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 204 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

E-006678/12 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Death sentences in Iran for drinking alcohol
Versione italiana 13
English version 14

E-006679/12 by Vladko Todorov Panayotov to the Commission
Subject: Landfilling and waste management
българска версия 15
English version 16

E-006680/12 by Catherine Grèze to the Commission
Subject: Plans for a quarry in the Western Corbières Special Protection Zone
Version française 17
English version 18

E-006681/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Reducing petrol price rises by compensating for rises in VAT revenue
Versione italiana 19
English version 20

E-006682/12 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Korean non-tariff barriers (NTBs) — update on issues resolved
English version 21

E-006684/12 by Christine De Veyrac to the Council
Subject: Difficulties in Cyprus and requests for financial support
Version française 22
English version 24

E-006685/12 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission
Subject: Difficulties in Cyprus and requests for financial support
Version française ... 26
English version ... 27

E-006686/12 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission
Subject: GMO risk assessment methods
Version française ... 28
English version ... 29

E-006687/12 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Cost of 'Science: It's a Girl Thing!' video
English version ... 30

E-006688/12 by Mario Mauro to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Plot to kill a prominent human rights activist in Pakistan
Versione italiana ... 31
English version ... 32

E-006689/12 by Mario Mauro to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Campaign against the custom of forcing girls to wear the veil
Versione italiana ... 33
English version ... 35

E-006690/12 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Legal and moral issues at stake in respect of EU funding for a foundation run by a Romanian politician
Versiunea în limba română ... 37
English version ... 38

E-006691/12 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Toxic reference value for aluminium
Versiunea în limba română ... 39
English version ... 40

P-006693/12 by Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz to the Commission
Subject: Promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources — Directive 2009/28/EC
Wersja polska ... 41
English version ... 42

E-006694/12 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — UN Human Rights Council resolution on Sri Lanka
English version ... 43

E-006695/12 by Mario Mauro to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Detainees in Syria tortured
Versione italiana ... 44
English version ... 45

E-006696/12 by Patrick Le Hyaric to the Commission
Subject: Redundancies in the French poultry industry
Version française ... 46
English version ... 47

E-006697/12 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Porto Tolle coal-fired power station project: disregard for the low-carbon economy roadmap recently endorsed by Parliament
Versione italiana ... 48
English version ... 50

P-006699/12 by Eva Ortiz Vilella to the Commission
Subject: Forest fires in the Valencian Community
Versión española ... 51
English version ... 52

E-006700/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the European Competition Network (ECN)
Versión española ... 53
English version ... 54

E-006701/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Balance of power in retail trade
Versión española ... 55
English version ... 56

E-006702/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: European Competition Network report
Versión española ... 57
English version ... 58

E-006703/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Cooperatives
Versión española ... 59
English version ... 60

E-006704/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Functioning of competition rules
Versión española ... 61
English version ... 62

E-006706/12 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Books for blind people — WIPO treaty update
English version ... 63

E-006708/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Council
Subject: Clarification regarding direct bank recapitalisation by the European Support Mechanism
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 64
English version ... 65

E-006709/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Tax-related offences in the form of transfer pricing by multinational companies
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 66
English version ... 67

E-006710/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Penalties for unfair trading practises in a multinational retail group
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 68
English version ... 69

E-006711/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: PSI — Bond repayments by the Greek Government
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 70
English version ... 71

P-006712/12 by Vicky Ford to the Commission
Subject: European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) investigation on lead in ammunition
English version ... 72

E-006714/12 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Council
Subject: Iceland's accession to the EU and negotiations on the fisheries chapter
Versión española ... 73
English version ... 74

E-006715/12 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission
Subject: Iceland's accession to the EU and negotiations on the fisheries chapter
Versión española ... 75
English version ... 76

E-006716/12 by Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska to the Commission
Subject: Nitrates Directive
Wersja polska ... 77
English version ... 78

E-006717/12 by Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska to the Commission
Subject: Financing for S-19 express road in Poland
Wersja polska ... 79
English version ... 80

E-006718/12 by Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska to the Commission
Subject: Inspections of fishing vessels in Poland
Wersja polska ... 81
English version ... 82

E-006719/12 by Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa to the Commission
Subject: Modification of Directive 2001/37/EC
Wersja polska ... 83
English version ... 84

P-006720/12 by Jürgen Klute to the Commission
Subject: Austrian complaint lodged on 3 September 2008 by Strabag SE, Vienna, and German complaint lodged on 22 October 2010 by TechniSat Digital GmbH and others (Ref.: CHAP(2010)03469
Deutsche Fassung ... 85
English version ... 86

E-006722/12 by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission
Subject: Sharia and democratic principles of the rule of law
Dansk udgave ... 87
English version ... 88

E-006723/12 by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission
Subject: Alcohol interlocks in cars
Dansk udgave ... 89
English version ... 90

E-006724/12 by Lambert van Nistelrooij and Corien Wortmann-Kool to the Commission
Subject: Green eMotion project
Nederlandse versie ... 91
English version ... 92

P-006727/12 by Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou to the Commission
Subject: Trade agreements between China and Mercosur — implications and prospects for the EU
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 93
English version ... 94

P-006729/12 by Elena Băsescu to the Commission
Subject: Attacks on the Romanian Constitutional Court
Versiunea în limba română ... 95
English version ... 96

E-006730/12 by Andres Perello Rodriguez, Josefa Andrés Barea and Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón to the Commission
Subject: Forest fires in the Valencian Community
Versión española ... 97
English version ... 99

E-006731/12 by María Muñiz De Urquiza, Antonio Masip Hidalgo, Iratxe García Pérez, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Miguel Angel Martínez Martínez and Inés Ayala Sender to the Commission
Subject: Viability of European investment in carbon-free technologies
Versión española ... 100
English version ... 101

E-006732/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Melting of glaciers in the Alps
Deutsche Fassung ... 102
English version ... 103

E-006733/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: WHO classifies diesel exhaust as carcinogenic
Deutsche Fassung ... 104
English version ... 105

E-006734/12 by Renate Sommer to the Commission
Subject: Media freedom in Poland — the case of TV Trwam
Deutsche Fassung ... 106
English version ... 107

E-006735/12 by Maria Eleni Koppa to the Commission
Subject: Flagrant violation of women's rights in Turkey
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 108
English version ... 109

E-006736/12 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: A new constitution in Fiji and free national elections
English version ... 110

E-006737/12 by Vicky Ford to the Commission
Subject: Hot water feeds in washing machines
English version ... 111

E-006738/12 by Jim Higgins to the Commission
Subject: List of Member States which do not allow their citizens to vote in national elections while resident abroad
English version ... 112

E-006739/12 by Patrizia Toia and Pier Antonio Panzeri to the Commission
Subject: Restructuring of Nokia Siemens Networks Italy
Versione italiana ... 113
English version ... 114

E-006740/12 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Specious use of Article 6(4) of Habitat Directive 92/43/EEC to justify non-compliance and proceed with the unnecessary construction of the Third Bridge in Cremona
Versione italiana ... 115
English version ... 116

E-006741/12 by Clemente Mastella, Antonello Antinoro, Aldo Patriciello, Salvatore Iacolino, Luigi Ciriaco De Mita, Crescenzio Rivellini, Lara Comi, Paolo Bartolozzi, Giuseppe Gargani, Giovanni La Via, Vito Bonsignore, Marco Scurria, Iva Zanicchi, Sergio Berlato, Gabriele Albertini, Potito Salatto, Carlo Fidanza, Cristiana Muscardini, Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, Antonio Cancian, Alfredo Pallone and Licia Ronzulli to the Commission
Subject: EU strategy for stemming the influx of counterfeit goods from China
Versione italiana ... 117
English version ... 119

E-006742/12 by Tanja Fajon, Jelko Kacin, Alojz Peterle, Ivo Vajgl and Milan Zver to the Commission
Subject: As a result of the increase in the number of pupils at the European School in Luxembourg (Luxembourg 1), a new school (Luxembourg 2) has been built in the suburb of Mamer/Bertrange, causing numerous organisational problems
Slovenska različica ... 121
English version ... 123

E-006744/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Council
Subject: Review of the list of priority substances in the field of water policy
Versione italiana ... 125
English version ... 126

E-006745/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Geographical indications: a controversial legal discipline — problems of compliance between international and EU legal protection
Versione italiana 127
English version 129

E-006746/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Italianisation of surnames containing special characters
Versione italiana 131
English version 132

E-006747/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Diversion of funding for a Ukrainian paediatric oncology hospital to the European Football Championship
Versione italiana 133
English version 134

E-006748/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Protection of the rights of people with disabilities and ratification of the UN Convention
Versione italiana 135
English version 136

E-006749/12 by Piotr Borys to the Commission
Subject: Cohesion Fund project No 2002/PL/16/P/PE/033 in Jelenia Góra
Wersja polska 137
English version 138

P-006750/12 by Anderson Martina to the Commission
Subject: Body scanners at EU airports: Written Question E-003034/2012
English version 139

E-006751/12 by Salvador Sedó i Alabart to the Commission
Subject: Increase in airport taxes
Versión española 140
English version 141

E-006752/12 by Phil Bennion to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Energy crisis in Pakistan
English version 142

E-006753/12 by Thijs Berman and Emine Bozkurt to the Council
Subject: Indonesia
Nederlandse versie 144
English version 145

E-006754/12 by Franck Proust to the Commission
Subject: Social rights of expatriates in the EU
Version française 146
English version 147

E-006756/12 by Cristiana Muscardini to the Commission
Subject: Disposal of special waste and dumping of radioactive material
Versione italiana 148
English version 149

P-006757/12 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Commission
Subject: Participation by creditors in restructuring the Spanish financial system
Versión española 150
English version 151

P-006758/12 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: 12-mile zone
English version 152

P-006759/12 by Andrea Zanoni to the Commission
Subject: Serious technical problems with the implementation of Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 and resulting discrimination as regards the free exercise of European citizens' right of initiative
Versione italiana 153
English version 154

E-006760/12 by Antolín Sánchez Presedo to the Council
Subject: Participation by creditors in restructuring the Spanish financial system
Versión española 155
English version 156

E-006763/12 by Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Rights of disabled air passengers
English version 157

E-006764/12 by Rebecca Harms to the Commission
Subject: Follow-up to Written Question E-003933/2012 on Ombla hydropower plant in proposed Natura 2000 site
Deutsche Fassung 158
English version 159

E-006765/12 by Daniel Hannan to the Commission
Subject: UCPD in Cyprus
English version 160

E-006766/12 by Daniel Hannan to the Commission
Subject: UCPD review
English version 161

E-006767/12 by Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu to the Commission
Subject: Recognition of volunteering as work experience
Versiunea în limba română 162
English version 163

E-006769/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Multilingualism in the European health system
Versión española 164
English version 165

E-006770/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Verbal violence on social networks
Versión española 166
English version 167

E-006771/12 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Disability discrimination by airlines
English version 168

E-006772/12 by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission
Subject: Social security benefits for Turkish nationals resident in an EU country
Dansk udgave 169
English version 170

E-006773/12 by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU meetings with Hamas
Dansk udgave 171
English version 172

E-006774/12 by Morten Messerschmidt to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Participation by Hamas in a UN conference
Dansk udgave 173
English version 174

E-006776/12 by Louis Grech to the Commission
Subject: Seventh Consumer Scoreboard (May 2012)
Verżjoni Maltija 175
English version 176

E-006777/12 by Marietje Schaake to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Syria Files — Investigation into implementation and enforcement of EU sanctions
Nederlandse versie 177
English version 179

P-006780/12 by Frédéric Daerden to the Commission
Subject: Redistribution of unsold edible foodstuffs by supermarkets
Version française 181
English version 182

E-006781/12 by Ana Miranda to the Commission
Subject: Legislation on invasive alien species (IAS)
Versión española 183
English version 184

E-006783/12 by Herbert Dorfmann to the Commission
Subject: Rules on use of the Italian language hindering trade in South Tyrol/protection of minorities and consumers
Deutsche Fassung 185
English version 187

E-006784/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Commission to sanction the UK if it infringes the right of free movement of Greek citizens
Ελληνική έκδοση 189
English version 190

E-006786/12 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — The destruction of historic sites in Timbuktu
Versione italiana 191
English version 192

E-006787/12 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Ties between Egypt and Israel
Versione italiana 193
English version 194

E-006789/12 by Ana Miranda and Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Hydroelectric dam projects in Chile
Versión española 195
English version 196

E-006790/12 by Ana Miranda, Barbara Lochbihler, Willy Meyer and Martin Häusling to the Commission
Subject: Human rights in Chile
Versión española 197
Deutsche Fassung 198
English version 199

E-006791/12 by Evelyn Regner and Karin Kadenbach to the Commission
Subject: Removing discriminatory questions from blood donation questionnaires
Deutsche Fassung 200
English version 201

E-006792/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Employment market re-entry for prison leavers
Ελληνική έκδοση 202
English version 203

E-006795/12 by Mikael Gustafsson to the Commission
Subject: Has the ESAB factory in Opole (Poland) received any kind of EU support?
Svensk version ... 204
English version ... 205

P-006796/12 by Nigel Farage to the Commission
Subject: Need for changes to the Treaties
English version ... 206

E-006797/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Loss of competitiveness of the port of Barcelona
Versión española ... 207
English version ... 208

E-006798/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Bargaining power in the value chain of dairy products
Versión española ... 209
English version ... 211

E-006799/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Competition in the Catalan and Spanish dairy sector
Versión española ... 213
English version ... 214

E-006800/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Drug which triggers cannibalistic tendencies
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 215
English version ... 217

E-006801/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Disproportionate increases in prices of own-label products
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 219
English version ... 221

E-006802/12 by Georgios Koumoutsakos to the Commission
Subject: Research by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction on cannabis production in Europe
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 222
English version ... 223

E-006803/12 by Konrad Szymański to the Commission
Subject: Freedom of religion in Vietnam
Wersja polska ... 224
English version ... 226

E-006804/12 by Reinhard Bütikofer and Keith Taylor to the Commission
Subject: Shale gas and environmental legislation
Deutsche Fassung ... 228
English version ... 230

E-006806/12 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: Enforcement of Council Directive 2008/120/EC
English version ... 231

E-006807/12 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: EU budget settlement
English version ... 232

E-006808/12 by Fiorello Provera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Honour killings in Afghanistan
Versione italiana ... 233
English version ... 234

E-006809/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: New research
Versión española ... 235
English version ... 236

E-006810/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Integrated knowledge on forests and forestry
Versión española ... 237
English version ... 238

E-006812/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Are politics in Morocco about to take a religious turn?
Versione italiana ... 239
English version ... 240

E-006813/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Moroccan legislation on rape
Versione italiana ... 241
English version ... 242

E-006815/12 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information about the use of EU funds over the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro and Macerata
Versione italiana ... 243
English version ... 245

E-006816/12 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information about the use of EU funds over the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Nardi and Corciano
Versione italiana ... 243
English version ... 245

E-006817/12 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Information about the use of EU funds over the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Arezzo, Grosseto, Firenze, Siena, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa and Livorno
Versione italiana ... 243
English version ... 245

E-006818/12 by Nicole Sinclaire to the Commission
Subject: Common agricultural policy entitlements
English version ... 247

E-006819/12 by Linda McAvan to the Commission
Subject: Food and Veterinary Office inspections
English version ... 248

E-006820/12 by Linda McAvan to the Commission
Subject: SME-friendly tender specifications for EU procurement of services
English version ... 249

E-006821/12 by Nigel Farage to the Commission
Subject: Restriction of lead in ammunition
English version ... 250

E-006822/12 by Struan Stevenson to the Commission
Subject: Ongoing discrimination against the *lettori* (response to the Commission's answer to E-002636/2011)
English version ... 251

E-006823/12 by Rachida Dati to the Commission
Subject: Sound level of vehicles
Version française ... 252
English version ... 253

E-006824/12 by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission
Subject: Draft law on NGOs
Wersja polska ... 254
English version ... 255

E-006827/12 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission
Subject: Differences between the MIC and the ERC
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 256
English version ... 257

E-006828/12 by Georgios Stavrakakis to the Commission
Subject: Mobilisation of the Community Civil Protection Mechanism
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 258
English version ... 259

E-006829/12 by Martin Häusling and José Bové to the Commission
Subject: Implementation in Member States of Regulation (EU) No 619/2011 on low-level presence of non-approved GMOs
Deutsche Fassung ... 260
Version française ... 261
English version ... 262

E-006830/12 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: Export of stolen mobile phones
English version ... 263

E-006831/12 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Treatment of Arab minority by the Iranian Government
English version ... 264

E-006832/12 by Syed Kamall to the Commission
Subject: Cam Bank of Spain
English version ... 265

E-006833/12 by Michael Cramer to the Commission
Subject: Effectiveness of fines for infringements of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005
Deutsche Fassung ... 266
English version ... 267

E-006834/12 by Struan Stevenson to the Commission
Subject: Dual pricing structure for Maltese and non-Maltese residents
English version ... 268

E-006835/12 by Alfredo Antoniozzi to the Commission
Subject: Access to home loans
Versione italiana ... 269
English version ... 270

E-006836/12 by Mikael Gustafsson to the Commission
Subject: Forced child labour in Uzbekistan
Svensk version ... 271
English version ... 272

P-006837/12 by Gabriel Mato Adrover to the Commission
Subject: Employment in the Canary Islands
Versión española ... 273
English version ... 274

P-006838/12 by Karl-Heinz Florenz to the Commission
Subject: Air travel — EASA Opinion No 1/2012 on non-commercial complex (NCC) aircraft
Deutsche Fassung ... 275
English version ... 276

P-006839/12 by Chris Davies to the Commission
Subject: Subsidies paid towards vessels benefitting from fisheries partnership agreements
English version ... 277

E-006840/12 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Human rights violations in Peru: state of emergency, repression, police brutality and illegal detentions: five people murdered in protests against Conga project
Versión española ... 278
English version ... 280

E-006841/12 by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission
Subject: Pesticide residues in fruit, vegetables and cereal products
Dansk udgave ... 281
English version ... 282

E-006842/12 by Karl-Heinz Florenz to the Commission
Subject: Revision of the Tobacco Products Directive (2001/37/EC)
Deutsche Fassung ... 283
English version ... 284

E-006843/12 by Alfredo Antoniozzi to the Commission
Subject: Low birth rates in Europe
Versione italiana ... 285
English version ... 286

E-006846/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: ERPUM project — Returning refugees to high-risk countries
Version française ... 287
English version ... 289

E-006894/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: European Return Platform for Unaccompanied Minors — ERPUM: violation of Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights
Version française ... 287
English version ... 289

E-006849/12 by Christine De Veyrac to the Commission
Subject: Potential risks of recreational water walking balls
Version française ... 291
English version ... 292

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006678/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(4 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Pena di morte in Iran per assunzione di alcolici

Il 25 giugno 2012, l'agenzia stampa Iranian Students News Agency (ISNA) ha riferito che stando a Hojjatoleslam Hasan Shariati, procuratore generale della provincia di Khorasan Razavi, la Corte suprema ha confermato la pena di morte emessa da un tribunale di grado inferiore nei confronti di due persone accusate di aver consumato alcolici. Egli avrebbe affermato che i due «avevano consumato bevande alcoliche per la terza volta», e il personale «sta predisponendo quanto necessario per eseguire l'ordine di esecuzione».

Un funzionario di Human Rights Watch ha affermato: «Condannare a morte gli iraniani per consumo di alcol è un segnale inquietante di quanto poco valga la loro vita per i giudici iraniani e con quale disinvoltura questi ultimi possono prendere una decisione che ne decreti la morte».

Secondo il codice penale iraniano, il consumo di alcol configura un reato *hadd*, ovvero un crimine contro Dio, per il quale la legge islamica prevede punizioni fisse. Di solito per il consumo di alcol sono comminate 80 frustate. L'articolo 179 del codice penale, tuttavia, prevede la pena di morte per la terza condanna per consumo di alcol.

Nel giugno 2006, Amnesty International ha riferito che le autorità iraniane hanno commutato la pena di morte emessa per Karim Fahimi, condannato per consumo di alcol. Numerose notizie diffuse dai media suggeriscono che la Repubblica islamica è alle prese con un'epidemia di alcolismo.

1. È disposto il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante a indagare sul caso delle due persone della provincia iraniana Khorasan Razavi nei cui confronti il procuratore generale ha emesso una condanna a morte?

2. È disposto il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante a interpellare le autorità iraniane affinché convertano le condanne immediatamente?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(24 agosto 2012)

Il SEAE non è in grado di svolgere indagini su singoli casi come quelli menzionati dall'onorevole parlamentare e deve in gran parte fare affidamento su informazioni riferite da terzi. In genere i tentativi di discutere dei singoli casi con le autorità iraniane non consentono di ottenere informazioni chiare o certe. Ciononostante, la rappresentanza dell'UE a Teheran solleva periodicamente la questione dei diritti umani, compresa la pena di morte.

L'AR/VP ha chiarito in modo inequivocabile l'assoluta opposizione dell'UE all'uso della pena di morte in quanto tale, nonché la sua forte preoccupazione per l'allarmante aumento dell'applicazione di tale pena nella Repubblica islamica dell'Iran. Secondo fonti attendibili, dai dati sulle esecuzioni capitali nel 2012 risulta che l'Iran è il primo paese al mondo per numero di condanne a morte pro capite. L'UE ha pertanto espresso pubblicamente in numerose occasioni la propria preoccupazione in proposito ed ha anche esortato l'Iran a non applicare la pena di morte quando viola direttamente le norme minime internazionali, vale a dire per reati non gravi, come quelli legati all'alcol o alla droga, spesso classificati «hadd» o «moharebeh» (reati o inimicizia contro Dio). Il più delle volte le condanne a morte comminate in Iran sono il risultato di processi ingiusti, che l'UE condanna.

L'UE continuerà a monitorare la situazione dei diritti umani in Iran e utilizzerà tutti i mezzi disponibili per invitare il paese a rispettare i propri obblighi internazionali, sia bilateralmente che nei consessi multilaterali. Ha inoltre applicato 78 sanzioni mirate nei confronti di cittadini iraniani responsabili di massicce violazioni dei diritti umani.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006678/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Death sentences in Iran for drinking alcohol

On 25 June 2012, the official Iranian Students' News Agency (ISNA) reported that the prosecutor general of Khorasan Razavi province, Hojjatoleslam Hasan Shariati, had confirmed that the Supreme Court had confirmed the death sentences issued by a lower court against two people convicted of drinking alcohol. He was quoted as saying that the two 'had consumed alcoholic drinks for the third time', and that officials were 'in the process of making the necessary arrangements for the implementation of the execution order'.

A Human Rights Watch official noted: 'Sentencing Iranians to death for consuming alcohol is a scary signal of how little Iran's judges value Iranian lives and how casually they can make a decision to end them'.

According to Iran's Penal Code, consumption of alcohol is a *hadd*, or a crime against God, to which Islamic law assigns fixed punishments. Normally the punishment for drinking alcohol is 80 lashes. Under Article 179 of the Penal Code, however, individuals with two prior alcohol convictions will receive the death penalty upon their third conviction.

In June 2006, Amnesty International reported that the Iranian authorities had commuted the death sentence handed down to Karim Fahimi, who had been convicted of drinking alcohol. There has been a spate of media reports which suggest that the Islamic Republic is facing an epidemic of alcoholism.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to investigate the case of the two individuals in Iran's Khorasan Razavi province who were issued death sentences by its prosecutor-general?

2. Is the VP/HR prepared to call on the Iranian authorities to commute the sentences immediately?

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

The EEAS is not in a position to conduct investigations into individual cases such as those raised by the honourable member and must rely to a large extent on reporting from third parties. Attempts to raise individual cases with the Iranian authorities do not usually lead to clear or certain information. Nevertheless, the local EU representation in Tehran conducts regular demarches on human rights issues including the death penalty.

The HR/VP has made abundantly clear the EU's outright opposition to the use of the death penalty as such, and her particular and deep concern at the alarming rise in its application in the Islamic Republic of Iran. According to reliable sources, data on executions during the course of 2012 make Iran the world's leading user of the death penalty per inhabitant. The EU has therefore expressed, publicly and on numerous occasions, its concern about these figures and has also urged Iran to refrain from imposing the death penalty in direct violation of international minimum standards, i.e. for non-serious crimes such as alcohol or drug offences often classified as 'hadd' or 'moharebeh' (crimes or enmity against God). Death sentences handed down in Iran are often the result of unfair trials, which the EU also condemns.

The EU will continue to monitor the situation of Human Rights in Iran and use all its tools available to call on the country to abide by its international obligations, both bilaterally and in multilateral fora. The EU has also applied 78 targeted sanctions on Iranian individuals responsible for massive human rights violations.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-006679/12
до Комисията
Владко Тодоров Панайотов (ALDE)
(4 юли 2012 г.)

Относно: Депониране и управление на отпадъците

1. Понастоящем почти 100 % от всички твърди отпадъци в България се обезвреждат чрез депониране. Като се има предвид, че новата Рамкова директива за отпадъците поставя депонирането на отпадъци на последно място в йерархията на отпадъците, как възнамерява Комисията да гарантира, че йерархията на отпадъците, включително новите технологии за управление на отпадъците, се прилага правилно?

2. Комисията би ли разгледала възможността повече да не се съфинансират проекти за депониране на отпадъци —с цел насърчаване на разделното събиране на отпадъците и използването на технологии за компостиране и производство на енергия от отпадъци?

3. По какъв начин може Комисията да подпомогне инсталациите за отпадъци, които са необходими, за да се избегне износът на опасни отпадъци и незаконното депониране на отпадъци?

Отговор, даден от г-н Поточник от името на Комисията
(20 август 2012 г.)

1. Държавите членки имат задължението да прилагат правилно законодателството на ЕС по отношение на отпадъците. Европейската комисия подкрепя държавите членки в това отношение, като осигурява напътствия, гарантира разпространението на най-добрите практики, предоставя структурни фондове и организира срещи за повишаване на осведомеността. През есента на 2012 г., например, Комисията ще организира семинари в десетте най-неблагополучно представящи се държави членки — между които и България, — където ще се обсъдят мерки за подобряване на управлението на отпадъците.

Освен това Комисията, в качеството си на „Пазител на Договора“, ще предприеме правни действия с цел гарантиране на спазването на изискванията на европейското законодателство.

2. В съответствие с Пътната карта за ефективно използване на ресурсите ([1]) Европейската комисия ще гарантира, че публичното финансиране от бюджета на ЕС дава приоритет на дейностите, които заемат по-високо място в „йерархията“ на управлението на отпадъците (превенцията, повторната употреба и рециклирането).

3. В рамките на структурните фондове е налице финансово подпомагане от Европейския съюз за по-нататъшно развитие на инфраструктурата за обработване на отпадъците.

([1]) COM(2011)571 окончателен.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006679/12
to the Commission
Vladko Todorov Panayotov (ALDE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Landfilling and waste management

1. Almost 100% of all solid waste in Bulgaria is currently disposed of as landfill. Given that the new Waste Framework Directive relegates landfilling to the bottom of the waste hierarchy, how does the Commission propose to ensure that the waste hierarchy, including new technologies for waste management, is properly implemented?

2. Would the Commission consider not co-financing any more landfilling schemes in order to promote the separate collection of waste and the use of composting and waste-to-energy technologies?

3. In what ways can the Commission support the waste installations needed if exports of dangerous waste and illegal landfilling are to be avoided?

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

1. Proper implementation of EU waste legislation is an obligation falling on the Member States. The Commission supports Member States in this respect, for instance, by providing guidance, ensuring diffusion of best practices, providing structural funds and organising awareness meetings. For instance, in the autumn of 2012, the Commission will organise seminars in ten least performing Member States — including Bulgaria — to discuss measures to improve waste management.

On top of these actions, as Guardian of the Treaty, if needed, the Commission will take legal actions to ensure that the requirements of the European legislation are respected.

2. In line with the Roadmap on Resource Efficiency ([1]), the Commission intends to ensure that public funding from the EU budget gives priority to activities higher up the waste hierarchy (prevention, re-use and recycling).

3. European financial support for the further development of waste treatment infrastructure is available within the framework of the structural funds.

([1]) COM(2011)571 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006680/12
à la Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(4 juillet 2012)

Objet: Projet de carrière sur la zone de protection spéciale Corbières occidentales

Sur le lieu-dit «La Balaure et les Cayrottes» (commune de Serviès-en-Val), dans le département de l'Aude en Languedoc-Roussillon, la société CCTS (Carrière Concassage Travaux de Serviès) a pour projet de créer une nouvelle carrière à ciel ouvert. Il s'agirait de l'exploitation d'un site calcaire d'une surface de 13 hectares se trouvant au cœur d'un site Natura 2000: la zone de protection spéciale Corbières occidentales (FR 9112027) relevant donc de la directive Oiseaux (2009/147/CE).

Cette zone est classée pour la «diversité de la végétation et le relief peu élevé mais marqué de barres rocheuses propices à la nidification des espèces rupicoles contribuant à la richesse de ce territoire» (fiche descriptive du site). D'après la directive Oiseaux, doivent être prises sur ces zones «les mesures qui s'imposent pour éviter la pollution et la détérioration des habitats, ainsi que les perturbations touchant les oiseaux» (article 4). Or, cette carrière empiéterait largement sur le territoire de vie, notamment de nidification, des espèces concernées et son exploitation, particulièrement bruyante du fait de l'extraction et du passage répété de camions, altérerait leurs conditions de vie.

Par ailleurs, une carrière existe d'ores et déjà sur ce site protégé. Dans le document d'objectif (DOCOB) adopté le 16 mars 2012, il est précisé qu'en raison de la fragilité du lieu, la carrière existante dispose d'une autorisation d'extraction de 14 000 tonnes annuelles au maximum. Or, le projet de la future carrière fixe comme objectif annuel de production entre 50 000 tonnes et 150 000 tonnes. L'argument de l'entreprise est que l'ensemble de ces 13 hectares ne serait pas exploité. Pourtant, les carriers ont déjà sollicité, à des fins de location, des propriétaires privés de terrains voisins … au final, plus de 20 hectares pourraient être concernés!

1. La Commission est-elle informée de ce projet?

2. Entend-t-elle protéger effectivement les espèces qu'elle a identifiées comme menacées?

3. Comment compte-t-elle s'assurer que la directive Oiseaux soit dûment respectée sur cette zone?

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

La Commission n'a pas connaissance de ce plan de nouvelle carrière dans les Corbières occidentales. La directive «Habitats» (directive 92/43/CEE) ([1]) et la directive «Oiseaux» (directive 2009/147/CE) ([2]) n'excluent pas a priori la possibilité d'exploiter des carrières dans un site Natura 2000 ou à proximité. La compatibilité de ces développements avec les objectifs de conservation des sites concernés doit être établie au cas par cas. Il appartient aux autorités nationales compétentes de déterminer si ces développements pourraient avoir des incidences négatives importantes sur les espèces et les habitats concernés et sur l'intégrité du site Natura 2000 en question. Les règles et procédures définies par l'article 6 de la directive «Habitats» doivent être respectées. En particulier, conformément à l'article 6, paragraphe 3, tout plan ou projet susceptible d'affecter un site Natura 2000 de manière significative doit faire l'objet d'une évaluation appropriée et les autorités compétentes ne marquent leur accord sur ce plan ou projet qu'après s'être assurées qu'il ne portera pas atteinte à l'intégrité du site concerné.

([1]) JO L 206 du 22.7.1992.
([2]) JO L 20 du 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006680/12
to the Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Plans for a quarry in the Western Corbières Special Protection Zone

The CCTS company, a quarrying and crushing undertaking based in Serviès, is planning a new quarry at a site known as La Balaure et les Cayrottes in the municipality of Serviès-en-Val (Aude department, Languedoc-Roussillon region). This would quarry limestone over an area of 13 hectares located in a Natura 2000 site: the Western Corbières Special Protection Zone (FR 9112027). It therefore comes under the Bird Directive (2009/147/EC).

The zone is classified because of the 'diversity of vegetation and low relief characterised by rocky bars ideal for cock-of-the-rock to nest, thereby contributing to the richness of the area' (fact sheet on the site). The Bird Directive stipulates that, in protection areas, 'Member States shall take appropriate steps to avoid pollution or deterioration of habitats or any disturbances affecting the birds' (Article 4). Yet the quarry would encroach significantly on the area where the species in question live and, in particular, nest, and its operation — which would be particularly noisy as a result of quarrying and heavy lorry traffic — would change their living conditions.

In addition, a quarry already exists in this protected area. The 'document of objective' (DOCOB) adopted on 16 March 2012 states that, in view of the fragile nature of the location, the existing quarry was authorised to extract a maximum of 14 000 tonnes per year. The planned quarry aims to produce between 50 000 and 150 000 tonnes a year. The company argues that not all the 13 hectares would be worked. However, the quarry operators have already approached the private owners of adjoining land with a view to renting it, so that over 20 hectares might in fact be involved.

1. Is the Commission aware of this plan?

2. Does it intend effectively to protect the species it has identified as endangered?

3. How does it intend to ensure compliance with the Bird Directive in the area in question?

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

The Commission is not aware of this plan for a new quarry in the Western Corbières. The Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC ([1]) and the Birds Directive 2009/147/EC ([2]) do not a priori exclude the possibility for operating quarries in or near Natura 2000 sites. The compatibility of such developments with the conservation objectives of the concerned sites needs to be determined on a case by case basis. It is up to the competent national authorities to assess whether such developments could cause significant negative effects on the relevant species and habitats and on the integrity of the concerned Natura 2000 site. The procedures and rules set by Article 6 of the Habitats Directive have to be followed. In particular, in accordance with Article 6 paragraph 3, any plan or project likely to have a significant effect upon a Natura 2000 site has to be subject to an appropriate assessment and the competent authorities may agree to this plan or project only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site.

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([2]) OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006681/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(4 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Ridurre il caro-benzina tramite la sterilizzazione dell'IVA

L'articolo 9 della Legge Finanziaria italiana del 2008 dispone che in presenza di una crescita dei prezzi petroliferi superiore del 2 % rispetto al valore del petrolio indicato nel Documento di programmazione economico-finanziaria, le misure delle aliquote di accisa siano ridotte per permettere la compensazione del maggior gettito IVA (a causa dell'aumento dei prezzi dei prodotti petroliferi).

Considerato che:

— ad oggi esistono le condizioni per attuare lo strumento, in quanto il prezzo dei carburanti (e in generale dei prodotti petroliferi) è aumentato molto più del 2 %;

— la Finanziaria 2008 subordina la «sterilizzazione» dell'IVA all'approvazione preventiva da parte della Commissione europea.

Chiedo alla Commissione:

— di riferire sul mancato via libera per l'attivazione dello strumento;

— di indicare se intenda approvare la «sterilizzazione» dell'IVA per ridurre il caro-benzina.

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(14 agosto 2012)

A norma della direttiva del Consiglio 2003/96/CE ([1]), che stabilisce le regole che disciplinano la riscossione dell'accisa sui prodotti energetici, gli Stati membri sono liberi di determinare il livello di tassazione dei prodotti petroliferi a condizione che tali livelli siano al di sopra delle aliquote minime stabilite dalla direttiva. Gli Stati membri hanno inoltre facoltà di modificare il livello di tassazione ogniqualvolta necessario, senza chiedere la preventiva approvazione della Commissione, a condizione che esso resti al di sopra del livello minimo. Essi sono soltanto tenuti a comunicare ai servizi della Commissione due volte l'anno le aliquote di accisa applicabili.

Pertanto, la decisione di modificare l'aliquota di accisa per i prodotti petroliferi in Italia allo scopo di compensare il maggior gettito IVA è una decisione presa dal governo italiano che non richiede alcuna autorizzazione da parte della Commissione o di altra istituzione dell'UE nella misura in cui non si discosta dalle regole di cui alla direttiva 2003/96/CE.

([1]) Direttiva 2003/96/CE del Consiglio, del 27 ottobre 2003, che ristruttura il quadro comunitario per la tassazione dei prodotti energetici e dell'elettricità, GU L 283 del 31.10.2003, pag. 51.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006681/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Reducing petrol price rises by compensating for rises in VAT revenue

Article 9 of the Italian Finance Law 2008 lays down that, if the price of oil rises by more than 2% above the reference value for oil indicated in the Economic and Financial Planning Document, rates of excise duty should be reduced to compensate for the increased VAT yield (due to the increased prices of oil products).

The right conditions currently exist to apply this clause, as fuel prices (and prices of oil products in general) have risen by far more than 2%. The Finance Law 2008 stipulates that such compensation for VAT requires the prior approval of the European Commission.

Will the Commission report on the failure to give the green light to applying the clause?

Will the Commission indicate whether it intends to approve compensation for VAT in order to reduce petrol price rises?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2012)

According to Council Directive 2003/96/EC ([1]) which lays down the rules for levying excise duty on energy products EU Member States are free to determine the level of taxation on oil products provided these levels are above the minima set in the directive. Member States are also allowed to change the level of taxation, provided it stays above the minimum level, as frequently as necessary without seeking prior approval by the Commission. They only need to inform the Commission services of the applicable excise duty rates twice a year.

Hence the decision to change the rate of excise duty for oil products in Italy in order to compensate for the increased VAT yield is a decision taken by the Italian Government and requires no authorisation by the Commission or other EU institution inasmuch as it does not derogate from the rules in Directive 2003/96/EC.

([1]) Council Directive 2003/96/EC of 27 October 2003 restructuring the Community framework for the taxation of energy products and electricity, OJ L 283, 31.10.2003, pp. 51-70.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006682/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Korean non-tariff barriers (NTBs) — update on issues resolved

Can the Commission update Parliament on the progress made concerning unresolved issues in relation to Korean non-tariff barriers since the entry into force of the free trade agreement with South Korea?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2012)

A number of Working Groups have been established under the EU-Korea Free Trade Agreement (FTA), as part of the monitoring mechanisms to ensure its proper implementation, particularly focusing on addressing non-tariff barriers.

On 26 and 27 April 2012, the Commission held the first meetings, with Korea, of the Working Groups on Motor Vehicles and Parts, Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals; and Medical Devices.

All three Working Groups took place in a cooperative and constructive manner with fruitful and open discussions between experts.

On motor vehicles and parts, progress was achieved with positive outcomes or clarifications obtained on aspects related to tyre marking, approval of cars in the same family, standards for chargers for electric vehicles and evaporative gas standards. The Commission will continue efforts to clarify and resolve further issues.

On chemicals, the Commission welcomed the interest of Korea to engage in cooperation for the setting up and implementation of K-Reach and awaits specific requests from Korea for such cooperation.

On pharmaceuticals and medical devices, the Commission, referring to the EU-Korea FTA principles of transparency and recognition of the value of innovation, invited Korea to take into account comments submitted on pricing reform for pharmaceutical products and medical devices. Consultations will continue in this regard.

In addition, barriers concerning acceptability of self-certification in the machinery sector, labelling of cosmetics and origin marking for coffee have also been resolved.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006684/12
au Conseil
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(4 juillet 2012)

Objet: Difficultés chypriotes et demandes de soutien financier

Alors qu'elle s'apprête à accéder à la présidence du Conseil de l'Union, la République de Chypre doit faire face à des difficultés pour combler son déficit budgétaire et protéger son système bancaire, affecté par les problèmes de l'économie grecque. Le 25 juin dernier, l'État chypriote a ainsi sollicité l'aide européenne au titre du Fonds européen de stabilité financière.

Compte tenu des crises successives actuelles, qui continuent de mettre à l'épreuve la solidité de notre Union, les difficultés du pays assurant actuellement la Présidence du Conseil devraient être l'occasion d'engager les actions nécessaires pour donner la preuve de notre attachement aux valeurs de solidarité et de responsabilité, qui sont au cœur du projet européen.

Or, l'éventualité d'une demande parallèle d'aide auprès de la Russie, qui compléterait une aide précédente de 2,5 milliards en 2011, fait peser des doutes sur la bonne volonté de l'État chypriote à promouvoir l'esprit européen et à accepter les principes de responsabilité inhérents à l'aide européenne.

Si l'aide de la Russie, partenaire important de l'Union européenne, ne pose en principe aucun problème, elle pourrait en effet s'avérer plus contestable si elle apparaissait comme un moyen d'échapper aux réformes de structures nécessaires pour stabiliser l'économie et le budget chypriotes.

1. Quelle est la position du Conseil de l'Union européenne sur l'attitude adoptée par la République chypriote? Estime t-il que cette demande s'inscrirait en conformité avec l'esprit de solidarité européen?

2. Le Conseil dispose t-il d'informations pertinentes sur la bonne volonté de cet État à engager les réformes nécessaires au rétablissement de sa situation bancaire et budgétaire?

3. Le Conseil peut-il expliquer les facteurs qui justifieraient les aides russes à un pays européen, en présentant notamment les liens de Chypre avec la Fédération de Russie et les intérêts russes dans l'économie chypriote?

Réponse
(8 octobre 2012)

Le soutien à la stabilité en faveur des pays de la zone euro est un instrument mis en place par les États membres dont la monnaie est l'euro. La nature et les conditions de cet instrument sont déterminées par l'accord-cadre régissant le FESF ([1]), qui est un accord international conclu entre les États membres de la zone euro et qui ne relève pas du champ d'application des traités de l'UE. Les conditions d'octroi de prêts sont énoncées dans un protocole d'accord annexé au contrat de prêt conclu entre les prêteurs et le pays bénéficiaire.

Par conséquent, le Conseil n'a pas débattu de la question d'une assistance financière en faveur de Chypre et n'est donc pas en mesure de se prononcer sur les conditions dans lesquelles cette assistance doit être accordée. Il n'a pas non plus débattu de la question de l'assistance financière accordée à Chypre par des pays tiers.

([1]) Fonds européen de stabilité financière.

Le 27 juin 2012, l'Eurogroupe a accueilli favorablement la demande des autorités chypriotes en vue de l'obtention d'une assistance financière des États membres de la zone euro. Reconnaissant qu'un programme d'ajustement était opportun à ce stade, l'Eurogroupe a envisagé de répondre favorablement à cette demande. La Commission en liaison avec la BCE ([2]) ainsi que les autorités chypriotes et le FMI ([3]) ont été invités à convenir d'un programme prenant en considération les besoins financiers du pays, eu égard à la situation du secteur bancaire et à la situation budgétaire. Basée sur une évaluation des besoins, l'assistance financière de la zone euro devrait être fournie dans le cadre d'un programme d'ajustement global, en s'appuyant sur les mesures déjà prises par les autorités chypriotes ainsi que sur les recommandations adoptées par le Conseil le 10 juillet 2012 dans le cadre du semestre européen ([4]). Le programme ne sera pas uniquement fondé sur des mesures ambitieuses destinées à assurer la stabilité du secteur financier, mais également sur une action déterminée visant à soutenir le processus d'assainissement budgétaire en cours ainsi que les réformes structurelles engagées pour favoriser la compétitivité et une croissance durable et équilibrée. L'Eurogroupe a également décidé que l'assistance financière serait accordée dans le cadre du FESF ou du MES ([5]).

([2]) Banque centrale européenne.
([3]) Fonds monétaire international.
([4]) doc. 11247/12.
([5]) Mécanisme européen de stabilité.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006684/12
to the Council
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Difficulties in Cyprus and requests for financial support

As it prepared to take over the Presidency of the Council of the European Union, Cyprus found itself facing difficulties in cutting its budget deficit and protecting its banking system, which had been hit by the economic problems in Greece. On 25 June 2012, Cyprus therefore requested EU support via the European Financial Stability Facility.

With the resilience of the EU being tested in an ongoing series of crises, the proper response to problems in the country currently holding the Council Presidency is to take measures that demonstrate our commitment to the values of solidarity and responsibility, values central to the concept of European union.

However, the fact of Cyprus making a parallel request for support from Russia — on top of the EUR 2.5 billion Russian loan it received in 2011 — calls into question the country's willingness to promote the EU spirit and accept the principles of financial responsibility that go hand in hand with EU support.

While support from Russia, which is an important partner of the EU, is not problematic in principle, it could become contentious if it looked like a device for dodging the structural reforms that are necessary to stabilise the Cypriot budget.

1. What is the Council's position on the attitude Cyprus has adopted? Does it regard a request for support from Russia as compatible with the spirit of EU solidarity?

2. Does the Council have relevant information about the country's willingness to undertake the reforms required to put its banking system and its budget back on a sound footing?

3. Can the Presidency explain the factors that would justify Cyprus being assisted by Russia, and in particular can it describe the country's ties with the Russian Federation and the Russian interests in the Cypriot economy?

Reply
(8 October 2012)

Stability support for euro area countries is set up by Member States whose currency is the euro. The nature and the conditions of this instrument are governed by the EFSF ([1]) framework agreement, which is an international agreement among these Member States and which does not fall within the scope of the EU Treaties. The conditions for disbursement of loans are stipulated in a memorandum of understanding attached to the loan agreement between the lenders and the recipient country.

The Council has therefore not discussed the question of providing financial support to Cyprus and is therefore not in a position to comment on the conditions under which such support would be granted. Neither has it discussed the issue of financial assistance to Cyprus from third countries.

([1]) European Financial Stability Facility.

On 27 June 2012, the Eurogroup welcomed the Cypriot authorities' request for financial assistance from euro area Member States. The Eurogroup acknowledged that an adjustment programme seemed warranted and considered responding favourably to it. The Commission, in liaison with the ECB ([2]), and the Cypriot authorities and the IMF ([3]) have been invited to agree on a programme taking into account the financing needs stemming from the banking sector and the budget. Based on a needs assessment, the euro area financial support would be provided in the framework of a comprehensive adjustment programme, building on the measures already taken by the Cypriot authorities and the recommendations adopted by the Council on 10 July 2012 under the European Semester ([4]). The programme will not only be based on ambitious measures to ensure the stability of the financial sector, but also on determined action to support the ongoing process of fiscal consolidation, as well as structural reforms to support competitiveness and sustainable and balanced growth. The Eurogroup also decided that the financial assistance would be provided by the EFSF or the ESM ([5]).

([2]) European Central Bank.
([3]) International Monetary Fund.
([4]) 11247/12.
([5]) European Stability Mechanism.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006685/12
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(4 juillet 2012)

Objet: Difficultés chypriotes et demandes de soutien financier

Alors qu'elle s'apprête à accéder à la présidence du Conseil de l'Union, la République de Chypre doit faire face à des difficultés pour combler son déficit budgétaire et protéger son système bancaire, affecté par les problèmes de l'économie grecque. Le 25 juin dernier, l'État chypriote a ainsi sollicité l'aide européenne au titre du Fonds européen de stabilité financière.

Compte tenu des crises successives actuelles, qui continuent de mettre à l'épreuve la solidité de notre Union, les difficultés du pays assurant actuellement la présidence du Conseil devraient être l'occasion d'engager les actions nécessaires pour donner la preuve de notre attachement aux valeurs de solidarité et de responsabilité, qui sont au cœur du projet européen.

Or, l'éventualité d'une demande parallèle d'aide auprès de la Russie, qui complèterait une aide précédente de 2,5 milliards en 2011, fait peser des doutes sur la bonne volonté de l'État chypriote à promouvoir l'esprit européen et à accepter les principes de responsabilité inhérents à l'aide européenne.

Si l'aide de la Russie, partenaire important de l'Union européenne, ne pose en principe aucun problème, elle pourrait en effet s'avérer plus contestable si elle apparaissait comme un moyen d'échapper aux réformes de structures nécessaires pour stabiliser l'économie et le budget chypriote.

1. La Commission dispose-t-elle d'informations pertinentes sur les causes des difficultés chypriotes et sur les réformes structurelles qui pourraient s'avérer nécessaires pour rétablir la situation bancaire et budgétaire du pays (notamment en matière de fiscalité)?

2. Quelle attitude la Commission compte-t-elle adopter s'agissant des aides russes (passées, voire à venir)? Les éventuelles aides accordées par l'Union européenne au titre du FESF tiendront-elles compte de l'appui financier de la Fédération de Russie?

3. La Commission estime-t-elle que les demandes chypriotes à l'égard de l'aide de la Russie s'inscrivent en conformité avec l'esprit de solidarité européen?

Réponse donnée par M. Rehn au nom de la Commission
(22 août 2012)

Les conséquences de l'exposition du secteur bancaire chypriote à la Grèce, résultat des pertes sur les obligations souveraines grecques lors de la restructuration de la dette, ainsi que la dégradation de la qualité des actifs chypriotes et grecs rendent nécessaire une recapitalisation importante du secteur bancaire. Le bilan approfondi réalisé pour Chypre dans le cadre du semestre européen a confirmé qu'il est urgent de prêter attention à sa politique économique, le pays étant actuellement confronté à de très sérieux déséquilibres macroéconomiques sur le plan structurel comme dans ses finances publiques et son secteur financier. Les principales conclusions du semestre européen 2012 montrent la nécessité d'un assainissement budgétaire de grande ampleur pour corriger le déficit excessif, qu'il faut associer à l'adoption sans réserve de réformes structurelles du marché du travail, des secteurs de la santé et des services et du système d'indexation des salaires pour rétablir la compétitivité.

En juin 2012, Chypre a officiellement sollicité une aide financière extérieure auprès des États membres de la zone euro, à travers le Fonds européen de stabilité financière/mécanisme européen de stabilité (FESF/MES). Parallèlement, elle a présenté une demande d'aide financière au Fonds monétaire international (FMI). Le programme économique qui l'accompagne devrait garantir la stabilité financière et l'ajustement budgétaire, ainsi que le lancement de réformes structurelles destinées à soutenir la compétitivité. L'octroi d'autres prêts bilatéraux à Chypre n'aurait aucune conséquence sur l'élaboration ni sur les conditions d'un programme d'assistance économique UE-FMI.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006685/12
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Difficulties in Cyprus and requests for financial support

As it prepared to take over the Presidency of the Council of the European Union, Cyprus found itself facing difficulties in cutting its budget deficit and protecting its banking system, which had been hit by the economic problems in Greece. On 25 June 2012, Cyprus therefore requested EU support via the European Financial Stability Facility.

With the resilience of the EU being tested in an ongoing series of crises, the proper response to problems in the country currently holding the Council Presidency is to take measures that demonstrate our commitment to the values of solidarity and responsibility, values central to the concept of European union.

However, the fact of Cyprus making a parallel request for support from Russia — on top of the EUR 2.5 billion Russian loan it received in 2011 — calls into question the country's willingness to promote the EU spirit and accept the principles of financial responsibility that go hand in hand with EU support.

While support from Russia, which is an important partner of the EU, is not problematic in principle, it could begin to be contentious if it looked like a device for dodging the structural reforms that are necessary to stabilise the Cypriot budget.

1. Does the Commission have relevant information about the causes of the problems in Cyprus and the structural reforms that may be required (particularly in the area of taxation) to put the country's budget as well as its banking system back on a sound footing?

2. What attitude does the Commission intend to take with regard to the Russian support (that already granted as well as any future support)? Will any EU assistance via the European Financial Stability Facility take account of the financial support from the Russian Federation?

3. Does the Commission regard Cyprus's requests for Russian support as compatible with the spirit of EU solidarity?

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

The implications of the exposure of the banking sector to Greece following losses on the Greek Government bonds under the debt restructuring and the asset quality deterioration in both Cyprus and Greece require a substantial increase of banking sector capital. Under the European Semester, the in-depth review for Cyprus confirmed the need for urgent economic policy attention as Cyprus faces very serious macroeconomic imbalances in the area of public finances, the financial sector, and on the structural front. The key elements of the 2012 European Semester findings indicate the necessity for substantial fiscal consolidation to correct the excessive deficit, while structural reforms in the labour market, services and health sectors, and of wage indexation need to be embraced to restore competitiveness.

In June 2012, Cyprus formally presented to euro area Member States a request for external financial assistance from the European Financial Stability Facility/European Stability Mechanism (EFSF/ESM). A parallel request for financial assistance was presented to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The accompanying economic programme should ensure financial stability, fiscal adjustment and structural reforms to support competitiveness. Any bilateral loan to Cyprus would not affect the design and conditionality of an EU-IMF economic assistance programme.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006686/12
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(4 juillet 2012)

Objet: Méthodes d'évaluation des risques OGM

Alors que le 20 février 2012, la France présentait à la Commission ses arguments scientifiques visant à l'interdiction de la mise en culture commerciale du maïs MON810 (seule céréale transgénique autorisée dans l'Union européenne), un doute subsiste sur la position de la Commission qui pourrait se traduire par une obligation de levée du moratoire français concernant les souches de maïs génétiquement modifiées de la firme américaine Monsanto.

La position européenne suit l'avis de l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) du 21 mai qui avance que la France n'a pas de preuve scientifique suffisante démontrant un risque pour la santé ou pour l'environnement.

Dans le document avancé à l'appui de leur demande d'interdiction du maïs MON810, les autorités françaises sollicitent de «réévaluer complètement le MON810 à la lumière des nouvelles lignes directrices publiées par l'EFSA en 2010». Face à cette demande, l'EFSA s'est simplement abstenue de répondre.

Face à la persistance des divergences entre les différents experts nationaux et européens, les États membres avaient demandé, déjà en 2008, une révision des procédures mises en œuvre par l'EFSA concernant l'évaluation des OGM.

Les autorités françaises ont également appelé l'EFSA à «renouveler ses outils statistiques» suite notamment à l'avis du Haut conseil des biotechnologies (HCB) qui considérait, déjà en 2009, que «les données de l'agence européenne [étaient] obsolètes du fait de l'absence d'effets majeurs et/ou faute de données suffisantes».

La Commission pourrait-elle indiquer si des réformes sont envisagées s'agissant des méthodes d'évaluation de l'EFSA concernant les risques scientifiques, sanitaires ou environnementaux présentés par certains organismes génétiquement modifiés?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(23 août 2012)

La Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire à sa réponse à la question écrite E 005919/2012 ([1]), qui énumère les mesures en cours d'élaboration destinées à renforcer l'évaluation des risques des OGM.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006686/12
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: GMO risk assessment methods

Even though France submitted its scientific arguments for a ban on the commercial cultivation of MON810 corn (the only GM cereal authorised in the European Union) to the Commission on 20 February 2012, doubts remain about the Commission's position which could result in an obligation to lift the French moratorium on American firm Monsanto's strains of GM corn.

The European position follows the opinion issued by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) on 21 May which argues that France does not have sufficient scientific evidence to demonstrate a risk to health and the environment.

In the document produced to support their request for a ban on MON810 corn, the French authorities asked for MON810 to be completely re-evaluated in the light of the new guidelines published by EFSA in 2010. EFSA has simply declined to answer this request.

Given that there is a persistent divergence of opinions among different national and European experts, the Member States had already asked, back in 2008, for a review of the procedures applied by EFSA to evaluate GMOs.

The French authorities have also called on EFSA to renew its statistical tools, particularly following the opinion of the French High Council for Biotechnology which, back in 2009, considered that the European agency's data were obsolete on account of the absence of major effects and/or lack of sufficient data.

Could the Commission state whether reforms are being considered with regard to EFSA's evaluation methods concerning the scientific, health or environmental risks presented by certain genetically modified organisms?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(23 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005919/2012 ([1]) which lists the measures being developed to strengthen GMOs risk assessment.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006687/12
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Cost of 'Science: It's a Girl Thing!' video

Can the Commission confirm how much it cost to fund the launch event for the 'Women in Research and Innovation' campaign, held outside Parliament on 21 June 2012, and the associated video entitled 'Science: It's a Girl Thing!'?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

The video 'Science: It's a Girl Thing' cost EUR 102 000.

The launch event which was held outside the European Parliament was composed of hands-on science activities, street actions and a flashmob. The total cost was EUR 199 227.

The objective of this event, run in parallel to the conference organised inside the Parliament, was to make people aware of the campaign and to involve young people, showing them that science is fascinating and useful.

Approximately 500 people (including young people) took part in the activities which attracted an estimated 1500 spectators (members of the public).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006688/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(4 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Pakistan complotto per uccidere nota attivista per i diritti umani

Una nota attivista per i diritti umani e avvocato teme per la sua vita da quando è venuta a conoscenza di un complotto per ucciderla da parte delle forze di sicurezza del Pakistan. Nell'ultimo anno il numero dei difensori dei diritti umani uccisi nel paese è aumentato, coinvolgendo in molti casi l'Inter-Service Intelligence (Isi). L'avvocato in questione ha sostenuto i diritti delle donne e dei minori, delle minoranze religiose, dei lavoratori forzati. Ha difeso il diritto alla libertà religiosa e alla libertà dalla discriminazione in Pakistan, sfidando le ordinanze hudood e le leggi sulla blasfemia che, rispettivamente, discriminano donne e minoranze religiose. Il 17 novembre 2010 è stata insignita di un prestigioso riconoscimento delle Nazioni Unite, il premio di Bilbao per la promozione della cultura dei diritti umani. Avvocatessa impegnata da sempre nella difesa dei diritti umani, è stata in prima linea nella lotta contro le leggi e le prassi discriminatorie in vigore in Pakistan. Per questo, e per aver criticato lo stato d'emergenza introdotto dall'allora presidente Musharraf, nel 2007 è stata posta agli arresti domiciliari e minacciata di morte. Dopo aver ricoperto numerosi incarichi riguardanti i diritti umani all'interno delle Nazioni Unite, è tornata a occuparsi della promozione dei diritti umani nel suo paese.

Si interroga pertanto l'Alto Rappresentante per sapere se:

1. È al corrente di questa situazione i cui sviluppi si stanno rivelando sempre più drammatici?

2. Quali misure intende adottare al fine di salvaguardare la vita di questi attivisti?

3. Pensa che verrà il giorno in cui queste persone non dovranno più temere per la propria vita?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(24 agosto 2012)

L'AR/VP è al corrente della difficile situazione dei difensori dei diritti umani in Pakistan e della situazione dell'avvocato a cui si riferisce l'onorevole parlamentare.

L'UE mantiene un dialogo regolare con il Pakistan in materia di diritti umani e principi democratici, compresi i diritti civili e politici, ed ha invitato le autorità pachistane ad adottare misure per garantire l'incolumità fisica e tutelare i diritti di tutti i cittadini. In seguito all'adozione del Piano d'impegno UE-Pakistan, il dialogo esistente sarà potenziato da regolari dialoghi settoriali sulla sicurezza, compresi lo Stato di diritto e l'accesso alla giustizia, e sui diritti umani. Si prevede che la lotta all'estremismo violento faccia parte del dialogo.

Nel contempo, l'UE sostiene progetti volti a migliorare l'accesso alla giustizia e l'applicazione della legge nel paese, anche da parte della polizia e delle procure.

Se si considerano la transizione del Pakistan verso la democrazia, le recenti modifiche costituzionali e le sfide economiche e sociali, che hanno favorito la crescita dell'estremismo violento, ci vorrà probabilmente tempo prima che possano essere garantiti il benessere e la sicurezza dei cittadini, compresi i difensori dei diritti umani.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006688/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Plot to kill a prominent human rights activist in Pakistan

A lawyer who is a prominent human rights activist has been in fear of her life since she learned of a plot by Pakistan's security forces to kill her. The number of killings of human rights defenders — in many cases with the involvement of Pakistan's intelligence service, the ISI — has increased over the past year. The lawyer has long fought for the rights of women and children, religious minorities and bonded labourers and championed the right to religious freedom and freedom from discrimination in Pakistan, challenging the Hudood laws and the blasphemy laws, which discriminate against women and religious minorities respectively. On 17 November 2010 she was given a prestigious United Nations award, the Bilbao Prize for the Promotion of a Culture of Human Rights. As a result of her front-line role in defending human rights and combating the discriminatory laws and practices in place in Pakistan, as well as her criticism of the state of emergency declared by the President of the time, General Musharraf, in 2007 she was placed under house arrest and threatened with death. She has served the United Nations in various human rights-related capacities.

1. Is the High Representative aware of the increasingly perilous situation for human rights defenders in Pakistan?

2. What steps does she intend to take to protect their lives?

3. Does she think that the day will come when such people will no longer have reason to fear for their lives?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the difficult situation faced by human rights defenders in Pakistan, and of the situation of the lawyer in question.

The EU engages in regular dialogue with Pakistan on human rights and democratic principles, including civil and political rights and has called on the Pakistani authorities to adopt measures to ensure the physical security and to protect the rights of all Pakistani citizens. Following adoption of the EU-Pakistan Engagement Plan, the existing dialogue will be enhanced by regular sector dialogues on security, including rule of law and access to justice, as well as human rights. Countering violent extremism is expected to be part of the dialogue.

At the same time the EU is supporting projects which are intended to improve access to justice and also to improve the quality of law enforcement in Pakistan, not least with the police and prosecution services.

In view of Pakistan's transitional democracy, the recent constitutional changes, economic and social challenges which have encouraged the growth of violent extremism, it is likely to take time before the well-being and safety of citizens, including human rights defenders, can be assured.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006689/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(4 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Campagna contro il velo imposto alle bambine

Il Centro per l'uguaglianza delle donne (Markaz musawa al-mara) con base in Marocco, ha lanciato una campagna contro il velo imposto alle bambine. L'iniziativa parte dalla sempre maggiore diffusione del velo tra le minorenni marocchine — e non solo — nella consapevolezza che si tratti di una barbara imposizione. Siffatto fenomeno riguarda bambine dai tre ai dieci anni, convinte di essere oggetti di desiderio, per cui devono celarsi e nascondere i loro capelli. Tutto questo accade in un'età in cui non conoscono nulla della religione e dei suoi fondamenti. Si tratta di un fenomeno estremamente pericoloso, che colpisce l'infanzia e la sua innocenza. Si tratta di una violazione dell'innocenza delle bambine, che non sanno nulla di ciò che è proibito e lecito. Nel 1993 la sociologa algerina, attualmente Ministro della Comunicazione e della Cultura, Khalida Messaoudi scriveva che esistono tre tipi di hijab: quello che permette di nascondere la propria miseria, perché la vita è molto cara e vestirsi lo è ancora di più; quello che si rivela un lasciapassare, perché così travestite le donne possono più liberamente muoversi per le strade; quello delle casalinghe già abituate a portare il haiq, ma che ora portano più volentieri il hijab perché ha il vantaggio di lasciare le mani libere. Senza contare che in una società in cui i giovani, e in particolare le ragazze, vivono una terribile povertà affettiva e sessuale e dove l'assoggettamento femminile viene organizzato molto precocemente e a tutti i livelli, l'hijab diventa uno strumento di identificazione e di affermazione di sé. Infine, l'hijab politico, quello cioè che viene coscientemente e liberamente indossato per indicare la propria appartenenza ideologica e che assume un significato di segno di identità e riconoscimento. Ebbene la studiosa algerina, laica, non parla di hijab religioso, ma non parlano di hijab come obbligo religioso nemmeno alcuni celebri teologi musulmani. Se il velo non è un obbligo religioso, ma il frutto della scelta di una donna consapevole che sceglie liberamente di indossarlo, per vari motivi, non può certamente essere imposto a nessuno, ma soprattutto non può essere imposto a bambine del tutto innocenti.

Si interroga pertanto l'Alto Rappresentante per sapere se:

1. È al corrente di questa situazione i cui sviluppi si stanno rivelando sempre più drammatici?

2. Quali misure intende adottare al fine di preservare l'innocenza di queste bambine?

3. Pensa che un giorno sarà possibile migliorare la condizione della donna in questi paesi in cui le donne vengono ancora trattate come diverse?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(13 agosto 2012)

L'AR/VP è al corrente della situazione delle donne in Marocco e del fatto che alcune soffrono ancora di discriminazione culturale e sociale. La situazione può essere affrontata adottando le misure adeguate per lottare efficacemente contro la discriminazione femminile e garantire l'uguaglianza di genere. L'AR/VP segue da vicino gli sviluppi in materia di diritti femminili attraverso la delegazione dell'UE a Rabat; le preoccupazioni dell'UE per i diritti delle donne nel paese sono state fatte presenti al più alto livello possibile.

L'AR/VP ritiene che il Marocco stia ottenendo progressi riguardo al rispetto dei principi dei diritti umani. In particolare, la nuova Costituzione comprende numerose disposizioni in materia di diritti umani e libertà fondamentali. Sono però necessari ulteriori miglioramenti, in particolare per quanto riguarda l'uguaglianza fra uomini e donne e la lotta contro la discriminazione di genere. L'UE si attende che il Marocco rispetti pienamente il diritto di parità sancito dalla nuova Costituzione.

La promozione dell'uguaglianza di genere è da tempo una priorità dell'attività dell'UE nel paese. La questione è esplicitamente menzionata nel nuovo Piano d'azione UE-Marocco in corso di negoziato nel quadro della Politica europea di vicinato.

La Commissione sta varando un programma di riforma settoriale del valore di 45 milioni di euro (per il periodo 2012-2015) a sostegno del piano d'azione governativo per l'uguaglianza di genere. Il programma sosterrà le attività per contrastare la violenza contro le donne, rafforzare l'uguaglianza di genere nell'elaborazione delle politiche, potenziare le capacità e fornire istruzione e formazione per le professioni giuridiche e le donne in generale su questi temi.

L'UE si sforza di promuovere l'uguaglianza di genere anche sostenendo in modo proattivo le iniziative della società civile che promuovono i diritti delle donne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006689/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Campaign against the custom of forcing girls to wear the veil

The Morocco-based Centre for Women's Equality (Markaz musawa al-mara) has launched a campaign against the custom of forcing girls to wear the veil. The campaign has been prompted by an increase in the number of Moroccan girls under the age of 18 are wearing the veil and by a recognition of the fact that it is a barbarous imposition. The young girls concerned are aged between three and ten, in other words they are at a time in their lives when they know nothing about religion and its rules; nevertheless, they are convinced that they are objects of desire and must therefore hide their hair. This extremely dangerous practice represents a violation of the innocence of childhood and of young girls who have no idea about what is permissible and what is not. In 1993, the Algerian sociologist Khalida Messaoudi, who is now Minister of Communication and Culture, wrote that there are three types of hijab: there is the one which enables women to hide their own poverty, because the cost of living is expensive and clothes are even more so; the one which serves as a kind of laissez-passer, because it enables women to move around more freely in the street; the one worn by housewives, who were already used to wearing the haiq, but who are now happy to wear the hijab because it leaves their hands free. Despite the fact that young people, and girls in particular, live in a society in which they are starved of affection and sexual experience and in which the subjugation of women starts at a very early age and in all areas of life, there is the hijab which becomes a means of asserting one's identity and of self-affirmation. Finally, there is the political hijab, which women choose freely and deliberately to wear as a sign of their own ideological beliefs and which thus becomes a symbol of identity and acknowledgement. It is striking that a non-religious Algerian academic should make no mention of the religious hijab, but then some famous Muslim theologists likewise do not see the hijab as a religious requirement. If the veil is thus not a religious requirement, but is worn on the basis of a free and informed choice, for a variety of reasons, it cannot be imposed on anyone, and in particular not on completely innocent young girls.

1. Is the VP/HR aware of this increasingly serious situation?

2. What measures does she intend to take to preserve the innocence of the young girls involved?

3. Does she believe that one day it will be possible to improve the situation of women in those countries in which they are still treated as people apart?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the situation of women in Morocco including that some women still suffer from cultural and social discrimination. This situation can be addressed through the adoption and implementation of appropriate measures to fight efficiently discrimination against women and to ensure gender equality. The HR/VP is following the developments regarding women rights closely through the EU Delegation in Rabat and concerns on women's rights in the country have been raised at the highest possible level.

The HR/VP considers that Morocco is making general progress towards greater compliance with human rights principles. In particular, the new Constitution includes significant measures with regard to human rights and fundamental freedoms. Further improvements are, however, needed in particular in the area of gender equality and the fight against gender discrimination. The EU expects Morocco to implement fully the principle of parity enshrined in the new Constitution.

Promoting gender equality has been a longstanding priority of the EU's action in Morocco. This issue is explicitly covered in the new EU-Morocco Action Plan which is currently being negotiated in the framework of the European Neighbourhood Policy.

The Commission is launching a sector reform programme (covering 2012-2015) supporting the Government's Gender Equality Action Plan, to a value of EUR 45 million. The programme will support efforts to combat violence against women, strengthen gender equality in policy-making, and provide capacity building, education and training for legal professionals and women generally on these issues.

The EU seeks to promote gender equality also by proactively supporting civil society initiatives that promote women's rights.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006690/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 iulie 2012)

Subiect: Legalitatea și moralitatea acordării unei finanțări europene pentru fundația unui politician român

„Fundația Dan Voiculescu pentru Dezvoltarea României", deținută de politicianul român Dan Voiculescu, președintele unui partid din coaliția de guvernământ, a câștigat o finanțare europeană în valoare de 4 milioane de lei (cca 1 milion de euro) în cadrul Programului Național de Dezvoltare Rurală, pentru proiectul „Promovarea meșteșugurilor tradiționale pentru a facilita trecerea de la agricultura de subzistență la ocuparea în activități non-agricole în mediul rural". În cadrul acestui proiect, Fundația organizează cursuri de pictură și de „împletituri de nuiele".

În ultimii doi ani, fundațiile lui Voiculescu au mai beneficiat de contracte finanțate din fonduri europene în valoare totală de aproximativ 11 milioane de lei, bani folosiți pentru formare profesională.

Comisia este rugată să răspundă la următoarele întrebări:

1. Dacă apreciază că acest mod de a utiliza fondurile europene corespunde obiectivelor pentru care acestea au fost puse la dispoziția României.

2. Dacă politicienii din statele UE nu ar trebui să se abțină de la a solicita finanțări din bugetul UE.

3. Dacă nu consideră că se impun verificări cu privire la legalitatea și corectitudinea acordării finanțării în această speță.

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(8 august 2012)

Comisia a aprobat Programul național de dezvoltare rurală (PNDR) propus de România, dar, având în vedere repartizarea responsabilităților între Comisie și statele membre, pe baza principiului gestiunii partajate, implementarea PNDR este responsabilitatea statului membru. Prin urmare, organizarea cererilor de propuneri pentru diferitele măsuri, evaluarea cererilor depuse în funcție de criteriile de eligibilitate și de selecție definite în PNDR și decizia finală de aprobare a proiectelor sunt de competența statelor membre.

În ceea ce privește prima întrebare, Comisia nu cunoaște proiectele individuale la care se referă distinsul membru. În cadrul procedurii de verificare și închidere a conturilor, serviciile Comisiei verifică în mod regulat dacă sistemele de gestiune și control ale statelor membre funcționează corect. În cadrul acestor sisteme, statele membre trebuie să efectueze controale administrative și controale la fața locului ale proiectelor. Comisia nu știe dacă proiectele menționate au fost deja verificate de statul membru și, în consecință, nu se poate pronunța dacă finanțarea acestora a fost utilizată pentru obiectivele urmărite.

În ceea ce privește cea de-a doua întrebare, nu există norme UE privind incompatibilitatea dintre exercitarea de funcții politice și primirea de fonduri UE. Aceasta este o chestiune de competență națională.

În ceea ce privește cea de-a treia întrebare, dacă în timpul controalelor și verificărilor sale Comisia descoperă informații legate de posibile cazuri de fraudă sau de corupție care prejudiciază bugetul UE, le transmite Oficiului European de Luptă Antifraudă (OLAF) ([1]). Informațiile incluse în întrebare nu prezintă suficiente elemente care să-i permită Comisiei să înainteze aspectele descrise către OLAF.

([1]) Articolul 7 din Regulamentul nr. 1073/1999 privind investigațiile efectuate de OLAF. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=DD:01:02:31999R1073:RO:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006690/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Legal and moral issues at stake in respect of EU funding for a foundation run by a Romanian politician

The 'Dan Voiculescu Foundation for the Development of Romania' run by the Romanian politician Dan Voiculescu, leader of a party in the government coalition, has secured EU funding of RON 4 million (around EUR 1 million) under the National Programme of Rural Development for 'the promotion of traditional crafts to facilitate the transition from subsistence farming to non-agricultural occupations in rural areas'. As part of this project, the foundation organises painting and wickerwork courses.

Over the last two years, Mr Voiculescu's foundations have also been awarded EU-funded contracts to a total value of approximately RON 11 million for the purposes of vocational training.

In view of this:

1. Does the Commission consider that this EU funding for Romania is being used for its intended objectives?

2. Does it not consider that politicians from EU Member States should abstain from seeking EU funding?

3. Does it not consider it necessary to investigate the legality and admissibility of funding in this case?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2012)

The Commission approved the National Rural Development Programme (NRDP) proposed by Romania but, in the light of the division of responsibilities between the Commission and the Member States, based on the principle of shared management, the implementation of the NRDP is the responsibility of the Member State. Therefore, the organisation of the calls for proposals for the different measures, the assessment of the applications submitted against the eligibility and selection criteria defined in the NRDP and the final decision of approval of projects are of the Member State's competence.

Regarding the first question, the Commission does not know the individual projects referred to by the Honourable Member. In the framework of the clearance of accounts procedure, the Commission services regularly verify whether the management and control systems of the Member States work correctly. As part of these systems, the Member States shall undertake administrative and on-the-spot checks of projects. The Commission does not know if the mentioned projects have already been checked by the Member State and, consequently, cannot state whether their funding has been used for the intended objectives.

Concerning the second question, there are no EU rules on incompatibility between the exercise of political functions and the receipt of EU funding. This is a matter of national competence.

As far as the third question is concerned, any information relating to possible cases of fraud or corruption detrimental to the EU Budget which the Commission would come across during its controls and checks, would be transmitted to the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) ([1]). The information provided in the question does not have sufficient elements allowing for the Commission to refer the matters described to OLAF.

([1]) Article 7 of Regulation 1073/1999 concerning investigations conducted by OLAF: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1999:136:0001:0007:EN:PDF.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006691/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 iulie 2012)

Subiect: Valoarea toxică de referință la aluminiu

Unele studii recente au determinat noi îngrijorări în rândul opiniei publice cu privire la alimentele care au în compoziție aditivi alimentari ce conțin aluminiu: E173 (colorant), E520 și E523 (întăritori), E541(agent de afânare), E554 — E556, E558 și E559 (antiaglomeranți) și E1452 (înlocuitori). Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă Autoritatea Europeană pentru Siguranța Alimentară (EFSA) ar putea avea în vedere revizuirea deciziei sale cu privire la valoarea toxică de referință la aluminiu.

