbelen.

In antwoord op de Mededeling van de Commissie inzake de tussentijdse evaluatie van het gemeenschappelijk AAL-programma, heeft de Raad de Commissie verzocht samen met de deelnemende landen voorstellen op tafel te leggen voor de follow-up van dit programma in het kader van Horizon 2020, overeenkomstig artikel 185 van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie. In nauwe samenwerking met het bestuursorgaan van de AAL-organisaties in de lidstaten is een begin gemaakt met de analyse van deze opties. Op basis hiervan is de Commissie bezig met een effectbeoordeling. De Europese Commissie kan dit voorstel waarin een gedetailleerd overzicht wordt gegeven van de communautaire deelneming echter alleen goedkeuren wanneer de lidstaten hun gemeenschappelijk programma hebben ingediend (met inbegrip van geplande financiële verbintenissen en een gemeenschappelijk overeengekomen onderzoeksagenda). Voordat beslissingen kunnen worden genomen moet de besluitvorming in verband met het voorstel voor Horizon 2020 en het meerjarig financieel kader voor de EU-begroting worden afgewacht. Wel moet tijdig actie worden ondernomen om te voorkomen dat er bij het gemeenschappelijk programma financieringgaten vallen.

([1]) Zie: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/information_society/evaluation/rtd/jti/aal_interim_evaluation_final_report.pdf

Bij dit voorstel zal rekening worden gehouden met de aanbevelingen van de tussentijdse evaluatie (bijv. meer gebruikersparticipatie en een nauwe band met de markt), en met de aanbevelingen van het Europees innovatiepartnerschap inzake actief en gezond ouder worden en het bijbehorende strategisch uitvoeringsplan. Volgens het Europees innovatiepartnerschap is het gemeenschappelijk programma AAL van vitaal belang omdat de focus ligt op het innovatiestadium, waar met name kmo's overheidssteun nodig hebben om onderzoeksresultaten sneller hun weg te doen vinden naar de markt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004427/12
to the Commission
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE) and Heinz K. Becker (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Continuation of Ambient Assisted Living Joint Programme (AAL JP) after 2013

The Ambient Assisted Living Joint Programme bundles and supports the national research efforts of 23 EU countries aimed at finding ways for ICT to help improve the quality of life of elderly people, and at enabling them to live at home as long as possible. Following four competitive calls for proposals, the programme currently supports about 80 R+D+I close-to-market projects with end-users involved. The projects funded address support and AAL solutions to 'management of chronic conditions', 'social interactions', 'participation and independence in society' and 'mobility'. A fifth call has just been launched at the end of February 2012. The projects to be funded address support and AAL solutions to 'management of chronic conditions' and 'social interactions'. The AAL Joint Programme is initially set up for the period from 2008 to 2013.

1. Will the Commission initiate a process for the continuation of the Ambient Assisted living Joint Programme after its current expiry date (2013)?

2. If so, when does the Commission expect to start this process?

3. How does the Commission foresee the inclusion of a possible continuation of the AAL JP in the context and in the budget of Horizon 2020?

4. To what extent will the Commission incorporate efforts already made under the European Innovation Partnership (EIP) on Active and Healthy Ageing?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2012)

Presuming that the continuation of the AAL JP meets the Horizon 2020 objectives and criteria and that the current AAL JP shows significant progress under FP7, the Commission has already initiated the process for the continuation of the Ambient Assisted Living Joint Programme (AAL JP). In 2010 an Interim Evaluation has been carried out ([1]). The main conclusion was that the AAL Joint Programme generates impressive results, but that a follow-up is needed to achieve fully its goals, in particular to make ICT solutions for health and care part and parcel of the daily life of elderly citizens. This corresponds to the DAE target to double the take-up of independent living arrangements for the elderly by 2015.

In reaction to the Commission communication on the AAL JP Interim Evaluation, the Council has requested the Commission in cooperation with participating countries to propose options for the follow-up to the AAL JP under Horizon 2020, in accordance with Article 185 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Work has started on analysing these options, in close cooperation with the AAL governing body of Member States agencies. On this basis, the Commission is working on an Impact assessment exercise Please note that this proposal detailing community participation can only be adopted by the European Commission after Member States have come forward with their joint programme (including planned financial commitments and a commonly agreed research agenda). Before anything is decided decision-making on the Horizon 2020 proposal and the MFF for the EU-budget have to be awaited. Timely action is needed though, to avoid funding gaps for the JP.

The proposal will take into account recommendations from the interim evaluation (e.g. on increasing user involvement and a close link to the market), as well as from the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing and its Strategic Implementation Plan. The EIP positions the AAL JP as crucial because of its focus on the innovation stage, where in particular SMEs need public support to accelerate innovations from research to market.

([1]) See: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/information_society/evaluation/rtd/jti/aal_interim_evaluation_final_report.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-004429/12
à la Commission
Michel Dantin (PPE)
(27 avril 2012)

Objet: Mesures d'urgence pour la mise en conformité de la directive 1999/74/CE relative à la protection des poules pondeuses

L'Union européenne a édicté de nouvelles mesures en ce qui concerne les dimensions des cages de volailles. Celles-ci sont rentrées en application le 1er janvier dernier.

Or, de grandes divergences apparaissent entre les États membres dans l'application de cette règle. Certains États autorisent la commercialisation d'œufs hors-norme dans les usages industriels.

— Quelles mesures d'urgence la Commission entend-t-elle prendre pour assurer des conditions égales de concurrence au sein du marché intérieur?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(22 juin 2012)

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à prendre connaissance de sa réponse à la question écrite nº E-00815/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004429/12
to the Commission
Michel Dantin (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Emergency measures ensuring compliance with Directive 1999/74/EC on the welfare of laying hens

The European Union has laid down new measures regarding the size of poultry cages. These came into force on 1 January this year.

However, there are huge discrepancies in how Member States are implementing these rules. Some States are allowing non-compliant eggs to be sold for industrial uses.

— What emergency measures will the Commission take to ensure competition within the internal market takes place on equal terms?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-00815/2012 ([1]).

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-004430/12
a la Comisión
Alejandro Cercas (S&D)
(27 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: Recortes en la sanidad pública española

Desde la UE se están promoviendo numerosas iniciativas dirigidas a apoyar la formación, el empleo y la inclusión de los jóvenes en el mercado laboral con el fin de evitar la creación de una generación perdida entre los millones de jóvenes que se encuentran actualmente desempleados en Europa. España es uno de los países más afectados por el desempleo juvenil con una tasa del 51,4 % de su población activa y las reformas en el mercado laboral, educativo y sanitario en este país van dirigidas a reducir sus derechos y garantías, así como todo apoyo público a que puedan seguir formándose y ser atendidos sanitariamente.

El Gobierno de España aprobó el pasado 20 de abril un Decreto-ley de medidas urgentes para garantizar la sostenibilidad del sistema nacional de salud y mejorar la calidad y seguridad de sus prestaciones que acaba con el principio de universalidad e igualdad de trato en las prestaciones sanitarias vigente en nuestro país desde el año 1983.

La reforma tendrá un impacto real especialmente grave sobre los colectivos más vulnerables como los inmigrantes, los pensionistas y los jóvenes puesto que se reducirán sus derechos y garantías sanitarias consagradas en el artículo 43 de la Constitución Española. Destaca el impacto sobre los jóvenes mayores de 26 años que todavía estén estudiando o que se encuentren en el paro: estos quedarán excluidos como beneficiarios ya que, si no trabajan o no han trabajado antes, el sistema de salud les niega la cobertura a no ser que paguen su asistencia sanitaria.

¿Está la Comisión al tanto de esta reforma y de su impacto sobre los derechos y garantías de los ciudadanos residentes en territorio español, así como del hecho de que se realiza alegando la necesidad de cumplir con los objetivos de reducción del déficit impuestos por la Comisión? ¿No atenta esta medida contra iniciativas como la «Juventud en movimiento», la «Iniciativa de oportunidades para la juventud» o el recientemente publicado «Hacia una recuperación rica en generación de empleo»? ¿Piensa la Comisión hacer alguna gestión para que los millones de jóvenes desempleados en España no sigan perdiendo derechos?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de junio de 2012)

Los Estados miembros tienen la responsabilidad principal a la hora de organizar sus sistemas de asistencia sanitaria. Sin embargo, la Unión podrá tomar iniciativas para fomentar la coordinación de las políticas sanitarias y sociales de los Estados miembros ([1]). De conformidad con las disposiciones nacionales pertinentes, los Estados miembros deben tomar todas las medidas necesarias para que todos los afectados puedan recibir el apoyo adecuado mediante el acceso a servicios de calidad, entre otras cosas, en cuestiones de asistencia social, empleo y formación, ayudas a la vivienda, atención a la infancia, cuidados de larga duración y sanidad.

En el informe conjunto sobre empleo de 2012 ([2]), la Comisión señala que una consolidación inteligente debería dar prioridad a que se mantengan los niveles de las pensiones mínimas y se garantice el acceso a la asistencia sanitaria para los grupos más vulnerables.

Además, el Estudio Prospectivo Anual sobre el Crecimiento establece que es necesario hacer un seguimiento más estrecho del impacto de las reformas de las finanzas públicas sobre determinados colectivos, entre otros motivos, para evitar un posible empeoramiento de sus condiciones sociales. En este sentido, los fondos de la UE pueden ser una fuente útil de financiación para garantizar la compatibilidad entre el ambicioso plan de consolidación fiscal y los ambiciosos objetivos que España ha establecido con el fin de permitir rápidamente el crecimiento, crear empleo y aliviar el impacto social de la crisis. Todo esto se tradujo en recomendaciones específicas para cada país.

([1]) Artículo 5, apartado 3, del TFUE.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2012_annex3_en.pdf

Además, tal y como se señala en el paquete de medidas de empleo ([3]), recientemente adoptado, la lucha contra el desempleo juvenil merece acciones más inmediatas. Al final del segundo Semestre Europeo, la Comisión emitirá recomendaciones específicas para cada país, con medidas clave para ayudar a los Estados miembros a superar la elevada tasa de desempleo (juvenil). A más tardar a finales de 2012 se presentará también una Propuesta de Recomendación del Consejo sobre garantías para la juventud.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/andor/headlines/news/2012/04/20120418_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004430/12
to the Commission
Alejandro Cercas (S&D)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Spanish public health cuts

The EU is promoting many initiatives to support training, employment and inclusion of young people in the labour market, in order to prevent the millions of young people currently unemployed in Europe from becoming a lost generation. Spain is one of the countries most affected by youth unemployment, with 51.4% of those economically active being unemployed, while reforms to the labour market, education and health in the country are aimed at reducing their rights and guarantees, as well as any public support to allow them to continue their education and have access to healthcare.

On 20 April 2012, the Spanish Government approved an Executive Order for urgent measures to ensure the sustainability of the national health system and to improve the quality and safety of what it does, putting an end to the principle of universality and equality of treatment in the provision of healthcare that has been in force in the country since 1983.

The reform will have a real impact, which will be especially serious for the most vulnerable groups, such as immigrants, pensioners and young people, since it will reduce their healthcare entitlements and guarantees enshrined in Article 43 of the Spanish Constitution. Of particular note is the impact on young people over 26 who are still studying or who are registered as unemployed: they will be excluded as beneficiaries since, if they are not in work or have not worked previously, the health system will deny them cover unless they pay for their healthcare.

Is the Commission aware of this reform and its impact on the rights and guarantees of citizens resident in Spain, and the fact that it is being carried out allegedly because of the need to meet the deficit reduction targets imposed by the Commission? Does this measure not threaten initiatives such as 'Youth on the Move', the 'Youth Opportunities Initiative' and the recently published 'Towards a job-rich recovery'? Does the Commission intend to take action so that the millions of unemployed young people in Spain do not continue to lose rights?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2012)

Member States have the primary responsibility in organising their healthcare system. However, the Union may take initiatives to encourage coordination of Member State's health and social policies ([1]). In accordance with the relevant national provisions, Member States should take every measure to enable those concerned to receive appropriate support through access to quality services, among others social assistance, employment and training, housing support, childcare, long term care and healthcare.

In the 2012 Joint Employment Report ([2]) the Commission points out that smart consolidation should give priority to maintaining minimum pension levels and guarantee healthcare access for the most vulnerable groups.

Furthermore, the Annual Growth Survey states that the impact of public finance reforms on specific groups requires closer monitoring, among other reasons, to avoid a possible worsening of social conditions. In this respect, EU funding can be a useful source of financing in order to ensure compatibility between the ambitious fiscal consolidation agenda and the ambitious targets that Spain has set with the objective to quickly unblock growth, create jobs and mitigate the social impact of the crisis. This was reflected in country specific recommendations.

Moreover, as pointed out in the recently adopted Employment Package ([3]), combating the youth unemployment merits further immediate actions. At the end of the second European Semester, the Commission is issuing country-specific recommendations that reflect key measures in order to help Member States to overcome the high share of (youth) joblessness. Furthermore, a proposal for a Council Recommendation on Youth Guarantees will be presented by the end of 2012.

([1]) Art.5-3of TFEU.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2012_annex3_en.pdf
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/andor/headlines/news/2012/04/20120418_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004432/12
an die Kommission
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)
(27. April 2012)

Betrifft: Gütesiegel zur Kennzeichnung von Lederwaren bzw. Zertifizierungsmethoden für die Einfuhr von Lederwaren in die EU

Aus dem kürzlich durchgeführten Ethiktest mehrerer europäischer Verbraucherorganisationen — darunter dem Österreichischen Verein für Konsumenteninformation (VKI) — geht hervor, dass der Großteil führender Markenschuhhersteller nicht über die Herkunft ihrer zu verarbeitenden Lederwaren Bescheid weiß. Demzufolge kann keiner der 16 getesteten Schuhhersteller nachweisen, dass seine Produkte frei von Sklaverei und Tierquälerei sind. Laut der aktuellen Ausgabe der Fachzeitschrift des VKI (Konsument 04/2012) leiden in Indien, Bangladesch und Nepal 40 Prozent der Gerbereiarbeiter an Hautkrankheiten, Asthma oder anderen durch Chemikalien bedingten Leiden. Vor allem die Chromgerbung, die noch immer zu 80 bis 85 Prozent angewendet wird, stellt eine große Gefahr für die Gesundheit der Arbeiter wie auch für die Umwelt dar. Länder wie Indien und Brasilien, die enorme Missstände in der Lederproduktion aufweisen, zählen zu den führenden Lieferanten der EU. Neben diesen Gegebenheiten geht aus Gesprächen mit EU-Bürgerinnen und -Bürgern hervor, dass sie großen Wert auf die Herkunft der Waren legen. Die Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten möchten sicherstellen, dass die Produkte frei von ausbeuterischer Kinderarbeit sowie Sklavenarbeit sind und nicht zu Lasten der Gesundheit von Arbeiterinnen und Arbeitern gehen.

1. Gibt es neben dem Europäischen Umweltzeichen andere (freiwillige) Gütesiegel zur Kennzeichnung von Lederwaren bzw. gibt es Zertifizierungsmethoden für die Einfuhr von Lederwaren in die EU, durch die eine faire und nachhaltige Produktion in den betroffenen Ländern gewährleistet wird?

2. Sollte dem nicht so sein, welche Schritte könnten seitens der Kommission unternommen werden, um die Bedingungen in der Lederproduktion zu verbessern und den Anliegen der Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten Rechnung zu tragen?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(2. Juli 2012)

Die Kommission beobachtet aufmerksam die Entwicklungen in der Leder- und Gerbereiindustrie.

Im September 2011 gab sie bei einer externen Beratungsfirma eine Studie in Auftrag, mit der festgestellt werden sollte, ob auf EU-Ebene Bedarf an einem oder mehreren Kennzeichnungssystemen besteht und wie dies in der Praxis umsetzbar ist.

Die Studie beschäftigt sich mit folgenden möglichen Kennzeichnungen für Lederwaren: Ursprungskennzeichnung; Hinweis darauf, dass die Ware aus echtem Leder hergestellt ist; Angabe des Tieres, von dem das Leder stammt; Rückverfolgbarkeit und Angabe des Herstellers; Umwelt- und Sozialgütesiegel.

In der Studie werden auch Informationen über die einschlägigen gesetzlichen Bestimmungen der Mitgliedstaaten sowie über die auf Freiwilligkeit beruhenden Systeme zur Kennzeichnung von Lederwaren zusammengestellt. Die Meinung aller relevanten Interessenträger einschließlich der Verbraucher wird darin ausführlich analysiert. Ferner werden in der Studie Optionen für politische Maßnahmen aufgezeigt und deren potenzielle Auswirkungen bewertet.

Die Kommission wird sich bei ihren Überlegungen zum künftigen Vorgehen im Bereich der Kennzeichnung von Lederwaren auf den Abschlussbericht der Beratungsfirma stützen, der im September 2012 vorliegen soll.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004432/12
to the Commission
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Quality seals for labelling leather goods and certification methods for the import of leather goods into the EU

The ethics test recently carried out by several European consumer organisations, including the Austrian Consumer Information Association (*Verein für Konsumenteninformation*, VKI) indicates that the majority of leading branded footwear producers know very little about the origin of the leather goods they use for manufacturing. Consequently, none of the 16 footwear producers tested were able to prove that their products were untainted by slavery and animal cruelty. According to the current issue of the VKI periodical (*Konsument* April 2012), 40% of tannery workers in India, Bangladesh and Nepal suffer from skin diseases, asthma or other chemical-related disorders. Chrome tanning in particular, which is still used in 80 to 85% of cases, poses a significant threat to both workers' health and the environment. Countries such as India and Brazil, where there are enormous abuses in the leather production industry, are among the leading suppliers to the EU. In addition to these considerations, consultations with EU citizens indicate that they place great value on the origin of goods. Consumers want to ensure that products are not manufactured using exploitative child labour or slavery and are not produced at the expense of workers' health.

1. Are there other (voluntary) quality seals for labelling leather goods, alongside the European eco-label, and are there any certification methods for the import of leather goods into the EU which ensure fair and sustainable production in the relevant countries?

2. If not, what steps could be taken by the Commission to improve conditions in the field of leather production and to respond to the concerns of consumers?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2012)

The Commission is closely following developments in the leather and tannery industry.

In order to explore the need and feasibility of EU-level labelling system(s), the Commission launched a study on these issues with an external consulting company in September 2011.

The study is looking into the following possible leather labels: origin marking; indication that the product is made of real leather; the indication of the animal from which the leather originates; traceability and indication of the manufacturer; environmental labelling, and social labelling.

The study is collecting available information on the existing Member State legislation in this field and also on the existing voluntary leather labelling schemes. It is looking extensively into the views of all the relevant stakeholders, including the views of consumers. It is also setting up possible policy options and assessing their potential impacts.

The final report by the consulting company is foreseen for September 2012 and will enable the Commission to reflect on the possible ways forward in the field of leather labelling.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004433/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Συμπίεση γεωργικού εισοδήματος στην Ελλάδα

Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία που δημοσιοποίησε προσφάτως η ΓΔ Γεωργίας και Ανάπτυξης της Υπαίθρου της Επιτροπής σχετικά με την Γεωργία στην ΕΕ κατά το 2011, σημειώθηκε αύξηση της τάξεως του 3,7 % στο πραγματικό γεωργικό εισόδημα σε επίπεδο ΕΕ, ως αποτέλεσμα της αύξησης τόσο του όγκου της γεωργικής παραγωγής (1,4 %), όσο και σε επίπεδο τιμών (5,7 %).

Επιπλέον, ως απόρροια της συνδυασμένης -ως άνω- αύξησης του πραγματικού γεωργικού εισοδήματος (3,7 %) και της μείωσης της εισροής γεωργικής εργασίας (-2.7 %), η αύξηση του μέσου πραγματικού γεωργικού εισοδήματος ανά ετήσια μονάδα εργασίας ήταν της τάξεως του 6,5 % (ως προς το 2010). Η εν λόγω αύξηση κρίνεται αξιόλογη, λαμβανομένων υπόψη των εξελίξεων στις τιμές εισροών αφενός και εκροών αφετέρου.

Αξίζει, επίσης, να σημειωθεί ότι, βάσει των προσωρινών διαθεσίμων στοιχείων, προκύπτει (κατ' εξαίρεση) γεωργικό εμπορικό πλεόνασμα (περί τα 7 δισ. ευρώ) κατά το 2011 σε επίπεδο ΕΕ.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Βάσει των στοιχείων που διαθέτει για τα επιμέρους κράτη μέλη (ως προς λ.χ. τις τιμές γεωργικών εισροών/εκροών, τον όγκο και την αξία της γεωργικής παραγωγής, τις εισαγωγές/εξαγωγές γεωργικών προϊόντων, καθώς και ως προς τη λειτουργία της αλυσίδας εφοδιασμού τροφίμων) σε ποιους παράγοντες αποδίδει το γεγονός ότι το 2011 στην Ελλάδα σημειώθηκε εκ νέου μείωση στο γεωργικό εισόδημα ανά ετήσια μονάδα εργασίας —5,3 % έναντι αύξησης της τάξεως του +6,5 % -κατά μέσο όρο- στην ΕΕ;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Ιουνίου 2012)

Σύμφωνα με τα τελευταία διαθέσιμα στοιχεία της Eurostat, το γεωργικό εισόδημα ανά εργαζόμενο σε πραγματικούς όρους αυξήθηκε κατά μέσο όρο κατά 7 % το 2011 στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση συνολικά, ενώ στην Ελλάδα, ακολούθησε ένα διαφορετικό σχήμα, σημειώνοντας μείωση κατά —5,6 %.

Η αύξηση του γεωργικού εισοδήματος ανά εργαζόμενο σε επίπεδο ΕΕ ήταν το αποτέλεσμα αύξησης στο εισόδημα των συντελεστών παραγωγής κατά 4 % (λόγω της αύξησης και στα δύο· στο δείκτη όγκου κατά 2 % και στις πραγματικές τιμές κατά 5 %) και της μέτριας μείωσης στις εισροές γεωργικής εργασίας (-3 %).

Η παρατηρούμενη μείωση του γεωργικού εισοδήματος ανά εργαζόμενο στην Ελλάδα οφείλεται σε πολλούς παράγοντες: πρώτον, ο όγκος της γεωργικής παραγωγής το 2011 παρέμεινε σχεδόν στο ίδιο επίπεδο με το προηγούμενο έτος (+0,3 %), μια μικρή αύξηση της αξίας της γεωργικής παραγωγής σε πραγματικούς όρους, που προέρχεται από την αύξηση κατά 1 % στις τιμές εκροών, και αμετάβλητες εισροές γεωργικής εργασίας· δεύτερον, η αξία της ενδιάμεσης ανάλωσης αυξήθηκε σε πραγματικούς όρους κατά 9 % λόγω της αύξησης κατά 11 % στις τιμές, ενώ ο όγκος παρέμεινε σχεδόν στο ίδιο επίπεδο με το 2010. Οι πιο αξιοσημείωτες αυξήσεις των τιμών παρατηρήθηκαν στις ζωοτροφές (κατά 14 %), την ενέργεια και τα λιπαντικά (κατά 17 %), και τα λιπάσματα (κατά 5 %)·και τρίτον, οι φόροι επί της παραγωγής αυξήθηκαν σημαντικά (κατά 39 %), ενώ σε επίπεδο ΕΕ αυτή η συνιστώσα παρέμεινε αμετάβλητη κατά μέσο όρο. Αυτές οι εξελίξεις οδήγησαν σε μείωση του γεωργικού εισοδήματος ανά εργαζόμενο κατά —5,6 %.

Αναφορικά με το εμπόριο, θα πρέπει να σημειωθεί ότι, ενώ η ΕΕ ενίσχυσε την καθαρή εξαγωγική της θέση στα γεωργικά προϊόντα (με εμπορικό πλεόνασμα 6,8 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ, δηλαδή +12 % σε σύγκριση με το 2010), στην Ελλάδα σημειώθηκε μείωση του εμπορικού πλεονάσματός της από 374 εκατομμύρια ευρώ σε 154 εκατομμύρια ευρώ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004433/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Contraction of farm income in Greece

According to data on agriculture in the EU in 2011 recently published by the Commission's Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development, there was a 3.7% increase in real farm income on an EU level as a result of increases in both the volume of farm production (1.4%) and in price levels (5.7%).

Moreover, due to a combination of the abovementioned increase in real farm income (3.7%) and a reduction in the agricultural labour input (–2.7%), the increase in average real farm income per annual work unit was 6.5% (compared with 2010). This increase is considered significant given the developments in both input and output prices.

It is also worth noting that, on the basis of the data currently available, an exceptional agricultural trade surplus (around EUR 7 billion) is emerging for 2011 on an EU level.

Will the Commission answer the following:

On the basis of the data it has on individual Member States (as regards, for example, farm input/output prices, the volume and the value of agricultural production, farm product imports/exports and the functioning of the food supply chain), what factors have led to a per annual work unit reduction in farm income of -5.3% in Greece compared with the +6.5% average increase in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(15 June 2012)

According to the latest data available at Eurostat, the agricultural income per worker in real terms increased on average by 7% in 2011 in the European Union as a whole, while in Greece, it followed a different pattern declining by -5.6%.

The rise in agricultural income per worker at EU level was the result of a 4% increase in factor income (due to the increase in both; the volume index by 2% and in real prices by 5%) and by a moderate reduction in the agricultural labour input (-3%).

The observed decrease in agricultural income per worker in Greece was due to several factors: firstly, the volume of agricultural production in 2011 remained almost at the same level as previous year (+0.3%), a moderate increase in value of agricultural production in real terms, driven by the 1% increase in output prices, and unchanged agricultural labour input; secondly, the value of intermediate consumption increased in real terms by 9% due to an increase of 11% in prices while the volume remained almost at the same level as in 2010. The most notable price increases were observed for feeding stuffs by 14%, energy and lubricants by 17% and fertilisers by 5% and thirdly, taxes on production increased considerably by 39% while at EU level this component remained unchanged on average. These developments resulted in the -5.6% drop of agricultural income per worker.

As regards trade, it should be noted that while the EU strengthened its net export position in agricultural products (with a trade surplus of EUR 6.8 billion, i.e. +12% compared to 2010), Greece recorded a decline in its trade surplus from EUR 374 million to EUR 154 million.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004434/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αξιοποίηση μικροχρηματοδοτήσεων Progress στην Ελλάδα

Για την Ελλάδα υπογράφηκε σύμβαση εγγύησης για 803 250 ευρώ και σύμβαση για δάνειο εξοφλητικής προτεραιότητας ύψους 8 750 000 ευρώ με την Παγκρήτια Συνεταιριστική Τράπεζα τον Δεκέμβριο του 2011 προκειμένου το ποσό αυτό να διοχετευθεί για την στήριξη των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων.

Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή για την πορεία αξιοποίησης των συγκεκριμένων πόρων; Πόσοι από αυτούς έχουν ήδη διατεθεί σε ελληνικές μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις; Είναι ικανοποιητικός ο βαθμός αξιοποίησης τους;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η συμφωνία εγγύησης που υπεγράφη με την Παγκρήτια Συνεταιριστική Τράπεζα τον Δεκέμβριο του 2011 στο πλαίσιο της μικροχρηματοδότησης Progress έχει ως στόχο να διευκολύνει την πρόσβαση στην παροχή χρηματοδότησης, ιδίως για νέους δανειολήπτες, οι οποίοι δεν μπορούν να παράσχουν επαρκή εχέγγυα, καθώς και για πολύ μικρές επιχειρήσεις με επιχειρηματικό ιστορικό μικρότερο των τριών ετών. Η συμφωνία σχετικά με το δάνειο προεξοφλητικής προτεραιότητας έχει με τη σειρά της στόχο τη δημιουργία χαρτοφυλακίων μικροδανείων για υφιστάμενες μικροεπιχειρήσεις. Επί του παρόντος, το δάνειο προεξοφλητικής προτεραιότητας δεν έχει ακόμη καταβληθεί στην Παγκρήτια Συνεταιριστική Τράπεζα και, ως εκ τούτου, δεν έχει χορηγηθεί κανένα σχετικό μικροδάνειο σε μικροεπιχειρήσεις. Ωστόσο, η Παγκρήτια Συνεταιριστική Τράπεζα άρχισε πρόσφατα τις δανειοδοτικές δραστηριότητές της στο πλαίσιο του χαρτοφυλακίου εγγυήσεων.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004434/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Utilisation of the Progress Microfinance Facility in Greece

A guarantee agreement for EUR 803 250 and an agreement on a senior loan of EUR 8 750 000 for Greece were signed with the Pancretan Cooperative Bank in December 2011 so that this amount could be channelled to the support of small and medium-sized enterprises.

Is the Commission in a position to provide information on the progress of utilising the funds in question? How much of the money has already been made available to Greek small and medium-sized enterprises? Is this degree of utilisation satisfactory?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

The guarantee agreement signed with the Pancretan Cooperative Bank in December 2011 under Progress Microfinance aims to ease access to finance, especially for new borrowers who cannot provide sufficient collateral, and for young micro-enterprises with a business history of less than three years. The agreement on the senior loan is in turn intended to create a micro-loan portfolio for existing micro-enterprises. At present, the senior loan has not yet been disbursed to the Pancretan Cooperative Bank and thus no related micro-loans have been made to micro-enterprises. However, Pancretan Cooperative Bank has recently started lending under the guarantee portfolio.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004435/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αξιοποίηση κοινοτικών πόρων από την Ελλάδα για εκπαιδευτικές υποδομές και σχολεία

Για τα προγράμματα ΕΤΠΑ 2007-2013, χορηγήθηκε δημόσια συνεισφορά στην Ελλάδα ύψους 970 εκατ. ευρώ για εκπαιδευτικές υποδομές. Οι ελληνικές αρχές έχουν καταδείξει πως περίπου το 7 % της συνολικής χορήγησης για εκπαιδευτικές υποδομές έχει διατεθεί ειδικά για την αγορά εξοπλισμού για σχολεία.

Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή για το ύψος των πόρων που έχει απορροφήσει και αξιοποιήσει η Ελλάδα μέχρι σήμερα τόσο για τις εκπαιδευτικές υποδομές συνολικά όσο και για την αγορά εξοπλισμού για σχολεία ειδικότερα;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Ιουνίου 2012)

Για τις παρεμβάσεις στον τομέα της εκπαίδευσης, τα επιλεγμένα έργα που υποστηρίχτηκαν από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης μέχρι τον Μάϊο του 2012 έχουν απορροφήσει 940 εκατομμύρια ευρώ, οι συμβάσεις 419 εκατομμύρια ευρώ και οι πληρωμές 206 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Οι παρεμβάσεις της πολιτικής συνοχής υλοποιούνται βάσει της αρχής της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης, σύμφωνα με την οποία το κράτος μέλος έχει την ευθύνη για την υλοποίηση των έργων επιτόπου. Επομένως, για λεπτομερέστερες πληροφορίες, η Επιτροπή καλεί τον κ. βουλευτή να επικοινωνήσει απευθείας με τις αρμόδιες εθνικές αρχές, συγκεκριμένα το Υπουργείο Παιδείας (www.minedu.gov.gr) και τις διαχειριστικές αρχές των προγραμμάτων, τις διευθύνσεις των οποίων μπορεί να βρει στο δικτυακό τόπο www.espa.gr. Ο ακόλουθος δικτυακός τόπος παρέχει επίσης πρόσθετες πληροφορίες: www.anaptyxi.gov.gr.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004435/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Utilisation of EU resources by Greece for educational infrastructure and schools

Under the 2007-2013 European Regional Development Fund programmes, public funding of EUR 970 million has been made available to Greece for educational infrastructure. The Greek authorities have indicated that approximately 7% of the total provision for educational infrastructure has been specifically earmarked for purchasing equipment for schools.

Can the Commission indicate the level of take-up and utilisation of funding to date by Greece, both for educational infrastructure in general and for purchasing school equipment in particular?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(21 June 2012)

For interventions in the field of education, the selected projects supported by the European Regional Development Fund up to May 2012 amount to EUR 940 million, contracts EUR 419 million and payments EUR 206 million. Cohesion policy interventions are implemented under the shared management principle, whereby the Member State has the responsibility for the implementation of the projects on the ground. Therefore, for more detailed information, the Commission invites the Honourable Member to contact directly the competent national authorities, in particular the Ministry of Education (www.minedu.gov.gr) and the managing authorities of the programmes, the addresses of which can be found on www.espa.gr. The following site also provides additional information:
www.anaptyxi.gov.gr.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004436/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αύξηση του κεφαλαίου της ΕΤΕπ και θέση της Επιτροπής

Πρόσφατα, ο Επίτροπος Ο. Ρεν ζήτησε την αύξηση του κεφαλαίου της ΕΤΕπ. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει ποιο είναι το ύψος της αύξησης του κεφαλαίου το οποίο προτείνει ο Επίτροπος και το οποίο είναι αναγκαίο να γίνει προκειμένου η ΕΤΕπ να μπορέσει να υποστηρίξει αποτελεσματικότερα την δανειοδότηση των επιχειρήσεων;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Ιουλίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι η αύξηση του κεφαλαίου της ΕΤΕπ κατά 10 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ θα βοηθούσε την ΕΤΕ και θα της επέτρεπε να δανείζει σε τομείς που έχουν τη μεγαλύτερη ανάγκη. Κατ' αυτόν τον τρόπο θα μπορούσαν να διατεθούν 60 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ σε ΜΜΕ, καθώς και για την έρευνα και την καινοτομία και για έργα υποδομής σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη.

Η ίδια πρόταση έγινε και στο πλαίσιο του άτυπου Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου της 23ης Μαΐου 2012, το οποίο κάλεσε το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο της ΕΤΕ να εξετάσει το ενδεχόμενο αύξησης του κεφαλαίου της μέχρι τον Ιούνιο για τη χρηματοδότηση έργων σε ολόκληρη την ΕΕ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004436/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Increase in the capital of the European Investment Bank and the Commission's position

Recently, Commissioner Rehn requested an increase in the capital of the European Investment Bank (EIB). Is the Commission in a position to provide information on the size of the capital increase proposed by the Commissioner, which is necessary for the EIB to effectively provide lending support to businesses?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

The Commission considers that a paid in capital increase of EUR 10 billion would help the EIB to expand its lending capacity where it is most needed. This would allow about EUR 60 billion to be channelled towards SMEs, research and innovation, and infrastructure projects across all Member States.

The proposal was also raised in the context of the informal European Council of 23 May 2012, which concluded that the Board of the EIB is invited to consider an increase of its capital by June for financing projects across the EU.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004437/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ανάληψη πρωτοβουλιών και χρονοδιάγραμμα ενεργειών από την ομάδα δράσης για την νεολαία στην Ελλάδα

Με πρωτοβουλία του προέδρου της Επιτροπής, στο άτυπο Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο της 30ής Ιανουαρίου 2012, η Επιτροπή στέλνει ομάδες δράσεις σε οκτώ κράτη μέλη με υψηλό ποσοστό νέων χωρίς απασχόληση. Μεταξύ των καθηκόντων των ομάδων αυτών είναι ο προσδιορισμός των απαραίτητων στοιχείων ενός προγράμματος για την απασχόληση των νέων και ο καθορισμός συγκεκριμένων μέτρων πολιτικής και δημοσιονομικών μέτρων για τη στήριξη της δημιουργίας απασχόλησης και εκπαίδευσης των νέων, που αντιμετωπίζουν τις αναντιστοιχίες δεξιοτήτων και την πρόωρη εγκατάλειψη της σχολικής εκπαίδευσης. Τα προγράμματα αυτά θα πρέπει να βασίζονται στην πρωτοβουλία της Επιτροπής «Ευκαιρίες για τους νέους».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει σαφές χρονοδιάγραμμα δράσεων της συγκεκριμένης ομάδας για την Ελλάδα; Πότε αναμένεται να τεθεί σε πλήρη επιχειρησιακή εφαρμογή το πρόγραμμα της;

2. Η ομάδα δράσης θα περιορίζεται μονάχα στην προσπάθεια καλύτερης και αποτελεσματικότερης αξιοποίησης των πόρων που προσφέρονται από τα ευρωπαϊκά διαρθρωτικά ταμεία, και ιδίως από το Κοινωνικό Ταμείο, ή θα προβαίνει και σε συγκεκριμένες προτάσεις δημοσιονομικής υφής με την πρόβλεψη σχετικών σημείων στην κατάρτιση του εθνικού προϋπολογισμού;

Απάντηση του κ. Barroso εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή πρότεινε πρότυπη δράση για να βοηθήσει οκτώ κράτη μέλη με τα υψηλότερα επίπεδα ανεργίας στους νέους να αναδιανείμουν μέρος των διαθρωτικών κεφαλαίων της ΕΕ με στόχο την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας των νέων. Στόχος είναι η κινητοποίηση κεφαλαίων της ΕΕ της περιόδου προγραμματισμού 2007-2013, που είναι ακόμα διαθέσιμα, για τη στήριξη ευκαιριών απασχόλησης για νέους και η διευκόλυνση πρόσβασης των ΜΜΕ σε χρηματοδότηση.

Γ' αυτό το σκοπό, ομάδες δράσεις που αποτελούνται από εθνικούς υπαλλήλους και υπαλλήλους της Επιτροπής, εργάστηκαν μεταξύ Φεβρουαρίου και Μαΐου 2012 για να στοχοθετήσουν τα διαθέσιμα κεφάλαια. Στις 14 Μαΐου, η Επιτροπή έστειλε επιστολές στους πρέσβεις των οκτώ κρατών μελών στις μόνιμες αντιπροσωπείες τους, ζητώντας τους σχόλια σχετικά με τα επιχειρησιακά συμπεράσματα που περιέγραφαν τα προκαταρκτικά αποτελέσματα του έργου των ομάδων δράσης.

Η Επιτροπή σκοπεύει να συνεχίσει να συνεργάζεται με την ελληνική διοίκηση για να οριστικοποιήσει τον επαναπρογραμματισμό και να διευκολύνει την ταχεία επιτόπια εφαρμογή.

Μετά το έργο της ομάδας δράσης για τους νέους, ξεκίνησαν νέες στοχευμένες δράσεις για νέους και ΜΜΕ, συμπεριλαμβανομένου ενός νέου οργάνου ρευστότητας ύψους 500 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ (με εγγύηση του ΕΤΠΑ για τα δάνεια της ΕΤΕ στις ΜΜΕ στην Ελλάδα) που υπογράφηκε στις 23 Μαρτίου 2012.

Εντός του Ευρωπαϊκού Εξαμήνου 2011-2012, η Επιτροπή ετοιμάζει ένα έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών το οποίο αναλύει την πρόοδο της Ελλάδας σχετικά με την επίτευξη των εθνικών στόχων στο πλαίσιο της στρατηγικής Ευρώπη 2020, καθώς και έγγραφο ειδικών συστάσεων για κάθε χώρα. Και τα δύο έγγραφα αναμένονται να εκδοθούν μέχρι τα τέλη Μαΐου 2012 προκειμένου να εγκριθούν οι συστάσεις από το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο του Ιουνίου στις 28-29 Ιουνίου. Για χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα, που εφαρμόζουν πρόγραμμα δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής, το πρόγραμμα παρέχει καθοδήγηση για τη διασφάλιση της χρηματοδοτικής βιωσιμότητας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004437/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Initiatives and timetable of actions for the youth action team in Greece

Following an initiative by the President of the Commission at the informal European Council of 30 January 2012, the Commission is sending action teams to eight Member States with high levels of youth unemployment. The duties of these teams include identifying the data vitally needed for a youth employment programme and defining specific policy measures and financial measures to support the creation of jobs and training for young people facing problems of skills mismatching and early school leaving. These programmes must be based on the Commission's Youth Opportunities Initiative.

Will the Commission answer the following:

1. Does it have a clear timetable of actions for this team in Greece? When does it expect this programme to be fully operational?

2. Will the action team be restricted solely to improving and increasing resource-use efficiency from the EU Structural Funds, specifically the European Social Fund, or will it make specific financial proposals providing the necessary guidelines for drawing up the national budget?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2012)

The Commission proposed the pilot action to help eight Member States with the highest levels of youth unemployment to re-allocate some of their EU structural funds allocations to tackle youth unemployment. The aim is to mobilise EU funding still available in the 2007-2013 programming period to support job opportunities for young people and to facilitate SMEs' access to finance.

To this end action teams composed of national and Commission officials worked between February and May 2012 to target available funding. On 14 May the Commission sent letters to the Ambassadors of the eight Member States' Permanent Representations asking for comments on the operational conclusions describing the preliminary results of the action team work.

The Commission intends to continue working with the Greek administration to finalise the reprogramming and facilitate rapid implementation on the ground.

Following the work of the youth action team new targeted actions are being initiated for youth and SMEs including a new liquidity instrument of EUR 500 million (ERDF guaranteeing for EIB SME loans in Greece) signed on 23 March 2012.

Within the European Semester 2011-2012 the Commission is preparing a staff working document analysing Greece's progress towards achieving its national targets in the context of the Europe 2020 strategy, as well as country specific recommendations. Both documents are scheduled to be issued by end of May 2012 in view of adoption of recommendations by the June European Council on 28-29 June. For countries like Greece, which are implementing a financial adjustment programme, guidance on ways to ensure financial sustainability is provided by that programme.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004439/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Καταβολή χρηματικού παραβόλου από πολίτες της ΕΕ για την επικύρωση τίτλων σπουδών (σφραγίδα Χάγης)

Στη πλειονότητα των κρατών μελών, προκειμένου να αναγνωριστεί και να αποκτήσει ισοτιμία βασικός η μεταπτυχιακός τίτλος σπουδών που αποκτήθηκε σε άλλο κράτος μέλος της ΕΕ, ο απόφοιτος υποχρεούται να προσκομίσει στην αρμόδια εθνική αρχή όπου επιθυμεί να λάβει την αναγνώριση και ισοτιμία, τίτλο σπουδών που θα πρέπει να είναι θεωρημένος για τη γνησιότητα των υπογραφών, σύμφωνα με τη Σύμβαση της Χάγης (σφραγίδα APOSTILLE), στην χώρα έκδοσης του σχετικού τίτλου. Δεδομένου ότι η σφραγίδα της Χάγης συνοδεύεται και από αρκετά υψηλό χρηματικό παράβολο (π.χ. Βέλγιο, 150 ευρώ), ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ενώ στο πλαίσιο της προσπάθειας των ευρωπαϊκών κρατών μελών για την προώθηση ενός ενιαίου χώρου ανώτατης εκπαίδευσης στην Ευρώπη (σύμφωνα με την διακήρυξη της Μπολόνια) θα πρέπει, μεταξύ άλλων, να εκλείπουν οι διακρίσεις πάσης μορφής, για ποιο λόγο συνεχίζεται και είναι απαραίτητη η χρηματική καταβολή του συγκεκριμένου παραβόλου από τους πολίτες της ΕΕ;

2. Σκέπτεται η Επιτροπή να εισηγηθεί στο Συμβούλιο, το Κοινοβούλιο και τα κράτη μέλη την άρση της συγκεκριμένης υποχρέωσης;

Απάντηση της κας Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Ιουνίου 2012)

Το ζήτημα της αναγνώρισης των προσόντων με σκοπό την παρακολούθηση σπουδών αποτελεί μέρος της οργάνωσης των εκπαιδευτικών συστημάτων και, ως εκ τούτου, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 165 παράγραφος 1 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, εμπίπτει στην αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών. Ωστόσο, η αναγνώριση των προσόντων που αποκτήθηκαν σε άλλο κράτος μέλος έχει ιδιαίτερη σημασία για τη διευκόλυνση της κινητικότητας των σπουδαστών μέσα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, και για το λόγο αυτό διευκρινίζεται στη Συνθήκη (άρθρο 165 παράγραφος 2) ότι θα πρέπει να ενισχύεται από τη δράση της Ένωσης.