Răspuns dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei
(24 august 2012)

Comisia îl invită pe distinsul membru să consulte răspunsul la întrebarea scrisă E-003799/2012, adresată de dl Bizotto ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006691/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Toxic reference value for aluminium

Recent studies have aroused fresh public concern about food produced using additives containing aluminium: E173 (colour), E520 and E523 (firming agents), E541(emulsifier), E554 — E556, E558 and E559 (anti-caking agents) and E1452 (substitute). Can the Commission say whether the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) may consider revising its decision on the toxic reference value for aluminium?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-003799/2012 by Mrs Bizotto ([1]).

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

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-006693/12
do Komisji
Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz (PPE)
(4 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Promowanie stosowania energii ze źródeł odnawialnych – dyrektywa 2009/28/WE

Chciałbym odnieść się do dyrektywy 2009/28/WE z dnia 23 kwietnia 2009 r. w sprawie promowania energii ze źródeł odnawialnych zmieniającej i w następstwie uchylającej dyrektywę 2009/77/WE oraz dyrektywę 2003/30/WE ([1]), a w szczególności do załącznika III (Wartość energetyczna w paliwach transportowych) i załącznika V (Zasady obliczania wpływu biopaliw, biopłynów i ich odpowiedników kopalnych na emisję gazów cieplarnianych).

Wykaz w załączniku III uwzględnia „hydrorafinowany olej roślinny (olej roślinny poddany termochemicznej obróbce wodorem)". Wykaz w załączniku V uwzględnia:

— hydrorafinowany olej roślinny z ziaren rzepaku,

— hydrorafinowany olej roślinny ze słonecznika,

— hydrorafinowany olej roślinny z oleju palmowego (technologia nieokreślona), oraz

— hydrorafinowany olej roślinny z oleju palmowego (technologia z wychwytem metanu w olejarni).

Zdaję sobie sprawę, że oba wymienione wyżej załączniki nie obejmują wszystkich rodzajów biopaliw i technologii. Jak wiadomo, technologie oparte na przetwarzaniu olejów roślinnych w obecności wodoru w celu uzyskania parafiny HVO (hydrorafinowanego oleju roślinnego), niezawierającej siarki lub węglowodorów aromatycznych, stają się coraz bardziej popularne.

Czy tego rodzaju przetwarzanie można uznać za jeden ze sposobów spełnienia wymogów niniejszej dyrektywy?

Byłbym bardzo wdzięczny za odpowiedź, która umożliwiłaby działanie zgodne przepisami unijnymi tym, którzy już wykorzystują lub też chcieliby wykorzystywać metodę hydrorafinowania.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Günthera Oettingera w imieniu Komisji
(2 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Biopaliwa spełniające kryteria w zakresie zrównoważonego rozwoju określone w dyrektywie w sprawie energii ze źródeł odnawialnych ([2]) mogą być zaliczane na poczet osiągnięcia celów określonych w tej dyrektywie ([3]) oraz otrzymania wsparcia finansowego. Ma to również zastosowanie do biopaliw produkowanych poprzez przetwarzanie olejów roślinnych w obecności wodoru w celu uzyskania parafiny HVO (hydrorafinowanego oleju roślinnego).

([1]) Dz.U. L 140 z 5.6.2009, s. 16.

([2]) Art. 17 dyrektywy Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady 2009/28/WE z dnia 23 kwietnia 2009 r. w sprawie promowania stosowania energii ze źródeł odnawialnych zmieniającej i w następstwie uchylającej dyrektywy 2001/77/WE oraz 2003/30/WE, Dz.U. L 140 z 5.6.2009.

([3]) Te same kryteria w zakresie zrównoważonego rozwoju mają zastosowanie na mocy dyrektywy w sprawie jakości paliw (2009/30/WE). Biopaliwa spełniające te kryteria można również zaliczać na poczet celów w zakresie ograniczenia intensywności emisji dwutlenku węgla określonych w tej dyrektywie.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006693/12
to the Commission
Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources — Directive 2009/28/EC

I would like to refer to 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 2009/77/EC and 2003/30/EC ([1]), and especially to Annexes III (Energy content of transport fuels) and V (Rules for calculating the greenhouse gas impact of biofuels, bioliquids and their fossil fuel comparators).

The list in Annex III includes 'hydrotreated vegetable oil (vegetable oil thermochemically treated with hydrogen)'. The list in Annex V includes:

— hydrotreated vegetable oil from rape seed,

— hydrotreated vegetable oil from sunflower,

— hydrotreated vegetable oil from palm oil (process not specified), and

— hydrotreated vegetable oil from palm oil (process with methane capture at oil mill).

I realise that the two annexes quoted above do not specify all biofuels and technologies. It is commonly known that technologies based on the co-processing of vegetable oils in the presence of hydrogen to produce paraffinic HVO (hydrotreated vegetable oil) containing no sulphur or aromatics are becoming more and more popular.

Can such co-processing be considered as one of the ways to fulfil the requirements of the directive?

I would be very grateful for your answer, which will enable those who have applied, or wish to apply, the co-hydrotreating process to comply with EU regulations.

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2012)

Biofuels that fulfill the sustainability criteria set out in the Renewable Energy Directive ([2]) can be used for the purpose of counting towards the targets set out in that directive ([3]), as well as receiving finacial support. This also applies to biofuels produced from the co-processing of vegetable oils in the presence of hydrogen to produce HVO (hydrotreated vegetable oil).

([1]) OJ L 140, 5.6.2009, p. 16.
([2]) Article 17 of Directive 2009/28/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC, OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.
([3]) The same sustainability criteria apply under the Fuel Quality Directive 2009/30/EC. Biofuels that comply with such criteria can also be counted towards the carbon intensity reduction target included in that directive.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006694/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — UN Human Rights Council resolution on Sri Lanka

On 22 March 2012 the United Nations Human Rights Council adopted a resolution which called on the Government of Sri Lanka to promote accountability and reconciliation in that country, following the end of the armed conflict on the island in 2009.

1. Can the Vice-President/High Representative state what action the EU has taken to date, or intends to take, to monitor the Government of Sri Lanka's cooperation with the resolution and the implementation of its recommendations?

2. Would the Vice-President/High Representative support an independent, international commission of inquiry into the conduct of the final months of the conflict, if Sri Lanka is shown to have fallen short on accountability and reconciliation?

3. To what extent has the Vice-President/High Representative pursued continuous dialogue with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Government of Sri Lanka on these matters?

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

The EEAS and its Colombo Delegation continue to work with the Sri Lankan authorities as well as with civil society on the follow up to the HRC resolution. They liaise on an ongoing basis with those governments which co-sponsored the resolution.

Accountability for alleged war crimes is and will remain an important part of the EU human rights policy towards Sri Lanka. The Lessons Learnt and Reconciliation Commission (LLRC) appointed by the Sri Lankan authorities, called for, *inter alia*, an investigation into specific responsibilities for possible crimes committed during the late stages of the conflict in Sri Lanka. The EU has consistently encouraged the Government of Sri Lanka to implement the LLRC's recommendations and to engage with the United Nations Secretary General (UNSG) and relevant UN bodies. The HR/VP will decide what measures would be the most appropriate to attain the objective of reconciliation between communities in the light of progress.

Following the adoption of the Resolution by the Human Rights Council, the EU has continued to express its concern over reports of intimidation and reprisals against civil society representatives in Sri Lanka. It has called on the Sri Lankan Government to respect and protect the rights of members of civil society who had cooperated with the United Nations.

The EU is working with other members of the international community and with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in preparing for the forthcoming Universal Periodic Review in November 2012. The EU is also ready to support the implementation of the recommendations of the LLRC through its assistance programmes.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006695/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(4 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Detenuti torturati in Siria

Il 3 luglio 2012, uno studio di Human Rights Watch ha rivelato che in 27 penitenziari in Siria i detenuti hanno denunciato ripetuti casi di torture eseguite dalle guardie che sottoponevano le vittime a percosse, aggressioni e umiliazioni a sfondo sessuale, finte esecuzioni e ad altre forme di violenza commesse per infliggere dolori atroci. Human Rights Watch ha condannato la Siria per aver perpetrato torture e maltrattamenti di Stato ed essersi macchiata di crimini contro l'umanità.

Ex detenuti hanno svelato i luoghi in cui sono ubicati i centri di tortura, i metodi utilizzati, le agenzie responsabili e spesso anche il comandante in carica. Tali informazioni provengono da oltre 200 interviste realizzate da Human Rights Watch dal marzo 2011. Nella maggior parte dei casi le persone intervistate erano uomini, ma tra le vittime di torture vi sono anche donne, bambini e anziani.

Dato che la Siria non ha ratificato lo statuto di Roma, con il quale è stata creata la Corte penale internazionale, non si possono consegnare alla Corte i responsabili delle torture, a partire dai dirigenti dei centri fino al capo di Stato, il Presidente Bashar al-Assad, a meno che non siano le Nazioni Unite a investire della questione la Corte penale internazionale. Human Rights Watch raccomanda tale provvedimento, nella speranza che la Russia e la Cina non blocchino, come in passato, i tentativi del Consiglio di sicurezza di mettere gli autori dinanzi alle proprie responsabilità.

Si chiede al Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante di rispondere alle seguenti domande:

1. È al corrente delle violazioni di massa dei diritti umani perpetrate nei centri di detenzione in Siria? Il mondo ne era a conoscenza prima della relazione del 3 luglio di Human Rights Watch?

2. Quale è il ruolo dell'UE in una tale situazione?

3. Come possiamo collaborare con le Nazioni Unite per far sì che i colpevoli siano chiamati a renderne conto e sia posto fine a questi casi di tortura?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(17 agosto 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza delle violazioni sistematiche dei diritti umani verificatesi in centri di detenzione della Siria. Tali violazioni costituiscono uno dei fattori che nel marzo del 2011 hanno portato allo scoppio della rivolta tuttora in atto. Nelle sue dichiarazioni del 23 settembre 2011 e del 17 febbraio 2012, l'AR/VP ha espresso la sua preoccupazione per l'incolumità fisica degli attivisti per i diritti dell'uomo arbitrariamente arrestati, ha chiesto informazioni sul luogo in cui si trovano e ha invitato il regime siriano a rilasciare immediatamente tutti i prigionieri politici. La delegazione dell'Unione europea ha seguito da vicino vari casi di arresti arbitrari e ha più volte condannato i casi di tortura segnalati nei centri di detenzione siriani.

Nelle conclusioni del suo Consiglio «Affari esteri», l'Unione europea ha costantemente ribadito la necessità che si indaghi su tutte le presunte violazioni dei diritti umani in Siria e che i responsabili siano chiamati a risponderne. A tale fine, l'UE ha sostenuto pienamente il lavoro della commissione d'inchiesta indipendente incaricata dal Consiglio per i diritti umani delle Nazioni Unite (UNHRC) di indagare su tutte le presunte violazioni dei diritti dell'uomo in Siria. L'UE ha svolto un ruolo trainante nelle sessioni speciali dell'UNHRC sulla Siria, facendo sì che tale organismo prendesse una posizione forte sulle responsabilità delle violazioni. Ha inoltre ripetutamente invitato il regime siriano a concedere alla commissione d'inchiesta indipendente il libero e immediato accesso in Siria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006695/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Detainees in Syria tortured

On 3 July 2012, a Human Rights Watch study revealed 27 detention centres in Syria where detainees have reported repeated cases of torture. Guards use tactics such as beatings, sexual assault and humiliation, mock executions, and other forms of inflicting acute pain. Human Rights Watch has condemned Syria for using a state policy of torture and ill-treatment, and thus being guilty of crimes against humanity.

Former detainees have identified the locations of torture facilities, the methods used, the agencies responsible, and often the commanding officer in charge. The information comes from over 200 interviews conducted by Human Rights Watch since March 2011. Most victims interviewed were men, but torture victims have also included women, children, and the elderly.

Because Syria has not ratified the Rome Statute, which created the International Criminal Court, the people responsible for the torture — from facility supervisors all the way up to the head of state President Bashar al-Assad — cannot be tried in this court unless the case is recommended to the ICC by the United Nations. Human Rights Watch is recommending this course of action, hoping that Russia and China will not, as in the past, block the Security Council's attempts to push for accountability.

The following questions are put to the Vice-President/High Representative:

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the mass violations of human rights taking place in detention facilities in Syria? Was the world aware of them before the Human Rights Watch report of 3 July?

2. What is the role of the EU in such a situation?

3. How can we work together with the UN to make sure that the culprits are held accountable and that these incidents of torture cease?

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

The HR/VP is aware of systematic human rights violations in Syrian detention centers, one of the factors that led to the outbreak of the current uprising in March 2011. In her statements of 23 September 2011 and 17 February 2012, she expressed concern over the physical safety of arbitarily arrested human rights activists, demanded information on their whereabouts and called on the Syrian regime to immediately release all political prisoners. The EU Delegation has closely followed cases of arbitrary arrests and has on numerous occasions condemned alleged instances of torture in Syrian detention facilities.

In its Foreign Affairs Council conclusions, the EU has consistently called for investigations into all alleged human rights violations in Syria. It made clear that those responsible need to be held accountable. To this end, the EU has fully supported the Independent Commission of Inquiry (CoI), mandated by the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) to investigate all alleged human rights violations in Syria. The EU has been a driving force in the UNHRC's Special Sessions on Syria, making sure that the body adopts a strong stance on accountability. It has repeatedly called on the Syrian regime to grant the CoI immediate and unhindered access to Syria.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006696/12
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(4 juillet 2012)

Objet: Suppressions de postes dans la filière avicole française

Le groupe Doux, leader européen dans le secteur de la volaille, est en redressement judiciaire — avec beaucoup d'incertitude pour son avenir — depuis le 1er juin 2012, accumulant une dette de plus de 430 millions d'euros.

Depuis 1998, quatorze usines en France ont été fermées alors que le groupe avait investi simultanément dans une filiale au Brésil dans l'objectif de réduire les coûts de production et de main-d'œuvre. Mais cette stratégie de dumping social s'est soldée par un échec subi principalement par les salariés français et brésiliens ainsi que par les éleveurs.

Des milliers d'emplois salariés ainsi que des centaines d'aviculteurs sont menacés. Le groupe Doux emploie près de 10 000 salariés dans le monde, dont 3 400 en France, et près d'un millier d'éleveurs en dépendent. Des régions entières, principalement l'Ouest de la France, se trouveraient amputées d'une activité économique essentielle.

Ces suppressions d'emplois directs et indirects se font alors que l'Union européenne aide l'exportation dans le cadre de la politique agricole commune. En 2011, le groupe Doux aurait bénéficié d'une aide de plus 55 millions d'euros.

1. Quel est le montant exact des aides attribuées au titre de la politique agricole commune au groupe Doux ces dix dernières années?

2. Selon quels critères de conditionnalité, en termes d'emploi, les aides dites de restitutions à l'exportation dans le secteur de la viande de volaille sont-elles attribuées?

3. La Commission envisage-t-elle d'intégrer des critères de conditionnalité imposant des obligations sociales et des sanctions en cas de non-respect de celles-ci dans le mécanisme d'attribution de restitutions à l'exportation dans le secteur de la viande de volaille?

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(10 août 2012)

Selon les informations communiquées par les autorités françaises ([1]), les subventions versées au groupe Doux au cours de ces trois dernières années s'élevaient à 56,3 millions d'euros en 2009, à 60,1 millions d'euros en 2010 et à 54,9 millions d'euros en 2011.

Afin de garantir l'équilibre sur le marché de l'UE, le paiement de restitutions à l'exportation est déterminé en fonction de plusieurs critères, qui sont énumérés à l'article 164, paragraphe 3, du règlement (CE) nº 1234/2007 portant organisation commune des marchés dans le secteur agricole et dispositions spécifiques en ce qui concerne certains produits de ce secteur (règlement «OCM unique») ([2]). Il n'est pas prévu de modifier ces critères ni l'objectif plus général visant à garantir l'équilibre du marché.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/funding/index_fr.htm
([2]) JO L 299 du 16.11.2007, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006696/12
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Redundancies in the French poultry industry

The Doux group, the European market leader in the poultry sector, has been in administration since 1 June 2012 — and faces a very uncertain future — after running up debts of more than EUR 430 million.

Since 1998, the group has closed 14 factories in France, whilst investing at the same time in a subsidiary in Brazil with the aim of reducing its production and labour costs. However, the impact of this failed social dumping strategy is now being felt mainly by French and Brazilian workers and by poultry farmers.

The jobs and livelihoods of thousands of workers and hundreds of poultry farmers are at stake. The Doux group employs almost 10 000 people around the world, 3 400 of them in France, and almost 1 000 poultry farmers depend on it for their income. Whole regions, mainly in western France, would lose industries vital to their economic well-being.

These job losses which are the direct and indirect result of the Doux group's problems are coming at a time when the EU is continuing to subsidise exports under the common agricultural policy. In 2011, the Doux group reportedly received more than EUR 55 million in subsidies.

1. Exactly how much money, in the form of subsidies under the common agricultural policy, has the Doux group received over the last 10 years?

2. Subject to what conditions, in terms of the safeguarding of jobs, are export refunds granted in the poultrymeat sector?

3. Does the Commission plan to incorporate employment-related requirements, and penalties for non-compliance with those requirements, into the arrangements for the granting of export refunds in the poultrymeat sector?

Answer given by Mr Çiolos on behalf of the Commission
(10 August 2012)

According to information made available by the French authorities ([1]) the subsidies paid to the Doux Group during the last three years were EUR 56,3 million in 2009, EUR60,1 million in 2010 and EUR54,9 million in 2011.

To ensure an equilibrium on the EU market, the payment of export refunds is determined by reference to a number of criteria, which are listed in Article 164(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 establishing a common organisation of agricultural markets and on specific provisions for certain agricultural products (Single CMO Regulation) ([2]). There are no plans to modify these criteria nor the broader objective of ensuring market equilibrium.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/funding/indes_fr.htm
([2]) OJ L 299, 16.11.2007, p. 1.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006697/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(4 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Progetto di centrale a carbone a Porto Tolle in evidente spregio della tabella di marcia per un'economia a basse emissioni di CO_2 recentemente approvata dal Parlamento europeo

L'Enel, grande multinazionale italiana controllata al 30 % dal Ministero del Tesoro e operante in molti Paesi del mondo, produce da sola in Italia con le sue centrali a carbone oltre 26 milioni di tonnellate di CO_2 l'anno. Come già noto alla Commissione, l'Enel intende convertire a carbone l'esistente, ma ormai obsoleta, centrale ad olio combustibile di Porto Tolle a Rovigo (RO), situata nel Parco del delta del Po, uno degli ecosistemi più fragili e preziosi d'Italia e d'Europa.

Secondo stime accreditate, la nuova centrale a carbone dalla potenza di 1 980 MW immetterebbe ogni anno nell'atmosfera 10 530 000 tonnellate di CO_2, pari a 4 volte le attuali emissioni annue di una città come Milano. Inoltre, l'Enel ha fatto sapere che la centrale funzionerà con carbone importato con navi oceaniche dall'Indonesia, il che comporterebbe un considerevole aumento delle emissioni di CO_2 causate complessivamente dalla centrale, oltre che un devastante impatto su ambienti tutelati dalla direttiva Habitat e dalla direttiva Uccelli, anche per l'intenso traffico navale e per la profonda escavazione di vie navigabili.

Nel dicembre 2009 la Commissione ha erogato all'Enel un contributo di 100 milioni di euro per realizzare un impianto sperimentale CCS ([1]) per la cattura e lo stoccaggio nel sottosuolo di parte della CO_2 prodotta dalla prevista centrale di Porto Tolle ([2]). Il progetto CCS riguarda un solo gruppo da 660 MW su tre gruppi per 1 980 MW totali e catturerebbe circa 1/10 della CO_2 emessa dal nuovo impianto. Come denunciato dall'associazione ambientalista Greenpeace ([3]), la tecnologia CCS — benché assolutamente non risolutiva dei problemi ambientali collegati all'attività di una centrale a carbone — viene promossa dall'industria del carbone e dalle aziende elettriche per veicolare un'immagine falsamente pulita del carbone.

Tutto questo avviene mentre, il 15 marzo 2012, il Parlamento europeo ha approvato la relazione Davies ([4]), che propone di diminuire dell'80-95 % le emissioni di CO_2 entro il 2050.

Alla luce di quanto esposto può la Commissione far sapere se:

1. ritiene che il progetto Enel di una centrale a carbone a Porto Tolle sia coerente con la tabella di marcia recentemente approvata dal Parlamento europeo;

2. sarebbe più opportuno stanziare fondi europei per progetti CCS che interessino impianti di produzione elettrica alimentati a carbone che, diversamente da quello previsto a Porto Tolle, siano già esistenti e si approvvigionino di carbone sul posto?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(20 agosto 2012)

1. Nella tabella di marcia per un'economia a basse emissioni di carbonio la Commissione giunge alla conclusione che varie forme di fonti energetiche a basse emissioni di carbonio, tra cui la cattura e lo stoccaggio del carbonio, sono essenziali per pervenire ad un sistema energetico a basse emissioni di CO_2 dopo il 2020. La cattura e lo stoccaggio del carbonio non dovrebbero limitarsi al settore dell'energia ma sono importanti anche per le emissioni dei processi industriali (ad esempio nel settore dell'acciaio e del cemento). Inoltre, la tabella di marcia per l'energia 2050 della Commissione dimostra che in un settore energetico senza emissioni di carbonio le centrali elettriche a carbone potrebbero restare nel mix energetico dopo il 2050 se si ricorre alla cattura e allo stoccaggio del carbonio. Durante la fase di dimostrazione solo un gruppo dell'impianto di Porto Tolle sarà dotato delle tecnologie di cattura, ma l'intero impianto è programmato per essere equipaggiato a posteriori della tecnologia di cattura e stoccaggio del carbonio una volta superata la fase di dimostrazione.

([1]) Carbon Capture and Storage.
([2]) Si veda comunicato stampa della Commissione: http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/09/542.
([3]) http://www.facciamolucesuenel.org/la-favola-del-carbone-pulito/.
([4]) «Una tabella di marcia verso un'economia competitiva a basse emissioni di carbonio nel 2050».

2. I criteri di finanziamento nel quadro del programma energetico europeo per la ripresa sono chiaramente definiti nel regolamento in materia ([5]), laddove uno dei criteri di selezione è quello dei costi. La maggior parte delle centrali in esercizio non sono state programmate per essere equipaggiate a posteriori di tecnologie di cattura, il che rende i progetti di cattura e stoccaggio del carbonio su impianti esistenti più costosi di quelli su impianti nuovi. L'origine del carbone è irrilevante nella dimostrazione di una tecnologia volta a ridurre le emissioni di CO_2 delle centrali e pertanto non ha costituito un criterio di ammissibilità, di selezione o di aggiudicazione di cui al regolamento suddetto.

([5]) Regolamento (CE) n. 663/2009 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 luglio 2009, che istituisce un programma per favorire la ripresa economica tramite la concessione di un sostegno finanziario comunitario a favore di progetti nel settore dell'energia (GU L 200 del 31.7.2009).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006697/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Porto Tolle coal-fired power station project: disregard for the low-carbon economy roadmap recently endorsed by Parliament

Enel is a large Italian multinational in which the Italian Treasury holds a 30% stake and it operates in many countries. On its own, that is to say, with its coal-fired power stations, it produces more than 26 million tonnes of CO_2 a year in Italy. As the Commission is already aware, it intends to convert the now obsolete oil-fired Porto Tolle power station, in Rovigo, into a coal-fired plant; the power station is situated in the Po Delta Park, one of the most fragile and precious ecosystems in Italy and Europe.

According to reliable estimates, the new 1 980 MW coal-fired power station will emit 10 530 000 tonnes of CO_2 into the atmosphere every year, in other words four times the present annual emissions of a city the size of Milan. Furthermore, Enel has indicated that the power station will run on coal imported from Indonesia, transported by ocean-going ships, and that will greatly increase the resulting overall emissions, in addition to having a devastating impact on environments protected under the Habitats and Birds Directives, not least on account of the busy shipping traffic and the deeply excavated waterways.

In December 2009 the Commission granted Enel EUR 100 million to enable it to build an experimental CCS ([1]) plant to capture part of the CO_2 to be produced by the projected Porto Tolle power station and store it in the subsoil ([2]). The CCS project covers only one 660 MW boiler unit out of three units and 1 980 MW in all and would capture about one tenth of the CO_2 emitted by the new power station. The environmentalist organisation Greenpeace has protested at the fact that CCS technology — even though it does nothing whatsoever to resolve the environmental problems arising from the operation of a coal-fired power station — is being promoted by the coal industry and electricity companies to create the illusion that coal is clean ([3]).

Coinciding with all this, Parliament, on 15 March 2012, adopted the Davies report ([4]), which calls for CO_2 emissions to be reduced by 80%-95% by 2050.

1. Does the Commission believe that Enel's Porto Tolle coal-fired power station project is consistent with the roadmap recently endorsed by Parliament?

2. Would it not be more expedient to allocate European funding to CCS projects for coal-fired power plants which, unlike the one to be set up at Porto Tolle, already exist and make use of local coal supplies?

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

1. e Commission's Low Carbon Economy Roadmap concludes that various forms of low carbon energy sources including carbon capture and storage are key to achieve a low carbon energy system after 2020. Carbon capture and storage would not be limited to the energy sector but would also be important to capture industrial process emissions (e.g. in the cement and steel sector). In addition the Commission's Energy Roadmap 2050 shows that in a decarbonised energy sector coal fired power plants could remain in the energy mix after 2050 if CCS is being deployed. While during the demonstration phase only one unit of the Porto Tolle power plant will be equipped with capture technologies, the whole plant is designed as capture ready and can therefore be retrofitted with carbon capture and storage (CCS) once the technology will have been demonstrated.

2. e criteria for funding under the European Energy Programme for Recovery (EEPR) have been clearly defined in the EEPR Regulation ([5]) with one of the selection criteria being a cost criterion. Most of the existing power plants have not been designed to be retrofitted with capture technologies which would make CCS projects on existing plants more expensive than on newly constructed ones. The origin of the coal to be used is of no importance to demonstrate a technology that aims at reducing CO2 emissions from power plants and was therefore not an eligibility, selection or award criterion under the EEPR Regulation.

([1]) Carbon capture and storage.
([2]) See Commission press release: http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/09/542.
([3]) http://www.facciamolucesuenel.org/la-favola-del-carbone-pulito/.
([4]) 'A roadmap for moving to a competitive low carbon economy in 2050'.
([5]) Regulation (EC) No 663/2009 of the Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 establishing a programme to aid economic recovery by granting Community financial assistance to projects in the field of energy, OJ L 200, 31.7.2009.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-006699/12
a la Comisión
Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE)
(4 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Incendios en la Comunidad Valenciana

El actual período de programación del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (Feader) presentado por los Estados miembros, y en el caso de España, las Comunidades Autónomas, acaba en el año 2013.

Ante los incendios de gran magnitud que asolan estos días la Comunidad Valenciana, y que están teniendo unos graves daños ecológicos en donde más de 48 000 hectáreas han sido calcinadas, ¿cree la Comisión que esta región española puede modificar este último año de programación de este Fondo de tal forma que pueda reprogramar de manera urgente los fondos necesarios para llevar a cabo la reforestación de la zona afectada?

¿Qué pasos se deberían seguir para modificar la programación de este Fondo?

Debido a las enormes dimensiones del fuego, ¿considera la Comisión que el incendio de la Comunidad Valenciana podría estar dentro del supuesto de «catástrofe extraordinaria» a escala regional del Fondo de Solidaridad de la UE?

¿Podría la Comisión establecer una ayuda excepcional para recuperar los ecosistemas dañados por esta catástrofe natural?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de agosto de 2012)

Los Estados miembros pueden modificar, en efecto, los programas de desarrollo rural. Para ello, la autoridad competente debe presentar una solicitud debidamente justificada a la Comisión, además de recabar su aprobación por el Comité de Seguimiento. En función del tipo y el ámbito de aplicación de la modificación, las solicitudes se deben presentar, a más tardar, el 30 de junio de 2013 o el 31 de agosto de 2015 y la Comisión las evaluará en el plazo de seis o cuatro meses. Puede encontrarse información más detallada sobre los cambios en los programas de desarrollo rural en los artículos 6 a 12 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1974/2006 ([1]).

Los incendios forestales entran en principio en el ámbito de aplicación del Fondo de Solidaridad. Si el Fondo puede activarse para los incendios forestales ocurridos en la región de Valencia solo puede evaluarse previa solicitud de las autoridades españolas presentada en el plazo de diez semanas a partir de la fecha del primer daño provocado por la catástrofe.

Por último, a propósito de la ayuda disponible para recuperar los ecosistemas degradados, y además de Fondo de Solidaridad ya recordado, la medida 227 del programa de desarrollo rural de Valencia podría servir para financiar inversiones no productivas dirigidas a restablecer las infraestructuras dañadas relacionadas principalmente con valores no económicos. Además, la autoridad competente podría revisar el programa para abarcar la recuperación del potencial forestal de los bosques dañados por desastres naturales e incendios (en el marco de la medida 226 del actual programa) e introducir la medida prevista en el Reglamento (CE) n° 1698/2005 ([2]), pero que no están programada en la actualidad «Reconstitución del potencial de producción agrícola dañado por catástrofes naturales» (medida 126).

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1974/2006 de la Comisión, por el que se establecen disposiciones de aplicación del Reglamento (CE) n° 1698/2005 del Consejo relativo a la ayuda al desarrollo rural a través del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (Feader) (DO L 368 de 23.12.2006, p. 15).

([2]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1698/2005 del Consejo relativo a la ayuda al desarrollo rural a través del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (FEADER) (DO L 277 de 21.10.2005, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006699/12
to the Commission
Eva Ortiz Vilella (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Forest fires in the Valencian Community

The current programming period for the European Agricultural Fund for Regional Development (EAFRD) presented by the Member States, and in Spain's case by the autonomous communities, ends in 2013.

In view of the extensive forest fires currently raging in the Valencian Community and the massive environmental damage caused by over 48 000 hectares having been burnt to the ground, does the Commission consider that this Spanish region could be permitted to modify the last programming year of this Fund in order to urgently reprogramme the funds needed for reforestation of the affected area?

What steps should be followed to change the programming of this fund?

In light of the huge dimensions of the fire in the Valencian Community, does the Commission consider that it could be categorised as an 'extraordinary regional disaster' under the terms of the EU Solidarity Fund?

Could the Commission provide special aid to restore the ecosystems damaged by this natural disaster?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(10 August 2012)

Rural Development Programmes can be indeed modified by Member States. In order to do so, the competent authority shall submit a duly justified request to the Commission further to the approval by the Monitoring Committee. Depending on the kind and scope of the change, requests shall be presented at the latest by 30 June 2013 or by 31 August 2015, and are assessed by the Commission within 6 or 4 months. More detailed information about changes in rural development programs can be found in Articles 6 to 12 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1974/2006 ([1]).

Forest fires fall in principle within the scope of the Solidarity Fund. Whether the Fund can be activated for the forest fires in the Valencia region could only be assessed on the basis of an application that the Spanish authorities would have to present within ten weeks of the date of the first damage caused by the disaster.

Finally, regarding the available support to restore the ecosystems damaged, and in addition to Solidarity Fund already mentioned, measure 227 of the Rural Development Programme of Valencia could be used to finance non-productive investments to restore damaged infrastructure related to primarily non-economic values. Furthermore, the Programme could be revised by the competent authority to cover the restoring of forestry potential in forests damaged by natural disasters and fire (within measure 226 of the current Programme) and to introduce the measure foreseen in Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 ([2]) but currently not programmed 'restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters' (measure 126).

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 1974/2006 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development, OJ L 368, 23.12.2006, p. 15.

([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), OJ L 277, 21.10.2005, p. 1.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006700/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(4 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Aplicación de la Red Europea de Competencia (REC)

Teniendo en cuenta la disparidad de criterios que se detecta en la aplicación de la normativa europea de competencia por parte de cada Estado miembro, ¿se ha fijado la Red Europea de Competencia (REC) entre sus prioridades establecer los mecanismos de control y actuación para que la aplicación de tales principios por parte de los distintos países se lleve a cabo de forma homogénea y sin fisuras?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de agosto de 2012)

El Reglamento 1/2003 ([1]) obliga a las autoridades nacionales de competencia a aplicar los artículos 101 ó 102 del TFUE a los acuerdos o conductas que entran dentro de su ámbito. Cuando también aplican la legislación nacional de competencia a estos acuerdos o conductas, las autoridades nacionales de competencia tienen una obligación de convergencia con el artículo 101 y deben aplicar el mismo criterio material de evaluación. Los Estados miembros pueden, no obstante, promulgar y aplicar leyes nacionales en materia de competencia más estrictas que el artículo 102 para prohibir o sancionar conductas unilaterales.

El recurso a estas normas ha dado lugar a mayor igualdad en la aplicación de la legislación en materia de competencia en la UE ([2]). Esta aplicación se realiza caso por caso y exige la evaluación individual de las prácticas presuntamente restrictivas y de los mercados afectados.

La Comisión contribuye a la aplicación efectiva y coherente de las normas de la UE en materia de competencia por parte de las autoridades nacionales de competencia mediante los mecanismos de cooperación que aporta la Red Europea de Competencia (REC). En particular, así ocurre en las decisiones previstas de las autoridades nacionales de competencia por las que se aplican los artículos 101 ó 102 del TFUE como establece el artículo 11, apartado 4, del Reglamento 1/2003. Las autoridades nacionales de competencia han recurrido ampliamente a este mecanismo y, desde mayo de 2004, la Comisión ha sido informada de más de 600 decisiones previstas que aplican los artículos 101 ó 102 del TFUE. Otros trabajos de cooperación dentro de la REC contribuyen también a fomentar un entendimiento común de la evolución y de las prácticas del mercado entre las autoridades nacionales de competencia y la Comisión.

([1]) DO L 1 de 4.1.2003, p. 1.
([2]) Comunicación de la Comisión al Parlamento Europeo y al Consejo — Informe sobre el funcionamiento del Reglamento 1/2003, COM(2009) 206 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006700/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Implementation of the European Competition Network (ECN)

In view of the disparity in the criteria used by each Member State when applying European competition rules, has the European Competition Network (ECN) made it one of its priorities to establish control mechanisms and take action to ensure that the different countries apply competition rules in a homogenous and seamless manner?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(28 August 2012)

Regulation 1/2003 ([1]) obliges National competition authorities (NCAs) to apply Articles 101 and/or 102 TFEU to agreements or conducts falling within their scope. When they also apply national competition law to these agreements or conducts, NCAs have an obligation of convergence with Article 101 and must apply the same substantive standard of assessment. Member States can, however, enact and enforce stricter national competition laws than Article 102 to prohibit or sanction unilateral conduct.

The application of these rules has led to a more level playing field in the enforcement of competition law in the EU ([2]). This enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis and requires individual assessment of the alleged restrictive practices and markets affected.

The Commission contributes to the effective and coherent enforcement of EU competition rules by NCAs through the cooperation mechanisms provided for by the European Competition Network (ECN). This is particularly the case for NCAs' envisaged decisions applying Articles 101 and/or 102 TFEU as set down by Article 11(4) of Regulation 1/2003. NCAs have made extensive use of this mechanism, and since May 2004 the Commission has been informed of more than 600 envisaged decisions applying Articles 101 and/or 102 TFEU. Further cooperation work within the ECN also contributes to fostering a common understanding of market developments and practices among NCAs and the Commission.

([1]) OJ L 1, 4.1.2003, p. 1.
([2]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council — Report on the functioning of Regulation 1/2003, COM(2009)206 final.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006701/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(4 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Balanza de poder en el comercio minorista

La Comisión hizo un comunicado sobre el informe Red Europa de Competencia, sobre la aplicación de la normativa de competencia en el sector alimentario ([1]).

A la luz de lo anterior y teniendo en cuenta afirmaciones que se encuentran en dicho comunicado como: «la aplicación de la normativa de competencia en el sector alimentario en toda Europa, en particular en los niveles de la transformación y la fabricación, ha beneficiado a los agricultores, proveedores y consumidores»:

1. ¿Ha estudiado la Comisión si un reducido número de cadenas del comercio minorista en la UE, tanto a nivel regional como supraestatal, forman un oligopolio, con precios en descenso e imposición de normas, impidiendo así que los precios se formen en libre concurrencia y perjudicando, por tanto, el libre mercado?

2. Si no lo ha estudiado, ¿puede informar el motivo por el cual no lo ha hecho?

3. ¿Puede informar la Comisión sobre cuáles son las conclusiones de dicho estudio?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(14 de agosto de 2012)

La concentración de cadenas minoristas difiere significativamente entre Estados miembros. Por ejemplo, los tres principales minoristas en Finlandia tienen una cuota de mercado nacional de alrededor del 75 %, mientras que en Grecia, los nueve minoristas más importantes solo representan aproximadamente el 28 % ([2]).

Para el consumidor, la competencia a nivel local es a menudo la más importante y, como se indica en el informe de la REC ([3]), las autoridades de competencia europeas han intervenido siempre que las concentraciones de minoristas han amenazado con obstaculizar de forma significativa la competencia efectiva.

Otra cuestión es la relación entre los minoristas y sus proveedores. En el caso de posiciones de negociación asimétrica, puede que el minorista pague un bajo precio de compra o que ejerza de algún otro modo un poder que podría considerarse como una práctica comercial desleal.

Según se explica con más detalle en el informe de la REC ([4]) y en las respuestas de la Comisión a las preguntas E-006270/2012 ([5]) y E-003041/2012 ([6]), la mayoría de estas prácticas no entran en el ámbito de aplicación de las normas de competencia a nivel de la UE (o en la mayoría de los Estados miembros). La mejor forma de abordar estas prácticas es mediante legislación contra prácticas comerciales desleales o códigos de conducta, en lo que está trabajando la Comisión. En términos de control de la competencia, la Comisión estaría preocupada si tales prácticas causasen efectos negativos en la cadena de suministro en términos de posibilidades de elección y de innovación a largo plazo.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2004:101:0043:0053:ES:PDF.
([2]) Véase BCE, Características estructurales del comercio de distribución y su impacto en los precios en la zona del euro, septiembre de 2011, pp. 47-50, http://www.ecb.int/pub/pdf/other/structuralfeaturesdistributivetrades201109en.pdf
([3]) Actividades de la REC en el sector alimentario (mayo de 2012), apartados 194-196 (control de concentraciones) 185-193 (lucha contra monopolios) y 248-262 (acciones de seguimiento), en http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports.
([4]) Véase la nota a pie de página anterior, apartados 26, 73, 190 y 254.
([5]) Disponible en http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-006270+0 +DOC+XML+V0//ES.
([6]) Disponible en http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-003041&language=ES.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006701/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Balance of power in retail trade

Following the publication of the European Competition Network report on competition law enforcement in the food sector ([1]), the Commission issued a press release in which it stated that 'enforcement of competition law in the food sector across Europe, in particular at the processing and manufacturing levels, has benefited farmers, suppliers and consumers'.

1. Has the Commission considered whether retail chains in the EU, be it at regional or at supranational level, are so few in number as to constitute an oligopoly that can pay lower prices and impose its own rules, thus preventing prices being formed by free competition and hence undermining the free market?

2. If not, why not?

3. What conclusions, if any, has the Commission drawn on the above points?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2012)

The concentration of retail chains differs significantly among Member States. For instance, the top three retailers in Finland have a market share at national level of around 75%, whereas in Greece, the top nine retailers only account for about 28%. ([2])

For the consumer it is often the local competition that is the most important and, as mentioned in the ECN Report, ([3]) the European competition authorities have intervened whenever concentrations by retailers threatened to significantly impede effective competition.

Another issue is the relationship between retailers and their suppliers. In case of asymmetric bargaining positions, it may well be that the retailer can pay a low purchase price or otherwise wield power that could be considered as an unfair commercial practice.

As explained in more detail in the ECN Report ([4]) and the Commission's answers to questions E-006270/2012 ([5]) and E-003041/2012 ([6]), most of these practices do not fall within the scope of competition rules at EU level (or in most of the Member States). They are better addressed by laws against unfair trading practices or codes of conduct, on which the Commission is working. In terms of competition control, the Commission would be concerned if such practices caused negative effects on the supply chain in terms of choice and innovation in the long term.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2004:101:0043:0053:EN:PDF.
([2]) See ECB, 'Structural Features of Distributive Trade and their Impact on Prices in the Euro Area,' September 2011, pages 47-50, http://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/other/structuralfeaturesdistributivetrades201109en.pdf.
([3]) 'ECN Activities in the Food Sector' (May 2012), paras 194-196 (merger control), 185-193 (antitrust), 248-262 (monitoring actions), available at: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports.
([4]) See above footnote, paras 26, 73, 190, 254.
([5]) Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-006270+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN.
([6]) Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-003041&language=EN.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006702/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(4 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Informe de la Red Europea de Competencia

1. ¿Puede informar la Comisión si ha analizado cuáles pueden ser las causas que expliquen la existencia de situaciones que pueden contravenir la lógica de los mercados, como sucede con el hecho de que durante ciertos períodos del año, un determinado producto agrario está más barato en los lineales de una gran cadena de un país que no es el productor de dicho producto que en las cadenas del país de origen del referido producto, y que en muchos casos esa práctica implica implícitamente una «venta a pérdida»?

2. Cuando un producto agrario entra en crisis de precios (por debajo de costes), ¿investigan las autoridades de competencia la trazabilidad de los precios desde el agricultor/ganadero hasta el consumidor para averiguar qué está sucediendo?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de agosto de 2012)

1. Instintivamente, puede resultar extraño que un producto cueste menos en una gran cadena de supermercados de un país importador que en las cadenas del país de origen. Sin embargo, no se puede concluir de esta diferencia de precio que los supermercados realicen prácticas contrarias a la competencia. El precio podría ser más bajo porque la cadena de suministro del país importador sea más eficaz y tenga menores costes: de hecho, el reciente Informe de la REC sobre las actividades de las autoridades europeas de competencia en el sector alimentario ([1]) muestra que gran parte de los costes que conforman el precio final de numerosos productos agrícolas se contraen en la fase de negociación.

Aunque una gran cadena de supermercados venda con pérdidas, esto no constituye necesariamente un problema con arreglo al Derecho de la competencia de la UE. En casos de un exceso de oferta significativo, a menudo tiene más sentido vender con pérdidas que no vender, en particular si el producto es perecedero. El Derecho de la competencia de la UE interviene principalmente si una empresa dominante vende por debajo de los costes para eliminar la competencia, o si tales estrategias afectan negativamente a la innovación o la posibilidad de elección.

2. Las autoridades nacionales de competencia han investigado una serie de casos en los que el mecanismo de transmisión de precios parecía no funcionar, principalmente en casos en que la disminución de los precios de las materias primas no se reflejaba (plenamente) en el precio final al consumidor. En algunas investigaciones, dichas autoridades también han examinado la medida en que algunos niveles de la cadena contrajeron pérdidas en determinados productos, por ejemplo la investigación de 2009 por parte de la autoridad danesa de competencia sobre los productos lácteos y el pan. Varias autoridades nacionales de competencia también han investigado específicamente la práctica de venta a pérdida (por ejemplo FR, IE, BE: téngase en cuenta que la práctica está permitida en algunos países y prohibida en otros) ([2]).

([1]) Disponible en http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports.
([2]) Por lo que se refiere a la venta por debajo de costes en general, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-004981/2012, disponible en http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-004981&language=EN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006702/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: European Competition Network report

1. Can the Commission state whether it has analysed the causes that may explain the existence of situations that might defy market logic, such as the fact that during certain periods of the year a given agricultural product is cheaper on the shelves of a large chain in a country that does not produce this product than in chains in its country of origin, and that in many cases this practice implicitly involves selling at a loss?

2. When an agricultural product enters a crisis situation in which prices are lower than cost, do the competition authorities investigate the traceability of prices from the farmer or livestock farmer to the consumer in order to find out what is happening?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(10 August 2012)

1. Intuitively, it might indeed be surprising that a product can cost less in a large supermarket chain in an importing country than in chains in the country of origin. However, one cannot conclude from such a difference in price that the supermarket engages in anticompetitive behaviour. The price could simply be lower because the supply chain in the importing country is more efficient and incurs lower costs: indeed, the recent ECN Report on activities of European Competition Authorities in the food sector ([1]) shows that a large part of the costs contributing to the final price for many agricultural products is incurred on the trading level.

Even if a large supermarket chain sells at a loss, however, this does not necessarily constitute a problem under EU competition law. In instances of significant oversupply, it often makes more sense to sell at a loss than not to sell at all — in particular if the product is perishable. EU competition law is primarily concerned if a dominant company uses below-cost selling to eliminate competition, or if such strategies negatively affect innovation or choice.

2. National Competition Authorities (NCAs) have investigated a number of cases where the price transmission mechanism appeared not to be working — mainly concerning cases in which commodity prices decreases were not (fully) reflected in the final consumer price. In some investigations NCAs have also examined the extent to which some levels of the chain incurred losses for certain products, e.g. the 2009 investigation by the Danish NCA for milk products and bread. Several NCAs have also specifically investigated the practice of below-cost selling (e.g. FR, IE, BE — please note that the practice is allowed in some countries and prohibited in others) ([2]).

([1]) Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports.
([2]) As regards selling below cost in general, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-004981/2012, available at:
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-004981&language=EN.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006703/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(4 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Cooperativas

Las autoridades de competencia mencionaron en el informe de la Red Europa Competencia la importancia que tiene para los agricultores, apostar decididamente por las cooperativas.

1. ¿Tiene la Comisión conocimiento estadístico acerca de las liquidaciones que las cooperativas españolas están pagando a sus socios en las últimas campañas?

2. Si los tiene, ¿puede faciltarlos?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de agosto de 2012)

La Comisión no dispone de cifras sobre los pagos efectuados por las cooperativas a sus socios durante las últimas campañas de comercialización.

No obstante, a petición del Parlamento Europeo, la Comisión ha iniciado un estudio sobre la forma de ayudar a los agricultores a organizarse en cooperativas. Los resultados provisionales se presentarán en un taller que tendrá lugar el 17 de octubre de 2012. Se espera la publicación y difusión del informe final el primer trimestre de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006703/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Cooperatives

In their report on the European Competition Network, the competition authorities state that it is important to farmers that a clearly supportive stance be taken towards cooperatives.

1. Does the Commission have any figures for the payments made by cooperatives to their members during the last few marketing years?

2. If so, can it provide them?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2012)

The Commission does not have any figures for the payments made by cooperatives to their members during the last few marketing years.

However, the Commission has launched, at the request of the European Parliament, a study on 'How to help farmers organise themselves in cooperatives'. A workshop where the provisional results will be presented will take place on 17 October 2012. Publication and dissemination of the final report is expected in the first quarter of 2013.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006704/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(4 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Funcionamiento de las normas de competencia

Teniendo en cuenta la Red Europea de Competencia ([1]), y los datos oficiales del Gobierno del Reino de España referentes a las estadísticas de superficie abandonadas en el Estado español ([2]),

1. ¿Ha tomado en consideración o tenido en cuenta la Comisión que todos los desajustes y asimetrías que caracterizan el actual funcionamiento de la cadena agroalimentaria están suponiendo el cierre de explotaciones agrarias y ganaderas en la UE y que Europa es el único continente de todo el planeta donde se abandonan tierras de cultivo de manera continua y creciente?

2. ¿Cómo explica la Comisión que la normativa de la competencia haya funcionado tan bien en el sector alimentario, según se desprende del comunicado de prensa de la CE, y que, sólo en el Reino de España, exista más de un millón de hectáreas de cultivo abandonadas y, lo que es aún más grave, que dicha realidad tienda a seguir creciendo, especialmente en las explotaciones de cultivos perecederos?

3. ¿Cuáles son los datos que ha utilizado la Comisión para afirmar que dicha normativa ha funcionado tan bien?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de agosto de 2012)

Según el Instituto para una Política Europea del Medio Ambiente (IEEP), el abandono de las tierras agrícolas en Europa parece afectar fundamentalmente a las zonas en las que la agricultura es menos productiva, especialmente en las zonas remotas y las zonas con suelos pobres y climas duros. La razón principal del abandono es la reducida rentabilidad debido a factores físicos que limitan el rendimiento y/o encarecen los costes de producción. Un reciente informe del IEEP ([3]) indica que el abandono de las tierras no desaparecerá sino que se intensificará con el aumento de la exposición a los mercados agrícolas mundiales.

Habida cuenta de estos elementos, la Comisión considera que la mejor forma de evitar el abandono de las tierras es fomentar el desarrollo de un sector agrícola sostenible y mejorar la gestión sostenible de los recursos naturales. Las propuestas de reforma de la Política Agrícola Común adoptadas por la Comisión en octubre de 2011 se proponen precisamente impulsar la competitividad y la sostenibilidad del sector agrario y las zonas rurales mediante un apoyo público más eficaz, más eficiente y mejor centrado, y fomentando la colaboración entre los agricultores para consolidar su situación en la cadena alimentaria.

Por lo que se refiere a las normas de competencia, el informe recientemente publicado por la Red Europea de Competencia sobre las actividades del sector alimentario («Activities in the Food Sector» ([4])) aporta datos útiles y clarificadores. El informe analiza más de cien acciones de seguimiento del mercado y pone de manifiesto que, aunque se considera que la competencia es beneficiosa en términos generales, existen muchas otras razones para que se produzca una evolución desfavorable del mercado (por ejemplo, las fluctuaciones de los mercados de productos básicos, el aumento de los costes de los insumos, la evolución de la oferta y la demanda mundiales, la disponibilidad de existencias, los costes energéticos y laborales, y la producción estacional). El informe también muestra que la aplicación de la legislación en materia de competencia ha beneficiado a los agricultores.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2004:101:0043:0053:ES:PDF.
([2]) http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/estadistica/temas/estadisticas-agrarias/ESPANAYCCAA_tcm7-213915.pdf
([3]) http://www.ieep.eu/work-areas/agriculture-and-land-management/2011/01/farmland-abandonment-in-the-eu-an-assessment-of-trends-and-prospects.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/food_report_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006704/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Functioning of competition rules

In light of the European Competition Network ([1]) and of official Spanish Government statistics on the extent of abandoned agricultural land in Spain ([2]):

1. Has the Commission considered or borne in mind that all the distortions and asymmetries which currently exist in the agro-food chain are leading to the closure of agricultural and livestock holdings in the EU and that Europe is the only continent on the planet on which farmland is constantly and increasingly being abandoned?

2. If the competition rules have worked as well as the Commission's press notice claims, how does the Commission explain the fact that in Spain alone, over a million hectares of agricultural land are lying abandoned and, even more seriously, this figure is on the rise, particularly where land used for the cultivation of perishable crops is concerned?

3. On what data does the Commission base its statement that competition rules have worked so well?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(29 August 2012)

According to the Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP), farm land abandonment in Europe seems to affect primarily areas where agriculture is less productive, particularly in remote areas, and areas with poor soils and harsh climates. The main reason for abandonment is reduced profitability caused by physical factors that limit yields and/or increase the costs of farming. A recent IEEP ([3]) report states that farmland abandonment will not disappear but rather intensify with increasing exposure to global agricultural markets.

Given this evidence, the Commission believes that the best way to avoid farmland abandonment is to encourage the development of a sustainable agricultural sector and enhance the sustainable management of natural resources. The proposals for the reform of the common agricultural policy adopted by the Commission in October 2011 aims precisely at fostering the competitiveness and sustainability of the farm sector and rural areas through more effective, efficient and better targeted public support and by promoting collaboration between farmers to strengthen their positioning in the food supply chain.

As regards competition rules, the recently published European Competition Network report on 'Activities in the Food Sector' ([4]) provides useful and insightful data. It analysed over 100 market monitoring actions and showed that, whereas competition was by and large considered to be healthy, many other reasons exist for unfavourable market developments (e.g. commodity market fluctuations, increased input costs, global demand and supply developments, stocks availability, energy/labour costs, and seasonal production). The report also shows how competition law enforcement has benefited farmers.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2004:101:0043:0053:EN:PDF.
([2]) http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/estadistica/temas/estadisticas-agrarias/ESPANAYCCAA_tcm7-213915.pdf
([3]) http://www.ieep.eu/work-areas/agriculture-and-land-management/2011/01/farmland-abandonment-in-the-eu-an-assessment-of-trends-and-prospects.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/food_report_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006706/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Books for blind people — WIPO treaty update

Can the Commission confirm that it supports increased access to books for blind people through a binding WIPO treaty? Can the Commission update Parliament on the progress made concerning WIPO since the discussions five months ago?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

The Commission is supportive of the work being carried out in the World Intellectual Property Organisation in order to facilitate access to books by visually impaired persons. The Commission has already shown its commitment to a binding international instrument by asking for an mandate from the Council to negotiate a treaty on 8 June 2012. The discussions in the Council have just begun.

The European Union has also been an active participant in the discussions on the draft of the future international instrument. In spring 2012 two intersessional meetings were held in Geneva in order to improve the quality of the draft. With the support of the EU Member States, the Commission will pursue its efforts towards an international treaty for the benefit of the visually impaired.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006708/12
προς το Συμβούλιο
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Διευκρινίσεις για την απευθείας ανακεφαλαιοποίηση των τραπεζών από Ευρωπαϊκό Μηχανισμό Στήριξης

Στη σύνοδο κορυφής της 28ης-29ης Ιουνίου 2012, αποφασίστηκε ότι, στο εξής, τα κράτη μέλη που ζητούν βοήθεια για την ανακεφαλαιοποίηση του τραπεζικού τους τομέα, θα χρηματοδοτούνται απευθείας από ευρωπαϊκούς μηχανισμούς στήριξης. Στην ίδια απόφαση το συμβούλιο κορυφής ανακοινώνει ότι το Eurogroup θα εξετάσει την κατάσταση του ιρλανδικού χρηματοοικονομικού τομέα υπό το πρίσμα της ανωτέρω απόφασης και κάνει λόγο για «παρόμοιες περιπτώσεις που θα πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστούν κατά όμοιο τρόπο», αναφερόμενο προφανώς σε Ελλάδα και Πορτογαλία, χωρίς όμως να διευκρινίζει αν θα υπάρξει ίση μεταχείριση και ελάφρυνση των δανειακών βαρών που έχουν επωμισθεί οι δύο χώρες.

Κατόπιν των ανωτέρω ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο:

Ποιο είναι το χρονοδιάγραμμα για τη δημιουργία του ευρωπαϊκού μηχανισμού στήριξης που θα χρηματοδοτεί κατευθείαν τις τράπεζες και ποια είναι τα κεφάλαια που πρέπει να έχει στη διάθεσή του; Ποιες θεσμικές ενέργειες απαιτούνται για την προώθηση των σχετικών με την ανακεφαλαιοποίηση αποφάσεων του συμβουλίου κορυφής;

Ποια μέτρα θα ληφθούν προκειμένου να εφαρμοστεί η αρχή της ίσης μεταχείρισης μεταξύ των κρατών μελών της ευρωζώνης; Ποιες ενέργειες θα κάνει το Συμβούλιο ώστε να υπάρξουν οι επιβαλλόμενες αλλαγές στις δανειακές συμβάσεις Ελλάδας και Πορτογαλίας, στην κατεύθυνση των αποφάσεων του συμβουλίου κορυφής;

Απάντηση
(18 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Στις 29 Ιουνίου 2012, κατά τη διάσκεψη κορυφής της ευρωζώνης δηλώθηκε ότι η Επιτροπή αναμένεται να υποβάλει προτάσεις δυνάμει του άρθρου 127, παράγραφος 6, για ενιαίο εποπτικό μηχανισμό και ζητήθηκε από το Συμβούλιο να μελετήσει τις προτάσεις μέχρι το τέλος του 2012. Σύμφωνα με τη δήλωση, αφ' ότου θεσπισθεί αποτελεσματικός ενιαίος εποπτικός μηχανισμός για τις τράπεζες στην ευρωζώνη, στον οποίον θα συμμετέχει και η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα, ο Ευρωπαϊκός Μηχανισμός Στήριξης (ΕΜΣ) θα μπορεί, κατόπιν αποφάσεως, να έχει τη δυνατότητα άμεσης ανακεφαλαιοποίησης των τραπεζών.

Στις 9 Ιουλίου, η ευρωομάδα χαιρέτισε την πρόθεση της Επιτροπής να υποβάλει στις αρχές Σεπτεμβρίου προτάσεις δυνάμει του άρθρου 127, παράγραφος 6 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, για ενιαίο εποπτικό μηχανισμό με τη συμμετοχή της ΕΚΤ. Δήλωσε ακόμη ότι αναμένει από το Συμβούλιο να μελετήσει αυτές τις προτάσεις κατεπειγόντως μέχρι το τέλος του 2012 και πρόσθεσε ότι προκειμένου να σπάσει ο φαύλος κύκλος τραπεζών και δημοσίου χρέους, οι τεχνικές συζητήσεις για το μελλοντικό μέσο άμεσης ανακεφαλαιοποίησης των τραπεζών του ΕΜΣ θα αρχίσουν επίσης το Σεπτέμβριο έτσι ώστε ο ΕΜΣ να μπορεί, κατόπιν αποφάσεως, να έχει τη δυνατότητα άμεσης ανακεφαλαιοποίησης των τραπεζών αφ' ότου θεσπισθεί αποτελεσματικός ενιαίος εποπτικός μηχανισμός.

Επιπροσθέτως, η ευρωομάδα σημείωσε ότι η Επιτροπή, σε συνεργασία με την ΕΚΤ και το ΔΝΤ, διενεργούν επί του παρόντος την έβδομη εξέταση του ιρλανδικού προγράμματος προσαρμογής. Στη συνάρτηση αυτή, πρόκειται να διεξαχθούν συζητήσεις για τεχνικές λύσεις για τη βελτίωση της βιωσιμότητας του προγράμματος προσαρμογής το οποίο προχωρεί ικανοποιητικά. Η ευρωομάδα υπενθύμισε ότι παρόμοιες περιπτώσεις θα εξεταστούν κατά τον ίδιο τρόπο, λαμβανομένων υπόψη των μεταβαλλόμενων συνθηκών.

Η Ευρωομάδα ζήτησε ακόμη από την Τρόικα (Επιτροπή, ΕΚΤ και ΔΝΤ) να συνεργαστεί με τις πορτογαλικές αρχές κατά την πέμπτη αποστολή εξέτασης η οποία αρχίζει στις 28 Αυγούστου 2012 έτσι ώστε να εξασφαλιστεί η ικανοποιητική πορεία του προγράμματος προσαρμογής.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006708/12
to the Council
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Clarification regarding direct bank recapitalisation by the European Support Mechanism

At the summit of 28-29 June 2012, it was decided that Member States seeking assistance for the recapitalisation of their banking sectors would henceforward receive direct funding from European support mechanisms. In this connection, it was also announced that the Eurogroup would examine the implications for the Irish financial sector, referring to comparable situations which would have to be similarly confronted, presumably in Greece and Portugal, without, however, giving any undertakings regarding equal treatment or the easing of their debt burden.

In view of this:

Can the Council indicate the timetable for the creation of the European support mechanism for direct bank funding? What resources will it have available? What structural measures will be necessary in support of the recapitalisation decisions adopted at the Council summit?

What measures will be taken to implement the principle of equal treatment between members of the euro area? What action will the Council take to amend the loan agreements applicable to Greece and Portugal as necessary to bring them into line with decisions adopted at the Council summit?

Reply
(18 September 2012)

On 29 June 2012, the euro area summit stated that the Commission was expected to present proposals on the basis of Article 127(6) for a single supervisory mechanism and asked the Council to consider the proposals by the end of 2012. According to the statement, when an effective single supervisory mechanism involving the European Central Bank is established for banks in the euro area, the European Stability Mechanism (ESM) could, following a regular decision, have the ability to recapitalise banks directly.

On 9 July, the Eurogroup welcomed the Commission's intention to present proposals for a single supervisory mechanism involving the ECB on the basis of Article 127(6) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union in early September. It further stated that it expected the Council to consider these proposals as a matter of urgency by the end of 2012 and added that in order to break the vicious circle between banks and sovereigns, technical discussions on the future ESM direct bank recapitalisation instrument would also start in September so that the ESM could, following a regular decision, have the ability to recapitalise banks directly once an effective single supervisory mechanism was established.

Moreover, the Eurogroup took note that the Commission, in liaison with the ECB, and the IMF were currently conducting their seventh review of the Irish adjustment programme. In this context, discussions would be held on technical solutions to improve the sustainability of the adjustment programme, which was performing well. The Eurogroup recalled that similar cases would be treated equally, taking into account changed circumstances.

The Eurogroup further requested the Troika (the Commission, the ECB and the IMF) to work together with the Portuguese authorities during the fifth review mission starting on 28 August 2012 so as to ensure that the adjustment process remained on track.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006709/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Φορολογικές παραβάσεις μέσω ενδοομιλικών συναλλαγών πολυεθνικής εταιρίας

Μετά από έλεγχους που πραγματοποίησαν οι ελληνικές αρχές, διαπιστώθηκε ότι υπήρξαν εικονικές συναλλαγές της εταιρίας Carrefour — Μαρινόπουλος ΑΕ, τουλάχιστον με μια εταιρία που συστηματικά εξέδιδε πλαστά εικονικά τιμολόγια.

Ταυτόχρονα, έχει διαταχθεί έλεγχος από τις αρμόδιες εισαγγελικές ελληνικές αρχές για τη διερεύνηση καταγγελιών σύμφωνα με τις οποίες η ανωτέρω εταιρία, μέσω διαδοχικών εικονικών πωλήσεων και μεταπωλήσεων προϊόντων της σε διάφορες χώρες της ΕΕ και σε συγγενείς της εταιρίες, πετύχαινε τη μη απόδοση του ΦΠΑ και φόρου εισοδήματος.

Με δεδομένο ότι στη συγκεκριμένη υπόθεση εμφανίζεται να εμπλέκονται φορολογικές αρχές τουλάχιστον από τρεις χώρες — Βουλγαρία, Κύπρος, Ολλανδία — και αντίστοιχος αριθμός συγγενών, της Carrefour, εταιριών, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Τι γνωρίζει για τη συγκεκριμένη υπόθεση; Προκειμένου να μην τελματωθεί ο έλεγχος εξαιτίας των «γραφειοκρατικών» προβλημάτων, που συνήθως ανακύπτουν, ποιους πρακτικούς τρόπους προτείνει για να διευκολυνθεί και να επιταχυνθεί η άμεση συνεργασία μεταξύ των φορολογικών αρχών, ώστε να διαλευκανθεί η συγκεκριμένη υπόθεση;

Δεδομένου ότι από την ερώτησή μου E- 001951/2012 για τις ενδοομιλικές συναλλαγές προκύπτει ότι οι ελληνικές αρχές δεν έχουν επιβάλει μέχρι σήμερα πρόστιμα και κυρώσεις «που θα μπορούσαν να θεωρηθούν σοβαρές σύμφωνα με την σύμβαση διαιτησίας» και ότι το ζήτημα θα μπορούσε να τεθεί στην επερχόμενη φορολογική μεταρρύθμιση, γνωρίζει ποια είναι η σχετική πρόοδος;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(14 Αυγούστου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις υπό έρευνα υποθέσεις φοροδιαφυγής στην Ελλάδα, τις οποίες αναφέρει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου.

Η ικανότητα της Επιτροπής για την καταπολέμηση της φορολογικής απάτης πρέπει να σέβεται τον καταμερισμό των αρμοδιοτήτων μεταξύ ΕΕ και εθνικού επιπέδου. Η ευθύνη για την οργάνωση και τη διαχείριση των φορολογικών συστημάτων βαρύνει κατά κύριο λόγο τα κράτη μέλη. Στις 27 Ιουνίου 2012, η Επιτροπή δημοσίευσε ανακοίνωση με αντικείμενο συγκεκριμένους τρόπους για τη δραστικότερη καταπολέμηση της φορολογικής απάτης και της φοροδιαφυγής, συμπεριλαμβανομένων τρόπων καταπολέμησης σε σχέση με τρίτες χώρες, στην οποία ανακοίνωση συνιστά, μεταξύ άλλων, τη βελτίωση της διασυνοριακής συνεργασίας μεταξύ φορολογικών διοικήσεων. Εμπειρογνώμονες από φορολογικές διοικήσεις όλων των κρατών μελών συνεργάζονται ήδη στο πλαίσιο του κοινού φόρουμ της ΕΕ σχετικά με τις τιμές μεταβίβασης (ΚΦΤΜ) για την εξεύρεση πρακτικών λύσεων στα προβλήματα που ανακύπτουν σε σχέση με τις τιμές μεταβίβασης. Επιπλέον, η οδηγία 2011/16/ΕΕ σχετικά με τη διοικητική συνεργασία στον τομέα της φορολογίας και ο κανονισμός 2010/904 για τη διοικητική συνεργασία στον τομέα του φόρου προστιθέμενης αξίας αποτελούν βάση για την ομαλή και αποτελεσματική διοικητική συνεργασία μεταξύ των κρατών μελών.

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει πρόσθετες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τη χρήση της σύμβασης διαιτησίας εκ μέρους της Ελλάδας, αλλά αντιλαμβάνεται ότι η ελληνική κυβέρνηση ετοιμάζει φορολογική μεταρρύθμιση. Επιπλέον, έχει τεθεί σε εφαρμογή από τις ελληνικές αρχές ένα σχέδιο δράσης για τη βελτίωση της λειτουργίας της φορολογικής διοίκησης και για την ενίσχυση της καταπολέμησης της φοροδιαφυγής και της απάτης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006709/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Tax-related offences in the form of transfer pricing by multinational companies

Investigations by the Greek authorities have uncovered a number of simulated transactions by Carrefour — Marinopoulos SA, with at least one company systematically issuing bogus invoices.

Furthermore, the Greek prosecution authorities have been called on to investigate use by the company of a series of fictitious product sale and resale transactions to affiliated companies in various EU Member States, thereby avoiding VAT and income tax.

Given that the tax authorities of at least three countries — Bulgaria, Cyprus and the Netherlands — and an equivalent number of companies affiliated to Carrefour appear to be involved:

What does the Commission know about this matter? How does it propose to facilitate and expedite direct cooperation between the tax authorities with a view to clarifying matters and preventing the investigations becoming bogged down in the bureaucratic difficulties generally arising?

In answer to my Written Question E-001951/2012 concerning transfer pricing, the Commission indicated that Greece had not yet imposed any penalties which could be considered as serious under the Arbitration Convention and referred to the possibility of tax reform. Does it know what progress has been made in this direction?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2012)

The Commission has no information about the tax avoidance cases under investigation in Greece cited by the Honourable Member.

The Commission's ability to combat tax fraud must respect the division of competences between EU and national level. Responsibility for the organisation and management of fiscal systems lies primarily with Member States. On 27 June 2012 the Commission published a communication on concrete ways to reinforce the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion including in relation to third countries in which it recommends *inter alia* improved cross-border cooperation between tax administrations. Experts from all Member States' tax administrations already collaborate in the framework of the EU Joint Transfer Pricing Forum (JTPF) to find practical solutions to problems arising in relation to transfer pricing. In addition Directive 2011/16/EU on Administrative Cooperation in the field of Taxation and Regulation 2010/904 on administrative cooperation in the field of value added tax provide for a basis for smooth and efficient administrative cooperation between Member States.

The Commission has no additional information on Greece's use of the Arbitration Convention, but understands that the Greek Government is working on a tax reform. In addition, an action plan to improve the functioning of the tax administration and to strengthen the fight against tax evasion and fraud is being implemented by the Greek authorities.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006710/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κυρώσεις για αθέμιτες εμπορικές πρακτικές σε πολυεθνικό όμιλο λιανικού εμπορίου

Με απόφασή της η Επιτροπή Ανταγωνισμού στην Ελλάδα έκρινε ότι η εταιρία «Carrefour Μαρινόπουλος ΑΕ» ακολουθούσε αθέμιτες εμπορικές πρακτικές σε βάρος όσων επιχειρηματιών είχαν ενταχθεί στο σύστημα franchising της Carrefour, αλλά και εντέλει και σε βάρος των καταναλωτών, γιατί επέβαλλε συγκεκριμένες τιμές λιανικής πώλησης στα προϊόντα του δικτύου.

Πιο συγκεκριμένα, με την απόφαση αριθ. 495/VI/2010, η Επιτροπή Ανταγωνισμού επέβαλε στην εταιρία πρόστιμα για παραβάσεις του άρθρου 101 της Συνθήκης για τη Λειτουργία της ΕΕ και του άρθρου 1 του ελληνικού νόμου 703/77. Τα πρόστιμα σε 6 728 272 ευρώ για τον «καθορισμό τιμών μεταπώλησης» και σε 5 784 576 ευρώ για «τον περιορισμό αμοιβαίων προμηθειών μεταξύ των διανομέων-δικαιοδόχων της». Επίσης η απόφασή υποχρέωνε την ανωτέρω εταιρία να «αναδιατυπώσει (ή να απαλείψει) εντός τριών (3) μηνών από την κοινοποίηση της απόφασης συμβατικούς όρους που συνεπάγονται, άμεσα ή έμμεσα, καθορισμό τιμών μεταπώλησης και περιορισμό αμοιβαίων προμηθειών μεταξύ των διανομέων–δικαιοδόχων της».

Η Carrefour Μαρινόπουλος ΑΕ, προσέφυγε στο διοικητικό Εφετείο Αθηνών, το οποίο, με την απόφασή 2803/2011, τροποποίησε την απόφαση της Επιτροπής Ανταγωνισμού και μείωσε τα πρόστιμα, για μεν την παράβαση του καθορισμού τιμών μεταπώλησης, σε 5 282 129 ευρώ, για δε την παράβαση του περιορισμού των αμοιβαίων προμηθειών μεταξύ των διανομέων-δικαιοδόχων σε 4 338 432 ευρώ και συνολικά στο ποσό των 9 620 561 ευρώ.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή

Γνωρίζει αν εισπράχθηκε ποτέ το παραπάνω πρόστιμο;

Γνωρίζει αν η εμπλεκόμενη εταιρεία έπαυσε να εφαρμόζει τις πρακτικές για τις οποίες της επιβλήθηκαν τα πρόστιμα και οι οποίες παραβίαζαν στην κοινοτική νομοθεσία;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(31 Αυγούστου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή είναι ενήμερη για την υπόθεση που ανέφερε το Αξιότιμο Μέλος. Στην απόφασή της αριθ. 495/VI/2010, η Ελληνική Επιτροπή Ανταγωνισμού αποφάνθηκε ότι η εταιρεία «Carrefour Μαρινόπουλος ΑΕ» παρέβη τους ενωσιακούς και εθνικούς κανόνες ανταγωνισμού επιβάλλοντας προκαθορισμένες τιμές μεταπώλησης και περιορίζοντας τις αμοιβαίες προμήθειες μεταξύ των δικαιοδόχων της (σε συνδυασμό με την επιβολή υποχρεώσεων αποκλειστικής προμήθειας). Η Επιτροπή Ανταγωνισμού διέταξε την εταιρεία να θέσει τέλος στη παράβαση και της επέβαλε πρόστιμα συνολικού ύψους 12 512 848 ευρώ.

Σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία που ελήφθησαν από την Επιτροπή Ανταγωνισμού, η Carrefour Μαρινόπουλος ΑΕ τροποποίησε τους όρους των συμβάσεών της βάσει της απόφασης και κοινοποίησε τις σχετικές τροποποιήσεις στην Επιτροπή Ανταγωνισμού εντός της ορισθείσας τρίμηνης προθεσμίας.

Επιπλέον, η Carrefour Μαρινόπουλος ΑΕ άσκησε έφεση κατά της απόφασης της Επιτροπής Ανταγωνισμού ενώπιον του Διοικητικού Εφετείου Αθηνών, ζητώντας, μεταξύ άλλων, την αναστολή της είσπραξης του επιβληθέντος προστίμου. Με την απόφαση αριθ. 151/2010, το Διοικητικό Εφετείο Αθηνών ανέστειλε εν μέρει την άμεση καταβολή του 50 % του προστίμου. Αποτέλεσμα αυτού ήταν να καταβάλει η εταιρεία το ποσό των 6 256 424 ευρώ.

Στη συνέχεια, το Διοικητικό Εφετείο Αθηνών επικύρωσε την απόφαση της Επιτροπής Ανταγωνισμού, μειώνοντας παράλληλα το συνολικό πρόστιμο σε 9 620 561 ευρώ. Η Carrefour Μαρινόπουλος ΑΕ άσκησε αναίρεση ενώπιον του Συμβουλίου της Επικρατείας (ΣτΕ). Εκκρεμούσης της συγκεκριμένης διαδικασίας, η εταιρεία ζήτησε αναστολή εκτέλεσης της διαδικασίας είσπραξης του υπόλοιπου ποσού του προστίμου (δηλ. 3 364 137 ευρώ). Με την προσωρινή απόφαση αριθ. 126/2012, το ΣτΕ χορήγησε την αιτηθείσα αναστολή υπό τον όρο να παράσχει η Carrefour Μαρινόπουλος ΑΕ τραπεζική εγγύηση για το σύνολο του ποσού (την οποία όντως υπέβαλε η εταιρεία). Η τελική απόφαση του ΣτΕ δεν έχει ακόμη εκδοθεί.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006710/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Penalties for unfair trading practises in a multinational retail group

The Hellenic Competition Committee has found Carrefour Marinopoulis SA guilty of unfair trading practises at the expense of companies forming part of its franchise network and, by extension, of consumers, by imposing retail price levels for products sold by the network.