Η Επιτροπή αναγνωρίζει ότι τα κράτη μέλη έχουν νόμιμο δικαίωμα να εξακριβώνουν το επίπεδο των προσόντων που αποκτήθηκαν σε άλλο κράτος μέλος και, δεδομένου ότι κάτι τέτοιο συνεπάγεται έξοδα, να χρεώνουν τέλη για την παροχή της εν λόγω υπηρεσίας. Επομένως, δεν σκοπεύει ούτε έχει την αρμοδιότητα να προτείνει την κατάργηση αυτής της χρέωσης. Ωστόσο, η Επιτροπή, ενεργώντας βάσει της νομολογίας του Δικαστηρίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αποσκοπεί να εξασφαλίζει ότι η χρέωση που επιβάλλεται από τα κράτη μέλη διατηρείται σε ένα επίπεδο το οποίο είναι ανάλογο με το κόστος των παρεχόμενων υπηρεσιών και δεν αποτελεί εμπόδιο στην ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία των πολιτών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004439/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Fees paid by EU citizens to validate qualifications (Hague Apostille)

In most Member States, in order for postgraduate diplomas obtained in another EU Member State to be recognised and certified equivalent, graduates must present their qualifications to the appropriate national authority where they want their diploma to be recognised and certified as equivalent. This diploma must be stamped certifying the authenticity of the signatures in accordance with the Hague Convention (APOSTILLE stamp) in the country where it was issued. Given that obtaining the Hague Apostille involves the payment of a relatively high fee (e.g. EUR 150 in Belgium), will the Commission answer the following:

1. If part of the EU Member States' efforts to promote the European Higher Education Area (Bologna Process) should involve, *inter alia*, putting an end to all forms of discrimination, why payment of this specific fee by EU citizens still necessary?

2. Does the Commission intend to submit a proposal for the removal of this specific obligation to the Council, the European Parliament and the Member States?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The issue of recognition of qualifications with a view to pursue studies is part of the organisation of educational systems and as such, under Article 165 paragraph 1 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, is the responsibility of Member States. However, recognition of qualifications acquired in another Member State is of particular importance in facilitating student mobility within the European Union and for that reason it is specified in the Treaty (Article 165 paragraph 2) that it should be encouraged by the Union's action.

The Commission recognises that Member States have a legitimate right to verify the level of qualifications gained in another Member State and, given the expense attached to doing so, to charge for this service. It has therefore no plans to propose the abolition of such charges, nor would it have the competence to do so. However, the Commission, acting on the basis of the jurisprudence of the Court of Justice, aims to ensure that such charges levied by Member States are kept at a level which is proportionate to the cost of the service provided and that they do not constitute a barrier to the free movement of citizens.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004440/12
to the Commission
Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Parliament officials' pensions

The pension scheme for officials of the European Parliament is not included in Parliament's own budget, but is classed as a 'common cost' of the EU institutions in the EU budget (Administration section) and is administered by the Commission.

Can the Commission provide me with a financial estimate of the current annual pension liability for Parliament officials? How is this funded?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

Officials of the European Parliament (EP) are covered by the pension scheme of officials of European Union (EU) institutions. This is an unfunded defined benefit scheme, which is different from a pay as you go scheme. Benefits are defined in the Staff Regulations. Because a fund does not exist, each month officials pay a contribution (11.6% of the basic salary at present) to the budget of the EU and pension payments are charged to this budget. The pension contribution is calculated each year in such a way that the long term equilibrium of the scheme is maintained.

The total Defined Benefits Obligation (DBO) which comprises the benefits accrued to all officials of EU institutions is known as 'liability' of the scheme and is calculated each year and detailed in the accounts of the EU ([1]). The DBO (gross DBO less taxes) of officials and other servants of the European Parliament, which is not normally published separately, amounts to EUR 4 169 million (provisional calculation at 31 December 2011). This amount represents the actuarial value of pension rights accumulated by current active staff and pensioners on that date. The pensions corresponding to these rights will be paid from the future retirement date (active staff) until their death or are being paid to current pensioners and invalids until their death and to their survivors.

The approximate share of gross appropriations for EP pensions (retirement pensions, invalidity pensions, survivors' pensions, severance grants and other payments) in the Draft Budget 2013 amounts to EUR 180 million.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:332:0001:0133:EN:PDF (the figure can be found in Section 2.12, page 37 'Notes to the Balance Sheet: Employee benefits').

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004441/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Settore delle angurie

Il settore delle angurie rischia il tracollo. Gli effetti della gravissima crisi del comparto si stanno facendo sentire in maniera molto acuta con il disagio e le difficoltà legate alla conduzione delle aziende. Difficile soprattutto la situazione finanziaria della maggior parte delle imprese che hanno dovuto abbandonare nei campi, la scorsa estate, migliaia di tonnellate di angurie. Molte le richieste di rinnovo di obbligazioni, fidi bancari, cambiali agrarie, prestiti, per far fronte sia alle esigenze della nuova campagna che, normalmente, prevede il trapianto delle piantine a partire dal mese di marzo, ma che quest'anno ha avuto una vistosa battuta d'arresto, sia per la realizzazione di coltivazioni alternative che diano qualche certezza di prospettiva di reddito.

Un segnale eloquente della drammaticità della situazione emerge dall'analisi che una Confederazione nazionale di coltivatori — associazione di rappresentanza e assistenza dell'agricoltura italiana — ha realizzato in merito all'acquisto di mezzi tecnici (piantine, concimi, fitofarmaci, impianti e attrezzature di irrigazione) che, ad oggi, presenta una riduzione sostanziale pari al 55 % rispetto all'anno precedente.

Alla luce di quanto esposto sopra, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se sono previsti interventi per il settore al fine di evitare che la contrazione della produzione di angurie e di altri ortaggi abbia poi ripercussioni pesanti su tutto il sistema economico, occupazione compresa;

2. se vi sono Stati membri che hanno fatto richiesta di fondi da destinare al settore summenzionato per far fronte ai danni provocati dalla psicosi generata dai casi di Escherichia coli negli ortaggi.

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2012)

Al momento della crisi dell'Escherichia coli (E.-coli), il regolamento di esecuzione della Commissione (UE) n. 585/2011 del 17 giugno 2011 [1] ha introdotto misure eccezionali e provvisorie di sostegno per il settore ortofrutticolo al fine di mitigare gli effetti della crisi sul reddito dei produttori. Gli sforzi si sono concentrati sui prodotti più colpiti a livello UE, ovvero pomodori, cetrioli, lattughe e talune varietà di indivie, zucchine e peperoni dolci.

La fiducia del consumatore nella sicurezza dei prodotti ortofrutticoli è stata ripristinata in tempi relativamente brevi e la domanda di ortofrutticoli è tornata a livelli normali, pertanto la Commissione non ravvisa al momento la necessità di adottare eventuali ulteriori misure speciali. Inoltre, nessuno Stato membro ha chiesto finanziamenti per le perdite causate dalla crisi dell'anno scorso in generale, né per le angurie in particolare. Tuttavia, la prevenzione delle crisi e gli strumenti di gestione sono disponibili nel quadro dei programmi operativi per i produttori che sono soci di organizzazioni di produttori.

---

[1] GU L 160 del 18.6.2011, pag. 71.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004441/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Watermelon sector

The watermelon sector is in danger of collapsing. The effects of the extremely serious industry slump are making themselves felt very acutely, through general distress and difficulties in managing businesses. Many firms had to leave thousands of tonnes of watermelons just lying in the fields last summer and their financial situation is particularly difficult. There have been numerous requests for renewal of bonds, bank overdrafts, agricultural bills of exchange and loans, not just to meet the needs of the new season — normally seedlings would start to be transplanted in March but this has been seriously delayed this year — but also to grow alternative crops which might bring in at least some income.

An analysis of purchases of equipment and supplies (seedlings, fertilisers, phytosanitary products, and irrigation systems and equipment) conducted by a national farmers' confederation (an association representing and sustaining Italian agriculture) provides an eloquent indicator of how dramatic this situation is. To date, purchase of these items stands at 55% of the previous year's figure, a substantial drop.

1. Can the Commission say whether any measures have been planned for this sector to prevent the drop in watermelon and vegetable production having serious repercussions on the entire economic system, including employment?

2. Have any Member States requested funding for the aforementioned sector in order to offset the damage caused by the panic over cases of Escherichia coli discovered in vegetables?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2012)

At the time of the Escherichia coli (E.-coli) crisis, Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 585/2011 of 17 June 2011 ([1]) introduced temporary exceptional support measures for the fruit and vegetables sector in order to alleviate the effects of this crisis on producers' income. Efforts were concentrated on the most affected products at EU level, i.e., tomatoes, cucumbers, lettuces and certain endives, courgettes and sweet peppers.

Consumer confidence in the safety of fruit and vegetable products was restored relatively quickly and the demand for fruit and vegetables has returned to normal levels, which is why the Commission currently sees no necessity to take any additional special measures. Moreover, no Member State has requested funding in relation to the losses caused by last year's crisis in general nor as regards watermelon in particular. However, crisis prevention and management tools are available in the framework of the operational programmes for producers who are members of producer organisations.

([1]) OJ L 160, 18.6.2011, p. 71.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004442/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Cyberattacchi

Le abituali attività quotidiane, private e professionali, risultano essere sempre più dipendenti dalle tecnologie dell'informazione e della comunicazione (TIC). La salvaguardia delle infrastrutture critiche informatizzate dai cyberattacchi è oggi una grande sfida per la società e l'economia europea.

Il tema della cyber-security ha acquisito una rilevanza crescente per l'Unione europea. Non poteva essere diversamente, se si pensa che l'economia digitale europea ammonta a oltre 500 miliardi di euro all'anno.

Il numero dei cyberattacchi non accenna a diminuire e le stesse istituzioni comunitarie sono state colpite da diversi attacchi informatici. Problemi simili sono riscontrati dai privati cittadini. Un sondaggio ha indicato ad esempio che negli ultimi cinque anni il 78 % degli utenti internet ha avuto problemi di sicurezza e che il 65 % è stato vittima di spam (messaggi di posta elettronica indesiderati); il 46 % (quindi quasi uno su due) ha invece trovato dei virus nel proprio computer.

Alla luce di quanto esposto sopra, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. quali strategie ha intrapreso l'UE nell'ultimo anno per far fronte al problema summenzionato;

2. quali piani per la sicurezza informatica hanno elaborato gli Stati membri per garantire il contenimento e la riparazione in caso di ciberperturbazioni o di attacchi cibernetici di rilevanza transfrontaliera.

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(19 giugno 2012)

La Commissione prende seriamente in considerazione le ripercussioni che le crescenti minacce alla sicurezza delle TIC potrebbero avere sulla prosperità dell'economia e della società. Dal 2006 ([1]) la Commissione adotta iniziative strategiche volte a rafforzare e facilitare la cooperazione tra le parti interessate, anche con il sostegno dell'Agenzia europea per la sicurezza delle reti e dell'informazione (ENISA).

Attualmente, la Commissione sta mettendo in atto le attività lanciate nell'ambito del piano d'azione sulla protezione delle infrastrutture critiche informatizzate ([2]) (CIIP) e dell'Agenda europea del digitale ([3]), tra cui le attività finalizzate a istituire una squadra di pronto intervento informatico (CERT) per le istituzioni europee. Inoltre, il 4 novembre 2010, si è svolta la prima esercitazione paneuropea in materia di sicurezza informatica (CyberEurope 2010), con una simulazione di attacchi su larga scala.

Nel 2011 è stata adottata una nuova comunicazione sulla protezione delle infrastrutture critiche informatizzate ([4]), nella quale, tra l'altro, la Commissione invita gli Stati membri a elaborare, con il sostegno dell'ENISA, un piano di emergenza europeo per il caso di incidenti informatici che definisca meccanismi di base per le comunicazioni tra Stati membri nell'eventualità di perturbazioni di carattere transfrontaliero. Gli Stati membri sono inoltre invitati a sviluppare piani di emergenza nazionali per il caso di attacchi informatici. In base alle informazioni comunicate alla Commissione e all'ENISA, diversi Stati membri hanno già adottato tali piani nazionali. Inoltre, l'ENISA pubblicherà a breve una guida sulle buone pratiche per i piani di emergenza nazionali.

La Commissione intende proporre, nel corso del 2012, una strategia europea per la sicurezza informatica, che dovrebbe prevedere anche un'iniziativa politica e una proposta legislativa che mirino a evitare o contrastare violazioni della sicurezza che possano ostacolare il buon funzionamento del mercato unico.

([1]) COM(2006)251 definitivo, Una strategia per una società dell'informazione sicura — «Dialogo, partenariato e responsabilizzazione».
([2]) COM(2009)149 definitivo, Comunicazione della Commissione, Proteggere le infrastrutture critiche informatizzate «Rafforzare la preparazione, la sicurezza e la resilienza per proteggere l'Europa dai ciberattacchi e dalle ciberperturbazioni» e COM(2011)163, Comunicazione della Commissione relativa alla protezione delle infrastrutture critiche informatizzate «Realizzazioni e prossime tappe: verso una sicurezza informatica mondiale».
([3]) COM(2010)245, Un'agenda digitale europea.
([4]) COM(2011)163, Comunicazione relativa alla protezione delle infrastrutture critiche informatizzate «Realizzazioni e prossime tappe: verso una sicurezza informatica mondiale».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004442/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Cyber-attacks

Our usual everyday activities, both private and professional, have become ever more dependent on information and communications technologies (ICT). Protecting critical information infrastructures from cyber-attacks is, at present, a considerable challenge for European society and its economy.

The subject of cyber-security has become increasingly important to the European Union. How could it be otherwise, when Europe's digital economy is worth more than EUR 500 billion per year?

The number of cyber-attacks shows no sign of decreasing and even the EU institutions themselves have been the victims of several of them. Private individuals are encountering similar problems. A survey has indicated, for example, that in the last five years 78% of Internet users have had security problems and 65% have been victims of spam (junk mail); meanwhile 46% (almost half) have found viruses on their computers.

In view of this, could the Commission say:

1. what strategies the EU has adopted over the last year to deal with this problem;

2. what computer security plans Member States have drawn up to guarantee containment and repair in the case of cross-border cyber-attacks or disruptions?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2012)

The Commission looks seriously at how growing threats to ICT security may negatively affect the prosperity of the economy and society. Since 2006 ([1]), the Commission has adopted policy initiatives to strengthen and facilitate cooperation among relevant players, also with the support of the European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA).

The Commission is currently implementing the activities launched in the action plan on Critical Information Infrastructure Protection ([2]) (CIIP) and the Digital Agenda for Europe ([3]). These include the activities towards the establishment of a Computer Emergency Response Team (CERT) for the EU institutions and the 1st pan-European cyber exercise (Cyber Europe 2010) simulating large scale attacks that took place on 4 November 2010.

In 2011, a new Communication on CIIP ([4]) was adopted in which, among the other things, the Commission calls upon the Member States to draw up, with the support of ENISA, a European cyber incident contingency plan, providing baseline mechanisms for communications between Member States in case of cross-border disruptions. Member States are also invited to develop national cyber incident contingency plans. According to the information provided to the Commission and to ENISA, a number of Member States has already adopted such national plans. Furthermore, ENISA is about to publish a Good practise guide on National contingency plans.

The Commission is considering proposing, in 2012, a European Strategy for Cyber Security, which should include a policy initiative and a legislative proposal aimed at avoiding or facing security breach which could hamper the smooth functioning of the single market.

([1]) COM(2006) 251 final, A strategy for a Secure Information Society — 'Dialogue, partnership and empowerment'.
([2]) COM(2009)149, Communication on Critical Information Infrastructure Protection 'Protecting Europe from large scale cyber-attacks and disruptions: enhancing preparedness, security and resilience' and COM(2011)163, Communication on Critical Information Infrastructure Protection 'Achievements and next steps: towards global cyber-security'.
([3]) COM(2010)245, 'A Digital Agenda for Europe'.
([4]) COM(2011)163, Communication on Critical Information Infrastructure Protection, 'Achievements and next steps: towards global cyber-security'.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004443/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Fibromi uterini

I fibromi uterini sono un problema molto comune: una ricerca internazionale che in Italia ha coinvolto oltre 2500 donne, intervistate attraverso il web, ha appena dimostrato che il nostro è uno dei Paesi in cui i fibromi sono maggiormente diffusi, con una prevalenza attorno al 10 per cento nella popolazione generale che diventa addirittura doppia fra i 40 e i 49 anni.

L'obiettivo era capire quanto siano diffusi i fibromi uterini, tumori benigni che si sviluppano in età fertile e generalmente regrediscono dopo la menopausa: finora infatti non erano stati svolti studi ad ampio raggio. L'età media delle pazienti che hanno avuto la diagnosi è circa 34 anni, ma è soprattutto dopo i 40 che i fibromi diventano più comuni, arrivando a colpire due donne su dieci.

Molti i sintomi lamentati dalle donne con fibromi, primo fra tutti un ciclo frequente e abbondante. Non mancano i dolori, più comuni fra le donne con fibromi: si va dalla sensazione di peso alla vescica, che riguarda una paziente su tre, al dolore durante il ciclo mestruale, subito prima o subito dopo; comune anche il dolore ai rapporti sessuali (23 per cento) o il dolore pelvico cronico (14 per cento).

Il trattamento dei fibromi uterini varia molto da un Paese all'altro e spesso si ricorre ad antidolorifici e pillola contraccettiva.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Esiste una strategia europea sulla malattia summenzionata e vi sono nuove ricerche in campo sanitario finanziate nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ)?

2. È in possesso di dati inerenti al numero di persone in Europa colpite dalla malattia in questione?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

1. Non esiste una strategia europea specificamente consacrata ai fibromi uterini. In termini di malattie croniche in senso lato la Commissione ha avviato un processo di riflessione sulle malattie croniche con gli Stati membri. Sebbene non tratti specificamente singole malattie l'obiettivo di questo processo è identificare le carenze e le possibilità di creare un valore aggiunto per eventuali azioni dell'UE volte ad affrontare le malattie croniche.

La Commissione è consapevole del problema del fibroma uterino e del suo impatto sulle donne. Anche se attualmente il Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (FP7, 2007-2013) non supporta ricerche specifiche in tema di fibromi uterini, notevoli risorse sono consacrate alla ricerca sui tumori maligni degli organi riproduttivi femminili, compresi i cancri della cervice dell'utero (21 milioni di EUR) e delle ovaie (13 milioni di EUR). Nel complesso, circa 230 milioni di EUR sono stati stanziati l sostegno della ricerca sui tumori che colpiscono le donne (seno, cervice e ovaie) per il periodo 2007-2012.

2. Non si dispone di dati a livello europeo sul numero di donne colpite da fibroma dell'utero.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004443/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Uterine fibroids

Uterine fibroids are a very common problem: international research involving more than 2 500 women in Italy, interviewed via the Internet, has just shown that our country has one of the highest incidences of fibroids, with around 10% of the overall population affected, and twice that amount among 40-49 year-olds.

The purpose was to determine the prevalence of uterine fibroids, benign tumours which develop in women of fertile age and generally recede after the menopause: in fact there have not been sufficiently in-depth studies conducted to date. The average age of patients who are diagnosed with fibroids is approximately 34, but in general they become more common in women over 40, two out of ten of whom are affected.

There are many symptoms which afflict women with fibroids, most notably a frequent and heavy menstrual cycle. There is also no lack of pain, which is more common among women with fibroids: this varies from a heavy feeling in the bladder, which affects one patient in three, to pain during the menstrual cycle, just before or just after; pain during sexual intercourse (23%) or chronic pelvic pain (14%) are also common.

The treatment of uterine fibroids varies greatly from one country to another and often painkillers and contraceptive pills are used.

In view of this, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is there a European strategy for the aforementioned disorder and is new healthcare research being funded within the context of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technical Development (FP7)?

2. Does it have any data concerning the number of people affected by this disorder in Europe?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

1. There is no European strategy specifically on uterine fibroids. In terms of chronic diseases more generally, the Commission has launched a reflection process on chronic diseases with Member States. While not disease-specific, the objective of this process is to identify gaps and areas of added value for potential EU action to address chronic diseases.

The Commission is aware of the burden of uterine fibroids and its impact on women. Although no specific research related to uterine fibroids is currently supported by the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013), significant resources are devoted to research on malignant cancers of female reproductive organs, including cancers of cervix uteri (EUR 21 million) and ovarian cancers (EUR 13 million). Overall, some EUR 230 million has been allocated to support research on female cancers (breast, cervix and ovary) for the period 2007-2012.

2. There is no European data on the number of women affected by uterine fibroids.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004444/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Malattie fungine e microbiche

Sia negli animali che nelle piante un numero senza precedenti di malattie fungine e micotiche ha recentemente causato alcune delle più gravi morie ed estinzioni alle quali si sia mai assistito in specie selvatiche, mettendo in pericolo la sicurezza alimentare. L'attività umana sta intensificando la dispersione delle malattie fungine, modificando gli ambienti naturali e creando così nuove opportunità per la loro evoluzione. Nascenti infezioni fungine causeranno un aumento del contrasto con la biodiversità, con ampie implicazioni per la salute umana e l'ecosistema, sempreché non vengano prese misure atte ad aumentare la biosicurezza in tutto il mondo.

La minaccia delle malattie fungine ha assunto una nuova gravità negli ultimi tempi, mettendo a rischio non solo le coltivazioni: compaiono sempre più funghi «killer» e sempre più specie animali vengono attaccate. Le patologie arrecate dai funghi alle sole colture di riso, grano e mais costano all'agricoltura circa 46 miliardi di euro ogni anno.

Alla luce di quanto sovraesposto, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È a conoscenza di nuovi studi della tecnologia della diagnostica genetica che possonoconsentire alle piante e gli animali di proteggersi dai funghi o dalle spore?

2. Quali alternative ad agenti chimici sono contemplate nelle norme europee al fine di difenderein modo naturale le colture tradizionali?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

Per intervenire sui meccanismi di difesa alla base di malattie fungine e sui metodi adeguati per controllarle esistono diversi progetti nazionali e dell'UE. Per quanto riguarda i funghi patogeni delle piante la Commissione sta attualmente finanziando progetti di ricerca quali Q-Detect ([1]), QBOL ([2]) e ISEFOR ([3]), al fine di sviluppare strumenti diagnostici ad uso dei National Plant Protection Officers. Sarà finanziata la ricerca per produrre strumenti diagnostici delle sementi e metodi di disinfezione efficaci.

Anche le alternative ai fungicidi chimici per le colture costituiscono oggetto di ricerche, che si avvalgono di approcci IPM (Integrated Pest Management, gestione integrata degli organismi nocivi) e della sostituzione degli antiparassitari rameici. È oggetto di finanziamento anche la ricerca sulla resistenza naturale ai funghi mediante programmi di allevamento molecolare a partire da varietà selvatiche (Triticeae Genome). Gli approcci IPM includono inoltre il potenziamento dei meccanismi naturali di difesa, lo sviluppo di strategie di controllo biologico e l'impiego di antiparassitari, come esemplificato dai progetti PURE ([4]), VALORAM ([5]) e CO-FREE ([6]).

Un'importante malattia fungina nel regno animale è la nosemosi delle api, che può pregiudicare l'impollinazione e la produzione agricola. Attualmente è oggetto di finanziamento il progetto Bee Doc ([7]), che studia lo status dell'infezione da nosema nell'ape mellifera europea, l'interazione con altri agenti patogeni e antiparassitari sulla mortalità dell'ape mellifera nonché l'allevamento di specie di api mellifere resistenti.

Negli ultimi anni è stato approvato l'uso di diverse sostanze attive nei prodotti fitosanitari, che, invece di agire direttamente contro gli organismi nocivi, stimolano i meccanismi di autodifesa delle piante. Altri progetti sono attualmente in corso di valutazione. La scelta, ove appropriata, di «cultivar» resistenti o tolleranti costituisce una delle fasi del processo decisionale ai sensi dell'approccio IPM, obbligatorio a partire dal 1° gennaio 2014.

([1]) http://qdetect.org/0_home/index.php.
([2]) http://www.qbol.org/UK/.
([3]) http://www.isefor.com/.
([4]) http://www.pure-ipm.eu/http://www.triticeaegenome.eu/.
([5]) http://valoram.ucc.ie/.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/agriculture/projects/co-free_en.htm
([7]) http://www.bee-doc.eu/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004444/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Fungal and microbial diseases

Recently, among both animals and plants, an unprecedented number of fungal and microbial diseases have caused some of the most dramatic epidemics and extinctions ever seen in wild species, putting food safety in jeopardy. Human activity is intensifying the spread of fungal diseases, modifying natural environments and thus creating new opportunities for their evolution. Nascent fungal infections will cause an increased conflict with biodiversity, with huge implications for human health and the ecosystem, unless appropriate measures are taken to increase biosafety worldwide.

The threat of fungal diseases has become even more serious in recent times and it is not only crops that are at risk: an increasing number of 'killer' fungi are appearing and an increasing number of animal species are being attacked. Pathologies caused by fungi and affecting rice, corn and maize alone cost the agriculture sector approximately EUR 46 billion every year.

In view of this, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of new studies in genetic diagnostic technology which could enable plants and animals to protect themselves from fungi or spores?

2. What alternatives to chemical agents are under consideration in EU legislation to provide a natural defence for traditional crops?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

A number of national and EU projects exist to unravel the defence mechanisms underlying fungal diseases, and the appropriate methods for their control. With respect to pathogenic plant fungi the Commission is currently funding research projects such as Q-Detect ([1]), QBOL ([2]) and ISEFOR ([3]) to develop diagnostic tools for use by National Plant Protection Officers. Research will be funded for generating seed diagnostic tools and efficient disinfection methods.

Alternatives to chemical fungicides for crops are also being investigated through Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approaches and through replacements for copper based pesticides. Natural resistance to fungi through molecular breeding programmes from wild varieties (Triticeae Genome[1]) is also funded while IPM approaches include enhancement of natural defence mechanisms, development of biocontrol strategies, and use of biopesticides as exemplified by the PURE ([4]), VALORAM ([5]), and CO-FREE ([6]) projects.

An important fungal disease in the animal kingdom is nosemosis in bees which can affect pollination and agricultural production. The Bee Doc ([7]) project is currently funded to analyse the status of Nosema infection in European honeybee, the interaction with other pathogens and pesticides on honeybee mortality and breeding resistant honeybees.

Over recent years, several active substances for use in plant protection products have been approved, which do not act directly against harmful organisms, but stimulate the self-defence mechanisms of plants. Others are currently under assessment. The choice, where appropriate, of tolerant or resistant cultivars has been taken up as one of the steps within the decision-making scheme under IPM, which is obligatory as from 1 January 2014.

([1]) http://qdetect.org/0_home/index.php.
([2]) http://www.qbol.org/UK/.
([3]) http://www.isefor.com/.
([4]) http://www.pure-ipm.eu/http://www.triticeaegenome.eu/.
([5]) http://valoram.ucc.ie/.
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/agriculture/projects/co-free_en.htm
([7]) http://www.bee-doc.eu/.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004446/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Torri energetiche

Integrazione sarà in futuro la parola d'ordine delle smart city, luoghi regolati da intelligenze artificiali, con sistemi energetici integrati che consentiranno agli edifici di generare autonomamente servizi ed energia pulita. Le torri energetiche ambientali multifunzionali sono un esempio di architettura intelligente che si sta sviluppando positivamente, per la sua funzionalità d'avanguardia, negli Emirati arabi.

In Italia si prevede di inserire nelle aree industriali una serie di torri alte 30 metri, connesse reciprocamente e comunicanti come nodi di una rete, capaci di fornire non solo servizi energetici, ma anche ambientali e informativi alle utenze produttive. Un progetto già in fase di realizzazione nell'area industriale di Perugia e che vedrà la costruzione dei primi due prototipi di sistemi energetici integrati. La torre energetica multifunzionale è il risultato dell'integrazione di differenti tecnologie che producono energie rinnovabili, concentrate tutte in un'unica struttura, capace di alimentare le utenze energetiche limitrofe, sia dal punto di vista elettrico che da quello termico.

Tanti sono i campi d'applicazione e le opportunità di utilizzo delle torri energetiche. Dallo smaltimento dei rifiuti organici, all'energia prodotta dall'impianto fotovoltaico e dal minieolico, dalla trasmissione del calore nelle sonde geotermiche, all'accumulo energetico termico e gravitazionale. Il tutto arricchito da sistemi di trigenerazione, illuminazione a LED, colonnine di ricarica per le macchine elettriche, trasmissioni wireless e ripetitori per la telefonia mobile.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione comunicare:

1. se è a conoscenza di progetti simili realizzati negli Stati membri;

2. se non ritiene che si debba approfondire lo studio sulle «torri energetiche», che potrebbero rivelarsi utili nelle aree civili, in virtù del fatto che sono in grado di fornire energia ad altri edifici che non ne hanno a sufficienza?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(20 giugno 2012)

L'integrazione di varie tecnologie per le energie rinnovabili nella produzione di elettricità nel riscaldamento e nel raffreddamento è uno degli elementi che la Commissione prevede nella sua iniziativa «Città intelligenti e comunità intelligenti». Progetti che prevedono la dimostrazione del funzionamento di torri energetiche potrebbero essere finanziati mediante l'iniziativa «Città intelligenti» e comunità intelligenti, se testati positivamente e valutati aventi un impatto su larga scala a livello dell'UE, in quanto domanda per le aree urbane. L'iniziativa «Città intelligenti e comunità intelligenti» ha come principale strumento di finanziamento il Settimo programma quadro e, a partire dal 2014, il programma Horizon 2020.

La Commissione non è a conoscenza dell'esistenza di progetti simili in altri Stati membri, che prevedono le torri energetiche, ma i precursori italiani di questo concetto possono consultare altre parti interessate attraverso la piattaforma delle parti interessate «Città intelligenti» sul sito www.smart-cities.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004446/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Solar chimney power plants

In the future, integration will be the watchword for the smart city: sites governed by artificial intelligence with integrated energy systems that will allow buildings to generate their own services and clean energy. Multifunctional solar chimney power plants are an example of intelligent architecture which is developing positively in the UAE, thanks to state-of-the-art operating methods.

As far as Italy is concerned, there are plans to install 30-metre interconnected and communicating solar chimney power plants in industrial areas, which will act as networked nodes and will provide not only energy but also environmental and information services to manufacturers. A development is already under construction in Perugia's industrial area, where the first two integrated energy system prototypes will be built. The multifunctional solar chimney power plant is the result of the integration of various technologies that produce renewable energy, all concentrated in one single complex which is able to supply neighbouring energy users with both electricity and heat.

There are a number of fields of application and opportunities for the use of such chimneys. From organic waste disposal to energy produced by photovoltaic installations and mini wind turbines, to heat transfer in geothermal probes and thermal and gravity energy storage. All of these are enhanced by trigeneration systems, LED lighting, charging points for electric vehicles and wireless transmission and signal repeaters for mobile telephones.

In view of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of similar projects implemented in Member States?

2. Does it not believe that we should study solar chimney power plants in greater depth, since they could prove useful in civilian areas as they can provide energy to other buildings suffering a shortfall?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2012)

The integration of various renewable energy technologies in the production of electricity and heating and cooling is one of the elements which the Commission envisages in its Smart Cities and Communities Initiative. Projects involving the demonstration of solar chimney power plants could be financed by the Smart Cities and Communities Initiative, if tested positively and assessed as having a large-scale impact at EU level as an application for urban areas. The Smart Cities and Communities initiative has as its main financing instrument the 7th Framework Programme and as from 2014 the Horizon 2020 Programme.

The Commission is not aware of the existence of similar projects in other Member States involving solar chimney power plants, but the Italian initiators of the concept could contact other stakeholders via the Smart Cities Stakeholders Platform at www.smart-cities.eu/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004447/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Costi dell'«open source»

Nel 2006 il Comune di Monaco di Baviera ha lanciato il progetto «Project LiMu» con l'intento di ristrutturare l'intera rete IT della sua pubblica amministrazione perseguendo il fine ultimo della migrazione della struttura da un OS basato sulla piattaforma Windows ad uno basato su quella open source Linux. È stato un percorso non facile durato alcuni anni, ma che, a fine 2011, si è concretizzato con l'iscrizione in bilancio di un risparmio di 4 000 000 EUR, grazie al risparmio sull'acquisto del rinnovo delle licenze Windows e dei pacchetti connessi e alla possibilità di riutilizzare hardware datati già in dotazione.

È la Commissione a conoscenza di questi dati? Può essa fornire i dati relativi ai costi di gestione degli attuali sistemi informatici «Windows based»? Reputa la Commissione che sarebbe economicamente vantaggiosa una migrazione a un OS «Linux based»?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(27 giugno 2012)

La Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alle risposte fornite ad altre interrogazioni scritte dello stesso argomento ([1]). La Commissione si avvale già di un gran numero di OSS ([2]) e dal 2001 possiede una strategia formalizzata e costantemente aggiornata al riguardo ([3]). Di conseguenza l'infrastruttura informatica della Commissione si basa su un portfolio ampio e ben diversificato di prodotti software, sia commerciali che OSS, i quali coesistono senza alcuna difficoltà ([4]).

La Commissione, pertanto, presume che l'interrogazione dell'onorevole parlamentare si riferisca in modo specifico alla piattaforma software per PC desktop, in cui le soluzioni OSS non sono, al momento, largamente diffuse nell'infrastruttura della Commissione e in quelle di altre istituzioni dell'UE.

La Commissione è a conoscenza di iniziative quali il progetto LiMux lanciato dal comune di Monaco di Baviera e ne segue gli sviluppi con grande interesse, prendendo in considerazione anche le difficoltà menzionate dall'onorevole parlamentare. Tuttavia ciascuna amministrazione pubblica deve valutare la propria situazione in modo indipendente, dato che progetti così complessi non sono direttamente trasferibili da un'amministrazione ad un'altra. Come affermato nelle risposte alle interrogazioni sopra menzionate, le decisioni della Commissione a questo riguardo vengono prese sulla base di analisi costi/benefici che seguono una metodologia rigorosa volta a determinare il costo totale di proprietà (e i rischi) di ciascuna opzione. Fino ad ora queste analisi hanno dimostrato che dal cambiamento proposto la Commissione non ricaverebbe nessun beneficio, considerati tutti i costi dell'intera piattaforma e paragonati questi ultimi ai soli costi delle licenze software. Per questo motivo, una tale migrazione non è al momento giustificabile, almeno da un punto di vista prettamente finanziario. La Commissione, tuttavia, rivaluta periodicamente le sue valutazioni al riguardo.

([1]) Si vedano, in particolare, le risposte alle interrogazioni scritte E-002735/2003, E-001487/2008, E-3622/2008 e E-10708/2011.
([2]) OSS = Open Source Software (software a codice sorgente aperto).
([3]) Si veda http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/informatics/oss_tech/index_en.htm
([4]) Per ulteriori informazioni la Commissione rimanda l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta data alla sua interrogazione scritta E-003622/2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004447/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Open-source software costs

In 2006, Munich's municipal authorities launched the 'LiMu Project' to restructure its entire IT network, with the ultimate aim of migrating from a Windows-based operating system to an open-source Linux environment. This process was not easy and took several years, but by the end of 2011 it yielded a budget saving of EUR 4 million as a result of not having to renew the licences for Windows and related packages and of being able to re-use existing hardware.

Is the Commission aware of the above saving? Can it say how much current Windows-based IT systems cost to run? Does it believe that migrating to a Linux-based operating system would bring cost benefits?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to a number of similar Written Questions ([1]). It already makes abundant use of OSS ([2]) and has had a formalised strategy in this field since 2001, which is regularly updated ([3]). As a result, the Commission's corporate IT infrastructure is based on a large, well-diversified portfolio of software products, both commercial and OSS, which coexist smoothly ([4]).

The Commission assumes therefore that the Honourable Member's question refers specifically to the desktop software platform, where OSS solutions are, at the moment, not widely used in the Commission's (and other EU institutions') infrastructure.

The Commission is aware of initiatives such as the LiMux project in the City of Munich and follows them with great interest, including as to the difficulties which the Honourable Member mentions. Each public administration must however carry out its own business case because such complex projects are not directly transposable from one of them to another. As stated in its replies to the abovementioned questions, the Commission's decisions in this area are based on cost-benefit analyses which follow a rigorous methodology aimed at determining the Total Cost of Ownership (and the risks) of any alternative. Until now, these analyses have shown that the Commission cannot expect any gains from the suggested change if all the costs of the entire platform are considered, as opposed to the cost of the software licences alone and that, therefore, a migration is not justified, at least on purely financial grounds. The Commission, however, reviews its assessments in this area periodically.

([1]) See, among others, the answers to Written Questions E-002735/2003, E-001487/2008, E-3622/2008 and E-10708/2011.
([2]) OSS = Open Source Software.
([3]) See: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/informatics/oss_tech/index_en.htm
([4]) For further details, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member in particular to its answer to Question E-003622/2008.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004448/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Applicazione della tecnologia di Radio Frequency IDentification ai bambini

In un asilo francese verrà introdotto l'uso della tecnologia a chip RFID inseriti in magliette, con cui poter monitorare la posizione dei bambini nella struttura. Sicuramente questo permetterà di ridurre i costi del personale essendo necessarie meno educatrici per seguire i bambini, ma l'associazione degli psicologi avverte che i piccoli potrebbero patire conseguenze nello sviluppo psicologico, sia per la minor presenza della figura dell'educatore che li segue costantemente, sia perché potrebbe essere in loro alimentata la sensazione di essere costantemente in pericolo anche in un ambiente di fatto protetto.

Posto che, nel caso di specie, se tale progetto fosse confermato, la scelta di iscrivere i propri figli nella struttura ricadrebbe senza dubbio nella sfera decisionale educativa delle famiglie, ritiene la Commissione che i diritti dei bambini e la loro privacy vengano lesi da questa iniziativa?

Qual è la posizione della Commissione circa l'uso di tali dispositivi applicati alle persone?

Potrebbe l'avallo di una politica di controllo di tal fatta aprire la strada ad un trend che porterà ad una compressione incontrollata della privacy e delle libertà basilari dei cittadini, se non da subito regolamentata?

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(19 giugno 2012)

La Commissione ha adottato delle misure per garantire i diritti e le libertà individuali al momento dell'introduzione delle applicazioni RFID. In linea con la sua raccomandazione relativa alle suddette applicazioni ([1]), essa ha intrapreso azioni intese a mettere a punto, in collaborazione con le parti interessate, un quadro per la valutazione di impatto sulla vita privata che gli operatori sono tenuti a seguire. Tale quadro è stato approvato dal gruppo di lavoro «articolo 29» sulla protezione dei dati e firmato nell'aprile 2011 dalla Vicepresidente Neelie Kroes.

Riguardo all'applicazione delle etichette RFID sulle magliette per bambini, è necessario distinguere tra due casi. Le etichette non contengono dati personali, dunque le preoccupazioni relative alla privacy sono limitate e non è necessaria una valutazione d'impatto sulla vita privata. Se, tuttavia, le etichette dovessero contenere dati personali dei bambini sarebbe opportuno eseguire tale valutazione. In ogni caso, è richiesta l'autorizzazione da parte delle persone responsabili dei minori. Per aiutare i cittadini a scegliere e fornire loro informazioni immediate, la Commissione sta lavorando con gli organismi di normalizzazione per presentare, entro l'inizio del 2014, un simbolo europeo comune che permetterà di individuare le applicazioni che utilizzano la tecnologia RFID.

L'applicazione delle clausole indicate nella raccomandazione RFID elimina la possibilità di «compressione incontrollata della privacy e delle libertà basilari dei cittadini». Tuttavia è di competenza degli Stati membri garantire che le disposizioni della raccomandazione RFID siano attuate correttamente. Inoltre, non vi è motivo per cui l'introduzione delle applicazioni RFID negli asili debba necessariamente tradursi in una riduzione del personale.

([1]) Raccomandazione della Commissione sull'applicazione dei principi di protezione della vita privata e dei dati personali nelle applicazioni basate sull'identificazione a radiofrequenza, COM(2009)3200.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004448/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Use of radio frequency identification (RFID) technology with children

A nursery in France has introduced the use of RFID chip technology attached to T-shirts, so as to be able to monitor children's movements on the premises. This will certainly bring about a reduction in staffing costs since fewer staff are needed to supervise the children. However, the Association of Psychologists warns that the children's psychological development could suffer, both because of the reduced presence of a teacher figure constantly watching over them and because they could have an increasing feeling of being in constant danger even in an environment which is actually safe.

Whilst, in this case, should this plan be confirmed, then the decision to enrol one's children in this nursery would certainly be an educational one to be taken by the family itself, does the Commission believe that children's rights and their privacy are prejudiced by this measure?

What is the Commission's position on the use of such devices when applied to people?

Could the endorsement of such a supervision policy lead to a trend which will result in an uncontrolled restriction of the privacy and basic liberties of citizens, unless it is immediately regulated?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2012)

The Commission has taken action to guarantee individual rights and freedoms when RFID applications are deployed. In line with its Recommendation on RFID applications ([1]), the Commission has taken steps to develop with stakeholders a Privacy impact assessment (PIA) framework that operators should follow. This framework has been endorsed by the article 29 Data Protection Working Party and signed in April 2011 by Vice-President Kroes.

Regarding the application with tags on children's T-shirts, two cases must be considered. The tags don't incorporate personal data, then privacy concerns are limited and a PIA isn't needed. If, however, the tag stores personal data of the child a PIA should be implemented. In any case, consent by the person responsible for the child is required. To ease choice and prompt awareness among citizens, the Commission is working with standards organisations to deliver by early 2014 a common European sign that will allow detecting applications using RFID.

The application of the clauses outlined in the RFID Recommendation eliminates the possibility of 'an uncontrolled restriction of the privacy and basic liberties of citizen'. However it is the responsibility of the Member States to ensure that the provisions of the RFID Recommendation are properly implemented. Furthermore, there is no reason the deployment of RFID applications in nurseries should necessarily lead to reductions in staff.

([1]) Recommendation on the implementation of privacy and data protection principles in applications supported by radio frequency identifications, COM(2009)3200.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004450/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Sicurezza voli

Negli ultimi due giorni, il 24 e il 25 aprile, due voli Ryanair, uno diretto a Lanzarote e uno a Brindisi, sono stati costretti al rientro sull'aeroporto di Orio al Serio poco dopo la partenza dallo stesso a causa di inconvenienti tecnici riscontrati in volo; non vi sono state conseguenze per i passeggeri se non quelle dovute al ritardo per le riparazioni.

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'accaduto? Considerato l'alto numero di voli cui sono sottoposti tali velivoli e le mosse sempre più audaci di questa compagnia aerea per ridurre i costi, è certa la Commissione che detta società mantenga gli standard di sicurezza dell'aviazione civile disposti dalle normative europee vigenti?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(7 giugno 2012)

Le questioni sollevate dall'onorevole parlamentare riguardano le funzioni e le responsabilità delle autorità aeronautiche nazionali, a norma del regolamento (CE) n. 216/2008. Nel caso in oggetto, spetta all'autorità competente irlandese eseguire ispezioni, controlli e indagini sulle prestazioni di Ryanair in termini di sicurezza e sulla sua conformità alle norme aeronautiche. Sinora la Commissione non ha ricevuto alcun elemento che confermi le preoccupazioni sollevate in merito alla sicurezza dei voli a basso costo.

Tutte le compagnie aeree, indipendentemente dal modello commerciale seguito, devono rispettare i requisiti in materia di sicurezza stabiliti dall'Unione europea. Quindi, i voli a basso costo non dovrebbero comportare un abbassamento del livello di sicurezza o una maggiore esposizione a guasti tecnici.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004450/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Flight safety

On two days recently — 24 and 25 April — two Ryanair flights, one to Lanzarote and one to Brindisi, were forced to return to Orio al Serio airport shortly after their departure from there due to technical problems discovered in-flight. There were no consequences for the passengers other than those due to the delay while repairs were carried out.

Is the Commission aware of this? In view of the high number of flights undertaken by these aircraft and this airline's increasingly audacious moves to reduce costs, is the Commission certain that this company is maintaining the civil aviation safety standards laid down by current EU legislation?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2012)

The issues raised by the Honourable Member concern the functions and responsibilities of the national aviation authorities, pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 216/2008. In this particular case, the Irish competent authority is in charge to oversee, contol and investigate Ryanair's safety performance and adherence to aviation standards. Untill now, the Commission has not received any evidence pointing to safety concerns in relation to low cost operations.

Any airline, irrespective of the business model it follows, must respect the safety requirements established in the European Union. Therefore, low cost operations should not lead to a lowering of safety or higher exposition to technical failures.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004452/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Informazioni sull'applicazione della direttiva servizi

In merito all'applicazione della direttiva 2006/123/CE relativa ai servizi nel mercato interno (la «direttiva servizi»), la stampa specializzata ha pubblicato delle informazioni e degli articoli relativi all'applicazione di detta direttiva in alcuni Stati membri.

È stata spesso riportata la notizia, ad esempio, che la Germania usufruirebbe di una deroga specifica sia per i cosiddetti «mercatini natalizi» sia per le proprie strutture «turistico-balneari».

Premesso ciò, può la Commissione chiarire se la Germania effettivamente usufruisce di tale deroga?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(19 giugno 2012)

I servizi della Commissione non sono a conoscenza delle deroghe menzionate dall'onorevole parlamentare riguardanti i «mercatini natalizi» e le strutture «turistico-balneari» in Germania.

Le deroghe alla direttiva, o alle disposizioni dell'articolo 16 della stessa, sono stabilite in particolare agli articoli 2, 17 e 18.

Qualora l'onorevole parlamentare potesse fornire informazioni più precise, la Commissione sarebbe disposta ad esaminare la questione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004452/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Information on the implementation of the Services Directive

With reference to the implementation of Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market (the Services Directive), the specialist press has published information and articles relating to the implementation of this directive in some Member States.

For example, it has often been reported that Germany makes use of a specific derogation both for 'Christmas markets' and for its 'seaside tourism' facilities.

In view of the above, can the Commission say whether Germany is in fact making use of such a derogation?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2012)

The Services of the Commission are not aware of the derogations mentioned by the Honourable Member, concerning 'Christmas markets' and 'seaside tourism' facilities in Germany.

The derogations from the directive or from Article 16 thereof are laid down in particular in Articles 2, 17 and 18.

Should the Honourable Member have more precise information the Commission is ready to look further into the matter.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004453/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ηθικοί καταναλωτές — καταγραφή τάσης

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατη έρευνα της εταιρείας Nielsen για την εταιρική υπευθυνότητα, οι «ηθικοί καταναλωτές», παγκοσμίως, φαίνεται να αποτελούνται, κυρίως, από τις νεότερες ηλικιακές ομάδες, συνηθίζουν να συμβουλεύονται τα κοινωνικά μέσα δικτύωσης για τις αγορές τους και δείχνουν έντονο ενδιαφέρον για περιβαλλοντικά και κοινωνικά θέματα. Ως «ηθικοί καταναλωτές» ορίζονται εκείνοι που δηλώνουν πρόθυμοι να πληρώσουν επιπλέον χρήματα για προϊόντα και υπηρεσίες προερχόμενα από εταιρείες που υλοποιούν κοινωνικά και περιβαλλοντικά προγράμματα. Επιπλέον, όπως προκύπτει από τα στοιχεία σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο, ένας στους δύο καταναλωτές (46 %) θεωρείται «ηθικός», αν και στην Ευρώπη μόλις το 32 % των ερωτώμενων δηλώνει πως θα πλήρωνε περισσότερα για τα ηθικά προϊόντα.

Δεδομένης της αυξημένης σημασίας που αποκτά η «ηθική κατανάλωση» παγκοσμίως, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Παρακολουθεί την τάση των «ηθικών καταναλωτών»; έχει προβεί σε κάποια αντίστοιχη έρευνα;

— Εάν ναι, επιβεβαιώνονται τα ανωτέρω στοιχεία; ποια είναι τα αποτελέσματα σε επίπεδο κρατών μελών και πώς αυτά διαμορφώνονται τα τελευταία χρόνια;

— Εάν όχι, σχεδιάζει κάποια αντίστοιχη πρωτοβουλία προκειμένου να καταγραφεί σε επίπεδο κρατών μελών η εν λόγω τάση;

2. Υπάρχουν διαθέσιμα στοιχεία αναφορικά με το πώς η οικονομική ύφεση έχει επηρεάσει τα κριτήρια επιλογής και αγοράς προϊόντων τόσο σε επίπεδο ΕΕ συνολικά όσο και ευρωζώνης;

Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει προβεί σε εμπεριστατωμένες έρευνες για να αναλύσει την «ηθική» κατανάλωση. Ωστόσο, διάφορες πλευρές της «ηθικής» κατανάλωσης έχουν εξεταστεί μέσα σε μελέτες με θέμα τους καταναλωτές και εμπίπτουν στο πεδίο ορισμένων δραστηριοτήτων της Επιτροπής, π.χ. σεμινάριο με θέμα τους «πράσινους» ισχυρισμούς στη διάρκεια της ευρωπαϊκής συνόδου κορυφής για τους καταναλωτές (29 Μαΐου 2012).

Αρκετά Ευρωβαρόμετρα που αφορούσαν τη βιώσιμη κατανάλωση, την εμβιοποικιλότητα, την αποτελεσματικότητα των πόρων, την οικοκαινοτομία ([1]) εξετάζουν τις στάσεις των καταναλωτών και των πολιτών απέναντι στην «ηθική» ενημέρωση και κατανάλωση.

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει προς το παρόν στοιχεία σχετικά με τον τρόπο με τον οποίο η οικονομική κρίση έχει επηρεάσει την επιλογή και την αγορά προϊόντων στη ζώνη του ευρώ στην ΕΕ ως σύνολο.

([1]) Τα Ευρωβαρόμετρα διατίθενται στη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004453/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Ethical consumers — recording a tendency

According to a recent study by the Nielsen company on corporate responsibility, 'ethical consumers' appear internationally to be comprised primarily of younger age groups, who commonly use the social networking media when making their purchases and demonstrate a keen interest in environmental and social themes. 'Ethical consumers' are defined as those who declare themselves willing to pay more for products and services deriving from companies that are implementing social and environmental projects. Moreover, as emerging from data at international level, one in every two consumers (46%) is considered 'ethical', though in Europe, only 32% of those questioned said that they would pay more for ethical products.

Given the increased significance that is being acquired worldwide by 'ethical consumerism', can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is it monitoring the 'ethical consumer' tendency? Has it carried out any relevant research?

— If it has, is the abovementioned information corroborated? What is the outcome at the level of Member States and what developments are to be noted in recent years?

— If it has not, does it plan to undertake any relevant initiative so that the tendency in question will begin to register at the level of the Member States?

2. Is any information available on the way the economic recession has influenced the product selection and purchasing criteria, both at the level of the EU as a whole and in the euro area?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The Commission has not carried out comprehensive research to analyse ethical consumption. However, aspects of ethical consumption have been addressed in consumer studies and fall within the scope of some Commission activities, e.g. a workshop on green claims held during the European Consumer Summit (29 May 2012).

Several Eurobarometers related to sustainable consumption, bio-diversity, resource efficiency or eco-innovation ([1]) address consumer and citizen attitudes towards ethical awareness and consumption.

At present the Commission has no data available on how the economic downturn has affected the selection and purchase of products in the euro area and EU as a whole.

([1]) Eurobarometers available at http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004454/12
an die Kommission
Evelyn Regner (S&D) und Klaus-Heiner Lehne (PPE)
(27. April 2012)

Betrifft: Pläne der Kommission zur EU-weiten Etablierung eines einheitlichen Berufs des „Europäischen Rechtspflegers“

Mit dem „Stockholmer Programm“ setzte sich die Kommission 2009 das Ziel einer verstärkten justiziellen Zusammenarbeit in der EU, um einen „Raum der Freiheit, der Sicherheit und des Rechts im Dienste der Bürger“ zu schaffen. Diesem Ziel könnte die Schaffung eines EU-weit einheitlichen Berufs des Rechtspflegers förderlich sein.

Plant die Kommission vor diesem Hintergrund,

1. die bereits bestehenden Berufe der Rechtspfleger bzw. verwandter Berufsbilder (greffier, referendarz sądowy, cancelliere, secretario judicial usw.) zu harmonisieren oder

2. darüber hinausgehend einen einheitlichen Beruf des „Europäischen Rechtspflegers“ zu schaffen und

3. im Rahmen einer Harmonisierung oder Vereinheitlichung für die Ausbildung der Rechtspfleger als Mindestcurriculum ein dreijähriges Studium der Rechtswissenschaft mit anschließendem einjährigem Praktikum bzw. Vorbereitungsdienst festzuschreiben?

4. Welche justiziellen und administrativen Aufgaben würde die Kommission diesem Berufsbild zuordnen wollen?

5. Falls die Kommission eine Harmonisierung oder die Schaffung eines einheitlichen Berufsbildes ins Auge gefasst hat, welche legislativen Schritte sind diesbezüglich geplant, und wie sieht der zugehörige Zeitplan aus?

6. Hat die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang bereits irgendwelche Schritte unternommen und falls ja, welche?

7. Sofern die Kommission die oben beschriebenen Schritte nicht plant, was sind jeweils die Gründe für diese Entscheidungen?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(28. Juni 2012)

Die Kommission ist nicht befugt, sich mit der Harmonisierung der Berufsprofile der „Rechtspfleger“ zu befassen, und plant auch nicht, den Beruf des „Europäischen Rechtspflegers“ zu schaffen. Sie ist für die Schaffung eines „Europäischen Rechtspflegers“ weder zuständig noch hält sie diese für angemessen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004454/12
to the Commission
Evelyn Regner (S&D) and Klaus-Heiner Lehne (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Plans by the Commission for the establishment of the profession of 'European judicial officer' on a uniform basis throughout the EU

In the 2009 Stockholm Programme, the Commission set itself the goal of greater cooperation on judicial matters within the EU in order to establish 'an area of freedom, security and justice, responding to a central concern of the peoples of the States brought together in the Union'. The establishment of the profession of 'judicial officer' on a uniform basis throughout the EU could help in achieving this goal.

In this context, is the Commission planning:

1. to harmonise the existing professions of judicial officer and associated professions (*greffier*, *referendarz sądowy*, *cancelliere*, *secretario judicial*, etc.) or

2. to go further and establish the profession of 'European judicial officer' on a uniform basis and,

3. in the context of harmonisation or standardisation in the training of judicial officers, to lay down a three-year course of study in law followed by a year's internship or preparatory service as a minimum curriculum?

4. What judicial and administrative tasks would the Commission intend to assign to this profession?

5. If the Commission intends to harmonise or establish a standardised profession, what relevant legislative steps are planned and within what time frame?

6. Has the Commission already taken any action in this connection and, if so, what action?

7. If the Commission is not planning to act as set out above, what are the reasons, in each case, for not doing so?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

The Commission has no jurisdiction to deal with the harmonisation of the professions of 'judicial officer'. The Commission has no plans to establish the profession of 'European judicial officer'. It has no jurisdiction to deal with the establishment of a European judicial officer, neither does it consider to be appropriate.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004455/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ανταγωνιστικότητα, μειώσεις αμοιβών και «φτωχοί εργαζόμενοι»

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατα στοιχεία της Eurostat σχετικά με το ωριαίο κόστος εργασίας στην Ευρώπη των 27 για το 2011, το ωριαίο κόστος εργασίας στην Ελλάδα (με διαθέσιμα στοιχεία του 2010 και χωρίς να υπολογίζονται οι μειώσεις του 2011) υπολογίζεται ότι αγγίζει το 17.5 ευρώ και κατατάσσεται πολύ χαμηλότερα από τον ευρωπαϊκό μέσο όρο (23.1 ευρώ στην Ευρώπη των 27 και 27.6 ευρώ στην ευρωζώνη) ως αποτέλεσμα της δρομολογούμενης απορρύθμισης των εργασιακών σχέσεων και της επιβαλλόμενης μείωσης του κατώτατου μισθού. Η συνεχόμενη και αλματώδης αύξηση της ανεργίας (21.3 %), η ανησυχητική επιδείνωση του φαινομένου των φτωχών εργαζομένων (13.8 % πολύ ανώτερο του ευρωπαϊκού μέσου όρου), καθώς και η περιορισμένη βελτίωση της ανταγωνιστικότητας, δεδομένης και της ανάγκης βελτίωσης της παραγωγικότητας -όπως τονίζεται και στην Έκθεση της Τράπεζας της Ελλάδος για το 2011-, συντελούν στο συμπέρασμα ότι όχι μόνο δεν έχουν επιτευχθεί τα επιθυμητά αποτελέσματα, αλλά αντίθετα έχουν υποστεί σημαντικές ζημιές τα Ασφαλιστικά Ταμεία. Ταυτόχρονα, η επακόλουθη συρρίκνωση της καταναλωτικής δύναμης των Ελλήνων πολιτών πλήττει ανεπανόρθωτα τόσο την πραγματική οικονομία όσο και την κοινωνική συνοχή. Με βάση τα παραπάνω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Δεδομένων των στόχων της Στρατηγικής ΕΕ 2020 για μείωση της φτώχειας και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού, προτίθεται να προχωρήσει σε συστάσεις προς την Ελλάδα, προκειμένου να περιορισθεί και να προληφθεί το φαινόμενο των φτωχών εργαζομένων;

2. Ποιά η σχέση μεταξύ της παραγωγικότητας και των μισθολογικών επιπέδων; Η ύπαρξη ιδιαίτερα χαμηλών αμοιβών και ανασφάλειας στην αγορά εργασίας τι επίδραση μπορεί να έχει στην παραγωγικότητα μιας χώρας;

3. Με βάση την εξέλιξη των κοινωνικών δεικτών στην Ελλάδα και τη σημαντική επίδραση της περικοπής των αμοιβών στην επιδείνωσή τους, πόσο συμβατές με την κοινωνική στόχευση και προοπτική της ΕΕ είναι οι συνεχείς μειώσεις των μισθών;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Ιουνίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή δεν προτίθεται να προβεί σε περαιτέρω ειδικές συστάσεις προς την Ελλάδα όσον αφορά τους κύριους στόχους της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020», εκτός από τη σύσταση εφαρμογής των μέτρων που προβλέπονται στο πρόγραμμα οικονομικής προσαρμογής.

2. Το κόστος εργασίας πρέπει να συμβαδίζει με τις εξελίξεις στον τομέα της παραγωγικότητας. Αυτό είναι πολύ σημαντικό για να αποφευχθεί περαιτέρω απώλεια της ανταγωνιστικότητας, η οποία θα επιτείνει τον κίνδυνο περαιτέρω απώλειας θέσεων εργασίας. Στην ετήσια έρευνα για την ανάπτυξη του 2012 υπογραμμίζεται ότι για να δημιουργηθούν θέσεις εργασίας και να εξασφαλιστεί μια ανάκαμψη πλούσια σε θέσεις εργασίας, τα κράτη μέλη πρέπει να δώσουν μεγάλη προτεραιότητα στις εξελίξεις που αντικατοπτρίζουν καλύτερα τον τομέα της παραγωγικότητας. Το ίδιο επαναλαμβάνεται και στη δέσμη μέτρων για την απασχόληση, στην οποία υπογραμμίζεται επίσης η σημασία του αξιοπρεπούς εισοδήματος ώστε να μην υπάρχουν φτωχοί εργαζόμενοι.

3. Η επιδείνωση της δημοσιονομικής κατάστασης στην Ελλάδα είναι τέτοια που κάνει τον αντίκτυπο στους κοινωνικούς δείκτες αναπόφευκτο, και εάν η οικονομική και δημοσιονομική κρίση δεν αντιμετωπιστεί οι κοινωνικοί δείκτες θα επιδεινωθούν ακόμη περισσότερο. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, επειδή η Ελλάδα πρέπει να αποκαταστήσει την ανταγωνιστικότητά της, η Επιτροπή (μαζί με τις ελληνικές αρχές) έχει αναλάβει διάφορες πρωτοβουλίες, ιδίως την πρωτοβουλία για την παροχή ευκαιριών στους νέους και τη δημιουργία μιας ομάδας δράσης για την Ελλάδα, με σκοπό να εξετάσει την ανακατανομή των υπολειπόμενων κονδυλίων από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία ώστε να μεγιστοποιηθούν τα αποτελέσματά τους στην απασχόληση των νέων. Επιπλέον, άλλες πρωτοβουλίες όπως η «ευρωπαϊκή πλατφόρμα για την καταπολέμηση της φτώχειας και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού» παρέχουν ένα πλαίσιο για την αντιμετώπιση των εν λόγω θεμάτων σε ένα ευρύ φάσμα πολιτικών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004455/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Competitiveness, salary cuts and 'the working poor'

According to recent Eurostat figures on hourly labour costs in the EU-27 in 2011, hourly labour costs in Greece (on the basis of available figures for 2010 and without taking into account the 2011 reductions) are reckoned to be in the vicinity of EUR 17.50, making it much lower than the European average (EUR 23.10 in the EU-27 and EUR 27.60 in the euro area), as a result of the programmed deregulation of labour relations and imposition of a reduction in the minimum wage. With unemployment currently at 21.3% and continuing to increase in leaps and bounds, with the disturbing exacerbation of the phenomenon of 'the working poor' (the current figure of 13.8% is much higher than the European average) and with only very limited improvements being registered in competitiveness, given the need for boosting productivity — as emphasised in the 2011 Bank of Greece report — the conclusion that emerges is that not only have the desired results not been achieved, but on the contrary, the social security funds have suffered significant losses. At the same time, the continuing contraction in the buying power of Greek citizens is doing irreparable damage both to the real economy and to social cohesion. In view of this:

1. Given the strategic goals of Europe 2020 for combating poverty and social exclusion, does the Commission intend to proceed with recommendations to Greece for the purpose of limiting and averting the phenomenon of the 'working poor'?

2. What is the relation between productivity and salary levels? What effect could the existence of exceptionally low wages and labour market insecurity have on a country's productivity?

3. On the basis of the evolution of social indicators in Greece and the significant contribution of wage cuts to worsening them, how compatible are continual reductions in wages with the social targets and perspectives of the EU?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

1. The Commission does not intend to issue any additional, specific recommendations with regard to the Europe 2020 headline targets beyond recommending that Greece implement the measures laid down in the Economic Adjustment Programme.

2. Labour costs must be in line with productivity developments. This is essential to avoid further loss of competitiveness which would aggravate the risk of further job losses. The 2012 Annual Growth Survey emphasises that in order to create jobs and ensure a job-rich recovery, the Member States should give special priority to better reflect productivity developments. This is also echoed in the Employment Package, which also underlines the importance of a decent income to avoid in-work poverty.

3. The deterioration of the financial situation in Greece is such that the impact on the social indicators is unavoidable, and should the financial and fiscal crisis remain unaddressed social indicators would deteriorate even further. Against this background where Greece has to restore its competitiveness, the Commission (together with the Greek authorities) has taken several initiatives, in particular the Youth Opportunity Initiative and the creation of an Action Team for Greece to review what remaining structural funds could be reallocated in order to maximise their impact on Youth employment. Furthermore, other initiatives such as the 'European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion' provide a framework to address these issues across a wide policy spectrum.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004456/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ραγδαία πτώση των πραγματικών εισοδημάτων στην Ελλάδα το 2011

Σύμφωνα με την Ετήσια Έκθεση του ΟΟΣΑ, οι μέσες ακαθάριστες αποδοχές των Ελλήνων εργαζόμενων για το 2011 παρουσιάζονται μειωμένες κατά 25,3 % (αν συμπεριληφθεί και η αύξηση του πληθωρισμού κατά 3 %) σε σχέση με το 2010, επιφέροντας ιδιαίτερα δυσμενείς δημοσιονομικές, οικονομικές και κοινωνικές επιπτώσεις. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει στατιστικά στοιχεία για τη διακύμανση των πραγματικών εισοδημάτων του έτους 2011στην Ευρωζώνη και στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση των 27;

2. Με δεδομένη τη λειτουργία του «κοινωνικού μισθού» ως εργαλείου αναχαίτισης δυσάρεστων κοινωνικών φαινομένων και περιορισμού των συνεπειών από τις εισοδηματικές απώλειες, υπάρχουν στοιχεία για το ύψος του, μέσα από μετρήσιμα δεδομένα, τόσο για την έκταση όσο και για την αποτελεσματικότητα του πλέγματος κοινωνικής προστασίας στα κράτη μέλη;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Ιουνίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή δημοσιεύει δείκτες για το πραγματικό προσαρμοσμένο ακαθάριστο διαθέσιμο εισόδημα των νοικοκυριών κατά κεφαλή ([1]). Τα στοιχεία αυτά διαβιβάζονται στην Επιτροπή από τα κράτη μέλη εντός σαφώς καθορισμένων χρονικών ορίων και βάσει μιας κοινής μεθοδολογίας. Τα κράτη μέλη έχουν προθεσμία έως τις 30 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012 ([2]) για να διαβιβάσουν τα στοιχεία που αφορούν το 2011.

Από τις απαντήσεις σε ερωτήματα έρευνας μεταξύ των καταναλωτών η οποία διενεργήθηκε στο πλαίσιο του κοινού εναρμονισμένου προγράμματος ερευνών συγκυρίας της ΕΕ στις επιχειρήσεις και τους καταναλωτές, προκύπτει ένας δείκτης οικονομικής δυσχέρειας και ως εκ τούτου μια ένδειξη για τις πρόσφατες τάσεις στο ποσοστό των νοικοκυριών που αντιμετωπίζουν οικονομική δυσχέρεια, η οποία αναφέρεται ότι στην Ελλάδα έχει αυξηθεί κατά το τελευταίο έτος ([3]).

2. Η Επιτροπή δημοσιεύει επίσης δείκτες για την παρακολούθηση της αποτελεσματικότητας της κοινωνικής προστασίας από τους κινδύνους και τις ανάγκες που συνδέονται με την ασθένεια ή την ιατροφαρμακευτική περίθαλψη και την αναπηρία, την ανικανότητα, το γήρας, τη φροντίδα των παιδιών, την απώλεια συζύγου ή γονέως, την ανεργία, τη στέγαση και τον κοινωνικό αποκλεισμό ([4]).

Δημοσιεύει επίσης διάφορους δείκτες για την παρακολούθηση των εξελίξεων που συνδέονται με τον στόχο της στρατηγικής «Ευρώπη 2020» για τη μείωση της φτώχειας και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού. Οι δείκτες αυτοί καλύπτουν άτομα που είναι εκτεθειμένα στον κίνδυνο της φτώχειας, αντιμετωπίζουν σοβαρές υλικές στερήσεις ή ζουν σε νοικοκυριά με πολύ χαμηλή ένταση εργασίας (όπου οι ενήλικες σε ηλικία εργασίας εργάστηκαν λιγότερο από το 20 % του χρόνου κατά τη διάρκεια μιας περιόδου αναφοράς).

Η Επιτροπή ενθαρρύνει ένθερμα τις κυβερνήσεις των κρατών μελών στην προσπάθειά τους να έχουν αποτελεσματικά δίκτυα κοινωνικής ασφάλειας (και να υποβάλλουν εκθέσεις σχετικά).

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tec00113&plugin=1.
([2]) Πρόκειται για την εκ του νόμου προβλεπόμενη προθεσμία η οποία καθορίζεται στον κανονισμό (ΕΚ) αριθ. 2223/96 του Συμβουλίου, της 25ης Ιουνίου 1996, περί του ευρωπαϊκού συστήματος εθνικών και περιφερειακών λογαριασμών της Κοινότητας (ΕΕ L 310 της 30.11.1996, σ. 1).
([3]) Βλ. την τριμηνιαία επισκόπηση της εργασιακής και κοινωνικής κατάστασης στην ΕΕ στη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=113&newsId=1255&furtherNews=yes.
([4]) Βλ. τις στατιστικές ESSPROSS: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/social_protection/introduction.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004456/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Dramatic fall in real incomes in Greece in 2011

According to the OECD Annual Report, the average gross wage for Greek employees fell by 25.3% in 2011 (taking into account the 3% rise in inflation) compared to 2010, with exceedingly unfavourable fiscal, economic and social consequences. In this context, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Does it possess statistical data on the fluctuations in real income for the year 2011 in the euro area and the EU-27?

2. Given the function of the 'social wage' as an instrument for checking disagreeable social phenomena and limiting the damage from income loss, are there available figures, in the form of measurable data, on its actual dimensions, in terms of both the extent and the effectiveness of the social safety net in EU Member States?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2012)

1. The Commission publishes indicators of the real adjusted gross disposable income of households per capita ([1]). These are forwarded to it by the Member States within clearly specified time limits and in accordance with a common methodology. Data for 2011 will be provided by the Member States by 30 September 2012 ([2]).

Responses to the questions to a consumer survey carried out under the joint harmonised EU programme of business and consumer surveys derive a financial distress indicator, and hence provide an indication of the recent trends in the percentage of households experiencing financial distress, which is reported to have increased in Greece over the past year ([3]).

2. The Commission also publishes indicators for monitoring the effectiveness of social protection from the risks and needs associated with sickness or healthcare and invalidity, disability, old age, parental responsibilities, the loss of a spouse or parent, unemployment, housing and social exclusion ([4]).

It also publishes several indicators for monitoring developments relating to the Europe 2020 strategy target for reducing poverty and social exclusion. These cover persons who are at risk of poverty, are severely materially deprived or live in households with very low work intensity (where working-age adults worked less than 20% of the time during a reference period).

The Commission is strongly encouraging national governments in their efforts to have effective social safety nets (and to report thereupon).

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tec00113&plugin=1.
([2]) This is the legal deadline set in Council Regulation (EC) No 2223/96 of 25 June 1996 on the European system of national and regional accounts in the Community, OJ L 310, 30.11.1996, p. 1.
([3]) See the EU Employment and Social Situation Quarterly Review at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=113&newsId=1255&furtherNews=yes.
([4]) See ESSPROSS statistics: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/social_protection/introduction.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004457/12
do Komisji
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(27 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Stosowanie najnowszej dyrektywy w sprawie pieniądza elektronicznego w Polsce

Zgodnie z komunikatem Komisji z dnia 26 kwietnia 2012 r. zwrócono się do Polski – oraz do innych krajów – o powiadomienie Komisji w ciągu najbliższych dwóch miesięcy o działaniach, jakie kraj ten ma zamiar podjąć w celu dostosowania swojego ustawodawstwa krajowego do najnowszej dyrektywy w sprawie pieniądza elektronicznego.

W dyrektywie skoncentrowano się na uaktualnieniu przepisów UE dotyczących pieniądza elektronicznego, a w szczególności na dostosowaniu systemu ostrożnościowego instytucji pieniądza elektronicznego do wymogów instytucji płatniczych określonych w dyrektywie w sprawie usług płatniczych (2007/64/WE).

W związku z tym zwracam się do Komisji z pytaniem, które konkretnie przepisy przedmiotowej dyrektywy nie zostały wdrożone przez Polskę i w jaki sposób mogą w konsekwencji ucierpieć polskie przedsiębiorstwa.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Michela Barniera w imieniu Komisji
(19 czerwca 2012 r.)

Komisja Europejska podjęła kroki prawne wobec państw członkowskich, w tym Polski, ponieważ wdrożyła ona jedynie częściowo do prawa krajowego dyrektywę w sprawie pieniądza elektronicznego [1] ponad rok po przewidywanej dacie transpozycji, tzn. 30 kwietnia 2011 r.

Niektóre główne przepisy dyrektywy w sprawie pieniądza elektronicznego, które nie zostały jeszcze wdrożone przez Polskę dotyczą ogólnych zasad ostrożnościowych, funduszy własnych, wymogów ochronnych oraz ubezpieczeń i możliwości wykupu.

W rezultacie nowi usługodawcy nie mogą w pełni korzystać z mniejszych barier wejścia na polski rynek. Brak jasności co do przepisów dotyczących agentów i pozostałych osób trzecich działających jako dystrybutorzy jest źródłem braku pewności prawnej dla podmiotów gospodarczych, niezależnie czy są to emitenci pieniądza elektronicznego z innych państw członkowskich, którzy chcieliby sprzedawać swoje produkty za pośrednictwem dystrybutorów w Polsce, czy też polscy emitenci pieniądza elektronicznego chcący skorzystać z usług agentów, aby uzyskać dostęp do rynków innych państw członkowskich.

Polska oświadczyła, że pełna transpozycja dyrektywy w sprawie pieniądza elektronicznego zostanie zakończona do czerwca 2012 r. Komisja będzie w dalszym ciągu monitorować postępy w transpozycji pozostałych przepisów dyrektywy w sprawie pieniądza elektronicznego przez Polskę i w przypadku takiej konieczności podejmie dalsze działania.

---

(1) Dyrektywa 2009/110/WE, Dz.U. L 267 z 10.10.2009, s. 7-17.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004457/12
to the Commission
Adam Bielan (ECR)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Implementation of the latest directive on e-money in Poland

According to a Commission press release issued on 26 April 2012, Poland — among other countries — has been asked to notify to the Commission within the next two months the measures it is taking to update its national legislation in conformity with the latest directive on e-money.

The directive focuses on modernising EU rules on electronic money, especially bringing the prudential regime for electronic money institutions into line with the requirements for payment institutions in the Payment Services Directive (2007/64/EC).

I would therefore like to ask the Commission which specific provisions of the directive have not been implemented by Poland and how Polish businesses could suffer as a result.

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2012)

The European Commission has taken action against Poland, among other Member States, as Poland only partially implemented into national law the Electronic money directive (EMD) ([1]), more than a year after the expected date for transposition, i.e. 30 April 2011.

Some of the major provisions of the EMD that have not yet been implemented by Poland concern general prudential rules, the own funds, the safeguarding requirements and the insurance and redeemabiliy.

As a result, new service providers cannot fully benefit from lower barriers to entry to the Polish market. The lack of clarity of the regulation of agents and other third-parties as distributors is a source of legal uncertainty for economic operators, be they e-money issuers from other Member States that would want to sell their products through distributors in Poland or Polish e-money issuers eager to use agents to get access to other European Member States' markets.

Poland announced that the full transposition of the EMD should be completed by June 2012. The Commission will continue to monitor progress of the transposition of the outstanding provisions of the EMD by Poland and will take further steps as appropriate.

([1]) Directive 2009/110/EC, OJ L 267, 10.10.2009, p. 7-17.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-004458/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR) oraz Adam Bielan (ECR)
(27 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – sprawa José Daniela Ferrera Garcíi

José Daniel Ferrer García, wypuszczony wiosną zeszłego roku po ośmiu latach z więzienia, rozpoczął strajk głodowy w ramach protestu przeciwko temu, że zatrzymano go na trzy tygodnie w areszcie policyjnym bez postawienia zarzutów. Ferrer i 42 innych dysydentów zostali aresztowani dnia 2 kwietnia 2012 r. w wyniku demonstracji ulicznych w Palmarito i Palmie. Wszyscy zostali wypuszczeni po kilku godzinach, jedynie Ferrera przeniesiono do stolicy prowincji.

Ferrer założył Kubański Związek Patriotyczny (UNPACU), patronackie ugrupowanie organizacji dysydenckich, i ściśle współpracował z Kobietami w Bieli (Damas de Blanco). Skazano go na 25 lat więzienia po fali represji systemu komunistycznego w 2003 r., nazywanej kubańską „czarną wiosną". Belkis Cantillo, żona Ferrera, poinformowała działaczy na rzecz praw człowieka, że podczas jej ostatniej wizyty u męża w ośrodku przesłuchań służb bezpieczeństwa narodowego we wschodniej części Santiago de Cuba, ten wyznał jej, że „powoli go zabijają".

Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel wie o sprawie José Daniela Ferrera Garcíi?

Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel omówi tę kwestię z przedstawicielami kubańskiego rządu w Brukseli, tj. z ambasador Mirthą M. Hormillą Castro oraz José Oriolem Marrero Martínezem, doradcą do spraw europejskich?

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

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca jest poinformowana o wspomnianej sytuacji. UE uważnie śledzi sprawę José Daniela Ferrera Garcíi i wyraziła wobec władz kubańskich w Hawanie i jej przedstawicieli w Brukseli swoje zaniepokojenie stanem tej sprawy oraz ogólnie wzrostem liczby przypadków tymczasowych zatrzymań.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004458/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR) and Adam Bielan (ECR)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — The case of José Daniel Ferrer García

José Daniel Ferrer García, who was freed only last spring after eight years in prison, has gone on hunger strike in protest at being held without charge in police custody for three weeks. Ferrer and 42 other dissidents were arrested on 2 April 2012 during street protests in Palmarito and Palma. The others were freed hours later, but Ferrer was transferred to the provincial capital.

Ferrer founded the Patriotic Union of Cuba (UNPACU), an umbrella group of dissident organisations, and has worked closely with the *Damas de Blanco*. He was sentenced to 25 years in prison following the communist regime's crackdown known as Cuba's Black Spring in 2003. Belkis Cantillo, Ferrer's wife, told human rights activists that during a visit to her husband in a state security interrogation centre in east Santiago de Cuba he had told her 'they are killing me slowly'.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case of José Daniel Ferrer García?

Will the Vice-President/High Representative take up his case with representatives of the Cuban Government based in Brussels, i.e. Ambassador Mirtha M. Hormilla Castro and José Oriol Marrero Martínez, Counsellor for European Affairs?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the situation mentioned. The EU is following closely the case of José Daniel Ferrer Garcia and has expressed to the Cuban authorities, in Brussels and in Havana, the EU's concern over this case and more generally on the upsurge of temporary detentions.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse P-004461/12
til Kommissionen
Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)
(27. april 2012)

Om: Om partikelforurening i lufthavne

I forlængelse af mine spørgsmål af 8. marts 2010 (E-1326/10), 13. januar 2011 (P-011302/2010) og 10. januar 2012 (P-012664/2011) om det alvorlige problem med arbejdsrelaterede kræfttilfælde som følge af partikelforurening i lufthavne og i forlængelse af, at det tredje arbejdsrelaterede kræfttilfælde i Københavns Lufthavn nu er blevet officielt anerkendt, bedes Kommissionen oplyse hvornår den forventer, at der kommer en færdig indstilling fra den undersøgelse, som Det videnskabelige Udvalg vedrørende Grænseværdier for Erhvervsmæssig Eksponering og Kommissionens Fælles Forskningscenter i øjeblikket gennemfører.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor
(4. juni 2012)

Kommissionens Fælles Forskningscenter er for øjeblikket ved at gennemgå og udarbejde et resumé af foreliggende videnskabelig litteratur om eksponering for flybrændstof og forbrændingsprodukter heraf med henblik på drøftelse i Det Videnskabelige Udvalg for Grænseværdier for Erhvervsmæssig Eksponering. Resuméet vil formentlig kunne forelægges udvalget i efteråret 2012. Udvalget vil så evaluere resuméet og andre oplysninger i overensstemmelse med den vedtagne metode for videnskabelig evaluering af kemiske agenser på arbejdspladsen.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004461/12
to the Commission
Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Particulate pollutant emissions at airports

Further to my questions of 8 March 2010 (E-1326/2010), 13 January 2011 (P-011302/2010) and 10 January 2012 (P-012664/2011) on the serious problem of work-related incidences of cancer resulting from particulate pollutant emissions at airports, and in view of the fact that a third incidence of work-related cancer at Copenhagen Airport has now been officially confirmed, can the Commission say when it expects a recommendation based on the study currently being carried out by the Scientific Committee on Occupational Exposure Limit Values and the Commission's Joint Research Centre?

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

The Commission's Joint Research Centre is currently drafting a review of the scientific literature available on exposure to aircraft fuel and its combustion products with a view to discussion within the Scientific Committee on Occupational Exposure Limit Values. The review should be available to the Committee in autumn 2012. The Committee will evaluate it, together with other information, in accordance with the methodology it has adopted for the scientific evaluation of workplace chemicals.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004462/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Energia transfrontaliera in Italia: aumento dei corrispettivi di accesso

Il mercato dell'energia elettrica in Europa si è sviluppato grazie all'elevato livello di concorrenzialità nel mercato all'ingrosso. Tuttavia, in Italia la situazione del mercato energetico presenta due rilevanti profili di criticità, in particolare:

— il gestore di rete italiano, prima GRTN S.p.A., e dal 2005 la Terna S.p.A., applica il cosiddetto CCT (corrispettivo di capacità di trasmissione) solo sulla base di differenziali di prezzi dell'energia elettrica del mercato all'ingrosso, non tenendo in considerazione i costi delle attività proprie del gestore di rete, relativi alle linee tecniche di trasmissione;

— a partire dal 2007, i corrispettivi di accesso alla rete italiana dell'energia transfrontaliera, in assenza di pattuizioni contrattuali, sono applicati agli importatori da Borsa elettrica italiana, che costituisce il luogo di incontro tra l'offerta da parte dei produttori e la domanda da parte di consumatori e grossisti, i quali acquistano energia per le loro necessità o per venderla ad altri utilizzatori, diversamente dal gestore di rete, la stessa Terna S.p.A. Tale contesto ha determinato un notevole aumento del prezzo dell'energia in Italia, con conseguente grave danno per i consumatori italiani.

Visti la direttiva 2009/72/CE del 13 luglio 2009, relativa a norme comuni per il mercato interno dell'energia elettrica, e il regolamento (CE) n. 714/2009, relativo alle condizioni di accesso alla rete per gli scambi transfrontalieri di energia elettrica e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1228/2003,

considerando che è compito dell'Unione europea facilitare l'interconnessione e lo sviluppo delle reti transeuropee dell'energia, nonché l'accesso a queste reti, conformemente al diritto dell'Unione vigente, al fine di garantire non solo l'effettiva realizzazione e lo sviluppo del mercato interno dell'energia, ma anche di ridurre il costo dell'energia per il consumatore, potrebbe la Commissione verificare se:

— l'aumento del prezzo dell'energia transfrontaliera in Italia, determinato da differenziali di prezzo elevati nei mercati all'ingrosso dell'energia elettrica tra le diverse zone in cui il sistema elettrico è suddiviso, non sia giustificabile sulla base dei diversi costi variabili di produzione, in particolare non consenta di conseguire e di trasferire pienamente ai clienti finali, i benefici realizzabili attraverso un compiuto processo di liberalizzazione dei mercati energetici?

— il meccanismo di «trasferimento» ai clienti finali dei costi sostenuti sia allineato a quello degli operatori di mercato, oppure se vi siano distorsioni tra i livelli di prezzo nel servizio di tutela e i medesimi livelli nel mercato libero?

— tale aumento protezionistico possa costituire un potenziale ostacolo al pieno sviluppo della concorrenza nel mercato della vendita al dettaglio?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

La direttiva 2009/72/CE, del 13 luglio 2009 ([1]), all'articolo 37 attribuisce alle autorità di regolamentazione degli Stati membri il potere di imporre ai gestori del sistema di trasmissione e di distribuzione, se necessario, di modificare le condizioni e le modalità, comprese le tariffe o le metodologie per il relativo calcolo. Rientra quindi nelle competenze e nella responsabilità dell'autorità nazionale di regolamentazione italiana intervenire in situazioni come quelle oggetto dell'interrogazione. Lo stesso articolo della direttiva dà altresì facoltà a qualsiasi parte che intenda sporgere reclamo contro il gestore di un sistema di trasmissione o di distribuzione per quanto concerne gli obblighi di quest'ultimo ai sensi della direttiva di adire l'autorità di regolamentazione la quale, in veste di autorità per la risoluzione delle controversie, adotta una decisione entro due mesi dalla ricezione del reclamo.

([1]) Direttiva 2009/72/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 luglio 2009, relativa a norme comuni per il mercato interno dell'energia elettrica e che abroga la direttiva 2003/54/CE (GU L 211 del 14.8.2009).

Per quanto riguarda i potenziali effetti di distorsione tra prezzi in servizio protetto e sul mercato libero, la Commissione condivide la preoccupazione che i prezzi regolamentati possano avere un effetto negativo sullo sviluppo dell'effettiva concorrenza. Al tempo stesso, la Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea ha affermato (nella causa Federutility (C-295/08)), che l'intervento statale nel prezzo non è, in quanto tale, vietato ma deve: 1) essere giustificato nell'interesse economico generale; 2) rispettare il principio di proporzionalità; 3) soddisfare il requisito di cui all'articolo 3, paragrafo 2, della direttiva per quanto riguarda gli obblighi di servizio pubblico.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004462/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Cross-border energy in Italy: increase in access fees

The electricity market in Europe has grown because of a greater amount of competition in the wholesale market. However, in Italy, the energy market situation presents two major problems:

— The manager of the Italian network, first GRTN S.p.A., and since 2005 Terna S.p.A., applies the so-called CCT (*corrispettivo di capacità di trasmissione*) [transmission capacity fee] only on the basis of wholesale electricity price differences, without taking into consideration the costs of the network manager's actual activities relating to technical transmission lines;

— As of 2007, access fees to the Italian cross-border energy network have been applied to importers, in the absence of contractual stipulations, by the Italian energy stock exchange, which is where the supply from producers meets the demand from consumers and wholesalers, who purchase the energy for their own requirements or to sell it to other users, unlike the network manager, Terna S.p.A. This context has caused a significant rise in energy prices in Italy, to the serious detriment of Italian consumers.