More specifically, under Decision No 495/VI/2010, the Hellenic Competition Committee ruled that the company had infringed Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Article 1 of Greek Law 703/77, fining it EUR 6 728 272 for 'resale price maintenance' and EUR 5 784 576 for 'restricting cross-supplies between members of its distribution and franchise network'. The company was given three months from promulgation for the decision to 'amend (or withdraw) clauses directly or indirectly resulting in resale price maintenance or restricting cross-supplies between members of its distribution and franchise network'.

Carrefour Marinopoulis SA referred the matter to the Athens Administrative Court of Appeal, which, under Decision 2803/2011 amended the ruling of the Hellenic Competition Committee, reducing to EUR 5 282 129 the fine for resale price maintenance and to EUR 4 338 432 the fine for restricting cross-supplies between members of the distribution and franchise network, a total of EUR 9 620 561.

In view of this:

Does the Commission know whether the fine was ever actually paid? Does it know whether the company ceased the practises for which it was fined and which constituted an infringement of EC law?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(31 August 2012)

The Commission is aware of the case referred to. In its Decision No 495/VI/2010, the Hellenic Competition Commission (HCC) found that Carrefour Marinopoulos infringed EU and national competition rules by imposing resale price maintenance and restricting cross-supplies between members of the franchise network (coupled with exclusive supply obligations). The HCC ordered the infringement to be brought to an end and imposed fines totalling EUR 12 512 848.

According to information received from the HCC, Carrefour Marinopoulos amended the terms of its contracts in accordance with the decision and notified the HCC thereof within the set three-month timeframe.

Moreover, Carrefour Marinopoulos appealed against the HCC decision before the Athens Administrative Court of Appeals (AACA), asking *inter alia* for the suspension of the fine imposed. By Decision No 151/2010, the AACA partially suspended the immediate payment of the fine up to 50%. As a result, Carrefour Marinopoulos paid the amount of EUR 6 256 424.

Subsequently, the AACA upheld the HCC decision, while reducing the overall fine to EUR 9 620 561. Carrefour Marinopoulos further appealed to the Supreme Administrative Court (SAC). Pending this procedure it asked for the suspension of the remainder of the fine (i.e. EUR 3 364 137). By interim decision No 126/2012, the SAC granted the requested suspension on condition that Carrefour Marinopoulos provided a bank guarantee for the full amount (which Carrefour Marinopoulos submitted). The final decision of the SAC is pending.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006711/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: PSI — Πληρωμή ομολόγου από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση

Η Ελληνική Δημοκρατία πραγματοποίησε εμπρόθεσμη καταβολή του κεφαλαίου καθώς και των δεδουλευμένων τόκων ύψους περίπου 435 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ ομολόγων λήξης 15 Μαΐου του 2012.

Τα ομόλογα αυτά συμπεριλαμβάνονται σε σύνολο ομολόγων περίπου 6,4 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ που έχουν εκδοθεί ή φέρουν την εγγύηση της Ελληνικής Δημοκρατίας, τα οποία ήταν επιλέξιμα για να συμπεριληφθούν στην ολοκληρωθείσα ανταλλαγή ομολόγων (γνωστή και ως PSI — συμμετοχή ιδιωτικού τομέα), αλλά τελικά δεν προσφέρθηκαν για ανταλλαγή από τους ομολογιούχους. Από δημοσιεύματα του Τύπου, που δεν διαψεύθηκαν, κάτοχος των ομολόγων λήξης 15 Μαΐου του 2012 ήταν η Dart Management, μία επενδυτική εταιρεία με βάση τα νησιά Καϊμάν

Με δεδομένα το παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Με βάση το αποτέλεσμα της διαδικασίας ανταλλαγής ομολόγων, θεωρεί ότι ήταν αναγκαία και επιβεβλημένη αυτή η πληρωμή των 435 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ ομολόγων λήξης 15 Μαΐου του 2012;

2. Η πληρωμή των ομολόγων λήξης 15 Μαΐου του 2012 δεσμεύει την ελληνική κυβέρνηση να πραγματοποιήσει πληρωμές στο μέλλον για όσα ομόλογα δεν προσφέρθηκαν για ανταλλαγή από τους ομολογιούχους; Πώς θα συμβούλευε την ελληνική κυβέρνηση να πράξει στο μέλλον όταν θα έρθει η χρονική στιγμή της λήξης αυτών των ομολόγων;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(24 Αυγούστου 2012)

Η Ελλάδα προέβη στην ανταλλαγή ομολόγων με σκοπό τη βελτίωση της βιωσιμότητας του χρέους της. Σύμφωνα με το μνημόνιο πρόσκλησης της 24ης Φεβρουαρίου 2012, η Ελλάδα διατηρεί το δικαίωμα, κατά την απόλυτη διακριτική της ευχέρεια, να αγοράζει, να ανταλλάσσει, να προσφέρει για αγορά ή να εκδίδει πρόσκληση υποβολής προσφορών για την ανταλλαγή ή την πώληση οποιωνδήποτε καθορισμένων αξιογράφων τα οποία δεν ανταλλάσσονται ή υποβάλλονται σύμφωνα με την πρόσκληση.

Δεδομένου ότι το θέμα αυτό δεν εμπίπτει στην εφαρμογή του δικαίου της ΕΕ, εναπόκειται στην Ελλάδα και μόνο να λαμβάνει τις ενδεικνυόμενες αποφάσεις. Η Επιτροπή δεν συμβούλευσε τις ελληνικές αρχές όσον αφορά την αποπληρωμή των ελληνικών κρατικών ομολόγων που έληγαν στις 15 Μαΐου 2012 και δεν είναι σε θέση να υποδείξει κάποια ιδιαίτερη τακτική σε σχέση με τυχόν μελλοντική εξαγορά.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006711/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: PSI — Bond repayments by the Greek Government

Capital and interest amounting to around EUR 435 million on bonds falling due on 15 May 2012 have been paid on time by the Greek Government.

These bonds are included among those amounting to around EUR 6.4 billion issued or guaranteed by the Greek Government and eligible for inclusion in the bond swap package (known as PSI — private sector involvement) but not finally surrendered for exchange by bondholders. According to undisputed press reports, the holder of the bonds falling due on 15 May 2012 was Dart Management, an investment company based in the Cayman Islands.

In view of this:

1. Given the result of the bond swap package, does the Commission consider that it was necessary or compulsory for payment of EUR 435 million to be paid on bonds falling due on 15 May 2012?

2. Does the repayment of bonds falling due on 15 May 2012 bind the Greek Government to make payments in future on any bonds not surrendered for exchange by their holders? What advice would it give to the Greek Government on the course to adopt in future when those bonds fall due?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

The debt exchange operation was launched by Greece in order to improve its debt sustainability. In accordance with the Invitation Memorandum dated 24 February 2012, Greece reserved the right in its sole discretion to purchase, exchange, offer to purchase or to issue an invitation to submit offers to exchange or sell any designated securities that are not exchanged or submitted pursuant to the invitation.

As this matter falls outside the implementation of EC law, it is for Greece alone to take the appropriate decisions. The Commission did not instruct the Greek authorities concerning the repayment of Greek sovereign bonds maturing on 15 May 2012 and is not in a position to suggest a particular course of action as regards any future redemption.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006712/12
to the Commission
Vicky Ford (ECR)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) investigation on lead in ammunition

Many residents from the east of England have written to me regarding a consultation by the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) on the use of lead shot in ammunition. I understand from the Countryside Alliance, an NGO based in the UK, that the ECHA has contracted a consultancy, AMEC, to study the use of lead shot from the trade, clay target and hunting perspectives.

The United Kingdom has a very long tradition of shotgun shooting and has led the world in the development of the sporting shotgun. It is estimated that nearly 1 million people take part in shooting sports in the United Kingdom, from informal shoots to Olympic competition. Game shooting is worth GBP 1.6 billion to the British economy and supports nearly 70 000 full-time jobs, many in remote rural areas. Shooting also contributes nearly 2.7 million man-days on conservation of the British countryside every year.

Further restrictions on lead in ammunition could have a serious negative effect on the shooting industry because most of the guns made by the historic British gunmakers, and many from other Member States, are unsuitable for use with economically comparable alternatives to lead. Alternatives to lead with comparable ballistic capability can cost up to 10 times more.

— Please can you let me know when the ECHA's report is likely to be published, what studies are being undertaken to assess the impact of any restrictions on the use of lead shot and under what legislative procedure any observations or recommendations are likely to be considered?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2012)

ECHA commissioned several studies in 2011 with the aim of establishing a capability to improve the assessment of the costs of reducing the use or emissions of hazardous substances. Several concrete cases were chosen for this research exercise. As the contracting parties to the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) ([1]) have agreed to phase out the use of lead shot in ammunition in wetlands, this case was selected to be part of the cost study. This case (as well as the others selected) of the cost study will be placed on the ECHA website ([2]) in the coming weeks. In the frame of this study, industry stakeholders were contacted in order to gather information. The study itself would not lead to any restrictions on the lead shot in ammunition.

The Commission did not ask ECHA to prepare an Annex XV restriction dossier. Sweden has notified its intention to prepare a restriction dossier concerning lead and lead compounds in articles intended for consumer use and the Commission understands that it is carrying out a preliminary investigation on the issue of lead shot in ammunition.

As concerns the procedure for adopting a possible restriction ([3]), if ECHA (at the request of the Commission) or a Member State proposes restrictions, the restriction dossier is made public on ECHA's website and the interested parties are invited to submit comments or information on socioeconomic aspects. Following the receipt of the opinion by the ECHA's Committees for risk and socioeconomic assessment, the Commission adopts the final decision in accordance with the regulatory procedure with scrutiny.

([1]) http://www.unep-aewa.org/.
([2]) http://echa.europa.eu/web/guest/support/socioeconomic-analysis-in-reach.
([3]) Articles 69-73 of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency, amending Directive 1999/45/EC and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 793/93 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 as well as Council Directive 76/769/EEC and Commission Directives 91/155/EEC, 93/67/EEC, 93/105/EC and 2000/21/EC, OJ L 396, 30.12.2006, p. 1.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006714/12
al Consejo
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(4 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Adhesión de Islandia a la UE y negociación del capítulo pesquero

Desde que el 17 de junio de 2010 el Consejo Europeo acordó la apertura de las negociaciones para la incorporación de Islandia como nuevo Estado miembro de la Unión Europea, a raíz de la solicitud de ingreso formalizada en julio de 2009, está pendiente el inicio de las negociaciones correspondientes al capítulo de la pesca, uno de los más importantes para la definitiva adhesión del nuevo Estado.

Debido a su pertenencia al espacio Schengen y al Espacio Económico Europeo, Islandia cuenta ya con dos terceras partes de la legislación de la UE dentro de su propio acervo.

Cuando se han cumplido dos años del acuerdo para la apertura de las negociaciones, llama la atención que no se hayan iniciado las negociaciones correspondientes al complejo capítulo XIII sobre pesca, dadas la particular sensibilidad de Islandia en este ámbito y la necesidad de progresos sustanciales en el proceso de integración. Siguiendo los precedentes de anteriores negociaciones, parece conveniente abordar este capítulo, que, junto con el agrícola y el financiero, entraña especiales dificultades.

1. ¿En qué momento está previsto que se inicien las negociaciones del capítulo XIII sobre pesca?

2. ¿Existe algún impedimento para iniciar cuanto antes este capítulo de la negociación?

3. ¿Considera el Consejo que la incertidumbre y la ausencia de progreso en este capítulo pueden dificultar el proceso de integración?

4. ¿Existe algún Estado miembro que se haya opuesto a las negociaciones en este capítulo pesquero?

Respuesta
(8 de octubre de 2012)

El informe de la Comisión sobre el análisis del capítulo 13 (Pesca) fue presentado al Consejo en abril de 2012. El Consejo sigue examinando el informe analítico de la Comisión. Por el momento, no es posible afirmar cuándo podrán iniciarse las negociaciones reales sobre este capítulo.

En cuanto al proceso de adhesión, el Consejo recuerda que las negociaciones tendrán por objetivo que Islandia adopte íntegramente el acervo de la UE y garantice su plena aplicación y el cumplimiento con la adhesión, reflejando los méritos propios de Islandia y las disposiciones del marco de negociación. También hay que recordar que, en consonancia con dicho marco de negociación, la correcta transposición y la aplicación del acervo comunitario por parte de Islandia, incluida su aplicación eficaz y eficiente mediante las estructuras administrativas y judiciales adecuadas, determinará el ritmo de las negociaciones.

En cuanto a las posiciones expresadas por los Estados miembros, no corresponde al Consejo hacer comentarios sobre las posiciones de los mismos en las negociaciones.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006714/12
to the Council
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Iceland's accession to the EU and negotiations on the fisheries chapter

On 17 June 2010 the European Council agreed to open negotiations on including Iceland as a new Member State of the European Union, following the formal application for membership received in July 2009. The start of negotiations on the fisheries chapter, one of the most important for Iceland's final accession, has been pending since then.

Given that it belongs to the Schengen Area and the European Economic Area, Iceland has already incorporated two-thirds of EU legislation within its own corpus of law.

Whilst two years have passed since the agreement to open negotiations, it is worth noting that negotiations have not yet started on the complex fisheries chapter (Chapter XIII), a particularly sensitive field for Iceland where substantial progress needs to be made in the integration process. Following the precedents set by previous negotiations, it is necessary to tackle this chapter which, along with the agricultural and financial chapters, involves special problems.

1. When are the negotiations on Chapter XIII expected to start?

2. Are there any impediments to starting this chapter of the negotiations as soon as possible?

3. Does the Council consider that the uncertainty and lack of progress concerning this chapter may hinder the integration process?

4. Have any Member States opposed the negotiations on this fisheries chapter?

Reply
(8 October 2012)

The Commission's report on the screening of Chapter 13 (Fisheries) was submitted to the Council in April 2012. The Council is still examining the Commission's screening report. At the present time, it is not possible to say when actual negotiations on this chapter can be opened.

As regards the overall accession process, the Council recalls that the negotiations will be aimed at Iceland integrally adopting the EU *acquis* and ensuring its full implementation and enforcement by accession, duly reflecting Iceland's own merits and the provisions of the Negotiating Framework. It should also be recalled that, in line with the Negotiating Framework, Iceland's correct transposition and implementation of the *acquis*, including its effective and efficient application through appropriate administrative and judicial structures, will determine the pace of negotiations.

As for the positions expressed by Member States, it is not for the Council to comment on the positions of Member States in the negotiations.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006715/12
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(4 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Adhesión de Islandia a la UE y negociación del capítulo pesquero

Desde que el 17 de junio de 2010 el Consejo Europeo acordó la apertura de las negociaciones para la incorporación de Islandia como nuevo Estado miembro de la Unión Europea, a raíz de la solicitud de ingreso formalizada en julio de 2009, está pendiente el inicio de las negociaciones correspondientes al capítulo de la pesca, uno de los más importantes para la definitiva adhesión del nuevo Estado.

Debido a su pertenencia al espacio Schengen y al Espacio Económico Europeo, Islandia cuenta ya con dos terceras partes de la legislación de la UE dentro de su propio acervo.

Cuando se han cumplido dos años del acuerdo para la apertura de las negociaciones, llama la atención que no se hayan iniciado las negociaciones correspondientes al complejo capítulo XIII sobre pesca, dadas la particular sensibilidad de Islandia en este ámbito y la necesidad de progresos sustanciales en el proceso de integración. Siguiendo los precedentes de anteriores negociaciones, parece conveniente abordar este capítulo, que, junto con el agrícola y el financiero, entraña especiales dificultades.

1. ¿En qué momento está previsto que se inicien las negociaciones del capítulo XIII sobre pesca?

2. ¿Existe algún impedimento para iniciar cuanto antes este capítulo de la negociación?

3. ¿Considera la Comisión que la incertidumbre y la ausencia de progreso en este capítulo pueden dificultar el proceso de integración?

4. ¿Existe algún Estado miembro que se haya opuesto a las negociaciones en este capítulo pesquero?

Respuesta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(4 de septiembre de 2012)

La Comisión envió el informe sobre el escrutinio del capítulo XIII sobre pesca al Consejo en abril de 2012. El informe está siendo examinado por el Consejo, al que ahora le corresponde tomar la decisión de cuándo se abren las negociaciones sobre dicho capítulo.

En cuanto al proceso general de adhesión, las negociaciones van encaminadas a que Islandia adopte el acervo de la UE y garantice su plena aplicación en la fecha de adhesión, salvo aquellas excepciones o el periodo transitorio que pueda obtener durante las negociaciones, con arreglo a sus propios méritos y a las disposiciones del Marco de negociación.

No corresponde a la Comisión comentar el punto de vista de los Estados miembros en lo referente a las negociaciones.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006715/12
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Iceland's accession to the EU and negotiations on the fisheries chapter

On 17 June 2010 the European Council agreed to open negotiations on including Iceland as a new Member State of the European Union, following the formal application for membership received in July 2009. The start of negotiations on the fisheries chapter, one of the most important for Iceland's final accession, has been pending since then.

Given that it belongs to the Schengen Area and the European Economic Area, Iceland has already incorporated two-thirds of EU legislation within its own corpus of law.

Whilst two years have passed since the agreement to open negotiations, it is worth noting that negotiations have not yet started on the complex fisheries chapter (Chapter XIII), a particularly sensitive field for Iceland where substantial progress needs to be made in the integration process. Following the precedents set by previous negotiations, it is necessary to tackle this chapter which, along with the agricultural and financial chapters, involves special problems.

1. When are the negotiations on Chapter XIII expected to start?

2. Are there any impediments to starting this chapter of the negotiations as soon as possible?

3. Does the Commission consider that the uncertainty and lack of progress concerning this chapter may hinder the integration process?

4. Have any Member States opposed the negotiations on this fisheries chapter?

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

The Commission sent the screening report for Chapter 13 Fisheries to the Council in April 2012. The report is being examined by the Council and it is now up to the Council to take the decision on when to open the negotiations on this chapter.

As regards the overall accession process, the negotiations are aimed at Iceland adopting the EU *acquis* and ensuring its full implementation except for any derogation or transition period they might obtain during the negotiations, by the date of accession in line with Iceland's own merits and with the provisions of the Negotiating Framework.

It is not for the Commission to comment on the views of Member States regarding the negotiations.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006716/12
do Komisji
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(4 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Dyrektywa azotanowa

Dyrektywa w sprawie ochrony wód przed zanieczyszczeniami spowodowanymi przez azotany pochodzenia rolniczego (91/676/EWG), zwana dyrektywą azotanową, wzbudza wiele kontrowersji wśród polskich rolników.

Komisja Europejska rekomenduje Polsce objęcie całego kraju strefą obszarów szczególnie narażonych (OSN). W ramach wdrażania dyrektywy azotanowej wyznaczono w naszym kraju 21 obszarów szczególnie narażonych na azotany pochodzenia rolniczego, w których odpływ azotu ze źródeł rolniczych do wód należy ograniczyć. Obecnie obszary te stanowią tylko 1.49 % powierzchni Polski.

Objęcie całego kraju strefą OSN spowoduje zwiększenie obciążeń dla rolników, którzy korzystają z płatności bezpośrednich i nałoży na nich dodatkowe kontrole.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z zapytaniem do Komisji:

— Czy propozycja Komisji, aby objąć cały obszar Polski obszarami szczególnie narażonymi jest zasadna?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Janeza Potočnika w imieniu Komisji
(16 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Dyrektywa 91/676/EWG ([1]) (dyrektywa azotanowa) ma na celu zmniejszenie zanieczyszczeń wód spowodowanych przez azotany pochodzące ze źródeł rolniczych oraz zapobieganie dalszemu zanieczyszczeniu. Dyrektywa zobowiązuje państwa członkowskie do wyznaczenia stref zagrożenia zgodnie z ustalonymi kryteriami obejmującymi eutrofizację terenów, na których składuje się obornik. W celu osiągnięcia założeń dyrektywy przyjmowane są i wdrażane stosowne programy działania w odniesieniu do wyznaczonych stref.

Zamiast wyznaczać szczególne strefy zagrożenia wrażliwe na zanieczyszczenia azotanami, państwa członkowskie mają możliwość przyjęcia podejścia ukierunkowanego na całe terytorium kraju i ustanowienia programu działania odnoszącego się do całego terytorium lub większej liczby takich programów.

Do chwili obecnej podejście takie zastosowały: Finlandia, Niemcy, Dania, Litwa, Niderlandy, Luksemburg, Irlandia, Słowenia, Malta i Austria. Podobnie jak w przypadku Polski, wody pierwszych czterech z wymienionych krajów spływają do Morza Bałtyckiego, które dotknięte jest eutrofizacją. Komisja docenia znaczenie podejścia ukierunkowanego na całe terytorium kraju, jako że zapewnia ono ochronę wszystkich wód, a nie tylko tych, które spełniają szczególne wymogi dotyczące stref zagrożenia. Podejście to przyczynia się w szczególności do rozwiązania problemów dotykających obszar Morza Bałtyckiego.

([1]) Dyrektywa 91/676/EWG, Dz.U. L 375 z 31.12.1991.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006716/12
to the Commission
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Nitrates Directive

Directive 91/676/EEC concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources, known as the Nitrates Directive, is extremely controversial among Polish farmers.

The Commission recommends that the entire territory of Poland be classified as a nitrate vulnerable zone (NVZ). As part of the implementation of the Nitrates Directive, 21 areas that are particularly vulnerable to nitrates of agricultural origin and in which nitrogen runoff from agricultural sources should be subject to limitations were identified. These areas, however, make up only 1.49% of Poland's surface area.

Classifying the entire country as an NVZ would increase the burden on farmers who receive direct payments and result in additional controls being imposed on them.

In this connection:

— Is the Commission's proposal to classify the entire territory of Poland as a nitrate vulnerable zone justified?

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

Directive 91/676/EEC ([1]) (the Nitrates Directive) has the objective to reduce water pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources and to prevent further such pollution. The directive requires Member States to designate vulnerable zones according to defined criteria which include eutrophication of manure areas. Action Programmes shall be adopted and implemented in those designated zones, in order to reach the directive's objectives.

Member States have the possibility, rather than designate specific nitrate vulnerable zones, to take a whole territory approach and establish action programme(s) for their entire territory.

To date, Finland, Germany, Denmark, Lithuania, Netherlands, Luxembourg, Ireland, Slovenia, Malta and Austria have taken this approach. The first four of these, like Poland, have waters flowing into the Baltic sea which is eutrophic. The Commission recognises the value of the whole territory approach as it provides protection for all waters rather than those fulfilling the specific requirements for vulnerable zones. This is beneficial especially in dealing with the problems of the Baltic.

([1]) Directive 91/676/EEC, OJ L 375, 31.12.1991.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006717/12
do Komisji
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(4 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Finansowanie drogi ekspresowej S19 w Polsce

S19 (odcinek tzw. „Via Carpathia") to zaplanowana droga ekspresowa, która ma połączyć największe miasta Polski Wschodniej – Białystok, Lublin i Rzeszów. Jej trasa ma przebiegać pomiędzy przejściami granicznymi z Białorusią w Kuźnicy Białostockiej oraz Słowacją w Barwinku. Powstanie takiego szlaku komunikacyjnego jest ogromną szansą na stymulację rozwoju gospodarczego w tych regionach peryferyjnych UE wymagających wsparcia.

Budowa S19 ma zostać sfinansowana, w największej części, ze środków funduszy strukturalnych UE, przeznaczonych na lata 2014-2020.

W ostatnim czasie w mediach pojawiają się informacje, że Komisja Europejska nie przewiduje finansowania inwestycji w ramach Programu Operacyjnego Infrastruktura i Środowisko tylko ze środków Programu Operacyjnego Rozwoju Polski Wschodniej.

Jakie jest stanowisko Komisji w przedmiotowej kwestii?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(20 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Z uwagi na zasięg programów operacyjnych przewidzianych dla Polski w nowej perspektywie finansowej na lata 2014-2020, Komisja nie rozpoczęła jeszcze rozmów z władzami Polski na temat treści tych programów. Komisja rozpoczęła dialog o przyszłej umowie partnerskiej, który określi rozmiary i zasięg działań UE w dziedzinie transportu. Z tego powodu Komisja jest zdania, że rozmowy o włączeniu konkretnych inwestycji drogowych, takich jak droga ekspresowa S19, do planowanych programów operacyjnych byłyby przedwczesne.

Niezależnie od tego Komisja położyła już szczególny nacisk na rozwój sieci drogowych we wschodniej Polsce. W latach 2007-2013 budowa niektórych odcinków drogi ekspresowej S19 była współfinansowana z funduszy unijnych. Chodzi mianowicie o odcinek Stobierna-Rzeszów oraz o odcinek Międzyrzec Podlaski-Lubartów. Co więcej, prace przygotowawcze nad budową innych odcinków S19 są wspierane przez inicjatywę JASPERS, która jest wspólnym przedsięwzięciem Komisji, Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego i innych partnerów. Przygotowanie dokumentacji projektowej dla wszystkich odcinków drogi ekspresowej S19 jest – jako pierwszy etap projektu inwestycyjnego – finansowane w tym okresie.

Jeśli chodzi o lata 2014-2020, w październiku 2011 r. Komisja przedstawiła nowy wniosek dotyczący sieci TEN-T, która obejmuje drogę ekspresową S19. Zważywszy na to, że połączenie drogowe Lublin-Rzeszów stanowi element podstawowej sieci drogowej TEN-T, władze Polski będą miały obowiązek jego stworzenia/unowocześnienia, co stanowić będzie priorytetową inwestycję w ramach sieci kompleksowej TEN-T do roku 2030. Możliwe będzie uzyskanie współfinansowania ze źródeł UE, aby ułatwić Polsce realizację tego celu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006717/12
to the Commission
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Financing for S-19 express road in Poland

The S-19 (the section known as 'Via Carpathia') is a planned express road that is intended to connect eastern Poland's largest cities: Białystok, Lublin and Rzeszów. Its route is planned to run between the border crossings with Belarus at Kuźnica Białostocka and with Slovakia at Barwinek. The creation of such a transport corridor represents an enormous opportunity to stimulate economic development in these peripheral EU regions, which are in need of assistance.

The largest share of funding for the construction of the S-19 is to come from EU Structural Funds for 2014-2020.

According to recent media reports, the Commission is not planning to finance the investment through the Environmental Protection and Infrastructure Programme, but only through the Operational Programme 'Development of Eastern Poland'.

What is the Commission's view on this matter?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2012)

Concerning the scope of operational programmes in Poland for the new financial perspective 2014-2020, the Commission has not yet started the discussion with the Polish authorities on the content of the programmes. The Commission has started the process of dialogue related to the future Partnership Agreement that will define the size and scope of EU interventions in the area of transport. It is therefore premature for the Commission to deliberate on the inclusion of specific road investments such as the expressway S19 into the future operational programmes.

Nevertheless, the Commission has already put special emphasis on the development of road networks in Eastern Poland. Within the 2007-2013 period, the construction of certain sections of the expressway S19 was co-financed by the European funds, namely the section Stobierna-Rzeszów, as well as the section Międzyrzec Podlaski — Lubartów. In addition, preparatory works for other sections of S19 are being supported by the JASPERS initiative, which is a joint venture of the Commission, the European Investment Bank and other partners. The preparation of project documentation for all sections of the S19 expressway, as a first phase of the investment project, is financed within this period.

With regard to the 2014-2020 period, in October 2011 the Commission presented a new proposal for the TEN-T network including the expressway S19. As the road connection between Lublin-Rzeszów is included in the TEN-T core road network, the Polish authorities will have the obligation to construct/upgrade it as a priority investment within the framework provided by the comprehensive TEN-T network by 2030. EU co-financing will be possible in order to assist Poland in this task.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006718/12
do Komisji
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(4 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Kontrole statków rybackich w Polsce

Obecnie w Sejmie RP w Komisji Sprawiedliwości trwa dyskusja na temat dużej liczby kontroli polskich statków rybackich ze strony Unii Europejskiej.

W Polsce zarejestrowanych jest 790 statków rybackich, które w okresie maj 2007 – grudzień 2011 zostały skontrolowane 10 832 razy, podczas gdy przykładowo w Finlandii na 3 332 zarejestrowanych statków przeprowadzono tylko 51 kontroli.

Liczne kontrole są czasochłonne i kosztowne.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z zapytaniem do Komisji:

1. Dlaczego przeprowadza się tak wiele kontroli statków rybackich w Polsce?

2. Czy kontrole te są zasadne?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Marię Damanaki w imieniu Komisji
(8 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Rozporządzenie Rady (WE) nr 1224/2009 nakłada na każde państwo członkowskie obowiązek kontrolowania działalności wykonywanej przez obywateli tych państw w ramach wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa. Kontrola ta odbywa się poprzez inspekcje przeprowadzane przez władze krajowe, a nie przez inspektorów Komisji, nawet jeśli tacy unijni inspektorzy mogą okazjonalnie towarzyszyć inspektorom krajowym zgodnie z art. 96 i następnymi regulaminu kontroli. Pytanie Pani Poseł należy zatem rozumieć jako odnoszące się do inspekcji przeprowadzanych na polskich statkach przez inspektorów krajowych.

Na mocy rozporządzenia Rady (WE) nr 1224/2009 inspekcjami należy objąć co najmniej 20 proc. wszystkich wyładunków gatunków objętych planem wieloletnim, a jeśli ryby są oferowane do sprzedaży na aukcjach, kontrolą należy objąć co najmniej 5 proc. ilości. W zakresie kompetencji państw członkowskich pozostaje przyjęcie stosownych środków, rozdzielenie wystarczających zasobów finansowych, ludzkich i technicznych oraz tworzenie struktur administracyjnych i technicznych niezbędnych do zapewnienia działań kontrolnych i inspekcyjnych oraz egzekwowania przepisów w odniesieniu do działalności prowadzonej w ramach wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa. Na podstawie oceny ryzyk państwa członkowskie podejmują decyzję odnośnie do sposobu zapewnienia zgodności z zasadami wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa. Dlatego też podejmowanie decyzji dotyczących właściwych środków, w tym inspekcji statków rybackich, leży w zakresie odpowiedzialności Polski.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006718/12
to the Commission
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Inspections of fishing vessels in Poland

The Justice Committee of the Polish Sejm is currently debating the large number of inspections being carried out on Polish fishing vessels by the European Union.

There are 790 fishing vessels registered in Poland, and these were subject to inspections 10 832 times between May 2007 and December 2011. However, only 51 inspections were carried out on the 3 332 registered vessels in Finland in the same period.

These numerous inspections are time-consuming and costly.

In this connection:

1. Why are so many inspections being carried out on fishing vessels in Poland?

2. Are these inspections justifiable?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2012)

Council Regulation (EC) 1224/2009 requires that each Member States shall control the activities carried out by their nationals within the scope the common fisheries policy. Such control is carried out by inspectors of the national authorities, not by the Commission inspectors, even if such EU inspectors may occasionally accompany national inspectors as foreseen in Articles 96 and following of the Control Regulation. The Honourable Member's question is thus to be understood as referring to inspections carried out on Polish vessels by national inspectors.

Council Regulation (EC) 1224/2009 requires that minimum of 20% of all landings of species subject to a multiannual plan shall be inspected and if the fish is offered for sale at auction, at least 5% of the quantities shall be inspected. It is the responsibility of the Member States to adopt appropriate measures, allocate adequate financial, human and technical resources and set up all administrative and technical structures necessary for ensuring control, inspection and enforcement activities within the scope of the common fisheries policies. The Member States on the basis of risk management shall decide how they ensure compliance with the rules of the common fisheries policy. It is therefore Poland's responsibility to decide on the appropriate measures, including the inspections of fishing vessels.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006719/12
do Komisji
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(4 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Zmiana dyrektywy 2001/37/WE

W ostatnim czasie dotarły do nas informacje, iż Komisja planuje rozpocząć prace legislacyjne nad zmianą dyrektywy 2001/37/WE, która ma, między innymi, zakazać produkcji i handlu tabaką.

Po zapoznaniu się z dokumentami dotyczącymi przyszłych zmian, okazało się, że będą one głównie dotyczyły etykietowania i pakowania wyrobów tytoniowych oraz nakazie umieszczania substancji smakowych (mentol, wanilia itp.) tylko i wyłącznie w składzie papierosów, a nie na etykietach w celach marketingowych. Niestety informacje dotyczące zmian, które wpłyną na produkcję, handel oraz zażywania tabaki nie są jeszcze sprecyzowane.

Zażywanie tabaki to jeden z najważniejszych kaszubskich zwyczajów. Według danych przemysłu tytoniowego stosuje ją regularnie ponad 100 tysięcy mieszkańców tego regionu. Uwagę należy zwrócić na fakt, iż zażywanie tabaki jest rytuałem, a nie uzależnieniem. Zarówno tabaka, jak i tabakiera mają dla Kaszubów wielkie znaczenie symboliczne. W związku z powyższym zamiany związane z legislacją związaną z tabaką byłyby dużym problemem dla mieszkańców Kaszub. Zakazanie produkcji, handlu, czy też zażywania tej substancji zagroziłoby długiemu i trwałemu, jak do tej chwili, zwyczajowi kaszubskiemu.

1. W związku z powyższym zwracam się do Komisji z pytaniem, czy Komisja planuje zaproponować jakieś zmiany, które mogą wpłynąć na produkcję, handel, czy też zażywanie tabaki?

2. Jeśli pojawiły się takie plany, to czy Komisja, może rozważyć rozwiązania, które nie wpłynęłyby destrukcyjnie na tradycję kaszubską?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johna Dallego w imieniu Komisji
(30 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Komisja rozważa obecnie różne warianty przepisów dotyczących tytoniu do stosowania doustnego w kontekście planowanego przeglądu dyrektywy w sprawie wyrobów tytoniowych 2001/37/WE ([1]). Wpływ na zainteresowane strony, w tym możliwy wpływ na poszczególne państwa członkowskie lub regiony, jest starannie analizowany. Komisja nie zajęła jak dotąd ostatecznego stanowiska w tej sprawie.

([1]) Dyrektywa 2001/37/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 5 czerwca 2001 r. w sprawie zbliżenia przepisów ustawowych, wykonawczych i administracyjnych państw członkowskich, dotyczących produkcji, prezentowania i sprzedaży wyrobów tytoniowych, Dz.U. L 194 z 18.7.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006719/12
to the Commission
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Modification of Directive 2001/37/EC

We have recently received information that the Commission is planning to begin legislative work on modifying Directive 2001/37/EC with a view, *inter alia*, to banning the production of and trade in snuff.

An examination of the documents concerning the future modifications reveals that they will mainly relate to the labelling and packaging of tobacco products, as well as to a requirement that flavourings (menthol, vanilla) be referred to solely in the list of cigarette ingredients and not on labelling for marketing purposes. Unfortunately, precise information regarding these changes, which will have an impact on snuff production, trade and use, is not yet available.

Snuff use is one of Kashubia's most important traditions. According to tobacco industry data, more than 100 000 residents of Kashubia use snuff regularly. It must be taken into account that the use of snuff is a ritual, not an addiction. Both snuff and the snuffbox hold great symbolic meaning for Kashubians. In view of the above, changes to legislation concerning snuff would represent a huge problem for the residents of Kashubia. Banning the production, trade or use of the substance would threaten an enduring Kashubian tradition.

1. Does the Commission intend to propose any modifications that could have an impact on the production, trade or use of snuff?

2. If so, would it consider solutions that would not have a destructive effect on Kashubian tradition?

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

The Commission is currently considering several options regarding the regulation of oral tobacco products in the context of the planned revision of the Tobacco Products Directive 2001/37/EC ([1]). The impact on stakeholders is being carefully considered, including any potential impacts on specific Member States and/or regions. The Commission has not, at this stage, taken a final position on this matter.

([1]) Directive 2001/37/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2001 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco products — Commission statement, OJ L 194, 18.7.2001.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-006720/12
an die Kommission
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL)
(4. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Österreichische Beschwerde der Strabag SE, Wien, und deutsche Beschwerde der TechniSat Digital GmbH und anderer (Aktenzeichen: CHAP(2010)03469)

Es wird verwiesen auf die Beschwerde gegen die Pflichtmitgliedschaft in den österreichischen Wirtschaftskammern vom 3.9.2008, eingereicht von der Strabag SE, und die Beschwerde gegen die Pflichtmitgliedschaft in den deutschen Industrie- und Handelskammern vom 22.10.2010 (Aktenzeichen: CHAP(2010)03469), eingereicht von der TechniSat Digital GmbH und anderen.

1. Ist es zutreffend, dass die österreichische Beschwerde der Strabag SE, Wien, vom 3.9.2008 mit Datum vom 25.11.2011 abgeschlossen bzw. zurückgewiesen wurde?

2. Wie ist der Inhalt der Stellungnahme der Kommission zu der Beschwerde?

3. Warum wurde das Büro von MdEP Klute nicht wie in der Antwort der Kommission vom 25.3.2011 (Antwort auf die Anfrage E-001911/2011) informiert?

4. Ist es zutreffend, dass die deutsche Beschwerde der TechniSat Digital GmbH und anderer vom 22.10.2010 (Aktenzeichen: CHAP(2010)03469) ebenfalls abgeschlossen bzw. zurückgewiesen wurde?

5. Welches wäre ggf. der Inhalt der Stellungnahme der Kommission?

6. Warum wurde das MdEP Klute nicht wie in der Antwort der Kommission vom 25.3.2011 (Antwort auf die Anfrage E-001911/2011) informiert?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(13. August 2012)

Beide Beschwerden, auf die die Frage des Herrn Abgeordneten Bezug nimmt, wurden in der Tat zu den Akten gelegt; zu der ersten, die unter der Nummer CHAP(2010)02829 registriert wurde, wurde am 5. Juli 2011 ein vorläufiger Einstellungsbescheid, am 15. September 2011 ein Einstellungsbescheid übermittelt; zu der zweiten, die unter der Nummer CHAP(2010)03469 registriert wurde, wurde am 5. Juli 2011 ein vorläufiger Einstellungsbescheid, am 8. September 2011 ein Einstellungsbescheid übermittelt. Der Beschwerdeführer reichte im Juni 2011 eine Petition (Nr. 725/2011) beim Europäischen Parlament ein, über die noch nicht entschieden wurde.

Die Kommission hat zur Frage der Pflichtmitgliedschaft in einer Industrie- und Handelskammer in den Bemerkungen Stellung genommen, die sie zu vorhergehenden, inzwischen abgeschlossen Petitionen sowie zu der Petition 725/2011 vorgelegt hat, die am 19. Juni 2012 im Ausschuss erörtert wurde.

Die Kommission bedauert, dass die oben genannten Informationen dem Herrn Abgeordneten nicht vorlagen. Es ist jedoch darauf hinzuweisen, dass alle relevanten Informationen dem Europäischen Parlament im Rahmen der Zusammenarbeit mit dem Petitionsausschuss übermittelt wurden.

Der Antrag des Herrn Abgeordneten auf Zugang zu Dokumenten wird entsprechend den Bestimmungen der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1049/2001 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 30. Mai 2001 über den Zugang der Öffentlichkeit zu Dokumenten des Europäischen Parlaments, des Rates und der Kommission ([1]) behandelt.

([1]) ABl. L 145 vom 31.5.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006720/12
to the Commission
Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Austrian complaint lodged on 3 September 2008 by Strabag SE, Vienna, and German complaint lodged on 22 October 2010 by TechniSat Digital GmbH and others (Ref.: CHAP(2010)03469

I refer to the complaint lodged on 3 September 2008 against compulsory membership of the Austrian chambers of commerce, by Strabag SE, and the complaint lodged on 22 October 2010 by TechniSat Digital GmbH and others (ref: CHAP(2010)03469) against compulsory membership of the German chambers of industry and commerce.

1. Is it true that processing of the Austrian complaint of 3 September 2008 by Strabag SE, Vienna, was terminated (i.e. the complaint was rejected) on 25 November 2011?

2. Can the Commission provide me with the text of its opinion on this complaint?

3. Why was my office not informed in line with the Commission's answer of 25 March 2011 to my Question E-001911/2011?

4. Is it true that processing of the German complaint lodged on 22 October 2010 by TechniSat Digital GmbH and others (ref: CHAP(2010)03469) was also terminated (i.e. the complaint was rejected)?

5. If so, can the Commission provide me with the text of its opinion?

6. Why was I not informed in line with the Commission's answer of 25 March 2011 to my Question E-001911/2011?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(13 August 2012)

Both complaints referred to in the question of the Honourable Member were indeed closed, as follows: the first, registered CHAP(2010)02829: pre-closure letter sent on 5 July 2011, closure letter sent on 15 September 2011; the second, registered CHAP(2010)03469: pre-closure letter sent on 5 July 2011, closure letter sent on 8 September 2011. The complainant lodged a petition with the Parliament, N° 725/2011 in June 2011, which is still open.

The position of the Commission on compulsory membership of Chambers of Commerce may be found in the observations it submitted in relation to earlier petitions, now closed, and on petition 725/2011, which was debated in committee on 19th June 2012.

The Commission regrets that the above information has not reached the Honourable Member directly. However, it should be stressed that all relevant information has been channelled to the European Parliament through the collaboration with the Petitions Committee.

The Honourable Member's request for access to documents will be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents ([1]).

([1]) OJ L 145, 31.5.2001.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-006722/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4. juli 2012)

Om: Sharia og demokratiske retsstatsprincipper

Vil Kommissionen i forlængelse af svaret på spørgsmål E-003930/2012 uddybe, hvad den mener med, at »sharia« er et generelt begreb, som omfatter adskillige retslige aspekter og er genstand for varierende fortolkninger, både i de lande, hvor det anvendes, og blandt »specialister« og i den forbindelse nærmere oplyse, hvilke former for sharia Kommissionen finder forenelige med demokratiske retsstatsprincipper og den europæiske menneskerettighedskonvention?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Viviane Reding
(31. juli 2012)

Ifølge de oplysninger, Europa-Kommissionen har til rådighed, omfatter »sharia« regler på en række områder, der omfattes af sekulær lovgivning, som f.eks. forbrydelser, ægteskab, skilsmisser og arv, og fortolkningen af disse regler varierer mellem kulturerne såvel som mellem forskellige opfattelser og skoler.

Som anført i artikel 17 i Traktaten om Den Europæiske Union er Kommissionens beføjelser begrænset til at føre tilsyn med gennemførelsen af EU-retten under Den Europæiske Unions Domstols kontrol. Kommissionen kan derfor ikke på et generelt plan vurdere, hvorvidt »sharia« er forenelig med de demokratiske retsstatsprincipper eller med den europæiske menneskerettighedskonvention.

Kommissionen minder om, at EU-retten såvel som medlemsstaterne, når disse gennemfører den, skal respektere de rettigheder, der en nedfældet i Den Europæiske Unions charter om grundlæggende rettigheder, og Kommissionen er forpligtet til at sikre respekten for disse rettigheder.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006722/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Sharia and democratic principles of the rule of law

Further to its answer to my Question E-003930/2012, could the Commission specify what it means when it says that 'sharia' is a general concept that encompasses several legal aspects and is subject to varying interpretations, both in the countries where it is applied and among 'specialists'? In that connection, can it also clarify what forms of sharia it considers are compatible with democratic principles of the rule of law and the European Convention on Human Rights?

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

According to information available to the European Commission, 'Sharia' includes rules on many issues addressed by secular law, such as crime, marriage, divorce and inheritance, and the interpretation of these rules vary between cultures as well as between different schools of thought and scholarship.

As stated in Article 17 of the Treaty on European Union, the powers of the Commission are limited to overseeing the application of Union law under the control of the Court of Justice of the European Union. The Commission cannot therefore assess at a general level the compatibility of 'Sharia' with democratic principles of the rule of law or the European Convention on Human Rights.

The Commission recalls that any EU legislation as well as the Member States, when implementing the EC law, must respect the rights enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and the Commission is committed to ensuring the respect for these rights.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-006723/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4. juli 2012)

Om: Alkohollåse i biler

Som bekendt forbyder artikel 34 i TEUF enhver restriktion i ind- eller udførsel af varer. Artikel 36 i TEUF foreskriver imidlertid en række undtagelser, dvs. situationer, hvor restriktioner er lovlige. Der er for tiden megen debat om indførelse af krav om alkohollåse i nye biler. Spørgsmålet er imidlertid, om dette ville være en restriktion efter artikel 34 og i givet fald, om det ville være lovligt efter artikel 36 eller de såkaldte Cassis-hensyn, som retfærdiggør krav, der søger at værne om et naturligt og nødvendigt gode.

Mener Kommissionen, at det vil stride mod en medlemsstats forpligtelser over for EU, hvis den pågældende stat indfører et generelt krav om alkohollås i alle biler, der sælges i det pågældende land?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Antonio Tajani
(13. august 2012)

Alkohollåse er anordninger, der installeres i motorkøretøjer. Alkohollåsen hindrer motoren i at starte, før føreren har åndet ud i anordningen, og alkoholtesten har analyseret koncentrationen af alkohol som værende under en bestemt grænse.

Typegodkendelse af motorkøretøjer er harmoniseret på EU-niveau med det grundlæggende pricip, at alle medlemsstater tillader registrering af motorkøretøjer, der har en europæisk typegodkendelse udstedt af en typegodkendende myndighed i en af EU's medlemsstater. Artikel 4, stk. 3, andet afsnit, i direktiv 2007/46/EF foreskriver, at medlemsstaterne »ikke må forbyde, begrænse eller hindre registrering af […] køretøjer, […], af grunde vedrørende deres konstruktion og funktioner, hvis de opfylder kravene i dette direktiv«.

De gældende EU-typegodkendelsesregler omfatter ikke bestemmelser om alkohollåse. Lovgivningen foreskriver ikke sådanne låse og omfatter ingen krav, der skal opfyldes, når sådanne alkohollåse installeres i motorkøretøjer.

Følgelig kan medlemsstaterne på grundlag af artikel 4 i direktiv 2007/46/EF ikke forbyde registrering af EU-typegodkendte køretøjer med den begrundelse, at de ikke de er udstyret med alkohollåse.

Da EU-typegodkendelse af nye køretøjer er fuldt ud harmoniseret ved direktiv 2007/46/EF, finder artikel 34 og 36 TEUF ikke anvendelse.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006723/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Alcohol interlocks in cars

As is well known, Article 34 TFEU prohibits any restriction on the import and export of goods. However, Article 36 TFEU provides for a number of exceptions, i.e. situations in which restrictions are lawful. At present there is a lively debate on introducing a requirement for alcohol interlocks to be installed in new cars. However, the question is whether this would be a restriction within the meaning of Article 34 and, if so, whether it would be lawful in accordance with Article 36 or the *Cassis de Dijon* judgment, which justifies requirements that seek to protect a natural or necessary interest.

Does the Commission consider that it would conflict with a Member State's obligations towards the EU if that state introduced a requirement for alcohol interlocks in all cars sold on its territory?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(13 August 2012)

Alcohol interlocks are devices which are installed in motor vehicles. The device prevents the engine from being started before the driver has exhaled into the device and the breath-alcohol concentration has been analysed as being below a certain threshold.

Type approval of motor vehicles is harmonised at EU level, with the underlying principle that all Member States allow for the registration of motorvehicles which have received a European type approval by a type approval authority in Member State of the Union. Article 4 (3) 2nd subparagraph of Directive 2007/46/EC provides that Member States 'shall not prohibit, restrict or impede the registration […] of vehicles […] on grounds related to aspects of their construction and functioning covered by this directive, if they satisfy the requirements of the latter.'

Current EU type approval legislation does not include any legislation on alcohol interlocks. In particular, it neither prescribes such lock, nor does it provide certain requirements to be fulfilled in case such locks are fitted on motor vehicles.

Accordingly, on the basis of Article 4, Member States may under Directive 2007/46/EC not refuse the registration of EU-type approved vehicles on the grounds that they are constructed without such a device.

As the EU-type approval for new vehicles is fully harmonised by Directive 2007/46/EC, Articles 34 and 36 TFEU do not apply.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006724/12
aan de Commissie
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE) en Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE)
(4 juli 2012)

Betreft: Green eMotion project

Het Green eMotion project, een grensoverschrijdend initiatief dat tot 2015 loopt en met name wordt gefinancierd uit het Zevende Kaderprogramma, wil elektrische mobiliteit in heel Europa bevorderen. In enkele geselecteerde Europese modelregio's zullen de 42 initiatiefpartners, bestaande uit industriële bedrijven en autoconstructeurs, elektriciteitsmaatschappijen, gemeentebesturen, universiteiten, technologie- en onderzoeksinstellingen, hun kennis en ervaring inbrengen, uitwisselen en verder uitbouwen.

Op 19 juni, tijdens de EU Sustainable Energy Week, hebben de commissarissen Oettinger en Kallas een stap naar de „electromobility age" genomen door twee laadpalen voor elektrisch vervoer in gebruik te nemen. Deze twee laadpalen, maken deel uit van het Green eMotion project. Door het stimuleren van elektrisch rijden door eigen mensen draagt de Commissie bij aan duurzaamheid in de leefomgeving. Ook de maatschappij wil dat zoveel mogelijk doen. Regelmatig vragen organisaties, die naar het Europees Parlement komen om te praten over zaken op het gebied van duurzame energie, dan ook of zij met hun elektrische auto naar Brussel kunnen komen.

1. Is de Commissie bereid om in het kader van het Green eMotion project, of anderszins, ook bij het Europees Parlement enkele laadpalen te plaatsen die door werknemers en bezoekers gebruikt kunnen worden?

2. In hoeverre verwacht de Commissie dat de ontwikkeling van uniforme Europese processen, normen en IT-oplossingen afgerond kan worden binnen het actieprogramma van het Green eMotion project?

3. Verwacht de Commissie het Green eMotion project voort te zetten binnen bijvoorbeeld het Horizon 2020-programma en zo ja, welke nieuwe prioriteiten wil zij daarbij stellen en worden daarbij nieuwe testregio's aangewezen?

4. Is de Commissie bekend met het „Verdrag van Vaals", de samenwerkingsovereenkomst tussen de Nederlandse stichting e-laad, het Duitse ladenetz.de, het Belgische Blue Corner, het Luxemburgse Enovos, het Oostenrijkse Vlotte, het Portugese Mobi-E en het Ierse ESB eCars, die grensoverschrijdend opladen en betalen mogelijk maakt?

5. Is de Commissie bereid om deze samenwerkingsovereenkomst verder te promoten, bijvoorbeeld door deze overeenkomst te betrekken bij het Green eMotion project?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(8 augustus 2012)

1. De Europese Commissie zou het toejuichen als het Europees Parlement belangstelling toont voor het plaatsen van laadpalen bij zijn gebouwen. De Commissie zal aan de projectcoördinator vragen om hierover contact op te nemen met de administratie van het Europees Parlement.

2. Uniforme Europese processen, normen en voorschriften inzake elektromobiliteit dienen te worden uitgestippeld door de betrokken normalisatie-instellingen. De Europese Commissie heeft de CEN-CENELEC opdracht gegeven om een gemeenschappelijke norm te ontwikkelen voor het opladen van elektrische stekkervoertuigen

3. Green eMotion is een project met een vast tijdschema overeenkomstig de voorschriften van het zevende kaderprogramma en loopt tot maart 2015. Er zijn nog geen werkzaamheden gepland voor het volgende kader 2014-2020. Het is al wel duidelijk wat de prioriteiten voor onderzoek en technologische ontwikkeling van de voornaamste vervoerstechnologieën op lange termijn zijn: die liggen op het gebied van elektriciteit en zijn met name gericht op het optimaliseren van de elektrische architectuur van elektrische voertuigen, de integratie ervan in het elektriciteitsnet en de oplaadinfrastructuur.

4. In het kader van het Green eMotion-project zijn er besprekingen gaande over het „Verdrag van Vaals".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006724/12
to the Commission
Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE) and Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE)
(4 July 2012)

Subject: Green eMotion project

The Green eMotion project, a cross-border initiative that runs until 2015 and is funded partly from the Seventh Framework Programme, seeks to promote electric mobility throughout Europe. In a number of selected European demonstration regions the 42 initiative partners, including industrial concerns and car manufacturers, electricity companies, local authorities, universities, technology and research establishments, will contribute, exchange and build on their knowledge and experience.

On 19 June 2012, during EU Sustainable Energy Week, Commissioners Oettinger and Kallas took a step into the 'electromobility age' by inaugurating two electric-vehicle charging stations. These two charging stations form part of the Green eMotion project. By encouraging electric motoring among its own staff the Commission is contributing to sustainability in the living environment. Society too wants to do as much as it can to that end. Accordingly, organisations visiting the European Parliament to talk about sustainable energy-related matters regularly ask whether they can come to Brussels with their electric cars.

1. Is the Commission prepared, in the context of the Green eMotion project or otherwise, to place a few vehicle charging stations at the European Parliament too, for use by staff and visitors?

2. To what extent does the Commission think it will be possible for the development of uniform European processes, standards and IT solutions to be completed within the action programme of the Green eMotion project?

3. Does the Commission expect to continue the Green eMotion project within the Horizon 2020 programme, for example, and if so, what new priorities will it set, and will new demonstration regions be designated?

4. Is the Commission aware of the 'Treaty of Vaals', the cooperation agreement between the Dutch foundation e-laad, the German ladenetz.de, the Belgian Blue Corner, Enovos from Luxembourg, Vlotte from Austria, Mobi-E from Portugal and ESB eCars from Ireland, which permits cross-border vehicle charging and payment?

5. Is the Commission prepared to give further promotion to this cooperation agreement, for example by involving it in the Green eMotion project?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2012)

1. The European Commission would welcome the interest of the European Parliament to have EU charging stations installed in its premises. The Commission will ask the project promoter to contact the EP administration on the subject.

2. Uniform European processes, standards and regulations on electromobility need to be established through the appropriate standardisation bodies. The European Commission has given a mandate to CEN/Cenelec to develop a common standard for a plug in electric vehicles charging.

3. Green eMotion is a project with a fixed time-schedule following FP7 rules and will end in March 2015. No specific actions are currently planned for the next framework 2014-2020 but electricity, in particular optimising the electrical architecture for electrified vehicles, grid integration and charging infrastructure, have been identified as long-term priorities for future research and technological development of key transport technologies.

4. Discussions on the 'Treaty of Vaals' are ongoing within the Green e-Motion project.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-006727/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(5 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εμπορικές συμφωνίες Κίνας-Mercosur, επιπτώσεις και προοπτικές για την ΕΕ

Σύμφωνα με την ανακοίνωση ([1]) της Γενικής Διεύθυνσης Εμπορίου (DG TRADE) της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής μετά την ολοκλήρωση του 8ου γύρου διαπραγματεύσεων με τα κράτη μέλη της Mercosur, επετεύχθη πρόοδος σε μία σειρά ζητημάτων (υπηρεσίες, δημόσιες συμβάσεις κ.ά). Όσον αφορά τον τομέα του εμπορίου, αναφέρεται πως οι δύο πλευρές προσδιόρισαν τις θέσεις και τις προσδοκίες τους. Επίσης τονίζεται πως ο επόμενος γύρος των διαπραγματεύσεων θα πραγματοποιηθεί τον τρέχοντα μήνα Ιούλιο 2012. Ωστόσο, σύμφωνα με την κινεζική κυβέρνηση ([2]), τον Ιούνιο του 2012 υπεγράφησαν επιμέρους συμφωνίες με τις χώρες της Mercosur, με ορίζοντα δεκαετίας, σε καίριους τομείς όπως η καινοτομία, η ενέργεια, η αξιοποίηση του ορυκτού πλούτου, οι επενδύσεις κ.ά, ενώ ο κινέζος πρωθυπουργός πρότεινε το διπλασιασμό του όγκου των εμπορικών συναλλαγών μεταξύ των δύο πλευρών στα 200 δισ. δολ. αλλά και τη δρομολόγηση μίας μελέτης σκοπιμότητας για τη δημιουργία ζώνης ελεύθερων συναλλαγών. Με βάση τα προαναφερθέντα, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς αντιμετωπίζει τις προαναφερόμενες συμφωνίες μεταξύ Κίνας και των χωρών της Mercosur; Τέτοιες συμφωνίες δυσχεραίνουν τις προσπάθειες της ΕΕ για την ολοκλήρωση των διμερών συμφωνιών με τη Mercosur, δεδομένων μάλιστα και των πολιτικών εξελίξεων στην Αργεντινή και την Παραγουάη;

2. Θεωρεί πως οι προαναφερόμενες συμφωνίες θα επηρεάσουν αρνητικά τις διαπραγματεύσεις και τις συναλλαγές της ΕΕ με τη ζώνη Mercosur και, αν ναι, σε ποιους τομείς; Διαθέτει σχετικές εκτιμήσεις για την εξέλιξη των οικονομικών σχέσεων και συνεργασιών μεταξύ ΕΕ και χωρών Mercosur ενόψει των διεθνών δεδομένων;

Απάντηση του κ. De Gucht εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Ιουλίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δεν θεωρεί ότι οι πρωτοβουλίες της Κίνας να ξεκινήσει διαπραγματεύσεις για μια συμφωνία ελεύθερων συναλλαγών με τις χώρες της Mercosur, ο διμερής διάλογος και οι συμφωνίες συνεργασίας που συνήψε η Κίνα με τις επιμέρους χώρες της Mercosur, ή η δήλωση των ηγετών της Κίνας και των χωρών της Mercosur όσον αφορά το κοινό στόχο τους για την περαιτέρω ανάπτυξη των εμπορικών τους σχέσεων θα επηρεάσουν αρνητικά τη διαδικασία διαπραγμάτευσης που βρίσκεται σε εξέλιξη μεταξύ της ΕΕ και της Mercosur. Οι πρωτοβουλίες αυτές αντικατοπτρίζουν τις προσπάθειες των χωρών της Mercosur να εφαρμόσουν μια ενεργητική εμπορική πολιτική απέναντι στους βασικούς εμπορικούς εταίρους της. Αξίζει επίσης να σημειωθεί ότι η ΕΕ είναι ο μοναδικός εμπορικός εταίρος με τον οποίο η Mercosur έχει αρχίσει ήδη διαπραγματεύσεις για μια ζώνη ελεύθερων συναλλαγών και δεν υπάρχουν μέχρι στιγμής ενδείξεις ότι η Mercosur προτίθεται να ξεκινήσει, στο άμεσο μέλλον, διαπραγματεύσεις για μια συμφωνία ελεύθερων συναλλαγών με την Κίνα.

Η Επιτροπή λαμβάνει υπό σημείωση τις πρόσφατες πολιτικές εξελίξεις στο πλαίσιο της Mercosur με την αποπομπή της Παραγουάης και την προσχώρηση της Βενεζουέλας. Η Επιτροπή θα συνεχίσει να παρακολουθεί από κοντά την κατάσταση στην περιοχή. Θα πρέπει, ωστόσο, να σημειωθεί ότι η ΕΕ διεξάγει διαπραγματεύσεις με τη Mercosur ως περιφέρεια και όχι διμερώς με τα επιμέρους κράτη της.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=787.
([2]) http://english.gov.cn/2012-06/28/content_2172546.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006727/12
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Trade agreements between China and Mercosur — implications and prospects for the EU

Following the eighth round of negotiations with the Mercosur countries, the Commission's Directorate-General for Trade indicated that progress had been made on a number of issues ([1]) (services, public procurement, etc.). With regard to trade, both sides clarified their positions and expectations. It was decided that the next round of negotiations would be held in July 2012. However, the Chinese Government has indicated ([2]) that in June 2012 ten-year agreements were signed with individual Mercosur countries in areas such as innovation, energy, mineral exploitation, investment etc. The Chinese leader also recommended doubling the trade volume with Mercosur to USD 2 billion and initiating a feasibility study on a free trade area pact between China and Mercosur.

In view of this:

1. What is the Commission's opinion of the agreements between China and the Mercosur countries referred to above? Are such agreements hampering EU efforts to conclude bilateral agreements with Mercosur, given political developments in Argentina and Paraguay?

2. Does it consider that these agreements will unfavourably affect negotiations and trade between the EU and the Mercosur countries and, if so, in which sectors? Does it have information regarding anticipated developments in economic relations and cooperation between the EU and the Mercosur countries in the light of international events?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(27 July 2012)

The Commission does not consider that the initiatives proposed by China to start negotiations for a Free Trade Agreement (FTA) with Mercosur, the bilateral dialogue and cooperation agreements concluded by China and individual Mercosur countries, or the declaration by China and Mercosur leaders regarding their common objective to further develop their trade relations will negatively impact on the negotiating process currently ongoing between the EU and Mercosur. These initiatives reflect the attempts by Mercosur to develop an active trade policy vis-à-vis its main trade partners. It should also be noted that the EU is the only major trade partner with which Mercosur is currently engaged in the negotiations for a FTA and that there are no indications so far that Mercosur could soon start FTA negotiations with China.

The Commission takes note of the recent political developments in Mercosur with the suspension of Paraguay and the entry of Venezuela. The Commission will continue to closely monitor the situation in the region. It should, however, be noted that the EU negotiates with Mercosur as a region and not with individual Mercosur countries bilaterally.

([1]) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/press/index.cfm?id=787
([2]) http://english.gov.cn/2012-06/28/content_2172546.htm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-006729/12
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(5 iulie 2012)

Subiect: Atacuri împotriva Curții Constituționale din România

Guvernul României a adoptat la data de 4 iulie a.c. Ordonanța de Urgență pentru modificarea Legii de organizare și funcționare a Curții Constituționale (Legea nr. 47/1992), prin care limitează atribuțiile Curții Constituționale, retrăgându-i competența de a se pronunța asupra constituționalității hotărârilor Parlamentului.

Este un atac grav asupra unei instituții fundamentale pentru respectarea și funcționarea statului de drept din România.

Având în vedere că această decizie contravine standardelor și principiilor europene, ce măsuri intenționează să ia Comisia, în calitate de garant al tratatelor, pentru a sancționa nerespectarea statului de drept, a separării puterilor în stat și a principiilor democratice fundamentale de către Guvernul roman?

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(2 august 2012)

În urma evenimentelor din vara anului 2012, Comisia și-a exprimat profunda preocupare în ceea ce privește statul de drept și independența sistemului judiciar din România. Raportul Comisiei ([1]), în temeiul mecanismului de cooperare și verificare, publicat la 18 iulie 2012, a analizat progresele înregistrate în România în ultimii cinci ani, inclusiv cele mai recente evoluții. Raportul cuprinde o serie de recomandări urgente care au făcut deja obiectul angajamentelor pe care prim-ministrul Ponta și le-a asumat față de președintele Barroso.

Printre recomandările formulate de Comisie, și angajamentele corespunzătoare asumate de prim-ministrul Ponta, se numără abrogarea ordonanțelor de urgență cu privire la competențele Curții Constituționale și la cvorumul pentru referendumul legat de demiterea președintelui, respectarea deciziilor Curții Constituționale și a Constituției României. Recomandările se referă, de asemenea, la procedura de numire în posturile importante, inclusiv Avocatul Poporului, Procurorul General al României, procurorul-șef al Direcției Naționale Anticorupție, la evitarea acordării grațierilor prezidențiale în cursul președinției interimare și la abținerea de la numirea pe post de ministru a persoanelor care au făcut obiectul unor hotărâri nefavorabile în ceea ce privește integritatea. Recomandările abordează, de asemenea, aspecte legate de adoptarea procedurilor referitoare la demisia parlamentarilor împotriva cărora au fost pronunțate hotărâri definitive privind incompatibilitatea, conflictul de interese și acte de corupție la nivel înalt.

Comisia va monitoriza situația, pentru a verifica dacă recomandările sunt respectate, iar angajamentele prim-ministrului Ponta onorate. Aplicarea rapidă și în mod riguros a recomandărilor formulate în temeiul MCV va contribui la asigurarea unui mediu economic stabil, credibil și favorabil investițiilor și la reasigurarea piețelor financiare.

([1]) Disponibil la adresa: http://ec.europa.eu/cvm/index_ro.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006729/12
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Attacks on the Romanian Constitutional Court

On 4 July 2012 the Romanian Government adopted an emergency ordinance amending the Law on the Organisation and Functioning of the Constitutional Court (Law No 47/1992), in so doing curtailing the Court's remit by depriving it of the power to rule on the constitutionality of decisions taken in Parliament.

This is a serious attack on an institution central to compliance with, and the operation of, the rule of law in Romania.

Bearing in mind that the government decision is contrary to European standards and principles, what steps does the Commission, as the guardian of the Treaties, intend to take with a view to imposing a penalty for the Romanian Government's failure to observe the rule of law, the separation of powers, and essential democratic principles?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2012)

Due to the events in the Summer 2012, the Commission has raised serious concerns for the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary in Romania. The Commission's report ([1]) under the Cooperation and Verification mechanism, published on 18th July 2012, took stock of the progress made in Romania over the last five years, including the most recent developments. The report includes a number of urgent recommendations, which have already been the subject of commitments made by Prime Minister Ponta to President Barroso.

These recommendations by the Commission, and the corresponding commitments by Prime Minister Ponta, include the repeal of emergency ordinances regarding the powers of the Constitutional Court and the eligibility rules for the referendum on the impeachment of the President, the respect for decisions of the Constitutional Court and of the Romanian Constitution. They also relate to the appointments procedure for key positions including the Ombudsman, the General Prosecutor of Romania and the Chief Prosecutor of the National Anti-Corruption Directorate, and to refraining from Presidential pardons during the interim Presidency and from appointing ministers with negative integrity rulings. They also cover the adoption of procedures regarding the resignation of Members of Parliament with final decisions on incompatibility, conflict of interest and high-level corruption.

The Commission will monitor the situation to verify whether its recommendations are followed and Prime Minister Ponta's commitments honoured. Urgent and rigorous implementation of the recommendations under the CVM will contribute to ensure a stable, credible and investment-friendly economic environment and to reassure financial markets.

([1]) Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/cvm/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006730/12
a la Comisión
Andres Perello Rodriguez (S&D), Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D) y Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D)
(5 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Incendios en la Comunidad Valenciana

Los incendios forestales están devastando con dureza este año la Comunidad Valenciana en España. En concreto, el fuego ha alcanzado ya a más de 22 municipios, entre los que se encuentran Cortes de Pallás y Andilla, las dos zonas más afectadas por la catástrofe. Se han quemado ya más de 50 000 hectáreas, más de 3 000 personas han tenido que ser evacuadas y una persona ha fallecido. Por lo que respecta a los ecosistemas de pino autóctono, se calcula que van a ser necesarios más de 40 años para su regeneración.

Teniendo en cuenta que, tanto desde el Parlamento Europeo como desde la misma Comisión Europea, se ha venido incidiendo en la prevención como uno de los principales elementos de las políticas de lucha contra los incendios forestales, no se comprende cómo las autoridades españolas y valencianas no han realizado mayores esfuerzos en políticas de prevención y que se haya reducido casi un 14 % de presupuesto en extinción de incendios. Cabe recordar que la Agencia Estatal de Meteorología (AEMET) ya había lanzado el pasado mes de marzo partes con previsiones alarmantes para el verano, sin que ello sirviera para que el Gobierno activara los protocolos de actuación contra la sequía existentes y sin que se plantearan los mecanismos de prevención ni la planificación de los medios de extinción de incendios necesarios para dar adecuada respuesta a una alerta semejante.

Visto el alcance catastrófico de los incendios mencionados:

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que el Fondo de Solidaridad debe liberar fondos para paliar los daños producidos por esta catástrofe?

2. ¿Considera la Comisión que, a la luz de las alertas planteadas y teniendo en cuenta lo recogido en las recomendaciones europeas sobre la lucha contra la sequía y los incendios, se debería adoptar un paquete legislativo en materia de prevención y de coordinación para que una catástrofe ecológica de esta magnitud no vuelva a producirse en la UE?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(20 de agosto de 2012)

1. El Fondo de Solidaridad solo puede activarse en respuesta a una solicitud de las autoridades nacionales presentada en el plazo de diez semanas a partir del primer daño causado por los incendios; la Comisión no puede activar el Fondo por iniciativa propia. La Comisión está en contacto con las autoridades españolas que aún no han comunicado si presentarán una solicitud. La ayuda financiera dependería también del cumplimiento de las condiciones establecidas en el Reglamento (CE) n° 2012/2002 del Consejo ([1]). Normalmente, el Fondo puede intervenir en caso de catástrofe cuando los daños totales superan un umbral que en el caso de España se sitúa actualmente en 3 600 millones de euros. Solo en casos muy excepcionales el Fondo de Solidaridad podría intervenir también en catástrofes de menor magnitud.

2. Por lo que se refiere a la legislación vigente y la prevención de incendios forestales en general, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-6907/2012.

El 20 de diciembre de 2011 la Comisión presentó una propuesta legislativa ([2]) para reforzar el Mecanismo de Protección Civil ([3]) de la Unión con vistas a garantizar una respuesta de la UE a las catástrofes más eficiente, eficaz, coherente y visible, en aras de mejorar la preparación e integrar los instrumentos de planificación de la política de prevención y gestión de riesgos.

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 2012/2002 del Consejo, de 11 de noviembre de 2002, por el que se crea el Fondo de Solidaridad de la Unión Europea (DO L 311 de 14.11.2002, p. 3).
([2]) COM(2011) 934 final.
([3]) Decisión 2007/779/CE, Euratom del Consejo, de 8 de noviembre de 2007, por la que se establece un Mecanismo Comunitario de Protección Civil (Refundición).

La Comisión vela también por que en la aplicación, la revisión y el desarrollo de la legislación aplicable y de los instrumentos de financiación de la UE se tomen en consideración los problemas de gestión de catástrofes; por ejemplo, las propuestas de política de cohesión para el periodo 2014-2020 incluyen disposiciones reforzadas sobre la prevención y la gestión de riesgos.

Además, para afrontar el reto planteado por la sequía y la escasez de agua, la Comisión ha adoptado una Comunicación ([4]) en la que presenta las opciones de actuación a nivel europeo, nacional y regional.

([4]) COM(2007) 414 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006730/12
to the Commission
Andres Perello Rodriguez (S&D), Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D) and Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Forest fires in the Valencian Community

This year the Valencian Community (Spain) is being devastated by forest fires, which have already affected more than 22 municipalities, including Cortes de Pallás and Andilla, the two areas most seriously affected by the disaster. Over 50 000 hectares have already been burnt to the ground, more than 3 000 people have had to be evacuated and one person has died. It has been calculated that it will take over 40 years to regenerate the native pine forests.

In view of the fact that both Parliament and the Commission have long insisted on prevention as a key element of policies to combat forest fires, it is incomprehensible that the Spanish and Valencian authorities have not made greater efforts to apply preventive policies and that the fire-fighting budget has been cut by almost 14%. It should be remembered that although the Spanish State Meteorological Agency (AEMET) issued alarming forecast bulletins for the summer months earlier this year, the Government failed to activate the existing anti-drought mechanisms or propose any prevention or fire-fighting plans with which to provide an adequate response to these warnings.

Given the catastrophic dimensions of the abovementioned fires:

1. Does the Commission consider that the Solidarity Fund should provide resources with which to mitigate the damage caused by this disaster?

2. Does the Commission not feel that, given the warnings and in light of the terms of European policy on preventing and combating droughts and forest fires, it would be advisable to adopt a legislative package addressing prevention and coordination, in order to ensure that no further environmental disasters on this scale take place within the EU?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2012)

1. The Solidarity Fund could only be activated on the basis of an application from the national authorities to be presented within 10 weeks of the first damage caused by the fires; the Commission may not activate the Fund upon its own initiative. The Commission is in contact with the Spanish authorities who have not yet communicated whether an application will be submitted. Financial aid would also depend on whether the conditions laid down in the Council Regulation 2012/2002 ([1]) are met. The Fund may normally intervene in cases of disasters where total damage exceeds a threshold which for Spain is currently at EUR 3.6 billion. Only in very exceptional cases the Solidarity Fund could also intervene for smaller disasters.

2. As regards existing legislation and other forest fire prevention in general, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-6907/2012.

On 20 December 2011 the Commission submitted a legislative proposal ([2]) strengthening the Union Mechanism for civil protection ([3]) with a view to ensure a more efficient, effective, coherent and visible EU disaster response, to increase the level of preparedness and to integrate prevention policy and risk management planning instruments.

The Commission is also ensuring that the implementation, review and further development of relevant EU legislation and funding instruments take into account disaster management concerns, e.g. the proposals for cohesion policy for the period 2014-2020 include strengthened provisions regarding risk prevention and management.

In addition, to address the challenge posed by droughts and water scarcity the Commission adopted a communication ([4]) presenting policy options to be addressed at European, national and regional levels.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 of 11 November 2002 establishing the European Union Solidarity Fund, OJ L 311, 14.11.2002.
([2]) COM(2011) 934 final.
([3]) Council Decision 2007/779/EC, Euratom of 8 November 2007 establishing a Community Civil Protection Mechanism (recast).
([4]) COM(2007) 414 final.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006731/12
a la Comisión
María Muñiz De Urquiza (S&D), Antonio Masip Hidalgo (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), Miguel Angel Martínez Martínez (S&D) y Inés Ayala Sender (S&D)
(5 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Viabilidad de las inversiones europeas en tecnologías limpias del carbón

La UE aporta el 43 % de la inversión total de 251,1 millones de euros prevista para la financiación de la Ciudad de la Energía de Compostilla en España. Se trata de uno de los seis proyectos de Captura y Almacenamiento de Carbono, junto a los de Hatfield (UK), Rotterdam (NL), Porto Tolle (IT), Belchatow (PL) y Janschwalde (DE) cofinanciados por la UE. Para España es una iniciativa muy importante que amplía el horizonte tecnológico de la industria española y su competitividad y que se enmarca en el esfuerzo por reducir los efectos contaminantes de la quema de carbón en línea con los objetivos de lucha contra el cambio climático. Además, se ha construido en Cubillos del Sil un centro de experimentación pionero en el mundo (Programa de Oxicombustión y Captura de CO_2) que busca la determinación de la viabilidad técnica y económica de diferentes opciones de captura de CO_2.