Having regard to Directive 2009/72/EC of 13 July 2009 concerning common rules for the internal market in electricity, and Regulation (EC) No 714/2009 on conditions for access to the network for cross-border exchanges in electricity and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1228/2003,

Given that it is the job of the European Union to facilitate the interconnection and development of the cross-border energy network, as well as access to these networks, in accordance with current EC law, in order to guarantee not only the effective creation and development of the internal energy market, but also to reduce energy costs for the consumer, could the Commission verify that:

— The increase in the cross-border energy price in Italy, caused by high price differentials in the wholesale electricity markets between the various areas in which the electrical system is divided, is not justifiable on the basis of the different variable production costs, in particular that it does not allow the benefits achievable by an efficient energy market liberalisation process to be achieved and fully passed on to customers?

— The mechanism for 'passing on' the costs incurred to end customers is consistent with that of the market operators, or whether there are discrepancies between price levels in the protected service and the same levels in the free market?

— This protectionist rise may create a potential obstacle to the full development of competition in the retail market?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

Directive 2009/72/EC of 13 July 2009 [1] in its Article 37 entrusts regulatory authorities of Member States with the authority to require transmission and distribution system operators, if necessary, to modify the terms and conditions, including tariffs or methodologies for their calculation. It is therefore within the powers and responsibility of the national regulatory authority of Italy to act in situations alleged in the question. The same article of the directive also entitles any party having a complaint against a transmission or distribution system operator in relation to that operator's obligations under the directive to refer the complaint to the regulatory authority which, acting as dispute settlement authority, must issue a decision within a period of two months after the receipt of the complaint.

[1] Directive 2009/72/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 concerning common rules for the internal market in electricity and repealing Directive 2003/54/EC, OJ L 211, 14.8.2009.

With reference to potential distortion between the prices in the protected service and in the free market, the Commission shares the concern that regulated prices may have an adverse effect on the development of effective competition. At the same time, the European Court of Justice has held (in the Federutility Case (C-295/08)), that State intervention in the price is not prohibited as such but must: (1) be justified in the general economic interest; (2) meet the principle of proportionality; (3) meet the requirement in Article 3(2) of the directive concerning public service obligations.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004463/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Siria: violenza e questione umanitaria

Continua a crescere il numero delle vittime civili del conflitto che da un anno ormai lacera internamente la Siria. Dopo lo stallo creato dal veto posto da Cina e Russia a un intervento internazionale in Siria durante l'ultima riunione del Consiglio di Sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite (UNSC), la comunità internazionale ha incominciato a studiare nuove soluzioni per affrontare la crisi umanitaria in corso nel paese.

Una delle prime alternative proposte riguarda la possibilità di stabilire un armistizio temporale per permettere l'ingresso nel paese agli aiuti umanitari. La seconda proposta è quella di creare un corridoio umanitario, uno spazio protetto attraverso cui possano entrare nel paese gli aiuti necessari a supportare la popolazione civile afflitta ormai da un anno di guerra civile. Data la mancanza di fonti ufficiali attendibili, riportiamo di seguito il bilancio fornito dalle autorità siriane, che finora non hanno però reso note cifre dettagliate delle vittime civili distinte da quelle militari.

Sono 8 715 le vittime riconosciute del conflitto siriano. Di queste 6 917 sono civili e 1 778 militari. Dei civili, 595 sono bambini e adolescenti e 270 sono donne. Ammonta invece a 20 217 il numero di persone imprigionate dal governo, di cui 206 donne e 446 minorenni.

Considerata la situazione di stallo a livello sia interno che esterno, può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante far sapere qual è la posizione dell'Unione europea dinanzi alla crisi siriana, non solo dal punto di vista politico ma soprattutto umanitario?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(20 giugno 2012)

L'Unione europea sostiene pienamente l'inviato congiunto dell'ONU e della Lega araba, Kofi Annan, e il suo piano in sei punti che prevede tra l'altro il cessate il fuoco immediato e l'accesso senza impedimenti agli aiuti umanitari. L'UE accoglie con favore le risoluzioni 2042 e 2043 del Consiglio di sicurezza dell'ONU che autorizzano l'invio di osservatori ONU in Siria per sorvegliare l'attuazione del cessate il fuoco e degli altri aspetti del piano di Kofi Annan e sostiene la missione di monitoraggio attraverso l'invio di osservatori e di attrezzature, tra cui anche 25 veicoli blindati che sono giunti in Siria il 12 maggio 2012.

L'UE accoglie favorevolmente i recenti accordi tra l'ONU e il governo siriano su un piano di risposta umanitaria che dia un ruolo di coordinamento all'Ufficio delle Nazioni Unite per il coordinamento degli affari umanitari e consenta al personale internazionale dell'ONU e delle organizzazioni non governative (ONG) internazionali presenti in Siria di operare sul posto. L'UE e gli Stati membri hanno mobilitato circa 28 milioni di euro in aiuti umanitari e assistono i paesi confinanti che accolgono i profughi siriani. Attraverso gli esperti umanitari sul campo, l'UE segue attentamente gli sviluppi all'interno della Siria e ai confini con il Libano, la Giordania e la Turchia.

L'idea dei corridoi umanitari o della protezione militare degli aiuti umanitari, anche se può sembrare allettante, potrebbe aprire la strada a un conflitto armato internazionale, imponendo la presenza di forze armate internazionali all'interno del paese e creando un rifugio sicuro per i gruppi armati dell'opposizione. Inoltre, l'apertura di corridoi umanitari in un paese di oltre 180 000 chilometri quadrati in cui le ostilità sono diffuse su tutto il territorio è molto difficile, se non impossibile, da attuare a livello pratico. È necessario garantire l'accesso alle persone bisognose di aiuti ovunque in Siria. L'UE continua ad insistere sul fatto che la concessione di un accesso senza restrizioni in tutto il paese, e non solo in alcuni luoghi specifici, rappresenti la modalità più realistica ed efficace di fornire assistenza umanitaria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004463/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Syria: violence and the humanitarian issue

The number of civilian victims is continuing to grow in the civil war which has devastated Syria over the last year. In view of the stalemate caused after China and Russia vetoed international intervention in Syria at the last United Nations Security Council (UNSC) meeting, the international community has begun to study new solutions to address the country's ongoing humanitarian crisis.

One of the first alternative proposals relates to the possibility of establishing a temporary armistice to allow humanitarian aid to enter the country. The second proposal is to create a humanitarian corridor, a protected space enabling aid to be delivered to the civilian population, which has now been afflicted by this civil war for a year. Given that there are no reliable official sources, the figures below are those provided by the Syrian authorities, which, however, have not so far given any detailed figures on civilian casualties as distinct from military casualties.

There are 8 715 known victims of the fighting in Syria. Out of that number, 6 917 are civilians and 1 778 are military personnel. Out of the civilians, 595 are children and teenagers and 270 are women. There are, moreover, 20 217 people being held prisoner by the Government, of whom 206 are women and 446 are minors.

Given the deadlock at both domestic and international level, can the Vice-President/High Representative say what attitude the European Union is taking to the Syrian crisis, not only from a political point of view but, above all, in humanitarian terms?

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

The EU fully supports the Joint UN-Arab League Envoy Kofi Annan and his six point plan which provides among others for an immediate ceasefire and full access for humanitarian aid. The EU welcomes the UN Security Council resolutions 2042 and 2043 authorising the deployment of UN observers to Syria to monitor the implementation of the ceasefire and other aspects of Annan's plan and supports the monitoring mission by sending observers and equipment, including 25 armoured vehicles that arrived in Syria on 12 May 2012.

The EU welcomes recent agreements between the UN and the Syrian Government on a humanitarian response plan that grants a coordinating role to the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and allows UN international staff and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) with a presence in Syria to operate on the ground. The EU and Member States have mobilised some EUR 28 million in humanitarian aid and support neighbouring countries, hosting Syrian refugees. The EU continues to closely monitor the situation inside Syria and at the borders with Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey, through its humanitarian experts in the field.

The idea of humanitarian corridors or military protection to humanitarian aid although intuitively attractive may pave the way for an international armed conflict by imposing international armed presence inside Syria, and by creating a safe haven for opposition armed groups. However, applying corridors in a country with more than 180 000 square kilometres and hostilities spread over the entire country is practically difficult, if not impossible. Access is needed to people in need everywhere in Syria. The EU continues to insist on the need for unimpeded access for humanitarian aid in the entire country and not just in specific locations as the most realistic and efficient way to deliver humanitarian assistance.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004464/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Sicurezza sul lavoro: quali prospettive per il futuro

Attraverso la direttiva quadro 89/391/CEE e le sue direttive derivate, la normativa dell'Unione europea offre il quadro giuridico che consente ai lavoratori in Europa di godere di elevati livelli di salute e sicurezza sul posto di lavoro.

Così come la nostra società si evolve sotto l'influenza della nuova tecnologia e delle mutevoli condizioni economiche e sociali, anche i luoghi di lavoro e i processi di produzione sono costantemente in evoluzione. Queste nuove situazioni occupazionali comportano rischi nuovi ed emergenti e sfide, che a loro volta richiedono approcci politici, amministrativi e tecnici che garantiscano elevati livelli di sicurezza e salute sul lavoro. I lavoratori sono esposti non solo al rischio fisico ma psicosociale, la gestione di quest'ultimo dovrebbe prevedere l'adozione di misure specifiche volte a tutelare il prestatore di lavoro.

Purtroppo ad oggi meno di un terzo delle imprese nell'UE-27 riferisce di possedere procedure per affrontare il bullismo o le molestie (30 %), la violenza o lo stress legati al lavoro (circa il 26 %). La prevalenza maggiore è riportata nelle imprese più grandi.

Considerato il crescente numero di infortuni sul lavoro, legati anche alle cosiddette malattie professionali, può la Commissione europea far sapere se intende elaborare un'analisi comparata in merito e se intende implementare gli strumenti a disposizione al fine di limitare tali rischi a tutela del lavoratore nel rispetto di quanto previsto per la Strategia Europa 2020?

Risposta di Laszlo Andor a nome della Commissione
(18 giugno 2012)

Per quanto concerne le malattie professionali la Commissione ha affidato a un consulente esterno l'elaborazione di una relazione di studio. Tale relazione fornirà elementi che consentiranno di formulare un'analisi comparativa quale menzionata dall'onorevole deputato. Allorché i risultati di tale studio saranno stati convalidati dalla Commissione questa provvederà a renderli noti al pubblico.

I servizi della Commissione tengono conto della problematica delle malattie professionali sia nell'ambito della valutazione dell'attuale strategia in tema di salute e sicurezza sul lavoro 2007-2012 [1] sia, in base ai risultati di tale valutazione, all'atto di identificare le priorità per il periodo successivo.

---

[1] Comunicazione della Commissione al Parlamento europeo, al Consiglio, al Comitato economico e sociale europeo e al Comitato delle regioni — Migliorare la qualità e la produttività sul luogo di lavoro: strategia comunitaria 2007-2012 per la salute e la sicurezza sul luogo di lavoro, COM(2007)62 definitivo del 21 febbraio 2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004464/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Safety at work: prospects for the future

Through Framework Directive 89/391/EEC and its derived directives, the European Union provides a legal framework that allows workers in Europe to enjoy high levels of health and safety at work.

Just as our society evolves under the influence of new technology and changing economic and social conditions, workplaces and production processes are also evolving constantly. These new employment situations involve new, emerging risks and challenges, which in turn require administrative, political and technical approaches to ensure high levels of occupational health and safety. Workers are exposed not only to physical but also to psycho-social risk, the management of which should include specific measures designed to protect them.

Unfortunately, less than one third of businesses in the EU-27 today say that they implement procedures for dealing with bullying or harassment (30%), violence or work-related stress (around 26%). This is most prevalent in larger companies.

In view of the growing number of accidents at work, linked to so-called occupational diseases, can the Commission state whether it intends to draw up a relevant comparative analysis and whether it intends to implement the tools at its disposal in order to limit these risks, to protect workers in compliance with the provisions of the Europe 2020 strategy?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2012)

As far as occupational diseases are concerned, the Commission has commissioned a study report from an external consultant. This report will provide elements that should help formulate a comparative analysis, as referred to by the Honourable Member. When the results of this study have been validated by the Commission they will be made available to the public.

The Commission services will also consider the issue of occupational diseases in both its evaluation of the current Health and Safety at Work strategy 2007-2012 ([1]) and, based on the results of this evaluation, when identifying priorities for the upcoming period.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on improving quality and productivity at work: Community strategy 2007-2012 on health and safety at work, COM(2007) 62 final of 21 February 2007.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004466/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Olimpiadi 2012 e sviluppo sostenibile

A meno di 100 giorni dall'inizio delle Olimpiadi di Londra, sussistono ancora molte perplessità su alcuni punti chiave dell'evento. È previsto un afflusso di 400 mila spettatori, il controllo di 40 mila agenti di sicurezza, un bilancio di 11 miliardi di euro e 7.5 miliardi di euro spesi per ammodernare la rete dei trasporti pubblici, il vero tallone d'Achille della città.

Nonostante le colossali opere infrastrutturali costruite in vista dei giochi olimpici, che avranno lo scopo di rivalutare un intero quartiere semi-abbandonato, secondo un sondaggio il 51 % dei londinesi ritiene che non si riuscirà a recuperare il denaro speso per l'evento. A sostegno di questa tesi intervengono anche i dati del *Capital Economics*, secondo i quali la crescita a lungo termine generata dalle Olimpiadi sarà meno dell'1 % del PIL. Al momento circa 1 500 imprese britanniche hanno beneficiato di contratti e appalti. I posti di lavoro derivati dall'organizzazione dell'evento sarebbero circa 300 mila, tuttavia, si tratta di contratti temporanei a tempo determinato, che potrebbero causare un aumento dei disoccupati una volta spenta la macchina organizzativa dei giochi.

A detta del Primo Ministro David Cameron, i giochi di Londra saranno «verdi» e caratterizzati da sostenibilità ambientale. Non è semplice credere a queste parole dal momento che alcuni elementi indicano il contrario, dato che alcuni complessi sono stati costruiti solo per i giochi e saranno smantellati dopo il 12 agosto. Ciò significa smaltire il materiale che non può essere riciclato. Inoltre vi sarà un alto tasso di emissioni se si pensa che circa 3 milioni di spostamenti supplementari si aggiungeranno ai 12 milioni che avvengono quotidianamente.

Visto che l'Europa si è impegnata a ridurre le sue emissioni di gas serra del 20 % entro il 2020, può la Commissione precisare la sua posizione in merito all'inquinamento prodotto dai giochi olimpici?

Risposta di Connie Hedegaard a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2012)

La Commissione europea apprezza il fatto che il Regno Unito abbia dichiarato l'impegno a organizzare i giochi olimpici 2012 in modo sostenibile. Anche se un evento di tale entità presenta inevitabilmente sfide in termini di emissioni di gas a effetto serra, e ambientali in generale, resta fermo l'obbligo per il Regno Unito e per tutti gli Stati membri di soddisfare le condizioni stabilite dall'UE in materia di cambiamenti climatici e di legislazione ambientale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004466/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: 2012 Olympics and sustainable development

With less than 100 days to go before the start of the London Olympics, there are still great concerns over some of its key points. The expected influx of 400 000 spectators will be policed by 40 000 security officers; the budget is estimated at EUR 11 000 million, and a further EUR 7 500 million is likely to be spent on modernising the public transport network, which is the city's Achilles heel.

Despite the colossal facilities built for the Olympic Games, whose longer-term aim is to revitalise an entire area left largely to decay, an opinion poll has shown that 51% of Londoners do not believe that the money spent on the event will be recouped. This view is further supported by statistics published in *Capital Economics*, which suggest that the long-term growth generated by the Olympics will be less than 1% of GDP. At present, about 1 500 UK companies have been awarded procurement contracts. While an estimated 300 000 jobs have been created by the event, these are accounted for by temporary fixed-term contracts, and unemployment figures may therefore swell once the organisational requirements of the Games have been fulfilled.

According to Prime Minister David Cameron, the London Games will be 'green' and founded on eco-sustainability. This is hard to believe in the face of the evidence to the contrary. Some facilities have been built only for the Games and will be dismantled after 12 August. Materials that cannot be recycled will accordingly have to be disposed of. In addition, emission levels will be pushed up by the roughly 3 million extra journeys on top of the normal daily total of 12 million.

Given that the EU has committed itself to reducing its greenhouse gas emissions by 20% by 2020, how does the Commission view the pollution generated by the Olympic Games?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(12 June 2012)

The European Commission welcomes the UK's stated commitment to organise a sustainable 2012 Olympic Games. While an event of this magnitude inevitably presents challenges in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, and the environment generally, the obligation to meet the requirements laid down in EU climate change and environmental legislation remains for the UK and all Member States.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004467/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Inquinamento marino e responsabilità dei governi

Nonostante vi siano controlli più rigorosi, ancora troppi rifiuti finiscono in mare causando gravi danni sia alle specie animali e vegetali marine sia all'uomo.

Gli ambientalisti, i rappresentanti di OSPAR, le 15 nazioni costiere e insulari europee chiedono una riduzione del volume dei rifiuti immessi in mare del 50 % entro il 2020.

Gli Stati membri sono già al lavoro per presentare entro il prossimo luglio i programmi d'azione nazionali che descriveranno i provvedimenti da adottare nell'ambito della direttiva quadro sulla strategia per l'ambiente marino. In verità, l'inquinamento delle acque è già ampiamente monitorato per evitare la perdita di biodiversità e porre un freno allo scarico dei rifiuti in mare.

Tuttavia, negli ultimi mesi abbiamo assistito a non pochi incidenti che hanno causato perdite di greggio e di altro materiale inquinante in mare. Ancora troppo spesso si vedono nuove immagini di coste rovinate dal petrolio che provoca danni ingenti all'habitat di molti pesci, uccelli e piante. Un altro inquinante marino per eccellenza è la plastica, che rappresenta un grave rischio anche per la salute umana visto che potrebbe entrare nella catena alimentare.

Considerato che c'è ancora una lunga strada da percorrere per ripulire i nostri fondali marini ed evitare ulteriore inquinamento, chiedo alla Commissione se intenda esortare i governi a verificare in maniera efficace che lo smaltimento dei rifiuti delle imbarcazioni avvenga prima che esse lascino i porti, e a potenziare le campagne di sensibilizzazione dei cittadini sul tema dell'inquinamento marino.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(28 giugno 2012)

L'inquinamento marino può assumere molteplici forme. Per quanto concerne le campagne di sensibilizzazione sull'argomento, la Commissione sta avviando diverse iniziative. Sul tema dei rifiuti marini, ad esempio, ha pubblicato un opuscolo e lanciato un esaustivo sito internet (www.ec.europa.eu/environment/marine). Con la prossima pubblicazione del Libro verde, che sarà corredato da un documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione sui rifiuti marini, la Commissione promuoverà poi il dibattito pubblico sui rifiuti plastici. La Commissione sta altresì discutendo con le parti interessate l'ipotesi di istituire una giornata annuale di pulizia delle coste europee, nel corso della quale si svolgerebbero attività a livello locale. Il progetto MARLISCO, finanziato nell'ambito del programma «Scienza nella società» del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo, mira a sensibilizzare sull'impatto che i comportamenti umani possono avere sulla produzione di rifiuti e sull'ambiente marino. Inoltre, l'attuazione della direttiva 2000/59/CE ([1]) sugli impianti portuali di raccolta per i rifiuti prodotti dalle navi e i residui del carico, nella sua versione modificata, ha contribuito ad aumentare la quantità di rifiuti delle imbarcazioni raccolti nei porti e a migliorare le pratiche di gestione dei rifiuti. Alla luce di una valutazione complessiva della situazione, la Commissione sta attualmente valutando la possibilità di procedere alla revisione della legislazione in materia, al fine di migliorare ulteriormente la gestione dei rifiuti prodotti dalle navi nei porti e la protezione dell'ambiente marino.

([1]) GU L 332 del 28.12.2000, pag. 81.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004467/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Marine pollution and government responsibilities

Despite stricter controls, an excessive amount of refuse still ends up in the sea, causing serious damage to marine flora and fauna, as well as to man.

Environmentalists and representatives of OSPAR, the 15 European coastal and island nations, are demanding a 50% reduction in the volume of refuse dumped in the sea by 2020.

Member States are already working to present national action programmes by next July, setting out the measures to take within the context of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive. Water pollution is already, in fact, being monitored closely enough to avoid biodiversity loss and to stem the dumping of waste at sea.

However, over the last few months there have been a large number of accidents resulting in crude oil and other pollutants being dispersed into the sea. Coastline are still all too often being damaged by oil, which occasions severe damage to the habitats of many fish, birds and plants. Another major marine pollutant is plastic, which also constitutes a serious risk to human health as it can enter the food chain.

Since there is still a long way to go to before the seabed is clean and further pollution is avoided, can the Commission state whether it will urge Member State governments to check effectively that the disposal of waste from ships takes place before they leave port, and to step up campaigns to raise the awareness of the issue of marine pollution among the public.

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

Marine pollution comes in many forms. With regard to public campaigns the Commission is taking several initiatives. On marine litter for instance, it has distributed a flyer and launched a comprehensive website (www.ec.europa.eu/environment/marine). The Commission will also stimulate public debate on plastic waste via a forthcoming Green Paper which will be accompanied by a commission staff working paper on marine litter. We are discussing with relevant stakeholders the setting up of an annual European coastal clean-up day under which local activities take place. The MARLISCO project, sponsored under the 'Science in Society' programme in the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, aims at increasing the awareness of the consequences of societal behaviour in relation to waste production and the marine environment. Also, the implementation of Directive 2000/59/EC ([1]) on port reception facilities for ship-generated waste and cargo residues, as amended, has contributed to increasing the amounts of ship's waste collected in ports and to improving waste management practices. Taking stock of the situation, the Commission is currently considering a revision of this legislation in order to further improve flow of ships' waste in ports and achieve a greater protection of the marine environment.

([1]) OJ L 332, 28.12.2000, p. 81-90.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004469/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Casa passiva, fonte di energia per auto elettrica

Una casa è definita «passiva» quando mantiene condizioni di benessere termico senza ricorrere a impianti di riscaldamento convenzionali e ha bassissimi consumi energetici, grazie a sistemi d'isolamento e allo sfruttamento dell'energia solare e di altre fonti di energia alternative.

Per la costruzione di una casa passiva si utilizzano generalmente materiali naturali, quali ad esempio il legno. Nate in Svezia, le case passive sono diffuse principalmente in Nord Europa: Germania, Austria e Olanda sono capofila.

Il comportamento della casa passiva, come è già stato verificato, è efficace. Resta solo da prendere esempio dagli esperimenti pilota, numerosi anche in Italia, per realizzare una sempre migliore efficienza — non soltanto dal punto di vista energetico, ma anche dal punto di vista economico — che ancora crea difficoltà per la diffusione a larga scala di questo tipo di edilizia. Anche la Francia, patria di 59 reattori nucleari, si sta impegnando nella promozione di una politica per l'energia a basso costo e ha realizzato un prototipo di casa passiva in grado di dare energia anche all'auto elettrica. Fulcro della casa è la domotica in grado di gestire e controllare la produzione e il consumo di energia, grazie a sistemi di recupero dell'acqua piovana e al controllo delle emissioni di CO_2.

Tutto ciò premesso, sono a chiedere alla Commissione europea quali misure intenda adottare per la realizzazione di questi prototipi sostenibili e rinnovabili, in grado di rispettare l'ambiente in una prospettiva di lungo periodo.

Risposta di Guenther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

Il principale strumento legislativo dell'UE nel settore, la direttiva 2010/31/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sulla prestazione energetica nell'edilizia ([1]), impone agli Stati membri di garantire che entro il 31 dicembre 2020 tutti gli edifici di nuova costruzione siano edifici a energia quasi zero, ossia edifici ad elevatissima efficienza energetica. La scadenza per adempiere a tale requisito è stata anticipata al 31 dicembre 2018 per gli edifici di nuova costruzione occupati da enti pubblici. La direttiva impone inoltre agli Stati membri di elaborare piani nazionali destinati ad aumentare il numero di edifici a energia quasi zero (che includono sia gli edifici di nuova costruzione sia quelli già esistenti).

La Commissione offre il proprio sostegno alle case passive già dal 1992 ma anche agli edifici ecologici ed ai distretti per l'energia sostenibile (www.concerto.eu). Nell'ambito del programma EIE (Energia intelligente per l'Europa) messo a punto dall'Istituto per la casa passiva, la Commissione ha di recente lanciato il progetto PassREg, progetto rivolto alle regioni pioniere che sostengono già attivamente e con successo il «principio della casa passiva». Nel rendere i loro successi più visibili e per agevolare l'applicazione della direttiva del 2010 sulla prestazione energetica nell'edilizia, il progetto intende aiutare altre regioni a diventare anch'esse pioniere nel settore.

Con l'iniziativa «Città e comunità intelligenti» ([2]) la Commissione adotta una metodologia di più ampio respiro, esplorando e promuovendo i collegamenti fra edifici dall'elevato rendimento energetico, la mobilità elettrica, le fonti di energia rinnovabili a livello locale, l'approvvigionamento energetico, l'accumulo d'energia, l'energia ricavata dai rifiuti e da altro, la pianificazione innovativa su ampia scala assieme a modelli commerciali innovativi da riprodurre su ampia scala. Al momento sono in atto negoziati su nove progetti dimostrativi che coinvolgono 29 città ed interlocutori del mondo dell'industria, della finanza e della ricerca (contributo globale dell'UE: circa 75 milioni di EUR).

([1]) GU L 153 del 18.10.2010, pag. 13 e successive. http://ec.europa.eu/energy/efficiency/buildings/buildings_en.htm
([2]) http://www.smart-cities.eu/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004469/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: The passive house: an energy source for electric cars

A house is defined as 'passive' when it maintains comfortable levels of heat without resorting to conventional heating systems and has very low energy consumption, through insulation systems, use of solar power and other alternative energy sources.

Passive houses are normally built using natural materials, such as wood. The passive house was invented in Sweden and is most widespread in Northern Europe, with Germany, Austria and the Netherlands leading the way.

It has already been confirmed that the passive house is efficient. Now we just need to act on the example set by trials, many of which can also be seen in Italy, to achieve ever greater efficiency, not only from the energy viewpoint, but also in financial terms, which still creates difficulties for the large-scale dissemination of this type of housing. Even France, home to 59 nuclear reactors, is busy promoting low-cost energy policies and has produced a passive house prototype that can also charge electric cars. The house revolves around a home automation system that manages and controls energy production and consumption through rainwater recovery systems and monitoring of CO_2 emissions.

In view of the above, I would ask the European Commission what steps it intends to take to implement these sustainable and renewable prototypes that will respect the environment in the long term.

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The EU's main legislative tool in this area, the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive 2010/31/EU ([1]), requires Member States to ensure that by 31 December 2020 all new buildings are nearly zero-energy buildings, defined as a building that has a very high energy performance. This requirement is advanced to 31 December 2018 for new buildings occupied and owned by public authorities. In addition, the directive requires Member States to develop national plans for increasing the number of nearly zero-energy buildings (covering both new & existing buildings).

The Commission has been supporting passive houses since 1992, then eco-buildings and then sustainable energy districts (www.concerto.eu). The Commission has recently launched, in the framework of the Intelligent Energy Europe programme and headed by the Passive House Institute, the 'PassREg project'. This project looks to front-runner regions already actively and successfully supporting the 'passive house principle'. By making their successes more visible and to facilitate the implementation of the EU's 2010 Energy Performance of Buildings Directive, the project aims to help other aspiring regions to become front-runners themselves.

In the Smart Cities and Communities Initiative ([2]) the Commission takes a wider approach and explores and promotes the connections between energy-efficient buildings, e-mobility, local renewable energy sources, energy supply, energy storage, energy from waste, etc., innovative large-scale planning together with innovative business models for large-scale replication. Nine demonstration projects involving 29 cities and partners from industry, finance and research are currently being negotiated (total EU contribution: ca. EUR 75 million).

([1]) OJ L 153, 18.10.2010, p. 13 and following. http://ec.europa.eu/energy/efficiency/buildings/buildings_en.htm
([2]) http://www.smart-cities.eu/.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004470/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Filtri solari dannosi per la salute

Le creme solari sono importanti per la protezione della pelle dai danni indotti dai raggi ultravioletti. Il loro uso è indispensabile per prevenire alcuni tumori della pelle come gli epiteliomi basocellulari e squamocellulari che sono provocati dall'esposizione solare accumulata negli anni.

Tuttavia, la presenza di nanoparticelle fa sorgere dei dubbi sulla tossicità di alcuni filtri solari. In particolare, l'ossido e il biossido di zinco, sostanze minerali molto usate negli schermi solari, potrebbero penetrare nei tessuti umani attraverso i cheratinociti della pelle.

La grandezza delle suddette sostanze è stata ridotta notevolmente per permettere la produzione di creme solari trasparenti sulla pelle e non più pastose e biancastre come una volta. La consistenza del prodotto però potrebbe provocare danni alla salute dell'uomo dal momento che tali nanoparticelle, dalle dimensioni che vanno dai 200 agli 8 nanometri di diametro, potrebbero penetrare nei tessuti e raggiungere altri organi.

Al momento non vi sono certezze sulla tossicità di questi ingredienti. È evidente che è necessario uno studio approfondito sulla questione. Considerato che l'uso di alcune nanoparticelle di composti minerali è stato recentemente limitato a livello europeo, chiedo alla Commissione se intenda tutelare la salute dei cittadini europei facendo luce sulla tossicità di queste sostanze e regolamentando il loro impiego nei cosmetici e nei filtri solari.

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

Ai sensi della direttiva 76/768/CEE (direttiva «Cosmetici») ([1]) possono essere immessi sul mercato solo prodotti sicuri; l'uso di coloranti, conservanti e filtri UV dev'essere esplicitamente autorizzato. Poste queste premesse, sono attualmente oggetto di esame da parte del comitato scientifico della sicurezza dei consumatori (CSSC) 4 nanofiltri UV: il biossido di titanio, l'ossido di zinco, l'ETH50 e l'HAA 299.

Il regolamento (CE) n. 1223/2009 ([2]) sui prodotti cosmetici è il primo strumento giuridico della UE a introdurre norme specifiche sui nanomateriali; entrerà in vigore in data 11 luglio 2013.

Coloranti, conservanti e filtri UV continueranno a essere autorizzati attraverso il loro inserimento nell'elenco di cui agli allegati del regolamento. Per cosmetici contenenti nanomateriali destinati ad altre funzioni sarà tuttavia necessaria una notifica pre-commercializzazione; ciò permetterà alla Commissione di impedire la vendita di prodotti contenenti nanomateriali, laddove esistano dubbi sulla loro sicurezza.

Le nuove disposizioni comprendono anche:

a) una definizione flessibile e specifica per settore di un nanomateriale;

b) un obbligo di etichettatura;

c) un'attenzione particolare ai nanomateriali all'atto della valutazione dei rischi presentati sia da sostanze che da prodotti finiti;

d) l'obbligo per la Commissione di pubblicare entro il 2014 un catalogo dei nanomateriali usati nei cosmetici nonché relazioni annuali che illustrino le nuove tendenze nell'uso dei nanomateriali.

La Commissione sta inoltre preparando una comunicazione relativa a un secondo esame della regolamentazione sui nanomateriali, che dovrà trovare anche una risposta alla definizione orizzontale di nanomateriale, risalente all'ottobre 2011, e i modi per effettuare un'adeguata valutazione della sicurezza.

([1]) GU L 262 del 27.9.1976.
([2]) GU L 342 del 22.12.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004470/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Sunscreens harmful to health

Sunscreens are important to protect the skin against damage caused by ultraviolet rays. Their use is essential to prevent some skin cancers such as basal cell and squamous cell epitheliomas, which are caused by exposure to the sun over a period of years.

Nevertheless, the presence of nanoparticles has raised doubts about the toxicity of some sunscreens. In particular, zinc oxide and dioxide, mineral substances which are frequently used in sunblocks, can penetrate human tissue through the keratinocytes in the skin.

The size of these substances has been reduced, in particular to enable the production of sun cream which is transparent on the skin and no longer pasty and white as it was in the past. The product's consistency could, however, cause damage to human health because these nanoparticles, which vary in size from 200 to 8 nanometres in diameter, could penetrate into the tissues and reach other organs.

At the moment, there are no certainties about the toxicity of these ingredients. An in-depth study on this issue is clearly necessary. Considering that the use of some nanoparticles with mineral ingredients has recently been limited at a European level, I would ask the Commission if it intends to safeguard the health of European citizens by shedding light on the toxicity of these substances and regulating their use in cosmetics and sunblocks.

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

According to Council Directive 76/768/EEC (Cosmetics Directive) ([1]) only safe products may be placed on the market; the use of colorants, preservatives and UV-filters has to be explicitly authorised. In this framework, four nano UV-filters are currently under assessment by the Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety (SCCS), namely titanium dioxide, zinc oxide, ETH50 and HAA 299.

Regulation (EC) No1223/2009 (Cosmetics Regulation) ([2]) is the first EU legal instrument to introduce specific rules on nanomaterials, which will become applicable on 11 July 2013.

Colorants, preservatives and UV-filters will continue to be authorised through the listing in the annexes to the regulation. However, for cosmetic products containing nanomaterials for any other functions, a pre-market notification will be necessary which will allow the Commission to take steps to prevent the marketing of a product containing nanomaterials, if there are relevant concerns about its safety.

The new provisions also include:

a) a sector-specific and flexible definition of a nanomaterial;

b) a labelling requirement;

c) a strong emphasis on nanomaterials in the risk assessment, both of substances and of finished products;

d) the obligation for the Commission to publish a catalogue of nanomaterials used in cosmetic products by 2014 and annual status reports on developments in the use of nanomaterials.

In addition, the Commission is currently preparing a communication on a second regulatory review on nanomaterials, which will also analyse how to respond to the horizontal definition of nanomaterials adopted in October 2011 and how to ensure proper safety assessment.

([1]) OJ L 262, 27.9.1976.
([2]) OJ L 342, 22.12.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004471/12
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: The cost of administering EU aid

The UK House of Commons International Development Committee has revealed that the administrative costs of EU aid are twice those of delivering aid through the UK Department for International Development (DFID).

What is the Commission doing to reduce the cost of administering EU aid?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2012)

The administrative costs of Official Development Aid (ODA) managed by the Commission represent 5.4% of total ODA.

The attention of the Honourable Member is drawn to the fact that this percentage may vary from one year to the other due to the lesser elasticity of administrative costs compared to that of actual disbursements on a given year.

Figures concerning administrative costs may also vary considerably if calculation is made on the total ODA including debt relief and multilateral contributions or only on bilateral aid.

The Commission has no indication on the methodology applied by DFID and whether the costs are comparable.

EU administrative costs are calculated following the OECD methodology and include:

— Staff (official and external);

— Infrastructure and associated running costs (e.g.: security);

— Information Technology (e.g.: computers);

— Training, missions;

— Other, e.g.: publications, meetings, studies and technical assistance.

EU assistance is provided to more countries, covers more sectors than most of the other donors and the delegation network is one of the largest in the world, but the EU manages to keep the administrative costs lower than the average administrative costs of the principal donors for bilateral aid.

An assessment of the workload of Commission staff in EU Delegations who are implementing external aid has been conducted in recent months, as a result of which some human resources will be rebalanced among Delegations in order to better optimize the use of staff. Regional hubs may also be created in order to have expertise on budget support issues and some thematic issues as close to the field as possible while also achieving some economies of scale.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004472/12
to the Commission
Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Necessity of amending Article 136 of the TFEU

Is the Commission of the opinion that the amending of Article 136 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), as agreed by the European Council on 16 December 2010, is necessary for the establishment of the European Stability Mechanism?

Answer given by VP Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2012)

The new Article 136(3) is a provision of an interpretative value that provides a useful political clarification. It is however not a legal basis or an authorisation for Member States for adopting measures.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004473/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Πορεία του παραδοσιακού τύπου βιβλίου

Με αφορμή την Παγκόσμια Ημέρα Βιβλίου, στις 23.4.2012. και σε συνδυασμό με τη δυναμική τάση που παρατηρείται στο χώρο του ηλεκτρονικού βιβλίου και της ηλεκτρονικής μελέτης, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Διαθέτει στοιχεία για τα ποσοστά των πολιτών των κρατών μελών που παραμένουν «πιστοί φίλοι» του παραδοσιακού τύπου βιβλίου; Ποια είναι τα σχετικά ποσοστά των ελλήνων αναγνωστών σε σχέση με τους εταίρους τους; Παρατηρεί η Επιτροπή αξιοσημείωτη στροφή των αναγνωστών από τον παραδοσιακό στον ηλεκτρονικό τύπο βιβλίου;

Απάντηση της κας Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Ιουλίου 2012)

Δεν διατίθενται επί του παρόντος επαρκή στατιστικά δεδομένα για τη μέτρηση του αντικτύπου των ηλεκτρονικών βιβλίων στους αναγνώστες και συγκεκριμένα για το ποσοστό των αναγνωστών ηλεκτρονικών βιβλίων στα κράτη μέλη.

Ανεπίσημα στοιχεία σχετικά με τις πωλήσεις και την αύξησή τους συλλέγονται ως επί το πλείστον από ενώσεις της βιομηχανίας και συμβούλους αγοράς. Σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία αυτά, τα επίπεδα αύξησης των πωλήσεων στις ανεπτυγμένες αγορές είναι πολύ υψηλά, αλλά ακόμη και σ' αυτές τις περιπτώσεις το συνολικό μέγεθος των πωλήσεων των ηλεκτρονικών βιβλίων σε σύγκριση με εκείνο των πωλήσεων των έντυπων βιβλίων είναι πολύ μικρό (λιγότερο από 1 % έως 5 % κατ' ανώτατο όριο της αγοράς του βιβλίου).

Τα στοιχεία που συγκεντρώθηκαν μέχρι σήμερα από τις εθνικές ενώσεις εκδοτών δείχνουν ότι οι πωλήσεις ηλεκτρονικών βιβλίων εξακολουθούν να αντιπροσωπεύουν μόνον ένα μικρό ποσοστό (περίπου 1 % για το 2010) των πωλήσεων βιβλίων σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη. Τα στοιχεία για το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο δείχνουν μια ελαφρώς μεγαλύτερη παρουσία στην αγορά (2-3 %).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004473/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Developments in relation to traditional-style books

Prompted by the occasion of the International Day of the Book, on 23 April 2012 and in conjunction with the dynamic trend observed in the electronic book and electronic research fields, we would like to ask the Commission:

Does it possess data on the percentage of citizens in Member States who remain 'faithful friends' of the traditional-style book? What is the relevant percentage of Greek readers in comparison with their counterparts in other Member States? Does the Commission detect any noteworthy turn among readers from traditional-style books to electronic books?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2012)

There is currently insufficient statistical data available to measure the impact of e-books on readers, notably the percentage of readers of e-books in the Member States.

Unofficial figures on sales and growth are mostly collected by commercial industry associations and market consultants. According to these figures rates of growth in the developed markets are very high, but even there the overall size of digital publishing compared to the printed book market is very small (ranging from less than 1% to maximum 5% of the book market).

Figures collected to date by national publishers associations suggest that e-books' sales still make up only a small proportion (around 1% for 2010) of book sales in all Member States. Figures for the United Kingdom suggest a slightly greater market presence (2-3%).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004477/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Συμπόρευση των κρατών μελών με την πρόταση της Επιτροπής για την κοινωνική ενσωμάτωση και την αντιμετώπιση της φτώχειας

Για την περίοδο 2014-2020 η Επιτροπή προτείνει το 20 % τουλάχιστον της χρηματοδότησης του ΕΚΤ σε κάθε κράτος μέλος να διατεθεί για την κοινωνική ενσωμάτωση και τη φτώχεια και κάθε κράτος μέλος να διαθέσει τουλάχιστον το 5 % από τα συνολικά του κονδύλια του ΕΤΠΑ για δράσεις βιώσιμης αστικής ανάπτυξης. Υπενθυμίζεται ότι, στο πλαίσιο του επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος για την ανάπτυξη του ανθρώπινου δυναμικού 2007-2013, το οποίο στην Ελλάδα συγχρηματοδοτείται από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο, ένας άξονας προτεραιότητας, με συνολικό προϋπολογισμό περίπου 274 εκατομμύρια, αφορά την προώθηση της κοινωνικής ενσωμάτωσης και της ένταξης των μη ευνοούμενων ομάδων στην αγορά εργασίας σε μια κοινωνία ίσων ευκαιριών. Ωστόσο, δεν υπάρχει ειδικός προϋπολογισμός που προορίζεται συγκεκριμένα για αυτή την ομάδα-στόχο.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει κατά πόσον τα κράτη μέλη ακολουθούν την πρότασή της και διαθέτουν το 20 % τουλάχιστον της χρηματοδότησης του ΕΚΤ για την κοινωνική ενσωμάτωση και τη φτώχεια και το 5 % τουλάχιστον από τα συνολικά κονδύλια του ΕΤΠΑ για δράσεις βιώσιμης αστικής ανάπτυξης; Ποια τα συγκριτικά αποτελέσματα που προκύπτουν;

2. Ποιες χώρες διακρίνονται για δράσεις για την κοινωνική ομάδα των αστέγων; Ποια είναι τα σχετικά στοιχεία στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας;

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

1. Οι νομοθετικές προτάσεις της Επιτροπής για την πολιτική συνοχής για την περίοδο 2014-2020 προβλέπουν να διατεθεί το 20 % της χρηματοδότησης του ΕΚΤ για το θεματικό στόχο «Προώθηση της κοινωνικής ένταξης και καταπολέμηση της φτώχειας» και τουλάχιστον το 5 % των πόρων του ΕΤΠΑ σε εθνικό επίπεδο για ολοκληρωμένες ενέργειες για τη βιώσιμη αστική ανάπτυξη.

Την περίοδο 2007-2013, οι χορηγήσεις του ΕΚΤ για τη βελτίωση της ίσης πρόσβασης στην απασχόληση, για την αύξηση της συμμετοχής των μεταναστών στην απασχόληση και για την ένταξη των μειονεκτούντων ατόμων στην απασχόληση υπερβαίνουν τα 13,5 δισεκατ. ευρώ ([1]).