Para el trienio 2012-2015 se preveía un presupuesto total de 133,5 millones, de los que casi un 40 % (45,3 millones de fondos europeos). Estos fondos proceden de diferentes proyectos de investigación financiados, entre otras fuentes por el Séptimo Programa Marco de I+D de la UE.

1. ¿Es consciente la Comisión de que el proyecto de la Ciudad de la Energía está en peligro y que ya se les ha anunciado a los trabajadores de la parte de desarrollo territorial del proyecto un expediente de regulación de empleo que amenaza el puesto de trabajo de más de 200 personas?

2. ¿Qué opina la Comisión del mantenimiento o no de estas inversiones que suponen un futuro puntal de la investigación de soluciones viables para reducir las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero en las centrales térmicas?

3. ¿Considera la Comisión que un cierre prematuro de las explotaciones mineras en España puede poner en riesgo este proyecto?

4. ¿Cree la Comisión que contar con una producción autóctona en España de carbón tiene efectos positivos sobre el proyecto de la Ciudad de la Energía de Compostilla?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de agosto de 2012)

1 y 2. Ciuden (Ciudad de la Energía) se beneficia de la financiación aportada por la UE a varios proyectos, entre ellos el de Compostilla, que ha recibido 180 millones EUR del Programa Energético Europeo para la Recuperación (PEER). Ciuden se propone, junto con otros dos socios, llevar a cabo la demostración de una planta de captura y almacenamiento de carbono a escala industrial. La Comisión, que desconoce la existencia en Ciuden de un plan de reducción de personal, no interviene en las decisiones de gestión de los beneficiarios, si bien trata siempre de garantizar que las actividades acordadas contractualmente en cada proyecto se ejecuten de forma satisfactoria.

3 y 4. Los centros de investigación de la captura y almacenamiento de carbono, como lo es Ciuden, no deben vincularse a la existencia de una industria nacional del carbón ni al cierre de las actividades mineras de un país. Por el contrario, de lo que dependen más es del mix energético a medio y largo plazo que elija el país o del grado de ambición que tenga este para desarrollar en el sector de las tecnologías de captura y almacenamiento de carbono una industria líder exportadora.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006731/12
to the Commission
María Muñiz De Urquiza (S&D), Antonio Masip Hidalgo (S&D), Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), Miguel Angel Martínez Martínez (S&D) and Inés Ayala Sender (S&D)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Viability of European investment in carbon-free technologies

The Compostilla Energy City (Spain), for which the EU is providing 43% of the total investment budget of EUR 251.1 million, is one of six carbon capture and storage projects being co-financed by the EU. The others are Hatfield (UK), Rotterdam (the Netherlands), Porto Tolle (Italy), Belchatow (Poland) and Janschwalde (Germany). For Spain, the project is an extremely important one which expands the technological horizon and competitiveness of the country's industry and forms part of effort to reduce the polluting effects of carbon emissions, in line with climate change objectives. Furthermore, a pioneering technology development centre has been built in Cubillos del Sil — the Oxycombustion and Carbon Capture Programme — to determine the technical and economic viability of different ways of capturing CO_2.

A total budget of EUR 133.5 million was assigned for the three-year period from 2012 to 2015, of which almost 40% (EUR 45.3 million) came from European funds. This funding came from a number of research programmes financed by, among other sources, the EU's 7th Framework Programme for research and development.

1. Is the Commission aware that the Energy City project is in danger, and that employees working on the spatial development of the project have already been informed of a labour force adjustment plan which threatens over 200 of their jobs?

2. How does the Commission view the continuation or suspension of this investment, which represents a future cornerstone of research into viable ways of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from power plants?

3. Does the Commission consider that the premature closure of mines in Spain may place this project at risk?

4. Does the Commission believe that the existence of an autochthonous coal mining industry in Spain has positive implications for the Compostilla Energy City project?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(16 August 2012)

1 and 2. Ciuden (Ciudad de la Energia) is a beneficiary in several EU-funded projects, including the Compostilla project which was awarded EUR 180 m from the European Energy Recovery Programme (EEPR). In this project Ciuden, together with two other partners, is pursuing the demonstration of a carbon capture and storage (CCS) facility at industrial scale. The Commission is not aware of any plans to reduce personnel at Ciuden and does not get involved in management decisions of the beneficiaries, but seeks to ensure that the activities contractually agreed in each project are satisfactorily implemented.

3 and 4. A CCS Research Institution, such as Ciuden, should not be linked to the existence of an indigenous coal industry or the closure of mining activities in a given country. Instead it is more dependent on the mid-and long term energy mix chosen by a country or its ambitions to build a leading CCS technology exporting industry.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006732/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(5. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Gletscherschmelze in den Alpen

Seit Jahrzehnten schmelzen die Alpengletscher in erschreckendem Ausmaße. Dies wird gravierende Auswirkungen auf die Umwelt haben, denn Gletscher sind Wasserspeicher, sie halten Niederschläge zurück und verhindern Steinschlag und Erdrutsche. Dies wird zudem deutlich negative Auswirkungen auf Tourismus und die Freizeitgebiete in den Alpen haben.

1. Welche Maßnahmen hat die Kommission ergriffen, um dem Abschmelzen der Alpengletscher entgegenzuwirken?

2. Inwieweit sieht sie die Trinkwasserversorgung der Bevölkerung durch das Abschmelzen gefährdet?

3. Welche Unterstützung kommt den Tourismusgebieten und dem Naturerhalt hierbei zu?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(22. August 2012)

1. Das Abschmelzen der Alpengletscher ist eine Folge der Erderwärmung. Die EU hat das weltweit umfassendste Maßnahmenpaket zur Reduzierung der Treibhausgasemissionen geschnürt, und die Kommission entwickelt derzeit eine Anpassungsstrategie, um Europas Widerstandsfähigkeit gegen die Auswirkungen des Klimawandels, auch in den Alpenregionen, zu stärken. Die EU setzt sich für einen globalen und ehrgeizigeren Rechtsrahmen ein, der für alle Länder gelten, bis 2015 erstellt und ab 2020 umgesetzt werden soll, um den weltweiten Temperaturanstieg auf unter 2 °C gegenüber dem vorindustriellen Niveau zu begrenzen.

2. Was die Trinkwasserversorgung betrifft, sind die Mitgliedstaaten dafür verantwortlich, dass die Trinkwasserqualität den Forderungen der Richtlinie 98/83/EG des Rates [1] entspricht und dass das Risiko der Nichteinhaltung der festgesetzten Parameterwerte bewertet wird. Sollte ein solches Risiko bestehen, müssen die Mitgliedstaaten gemäß Artikel 8 der genannten Richtlinie sicherstellen, dass die zur Einhaltung der Werte erforderlichen Abhilfemaßnahmen ergriffen werden.

3. Nachhaltige und innovative Formen des Tourismus werden durch mehrere Finanz-instrumente der EU, insbesondere die Strukturfonds, gefördert. In der neuen Mitteilung „Europa — wichtigstes Reiseziel der Welt: ein neuer politischer Rahmen für den europäischen Tourismus“ werden mehrere konkrete Maßnahmen zur Förderung eines nachhaltigen, verantwortungsvollen und hochwertigen Tourismus vorgestellt. Was den Erhalt der Natur betrifft, so wird das Netz der in der Vogelschutzrichtlinie [2] bzw. der FFH-Richtlinie [3] festgelegten Natura-2000-Gebiete dazu beitragen, die Auswirkungen des Klimawandels abzumildern.

Schließlich stellt das Übereinkommen zum Schutz der Alpen (Alpenkonvention) für alle Beteiligten einen geeigneten Rahmen dar, um diese Fragen zu diskutieren und gemeinsame Lösungen zu finden.

---

[1] ABl. L 330 vom 5.12.1998.
[2] Richtlinie 2009/147/EG (kodifizierte Fassung, die die Richtlinie 79/409/EWG ersetzt), ABl. L 20 vom 26.1.2010.
[3] Richtlinie 92/43/EWG des Rates vom 21. Mai 1992 zur Erhaltung der natürlichen Lebensräume sowie der wildlebenden Tiere und Pflanzen, ABl. L 206 vom 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006732/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Melting of glaciers in the Alps

Glaciers in the Alps have been melting at an alarming rate for decades. This will have a serious impact on the environment, since glaciers store water, act as a brake on precipitation and reduce rockfalls and landslips. It will also have a markedly negative effect on tourism and recreational areas in the Alps.

1. What action has the Commission taken to counter the melting of glaciers in the Alps?

2. To what extent are the inhabitants' drinking water supplies put at risk by the glaciers melting?

3. What support is being given to tourist areas and nature conservation?

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

1. The melting of alpine glaciers is one impact of global warming. The EU has in place the world's most comprehensive set of measures for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The Commission is developing an adaptation strategy to strengthen Europe's resilience to climate change, including in alpine areas. The EU is committed to a global and more ambitious legal framework covering all countries to be finalised by 2015 and implemented from 2020 to limit global temperature increase to below 2°C compared to pre-industrial levels.

2. In relation to drinking water supplies, it is the Member State's responsibility to ensure that quality of drinking water meets the requirements of Council Directive 98/83/EC ([1]) and to assess the risk of non-compliance with the established parametric values. If there would be such a risk, Member States must in accordance with Article 8 of this directive ensure that the necessary remedial action is taken to ensure compliance.

3. Sustainable and innovative tourism practices are supported through various EU financial instruments, in particular the structural funds. The new Communication 'Europe, the world's No 1 tourist destination — a new political framework for tourism in Europe' highlights several concrete measures for the promotion of the development of sustainable, responsible and high-quality tourism. Concerning nature conservation, the network of Natura 2000 sites designated under the Birds ([2]) or the Habitats ([3]) Directives will contribute to help mitigate the effects of climate change.

Finally, the Alpine Convention provides an adequate framework for all concerned parties to discuss and tackle in common these issues.

([1]) OJ L 330, 5.12.1998.
([2]) Directive 2009/147/EC (codified version replacing Directive 79/409/EEC), OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.
([3]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006733/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(5. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: WHO stuft Dieselabgase als krebserregend ein

Die Weltgesundheitsorganisation (WHO) hat kürzlich bekannt gegeben, dass Dieselabgase als bei Menschen krebserregend einzustufen sind.

1. Welche Maßnahmen in Bezug auf Dieselkraftstoff gedenkt die Kommission zum Schutz der Bevölkerung vor diesem Hintergrund zu ergreifen?

2. Sieht sie bestimmte Bevölkerungsgruppen als besonders durch Dieselkraftstoffabgase gefährdet an?

3. Hält sie an ihren Plänen zur Besteuerung von Kraftstoffen gemäß ihrem jeweiligen Energiegehalt fest?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(17. August 2012)

1. In der EU wurden bereits strikte Grenzwerte (bezogen auf Masse und Anzahl) für Feinstaubemissionen von Neufahrzeugen festgelegt, die für LKW seit Januar 2012 gelten (Euro 6). Für PKW gelten solche Normen seit 2009 (Euro 5), und die Euro-6-Normen treten ab 2014 in Kraft. Aufgrund dieser Normen ist die Verwendung von Feinstaubfiltern für Neufahrzeuge obligatorisch (Euro 5), und die Emissionen von Vorläufern wie NOx werden weiter gesenkt (Euro 6). Mit der fortschreitenden Ersetzung von Alt- durch Neufahrzeuge in den kommenden Jahren wird sich die Exposition der Bevölkerung gegenüber Feinstaub und anderen bei der Verbrennung von Dieselkraftstoffen entstehenden Schadstoffen daher weiter verringern.

Darüber hinaus werden alle Maßnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten gefördert, mit denen die Erneuerung der Fahrzeugflotte beschleunigt werden soll. Die Nachrüstung von schweren Nutzfahrzeugen mit Feinstaubfiltern wird ebenfalls gefördert, und die Kommission beteiligt sich an der UNECE-Initative zur Festlegung geeigneter diesbezüglicher Normen.

2. Ja. Personen, die in städtischen Gebieten oder Gebieten mit hohem Verkehrsaufkommen leben oder arbeiten, sind generell Dieselabgasen stärker ausgesetzt und haben stärker unter schlechter Luftqualität zu leiden. Einige Mitgliedstaaten verringern die Exposition gegenüber u. a. Dieselabgasen, indem sie „Umweltzonen“ und „Niedrigemissionszonen“ ausweisen.

Die Europäische Kommission verfolgt fortlaufend einschlägige Informationen über die Auswirkungen von Emissionen auf die menschliche Gesundheit, um die EU-Rechtsvorschriften erforderlichenfalls anzupassen. Bei der für 2013 geplanten Überarbeitung der thematischen Strategie der EU zur Luftreinhaltung werden die Kosten und Nutzen der Reduzierung von Emissionen in die Luft aus allen bedeutenden Quellen (auch aus im Verkehrssektor verwendeten Dieselkraftstoffen) bewertet.

3. Ja.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006733/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: WHO classifies diesel exhaust as carcinogenic

The World Health Organisation (WHO) has recently announced that diesel exhaust will be classified as carcinogenic for humans.

1. In the light of this announcement, what action does the Commission plan to take with regard to diesel fuel in order to protect people?

2. Does it think that certain groups of people are particularly at risk from diesel fuel exhaust?

3. Is it keeping to its plan to impose duty on fuels according to their energy content?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

1. In the EU, strict mass and number limits for the emissions of particulates for new vehicles have already been defined and apply as from January 2012 for trucks (Euro VI). For cars, such standards apply as from September 2009 (Euro 5) with Euro 6 standards entering into force from 2014 onwards. These standards have the effect of making the use of particle filters obligatory for new vehicles (Euro 5) whilst further reducing its precursors such as NOx (Euro 6). The progressive replacement of old vehicles with new ones in the coming years will therefore lead to a further reduction in the exposure of citizens to particulates and other harmful pollutants derived from diesel combustion.

In addition, any measures by Member States to speed up the fleet renewal are encouraged. Also retrofitting heavy-duty vehicles with particulate filters is supported and the Commission is involved in the UNECE initiative defining the appropriate standards for this.

2. Yes, European citizens who live or work in urban areas or heavily trafficked zones are more exposed to diesel fumes and to bad air quality in general. Some Member States are reducing exposure to i.a. diesel fumes by deploying 'environmental zones' and 'low emission zones'

The European Commission is continuously monitoring relevant information about the influence of emissions on human health, in order to adapt EU legislation, if needed. The review of the EU Thematic Strategy on Air Pollution scheduled for 2013 will assess the costs and benefits of reduction in emissions to air from all significant sources, including diesel used by transport.

3. Yes.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006734/12
an die Kommission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(5. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Medienfreiheit in Polen — der Fall TV Trwam

TV Trwam ist ein seit dem 12. Juni 2003 existierender katholischer Fernsehsender in Polen. Im Januar 2012 verweigerte der polnische Rundfunkrat diesem Sender die Lizenz für die Ausstrahlung des im Sommer startenden digitalen terrestrischen Fernsehens DVB-T. Die Begründung hierfür war, dass für den digitalen Sendebetrieb keine ausreichenden finanziellen Sicherheiten nachgewiesen worden seien, da das Vermögen des Senders zum größten Teil aus einem Darlehen der polnischen Redemptoristen-Provinz bestehe. Damit sei nicht garantiert, dass TV Trwam die jährlichen Kosten der Digital-Frequenz von umgerechnet 2,25 Mio. EUR tragen könne. Die ablehnende Entscheidung des Rundfunkrates stieß auf massiven Protest in der polnischen Öffentlichkeit; so demonstrierten am 21. April 2012 in Warschau 20 000 Menschen gegen den Ablehnungsbescheid. Insbesondere die römisch-katholische Gemeinschaft sieht sich diskriminiert und die pluralistische Medienlandschaft in Gefahr. Die Entscheidung sei völlig intransparent, weil die Kriterien für die Konzessionsvergabe nicht klar definiert seien. Zudem sei die finanzielle Situation von TV Trwam besser als diejenige dreier anderer Sender, welche die Digital-Konzession erhielten (Lemon Records, Eska TV, Stavka TV).

Kann die Kommission vor diesem Hintergrund folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Ist der Kommission dieser Fall bekannt?

2. Sieht die Kommission hier einen Verstoß gegen Grundrechte wie das Gebot der Gleichbehandlung bzw. das Verbot von Diskriminierung sowie die Meinungsfreiheit?

3. Teilt die Kommission die Auffassung der Kritiker, dass der polnische Rundfunkrat eine intransparente und diskriminierende Entscheidung zuungunsten von TV Trwam gefällt hat sowie seiner originären Aufgabe, nämlich den Medienpluralismus zu gewährleisten, nicht nachgekommen ist?

4. Gedenkt die Kommission gegebenenfalls, im Sinne der Meinungs- und Medienfreiheit sowie des Diskriminierungsverbotes einzuschreiten?

Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission
(28. August 2012)

Die Kommission möchte die Frau Abgeordnete auf ihre Antwort zur schriftlichen Anfrage E-000191/2012 von Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR), Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR), Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Jacek Olgierd, Kurski (EFD), Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR) und Marek Józef, Gróbarczyk (ECR) verweisen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006734/12
to the Commission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Media freedom in Poland — the case of TV Trwam

TV Trwam is a Catholic television broadcaster in Poland which has been in operation since 12 June 2003. In January 2012 the Polish Broadcasting Council refused to give it a licence to broadcast DVB-T (digital video broadcasting -— terrestrial), which will be introduced in the summer. The reason given was lack of proof of sufficient financial guarantees for digital broadcasting, as the broadcaster's assets mainly consist of a loan from the Redemptorist Province. This was no guarantee, it was claimed, that TV Trwam would be able to bear the annual cost of the digital frequency, amounting to EUR 2.25 million. The Broadcasting Council's negative decision gave rise to widespread public protests in Poland, with one demonstration in Warsaw on 21 April 2012 attracting 20 000 people. The Roman Catholic community, in particular, feels that it is being discriminated against and media pluralism put at risk. The decision was said to be completely transparent, since the criteria for awarding the concession were not clearly defined. In addition, the financial situation of TV Trwam is reported as being better than that of three other broadcasters which were awarded the digital concession (Lemon Records, Eska TV and Stavka TV).

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Does the Commission consider that it constitutes a breach of fundamental rights, such as the principle of equal treatment, the prohibition of discrimination and the freedom of thought?

3. Does the Commission agree with critics who say that the Polish Broadcasting Council has taken an un-transparent, discriminatory decision to the detriment of TV Trwam and is in breach of its original remit, which is to guarantee media pluralism?

4. Does the Commission intend to intervene if necessary, for the sake of the freedom of thought and of the media and the prohibition of discrimination?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(28 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-000191/2012 by Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR), Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR), Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Jacek Olgierd, Kurski (EFD), Tadeusz Cymański (EFD), Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR) and Marek Józef, Gróbarczyk (ECR).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006735/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(5 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κατάφωρη παραβίαση δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών στην Τουρκία.

Το Υπουργείο Υγείας της Τουρκίας πρόσφατα προέβη σε ακόμη μία κατάφωρη παραβίαση των δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών. Στο πλαίσιο του τελευταίου κύματος μεταρρυθμίσεων της κυβέρνησης Ερντογάν σχετικά με την εγκυμοσύνη, μετά τα σχέδιά της κατά των αμβλώσεων, αποφασίστηκε να ενημερώνεται με μήνυμα στο κινητό τηλέφωνό του ο σύζυγος ή ο πατέρας των γυναικών των οποίων το τεστ εγκυμοσύνης βγαίνει θετικό, χωρίς την συγκατάθεσή και ενημέρωσή τους.

Πέραν της κατάφωρης παραβίασης του ιατρικού απορρήτου και των θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων του ανθρώπου, η πρακτική αυτή δημιουργεί σοβαρούς κινδύνους για τις ίδιες τις γυναίκες, ειδικότερα τις άγαμες, σε μία χώρα όπου το θέμα της εκτός γάμου εγκυμοσύνης παραμένει ένα από τα πιο ισχυρά ταμπού της τουρκικής κοινωνίας και αιτία για εγκλήματα τιμής.

Η νέα πρακτική έρχεται να εφαρμοστεί τη στιγμή που είναι ακόμη ζωηρές οι αντιδράσεις εντός και εκτός της Τουρκίας για την άλλη ανάλογη πρόθεση της κυβέρνησης, να απαγορεύσει τις αμβλώσεις, προκαλώντας κύμα αντιδράσεων από γυναικείες οργανώσεις και οργανώσεις προάσπισης των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων.

Κατόπιν τούτου, ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή πώς σκοπεύει να αντιμετωπίσει τη νέα προκλητική πρακτική της τουρκικής κυβέρνησης που οδηγεί την τουρκική κοινωνία σε οπισθοδρόμηση.

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Αυγούστου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει ότι υπάρχουν αναφορές σχετικά με τις πρακτικές στις οποίες αναφέρεται η ερώτηση του Αξιότιμου Μέλους. Το Υπουργείο Υγείας της Τουρκίας διέψευσε τις αναφορές αυτές τον Ιούνιο του 2012.

Η προάσπιση των δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών, η προώθηση της ισότητας των φύλων και η καταπολέμηση της βίας κατά γυναικών εξακολουθούν να αποτελούν μείζονες προκλήσεις για την Τουρκία. Παρά το γεγονός ότι έχει ήδη θεσπισθεί σε μεγάλο βαθμό το νομικό πλαίσιο που απαιτείται για την κατοχύρωση των δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών και της ισότητας των φύλων, χρειάζονται περαιτέρω σημαντικές προσπάθειες για την αποτύπωση των σχετικών κανόνων στην πολιτική, κοινωνική και οικονομική πραγματικότητα. Η νομοθεσία πρέπει να εφαρμόζεται συνεκτικά στο σύνολο της χώρας. Οι φόνοι τιμής, οι γάμοι που συνάπτονται σε νεαρή ηλικία ή με την άσκηση καταναγκασμού και η ενδοοικογενειακή βία κατά γυναικών παραμένουν σοβαρά προβλήματα προς επίλυση. Τέλος, είναι απαραίτητη περαιτέρω επαγγελματική κατάρτιση και ευαισθητοποίηση σχετικά με τα δικαιώματα των γυναικών και την ισότητα των φύλων, με αποδέκτη, ιδίως, την αστυνομία.

Η Επιτροπή θα εξακολουθήσει να παρακολουθεί επισταμένως το θέμα και θα αναφερθεί σε αυτό στο πλαίσιο της έκθεσης προόδου της Τουρκίας για το 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006735/12
to the Commission
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Flagrant violation of women's rights in Turkey

The Turkish Ministry of Health has recently committed yet another flagrant violation of women's rights. In the latest wave of reforms proposed by the Erdoğan Government relating to pregnancy and following the anti-abortion bill, it has been decided that husbands or fathers are to be informed by SMS of positive pregnancy tests without consulting or obtaining the agreement of the women concerned.

This blatant infringement of medical secrecy and fundamental human rights is also placing the women concerned — particularly unmarried women — in serious danger, Turkey being a society in which pregnancies out of wedlock are still one of the harshest taboos and regarded as grounds for honour crimes.

These new measures are to be implemented at a time when strong protests are being heard both inside and outside Turkey regarding another similar government measure banning abortions, prompting a wave of opposition from women's organisations and human rights bodies.

In view of this, what action will the Commission take in response to this new provocative measure by the Turkish Government, which is a retrograde step for Turkish society?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(28 August 2012)

The Commission is aware of reports about practices referred to in the question of the Honourable Member. The Turkish Ministry of Health has refuted these reports in June 2012.

Protecting women's rights, promoting gender equality and combating violence against women remain major challenges for Turkey. Although the legal framework guaranteeing women's rights and gender equality is broadly in place, further substantial efforts are needed to turn it into political, social and economic reality. Legislation needs to be implemented consistently across the country. Honour killings, early and forced marriages and domestic violence against women remain serious problems that need to be addressed. Finally, further training and awareness raising on women's rights and gender equality are needed, particularly for the police.

The Commission will keep monitoring the situation closely and report in the context of its Turkey 2012 Progress Report.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006736/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: A new constitution in Fiji and free national elections

1. What is the Commission's assessment of Fiji's political roadmap and the country's new constitution?

2. Is the Commission providing technical assistance for the free national elections to be held by September 2014?

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

The EU shares the cautious optimism by international partners following the announcement and launch of the political process leading to a new constitution by March 2013 and elections in 2014. Both the Pacific Islands Forum's Ministerial Contact Group, which visited Fiji in early May — the first time in over three years — and the Commonwealth Ministerial Action Group on 16 April 2012 welcomed these developments. Fiji's actions are indeed a step in the right direction.

However, a number of issues still remain to be clarified such as the role of the military and political parties, and the composition and working methods of the Constituent Assembly. Furthermore restrictions on certain human rights and fundamental freedoms remain in place. There is hence a certain degree of confidence that elections will be held in 2014, but the genuineness of the regime's commitment to democracy remains to be tested and at this stage the Commission considers that the return of full democracy will be a gradual process, with the 2014 elections only being the starting point.

The Commission is committed to actively assist Fiji's return to democracy and is at present examining possibilities to support this process, in particular the constitutional process and election preparation. Activities are closely coordinated with international partners and are planned to cover in particular but not exclusively civic and voter education activities. As we come closer to the elections further specific assistance could be envisaged.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006737/12
to the Commission
Vicky Ford (ECR)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Hot water feeds in washing machines

Many washing machines sold in the EU do not have a hot water inlet supply facility. This means that the machine can only be filled with cold water which must then be heated electrically, requiring an energy use of 1 kW per litre per degree Celsius.

Current photovoltaic generating technology cannot satisfy this kind of energy demand. Without the hot water inlet supply facility, hot water generated by household solar water heating systems — systems which the EU is keen to encourage homeowners to install — cannot be used.

Using washing machines that have only cold water feeds has other environmental impacts, such as the need to use anti-scaling additives to combat the build-up of scale on the washing machine heater. These additives enter the water supply and are an additional contaminant that the water treatment authorities have to deal with.

The current washing machine design, which makes unnecessary use of electrical water heating, goes against the EU's initiatives on reducing electricity consumption. It also goes against the EU's goal to reduce CO_2 emissions because the electricity required for water heating most likely comes from the CO_2-generating national grid and prevents the use of local solar water heating and also reduces the cost-effectiveness of solar water heating by eliminating one of its uses.

What is the Commission doing to ensure that washing machines manufactured and sold in the EU are fitted with hot water feeds given the significant environmental and economic impact that this design feature has?

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

Washing machines with hot water supply ('hot fill') are available on the European market; however, their availability varies within the European countries. Current EU legislation ([1]) on washing machines does not regulate the use of 'hot or cold fill'. The Commission has the intention to explore this issue in the framework of the revision of this legislation in 2014, as foreseen by the regulation itself which states that 'The review shall in particular assess … the potential for hot water inlet'.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EU) 1015/2010 implementing Directive 2009/125/EC of the Parliament and of the Council with regard to ecodesign requirements for household washing machines, OJ L 293, 11.11.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006738/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: List of Member States which do not allow their citizens to vote in national elections while resident abroad

I refer to the answer to my Written Question E-7910/2010 given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission, in which she stated that 'the Commission is aware that national provisions in a number of Member States provide for disenfranchisement of their citizens due to residing abroad. Consequently, EU citizens of the Member States concerned cannot participate in any national elections'.

Could the Commission provide a list of these countries?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

According to information at the disposal of the Commission, the Member States which currently impose conditions for maintaining the right to vote in national elections in cases of national citizens residing abroad are the following: Ireland, Hungary, Cyprus, Denmark, Malta, Austria and United Kingdom. In the context of the EU Citizenship Report 2010 ([1]) the Commission called on Member States to address this issue.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/reding/factsheets/pdf/citizenship_report_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006739/12
alla Commissione
Patrizia Toia (S&D) e Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D)
(5 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Ristrutturazione Nokia Siemens Networks Italia

— considerando che Nokia Siemens Networks è una delle principali aziende di telecomunicazioni al mondo, con più sedi in Europa e circa 70 000 dipendenti;

— considerando che all'inizio della joint venture nel 2007 la Nokia Siemens Networks contava in Italia oltre 3000 dipendenti, più un importante indotto di consulenti, concentrati prevalentemente nelle sedi di Cinisello Balsamo e Cassina de Pecchi, in provincia di Milano;

— considerando che nel gennaio 2008 Nokia Siemens Networks, governo e sindacati hanno firmato un protocollo di intesa per potenziare i siti di ricerca e sviluppo, impegno poi disatteso in quanto ad oggi i dipendenti di NSN Italia sono stati ridimensionati del 70 %;

— considerando che a maggio 2012 l'azienda ha invece firmato un accordo di cessione del ramo d'azienda Microwave alla canadese Dragonwave con conseguente esubero di 580 lavoratori su 1100;

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione verificare:

— la conformità delle vicende ultime della Nokia Siemens Networks Italia rispetto alla normativa europea relativa all'impatto sociale delle ristrutturazioni industriali, tra cui la direttiva 98/59/CE sui licenziamenti collettivi, la direttiva 2001/23/CE sul trasferimento di imprese, la direttiva 94/45/CE e, non ultima, la direttiva 2002/14/CE sull'informazione e la consultazione dei lavoratori?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(21 agosto 2012)

La Commissione porta all'attenzione dell'onorevole parlamentare che essa non è in grado di valutare i fatti né di stabilire se effettivamente una società privata abbia rispettato o meno una disposizione nazionale di attuazione della legislazione dell'UE.

Spetta invece alle competenti autorità nazionali, come i tribunali, vigilare sulla corretta e ed effettiva applicazione della legislazione nazionale di recepimento delle direttive comunitarie menzionate dall'onorevole parlamentare da parte del datore di lavoro interessato, considerate le circostanze specifiche dei singoli casi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006739/12
to the Commission
Patrizia Toia (S&D) and Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Restructuring of Nokia Siemens Networks Italy

Nokia Siemens Networks is one of the leading telecommunications companies in the world, with various establishments in Europe and some 70 000 employees.

When the joint venture was launched in 2007, Nokia Siemens Networks had more than 3 000 employees in Italy, as well as drawing on the services of a significant number of consultants, mainly concentrated at the Cinisello Balsamo and Cassina de Pecchi facilities in the province of Milan.

In January 2008, Nokia Siemens Networks, the government and trade unions signed a memorandum of understanding to step up the work being done at the research and development facilities, an undertaking which was subsequently disregarded, as NSN Italy currently has 70% fewer employees.

In May 2012, however, the company signed an agreement assigning the Microwave branch of the company to the Canadian company Dragonwave, which resulted in 580 employees out of 1 100 being made redundant.

Can the Commission therefore check whether recent developments at Nokia Siemens Networks Italy comply with European law concerning the impact on the workforce of industrial restructuring, including Directive 98/59/EC on collective redundancies, Directive 2001/23/EC on transfers of undertakings, Directive 94/45/EC and, not least, Directive 2002/14/EC on information and consultation of workers?

Answer given by M. Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2012)

The Commission would remind the Honourable Member that it is not in a position to assess the facts or state whether a private company has or has not complied with any national provisions which serve to implement EU directives.

Instead, it is for the competent national authorities, including the courts, to ensure that the national legislation transposing the EU Directives to which the Honourable Member refers is correctly and effectively applied by the employer concerned, having regard to the specific circumstances of the case.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006740/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(5 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Pretestuoso utilizzo articolo 6, paragrafo 4, della direttiva 92/43/CEE «Habitat» per giustificarne il non rispetto e procedere all'inutile costruzione del Terzo Ponte a Cremona

Nella sua risposta E-005085/2011 del 6.1.2012, relativa alla contestata compatibilità ambientale del nuovo raccordo autostradale della A21 tra Castelvetro piacentino (PC) e Cremona, chiamato Terzo Ponte, il Commissario Potočnik, a nome della Commissione, ricordava che secondo l'articolo 6, paragrafo 4, della direttiva 92/43/CEE («Habitat»), in mancanza di soluzioni alternative, gli Stati membri possono adottare misure che non escludono effetti negativi sull'integrità dei Siti natura 2000, qualora un progetto debba essere realizzato per motivi imperativi di rilevante interesse pubblico.

Come già segnalato alla Commissione attraverso diverse interrogazioni parlamentari e da una denuncia in corso del Comitato di cittadini «Amici della grande Nonna Quercia», questo faraonico progetto, concepito 22 anni fa, ha comportato tre ricorsi amministrativi al TAR del Lazio, forti critiche da consulenti del comune di Castelvetro e da 18 docenti universitari ed esperti indipendenti che, in un dossier ([1]), hanno bocciato l'opera come inutile e impattante, a fronte di varie alternative.

I flussi di traffico ufficiali ([2]) della regione Emilia Romagna, non utilizzati nel progetto ma elaborati nel medesimo dossier, confermano l'assoluta inutilità dell'opera.

La costruzione del Terzo ponte comprometterà tre siti SIC/ZPS della Rete Natura 2000 (Spiaggioni, Spinadesco e Rio Boriacco), 300 ettari di aree golenali e zone agricole integre, l'interruzione del corridoio ecologico fluviale e la devastazione dell'Isola del deserto, una delle più antiche del Po ([3]).

Da ultimo, anche l'Associazione Industriali di Cremona, in un recente documento ([4]), non cita il «Terzo Ponte» tra le opere classificate come «necessarie».

— Alla luce di quanto esposto, la Commissione è consapevole che esistono misure alternative al Terzo Ponte?

— Può indicare sulla base di quale criteri/parametri questo contestatissimo progetto possa essere classificato necessario per motivi imperativi di rilevante interesse pubblico e pertanto autorizzato a violare la direttiva Habitat?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(16 agosto 2012)

La Commissione ha chiesto alle autorità italiane informazioni dettagliate sulla valutazione, in conformità all'articolo 6, paragrafo 3, della direttiva Habitat ([5]), dell'impatto del progetto «Terzo ponte» su diversi siti Natura 2000. Ha inoltre chiesto di essere informata della decisione finale delle autorità competenti in seguito alla suddetta valutazione. Ad oggi, la Commissione non ha ricevuto comunicazioni in merito all'attuazione delle disposizioni dell'articolo 6, paragrafo 4, della direttiva Habitat.

La Commissione non dispone delle informazioni pertinenti in merito: spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti decidere se vi sono ragioni imperative per scavalcare l'interesse pubblico nel portare avanti il progetto.

La Commissione desidera tuttavia rammentare che la responsabilità di assicurare l'osservanza della direttiva 92/43/CEE Habitat incombe innanzitutto alle autorità nazionali. Spetta in primo luogo ai giudici e alle autorità amministrative nazionali far sì che le autorità degli Stati membri rispettino la normativa dell'Unione europea.

([1]) Scaricabile su http://www.terzoponte.com/documenti.html
([2]) I dati sui flussi di traffico 2009-2011 e l'aggiornamento a maggio 2012 sono scaricabili dal sito http://www.terzoponte.com/documenti.html
([3]) Leggi anche il contributo del prof. Riccardo Groppali (Università di Pavia), uno dei maggiori esperti sul tema, scaricabile su http://www.terzoponte.com/pareri%20critici.html
([4]) Documento strategico del 24 maggio 2010 «Cremona al futuro. Prospettive di sviluppo del Territorio Cremonese» (www.assind.cr.it).
([5]) Direttiva 92/43/CEE del Consiglio, del 21 maggio 1992, relativa alla conservazione degli habitat naturali e seminaturali e della flora e della fauna selvatiche (GU L 206 del 22.7.1992).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006740/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Specious use of Article 6(4) of Habitat Directive 92/43/EEC to justify non-compliance and proceed with the unnecessary construction of the Third Bridge in Cremona

Replying for the Commission to Question E-005085/2011 of 6 January 2012 on the new stretch of the A21 motorway connecting Castelvetro Piacentino (PC) and Cremona, known as the 'Terzo Ponte' [Third Bridge], and its disputed compliance with environmental requirements, Commissioner Potočnik stated that under Article 6(4) of Directive 92/43/EEC ('Habitat Directive'), in the absence of alternative solutions and where projects must be carried out for reasons of overriding public interest, Member States may take measures wherein negative effects on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites cannot be excluded.

As has already been pointed out to the Commission in a number of parliamentary questions and in an ongoing complaint by the Citizens Association 'Amici della grande Nonna Quercia', this monumental project, first dreamt up 22 years ago, has so far been the subject of three administrative appeals to the Regional Administrative Court for the Region of Lazio, as well as being heavily criticised by advisors to the Castelvetro municipality and by 18 academics and independent experts who have produced a file ([1]) with documents showing that the work will both have a serious impact and is unnecessary in view of various possible alternatives.

Official traffic flow figures from the Emilia Romagna regional authorities ([2]) confirm that the work is completely unnecessary. These figures were not used in the project, but were produced as part of the same file.

Construction of the Third Bridge will jeopardise three Natura 2000 SCI/SPA sites (Spiaggioni, Spinadesco and Rio Boriacco), 300 hectares of flood plain and virgin farmland, will interrupt the ecological river corridor and devastate the Isola del Deserto, one of the oldest in the Po ([3]).

As a final point, even the Associazione Industriali di Cremona did not include the Third Bridge among works classed as 'necessary' in a recent document ([4]).

— Is the Commission aware that there are alternatives to the Third Bridge?

— Can it give details of the criteria/parameters that allow this extremely questionable project to be classed as necessary for reasons of overriding public interest and therefore be permitted to infringe the Habitat Directive?

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

The Commission has asked the Italian authorities to provide detailed information on the assessment, in accordance with Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive ([5]), of the impacts of the 'third bridge' project on various Natura 2000 sites. It has also asked to be informed of the final decision taken by the competent authorities after the assessment. To date, the Commission has not received any communication concerning the implementation of the provisions of Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive.

The Commission does not possess the relevant information for this project. It falls to the competent national authorities to decide whether there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest to carry out this project.

The Commission would like, however, to recall that the responsibility for ensuring compliance with the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC lies primarily with the national authorities. National courts and administrative bodies are primarily responsible for ensuring that the authorities of the Member States comply with European Union legislation.

([1]) Can be downloaded from http://www.terzoponte.com/documenti.html
([2]) Traffic flow figures for 2009-2011 with the updated May 2012 figures can be downloaded from http://www.terzoponte.com/documenti.html
([3]) See also comments by Professor Riccardo Groppali (University of Pavia), one of the foremost experts in the field, which can downloaded from http://www.terzoponte.com/pareri%20critici.html
([4]) Planning document dated 24 May 2010 'Cremona al futuro. Prospettive di sviluppo del Territorio Cremonese' [Cremona in the future. Development prospects for the Cremona region] (www.assind.cr.it).
([5]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC, of 21 May 1992, on the protection of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006741/12
alla Commissione
Clemente Mastella (PPE), Antonello Antinoro (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Luigi Ciriaco De Mita (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Sergio Berlato (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE) e Licia Ronzulli (PPE)
(5 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Strategia europea contro la contraffazione cinese

La contraffazione e la pirateria hanno effetti drammatici e pregiudizievoli sulle attività delle imprese: violano i diritti della proprietà intellettuale, arrecano notevoli pregiudizi economici a fabbricanti e commercianti ed ingannano i consumatori. Da tempo l'Unione Europea ed i singoli Stati membri hanno messo in campo misure di contrasto alle frodi imponendo sanzioni, istituendo deterrenti di altra natura e sollecitando gli stessi titolari dei diritti ad attivarsi presso gli organi di controllo. Di recente è stata approvata l'istituzione di un Osservatorio Europeo sulla Contraffazione e la Pirateria per garantire i diritti della proprietà intellettuale, con finalità di controllo e di coordinamento con gli strumenti di contrasto adottati dai singoli Stati membri. L'Unione europea e la Cina (di gran lunga la principale fonte — circa il 60 % — dei prodotti di questo tipo confiscati alle frontiere dell'UE) hanno firmato un piano d'azione specifico, inteso a rafforzare la cooperazione doganale nel settore della tutela dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale.

Il piano d'azione prevede: l'istituzione di un gruppo di lavoro con il mandato di studiare il flusso di merci contraffatte tra la Cina e l'UE; lo scambio di informazioni sui rischi in materia di proprietà intellettuale; una cooperazione operativa tra i principali porti e aeroporti; lo scambio di funzionari; lo sviluppo di partenariati con il settore privato in Cina intesi a individuare più facilmente le spedizioni sospette.

Si chiede, pertanto alla Commissione:

1. Come intende potenziare ulteriormente il ruolo ed i poteri dell'Osservatorio, grazie al quale poter circoscrivere una volta per tutte il fenomeno e valutare obiettivamente la sua ampiezza e relative ripercussioni su economia e società, nonché sull'occupazione in Europa?

2. Come intende rilanciare la cooperazione tra l'Unione e la Cina, in modo da garantire uno scambio più efficace di informazioni ed un coordinamento più efficace delle iniziative di lotta alla contraffazione, incoraggiando l'armonizzazione delle legislazioni nazionali in questione con il diritto dell'Unione?

3. Se, infine, intende adottare misure concrete per meglio orientare e sensibilizzare i consumatori europei alla questione dei prodotti contraffatti ed effettuare una revisione della sua strategia in materia di lotta alla contraffazione e alla pirateria alla luce della strategia «UE 2020» e del Rapporto Monti?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(14 agosto 2012)

La Commissione vede con preoccupazione il fatto che l'UE sia da lungo tempo una destinazione privilegiata per merci contraffatte e frutto di pirateria e sta mettendo in atto una serie di iniziative in risposta a tali problemi.

Al fine di migliorare la propria conoscenza del fenomeno la Commissione ha varato uno studio per elaborare una metodologia atta a facilitare la valutazione della contraffazione nell'UE e delle tendenze a ciò associate. Tale metodologia sarà collaudata con progetti pilota nel corso del 2012.

Nel 2009 la Commissione ha istituito l'Osservatorio europeo sulle violazioni dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale, nell'intento di perfezionare la raccolta dei dati, la cooperazione tra le autorità competenti in fatto di Proprietà Intellettuale (PI) e il dialogo con le parti interessate a livello di Unione. L'Osservatorio è stato recentemente trasferito all'Ufficio per l'Armonizzazione nel Mercato Interno.

La Commissione sta operando per risolvere le divergenze bilaterali sui diritti di proprietà intellettuale (DPI) a livello sia tecnico sia politico. Più specificamente, essa ha impostato una collaborazione mediante un «Dialogo sulla PI» e un «Gruppo di lavoro sulla PI». In tali ambiti la Commissione collabora attivamente con i legislatori e le autorità giudiziarie cinesi al fine di perfezionare la legislazione in fatto di DPI.

La Commissione ha firmato un piano d'azione di lungo periodo attinente alla collaborazione doganale tra l'UE e la Cina in merito ai DPI. Il piano d'azione è articolato in quattro iniziative prioritarie e prevede fra l'altro lo scambio sistematico d'informazioni e il funzionamento di una rete di esperti delle dogane presso aeroporti e porti marittimi al fine d'intercettare le spedizioni ad alto rischio.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006741/12
to the Commission
Clemente Mastella (PPE), Antonello Antinoro (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Salvatore Iacolino (PPE), Luigi Ciriaco De Mita (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE), Giuseppe Gargani (PPE), Giovanni La Via (PPE), Vito Bonsignore (PPE), Marco Scurria (PPE), Iva Zanicchi (PPE), Sergio Berlato (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Cristiana Muscardini (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE), Alfredo Pallone (PPE) and Licia Ronzulli (PPE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: EU strategy for stemming the influx of counterfeit goods from China

Counterfeiting and piracy have a disastrous effect on business. By violating intellectual property rights, they result in major financial losses for manufacturers and retailers and trick consumers. The European Union and the individual Member States have for years been attempting to combat this type of fraud by bringing penalties and other deterrents to bear and encouraging rights holders to contact the supervisory authorities. It was recently decided to set up a European Counterfeiting and Piracy Observatory to monitor compliance with intellectual property rights and coordinate EU and national measures. Furthermore, the EU and China (the source of by far the largest proportion — some 60% — of counterfeit goods confiscated at EU borders) have signed a dedicated action plan for closer customs cooperation in enforcing intellectual property rights.

The action plan covers: the setting up of a working party to look into counterfeit goods flows between China and the EU; the exchange of information on intellectual property risks; operational cooperation among the main ports and airports; exchanges of officials; and the development of partnerships with the private sector in China, with a view to making it easier to intercept suspicious consignments.

1. How does the Commission intend to enhance the role and powers of the Observatory in order to be able to gain an accurate picture of the scale of this problem and its impact on the economy, society and jobs in Europe and to bring it under control once and for all?

2. How does it intend to step up cooperation between the EU and China with a view to improving information exchange and the coordination of anti-counterfeiting action and bringing the relevant national legislation more closely into line with EC law?

3. Will it take specific steps to provide consumers with more information and better guidance on the problem of counterfeiting and will it review its strategy on counterfeiting and piracy in the light of the Europe 2020 strategy and the Monti Report?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2012)

The Commission is concerned that the EU has long been an attractive destination for counterfeits and piracy and is putting in place a set of initiatives to respond to these issues.

To improve its knowledge, the Commission has launched a study to devise a methodology that would facilitate the estimation of counterfeiting in the EU and the associated trends. This methodology will be pilot tested during 2012.

In 2009, the Commission put in place the European Observatory on Infringement of Intellectual Property Rights which aims at improving the collection of data, the cooperation between Intellectual Property (IP) authorities and the dialogue with stakeholders throughout the EU. The Observatory was recently transferred to the Office of Harmonisation for the internal market.

The Commission is pursuing the resolution of bilateral Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues, both at technical and political level. In particular it has established cooperation through an 'IP Dialogue' and an 'IP Working Group'. In these frameworks, the Commission actively cooperates with Chinese lawmakers and judicial authorities to improve IPR laws.

The Commission has signed an extended Action Plan concerning EU-China customs cooperation on IPR. This Action Plan is structured around four key actions, involving among other things a systematic exchange of information and the operation of a network of customs experts at airports and seaports to target high risk consignment.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-006742/12
za Komisijo
Tanja Fajon (S&D), Jelko Kacin (ALDE), Alojz Peterle (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE) in Milan Zver (PPE)
(5. julij 2012)

Zadeva: Zaradi porasta števila učencev Evropske šole v Luxembourgu (Luxembourg 1) je bila v predmestju Mamer/Bertrange zgrajena šola Luxembourg 2, ki povzroča številne organizacijske težave

1. PREVOZ. Povezave z javnim prometom so slabe, za najmlajše ni organiziranega prevoza. Otroci lahko samostojno uporabljajo javni prevoz šele po dopolnjenem 12. letu, do tedaj jih vozijo starši. Zanje in mlajše otroke v novi šoli to pomeni približno dve uri na dan na cesti.

2. ORGANIZACIJA POPOLDANSKEGA VARSTVA. Varstvo je sicer organizirano poleg šole Luxembourg 2 (CPE V), vendar ti otroci nimajo možnosti, da bi bili v popoldanskem varstvu bliže kraju dela svojih staršev (CPE III). Starši morajo zato iz službe veliko prej, da pravočasno poberejo otroke. Namen varstva pa je v tem, da razbremeni starše!

Otroci so bili v obe šoli dodeljeni na podlagi narodnosti/jezika, deloma upoštevaje kraj bivanja največjih jezikovnih skupin. Na šoli Luxembourg 1 so otroci iz Švedske, Finske, Estonije, Litve, Latvije, Nizozemske, Poljske, Španije, Portugalske in Bolgarije. Otroci, ki govorijo italijansko, grško, dansko, madžarsko, češko, romunsko, slovaško, malteško, irsko in slovensko, so dodeljeni v šolo Luxembourg 2. Angleška, nemška in francoska sekcija so prisotne v obeh šolah. Horizontalna delitev (primarna stopnja v eni šoli in sekundarna stopnja v drugi šoli) kot običajen način organizacije izobraževanja v nacionalnih sistemih, je bila v času gradnje šole zavrnjena zaradi stroškov preureditve prostorov, čeprav ima vrsto prednosti, predvsem pa bi med vse države članice/družine enakomerno porazdelila breme oddaljenosti šole Luxembourg 2 od Kirchberga, kjer se nahaja Luxembourg 1.

Vprašanji Komisiji:

Kdaj bo Komisija izvedla analizo šolskega izobraževanja v Luxembourgu, v kateri bo celovito upoštevala tako koristi kot stroške horizontalne delitve?

Kako namerava Komisija pomagati staršem šole Luxembourg 2: kdaj je pričakovati možnost popoldanskega varstva bliže kraju dela in dogovor glede organizacije in povračila stroškov prevoza?

Odgovor g. Šefčoviča v imenu Komisije
(17. avgust 2012)

Upravljanje Evropskih šol je v pristojnosti medvladne organizacije. Za odločitev o horizontalni razdelitvi je potrebno soglasje v njenem svetu guvernerjev. Komisija podpira to idejo, vendar jo je leta 2003 svet guvernerjev v zvezi z evropskima šolama Luxembourg I in II zavrnil, te odločitve pa pozneje ni bilo mogoče spremeniti. Evropska šola Luxembourg II, ki bo opremljena za vse stopnje vrtca in osnovne šole, se odpre septembra 2012.

Vse, razen ene države članice, katerih nacionalni jeziki se poučujejo na Evropski šoli Luxembourg II, so leta 2004 glasovale za sedanjo porazdelitev jezikovnih oddelkov oziroma so jo sprejele ob pristopu.

Zato odločitev sveta guvernerjev, da je treba šolski sistem v Luxembourgu proučiti glede horizontalne porazdelitve, ni verjetna.

Komisija podpira načrt prevozov, ki so ga pripravili združenje staršev (ATSEE), Evropska šola Luxembourg II in luksemburška vlada.

Načrt med drugim predvideva železniško postajo, več javnih in 15 posebnih avtobusnih prog od in do bivališč učencev ter izmenične prevoze od in do zbirališč v bližini služb, kjer so zaposleni starši. Ta storitev bo krila do 5 postajališč pred šolo in 1 varovan sprejemni prostor za čas po pouku.

ATSEE za Evropsko šolo Luxembourg I organizira prevoz tudi v poznejših urah, in sicer za otroke, ki ob 18.00 h zapustijo oddelek podaljšanega bivanja oziroma varstva (CPE V).

CPE V se zaradi interesa otrok nahaja v stavbi šole, zagotovljen pa je tudi prevoz v poznejših urah. Ni predvideno, da bi bilo treba to varstvo dopolniti z oddelki otroškega varstva kjer koli drugje.

Doseženo je bilo tudi soglasje glede organizacije avtobusnih prevozov. Od Luxembourga se pričakuje, da bo kril stroške avtobusnega prevoza v šolo in takoj po končanem pouku. Razprave o 15 progah šolskih avtobusov še vedno potekajo in odločitev se pričakuje v kratkem.

Pristojbine za prisotnost odraslih spremljevalcev na avtobusnih prevozih v poznejših urah so del stroškov prevoza, ki se krijejo iz dodatka za šolanje za šoloobvezne otroke.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006742/12
to the Commission
Tanja Fajon (S&D), Jelko Kacin (ALDE), Alojz Peterle (PPE), Ivo Vajgl (ALDE) and Milan Zver (PPE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: As a result of the increase in the number of pupils at the European School in Luxembourg (Luxembourg 1), a new school (Luxembourg 2) has been built in the suburb of Mamer/Bertrange, causing numerous organisational problems

1. TRANSPORT. Public transport links are poor and no transport has been organised for the youngest children. Children can travel unaccompanied on public transport only from the age of 12; before that they are taken by their parents. For those parents and their young children in the new school that means spending approximately two hours a day on the road.

2. ORGANISATION OF AFTERSCHOOL CARE. Afterschool care has been arranged next to the Luxembourg 2 school (at the CPE V facility), but there is no possibility for the children concerned to attend afterschool care closer to the place where their parents work (i.e. at CPE III in Kirchberg). The parents will therefore have to leave work much earlier in order to collect their children on time, despite the fact that the purpose of afterschool care is to ease the burden on the parents.

Children were allocated to the two schools on the basis of nationality/language, partly taking into account the place of residence of the biggest language groups. Children from Sweden, Finland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Portugal and Bulgaria are in Luxembourg 1. Children who speak Italian, Greek, Danish, Hungarian, Czech, Romanian, Slovak, Maltese, Irish and Slovene were allocated to Luxembourg 2. Both schools have English, French and German sections. When the Luxembourg 2 school was being built the idea of a horizontal split (primary level at one school and secondary level at the other), which is the standard way of organising education in national systems, was rejected on account of the cost of refitting the buildings, although it has many advantages, and, above all, the difficulties caused by the distance of Luxembourg 2 from Kirchberg, where Luxembourg 1 is located, would be shared equally among all Member States/families.

Can the Commission please indicate:

When it will carry out an analysis of the school system in Luxembourg which takes full account of the benefits and costs of a horizontal split?

How it intends to help parents of children at the Luxembourg 2 school? When can we expect afterschool care to be arranged closer to the place of work and when can an agreement be expected on the organisation of transport and the reimbursement of the costs involved?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

The European Schools are managed by an intergovernmental organisation. A decision on a horizontal split requires unanimity in its Board of Governors (BoG). The Commission has sympathies for this idea, but regarding Luxembourg I and II it was rejected by the BoG in 2003, and the decision could not be reversed later on. Luxembourg II opens in September 2012, specifically equipped for all kindergarten and school levels.

All but one of the Member States, whose national languages are taught at Luxembourg II voted for the present language section distribution in 2004, respectively accepted it upon accession.

Thus a BoG decision to have the Luxembourg school system analysed in view of a horizontal split is unlikely.

The Commission supports the transport plan developed by the parents' association (ATSEE), Luxembourg II and the Luxembourg government.

The plan foresees, i.a., a train station, several public and 15 special school bus lines from and to the pupils' residences, and shuttles from and to collection points close to the workplaces. This service will cover up to 5 stops before school and 1 secured reception area after school.

ATSEE organises late shuttles leaving at 6 p.m. the after-school childcare (CPE V) for Luxembourg I.

In the interest of the children, CPE V is on the school site and late shuttles are ensured. It is not intended to complement this by childcare facilities elsewhere.

There is agreement on the organisation of the bus lines. Luxembourg is expected to pay for the shuttles to and directly after school. Discussions about the 15 school bus lines are ongoing. A decision is expected shortly.

The fees for the adult supervision in the (late) shuttles organised by ATSEE are transport costs covered by the education allowance for school children.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006744/12
al Consiglio
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(5 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Riesame dell'elenco delle sostanze prioritarie nel settore della politica delle acque

Il Parlamento è attualmente impegnato nell'esame della proposta della Commissione del 31 gennaio 2012, recante modifica delle direttive 2000/60/CE e 2008/105/CE, per quanto riguarda le sostanze prioritarie nel settore della politica delle acque ([1]).

Recentemente sono stati presentati nuovi dati che sollevano dubbi in merito all'inclusione di determinate sostanze nell'elenco delle sostanze prioritarie, che era stato proposto sulla base di studi antecedenti indicati dai gruppi di esperti che collaborano con la Commissione.

Visto l'articolo 191, paragrafo 3, del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea, che stabilisce che «Nel predisporre la politica in materia ambientale l'Unione tiene conto: […] dei dati scientifici e tecnici disponibili», intende il Consiglio prendere in considerazione studi più recenti nella formulazione della propria posizione?

Risposta
(1º ottobre 2012)

Il Consiglio, come il Parlamento europeo, sta attualmente lavorando sulla proposta, presentata dalla Commissione il 31 gennaio 2012, di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio recante modifica delle direttive 2000/60/CE e 2008/105/CE per quanto riguarda le sostanze prioritarie nel settore della politica delle acque ([2]), e concorda con l'onorevole Parlamentare sull'opportunità di tener conto dei dati scientifici e tecnici disponibili.

Al riguardo il Consiglio auspica una proficua collaborazione con il Parlamento europeo al fine di pervenire a un accordo su tale proposta con la massima celerità.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-dangersub/pdf/com_2011_876.pdf
([2]) Doc. 6019/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006744/12
to the Council
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Review of the list of priority substances in the field of water policy

Parliament is currently working on the Commission proposal of 31 January 2012 amending Directives 2000/60/EC and 2008/105/EC as regards priority substances in the field of water policy ([1]).

New data has recently been presented which questions the inclusion of some substances on the list of priority substances proposed on the basis of earlier literature considered by expert groups supporting the Commission.

In view of Article 191(3) TFEU which states that 'in preparing its policy on the environment, the Union shall take account of: […] available scientific and technical data', does the Council, in formulating its position, intend to take any new studies into consideration?

Reply
(1 October 2012)

The Council, like the European Parliament, is also currently working on the Commission proposal of 31 January 2012 for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directives 2000/60/EC and 2008/105/EC as regards priority substances in the field of water policy ([2]) and agrees with the Honourable Member that available scientific and technical data should be taken into account.

In this respect, the Council is looking forward to a fruitful collaboration with the European Parliament in reaching an agreement on this proposal as soon as possible.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-dangersub/pdf/com_2011_876.pdf
([2]) 6019/12.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006745/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(5 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Indicazioni Geografiche (IG): una disciplina giuridica controversa — tra protezione legale internazionale e la mancata compliance europea

La legge internazionale per la protezione IG concerne i segni o le denominazioni che indicano l'origine geografica di un prodotto. Al tempo stesso aggiungono qualche informazione riguardante la loro origine. Questo può comprendere la reputazione storica del prodotto, un segnale della sua adesione alle tecniche di produzione provate nel tempo e del fatto che certi standard qualitativi siano stati raggiunti. La tutela delle IG protegge, infatti, il segno o il marchio, non il prodotto stesso o il suo metodo di produzione. La disciplina giuridica più nota per la protezione del marchio è quella del «marchio commerciale». Tale protezione giuridica si fonda su due presupposti: — il principio della territorialità, e la cosiddetta «prova del nove» della percezione del consumatore nel decidere se una terza parte che usa una denominazione geografica in commercio sia in errore o stia attuando una pratica di concorrenza sleale. I casi europei di «Champagne», «Feta» o «Mozzarella» hanno fatto scuola nel solco della normativa europea ed hanno acceso il dibattito internazionale. L'argomento più usato per «aggirare» la protezione del marchio è invocare l'assenza di una tutela giurisdizionale del marchio in alcuni paesi terzi e di diritti esclusivi sul prodotto nei paesi dove tale protezione invece è espressamente prevista. Quello che ne deriva è, dunque, una dimensione internazionale della tutela giuridica delle IG disarmonica ed alcune volte in contrasto con quella dell'UE. Vi è una sconcertante diversità di norme che si sovrappongono e interagiscono con altre e differenti discipline. Tale fenomeno è ancor più evidente per i modelli legali operativi nei rapporti con i PVS, che invece richiederebbero un protocollo giuridico indipendente, vista anche la genericità degli articoli 22-23-24 dell'accordo dell'OMC sui diritti di proprietà intellettuale relativi al commercio (TRIPS).

Considerato che la struttura di protezione giuridica europea presenta dubbi evidenti circa l'applicabilità ai diversi prodotti e alle diverse denominazioni nazionali; che il cosiddetto «terroir approach», il protocollo che focalizza la tutela sul legame tra il prodotto e la terra di produzione, consente che l'uso del nome venga riservato solo ai legittimi produttori della regione, senza creare confusione al consumatore; che i prodotti non terroir «vietati» comporterebbero il beneficio di aumentare la qualità dei prodotti sul mercato e la «consapevolezza-conoscenza» dei consumatori circa i prodotti di IG;

Chiedo alla Commissione quali misure di armonizzazione legislativa intende adottare al fine di creare una maggiore compliance tra norme UE e protezione internazionale delle IG, come pure se intende predisporre studi che valutino l'impatto ed i benefici del terroir approach sulla normativa europea vigente, sempre più spesso in conflitto con quella internazionale?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(9 agosto 2012)

Le Indicazioni Geografiche (IG) rientrano nei diritti di proprietà intellettuale (DPI) definiti dall'accordo sui diritti di proprietà intellettuale relativi al commercio (TRIPs) dell'Organizzazione Mondiale del Commercio (OMC). I contraenti dell'accordo TRIPs hanno la facoltà di stabilire le modalità appropriate di attuazione delle disposizioni dell'accordo nel quadro delle rispettive legislazioni e prassi. L'UE e gli Stati membri hanno attuato i propri obblighi di protezione delle IG tramite diversi strumenti legali.

Norme specifiche a livello dell'UE offrono tutela legale alle IG attinenti a vini, bevande alcoliche, prodotti agricoli e alimentari. Sono inoltre disponibili altri strumenti legali, quali ad esempio quelli a tutela dei marchi commerciali o la legislazione a tutela del consumatore o contro la concorrenza sleale, tutti utilizzabili per l'attuazione degli obblighi statuiti dall'accordo TRIPs in fatto di IG. Gli stati membri dell'OMC sono tenuti ad attuare gli obblighi dell'accordo TRIPs che definiscono lo standard minimo di legge di tutela delle IG. La legislazione dell'Unione citata in precedenza offre alle IG una tutela molto maggiore, nel pieno rispetto delle norme internazionali a loro protezione.

La proposta della Commissione ([1]) di un nuovo regolamento sui regimi di qualità dei prodotti agricoli, che sta seguendo l'iter della procedura legislativa ordinaria, apporterà ancora maggior coerenza e rafforzerà il sistema posto in atto dall'UE per la protezione delle designazioni d'origine e delle indicazioni geografiche per i prodotti agricoli e alimentari. L'UE promuove inoltre la definizione di una normativa più chiara e incisiva per la protezione delle IG nelle negoziazioni bilaterali e multilaterali.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/policy/quality-package-2010/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006745/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Geographical indications: a controversial legal discipline — problems of compliance between international and EU legal protection

International law on the protection of geographical indications (GI) deals with the signs or names that indicate the geographical origin of a product. They also provide some information on their origin. This may refer to the product's historical reputation, or indicate its compliance with production techniques that have stood the test of time and the fact that certain quality standards have been achieved. Protection of geographical indications actually protects the sign or mark itself, not the product or its production method.

The 'trademark' is the best known form of legal protection. This is founded on two prerequisites: the territoriality principle and customer perception, the latter being the acid test when deciding whether a third party making commercial use of a geographical name is doing so by mistake or whether this is a case of unfair competition. In Europe, the 'Champagne', 'Feta' and 'Mozzarella' cases led the way in EU legislation and sparked off the international debate.

Claiming that the trademark has no judicial protection in some third-party countries or, in countries where such protection is expressly provided for, that no exclusive rights over the product exist are the most commonly used methods of by-passing trademark protection. However, at the root of this lies the fact that international legal protection for geographical indications differs from, and in some cases is contradictory to, that of the EU. There is a bewildering variety of laws that overlap and interact with other and different disciplines. This phenomenon is even more evident for the legal models applicable to relations with the developing countries. These would require instead an independent legal protocol, given the approximation of Articles 22, 23 and 24 of the WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS).

Uncertainties clearly exist as to whether the structure for legal protection in the EU can be applied to certain products and certain national denominations. The 'terroir approach', the protocol that focuses protection on the link between the product and the land on which it is produced, allows use of the name to be reserved solely for legitimate producers in the region concerned, and prevents the customer from being confused. Non-terroir 'banned' products have the benefit of raising the quality of products on the market and increasing consumers' awareness and knowledge of GI products;

What legislative harmonisation measures is the Commission planning to adopt to bring about greater compliance between EC laws and international protection of geographical indications? Will it arrange for studies beforehand to assess the impact on and benefits of the terroir approach for current EU legislation, which is coming ever more frequently into conflict with international legislation?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2012)

Geographical Indications (GIs) are part of the Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) defined in the Agreement on Trade-related aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). Parties to the TRIPS are free to determine the appopriate method of implementing the provisions of the TRIPS, whithin their own legal system and practice. The EU and its Member States have implemented their obligations concerning protection of GIs through several legal instruments.

Specific rules at EU level provide legal protection to GIs for wines, spirit drinks, agricultural products and foodstuffs. Other legal instruments such as those on trade marks or laws on consumer protection or unfair competition are also available to implement the TRIPS obligations with respect to GIs. WTO Members are bound to implement the TRIPS obligations, which set the minimum legal standard for GIs protection. The specific EU legislation referred to above provides for more extensive protection of GIs, in full compliance with the international rules on their protection.

The Commission proposal ([1]) for a new 'Agricultural Product Quality Schemes Regulation', currently under ordinary legislative procedure will bring additional coherence and reinforce the EU scheme for protected designations of origin and geographical indications for agricultural products and foodstuffs. In addition, the EU is advocating a clear and stronger framework for GI protection in bilateral and multilateral negotiations.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/quality/policy/quality-package-2010/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006746/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Italianizzazione dei cognomi contenenti caratteri speciali

Con il D.M. 2.2.2009 del Ministro per la pubblica amministrazione e l'innovazione viene stabilita la traslitterazione dei nomi e cognomi di cittadini italiani contenenti caratteri diacritici di altri alfabeti in caratteri latini. L'obiettivo cui mira tale decreto è semplificare l'inserimento dei dati personali in via telematica. I caratteri diacritici sono propri di nomi e cognomi degli individui discendenti dalle comunità germanofone sudtirolesi, francofone valdostane, slovene friulane e molte altre. L'osservanza di suddetto D.M. comporta l'alterazione di dati personali, portatori di valori linguistico-culturali e veicolo di identità etnica e geografica, che sono tutelati dalla normativa europea. Il diritto alla registrazione dei caratteri diacritici è riconosciuto in Italia solo per i comuni bilingui. Gli sportelli linguistici delle zone montane forniscono informazioni ai cittadini interessati da questo processo di formalizzazione linguistica riguardo alla ratio del D.M. 2.2.2009.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione fornire dati in merito all'esistenza di normative simili in materia di standardizzazione di diversi alfabeti nell'idioma ufficiale negli altri Stati membri?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(10 settembre 2012)

La normativa nazionale secondo cui i cognomi e i nomi di una persona possono essere registrati negli atti di stato civile del suo Stato membro di origine esclusivamente in una forma che rispetti le regole di grafia della lingua ufficiale nazionale è stata valutata dalla Corte di Giustizia dell'Unione Europea nella Causa C-391/09, Runevič-Vardyn. In tale causa la Corte ha sostenuto che tale normativa è in linea con la normativa dell'Unione se utilizzata in maniera uniforme e se i nomi e cognomi in oggetto sono stati registrati alla nascita seguendo tali norme.

La Commissione non possiede dati in merito alle disposizioni esistenti in materia nei 27 Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006746/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Italianisation of surnames containing special characters

By a Ministerial Decree of 2 February 2009, the Ministry of Public Administration and Innovation has stipulated that where Italian citizens' first names or their surnames contain diacritic characters from other alphabets, these are to be transliterated into Latin characters. The purpose of this decree is to simplify the electronic entry of personal data. Diacritic characters are found in the given names and surnames of people descended from the South Tyrolean German-speaking community, the French-speaking community in Val d'Aosta, the Friulian Slovene-speaking community and many others. Observance of this Ministerial Decree entails changing personal data that have a linguistic and cultural value and which provide ethnic and geographic identity, attributes that are protected by EU legislation. Only the bilingual municipalities in Italy are recognised as having the right to register diacritic characters. The offices responsible for language matters in the mountainous regions can provide members of the public affected by this linguistic procedure with further information on the rationale of the Ministerial Decree of 2 February 2009.

Can the Commission furnish information as to whether other Member States have similar laws on standardising different alphabets within the official language?

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

The issue of national rules which provide that a person's surnames and forenames may be entered on the certificates of civil status of his/her Member State of origin only in a form which complies with the rules governing the spelling of the official national language was assessed by the Court of Justice of the European Union in Case C-391/09, Runevič-Vardyn. In this case, the Court held that such rules are in line with EC law where they are used in a uniform way and where those names were registered at birth in accordance with those rules.

The Commission does not have an overview of the existing relevant provisions in the 27 Member States.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006747/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Finanziamento per ospedale pediatrico oncologico ucraino dirottato sul Campionato europeo di calcio

Nei giorni scorsi è stata sporta denuncia nei confronti del governo ucraino da molte organizzazioni non governative ucraine e internazionali, tra cui l'italiana Soleterre, la quale nel 2010 aveva avviato un «Programma internazionale di oncologia pediatrica» per fornire aiuto ai bambini malati residenti in quattro Paesi a medio e basso sviluppo, di cui proprio l'Ucraina ne aveva beneficiato per prima.

Con il decreto governativo numero 433 del 21 maggio 2012, atto a modificare in parte il programma statale per la preparazione e lo svolgimento della fase finale del Campionato europeo di calcio in Ucraina, il governo ucraino ha tagliato i fondi di circa 349 milioni di grivne (circa 34,9 milioni di euro) destinati a finanziare la creazione di un reparto oncologico presso l'ospedale pediatrico Oxkhmatdyt di Kiev. Il medesimo decreto ha disposto l'aumento dei fondi per l'evento sportivo di Euro 2012 di 340 milioni di grivne.

L'Ucraina è sprovvista di centri specializzati per la cura dei tumori infantili, quindi le famiglie devono andare a curare i figli all'estero.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza di questo fatto?

2. L'accesso alle cure è uno dei diritti inviolabili dell'uomo e i bambini costituiscono la fascia più indifesa ed esposta alle ingiustizie sociali. Come valuta la Commissione la decisione del governo ucraino di ridurre consistentemente i fondi per le terapie oncologiche ai bambini ucraini?

3. Quali misure intende adottare la Commissione per indurre l'Ucraina (possibile futuro Paese candidato all'entrata nell'Unione europea) a porre più attenzione ai temi sociali, in particolar modo alla protezione dei minori e all'accesso dei meno fortunati alle cure mediche?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(11 settembre 2012)

Le questioni alle quali si riferisce l'onorevole parlamentare sono state riportate sia dalla società civile sia dai media indipendenti ucraini e vengono seguite dall'Unione Europea attraverso la delegazione di Kiev. Gli aspetti legati alla protezione sociale dei minori e al diritto alla salute sono affrontati nelle riunioni di dialogo politico con l'Ucraina. Di recente tali questioni figuravano nell'ordine del giorno della sessione dedicata ai diritti umani della riunione del sottocomitato UE-Ucraina «Giustizia e Affari Interni» tenutasi a Kiev il 1º giugno 2012. In questa riunione, l'UE ha espresso preoccupazione riguardo ad aspetti che hanno un'incidenza sui diritti sociali ed economici e la parte ucraina ha accettato di fornire una risposta scritta dettagliata a tutte le questioni sollevate dalla parte UE. La delegazione dell'UE a Kiev resterà in contatto con la società civile e con l'ufficio dell'UNICEF in Ucraina per assicurarsi che le autorità ucraine garantiscano un adeguato seguito alle questioni sollevate su questo problema. La parte UE potrà sollevare queste o altre questioni a esse collegate nei prossimi incontri con le autorità ucraine.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006747/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Diversion of funding for a Ukrainian paediatric oncology hospital to the European Football Championship

Over the past few days there has been a raft of complaints about the Ukrainian Government from Ukrainian and international non-governmental organisations, including Soleterre, an Italian organisation which in 2010 launched an 'international paediatric oncology programme' to help sick children living in four countries with a medium or low level of development; the first country to benefit was Ukraine.

By Government Decree No 433 of 21 May 2012, partially amending the state programme for the preparation and staging of the European Football Championship finals in Ukraine, the Ukrainian Government cut funding of about UAH 349 million (approximately EUR 34.9 million) that was to have been used to set up an oncology unit at the Oxkhmatdyt children's hospital in Kiev. The funds for Euro 2012 were increased under the same decree by UAH 340 million.

Ukraine does not have centres specialising in the treatment of tumours in children, and families are therefore obliged to seek treatment abroad.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above facts?

2. Access to treatment is an inviolable human right, and children are the weakest group and most vulnerable to social injustices. How does the Commission view the Ukrainian Government's decision to make a swingeing cut in the funding for oncological therapies for Ukrainian children?

3. What steps will the Commission take to persuade Ukraine (which may in the future become a candidate for membership of the EU) to focus greater attention on social matters, especially protection of children and access to medical treatment for the less well off?

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

The issues to which the Honourable Member refers have been reported both by civil society and by independent Ukrainian media, and have been followed by the European Union through its Delegation in Kyiv. Aspects related to the social protection of children and right to health are addressed in political dialogue meetings with Ukraine. Most recently, these issues were on the agenda of the session dedicated to Human Rights of the EU-Ukraine Justice and Home Affairs Subcommittee meeting in Kyiv on 1 June 2012. During this meeting, the EU expressed its concern as to issues affecting social and economic rights, and the Ukrainian side agreed to provide a detailed written response to the points raised by the EU side. The EU Delegation in Kyiv will continue to liaise with civil society and with the Unicef Office in Ukraine so as to ensure that Ukrainian authorities ensure an appropriate follow-up to the questions raised regarding this problem. The EU side may raise this and other related issues in forthcoming meetings with the Ukrainian authorities.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006748/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Tutela dei diritti dei disabili e conferma della convenzione ONU

L'Assemblea generale del Forum europeo della disabilità (EDF), tenutasi a Copenaghen nel maggio 2012 ha portato all'adozione della risoluzione dal titolo «La via dei diritti umani per uscire dalla crisi», che sottolinea l'urgenza di tutelare i diritti dei disabili e dei loro familiari dagli effetti delle manovre adottate per contrastare la crisi economica in corso. Secondo i dati dell'EDF, circa 80 milioni di persone in Europa vivono con un grado più o meno grave di disabilità e, a causa di ciò, rappresentano la fascia di popolazione più esposta al rischio d'indigenza.

L'efficacia delle strategie attuate negli ultimi anni dall'Unione europea è messa a rischio dall'esiguità dei fondi a disposizione. Tuttavia, il trattato di Lisbona ha reso vincolante per gli Stati membri l'osservanza della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, la quale all'articolo 26 stabilisce il diritto dei disabili alla piena partecipazione alla vita sociale, senza discriminazione alcuna rispetto ai normodotati. Inoltre, la convenzione ONU sui diritti delle persone con disabilità, all'articolo 8 impegna gli Stati parti a garantire l'inserimento dei disabili nel mondo del lavoro secondo il rispetto delle loro capacità e competenze.

1. Può la Commissione far sapere lo stato di avanzamento del processo di ratifica da parte degli Stati membri della convenzione ONU sui diritti dei disabili?

2. L'articolo 21 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea vieta ogni forma di discriminazione fondata sulla disabilità. Ritiene la Commissione che le normative in atto negli Stati membri siano sufficienti a garantire il pieno accesso all'istruzione e all'occupazione dei cittadini europei affetti da disabilità?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(3 settembre 2012)

La convenzione ONU sui diritti delle persone con disabilità (UNCPRD) è stata firmata da tutti gli Stati membri e dall'UE. Al luglio 2012 ventidue Stati membri avevano ratificato la convenzione, mentre il processo di ratifica è ancora in corso in Finlandia, Irlanda, Malta, Paesi Bassi e Polonia.

Ogni anno, dal 2008, la Commissione e il gruppo ad alto livello dell'UE sulla disabilità (HLG) pubblicano una relazione congiunta sui progressi realizzati nell'attuazione della convenzione ([1]) da parte dell'UE e degli Stati membri. La relazione del 2012 è stata presentata al Consiglio EPSCO il 21 giugno 2012 ([2]).

Nel quadro di un progetto della Commissione, la Rete accademica di esperti europei in disabilità (ANED) ha costituito una grande banca dati ([3]) contenente informazioni sulle leggi, le politiche, le strategie e le iniziative nazionali degli Stati membri dell'UE, dei paesi candidati e di altri paesi associati, relative all'attuazione pratica della convenzione, tra l'altro nei settori dell'occupazione e dell'istruzione.

L'Unione europea (UE) è vincolata dalla convenzione sui diritti delle persone con disabilità entro i limiti delle sue competenze. Soltanto ove gli Stati membri stiano attuando il diritto dell'UE la Commissione può valutare se una legge o una misura nazionale sia conforme alla convenzione e ai diritti sanciti dalla Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea.

La direttiva 2000/78/CE ([4]) proibisce la discriminazione sul lavoro, tra l'altro, per motivi di disabilità, ma non si applica all'istruzione in generale. La Commissione ha avviato procedure di infrazione contro diversi Stati membri che non hanno recepito completamente o correttamente la direttiva. Le procedure saranno chiuse solo quando gli Stati membri provvederanno a chiarire in modo soddisfacente la loro legislazione nazionale o a conformarsi alla direttiva.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/document/index_en.htm#h2-5.
([2]) Nota informativa della Commissione sui progressi compiuti nell'applicazione della convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti delle persone con disabilità (UNCRPD); rif. 11171/12
http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st11/st11171.en12.pdf.
([3]) http://www.disability-europe.net/dotcom.
([4]) Direttiva 2000/78/CE del Consiglio, del 27 novembre 2000, che stabilisce un quadro generale per la parità di trattamento in materia di occupazione e di condizioni di lavoro (GU L 303 del 2.12.2000, pag. 16).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006748/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Protection of the rights of people with disabilities and ratification of the UN Convention

The general assembly of the European Disability Forum (EDF), held in Copenhagen in May 2012, adopted a resolution entitled 'The human rights way out of the crisis', which points to the urgent need to protect the rights of people with disabilities and their family members from the effects of the measures being taken to tackle the current economic crisis. According to EDF figures, about 80 million people in Europe have a disability of varying seriousness; on that account, they are the population segment most exposed to the risk of poverty.

The effectiveness of the EU strategies applied in recent years is being jeopardised by the meagreness of the funding available. However, the Treaty of Lisbon has imposed an obligation on Member States to observe the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 26 of which stipulates that people with disabilities have the right to participate fully in the life of their communities, without being discriminated against in any way compared with the able-bodied. Furthermore, Article 8 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities calls for States Parties to enable people with disabilities to integrate into the labour market according to their skills and abilities.

1. How far have the Member States progressed with the ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities?

2. Article 21 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights prohibits all forms of discrimination based on disability. Does the Commission consider that the Member States' existing legislation is sufficient to guarantee full access to education and employment for European citizens with disabilities?

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

The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD) was signed by all EU Member States and the EU. As of July 2012, twenty-two Member States have ratified the Convention, while the ratification process is ongoing in Finland, Ireland, Malta, Netherlands and Poland.

Since 2008 the Commission and the EU Disability High-Level Group (HLG) have published an annual joint report on progress made with the implementation of the Convention ([1]) by the EU and by the Member States. The 2012 HLG Report was presented at the EPSCO Council of 21 June 2012 ([2]).

As part of a Commission project, the Academic Network of European Disability experts (ANED), has developed a large database ([3]) with information about national laws, policies, strategies and initiatives in the EU's Member States, Candidate countries and other associated countries for the practical implementation of the Convention including in the areas of employment and education.

The UN CRPD binds the EU to the extent of its competence. Only where Member States are implementing EC law can the Commission assess whether a national law or measure complies with the UN CRPD and the rights enshrined in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Directive 2000/78/EC ([4]) prohibits discrimination in employment based, *inter alia*, on disability. It does not apply to education in general. The Commission has opened infringement procedures against several Member States for lack of complete and correct transposition of this directive. It only closes this procedure when the Member State provides satisfactory clarification of its national law or after it has brought its law in conformity with the directive.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/document/index_en.htm#h2-5.
([2]) Information note from the Commission on progress in implementing the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD), ref. 11171/12 http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st11/st11171.en12.pdf
([3]) http://www.disability-europe.net/dotcom.
([4]) Council Directive 2000/78/EC of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, OJ L 303, 2.12.2000, p. 16.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006749/12
do Komisji
Piotr Borys (PPE)
(5 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Projekt w ramach Funduszu Spójności nr 2002/PL/16/P/PE/033 w Jeleniej Górze

Projekt nr 2002/PL/16/P/PE/033 „Zaopatrzenie w wodę i oczyszczanie ścieków w Jeleniej Górze" finansowany w ramach Funduszu Spójności, został ukończony dnia 31 grudnia 2009 r.

Na podstawie wytycznych do przygotowania raportu końcowego projektu Funduszu Spójności Komisja Europejska dokonuje wpłaty płatności końcowej po zatwierdzeniu raportu końcowego oraz po przedstawieniu Komisji Europejskiej wniosku o płatność końcową.

Miasto Jelenia Góra złożyło wniosek o płatność końcową w wysokości 5 298 165,61 Euro. Wniosek został złożony 28 lutego 2010 r. zgodnie z terminem wyszczególnionym w decyzji o otrzymaniu dofinansowania. Komisja Europejska rozpoczęła weryfikację raportu końcowego w grudniu 2011 r. Beneficjent spełnił warunki przedstawione w Memorandum Finansowym, które zostało podpisane w Brukseli 23 września 2002 r. Zgodnie z jego zapisami następnym krokiem powinno być dokonanie płatności salda końcowego pomocy wspólnotowej.

Jelenia Góra zaciągnęła pożyczkę w celu prefinansowania projektu w wysokości 18 545 181,61 PLN. Miasto comiesięcznie spłaca odsetki od pożyczki w wysokości 72 876,10 PLN. Od zakończenia projektu 31 grudnia 2009 r. do 31 marca 2012 r. wartość zapłaconych odsetek wyniosła 2 mln PLN.

— Kiedy Miasto Jelenia Góra może liczyć na zatwierdzenie raportu końcowego projektu Funduszu Spójności oraz dokonania płatności końcowej przez Komisję?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(3 września 2012 r.)

Komisja wysłała państwu członkowskiemu pismo w sprawie zamknięcia projektu dnia 30 lipca 2012 r. Państwo członkowskie będzie miało obowiązek odpowiedzi na propozycję zamknięcia projektu w ciągu dwóch miesięcy po otrzymaniu wspomnianego pisma.

Jeśli chodzi o proces zamykania projektu, wydaje się, iż dzień 28 lutego 2010 r., na który zwraca uwagę Pan Poseł, był dniem wewnętrznego złożenia dokumentów zamknięcia organom krajowym przez beneficjenta. Komisja otrzymała wniosek o płatność końcową w dniu 6 lipca 2010 r., po jego ocenie przez władze Polski. Pozostałe części pełnego zestawu dokumentów (raport końcowy oraz poświadczenie zamknięcia) wpłynęły jednak do Komisji odpowiednio w dniach 20 lipca i 7 września 2010 r., co oznacza, że Komisja mogła rozpocząć wewnętrzną procedurę oceny dopiero we wrześniu 2010 r. W trakcie procedury oceny pojawiły się pewne pytania, które skierowano do władz Polski w piśmie z dnia 29 kwietnia 2011 r. w sprawie zamówień publicznych oraz w piśmie z dnia 7 marca 2012 r. w sprawie zagadnień środowiskowych. Ta procedura zamknięcia projektów inwestycyjnych stanowiła dla władz Polski pierwsze tego typu doświadczenie, wskutek czego Komisji przesyłano dokumenty różnej jakości, co z uwagi na liczne problemy interpretacyjne istotnie wpłynęło na czas potrzebny Komisji na ich rozpatrzenie. Ponieważ projekt był częścią jednej z pierwszych partii zamykanych projektów w sektorze ochrony środowiska, niezbędne było przeprowadzenie w toku procedury zamykania dodatkowych weryfikacji, mających na celu zapewnienie właściwego zastosowania zasady należytego zarządzania finansami. Weryfikacje te obejmowały zamówienia publiczne, dodatkową gwarancję, że projekt jest w pełni funkcjonalny i może zostać oddany do użytku, oraz prezentację głównego planu dotyczącego gospodarki wodnej, który stanowił jeden z wymogów przewidzianych w pierwotnym memorandum finansowym.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006749/12
to the Commission
Piotr Borys (PPE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Cohesion Fund project No 2002/PL/16/P/PE/033 in Jelenia Góra

Project No 2002/PL/16/P/PE/033 'Jelenia Góra water supply and waste water treatment', which was financed under the Cohesion Fund, was completed on 31 December 2009.

Under the guidelines on the preparation of final reports on Cohesion Fund projects, the Commission must make a final payment once it has approved the final report and been presented with an application for final payment.

The city of Jelenia Góra submitted an application for final payment in the amount of EUR 5 298 165.61. This application was submitted on 28 February 2010, in accordance with the time limit specified in the decision on the granting of funding. The Commission launched its verification of the final report in December 2011. The beneficiary had met all of the conditions set out in the Financing Memorandum, which had been signed in Brussels on 23 September 2002. Under the provisions of the Memorandum, the next step should have been the payment of the final balance of EU assistance.

Jelenia Góra took out a loan in order to pre-finance the project to the tune of PLN 18 545 181.61. Each month, the city pays PLN 72 876.10 in interest on this loan. The amount paid in interest in the period between the project's completion on 31 December 2009 and 31 March 2012 was PLN 2 million.

— When can the city of Jelenia Góra expect the final report on the Cohesion Fund project to be approved and the final payment to be paid by the Commission?

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

The closure letter was sent by the Commission to the Member State on 30 July 2012. Member State will have two months after receiving the aforesaid letter to reply to the closure proposal.

As regards the closure process, the date of 28 February 2010, as quoted by the Honourable Member, seems to be a date of the internal submission of the closure documents by the beneficiary to the national authorities. The Commission received the final payment claim for the project on 6 July 2010 after the assessment of the Polish authorities. However, the full set of documents (final report and winding-up declaration) was received respectively on 20 July and 7 September 2010, which means that the Commission could only start the internal appraisal procedure in September 2010. During the appraisal procedure several questions appeared and were communicated to the Polish authorities, i.e. by letter of 29 April 2011 on public procurement and of 7 March 2012 on environmental issues. This closure exercise for investment projects was the first unprecedented experience for the Polish authorities and that resulted in a variable quality of documents provided to the Commission, significantly influencing the time proceedings on the Commission side due to numerous interpretation problems. As the project was one of the first wave of closures in the environmental sector, additional verifications had to be conducted during the closure procedure in order to assure the correct application of the principle of sound financial management. These checks concerned the public procurement, an additional assurance that the project is functional and operational, and presentation of the Master Plan for water management, that was a condition stemming from the original Financing Memorandum.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006750/12
to the Commission
Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Body scanners at EU airports: Written Question E-003034/2012

With regard to Written Question E-003034/2012, the Commission has failed to adequately answer the question or provide the clarity requested. Could the Commission please reconsider its response and provide a more tangible answer to this question?

Can the Commission, with reference to the original question, clarify if providing an 'alternative screening method' is mandatory?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2012)

The Commission considers that its reply to E-003034/2012 ([1]) on more stringent measures and security equipment trials answers the questions raised therein.

In reply to the second question relating to the discretion or not of Member States to provide 'alternative screening methods' the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-5926/2012 ([2]).

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006751/12
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(5 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Subida de las tasas aeroportuarias

El pasado 1 de julio, el gestor aéreo español AENA elevó el precio de los billetes por medio de una subida de las tasas aeroportuarias.

Dicha medida, que no ha sido bien recibida por parte de la mayoría de aerolíneas que operan desde España, podría suponer una significante pérdida de competitividad de los aeropuertos españoles con respecto al resto de la Unión Europea, ya que la subida de las tasas es significativamente superior a la media europea. Este motivo ha llevado a la compañía aérea EasyJet a abandonar el aeropuerto de Barajas como base de operaciones recientemente.

Además, la subida de las tasas tiene un efecto retroactivo que afecta también a los billetes que han sido vendidos con anterioridad al 1 de julio. Con el fin de capear el aumento del coste al que deben hacer frente las compañías aéreas, algunas han optado por hacer repercutir la diferencia de precio en las personas que hayan comprado su billete antes del 1 de julio, a pesar de que la relación financiera transaccional con la compañía ya haya terminado.

A la luz de lo anterior:

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que el hecho de que las compañías aéreas exijan a los pasajeros el pago correspondiente al incremento de las tasas en billetes vendidos con anterioridad al 1 de julio para volar en fechas posteriores supone una práctica comercial desleal?

2. La subida de las tasas aeroportuarias es del 18 % de media. Sin embargo, en aeropuertos como el de Barcelona y Madrid, el porcentaje podría ser aún más alto. ¿Cómo valora la Comisión dicha subida desigual de las tasas aeroportuarias?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de agosto de 2012)

1. La Comisión cree que la decisión de una compañía aérea de cobrar a los pasajeros el aumento de las tasas aeroportuarias en relación con los vuelos sujetos a las tasas incrementadas, pero reservados antes de que su aumento hubiera entrado en vigor, no constituye una práctica comercial desleal siempre que la inclusión de la tasa en la tarifa total se indique en el momento de la compra, de conformidad con los requisitos de transparencia del Reglamento (CE) n° 1008/2008 ([1]), y que las cláusulas del contrato de transporte comunicadas al pasajero contemplen la posibilidad de cobrar cualquier incremento nominal de la tasa o de reembolsar cualquier rebaja de la misma después de la compra. La tasa misma no es un ingreso de la compañía aérea, sino un coste que el pasajero paga a la compañía aérea y que se transfiere a la autoridad pertinente.

2. La Comisión está investigando el aumento de las tasas aeroportuarias de los aeropuertos españoles y se mantiene en contacto con las autoridades españolas a fin de comprobar el cumplimiento en este caso de los requisitos de la Directiva 2009/12/CE relativa a las tasas aeroportuarias ([2]).

([1]) El Reglamento (CE) n° 1008/2008 establece que «se indicará en todo momento el precio final que deba pagarse, que incluirá la tarifa o flete aplicable así como todos los impuestos aplicables y los cánones, recargos y derechos que sean obligatorios y previsibles en el momento de su publicación».

([2]) DO L 70 de 14.3.2009, p. 11.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006751/12
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Increase in airport taxes

On 1 July 2012, the Spanish airport management agency AENA raised ticket prices by increasing airport taxes.

This measure, which has not been well received by most airlines operating out of Spain, could cause Spanish airports to lose competitiveness in relation to their counterparts in other EU countries, since the tax increase is significantly above the European average rate. It has already caused the airline Easyjet to withdraw from Barajas airport as an operational base.

Furthermore, the tax increase is applied retroactively, so that it also affects tickets sold before 1 July. In an attempt to sidestep the additional cost accruing to them, some airlines have opted to charge passengers who purchased their tickets before this date with the price difference, even though they have already completed their financial transaction with the company.

1. Does the Commission consider the decision by airlines to charge passengers for the tax increase on tickets sold before 1 July 2012 for flights after that date to constitute unfair commercial practice?

2. Airport taxes have risen by an average of 18%. However, at airports such as Barcelona and Madrid, this percentage could be higher. How does the Commission view this unequal increase in airport taxes?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

1. The Commission is of the opinion that the decision of an airline to charge passengers for the increase in airport charges in respect of flights attracting the increased charges but booked prior to the entry into force of the increased charges does not constitute an unfair commercial practice as long as the inclusion of the charge in the total fare is disclosed at the time of purchase, in accordance with the price transparency requirements of Regulation (EC) 1008/2008 ([1]), and the terms and conditions of the contract for transport communicated to the passenger foresee the possibility to perceive any nominal increase or to reimburse any decrease of the charge after purchase. The charge itself is not an income of the airline, but a cost that the passenger pays to the airline and which is passed through to the relevant authority.

2. The Commission is investigating the increased airport charges at Spanish airports and is in contact with the Spanish authorities in order to check that the requirements of the Airport Charges Directive 2009/12/EC ([2]) have been fulfilled in this case.

([1]) Regulation (EC)1008/2008 states that 'the final price to be paid shall at all times be indicated and shall include the applicable air fare or rate as well as all applicable taxes and charges, surcharges and fees which are unavoidable and foreseeable at the time of publication'.

([2]) OJ L 70, 14.3.2009, p. 11.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006752/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Phil Bennion (ALDE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Energy crisis in Pakistan

The energy sector in Pakistan has experienced a major shortfall which has had a serious effect on the economy and political situation. Severe energy shortages in South Punjab in recent months have led to days of riots and protests.

Can the Vice-President/High Representative answer the following questions in light of this:

1. What initiatives are planned by the Vice-President/High Representative and what degree of EU support is envisaged to help stimulate and support investment from European companies in the energy sector in Pakistan — in particular in the development of micro- hydel projects which would ensure the availability of water for irrigated agriculture, help control floods and provide low-cost hydel-electricity?

2. What were the results of the EU-Pakistan business venture and capacity-building seminar for renewable energy companies which took place in 2007-2008? Does the EEAS have any plans to relaunch such an initiative? How frequently does the EU organise delegation visits of European companies to Pakistan?

3. What will be the extent of EU public and private sector involvement and support for the EU-funded projects that were recently announced? When are these projects, which include the rehabilitation and upgrade of power plants, small hydro-plants and the EU programme of solar pumps for Balochistan, likely to be launched? In addition, are any EU-funded projects planned for the upgrade of the transmission and distribution systems to support Pakistan in reducing its line losses?

4. What kind of targeted support has been planned in order to help Pakistan in tackling its lack of long-term planning with regard to the energy sector, to achieve the best energy mix and to limit its increased dependence on imported oil?

5. Has the Vice-President/High Representative ever raised the crucial issues of rampant electricity theft and circular debt with her Pakistani counterparts, issues that have reached alarming levels and that are exacerbating an already dire situation?

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

The HR/VP visited Pakistan in June 2012 to launch the EU-Pakistan Strategic Dialogue. In the course of discussions with Foreign Minister Khar, she conveyed EU concerns at the serious social and economic consequences of the crippling energy shortages in the country.

The EU and Pakistan will discuss energy concerns further under the new political framework — the five-Year Engagement Plan. Possible approaches on energy in the Plan include: support to FoDP ([1])-led actions; encouragement for corporate Joint Ventures; technology transfer.

So far, interest by the EU private sector in investing in Pakistan has been low. Reform of the energy sector will be crucial in reversing this situation.

The EU provides EUR 40 million in support of small hydro power development projects in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province, and EUR 1.2 million for a climate change impact study of the Munda dam, in cooperation with AFD ([2]). A EUR 2.5 million project in cooperation with AFD is being considered under the Asia Investment Facility, in the field of hydropower. The EIB ([3]) and Pakistan signed a EUR 100 million financing agreement in 2009 to support renewable energy investments in the country, in co-financing agreement with the ADB ([4]).

([1]) Friends of Democratic Pakistan.
([2]) Agence Francaise de Development.
([3]) European Investment Bank.
([4]) Asian Development Bank.

The seminar referred to, co-funded by the EU, was organised within an Asia Invest project to raise awareness on the use of renewable energy sources and exchange views on the most suitable European renewable energy technologies for Pakistan.

Regarding assistance to Pakistan under the next financial perspectives (2014-2020), the identification of future sectors and allocation of funding, is expected to be carried out in 2012-2013 in cooperation with the Government of Pakistan, and in consultation with Member States, civil society and EU institutions.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006753/12
aan de Raad
Thijs Berman (S&D) en Emine Bozkurt (S&D)
(5 juli 2012)

Betreft: Indonesië

In de Papua-regio in Indonesië zijn begin juni 2012 grote spanningen ontstaan na de gewelddadige dood van een Indonesische soldaat. Als antwoord hierop heeft het Indonesische leger acties ondernomen die later door de Indonesische president, de heer Yudhoyono, een „te sterke reactie" werden genoemd. Een aantal mensen is verwond en huizen zijn in de as gelegd. Er zijn geen meldingen van enig gerechtelijk onderzoek na deze incidenten, ondanks dat zowel de dood van de soldaat als de vergelding van het leger voldoende reden lijken te zijn om een dergelijk onderzoek te rechtvaardigen.

Het valt onder de bevoegdheid van lidstaten om toestemming voor de export van wapens te verlenen. De EU-gedragscode betreffende wapenuitvoer is echter politiek bindend en biedt duidelijke criteria. Een van de redenen om een uitvoervergunning te weigeren is een situatie waarin er „een duidelijk risico bestaat dat de beoogde uitvoer wordt gebruikt voor binnenlandse onderdrukking".

1. Hoe beoordeelt de Raad de mensenrechtensituatie in Indonesië?

2. Is de Raad van mening dat Indonesië volledig voldoet aan de criteria voor wapenuitvoer vanuit de EU-lidstaten na de incidenten in Papua?

3. Is de Raad van mening dat de export van alle conventionele wapens nog steeds moet worden geaccepteerd en zo ja, waarom?

4. Moeten wapens die tegen de bevolking kunnen worden gebruikt worden uitgesloten?

Antwoord
(1 oktober 2012)

Indonesië heeft sedert de val van het Suharto-regime aanmerkelijke vooruitgang geboekt met betrekking tot de eerbiediging van de mensenrechten. Het land is met de internationale gemeenschap een gedachtewisseling over de mensenrechtenproblematiek begonnen, zoals blijkt uit het actieve lidmaatschap van de VN-Mensenrechtenraad en de deelname aan de mensenrechten-dialoog EU-Indonesië (waarvan de derde ronde heeft plaatsgevonden in mei 2012).

Natuurlijk resteren er nog problemen, met name op het gebied van de vrijheid van godsdienst en overtuiging, de bescherming van minderheden en de benadering van Papua door de overheden. Al deze vraagstukken worden aan de orde gesteld in de dialoog EU-Indonesië, met het oogmerk vooruitgang aan te moedigen en degenen die betrokken zijn bij schendingen van de mensenrechten voor de rechter te brengen.

De wapenuitvoer van EU-lidstaten naar Indonesië valt onder het gemeenschappelijk standpunt van de Raad van december 2008, dat gemeenschappelijke voorschriften bevat betreffende de controle op de uitvoer van militaire technologie en uitrusting. Het Indonesische leger gebruikt echter overwegend vuurwapens die door het overheidsbedrijf PT Pintad zijn geproduceerd en voert op beperkte schaal uitrusting in uit derde landen, met name vliegtuigen, zeeschepen en voertuigen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006753/12
to the Council
Thijs Berman (S&D) and Emine Bozkurt (S&D)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Indonesia

Serious tensions arose in the Papua region of Indonesia after the violent death of an Indonesian soldier in early June 2012. In response, the Indonesian army carried out actions that were later described by Indonesia's President, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, as an 'overreaction'. Several people were wounded and houses were burnt down. There are no reports of any judicial inquiries into these incidents, although both the death of the soldier and the army's retaliation would seem to amply warrant such an investigation.

The decision to grant permission for arms exports lies with the Member States. However, the EU Code of Conduct on Arms Exports is politically binding and offers clear criteria. One of the reasons for refusing an export licence is where 'there is a clear risk that the proposed export might be used for internal repression'.

1. What is the Council's assessment of the human rights situation in Indonesia?

2. In the light of the incidents that occurred in Papua in June, does the Council consider that Indonesia fully meets the criteria for arms exports from EU Member States?

3. Does the Council consider that the export of all conventional arms is still acceptable, and if so, on what grounds?

4. Should there be an exclusion of armaments that could be used against the population?

Reply
(1 October 2012)

Indonesia has made substantial progress in improving respect for human rights since the fall of the Suharto regime. The country has engaged with the international community on human rights concerns, as demonstrated by its active membership of the UN Human Rights Council and participation in the EU-Indonesia Human Rights Dialogue (the third session of which took place in May 2012).

Clearly challenges remain, notably in the area of freedom of religion and belief, protection of minorities and the approach of the authorities to Papua. These are all concerns that are being addressed in the EU-Indonesia dialogue, with a view to encouraging progress and to bringing to justice those implicated in human rights abuses.

Arms exports from EU Member States to Indonesia are governed by the Council's Common Position of December 2008 defining common rules on the control of export of military technology and equipment. However, the Indonesian army largely uses firearms produced by the government-owned PT Pindad company, with a few imports from third countries, notably aircraft, marine vessels and vehicles.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006754/12
à la Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(5 juillet 2012)

Objet: Droits sociaux des expatriés au sein de l'Union

La mobilité des travailleurs est l'une des raisons d'être de l'Europe. S'établir dans un autre pays de l'Union est une démarche qui demande beaucoup d'efforts. C'est quitter ses repères pour vivre une nouvelle culture, une nouvelle vie. Souvent, la langue constitue une barrière supplémentaire.

Arriver dans un nouveau territoire impose de respecter des règles. Mais quitter son pays, c'est aussi partir avec un certain nombre de droits sociaux et de sécurité sociale. Grâce à l'Europe, l'expérience professionnelle acquise au sein de l'Union et la situation familiale sont des critères automatiquement pris en compte dans le pays d'accueil pour bénéficier de prestations précises, sur un pied d'égalité avec les ressortissants de celui-ci.

Néanmoins, dans beaucoup de cas vécus (France/Belgique, France/Espagne), les organismes institutionnels chargés de ces questions ne prêtent pas assez d'attention à leurs obligations en matière de coopération internationale. Cela rallonge les délais et augmente encore un peu le poids de l'expatriation. Cela devient très problématique lorsque les aléas de la vie professionnelle amènent le travailleur à constituer un dossier de chômage.

Ces situations constituent, de fait, une entrave à la mobilité des personnes. Il existe pourtant une réglementation bien établie.

1. La Commission peut-elle me donner les textes en vigueur régissant la coopération européenne en matière de droits sociaux et de sécurité sociale?

2. Quels en sont les grands principes?

3. Enfin, les organisations des pays amenées à coopérer ont-elles des obligations de résultats, de moyens, de transparence et de réponse dans un délai raisonnable? Si oui, quelles sont-elles précisément?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(21 août 2012)

1. Les systèmes de sécurité sociale des États membres sont actuellement coordonnés (et non harmonisés) par le règlement (CE) nº 883/2004 ([1]) et par le règlement (CE) nº 987/2009 ([2]).

2. Les grands principes sont la non-discrimination, l'exportation des prestations, la totalisation des périodes d'assurance, l'assimilation des faits et la coopération renforcée entre les institutions nationales compétentes.

3. Conformément aux articles 2 et 3 du règlement (CE) nº 987/2009, les échanges entre les autorités et institutions des États membres et les personnes couvertes par le règlement reposent sur les principes du service public, de l'efficacité, de l'assistance active, de la fourniture rapide et de l'accessibilité, y compris l'accessibilité en ligne. Entre outre, le considérant 7 du règlement (CE) nº 987/2009 prévoit ce qui suit: «Les personnes visées par le présent règlement devraient recevoir de l'institution compétente une réponse à leur demande en temps voulu. Cette réponse devrait être communiquée au plus tard dans les délais prescrits par la législation en matière de sécurité sociale de l'État membre concerné […].».

([1]) Règlement (CE) n° 883/2004 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 29 avril 2004 portant sur la coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale (JO L 200 du 7.6.2004, p. 1).

([2]) Règlement (CE) n° 987/2009 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 16 septembre 2009 fixant les modalités d'application du règlement (CE) n° 883/2004 portant sur la coordination des systèmes de sécurité sociale (JO L 284 du 30.10.2009, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006754/12
to the Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Social rights of expatriates in the EU

Labour mobility is one of the founding principles of the European Union. Moving to another Member State is an undertaking that requires much effort. It means leaving behind the familiar to live a new life in a new culture. Often, the issue of language poses an additional problem.

Arriving in a new place means having to follow the rules, but leaving one's home country also means leaving with a number of social rights and social security entitlements. Thanks to the EU, one's professional experience within the Union and family situation are some of the criteria that are automatically taken into consideration in the host country when determining entitlement to particular benefits, placing expatriates on an equal footing with the nationals of the host country.

However, in many cases (France/Belgium, France/Spain) the institutional bodies responsible for such matters do not pay sufficient attention to their duties in terms of international cooperation. This leads to longer waiting times and adds to the burden faced by expatriates. This becomes a major problem when the hazards of working life mean that a worker has to file for unemployment benefits.

Such situations in fact represent an obstacle to people's mobility. And yet, well established rules already exist.

1. Can the Commission state which provisions currently in force regulate European cooperation in the area of social rights and entitlements to social security?

2. What are their main principles?

3. Lastly, do the relevant organisations in those countries required to cooperate have obligations vis-à-vis results, transparency or providing a response within a reasonable time? If so, what are these obligations specifically?

Answer given by M. Andor on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2012)

1. The social security systems of the Member States are currently coordinated (not harmonised) by Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 ([1]) and Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 ([2]).

2. The main principles are: non-discrimination, export of benefits, aggregation of insurance periods, assimilation of facts, and enhanced cooperation between national competent institutions.

3. According to Articles 2 and 3 of Regulation (EC) No 987/2009, exchanges between Member States' authorities and institutions and persons covered by the regulation shall be based on the principles of public service, efficiency, active assistance, rapid delivery and accessibility, including e-accessibility. Recital 7 of Regulation (EC) No 987/2009 also provides that: 'The persons covered by this regulation should receive from the competent institution a timely response to their requests. The response should be provided at the latest within the time-limits prescribed by the social security legislation of the Member State in question'.

([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 200, 7.6.2004, 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 883/2004 on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 284, 30.10.2009, p. 1.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006756/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(5 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Smaltimento di rifiuti speciali e deposito dei materiali radioattivi

Il definitivo smantellamento della centrale elettronucleare di Caorso, nei pressi di Piacenza, ha comportato una serie di misure durate anni. Ora è stata completata la decontaminazione di oltre 6 500 tonnellate di materiali metallici relativi al ciclo termico dell'edificio turbina ed è stata realizzata la stazione di gestione dei materiali, che servirà per il prossimo smantellamento e per la decontaminazione dell'edificio che ospita il reattore.

Un problema cruciale, tuttavia, è rappresentato dalla realizzazione di depositi per i materiali radioattivi, compresi quelli ospedalieri o di altra origine. Risulta evidente che non bastano i «no» al nucleare per liberarsi una volta per tutte dalle scorie, ma che occorrono depositi che garantiscano sicurezza in luoghi idonei e isolati.

Può la Commissione riferire:

1. se segue gli smantellamenti delle centrali nucleari;

2. se collabora con gli Stati membri per garantire la tutela dell'ambiente e la sicurezza dei cittadini;

3. se esistono depositi ad hoc per il materiale radioattivo negli Stati che hanno in funzione o che smantellano centrali nucleari;

4. quali sono le caratteristiche essenziali dei depositi per garantire il massimo grado possibile di sicurezza?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(16 agosto 2012)

1. La disattivazione degli impianti nucleari, compresa la gestione dei rifiuti radioattivi che ne derivano, è di competenza nazionale ([1]). Il ruolo della Commissione nella disattivazione è la verifica dell'osservanza della normativa UE da parte degli Stati membri.

2.-4. Spetta agli Stati membri, ai sensi dell'articolo 37 del trattato Euratom e della raccomandazione 635/2010/Euratom della Commissione sull'applicazione del suddetto articolo ([2]), fornire alla Commissione i dati di qualsiasi progetto relativo allo smaltimento di rifiuti radioattivi al fine di determinare se tale progetto sia suscettibile di provocare una contaminazione delle acque, del suolo o dello spazio aereo di un altro Stato membro. La Commissione è tenuta a esprimere il suo parere in merito previa consultazione di un gruppo di esperti.

Inoltre la direttiva 2011/70/Euratom del Consiglio, che disciplina i rifiuti radioattivi derivanti dall'esercizio e dalla disattivazione delle centrali nucleari nonché da attività sanitarie, industriali, agricole e di ricerca, garantisce che gli Stati membri adottino adeguati provvedimenti in ambito nazionale per un elevato livello di sicurezza nella gestione del combustibile esaurito e dei rifiuti radioattivi, al fine di proteggere i lavoratori e la popolazione dai pericoli derivanti dalle radiazioni ionizzanti.

La direttiva, in particolare l'articolo 7, paragrafo 3, precisa gli obblighi relativi alla dimostrazione della sicurezza di tutte le attività di gestione dei rifiuti radioattivi e dei relativi impianti, anche quelli di stoccaggio e di smaltimento. I rifiuti radioattivi sono gestiti in sicurezza, anche nel lungo periodo con caratteristiche di sicurezza passiva.

Per informazioni sui depositi esistenti negli Stati membri, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta data all'interrogazione E-003434/12 di H-P. Martin.

([1]) Secondo la normativa dell'Unione europea, in particolare la direttiva 2009/71/Euratom del Consiglio, del 25 giugno 2009, che istituisce un quadro comunitario per la sicurezza nucleare degli impianti nucleari (GU L 172 del 2.7.2009) e la direttiva 2011/70/Euratom del Consiglio, del 19 luglio 2011, che istituisce un quadro comunitario per la gestione responsabile e sicura del combustibile nucleare esaurito e dei rifiuti radioattivi (GU L 199 del 2.8.2011).

([2]) GU L 279 del 23.10.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006756/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Disposal of special waste and dumping of radioactive material

The definitive decommissioning of Caorso nuclear power station, near Piacenza, has entailed a series of measures over a period of years. Now the decontamination of more than 6 500 tonnes of metallic material associated with the thermal cycle of the turbine building has been completed, and the material management facility has been built which will be used in the forthcoming dismantling work and for the decontamination of the reactor building.

However, one crucial problem is the creation of dumps for the radioactive material, including hospital waste and waste from other origins. It seems obvious that it is not enough to say 'no' to nuclear power in order for all the nuclear waste to disappear once and for all, but that dumps are needed which will guarantee safety in suitable, isolated places.

1. Is the Commission monitoring the decommissioning of nuclear power stations?

2. Is the Commission cooperating with Member States to protect the environment and maintain public safety?

3. Do ad hoc dumps for radioactive material exist in the States which have nuclear power stations in operation or are decommissioning them?

4. What are the essential characteristics which dumps must possess in order to maximise safety?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(16 August 2012)

1. The decommissioning of nuclear power plants, including managing radioactive waste from decommissioning, is a national responsibility ([1]). The role of the Commission in decommissioning is to monitor and ensure that the applicable EU legislation is complied with by the Member States.

2-4. Member States have the responsibility, pursuant to Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty and to Commission Recommendation 635/2010/Euratom on the application of this article ([2]), to provide the Commission with data on any plan to dispose of radioactive waste with a view to determining if it would result in contamination of water, soil or airspace of another Member State. The Commission is required to deliver its opinion on the matter after consultation with a group of experts.

In addition, Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom, which covers radioactive waste arising from operation and decommissioning of nuclear power plants and from medicine, industry, agriculture and research, ensures that Member States provide for appropriate national arrangements for a high level of safety in spent fuel and radioactive waste management to protect workers and the general public against the dangers arising from ionising radiation.

The directive, and in particular Article 7.3, specifies obligations for demonstration of the safety of any radioactive waste management activity and facility, including storage and disposal facilities. Radioactive waste shall be safely managed, including in the long term with passive safety features.

For information regarding existing repositories in Member States, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Question E-003434/12 by Mr H-P. Martin.

([1]) In accordance with European Union (EU) legislation, in particular Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations, OJ L 172, 2.7.2009, and Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste, OJ L 199, 2.8.2011.

([2]) OJ L 279, 23.10.2010.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-006757/12
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(5 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Participación de los acreedores en la reestructuración del sistema financiero español

El Fondo Monetario Internacional publicó en junio de 2012 un informe sobre la estabilidad financiera de España. En el ámbito de la gestión de la crisis, la recomendación 74, de implementación inmediata para el Fondo, señala que las nuevas medidas «deben permitir la distribución de pérdidas entre accionistas y acreedores».

¿Se está siguiendo esta recomendación en la negociación de las condiciones sobre la asistencia financiera solicitada por España para su sistema financiero? ¿Qué medidas están previstas para llevarla a efecto?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(3 de agosto de 2012)

En el marco del cumplimiento por el sector financiero de las condiciones a las que se supedita la ayuda financiera del programa sectorial de hasta 100 000 millones de euros concedidos a España, el sector bancario español será objeto de un diagnóstico global, incluidos un examen de la calidad de los activos y una prueba de la resistencia de cada banco para determinar las necesidades de recapitalización de cada uno de ellos. A juzgar por los resultados de las pruebas de resistencia, los bancos que no puedan hacer frente con sus recursos propios a las necesidades de capital, determinadas mediante la prueba de resistencia, se recapitalizarán con fondos públicos en el respeto de las normas de la UE en materia de ayudas estatales.

A fin de reducir al mínimo el coste para los contribuyentes, según lo previsto en las condiciones asociadas al programa sectorial, un reparto de cargas puede preceder a la recapitalización de los bancos. Antes de inyectarse capital público, las pérdidas se repartirán no solo entre los accionistas, sino también entre los titulares de deuda subordinada en los bancos que se acojan a las ayudas estatales para hacer frente a las necesidades de capital determinadas mediante la prueba de resistencia. A los bancos que puedan hacer frente a sus necesidades de capital con sus recursos propios o acumulando capital social privado no les afectará ese reparto de cargas. Se ha adoptado este mismo planteamiento en otros ejemplos de recapitalización de bancos de la UE con fondos públicos.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006757/12
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Participation by creditors in restructuring the Spanish financial system

In June 2012 the International Monetary Fund published a report assessing Spain's financial stability. Under the heading of crisis management, Point 74 of the report, which the fund recommends should be immediately introduced, indicates that the new measures 'should enable allocation of losses to shareholders and creditors'.

Is this recommendation being followed in the negotiations over conditions to be applied to the financial aid being requested by Spain for its financial system? What measures will be included in order to implement it?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

As part of the financial sector conditionality attached to the financial assistance sectoral programme of up to EUR 100 billion granted to Spain, the Spanish banking sector will be subject to a comprehensive diagnostic including an asset quality review as well as a bank-by-bank-stress test to determine the recapitalisation needs of individual banks. Based on the results of the stress test, banks which will not be able to meet the capital needs identified by the stress test through own resources will be recapitalised with public resources subject to the EU state aid rules.

In order to minimise the cost to taxpayers, as foreseen in the conditionality attached to the sectoral programme, the recapitalisation of banks will be preceded by a burden-sharing exercise. Before the injection of public capital, losses will be allocated not only to shareholders, but also to junior debt holders in banks which will benefit from state aid to meet the capital needs identified by the stress test. Banks which are able to meet their capital needs through own resources of by raising private equity are not included in the scope of this burden-sharing exercise. The same approach was used in other cases of recapitalisation of EU banks with public resources.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006758/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: 12-mile zone

At present, under Council Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002, waters within 12 nautical miles of each EU nation's coastline are exempted from the general principle of equal access built into the common fisheries policy (CFP).

Given the widely acknowledged success of the 12-miles regime, and the fact that it protects some of Europe's most fragile coastal communities, there are strong arguments in favour of extending its scope.

The exemption is due to run out on 31 December 2012.

What, in detail, would be the short- and long-term implications if the 12-mile exemption zone were not renewed?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

Temporary fishing restrictions in the 12 nautical miles waters were introduced in order to ensure the conservation of fish resources and to preserve coastal fleets' traditional fishing activities.

As indicated in the Commission's Report ([1]) and pointed out by the Honourable Member in his question, the rules have continued to operate satisfactorily. That is why the proposal for the new Regulation on the common fisheries policy (CFP) ([2]) forsees the extension of the regime from 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2022. Seeing that it is now unlikely that the negotiations would be concluded by the end of 2012, the Commission adopted a proposal for a regulation ([3]) extending the validity of the 12 nautical miles regime from 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2014, pending the adoption of the new CFP Regulation. The temporary nature of these restrictions is due to the fact that they are an exception to one of the basic principles of the Treaty.

If the 12 nautical miles regime is not renewed by 1 January 2013, the principle of general equal access to waters and resources for all Union fishing vessels will also apply to the 12 nautical miles zones of the EU Member States.

([1]) Report from the Commission to the European Parliament , the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Reporting Obligations under Council regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 of 20 December 2002 on the conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources under the common fisheries policy, COM(2011)418.
([2]) COM(2011)425.
([3]) COM(2012)277.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-006759/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(5 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Gravi problemi tecnici nell'applicazione del regolamento (UE) n. 211/2011 che discriminano il libero esercizio del diritto di iniziativa dei cittadini europei

Ad oggi sono ben otto le iniziative dei cittadini europei che sono state registrate dalla Commissione conformemente all'articolo 4 del regolamento (UE) n. 211/2011 riguardante l'iniziativa dei cittadini.

In base all'articolo 6, punto 3, di detto regolamento, la Commissione entro il 1°gennaio 2012 avrebbe dovuto predisporre un software open-source efficace per procedere alla raccolta delle firme che incorporasse tutti i requisiti tecnici e di sicurezza necessari.

Il software messo a disposizione dalla Commissione, però, si è dimostrato impossibile da implementare da un punto di vista tecnico, non permettendo di rispettare le condizioni previste per la raccolta delle firme, come indicato dal citato regolamento.

Di conseguenza i comitati organizzatori, salvo affrontare un ingente sforzo economico che, ovviamente, non tutti si possono permettere, si trovano, di fatto, nell'impossibilità oggettiva di raccogliere le firme.

L'attuale incapacità della Commissione di fornire un software «user friendly» per la raccolta di dichiarazioni di sostegno online, rischia quindi di pregiudicare il libero esercizio di quest'importante strumento democratico e scoraggiare i cittadini dall'utilizzarlo.

Può la Commissione dare indicazioni precise in merito a quando potrà produrre un software che possa essere correttamente utilizzato dagli organizzatori per procedere alla raccolta di dichiarazioni di sostegno online? Per rimediare a questa situazione, può la Commissione garantire ai promotori delle diverse iniziative che sono state già registrate, una proroga della scadenza dei termini entro la quale procedere alla raccolta delle firme, in modo che i dodici mesi previsti dal regolamento per la raccolta di un milione di firme non partano dalla registrazione, ma dalla messa a disposizione, da parte della Commissione, di un software praticabile ed efficace, come previsto all'articolo 6 del regolamento (UE) n. 211/2011?

Nel caso in cui i promotori di un'iniziativa abbiano iniziato a raccogliere dichiarazioni di sostegno su moduli cartacei, al fine di evitare che siano cestinate, la Commissione ne riconoscerà la validità e permetterà che esse siano comunque raccolte dalla data di registrazione fino alla fine del periodo di dodici mesi che comincerà quando la Commissione metterà disposizione il software necessario per la raccolta online delle firme?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(8 agosto 2012)

Conformemente al regolamento riguardante l'iniziativa dei cittadini ([1]), gli organizzatori devono istituire i loro sistemi di raccolta elettronica. La Commissione doveva sviluppare un software con codice sorgente aperto per agevolare questo compito. Il software è stato messo a disposizione il 22 dicembre 2011 ([2]) e ottempera alle disposizioni tecniche e di sicurezza del regolamento. Diversi organizzatori lo hanno installato nei loro sistemi chiedendone la certificazione alle rispettive autorità nazionali. Una delle iniziative ha già ottenuto la certificazione.

I problemi incontrati da alcuni organizzatori sono essenzialmente legati all'hosting, che rientra fra le loro responsabilità, e alla certificazione del sistema da parte della competente autorità nazionale. Nella fase di lancio di questo nuovo strumento alcuni organizzatori hanno avuto difficoltà a trovare sul mercato fornitori di servizi informatici a costi accessibili.

La Commissione ha pertanto deciso, in via facoltativa, temporanea ed eccezionale, di ospitare un numero limitato di sistemi di raccolta elettronica sui propri server e di prorogare di 12 mesi il termine ultimo per le prime iniziative al fine di evitare i problemi della fase iniziale. La proroga vale per le dichiarazioni di sostegno raccolte online e su carta.

([1]) Regolamento (UE) n. 211/2011 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 16 febbraio 2011 riguardante l'iniziativa dei cittadini, GU L 65 dell'11.3.2011, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:065:0001:0022:EN:PDF.
([2]) https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/ocs/release/all.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006759/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Serious technical problems with the implementation of Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 and resulting discrimination as regards the free exercise of European citizens' right of initiative

To date eight citizens' initiatives have been registered by the Commission in accordance with Article 4 of Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 on the citizens' initiative.

Under Article 6(2) of the regulation, the Commission was supposed, by 1 January 2012, to have set up an effective open-source software system for collecting signatures, incorporating all the necessary technical and security features.

The software provided by the Commission, however, has proved technically impossible to implement, as it is incompatible with the conditions laid down in the regulation for the collection of signatures, which consequently cannot be complied with.

This means that, unless they incur a huge financial outlay, which, obviously, they cannot afford to do, organising committees are, to all intents and purposes, unable to collect signatures.

The Commission's current inability to supply user-friendly software for online collection of statements of support is therefore in danger of undermining the freedom to employ what is an important democratic channel and discouraging citizens from using it.

When exactly will the Commission be able to produce software that can be properly used by organisers to collect statements of support online? To remedy the present situation, can it give a guarantee to the proponents of the initiatives already registered that the time limits for the collection of signatures will be put back so that the twelve months allowed under the regulation to collect a million signatures will start not on the date of registration, but once the Commission has set up a practicable, effective software system, as referred to in Article 6 of Regulation (EU) No 211/2011?

If the organisers of an initiative have already begun to collect statements of support in paper form, and to prevent these simply being thrown away, will the Commission recognise their validity and allow them to be collected in any event from the date of registration until the end of the twelve-month period that will start to run when the Commission has supplied the software necessary for online collection of signatures?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2012)

In accordance with the regulation on the citizens' initiative ([1]), organisers have to set up their own online collection system and, in order to help them build their system, the Commission had to develop an open source software. This software was made available on 22nd December 2011 ([2]) and complies with the relevant technical and security features. Several organisers have installed it in their system and asked for certification to the respective national authorities. One initiative has already obtained such certification.

The issues faced by some organisers are mainly related to the hosting of the software (which is up to the organisers) and to the certification of the system by the competent national authority: in the teething stage of this new instrument, it has proven challenging for some organisers to find affordable service providers on the market.

The Commission has therefore decided as an optional, temporary and exceptional measure to host a limited number of online collection systems on its own servers and to extend the 12-month deadline for the first initiatives, so that these initiatives should not suffer from issues inherent in the start-up phase. The extension of the time-limit will apply to the statements of support collected online as well as in paper form.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 211/2011 of the Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 on the citizens' initiative, OJ L 65, 11.3.2011, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:065:0001:0022:EN:PDF.

([2]) https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/ocs/release/all.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006760/12
al Consejo
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(5 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Participación de los acreedores en la reestructuración del sistema financiero español

El Fondo Monetario Internacional publicó en junio de 2012 un informe sobre la estabilidad financiera de España. En el ámbito de la gestión de la crisis, la recomendación 74, de implementación inmediata para el Fondo, señala que las nuevas medidas «deben permitir la distribución de pérdidas entre accionistas y acreedores».

¿Se está siguiendo esta recomendación en la negociación de las condiciones sobre la asistencia financiera solicitada por España para su sistema financiero? ¿Qué medidas están previstas para llevarla a efecto?

Respuesta
(18 de septiembre de 2012)

La Decisión del Consejo de 23 de julio de 2012 dirigida a España sobre medidas concretas para reforzar la estabilidad financiera ([1]) recuerda que, el 25 de junio de 2012, las autoridades españolas solicitaron oficialmente ayuda financiera en el contexto del actual proceso de reestructuración y recapitalización del sector bancario español. La ayuda se solicita en el marco de la ayuda financiera de la Facilidad Europea de Estabilización Financiera (FEEF) para la recapitalización de las entidades financieras y se supedita al cumplimiento de determinadas condiciones por el sector financiero tal como está previsto en el memorándum de entendimiento negociado entre el Gobierno español y la Comisión, junto con el Banco Central Europeo (BCE), la Autoridad Bancaria Europea (ABE), con la asistencia técnica del Fondo Monetario Internacional (FMI). La asistencia incluirá tanto una condicionalidad específicamente destinada al sector bancario, en consonancia con las normas en materia de ayudas de Estado y una condicionalidad horizontal. Se aplicarán tanto condiciones específicas para el sector bancario, en consonancia con las normas sobre ayudas estatales, como condiciones horizontales. De forma paralela, España tendrá que cumplir íntegramente sus compromisos y obligaciones en el marco del procedimiento de déficit excesivo y las recomendaciones destinadas a corregir los desequilibrios macroeconómicos en el marco del Semestre Europeo.

([1]) Doc. 12450/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006760/12
to the Council
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Participation by creditors in restructuring the Spanish financial system

In June 2012 the International Monetary Fund published a report assessing Spain's financial stability. Under the heading of crisis management, Point 74 of the report, which the fund recommends should be immediately introduced, indicates that the new measures 'should enable allocation of losses to shareholders and creditors'.

Is this recommendation being followed in the negotiations over conditions to be applied to the financial aid being requested by Spain for its financial system? What measures will be included in order to implement it?

Reply
(18 September 2012)

The Council Decision of 23 July 2012 addressed to Spain on specific measures to reinforce financial stability ([1]) recalls that on 25 June 2012, the Spanish authorities officially requested financial assistance in the context of the ongoing restructuring and recapitalisation of the Spanish banking sector. The assistance is sought under the terms of the Financial Assistance for the Recapitalisation of Financial Institutions by the European Financial Stability Facility and is subject to specific financial sector policy conditions, as laid down in the memorandum of understanding (MoU) negotiated between the Spanish Government and the Commission, in liaison with the European Central Bank (ECB) and the European Banking Authority (EBA), with the technical assistance of the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The assistance will include both bank-specific conditionality in line with state aid rules and horizontal conditionality. In parallel, Spain will have to comply fully with its commitments and obligations under the Excessive Deficit Procedure (EDP) and the recommendations to address macroeconomic imbalances within the framework of the European Semester.

([1]) 12450/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006763/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Rights of disabled air passengers

A disabled constituent has recently launched a campaign to improve the conditions for disabled passengers travelling by air, following several unpleasant experiences as a passenger.

My constituent believes that some airlines are simply interpreting the law to their own convenience and believes that more can be done to hold the airline industry and airports to account in order to ensure that they follow the law to the letter. Is the Commission aware of such infringements, and what has it done since the 2008 law came into force to ensure that the airline industry complies with the law?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(10 August 2012)

Since its entry into force, Regulation (EC) N° 1107/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 concerning the rights of disabled persons and passengers with reduced mobility when travelling by air ([1]) has definitely improved the travel experience of such passengers ([2]).

In order to further improve the application of the regulation and to address unclear issues for assistance providers and national authorities in charge of its enforcement, the Commission published, on 14 June 2012, guidelines on the application of Regulation 1107/2006 ([3]).

The guidelines make it clear that disabled persons must be carried and are entitled to assistance at the airport and on-board aircraft, subject only to safety requirements, which the air carrier must make available to passenger in an accessible and transparent way. The guidelines also emphasise the need for appropriate training so that airline and airport staff dealing with disabled passengers are better aware of such passengers needs in order to improve their travel experience.

([1]) OJ L 204, 26.7.2006, p. 1.
([2]) Report from the Commission ot the European Parliament and the Council on the functioning and effects of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 of 11.4.2011 — COM(2011) 166 final.
([3]) SWD(2012)171 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006764/12
an die Kommission
Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE)
(5. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Weiterbehandlung der schriftlichen Anfrage E-003933/2012 betreffend Wasserkraftwerk Ombla in vorgeschlagenem Natura-2000-Gebiet

In seiner Antwort vom 14. Juni 2012 auf die schriftliche Anfrage zum geplanten Wasserkraftwerk Ombla in Kroatien erklärte Olli Rehn, dass der von der EIB im November 2011 für das Projekt bewilligte Kredit von einer zusätzlichen Studie zur Artenvielfalt abhängig gemacht werde. Jedoch wurde das Projekt noch vor Inauftraggabe der Studie genehmigt und somit bevor der Nachweis erbracht werden konnte, dass EU-Standards erfüllt werden.

Der Minister für Umwelt in der neuen kroatischen Regierung veranlasste außerdem eine Überprüfung der Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung (UVP) von 1999 zur Bewertung ihrer Qualität. Am 8. Juni wurde bekannt gegeben, dass drei der vier Sachverständigen ein negatives Gutachten zu der Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung abgegeben hatten, wobei der vierte eine bedingt positive Stellungsnahme abgegeben hat. Die Überprüfungen sind noch nicht veröffentlicht worden. Bei der Bewertung der Artenvielfalt werden die Mängel der UVP, die nicht die Artenvielfalt betreffen, nicht berücksichtigt werden, so dass sie sich folglich für die Befassung mit weiteren Umweltmängeln des Projekts als unzureichend erweisen wird, was z. B. für die Auswirkungen des Projekts auf das komplexe Karstwassersystem gilt.

Kann die Kommission als Vertreterin der Europäischen Union im Vorstand der EBWE folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Was wird die Kommission unternehmen, um sicherzustellen, dass die Mängel in der UVP, die nicht die Artenvielfalt betreffen, angegangen werden?

2. Hat der Vertreter der EU im Vorstand der EBWE dem Projekt eine bedingte Zustimmung erteilt, sich enthalten oder dagegen gestimmt?

3. Welche Maßnahmen wird die Kommission ergreifen, damit die EBWE in Zukunft keine Projekte mehr genehmigt, solange die Rechtsvorschriften der EU nicht vollständig erfüllt sind?

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

Die Kommission hat die Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung des angesprochenen Projekts sowie geplanter weiterer Projekte der Flussregulierung in Kroatien unlängst einer Bewertung unterzogen. Das für die Umwelt zuständige Mitglied der Kommission wird dem kroatischen Umweltminister in einem Schreiben die Ergebnisse dieser Bewertung darlegen und ihn daran erinnern, dass bei jeder Projektentwicklung die einschlägigen EU-Standards einzuhalten sind.

Die Beratungen und Abstimmungen des EBWE-Gouverneursrats sind aufgrund der Unternehmensführung der EBWE vertraulich. Allerdings hat der EU-Vorsitz in den Gesprächen seine Bedenken hinsichtlich dieses Projekts geäußert und die Versicherung erhalten, dass bei den Beratungen des Gouverneursrats den Ansichten der Kommission über dieses Projekt in vollem Umfang Rechnung getragen wurde.

In Mitgliedstaaten, einschließlich der Einsatzländer der EBWE, müssen die rechtlichen Anforderungen der EU bei allen Projekten erfüllt werden, es sei denn Mitgliedstaaten haben eine Ausnahmegenehmigung oder einen Übergangszeitraum ausgehandelt.

In Drittländern pflegt die EBWE eine enge Zusammenarbeit mit sowohl der EU als auch den betreffenden Ländern, damit diese EU-Anforderungen erfüllen oder sich diesen soweit wie möglich annähern können. Allerdings wird es — insbesondere aus Fragen der Erschwinglichkeit und aufgrund der häufig noch großen Lücken bei der Übernahme von EU-Vorschriften — nicht bei allen EBWE-Projekten gelingen, von Anfang an sämtliche EU-Standards zu erfüllen. Ist dies der Fall, müssen im Voraus Abweichungen von den betreffenden Grundsätzen der EBWE (die die gleichen oder ähnliche Standards wie die EU handhabt) genehmigt werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006764/12
to the Commission
Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Follow-up to Written Question E-003933/2012 on Ombla hydropower plant in proposed Natura 2000 site

In his answer dated 14 June 2012 to my written question on the planned Ombla hydropower plant in Croatia, Mr Rehn stated that the EBRD's November 2011 approval of a loan for the project was conditional on an additional biodiversity study being carried out. However, the project was approved before this study was commissioned and thus before it could be proven to meet EU standards.

The Minister of the Environment in the new Croatian Government also commissioned a review of the 1999 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to assess its quality. On 8 June it was announced that three out of the four experts had given a negative opinion on the EIA, with the fourth giving a conditional positive opinion. The reviews have not been published as yet. The biodiversity assessment will not take into account the non-biodiversity-related deficiencies of the EIA and hence will not be sufficient to address other environmental weaknesses in the project such as its impact on the complex karst water system.

I would therefore like to ask the Commission, which represents the European Union on the board of the EBRD, the following:

1. What will the Commission do to ensure that the non-biodiversity deficiencies in the EIA are addressed?

2. Did the EU's representative on the EBRD board vote conditionally in favour of this project, abstain or vote against it?

3. What action will the Commission take to ensure that in the future the EBRD does not approve projects before EU legal requirements are fully met?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 August 2012)

The Commission recently carried out an evaluation of the environmental impact assessment for this project as well as for other planned river regulation projects in Croatia. The Member of the Commission responsible for Environment will send a letter to the Croatian Minister for Environment to present the results of this evaluation and to remind him of the necessity to follow EU standards for all project development.

The governance structure in EBRD operates so that EBRD Board deliberations and votes are confidential. During the discussion, however, the EU Chair did express concerns about this project, and we can provide assurances that the views of the Commission were taken into account fully during Board consideration of this project.

All projects in Member States, including those that are EBRD countries of operations, are required to meet EU legal requirements, unless Member States have negotiated a derogation or a transition period.

In non-EU countries, the EBRD works closely both with the EU and the country in question so that they can meet or can approximate as far as possible to EU requirements. It has to be recognised, however, that not all EBRD projects will be able to meet EU standards from the outset, mainly due to affordability constraints and the often significant transition gap. In this instance, derogations from the relevant EBRD policies (which have the same or similar standards to the EU) need to be approved beforehand.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006765/12
to the Commission
Daniel Hannan (ECR)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: UCPD in Cyprus

In reference to official complaint CHAP(2011)3252, will the Commission state what action it will take regarding Cyprus' failure to inform its consumers about the existence of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive (UCPD) and the existence of the Cyprus Consumer Protection Service (CCPS)? And what action will the Commission take regarding the failure of the CCPS to properly investigate consumer complaints?

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

The question of the Honourable Member concerns the situation of immovable property buyers in Cyprus.

A number of measures have already been initiated to ensure both an effective protection of EU consumers and a correct application of EU legislation. The European Commission sent an administrative letter to the Cypriot authorities enquiring about the actions carried out at national level to address the reported problems, in particular to ensure that all consumers on their territory are adequately informed about the Cypriot law transposing the directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices ([1]).

Vice-President Reding recently met the Cypriot Interior Minister who committed to smoothly find a solution to this issue. As a follow up to this high-level meeting, cooperation and bilateral contacts at services level have been undertaken with a view to allow the European Commission to find out about the measures which the Cypriot authorities have already put in place to tackle this problem and to assess what still needs to be done for them to ensure full compliance with EC law.

The European Commission is determined to take all appropriate actions within the remit of its competence in order to tackle this problematic issue.

([1]) OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006766/12
to the Commission
Daniel Hannan (ECR)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: UCPD review

Can the Commission explain why it did not recommend a review of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive (UCPD) in its recent report on the directive?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

The report on the application of Directive 2005/29/EC on Unfair Commercial Practices Directive ([1]) is due for adoption by the Commission in autumn and has neither been finalised nor published. It is therefore not apparent to the Commission to which 'recent report' the Honourable Member is referring.

([1]) OJ L 149, 11.6.2005, p. 22.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-006767/12
adresată Comisiei
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(5 iulie 2012)

Subiect: Recunoașterea voluntariatului ca experiență în muncă

În cadrul Uniunii Europene activitățile de voluntariat nu sunt recunoscute ca și experiență de muncă. Mai mult, cum se întâmplă și în cazul instituțiilor europene, nici stagiile sau studiile doctorale neplătite nu sunt luate în calcul pentru stabilirea vechimii în muncă.

Atât în cazul voluntariatului și al stagiilor neplătite, cât și în cazul stagiilor plătite efortul depus de tineri este același. De cele mai multe ori doctoranzii care nu beneficiază de burse sunt nevoiți să apeleze la un împrumut bancar pentru finalizarea pregătirii lor. Din aceste motive consider că aceste eforturi, care denotă devotament și implicare, ar trebui apreciate la adevărata lor valoare și recunoscute ca experiență de muncă.

Doresc să întreb Comisia dacă intenționează să remedieze această situație și, dacă da, aș aprecia să fiu informat cu privire la modalitățile avute în vedere pentru clarificarea acestei situații.

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

Comisia împărtășește opinia conform căreia voluntariatul, studiile doctorale și stagiile necesită eforturi substanțiale din partea tinerilor.

SEV ([1]) — sprijinit în cadrul programului UE „Tineretul în acțiune” — permite tinerilor să întreprindă activități de voluntariat în străinătate pentru o perioadă de până la un an, timp în care primesc sprijin financiar aproape integral pentru cazare, ședere, asigurare medicală, deplasări internaționale, transport local și pentru costurile legate de nevoi speciale, precum și un certificat „Youthpass” care descrie capacitățile și competențele dobândite, stimulând astfel recunoașterea voluntariatului ca mijloc de promovare a șanselor de angajare ale tinerilor.

În conformitate cu Carta europeană a cercetătorilor și Codul de conduită pentru recrutarea cercetătorilor, adoptat în 2005, Comisia subliniază faptul că candidații la doctorat sunt profesioniști și ar trebui să fie tratați ca atare de către angajatori, finanțatori și de legislația națională relevantă, cum este cazul pentru candidații la doctorat sprijiniți de acțiunile „Marie Curie” și programul „Erasmus Mundus” ale UE.

În contextul inițiativei privind oportunitățile pentru tineri, Comisia lucrează, de asemenea, la instituirea unui cadru de calitate pentru stagii. O consultare publică pe baza unui document de lucru al serviciilor Comisiei, ca parte a pachetului privind ocuparea forței de muncă, a luat sfârșit la 11 iulie. Elementele de consultare au fost acordul de stagiu, obiectivele profesionale și de învățare, precum și mentoratul/orientarea, recunoașterea stagiului, durata, protecția socială și remunerarea stagiarului, drepturile și obligațiile. În prezent, Comisia analizează aproximativ 270 de răspunsuri și va analiza dacă recunoașterea stagiilor ca experiență profesională poate fi inclusă sau facilitată de un astfel de cadru de calitate.

([1]) Serviciul European de Voluntariat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006767/12
to the Commission
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Recognition of volunteering as work experience

In the European Union volunteering is not recognised as work experience. Furthermore, as is the case in EU institutions also, neither traineeships nor unpaid doctoral studies are taken into account for the purposes of establishing seniority.

It must however be acknowledged that the effort made by young people is the same for volunteering and unpaid traineeships as for paid traineeships. Those studying for doctorates generally do not receive grants and are forced to take out bank loans to finance their studies. Undertakings requiring such a degree of single-mindedness and commitment should accordingly be appreciated for their true worth and recognised as work experience.

In view of this:

Does the Commission intend to take action to remedy this situation and, if so, how does it intend to clarify matters?

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

The Commission shares the view that volunteering, doctoral studies and traineeships require substantial effort on the part of young people.

The EVS ([1]) -supported under the EU Youth in Action programme- allows young people to undertake voluntary activities abroad for up to one year, during which they receive almost full financial support for accommodation, subsistence, insurance, international travel, local transports, and costs linked to special needs, as well as a Youthpass Certificate describing the skills and competences acquired, thus fostering the recognition of volunteering as a mean to promote young people's employability.

In line with the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers adopted in 2005, the Commission stresses that doctoral candidates are professionals and should be treated accordingly by employers, funders and the relevant national legislation, which is the case for doctoral candidates supported by EU Marie Curie Actions and the Erasmus Mundus programme.

In the context of the Youth Opportunities Initiative, the Commission is also working towards a quality framework for traineeships. A public consultation on the basis of a Staff Working Document, as part of the Employment Package, has come to an end on 11 July. The elements for consultation were traineeship agreement, professional and learning objectives as well as tutoring/guidance, recognition of the traineeship, duration, social protection and remuneration of the trainee, rights and obligations. The Commission is currently analysing around 270 replies and will consider if the recognition of traineeships for the purposes of seniority can be included in or facilitated by such a quality framework.

([1]) European Voluntary Service.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006769/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Multilingüismo en el sistema sanitario europeo

Desde la aplicación del Acuerdo de Schengen y también gracias a las compañías aéreas «low cost», principalmente, los ciudadanos europeos realizan numerosos viajes, periódicamente, en los distintos países de la UE.

Una de las peores experiencias que se puede sufrir es tener que ir al médico cuando te encuentras fuera de tu país de origen. ¿Cómo le explico a un médico extranjero qué me duele y qué síntomas tengo para que me entienda y me atienda? Un buen tratamiento es resultado de un buen diagnóstico y en estos casos el idioma puede ser un factor decisivo.

En una reciente publicación de la Comisión sobre multilingüismo y aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras ([1]), se manifiesta que solamente el 42 % de los europeos son competentes en una primera lengua extranjera, cifra que disminuye al 25 % en la segunda lengua. Es decir, solamente el 42 % de los ciudadanos europeos serían capaces de comunicarse con un médico extranjero, suponiendo que el médico hablara también uno de los idiomas que habla el paciente.

¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre este tema?

¿No cree la Comisión que es importante que el paciente y el médico puedan entenderse, no solamente para tener un buen diagnóstico, sino también para que el paciente entienda bien el tratamiento al que tenga que someterse?

Actualmente ya existen algunas aplicaciones móviles multilingües con locuciones adaptadas para mejorar la comprensión entre pacientes y profesionales sanitarios que hablan idiomas diferentes, así como traducción telefónica en diferentes países. ¿No cree la Comisión que sería importante que existiera una aplicación de estas características en todos los centros sanitarios europeos, en todos los idiomas de la UE?

Respuesta de la Sra. Vassiliou en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de agosto de 2012)

Ciertamente, las dificultades de comunicación por causa del idioma son frecuentes entre los pacientes y el personal sanitario, no solo en el caso de los turistas, sino también en el de otros extranjeros que residan de forma permanente o temporal en un Estado miembro determinado. Según una encuesta del Eurobarómetro realizada en 2008, las barreras lingüísticas eran un problema para casi el 20 % de las personas que contactaban a los servicios de emergencia durante su estancia en otro país de la UE.

Los servicios médicos intentan hacer frente a estos problemas de comunicación con la ayuda de mediadores voluntarios y profesionales, aunque es evidente que ninguna institución puede proporcionar cobertura a tiempo completo de todos los idiomas posibles. Las aplicaciones multilingües pueden facilitar la comunicación entre los pacientes y el personal sanitario, pero las implicaciones culturales, la terminología especializada y las graves consecuencias de un malentendido hacen que difícilmente puedan sustituir a un mayor conocimiento de los idiomas o a la intervención de un mediador.

La Comisión concede gran importancia a la promoción del multilingüismo en la Unión Europea, ya que permitiría una comunicación más fluida en todas las circunstancias, incluidas las mencionadas por Su Señoría. La Comisión creó el portal de internet «Salud-UE», disponible en veintidós idiomas, para facilitar el acceso a los servicios de salud y la información en un idioma que los ciudadanos puedan comprender.

En abril de 2012, se lanzó el proyecto epSOS, que está cofinanciado por la Comisión y cuyo objetivo es facilitar el intercambio transfronterizo de datos sanitarios en un formato electrónico seguro.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/20120621_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006769/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Multilingualism in the European health system

Since the entry into force of the Schengen agreement and also thanks mainly to low cost airlines, European citizens have become accustomed to frequent travel among the different EU countries.

One of the worst experiences is having to visit a doctor while abroad: how can I describe my pain and symptoms to a foreign doctor in such a way that he/she can understand and treat me? Good treatment stems from a good diagnosis, and in such cases language can be a decisive factor.

A recent Commission publication on multilingualism and language learning ([1]) showed that only 42% of Europeans are competent in a first foreign language and only 25% in a second one. In other words, it appears that only 42% of European citizens have the ability to communicate with a foreign doctor, assuming the doctor also speaks one of the languages known to the patient.

What is the Commission's view on this matter?

Does the Commission consider it important for patients and doctors to be able to understand each other, not only in order to reach a good diagnosis but also so that the patient can understand the treatment being prescribed?

Several multilingual mobile applications already exist, with phrases designed to improve understanding between patients and health professionals who do not share a language, as do telephone translation services in some countries. Does the Commission not think that an application of this type should be available in all European health centres and in all European languages?

Answer given by Mrs Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

Language-related communication difficulties between patients and medical staff are indeed common, not only with tourists but also with other foreigners that permanently or temporarily reside in a given Member State. According to a Eurobarometer survey conducted in 2008, language barriers were a problem for almost 20% of people contacting emergency services when visiting another EU country.

Medical services try to cope with these communication problems with the help of volunteers and professional mediators, although it is clear that no institution can provide full-time coverage of all possible languages. Multilingual applications can facilitate communication between patients and medical staff, but can hardly replace a widespread knowledge of languages or the intervention of a mediator, given the cultural implications, the specialised terminology and the serious consequences of a misunderstanding.

The Commission attaches great importance to the promotion of multilingualism in the European Union, enabling smoother communication in all circumstances, including those mentioned by the honourable member. To facilitate access to health services and information in a language that citizens can understand, the Commission created the Internet portal 'Health EU', available in 22 languages.

In April 2012, the large scale piloting phase of the epSOS project, aimed at ensuring cross-border exchange of medical data in a secure electronic format and co-funded by the Commission, was launched.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/20120621_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006770/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Violencia verbal en redes sociales

Twitter ha sido desde su creación un medio de comunicación que ha permitido en todo el mundo expresar de forma directa y libre las ideas y reflexiones de sus usuarios. Su papel en las revoluciones pacíficas y democráticas que desde 2011 se han dado en el mundo árabe, por ejemplo, es incuestionable.

Aún así, en España, han empezado a surgir interrogantes sobre cuáles son los límites de aquello que se puede expresar públicamente, especialmente cuando algunos comentarios tienen un carácter violento y amenazador hacia ciertos sectores de la población.

Por ejemplo, en las últimas semanas, algunos acontecimientos deportivos han sido excusa para hacer comentarios profundamente violentos contra los catalanes. En algunos casos pidiendo para ellos la muerte y la cámara de gas, como en este:

«todos los independentistas merecéis la muerte! Cataluña es España y tu madre es una puta. CamaraDeGas» ([1])

Más comentarios en la misma línea se pueden encontrar en los siguientes links, en que se llega a pedir puntualmente la muerte de los catalanes (y vascos) o de aquellos que tienen una cierta ideología independentista. La demanda de utilización de bombas contra ellos también es notoria. ([2])

1. ¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión de la violencia verbal que estos mensajes ponen de manifiesto, y su gravedad en un contexto de crisis económica y social?

2. ¿Piensa la Comisión emitir una comunicación con recomendaciones de buenas prácticas con tal de evitar que las redes sociales sirvan como plataforma para comentarios violentos y totalitarios que declaran públicamente su falta de respeto a la vida humana, al artículo 10 del TUE y los valores de la Unión?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de agosto de 2012)

La Comisión considera de vital importancia el respeto de los valores en los que se fundamenta la Unión Europea y condena cualquier episodio de violencia verbal o física que ponga en peligro dichos valores.

La Comisión no tiene previsto en estos momentos presentar una comunicación sobre las cuestiones a las que se refiere Su Señoría. No obstante, la Decisión marco 2008/913/JAI obliga a todos los Estados miembros de la UE a sancionar la incitación pública a la violencia o al odio dirigidos contra un grupo de personas o un miembro de tal grupo, definido en relación con la raza, el color, la religión, la ascendencia y el origen nacional o étnico, incluso cuando se cometan mediante la difusión o reparto de escritos, imágenes u otros materiales ([3]). Además, la Directiva 2010/13/UE prevé, entre otras cosas, que los Estados miembros garantizarán, aplicando las medidas idóneas, que los servicios de comunicación audiovisual ofrecidos por prestadores bajo su jurisdicción no contengan incitaciones al odio por razón de raza, sexo, religión o nacionalidad ([4]).

La Comisión supervisa de cerca la correcta aplicación de ambos instrumentos por los Estados miembros. No obstante, corresponde a las autoridades nacionales, incluidas las judiciales, investigar las situaciones concretas y determinar, según el contexto y las circunstancias particulares, si suponen incitación a la violencia o al odio basados en los motivos mencionados.

([1]) https://twitter.com/#!/search/%23CamaraDeGas; https://twitter.com/jorgeatm/status/219842049166417920.

([2]) http://apuntem.cat/recull-de-comentaris-la-seleccio-espanyola-guanya-leurocopa/; http://apuntem.cat/mes-apologia-del-genocidi-despres-de-la-final-de-la-copa-del-rei/.