Η χρηματοδότηση από το ΕΤΠΑ που διατίθεται σήμερα για την αστική ανάπτυξη είναι γενικά υψηλότερη από 5 % (οι χορηγήσεις την περίοδο 2007-2013 ανέρχονται σε 7 %). Δεδομένου ότι οι αστικές περιοχές ωφελούνται και από επενδύσεις σε άλλους τομείς (π.χ. ΜΜΕ, έρευνα) οι πραγματικές δαπάνες είναι πολύ υψηλότερες. Ωστόσο, τα στοιχεία δεν είναι άμεσα συγκρίσιμα, δεδομένου ότι η πρόταση της Επιτροπής προβλέπει την άμεση συμμετοχή των πόλεων στην υλοποίηση των ολοκληρωμένων ενεργειών για τη βιώσιμη αστική ανάπτυξη. Το κριτήριο αυτό δεν αντικατοπτρίζεται στο σημερινό σύστημα παρακολούθησης.

2. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει στη διάθεσή της ακριβή ή συγκρίσιμα στοιχεία σχετικά με τις δράσεις υπέρ των αστέγων. Η Επιτροπή αναμένει ότι τα αποτελέσματα της έρευνας για τη χαρτογράφηση της φτώχειας στην ΕΕ που ξεκίνησε στις αρχές του έτους θα προσφέρει ιδιαίτερα χρήσιμα στοιχεία σχετικά με την αστεγία. Το πεδίο εφαρμογής του ΕΚΤ δεν περιλαμβάνει άμεσες δράσεις για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος των αστέγων στο πλαίσιο των στόχων «σύγκλισης» και «περιφερειακής ανταγωνιστικότητας και απασχόλησης». Ωστόσο, οι άστεγοι θα μπορούσαν να επωφεληθούν από τα μέτρα για την ένταξη των μειονεκτουσών ομάδων στην κοινωνία και στην αγορά εργασίας στο πλαίσιο του τρέχοντος προγράμματος για την ανάπτυξη του ανθρώπινου δυναμικού.

Συγκεκριμένα στοιχεία για την υλοποίηση μπορείτε να βρείτε στη διαχειριστική αρχή ([2]).

([1]) Βλέπε: http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/emplweb/esf_budgets/results.cfm για στοιχεία ανά κράτος μέλος.

([2]) Διαχειριστική αρχή του επιχειρησιακού προγράμματος για την ανάπτυξη των ανθρώπινων πόρων, Κοραή 4, GR-106 64 Αθήνα.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004477/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Member States' compliance with Commission recommendation concerning social inclusion and combating poverty

For the period 2014-2020, the Commission recommends that each Member State should allocate at least 20% of ECB funding to social inclusion and poverty and at least 5% of total ERDF funds to sustainable urban development actions. It is recalled that a key priority of the Operational Programme for Human Resources Development 2007-2013 which, in Greece, is funded by the European Social Fund, is the promotion of social inclusion and the integration of the least privileged groups into the labour market in a society based on equal opportunities, with a total budget of around EUR 274 million. However, there is no specific budget allocated for this target group.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission say to what extent Member States are implementing its proposal, allocating at least 20% of ECB funding to social inclusion and poverty and at least 5% of total ERDF funds to sustainable urban development actions? What are the comparative results arising from this?

2. Which Member States stand out for actions concerning homeless social groups? What are the relevant data in the case of Greece?

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

1. The Commission's legislative proposals for cohesion policy 2014-2020 foresee to allocate 20% of ESF funding to the thematic objective 'promoting social inclusion and combating poverty' and at least 5% of the ERDF resources at national level to integrated actions for sustainable urban development.

In 2007-2013, ESF allocations to improving equal access to employment, increasing migrants' participation in employment and integrating disadvantaged people into employment amount to over EUR 13.5 billion ([1]).

ERDF-funding currently allocated to urban development is generally higher than 5% (2007-2013 allocations amount to 7%). As urban areas also benefit from investments in other areas (e.g. SMEs, research) actual spending is therefore much higher. Figures are not directly comparable, however, since the Commission proposal foresees a direct involvement of the cities in the implementation of the integrated actions for sustainable urban development. This criterion is not reflected in the current monitoring system.

2. The Commission does not have precise or comparative data concerning actions in favour of homeless social groups. The Commission expects that the results of the EU poverty mapping survey launched earlier this year will provide particularly useful data concerning homelessness. The scope of the ESF does not include direct actions tackling the problem of homelessness as part of the Convergence and Regional Competitiveness and Employment objectives. However, homeless people could benefit from social and labour market inclusion measures for disadvantaged groups under the current Human Resources Development programme. Specific implementation data can be obtained from the managing authority ([2]).

([1]) cf. http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/emplweb/esf_budgets/results.cfm for national breakdowns.
([2]) Managing Authority for Human Resources Development OP, Korai Street 4, GR-106 64 Athens.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-004480/12
alla Commissione
Tiziano Motti (PPE)
(27 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Benessere degli animali e rilevanza europea del randagismo

Nel testo della risposta E-010483/2011 che la Commissione ha dato all'interrogazione «Traffico clandestino di cani italiani», si legge che «Non esiste una normativa UE per la protezione dei cani randagi, la loro sterilizzazione o registrazione. Il modo in cui gli Stati membri applicano la legislazione nazionale in materia non rientra fra le competenze dell'UE e rimane di esclusiva competenza degli Stati membri».

La Convenzione europea per la protezione degli animali da compagnia, del 13 novembre 1987, dispone precise misure di sterilizzazione come metodo di prevenzione per prevenire l'incontrollata riproduzione dei randagi. Non tutti gli Stati membri del Consiglio d'Europa hanno firmato la suddetta convenzione. Il TFUE, all'art. 13, definisce tuttavia gli animali come «esseri senzienti». Il trattato di Lisbona è stato firmato e ratificato da TUTTI gli Stati membri, ivi comprese la Romania e la Spagna, dove si stanno perpetrando veri e propri stermini dei cani randagi.

Il randagismo è un fenomeno in crescita, una piaga in continuo deterioramento in tutta l'Europa. L'animale lasciato solo non è capace di procacciarsi il cibo e spesso muore di fame e di sete oppure investito da veicoli in transito. Alcuni animali, abbandonati perché vecchi o malati, non hanno alcuna possibilità di sopravvivere.

In Europa vi sono circa 120 milioni di animali randagi, e solo l'adozione di strategie politiche a livello UE relative alla gestione della popolazione canina ed alla promozione di una cura degli animali responsabile permetterà di tenere sotto controllo il fenomeno. La crescita incontrollata della popolazione canina e la mancanza di standard comuni per la gestione della popolazione canina nell'UE è una minaccia per la salute della stessa popolazione canina ed eventualmente umana, con il rischio di diffusione di malattie dai cani ad altri animali con loro grande sofferenza e senza accesso alle dovute cure in quanto animali senzienti.

Rispetto alla competenza dell'UE in materia di gestione della salute umana degli animali quali esseri senzienti e dei cittadini, qual è la posizione della Commissione europea verso i rischi di diffusione di malattie trasmissibili tra gli animali randagi, che, alla luce dell'interrogazione sopracitata, vengono trasportati illegalmente da uno Stato all'altro? Ritiene la Commissione che Stati quali la Romania, la Spagna, con i loro stermini di massa documentati da varie associazioni internazionali animaliste ed avallati dalle stesse autorità locali con decisioni politiche, non infrangano l'art. 13 del trattato di Lisbona? Qual è, secondo la Commissione, il senso del principio finalmente introdotto nel trattato di Lisbona all'art. 13, alla luce del comportamento di non applicazione da parte di alcuni Stati membri? Non ritiene la Commissione necessario aprire una procedura d'infrazione contro gli Stati che non applicano tale articolo?

Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(31 maggio 2012)

In aggiunta alla propria precedente risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-10483/2011 ([1]), la Commissione desidera specificare che la convenzione europea per la protezione degli animali da compagnia non rientra nello strumentario normativo dell'UE.

In relazione all'articolo 13 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, la Commissione desidera rinviare l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-6543/2011 ([2]).

Per quanto concerne i rischi per la salute umana associati all'espansione incontrollata della popolazione canina, la Commissione non ha ricevuto prove scientifiche sostanziali atte a giustificare un'iniziativa generale a livello di UE.

Il progetto di ricerca dell'UE denominato CALLISTO ([3]) consiste nel fare una panoramica del ruolo degli animali da compagnia quali fonte di malattie infettive per le persone e per gli animali destinati alla produzione alimentare. I risultati di questo progetto dovrebbero essere disponibili entro la fine del 2014.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004480/12
to the Commission
Tiziano Motti (PPE)
(27 April 2012)

Subject: Animal welfare and the size of the European stray animal population

The Commission's reply to Written Question E-010483/2011 concerning 'Clandestine trafficking in dogs in Italy' states that 'There is no EU legislation on the protection of stray dogs, on sterilisation and registration of dogs. The way Member States implement national legislation on these matters is not under the competencies of the EU and remains under the sole competence of the Member States'.

The European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals, of 13 November 1987, provides for precise sterilisation measures as a way of preventing the uncontrolled reproduction of stray dogs. Not all the Member States of the Council of Europe have signed this convention. However, Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union defines animals as 'sentient beings'. The Treaty of Lisbon has been signed and ratified by ALL the Member States, including Romania and Spain, where veritable exterminations of stray dogs are being carried out.

Stray dogs are a growing problem and a constantly worsening nuisance throughout Europe. Animals left to their own devices are unable to obtain food for themselves and often die of hunger and thirst, or are run over by passing vehicles. Some animals, abandoned because they are old or sick, have no chance of survival.

There are approximately 120 million stray animals in Europe, and only the adoption of political strategies at EU level for managing the canine population and promoting the responsible care of animals can bring this problem under control. The uncontrolled growth of the canine population and the lack of common standards for its management in the EU is a threat to the health of the canine population itself, and possibly the human population as well, with the risk of diseases spreading from dogs to other animals, causing them great suffering and without access to the treatment to which they are entitled as sentient beings.

As regards the competence of the EU for the humane management of the health of animals as sentient beings, and for the health of citizens, what is the Commission's position regarding the risks of the spread of transmissible diseases among stray dogs, which, with reference to the question mentioned above, are being illegally trafficked from one state to another? Does the Commission not consider that states such as Romania and Spain, with their mass exterminations documented by various international animal welfare bodies and backed by political decisions on the part of the local authorities themselves, are an infringement of Article 13 of the Treaty of Lisbon? What, in the Commission's opinion, is the point of the principle finally introduced into Article 13 of the Treaty of Lisbon, given the failure by certain Member States to apply it? Does the Commission not consider it necessary to open infringement proceedings against the states that are failing to apply this article?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2012)

In addition to its previous reply to Written Question E-10483/2011 ([1]), the Commission would like to specify that the European convention for the protection of pet animals is not part of the EU set of rules.

In relation to Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-6543/2011 ([2]).

In relation to the human health risks associated with the uncontrolled growth of the dog population, the Commission has not received substantial scientific evidence that could justify an overall initiative at EU level.

The EU research project CALLISTO ([3]) is to provide an overview with regard to the role of companion animals, as a source of infectious diseases for people and food animals. The results of this project are expected by the end of 2014.

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

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004481/12
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(2. maj 2012)

Om: Opfølgende spørgsmål til P-003149/2012

Kommissionen har i et svar på undertegnedes spørgsmål, som blev stillet d. 22. marts 2012 (P-003149/2012), gjort det klart at, den fuldt ud overholder artikel 153 i traktaten om Den Europæiske Unions funktionsmåde, og samtidig gør det klart, at den ikke på nogen måde vil påvirke friheden eller retten til at strejke, som er anerkendt i medlemsstaterne.

Medlemsstaterne skal dog fortsat videregive informationer vedrørende »aktioner og situationer« til Kommissionen ifølge dens forslag (KOM(2012)0130 — 2012/0064(APP)) til en varslingsmekanisme.

Som opfølgende spørgsmål bedes Kommissionen redegøre for, hvad de oplysninger, som medlemslandene skal videregive til den, så helt konkret skal bruges til?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor
(19. juni 2012)

Medlemsstaterne skal indsende relevante oplysninger om de situationer, der er beskrevet i Kommissionens svar på spørgsmål P-3149/2012 ([1]). Begrundelsen for at afgive oplysninger til andre berørte medlemsstater og Kommissionen er at skabe gensidig tillid og en bedre forståelse af de faktiske og retlige forhold og ikke at skabe hindringer for udøvelsen af retten til at strejke.

Kommissionen henleder det ærede medlems opmærksomhed på eksemplerne i dens beretning ([2]) om anvendelsen af forordning (EF) nr. 2679/98 ([3]) og den eksterne evalueringsrapport ([4]) om det indre markeds funktion.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp
([2]) Beretning fra Kommissionen til Rådet og Europa-Parlamentet om anvendelsen af forordning (EF) nr. 2679/98 (KOM(2001)0160 endelig af 22. marts 2001).
([3]) Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 2679/98 af 7. december 1998 om det indre markeds funktion med hensyn til fri bevægelighed for varer mellem medlemsstaterne (EFT L 337 af 12.12.1998, s. 8).
([4]) »Evaluation of the functioning of Regulation (EC) No 2679/98 of 7 December 1998 on the functioning of the internal market in relation to the free movement of goods among the Member States«, endelig rapport udarbejdet af GHK og Technopolis, 5. december 2007, kan findes på følgende websted: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/files/goods/docs/regl267998/finalreport-051207_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004481/12
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Follow-up question to Question P-003149/2012

In its answer to my question of 22 March 2012 (P-003149/2012), the Commission made it clear that it fully respects Article 153 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and also that it will not in any way impede the freedom or right to strike that is acknowledged by the Member States.

However, according to the Commission's proposal (COM(2012)0130 — 2012/0064(APP)) for an alert mechanism, Member States will still have to pass on information on actions and situations to the Commission.

As a follow-up question, can the Commission explain what information Member States will be required to pass on and what it will be used for?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(19 June 2012)

Member States will be required to submit information relevant to the situations outlined in the Commission's answer to Question P-3149/2012 ([1]). The reason for providing the information to other Member States concerned and to the Commission is to create mutual trust and better understanding of the factual and legal situation at stake, and not obstacles to the exercise of the right to strike.

The Commission would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the examples given in its report ([2]) on the application of Regulation (EC) No 2679/98 ([3]) and the external evaluation report ([4]) on the functioning of the internal market.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp
([2]) Report from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on the application of Regulation (EC) No 2679/98 (COM(2001) 160 final of 22 March 2001).
([3]) Council Regulation (EC) No 2679/98 of 7 December 1998 on the functioning of the internal market in relation to the free movement of goods among the Member States, OJ L 337, 12.12.1998, p. 8.
([4]) 'Evaluation of the functioning of Regulation (EC) No 2679/98 of 7 December 1998 on the functioning of the internal market in relation to the free movement of goods among the Member States', Final Report submitted by GHK and Technopolis, 5 December 2007, at: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/single-market-goods/files/goods/docs/regl267998/finalreport-051207_en.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004482/12
aan de Commissie
Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE)
(2 mei 2012)

Betreft: NAIADES

Op 9 juni 2010 heeft het Europees Parlement ingestemd met het verslag over de toekomst van het vervoer in Europa van Matthieu Grosch, waarin concrete aanbevelingen geformuleerd staan inzake de ontwikkeling van de Europese binnenvaart.

Vervolgens is er op 29 november 2011 door het Europees Parlement ingestemd met het Witboek Toekomst van het Vervoer, waarin is verzocht om werk te maken van de voortzetting van het NAIADES-programma.

De Commissie zou medio 2011 met een mededeling komen, maar deze is tot op heden nog steeds niet verschenen.

Wegens de tijd die het opstellen van een mededeling in beslag neemt, zou de Commissie ondertussen werk maken van een stafdocument voorafgaand aan de officiële mededeling.

Dit document was voor januari dit jaar gepland, maar is ook nog steeds niet af.

Het Europees Parlement hecht bijzonder veel belang aan de voorzetting van het

NAIADES-programma in de periode 2014-2020. Hierbij is het noodzakelijk dat er rekening wordt gehouden met voldoende (financiële) middelen om het programma ook daadwerkelijk te implementeren.

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven waarom het NAIADES-stafdocument én de Mededeling vertraging oplopen?

2. Kan de Commissie een indicatie geven wanneer stafdocument en Mededeling klaar zijn en gepubliceerd zullen worden?

3. De debatten rondom het MFK zijn momenteel gaande. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat de vertraging van de publicatie geen gevolg heeft voor de financiering van NAIADES 2014-2020?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(6 juni 2012)

De Commissie kan het geachte Parlementslid verzekeren dat zij een hoge prioriteit toekent aan de herziening van NAIADES en de lopende uitvoering ervan.

1. Het klopt dat de Commissie aanvankelijk een afzonderlijke rechtsgrondslag voor de financiering van NAIADES heeft overwogen, waarvoor het nodig was om de herziening van NAIADES af te stemmen op de vaststelling van het meerjarig financieel kader voor de periode 2014-2020. Het meerjarig financieel kader voorziet echter in een bredere aanpak, waarbij bestaande sectorale financieringsinstrumenten opgaan in bredere, multisectorale instrumenten. Een afzonderlijke rechtsgrondslag voor NAIADES was daardoor niet meer aan de orde. Aangezien het huidige NAIADES-programma nog tot 2013 loopt, is er geen reden meer om het programma nog te herzien. Daarnaast heeft de Commissie zich geconcentreerd op het overbruggen van de kloof tussen de steun in het kader van de huidige NAIADES I-initiatieven, die in 2012 eindigt, en de voorziene start in 2014 van nieuwe initiatieven in het kader van het meerjarig financieel kader.

2. De Commissie heeft aanzienlijke vorderingen gemaakt met de voorbereiding van het werkdocument, dat naar verwachting begin juni 2012 zal worden gepubliceerd. In het werkdocument is de aanpak uitgestippeld voor de mededeling, die in 2013 zou moeten worden aangenomen.

3. De NAIADES II-mededeling zal voortbouwen op de instrumenten van het meerjarig financieel kader die momenteel het wetgevingsproces doorlopen, in het bijzonder op de financieringsfaciliteit voor Europese verbindingen en HORIZON 2020. De Commissie is van oordeel dat de sector er baat bij heeft dat NAIADES II wordt afgestemd op de bredere, multisectorale aanpak van deze instrumenten, aangezien er daardoor een bredere basis voor financiële steun ontstaat. Het werkdocument levert ook een bijdrage aan de integratie van NAIADES II in deze instrumenten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004482/12
to the Commission
Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: NAIADES

On 9 June 2010 the European Parliament voted in favour of Matthieu Grosch's report on the future of transport in Europe, which featured specific recommendations on the development of inland waterway transport in Europe.

Then, on 29 November 2011, the European Parliament voted in favour of the Future of Transport White Paper, which called for effective action to continue the NAIADES programme.

The Commission was meant to issue a communication in mid-2011, but this has not yet been published.

It was also expected to produce a staff working document prior to the official Communication, due to the time required to draft an official Communication.

This document was scheduled for January this year, but has still not been completed either.

The European Parliament attaches great importance to continuing the NAIADES programme in the 2014-2020 period. This means that provision must be made for allocating sufficient resources (particularly financial resources) to implement the programme effectively.

1. Can the Commission specify the reason for the delay with both the NAIADES staff working document and the communication?

2. Can the Commission indicate when the staff working document and Communication will be completed and published?

3. Debates concerning the Multiannual Financial Framework are currently under way. Can the Commission confirm that the delay in publication will not have any impact on funding for NAIADES in the 2014-2020 period?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2012)

The Commission can ensure the Honourable Member that it gives a high priority to the review of NAIADES and to its ongoing implementation.

1. It is true that the Commission initially contemplated a separate legal basis for the financing of NAIADES, which necessitated the synchronisation of the revision of NAIADES with the adoption of the 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework. However, in view of the broader approach retained in the Multiannual Financial Framework of consolidating existing sectoral financing instruments into broader multi-sectoral instruments, a separate legal basis for NAIADES was not appropriate any more. As the current NAIADES programme is still ongoing until 2013, the reasons underlying the anticipation of the NAIADES review have disappeared. Furthermore, the Commission has concentrated on bridging the gap between the support under existing NAIADES I initiatives which ends in 2012 and the foreseen start up of new initiatives under the Multiannual Financial Framework starting in 2014.

2. The Commission has made good progress with the preparation of the Staff Working Document which is expected to be published at the beginning of June 2012. The Staff Working Document sets out the approach for the communication which is planned for adoption in 2013.

3. It is foreseen for the NAIADES II Communication to rely on the instruments of the Multiannual Financial Framework currently in the legislative process, in particular the Connecting Europe Facility and HORIZON 2020. The Commission considers that aligning NAIADES II with the broader multi-sectoral approach of these instruments will help the sector as it will broaden the basis for its financial support. The Staff Working Document will also contribute to the integration of NAIADES II into these instruments.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004483/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(2 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Desaparición forzada de Hernán Henry Díaz, líder campesino colombiano: campaña mediática de estigmatización de la «marcha patriótica»

Tal como denuncia la Comisión Nacional de Derechos Humanos del movimiento político colombiano «Marcha Patriótica», el líder campesino de Putumayo (Colombia) y miembro del Consejo Patriótico de este departamento, Hernán Henry Díaz, desapareció el pasado 18 de abril de 2012.

En el momento de su desaparición, Hernán era el encargado de organizar la delegación de más de 200 personas del municipio del valle de Guames para la participación en el lanzamiento del movimiento político «Marcha Patriótica» y la constitución de su Consejo Patriótico Nacional. La última noticia sobre el paradero de este líder campesino indica que se encontraba en la región de Puerto Vega, zona con altos niveles de presencia del ejército.

El contexto y las causas de su desaparición están claramente marcados por la intensa campaña de estigmatización y denigración que están desarrollando miembros del ejército y personas cercanas al gobierno colombiano contra la «Marcha Patriótica» y las personas que, como Hernán, han decidido formar parte de este movimiento político que, entre otros objetivos, busca una solución política negociada al conflicto y el avance en la democratización del Estado y la sociedad civil colombiana. Esta campaña, en la cual se apunta sin prueba alguna a la infiltración del movimiento por parte de las FARC, instiga a la opinión pública a concebir el movimiento como un enemigo y coloca de esta manera a sus miembros como blanco fácil de los grupos paramilitares, deslegitimando y poniendo en riesgo la vida de las cerca de 100 000 personas, pertenecientes a organizaciones sociales, campesinas, afrodescendientes, indígenas, sindicales, de derechos humanos, entre otras, que integran el movimiento político «Marcha Patriótica».

Teniendo en cuenta la importancia que supuestamente tiene para la Unión Europea la garantía de los derechos humanos y el cumplimiento de los principios democráticos ¿se ha dirigido, o piensa dirigirse, la Alta Representante al gobierno colombiano para mostrar su preocupación por la desaparición de este líder campesino y exigir que se investigue?

¿Piensa la Alta Representante interceder ante el gobierno colombiano para que detenga inmediatamente la campaña de estigmatización y desprestigio del movimiento político «Marcha Patriótica» e implemente todos las medidas necesarias para que no se repita lo ocurrido con la Unión Patriótica en los años 80, cuando fueron asesinados 2 candidatos a la Presidencia, 7 congresistas, 13 diputados, 11 alcaldes, 69 concejales y más de 3 000 dirigentes y militantes y hubo más de 1 000 desaparecidos?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de junio de 2012)

Desde hace tiempo, la política de la Unión Europea ha consistido en instar al hallazgo de una solución negociada del conflicto de Colombia. En este contexto, la UE apoya todas las medidas que puedan contribuir a la superación de la polarización de la sociedad colombiana y a reforzar el respeto mutuo y la cooperación entre todos los sectores de la sociedad, así como al reconocimiento del papel legítimo del Gobierno, las fuerzas de la oposición y la sociedad civil. La Unión condena con firmeza el uso de la violencia y ha pedido insistentemente al Gobierno que adopte medidas eficaces para garantizar la seguridad de los sectores vulnerables de la población y de las personas amenazadas.

La UE también es consciente del caso del Sr. Díaz y ha solicitado al Gobierno colombiano que le facilite información adicional sobre las circunstancias del caso y las medidas adoptadas para comprobar su suerte.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004483/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Forced disappearance of Hernán Henry Díaz, leader of Colombian peasant farmers: media campaign to stigmatise the 'patriotic march'

As reported by the National Human Rights Commission of Colombia's 'Patriotic March' political movement, Hernán Henry Díaz, the peasant farmers' leader from Putumayo (Colombia) and member of this region's Patriotic Council, disappeared on 18 April 2012.

At the time of his disappearance, Hernán was in charge of organising a delegation of more than 200 people from the Valle del Guamuez municipality to take part in the launch of the 'Patriotic March' political movement and the formation of the movement's National Patriotic Council. The last reports on Hernán's whereabouts indicate that he was in the Puerto Vega region, an area with a high military presence.

The context surrounding his disappearance, as well as the causes for it, are clearly marked by the intense campaign being conducted by the army and people close to the Colombian government to stigmatise and vilify the 'Patriotic March' and people who, like Hernán, have decided to join this political movement. The movement's objectives include seeking a negotiated political solution to the conflict and progress in the democratisation of the Colombian State and civil society. This campaign — which suggests, without any evidence whatsoever, that the movement has been infiltrated by the FARC — incites public opinion to perceive the movement as an enemy, thereby making its members easy targets for paramilitary groups, and devaluing and endangering the lives of the almost 100 000 people who belong to the social, peasant, Afro-descendant, indigenous, labour and human rights organisations, among others, that make up the 'Patriotic March' political movement.

Given the importance that the safeguard of human rights and compliance with democratic principles supposedly have for the European Union, has the High Representative contacted, or does she plan to contact, the Colombian government to express her concern about the disappearance of this peasant farmers' leader and to demand an investigation?

Does the High Representative intend to intercede with the Colombian government for it to immediately end the campaign to stigmatise and discredit the 'Patriotic March' political movement, and to take all necessary steps to prevent a repetition of what happened to the Patriotic Union in the 1980s, when 2 presidential candidates, 7 congress members, 13 deputies, 11 mayors, 69 councillors and more than 3 000 leaders and activists were killed and more than 1 000 people went missing?

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

It has long been the policy of the European Union to call for a negotiated solution to Colombia's conflict. In this context, the EU supports all measures that can contribute to overcoming the polarisation in Colombian society and to enhance mutual respect and cooperation between all parts of society, and the recognition of the respective legitimate roles of the government, opposition forces and civil society. The Union firmly condemns the use of violence, and has consistently called on the government to take effective measures to ensure the safety of vulnerable parts of the population and of persons under threat.

The EU is also well aware of the case of Mr Díaz. It has requested the Colombian government to provide it with further information on the circumstances of the case and on the measures taken to ascertain his fate.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004484/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(2 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Ομαδικές απολύσεις εργαζομένων της Arcelor Mittal Construction Hellas Α.Ε. (πρώην ΚΟΝΤΙ ΑΒΕΕ) και κοινωνική ευθύνη της Arcelor Mittal

Η εταιρεία Arcelor Mittal Construction Hellas Α.Ε. (πρώην ΚΟΝΤΙ ΑΒΕΕ), θυγατρική της Arcelor Mittal με έδρα τη Γαλλία, που έχει προβεί σε ομαδικές απολύσεις χιλιάδων εργαζομένων σε ευρωπαϊκές χώρες, προέβη σε ομαδικές απολύσεις εργαζομένων στο εργοστάσιο Βόλου, μεταξύ 10.2010-01.2012, ενώ προηγουμένως είχε εξαγγείλει πρόγραμμα εθελούσιας εξόδου. Η εταιρεία δικαιολογεί τις απολύσεις λόγω δυσχερούς οικονομικής κατάστασης που την οδηγεί σε κλείσιμο, κατάσταση που δεν στοιχειοθετείται από τα οικονομικά της στοιχεία. Απεναντίας, πρόσφατα η εταιρεία προέβη σε επαναπροσλήψεις ([1]) πρώην εργαζομένων που είχαν δεχτεί την εθελούσια έξοδο και ασκεί πίεση με διάφορες πρακτικές στους απεργούς και λοιπούς απολυμένους, ενώ φαίνεται να ιδρύει νέα εταιρεία με το όνομα ARCELORMITAL FLAT CARBON S.A. και έδρα στην Αττική, με τον ίδιο σκοπό και τμήμα του παλιού της προσωπικού, όπως επιβεβαιώνεται από την απάντηση του περιφερειάρχη Αττικής σε επιστολή του δημάρχου Βόλου ([2]). Σε βάρος της εταιρείας εκκρεμεί δίκη για παραβίαση της εργατικής νομοθεσίας και κακουργηματική απάτη για εξαπάτηση του Ελληνικού Δημοσίου, κατόπιν μηνυτήριας αναφοράς του Σωματείου Εργαζομένων ([3]) και του ΕΚΒ ([4]), καθώς και δίκη για τις ομαδικές απολύσεις, κατόπιν μηνυτήριας αναφοράς της Επιθεώρησης Εργασίας. Το 2010 διαπιστώθηκε ότι η εταιρεία παραβιάζει τη νομοθεσία για τη διαχείριση των επικίνδυνων αποβλήτων, ενώ, όπως επισημαίνεται σε έκθεση της Greenpeace ([5]), η Arcelor Mittal είναι ανάμεσα στις εταιρείες που εμποδίζουν την πρόοδο για μείωση των εκπομπών CO_2, παρά τις αμέτρητες οικονομικές αναλύσεις που καταδεικνύουν τα μεγάλα οικονομικά οφέλη από μια πιο φιλόδοξη κλιματική πολιτική.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει λάβει η εταιρεία Arcelor Mittal Construction Hellas Α.Ε. κοινοτικές ενισχύσεις και αν ναι, ποιες; Δεσμεύτηκε για τη διατήρηση των θέσεων εργασίας στο πλαίσιο αυτών;

2. Ποιες κοινοτικές ενισχύσεις έχει λάβει η μητρική Arcelor Mittal πανευρωπαϊκά;

3. Αν και πώς μπορεί να δοθεί στήριξη από το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Προσαρμογής στην Παγκοσμιοποίηση (ΕΤΠ) για την επανένταξη στην εργασία των απολυμένων από την εταιρεία;

4. Σκοπεύει να αναπτύξει δεσμευτικό κώδικα κοινωνικής ευθύνης για τις πολυεθνικές εταιρείες, ιδιαίτερα αυτές που δραστηριοποιούνται σε περισσότερες από μία ευρωπαϊκές χώρες;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Ιουνίου 2012)

1. Η ΚΟΝΤΙ Ελληνική Εταιρεία Χάλυβος ΑΒΕΕ έλαβε επιδοτήσεις από το επιχειρησιακό πρόγραμμα βιομηχανίας και υπηρεσιών (αριθ. 94.08.09.021) του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης κατά την περίοδο προγραμματισμού 1994-1999.

Η ArcelorMittal Construction Hellas AE δεν έχει λάβει καμία συνεισφορά από το Ταμείο Έρευνας για τον Άνθρακα και τον Χάλυβα (ΤΕΑΧ), αλλά ούτε και από το 6ο ή το 7ο πρόγραμμα-πλαίσιο (ΠΠ). Επίσης, δεν έχει λάβει καμία συνεισφορά από το επιχειρησιακό πρόγραμμα «Αττική 2007-2013».

2. Σε εταιρικό επίπεδο, η ArcelorMittal έχει λάβει:

— 7 398 177 ευρώ στο πλαίσιο του 6ου ΠΠ

— 732 979 ευρώ στο πλαίσιο του 7ου ΠΠ

— 41 757 313 στο πλαίσιο του ΤΕΑΧ από το 2003 έως το 2012.

([1]) http://www.taxydromos.gr/article.php?id=43734&cat=1.
([2]) http://www.taxydromos.gr/article.php?id=42712&cat=88.
([3]) Σωματείο Εργαζομένων «ΚΟΝΤΙ ΑΒΕΕ ARCELOR MITTAL HELLAS».
([4]) Εργατοϋπαλληλικό Κέντρο Βόλου.
([5]) http://www.greenpeace.org/greece/Global/greece/report/2011/climate/holdback.pdf.

Καμία από τις εταιρείες του ομίλου που βρίσκονται στην ΕΕ δεν έχει λάβει ποτέ κρατικές ενισχύσεις για σκοπούς διάσωσης ή αναδιάρθρωσης κατά τα τελευταία έτη. Οι εταιρείες που έλαβαν πρόσφατα άλλα είδη κρατικών ενισχύσεων είναι: — Η ArcelorMittal Eisenhuettenstadt GmbH, στη Γερμανία, έλαβε 30,18 εκατ. ευρώ περιβαλλοντική ενίσχυση το 2010 για το έργο Top Gas Recycling, η οποία βασίζεται στο εγκεκριμένο καθεστώς κρατικών ενισχύσεων N450/2009· — Η ArcelorMittal Al et SA και η ArcelorMittal Geo Lorraine, και οι δύο στη Γαλλία, έλαβαν αντίστοιχα ενίσχυση 5,5 εκατ. ευρώ και 3,8 εκατ. ευρώ για την έρευνα στον τομέα των συστημάτων δέσμευσης των εκπομπών CO_2, η οποία βασίζεται στο εγκεκριμένο καθεστώς κρατικών ενισχύσεων N397/2007.

3. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στον αρμόδιο επικοινωνίας του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Προσαρμογής στην Παγκοσμιοποίηση στην Ελλάδα ([6]) για να πληροφορηθεί εάν υπάρχει αίτηση η οποία να συνδέεται με τις εν λόγω απολύσεις.

4. Η Επιτροπή δεν προτίθεται να καθιερώσει δεσμευτικό κώδικα κοινωνικής ευθύνης για τις πολυεθνικές εταιρείες, ωστόσο το 2011 δημοσίευσε ανακοίνωση σχετικά με την εταιρική κοινωνική ευθύνη ([7]). Η ανακοίνωση αυτή αναφέρεται σε συγκεκριμένες διεθνείς πρωτοβουλίες στον τομέα της εταιρικής κοινωνικής ευθύνης τις οποίες η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει δραστήρια.

([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=el.

([7]) Ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, το Συμβούλιο, την Ευρωπαϊκή Οικονομική και Κοινωνική Επιτροπή και την Επιτροπή των Περιφερειών — Μια ανανεωμένη στρατηγική ΕΕ 2011-14 για την εταιρική κοινωνική ευθύνη [COM(2011)681 τελικό της 25ης Οκτωβρίου 2011].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004484/12
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Mass dismissals of workers by Arcelor Mittal Construction Hellas S.A. (formerly KONTI Steel Hellas S.A.) and the social responsibility of Arcelor Mittal

The company Arcelor Mittal Construction Hellas S.A. (formerly KONTI Steel Hellas S.A.), an affiliate of Arcelor Mittal, whose headquarters are in France, and which has proceeded with mass dismissals of thousands of workers in European countries, carried out mass dismissals of workers at its factory in Volos between October 2010 and January 2012, whereas it had previously announced a programme of voluntary redundancy. The company justifies the dismissals on the grounds of the difficult economic situation, which is leading to its closure. The claim is not, however, supported by the company financial data. On the contrary, recently it has proceeded with reappointments ([1]) of former workers who had accepted voluntary redundancy, and it is exerting pressure in various ways on strikers and other dismissed workers, while at the same time evidently establishing a new company named ArcelorMittal Flat Carbon S.A., based in Attica, to perform the same work and employing some of the old staff, as is confirmed by the answer given by the head of the Attica Prefecture to a letter from the Mayor of Volos ([2]). Proceedings are currently pending against the company for violation of labour laws and criminal fraud for the purpose of deceiving the Greek public authorities, as alleged in the complaint filed by the Staff Association ([3]) and the Volos Workers' Centre ([4]), in addition to proceedings initiated by the Labour Inspectorate for the mass dismissals. In 2010, it was ascertained that the company is in violation of the law on management of dangerous waste, and — as noted in a report by Greenpeace ([5]) — Arcelor Mittal is among the companies impeding progress on reduction in levels of CO_2 emissions, notwithstanding the countless analyses highlighting the great economic benefits to be obtained from a more ambitious climate policy.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. Has the company Arcelor Mittal Construction Hellas A.E. received EU subsidies, and if so, which? In this connection, has it given any commitments to safeguard jobs?

2. What EU subsidies have been awarded, at pan-European level, to the Arcelor Mittal parent company?

3. Can resources be provided through the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) for reinstatement of the workers dismissed by the company, and if so how?

4. Does it intend to establish a binding code of social responsibility for multinational companies, particularly for those active in more than one European country?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

1. KONTI Steel Hellas S.A. received subsidies under the European Regional Development Fund industry and services operational programme (No 94.08.09.021) during the 1994-99 programming period.

ArcelorMittal Construction Hellas A.E. has not received any contribution from the Research Fund for Coal and Steel (RFCS) nor under the 6th and 7th Framework Programmes (FP). It has not received any contribution either from the Operational Programme 'Attica 2007-2013'.

2. At a corporate level, ArcelorMittal received:

— EUR 7 398 177 under the 6th FP;

— EUR 732 979 under the 7th FP;

— EUR 41 757 313 under the RFCS from 2003 to 2012.

([1]) http://www.taxydromos.gr/article.php?id=43734&cat=1.
([2]) http://www.taxydromos.gr/article.php?id=42712&cat=88.
([3]) Trade Union 'KONTI ABEE ARCELOR MITTAL HELLAS'.
([4]) Labor Trade Union of Volos.
([5]) http://www.greenpeace.org/greece/Global/greece/report/2011/climate/holdback.pdf

None of the companies of the group located in the EU has ever received state aid for rescue or restructuring purposes in recent years. Those which recently received other types of state aid are:

— ArcelorMittal Eisenhuettenstadt GmbH, in Germany, received EUR 30.18 million of environmental aid in 2010, in support of a Top Gas Recycling project, based on the approved state aid scheme N450/2009;

— ArcelorMittal AL et SA and ArcelorMittal Geo Lorraine, both in France, respectively received EUR 5.5 million and EUR 3.8 million of R & D aid for research on CO_2 emissions capture systems, based on the approved state aid scheme N397/2007.

3. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the Contact person for the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund in Greece [6] to know whether an application related to those redundancies is being prepared.

4. The Commission does not intend to establish a binding code of social responsibility for multinational companies, but it did produce a communication on corporate social responsibility in 2011 [7]. It refers to a number of international CSR initiatives that the Commission actively supports.

(6) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=el.

(7) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on a renewed EU strategy 2011-2014 for Corporate Social Responsibility (COM(2011) 681 final of 25 October 2011).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004486/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(2 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Παράνομες έρευνες και γεωτρήσεις για εντοπισμό κοιτασμάτων υδρογονανθράκων στην Κύπρο από την Τουρκία

Σύμφωνα με επίσημες ανακοινώσεις που έγιναν στην Τουρκία αλλά και στο κατεχόμενο βόρειο τμήμα της Κύπρου, η Άγκυρα προχώρησε στην έναρξη γεωτρήσεων στην περιοχή Σύγκραση της κατεχόμενης Αμμοχώστου και στην έκδοση άδειας για διερευνητικές γεωτρήσεις σε περιοχές από τη Ρόδο μέχρι την Κύπρο.

Καλείται η Επιτροπή:

1. Να τοποθετηθεί ξεκάθαρα για την νομιμότητα ή παρανομία αυτών των ενεργειών.

2. Να απαντήσει κατά πόσο μπορεί να παρέμβει για πάγωμα των προκλητικών τουρκικών ενεργειών.

3. Να υποδείξει προς την Τουρκία ότι η συμπεριφορά της βρίσκεται εκτός του πλαισίου που καθορίζουν οι υποχρεώσεις της ως υπό ένταξη χώρας.

4. Να τοποθετηθεί η Επιτροπή κατά πόσο προτίθεται να προχωρήσει σε οποιεσδήποτε κυρώσεις εναντίον της Τουρκίας.

5. Να σχολιάσει την τουρκική προκλητικότητα ενόψει της ανάληψης της Προεδρίας του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου από την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία.

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-004710/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(9 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Παράνομες γεωτρήσεις από την Τουρκία στο κατεχόμενο μέρος της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας

Στις 27 Απριλίου, η τουρκική κρατική εταιρεία πετρελαίου TPAO ξεκίνησε γεωτρήσεις στην περιοχή Σύγκραση της κατεχόμενης Αμμοχώστου, γεγονός που αποτελεί κατάφωρη παραβίαση των αποφάσεων του Συμβουλίου Ασφαλείας του ΟΗΕ.

Μια μέρα αργότερα, με σχετική αναφορά στην τουρκική Εφημερίδα της Κυβερνήσεως, δόθηκαν στη δημοσιότητα οι άδειες εκτέλεσης πετρελαϊκών εργασιών σε περιοχές νότια της Ρόδου και του Καστελόριζου, γεγονός που παραβιάζει τους κανόνες του Δικαίου της Θάλασσας εφόσον θίγει τα κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα της Ελλάδας εντός της υφαλοκρηπίδας της.

Έχοντας υπόψη τις συνεχόμενες προκλήσεις μιας υποψήφιας προς ένταξη στην ΕΕ χώρας, ιδίως σε ό,τι αφορά τους κανόνες Διεθνούς Δικαίου, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Θεωρεί ότι η έναρξη των γεωτρήσεων στην κατεχόμενη Αμμόχωστο αποτελεί παραβίαση της κυριαρχίας και της ανεξαρτησίας της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας;

2. Πώς σχολιάζει τα σχέδια της Τουρκικής Δημοκρατίας για πετρελαϊκές εργασίες εντός της ΑΟΖ ενός κράτους μέλους της ΕΕ;

3. Πώς δικαιολογεί την απουσία άμεσης αντίδρασης από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση για τα δύο αυτά γεγονότα;

4. Πώς προτίθεται να αντιδράσει σε παρόμοιες προκλητικές ενέργειες που ενδεχομένως να αυξηθούν εν όψει της Κυπριακής Προεδρίας του Συμβουλίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, το δεύτερο εξάμηνο του 2012;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή σημείωσε τις δραστηριότητες της Τουρκίας για την εκμετάλλευση κοιτασμάτων φυσικού αερίου/πετρελαίου.

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει στα συμπεράσματα του Συμβουλίου της 5ης Δεκεμβρίου 2011, όπου υπογραμμίζεται ότι «η Τουρκία πρέπει να δεσμευτεί κατηγορηματικά για την ανάπτυξη σχέσεων καλής γειτονίας και την ειρηνική διευθέτηση των διαφορών σύμφωνα με τον Χάρτη των Ηνωμένων Εθνών, προσφεύγοντας, εφόσον είναι αναγκαίο, στο Διεθνές Δικαστήριο. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο, η Ένωση εκφράζει σοβαρές ανησυχίες και προτρέπει να αποφεύγεται κάθε είδους απειλή ή ενέργεια στρεφόμενη κατά κράτους μέλους, ή αιτία τριβής ή ενέργειες που θα μπορούσαν να βλάψουν τις καλές σχέσεις γειτονίας και την ειρηνική επίλυση των διαφορών».

Η Επιτροπή θα συνεχίσει να απευθύνει έκκληση σε όλους τους ενδιαφερομένους να ενεργούν προς την κατεύθυνση αυτή.

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει επίσης στα συμπεράσματα του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου της 9ης Δεκεμβρίου 2011, όπου το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο εξέφρασε σοβαρές επιφυλάξεις όσον αφορά τις τουρκικές δηλώσεις και απειλές κατά της Κύπρου και ζητεί τον πλήρη σεβασμό του ρόλου της Προεδρίας του Συμβουλίου, η οποία αποτελεί θεμελιώδες θεσμικό χαρακτηριστικό γνώρισμα της ΕΕ, προβλεπόμενο στη Συνθήκη.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004486/12
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Illegal exploration and drilling by Turkey to locate hydrocarbon deposits in Cyprus

According to official announcements made in Turkey and also in the occupied northern part of Cyprus, Ankara has proceeded with the commencement of drilling in the Sygkrasi area of occupied Cyprus, and the issuing of licences for exploratory drilling in regions from Rhodes to Cyprus.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission take a clear position on the legality or illegality of these actions?

2. Can it clarify to what extent it is able to intervene to secure cessation of these provocative Turkish actions?

3. Can it indicate to Turkey that its behaviour is beyond the limits that a country seeking admission to the EU is obliged to respect?

4. Can it take a position on how far it intends to proceed with sanctions against Turkey?

5. Can it comment on the provocative character of Turkish behaviour in the light of the upcoming assumption of the Presidency of the European Council by the Republic of Cyprus?

Question for written answer E-004710/12
to the Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Illegal drilling by Turkey in the occupied part of the Republic of Cyprus

On 27 April, the Turkish state-owned oil company TPAO began drilling in the Sygkrasi area of occupied Famagusta, an action that is in flagrant violation of decisions by the United Nations Security Council.

One day later, a related report in the Turkish Government Gazette disclosed that permits had been issued for conducting oil-related operations in areas to the south of Rhodes and Kastellorizo, violating the rules of the Law of the Sea as they infringe upon Greece's sovereign rights within its continental shelf.

In view of the continuing provocations by a candidate country for EU accession, and specifically in relation to the provisions of International Law, will the Commission say:

1. Does it consider that the commencement of drilling in occupied Famagusta constitutes a breach of sovereignty and a challenge to the independence of the Republic of Cyprus?

2. What view does it take on the plans of the Republic of Turkey to conduct oil drilling operations inside the Exclusive Economic Zone of an EU Member State?

3. How does it justify the lack of immediate reaction from the European Union to these two events?

4. How does it plan to react to the similarly provocative actions, which are likely to increase in number in light of the Cyprus presidency of the Council of the European Union in the second half of 2012?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission

(21 June 2012)

The Commission has taken note of Turkey's gas/oil exploration activities.

The Commission refers to the Council conclusions of 5 December 2011, which underline that 'Turkey needs to commit itself unequivocally to good neighbourly relations and to the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the United Nations Charter, having recourse, if necessary, to the International Court of Justice. In this context, the Union expresses serious concern and urges the avoidance of 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'.

The Commission will continue calling on all stakeholders to act in this sense.

The Commission furthermore refers to the Conclusions of the European Council of 9 December 2011, in which the European Council expressed serious concern with regard to Turkish statements and threats vis-à-vis Cyprus and calls for full respect of the role of the Presidency of the Council, which is a fundamental institutional feature of the EU provided for in the Treaty.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004487/12
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(2 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Utilizzo di finanziamenti FSE da parte della Regione Emilia Romagna per attività di monitoraggio sul sistema di governance regionale

La determina della Regione Emilia Romagna n. 4438 del 25 maggio 2009 affida alla società cooperativa Plan l'incarico dei «servizi di assistenza tecnica e monitoraggio del sistema di governance regionale» per una spesa complessiva di 197 568 euro. I primi parziali risultati della consulenza svolta sono stati sintetizzati in un cd-rom e in una serie di seminari, svolti su base provinciale.

Considerato che i seminari provinciali sul sistema d'istruzione e formazione professionale nella regione in oggetto, svolti tra novembre e dicembre 2011, hanno avuto come relatore per l'assistenza tecnica il dott. Giuseppe Boschini, socio della società cooperativa Plan, nonché segretario cittadino del Partito Democratico di Modena, forza politica attualmente in maggioranza presso la giunta regionale dell'Emilia Romagna;

che il costo dei servizi erogati è stato coperto grazie a finanziamenti del Fondo sociale europeo;

che i funzionari di un'amministrazione regionale dovrebbero essere in possesso delle prerogative per svolgere le attività di consulenza esternalizzate alla società cooperativa Plan;

che la Regione Emilia Romagna ha attivato, da lungo tempo, un apposito servizio «gestione e monitoraggio», dotato di un consistente apparato che ha realizzato gran parte delle rilevazioni successivamente affidate alla società in questione;

che il monitoraggio sul sistema di governance regionale è già stato automaticamente svolto anche attraverso il Sifer (Sistema Informativo della Formazione Professionale);

può la Commissione far sapere relativamente al caso sopra esposto:

1. se l'utilizzo dei finanziamenti FSE sia stato in linea con i principi che dovrebbero guidare gli interventi comunitari nell'ambito sociale;

2. qualora venisse accertato che le professionalità richieste sarebbero state in possesso dei dipendenti regionali, se tali fondi dovrebbero essere stanziati in maniera più proficua, ad esempio evitando che le linee di bilancio comunitarie si sovrappongano a quelle regionali?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(20 giugno 2012)

In conformità al principio di sussidiarietà e considerando che la politica di coesione viene attuata attraverso la *gestione congiunta*, la Commissione non interviene nella selezione, nel monitoraggio e nella valutazione dei progetti cofinanziati dai Fondi strutturali della UE. La Commissione invita pertanto l'onorevole parlamentare a prendere direttamente contatto con l'autorità di gestione responsabile dell'attuazione del Programma operativo per la regione Emilia Romagna del Fondo sociale europeo ([1]).

([1]) http://formazionelavoro.regione.emilia-romagna.it/sito-fse.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004487/12
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Use of ESF funds by the Emilia-Romagna Region to monitor the regional governance system

Resolution No 4438 of the Emilia-Romagna Region, dated 25 May 2009, appointed the Plan cooperative company to provide 'technical support and regional governance system monitoring services' for a total price of EUR 197 568. The first partial results of the consultancy service provided have been summarised on a CD-ROM and in a series of seminars held in the province.

Provincial seminars on the region's vocational education and training system were held between November and December 2011. The speaker on technical support was Giuseppe Boschini, a partner in the Plan cooperative company and local secretary of the Democratic Party of Modena, a political party that currently has a majority in Emilia-Romagna's regional council.

The cost of the services was covered by financing from the European Social Fund.

Civil servants in a regional administration body should have the skills needed to provide the consultancy services outsourced to the Plan cooperative company. Furthermore, the Emilia-Romagna Region has for a long time had a special and well equipped 'management and monitoring' department, which carried out a great deal of the survey work subsequently entrusted to the company in question, and the regional governance system has already been automatically monitored through the SIFER vocational training information system.

1. Does the Commission consider the use of ESF funds here to be in line with the principles that should guide EU action in the social sphere?

2. Where it is ascertained that a regional authority's employees already have the professional skills required, would the Commission agree that these funds should be allocated more usefully, avoiding, for example, any overlapping of regional budget lines by EU budget lines?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(20 June 2012)

In line with the principle of subsidiarity and given that cohesion policy is implemented through shared management, the Commission does not intervene in the selection, monitoring and evaluation of projects co-financed through EU structural funds. The Commission would therefore invite the Honourable Member to contact directly the Managing Authority responsible for the implementation of the European Social Fund Operational Programme for the Emilia Romagna region ([1]).

([1]) http://formazionelavoro.regione.emilia-romagna.it/sito-fse.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004488/12
alla Commissione
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(2 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Caso della sig.ra M.I.: un episodio di inadempienza giudiziaria

La vicenda scaturisce da una denuncia presentata da una cittadina italiana a carico di Goldman Sachs per licenziamento ingiustificato, discriminazione di genere e nazionalità, mobbing, violazione di statuto, violazione di contratto, diffamazione, violazione dei diritti umani ed estromissione forzata illegale attraverso l'uso della violenza fisica.

La sig.ra M.I. non ha trovato alcuno studio legale che volesse rappresentarla in giudizio presso la competente autorità giudiziaria a Londra; si rivolge, il 9 maggio 2007, alla Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo, ma ottiene risposta negativa in quanto il ricorso non ottempera a quanto previsto dagli articoli 34 e 35 della convenzione di Strasburgo; il 27 luglio 2010 la signora presenta una denuncia alla Commissione europea (prot. n. CHAP201002528) ricevendo il 24 gennaio 2011 una comunicazione con cui si respinge la denuncia a motivo che trattasi di «lamentela di lavoro» e non di inadempimento giudiziario da parte di uno Stato membro, riservando al suo caso pochissima considerazione, giacché sono in gioco non soltanto aspetti di remunerazione in caso di risoluzione del rapporto di lavoro, ma soprattutto il licenziamento ingiusto e immotivato, le qualificazioni negative nel fascicolo dell'interessata e lo strapotere di un colosso bancario contro una persona che difende strenuamente la propria dignità umana e professionale.

La vertenza di lavoro della sig.ra M.I. giace in attesa di sentenza sulle scrivanie di tribunali e corti del Regno Unito e, non avendo tali autorità giudiziarie deciso alcunché nel merito, le è stato impedito così di accedere ai previsti canali giudiziari successivi.

Alla luce di ciò, può la Commissione fornire il motivo per cui non sono state approfondite le responsabilità dei giudici del Regno Unito che hanno lasciato la signora senza una decisione giudiziaria che spetta a qualunque cittadino europeo, visti appunto i diritti fondamentali dell'UE, pubblicati nella Gazzetta ufficiale del 18.12.2000? Ha ora l'intenzione di far luce sulle loro responsabilità?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(28 giugno 2012)

La denuncia CHAP(2010)2528, vale a dire il caso cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato, è stata esaminata da diversi servizi della Commissione. La loro analisi ha confermato che il caso riguardava una controversia lavorativa individuale sfociata poi in una denuncia di cattiva amministrazione nel sistema giudiziario del Regno Unito. Tali denunce non riguardano il recepimento delle regole UE antidiscriminazione o del diritto del lavoro UE e, in quanto tali, esulano dal campo di applicazione della normativa dell'UE. Per tale motivo non si applica la Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea e non è possibile avviare procedimenti di infrazione. Come la Commissione ha spiegato a più riprese alla denunciante, per i motivi summenzionati le istituzioni dell'UE non hanno alcun poter per intervenire nella questione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004488/12
to the Commission
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Case of Ms M.I.: a failure of justice

The affair springs from a complaint made by an Italian citizen against Goldman Sachs for unfair dismissal, discrimination on grounds of gender and nationality, workplace bullying, breach of statute, breach of contract, defamation, breach of human rights and illegal forced eviction through the use of physical violence.

Ms M.I. was unable to find any law firm willing to represent her in legal proceedings before the competent judicial authority in London. On 9 May 2007, she turned to the European Court of Human Rights, but was turned down on the grounds that her appeal did not comply with Articles 34 and 35 of the Strasbourg Convention. On 27 July 2010, she filed a complaint with the Commission (ref. CHAP201002528) and received a response, on 24 January 2011, in which the complaint was rejected on the grounds that it was an 'employment grievance' rather than a failure of justice on the part of a Member State. Her case was given very little consideration, considering that the matter involved not only issues of severance pay but also unfair and unjustified dismissal, negative references in the interested party's file and the excessive power of a banking giant against a person who is strenuously defending her human and professional dignity.

Ms M.I.'s employment dispute is still awaiting a ruling from the courts in the United Kingdom and, since these judicial authorities have not yet taken any decision in the matter, she is unable to take her case to the subsequent judicial channels.

In view of the above, can the Commission say why there has been no scrutiny of the responsibilities of the UK judges, who have left this lady without the court decision to which any EU citizen should be entitled in view of the fundamental rights of the EU, published in the Official Journal of 18 December 2000? Does it now intend to shed light on their responsibility?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

Complaint CHAP(2010)2528, namely the case to which the Honourable Member refers, has been examined by several departments of the Commission. Their analysis confirmed that the case concerned an individual employment dispute which then led to a claim of maladministration in the UK's court system. These complaints do not touch upon the transposition of EU anti-discrimination rules or that of EU labour law legislation and, as such lie outside the scope of EC law. For this reason, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union does not apply and infringement proceedings cannot be brought. As the Commission has pointed out to the complainant on a number of occasions, in view of the abovementioned reasons, the EU institutions have no power to act on this matter.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004491/12
alla Commissione
Tiziano Motti (PPE)
(2 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Conseguenze giuridiche della zoorastia in Europa

Il piano d'azione «Benessere animale 2012-2015» prende in considerazione il benessere animale alla luce dell'attività economica, sì da conciliare le esigenze degli animali in quanto esseri senzienti secondo il disposto dell'art. 13 del Trattato di Lisbona, e le esigenze degli operatori economici.

Alla luce della mobilitazione sul web e delle informazioni circolanti, sembra che in alcuni Stati membri della UE, come Svezia, Spagna, Danimarca ed ultimamente anche Germania, un vuoto legislativo nelle disposizioni nazionali consenta di utilizzare alcuni tipi di animali, domestici o randagi, a fini di sfruttamento sessuale da parte di esseri umani in cambio di un corrispettivo di denaro ed all'interno di strutture destinate all'uopo. Alcuni proprietari di animali offrirebbero le proprie bestiole per tale tipo di lucro e questo fenomeno, tutt'altro che relegato a singoli episodi ma già organizzato a livello europeo, sarebbe già fonte di «turismo sessuale».

È fuori dubbio che, nell'elaborazione di questa strategia, la Commissione non ha certamente tenuto in conto questo tipo di «attività economica». Ma la situazione esiste e per il trattamento subito dagli animali va al di là di una semplice questione morale lasciata alle singole coscienze.

In Italia la legge 189/2004 riconosce gli animali come «soggetti di diritto passivo» in caso di maltrattamenti: Chiunque, per crudeltà o senza necessità, cagiona una lesione ad un animale ovvero lo sottopone a sevizie o a comportamenti o a fatiche o a lavori insopportabili per le sue caratteristiche etologiche è punito con la reclusione da tre mesi a un anno o con la multa da 3 000 a 15 000 euro (art. 544/ter). È documentato che la pratica della zoorastia induce sofferenze e danni fisici agli animali, che non sono certo consenzienti. La zoorastia rappresenta quindi una violenza sessuale, cioè uno stupro, impunito.

Ritiene il Consiglio che la zoorastia, tollerata in un numero crescente di Stati membri, possa portare ad un pregiudizio sanitario nell'Unione europea?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(27 giugno 2012)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza del tipo di abusi menzionato dall'onorevole deputato e non ha ricevuto indicazioni convalidate degli eventuali problemi sanitari legati a tale pratica nell'UE.

Conformemente all'articolo 13 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea ([1]) si tiene conto del benessere degli animali soltanto negli ambiti in cui il trattamento degli animali può interferire con le politiche dell'UE come ad esempio quella agricola o il mercato interno. Per tale motivo la questione rimane di competenza esclusiva degli Stati membri.

([1]) GU C 83 del 30.3.2010, pag. 47.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004491/12
to the Commission
Tiziano Motti (PPE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Legal consequences of zooerastia in Europe

The EU Strategy for the Protection and Welfare of animals 2012-2015 considers animal welfare in an economic context, with a view to reconciling the needs of animals as sentient beings, under the terms of Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), with the needs of businesses.

It would appear, in light of activity on the Internet and of various reports, that in some EU Member States, such as Sweden, Spain, Denmark and lately even Germany, there is a gap in national provisions that allows certain pets and stray animals to be sexually exploited, in exchange for money, within dedicated venues. Apparently, some pet owners are offering their animals for this type of commercial use, and these are not isolated incidents but form part of an organised trade at European level that has already become a source of 'sex tourism'.

There can be no doubt that, in devising the above strategy, the Commission did not take this type of 'business' into account. However, the situation exists and the suffering endured by these animals means that this is more than a mere ethical issue that is a matter for individual conscience.

In Italy, Law 189/2004 recognises animals as 'passive subjects of law' in case of mistreatment: 'Anyone who cruelly or unnecessarily causes injury to an animal, or subjects it to torture or to behaviour or labour or intolerable work conditions in ethological terms, shall be punished with imprisonment from three months to one year, or with a fine of between EUR 3 000 and EUR 15 000' (Article 544-ter). The practice of zooerastia is documented as causing suffering and physical harm to animals, which certainly do not consent to it. Bestiality thus constitutes a form of sexual violence — in other words rape — that goes unpunished.

Does the Commission believe that zooerastia, which is tolerated in an increasing number of Member States, might lead to health-related problems in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

The Commission is not aware of the type of abuses mentioned by the Honourable Member and has not receive any evidence of possible health problems related to such practice in the EU.

According to Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ([1]), animal welfare is to be taken into consideration only in areas where the treatment of animals may interfere with some EU policies, like agriculture or the internal market. Therefore, this matter remains under the sole competence of the Member States.

([1]) OJ C 83, 30.3.2010, p. 47.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004492/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(2 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Un nuovo antiossidante?

Si chiama ASEA e viene propagandato come l'unico prodotto al mondo che, basandosi sull'ultima scoperta scientifica delle molecole Redox Signaling, contiene le molecole reattive stabilizzate che danno supporto in pratica a tutte le funzioni del sistema immunitario e della reazione rigenerante dei tessuti. I suoi promotori affermano che i componenti di ASEA aumentano l'efficacia degli antiossidanti naturali più importanti del corpo del 500 per cento, danno supporto alle funzioni del sistema immunitario che riducono lo stress ossidativo e riparano i danni cellulari. Accelererebbero, infine, nell'organismo la produzione naturale di antiossidanti come glutatione e SOD. Pur non avendo la pretesa di essere un medicinale, ci si pone il problema di sapere se le qualità che le vengono assegnate corrispondono al vero e non recano danni alla salute.

Può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se conosce il prodotto;

2. se le agenzie per i medicinali e per la prevenzione si sono pronunciate su di esso;

3. se ASEA può essere considerato un integratore;

4. chi può garantire che le sue funzioni antiossidanti sono veramente tali e pertanto efficaci?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

Né la Commissione né l'Agenzia europea per i medicinali dispongono di informazioni dettagliate sul prodotto denominato ASEA dato che nessuna domanda per autorizzarne la commercializzazione in quanto medicinale è stata presentata all'Agenzia stessa.

Classificare i prodotti come alimenti o medicinali spetta agli Stati membri, che decidono caso per caso in base alla legislazione nazionale, a quella della UE e fatte salve le disposizioni del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea.

Se un prodotto corrisponde alla definizione di «prodotto alimentare», deve rispettare la legislazione alimentare della UE. Il regolamento (CE) n. 1924/2006 ([1]) stabilisce norme armonizzate in tutta la UE per l'uso delle indicazioni nutrizionali e sanitarie fornite sui prodotti alimentari. Esso impone che messaggi o immagini pubblicitarie, che dichiarino, suggeriscano o suppongano che un alimento, o un suo componente, abbia effetti positivi sulla salute, devono fondarsi ed essere confermati da prove scientifiche universalmente accettate ed essere autorizzati dalla Commissione dopo un esame scientifico dell'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare, conforme alle procedure previste dal regolamento. Sono in fase di elaborazione i rispettivi elenchi di indicazioni sanitarie autorizzate e di indicazioni non autorizzate. Le autorità nazionali competenti devono garantire il rispetto del regolamento da parte degli operatori.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1924/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 20 dicembre 2006, relativo alle indicazioni nutrizionali e sulla salute fornite sui prodotti alimentari — GU L 404 del 30.12.2006.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:404:0009:0025:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004492/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: A new antioxidant?

ASEA, as it is called, is based on the latest scientific discovery concerning redox signalling molecules and being touted as the only product in the world to contain stabilised reactive molecules that in practice support all immune system and tissue regeneration reaction functions. Its promoters say that ASEA's components increase the effectiveness of the body's most important natural antioxidants by 500% and support immune system functions that reduce oxidative stress and repair cell damage. Lastly, ASEA is said to accelerate the body's own production of antioxidants such as glutathione and super oxide dismutase. While ASEA is not claimed to be a medicine, it does prompt the question whether it really has the properties attributed to it and, if so, whether it is safe.

1. Does the Commission know of the product?

2. Have medicine and prevention agencies expressed any opinions on it?

3. Can ASEA be considered a supplement?

4. Who can guarantee that its antioxidant functions are truly as described and hence effective?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The Commission does not have any detailed information about the product ASEA, nor does the European Medicines Agency, as no application for granting the marketing authorisation as a medicinal product has been submitted to the agency.

The classification of products as foodstuffs, or medicinal products, is the competence of Member States, which decide on a case-by-case basis in accordance with specific Union and national legislation, and without prejudice to the rules of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

If a product fulfils the definition of foodstuff, it has to comply with EU food law. Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 ([1]) lays down harmonised rules across the European Union for the use of nutrition and health claims made on foods. This regulation requires that all commercial messages or representations stating, suggesting or implying that a food, or one of its constituents, has a beneficial effect on health, need to be based on, and substantiated by, generally accepted scientific evidence, and need to be authorised by the Commission after a scientific assessment of the European Food Safety Authority in accordance with the procedures foreseen in the regulation. Relevant lists of permitted and not-authorised health claims are being put in place. National competent authorities are responsible to ensure operators comply with the regulation.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods, OJ L 404, 30.12.2006;
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:404:0009:0025:EN:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004493/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Recycling of ink cartridges

Often on ink cartridges for printers, there is no evident information regarding recommendations on how to recycle the packaging/used cartridges. Is the Commission working on obliging specialised packaging suppliers (manufacturers) to direct consumers to an appropriate recycling entity, or to provide such a service themselves through their distributors?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

The Commission is not working on a specific obligation for manufacturers of ink cartridges for printers, because the obligation is already covered by the WEEE Directive, at least for ink cartridges which are inside a printer at the time of discarding.

Article 10 of Directive 2002/96/EC ([1]) on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) requires Member States to ensure that users of electrical and electronic equipment (EEE) in private households are given the necessary information about the disposal of WEEE.

Specifically regarding ink cartridges for printers, the 'Frequently Asked Questions' document ([2]) of the Commission states the following:

'If a printer is discarded, it becomes WEEE. This means that if an ink cartridge is inside a discarded printer, the cartridge becomes part of the WEEE because it is a consumable which is part of the printer at the time of discarding.'

In view of the agreement found between the co-legislators on the Commission's proposal for a recast of the WEEE Directive, the Commission will develop revised 'Frequently Asked Questions' to provide guidance on how its provisions should be interpreted.

([1]) OJ L 37, 13.2.2003.
([2]) See http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/weee/pdf/faq_weee.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004494/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in Algeria

At the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. That report stated that Market Access Teams were now operational and would be established in specific third countries. One of the third countries listed was Algeria. Can the Commission say why Algeria was chosen for the location of a Market Access Team, when the Secretary-General of the current party in power (the FLN), who is a leading contender for President in the upcoming election, is accused of being too close to wealthy business interests?

Question for written answer E-004495/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Deadline for establishment of Market Access Teams

At the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. That report stated that Market Access Teams were now operational and would be established in specific third countries. Can the Commission give an estimated deadline for when the Market Access Teams will be fully established? Also, can the Commission state whether the not-yet-operational Market Access Teams are being funded before they begin operations?

Question for written answer E-004496/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Establishment of Market Access Teams

At the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. That report stated that there would now be Market Access Teams in specific third countries. Can the Commission say whether these Market Access Teams will be under its supervision or that of another EU institution (such as the EEAS)?

Question for written answer E-004497/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Duties of Market Access Teams

At the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. That report stated that Market Access Teams were now operational in specific third countries. Can the Commission detail the specific duties of these Market Access Teams?

Question for written answer E-004498/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Placement of Market Access Teams

At the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. That report stated that Market Access Teams were now operational in specific third countries. Can the Commission detail why these specific third countries were chosen to host Market Access Teams? Can it also detail how these third countries were chosen?

Question for written answer E-004499/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Funding of Market Access Teams

At the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. That report stated that Market Access Teams were now operational in specific third countries. Can the Commission detail how these Market Access Teams will be funded?

Question for written answer E-004500/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Teams and diplomatic functions

At the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. That report stated that Market Access Teams were now operational in specific third countries. Can the Commission state whether these Market Access Teams will have objectives focused specifically on trade, or whether diplomatic functions will also be part of their mandate?

Question for written answer E-004827/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(10 May 2012)

Subject: The establishment of a market access team in Argentina

Could the Commission explain why a market access team is being established in Argentina — presumably for the purpose of facilitating trade — at a time when the EU has condemned Argentina's hostile takeover of the company YPF and is considering trade sanctions as a result of the Argentine Government's actions?

Question for written answer E-004867/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(11 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in Argentina

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. In this report, it was discussed that Market Access Teams are now operational and intended to be established in specific third countries. One of the third countries listed was Argentina.

Can the Commission please detail why a Market Access Team is to be established in a country that can be seen as hostile to foreign businesses, given the recent renationalisation of the energy company YPF?

Question for written answer E-004868/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(11 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in Chile

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. In this report, it was discussed that Market Access Teams are now operational in specific third countries. One of these countries is Chile.

Given the current opposition in Chile to the establishment of enterprises in the energy sector (such as the Brazilian company MPX), can the Commission please detail why a Market Access Team is being established in a country that is somewhat hostile to foreign investment and that is lacking in infrastructure after a devastating earthquake in 2010?

Question for written answer E-004869/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(11 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in Colombia

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. In this report, it was discussed that Market Access Teams are now operational in specific third countries.

One of these countries is Colombia. Given that the US and Colombia recently established a free trade deal that allows more than 80% of industrial and manufactured products exported from the US and Colombia to immediately become duty free, can the Commission please detail how it plans to compete with this arrangement through the newly established Market Access Teams?

Question for written answer E-004870/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(11 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team composition

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. In this report, it was discussed that Market Access Teams are now operational and intended to be established in specific third countries.

— Can the Commission please detail the staff composition of these Market Access Teams (Commission staff, EEAS staff, Seconded Member State Staff, locally-based staff, etc.)?

— Can the Commission also detail whether these Market Access Teams would include representatives from the private sector?

Question for written answer E-004912/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(14 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in Mexico

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. In this report, it was discussed that Market Access Teams are now operational in specific third countries. One of these countries is Mexico.

Can the Commission please discuss its decision to establish a Market Access Team in a country where bribery of public officials on the part of enterprises is the norm, as evidenced by the recent Walmart case in Mexico?

Can the Commission detail how it plans to address such concerns on behalf of all Member States through the Market Access Team in Mexico?

Question for written answer E-004913/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(14 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in Hong Kong

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. In this report, it was discussed that Market Access Teams are now operational in specific third countries. One of these countries is Hong Kong.

Can the Commission please detail why a separate Market Access Team is to be established in Hong Kong when it is a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and there is already a Market Access Team established in China?

Question for written answer E-004914/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(14 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in Kazakhstan

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. In this report, it was discussed that Market Access Teams are now operational in specific third countries. One of these countries is Kazakhstan.

Can the Commission please comment on how the Market Access Team plans to deal with the intricacies of Kazakhstan's system of Islamic finance on behalf of all Member States?

Question for written answer E-004915/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(14 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in Morocco

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. In this report, it was discussed that Market Access Teams are now operational in specific third countries. One of these countries is Morocco.

Given that there are already strong trade ties between the EU and its Member States and Morocco, can the Commission please detail the reasoning behind establishing a Market Access Team there?

Question for written answer E-004951/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in South Korea

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. In this report, it was discussed that Market Access Teams are now operational in specific third countries. One of these countries is South Korea.

Given that South Korea's own government has had difficulty improving domestic demand there, can the Commission please detail what plans the Market Access Team established in South Korea has to address this situation?

Question for written answer E-004952/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in the United States

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. In this report, it was discussed that Market Access Teams are now operational in specific third countries. One of these countries is the United States.

Can the Commission please detail where this office will be located in the United States? Also, will there be only one Market Access Team in the United States?

Question for written answer E-004954/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in Turkey

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. In this report, it was discussed that Market Access Teams are now operational in specific third countries. One of these countries is Turkey.

Given that the EU and Turkey already have a strong trade relationship (including the legacy of a customs unions), can the Commission comment on the necessity of establishing a Market Access Team in Turkey?

Question for written answer E-005083/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Market Access Team in New Zealand

During the INTA Committee meeting on 25 April 2012, a communication from the Commission entitled 'Small Business, Big World — a new partnership to help SMEs seize global opportunities' was presented. This report states that Market Access Teams are now operational in certain specific third countries. One of these countries is New Zealand.

Given that New Zealand's own government has had difficulty improving domestic demand, can the Commission please detail what plans the Market Access Team established in New Zealand has to address this situation?

Joint answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission

(18 June 2012)

The Commission's renewed Market Access Strategy (COM(2007) 183 of 18 April 2007) makes an essential contribution to supporting the internationalisation of European SMEs.

Market Access Teams exist in 34 key export markets for EU companies. EU Delegations coordinate and supervise their work pooling resources of Commission departments, Member State embassies and EU business representatives. These teams collect information about locally available expertise to identify, analyse and help dismantling trade barriers faced by EU companies in a coordinated manner. Market Access Teams do not perform diplomatic functions nor are they linked to local authorities.

The organisation and operational tasks of these teams vary depending on the country, the business climate prevailing locally and the available EU business structures in the country. Their meetings can be either specific or part of the more regular discussions among EU economic counsellors. There is no specific budget for Market Access Teams.

The role of these teams is being extended to support SMEs internationalisation in line with the communication 'Small Business, Big World' (COM(2011) 702 of 9 November 2011). For more information, see also:
http://ec.europa.eu/trade/creating-opportunities/trade-topics/market-access/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004502/12
to the Commission
Emma McClarkin (ECR)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Fire safety

Would the Commission agree that fire safety across Europe is of key importance to all EU citizens? Could the Commission confirm whether there is an Inter-service Working Group on Fire Safety monitoring the consistency of fire safety in EU legislation as well as the impact of EU legislation on fire safety standards across the work of all committees? If not, has there ever been one in the past, and would the Commission think it important to set up such a working group to ensure that consistently high fire safety standards are maintained?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2012)

Fire safety for EU citizens is an important work area for the Commission. No specific Inter-Service Group on Fire Safety has been set up and inter-service work takes place according to the usual practice where all concerned services contribute whenever an issue of their competence emerges.

Examples of inter-service work include the study of flame retardants used in upholstered furniture and cooperation between the Commission and the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) in improving understanding of the risks from such flame retardants. Different departments are also in close contact on the work on fire safety in hotels and the possible revision of Council Recommendation 86/666/EEC.

For buildings and other civil engineering works, the Member States themselves are competent to set the level of fire safety in their national legislation. The implementation of Directive 89/106/EEC on construction products has allowed for the creation of a common European technical language which facilitates considerably the exchange of knowledge and experience between the fire safety regulators of the Member States, and contributes to a much more consistent approach throughout the EU.

A specific Commission Inter-Service Group on Fire Safety does therefore not appear to be necessary.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004503/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Site of Community importance ES6120032: Estrecho Oriental

In December 2008 a site of Community importance (SCI) was introduced under reference 'ES6120032: Estrecho Oriental', covering in part an area already covered under the UK's SCI listing of site 'UKGIB0002: Southern Waters of Gibraltar'.

On 26 September 2011 the Committee on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (HABITAT) agreed, pursuant to Council Directive 92/43/EEC, a fifth updated list of sites of Community importance for the Mediterranean biogeographical region, which included site ES6120032. The UK Government voted against this decision.

Notwithstanding the Commission's previous replies with regard to site ES6120032 in response to Written Questions E-3840/2009, E-4972/2009 and, most recently, E-7777/2011, in which the Commission highlights the fact that it consulted all Member States in accordance with the procedure set out in Article 21 of the directive prior to the adoption of each of the lists of sites of Community importance for the Mediterranean, is the Commission satisfied that the Spanish authorities have fulfilled their duty of sincere cooperation in respect of the Estrecho Oriental listing?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(15 June 2012)

The Commission believes that pursuant to the principle of sincere cooperation set out in Article 4(3) of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) a Member State designating a site in an area concerned by a territorial dispute should notify the other concerned Member State before submitting this proposal to the Commission. Whilst it would appear that neither Spain nor the United Kingdom formally undertook this step for the sites they proposed in the disputed territory, the emphasis now must be on the two Member States to cooperate in finding a practical way forward in managing the sites in order to deliver the requirements of Directive 92/43/EEC ([1]) on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, as such designation implies.

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004505/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Swappable re-chargeable electric batteries

The Commission's White Paper entitled 'Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area — Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system' highlights the need to dramatically reduce Europe's dependence on imported oil and cut carbon emissions in transport by 60% by 2050. The White Paper notes the use of electric vehicles and the need for greater standardisation of charging points.

Nonetheless the time delay in charging vehicles can be seen as a barrier to use of electric vehicles. The possibility of swapping pre-charged batteries could help overcome this problem, with batteries being recharged ready to install in vehicles rather than owners waiting to recharge a specific vehicle.

What consideration has the Commission given to 'swappable' re-chargeable batteries for electric vehicles? Will the Commission be encouraging such infrastructure and possible standardisation to allow 'swappable' electric batteries?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions E-008744/2011, E-000021/2012, E-000671/2012 and E-000870/2012 by Mr Jim Higgins (PPE), Ms Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D), Mr Andreas Mölzer (NI) and Mr Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D) ([1]).

The Commission would moreover like to inform the Honourable Member that 'swappable' electric batteries are being supported within the project Green eMotion through the Green Car Initiative of the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. 'Swappable' electric batteries are also supported in the 'Greening European Transportation Infrastructure for Electric Vehicles' project under the 'Trans-European Transport Network' programme.

([1]) Available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/search.do.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004506/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: RoHS Directive and metal whiskering

The European Union Directive on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment (RoHS Directive 2011/65/EU, recasting Directive 2002/95/EC) restricts the use of six hazardous materials in the manufacturing of various types of electronic and electrical equipment. This legislation has been important in removing toxic substances such as lead from many products found in people's homes, as well as reducing employees' exposure during manufacture and preventing products containing such substances from entering landfill sites.

Lead has been used in solder to reduce 'metal whiskering' (that is, the formation of tiny crystalline hairs on metallic surfaces). Metal whiskering can be a cause of short-circuiting. Whilst a ban applicable to many consumer products was introduced in 2006, the legislation allowed exceptions for certain products, such as medical devices until 2016, monitoring and control instruments until 2014 and industrial monitoring and control instruments until 2017.

It should be noted that manufacturers have been addressing this issue in relation to devices such as IT and communications equipment since 2006, including within the aerospace sector. Nonetheless, in view of the challenges posed by metal whiskering in the aviation sector, not only to IT and communications equipment but also to key aircraft instrumentation, what support is the Commission providing to industry to ensure that products are compliant with the RoHS Directive whilst also enabling such devices to maintain high levels of product integrity? What alternatives have been identified with a view to overcoming the continued use of lead in such devices?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

The Honourable Member is right to emphasise the balance between the protection of the environment, consumers and workers from hazardous substances and the need for reliable materials in advanced technical appliances. Both Directives on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment (RoHS Directive 2011/65/EU ([1]), recasting Directive 2002/95/EC ([2])) are characterised by this complex interaction.

Whereas the RoHS substance restrictions and the material and component specific exemptions from those restrictions are subject to scientific and technical progress, several product categories are permanently excluded from the RoHS scope. The reasons are manifold, as they range from safety issues — definitely relevant to the aerospace sector — to the development of renewable energy technologies. Most transport equipment is also excluded from RoHS.

It is the remit and responsibility of the manufacturer of such a product to decide if the use of hazardous substances is necessary. Whilst it would be detrimental or even dangerous to force these sectors into compliance with the RoHS restrictions, the Commission trusts that innovation in the field of IT and telecommunications due to RoHS and the resulting design changes are a strong driving force for overcoming the use of hazardous substances in non-RoHS sectors as well.

([1]) OJ L 174, 1.7.2011.
([2]) OJ L 37, 13.2.2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004507/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Vessels under 10 metres

Across Europe, those involved in small-scale sustainable fishing are increasingly having to compete with industrial-scale fishing vessels equipped with the latest technology.

In the UK, fishermen with vessels under 10 metres account for 85% of the fishing fleet but are allocated only 4% of the annual quota.

Is the Commission aware of this inequitable situation? What measures would the Commission like to see in the reformed common fisheries policy to ensure that those fishing on a smaller scale are allocated a fair proportion of the fishery with a view to ensuring its survival?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(10 July 2012)

The Commission has been informed about this situation before. Under the current common fisheries policy each Member State decides, for vessels flying its flag, on the method of allocating the fishing opportunities assigned to that Member State. While allocation of fishing opportunities to individual fishermen is done at a national level, the Commission believes that Member States should allocate these opportunities by rewarding sustainable, low impact fishing and has introduced specific provision to this end in the proposal for the reform of the common fisheries policy. In the same vein, the proposal for the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund includes specific measures to support small scale fisheries and provides for higher aid intensities for aid granted to the operators in this sector.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004508/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Airport noise pollution

Under its airports package, the Commission is reviewing Directive 2002/30/EC on noise reduction at Community airports. Under the proposals contained in paper COM(2011) 0828, it will ensure that the noise assessment process will become more robust, clarifying the steps within the assessment process. However, it does not stipulate noise quality objectives and does not appear to provide any guidance on noise targets for airports to meet. In other sectors legislative guidance and targets have been found to be useful mechanisms to improve standards. For instance, the Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC) sets legal limits and timescales for improvements to be achieved.

Whilst bearing subsidiary and proportionality in mind, does the Commission not agree that such targets could be useful to improve citizens' lives by reducing noise pollution from this sector across the Union?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(13 June 2012)

The Commission agrees that legislative guidance and targets have been useful in EU legislation such as the Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC) in driving environmental improvements. The question whether such targets or similar mechanisms could be useful in noise regulation at EU level was raised in the Commission's Implementation Report on the Environmental Noise Directive (2002/49/EC) (COM(2011) 321 final) and will be considered in the review of that directive.

Directive 2002/30/EC, reviewed in the framework of the 'Better' Airports Package, is a 'process' directive, prescribing the various steps of the procedure that authorities must follow if they intend to introduce a noise-related operating restriction at an airport with more than 50 000 movements. This process does not prejudge the noise objectives set, which, in line with the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality mentioned by the Honourable Member, are for Member States to determine.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-004512/12
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(2 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Carencias del sistema democrático en Ucrania

Los medios de comunicación han dado noticia del empeoramiento de la salud de la ex primera ministra ucraniana Yulia Tymoshenko, así como de las denuncias sobre posibles lesiones que ha sufrido en prisión. Algunos líderes europeos han realizado declaraciones de condena y han adoptado con prontitud una actitud crítica frente al gobierno ucraniano. Tal es el caso, entre otros, del Presidente de la República Federal Alemana cancelando su visita a la cumbre de Jefes de Estado europeos organizada en Yalta o de la Canciller de la República Federal Alemana anunciando que no acudirá a los encuentros de la Eurocopa.

Ante esta situación, que pone de manifiesto las graves carencias de un sistema democrático que no respeta los derechos fundamentales, a este diputado le interesa saber:

1. ¿Qué actitud van a mantener los representantes de las instituciones europeas, en especial con motivo de esos acontecimientos, la cumbre de Jefes de Estado y la celebración de la Eurocopa de fútbol?

2. ¿Qué va a ocurrir con el Acuerdo de asociación especial entre la Unión Europea y Ucrania?

Respuesta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de junio de 2012)

La Cumbre de Jefes de Estado en Yalta se pospuso a petición de Ucrania.

El Presidente del Consejo Europeo, el Presidente de la Comisión Europea y los miembros de la Comisión tomaron la decisión a título personal de no asistir a los partidos del Campeonato Europeo que se está celebrando en Ucrania, como reflejo de su preocupación por la situación del Estado de Derecho.

El Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Ucrania, que incluye una zona de libre comercio de alcance amplio y profundo, está siendo revisado desde el punto de vista jurídico. La UE sigue considerando que la asociación política y la integración económica, previstas en el Acuerdo, constituyen la mejor vía para una Ucrania moderna y democrática. Sin embargo, la UE también ha dejado claro a Ucrania que su actuación, en particular en relación con el respeto de los valores comunes y del Estado de Derecho, será de una importancia crucial para acelerar la asociación política con la UE y la integración económica en la misma, principalmente en el contexto de la celebración del Acuerdo de Asociación.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004512/12
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Shortcomings of the democratic system in Ukraine

The deteriorating health of former Ukrainian Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko — and complaints about possible injuries she has suffered in prison — has been reported in the news media. Some European leaders have made statements of condemnation and have promptly adopted a critical attitude towards the Ukrainian Government. These include, among others, the President of the Federal Republic of Germany, who has cancelled his visit to the Summit of European Heads of State organised in Yalta, and the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, who has announced that she will not attend UEFA European Championship matches.

In view of this situation, which reveals the serious deficiencies of a democratic system that does not respect fundamental rights, this MEP wishes to know:

1. What will be the stance of representatives of the EU institutions, particularly with regard to the Summit of Heads of State and the UEFA European Championship?

2. What will happen to the Special Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the Ukraine?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2012)

The Summit of Heads of State in Yalta was postponed by Ukraine.

The President of the European Council, the President of the European Commission, and Members of the Commission took personal decisions not to attend matches of the European Championship being held in Ukraine, reflecting their concern at the state of the Rule of Law.

The EU-Ukraine Association Agreement, including a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area, is undergoing legal revision. The EU continues to believe that political association and economic integration, as foreseen in the Agreement, represents the best route to a modern and democratic Ukraine. However, the EU has also made it clear to Ukraine that its performance, notably in relation to respect for common values and the rule of law, will be of crucial importance for the speed of political association and economic integration with the EU, including in the context of conclusion of the Association Agreement.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004513/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Kazakh authorities and minority religious communities

Since the entry into force of the 2011 religion law, the Kazakh authorities have begun to crack down on minority religious communities, especially those which use private homes for religious worship.

1. Can the EEAS give its assessment of how the religion law is restricting the freedom of religion and fostering discrimination based on religious beliefs?

2. Will the EEAS systematically raise the issue of freedom of religion in all bilateral contacts with Kazakhstan?

3. Will the EEAS urge the Kazakh authorities to address the issue of the forced closure of the Ahmadi Muslim Community (the main office of which is based in my home constituency of London) in Medeu District, Almaty? This leaves the community unable to worship legally anywhere in the country, following the 2011 suspension of the Shymkent Ahmadiyya Muslim Community's right to use its mosque and land.