([3]) Decisión Marco 2008/913/JAI del Consejo, de 28 de noviembre de 2008, relativa a la lucha contra determinadas formas y manifestaciones de racismo y xenofobia mediante el Derecho penal, DO L 328 de 6.12.2008.

([4]) Directiva 2010/13/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, sobre la coordinación de determinadas disposiciones legales, reglamentarias y administrativas de los Estados miembros relativas a la prestación de servicios de comunicación audiovisual (Directiva de servicios de comunicación audiovisual), DO L 95 de 15.4.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006770/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Verbal violence on social networks

Since its creation as a means of communication, Twitter has enabled its users around the world to express their ideas and thoughts freely and directly. It has, for example, played an undeniable role in the peaceful and democratic revolutions in the Arab world since 2011.

Despite this, questions have started to be raised in Spain about the limits of what can be expressed in public, especially when some comments express violence and threats towards certain sectors of the population.

For example, in recent weeks certain sporting events have served as an excuse for the expression of extremely violent anti-Catalan comments, which in some cases have gone so far as to suggest Catalans should be killed or sent to the gas chamber, such as this one: 'all you separatists deserve to die! Catalonia is Spain and your mother's a whore. GasChamber' ([1]).

More comments along these lines can be found on the links listed below ([2]), which contain repeated death threats against Catalans (and Basques) and all those with a particular separatist ideology. There are also numerous calls for bombs to be used against them.

1. Is the Commission aware of the verbal violence clearly displayed in these messages and its seriousness in a context of economic and social crisis?

2. Does the Commission intend to issue a communication containing recommended good practices with which to prevent social networks from becoming a platform for violent and totalitarian comments which publicly display a lack of respect for human life, Article 10 of the TFEU and the values upheld by the Union?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

The Commission considers the respect for the values on which the European Union is founded of paramount importance and condemns any episode of verbal or physical violence threatening these values.

The Commission does not plan to present a communication on the issues referred to by the Honorable Member at the present point in time. However, Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA obliges all EU Member States to penalise the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred directed against a group of persons or a member of such group defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin, including when committed by public dissemination or distribution of tracts, pictures or other material ([3]). Additionally, Directive 2010/13/EU foresees amongst others that Member States shall ensure by appropriate means that audiovisual media services provided by media service providers under their jurisdiction do not contain any incitement to hatred based on race, sex, religion or nationality ([4]).

The Commission monitors closely the correct implementation of these two instruments by the Member States. However, it is for national authorities, including courts, to investigate concrete situations and to determine, according to the surrounding circumstances and context, whether they represent incitement to violence or hatred based on the abovementioned grounds.

([1]) https://twitter.com/#!/search/%23CamaraDeGas; https://twitter.com/jorgeatm/status/219842049166417920.

([2]) http://apuntem.cat/recull-de-comentaris-la-seleccio-espanyola-guanya-leurocopa/; http://apuntem.cat/mes-apologia-del-genocidi-despres-de-la-final-de-la-copa-del-rei/.

([3]) 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.

([4]) Directive 2010/13/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on the coordination of certain provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action in Member States concerning the provision of audiovisual media services (Audiovisual Media Services Directive), OJ L 95, 15.4.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006771/12
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(5 July 2012)

Subject: Disability discrimination by airlines

Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 has brought advantages to disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility (PRM). However, a number of constituents in South West England and Wales have reported difficulties when flying with various airlines across Europe.

— Mr G from Bridgwater (Somerset) would like to see hoists on aeroplanes so as to be able to fly to China to see his relatives. He has to wear a nappy when flying, because he cannot go to the toilet on planes.

— Mr S from Marston Magna (Somerset) has had to urinate into a bottle in his seat, because he is unable to get to the toilet.

— Ms R from Taunton (Somerset) has spinal muscular atrophy and uses an electric wheelchair. The first time she flew she tried to explain that she could not walk and should not be lifted, because of a recent back operation. The Polish staff did not really understand and dropped her.

— Mr P from Taunton (Somerset) has not had awful experiences, but says it is often difficult to move around a plane. He was almost carried over a crew member's shoulder once.

— Ms H from Ilminster (Somerset) has a daughter who has muscular dystrophy and who is in Australia at the moment. They have been trying to get her back to Somerset, but it is taking a very long time. After much communication, they have yet to find an airline that can help them.

— Mr H from Wales will not go to the toilet on planes, and takes tablets to stop him needing to go the toilet. He knows of wheelchair users who will not fly because of the toilet issue.

Is the Commission aware of the ongoing difficulties faced by many disabled people when using the airline network in Europe?

Does the Commission plan to conduct further reviews of disability regulations specifically for air travel?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(28 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-6763/2012 ([1]).

In addition, the Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that no further reviews of Regulation 1107/2006 are currently planned.

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

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-006772/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6. juli 2012)

Om: Sociale ydelser til tyrkiske statsborgere der opholder sig i et EU-land

Vil Kommissionen oplyse om status for »Forslag til Rådets afgørelse om den holdning, der skal indtages på vegne af Den Europæiske Union i det associeringsråd, der er oprettet ved aftalen om oprettelse af en associering mellem Det Europæiske Økonomiske Fællesskab og Tyrkiet, for så vidt angår bestemmelserne om koordinering af de sociale sikringsordninger«, KOM(2012)0152?

Kan Kommissionen bekræfte, at dette forslag betyder, at tyrkiske statsborgere, herunder også deres familie og efterkommere, der opholder sig i et EU-land, vil kunne oppebære fuldkommen samme sociale ydelser og rettigheder i øvrigt som EU-borgere?

Det tyske arbejdsministerium har 23. februar 2012 udstedt et direktiv til arbejdsmarkedsstyrelsen (Bundesagentur für Arbeit), der blokerer for arbejdsløshedsunderstøttelse (Hartz IV-ydelser) til borgere fra 14 EU-lande, herunder Grækenland og Spanien, samt Norge, Island og Tyrkiet.

Vil Kommissionen oplyse, hvorledes dette tyske direktiv forholder sig til ovennævnte forslag til rådsafgørelse, særligt for så vidt angår EU-retten?

Finder Kommissionen derudover generelt, at det tyske arbejdsministeriums direktiv er i overensstemmelse med EU-retten?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af László Andor
(16. august 2012)

I sag C-262/96 (*Surül*) anerkendte Domstolen den direkte virkning af bestemmelsen om ligebehandling i afgørelse nr. 3/80 fra Associeringsrådet EØF-Tyrkiet ([1]). Formålet med Kommissionens forslag fra 2012 ([2]) om den holdning, der skal indtages på vegne af Den Europæiske Union i associeringsrådet, er at nå frem til en aftale med Tyrkiet om at erstatte afgørelse nr. 3/80 med en ny, moderne afgørelse om koordinering af sociale sikringsordninger mellem EU og Tyrkiet.

I dette forslag til afgørelse forbliver tyrkiske arbejdstageres og deres familiers ret til ligebehandling, for så vidt angår social sikring — som anerkendt af Domstolen i *Surül*-sagen — uændret. For så vidt angår tyrkiske statsborgeres ret til »Hartz IV«-ydelser, betegnes disse af Tyskland som »sociale ydelser« i modsætning til »social sikring«. Afgørelse nr. 3/80 og forslaget til afgørelse, der kommer til at erstatte den, sikrer ikke ligebehandling, for så vidt angår sociale ydelser. Når det drejer sig om EU-statsborgeres ret til sociale ydelser i en anden medlemsstat, begrænses retten hertil af artikel 24, stk. 2, i direktiv 2004/38/EF, navnlig for så vidt angår førstegangsjobsøgende. I sag C-22/08 og C-23/08 (*Vatsouras* og *Koupatantze*) fastslog Domstolen imidlertid, at ydelser af økonomisk art, der har til formål at lette adgangen til beskæftigelse, ikke kan betegnes som sociale ydelser i den forstand, hvori udtrykket er anvendt i direktivet. Endvidere fandt den, at EU-borgere, som søger beskæftigelse i en anden medlemsstat, sikres ligebehandling på grundlag af artikel 45, stk. 2, i TEUF, for så vidt angår betaling af sådanne ydelser, forudsat at de kan påvise en reel forbindelse til arbejdsmarkedet i den pågældende medlemsstat. En tyrkisk jobsøgendes ret til »Hartz IV«-ydelser bør derfor vurderes ud fra principperne i denne retspraksis.

([1]) Associeringsrådet EØF-Tyrkiets afgørelse nr. 3/80 af 19. september 1980 om anvendelse af De Europæiske Fællesskabers medlemsstaters sociale sikringsordninger på tyrkiske arbejdstagere og deres familiemedlemmer.

([2]) Forslag til Rådets afgørelse om den holdning, der skal indtages på vegne af Den Europæiske Union i det associeringsråd, der er oprettet ved aftalen om oprettelse af en associering mellem Det Europæiske Økonomiske Fællesskab og Tyrkiet, for så vidt angår bestemmelserne om koordinering af de sociale sikringsordninger (KOM(2012)0152 endelig af 30. marts 2012).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006772/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: Social security benefits for Turkish nationals resident in an EU country

Could the Commission clarify the status of the proposal for a Council Decision on the position to be taken on behalf of the European Union within the Association Council set up by the Agreement establishing an association between the European Economic Community and Turkey with regard to the provisions on the coordination of social security systems (COM(2012) 0152)?

Can the Commission confirm that this proposal means that Turkish nationals, including their families and descendants, who are resident in an EU country will be able to receive exactly the same social security benefits and rights as other EU citizens?

On 23 February 2012 the German Labour Ministry issued a directive to the German Labour Agency (Bundesagentur für Arbeit), which blocks nationals of 14 EU countries, including Greece and Spain, plus Norway, Iceland and Turkey, from receiving unemployment benefits (Hartz IV benefits)?

Can the Commission explain how this German directive relates to the abovementioned proposal for a Council Decision, particularly in the light of EC law?

Does the Commission consider that the German Labour Ministry's directives are generally speaking in accordance with EC law?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(16 August 2012)

In Case C-262/96 *Surül*, the Court of Justice recognised the direct effect of the provision on equal treatment in Decision No 3/80 of the EEC-Turkey Association Council ([1]). The Commission's 2012 proposal ([2]) for an EU position in the Association Council aims to reach an agreement with Turkey to replace Decision No 3/80 with a new, modernised Decision on social security coordination between the EU and Turkey.

Under this proposed Decision, the right of Turkish workers and their families to equal treatment in matters of social security — as recognised by the Court in *Surül* — will remain unaffected. As regards the entitlement of Turkish nationals to 'Hartz IV' benefits, these are classified by Germany as 'social assistance' as opposed to 'social security'. Decision No 3/80, and the proposed Decision that will replace it, do not guarantee equal treatment in respect of social assistance. As regards the right of EU nationals to social assistance in another Member State, limits are placed on this right by Article 24(2) of Directive 2004/38/EC, particularly in respect of first-time job-seekers. However, in Cases C-22/08 and C-23/08 *Vatsouras* and *Koupatantze*, the Court of Justice held that benefits of a financial nature, which are designed to facilitate access to employment, could not be classified as social assistance within the meaning of the directive. Moreover, it found that EU nationals who seek employment in another Member State enjoy equal treatment based on Article 45(2) TFEU as regards the payment of such benefits, provided they can show a real link with the labour market of the Member State in question. The entitlement of a Turkish jobseeker to 'Hartz IV' benefits should therefore be assessed in accordance with the principles set out in this case-law.

([1]) Decision No 3/80 of the Association Council of 19 September 1980 on the Application of the Social Security Schemes of the Member States of the European Communities to Turkish workers and members of their families.

([2]) Proposal for a Council Decision on the position to be taken on behalf of the European Union within the Association Council set up by the Agreement establishing an association between the European Economic Community and Turkey with regard to the provisions on the coordination of social security systems, COM(2012) 152 final of 30 March 2012.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-006773/12
til Kommissionen (Næstformand / Højtstående repræsentant)
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6. juli 2012)

Om: VP/HR — EU-møder med Hamas

Hvad kan EU's højtstående repræsentant oplyse om de møder, der angiveligt har fundet sted de seneste måneder mellem repræsentanter for 5 EU-medlemsstater og Hamas?

Vil den højtstående repræsentant herunder specielt oplyse hvilke medlemsstater, der er tale om, på hvilket niveau og med hvilke organer disse møder har fundet sted, om den højtstående repræsentant eller andre medlemmer af Kommissionen har deltaget i dem eller har haft en koordinerende rolle, og endelig hvad formålet med dem har været set i lyset af EU's officielle politik i forhold til Hamas?

Har Kommissionen officielt ændret politik i forhold til Hamas, således at den ikke længere betragter Hamas som en terrororganisation, eller er den højtstående repræsentant vidende om, at noget sådant skulle være tilfældet for nogle af EU's medlemsstater?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af den højtstående repræsentant/næstformand Catherine Ashton
(22. august 2012)

Den højtstående repræsentant/næstformand har intet kendskab til kontakter mellem EU-medlemsstater og Hamas.

Hamas er opført på EU's liste over terrororganisationer. EU's politik over for Hamas forbliver uændret.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006773/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU meetings with Hamas

What can the EU High Representative tell us about the meetings that are alleged to have taken place in recent months between representatives of five EU Member States and Hamas?

Will the HR specifically state which Member States were involved, at what level and with which bodies these meetings took place, whether the HR or other Members of the Commission took part, or played a coordinating role, and finally what the purpose of these meetings was, in the light of the EU's official policy towards Hamas?

Has the Commission officially changed its policy towards Hamas so that it no longer considers Hamas as a terrorist organisation, or does the HR know if this might be the case for some EU Member States?

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

The HR/VP has no knowledge of contacts between EU Member States and Hamas.

Hamas is listed as a terrorist organisation by the EU. The EU policy towards Hamas remains unchanged.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-006774/12
til Kommissionen (Næstformand / Højtstående repræsentant)
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6. juli 2012)

Om: VP/HR — Hamas-deltagelse i en FN-konference

Kan EU's højtstående repræsentant bekræfte, at der i FN-konferencen (UNRWA) i Bruxelles den 19. marts 2012, hvor den højtstående repræsentant selv deltog, også deltog repræsentanter fra Hamas, der både af EU og USA betragtes som en terrororganisation?

Vil den højtstående repræsentant i givet fald oplyse, hvorvidt Hamas-repræsentanterne var officielle delegerede?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Den højtstående repræsentant og næstformand Catherine Ashton
(2. oktober 2012)

UNRWA var vært ved konferencen »Engaging Youth« på Palais d'Egmont i Bruxelles. EU og Kongeriget Belgien var medarrangører af konferencen. Konferencen var kun for indbudte deltagere (UNRWA-donorer, partnere og andre aktører). Hamas var ikke indbudt. En liste over deltagerne er tilgængelig på konferencens websted ([1]).

([1]) www.engagingyouth.eu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006774/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Participation by Hamas in a UN conference

Can the EU High Representative confirm that representatives from Hamas, which both the EU and the US consider a terrorist organisation, also took part in the UN conference (UNRWA) in Brussels on 19 March 2012, at which the High Representative herself was present?

If so, will the High Representative state whether the Hamas representatives were official delegates?

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

The 'Engaging Youth' conference was hosted by UNRWA at the Palais d'Egmont in Brussels. It was co-sponsored by the EU and the Kingdom of Belgium. Attendance of UNRWA donors, partners and other stakeholders was by invitation only. Hamas was not among the invitees. A list of the attendees can be found on the conference website. ([1])

([1]) www.engagingyouth.eu.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-006776/12
lill-Kummissjoni
Louis Grech (S&D)
(6 ta' Lulju 2012)

Suġġett: Is-seba' Tabella ta' Valutazzjoni tal-Konsumatur (Mejju 2012)

It-tabella ta' valutazzjoni tal-konsumatur hija għodda essenzjali li tista' tintuża minn min ifassal il-politika u partijiet interessati oħra sabiex titkejjel il-prestazzjoni u l-attività fis-suq vis-à-vis l-konsumaturi tal-UE.

It-tabella ta' valutazzjoni l-aktar riċenti enfasizzat numru ta' nuqqasijiet li bħalissa huma prevalenti fis-suq intern:

— il-konsumaturi għadhom iħossu li ma jistgħux jixtru minn naħa għal oħra tal-fruntiera bl-istess serħan tal-moħħ bħal meta jkunu f'pajjiżhom;

— il-konsumaturi għadhom mhux infurmati sew dwar id-drittijiet u l-obbligi tagħhom ġewwa s-suq intern. Fil-fatt, 12 % biss minn dawk li taw tweġiba setgħu iwieġbu mistoqsijiet dwar id-drittijiet tagħhom bħala konsumaturi fir-rigward ta' perjodi ta' riflessjoni, garanziji u x'iridu jagħmlu jekk jirċievu prodotti li ma jkunux ordnaw. Fuq nota relatata, in-negozji mhumiex konxji biżżejjed dwar l-obbligi legali tagħhom lejn il-konsumaturi — 27% biss tal-bejjiegħa bl-imnut kienu jafu l-perjodu ta' żmien li fih il-konsumaturi huma intitolati li jirritornaw prodotti difettużi.

Fid-dawl tar-riżultati tat-tabella ta' valutazzjoni, x'azzjoni leġiżlattiva u mhux leġiżlattiva tippjana li tieħu l-Kummissjoni?

Liema minn dawn il-konklużjonijiet l-aktar importanti miksuba f'dan l-istudju se jkunu indirizzati u mogħtija prominenza fit-tieni Att dwar is-Suq Uniku li l-Kummissjoni hi mistennija li tressaq fil-Ħarifa 2012?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Dalli f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' Awwissu 2012)

Bħala segwitu għall-Att dwar is-Suq Uniku, il-proposti tal-Kummissjoni dwar is-Soluzzjoni Alternattiva tat-Tilwim (ADR) ([1]) u s-Soluzzjoni Onlajn tat-Tilwim (ODR) ([2]) għandhom l-għan li jiffaċilitaw ir-rimedju u b'hekk tissaħħaħ il-fiduċja fis-Suq Uniku. Bl-istess mod, il-proposta tal-Kummissjoni dwar il-Liġi Komuni Ewropea dwar il-Bejgħ ([3]) hija sforz biex tiffaċilita x-xiri transkonfinali bil-ħolqien ta' sett uniku ta' regoli, mhux mandatorju, għall-kuntratti transkonfinali fl-UE kollha. Għaddejja ħidma dwar l-implimentazzjoni tal-azzjonijiet imħabbra fil-Komunikazzjoni riċenti dwar il-kummerċ elettroniku ([4]), fost l-oħrajn biex fl-Ewropa l-prodotti jibdew jitwasslu b'mod aktar effiċjenti u bi prezz tajjeb, biex il-pagamenti onlajn isiru aktar sempliċi u biex jiġu żviluppati aktar websajts trasparenti, li jipparagunaw il-prezzijiet u l-kwalità bejn il-pajjiżi differenti. Aktar inizjattivi li jindirizzaw il-frammentazzjoni tas-suq intern se jiġu proposti fl-Att dwar is-Suq Uniku 2.

L-Aġenda tal-Konsumatur adottata riċentement ([5]) tagħti lista ta' passi konkreti li se jittieħdu qabel l-2014 biex itejbu l-informazzjoni u biex titqajjem kuxjenza dwar id-drittijiet u l-interessi tal-konsumaturi, kemm fost il-konsumaturi u kemm fost in-negozjanti. Dawn jinkludu kampanja ta' sensibilizzazzjoni fl-UE kollha li għandha tiġi varata fl-2013, l-appoġġ għal organizzazzjonijiet Ewropej tal-konsumatur, u t-tisħiħ tar-rwol ta' Netwerk taċ-Ċentri Ewropej għall-Konsumatur biex il-konsumaturi jiġu infurmati aħjar dwar id-drittijiet tagħhom fix-xiri transkonfinali u biex jingħataw l-għajnuna meta jispiċċaw f'tilwima transkonfinali. Barra minn hekk, bħala parti mill-Aġenda Diġitali għall-Ewropa ([6]), il-Kummissjoni qed taħdem fuq Kodiċi ta' Drittijiet Onlajn tal-UE li jiġbor fil-qosor id-drittijiet eżistenti tal-utenti diġitali fl-UE b'mod ċar u aċċessibbli.

([1]) COM(2011) 793 finali.
([2]) COM(2011) 794 finali.
([3]) COM(2011) 206 finali.
([4]) COM(2011) 942 finali.
([5]) COM(2012) 225 finali.
([6]) COM(2010) 245 finali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006776/12
to the Commission
Louis Grech (S&D)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: Seventh Consumer Scoreboard (May 2012)

The consumer scoreboard is a vital tool that policymakers and other stakeholders can use to gauge market performance and activity vis-à-vis EU consumers.

The most recent scoreboard highlighted a number of the shortcomings which are currently prevalent in the internal market:

— consumers still feel that they cannot shop across borders with the same ease that they can at home;

— consumers are still not well informed about their rights and obligations within the internal market. In fact, only 12% of respondents could answer questions about their consumer rights with respect to cooling-off periods, guarantees and what to do if they receive goods they have not ordered. On a related note, businesses are insufficiently aware of their legal obligations towards consumers — only 27% of retailers knew the time-frame within which consumers are entitled to return defective products.

In the light of the results of the scoreboard, what legislative and non-legislative action does the Commission plan to take?

Which of the more salient conclusions obtained in this study will be addressed and given prominence in the second Single Market Act which the Commission is expected to bring forward in autumn 2012?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(28 August 2012)

As a follow-up to the Single Market Act, the Commission proposals on Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) ([1]) and Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) ([2]) aim at facilitating redress and thus boosting confidence in the Single Market. Likewise, the Commission proposal for Common European Sales Law ([3]) strives to facilitate cross-border shopping by creating an optional, single set of rules for cross-border contracts throughout the EU. Work is underway on the implementation of the actions announced in the recent e-commerce Communication ([4]), *inter alia* to ensure more efficient and affordable delivery of products across Europe, easier payments online and the development of more transparent, cross-border price and quality comparison websites. Further initiatives to address internal market fragmentation will be proposed in the Single Market Act 2.

The recently adopted Consumer Agenda ([5]) lists concrete steps that will be taken before 2014 to improve information and raise awareness of consumer rights and interests among both consumers and traders. These include an EU-wide awareness-raising campaign to be launched in 2013, support to European consumer organisations and strengthening the role of European Consumer Centres' Network to better inform consumers about their rights when shopping cross-border and assist them when they become entangled in cross-border disputes. In addition, as part of the Digital Agenda for Europe ([6]), the Commission is working on a Code of EU Online Rights summarising existing digital user rights in the EU in a clear and accessible way.

([1]) COM(2011) 793 final.
([2]) COM(2011) 794 final.
([3]) COM(2011) 206 final.
([4]) COM(2011) 942 final.
([5]) COM(2012) 225 final.
([6]) COM(2010) 245 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-006777/12
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter — Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(6 juli 2012)

Betreft: VP/HR —"Syrië files" — onderzoek naar uitvoering en handhaving van EU-sancties

Op 5 juli 2012 werd op de website *www.wikileaks.org* de publicatie van de „Syrië files" aangekondigd. Hoewel tot dusver slechts een beperkt aantal emails is gepubliceerd, rijzen er diverse klemmende vragen ten aanzien van niet-eerbiediging door EU-bedrijven van de EU-sancties tegen Syrië en ten aanzien van de capaciteiten en bereidheid van de lidstaten om EU-sancties uit te voeren, zelfs wanneer de EDEO of de Commissie op zichzelf de echtheid van de gepubliceerde documenten niet onafhankelijk kunnen nagaan. Wat de thans tegen Syrië van kracht zijnde sancties betreft verwijs ik naar het document met de titel „Restrictive measures (sanctions) in force" op de EDEO-website.

1. Is de VP/HR op de hoogte van de publicatie van de „Syrië files" en wat is haar reactie op deze informatie?

2. Is de VP/HR niet ook van mening dat er op grond van de tot dusver gepubliceerde informatie sterke aanwijzingen zijn dat in de EU gevestigde bedrijven zich niet aan EU-sancties tegen Syrië hebben gehouden, in het bijzonder waar het gaat om de bepalingen die de uitvoer van apparatuur voor de controle van internet- en telefooncommunicatie aan Syrië verbiedt, zoals vermeld in Verordening (EU) nr. 36/2012?

3. Is de VP/HR bereid een ad hoc groep van ambtenaren van de EDEO en EU-lidstaten samen te stellen om de „Syrië files" te bestuderen en de vermelde feiten te onderzoeken en verslag uit te brengen over hun inhoud, gevolgen en verantwoordelijkheden voor EU-bedrijven, lidstaten, EU-ambtenaren, ambtenaren van EU-lidstaten en hun mogelijke betrokkenheid bij de niet-eerbiediging van de EU-sancties? Zo nee, waarom niet?

4. Is de VP/HR bereid te onderzoeken of schending van EU-sancties tegen Syrië en het ontbreken van hun handhaving door de lidstaten hebben geleid of bijgedragen tot schendingen van de mensenrechten? Zo nee, waarom niet?

5. Is de VP/HR niet ook van mening dat er ernstige vraagstukken aan de orde zijn gesteld en onzekerheden aan de dag zijn getreden, en dat deze situatie noopt tot een algemeen, uitgebreid EU-onderzoek naar de uitvoering en handhaving van de sancties van de EU? Zo nee, waarom niet?

6. Hoe kan de VP/HR tot coördinatie met de lidstaten komen en welke maatregelen kan en zal de VP/HR nemen om te zorgen voor een zo snel mogelijke volledige uitvoering en handhaving van alle EU-sancties?

7. Op welke wijze kan de VP/HR ervoor zorgen dat de lidstaten de sancties van de EU uitvoeren en handhaven? Kan de VP/HR of de Commissie boetes opleggen of juridische stappen tegen de lidstaten nemen wegens niet-eerbiediging, niet-uitvoering en niet-handhaving van de EU-sancties?

8. Is de VP/HR het er niet mee eens dat het gevaar bestaat dat sancties van de Europese Unie en het buitenlands beleid van de EU tegenover Syrië een dode letter blijven en dat het niet tot concrete daden komt?

9. Is de VP/HR het er niet mee eens dat de praktijken die uit de „Syrië files" blijken de geloofwaardigheid van de EU ernstig ondermijnen?

10. Is de VP/HR het er niet mee eens dat zij uiteindelijk verantwoordelijk is voor een juiste en volledige uitvoering van de beperkende maatregelen van de EU? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(20 september 2012)

Bij Verordening (EU) nr. 36/2012 ([1]) is een verbod ingesteld op de uitvoer van uitrusting of software die kan worden gebruikt voor toezicht op of interceptie van internetcommunicatie of telefoongesprekken in Syrië.

De hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter heeft geen aanwijzingen dat deze sanctiebepalingen zijn geschonden. De zaak wordt evenwel voortdurend gevolgd. Geloofwaardige meldingen van eventuele schendingen worden gecontroleerd bij de lidstaten. Op dit moment zijn er geen bijzondere onderzoeken gepland naar de uitvoering en handhaving van de EU-sancties.

De uitvoering en handhaving van de EU-sancties staan centraal in het sanctiebeleid van de EU. Het is primair de verantwoordelijkheid van de lidstaten om de beperkende maatregelen van de EU op de juiste wijze en volledig ten uitvoer te leggen. De Commissie ondersteunt de uitvoering van beperkende maatregelen door de lidstaten en houdt daar toezicht op. Wanneer in Europese wetgeving uitvoering wordt gegeven aan sancties, kan de Commissie specifieke onderzoeken in gang zetten of een inbreukprocedure tegen een lidstaat inleiden, indien noodzakelijk.

De EU-sancties tegen Syrië omvatten een breed pakket maatregelen, onder andere een verbod op de uitvoer van wapens en uitrusting die kan worden gebruikt voor repressie, een verbod op de invoer van ruwe olie uit Syrië, een verbod op de levering van essentiële apparatuur en technologie voor de aardolie- en aardgasindustrie, de bevriezing van tegoeden en een reisverbod voor personen die direct of indirect verantwoordelijk zijn voor de gewelddadige repressie in Syrië, en een aantal andere concrete maatregelen. Een aantal derde landen heeft zich aangesloten bij de EU-maatregelen, waardoor het effect daarvan wordt versterkt. De EU speelt ook een actieve rol in de „Friends of Syria Sanctions Group", die tot doel heeft de internationale gemeenschap aan te moedigen om gelijkaardige maatregelen te treffen en deze doeltreffend uit te voeren.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:016:0001:0032:NL:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006777/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Syria Files — Investigation into implementation and enforcement of EU sanctions

On 5 July 2012, the website www.wikileaks.org announced that it will publish the 'Syria Files'. Although only a limited amount of emails have been published so far, several pressing question arise with regard to non-compliance by EU companies with EU sanctions against Syria and regarding Member States' capabilities and willingness to implement EU sanctions, even though the EEAS or the Commission in and of itself cannot independently verify the validity of the published documents. Regarding the Syria sanctions currently into force, I refer to the document entitled 'Restrictive measures (sanctions) in force' on the EEAS website.

1. Is the VP/HR aware of the publication of the Syria Files and what is the VP/HR's response to this information?

2. Does the VP/HR agree that on the basis of the information published so far, there are strong indications that EU-based companies have violated EU sanctions against Syria, in particular the provisions banning the export of Internet or telephone communications monitoring equipment to Syria as laid down in Regulation (EU) No 36/2012?

3. Is the VP/HR willing to assemble an ad hoc team of EEAS and EU Member State officials to study the Syria Files and investigate the reported facts, report on its contents, implications and responsibilities for EU companies, Member States, EU officials, EU Member State officials and their potential involvement in the non-compliance with EU sanctions? If not, why not?

4. Is the VP/HR willing to investigate whether violations of EU sanctions against Syria and their non-enforcement by Member States have resulted in or contributed to human rights violations? If not, why not?

5. Does the VP/HR agree that serious questions have been raised and uncertainties have surfaced, and that this situation merits a general and comprehensive EU inquiry into the implementation and enforcement of EU sanctions? If not, why not?

6. How will the VP/HR coordinate with Member States and what actions can, and will, the VP/HR take to ensure full implementation and enforcement of all EU sanctions as soon as possible?

7. How can the VP/HR ensure that Member States implement and enforce EU sanctions? Can the VP/HR or the Commission impose fines or start legal actions against Member States because of non-compliance, non-implementation and non-enforcement of EU sanctions.

8. Does the VP/HR agree that European Union sanctions and the EU's foreign policy towards Syria are threatening to become a paper reality instead of concrete actions?

9. Does the VP/HR agree that the practices that the Syria Files reveal are seriously undermining the EU's credibility?

10. Does the VP/HR agree that she carries the final responsibility for the correct and full implementation of EU restrictive measures? If not, why not?

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

Council Regulation 36/2012 ([1]) imposes a ban on the export of equipment or software which may be used for the monitoring or interception of the Internet and telephone communications by the Syrian government.

The HR/VP does not possess any indication that violations of sanctions provisions would have occurred. However, the matter continues to be monitored. Any credible reports of a possible violation of the measures will be verified with Member States. No extraordinary investigations regarding the implementation and enforcement of EU sanctions are foreseen at this time.

The implementation and enforcement of EU sanctions is a central element of the EU's sanctions policy. The responsibility for the correct and full implementation of EU restrictive measures lies primarily with the Member States. The Commission supports and monitors the implementation of restrictive measures by the Member State and may, where the sanctions are given effect in EC law, open specific investigations or initiate an infringement procedure against a Member State if necessary.

EU sanctions against Syria consist of a wide array of measures. The measures include a prohibition on the export of arms and equipment for repression, an import ban on crude oil from Syria, a ban on providing key equipment and technology to Syria for the oil and gas industry, an asset freeze and travel ban on persons directly or indirectly responsible for the violent repression in Syria, and a number of other concrete measures. A number of third States have aligned with EU measures reinforcing their effect. The EU is also playing an active role in the Friends of Syria Sanctions Group which is precisely intended to encourage the international community to adopt similar measures and implement them effectively.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:016:0001:0032:EN:PDF.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-006780/12
à la Commission
Frédéric Daerden (S&D)
(6 juillet 2012)

Objet: Redistribution par les grandes surfaces des invendus alimentaires encore consommables

Chaque année en Europe, de plus en plus de denrées alimentaires saines et comestibles (jusqu'à 50 % selon certaines estimations) sont gaspillées tout au long de la chaîne agroalimentaire, y compris jusqu'au stade du consommateur, et deviennent des déchets. En effet, une étude publiée par la Commission indique que la production de déchets alimentaires dans les 27 États membres atteint chaque année environ 89 millions de tonnes, soit 179 kilos par personne.

Par ailleurs, 16 millions de citoyens européens dépendent de l'aide alimentaire et la menace de diminuer le budget du programme européen d'aide alimentaire se fait de plus en plus pesante, alors que ce dernier devrait être renforcé et pérennisé.

Au moment de traiter la demande de renouvellement des permis d'environnement de grandes surfaces et afin de répondre au problème du gaspillage alimentaire, la ville de Herstal (Belgique) a décidé que tous les commerces de ce type seront tenus, avant d'envisager le traitement ou la valorisation des denrées alimentaires dans la filière des déchets, de redistribuer leurs vivres périssables invendues encore consommables à des associations affiliées à la Fédération des banques alimentaires, qui les redistribueront ensuite aux plus démunis.

1. La Commission ne pense-t-elle pas que la généralisation d'une telle mesure pourrait contribuer à la distribution de denrées alimentaires aux personnes les plus défavorisées dans l'Union, comme le préconise la résolution du Parlement européen intitulée «Éviter le gaspillage des denrées alimentaires: stratégies pour une chaîne alimentaire plus efficace dans l'Union européenne»?

2. Dans l'affirmative, de quelle façon la Commission pourrait-elle traduire la décision de la ville de Herstal de manière juridiquement contraignante au niveau européen?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(30 août 2012)

1. La Commission estime que, dans une politique de réduction des déchets alimentaires, il convient d'observer une hiérarchie de valeur décroissante, la priorité absolue devant être accordée à la «prévention» des déchets alimentaires. Lorsque des déchets alimentaires sont produits, il faudrait examiner si les prescriptions applicables en matière de sécurité des aliments sont respectées avant d'envisager la réutilisation de ces déchets pour la consommation humaine et, si cela n'est pas possible, récupérer ceux-ci pour l'alimentation des animaux, le compostage ou à des fins énergétiques, conformément aux dispositions applicables.

2. La Commission est en train de définir les mesures à l'échelon de l'UE qui pourraient le mieux compléter celles appliquées aux échelons national et local. Elle consulte à cet égard les parties concernées (y compris les villes et les banques alimentaires), les experts et les autorités compétentes des États membres sur la meilleure manière de réduire au minimum les déchets alimentaires sans porter atteinte à la sécurité des aliments.

La Commission créera une base de données de l'UE sur les bonnes pratiques relatives aux initiatives de réduction des déchets alimentaires dans les États membres afin de favoriser l'échange de bonnes pratiques à l'échelle de l'Union.

Par ailleurs, la communication de la Commission intitulée «Feuille de route pour une Europe efficace dans l'utilisation des ressources» ([1]) a défini le secteur des denrées alimentaires comme un secteur clé où l'efficacité des ressources devrait être accrue. Elle contient un engagement à continuer à étudier la meilleure manière de limiter les déchets alimentaires tout au long de la chaîne d'approvisionnement alimentaire et à rechercher des mesures incitatives pour réduire de moitié l'élimination de denrées alimentaires encore propres à la consommation.

([1]) COM(2011)571 final adopté le 20 septembre 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006780/12
to the Commission
Frédéric Daerden (S&D)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: Redistribution of unsold edible foodstuffs by supermarkets

Every year in Europe, more and more perfectly healthy and edible foodstuffs (up to 50% according to some estimates) are wasted all along the agri-foodstuffs chain, including at the consumer stage, and become rubbish. A study published by the Commission indicates that some 89 million tonnes of food waste (179 kg per person) are produced in the 27 Member States every year.

At the same time, 16 million European citizens are dependent on food aid, and the budget of the European food aid programme is increasingly under threat of cuts, when it should be continued and stepped up.

When dealing with applications for the renewal of supermarkets' environmental licences, and seeking to respond to the problem of food waste, the town of Herstal (Belgium) has decided that all such firms should be required, before processing or recycling foodstuffs as waste, to redistribute their unsold perishable foodstuffs that are still edible to associations affiliated to the Food Banks Federation, which would redistribute them to the most deprived members of society.

1. Does not the Commission think that if such measures became widespread practice this could contribute to the distribution of foodstuffs to the most disadvantaged people in the Union, as recommended in the European Parliament's resolution entitled 'how to avoid food wastage: strategies for a more efficient food chain in the European Union'?

2. If so, how could the Commission transpose the decision of the town of Herstal in a legally binding form to European level?

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

1. The Commission takes the view that, in a food waste reduction policy, a hierarchy of declining value should be respected: the highest priority should be the 'prevention' of food waste. Once food waste has occurred, an assessment of the respect of relevant food safety requirements should be carried out before considering the re-use for human consumption and if this is not possible, it should be recovered for feed, energy or composting, in accordance with the relevant provisions.

2. The Commission is defining the most appropriate actions at EU level to complement the actions carried out at national and local level. In this regard, the Commission is consulting stakeholders (including cities and food banks), Member State competent Authorities and experts on how best to minimise food waste without compromising food safety.

The Commission will set up an EU database on good practices on food waste reduction initiatives in the Member States in order to facilitate the EU-wide exchange of good practices.

Furthermore, the Commission's Communication on a 'Roadmap to a Resource Efficient Europe' ([1]) identified food as a key sector where resource efficiency should be improved. It includes a commitment to further assess how best to limit food waste throughout the food supply chain and to investigate incentives to halve the disposal of edible food waste in the EU by 2020.

([1]) COM(2011) 571 final adopted on 20 September 2011.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006781/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(6 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Normativa sobre la invasión de especies exóticas

En respuesta a la pregunta sobre la invasión de la avispa asiática, *Vespa velutina* (E-008738/2011), el Comisario de Medio Ambiente, Janez Potočnik, manifestó textualmente que la Comisión Europea «tiene previsto crear un instrumento legislativo sobre las especies exóticas invasoras al efecto de tratar los problemas que no entran en el ámbito de aplicación de la normativa de la UE vigente.» Además, añadió que se prevé publicar la propuesta para ese instrumento legislativo durante el segundo semestre de 2012.

1. ¿Podría indicar la Comisión en qué situación se encuentra la redacción de dicha propuesta?

2. ¿En qué fechas prevé la Comisión su publicación?

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

La Comisión está trabajando en la formulación de un instrumento legislativo dedicado a las especies exóticas invasoras, como se indica en la Comunicación sobre la estrategia de la UE sobre la biodiversidad hasta 2020 ([1]). La Comisión está elaborando ahora la propuesta legislativa y la evaluación de impacto adjunta, cuya publicación está prevista en los próximos meses.

([1]) COM(2011) 244 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006781/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: Legislation on invasive alien species (IAS)

In his reply to the question on the invasion of the Asian hornet, *Vespa velutina* (E-008738/2011), the Commissioner for the Environment, Janez Potočnik, stated that the Commission, and I quote, 'intends to develop a dedicated legislative instrument on IAS, to address the problems that do not fall under the scope of existing EU rules'. Furthermore, he added that he expected the proposal for this legislative instrument to be published in the second half of 2012.

1. Can the Commission say what progress has been made on drafting this proposal?

2. When is it likely to be published?

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

The Commission is working on the development of a dedicated legislative instrument on invasive alien species, as outlined in the communication on an EU biodiversity strategy to 2020 ([1]). The Commission is currently drafting the legislative proposal and its accompanying impact assessment, with publication foreseen in the coming months.

([1]) COM(2011)244 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006783/12
an die Kommission
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE)
(6. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Sprachvorgaben in Italienisch führen in Südtirol zu Handelsbarrieren — Minderheiten- und Verbraucherschutz

In europäischen Regelungen wird festgelegt, dass Unternehmer auf Produkten Angaben in einer leicht verständlichen Sprache zu formulieren haben. Im Mitgliedstaat Italien sind die für den Verbraucher bestimmten Informationen ungeachtet der deutschsprachigen Minderheit in Südtirol in italienischer Sprache wiederzugeben. Über die europäischen Vorgaben hinaus wird dies in Artikel 6 des Verbraucherschutzgesetzes auch für die Bedienungsanleitung, Verkaufsbezeichnung und weitere verbindliche Auskünfte vorgeschrieben, obwohl in Artikel 99 des Südtiroler Autonomiestatutes innerhalb der Region die Gleichstellung beider Sprachen vorgesehen ist und die Erzeugnisse den europäischen Sicherheitsvorgaben genügen. Kontrollorgane beanstanden im deutschsprachigen Südtirol systematisch deutschsprachige oder deutsch etikettierte Erzeugnisse. Mit der Übersetzung sicherheitsrelevanter Hinweise und von Zusatzinformationen übernehmen Vertreiber die Verantwortung eines Herstellers. Hierzu fehlen aber Kenntnisse der technischen und rechtlichen Normen.

Daraus folgt, dass die Sprachvorgaben den Zugang der deutschsprachigen Südtiroler Bevölkerung zu Erzeugnissen aus dem deutschen Sprachraum behindern und der deutschsprachigen Bevölkerung in Südtirol im Gegensatz zur italienischen Bevölkerung das Recht abgesprochen wird, Produkte zu erwerben, deren Bedienungsanleitungen ausschließlich in der eigenen anerkannten Muttersprache abgefasst sind.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Kann das Recht auf Information innerhalb eines Gebietes mit anerkannten Sprachminderheiten auch von den anerkannten Sprachminderheiten beansprucht werden?

2. Können im Gebiet der Sprachminderheit Produkte verkauft werden, welche — analog zu den Vorgaben zur Verwendung der Sprache des Mitgliedstaates — ausschließlich von Informationen in der offiziell anerkannten Minderheitensprache begleitet werden?

3. Können im Gebiet der Sprachminderheit Produkte verkauft werden, welche ausschließlich in der Sprache des Mitgliedstaates abgefasst sind?

4. Welche Lösungen kann die Kommission zu jedem einzelnen der geschilderten Probleme vorschlagen, insbesondere da z. B. bei Wein die obligatorischen und fakultativen Angaben nach Artikel 118za der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1234/2007 in einer oder mehreren Amtssprachen der Gemeinschaft abgefasst sein können?

Antwort von Herrn Tajani im Namen der Kommission
(17. August 2012)

Die Bestimmungen über Produktinformationen für Verbraucher (d. h. Gebrauchsanleitungen und Sicherheitsinformationen) in den Harmonisierungsrechtsvorschriften der Union für Produkte („Harmonisierungsregeln“) sind von Richtlinie zu Richtlinie verschieden.

Bei der Ausarbeitung neuer oder der Überarbeitung bestehender Harmonisierungsregeln sollten diese Rechtsvorschriften an die Musterbestimmungen des Beschlusses Nr. 768/2008 angepasst werden, der Teil des neuen Rechtsrahmens ist.

Die am neuen Rechtsrahmen ausgerichteten Rechtsvorschriften verpflichten die Hersteller und Einführer, zu gewährleisten, dass dem Produkt eine Gebrauchsanleitung und Sicherheitsinformationen in einer für die Verbraucher und sonstigen Endnutzer leicht verständlichen Sprache gemäß der Entscheidung des betreffenden Mitgliedstaates beigefügt werden. Die Händler müssen sich vergewissern, dass diese Unterlagen dem Produkt beiliegen. Somit legt jeder Mitgliedstaat in seinen nationalen Umsetzungsmaßnahmen fest, welche Sprache oder welche Sprachen für seine Staatsbürger leicht verständlich sind. Sprachliche Minderheiten sollten daher an die Behörden der Mitgliedstaaten herantreten, wenn sie sicherstellen wollen, dass bestimmte Sprachen in den genannten Produktunterlagen verwendet werden.

Sind die Harmonisierungsregeln nicht am neuen Rechtsrahmen ausgerichtet, ist die Sprachenfrage von Fall zu Fall zu betrachten.

Für Weinbauerzeugnisse gelten besondere sprachliche Regelungen ([1]).

Nationalen Rechtsvorschriften, die zur Kennzeichnung von Produkten eine bestimmte Sprache vorschreiben, ohne dass der Gebrauch einer anderen für die Verbraucher leicht verständlichen Sprache zulässig ist und ohne dass auf andere Weise für die Information des Verbrauchers gesorgt wird, steht Artikel 34 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union (AEUV) entgegen, da die Verpflichtung zum ausschließlichen Gebrauch der Sprache eines Sprachgebietes in ihrer Wirkung einer mengenmäßigen Einfuhrbeschränkung gleichkommt. Solche Maßnahmen sind gemäß Artikel 34 AEUV verboten.

([1]) Siehe Artikel 118za der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1234/2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006783/12
to the Commission
Herbert Dorfmann (PPE)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: Rules on use of the Italian language hindering trade in South Tyrol/protection of minorities and consumers

EU legislation stipulates that manufacturers must provide information on products in an easily understood language. Despite the presence in Italy of a German-speaking minority in South Tyrol, all consumer information is relayed in Italian. Going over and above EU rules, this is also stipulated in Article 6 of the consumer protection law for operating instructions, sales descriptions and other related information, although Article 99 of the Statute of Autonomy of South Tyrol gives both languages equal status within the region and products comply with EU safety requirements. Inspection bodies object to products in German-speaking South Tyrol being systematically labelled in German. Distributors provide translations of safety advice and additional information, thereby assuming responsibilities that should rightly be the manufacturers'. However they lack the knowledge of technical and legal standards to do so.

The language rules are, therefore, standing in the way of the South Tyrolean German-speaking population accessing products from the German-speaking world and denying them the right, granted to the Italian population, to purchase products with operating instructions written solely in their own recognised mother tongue.

Could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Can recognised linguistic minorities, within a region inhabited by said recognised linguistic minorities, also lay claim to the right to information?

2. Can products be sold in a linguistic minority's region if their accompanying information — by analogy with the rules on the use of the language of the Member State — is only in the language of said officially recognised minority?

3. Can products written only in the language of the Member State be sold in a linguistic minority's region?

4. What solutions can the Commission suggest to each of the problems outlined herein, in particular since under Article 118za of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 the compulsory and optional information for wine, for example, can be written in one or more official languages of the Community?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

Requirements in Union product harmonisation legislation ('harmonising rules') on product information destined for consumers (e.g. instructions for use and safety information) vary from directive to directive.

When new harmonising rules are prepared, or existing rules are revised, that legislation should be aligned with the reference provisions in Decision 768/2008 which is part of the New Legislative Framework (NLF).

Legislation aligned with the NLF obliges manufacturers and importers to ensure that the product is accompanied by instructions and safety information in a language which can be easily understood by consumers and other end users, as determined by the Member State concerned. Distributors must verify that the product is so accompanied. Thus each Member State determines, in its national transposition legislation, which language(s) are easily understood by its citizens. Linguistic minorities should therefore raise these issues with the Member States' authorities in order to ensure that particular languages are specified.

Where harmonising rules are not aligned with the NLF, the language question must be looked at on a case by case basis.

Wine products are subject to a specific linguistic regime ([1]).

([1]) See Article 118za of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007.

Article 34 of the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union (TFEU) precludes national legislation from requiring the exclusive use of a specific language for the labelling of products, without allowing the use of another language easily understood by consumers or ensuring that the consumer is otherwise informed. The obligation to use exclusively the language of a linguistic region constitutes a measure having equivalent effect to a quantitative restriction on imports, prohibited by Article 34 TFEU.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006784/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(6 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κυρώσεις της Επιτροπής εις βάρος του ΗΒ, αν αυτό παραβιάσει το δικαίωμα ελεύθερης κυκλοφορίας των ελλήνων πολιτών

Ο Πρωθυπουργός του ΗΒ, κ. David Cameron, δήλωσε στους βουλευτές, στη διάρκεια μιας συνεδρίασης της Επιτροπής Εσωτερικών Υποθέσεων στις 3 Ιουλίου 2012, ότι θα μπορούσε να περιορίσει την είσοδο ελλήνων πολιτών στο ΗΒ. Δήλωσε επίσης ότι, αν υπήρχε σημαντική πίεση, είναι πιθανό πως το ΗΒ θα προχωρούσε στη λήψη νομικής φύσης μέτρων για να κάμψει το μεταναστευτικό ρεύμα. Τα μέσα ενημέρωσης παρουσίασαν την υπόθεση πως το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο εξετάζει το ενδεχόμενο να κλείσει τα σύνορά του για τους πολίτες της Ελλάδας και άλλων χωρών της ευρωζώνης που δοκιμάζονται από την κρίση χρέους.

Όλα τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, εκτός από την Ιρλανδία, το ΗΒ, τη Βουλγαρία, τη Ρουμανία και την Κύπρο, είναι και μέλη της ζώνης Σένγκεν, όπου δεν χρειάζεται η επίδειξη διαβατηρίου για τη διάβαση των εσωτερικών συνόρων. Ωστόσο, δυνάμει των διατάξεων των Συνθηκών της ΕΕ, οι πολίτες της ΕΕ έχουν το δικαίωμα να ταξιδεύουν και να κατοικούν σε άλλα κράτη μέλη της, περιλαμβανομένου του ΗΒ.

Τον Απρίλιο του 2012, η Επιτροπή εξέδωσε μια προειδοποίηση προς το ΗΒ αναφορικά με την υποχρέωσή του να συμμορφωθεί προς τους κανόνες της ΕΕ περί ελεύθερης κυκλοφορίας των πολιτών της ΕΕ. Μετά τις πρόσφατες δηλώσεις του βρετανού Πρωθυπουργού, καλείται η Επιτροπή να απαντήσει στα εξής:

1. Έχει λάβει γνώση η Επιτροπή των δηλώσεων του Πρωθυπουργού του ΗΒ, και πώς προτίθεται να απαντήσει;

2. Εξετάζει η Επιτροπή το ενδεχόμενο να ξεκινήσει -ή έχει ήδη ξεκινήσει- τις διαδικασίες επί παραβάσει, δυνάμει του άρθρου 258 της ΣΛΕΕ, στην περίπτωση που το ΗΒ δεν συμμορφώνεται προς την αρχική προειδοποίηση της Επιτροπής, ούτε προσφέρει έγκαιρη απάντηση;

Απάντηση της κας Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Αυγούστου 2012)

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή δεν είναι ενήμερη για τυχόν πρόθεση της κυβέρνησης του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου να προβεί σε επίσημες ενέργειες για το κλείσιμο των συνόρων της χώρας σε πολίτες άλλων κρατών μελών.

Όσον αφορά τις συγκεκριμένες ερωτήσεις που υποβλήθηκαν, η Επιτροπή δεν κρίνει σκόπιμο να δώσει απάντηση που θα αφορά μια καθαρά υποθετική κατάσταση.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006784/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: Commission to sanction the UK if it infringes the right of free movement of Greek citizens

The UK's Prime Minister David Cameron told MPs at a Home Affairs Committee meeting on 3 July 2012 that he would be prepared to restrict Greek citizens from entering the UK. He also stated that if there was significant pressure, it is likely that from a legal standpoint the UK would take steps to curb the migration flow. The media have speculated that the United Kingdom is considering sealing its borders from Greek citizens and other eurozone citizens from debt-stricken countries.

All EU Member States except Ireland, the UK, Bulgaria, Romania and Cyprus are part of the EU's passport-free Schengen zone. Nevertheless, the EU rules enshrined in the Treaty entitle EU citizens to travel and live in other EU Member States, including the UK.

In April 2012, the Commission issued a warning to the UK that it must comply with EU rules on the free movement of EU citizens. In light of the recent remarks made by the Prime Minister, the Commission is asked to respond to the following:

1. Is the Commission aware of these statements made by the UK's Prime Minister, and how does it plan to respond?

2. Is the Commission considering or has it already begun to pursue infringement proceedings, in accordance with Article 258 of the TFEU, if the UK does not comply with the Commission's initial warning or respond to it in due time?

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

The European Commission is not aware of any intentions of the United Kingdom Government to take formal measures to close its borders to citizens of other Member States.

With regard to the specific questions raised, the Commission does not consider it useful to provide an answer in what is a purely hypothetical situation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006786/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(6 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Distruzione di siti storici a Timbuctu

I militanti del gruppo islamico Ansar Dine, legato ad al-Qaeda, sono riusciti a espellere le forze moderate dei tuareg dalla città di Timbuctù, nel Mali. Oltre ad imporre una versione rigorosa della sharia, la legge islamica, il gruppo colpito tre dei sedici templi storici della città e ha dichiarato che intende distruggerne il resto. Inoltre ha distrutto un cimitero con quattro tombe, vasi in terracotta e altri manufatti. Gli islamisti ritengono infatti idolatrici questi santuari, che sono dedicati a santi locali, venerati nell'ambito della tradizione sufi dell'Islam. Sono inoltre a rischio di distruzione circa 100 000 antichi manoscritti, custoditi da teologi e conservati in palazzi privati e biblioteche.

Timbuctù, oltre a essere un centro culturale, è nota come «la città dei 333 santi». Fatou Bensouda, procuratore capo del Tribunale penale internazionale, ha dichiarato che la distruzione di questi siti «costituisce un crimine di guerra, sul quale il Tribunale è competente a condurre un'indagine ad ampio raggio». Il direttore generale dell'UNESCO ha esortato «tutte le parti in conflitto a porre fine a questi atti terribili ed irreversibili». Nel frattempo un portavoce di Ansar Dine ha fatto sapere che il gruppo, che agisce nel nome di Dio, «distruggerà tutti i mausolei della città, senza alcuna eccezione». Il ministro maliano della Cultura e del turismo ha sollecitato le Nazioni Unite ad adottare provvedimenti a tutela del patrimonio culturale del paese.

La distruzione dei siti storici di Timbuctù ricorda l'atto perpetrato dai talebani in Afghanistan, che fecero esplodere due statue giganti del Buddha nella valle di Bamiyan, dopo aver definito le opere come anti-islamiche.

1. Alla luce della distruzione di questi siti storici di inestimabile valore, quali azioni intende intraprendere l'Unione europea a supporto degli sforzi profusi per espellere Ansar Dine da Timbuctù e da altre città nel nord del Mali?

2. Quale aiuto concreto intende offrire l'Unione europea per il restauro dei siti colpiti da Ansar Dine?

3. È disposto l'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente a incontrare funzionari delle Nazioni Unite e del Tribunale penale internazionale, al fine di coordinare le azioni di contrasto alla campagna di distruzione messa in atto nella città di Timbuctù?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(14 agosto 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha condannato con forza, nella dichiarazione rilasciata il 4 luglio 2012, la distruzione dei siti storici a Timbuctu e il Consiglio «Affari esteri» dell'UE lo ha ribadito nelle conclusioni del 23 luglio 2012. L'approccio dell'UE segue una soluzione orientata preferibilmente al dialogo nel nord del Mali.

Data la situazione politica nel paese, l'assistenza allo sviluppo è temporaneamente sospesa, fatti salvi gli aiuti umanitari e i progetti che favoriscono direttamente la popolazione e quelli a sostegno della transizione democratica. La nomina di un governo di unità nazionale e l'approvazione di una tabella di marcia, che sono in previsione, auspicabilmente consentiranno all'UE di riprendere la cooperazione allo sviluppo. Il portafoglio di aiuti dell'UE al Mali potrebbe richiedere una revisione che lo adegui alla nuova situazione. A breve termine, sarà accordata priorità all'assistenza alla popolazione e alle istituzioni, e forse anche, a seconda di quelle che saranno le priorità del futuro legittimo governo, al patrimonio culturale.

Dall'inizio della crisi in Mali l'UE si è costantemente adoprata, in stretta collaborazione con l'ONU e gli organi internazionali, ad aiutare il paese a misurarsi con le attuali sfide. Attraverso gli Stati membri, l'UE è anche stata strettamente associata alle discussioni in vista di una risoluzione del Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006786/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — The destruction of historic sites in Timbuktu

Militants in the Islamist group Ansar Dine, which has links to al-Qaeda, have succeeded in pushing out moderate Tuareg forces from the town of Timbuktu in Mali. The group is now enforcing an austere version of Sharia law. It has attacked three of Timbuktu's sixteen historic shrines, and intends to destroy the rest of them. A cemetery with four tombs has also been destroyed, along with earthenware jars and other artefacts. The Islamists believe that that the shrines, which are dedicated to local saints who adhere to the Sufi interpretation of Islam, are idolatrous. Almost 100 000 ancient manuscripts are stored in both private homes and libraries: these are looked after by religious scholars, but are now at risk of being destroyed.

Timbuktu, a centre of learning, is known as the 'City of 333 Saints'. Fatou Bensouda, Chief Prosecutor at the International Criminal Court (ICC), said that the destruction of the sites 'is a war crime which my office has authority to fully investigate'. Unesco's Director-General called on 'all parties engaged in the conflict to stop these terrible and irreversible acts'. Meanwhile an Ansar Dine spokesman said the group was acting in the name of God and would 'destroy every mausoleum in the city. All of them, without exception'. Mali's culture and tourism minister has urged the United Nations to take action to preserve her country's heritage.

The destruction of Timbuktu's heritage sites is reminiscent of the Taliban branding the giant Buddhas of the Bamiyan valley in Afghanistan un-Islamic and blowing them up.

1. In the light of the destruction of these unique historical sites, what steps is the EU prepared to take to support efforts to flush out Ansar Dine from towns in northern Mali such as Timbuktu?

2. What practical help is the EU prepared to offer to help restore the sites attacked by Ansar Dine?

3. Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to meet with UN and ICC officials to coordinate plans to address the destructive campaign currently under way in the town of Timbuktu?

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

The HR/VP strongly condemned, in her statement dated 4 July 2012, the destruction of historic sites in Timbuktu and the EU Foreign Affairs Council did the same in its conclusions on 23 July 2012. The EU's approach is to seek a solution preferably through dialogue in the north of Mali.

Given the political situation in Mali, development assistance has been put on hold, with the exception of humanitarian aid and projects which benefit directly the population, as well as projects which support the democratic transition. The nomination of a national unity government and the approval of a road map are expected, which will hopefully enable the EU to gradually resume development cooperation. The EU aid portfolio to Mali may need to be reviewed and adapted to the new circumstances. In the short term, the priority will be assistance to the population and to the institutions. This may — depending also on the priorities of the future legitimate government — include support for cultural heritage.

Since the beginning of the crisis in Mali, the EU has constantly worked in close cooperation with the UN and international bodies to help to tackle the challenges Mali is facing. The EU, through its Member States, has also been closely associated with discussions on a UN Security Council Resolution.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006787/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(6 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Legami fra Egitto e Israele

In seguito all'elezione del Presidente Mohammed Morsi in Egitto, sono sorti timori sul fatto che sia posto in discussione il trattato di pace fra Israele ed Egitto derivante dagli accordi di Camp David e che l'accordo di pace sia visto semplicemente, in certi ambienti, come parte del retaggio dell'epoca di Mubarak. Il primo ministro israeliano Benjamin Netanyahu ha dichiarato che rispetta gli esiti del processo democratico egiziano e spera che l'accordo di pace rimanga immutato. In un discorso pronunciato di recente, Mohammed Morsi ha affermato che l'Egitto «rispetterà tutti gli accordi internazionali», senza però menzionare esplicitamente Israele. Ha inoltre dichiarato che intende «riconsiderare» l'accordo di pace con Israele e sviluppare legami con l'Iran in modo da «creare un equilibrio strategico» in Medio Oriente. Secondo quanto riferito dal quotidiano canadese *The National Post*, Morsi ha definito «molto importante» la questione del ritorno dei rifugiati palestinesi alle case abbandonate dalle loro famiglie durante la guerra arabo-israeliana del 1948 e la guerra dei sei giorni del 1967.

1. Quali passi intende intraprendere il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante al fine di sostenere e mantenere l'attuale trattato di pace fra Israele ed Egitto?

2. È disposto il VP/HR ad affrontare la questione con il Presidente egiziano neoeletto?

3. Qual è la valutazione dei funzionari dell'UE in Egitto riguardo alla probabilità che il nuovo Presidente rispetti l'accordo in vigore?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(3 ottobre 2012)

La pace e la stabilità dell'intera regione costituiscono un obiettivo strategico per l'UE. L'importanza e la responsabilità dell'Egitto in questo ambito sono state sottolineate nelle conclusioni del Consiglio Affari esteri adottate il 25 giugno 2012, dopo l'elezione del Presidente Morsi. Nel quadro del suo dialogo regolare con le autorità egiziane, l'UE incoraggia l'Egitto a continuare ad impegnarsi per la stabilità regionale e a tenere fede agli impegni internazionali. L'Egitto è inoltre un attore importante per la riconciliazione palestinese, che è la chiave del processo di pace in Medio Oriente. Prima e dopo il suo insediamento, il Presidente Morsi ha dichiarato che gli accordi internazionali conclusi precedentemente saranno rispettati e l'UE confida che la nuova amministrazione non deluderà le aspettative. L'UE continuerà a seguire la questione con la massima attenzione e, a tal proposito, intende basare le proprie valutazioni sulle azioni concrete intraprese dal nuovo Presidente e dal futuro governo.

Riguardo alle relazioni tra Egitto e Iran, attualmente non ci sono indicazioni di cambiamenti rilevanti nel prossimo futuro. Secondo le autorità egiziane, l'intervista pubblicata dalla stampa iraniana in cui il Presidente Morsi avrebbe dichiarato la sua intenzione di rafforzare i rapporti con l'Iran è stata prodotta ad arte e nei confronti dell'agenzia di stampa che l'ha diffusa è stata intentata una causa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006787/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Ties between Egypt and Israel

Since the election of President Mohammed Morsi in Egypt, there have been concerns that the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, as a result of the Camp David accords, could be undermined. There are fears that the peace agreement is viewed in some circles as simply part of the legacy of the Mubarak era. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said he respected the results of Egypt's democratic process and hoped the peace agreement would remain intact. In a recent speech Mohammed Morsi said that Egypt would 'respect all international agreements', but he did not specifically mention Israel. Morsi has said that he wants to 'reconsider' the peace deal with Israel and build ties with Iran to 'create a strategic balance' in the Middle East. The Canadian newspaper *The National Post* reported that Morsi said the issue of Palestinian refugees returning to homes their families abandoned in the 1948 Arab-Israeli War and the 1967 Six-Day War 'is very important'.

1. What steps is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to take in order to support and maintain the current peace treaty between Israel and Egypt?

2. Is the VP/HR prepared to address this issue with the newly elected Egyptian president?

3. What is the assessment of EU officials in Egypt as to the likelihood of the new president respecting the current agreement?

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

The peace and stability of the whole region is a strategic objective for the EU. The importance and responsibility of Egypt in this regard has been stressed in the conclusions of the Foreign Affairs Council adopted on 25 June 2012 after the election of President Morsy. In its regular dialogue with the Egyptian authorities, the EU encourages Egypt to remain engaged towards regional stability and to respect its international commitments. Egypt is also an important actor in the Palestinian reconciliation which is key to the Middle East Peace Process. Before and after his inauguration, President Morsy has declared that the international agreements concluded previously will be upheld. The EU trusts that the new leadership will live up to these expectations. The EU will continue to follow this issue with the greatest attention; with this respect, it intends to base its assessment on the concrete actions taken by the new President and the future government.

As regards the relations between Egypt and Iran, nothing indicates for the time being that groundbreaking changes will occur in the near future. According to the Egyptian authorities, the Iranian news agency interview in which President Morsy supposedly declared its intention to improve ties with Iran was fabricated and a law suit has been launched against the news agency which reported it.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006789/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE) y Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(6 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Proyectos de presas hidroeléctricas en Chile

El proyecto HidroAysén, que planea construir cinco presas hidroeléctricas en los ríos de Pascua y Baker en la Patagonia de Chile, amenaza con poner en peligro una de las últimas regiones de naturaleza intacta en el mundo.

Las empresas que están detrás de la construcción son Endesa (empresa española) y Enel (empresa italiana). El 74 % de la población chilena está en contra de la decisión de construir estas presas, que van a afectar a numerosas especies de plantas y animales acuáticos autóctonos, algunos de los cuales ya están en peligro de extinción.

El proyecto va a tener un duro impacto sobre la comunidad local de Aysén, una de las regiones menos desarrolladas de Chile. La mayor parte de la energía que se generará allí se enviará a Santiago y a otras ciudades del norte por una línea de alta tensión de 2 000 Km, que todavía no ha sido aprobada en espera de la evaluación del impacto ambiental.

La respuesta del Gobierno chileno es que el país necesita más energía, y el proyecto es el único modo de obtenerla, pero diversos estudios académicos han mostrado que Chile tiene otras opciones energéticas, utilizando su extenso potencial de energía alternativa.

La Unión Europea, promotora internacional de la conservación de la naturaleza y la biodiversidad, ¿va a oponerse a la construcción del proyecto HidroAysén?

La Unión Europea, importante socio político y económico de Chile, ¿va a tratar de persuadir al Gobierno chileno para que explore otras opciones energéticas, respetando las demandas de la población?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de agosto de 2012)

La Comisión reconoce el importante papel que las fuentes de energía renovables, incluida la energía hidroeléctrica, desempeñan en la consecución de los objetivos de reducción de las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero, la diversificación del suministro energético y la reducción de la dependencia de los combustibles fósiles, tanto en la Unión Europea como en Chile. La Comisión opina que el desarrollo de proyectos de energía renovable, incluida la energía hidroeléctrica, debería tener lugar de manera compatible con los requisitos de protección medioambiental aplicables. Si bien es evidente que algunos chilenos se oponen al proyecto HidroAysén, el proyecto y sus repercusiones medioambientales y otras fueron examinados por las respectivas autoridades chilenas de conformidad con la legislación nacional pertinente antes de que se adoptara la decisión de autorizar la construcción de las presas. La concesión de estos permisos compete a las autoridades chilenas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006789/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE) and Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Hydroelectric dam projects in Chile

The HidroAysén project — a plan to build five hydroelectric dams on the Pascua and Baker rivers in Chilean Patagonia — could well endanger one of the world's last regions of unspoiled wilderness.

The companies behind the construction plans are Endesa (a Spanish company) and Enel (an Italian company). 74% of the Chilean population opposes the decision to build these dams, which will affect many native plant and aquatic animal species, some of which are already endangered.

The project will have a severe impact on the local community of Aysén, one of Chile's least developed regions. Most of the energy generated will be sent to Santiago and other cities in the north via a 2 000 km long high-voltage power line that has still to be approved pending the environmental impact assessment.

The Chilean government's response is that the country needs more energy, and the project is the only way of getting it, but various academic studies have shown that Chile has other energy options involving the use of its vast alternative energy potential.

Given its international role in promoting nature conservation and biodiversity, will the European Union oppose construction of the HidroAysén project?

As one of Chile's main political and economic partners, will the European Union try to persuade the Chilean government to explore other energy options and respect the demands of its population?

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

The Commission acknowledges the important role that renewable energy sources, including hydro-power, play in achieving the objectives of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, diversifying energy supplies and reducing dependence on fossil fuel, both in the EU and in Chile. The Commission believes the development of renewable energy projects, including hydro-power, should take place in a manner which is compatible with the applicable environmental protection requirements. While it is evident that some Chileans are opposed to the HidroAysén project, the project and its environmental and other impacts were examined by the respective Chilean authorities in accordance with the relevant national legislation before the decision was made to grant permission for the construction of the dams. The granting of such permissions is a matter for the respective Chilean authorities.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006790/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL) y Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE)
(6 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Derechos humanos en Chile

La comunidad mapuche sufrió mucho bajo la dictadura chilena, principalmente a consecuencia de la confiscación de sus tierras y la represión a la que la sometieron las fuerzas militares. A pesar del proceso de democratización que se ha desarrollado en Chile desde el final de la dictadura, las comunidades mapuches siguen siendo objeto de discriminación y soportando el uso excesivo de la fuerza por los miembros del Cuerpo de Carabineros. En aquellas comunidades, el uso indiscriminado de balas de goma y gases lacrimógenos y los actos de intimidación y violencia han causado daños no solo físicos, sino también psicológicos a hombres, mujeres y niños. Las violaciones de derechos humanos se han documentado en el informe anual de la Comisión Ética contra la Tortura, la organización chilena que combate estas prácticas. El informe se envió a miembros del Gobierno chileno, que no han contestado.

Los abusos descritos infringen numerosos tratados y convenios internacionales, incluido el Convenio n° 169 de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo sobre pueblos indígenas y tribales, la Convención de las Naciones Unidas contra la Tortura y Otros Tratos o Penas Crueles, Inhumanos o Degradantes y la Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos del Niño.

La falta de respuesta política ha hecho que las comunidades y organizaciones no gubernamentales afectadas busquen ayuda fuera del país: se ha denunciado ante la Corte Interamericana de Derechos Humanos un caso de acoso y violencia contra niños mapuches. Como se indica en el artículo 12 del Acuerdo de asociación UE-Chile, la UE tiene la responsabilidad de plantear, en el marco del diálogo político conjunto, cuestiones relativas a la defensa común de los valores democráticos, como el respeto de los derechos humanos. En consideración de lo expuesto, proponemos que en el programa de la visita que la Delegación en la Comisión Parlamentaria Mixta UE-Chile efectuará a en aquel país en enero de 2013 se incluya una visita a Temuco, con el fin de celebrar una reunión con los miembros de la comunidad mapuche y las ONG locales.

1. ¿Reconoce la Comisión que esta descripción de la situación responde a la realidad?

2. ¿Piensa insistir la Comisión ante el Gobierno chileno para que investigue los casos documentados en el informe arriba mencionado y adopte medidas en respuesta a los mismos?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(30 de agosto de 2012)

La UE es consciente de las alegaciones de discriminación contra ciudadanos mapuches de Chile y de las alegaciones de abuso de fuerza contra algunas comunidades mapuches; así mismo ha tomado nota de la preocupación por esta y otras cuestiones que están documentadas en el último informe anual de la Comisión Ética Contra la Tortura que se hizo público en Chile y en internet el 12 de julio de 2012

En el marco del Acuerdo de asociación UE-Chile, la UE mantiene un diálogo político y sobre políticas con Chile respecto a una serie de cuestiones, entre las que se encuentran los derechos humanos y, en particular, los derechos humanos de los mapuches y otros indígenas chilenos. Los derechos humanos de los indígenas chilenos, incluidos los mapuches, se han debatido, tanto con organizaciones de la sociedad civil como con las autoridades chilenas, en los tres Diálogos locales sobre derechos humanos UE-Chile celebrados hasta la fecha, el último de ellos el 29 de mayo de 2012 en Santiago.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006790/12
an die Kommission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL) und Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE)
(6. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Menschenrechte in Chile

Während der Diktatur in Chile litt die Gemeinschaft der Mapuche vor allem sehr unter der widerrechtlichen Enteignung ihrer Ländereien und unter der Unterdrückung durch die Militärkräfte. Trotz des Prozesses der Demokratisierung, den Chile nach dem Ende der Diktatur durchlaufen hat, werden die Gemeinschaften der Mapuche immer noch diskriminiert und geht die lokale Militärpolizei mit unverhältnismäßiger Gewalt gegen sie vor. Der willkürliche Einsatz von Gummigeschossen, Tränengas, Einschüchterung und Gewalt in diesen Gemeinschaften hat den Männern, Frauen und Kindern nicht nur körperlichen, sondern auch psychischen Schaden zugefügt. Berichte über Fälle von Menschenrechtsverletzungen wurden in dem Jahresbericht der chilenischen Ethikkommission gegen die Folter (Comisión Ética Contra la Tortura) aufgezeigt. Dieser Bericht wurde an Mitglieder der chilenischen Regierung übersandt, die jedoch nicht reagierten.

Diese Verletzungen stellten Verstöße gegen zahlreiche internationale Verträge und Übereinkommen dar, unter anderem gegen das IAO-Übereinkommen Nr. 169 über eingeborene und in Stämmen lebende Völker, das Übereinkommen der Vereinten Nationen gegen Folter und andere grausame, unmenschliche oder erniedrigende Behandlung oder Strafe und das Übereinkommen der Vereinten Nationen über die Rechte des Kindes.

Der Mangel an politischer Reaktion hat dazu geführt, dass die betroffenen Gemeinschaften und nichtstaatlichen Organisationen außerhalb des Landes um Unterstützung ersucht haben: Ein Fall von Belästigungen und Drohungen gegen Mapuche-Kinder wurde vor den Inter-Amerikanischen Gerichtshof für Menschenrechte gebracht. Gemäß Artikel 12 des Assoziierungsabkommens zwischen der EU und Chile obliegt es der EU, im Rahmen des politischen Dialogs zwischen den Vertragsparteien Fragen in Bezug auf die „gemeinsame Verteidigung demokratischer Wertvorstellungen wie der Achtung der Menschenrechte“ zu stellen. In diesem Zusammenhang schlage ich vor, dass die Delegation im Gemischten Parlamentarischen Ausschuss EU-Chile, die im Januar 2013 nach Chile reisen wird, auch einen Besuch in Temuco auf die Tagesordnung setzt, um dort mit Mitgliedern der Gemeinschaft der Mapuche und lokalen nichtstaatlichen Organisationen zusammenzutreffen.

1. Erkennt die Kommission diese Situation an?

2. Wird die Kommission darauf bestehen, dass die chilenische Regierung auf die in dem oben genannten Bericht aufgezeigten Fälle reagiert und sie untersucht?

Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(30. August 2012)

Der EU sind die vermeintlichen Diskriminierungen der chilenischen Bürger, die der Gemeinschaft der Mapuche angehören, sowie die Vorwürfe unverhältnismäßiger Gewaltanwendungen gegenüber einigen Mapuche-Gemeinschaften bekannt und sie hat diesbezügliche sowie anderweitige Bedenken, die im aktuellen, am 12. Juli 2012 in Chile und im Internet veröffentlichten Jahresbericht der „Comisión Ética Contra la Tortura“ geäußert wurden, zur Kenntnis genommen.