4. Will the EEAS investigate the persecution of members of congregations of the Baptist Council of Churches and the Methodist Church and urge the Kazakh authorities to ensure Baptists' and Methodists' freedom to worship?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President and her services are well aware of the situation and the law on religion, and its new decrees adopted in January 2012, in Kazakhstan. As OSCE/ODIHR stated at the adoption of the new Law on Religion, there is a risk that the freedom of religion is being unnecessarily restricted in Kazakhstan.

The HR/VP and her services have expressed concerns about this in bilateral meetings with Kazakhstan, including in the regular Human Rights Dialogues, and will continue to do so in the future. The next round of the Human Rights Dialogue is expected in November 2012 and we will raise the problems faced by and the alleged prosecutions of different religious groups in Kazakhstan.

The Head of Kazakhstan's Agency for Religious Affairs, Kairat Lama Sharif publically stated that since the adoption of the new governmental decree the minority religious groups with less than 50 members do not posses any valid legal personality and cannot convene anymore. However, these minority groups have not applied for re-registration yet. According to the law, they have one year (until October 2012) to complete re-registration process if they can gather the necessary signatures. Until then, they can be active and their right to convene cannot be restricted. So far there has been no court cases initiated or administrative fines applied to those religious minority groups. The EU Delegation in Astana is and will continue to closely follow the implementation of the law and its decrees, in close consultation with religious groups and civil society organisations, as well as the authorities. The EU will keep encouraging Kazakhstan to maintain and promote inter-ethnic and inter-religious tolerance.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-004517/12
do Komisji
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(2 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Sytuacja producentów rolnych ogórków gruntowych i pomidorów /pytanie uzupełniające/

W nawiązaniu do odpowiedzi Komisji z dnia 5 stycznia 2012 (E-010766/11) w powyższej sprawie mam pytanie uzupełniające: czy Komisja wystosowała do władz Polski jakieś wystąpienie i czy władze polskie przedstawiły jakieś dokumenty w tej sprawie? Jeśli tak to proszę o przedstawienie treści stosownych dokumentów.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Daciana Cioloșa w imieniu Komisji
(6 czerwca 2012 r.)

Komisja zwróciła się do władz polskich w kwestii domniemanych naruszeń przez Agencję Rynku Rolnego rozporządzenia wykonawczego Komisji (UE) nr 585/2011 ([1]) dnia 17 czerwca 2011 r. ustanawiającego tymczasowe nadzwyczajne środki wspierania sektora owoców i warzyw. Komisja otrzymała odpowiedź od władz polskich, która jest obecnie analizowana.

Jako że analiza jest w toku, Komisja nie może na obecnym etapie wypowiedzieć się na ten temat.

Osoby skarżące zostaną poinformowane o wynikach dochodzenia Komisji poprzez zawiadomienie opublikowane w Dzienniku Urzędowym Unii Europejskiej.

([1]) Dz.U. L 670 z 18.6.2011, s. 71.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004517/12
to the Commission
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Situation faced by cucumber and tomato producers — supplementary question

In reference to the Commission's response of 5 January 2012 (E-010766/11) on the above-mentioned matter, I have a supplementary question: has the Commission addressed the Polish authorities and have the Polish authorities presented any documentation on this matter? If so, could you please indicate the content of the relevant documents?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2012)

The Commission contacted the Polish authorities regarding the alleged violations by the Polish Paying Agency of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 585/2011 [1] of 17 June 2011 laying down temporary exceptional support measures for the fruit and vegetable sector. The Commission has received information on the matter from the Polish authorities, which is currently being considered.

As the investigation is ongoing the Commission cannot comment further at this stage.

The complainants will be informed of the results of the Commission investigation by notice published in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

---

[1] OJ L 670, 18.6.2011, p. 71.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004522/12
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(2. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Schuldenfalle Mikrokredite

Wer in Entwicklungsländern keine Arbeit hat, ist von seinen Verwandten abhängig und stellt eine Belastung dar. Mikrokredite bieten hier Hilfe zur Selbsthilfe mit der Möglichkeit der wirtschaftlichen Selbstständigkeit. Viele Menschen schaffen sich damit eine Existenz, egal ob mit dem Verkauf von Gewand, Essen, heimischer Heilkräuter oder Feuerholz. Zudem kann dadurch Landflucht verhindert werden.

Mittlerweile besteht in Entwicklungsländer ein Überangebot, es kommt zum Wettstreit zwischen öffentlichen Entwicklungsbanken und privaten Investoren. Experten kritisieren, dass Entwicklungshilfe, die verwendet wird, um Mikrofinanz-Institute noch billiger mit Geld zu versorgen, nicht den Armen, sondern letztlich nur der Bank hilft. Die Konkurrenz zwischen öffentlichen Entwicklungshilfebanken und privaten Investoren wird vor allem dann gefährlich, wenn sich die Investoren plötzlich — etwa aufgrund politischer Unruhen — aus einem Land zurückziehen, wie dies etwa in Ägypten der Fall war.

Die indische Regierung schrieb den Banken vor, dass 40 Prozent ihrer Darlehen Mikrokredite sein müssten. Allerdings gibt es traditionellerweise in dem Land keine Analyse, wofür die Kredite gebraucht werden. Stattdessen werden sie einfach an Gruppen von Frauen vergeben, die gegenseitig füreinander bürgen. Es ist bekannt, dass dort der Großteil der Darlehen verkonsumiert wird. De facto wurden mit dem absehbaren Platzen der Kreditblase die Menschen nicht reicher, sondern gar ärmer. Tausende Menschen stürzten in die Schuldenfalle.

1. Die EU setzt ja in der Entwicklungshilfe auch vermehrt auf Mikrokredite. Ist sich die Kommission der oben beschriebenen Problematik hinsichtlich Mikrofinanz-Institute bewusst?

2. Wird bei EU gestützten Mikrokrediten sichergestellt, dass eine Kreditanalyse stattfindet, damit das geliehene Geld nicht in kurzfristigem Konsum verschwindet?

3. Welche Konzepte gibt es auf EU-Ebene, damit die Mikrokredite in Entwicklungsländern nicht zur Schuldenfalle für die ärmsten der Armen werden?

4. Werden Mikrokredite auch in jenen Ländern von der EU unterstützt, in denen sie die Demokratisierungsprozesse fördert? Falls ja, in welchem Ausmaß?

Antwort von Herrn Piebalgs im Namen der Kommission
(18. Juni 2012)

Die EU-Hilfe im Bereich der Mikrofinanzierung belief sich Ende 2010 auf insgesamt rund 200 Mio. EUR (sämtliche laufenden Maßnahmen). Dieses Volumen ist in den letzten Jahren relativ stabil geblieben.

Die Kommission verfolgt die Entwicklungen im Bereich der Mikrofinanzierung mit großer Aufmerksamkeit. In den vergangenen zehn Jahren haben viele Mikrofinanzinstitute (MFI) erhebliche Anstrengungen unternommen, um ihre Arbeit als Finanzdienstleister professioneller zu gestalten. Dadurch ist es ihnen gelungen, Zugang zu privaten Finanzquellen zu bekommen und ihre Kundenbetreuung auszubauen. Die Erschließung privater Finanzquellen ist zwar an sich eine positive Entwicklung, birgt jedoch das Risiko, die Anreizstruktur von MFI auf die Erzielung von Einnahmen und Gewinnen umzuorientieren. Dieses Risiko wird durch das Fehlen eines ordnungsgemäßen nationalen Regulierungsrahmens verschärft.

Die EU unterstützt die Mikrofinanzierung als wirksames Instrument zu Förderung der wirtschaftlichen ([1]) und sozialen ([2]) Entwicklung. Die EU-Unterstützungsprogramme setzen auf drei Ebenen an: i) auf der Makroebene (Politikebene), um die Regulierung und Aufsicht u. a. im Sinnes eines wirksamen Kundenschutzes zu verbessern, ii) auf der Mesoebene, um z. B. die Leistungsfähigkeit von Kreditregistern zu steigern, die entscheidend dazu beitragen, eine Überschuldung der Kunden zu vermeiden, und iii) auf der Mikroebene (MFI), um die Sozialverträglichkeit der Kreditvergabe zu verbessern. Durch gezieltes Handeln auf diesen drei Ebenen kann das Entwicklungspotenzial der Mikrofinanzierung maximiert und das Überschuldungsrisiko gemindert werden.

([1]) Z. B zur Existenzgründung in kleinem Maßstab.
([2]) Arme Menschen werden in die Lage versetzt, ihre finanzielle Angelegenheit selber zu verwalten. Sie erhalten dadurch ein stärkeres Mitspracherecht, was wiederum zur Festigung der Demokratie beiträgt.

Die EU unterstützt die Mikrofinanzierung gerade auch in jenen Ländern, in denen sie den demokratischen Wandel unterstützt, so z. B. in den Ländern Nordafrikas und des Nahen Ostens (auf Letztere entfallen 16 % der insgesamt für den Bereich Mikrofinanzierung bereitgestellten Mittel).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004522/12
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: The microcredit debt trap

In developing countries, the unemployed are dependent — and thus become a burden — on their families. Microcredit is a way to help people help themselves to become economically independent. Many people make a living in this way by selling, for example, clothing, food, local medicinal herbs or firewood, and it can also halt the depopulation of rural areas.

Developing countries are currently experiencing a credit surplus, with public development banks competing with private investors. Experts criticise the fact that development aid being used to supply microfinance institutions with cheaper money is, in the final analysis, helping not the poor, but rather the bank. Competition between public development aid banks and private investors is particularly dangerous when investors suddenly withdraw from a country — because of political unrest, for example — as happened in Egypt.

The Indian Government required banks to provide 40% of their loans in the form of microcredit. It is not traditional practice in India, however, to analyse how these loans are used. Instead, they are simply given to groups of women who act as guarantors for one another. It is known that a large proportion of the loans are used in this way for purposes of consumption. In effect, the predictable bursting of the credit bubble made people poorer, not richer. Thousands of people have fallen into the debt trap.

1. The EU is increasingly concentrating on microcredit in its development aid. Is the Commission aware of the abovementioned problems with microfinance institutions?

2. Is a credit analysis carried out on EU-supported microcredits in order to ensure that the borrowed money is not frittered away on short-term consumption?

3. Are there ideas at EU level for preventing microcredits in developing countries from becoming credit traps for the poorest of the poor?

4. Does the EU also support microcredit programmes in countries where it is promoting a process of democratisation? If so, to what extent?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(18 June 2012)

EU support for microfinance amounted to about EUR 200 million end-2010 (total portfolio of ongoing operations). This volume has remained quite stable in recent years.

The Commission is closely monitoring developments in microfinance. Over the last decade, many microfinance institutions (MFIs) have undertaken significant efforts to become professional financial service providers, which has allowed them to tap private funding sources and to expand client outreach. While the arrival of private funding sources is in itself a positive development, it also risks changing the incentive structure of MFIs in favour of revenue generation and profits. These risks are exacerbated in the absence of a proper national regulatory framework.

The EU supports microfinance as it can be an effective tool for development, both in economic ([1]) and social ([2]) terms. EU support programmes intervene on three levels: (i) at macro (policy) level, to improve financial sector regulation and supervision, among others to ensure client protection; (ii) at meso level to e.g. credit bureaus, which play a crucial role in preventing client over-indebtedness and (iii) at micro (MFI) level, e.g. to improve social performance management. Selective targeting of interventions at these three levels will allow maximising the development potential of microfinance, while containing the risks of over-indebtedness.

The EU also supports microfinance in countries where it is promoting democratic change, such as in North Africa and the Middle East (the latter representing about 16% of the overall microfinance portfolio).

([1]) e.g. for building up a small livelihood.
([2]) allowing poor people to manage their financial assets, giving poor people a voice, building democracies.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004523/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(2. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Raketentest in Indien

Vor einigen Tagen hat Indien eine atomwaffenfähige Rakete vom Typ „Agni-5" mit einer Reichweite von 5 000 Kilometern erfolgreich getestet. In einem Interview erklärte ein indischer China-Experte, Indien verfüge derzeit über die Kompetenz, auf mögliche Grenzüberschreitungen der Volksrepublik entsprechend zu reagieren. Am Test-Tag selbst bezeichnete der chinesische Außenministeriumssprecher Liu Weimin China und Indien als wichtige Entwicklungs- und Schwellenländer, die Partner und keine Konkurrenten seien.

1. Wie ist die Haltung der Vizepräsidentin/Hohen Vertreterin zum indischen Raketentest?

2. In welchem Ausmaß wird dies Einfluss auf die EU-Beziehungen haben?

3. Welchen Einfluss würden ggf. Spannungen zwischen China und Indien auf die jeweiligen EU-Beziehungen haben?

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

Die EU verfolgt eine allgemeine Politik zur Förderung von Frieden und Stabilität in der Welt. Friedliche Beziehungen zwischen Indien und China sind daher von entscheidender Bedeutung. Alle nuklearfähigen Mitgliedstaaten müssen bezüglich ihrer Nuklearkapazitäten Zurückhaltung üben.

Nach Ansicht der EU wird der in der schriftlichen Anfrage genannte Test Indiens keine unmittelbaren Auswirkungen auf die Beziehungen der EU zu Indien oder China haben.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004523/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Rocket testing in India

A few days ago, India successfully tested an Agni-5 rocket, which is nuclear capable and has a range of 5 000 kilometres. In an interview, an Indian sinologist explained that India now had the ability to respond to possible border incursions by the People's Republic of China. On the day of the test, the Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs, Liu Weimin, described China and India as important developing and emerging countries that were partners rather than competitors.

1. What is the view of the Vice-President/High Representative on the Indian rocket test?

2. To what extent will this development influence relations with the EU?

3. What would be the effect of any tensions between China and India on their relations with the EU?

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

The EU pursues a general policy in favour of international peace and stability. Peaceful relations between India and China are therefore of key importance. All nuclear-capable states have to exercise restraint regarding their nuclear capabilities.

The EU does not consider that the test carried out by India and referred to in the written question will have any direct consequences on EU relations with India or with China.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004525/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(2 mei 2012)

Betreft: Turkije: „liever de OIC, dan de EU"

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht ([1]) dat Turkije een EU delegatie door middel van een veto wil uitsluiten van deelname aan een NAVO-top zolang er niemand van de Organisatie van de islamitische Conferentie (OIC) wordt uitgenodigd?

2. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat Turkije hierbij wederom aantoont dat het als kandidaat-lidstaat niet in de EU thuishoort? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het gegeven dat Turkije lid is van een organisatie (de OIC) die de mensenrechten beperkt tot die beschreven in de sharia, de islamitische wetgeving?

4. Is de Commissie van mening dat een land dat lid is van een organisatie (de OIC) die o.a. de doodstraf door steniging voor overspel toestaat, het amputeren van ledematen als strafmaat hanteert en duidelijk maakt dat de vrouw in alle tijden ondergeschikt is aan de man, nooit en te nimmer lid kan worden van de EU? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(26 juni 2012)

De Commissie wenst niet te reageren op het artikel waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst.

Wat betreft het Turkse lidmaatschap van de Organisatie van de islamitische Conferentie (OIC) vestigt de Commissie de aandacht van het geachte Parlementslid op de verklaring op grond van artikel 37, lid 2, van het charter van de OIC dat Turkije het charter zal uitleggen en uitvoeren overeenkomstig de Turkse grondwet en wetgeving en de verplichtingen die voortvloeien uit de internationale overeenkomsten die Turkije heeft ondertekend.

Wat betreft het toetredingsproces van Turkije verwijst de Commissie naar de bepalingen die duidelijk worden uiteengezet in het onderhandelingskader, waarmee alle lidstaten in 2005 hebben ingestemd, en op het besluit van de Raad van december 2006.

([1]) http://www.neurope.eu/article/turkey-veto-eu-participation-nato-summit.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004525/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(2 May 2012)

Subject: Turkey prefers the OIC to the EU

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report ([1]) that Turkey intends to veto participation by an EU delegation at a NATO summit unless representatives of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference (OIC) are invited?

2. Does the Commission agree with the Party for Freedom that Turkey is once more demonstrating that it does not belong in the EU as a candidate Member State? If not, why not?

3. What is the Commission's view of Turkey's membership of an organisation (the OIC) which restricts human rights to those described by Sharia, or Islamic law?

4. Does the Commission believe that a country which is a member of an organisation (the OIC) that permits, among other things, the death penalty by stoning for adultery, uses amputation of limbs as a punishment and makes it clear that women are at all times inferior to men can never become a member of the European Union? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(26 June 2012)

The Commission does not wish to comment on the article referred to by the Honourable Member.

Regarding Turkey's membership in the Organisation of the Islamic Conference (OIC), the Commission draws the Honourable Member's attention to Turkey's declaration in line with paragraph 2 of Article 37 of the OIC Charter that Turkey will interpret and implement the Charter in conformity with its Constitution and laws as well as its obligations arising from international agreements.

Regarding Turkey's accession process, the Commission refers to the provisions clearly set out in the Negotiating Framework agreed by all Member States in 2005 as well as the Council decision of December 2006.

([1]) http://www.neurope.eu/article/turkey-veto-eu-participation-nato-summit.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-004526/12
adresată Comisiei
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(3 mai 2012)

Subiect: Cerințele privind autorizarea medicamentelor homeopate

Medicamentele homeopate urmează o abordare cu obiective multiple, în timp ce alte medicamente urmează o abordare cu un obiectiv unic. Cu toate acestea, procedurile de autorizare armonizate la nivel european pentru testările privind eficacitatea prevăd aceleași cerințe de autorizare pentru ambele tipuri de produse [a se vedea Directiva 2001/83/CE ([1]), articolul 8 alineatul (3) litera (i) și articolul 16 alineatul (1)]. În timp ce pentru alte medicamente este posibilă, în practică, testarea clinică a contribuției fiecărui ingredient activ conținut de produs, nu se poate vorbi despre același lucru în cazul medicamentelor homeopate. Cerințele de autorizare ar trebui să accepte, pentru o abordare cu obiective multiple, testările clinice privind eficacitatea ale produselor „în ansamblu", pentru ca producătorii să le poată respecta la nivel practic.

Produsele autorizate furnizează mult mai mult informații consumatorului și pacientului. O procedură de autorizare adaptată (de exemplu, prin includerea unor dispoziții specifice în anexa 1 la Directiva 2001/83/CE) ar fi, prin urmare, un pas pozitiv în ceea ce privește medicamentele homeopate. În plus, numărul etapelor testărilor clinice care urmează să fie efectuate de producători în cadrul unei proceduri de autorizare este cu mult mai mare decât în cadrul unei simple proceduri de înregistrare. Întrucât actuala procedură de autorizare armonizată la nivel european nu este fezabilă în practică pentru producători, nu există niciun stimulent pentru efectuarea unei cercetări clinice cuprinzătoare cu privire la produse. În consecință, în domeniu este disponibilă numai o cercetare insuficientă. Modificarea cerințelor de autorizare ar încuraja cercetarea clinică în acest domeniu, având numeroase beneficii pentru consumatori, pacienți, furnizorii de servicii medicale și reputația generală a homeopatiei.

1. Având în vedere faptul că niciun medicament homeopat nu a fost încă autorizat în temeiul procedurii de armonizare de la nivel european în conformitate cu articolul 16 alineatul (1) și articolul 8 alineatul (3) litera (i) de la anexa 1 la Directiva 2001/83/CE, are de gând Comisia să consolideze cerințele de autorizare legate de eficacitate pentru medicamentele homeopate de la anexa 1?

2. Recunoaște Comisia faptul că o consolidare adecvată a cerințelor de autorizare în conformitate cu particularitățile homeopatiei — acceptând testările clinice privind eficacitatea ale produsului „în ansamblu" ca fiind suficiente — ar putea spori aspectele benefice ale homeopatiei, contribuind la efecte pozitive semnificative pentru consumatori, pacienți, cercetători și producători?

Răspuns dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei
(7 iunie 2012)

Comisia îi invită pe distinșii membri să consulte răspunsurile la întrebarea scrisă anterioară E-003839/2012, adresată de dna Harkin.

([1]) JO L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 67.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-004526/12
to the Commission
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: Authorisation requirements for homeopathic medicinal products

Homeopathic medicinal products follow a multi-target approach, whereas other medicinal products follow a single-target approach. Despite this, the Europe-wide harmonised authorisation procedures for efficacy testing foresee the same authorisation requirements for both kinds of products (see Directive 2001/83/EC ([1]), Articles 8(3)(i) and 16(1)). While for other medicinal products it is possible in practice to clinically test the contribution of each active ingredient contained in the product, this is not the case for homeopathic medicinal products. For a multi-target approach, the authorisation requirements would need to accept clinical efficacy testing of the products 'as a whole' in order for manufacturers to be able to comply with them on a practical level.

Authorised products provide much more information to the consumer and patient. An adapted authorisation procedure (e.g. by including specific provisions in Annex A to Directive 2001/83/EC) would therefore be a positive step where homeopathic medicinal products are concerned. Moreover, the number of clinical testing phases to be performed by manufacturers within an authorisation procedure is far higher than it is within a mere registration procedure. Since the current Europe-wide harmonised authorisation procedure is not feasible in practice for manufacturers, there is no incentive to carry out comprehensive clinical research on the products. Consequently, only scant research is available in the field. Amending the authorisation requirements would encourage clinical research in this field, with great benefits for consumers, patients, healthcare providers and the overall reputation of homeopathy.

1. Given the fact that no homeopathic medicinal product has yet been authorised under the Europe-wide harmonised authorisation procedure in line with Articles 16(1) and 8(3)(i) of Annex A to Directive 2001/83/EC, is the Commission going to consolidate the efficacy-related authorisation requirements for homeopathic medicinal products in Annex A?

2. Does the Commission acknowledge that with a suitable consolidation of the authorisation requirements in line with the specificities of homeopathy — accepting clinical efficacy testing of the product 'as a whole' as sufficient — the beneficial aspects of homeopathy could be boosted, bringing significant positive effects for consumers, patients, researchers and manufacturers?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(7 June 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answers to previous Written Question E-003839/2012 by Ms Harkin.

([1]) OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 67.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-004527/12
a la Comisión
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE) y Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(3 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Reforma del Código Penal en España II

Esta pregunta es complementaria de la pregunta escrita presentada por Raül Romeva i Rueda el 12 de abril de 2012 (E-003796/2012), que reza lo siguiente: «El Gobierno español ha decidido reformar el Código Penal, la Ley de Enjuiciamiento Criminal y la Ley orgánica de Protección de la Seguridad Ciudadana. Estas reformas pretenden luchar contra lo que el gobierno ha denominado "espiral de violencia", pero supondrán graves restricciones de derechos y de las libertades de expresión, comunicación y manifestación».

— ¿Cuáles son los posibles efectos de la nueva ley española sobre los derechos y libertades de las personas fuera de España?

— ¿Es posible que se pueda acusar también a estas personas por debatir sobre futuras protestas públicas en España en línea?

— ¿Podrían ser acusadas si visitasen España posteriormente? En caso afirmativo, ¿cree que es una situación aceptable?

— ¿Con qué medios podría contar la Comisión para garantizar los derechos y las libertades fundamentales en el entorno en línea a la luz de las modificaciones propuestas del Código Penal español? ¿Está considerando la Comisión la posibilidad de emprender acciones? En caso afirmativo, ¿qué acciones se están estudiando?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de junio de 2012)

La Comisión no ha recibido información específica alguna sobre la propuesta a que hacen referencia Sus Señorías. En caso de adoptarse, la Comisión evaluará si las medidas entran en el ámbito de aplicación de la legislación de la UE.

Dentro de sus competencias, la Comisión siempre se ha comprometido con firmeza para garantizar que la libertad de expresión, de información y de reunión, son respetadas de manera estricta ya que constituyen los cimientos de una sociedad libre, democrática y plural. La Comisión también está a favor del libre acceso a Internet y de la libertad de expresión y de información a través de Internet.

No obstante, las atribuciones de la Comisión en lo que respecta a los actos y omisiones de los Estados miembros se limitan a la supervisión de la aplicación de la legislación de la Unión Europea, bajo el control del Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea. Con arreglo al artículo 51, apartado 1, de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales, las disposiciones de la misma están dirigidas a los Estados miembros únicamente cuando apliquen el Derecho de la Unión.

Cuando los Estados miembros actúen fuera del ámbito de aplicación de la legislación de la Unión, las autoridades nacionales deberán garantizar que sus obligaciones relativas a los derechos fundamentales y derivadas de los acuerdos internacionales y de la legislación interna, son respetadas. España, como cualquier otro Estado miembro, está obligada a respetar el Convenio Europeo para la Protección de los Derechos Humanos y las Libertades Fundamentales.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004527/12
aan de Commissie
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE) en Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(3 mei 2012)

Betreft: Hervorming van het strafwetboek in Spanje II

Deze vragen zijn een aanvulling op de schriftelijke vraag die werd ingediend door Raül Romeva i Rueda op 12 april 2012 (E-003796/2012) en die als volgt luidt: „De Spaanse regering heeft besloten om het strafwetboek, het wetboek van strafvordering en de wet inzake bescherming en openbare veiligheid te hervormen. Deze hervormingen zijn gericht tegen wat door de regering een „spiraal van geweld" werd genoemd, maar zij houden ernstige beperkingen in van de rechten en de vrijheden van meningsuiting, communicatie en protest."

— Wat zijn de mogelijke gevolgen van de nieuwe Spaanse wetgeving voor de rechten en vrijheden van mensen buiten Spanje?

— Zouden ook zij in beschuldiging kunnen worden gesteld als zij toekomstige openbare protesten in Spanje bespreken op het internet?

— Zouden zij in beschuldiging kunnen worden gesteld als zij vervolgens naar Spanje reizen? Indien ja, vindt u dit een aanvaardbare situatie?

— Welke maatregelen kan de Commissie nemen om de fundamentele rechten en vrijheden in de on-linesfeer te garanderen in het licht van de voorgestelde wijziging van het Spaanse strafwetboek? Is de Commissie van plan actie te ondernemen? Zo ja, welke?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(18 juni 2012)

De Commissie heeft geen specifieke informatie ontvangen over het voorstel waarnaar de geachte Parlementsleden verwijzen. Mocht dit voorstel worden goedgekeurd, dan zal de Commissie beoordelen of de maatregelen in overeenstemming zijn met het EU-recht.

Binnen haar bevoegdheden heeft de Commissie zich altijd sterk ingezet voor het waarborgen van de vrijheid van meningsuiting en informatie en de vrijheid van vergadering, aangezien deze de grondslag vormen van een vrije, democratische en pluralistische samenleving. De Commissie is ook voorstander van een vrij toegankelijk internet en van de vrijheid van meningsuiting en informatie op het internet.

De bevoegdheden van de Commissie inzake wat lidstaten doen of nalaten zijn evenwel beperkt tot het toezien op de toepassing van het recht van de Unie, onder de controle van het Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie. Overeenkomstig artikel 51, lid 1, van het Handvest van de grondrechten zijn de bepalingen van dit handvest uitsluitend tot de lidstaten gericht wanneer deze het recht van de Unie ten uitvoer leggen.

Wanneer lidstaten buiten het kader van de tenuitvoerlegging van het recht van de Unie handelen, moeten de nationale autoriteiten hun uit internationale overeenkomsten en de nationale wetgeving voortvloeiende verplichtingen op het gebied van grondrechten nakomen. Spanje is zoals elke andere lidstaat gehouden het Europees Verdrag tot bescherming van de rechten van de mens en de fundamentele vrijheden te eerbiedigen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004527/12
to the Commission
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE) and Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: Reform of the Criminal Code in Spain II

These questions are supplementary to the written question tabled by Raül Romeva i Rueda on 12 April 2012 (E 003796/2012), which reads as follows: 'The Spanish Government has decided to reform the Criminal Code, the Criminal Procedure Law and the Organic Law on Protection of Public Safety. These reforms seek to combat what the government has termed a "spiral of violence", but they will mean serious restrictions on rights and freedoms of expression, communication and protest.'

— What are the possible effects of the new Spanish law on the rights and freedoms of people outside Spain?

— Is it possible that they too could be charged as a result of discussing future public protests in Spain online?

— Could they be charged when they subsequently visit Spain? If so, do you think that is an acceptable situation?

— Which possible actions are available to the Commission to guarantee the fundamental rights and freedoms in the online domain in light of the proposed changes in the Spanish Criminal Code? Is the Commission considering taking action? If so, which actions are being considered?

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

The Commission has not received any specific information on the proposal referred to by the Honourable Members. If adopted, the Commission will assess whether the measures fall within the scope of EC law.

Within its competences, the Commission has always been strongly committed to ensuring that freedom of expression and information and freedom of assembly are strictly respected since they lie at the very base of a free, democratic and pluralist society. The Commission also stands for a freely accessible Internet and for freedom of expression and freedom of information via the Internet.

However, the Commission's powers regarding acts and omissions by Member States are limited to overseeing the application of European Union law, under the control of the Court of Justice of the European Union. According to Article 51(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the provisions of the Charter are addressed to the Member States only when they are implementing Union law.

Where Member States act outside the implementation of Union law, it is for the national authorities to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights — as resulting from international agreements and from internal legislation — are respected. Spain, like all the other Member States, is bound to respect the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004528/12
aan de Commissie
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(3 mei 2012)

Betreft: BTW-plicht wereldwinkels — Gevolgen implementatie Richtlijn 2006/69/EG voor ideële kleine ondernemingen

Nederland heeft een speciale regeling voor de BTW-plicht van kleine ondernemingen, de zogenaamde kleineondernemersregeling. Twee belangrijke onderdelen van deze regeling zijn de vermindering of vrijstelling van de te betalen BTW, en de mogelijkheid tot ontheffing van administratieve verplichtingen met betrekking tot BTW. Hierdoor konden kleine ondernemingen met ideëel doel, zoals de wereldwinkels, het hoofd boven water houden.

De Nederlandse staatssecretaris Weekers is van plan om, op basis van Richtlijn 2006/69/EG, de kleineondernemingregeling te wijzigen. Dit heeft ingrijpende gevolgen voor kleine ideële ondernemingen. Ten eerste betekent de afdracht van BTW een forse lastenverzwaring. Ten tweede zijn de administratieve lasten ook een bedreiging voor het bestaan van deze vaak door vrijwilligers gerunde ondernemingen. Het argument van concurrentievervalsing gaat hier niet op, omdat deze winkels voornamelijk producten verkopen die via de gewone, commerciële markt in Nederland niet of nauwelijks verkrijgbaar zijn.

1. Is de Commissie bereid om richtlijn Richtlijn 2006/69/EG aan te passen en zo, indachtig het Think Small First principe dat de Commissie zelf heeft ingevoerd, kleine ondernemingen met ideëel doel uit te sluiten van de BTW-verplichting?

2. Zo ja, is de Commissie bereid om, in afwachting van deze wijziging, de bestaande richtlijn niet van toepassing te verklaren op dergelijke kleine ondernemingen?

Antwoord van de heer Šemeta namens de Commissie
(27 juni 2012)

In antwoord op de twee vragen van het geachte Parlementslid wordt erop gewezen dat de btw in algemene zin, inclusief de bijzondere btw-regeling voor kleine ondernemingen, in Richtlijn 2006/112/EG van de Raad van 28 november 2006 betreffende het gemeenschappelijke stelsel van belasting over de toegevoegde waarden (de btw-richtlijn) is geregeld. Elke verandering in de bijzondere btw-regeling voor kleine ondernemingen zoals beschreven in de artikelen 281 tot en met 294 van deze richtlijn zou daarom indien nodig eerder wijzigingen in deze bepalingen met zich meebrengen dan in Richtlijn 2006/69/EG.

Het idee achter de regeling is om de levering van goederen en diensten door kleine ondernemingen te laten profiteren van een vrijstelling of een degressieve vermindering van de belasting, wat leidt tot een vermindering van de belastingdruk en de administratieve lasten voor de betrokken kleine ondernemingen.

De toepassing van de regeling, die aan de lidstaten wordt overgelaten, maakt geen onderscheid tussen profit- en non-profitorganisaties. Als de regeling in een bepaalde lidstaat van toepassing is, kunnen kleine non-profitorganisaties voor een btw-vrijstelling of degressieve vermindering kiezen voor zover zij de nationale voorwaarden van deze regeling respecteren. De Commissie ziet om die reden geen noodzaak de EU-wetgeving met betrekking tot deze bijzondere regeling te wijzigen.

Daarnaast bevat Richtlijn 2006/112/EG bepalingen met betrekking tot vrijstellingen voor bepaalde activiteiten van algemeen belang.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004528/12
to the Commission
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: VAT liability of worldshops — consequences of implementation of Directive 2006/69/EC for non-profit-making small enterprises

The Netherlands has a special regulation on the VAT liability of small enterprises, the so-called small-enterprise regulation. Two important elements of this regulation are a reduction of or exemption from VAT payable and the possibility of being granted relief from administrative obligations in relation to VAT. These have allowed small non-profit-making enterprises, such as worldshops, to keep their heads above water.

Dutch State Secretary of Finance Frans Weekers is planning to amend the small-enterprise regulation on the basis of Directive 2006/69/EC. This has profound implications for small non-profit-making enterprises. Firstly, the payment of VAT will significantly increase their burden. Secondly, the administrative burden also threatens the survival of these enterprises, which are often run by volunteers. The argument of unfair competition does not apply in this case because these shops mainly sell goods which are not available or barely available on the general commercial market in the Netherlands.

1. In light of the 'Think Small First' principle introduced by the Commission itself, is the Commission prepared to adapt Directive 2006/69/EC to exempt small non-profit-making enterprises from VAT liability?

2. If so, is the Commission prepared, pending this amendment, to declare the existing directive inapplicable to such small enterprises?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

In replying to the two questions posed by the honourable member, it should be pointed out that VAT generally, including the special VAT scheme for small enterprises, is regulated in the Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006 on the common system of Value Added Tax (the VAT Directive). Hence any changes to the special VAT scheme for small enterprises, as set out in Articles 281 to 294 of this directive, would if needed involve changes to these provisions rather than Directive 2006/69/EC.

The rationale behind the scheme is to allow the supply of goods and services by small enterprises to benefit from either an exemption or a graduated tax relief, which results in reducing the tax and administrative burden for the small enterprises concerned.

The application of the scheme, which is at the discretion of Member States, does not make a distinction between profit and non-profit-making enterprises. Should the scheme be available in a specific Member State, small non-profit making enterprises can opt for a VAT exemption or graduated relief in so far they respect the national conditions of this scheme. The Commission therefore does not see the need to change the EU legislation on this specific scheme.

In addition to that, Directive 2006/112/EC contains provisions as regards exemptions for certain activities in the public interest.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-004529/12
aan de Commissie
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(3 mei 2012)

Betreft: Compensatie vluchten uitgevoerd door derden (niet-EU) n.a.v. Verordening (EG) nr. 261/2004

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van problemen van passagiers met betrekking tot het krijgen van compensatie voor vertraagde vluchten, waarvoor de passagier een contract heeft afgesloten met een Europese luchtvaartmaatschappij, maar waarbij de vlucht wordt uitgevoerd door een niet-Europese luchtvaartmaatschappij?

2. Kan de Commissie aangeven of, en zo ja hoe, Verordening (EG) nr. 261/2004 de passagier het recht verschaft om in bovenstaande situatie te worden gecompenseerd in geval van een vertraagde vlucht, ook wanneer het een vlucht vanaf een niet-Europese luchthaven naar een Europese luchthaven betreft?

3. Kan de Commissie aangeven welke partij in bovenstaande situatie verantwoordelijk is voor eventuele compensatie aan de passagier?

4. Indien Verordening (EG) nr. 261/2004 in de hierboven geschetste situatie niet voorziet in bescherming van de passagier, is de Commissie dan bereid om met nieuwe wetgeving te komen?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(8 juni 2012)

1. De Commissie weet dat passagiers problemen ondervinden bij het vragen van compensatie voor vertragingen uit hoofde van Verordening (EG) nr. 261/2004. Dit is hoofdzakelijk te wijten aan een aantal communautaire luchtvaartmaatschappijen en maatschappijen van buiten de EER die compensatie weigeren in afwachting van de uitspraak in de zaken Nelson (C-581/10) en TUI Travel (C-629/10), die momenteel door het Hof van Justitie van de EU worden behandeld. Het advies van de advocaat-generaal in deze zaken is gepubliceerd op 15 mei.

2. In artikel 3 van de verordening is bepaald dat alle luchtvaartmaatschappijen die vluchten in de Unie of naar derde landen uitvoeren, verplicht zijn compensatie te betalen, ongeacht de nationaliteit van de betrokken luchtvaartmaatschappij. De verordening is ook bindend voor EER-luchtvaartmaatschappijen, voor wat vluchten uit derde landen naar de Unie betreft, maar niet voor vluchten die worden uitgevoerd door luchtvaartmaatschappijen van buiten de EER.

3. Alle verplichtingen uit hoofde van Verordening (EG) nr. 261/2004 berusten bij de luchtvaartmaatschappij die de vlucht uitvoert. Dit is in artikel 2, onder b), gedefinieerd als de luchtvaartmaatschappij die een vlucht uitvoert of voornemens is een vlucht uit te voeren in het kader van een overeenkomst met een passagier of namens een andere natuurlijke of rechtspersoon die een overeenkomst heeft met die passagier. Overeenkomstig artikel 3 zijn luchtvaartmaatschappijen van buiten de EER dus niet verplicht om compensatie te betalen voor vertragingen van vluchten naar de Unie.

4. De Commissie is bezig met een evaluatie van de verordening en zal nagaan hoe het door het geachte Parlementslid aangehaalde probleem kan worden opgelost.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004529/12
to the Commission
Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: Compensation for flights operated by air carriers from third (non-EU) countries in connection with Regulation (EC) No 261/2004

1. Is the Commission aware of the problems experienced by passengers attempting to secure compensation for delayed flights when the contract for the flight is with a European air carrier but the flight is operated by a non-European air carrier?

2. Can the Commission indicate whether and how Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 accords passengers in the above situation the right to compensation for delayed flights, including for flights departing from a non-European airport to a European airport?

3. Can the Commission indicate which party is responsible for compensating the passenger in the above situation?

4. If Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 does not accord passengers any protection in the situation described, is the Commission prepared to propose new legislation?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(8 June 2012)

1. The Commission is aware that passengers are experiencing difficulties in claiming compensation for delay under Regulation (EC) No 261/2004. This is primarily due to a number of Community and non-EEA air carriers refusing compensation pending the outcome of a series of cases, Nelson (C-581/10) and TUI Travel (C-629/10), presently before the Court of Justice of the EU. The opinion of the Advocate General in these cases was published on 15 May.

2. Under the terms of Article 3 of the regulation all air carriers operating services within the Union, or flights to third countries, are under the obligation to pay delay compensation irrespective of the nationality of the carrier concerned. The regulation is also binding on EEA air carriers in respect of services from third countries coming to the Union, but not on services undertaken by non-EEA carriers.

3. All air carrier's obligations under Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 rests with the operating air carrier defined under Article 2(b) as the air carrier that performs or intends to perform a flight under a contract with a passenger or on behalf of another person, legal or natural, having a contract with that passenger. Consequently, in accordance with Article 3, there is no obligation on a non-EEA air carrier to pay compensation for delay on flights into the Union.

4. The Commission is currently undertaking a review of the regulation in which it will consider how the issue raised by the Honourable Member might be addressed.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-004531/12
til Kommissionen
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(3. maj 2012)

Om: Afvisning af aktindsigt omkring muslingefiskeriet i Limfjorden

Danmarks Fiskeriforening anmodede den 3. marts 2012 om aktindsigt i sagen om traktatkrænkelse vedrørende konsekvensvurdering af og tilladelse til muslingefiskeri med skraber i to Natura 2000 områder i Limfjorden. Aktindsigten vedrører en kopi af Europa-Kommissionens åbningsskrivelse samt supplerende åbningsskrivelse.

Kommissionen modsatte sig imidlertid den 26. marts aktindsigt i de to åbningsskrivelser. I sin begrundelse for at afvise anmodning om aktindsigt henviser Kommissionen til artikel 4 (2), 3. led i Forordning (EF) Nr. 1049/2001. Bestemmelsen påskriver, at institutionerne kan afvise en anmodning om aktindsigt i tilfælde, hvor offentliggørelse af dokumenter vil kunne undergrave beskyttelsen af formålet med inspektioner, undersøgelser og revision. Undtagelser fra denne regel kan dog gives, hvis der er en tungtvejende offentlig interesse i udbredelsen af dokumentet.

I betragtning af de store sociale og økonomiske hensyn, der er knyttet til muslingefiskeriet i lokalområdet omkring Limfjorden (muslingeerhvervet i Limfjorden tegner sig for mere end 300 arbejdspladser i et randområde med betydelige beskæftigelsesmæssige og demografiske udfordringer), bedes Kommissionen forklare, hvorfor den vurderer, at der ikke foreligger en tungtvejende offentlig interesse i overensstemmelse med artikel 4 (2), 3. led i Forordning (EF) Nr. 1049/2001?

Svar afgivet på vegne af Kommissionen af Janez Potočnik
(29. juni 2012)

Det skal indledningsvis slås fast, at Danmarks Fiskeriforening ikke har anmodet Kommissionen om aktindsigt. Den har anmodet de danske myndigheder, som efterfølgende har rådført sig med Kommissionen. Kommissionen har derfor ikke afvist aktindsigt i disse dokumenter, men blot afgivet en negativ udtalelse til de danske myndigheder, som i sidste instans besluttede, hvorvidt dokumenterne skulle offentliggøres eller ej i henhold til den danske lov om aktindsigt i offentlige myndigheders dokumenter.

Kommissionen mener, at de efterspurgte dokumenter hører under en af undtagelserne i bestemmelserne i artikel 4 i forordning 1049/2001 ([1]) om aktindsigt i Europa-Parlamentets, Rådets og Kommissionens dokumenter, og at offentliggørelse af de pågældende dokumenter vil være til skade for den igangværende undersøgelse. Kommissionen har ikke været i stand til at påvise en tungtvejende offentlig interesse, som kan retfærdiggøre, at dokumenterne bliver offentliggjort på trods af undtagelsen. Det er netop i offentlighedens interesse, at en mulig overtrædelse bliver stoppet, og det er derfor, at Kommissionen foretager undersøgelsen. Kommissionen mener, at offentligheden er bedre tjent med, at det loyale samarbejde og den gensidige tillid mellem Kommissionen og den berørte medlemsstat bevares. Domstolens retspraksis (dom i sag *T-191/99*) bekræfter, at en afvisning af aktindsigt i åbningsskrivelser kan retfærdiggøres med hensynet til fremme af det formål det er, at der findes en mindelig løsning på tvisten mellem Kommissionen og den pågældende medlemsstat.

([1]) EFT L 145 af 31.5.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004531/12
to the Commission
Ole Christensen (S&D)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: Refusal of access to documents on mussel dredging in Limfjord

On 3 March 2012, the Danish Fishermen's Association requested access to documents on the case of violation of the treaty with regard to the impact assessment of and permission for mussel dredging in two Natura 2000 areas in the Limfjord. The access to documents concerns a copy of the European Commission's opening Statement and supplementary opening statement.