Im Rahmen des zwischen der EU und Chile geschlossenen Assoziationsabkommens führt die EU mit Chile einen politischen Dialog sowie spezifische Politikdialoge zu zahlreichen Themen, zu denen auch die Menschenrechte und insbesondere die Menschenrechte der Mapuche sowie weiterer indigener Chilenen gehören. Die Menschenrechte der indigenen Chilenen wie den Mapuche waren Gegenstand der Gespräche mit zivilgesellschaftlichen Organisationen und den chilenischen Behörden bei allen drei Menschenrechtsdialogen zwischen der EU und Chile; der letzte fand am 29. Mai 2012 in Santiago statt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006790/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE), Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL) and Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE)
(6 July 2012)

Subject: Human rights in Chile

The Mapuche community suffered a great deal under the dictatorship in Chile, principally as a result of the confiscation of their lands and the repression inflicted on them by military forces. Despite the democratisation process that has been under way in Chile since the dictatorship ended, Mapuche communities are still subject to discrimination, with the local *carabineros* using excessive force against them. The indiscriminate use of rubber bullets, tear gas, intimidation and violence in these communities has caused not only physical but also psychological damage to men, women, and children. Human rights abuses were documented in the annual report of Chile's anti-torture organisation, the *Comisión Ética Contra la Tortura*. This report was sent to members of the Chilean Government, who have not responded.

These abuses have breached numerous international treaties and conventions including International Labour Organisation Convention No 169 on indigenous and tribal peoples, the United Nations Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The lack of a political response has led the communities affected and NGOs to seek support outside the country: a case concerning harassment and violence against Mapuche children has been brought before the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. As indicated in Article 12 of the EU-Chile Association Agreement, the EU has a responsibility, within the joint political dialogue, to put questions concerning 'the common defence of democratic values, such as the respect for human rights'. In the light of this, I propose that the schedule for the Delegation to the EU-Chile Joint Parliamentary Committee's visit to Chile in January 2013 include a visit to Temuco in order for a meeting to be held with members of the Mapuche community and local NGOs.

1. Does the Commission recognise this situation?

2. Will the Commission insist that the Chilean Government respond to and investigate the cases documented in the report mentioned above?

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

The EU is aware of allegations of discrimination against Mapuche citizens of Chile and allegations of use of excessive force against some Mapuche communities; and has taken note of concerns about these and other matters that are documented in the latest annual report of the Comisión Ética Contra la Tortura which was released in Chile and on the Internet on 12 July 2012.

In the framework of the EU-Chile Association Agreement, the EU holds political and policy dialogues with Chile on a range of issues including human rights and in particular the human rights of the Mapuche and other indigenous Chileans. The human rights of indigenous Chileans including the Mapuche have been discussed, both with civil society organisations and with the Chilean authorities, during all three local EU-Chile Human Rights Dialogues held to date, most recently on 29 May 2012 in Santiago.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006791/12
an die Kommission
Evelyn Regner (S&D) und Karin Kadenbach (S&D)
(9. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Aufhebung diskriminierender Fragestellungen bei Blutspende-Fragebögen

Auf Fragebögen für Blutspenderinnen und Blutspendern werden unter anderem Fragen zu den sexuellen Aktivitäten der potentiellen Spenderin/des potentiellen Spenders gestellt, die auf die mögliche Infektion mit sexuell übertragbaren Krankheiten abzielen. Dabei kommt es bei Fragebögen in einigen Mitgliedstaaten zu Fragestellungen, wie etwa: „Hatten Sie als Mann Sex mit einem anderen Mann?", die gegenüber homosexuellen Männern eine Diskriminierung darstellt.

1. Teilt die Kommission die Auffassung, dass solche Fragestellungen gemäß Artikel 19 Absatz 1 AEUV und Artikel 21 Absatz 1 der Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union als diskriminierend einzustufen sind und dass solche Fragestellungen auf ein allgemeines Risikoverhalten abzielen sollten?

2. Welche Vorgaben gibt es seitens der Europäischen Union hinsichtlich der Ausgestaltung solcher Fragebögen? Wie werden diese Vorgaben in den verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten umgesetzt?

3. Sollte es solche Vorgaben (siehe Ziffer 2) noch nicht geben, erwägt die Kommission aufgrund des grenzüberschreitenden Charakters von Blutspenden, EU-weite Regelungen oder Leitlinien für die Erstellung von Blutspende-Fragebögen zu erlassen?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(5. September 2012)

Die Kommission verweist auf ihre Antwort auf die Anfrage E-006484/2011 ([1]). In dieser Antwort erinnert sie daran, dass in der Richtlinie 2004/33/EG der Kommission ([2]) festgelegt ist, dass die Blutspendeeinrichtungen in den Mitgliedstaaten als Spender „Personen [ausschließen sollten], deren Sexualverhalten ein hohes Übertragungsrisiko für durch Blut übertragbare schwere Infektionskrankheiten birgt". Die Kommission weist in diesem Zusammenhang darauf hin, dass „Sexualverhalten" nicht mit „sexueller Ausrichtung" gleichzusetzen ist. Die Mitgliedstaaten müssen diese Richtlinie unter umfassender Beachtung der EU-Grundrechtecharta und insbesondere von deren Artikel 21 umsetzen, der die Diskriminierung aus Gründen der sexuellen Ausrichtung untersagt.

Vor diesem Hintergrund liegt es in der Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten, in ihrem Land Fragebögen für potenzielle Spender zu formulieren und auf dem Sexualverhalten basierende Ausschlusskriterien festzulegen und anzuwenden. Solche Kriterien sind auf wissenschaftliche und epidemiologische Daten über die nationale Prävalenz übertragbarer Krankheiten wie HIV oder Hepatitis zu stützen ([3]).

Damit die Ausschlusskriterien genauer definiert werden können, ruft die Kommission alle Mitgliedstaaten auf, verstärkt Daten über die Häufigkeit solcher Erkrankungen bei speziellen Bevölkerungsgruppen zu erheben.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/de/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:091:0025:0039:DE:PDF.
([3]) http://www.edqm.eu/medias/fichiers/paphts_11_28_2r_european_committee_partial_agreeme.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006791/12
to the Commission
Evelyn Regner (S&D) and Karin Kadenbach (S&D)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Removing discriminatory questions from blood donation questionnaires

Blood donation questionnaires include questions on the sexual activities of potential donors which aim to identify the risk of infection with sexually-transmitted diseases. In some Member States such questionnaires include questions like 'If you are male, have you ever had sex with another man?', which is discriminatory towards homosexual men.

1. Does the Commission agree that such questions qualify as discriminatory under Article 19(1) TFEU and Article 21(1) of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and that they should aim to identify general at-risk behaviour?

2. What requirements does the EU have regarding the formulation of such questionnaires? How are these requirements implemented in the various Member States?

3. If such requirements do not yet exist, is the Commission considering the adoption of EU-wide rules or guidelines for the formulation of blood donation questionnaires, in view of the cross-border nature of blood donation?

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

The Commission refers to the reply given to Question E-006484/2011 ([1]). In this reply, the Commission recalls that Commission Directive 2004/33/EC ([2]) establishes that blood establishments in Member States should defer as donors 'persons whose sexual behaviour puts them at high risk of acquiring severe infectious diseases that can be transmitted by blood.' The Commission notes, in this respect, that 'sexual behaviour' is not identical to 'sexual orientation'. Member States have to implement this directive in full respect of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, notably its Article 21 which prohibits discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation.

According to this background, it is up to the Member States to formulate local questionaires to potential donors and to define and implement deferral criteria based on sexual behaviour. Such criteria are to be established in function of scientific and epidemiological data of national prevalence of communicable diseases like HIV or hepatitis ([3]).

In order to fine-tune the deferral criteria, the Commission therefore calls on all Member States to collect more data on incidence of such diseases in specific population groups.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:091:0025:0039:EN:PDF.
([3]) http://www.edqm.eu/medias/fichiers/paphts_11_28_2r_european_committee_partial_agreeme.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006792/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(9 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Επανένταξη των αποφυλακιζομένων στην αγορά εργασίας

Η επαγγελματική αποκατάσταση των αποφυλακιζομένων συνιστά βασική προϋπόθεση για την επιτυχή επανένταξή τους στην κοινωνία, την αποφυγή νέων υποτροπών στη συμπεριφορά τους καθώς και την καταπολέμηση φαινομένων φτώχειας, κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού και στιγματισμού σε βάρος τους. Η ραγδαία αυξανόμενη ανεργία -ειδικά σε τομείς χαμηλής ειδίκευσης- εντείνει ακόμη περισσότερο τη δυσκολία εύρεσης εργασίας και ταυτόχρονα μεγιστοποιεί την ανάγκη για την υλοποίηση στοχευμένων προγραμμάτων εκπαίδευσης και κατάρτισης, τόσο κατά τη σωφρονιστική διαδικασία, όσο και στην πρώτη μετασωφρονιστική φάση. Σε αυτή την κατεύθυνση, και με δεδομένο ότι ο εγκλεισμός όχι μόνο δεν πρέπει να αναστέλλει, αλλά επιβάλλεται να ενισχύει, την άσκηση του δικαιώματος κάθε πολίτη στην εκπαίδευση, την επαγγελματική κατάρτιση, την εργασία και γενικότερα στην προσωπική του ανάπτυξη, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Προτίθεται να προωθήσει την ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών μεταξύ των κρατών μελών, αφενός, για την ανάδειξη των πιο ενδεδειγμένων προγραμμάτων αναβάθμισης κοινωνικών και επαγγελματικών δεξιοτήτων των φυλακισμένων και, αφετέρου, των πιο αποτελεσματικών προτάσεων στο πεδίο της θέσπισης κινήτρων είτε για την πρόσληψή τους είτε για τη συμμετοχή τους σε προγράμματα επαγγελματικής επιμόρφωσης;

Διαθέτει στοιχεία για τα ποσοστά απορροφητικότητας των κρατών μελών αναφορικά με τα διαθέσιμα κοινοτικά κονδύλια για την εκπαίδευση των εγκλείστων στα σωφρονιστικά ιδρύματα, αλλά και κατά το κεφαλήν ποσό που διαθέτουν για τη συγκεκριμένη διαδικασία;

Επεξεργάζεται, ή σκοπεύει να επεξεργαστεί σε συνεργασία με τους κοινωνικούς εταίρους, ένα ευρωπαϊκό σχέδιο δράσης για τη διάδοση των προγραμμάτων επαγγελματικής επιμόρφωσης και εκπαίδευσης στα σωφρονιστικά ιδρύματα στο πλαίσιο των κοινωνικών στόχων και των στόχων για την απασχόληση που τίθενται στην Ευρωπαϊκή Στρατηγική ΕΕ 2020;

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

Δραστηριότητες επαγγελματικής κατάρτισης και κοινωνικής ένταξης διοργανώνονται από το ΕΚΤ για φυλακισμένους σε σωφρονιστικά ιδρύματα και αμέσως μετά την αποφυλάκισή τους. Σε περίπτωση που δεν υπάρχουν δραστηριότητες του ΕΚΤ ειδικά για έγκλειστους, μπορούν τότε να συμπεριλαμβάνονται στο πλαίσιο της κοινωνικής ένταξης των ευάλωτων ομάδων. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει στατιστικά στοιχεία και αριθμούς σχετικά με το ποσό που δαπανάται κατά κεφαλή ανά χώρα, αλλά έχει ορισμένα παραδείγματα αυτών των ενεργειών (170 στη βάση των σχεδίων ([1])).

Στο πλαίσιο της διακρατικής συνεργασίας και καινοτομίας του ΕΚΤ υποστηρίζεται επίσης το δίκτυο μάθησης ExOCoP: 40 εταίροι από 13 χώρες με στόχο να μειωθεί η υποτροπή στην παρανομία με την χάραξη σαφούς πορείας εκπαίδευσης, κατάρτισης και απασχόλησης για φυλακισμένους και αποφυλακισμένους, ούτως ώστε να διευκολυνθεί η πρόσβασή τους στις υποδομές στρατηγικών επανένταξης. Το πολιτικό φόρουμ του Βερολίνου που πραγματοποιήθηκε τον Ιούνιο ήταν η ευκαιρία για την ενημέρωση των υπεύθυνων για τη χάραξη πολιτικής στα κράτη μέλη (υπουργεία Απασχόλησης και Δικαιοσύνης) σχετικά με ορθές στρατηγικές επανένταξης. Τα διαθέσιμα εγχειρίδια και συστάσεις θα μπορούσαν να χρησιμοποιηθούν ως πηγή για άλλα επιχειρησιακά προγράμματα του ΕΚΤ (www.exocop.eu). Ένα παράρτημα με πληροφορίες που συγκεντρώθηκαν από το δίκτυο σχετικά με τη χρήση των κονδυλίων του ΕΚΤ για τους αποφυλακισμένους αποστέλλεται απευθείας στον κ. βουλευτή και στη Γραμματεία του Κοινοβουλίου.

Όσον αφορά ένα ευρωπαϊκό σχέδιο δράσης για την εκπαίδευση και κατάρτιση στα σωφρονιστικά ιδρύματα, οι ευρωπαίοι κοινωνικοί εταίροι δεν προτίθενται να εκπονήσουν τέτοιου είδους σχέδιο δράσης στο πλαίσιο του ευρωπαϊκού κοινωνικού διαλόγου.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/search.cfm?lang=en.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006792/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Employment market re-entry for prison leavers

The re-employment of prison leavers is a basic condition for ensuring their successful rehabilitation within society, preventing them from reverting once more to their former ways and combating the poverty, social exclusion and ostracism suffered by them. The massive increase in unemployment figures — particularly in low-skill jobs — is making it even harder to find work and increasing the need for targeted training programmes both during imprisonment and in the immediate aftermath. In this connection, imprisonment should not undermine but, on the contrary, underpin the exercise by all individuals of their right to education, vocational training, employment and, more generally, personal development.

In view of this:

Will the Commission encourage an exchange of best practices between Member States with a view to establishing the most appropriate programmes for improving the social and vocational skills of convicts and identifying the most effective proposals regarding incentives for their recruitment or acceptance on vocational training programmes?

Does it have information regarding the take-up by Member States of available EU funding for the provision of training in correctional institutions and the per capita amounts earmarked for this purpose?

Will it draw up or does it intend to draw up, in cooperation with the social partners, a European plan of action for education and training in correctional institutions in the context of the social and employment objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy?

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

Training and social inclusion activities are organised with ESF for convicts in correctional institutions and immediately after their release. As far as prisoners are not explicitly targeted by the ESF but in the context of the social inclusion of vulnerable groups they can be addressed the Commission doesn't have any statistics and figures on the amount spent per capita per country, but has some examples of such actions (170 on the projects' database ([1])).

ESF transnational cooperation and innovation supports as well the ExOCoP learning network: 40 partners from 13 countries to reduce re-offending by developing a clear Education, Training and Employment path for prisoners and ex-offenders to access strategic resettlement facilities. The Berlin policy forum that took place in June was the opportunity to inform different national policy-makers (employment and justice ministries) about good strategies of resettlement. Manuals and recommendations available could be used as a source for further operational programmes of the ESF (www.exocop.eu). An annex with information gathered by the network on the use of ESF funding for (ex-)offenders is sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

Concerning a European plan of action for education and training in correctional institutions, the European Social Partners have no intention of drawing up such a plan of action in the context of the European Social Dialogue.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/search.cfm?lang=en.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-006795/12
till kommissionen
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(9 juli 2012)

Angående: Har ESAB:s fabrik i Opole i Polen erhållit någon form av stöd från EU

Bakgrund: Företaget ESAB i Laxå i Sverige, som bland annat tillverkar svetsutrustningar, varslade 171 av 373 anställda om uppsägning i maj i år. En hel avdelning ska flyttas till Polen. Alla 171 varslade förlorar sina arbeten.

ESABs flytt sker till en fabrik i Opole i södra Polen mellan Wroclav och Krakov. Fabriken har ett lokalt delägarskap på ca 13-15 % och resten ägs av ESAB. ESAB i sin tur ägs av Colfax Corporations.

Fråga: Har ESAB:s fabrik i Opole i Polen erhållit någon form av stöd från EU?

Svar från Johannes Hahn på kommissionens vägnar
(6 september 2012)

Enligt uppgifter som inkommit från Polens ministerium för regional utveckling har ESAB-gruppen tre företag som är verksamma i Polen:

— Ozas-Esab sp. z o.o. baserat i Opole

— Esab Polska sp. z o.o. baserat i Katowice

— Esab sp. z o.o. baserat i Katowice

Inget av dessa företag har fått sammanhållningspolitiska medel från något nationellt program (innovativ ekonomi, infrastruktur och miljö eller humankapital). Esab Sp. z o.o. har ansökt om EU-bidrag inom programmet humankapital, men det har inte beviljats.

Enligt den information som vi har fått från förvaltningsmyndigheten för det regionala operativa programmet för regionen Opole, har Ozas-Esab sp. z o.o. varken fått eller ansökt om EU-bidrag inom det programmet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006795/12
to the Commission
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Has the ESAB factory in Opole (Poland) received any kind of EU support?

Background: The firm of ESAB in Laxå (Sweden), whose activities include the manufacture of welding equipment, issued warnings of dismissal to 171 of its 373 employees in May this year. A whole department is to be transferred to Poland. All 171 of those warned lost their jobs.

ESAB is moving to a factory in Opole in southern Poland between Wroclaw and Krakow. Some 13-15% of its shares are in local hands and the rest are owned by ESAB, which in turn is owned by Colfax Corporations.

My question is: Has the ESAB factory in Opole (Poland) received any kind of support from the EU?

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

According to information received from the Polish Ministry of Regional Development, there are three companies operating in Poland which belong to the ESAB group:

— Ozas-Esab sp. z o.o. based in Opole

— Esab Polska sp. z o.o. based in Katowice

— Esab sp. z o.o. based in Katowice

None of them has received cohesion policy funding from the national programmes (Innovative Economy, Infrastructure and Environment, and Human Capital). Esab sp. z o.o. applied for EU funding under the Human Capital programme, but it was not granted.

According to information received from the managing authority for the regional operational programme for the Opolskie region, Ozas-Esab sp. z o.o. has not received, or applied for, any EU funding under this programme.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006796/12
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Need for changes to the Treaties

Will the Commission confirm that initiatives such as a banking union and European bonds will be impossible to implement unless the Treaties are amended?

Will the Commission confirm that the creation of a banking union will involve one or more of the following changes and, if so, which ones?

— the extension of the objectives of the EU as set out in Article 3 of TEU,

— the conferring on the EU of a new exclusive competence,

— the extension of an exclusive competence of the EU,

— the conferring on the EU of a new competence shared with the Member States,

— the extension of any competence of the EU that is shared with the Member States,

— the extension of the competence of the EU in relation to the coordination of economic and employment policies,

— the conferring on the EU of a new competence to carry out actions to support, coordinate or supplement the actions of the Member States,

— the extension of a supporting, coordinating or supplementing competence of the EU,

— the conferring on an EU institution or body of power to impose a requirement or obligation on Member States or the removal of any limitation on any such power of an EU institution or body,

— the conferring on an EU institution or body of new or extended power to impose sanctions on Member States.

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2012)

The Commission is actively engaged in work on the deepening of Economic and Monetary Union and will in particular present legislative proposals for banking supervision in early September, following the European Council and Euro Area Summit on 28-29 June.

The Commission's preliminary view is that banking union comprising a single supervisory mechanism and effective resolution and deposit insurance funds can be implemented without amending the EU Treaties.

Concerning the Stability Bonds (Eurobonds) project, the legal framework needed to implement this project depends to a great extent on the design of a common bond. A more detailed description of possible options and related legal issues, including possible amendments to the Treaty, were provided in the Green Paper on the feasibility of introducing Stability Bonds ([1]) published in November 2011.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/news/documents/pdf/green_en.pdf

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006797/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(9 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Pérdida de competitividad del puerto de Barcelona

Los accesos al Puerto de Barcelona, tanto por carretera como por ferrocarril, todavía están en fase de proyecto. Aunque la nueva terminal del muelle Prat, financiada por el grupo Hutchinson Port Holdings, entró en funcionamiento de pruebas el pasado lunes 2 de julio de 2012, todavía no está claro ni el trazado definitivo ni cómo se financiarán estas obras ([1]).

En este último sentido, el Ministerio de Fomento español parece ser que se está planteando cobrar un «peaje» directo a los usuarios para financiar estas obras. Una de las posibilidades es que se podría cobrar hasta diez euros por cada contenedor descargado en el puerto, o también que las empresas concesionarias de las terminales asuman este coste para no perder tráfico.

De entrada, se encarecerían las operaciones en este puerto. Para un barco que cargue 8 000 contenedores, la tarifa extra puede resultar de hasta 80 000 euros de peaje.

En línea con la estrategia de Lisboa de asegurar el dinamismo y el desarrollo de todas las regiones, teniendo en cuenta la necesidad de asegurar el principio de libertad y competencia leal y que la competencia entre los puertos y dentro de ellos está aumentando por diversos motivos, y destacando factores como los que disuaden el comercio entre Estados miembros, ¿no cree la Comisión que esas tasas extras para financiar los nuevos accesos, solo aplicadas al Puerto de Barcelona, disminuyen la competitividad de este puerto respecto al resto de puertos españoles y también respecto al resto de puertos europeos del Mediterráneo?

¿No piensa la Comisión Europea que la inversión en los accesos a los puertos es crucial para hacer que los puertos sean más competitivos y para que de esta manera la inversión pública y su retorno, desde un punto de vista económico, sean positivos?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de septiembre de 2012)

La Comisión entiende que las autoridades españolas no han adoptado aún ninguna decisión definitiva acerca del procedimiento de financiación de nuevas rutas de acceso al puerto de Barcelona.

La Comisión puede informar a Su Señoría de que la infraestructura de acceso a un puerto de la RTE-T se considera parte integrante de la RTE-T ([2]). Por lo tanto, si las autoridades españolas persisten en su intención de cobrar por el acceso por carretera y ferrocarril al puerto de Barcelona, deben garantizar en cualquier caso la aplicación de la legislación europea pertinente en vigor, incluidas la Directiva 1999/62/CE ([3]) sobre la euroviñeta en lo relativo a los cánones viales, que contempla, entre otras cosas la necesidad de diferenciación en relación con los costes y la de que los cánones cobrados sean proporcionados, y la Directiva 2001/14/CE ([4]) en lo relativo a los cánones ferroviarios, que dispone, entre otras cosas, la diferenciación en función de la magnitud del efecto. Ni los cánones ferroviarios ni los viales deben suponer una distorsión de la competencia.

Se acaba de presentar a la cofinanciación de la RTE-T un proyecto de modernización de la red y conexiones ferroviarias existentes del puerto de Barcelona. La propuesta de Reglamento sobre el mecanismo «Conectar Europa» ([5]) prevé que se pueda conceder a estudios u obras ayuda financiera de la Unión en concepto de inversiones portuarias y esta medida se aplicaría a los proyectos relacionados con los accesos ferroviarios de los puertos pertenecientes a la propuesta de red principal ([6]), como el puerto de Barcelona.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/barcelona/20120706/54321401545/fomento-peaje-contenedores-puerto-barcelona.html

([2]) Decisión n° 661/2010/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 7 de julio de 2010, sobre las orientaciones de la Unión para el desarrollo de la red transeuropea de transporte (DO L 204 de 5.8.2010, pp. 1-129).

([3]) Directiva 1999/62/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 17 de junio de 1999, relativa a la aplicación de gravámenes a los vehículos pesados de transporte de mercancías por la utilización de determinadas infraestructuras (DO L 187 de 20.7.1999, pp. 42-50), modificada en último lugar por la Directiva 2011/76/UE de 27 de septiembre de 2011 (DO L 269 de 14.10.2011, p. 1).

([4]) Directiva 2001/14/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 26 de febrero de 2001, relativa a la adjudicación de la capacidad de infraestructura ferroviaria, aplicación de cánones por su utilización y certificación de la seguridad (DO L 75 de 15.3.2001, pp. 29-46), modificada en último lugar por la Directiva 2007/58/CE, de 23 de octubre de 2007 (DO L 315 de 3.12.2007, pp. 44-50).

([5]) COM(2011)665/3, de 13 de marzo de 2012 — 2011/0302(COD).

([6]) Tal como se propone en COM(2011) 650, de 19 de octubre de 2011 — 2011/0294(COD).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006797/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Loss of competitiveness of the port of Barcelona

Work on the road and rail access routes to the port of Barcelona is still at the planning stage. Although the new Muelle Prat terminal, which was financed by the Hutchison Port Holdings group, began functioning on Monday, 2 July 2012 as part of a testing phase, it is still not clear where these access routes will finally be drawn or how they will be paid for ([1]).

With regard to the latter point, the Spanish Ministry of Public Works appears to be planning to charge users a direct 'toll' as a means of funding the project. Possible options are to charge up to EUR 10 for each container unloaded at the port, or for the companies operating the port terminals to take on these costs so as not to lose traffic.

This would increase the cost of using this port from the outset. A vessel carrying 8 000 containers could incur up to EUR 80 000 in additional tolls.

In line with the Lisbon strategy to ensure the vitality and development of all the regions, and bearing in mind the need to uphold the principle of free and fair competition and that competition among and within ports is increasing for a number of reasons and highlighting factors which can deter trade among Member States, does the Commission not think that these extra charges to finance the access routes, applicable only to the port of Barcelona, will harm this port's competitiveness in relation to other Spanish ports, and to other European ports in the Mediterranean?

Does the Commission not think that investment in port accesses is crucial to the competitiveness of the ports involved and to ensuring that public investment has an economically positive impact?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(7 September 2012)

The Commission understands that no final decision has yet been taken by the Spanish authorities on the way to finance further access routes to the port of Barcelona.

The Commission can inform the Honourable Member that access infrastructure to a TEN-T port is considered as being part of the TEN-T network ([2]). Therefore, if the Spanish authorities would pursue their intention to charge the road and rail access to the port of Barcelona, they should in any case ensure that the relevant European legislation in force (including the 'Eurovignette' Directive 1999/62/EC ([3]) for road charges, which provides amongst others the need to differentiate in relation to the cost, and the need for the charge to be proportionate and Directive 2001/14/EC ([4]) for rail charges, which provides amongst others the differentiation according to the magnitude of the effect) is applied. Neither road nor rail charges should entail a distortion of competition.

Currently, a project for the upgrading of the existing rail connection and network of Barcelona Port has been submitted for TEN-T co-financing. The proposed Connecting Europe Facility ([5]) regulation foresees that financial aid by the Union for port investments could be granted to studies or works — this would apply to projects concerning a rail access to Ports belonging to the proposed Core Network ([6]), such as the Port of Barcelona.

([1]) http://www.lavanguardia.com/local/barcelona/20120706/54321401545/fomento-peaje-contenedores-puerto-barcelona.html

([2]) Decision No 661/2010/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2010 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network (OJ L 204, 5.8.2010, p. 1-129).

([3]) Directive 1999/62/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 1999 on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures (OJ L 187, 20.7.1999, p. 42-50) as last amended by Directive 2011/76/EU of 27 September 2011 (OJ L 269, 14.10.2011, p. 1-16).

([4]) Directive 2001/14/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2001 on the allocation of railway infrastructure capacity and the levying of charges for the use of railway infrastructure and safety certification (OJ L 75 of 15.3.2001, p. 29-46) as last amended by Directive 2007/58/EC of 23 October 2007 (OJ L 315, 3.12.2007, p. 44-50).

([5]) COM(2011)665/3 of 13 March 2012 — 2011/0302(COD).

([6]) As proposed in COM(2011)650 if 19 October 2011 — 2011/0294(COD).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006798/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(9 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Poder de negociación en la cadena de valor

Una de las grandes explotaciones lecheras catalanas, Can Feliu de Campllong, decidió renegociar su contrato, dentro del plazo establecido en el mismo, con la empresa transformadora que le compraba la leche cruda pues quería mejorar, si era posible, algunos aspectos del contrato, pero con la intención de continuar suministrando la leche a CAPSA.

En su respuesta a la pregunta E-008603/2011, decía la Comisión que el sistema canadiense no es trasladable al territorio de la UE pues Canadá es importador neto de productos lácteos y el equilibrio de mercado de la UE depende en parte de las exportaciones.

La región de Cataluña es deficitaria en la producción de leche, como lo es el resto de España, dado que se consumen anualmente unos 9 millones de toneladas y se producen sólo 6 millones.

¿Puede informar la Comisión sobre qué países de la UE son exportadores y, por lo tanto, beneficiarios del sistema europeo actual?

¿Puede informar la Comisión sobre si la negativa por parte de las empresas transformadoras, en este caso CAPSA, Danone, Lactalis e Iparlat, de no comprar más leche de dichos productores catalanes a un precio que no sea deficitario, es el reflejo del valor máximo que pueden pagar los transformadores de leche?

¿Puede informar la Comisión sobre si la negativa por parte de las empresas transformadoras, en este caso CAPSA, Danone, Lactalis e Iparlat, de no comprar más leche de dichos productores catalanes a un precio que no sea deficitario, responde únicamente a razones de mercado?

¿Puede informar la Comisión sobre cómo pueden las explotaciones, de forma individual, encontrar un equilibrio entre su capacidad de producción, sus costes de inversión y sus perspectivas de futuro para mantener una producción duradera en las condiciones específicas del entorno local y regional, si las empresas transformadoras catalanas y españolas no compran ni pagan a precios de mercado?

Respuesta del Sr. Çioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de agosto de 2012)

Conforme a lo dispuesto en los Tratados, el mercado interior es un espacio sin fronteras interiores en el que está garantizada la libre circulación de mercancías, personas, servicios y capitales.

Algunos Estados miembros producen más leche que la que consumen sus habitantes. Otros Estados miembros producen menos. Como todos los agentes económicos operan en el mismo marco jurídico, depende de su competitividad si logran obtener una cuota de mercado dentro o fuera de la Unión Europea (los volúmenes de exportación por Estados miembros se presentan en el anexo, según lo solicitado ([1])).

El precio de la leche lo negocian libremente el agricultor, el transformador u otro comprador. La Comisión no puede interferir en esta negociación.

Su Señoría recordará que, en el marco del llamado paquete de medidas sobre la leche ([2]), la capacidad de negociación de los productores de leche se reforzará respecto a los transformadores de productos lácteos, lo que se traducirá en un reparto más equitativo del valor añadido a lo largo de la cadena de suministro, al permitir a las organizaciones de productores negociar conjuntamente las cláusulas del contrato, incluido el precio. Además, los Estados miembros podrán, dentro de sus propios sistemas de Derecho contractual, decidir hacer obligatorio el uso de contratos. Algunas condiciones básicas para el uso de tales contratos también forman parte del paquete de medidas sobre la leche. No obstante, todas esas condiciones básicas se deben negociar libremente.

([1]) El anexo se envía directamente el anexo a Su Señoría y a la Secretaría del Parlamento.
([2]) Reglamento (UE) n° 261/2012 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, que modifica el Reglamento (CE) n° 1234/2007 del Consejo en lo que atañe a las relaciones contractuales en el sector de la leche y de los productos lácteos.

Las disposiciones para reforzar el poder de negociación de los productores lácteos entrarán en vigor el 3 de octubre de 2012. No obstante, los agricultores siguen siendo empresarios con su propia responsabilidad en lo tocante a la capacidad de producción, la inversión y otros aspectos de la gestión. En lo que respecta a la sostenibilidad de la producción en condiciones específicas de la localidad y la región, la Comisión remite a su respuesta a la pregunta E-008603/2011 ([3]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006798/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Bargaining power in the value chain of dairy products

One of Catalonia's largest dairy producers, Can Feliu of Campllong, decided within the contractually stipulated period to renegotiate the contract it holds with the milk processing company CAPSA for the sale of raw milk. Can Feliu wished to continue supplying CAPSA and, if possible, to improve certain aspects of the contract.

In response to Written Question E-008603/2011, the Commission stated that the production control system used in Canada could not be applied in the EU since Canada is a net importer of dairy products and that on the EU market, balance is maintained in part by exports.

Both the region of Catalonia and Spain as a whole are net importers of milk, and consume each year an average of 9 million tonnes and produce only 6 million tonnes.

Can the Commission say which EU countries are exporters and, therefore, benefit from the current EU system?

Can the Commission say whether the refusal of milk processing companies — in this case CAPSA, DANONE, LACTALIS and IPARLAT — to buy more milk from Catalan producers at above cost price reflects the maximum price that such companies can pay?

Can the Commission say whether the refusal of milk processing companies — in this case CAPSA, DANONE, LACTALIS and IPARLAT — to buy more milk from Catalan producers at above cost price is wholly attributable to market conditions?

Can the Commission say how farms can balance, on their own, their production capacity, investment cost and future prospects, with a view to ensuring sustainable production in the specific conditions of their locality and region, if Catalan and Spanish milk processing companies refuse to pay the market price?

Answer given by Mr Çioloş on behalf of the Commission
(17 August 2012)

In accordance with the provisions in the Treaties, the internal market is an area without internal frontiers in which the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital is ensured.

Some Member States produce more milk than the inhabitants consume. Other Member States produce less. As all actors operate in the same legal framework it depends on their competitiveness if they succeed in getting a market share in or outside the European Union (as requested the export volumes per Member State are presented in the annex ([1])).

The price of milk is freely negotiated between a farmer, a processor or other purchaser. The Commission cannot interfere in this negotiation.

The Honourable Member may remember that in the framework of the so called Milk package ([2]) the bargaining power of dairy farmers vis-à-vis dairy processors will be strengthened, resulting in a fairer distribution of value added along the supply chain, by allowing producer organisations to jointly negotiate contract terms, including price. Furthermore Member States may, within their own contract law systems, decide to make the use of contracts compulsory. Some basic conditions for the use of such contracts are also part of the Milk package. All such basic conditions should, however, be freely negotiated.

([1]) The annex is sent directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of Parliament.
([2]) REGULATION (EU) No 261/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards contractual relations in the milk and milk products sector.

The provisions to strengthen the bargaining power of the dairy farmers enter into force at 3 October 2012. Nevertheless, farmers remain entrepreneurs with their own responsibility for production capacity, investment and other management aspects. Regarding the sustainability of production in specific conditions of locality and region, the Commission refers to the answer given under E-008603/2011 ([3]).

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006799/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(9 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Competencia en el sector láctico catalán y español

En su respuesta a la pregunta E-010692/2011, la Comisión reconoce que las leyes de competencia de la UE permiten a los agricultores decidir junto con el distribuidor el precio de la leche, si es conforme a las leyes que lo regulan.

Una de las cinco grandes explotaciones lecheras catalanas, cuya producción diaria es de 22 000 litros de leche cruda, se verá obligada a cerrar porque la empresa con la que tenía contratada su distribución no le va a comprar más leche ya que, al parecer, no la necesita. Según publica la prensa, ninguna otra empresa transformadora tiene intención de adquirir esa producción ([1]) ([2]).

No obstante, se da la paradoja de que Cataluña es deficitaria en la producción de leche, al igual que el resto de España, pues se consumen anualmente unos 9 millones de toneladas y se producen 6 millones.

En vista del Reglamento (CE) n° 1234/2007:

¿Puede la Comisión informar de si las leyes de competencia se pueden aplicar en este caso, puesto que las PYME productoras catalanas están siendo gravemente perjudicadas?

¿Tiene la Comisión conocimiento de otros casos en que el productor se vea obligado a cerrar por falta de acuerdo con el transformador, dado el bajo precio que éste le aplica?

¿Es este el equilibrio de poder de negociación esperado por la Comisión?

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

Para reforzar la posición de los ganaderos en las negociaciones con los transformadores lácteos, el reciente Reglamento 261/2012 ([3]) da la posibilidad a los ganaderos de negociar conjuntamente un contrato para la entrega de leche cruda sin incurrir en comportamiento contrario a la competencia si se cumplen determinadas condiciones en lo referente al volumen ([4]) y siempre y cuando no se elimine la competencia.

Su pregunta se refiere al parecer a las prácticas de un transformador que comprase leche a ganaderos que afectarían negativamente a dichos ganaderos.

Si esas prácticas proceden de un acuerdo alcanzado por el transformador con otros ganaderos productores de leche, ese acuerdo debe ser evaluado con arreglo al nuevo Reglamento. Si el acuerdo entre los ganaderos y el transformador lácteo cumple las condiciones en lo referente al volumen, puede quedar exento de la aplicación de la legislación en materia de competencia, salvo que elimine la competencia. Si el acuerdo no cumple las condiciones en lo referente al volumen, no se aplicará la exención y debe evaluarse con arreglo a las normas generales en materia de competencia.

Si las prácticas del transformador no se derivan de un acuerdo con los ganaderos ([5]), deben evaluarse con arreglo a las normas generales en materia de competencia.

Las autoridades de competencia supervisan la situación de este mercado, como muestra el Informe de la REC ([6]) recientemente publicado. Las autoridades españolas de competencia están investigando actualmente prácticas posiblemente contrarias a la competencia por parte del sector lácteo en el mercado de suministro de leche cruda de vaca, consistentes en intercambios de información o en acuerdos de reparto de mercado, así como en la imposición de condiciones comerciales en el mercado de suministro de leche cruda de vaca. Se han efectuado inspecciones en varias asociaciones y compañías lácteas, especialmente en Cataluña ([7]).

([1]) http://www.elpuntavui.cat/noticia/article/4-economia/18-economia/556341-can.
([2]) http://www.elpuntavui.cat/noticia/article/4-economia/18-economia/543150-una.
([3]) Reglamento (UE) n° 261/2012 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 14 de marzo de 2012, que modifica el Reglamento (CE) n° 1234/2007 del Consejo en lo que atañe a las relaciones contractuales en el sector de la leche y de los productos lácteos, DO L 94 de 30.3.2012, p. 38.
([4]) La negociación no puede cubrir más que un determinado volumen de leche cruda.
([5]) Esas prácticas podrían formar parte de una estrategia de ese transformador.
([6]) «ECN Activities in the Food Sector — Report on competition law enforcement and market monitoring activities by European competition authorities in the food sector», http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports.
([7]) Puede consultarse el Comunicado de prensa en la siguiente dirección: http://www.cncompetencia.es/Inicio/Noticias/TabId/105/Default.aspx?contentid=515776.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006799/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Competition in the Catalan and Spanish dairy sector

In its answer to Question E-010692/2011, the Commission recognises that EU competition rules allow farmers to decide on milk prices jointly with the distributor provided that the relevant laws are complied with.

One of the big five Catalan dairy farms, whose daily output amounts to 22 000 litres of raw milk, will be forced to close because the undertaking with which it had signed a distribution contract will not be buying any more milk from it, since it appears it no longer needs it. According to press reports, no other processing company intends to buy the farm's milk ([1]) ([2]).

Paradoxically, like the rest of Spain, Catalonia has a shortfall in milk production, with annual consumption standing at around 9 million tonnes against production of 6 million tonnes.

In the light of Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007:

Can the Commission say whether competition laws can be applied in this case, since serious damage is being done to Catalan SME producers?

Is the Commission aware of other cases where a producer has been forced to close owing to the lack of agreement with the processor, given the low price set by the processor concerned?

Is this the balance of bargaining power that the Commission was hoping for?

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

In order to strengthen the position of farmers when negotiating with dairy processors, the recent Regulation 261/2012 ([3]) gives farmers the possibility to jointly negotiate a contract for the delivery of raw milk without being prosecuted for anti-competitive behaviour if certain volume-based conditions are fulfilled ([4]) and provided i.a. that competition is not excluded.

Your question concerns apparently the practices of a processor buying milk from farmers that would negatively affect such farmers.

If these practices stem from an agreement reached by the processor with other milk-supplying farmers, such agreement needs to be assessed under the new Regulation. If the agreement between farmers and the dairy processor fulfils the volume-based conditions, it can be exempted from the application of competition law unless it excludes competition. If the agreement does not fulfil the volume-based conditions, the exemption will not apply and it has to be assessed under the general competition rules.

If the practices of the processor are not the result of an agreement with farmers ([5]), they need to be assessed under general competition rules.

The Competition Authorities are following the situation on this market, as shown by the recently published ECN Report ([6]). The Spanish Competition Authority is currently investigating possible anti-competitive practices by the dairy industry in the market for the supply of raw cow's milk, consisting in exchanging information and/or market-sharing agreements, as well as imposing commercial conditions in the market for the supply of raw cow's milk. Inspections have been carried out at several dairy associations and companies, notably in Catalonia ([7]).

([1]) http://www.elpuntavui.cat/noticia/article/4-economia/18-economia/556341-can.
([2]) http://www.elpuntavui.cat/noticia/article/4-economia/18-economia/543150-una.
([3]) Regulation (EU) 261/2012 of 14 March 2012 amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards contractual relations in the milk and milk products sector, OJ L 94, 30.3.2012, p. 38.
([4]) The negotiation cannot cover more than a certain volume of raw milk.
([5]) These practices could be part of a strategy of that processor.
([6]) 'ECN Activities in the Food Sector — Report on competition law enforcement and market monitoring activities by European competition authorities in the food sector', http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports.
([7]) Press release accessible at the following address: http://www.cncompetencia.es/Inicio/Noticias/TabId/105/Default.aspx?contentid=515776.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006800/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(9 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ναρκωτική ουσία που προκαλεί τάσεις κανιβαλισμού

Ανησυχητικές διαστάσεις λαμβάνει το τελευταίο διάστημα κυρίως στις ΗΠΑ, αλλά και σε άλλες χώρες, η εξάπλωση ενός νέου ναρκωτικού, με την ονομασία «άλατα μπάνιου» λόγω της ομοιότητάς στην όψη και στην αφή με εν λόγω άλατα, που προκαλεί κρίσεις βίας και έντονες ψυχολογικές διαταραχές. Όπως υποστηρίζει μάλιστα η ιατρική κοινότητα, το ισχυρό αυτό ναρκωτικό προκαλεί στους χρήστες απρόβλεπτη ψυχωτική συμπεριφορά με τάσεις αυτοκτονίας, αλλά και επιθετικότητα που κατέληγε σε κανιβαλισμό.

Σύμφωνα με στατιστικά στοιχεία, ήδη στην Αμερική το τελευταίο διάστημα έχουν αυξηθεί τα περιστατικά χρηστών που επιτίθενται σε περαστικούς, παρουσιάζοντας βίαιη συμπεριφορά με τάσεις κανιβαλισμού, ενώ παράλληλα αρκετά δημοσιεύματα στον Τύπο αναφέρουν ότι το επικίνδυνο αυτό χημικό ναρκωτικό έχει ήδη εισχωρήσει στην ευρωπαϊκή αγορά πχ. Γερμανία προκαλώντας την έντονη ανασφάλεια των πολιτών.

Δεδομένου ότι πρόκειται για άκρως ανησυχητικό φαινόμενο και οι χρήστες εύκολα μπορούν να προμηθευτούν τον συγκεκριμένο τύπο ναρκωτικού ακόμα και μέσω Διαδικτύου, καθώς και ότι 6 500-8 000 θάνατοι κάθε χρόνο στην ΕΕ εξακολουθούν να οφείλονται στα ναρκωτικά,

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι ενημερωμένη σχετικά με την εξάπλωση της νέας αυτής ουσίας; Εάν ναι, βρίσκεται σε εξέλιξη κάποια συντονισμένη δράση για την παρακολούθησή της; Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία που διαθέτει η Επιτροπή σε ποια κράτη μέλη έχουν αναφερθεί κρούσματα για χρήση της εν λόγω ναρκωτικής ουσίας;

2. Προτίθεται να αναλάβει πρωτοβουλία με στόχο την ενημέρωση τόσο των αρμόδιων εθνικών αρχών, όσο και των πολιτών για το φαινόμενο αυτό καθώς και να αναλάβει εκ νέου συντονισμένες εκστρατείες ενημέρωσης των πολιτών για τη μάστιγα των ναρκωτικών;

Απάντηση της κας Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Αυγούστου 2012)

Κάθε χρόνο εμφανίζονται στην ΕΕ πολλές νέες ψυχοδραστικές ουσίες. Για να μην υποβληθούν σε ελέγχους κυκλοφορούν στο εμπόριο ως «χημικές ουσίες για επιστημονικές έρευνες», «άλατα λουτρού» και «φυτικά λιπάσματα». Συνήθως τα προϊόντα αυτά περιέχουν παράγωγα καθινόνης, ορισμένα από τα οποία απαγορεύονται από την εθνική νομοθεσία. Στην Ευρώπη η κυριότερη συνθετική καθινόνη είναι η μεφεδρόνη, για την οποία επιβλήθηκαν το 2010 μέτρα ελέγχου και ποινικές κυρώσεις ([1]) από το Συμβούλιο. Στη συνέχεια η ουσία αυτή απαγορεύθηκε σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη.

Η εμφάνιση νέων ουσιών, τοξικώσεων και θανάτων που συνδέονται με αυτές παρακολουθούνται στενά από το σύστημα έγκαιρης προειδοποίησης της ΕΕ που εφαρμόζει το Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο Παρακολούθησης Ναρκωτικών και Τοξικομανίας (EMCDDA). Από το 2009 παράγωγα καθινόνης βρέθηκαν σε δείγματα νεκροψίας σε πέντε κράτη μέλη (Βέλγιο, Φινλανδία, Ουγγαρία, Σουηδία και ΗΒ) ([2]), μολονότι αυτό δεν επιβεβαιώνει την αιτία θανάτου.

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην απάντησή της στην ερώτηση αριθ. E— 010409/2011 ([3]), στην οποία εξηγεί τον τρόπο με τον οποίο σκοπεύει να ανταποκριθεί τόσο στην πρόκληση την οποία αποτελούν οι νέες ψυχοδραστικές ουσίες όσο και στην ετήσια έκθεση του EMCDDA για το 2011 ([4]).

([1]) Απόφαση αριθ. 2010/759/ΕΕ του Συμβουλίου, της 2ας Δεκεμβρίου 2010, για την υπαγωγή της ουσίας 4-methylmethcathinone (μεφεδρόνη) σε μέτρα ελέγχου (ΕΕ L 322 της 8.12.2010, σ. 44).

([2]) Επισημαίνεται ότι το σύστημα συγκέντρωσης στοιχείων του EMCDDA βασίζεται στην αναφορά της ανίχνευσης συγκεκριμένων χημικών ουσιών (όπως 4-methylmethcathinone (μεφεδρόνη)) και όχι σε χαρακτηρισμούς προϊόντων (όπως «άλατα λουτρού» που είναι γενικόλογοι και η σημασία τους μπορεί να διαφέρει ανάλογα με την χρονική περίοδο ή τον τόπο και απαιτούν την ερμηνεία πληροφοριών όσον αφορά τις συνθήκες χρήσης, οι οποίες τις περισσότερες φορές δεν είναι διαθέσιμες ή αποτελούν μέρος ιατροδικαστικής ή άλλης έρευνας). Ενώ τα δεδομένα από νεκροψίες δηλώνουν την παρουσία συγκεκριμένης ουσίας σε βιολογική μήτρα, δεν συνεπάγεται ότι αυτή αποτελεί και την αιτία θανάτου. Ο θάνατος μπορεί να οφείλεται σε άλλες ουσίες ή αιτίες. Επιπλέον, από την ανάλυση των επιστημονικών δημοσιευμάτων που έχει στη διάθεσή του το EMCDDA προκύπτει ότι παράγωγα καθινόνης έχουν επίσης ανιχνευθεί σε βιολογικά δείγματα από μη θανατηφόρες τοξικώσεις και/ή θανάτους στην Ιρλανδία και τις Κάτω Χώρες.

([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.

([4]) EMCDDA (2010), Ετήσια έκθεση 2011: η κατάσταση όσον αφορά το πρόβλημα των ναρκωτικών στην Ευρώπη, Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο Παρακολούθησης Ναρκωτικών και Τοξικομανίας, Λισαβόνα, πληροφορίες σχετικά με την παρακολούθηση της χρήσης και διαθεσιμότητας μεφεδρόνης στην ΕΕ — από τη σελίδα 93 και μετά.

Τα κράτη μέλη είναι αρμόδια για την κατάρτιση και εφαρμογή των πολιτικών πρόληψης των ναρκωτικών που είναι οι πλέον κατάλληλες για τα κοινωνικοοικονομικά και πολιτιστικά δεδομένα τους. Μπορούν να οργανώσουν προληπτικές εκστρατείες ενημέρωσης των πολιτών σχετικά με τους κινδύνους και να αποθαρρύνουν τη χρήση ψυχοδραστικών ουσιών. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει και συμπληρώνει τις δράσεις των κρατών μελών για τη μείωση της ζήτησης των ναρκωτικών, προωθώντας την ανάπτυξη αποτελεσματικών και καινοτόμων προσεγγίσεων, και διαδίδοντας τις καλύτερες πρακτικές στον τομέα αυτό μέσω των οικονομικών προγραμμάτων της ΕΕ, του προγράμματος «πρόληψη των ναρκωτικών και σχετική ενημέρωση» ([5]) και του προγράμματος δημόσιας υγείας ([6]).

([5]) Απόφαση αριθ. 1150/2007/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 25ης Σεπτεμβρίου 2007, για τη θέσπιση, για την περίοδο 2007-2013, του ειδικού προγράμματος «Πρόληψη των ναρκωτικών και σχετική ενημέρωση» στο πλαίσιο του γενικού προγράμματος «Θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα και δικαιοσύνη», ΕΕ L 257 της 3.10.2007, σ. 23-29.

([6]) Απόφαση αριθ. 1350/2007/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 23ης Οκτωβρίου 2007, για τη θέσπιση δεύτερου προγράμματος κοινοτικής δράσης στον τομέα της υγείας (2008-2013), ΕΕ L 301 της 20.11.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006800/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Drug which triggers cannibalistic tendencies

The spread of a new drug, which has been dubbed 'bath salts' because it looks and feels like bath salts and which triggers fits of violence and severe psychological disturbances, has recently assumed alarming proportions mainly in the US but also in other countries. The medical community maintains that this powerful drug causes unpredictable psychotic and suicidal behaviour as well as aggression that has even resulted in cannibalism.

According to statistics, there has already been an increase recently in the US in incidents of users attacking passersby, exhibiting violent behaviour with a tendency towards cannibalism; moreover, a number of press reports indicate that this dangerous synthetic drug has already penetrated the European market, in particular Germany, causing alarm among the general public.

Since this is an extremely worrying phenomenon and users can easily obtain this type of drug, even over the Internet, and between 6 500 and 8 000 deaths annually in Europe continue to be caused by drugs, will the Commission say:

1. Is it aware of the spread of this new drug? If so, is a concerted monitoring action under way? According to data available to it, in which Member States have incidents involving the use of this drug been reported?

2. Will it act to inform both the relevant national authorities and ordinary citizens about this phenomenon and to launch fresh coordinated campaigns to inform citizens about the scourge of drugs?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

Many new psychoactive substances appear in the EU each year. To circumnavigate possible controls they are marketed as 'research chemicals', 'bath salts' and 'plant food'. Common ingredients of those products are cathinone derivatives — some of which are banned by national legislation. In Europe the main synthetic cathinone is mephedrone, submitted in 2010 to control measures and criminal sanctions ([1]) by the Council and consequently banned in all Member States.

Emergence of new substances, intoxications and deaths related to them are closely monitored by the EU Early-Warning System operated by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA). Since 2009 cathinone derivatives were found in post-mortem samples in five Member States — Belgium, Finland, Hungary, Sweden and the UK ([2]), though this does not determine the cause of death.

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Question E- 010409/2011 ([3]), which explained how the Commission is planning to respond to the challenge posed by new psychoactive substances as well as to the 2011 Annual Report of the EMCDDA ([4]).

([1]) Council Decision 2010/759/EU of 2 December 2010 on submitting 4-methylmethcathinone (mephedrone) to control measures (OJ L 322, 8.12.2010, p. 44).

([2]) Please note that the EMCDDA's data collection system is based on reporting the detection of specific chemical substances (such as 4-methylmethcathinone (mephedrone)) rather than by product names (such as 'bath salts' — which are unspecific, their content may vary overtime and in different locations, and require interpretation of information on the circumstances of use which in most of the cases does not exist or is a part of investigation, coroners' inquests, etc). Whereas post-mortem data indicate the presence of a certain substance in a biological matrix, it should not be interpreted as the cause of death. Fatalities may involve other drugs and/or alternative cause of death. Furthermore, analysis of scientific literature/publications available to the EMCDDA suggest that cathinone derivatives have also been detected in biological samples from non-fatal intoxications and/or fatalities in Ireland and the Netherlands.

([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.

([4]) EMCDDA (2010), Annual report 2011: the state of the drugs problem in Europe, European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, Lisbon; information on monitoring of mephedrone use and availability in the EU — as of page 93.

Member States are competent for developing and implementing policies on drug prevention that work best in their socioeconomic and cultural contexts. They can deploy prevention campaigns to inform citizens of potential risks and to discourage the use of psychoactive substances. The Commission supports and complements Member States' action on drug-demand reduction, by promoting the development of effective and innovative approaches and the sharing of best-practice, through the EU financial programmes, the Drug Prevention and Information Programme ([5]) and the Public Health Programme ([6]).

([5]) Decision No 1150/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 September 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013 the Specific Programme Drug prevention and information as part of the General Programme Fundamental Rights and Justice, OJ L 257, 3.10.2007, p. 23-29.

([6]) Decision No 1350/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 establishing a second programme of Community action in the field of health (2008-2013), OJ L 301, 20.11.2007.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006801/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(9 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Δυσανάλογες αυξήσεις τιμών σε προϊόντα ιδιωτικής ετικέτας

Ολοένα και περισσότεροι έλληνες καταναλωτές στρέφονται σε προϊόντα ιδιωτικής ετικέτας προσπαθώντας να μειώσουν το κόστος του «οικογενειακού καλαθιού» που επιβάλει η ακρίβεια, η δραματική μείωση του διαθέσιμου εισοδήματος και τα αυστηρά μέτρα λιτότητας. Αυτό επιβεβαιώνουν και τα αποτελέσματα έρευνας της εταιρείας ερευνών στην ελληνική αγορά, σύμφωνα με τα οποία οι πωλήσεις των εν λόγω προϊόντων αυξήθηκαν με μέσο ετήσιο ρυθμό της τάξεως του 12,4 % την περίοδο 2007-2010. Αντίστοιχα, ο βαθμός διείσδυσής τους στο σύνολο των πωλήσεων των σουπερμάρκετ διαμορφώθηκε στο 19 % περίπου, όταν την προηγούμενη δεκαετία έφθανε μόλις στο 5 %.

Την ίδια ώρα ωστόσο, εκμεταλλευόμενο την παραπάνω τάση, το οργανωμένο λιανεμπόριο επιχειρεί μέσα από ευρείες ανατιμήσεις στα σήματά του, να αντισταθμίσει τις απώλειες σε τζίρο και κέρδη της τελευταίας διετίας λόγω της συρρίκνωσης της κατανάλωσης. Αυξήσεις οι οποίες σε αρκετά προϊόντα μπορεί να φτάνουν και το δεκαπλάσιο του τρέχοντος πληθωρισμού, σε μια χώρα που μαστίζεται αυτή τη στιγμή από την οικονομική ύφεση.

Βάσει των παραπάνω, αλλά και του γεγονότος ότι τα προϊόντα ιδιωτικής ετικέτας παίζουν σημαντικό ρόλο στις δαπάνες των νοικοκυριών (το μερίδιό τους στο σύνολο των πωλήσεων σούπερ μάρκετ διαμορφώνεται κοντά στο 20 %), ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Υπάρχουν διαθέσιμα στοιχεία (ποσοτικά & ποιοτικά) που αποτυπώνουν αυτή την στροφή των ευρωπαίων καταναλωτών στα προϊόντα ιδιωτικής ετικέτας συνολικά και ανά κράτος μέλος;

2. Υπάρχουν στοιχεία που συσχετίζουν την αυξητική πορεία των πωλήσεων των εν λόγω προϊόντων με αντίστοιχες αυξήσεις στις τιμές τους;

3. Πώς αξιολογεί το γεγονός ότι εν μέσω οικονομικής ύφεσης με χιλιάδες υπερχρεωμένα νοικοκυριά να ζουν στο όριο της φτώχειας, μεγάλες αλυσίδες λιανεμπορίου συνεχίζουν στην Ελλάδα τις ανατιμήσεις στα προϊόντα ιδιωτικής ετικέτας όταν μάλιστα διαθέτουν τα ίδια ακριβώς αγαθά σε χαμηλότερες τιμές, σε άλλα κράτη μέλη;

Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

1. και 2. Στα στοιχεία που δημοσιεύονται τακτικά από την Eurostat σχετικά με την εξέλιξη των τιμών στην ΕΕ και στα κράτη μέλη δεν γίνεται διάκριση μεταξύ των προϊόντων ιδιωτικού σήματος και άλλων προϊόντων. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει υπόψη της κάποια βάση δεδομένων στην οποία να συγκεντρώνονται τακτικά δεδομένα για τις τιμές στο επίπεδο της ΕΕ. Ωστόσο, υπάρχουν ορισμένες μελέτες που αποδεικνύουν ότι έχει αυξηθεί το μερίδιο της αγοράς που κατέχουν τα προϊόντα ιδιωτικού σήματος σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη ([1]).

3. Οι διαφορές στις τιμές των τροφίμων μεταξύ των κρατών μελών μπορούν να εξηγηθούν από παράγοντες όπως τα διαφορετικά φορολογικά συστήματα, οι διαφορετικές μακροοικονομικές συνθήκες, η κοινωνική νομοθεσία ή άλλοι κανονισμοί.

Οι εθνικές αρχές ανταγωνισμού (ΕΑΑ) είναι επιφορτισμένες με τη διερεύνηση των πρακτικών που νοθεύουν τον ανταγωνισμό στην επικράτειά τους. Η ελληνική ΕΑΑ παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς τις λιανικές αγορές τροφίμων και έχει ήδη επιβάλει πρόστιμα σε σούπερ μάρκετ που εμπλέκονται σε οριζόντιες συμφωνίες ή κάθετους περιορισμούς στο παρελθόν ([2]).

Η Επιτροπή εργάζεται με στόχο να βελτιώσει τη λειτουργία της λιανικής αλυσίδας εφοδιασμού μέσω πολυάριθμων πρωτοβουλιών, όπως το ευρωπαϊκό σχέδιο δράσης για τον τομέα του λιανικού εμπορίου, η ανακοίνωση σχετικά με τις αθέμιτες εμπορικές πρακτικές και το φόρουμ υψηλού επιπέδου για τη βελτίωση της λειτουργίας της αλυσίδας εφοδιασμού τροφίμων, το οποίο επιδιώκει να βελτιώσει τις σχέσεις μεταξύ των επιχειρήσεων, καθώς και τη διαφάνεια των μηχανισμών μετάδοσης των τιμών όσον αφορά τα τρόφιμα.

([1]) Για παράδειγμα: ΓΔ ENTR (2011), «The impact of private labels on the competitiveness of the European food supply chain» (Ο αντίκτυπος των ιδιωτικών ετικετών στην ανταγωνιστικότητα της ευρωπαϊκής αλυσίδας εφοδιασμού τροφίμων), τμήμα 5.3, σσ. 90-97, διαθέσιμη στη διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/documents/studies/index_en.htm.

([2]) Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις δραστηριότητες που επιτελούν οι ΕΑΑ της ΕΕ όσον αφορά τον ανταγωνισμό στην αλυσίδα εφοδιασμού τροφίμων, βλέπε την πρόσφατα δημοσιευθείσα έκθεση που διαβιβάστηκε από το Ευρωπαϊκό Δίκτυο Ανταγωνισμού, στη διεύθυνση http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports.

Επιπλέον, η Επιτροπή σημειώνει ότι παρακολουθεί την οικονομική κατάσταση στα κράτη μέλη και υποστηρίζει τα μέτρα που αποσκοπούν στην αποκατάσταση της ανάπτυξης, έτσι ώστε να βοηθήσει στην άρση των δυσχερών συνθηκών διαβίωσης για τα νοικοκυριά. Υποστηρίζει επίσης τα μέτρα που λαμβάνουν το Ευρωπαϊκό Σύστημα Κεντρικών Τραπεζών και η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα με σκοπό τη σταθερότητα των τιμών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006801/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Disproportionate increases in prices of own-label products

More and more Greek consumers, under pressure from high prices, the dramatic decline in disposable income and the strict austerity measures, are turning to own-label products in an attempt to reduce the cost of the family budget. This is borne out by the results of a survey conducted by a Greek market research company, according to which sales of these products increased at an average rate of 12.4% over the period 2007-2010. Similarly, own-label products accounted for approximately 19% of total supermarket sales, compared to only 5% the previous decade.

At the same time, however, the organised retail trade is exploiting the above trend and endeavouring, through widespread price increases in its brand products, to offset losses in turnover and profits over the last two years owing to the decline in consumption — increases which, in the case of some products, can amount to as much as ten times the current inflation rate in a country currently plagued by the economic downturn.

In view of the above and given the fact that own-label products play an important role in household spending (they account for almost 20% of total supermarket sales), will the Commission say:

1. Are any (quantitative and qualitative) data available showing this swing by European consumers towards own-label label products overall and per Member State?

2. Are there any data linking the rising sales of such products with corresponding increases in their prices?

3. How does it view the fact that in the midst of an economic downturn, with thousands of over-indebted households living on the threshold of poverty, large retail chains in Greece are continuing to mark up the prices of own-label products, even where they sell exactly the same goods at lower prices in other Member States?

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

1 and 2. The data regularly published by Eurostat on price developments in the EU and in Member States do not distinguish between own-label products and other products. The Commission is not aware of the existence of any database which regularly collects such price data at EU level. However, there are a number of studies showing the increase in market share of own-label products in all Member States ([1]).

3. Differences in food prices between Member States can be explained by factors such as different tax regimes, different macroeconomic conditions, social legislation or other regulations.

National Competition Authorities (NCAs) are in charge of investigating anti-competitive practices in their territories. The Greek NCA is closely monitoring food and retail markets and has already imposed fines on supermarkets engaging in horizontal agreements or vertical restrictions in the past ([2]).

The Commission works on promoting a better functioning of the retail supply chain through several initiatives, such as a European Retail Action Plan, a communication on Unfair Trading Practices, and the High Level Forum on the Better Functioning of the Food Supply Chain, which aims at improving business-to-business relationships as well as transparency in food price transmission.

The Commission further wishes to point out that it monitors the economic situation in the Member States and supports measures aiming at restoring growth which will help in lifting households out of difficult living conditions. It also supports the measures taken by the European System of Central Banks and by the European Central Bank to achieve price stability.

([1]) For example: DG ENTR (2011), 'The impact of private labels on the competitiveness of the European food supply chain', Section 5.3, pp. 90-97, available at http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/documents/studies/index_en.htm.

([2]) For more information on the activities undertaken by the EU's NCAs regarding competition in the food supply chain, see the recently published report by the European Competition Network available at http://ec.europa.eu/competition/ecn/documents.html#reports.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006802/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(9 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Έρευνα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κέντρου Παρακολούθησης Ναρκωτικών και Τοξικομανίας σχετικά με την παραγωγή κάνναβης στην Ευρώπη

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατη έρευνα σχετικά με την παραγωγή κάνναβης στην Ευρώπη, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο Παρακολούθησης Ναρκωτικών και Τοξικομανίας επεσήμανε ότι το μερίδιο αγοράς της φυτικής κάνναβης αυξάνεται σε βάρος της κάνναβης σε μορφή ρητίνης ενώ παρουσιάζεται σημαντική αύξηση της παραγωγής κάνναβης εντός της Ευρώπης. Δεδομένου ότι, σύμφωνα με τον Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο, η αυξημένη ευρωπαϊκή εγχώρια παραγωγή συνδέεται με την αυξημένη κατανάλωση κάνναβης και με την αύξηση των κρουσμάτων βίαιης συμπεριφοράς και εγκληματικότητας, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιά περαιτέρω μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει ώστε να περιοριστεί η χρήση κάνναβης, ιδίως μεταξύ νέων ηλικίας 15-34 ετών;

2. Ποιές συγκεκριμένες δράσεις, προτίθεται να αναλάβει, στο πλαίσιο της «Παγκόσμιας δράσης για υγιείς κοινότητες χωρίς ναρκωτικά» και σε τί αποτελέσματα προσβλέπει;

Απάντηση της κας Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Αυγούστου 2012)

1. Η πολιτική για τα ναρκωτικά υπάγεται, σε μεγάλο βαθμό, στην αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών της ΕΕ. Οι πολιτικές όσον αφορά τη χρήση ναρκωτικών και οι δράσεις για τη μείωση της ζήτησης ναρκωτικών εξαρτώνται από τα κοινωνικοοικονομικά και πολιτισμικά δεδομένα κάθε χώρας. Συνεπώς, κάθε κράτος μέλος αποφασίζει ποια είναι η καταλληλότερη πολιτική όσον αφορά τη χρήση παράνομων ναρκωτικών ουσιών, περιλαμβανομένης της καννάβεως. Η Επιτροπή δεν είναι αρμόδια για τη λήψη μέτρων στον τομέα αυτόν.

2. Η Επιτροπή δεν συμμετέχει στην Παγκόσμια δράση για υγιείς κοινωνικές ομάδες χωρίς ναρκωτικά (Global Action for Healthy Communities Without Drugs) την οποία συντονίζει το Γραφείο των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τον Έλεγχο των Ναρκωτικών και την Πρόληψη του Εγκλήματος. Ως εκ τούτου, όλα τα ερωτήματα σχετικά με τη δράση αυτή πρέπει να απευθύνονται στο Γραφείο των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τον Έλεγχο των Ναρκωτικών και την Πρόληψη του Εγκλήματος.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006802/12
to the Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Research by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction on cannabis production in Europe

According to recent research on the production of cannabis in Europe, the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction has said that the market share of herbal cannabis is increasing compared to cannabis resin and there has been a significant increase in cannabis production in Europe. Since, according to the EMCDDA, the increase in European domestic production is associated with increased consumption of cannabis and an increase in the incidence of violent behaviour and crime, will the Commission say:

1. What further steps will it take to restrict the use of cannabis, especially among young people between 15 and 34 years old?

2. What practical measures will it take, as part of the 'Global Action for Healthy Communities Without Drugs' and what results does it expect?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

1. Drug policy is to a large extent the competence of the EU Member States. Policies regarding drug use, and actions aimed at reducing the demand for drugs, are linked to the socioeconomic and cultural context of each country. Therefore, each Member State decides what is the most appropriate policy regarding the use of illicit drugs, including that of cannabis. The Commission does not have the competence to act in this area.

2. The Commission is not part of the 'Global Action for Healthy Communities Without Drugs', which is run by the UN Office on Drugs and Crime. Consequently, all questions about the action should be addressed to the UN Office on Drugs and Crime.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006803/12
do Komisji
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(9 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wolność wyznania w Wietnamie

W dniu 26 czerwca 2012 r. rozpoczęły się oficjalne negocjacje między UE i Wietnamem w sprawie umowy o wolnym handlu.

Jednocześnie w Wietnamie wiele osób więzionych jest za swe przekonania. Wśród nich są wyznawcy Falun Gong Le Van Thanh i Vu Duc Trung, dwóch pastorów protestanckich z mniejszości etnicznych Ksor Y Du i Kpa Y Ko, khmerski opat buddyjski Tchach Sophon i ksiądz Nguyen Van Ly więziony za obronę wolności wyznania i praw człowieka.

Rząd nadal utrudnia niezależny kult buddyjski i odmawia prawnego uznania wielu buddyjskim organizacjom (w tym Zjednoczonemu Kościołowi Buddyjskiemu w Wietnamie). Represje polegają między innymi na utracie pracy, dyskryminacji, nękaniu i więzieniu pokojowych demonstrantów.

Powszechne są ataki policji na społeczności katolickie. Policja napadła na klasztor, sterroryzowała parafian psami i pobiła kilku księży. Dokonano aresztowań wśród pokojowych demonstrantów.

Chrześcijanie w północnym Wietnamie zamieszkanym przez lud Hmong znajdują się w jeszcze gorszej sytuacji. Władze wynajmują bandytów, którzy nękają ludzi, grożą im i biją, aby zmusić ich do porzucenia wiary chrześcijańskiej. Masowe protesty chrześcijan z ludu Hmong zostały brutalnie stłumione, wiele osób aresztowano, wiele zaginęło i prawdopodobnie zostało zamordowanych.

Roczny raport Amerykańskiej Komisji ds. Międzynarodowej Wolności Religijnej za 2012 r. stwierdza, że „rząd w Wietnamie nadal sprawuje kontrolę nad wszystkimi wspólnotami religijnymi, nie tylko chrześcijańskimi, ale także nad wyznawcami buddyzmu i Falun Gong. Wietnamski rząd poważnie ogranicza i karze niezależne praktyki religijne i poddaje represjom jednostki i grupy postrzegane jako kwestionujące jego władzę." Prześladowanie grup religijnych w Wietnamie narasta i amerykańska komisja zaleca wciągnięcie Wietnamu na listę „państw budzących szczególne obawy".

— Czy kwestia wolności religijnej zostanie poruszona podczas negocjacji umowy o wolnym handlu?

— Czy w umowie o wolnym handlu znajdą się klauzule dotyczące praw człowieka otwarcie wymieniające wolność wyznania?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji
(14 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Unia Europejska (UE) jest zaangażowana w propagowanie poszanowania praw człowieka i podstawowych wolności, zarówno w Wietnamie, jak i w innych regionach świata.

UE zamierza ustalić spójne ramy polityki ogólnych stosunków politycznych i gospodarczych z Wietnamem oraz innymi krajami należącymi do Stowarzyszenia Narodów Azji Południowo-Wschodniej (ASEAN). Nowa Umowa o partnerstwie i współpracy między UE a Wietnamem podpisana w dniu 27 czerwca 2012 r. zawiera istotne przepisy dotyczące praw człowieka.

Aby zapewnić spójność dążeniom UE do osiągnięcia szeroko pojętych celów polityki zagranicznej, Komisja i Wysoki Przedstawiciel dążą do powiązania umów o wolnym handlu z umowami o partnerstwie i współpracy, w tym w kwestii zasadniczych elementów praw człowieka, takich jak wolność religii.

Ponadto również polityka handlowa może przyczynić się do osiągnięcia tego celu. Doświadczenie pokazuje, że liberalizacja handlu może pozytywnie wpłynąć na propagowanie praw człowieka. Otwarcie rynków stymuluje wzrost gospodarczy, który jest kluczowym czynnikiem wspierania zrównoważonego rozwoju i wdrażania praw podstawowych.

UE będzie nadal poruszać z władzami wietnamskimi – w tym także z władzami najwyższego szczebla – przedmiotowe kwestie. Podczas ostatniej rundy dialogu UE-Wietnam dotyczącego praw człowieka, która odbyła się 12 stycznia 2012 r., UE zachęcała rząd Wietnamu do zaproszenia specjalnego sprawozdawcy ONZ ds. wolności religii i wyznania do złożenia wizyty w tym kraju.

Połączenie presji politycznej i konstruktywnego zaangażowania stwarza największe szanse, aby wpłynąć na transformację Wietnamu w kierunku bardziej otwartego społeczeństwa opartego na zasadach państwa prawa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006803/12
to the Commission
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Freedom of religion in Vietnam

On 26 June 2012 official negotiations between the EU and Vietnam on a free trade agreement (FTA) were launched.

At the same time, there are many prisoners of conscience in Vietnam. Among them are Falun Gong practitioners Le Van Thanh and Vu Duc Trung, two ethnic minority Protestant pastors Ksor Y Du and Kpa Y Ko, Khmer Buddhist abbot Tchach Sophon and Father Nguyen Van Ly, who was imprisoned for his advocacy of religious freedom and human rights.

The government continues to discourage independent Buddhist religions and denies legal recognition to many Buddhist organisations (including the Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam, UBCV). The repression includes loss of jobs, discrimination, harassment and imprisonment of peaceful protesters.

Police assaults on Catholic communities' property are common. The police have smashed a monastery, intimidated parishioners with dogs and beaten several priests. Peaceful protesters were arrested.

Christians in the northern provinces inhabited by the Hmong people are in an even worse position. The authorities use 'contract thugs' to harass, threaten and beat people in an attempt to force them to abandon the Christian faith. Mass protests of Hmong Christians have been brutally crushed, with many people arrested, missing and presumably killed.

The 2012 Annual Report of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom states that 'the government of Vietnam continues to control all religious communities, not only Christians but also Buddhists and Falun Gong practitioners. The government of Vietnam severely restricts and penalises independent religious practice and represses individuals and groups viewed as challenging its authority'. The persecution of religious groups in Vietnam has risen, and the U.S. Commission has recommended that Vietnam be named a CPC (country of particular concern).

— Will the issue of religious freedom be brought up during the FTA negotiations?

— Will there be human rights clauses included in the FTA that will directly mention freedom of religion?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2012)

The European Union (EU) is committed to promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, in Vietnam as elsewhere.

The EU is aiming to establish a coherent policy framework for overall political and economic relations with Vietnam, as with other countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). The new EU-Vietnam Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA), signed on 27 June 2012, includes significant provisions on human rights.

In order to ensure coherence in the way the EU pursues its broader foreign policy objectives, the Commission and the High Representative pursue a linkage between FTAs and PCAs, including on the essential elements of human rights, such as freedom of religion.

Furthermore, trade policy can also contribute to this objective. Experience shows that trade liberalisation can have a positive effect to promote human rights. The opening of markets stimulates growth, and this is a key factor to foster sustainable development and the implementation of fundamental rights.

The EU will continue to raise its concerns with the Vietnamese authorities, including at the highest level. During the last EU-Vietnam human rights dialogue which took place on 12 January 2012, the EU encouraged the Government of Vietnam to invite the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief to visit the country.