However, on 26 March, the Commission opposed access to these two opening statements. In its justification for refusing access, the Commission refers to Article 4(2), point 3 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001. The provision states that institutions can refuse a request for access to a document where disclosure would undermine the purpose of inspections, investigations and audits. Dispensation from this rule can however be granted if there is an overriding public interest in disclosure.

Taking into consideration the great social and economic issues associated with mussel dredging in the local area around the Limfjord (the mussel industry provides more than 300 jobs in a peripheral region with significant employment and demographic problems), will the Commission explain why it does not consider there is 'overriding public interest' in this instance, in accordance with Article 4(3), point 3 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

It should first be clarified that the Danish Fishermen's Association did not submit a request for access to documents to the Commission, but to the Danish authorities, which then consulted the Commission. Therefore, the Commission did not refuse to grant the Association access to these documents, but only delivered a negative opinion to the Danish authorities, which eventually decided whether or not to disclose the documents requested under the provisions of the Danish legislation on access to public administration files.

The Commission is of the opinion that the requested documents fall under one of the exceptions provided by Article 4 of Regulation 1049/2001 ([1]) on public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents and that disclosure of the documents would undermine the protection of the purpose of the ongoing investigation. The Commission has not been able to identify an overriding public interest which could justify disclosure of the documents in spite of the exception. Putting an end to a possible infringement is precisely the matter of public interest and is the reason that the Commission is conducting this investigation. The Commission considers that this public interest is better served by maintaining the atmosphere of sincere cooperation and mutual trust between the Commission and the Member State concerned. The jurisprudence of the European Court of Justice (judgment in *T-191/99*) confirms that the preservation of the objective, namely an amicable resolution of the dispute between the Commission and the Member State justifies the refusal of the letters of formal notice.

([1]) OJ L 145, 31.5.2001.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004533/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(3 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: L'euro ha solo quattro modi per morire

Premesso che la spietata analisi svolta su Time dall'analista e commentatore economico-finanziario Michael Sivy nell'articolo dal significativo titolo «4 ways the euro could fail» non offre grandi prospettive all'euro, per il quale l'autorevole penna statunitense (che, sottolinea SI Sistema Italia, commenta i fatti economici su importanti canali televisivi quale ABC, CBS, NBC e Fox) profetizza quattro modi per morire.

Nell'editoriale pubblicato sul Time, vengono descritti quattro scenari:

— Primo scenario ovvero «La Francia e altri paesi convincono la Germania ad adottare politiche pro-crescita».

— Secondo scenario ovvero «Le politiche di austerity portano la maggior parte dell'Europa in recessione».

— Terzo scenario ovvero «I paesi più deboli vengono cacciati uno dopo l'altro dall'Eurozona».

— Quarto scenario ovvero «L'Eurozona si divide in due diverse aree valutarie».

La Commissione come valuta le seguenti conclusioni dell'analista Michael Sivy: «In definitiva, una soluzione ideale, probabilmente, non esiste. Tutti e quattro gli scenari contemplano una crisi finanziaria e differiscono solo per intensità di crisi e per il timing. Sicuramente le politiche peggiori sono quelle estreme: non fare nulla, o essere troppo duri. La cosa migliore sarebbe tentare di mantenere in atto alcune misure per la crescita economica, impedendo allo stesso tempo ai paesi già ultra-indebitati di indebitarsi ulteriormente. Il target più realistico a questo punto potrebbe essere semplicemente quello di evitare che le condizioni dell'Eurozona peggiorino e minimizzare dunque il danno»?

Risposta di Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(27 giugno 2012)

Non fa parte della politica della Commissione commentare articoli pubblicati sulla stampa o dichiarazioni rese da politici o altri cittadini negli Stati membri. La Commissione ha illustrato la propria analisi della crisi del debito sovrano nella zona euro in vari documenti, tra cui di particolare rilievo è l'Analisi annuale della crescita per il 2012 ([1]). Essa ha inoltre presentato uno schema per una risposta ampia e articolata ([2]) e ha sottolineato l'importanza del successo di questa strategia. La Commissione sta quindi portando avanti con convinzione le politiche che sostengono quest'approccio di ampio respiro ed è determinata a salvaguardare l'integrità dell'UE e della zona euro.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/documents/pdf/ags_en.pdf Si veda in particolare la relazione macroeconomica: http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/documents/pdf/annex_2_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/speeches-statements/pdf/20111012communication_roadmap_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004533/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: The euro has only four ways to die

The ruthless analysis made in *Time* by financial analyst and commentator Michael Sivy, in an article with the significant title of '4 ways the euro could fail', offers no great prospects for the euro. Indeed, in his *Time* editorial, the influential American writer (who, *SI Sistema Italia* stresses, comments on economic matters on prominent television channels such as ABC, CBS, NBC and Fox) describes four scenarios in which the euro could die:

— First scenario: 'France and other countries persuade Germany to agree to pro-growth policies'.

— Second scenario: 'Austerity policies force most of Europe into recession'.

— Third scenario: 'The weakest countries get pushed out of the eurozone one by one'.

— Fourth scenario: 'The eurozone splits into two separate currency areas'.

How does the Commission rate the following conclusions from Michael Sivy: 'There may, in fact, be no ideal solution. In all four scenarios, there is major financial disruption ahead. They differ only in the severity of the eventual crisis and its timing. The worst policies are the most extreme ones: doing nothing, or being purely harsh and punitive. The best would be to try to maintain some measure of economic growth while preventing countries that are already overindebted from adding too much to their borrowing. The most realistic goal at this point may simply be to avoid making matters worse and to try to minimise the damage'?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

It is Commission policy not to comment on articles appearing in the press or on statements by politicians or other individuals in the Member States. The Commission has provided its own analysis of the sovereign debt crisis in the euro area in various documents, among them importantly the 2012 Annual Growth Survey ([1]). It also set out the blueprint for a comprehensive response ([2]) and has underlined the importance of success with this strategy. The Commission is therefore steadfastly pursuing the policies underpinning this comprehensive approach. The Commission is committed to the integrity of the EU and the euro area.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/documents/pdf/ags_en.pdf See in particular the Macroeconomic report: http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/documents/pdf/annex_2_en.pdf

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/speeches-statements/pdf/20111012communication_roadmap_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-004534/12
an die Kommission
Paul Rübig (PPE)
(3. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Mobile Breitbandkommunikation für europäische Organisationen der öffentlichen Sicherheit

In der Erwägung, dass

— die Weltfunkkonferenz 2012 (WRC12) den Funksektor (ITU-R) beauftragt hat, die Einführung mobiler Dienste im Frequenzband 694-790 MHz für die Region 1 zu prüfen, und die Weltfunkkonferenz 2015 beauftragt hat, die notwendigen Maßnahmen durch Tagesordnungspunkt 1.2 einzuleiten;

— die Arbeitsgruppe Frequenzmanagement des Ausschusses für elektronische Kommunikation (ECC WG FM) im Juni 2011 das Projektteam PT 49 zusammengestellt hat, das die modernen Dienste für die öffentliche Sicherheit und Katastrophenschutz sowie deren Bedarf nach Funkfrequenzen prüfen soll;

unter Hinweis darauf, dass

— der Beschluss zum Programm für die Funkfrequenzpolitik (RSPP) angenommen und veröffentlicht wurde;

unter Berücksichtigung

— von RSPP Artikel 8.3 zu speziellen Frequenzen für moderne Breitbanddienste für die öffentliche Sicherheit unter harmonisierten Bedingungen in Mitgliedstaaten;

— der Bestimmungen der Entscheidung Nr. 676/2002/EG;

weiterhin unter Hinweis darauf, dass

— der US-Kongress am Freitag, dem 16. Februar 2012, ein Gesetz verabschiedet hat, das die Federal Communications Commission (FCC) berechtigt, den Frequenzblock 700 MHz D exklusiv für die Breitbandnutzung für die öffentliche Sicherheit neu zu vergeben;

— Industry Canada seine Absicht erklärt hat, dem US-Beschluss zu folgen und damit eine nahtlose grenzübergreifende funktionelle Umgebung für die öffentliche Sicherheit zwischen den Vereinigten Staaten und Kanada zu schaffen;

— Asia-Pacific Telecommunity (APT) untersucht, wie die Frequenzen innerhalb des Frequenzbandes 698-806 MHz in der gesamten Region für moderne Dienste für die öffentliche Sicherheit bereitgestellt werden können.

Welche Schritte plant die Kommission bis 2015, um das Erreichen des Ziels der Bestimmungen des RSPP und insbesondere des Artikels 8.3 zu gewährleisten und so dafür zu sorgen, dass Europa nicht hinter der restlichen Welt zurückbleibt, wenn es um die Bereitstellung einer harmonisierten Frequenzumgebung für moderne, mobile Breitbandkommunikation für die öffentliche Sicherheit und den Katastrophenschutz geht?

Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission
(14. Juni 2012)

Das Programm für die Funkfrequenzpolitik (RSPP) erfordert von der Kommission, in Zusammenarbeit mit den Mitgliedstaaten dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass ausreichend Funkfrequenzen für Belange der öffentlichen Sicherheit und des Bevölkerungsschutzes, des Katastrophenschutzes und der Katastrophenhilfe bereitstehen. Im Rahmen des RSPP hat die Kommission auch die Aufgabe, die Methodik für ein Inventar der gewerblichen wie auch öffentlichen Funkfrequenznutzung auszuarbeiten und das Inventar zu verwalten. Das Inventar soll unter anderem helfen, die Frequenzbereiche zu ermitteln, die für eine Neuzuweisung und für eine mögliche gemeinsame Frequenzbandnutzung infrage kommen, um die EU-Politik in den im RSPP genannten Bereichen, wozu auch die öffentliche Sicherheit und der Bevölkerungsschutz gehören, zu unterstützen.

Laut RSPP soll bis zum 1. Juli 2013 ein Durchführungsbeschluss zur Methodik eines Inventars erlassen werden, bei dem die vor kurzem verabschiedete Stellungnahme der Gruppe für Frequenzpolitik zu berücksichtigen ist. Die Kommission hat ferner eine Studie zum Frequenzangebot in Auftrag gegeben, deren Ergebnisse im August 2012 zur Verfügung stehen werden. In einem zweiten Schritt wird die Kommission die Nachfrageseite näher betrachten, wozu auch der Bedarf der für die öffentliche Sicherheit zuständigen Organisationen gehört. Die entsprechende Studie wird derzeit ausgeschrieben und wird mehrere Workshops mit den beteiligten Kreisen in der ersten Jahreshälfte 2013 umfassen.

Nach Erlass des Durchführungsbeschlusses wird die Kommission auf der Grundlage der genannten Studien und der für das Inventar relevanten Informationen der Mitgliedstaaten eine Analyse des Frequenz-angebots und -bedarfs vornehmen. Bezüglich des Bedarfs fordert die Kommission einen Bericht der Gruppe für Funkfrequenzen zum strategischen Frequenzbedarf der verschiedenen Sektoren an. Diese Anforderung umfasst ausdrücklich auch Sicherheitsdienste und den PPDR-Bereich (Schutz der Öffentlichkeit und Katastropheneinsatz); ein Abschlussbericht soll im November 2013 vorgelegt werden. Ein Bericht an das Europäische Parlament und den Rat sowie Folgemaßnahmen zur technischen Umsetzung sind 2014 und 2015 zu erwarten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004534/12
to the Commission
Paul Rübig (PPE)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: Wireless broadband communications for European public safety organisations

Whereas

— the World Radiocommunication Conference 2012 (WRC12) instructed the radiocommunication sector (ITU-R) to study the introduction of mobile services in the spectrum band 694-790 MHz for Region 1 and WRC15 to take the necessary actions through Agenda Item 1.2;

— in June 2011 the Electronic Communications Committee Working Group Frequency Management (ECC WG FM) established project team PT 49, tasked to study the advanced public safety and disaster relief services and their demand for radio spectrum;

Noting that

— the decision on the Radio Spectrum Policy Programme (RSPP) has been adopted and published;

Taking into account

— RSPP Article 8.3 on dedicated spectrum for advanced broadband public safety services under harmonised conditions in Member States;

— the provisions of Decision No 676/2002/EC;

Further noting that

— on Friday 16 February 2012, the US Congress passed a bill authorising the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to reallocate the 700 MHz D-Block spectrum for dedicated public safety broadband use;

— Industry Canada has announced its intention to follow the US decision, thus establishing a seamless cross-border public safety operational environment between the United States and Canada;

— Asia-Pacific Telecommunity (APT) is studying how spectrum within the band 698-806 MHz can be allocated across the region to advanced public safety services.

What steps is the Commission planning to take by 2015 to safeguard the achievement of the aim of the provisions of the RSPP, and in particular Article 8.3, and thus ensure that Europe does not fall behind the rest of the world in providing a harmonised spectrum environment for advanced, mobile broadband public safety and disaster relief communication?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(14 June 2012)

The Radio Spectrum Policy Programme (RSPP) requires the Commission, in cooperation with the Member States, to seek to ensure that sufficient spectrum is made available for public safety and protection, civil protection and disaster relief. The RSPP also tasks the Commission with developing the methodology for and administering an inventory of spectrum use for both commercial and public purposes. One of the objectives of the inventory is to help identify frequency bands that could be suitable for reallocation and spectrum-sharing opportunities, in order to support Union policies set out in the RSPP including, but not only, public safety and protection.

The RSPP requires the adoption of an implementing act on the methodology for an inventory by 1 July 2013, taking into account the opinion of the Radio Spectrum Policy Group which has recently been adopted. The Commission has also commissioned a study on spectrum supply, the results of which will be available in August 2012. In a second step the Commission will look at the demand side — this will include the needs of public safety organisations. The relevant study is currently in the tender phase and will include several workshops with stakeholders during the first half of 2013.

After the implementing decision has been adopted the Commission will conduct an analysis of spectrum supply and demand based on the studies mentioned above and inputs from the Member States relevant to the inventory. Concerning the latter the Commission is issuing a Request for a Report from the RSPG on strategic sectoral spectrum needs. This request explicitly includes safety services and public protection and disaster relief (PPDR) and a final report is expected in November 2013. A report to the European Parliament and Council as well as follow-up technical implementation measures can be expected in 2014 and 2015.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004535/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(3 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Auto elettriche

Il 2013 potrebbe essere l'anno in cui il mercato dell'auto elettrica si accenderà sul serio. All'inizio di aprile l'Italia ha inserito nelle «Norme per lo sviluppo degli spazi verdi urbani» la parte che riguarda l'installazione nelle aree pubbliche di colonnine a cura delle società distributrici di energia. Sul versante privato, si riconosce il diritto di collocare punti di ricarica nei parcheggi condominiali e s'impone ai Comuni di concedere l'abitabilità solo agli edifici nuovi che abbiano un'infrastruttura di ricarica.

La diffusione della trazione elettrica avrebbe un impatto positivo solo se potesse dispiegare in pieno le sue attuali potenzialità. Con l'autonomia di oggi tra 100 e 200 km (si tenga conto che il 90 % degli europei non fa più di 60 km al giorno) è utile in città, specialmente come mezzo commerciale adatta ai pendolari, che potrebbero lasciarla nei parcheggi d'interscambio (sotto carica) per proseguire con i mezzi pubblici e perfetta per i taxi.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è in possesso di dati inerenti al numero di macchine elettriche vendute nell'ultimo anno negli Stati membri;

2. quali Stati membri prevedono incentivi per incrementare le vendite di auto elettriche;

3. se l'UE ha attivato incentivi al fine di alimentare il mercato della trazione elettrica che avrebbe un impatto positivo sul clima e sull'ambiente?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(2 luglio 2012)

Si rinvia alla risposta fornita dalla Commissione all'interrogazione E-008744/2011 dell'onorevole Jim Higgins. Per il 2011 la stampa ha menzionato vendite nell'Europa occidentale per un volume di 11 000 veicoli elettrici.

La creazione di un mercato per veicoli puliti ed efficienti nel consumo energetico, compresi i veicoli elettrici, è sostenuta a livello dell'UE dalla direttiva 2009/33/CE. Tale direttiva, già recepita nella legislazione nazionale da tutti gli Stati membri, prescrive che tutti gli acquisti di veicoli da parte delle autorità pubbliche e degli operatori dei trasporti pubblici tengano conto del consumo energetico, delle emissioni di CO_2 e di inquinanti nell'intero ciclo di vita dei veicoli ([1]).

Conformemente all'articolo 10 della direttiva summenzionata la Commissione presenterà entro il 4 dicembre 2012 una relazione sull'attuazione e sull'eventuale revisione della stessa.

Si noti anche che la Commissione ha proposto diverse azioni specifiche a sostegno della diffusione dei veicoli elettrici, come annunciato nella strategia dell'UE per i veicoli puliti ed efficienti sul piano energetico ([2]) adottata nell'aprile 2010. Una delle azioni consiste nella pubblicazione di linee guida in tema di incentivi finanziari per veicoli puliti ed efficienti sul piano energetico, che dovrebbero essere adottate nel 2012. Le linee guida intendono promuovere un più forte coordinamento degli incentivi finanziari posti in atto dagli Stati membri evitando così la frammentazione del mercato unico. Si proporrà di concedere gli incentivi sulla base di criteri oggettivi e neutri sul piano tecnologico.

In effetti, diversi Stati membri offrono attualmente incentivi per le automobili elettriche. Tali incentivi possono configurarsi in diverse forme che vanno dall'esenzione della tassa di circolazione o di registro a sussidi per l'acquisto.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/urban/vehicles/clean_energy_efficient_vehicles_en.htm
([2]) COM(2010)186 definitivo del 28.04.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004535/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: Electric cars

The year 2013 could be the year when the electric car market really takes off. In early April, Italy inserted into the 'Regulations for developing urban green areas' a section concerning the installation in public areas of charging stations by energy distribution companies. Meanwhile, it has been recognised that private individuals have the right to install recharging points in parking lots and town councils are required to approve for habitation only those buildings which have recharging facilities.

The increased use of electric cars would have a positive impact if the cars were able to achieve their full potential. With a current range of between 100 and 200 km (bearing in mind that 90% of Europeans do not travel more than 60 km per day) they are useful in cities, especially as a commercial means of transport suitable for commuters who could leave them at interchange car parks (on charge) and continue their journey on public transport. They are also perfect for taxis.

In view of this, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does it possess data concerning the number of electric cars sold in Member States over the past year?

2. Which Member States offer incentives to increase sales of electric cars?

3. Has the EU implemented incentives in order to boost the electric car market, which would have a positive impact on the climate and the environment?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(2 July 2012)

Reference is made to the answer provided by the Commission to Question E-008744/2011 by Mr Jim Higgins. For 2011, press articles have mentioned sales in Western Europe of more than 11 000 electric vehicles.

The market build-up for clean and energy-efficient vehicles, electric vehicles included, is supported at EU level by Directive 2009/33/EC. This directive, already transposed in national legislation by all Member States, requires that all purchases of vehicles by public authorities and public transport operators take into account energy consumption, CO_2 emissions and pollutant emissions over the entire lifetime of vehicles ([1]).

According to Article 10 of the abovementioned Directive, a report on implementation and possible revision will be provided by the Commission by 4 December 2012.

It should also be noted that the Commission proposed a number of specific actions to support the deployment of electric vehicles, as announced in the EU strategy for clean and energy-efficient vehicles ([2]), adopted in April 2010. One of the actions is the publication of guidelines for financial incentives for clean and energy-efficient vehicles, which are planned to be adopted in 2012. The guidelines will aim to promote a stronger coordination of financial incentives put in place by Member States thereby avoiding the fragmentation of the single market. It will be proposed to award incentives on the basis of objective and technology-neutral criteria.

Indeed, a large number of Member States are currently offering incentives for electric cars. These can take different forms, ranging from exemptions of road or registration tax to purchase subsidies.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/urban/vehicles/clean_energy_efficient_vehicles_en.htm
([2]) COM(2010)186 final, 28.4.2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004538/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(3 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Diabete giovanile

L'aumento dell'obesità infantile sta facendo aumentare il numero di adolescenti affetti da diabete di tipo 2, che è molto più difficile da curare che negli adulti. Uno studio condotto da ricercatori americani ne ha esaminati 699 per 4 anni, scoprendo che solo nella metà dei casi il farmaco più comune funziona, mentre negli altri sono necessari un mix di terapie o l'insulina.

Uno dei primi sintomi del diabete infantile è la necessità per il bambino di alzarsi molte volte durante la notte per urinare. Un altro sintomo da non sottovalutare è rappresentato dall'improvviso dimagrimento, dovuto al fatto che l'organismo, non riuscendo ad utilizzare il glucosio (è l'insulina che ne regola l'utilizzo da parte delle cellule), cerca energia alternativa attingendo ai depositi di grasso sottocutaneo con conseguente perdita di peso. Di fondamentale importanza è l'educazione sanitaria impartita dal diabetologo e soprattutto dalla famiglia.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se esiste una strategia europea sulla malattia summenzionata e se vi sono nuove ricerche in campo sanitario finanziate nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ);

2. se dispone di dati inerenti al numero di bambini colpiti dalla malattia in questione?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(22 giugno 2012)

La Commissione è consapevole che l'incidenza del diabete di tipo 2 è in aumento tra i bambini e gli adolescenti, anche a causa di fattori quali l'obesità infantile. Il carico di morbilità di questa malattia potrebbe in gran parte essere prevenuto agendo sui fattori di rischio, tra cui alimentazione e attività fisica: in questo campo la Commissione ha messo in atto una strategia globale ([1]).

La Commissione finanzia inoltre una serie di progetti relativi al diabete nel quadro del programma per la salute, quali «Better control in paediatric and adolescent diabetes in the EU: working to create Centres of Reference (SWEET) ([2])» (Migliorare il controllo del diabete pediatrico e adolescenziale nell'UE: la creazione di centri di riferimento), «EUropean Best Information through Regional Outcomes in Diabetes (EUBIROD) ([3])» (Informazione ottimale a livello europeo mediante gli esiti dei dati regionali sul diabete), e «Development & Implementation of a European Guideline and training standards for Diabetes Prevention (IMAGE) ([4])» (Sviluppo e attuazione di linee guida europee e norme sulla formazione per la prevenzione del diabete).

Dall'avvio del settimo programma quadro nel 2007 circa 127 milioni di euro sono stati destinati a progetti di ricerca direttamente collegati al diabete di tipo 2 e finalizzati a una migliore conoscenza della malattia, alla ricerca di approcci terapeutici ottimali e di marcatori per la diagnosi precoce nonché ad approcci preventivi e conservativi più accurati. Il progetto BETA-JUDO, ad esempio, riguarda specificamente la prevenzione dell'insulinoresistenza e del diabete di tipo 2 nei giovani obesi ([5]).

La Commissione sostiene inoltre la ricerca e l'innovazione nel settore delle malattie collegate all'alimentazione con l'iniziativa di programmazione congiunta «A healthy Diet for a Healthy Life», (un'alimentazione sana per una vita sana), che mira a modificare le abitudini alimentari e l'offerta alimentare seguendo gli sviluppi delle scienze alimentari, nutrizionali, sociali e sanitarie.

([1]) Libro bianco — Una strategia europea sugli aspetti sanitari connessi all'alimentazione, al sovrappeso e all'obesità COM(2007)279 def.
([2]) http://sweet-project.eu/.
([3]) http://www.eubirod.eu/.
([4]) http://www.image-project.eu/.
([5]) http://betajudo.org/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004538/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: Juvenile diabetes

The rise in child obesity is resulting in an increase in the number of adolescents affected by type 2 diabetes, which is much more difficult to cure than diabetes in adults. A study conducted by American researchers surveyed 699 adolescents over four years and revealed that the most commonly-used medicines only worked in half of cases, while in the others a combination of treatments or insulin was necessary.

One of the first symptoms of childhood diabetes is that a child needs to get up many times during the night to urinate. Another symptom which should not be ignored is sudden weight loss. Such weight loss is caused by the body being unable to use glucose (insulin regulates the cells' use of glucose), seeking alternative energy sources and drawing on subcutaneous fat deposits. Health education, in particular of families, by diabetes experts is of paramount importance.

In view of this, can the Commission state:

1. whether there is a European strategy for the aforementioned disorder and whether new healthcare research is being funded within the context of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technical Development (FP7)?

2. whether the Commission has statistics on the number of children affected by this disorder?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The Commission is aware of the fact that the incidence of type 2 diabetes rates is increasing among children and adolescents, linked to factors such as childhood obesity. Much of this disease burden is preventable by taking action on risk factors such as nutrition and physical activity, where the Commission has put in place a comprehensive strategy ([1]).

In addition, the Commission has been financing projects related to diabetes under the Health Programme, such as 'Better control in paediatric and adolescent diabetes in the EU: working to create Centres of Reference (SWEET)' ([2]), 'EUropean Best Information through Regional Outcomes in Diabetes (EUBIROD)' ([3]), and 'Development & Implementation of a European Guideline and training standards for Diabetes Prevention (IMAGE)' ([4]).

Since the start of the 7th Framework Programme in 2007, some EUR 127 million have been devoted to research projects directly related to type 2 diabetes to better understand the disease, search for better therapeutic approaches and earlier diagnostic markers as well more accurate preventive and restorative approaches. For example the BETA-JUDO project specifically addresses prevention of insulin resistance and type 2 diabetes in young obese people ([5]).

The Commission further supports research and innovation to address diet related diseases, with the Joint Programming Initiative 'A healthy Diet for a Healthy Life', which aims to change dietary patterns and food supply based on developments in food, nutritional, social and health sciences.

([1]) White paper on a strategy for Europe on nutrition, overweight and obesity related health issues COM(2007)279 final.
([2]) http://sweet-project.eu/.
([3]) http://www.eubirod.eu/.
([4]) http://www.image-project.eu/.
([5]) http://betajudo.org/.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004539/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(3 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Moria di pellicani

Il governo peruviano sta cercando di comprendere le ragioni della morte di più di mille pellicani lungo 70 chilometri di costa nella parte settentrionale del paese, in cui sono state rinvenute anche 54 carcasse di uccelli tropicali, di leoni marini e di una tartaruga. Gli animali sono stati individuati nella stessa regione in cui sono stati rigettati a riva 800 delfini, la cui morte è ancora un mistero.

Un biologo peruviano esponente di una organizzazione ambientalista ha recentemente fatto sapere che la causa della morte potrebbe essere un virus in grado di mutare gli esseri umani che potrebbe causare un'epidemia mondiale. Il governo del Perù ha definito la situazione drammaticamente preoccupante. Ora si attendono nuovi studi e test che saranno effettuati sugli animali e che potranno dare maggiori informazioni sulla loro morte.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza della vicenda che sta interessando le coste del Perù;

2. se ritiene di compiere studi per assicurarsi che non si tratti di un virus contagioso e pericoloso per l'uomo onde tutelare la salute di individui che potrebbero venire a contatto con esseri viventi colpiti dal virus?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(29 giugno 2012)

La Commissione non ha ricevuto informazioni dirette dalle autorità peruviane in merito a tale evento. Essa però è a conoscenza della dichiarazione ufficiale sulla mortalità dei pellicani fatta dal Perù il 9 maggio 2012 ([1]). Il governo peruviano ha istituito un gruppo di esperti per studiare il fenomeno. Esso però ritiene che la mortalità dei pellicani sia dovuta a mancanza di cibo, soprattutto di pesci della famiglia delle sardine, in seguito a cambiamenti del locale ecosistema marino. In ciò rientrano l'influsso di acque superficiali calde, che inducono specie di pesci che di norma vivono vicino alla superficie a migrare verso sud in acque più profonde riducendo così la disponibilità di cibo. I test di laboratorio effettuati per verificare la presenza di importanti patologie aviarie hanno dato risultati negativi. Le informazioni fornite dal Perù indicherebbero che questo evento non rappresenterebbe un rischio significativo per la salute umana. In tutti i casi le indagini continuano.

([1]) http://redpeia.minam.gob.pe/noticia_131_omunicado-mortandad-de-pelicanos-y-delfines.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004539/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: Mass pelican deaths

The Government of Peru is investigating the deaths of over 1 000 pelicans along a 70 kilometre stretch of coastline in the north of the country where 54 tropical birds, sea lions and a tortoise were also found dead. The animals were found in the same region where 800 dolphins had been washed ashore. The cause of their deaths is still a mystery.

A Peruvian biologist who represents an environmental organisation has recently expressed the view that the cause of death could be a virus capable of spreading to humans, which could cause a global epidemic. The Peruvian Government has described the situation as extremely worrying. New studies and tests are to be conducted on the animals, which may give more information about their deaths.

1. Is the Commission aware of the events occurring on the coast of Peru?

2. Does it consider that studies should be carried out to establish whether or not this is a contagious virus which could pose a threat to humans, in order to protect the health of individuals who might come into contact with living organisms infected by the virus?

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

The Commission has not received any direct information on this event from the Peruvian authorities. However, it is aware of the official statement on the mortality in pelicans made by Peru on 9 May 2012 ([1]). The Peruvian government has established a group of experts to study this problem. However, it currently considers that the mortality in pelicans is due to lack of food, namely of sardine-type species. due to changes to the local marine ecosystem. This includes an influx of warm surface waters, causing species of fish which normally live close to the surface to migrate to deeper waters further south, causing a decline in food availability. Laboratory tests carried out to verify the presence of major bird diseases have given negative results. The information made available by Peru would indicate that this event would not pose any significant risk to human health, while further investigations are ongoing.

([1]) http://redpeia.minam.gob.pe/noticia_131_omunicado-mortandad-de-pelicanos-y-delfines.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004540/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(3 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Scontri al Cairo

L'Egitto è entrato nel pieno della campagna elettorale per le presidenziali di fine maggio che vedrà tredici candidati contendersi la carica più alta dello Stato. La tensione nelle strade tuttavia resta palpabile dopo l'ennesimo bagno di sangue al Cairo.Un bilancio di cinque morti e più di cento feriti, negli scontri con ignoti aggressori, nel corso di una protesta organizzata dai salafiti nei pressi del Ministero della Difesa.

Le fonti parlano di «uomini armati non identificati», che all'alba avrebbero attaccato le centinaia di dimostranti accampati da giorni nella zona per chiedere la fine del governo dei generali. L'accaduto conferma la fragilità della situazione politica e sociale dell'Egitto a più di un anno dalla caduta di Mubarak, assieme al ruolo ambiguo dei militari al potere e del governo, confermato anche dall'atteggiamento verso quest'ultima strage nelle strade del Cairo. Secondo alcune testimonianze, gli uomini che hanno attaccato sarebbero agenti di polizia e militari egiziani in borghese. I militari intorno al Ministero non avrebbero fatto nulla per fermare gli scontri, che sarebbero proseguiti per diverse ore.

Altri scontri si erano avuti nei giorni scorsi, provocati dai cosiddetti «baltageya», piccoli criminali comuni quasi sempre ingaggiati da privati o anche dalla polizia per creare disordini.

Alla luce di quanto precede, si interroga l'Alto Rappresentante per sapere:

1. Se è a conoscenza della situazione nella capitale egiziana?

2. Se ritiene che si debba intervenire e attivare contromisure che garantiscano la salvaguardia dei diritti umani?

3. Quali sono le attività diplomatiche intraprese in precedenza dall'Unione europea nello Stato egiziano?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004712/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Proteste e violenza in Egitto

In Egitto l'escalation delle violenze legate alle forti proteste contro il regime militare sta continuando. Gli scontri del 4 maggio fra i manifestanti che chiedono regolari elezioni e i militari hanno portato a 12 morti e centinaia di feriti in piazza Abbaseya al Cairo; la reazione del regime è stata proclamare il coprifuoco dalle 23.00 alle 6.00 e sono stati disposti dalla magistratura militare 300 arresti preventivi fra i dimostranti (fra i quali vi sono 9 giornalisti).

— La Commissione è a conoscenza della situazione?

— Può la Commissione fornire notizie circa lo stato del processo di democratizzazione del Paese?

— Essa reputa che alla base di queste proteste vi sia un'effettiva non volontà di rinnovamento politico da parte degli attuali vertici del potere, oppure vi siano piuttosto infiltrazioni di stampo estremista?

Risposta congiunta di Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione

(25 giugno 2012)

La Commissione segue da vicino la situazione interna in Egitto e nutre preoccupazione per gli atti di violenza commessi contro manifestanti pacifici. L'UE ha condannato inequivocabilmente e ripetutamente gli scontri violenti verificatisi tra le forze di sicurezza e i manifestanti dopo la deposizione del presidente Mubarak. Il diritto di manifestare pacificamente e il diritto di riunione devono essere garantiti e protetti. L'11 maggio 2012 è stata rilasciata una dichiarazione che evidenzia la responsabilità delle autorità provvisorie di difendere il pieno rispetto dei diritti fondamentali ed esprimere preoccupazione per i violenti scontri verificatisi al Cairo nelle vicinanze del Ministero della Difesa. Il coprifuoco è stato revocato e la situazione nelle strade del Cairo è tornata alla normalità. Tuttavia, più di 300 persone sono state arrestate e corrono il rischio di essere processate da tribunali militari. L'UE, sfruttando tutti i canali diplomatici, continuerà ad esortate le autorità provvisorie a rispettare i diritti fondamentali dei cittadini, a rilasciare quanti sono detenuti solo per aver esercitato il diritto alla libertà di riunione o il diritto di espressione e, inoltre, a deferire i presunti autori di reati alla giustizia civile. L'UE auspica che il trasferimento di tutti i poteri al governo civile abbia luogo nelle prossime settimane. L'abolizione della legge di emergenza dovrebbe contribuire a migliorare la situazione in materia di diritti umani nel paese. L'UE continuerà a sostenere l'Egitto nel suo processo di trasformazione in una società realmente democratica.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004540/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Clashes in Cairo

Egypt is at the height of the presidential election campaign at the end of May 2012, which will see 13 candidates contending for the highest office in the country. Tension on the streets, however, remains palpable after the latest bloodbath in Cairo, which claimed 5 lives and wounded more than 100 in clashes with unknown aggressors, during a protest organised by Salafis at the Ministry of Defence.

Sources speak of 'unidentified gunmen' who at dawn attacked the hundreds of demonstrators camped out in the area for days to call for an end to the generals' rule. The incident confirms the fragility of the political and social situation in Egypt more than a year after the fall of President Mubarak, along with the ambiguous role of the controlling military and the government demonstrated by their attitude towards this latest massacre on the streets of Cairo. According to witnesses, the men who carried out the attack were Egyptian police officers and soldiers in plain clothes. The military within the Ministry are said to have done nothing to stop the clashes, which continued for several hours.

Other clashes had occurred in the preceding days, provoked by *baltageya,* petty criminals that are frequently hired by private individuals or the police to create disorder.

In view of the above, can the High Representative state:

1. Is she aware of the situation in the Egyptian capital?

2. Does she not agree that the Commission should intervene and adopt countermeasures to ensure the protection of human rights?

3. What diplomatic activities have previously been undertaken by the European Union in Egypt?

Question for written answer E-004712/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Protests and violence in Egypt

In Egypt, the violence linked to strong opposition to the military regime continues to escalate. The clashes between demonstrators calling for proper elections and soldiers on 4 May 2012 led to 12 deaths and hundreds of injuries in Abbassia Square in Cairo. The reaction of the regime has been to impose a curfew from 23.00 to 06.00 and 300 preventative arrests have been made from among the demonstrators (including nine journalists).

— Is the Commission aware of the situation?

— Can the Commission provide any news on the status of the democratisation process in the country?

— Does it believe that these protests are based on an effective lack of desire for political renewal on the part of the current ruling powers, or that there have been infiltrations by extremists?

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

(25 June 2012)

The Commission is closely following the domestic situation and is concerned about the acts of violence committed against peaceful demonstrators. The EU has condemned univocally and repeatedly the violent clashes between security forces and demonstrators since the ouster of President Mubarak. The right to peaceful demonstrations and the right to assembly must be ensured and protected. A statement has been issued on 11 May 2012 to recall the responsibility of the interim authorities to uphold the full respect of fundamental rights and to express our concern about the recent outbreak of violence which took place in Cairo in the vicinity of the Ministry of Defence. The curfew has now been lifted and the situation has returned to normal in the streets of Cairo. However, over 300 people have been arrested and face the risks of trial before military courts. The EU will continue through all the diplomatic channels, to urge the interim authorities to respect the fundamental rights of their citizens, to release those who are detained only because they exerted their right to freedom of assembly or their right of expression and to refer the criminal suspects to the civilian Justice system. The EU experts that the transfer of all powers to a civilian rule will take place in the coming weeks. The lifting of the Emergency law should contribute to improve the human rights record in the country. The EU will pursue all its efforts in supporting Egypt to convert into a truly democratic society.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004541/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(3 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Sierra Leone

Carichi di sabbia per aiutare i genitori nelle cave del sud, oppure di legna da portare per chilometri alle case o ai mercati. Lavorano a denti stretti, senza una paga, senza un lamento, senza tregua e sorridono sempre ai «pumui», i bianchi, gli stranieri. Dieci anni dopo, i graffiti di sangue lasciati dal machete sono ancora sui muri, assieme ai fantasmi di chi veniva condotto fra queste pareti per morire sgozzato. In Sierra Leone il mezzo era il machete e il messaggio ai civili era il potere della guerriglia sul territorio.

La ferocia del Fronte Rivoluzionario Unito è stata paragonata a quella di Pol Pot, ma la strategia del machete era un'operazione economica: tagliando le braccia di alcuni si riducevano in schiavitù quelle di tutti gli altri, costringendoli a lavorare sino allo sfinimento nelle miniere dei diamanti, «la più maneggevole di tutte le ricchezze», perché consentiva di riciclare il denaro sporco dei narcos, ma anche quello di Hezbollah e al Qaeda.

Sedato l'incendio della guerra civile con un dispiegamento colossale di caschi blu (17 000) è iniziata la cosiddetta «politica di riconciliazione nazionale». Per domare i ribelli e convincerli a deporre le armi gli è stata donata una moto per ogni kalashnikov.

Alla luce di quanto precede, si interroga l'Alto Rappresentante per sapere:

1. Qual è oggi la situazione nello Stato africano?

2. Se sono presenti delegazioni europee in Sierra Leone e quali sono i risultati dei piani attivati?

3. Se sono previsti nuovi programmi a favore della società civile?

4. Se ci sono società europee che hanno iniziato ad investire in questo Stato?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(28 giugno 2012)

1. La situazione politica in Sierra Leone è migliorata e si stanno compiendo sforzi per ridurre le cause all'origine della fragilità del paese. Sono stati conseguiti buoni risultati economici, ma occorre diversificare l'economia che dipende essenzialmente dal settore minerario e dall'agricoltura. La disoccupazione resta un grave problema, in particolare per i giovani. Nel novembre 2012 si terranno le elezioni presidenziali, parlamentari e locali, che potrebbero rivelarsi un banco di prova della stabilità politica del paese. L'UE, che fornisce assistenza elettorale, le seguirà da vicino.

La situazione dei diritti umani è in graduale miglioramento e l'esame periodico universale del 2011 è stato nell'insieme positivo. La Sierra Leone ha compiuto progressi per quanto riguarda il quadro normativo, ma la vera sfida rimane l'attuazione delle leggi, mentre regna ancora profonda preoccupazione per il ricorso al lavoro minorile.

2. L'UE ha una delegazione a Freetown. Il 10° Fondo europeo di sviluppo (FES) assegna 301,22 milioni di EUR per l'assistenza alla Sierra Leone, concentrandosi su due ambiti prioritari: buona governance, da un lato, e sostegno istituzionale e infrastrutture, dall'altro. Sono stati conseguiti risultati nei seguenti settori: decentramento, riforma della pubblica amministrazione, sviluppo rurale, ambiente e risanamento delle infrastrutture prioritarie.

3. Gli scambi tra l'UE e le organizzazioni della società civile sono molto frequenti. Vengono tenute formazioni per la gestione di progetti in modo da migliorare la capacità operativa di dette organizzazioni e vengono attuare iniziative al fine di rafforzarne le loro capacità e incoraggiarle a portare avanti le loro attività.

4. L'UE è il primo partner commerciale della Sierra Leone (nel 2009 le esportazioni verso gli Stati membri hanno costituito il 64 % delle esportazioni totali). Le imprese europee investono nel settore minerario e nello sfruttamento petrolifero off-shore.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004541/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(3 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Sierra Leone

Laden with sand to help their parents in the quarries in the south, or carrying wood for miles to houses or markets, they work with clenched teeth, without pay, without complaining, without respite, and they always smile for *pumui* (white people, foreigners). Ten years on, the blood left by machetes remains on the walls, alongside the ghosts of those brought inside these walls to be butchered. In Sierra Leone, the means was the machete, and the message to civilians was the power of the guerrillas.

The ferocity of the Revolutionary United Front has been compared to that of Pol Pot, but the strategy of the machete was an economic operation: by cutting off arms, others were reduced to slavery, forcing them to work until they dropped in diamond mines, 'the most manageable of all riches' because it made it possible to recycle dirty money from narcotics, and also money belonging to Hezbollah and Al-Qaeda.

The fire of civil war was quelled with a massive deployment of 17 000 'blue berets' and the so-called 'policy of national reconciliation' began. To subdue the rebels and persuade them to give up their arms, a motorcycle was donated for every Kalashnikov.

1. Could the High Representative say what the situation in Sierra Leone is today?

2. Are there any EU delegations on the ground in Sierra Leone, and what are the results of the implemented plans?

3. Are there any plans for new programmes to help civil society?

4. Are any European companies beginning to invest in the country?

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

1. The political situation in Sierra Leone has improved and efforts are being made to reduce the root causes of fragility. The country has shown good economic performance but its economy is in need of diversification being dependant mainly on mining and agriculture. Unemployment remains a major problem, especially for youths. In November 2011, Presidential, Parliamentary and Local elections will be held, which could prove a milestone in assessing the political stability of the country. The EU is providing electoral assistance and will closely follow these elections.

The Human Rights situation is gradually improving and the 2011 Universal Periodic Review (UPR) was generally positive. Sierra Leone made progress in the legal framework but implementation remains a challenge and deep concerns concerning the use of child labour still exist.

2. The EU has a delegation in Freetown. The 10th European Development Fund (EDF) provides EUR 301.22 million of assistance to Sierra Leone focusing on two priority areas: good governance & institutional support and infrastructure. Several results have been achieved in the field of decentralisation, civil service reform, rural development, environment and rehabilitation of priority infrastructures.

3. Exchanges between the EU and Civil Society Organisations (CSO) are very frequent. Training on project management has been organised to increase CSO operational capacity and several projects are being implemented through them to scale-up their capacity and self confidence.

4. The EU is Sierra Leone's first trading partner (in 2009, export to the EU represented 64% of total exports). EU companies are investing in mining and in off-shore oil exploitation.