A combination of political pressure and constructive engagement bears the greatest chance of influencing Vietnam towards a more open society based upon the rule of law.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006804/12
an die Kommission
Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE) und Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE)
(9. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Schiefergas und Umweltvorschriften

Immer mehr Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union lassen in Bezug auf Schiefergas Vorsicht walten. Sowohl Franreich als auch Bulgarien haben ein Moratorium in Bezug auf den Einsatz hydraulischer Aufbrechtechnologie bei der Gewinnung von Schiefergas umgesetzt. Rumänien und die Tschechische Republik erwägen ähnliche rechtliche Schritte, während sich die Regierung des Vereinigten Königreichs einer wachsenden Kampagne ausgesetzt sieht, die sich für die Anerkennung der Tatsache einsetzt, dass die Gewinnung von Schiefergas in keinem Verhältnis zu den damit verbundenen Risiken steht.

Kann die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Inwieweit gibt es eine rechtliche Grundlage, um trotz der Bemühungen der Mitgliedstaaten hinsichtlich eines Energiemix den Einsatz hydraulischer Aufbrechtechniken auf Unionsebene zu untersagen?

2. Inwieweit beabsichtigt die GD Umwelt, Rechtsvorschriften nach dem Vorbild der neuen, von der US-amerikanischen Umweltschutzbehörde ausgearbeiteten Normen für saubere Luft in den USA vorzuschlagen, mit denen die Absorption flüchtiger Methanemissionen bei der Gewinnung von Schiefergas zwingend vorgeschrieben würde?

3. Welchen Standpunkt vertritt die Kommission in Bezug auf die Forderung nach einer vollständigen Offenlegung der bei der hydraulischen Aufbrechung eingesetzten Chemikalien, wie dies in den Rechtsvorschriften mehrerer US-Bundesstaaten vorgesehen ist?

4. Inwieweit verfügt die Kommission über Pläne, um die radioaktiven Chemikalien zu überwachen, die bei Arbeiten mit hydraulischen Aufbrechtechniken tief aus dem Erdreich losgelöst werden?

5. Inwieweit beabsichtigt die GD Umwelt, eigene neue Rechtsvorschriften vorzusehen, um den mit Schiefergas und hydraulischer Aufbrechtechnik einhergehenden Risiken sowohl auf der technischen Ebene der Gasgewinnung als auch auf der Ebene der gewerblichen Ausbeutung anzugehen, bzw. inwieweit beabsichtigt sie, dies über den bestehenden Rechtsrahmen zu regulieren? Inwieweit hält die GD Umwelt bejahendenfalls den vorhandenen Regelungsrahmen in Bezug auf die technische Ebene der Gasgewinnung und die Ebene der gewerblichen Ausbeutung in der EU für ausreichend?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(28. August 2012)

1. Nach Artikel 192 Absatz 2 Buchstabe c des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union erfordern Maßnahmen, welche die Wahl eines Mitgliedstaats zwischen verschiedenen Energiequellen und die allgemeine Struktur seiner Energieversorgung erheblich berühren, den einstimmigen Beschluss des Rates gemäß einem besonderen Gesetzgebungsverfahren nach Anhörung des Europäischen Parlaments, des Wirtschafts- und Sozialausschusses sowie des Ausschusses der Regionen.

2.-5. Nach rechtlicher Prüfung kam die Kommission zu dem Ergebnis, dass die derzeitigen EU-Vorschriften aufgrund der vorliegenden technischen Informationen auch für die Verfahren zur Exploration und Herstellung von Schiefergas von der Planungsphase bis zur Einstellung der Förderung gelten ([1]). Im Rahmen der laufenden Bemühungen zur Feststellung, ob die derzeitigen EU-Vorschriften einen ausreichenden Schutz der menschlichen Gesundheit und der Umwelt bieten, hat die Kommission Arbeiten aufgenommen, um bis Ende 2013 zu prüfen, ob eine Rahmenregelung für das Risikomanagement von Schiefergasvorhaben in Europa sowohl in der Explorations- als auch in der kommerziellen Herstellungsphase erforderlich ist und wie dieser gegebenenfalls gestaltet werden muss. Bei dieser Prüfung werden u. a. auch die Fragen der Herren Abgeordneten zur Luftqualität, zur Verwendung von Chemikalien oder zur Behandlung von Abwasser, einschließlich der Möglichkeit natürlich vorkommender radioaktiver Stoffe, untersucht werden. Im Rahmen dieser Arbeiten, sich auf weitere, von der Kommission unlängst öffentlich ausgeschriebener Studie ([2]) stützen, werden alle möglichen Politikoptionen gebührend berücksichtigt.

([1]) Vermerk der Europäischen Kommission zum geltenden Umwelt-Regelungsrahmen der EU für die Schiefergasförderung auf der Website der GD ENV: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/unconventional_en.htm

([2]) Ausschreibung von Dienstleistungsaufträgen abrufbar unter: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/unconventional_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006804/12
to the Commission
Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE) and Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Shale gas and environmental legislation

An increasing number of EU Member States are wary of shale gas. Both France and Bulgaria have put into effect moratoria regarding the use of hydraulic fracturing technology used in shale gas. Romania and the Czech Republic are considering similar legislation, and the UK Government is facing a growing campaign to recognise that the exploitation of shale gas is not worth the associated risks.

In this context, we would like to put the following questions to the Commission:

1. Although the energy mix is a matter for the Member States, is there a legal basis on environmental grounds to prohibit the use of hydraulic fracturing on an EU level?

2. Does DG Environment intend to propose legislation similar to the new US clean air standards put forward by the US Environmental Protection Agency, which would make the capture of fugitive methane emissions in shale gas extraction mandatory?

3. What is the Commission's position on requiring full public disclosure of the chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing, as is the case with the legislation in a number of US states?

4. Does the Commission have plans to monitor the radioactive chemicals which are dislodged from deep in the ground when hydraulic fracturing occurs?

5. Does DG Environment intend to introduce separate new legislation to address the risks of shale gas and hydraulic fracturing, on both an exploratory level as well as commercial-scale extractions, or does it intend to regulate these via the existing framework? If so, does DG Environment consider the existing regulatory framework to be sufficient for the exploratory- or commercial-scale extraction of shale gas in the EU?

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

1. As per Article 192(2)(c) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, measures significantly affecting a Member State's choice between different energy sources and the general structure of its energy supply require a unanimous decision of the Council in accordance with a special legislative procedure, after consultation of the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions.

2.-5. The Commission's legal assessment has concluded that, based on the available technical information, the existing EU legislation applies to practices required for shale gas exploration and production from planning until cessation ([1]). As part of its ongoing effort to determine whether the level of human health and environmental protection provided by the existing EU legislation is appropriate, the Commission has initiated work in order to assess by end 2013 whether or not there is a need for a risk management framework for shale gas developments in Europe — both at the exploration and commercial production phases-, and if necessary the form it would take. Issues to be examined as part of this assessment will cover those raised by the Honourable Members such as air quality, the use of chemicals as well as the management of waste water, including possible naturally occurring radioactive materials. All policy options will be duly considered in the frame of this work, which will be supported by further studies for which open calls have been recently launched by the Commission ([2]).

([1]) European Commission's note on the EU environmental legislative framework applicable to shale gas practices available on DG ENV's website: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/unconventional_en.htm.
([2]) Calls for service contracts available on: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/energy/unconventional_en.htm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006806/12
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Enforcement of Council Directive 2008/120/EC

On 18 December 2009, Parliament approved Council Directive 2008/120/EC, which will set the minimum standards for the treatment and welfare of pigs across the European Union.

These minimum standards include a ban on individual stalls, treatment against parasites and diseases, and permanent access to drinking water.

The directive is currently due to come into force in January 2013. However, as Written Declaration 0006/2012 shows, there is still anxiety that the Commission and the Council Presidency will delay its enforcement. I have also received a considerable number of letters from my constituents on this matter.

— Can the Commission give assurances that there are no current plans to postpone the enforcement of this directive beyond January 2013?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(28 August 2012)

The Commission would refer to its answer to Written Question E-002820/2012.

The Commission does not intend to propose postponing the legal deadline to implement the requirements of Council Directive 2008/120/EC of 18 December 2008 laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs ([1]).

([1]) OJ L 47, 18.2.2009, p. 5.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006807/12
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: EU budget settlement

The EU institutions are currently negotiating a settlement for the European Union's budget for the forthcoming year.

I believe that the EU budget must be realistic in these tough economic times. However, we must also make sure that the budget is fair and reaches the poorest in our society. It is they who have been hit hardest by the economic crisis, and who are most in need of our help.

In London, the region I represent, the levels of child poverty in some areas are among the worst in Europe. In Bethnal Green and Bow, in Inner London, the figure reaches 57% of children below the poverty line.

In the 2007-2013 budget, London was allocated approximately EUR 500 million through the European Social Fund in order to improve the lives of Londoners through training, gaining new skills and improving job prospects.

— How does the Commission envisage the poorest in our society, in London and across Europe, benefiting from the forthcoming EU budget settlement?

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

Combatting child poverty is one of the areas of focus of the 2007-13 European Social Fund (ESF) Operational Programme in England. Through its two main objectives, the Programme aims to improve the employability of unemployed and inactive people who face barriers to work and help employed people, particularly those with low or no basic skills, gain new skills and gain better qualifications. Furthermore, the issue of child poverty will remain a priority for both the Commission and the Member State in question during the forthcoming negotiations on the 2014-2020 programming period for Structural Funds.

Design of ESF programmes and selection of interventions to be supported is the responsibility of the National Authorities. The Commission would therefore suggest that the Honourable Member contacts the relevant Authorities directly to obtain information on specific initiatives or projects that go towards combatting child poverty and enhancing the prospects of disadvantaged and vulnerable people in London in 2013 and beyond.

In the case of the United Kingdom, and more specifically, England, the Managing Authority for ESF is the European Social Fund Division of the Department for Work and Pensions in Sheffield. They may be contacted at ESF.feedback@dwp.gsi.gov.uk.

In London itself, ESF, under the responsibility of the Mayor, is managed by the European Programmes Management Unit at the Greater London Authority working in partnership with DWP. The e-mail contact point is alex.conway@london.gov.uk.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006808/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(9 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Delitti d'onore in Afghanistan

Il 4 luglio 2012 vari organi d'informazione, tra cui la Reuters e al-Arabiya, hanno riportato la notizia dell'aumento dei cosiddetti delitti d'onore in Afghanistan. Nell'est del paese una donna di trent'anni è stata decapitata insieme ai suoi due figli. La donna, divorziata, è stata uccisa nella capitale della provincia di Ghazni dall'ex marito, che aveva lasciato un anno fa dopo anni di violenze domestiche. Il termine «delitto d'onore» indica l'omicidio di donne e ragazze accusate di danneggiare la reputazione della famiglia.

Secondo la Commissione indipendente afghana dei diritti dell'uomo (CIADU), nei mesi di aprile e maggio di quest'anno sono stati registrati sedici casi di delitti d'onore nel paese, contro i venti casi dell'anno scorso. Per la CIADU questo incremento sarebbe da attribuire alla crescente insicurezza e alla debolezza dello stato di diritto. Secondo le notizie diffuse dalla Reuters, il presidente Hamid Karzai starebbe apparentemente dedicando sempre meno tempo ai diritti delle donne. In molti villaggi afghani l'analfabetismo femminile tocca il 90 % e i matrimoni tra minori rappresentano una pratica diffusa.

1. Può la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante fare sapere se è a conoscenza dell'incremento dei delitti d'onore in Afghanistan?

2. È la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante disposta a sollevare la questione di fronte al presidente Hamid Karzai e ad altri responsabili afghani?

3. Qual è attualmente la strategia dell'Unione europea in Afghanistan per ridurre l'analfabetismo femminile e fornire assistenza legale?

4. Inoltre, sono disposti i funzionari dell'UE in Afghanistan ad affrontare il tema del delitto d'onore con le forze di polizia?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(30 agosto 2012)

L'AR/VP è al corrente delle riprovevoli e ricorrenti violenze perpetrate nei confronti delle donne in Afghanistan. L'episodio cui l'onorevole parlamentare fa riferimento è purtroppo solo uno dei tanti atti efferati che spesso non vengono neanche denunciati.

Dal canto suo, in occasione della conferenza di Tokyo dell'8 luglio 2012 il governo afghano ha ribadito l'impegno a difendere i diritti umani e le libertà fondamentali dei cittadini, in particolare la parità tra uomini e donne sancita dalla Costituzione e dagli obblighi internazionali dell'Afghanistan in materia di diritti umani.

L'UE continuerà a promuovere un maggior rispetto dei diritti umani e a sollevare direttamente la questione con il governo dell'Afghanistan, nel modo appropriato. La sua posizione è stata inoltre ribadita nelle conclusioni del Consiglio, da ultimo il 14 maggio 2012. L'AR/VP ha sollevato la questione con le autorità afghane in occasione delle conferenze di Kabul e di Bonn e durante un incontro con il ministro degli Esteri afghano svoltosi nell'aprile 2012.

In tale contesto, l'UE fornisce assistenza al governo e alla società civile dell'Afghanistan per combattere le violenze contro le donne e i matrimoni precoci e forzati e fornire un riparo sicuro a chi ne ha bisogno. I programmi di assistenza della CE continuano a concentrarsi sulla governance, compresa la riforma della giustizia e delle sue istituzioni, in quanto ciò è indispensabile per tutelare i diritti delle donne vittime di violenze. L'UE ha speso più di 31 milioni di EUR per progetti volti a sostenere direttamente le donne e ad affrontare il problema più generale della loro emarginazione sociale, culturale ed economica. Nello stesso contesto, l'UE sostiene l'erogazione di servizi sociali alle persone più vulnerabili, come la consulenza, l'assistenza legale e la mediazione per le donne in conflitto con le tradizioni. I diritti umani sono inoltre al centro della missione di formazione della polizia civile svolta da EUPOL Afghanistan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006808/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Honour killings in Afghanistan

On 4 July 2012, a number of media organisations including Reuters and al-Arabiya reported that there is a growing trend of so-called honour killings in Afghanistan. In eastern Afghanistan, a 30-year-old woman and her two children were beheaded. The woman, who was divorced, was murdered by her former husband in the capital of Ghazni province. She had left him a year ago after enduring years of domestic abuse. The term 'honour killings' is used to describe the murder of women and girls who are accused of damaging a family's reputation.

During March and April of this year, there were 16 cases of 'honour killings' recorded across Afghanistan, according to the country's Independent Human Rights Commission (AIHRC). This is in comparison to 20 cases for the previous year. The organisation blames the rise in insecurity and weak rule of law. The Reuters report suggests that President Hamid Karzai appears to be devoting less and less time to women's rights. In many villages in Afghanistan, illiteracy amongst women is 90% and child marriages are widespread.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the increasing numbers of honour killings taking place in Afghanistan?

2. Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to raise these concerns with President Hamid Karzai, and other relevant Afghan officials?

3. What is the current EU strategy towards Afghanistan on addressing the problem of female illiteracy, as well as the provision of legal aid?

4. In addition, are EU officials in Afghanistan prepared to raise the issue of honour killings with the police services?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the deplorable and continued violence against women in Afghanistan. The incident referred to is, regrettably, only one of many and not all of these are reported.

For its part, the Government of Afghanistan has, at the Tokyo Conference on 8 July 2012, reaffirmed its commitment to uphold the human rights and fundamental freedoms of its citizens, in particular the equality of men and women as guaranteed under the Constitution and Afghanistan's international human rights obligations.

The EU will continue to champion greater respect for human rights and raise the issue directly with the Government of Afghanistan as appropriate, and has reiterated its position in Council conclusions, most recently on 14 May 2012. The HR/VP raised the issue with the Afghan authorities at both the Kabul and Bonn Conferences, and most recently in a meeting with the Afghan Foreign Minister in April 2012.

In this context, the EU provides assistance to the Afghan Government and Civil Society to fight violence against women and early and forced marriages and to provide safe shelter for those in need. EC assistance programmes continue to focus on governance, including reform of the justice sector and its institutions. This is indispensable to upholding the rights of victims of violence against women. The EU has spent more than EUR 31 million on projects in direct support of women and addressing more broadly their social, cultural and economic marginalisation. In this context also, the EU supports social services to the most vulnerable, including counselling, legal aid and mediation for women in conflict with traditions. In addition, EUPOL Afghanistan focuses, *inter alia* on human rights as a core issue of its civilian police training mission.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006809/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(9 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Nueva investigación

En la respuesta de la Comisión a mi pregunta (E-003711/2012), se indicaba que «proyectos de investigación […], tales como Motive y Newforex, se han pensado para proporcionar herramientas de ayuda a la toma de decisiones, así como instrumentos de mercado para la gestión integrada de los bosques. Estos proyectos incluyen las relaciones entre el agua y los bosques, pero van más lejos». No obstante, pensamos que ninguno de estos proyectos toma en consideración el impacto de los bosques en los recursos hídricos.

1. Creemos que las nuevas investigaciones de la Comisión, así como la integración del conocimiento actual, repercutirán en el desarrollo de nuevos planes integrados de gestión y de instrumentos de apoyo a la toma de decisiones, que vincularán las decisiones a nivel de rodal (silvicultura) y de cuenca (planificación del uso de la tierra) para optimizar el impacto de la silvicultura en el ciclo hidrológico y favorecer la comprensión de sus relaciones con otros servicios ecosistémicos. ¿Cómo evaluará la Comisión dicha repercusión?

2. Creemos que las nuevas investigaciones de la Comisión, así como la integración del conocimiento actual, repercutirán en el desarrollo de instrumentos económicos adecuados (precio del agua y los mercados, pagos por servicios ambientales, etc.) y de recomendaciones políticas que apliquen un enfoque integrado de los bosques y el agua. ¿Cómo tiene previsto la Comisión incorporar este tipo de conocimiento e instrumentos, que proporcionan a los responsables políticos una mejor comprensión de la relación entre los bosques y el agua, en el contexto de la Directiva marco sobre el agua de la UE y el proceso «Protección de los Bosques de Europa»?

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

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a sus respuestas a las preguntas escritas E-003711/2012, E-003712/2012 y E-003713/2012 ([1]).

La Comisión no puede prever los resultados exactos de los proyectos de investigación en curso y, por lo tanto, no desea hacer ninguna declaración sobre la aplicación de esos resultados por el momento.

Debe aprovecharse cualquier resultado útil de la investigación que pueda facilitar la aplicación de la Directiva marco del agua mediante la mejora de la formulación de políticas y la contribución a un mejor entendimiento de la relación entre los bosques y el agua. El procedimiento de aplicación conjunta establecido entre los Estados miembros y la Comisión ([2]) va a brindar una oportunidad gracias a la actuación concertada en materia de investigación e integración de políticas. Compartir conocimientos sobre las actividades de investigación dará a los Estados miembros la oportunidad de aprender más sobre la gestión eficiente del agua y la relación de la política de aguas con otras políticas como la forestal.

La Comisión recuerda que, como el Tratado UE no contempla ninguna disposición específica sobre una política forestal común de la UE, no tiene la competencia para dedicarse a elaborar directamente disposiciones de gestión forestal que influirían en la ordenación del territorio por los Estados miembros.

Como principio general, la Comisión prefiere comunicar los resultados de la investigación directamente a los Estados miembros por los canales existentes, tales como el Comité Forestal Permanente y el Comité Consultivo de los Montes y la Producción del Corcho, en los que participan las partes interesadas y los Estados miembros de la UE.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/.
([2]) Estrategia común de aplicación: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/objectives/implementation_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006809/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: New research

In the Commission's answer to my question (E-003711/2012), it stated that, 'research projects, such as MOTIVE and NEWFOREX, are designed to provide decision support tools and market-based instruments for the integrated management of forests. These include and go beyond water-forest relationships'. However, we believe that neither project takes account of the impact of forests on water resources.

1. We believe that the Commission's new research, and the integration of existing knowledge, will have an impact on the development of new integrated management strategies and decision-support tools that will link stand-level (silviculture) to basin-level (land-use planning) decisions aimed at optimising the impact of forestry on the water cycle as well as at understanding trade-offs with other ecosystem services. How will the Commission assess this impact?

2. We believe that the Commission's new research, and the integration of existing knowledge, will have an impact on the development of adequate economic instruments (water pricing and markets, payments for environmental services, etc) and policy recommendations that look at forests and water in an integrated manner. How does the Commission plan to incorporate this knowledge and tools, which give policy-makers a better understanding of the water-forest relationship, in the framework of the EU Water Framework Directive and the Forest Europe process?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to his written questions E-003711/2012, E-003712/2012 and E-003713/2012 ([1]).

The Commission cannot foresee the exact outcome of ongoing research projects and therefore does not wish to make any statements about application of results at this moment.

Any useful research results which can facilitate the implementation of the Water Framework Directive by improving policy-making and helping towards a better understanding of the relationship between forests and water should be used. The joint implementation process established between Member States and the Commission ([2]) is providing an opportunity through a concerted action on research and policy integration. Knowledge sharing about research activities will give Member States the opportunity to learn more about efficient water management and water's relationship with other policies such as forestry.

The Commission wishes to recall that, as the EU Treaty does not foresee specific provisions for a common EU forest policy, it has no competence to engage in the direct development of provisions for forest management that would influence land-use planning by Member States.

As a general principle, the Commission prefers to spread research results directly to the EU Member States via existing channels, such as the Standing Forestry Committee and the Advisory Group on Forests and Cork, in which EU Member States and stakeholders participate.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/.
([2]) Common Implementation Strategy: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/objectives/implementation_en.htm.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006810/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(9 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Conocimientos integrados sobre bosques y silvicultura

Las cuestiones relacionadas con los bosques y el agua son de suma importancia, ya que los bosques representan el 40 % de la superficie terrestre de la UE y la mayoría del agua potable procede de cuencas aforadas.

A pesar de ello, se observan importantes lagunas de conocimiento por lo que respecta a la comprensión científica de la interacción entre los bosques y el agua, llegando ciertas escuelas científicas de pensamiento a defender posturas profundamente contradictorias:

1. por un lado, varios científicos han llegado a la conclusión de que la forestación y la reforestación ejercen un impacto negativo en la producción de agua (aunque el impacto en la calidad del agua sea positivo), y que talar árboles aumentará, en principio, la disponibilidad de corrientes de agua;

2. un segundo grupo de científicos arguye lo contrario, es decir, que la presencia de bosques y la plantación de árboles deberían aumentar la disponibilidad de corrientes de agua e intensificar el ciclo hidrológico. La cuestión tiene muchos matices, puesto que el impacto de los bosques y la silvicultura en la cantidad y la calidad del agua varía en función de factores como la escala geográfica, las condiciones geoclimáticas y el tipo de bosque en cuestión.

Lo que resulta obvio es que ha llegado la hora de integrar eficazmente los conocimientos de distintos niveles y disciplinas para superar la actual fragmentación cognitiva y la falta de comprensión científica con el objetivo de velar por que, en el marco de la gestión de los bosques y la política de aguas, se tenga en cuenta el impacto de los bosques en los recursos hídricos.

En este contexto y habida cuenta de que conocemos los proyectos Motive y Newforex y sabemos que no se centran en la interacción o la interrelación entre el agua y los bosques, ¿no considera la Comisión que se necesita urgentemente una nueva investigación, interdisciplinaria y de escala múltiple, que tenga por objeto el desarrollo de conocimientos nuevos e integrados? Este tipo de investigación favorecería una mejor comprensión del impacto que los bosques y la silvicultura (desde el nivel de las hojas hasta el de las cuencas del paisaje) causan en el ciclo hidrológico. Esta investigación también contribuirá al desarrollo de un enfoque socio-eco-hidrológico nuevo y eficaz para la gestión de los bosques a fin de optimizar los servicios vinculados al agua (en términos tanto de calidad como de cantidad de agua) y minimizar los riesgos hidrológicos, tales como sequías e inundaciones.

Respuesta de la Sra. Geoghegan-Quinn en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de agosto de 2012)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a las preguntas escritas E-003712/2012 y E-006809/2012 ([1]).

Además, la Comisión remite a su propuesta «Horizonte 2020 — Programa Marco de investigación e innovación (2014-2020)», que están negociando actualmente el Parlamento Europeo y el Consejo. Su objeto es apoyar la investigación sobre la gestión sostenible de los recursos naturales y los ecosistemas, incluida la valoración de servicios ecosistémicos estratégicos (agua, suelo, biodiversidad, etc.), y dar lugar a conocimientos y planteamientos dirigidos a la recuperación de los recursos biológicos.

La Comisión desea recordar que la Comisión no tiene competencias para participar directamente en la formulación de las disposiciones relativas a la gestión de los bosques, cuya ejecución incumbe a los Estados miembros de la UE. La Comisión difunde los resultados de la investigación directamente a los Estados miembros de la UE a través de los canales existentes, como el Comité Forestal Permanente y el Grupo Consultivo de la Silvicultura y la Producción de Corcho, en los que participan todos los Estados miembros de la UE y las partes interesadas.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006810/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Integrated knowledge on forests and forestry

Forest- and water-related issues are of the utmost importance: forests cover 40% of the land surface in the EU and most drinking water comes from forested catchments.

Despite this, however, there are major knowledge gaps when it comes to the scientific understanding of the interactions between forests and water, with certain scientific schools of thought holding strongly contradictory opinions:

1. on the one hand, several scientists have concluded that the impact of reforestation or afforestation on water yield is negative (even if their impact on water quality is positive) and that removing trees will, in principle, increase the availability of water downstream;

2. a second group of scientists argues the opposite, i.e. that the existence of forests and the planting of trees should increase the availability of water downstream and intensify the hydrological cycle. The issue is not black and white, geographical scale, geo-climatic conditions and the type of forests involved can all have an impact on the way in which forests and forestry affect water quantity and quality.

What is clear is that the time has come to effectively integrate knowledge from different levels and different disciplines to overcome the current fragmentation of knowledge and lack of scientific understanding in order to ensure that forest management and water policy take into account the impact that forests have on water resources.

In this context, and bearing in mind that we are aware of the MOTIVE and NEWFOREX projects and know that they do not focus on water and forest interactions/interrelations, does the Commission not believe that there is an urgent need for new, cross-disciplinary, multi-scale research that aims to develop new, integrated knowledge? This will improve understanding of the impact that forests and forestry (from the level of the leaf to the level of the landscape-basin) have on the water cycle. It will also help in the development of a new, effective socio-eco-hydrological approach to forest management with the aim of optimising water-related services (e.g. water quality and quantity) and minimising water-related risks (e.g. droughts and floods).

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(29 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Questions E-003712/2012 and 006809/2012 ([1]).

In addition, the Commission refers to its proposal currently under negotiation between the European Parliament and the Council on Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020). This intends to support research on the sustainable management of natural resources and ecosystems, including the valuation of strategic ecosystem services (water, soil, biodiversity, etc.) and to establish know how and approaches to restore biological resources.

The Commission wishes to recall that it has no competence to engage directly in the development of provisions for forest management that would have to be executed by EU Member States. The Commission disseminates research results directly to the EU Member States via existing channels, such as the Standing Forestry Committee and the Advisory Group on Forests and Cork, in which all EU Member States and stakeholders participate.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006812/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Possibile svolta religiosa nella politica del Marocco

Il Partito per la giustizia e lo sviluppo (PJD) attualmente alla guida della coalizione di governo in Marocco si era presentato sulla scena internazionale come formazione islamica moderata con un programma basato sulla lotta alla corruzione e l'ascolto dei bisogni dei cittadini.

Pochi giorni fa, il PJD ha presentato al governo una proposta di legge che intende vietare ogni tipo di pubblicità sugli alcolici e ogni forma di marketing diretta attraverso i media o indiretta, per esempio esponendo le bottiglie nei negozi. Questa decisione rappresenta, da un lato, la prova generale del Partito marocchino PJD di una sterzata fondamentalista di stampo religioso che vorrebbe proibire totalmente l'uso di alcolici e, dall'altro, è certamente una scelta che disattende nettamente la linea elettorale che ha portato il PJD al governo.

A questa decisione si oppongono fermamente i produttori di vino del paese, che sono già stati largamente colpiti dalla crisi economica globale e che rischierebbero di subire ulteriori contraccolpi economici che si ripercuoterebbero sia sul comparto direttamente connesso alla produzione vitivinicola sia sull'indotto turistico che negli ultimi anni si è sempre più consolidato con percorsi a tema proposti ai turisti.

È la Commissione a conoscenza di tale proposta di legge?

Reputa essa che tale proposta di legge sia prodromica di una progressiva islamizzazione politica del Marocco a differenza dell'afflato democratico che seguiva la primavera araba e pareva essere di orientamento moderato?

Nell'ambito della politica europea di vicinato il Marocco ha ottenuto lo status di paese avanzato. Considerata la risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 7 aprile 2011 sulla revisione della politica europea di vicinato — dimensione meridionale, come intende porsi la Commissione di fronte a questi eventi?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(21 agosto 2012)

L'AR/VP è a conoscenza della proposta di legge menzionata dall'onorevole parlamentare.

L'UE si attende che il nuovo governo guidato dal Partito Giustizia e Sviluppo (PJD) continui e porti a compimento le necessarie riforme politiche, economiche e sociali in risposta alle aspirazioni del popolo marocchino. L'UE continuerà a dare pieno appoggio a tali riforme nel contesto della politica europea di vicinato e dello «status avanzato» del Marocco nelle relazioni con l'UE. Un elemento essenziale di questa impostazione è la piena attuazione della nuova costituzione, segnatamente per consolidare il rispetto dei principi democratici e delle libertà fondamentali.

La questione dei diritti umani, al centro del dialogo tra l'UE e il Marocco, è regolarmente affrontata anche nelle riunioni degli organismi misti istituiti nel quadro dell'accordo di associazione UE-Marocco. In tal senso l'UE è particolarmente impegnata a sostenere il rispetto della libertà di religione, di credo e di espressione in ogni luogo e a favore di tutti. L'UE segue attentamente la situazione, principalmente tramite la propria Delegazione a Rabat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006812/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Are politics in Morocco about to take a religious turn?

The Party for Justice and Development (PJD), which currently leads the coalition government in Morocco, portrayed itself internationally as a moderate Islamic party with a programme based on fighting corruption and responsiveness to the needs of ordinary people.

A few days ago, the PJD presented to the government a bill which would ban all forms of advertising of alcoholic beverages and all forms of marketing of such products, whether direct, through the media, or indirect, for example in the form of displays of bottles in shops. This decision constitutes both a dress rehearsal for a shift towards fundamentalist religious policies, involving a complete ban on alcohol, and a clear departure from the electoral programme which brought the PJD to power.

The proposed advertising and marketing ban has prompted loud protests from Morocco's wine producers, who have already been badly hit by the world economic crisis and would face further economic setbacks which would affect both their wine-growing activities per se and their efforts to attract tourists, which they have stepped up in recent years by creating wine-related tourist itineraries.

Is the Commission aware of the bill referred to above?

Does it regard the bill as symptomatic of a trend towards the Islamisation of politics in Morocco, in defiance of the upsurge in democracy which followed the Arab Spring and which seemed to herald an era of moderate policies?

Morocco has secured 'advanced' status in the context of the European Neighbourhood Policy. In the light of Parliament's resolution of 7 April 2011 on the revision of the European Neighbourhood Policy — southern dimension, how does the Commission intend to respond to these developments in Morocco?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the bill referred to by the Honourable Member.

The EU expects from the new government led by the Party for Justice and Development (PJD) the continuation and full implementation of political, economic and social reforms needed in response to the aspirations of the Moroccan people. The EU will continue to fully support these reforms, in the context of the EU's ENP and 'Advanced Status' of EU-Morocco relations. A key for progress is the full implementation of the provisions of the new Constitution, notably in order to consolidate the respect of democratic principles and fundamental freedoms.

Human rights are indeed at the heart of the EU's dialogue with Morocco and are regularly addressed in the meetings of the relevant joint bodies established under the EU Morocco Association Agreement. In this context, the EU is strongly committed to the respect of the freedom of religion or belief and of expression everywhere and for everyone. The EU is committed mainly through its Delegation in Rabat to ensuring close follow up in this regard.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006813/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Normativa sullo stupro in Marocco

La legge del Marocco prevede che il matrimonio si possa contrarre al compimento del diciottesimo anno di età. L'articolo 475 del codice penale marocchino apre ad una deroga, infatti al comma 2 prevede che nel caso di stupro o violenza su una minorenne, il colpevole può sottrarsi alla pena prevista dal comma 1 se la famiglia della vittima acconsente a concederla a lui in moglie, ed egli è perseguibile quindi solo dalle persone abilitate a chiedere l'annullamento del matrimonio e solo dopo la sentenza di annullamento.

È una pratica che spesso viene seguita, soprattutto nelle zone più periferiche del paese dove la perdita della verginità di una donna prima del matrimonio, anche se a seguito di una violenza subita, è vissuta come atto di vergogna e disonore per la famiglia della vittima e per la vittima stessa.

Come si evince dalla risposta E-003314/2012, la Commissione è a conoscenza dello stato dei fatti e ha fra le sue priorità sostenere la riforma del codice penale e l'adozione di una legge sulla violenza coniugale. Considerando però che nell'ambito del sottocomitato «Diritti umani, democratizzazione e governance» e nella riunione del Consiglio di associazione non si è toccato esplicitamente il tema relativo all'articolo 475 del codice penale marocchino, può la Commissione riferire come stanno procedendo gli incontri e se vi è un'effettiva apertura da parte del Marocco verso una reale riforma del suo sistema normativo?

Vi è stato uno stanziamento di 45 milioni di euro per il periodo 2012-2015 a sostegno del piano di azione del governo del Marocco per la parità dei sessi. Per quanto sia fondamentale il sostegno che l'UE può dare ai paesi terzi anche a livello economico, non reputa la Commissione che sia controproducente attuare una politica di aiuti economici in questo settore, quando il governo in questione non ha ancora dimostrato di essere in grado di apportare effettive modifiche alla propria normativa interna in materia di tutela dei diritti delle donne? Può la Commissione riferire circa l'impiego che sarà fatto di tali fondi?

Risposta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(5 settembre 2012)

La questione della riforma del codice penale marocchino, in particolare la modifica del suo articolo 475, sarà sollevata in occasione della prossima riunione del sottocomitato UE-Marocco per i diritti umani, la democrazia e la governance, che si terrà nell'ottobre 2012.

Questo problema specifico e fondamentale non deve far dimenticare gli importanti progressi compiuti dal Marocco nell'ultimo decennio per quanto riguarda i diritti delle donne (riforma del Moudawana, del codice civile, del codice del lavoro ecc.), progressi che giustificano pienamente l'intensificazione della cooperazione in questo settore, compreso l'ingente sostegno finanziario concesso nell'ambito del programma dell'UE a favore della parità fra i sessi in Marocco. Il programma mira a garantire l'attuazione delle riforme giuridiche già decise in questo campo e a promuovere ulteriori riforme per garantire i diritti delle donne (compresa la riforma del codice penale). Sarà questa l'occasione per l'UE di approfondire i contatti con le autorità, in particolare attraverso un dialogo settoriale regolare sulle questioni connesse alla parità fra i sessi. Si spera inoltre che l'aiuto al bilancio concesso nell'ambito del programma, la cui erogazione è subordinata al rispetto di indicatori ben precisi riguardanti la riforma del codice penale e la lotta contro la violenza domestica e tutte le altre forme di violenza contro le donne, possa influire positivamente sull'adozione di nuove leggi che garantiscano maggiormente il rispetto dei diritti delle donne.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006813/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Moroccan legislation on rape

In Morocco, the law provides that marriage can be contracted from the age of eighteen. Article 475 of the Moroccan penal code, however, provides an exception; paragraph 2 of the article stipulates that, in the case of the rape of, or violence against, a minor, the guilty party can escape the penalty provided for in paragraph 1 if the victim's family agrees to grant her in marriage to the man in question. He may be prosecuted, therefore, only by those who have the authority to call for the marriage to be annulled and only after the judgment of annulment has been delivered.

This practice is often implemented, especially in the more peripheral areas of the country where the loss of a woman's virginity before marriage, even if it is the result of violence, is seen as an act of shame and dishonour to the family of the victim and the victim herself.

As shown in its reply to Written Question E-003314/2012, the Commission is aware of this state of affairs and one of its priorities is to support the reform of the penal code and the adoption of a law on marital violence. Considering, however, that at the meetings of the Subcommittee on Human Rights, Democratisation and Governance and of the Association Council, matters relating to Article 475 of the Moroccan penal code were not explicitly addressed, can the Commission say how the talks are progressing and whether Morocco is genuinely becoming more open to the idea of truly reforming its legislative system?

EUR 45 million has been allocated for the period 2012-2015 in support of the Moroccan Government's Gender Equality Action Plan. However essential the support that the EU can give to non-member countries may be — including financial support — does the Commission not agree that it may be counter-productive to implement a policy of economic assistance in this area when the government concerned has not yet shown that it is capable of genuinely amending its internal legislation concerning the protection of women's rights? Can the Commission say how these funds will be used?

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

The issue of the penal code's reform and specifically of the amendment of its Article 475 will be addressed with Morocco at the next meeting of the EU-Morocco Subcommittee for Human Rights, Democracy and Governance in October 2012.

This specific and fundamental problem should not hide the important progress in terms of women's rights achieved by Morocco during the last decade (Moudawana reform, civil code reform, laboral code reform, etc.) and that has already been translated into legal texts. These steps fully justify the intensification of cooperation in this area, including the meaningful financial support being provided in the framework of the EU programme supporting gender equality in Morocco. The aims of this programme are to ensure the implementation of already decided legal reform in this area and promote further reforms to guarantee women's rights (including penal code reform). The programme will allow the EU to engage more deeply on this issue with the authorities; in particular sectoral dialogue on gender equality issues will be regularly conducted in the framework of the programme. It is also expected that the use of budgetary aid in this programme, which implies disbursement upon the fulfilment of precise indicators concerning reform of the penal code and the fight against domestic and all forms of violence against women, can successfully influence the adoption of new laws further guaranteeing respect for women's rights.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006815/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(9 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari del periodo 2007-2013 da parte dei comuni di Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro e Macerata

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i comuni di Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro e Macerata, può la Commissione far sapere se ciascuno di essi ha presentato progetti per i seguenti programmi:

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the Move?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006816/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(9 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari del periodo 2007-2013 da parte dei comuni di Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Nardi e Corciano

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i comuni di Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Nardi e Corciano, può la Commissione far sapere se ciascuno di essi ha presentato progetti per i seguenti programmi:

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the Move?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006817/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(9 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Informazioni circa l'utilizzo dei fondi comunitari del periodo 2007-2013 da parte dei comuni di Arezzo, Grosseto, Firenze, Siena, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa e Livorno

Nell'ambito del quadro finanziario dell'Unione europea 2007-2013 sono stati inseriti numerosi programmi intesi a sostenere le politiche comunitarie in varie aree tematiche quali, ad esempio, ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico, programmi di formazione, promozione della cultura, ambiente, trasporti, energia nonché tutela della salute e del consumatore.

Per quanto riguarda i comuni di Arezzo, Grosseto, Firenze, Siena, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa e Livorno, può la Commissione far sapere se ciascuno di essi ha presentato progetti per i seguenti programmi:

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the Move?

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

In allegato alla presente figura un elenco dei progetti richiesti, presentati alla Commissione in regime di gestione diretta.

L'onorevole parlamentare è inoltre invitata a contattare le autorità nazionali o regionali competenti per i progetti attuati in gestione concorrente, nella cui selezione e nel cui monitoraggio la Commissione non è direttamente coinvolta.

La Commissione nota che l'onorevole parlamentare è interessata ai finanziamenti concessi direttamente alle città italiane nel quadro di specifici programmi UE gestiti dalla Commissione. Qualora l'onorevole parlamentare lo desiderasse, la Commissione è disposta a fornirgli una tabella contenente queste informazioni per le principali città italiane che potrebbero partecipare ai programmi in questione. La Commissione potrebbe in tal modo risparmiare il tempo impiegato per rispondere ad ogni singola interrogazione e fornire all'onorevole parlamentare un unico insieme di dati esaustivi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006815/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Information about the use of EU funds over the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro and Macerata

Under the EU financial framework for the period 2007-2013 many programmes make funding available to support EU policies in a number of thematic areas, such as research and technological development, training programmes, promotion of culture, the environment, transport, energy and health and consumer protection.

Can the Commission state whether the municipalities of Urbino, Ancona, Pesaro and Macerata have submitted projects for the following programmes:

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the Move?

Question for written answer E-006816/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Information about the use of EU funds over the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Nardi and Corciano

Under the EU financial framework for the period 2007-2013 many programmes make funding available to support EU policies in a number of thematic areas, such as research and technological development, training programmes, promotion of culture, the environment, transport, energy and health and consumer protection.

Can the Commission state whether the municipalities of Perugia, Terni, Città di Castello, Spoleto, Gubbio, Nardi and Corciano have submitted projects for the following programmes:

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the Move?

Question for written answer E-006817/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Information about the use of EU funds over the period 2007-2013 by the municipalities of Arezzo, Grosseto, Firenze, Siena, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa and Livorno

Under the EU financial framework for the period 2007-2013 many programmes make funding available to support EU policies in a number of thematic areas, such as research and technological development, training programmes, promotion of culture, the environment, transport, energy and health and consumer protection.

Can the Commission state whether the municipalities of Arezzo, Grosseto, Firenze, Siena, Pistoia, Carrara, Pisa, Massa and Livorno have submitted projects for the following programmes:

— Citizenship

— Culture

— Life+

— Youth on the Move?

Joint answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2012)

The attached annex presents a list of requested projects submitted to the Commission under direct management.

The Honourable Member is invited to contact relevant national or regional authorities with regard to projects implemented through shared management as the Commission is not directly involved in selecting and monitoring them.

The Commission notes that the Honourable Member is interested in the funding granted directly to Italian cities from specific EU programmes managed by the Commission. Should the Honourable Member so wish, the Commission could prepare a table providing this information for the major Italian cities likely to take part in these programmes. This would save the Commission time needed to reply to each individual question and provide the Honourable Member with one single set of comprehensive data.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006818/12
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Common agricultural policy entitlements

1. In the opinion of the Commission, is the UK Government utilising the funding opportunities available to British farmers under the provisions of the common agricultural policy to the fullest potential?

2. If not, in the further opinion of the Commission, what entitlements are being underutilised?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(16 August 2012)

The Commission considers that UK Government is utilising well the funding opportunities available to British farmers under the provision of the common agricultural policy.

For instance, the execution rate for the Rural Development Programme for England has been 47%, end of 2011, which is quite satisfactory (EU average 48.97%).

As regards direct support under the Pillar I of the CAP, the execution rate for the UK for the financial year 2011 (the calendar year 2010) is 98,6%. The single payment scheme (SPS), which forms the largest part of direct support, is implemented through payment entitlements. In order to claim the single payment, farmers 'activate' their payment entitlements by declaring an equivalent number of eligible hectares in a yearly application. If payment entitlements are not activated during two years, and hence not paid, they are reverted into the 'national reserve', from which the administration can allocate them to other farmers in specific situations (e.g. newcomers, *force majeure* cases, investments).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006819/12
to the Commission
Linda McAvan (S&D)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Food and Veterinary Office inspections

The EU Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) undertakes regular audits to ensure that Member States are respecting EU legislation on food safety, animal welfare, etc.

— Can the Commission indicate whether the dates of the FVO inspection visits are announced in advance — i.e. do the national authorities and individual farms or slaughterhouses know when to expect the inspectors?

— If so, does the Commission consider that surprise inspections would be more useful?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

The EU Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) undertakes regular audits to ensure that Member States are respecting EU legislation on food safety, animal health and welfare and plant health.

The details of audits including dates are agreed in advance with Member States as is provided for in the relevant legislation. This is essential to ensure that best use is made of time and resources in evaluating the effectiveness of Member State control measures. However, as part of the audit process the Commission also identifies in advance the nature of establishments and holdings it wishes to visit which is based on its assessment and knowledge of those issues of most interest to the audit process, i.e. where problems are likely to be found or where the Competent Authority will be required to present evidence of the effectiveness of control measures. This includes a representative number of unannounced visits or visits announced at short notice.

Surprise inspections chosen at random are not likely to reveal interesting findings as, in practice, most establishments and holdings perform to the required standards. A targeted approach where a prior risk analysis is carried out to identify establishments or holdings of interest, as outlined above, is likely to give better results. An immediate or unannounced inspection is of course warranted where there is evidence or suspicion of a real risk to health or of criminal activity. In such cases, however, the Member State is better placed to carry out such inspections as they have the required legal powers, local knowledge and back-up etc. The Commission as part of the audit process also looks to the effectiveness of the Member States in responding to evidence or suspicion of non-compliances likely to create risks to health.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006820/12
to the Commission
Linda McAvan (S&D)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: SME-friendly tender specifications for EU procurement of services

It has been brought to my attention by a local SME that it is impossible for them to access Commission tenders (for research, for example) under the LIFE programme because all calls follow the same template, stating that pre-financing will be limited to 30% and will be linked to a 'deliverable' (e.g., an interim report). In effect, this means that no payment will be made to the contractor for the first six months of the contract.

1. Can the Commission confirm whether the tender specifications in other EU programmes follow the same template?

2. Has the Commission considered ways to make these tenders more SME-friendly by allowing more flexibility in the pre-financing conditions, for example?

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

1. The Commission's policy on public procurement is codified in the Financial Regulation (FR) and its Implementing Rules (IR) which is a transposition of the directive 2004/18/EC ([1]). Procurement rules are therefore independent from specific grant programmes.

Tender specifications are drafted under the responsibility of the authorising officer. Since these specifications are linked to the subject of the contract, there is no single template followed across the Commission.

2. Pre-financings are meant to provide a float to a recipient of EU funding but also constitute a risk to the EU budget and an administrative burden. Authorising officers therefore decide whether to pre-finance and/or to make interim payments which are usually linked to specific deliverables defined in the contract.

Under current rules, pre-financing of over EUR 150 000 requires the contractor to produce a financial guarantee which may prove costly and administratively burdensome, particularly for SMEs. Under the revised FR, financial guarantees will no longer be compulsory: they will no longer apply to contracts of less than EUR 60 000 and will be allowed for higher value contracts based on a risk assessment by the authorising officer.

3. Legal provisions governing LIFE+ programme neither link pre-financing to specific deliverables nor limit it to 30%. The Commission decides on payment terms in LIFE+ procurements on individual basis. As a general rule, pre-financing is always envisaged in contracts involving great deal of preparatory work or advance payments to supplies.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32004L0018:en:NOT.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006821/12
to the Commission
Nigel Farage (EFD)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Restriction of lead in ammunition

1. Has the Commission asked the European Chemicals Agency to draw up a restriction report on the use of lead in ammunition? If so, what is the justification, timeframe and regulatory procedure to be used?

2. Does the Commission intend to bring forward such a proposal in the future? If so, what is the justification, timeframe and regulatory procedure to be used?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-006712/2012 by Ms Vicky Ford ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006822/12
to the Commission
Struan Stevenson (ECR)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Ongoing discrimination against the *lettori* (response to the Commission's answer to E-002636/2011)

In March 2011, I tabled Written Question E-002636/2011 to the Commission on the subject of discrimination against foreign teachers of languages at universities in Italy, known as *lettori*.

The Commission's reply included the following statements:

' (…) the Commission is analysing the new law (Law No 240 of 30 December 2010) which entered into force on 15 February 2011. Should the results of this enquiry point to issues of compliance of this new legislation with EC law on the free movement of workers, the Commission services will contact the Italian authorities for more information.'

Nevertheless, it has been brought to my attention that the ECJ ruling is still being breached at the University of Cassino and Southern Lazio, Italy, in respect of the 18 foreign language *lettori* who have been teaching there under permanent contracts for between 12 and 20 years.

The background to this case includes an initial legal battle asking for an end to discrimination and adequate retribution for work undertaken. This was won in the Italian Supreme Court. However, the court decision regarding adequate salaries was not applied by the university administration, although the plaintiffs were given back-pay up to the date of the decision. As a consequence, a second case was undertaken to force the university administration to comply with the previous judgment regarding salaries and to demand equal treatment for the *lettori* who had been hired in the meantime and who were doing the same job. The second case is now pending judgment from the employment tribunal of Cassino.

As a result, despite the fact that a legal accountant (C.T.U.) has been appointed by the court to calculate the amount which is owed to the *lettori* by the University, it has already started proceedings to dismiss them all and replace their services with 'less costly means' in blatant disregard of both Italian and European legislation.

— In this context, and given that no apparent progress has been made with regard to the situation that the *lettori* are in, has the Commission indeed contacted the Italian authorities on this issue? What was the outcome of these discussions?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 August 2012)

The issue of working conditions of former and current foreign language lecturers (lettori) and 'collaboratori e esperti linguistici' (CELs) in Italy is being followed up closely by the Commission.

As regards the question on the proceedings brought by the University with the aim to dismiss the lecturers and replace them with 'less costly means', the Commission would like to refer to the reply given to Written Question E-006582/12 ([1]).

In relation to the inquiries made by the Commission regarding the Italian law n°240 of 30 December 2010 (the so-called 'Gelmini reform'), the Italian authorities replied on the 29 May 2012.

In the light of the comments received from the Italian Government, the Commission is currently in the process of evaluating the situation of foreign lecturers in Italy in order to establish if the new law as such and/or the administrative practice is violating EC law. Further inquiries might be needed.

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006823/12
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(9 juillet 2012)

Objet: Niveau sonore des véhicules

Depuis 1970, en vue d'assurer la protection de la santé publique et de l'environnement, l'Union européenne a imposé des limites sur le niveau sonore des véhicules.

À la suite des avancées dans les processus de fabrication et d'une augmentation du nombre des véhicules électriques et hybrides sur les routes, la Commission a proposé un nouveau règlement en décembre 2011. Il vise à abaisser à nouveau les limites de bruit pour les véhicules à moteur, et à instaurer un niveau de bruit minimum pour les voitures électriques.

Tout en reconnaissant les exigences liées à la nécessité de protéger la santé publique et l'environnement, il convient néanmoins de noter que la directive initiale de 1970 a, à ce jour, été modifiée douze fois. On peut noter également que le nouveau règlement proposé par la Commission prévoit la possibilité de modifications dans un futur proche.

Ce climat juridique changeant pourrait être un obstacle à la croissance. Les fabricants d'automobiles ont besoin de stabilité juridique pour assurer leur compétitivité et garantir les emplois. Et afin de pouvoir innover, le secteur des voitures électriques et hybrides a tout autant besoin d'une base juridique solide. Je rappelle que, récemment, la Commission a présenté un plan pour une «nouvelle révolution industrielle» appelant à faire de la voiture électrique un produit de consommation de masse.

La période actuelle est cruciale pour l'économie européenne et ses entreprises, et il faut tout faire pour leur éviter l'imposition de normes onéreuses et inattendues.

Compte tenu de ces éléments, et des exigences liées à l'ambition que s'est fixée l'Europe d'une «meilleure réglementation», plus rationnelle et intelligente, que compte faire la Commission pour limiter l'instabilité normative en la matière?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(3 septembre 2012)

La Commission soutient pleinement la mise en œuvre des principes de la réglementation intelligente, y compris les analyses d'impact et les consultations des parties concernées. S'agissant du bruit généré par les véhicules, la Commission a consulté, avant de présenter sa proposition, l'industrie et d'autres acteurs concernés par l'intermédiaire du groupe de haut niveau CARS 21 et au cours de plusieurs autres réunions ad hoc. De plus, les parties concernées ont également été consultées lors de l'analyse d'impact de la proposition, réalisée en 2010-2011. Enfin, il convient de rappeler que les limites du niveau sonore des véhicules n'ont pas été modifiées depuis 1996 et que, dès 2007 ([1]), il a été reconnu que la méthode d'essai devrait être améliorée afin qu'elle soit plus représentative des émissions sonores en conditions réelles.

Par conséquent, la proposition d'une nouvelle méthode d'essai accompagnée de nouvelles limites ne pouvait pas être considérée par les parties concernées comme une surprise lorsque la Commission l'a adoptée le 9 décembre 2011. Deux étapes ont été proposées. La première (trois ans après la publication du texte définitif) ne s'appliquera qu'aux nouveaux modèles de véhicules et nécessitera quelques adaptations mineures en matière d'ingénierie automobile, ne générant que des coûts limités. La seconde étape est plus importante et s'appliquera à tous les véhicules. Un délai de mise en œuvre adéquat (sept ans après la publication) est dès lors prévu pour cette phase.

En ce qui concerne les véhicules électriques et les véhicules électriques hybrides, seules des exigences minimales fondées sur une norme internationale sont introduites pour les véhicules équipés de systèmes d'avertissement acoustique. Étant donné que cette nouvelle technologie est encore en cours de développement, ni le respect de limites de niveau sonore ni l'installation obligatoire de ces dispositifs ne sont requis à ce stade.

Le texte est actuellement examiné par le Conseil et le Parlement et la Commission est disposée à envisager tout amendement qui améliorerait sa proposition.

([1]) Directive 2007/34/CE, JO L 155 du 15.6.2007, p. 49.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006823/12
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Sound level of vehicles

Since 1970, the European Union has imposed limits on vehicle sound levels in order to protect public health and the environment.

In December 2011, in response to developments in manufacturing processes and an increase in the number of electric and hybrid vehicles on the roads, the Commission put forward a new proposal for a regulation with the aim of further reducing noise levels for motor vehicles and establishing a new minimum noise level for electric cars.

Whilst it is important to protect public health and the environment, it should be noted that the original directive has been amended 12 times since its adoption in 1970 and that the new Commission proposal includes a clause providing for its own revision in the near future.

This unsettled legal climate could prove an obstacle to growth, given that car manufacturers need legal stability in order to remain competitive and safeguard jobs, just as the electric and hybrid car sector does if it is to pursue innovation. In that connection, the Commission would do well to remember that it recently put forward a plan for a 'new industrial revolution' in which it called for electric cars to become items of mass consumption.

This is a crucial time for the European economy and for individual businesses, which is why every effort should be made to spare them the cost of complying with new standards introduced without warning.

In the light of these factors and the steps that Europe must take to pursue its ambition of better, i.e. more rational and smart, regulation, what does the Commission intend to do to limit regulatory instability in this area?

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

The Commission fully supports the implementation of smart regulation principles, including impact assessments and stakeholder consultations. In the field of vehicle noise, before making its proposal, the Commission consulted industry and other stakeholders through the CARS 21 High Level Group process and in several other ad-hoc meetings. Furthermore, stakeholders were also consulted when the impact assesment on the proposal was carried out in 2010-2011. Finally, it should be reminded, that vehicle noise limits have not been changed since 1996 and that already in 2007 ([1]), it was recognised that the test method should be improved to better represent real life noise emissions.

Therefore, the proposal for a new test method with associated new limits could not be regarded by stakeholders as a surprise when the Commission adopted it on 9 December 2011. 2 stages have been proposed. The first stage (3 years after publication of the final text) will only apply to new models of vehicles and will require minor vehicle engineering, creating limited costs. The second stage is more substantial and will apply to all vehicles. An appropriate lead time (7 years after publication) is therefore foreseen for this stage.

Concerning electric and hybrid-electric vehicles, only minimum requirements based on an international standard are introduced for the vehicles fitted with acoustic warning systems. Since this new technology is still under development, neither minimum noise levels nor the mandatory fitting of such devices are required at this stage.

The text is now on the table of the Council and the Parliament and the Commission is ready to consider any amendment that will improve its proposal.

([1]) Directive 2007/34/EC, OJ L 155, 15.6.2007, p. 49.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006824/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(9 lipca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Projekt ustawy o organizacjach pozarządowych

Do Dumy Państwowej wpłynął projekt ustawy, na mocy której organizacjom pozarządowym zajmującym się w Rosji działalnością polityczną i korzystającym z zagranicznych grantów będzie nadawany status „organizacji pełniących funkcje zagranicznych agentów". Organizacje te zostaną objęte restrykcyjną kontrolą ze strony państwa. Będą zmuszone do wystąpienia do Ministerstwa Sprawiedliwości Federacji Rosyjskiej o wpisanie do specjalnego rejestru, a wszystkie swoje publikacje – również te w Internecie – będą musiały opatrywać adnotacją informującą o ich statusie zagranicznych agentów.

Organizacje ze statusem zagranicznego agenta będą zobowiązane do składania sprawozdań nie rocznych, jak pozostałe NGO, a półrocznych. Natomiast co kwartał będą musiały składać raporty o otrzymywanych środkach zagranicznych i ich wydatkowaniu. Oprócz tego, Ministerstwo Sprawiedliwości otrzyma dodatkowe możliwości nieplanowych kontroli wspomnianych organizacji, w tym na wniosek obywateli, lub też na podstawie publikacji prasowych o faktach działalności ekstremistycznej.

Pragnę przypomnieć, że to już kolejna ustawa tak silnie naruszająca wolności obywatelskie w Rosji. W czerwcu prezydent Władimir Putin podpisał nową ustawę o manifestacjach, drastycznie zwiększającą karę grzywny za udział w zgromadzeniach publicznych.

W związku z tym zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja posiada informacje o projekcie nowej rosyjskiej ustawy o organizacjach pozarządowych i ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w sprawie ograniczania przez rosyjskie władze praw i swobód obywatelskich w tym kraju?

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

UE jest świadoma zmian w przepisach rosyjskiego prawa dotyczących organizacji pozarządowych. W dniu 10 lipca 2012 r. rzecznik Wysokiej Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącej Komisji wydał oświadczenie wyrażające zaniepokojenie tymi zmianami. Szef delegatury UE w Federacji Rosyjskiej osobiście przekazał przewodniczącemu właściwej komisji w Dumie, jak również wiceministrowi sprawiedliwości, poważne obawy UE dotyczące projektu ustawy, jeszcze przed jego przyjęciem. UE wyraziła również zaniepokojenie rosyjskim ustawodawstwem dotyczącym demonstracji publicznych, wolności w Internecie i zniesławienia. Obawy te zostały również podniesione przez stronę europejską podczas ostatnich konsultacji UE-Rosja dotyczących praw człowieka.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006824/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Draft law on NGOs

A draft law has been put to the Russian State Duma under which NGOs engaging in political activities in Russia and receiving foreign grants would be categorised as 'foreign agents'. Such organisations would be subject to restrictive state controls. They would be forced to apply to the Russian Ministry of Justice for inclusion in a special register, and all of their publications — including Internet publications — would have to include a reference to their status as foreign agents.

Organisations categorised as foreign agents would be required to submit reports not on an annual basis, as other NGOs do, but on a biannual basis. They would also be required to submit quarterly reports on foreign funding received and how it has been spent. The Ministry of Justice would, furthermore, receive additional powers to carry out checks on such organisations without warning, including in response to requests from members of the public and press articles alleging extremist activities.

I would point out that this is the latest in a line of Russian laws that seriously breach civil liberties. In June 2012, President Vladimir Putin signed a new law on demonstrations which dramatically increased the fines imposed for attending public rallies.

Is the Commission aware of the new draft law on NGOs in Russia, and does it intend to make representations to the Russian authorities regarding the imposition of restrictions on civil rights and liberties?

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

The EU is aware of the amendments to the Russian law on NGOs. On 10 July 2012, the spokesperson of the HR/VP issued a statement expressing concern at this development. The Head of the EU Delegation to the Russian Federation has personally conveyed the EU's strong concerns on the bill before its adoption to the chairman of the responsible Duma committee, as well as to the Deputy Minister of Justice. The EU also expressed concerns about Russian legislation on public demonstrations, Internet freedom and libel. These concerns were also raised by the EU at the latest EU-Russian Human Rights Consultations.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006827/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(9 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Διαφορές μεταξύ του Κέντρου Παρακολούθησης και Πληροφόρησης (MIC) και του ευρωπαϊκού κέντρου αντιμετώπισης καταστάσεων έκτακτης ανάγκης

Ο κοινοτικός μηχανισμός πολιτικής προστασίας υποστηρίζει και διευκολύνει την κινητοποίηση των υπηρεσιών έκτακτης ανάγκης για την κάλυψη των άμεσων αναγκών των χωρών που επλήγησαν ή διατρέχουν τον κίνδυνο να πληγούν από καταστροφές. Βελτιώνει το συντονισμό των επεμβάσεων παροχής βοήθειας με τον καθορισμό των αντίστοιχων υποχρεώσεων των κρατών μελών της ΕΕ και της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, και με τη θέσπιση ορισμένων φορέων και διαδικασιών, όπως το Κέντρο Παρακολούθησης και Πληροφόρησης (MIC).

Στην πρότασή της για απόφαση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με έναν ενωσιακό Μηχανισμό Πολιτικής Προστασίας, η Επιτροπή προτείνει τη σύσταση και διαχείριση ενός κέντρου αντιμετώπισης καταστάσεων έκτακτης ανάγκης (ERC) με βάση το υφιστάμενο MIC, το οποίο θα πρέπει να ενισχυθεί ώστε να διασφαλισθεί μια συνεχής και αδιάλειπτη 24/7 επιχειρησιακή ικανότητα.

Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να μας παράσχει πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις διαφορές μεταξύ του ERC και του MIC και για το πώς προτίθεται να διεξάγει επιχειρήσεις κατά τη διάρκεια της μεταβατικής περιόδου;

Απάντηση της κας Georgieva εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Διαφορές μεταξύ του Κέντρου παρακολούθησης και πληροφόρησης (MIC) και του Κέντρου αντιμετώπισης καταστάσεων έκτακτης ανάγκης (ERC)

Η συγχώνευση της πολιτικής προστασίας και της ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας στο πλαίσιο μιας Γενικής Διεύθυνσης της Επιτροπής καθιστά δυνατή τη μετατροπή του MIC σε Κέντρο αντιμετώπισης καταστάσεων έκτακτης ανάγκης (ERC) το οποίο μπορεί, αφενός, να αντλεί πληροφορίες και εμπειρογνωμοσύνη και από τους δύο τομείς και, αφετέρου, να συνδέει αποτελεσματικά τις αρχές πολιτικής προστασίας και ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας στα κράτη μέλη.

Το ERC θα λειτουργεί 24 ώρες το εικοσιτετράωρο, επτά ημέρες την εβδομάδα, και θα είναι υπεύθυνο για τον συντονισμό της πολιτικής αντιμετώπισης των καταστροφών από την ΕΕ. Τα υφιστάμενα καθήκοντα του Κέντρου ως προς την παρακολούθηση, ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών και αντιμετώπιση των καταστάσεων έκτακτης ανάγκης θα μεταβληθούν και ο ρόλος του θα γίνει πιο ενεργός δεδομένου ότι θα του ανατεθούν καθήκοντα σχεδιασμού, παρακολούθησης, προετοιμασίας, συντονισμού και υλικοτεχνικής υποστήριξης. Το ERC θα αναπτύξει ολοκληρωμένη ικανότητα παρακολούθησης με βάση τις υπηρεσίες της Παγκόσμιας Παρακολούθησης του Περιβάλλοντος και της Ασφάλειας (GMES) και τη συνεργασία με το Κοινό Κέντρο Ερευνών. Με αυτόν τον τρόπο θα διασφαλιστεί η συνεχής ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών με τις αρχές πολιτικής προστασίας και ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας σχετικά με τις ανάγκες, ώστε τα κράτη μέλη να μπορούν να λαμβάνουν περισσότερο εμπεριστατωμένες αποφάσεις.

Το ERC θα συνεργάζεται στενά και με άλλες δομές ταχείας απόκρισης στην Επιτροπή και θα αναπτύξει σενάρια αναφοράς για τα κύρια είδη καταστροφών εντός και εκτός της ΕΕ. Θα διευκολύνει τον επιχειρησιακό συντονισμό με άλλους φορείς της ΕΕ όπως την ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών και την ανάλυσή τους με την Ευρωπαϊκή Υπηρεσία Εξωτερικής Δράσης (EEAS) και τις αντιπροσωπείες της ΕΕ.

Έχουν ήδη ληφθεί διάφορα μέτρα για την οργάνωση της μετάβασης στο νέο σύστημα. Συνήφθη συμφωνία με τη Γενική Διεύθυνση HOME για ταχεία ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών ενώ προβλέπονται παρόμοιες συμφωνίες και με άλλες Γενικές Διευθύνσεις. Περαιτέρω, λαμβάνονται μέτρα για την ενίσχυση του τρέχοντος συστήματος επιφυλακής του MIC, το οποίο λειτουργεί 24 ώρες το εικοσιτετράωρο, επτά ημέρες την εβδομάδα.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006827/12
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Differences between the MIC and the ERC

The Community Mechanism for Civil Protection supports and facilitates the mobilisation of emergency services to meet the immediate needs of countries hit by a disaster or at risk from one. It improves the coordination of assistance interventions by defining the obligations of EU countries and the European Commission and by establishing certain bodies and procedures, such as the Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC).

In its proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Union Civil Protection Mechanism, the Commission suggests the establishment and management of an Emergency Response Centre (ERC) on the basis of the existing MIC, which should be strengthened to ensure 24/7 operational capacity.

Could the Commission provide us with information on the differences between the ERC and the MIC and on how it plans to conduct operations during the transition period?

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

Subject: Differences between the MIC and the ERC

The merger of civil protection and humanitarian aid within one DG of the Commission makes it possible to transform the MIC into an Emergency Response Centre (ERC) that can draw on information and expertise from both areas and effectively link the civil protection and the humanitarian aid authorities in the Member States.

The ERC will be staffed on a 24/7 basis and will be responsible for the coordination of the EU's civilian disaster response. It will shift from the current monitoring, information sharing and reacting to emergencies to a more proactive role of planning, monitoring, preparing, coordination and logistical support. The ERC will develop an integrated monitoring capacity based on GMES services and cooperation with the Joint Research Centre. This will ensure a continuous exchange of information with civil protection and humanitarian aid authorities on needs, so Member States can make better informed decisions.

The ERC will also closely cooperate with other rapid response structures in the Commission and develop reference scenarios for the main types of disasters inside and outside the EU. It will facilitate operational coordination with other EU actors such as sharing information and analysis with the EEAS and EU Delegations.

Several steps have already been launched to organise the transition towards the new system. An agreement was concluded with DG HOME on rapid information sharing. Similar agreements are envisaged with other DGs. Furthermore, steps are being taken to reinforce the current 24/7 stand-by duty system of the MIC.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006828/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(9 Ιουλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κινητοποίηση του κοινοτικού μηχανισμού πολιτικής προστασίας

Ο κοινοτικός μηχανισμός πολιτικής προστασίας υποστηρίζει και διευκολύνει την κινητοποίηση των υπηρεσιών έκτακτης ανάγκης για την κάλυψη των άμεσων αναγκών των χωρών που επλήγησαν ή διατρέχουν τον κίνδυνο να πληγούν από καταστροφές. Βελτιώνει το συντονισμό των επεμβάσεων παροχής βοήθειας με τον καθορισμό των αντίστοιχων υποχρεώσεων των κρατών μελών και της Επιτροπής, και με τη θέσπιση ορισμένων φορέων και διαδικασιών, όπως το Κέντρο Παρακολούθησης και Πληροφόρησης (MIC).

Τον Ιανουάριο του 2006, η Επιτροπή πρότεινε να ενισχυθεί ο υφιστάμενος ευρωπαϊκός μηχανισμός πολιτικής προστασίας με βάση την εμπειρία του παρελθόντος και να προβλεφθεί η κατάλληλη νομική βάση για τη μελλοντική δράση στον τομέα αυτό. Η ενίσχυση αυτή έχει σχεδιαστεί για να αντιμετωπίσει τις αυξανόμενης συχνότητας και σοβαρότητας φυσικές και ανθρωπογενείς καταστροφές.

Θα μπορούσε η Επιτροπή να παράσχει λεπτομερή κατάλογο όλων των δράσεων των κοινοτικών μηχανισμών πολιτικής προστασίας, τόσο εντός όσο και εκτός της ΕΕ, κατανεμημένες ανά χώρα, τύπο καταστροφής (ανάλογα με την προέλευση (φυσικές ή τεχνητές) και είδος (σεισμός, δασικές πυρκαγιές, πυρηνικό ατύχημα, κ.λπ.)), και των οικονομικών συνεισφορών της ΕΕ και των κρατών μελών για την τρέχουσα περίοδο προγραμματισμού 2007-2013;

Απάντηση της κας Georgieva εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Ο κοινοτικός μηχανισμός πολιτικής προστασίας χρησιμεύει για τη διευκόλυνση και τον συντονισμό της παροχής από τα κράτη μέλη συνδρομής στον τομέα της πολιτικής προστασίας όταν ανακύπτουν μείζονες καταστάσεις έκτακτης ανάγκης, τόσο εντός όσο και εκτός της ΕΕ.

Ο μηχανισμός αυτός ενεργοποιήθηκε 148 φορές κατά την περίοδο 2007-2011, περιλαμβανομένων 36 προειδοποιήσεων και 112 υποβληθέντων αιτημάτων συνδρομής. Αυτά τα τελευταία αιτήματα οδήγησαν σε 39 επιχειρήσεις έκτακτης ανάγκης εντός της ΕΕ και σε 73 τέτοιες επιχειρήσεις εκτός της ΕΕ. Οι πλημμύρες, οι δασικές πυρκαγιές και οι σεισμοί αποτελούν τα συνηθέστερα είδη καταστροφών για τα οποία επιστρατεύεται ο μηχανισμός, αντιπροσωπεύοντας το 30 %, 28 % και 13 %, αντιστοίχως, του συνόλου των ενεργοποιήσεων από το 2007 έως σήμερα. Σε μικρότερη έκταση, ο μηχανισμός έχει επίσης χρησιμοποιηθεί για επείγοντα περιστατικά θαλάσσιας ρύπανσης (7 επιχειρήσεις ή 5 %). Αναλυτικός κατάλογος όλων των ενεργοποιήσεων του μηχανισμού πολιτικής προστασίας κατά την περίοδο 2007-2011 και των ενεργειών στις οποίες προέβησαν τα συμμετέχοντα κράτη και το κέντρο παρακολούθησης και πληροφόρησης είναι διαθέσιμος στην εξής ηλεκτρονική διεύθυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/index_en.htm

Η δαπάνη για τη συνδρομή που παρέχεται στο πλαίσιο αυτών των επιχειρήσεων έκτακτης ανάγκης καλύπτεται από τα κράτη μέλη. Παρόλα αυτά, κατ' εφαρμογή του χρηματοδοτικού μέσου πολιτικής προστασίας, η Επιτροπή δύναται να συγχρηματοδοτήσει τη μεταφορά συνδρομής εις είδος μέχρι το 50 % των συνολικών επιλέξιμων εξόδων μεταφοράς. Το ετήσιο ύψος της χρηματοδότησης που η ΕΕ παρέχει για την κάλυψη εξόδων μεταφοράς έχει αυξηθεί από 30 418 ευρώ το 2007 σε 13,7 εκατ. ευρώ το 2011, ενώ, για την περίοδο 2007-2012, το σχετικό συνολικό ποσό υπερέβη τα 20 εκατ. ευρώ.

Λόγω της αύξησης του αριθμού των καταστροφών σε ολόκληρο τον κόσμο, η Επιτροπή έχει προτείνει τη σημαντική ενίσχυση του ευρωπαϊκού μηχανισμού πολιτικής προστασίας. Η νομοθετική πρόταση της Επιτροπής με αριθμό COM(2011)934 τελικό, της 20ής Δεκεμβρίου 2011, εισηγείται την απόδοση μεγαλύτερης βαρύτητας στην πρόληψη και την ετοιμότητα, καθώς και την ανάπτυξη μιας περισσότερο προσχεδιασμένης, προβλέψιμης και συνεκτικής προσέγγισης σε σχέση με την αντιμετώπιση καταστροφών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006828/12
to the Commission
Georgios Stavrakakis (S&D)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Mobilisation of the Community Civil Protection Mechanism

The Community Civil Protection Mechanism supports and facilitates the mobilisation of emergency services to meet the immediate needs of countries hit or at risk of being hit by disaster. It improves the coordination of assistance interventions by defining the respective obligations of the Member States and the Commission, and by establishing certain bodies and procedures, such as the Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC).

In January 2006, the Commission proposed that the existing European Civil Protection Mechanism should be reinforced on the basis of past experience and that a suitable legal basis should be provided for future action in this area. This reinforcement is designed to deal with the increasing frequency and seriousness of natural and man-made disasters.

Could the Commission provide a detailed list of all Community Civil Protection Mechanisms mobilisations, both inside and outside the EU, broken down by country, type of disaster (by origin (natural or man-made) and kind (earthquake, forest fire, nuclear accident, etc.)) and EU and Member State financial contributions for the current programming period 2007-2013?

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

The Community Civil Protection (CP) Mechanism facilitates and coordinates the deployment of Member States' civil protection assistance in the event of major emergencies inside and outside the EU.

The Mechanism was activated 148 times in the period 2007-11, including 36 pre-alerts and 112 actual requests for assistance. The latter led to 39 emergency operations inside the EU and 73 operations outside the EU. Floods, forest fires and earthquakes are the most frequent types of disasters for which the Mechanism is used, representing respectively 30%, 28% and 13% of all activations since 2007. To a lesser extent, the Mechanism has also been used for marine pollution emergencies (7 operations or 5%). A detailed list of all CP Mechanism activations for 2007-11 and the actions taken by the Participating States and the Monitoring and Information Centre can be found at: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/index_en.htm

The costs of the assistance provided in these emergency operations are covered by the Member States. However, in accordance with the Civil Protection Financial Instrument, the Commission can co-finance the transport of in-kind assistance up to 50% of the total eligible transport costs. The yearly level of EU transport funding has grown from EUR 30 418 in 2007 to EUR 13.7 million in 2011, with a total over EUR 20 million for the period 2007-2012.

Given the increase in the number of disasters worldwide, the Commission has proposed to significantly strengthen the European Civil Protection Mechanism. The Commission's legislative proposal COM(2011)934 final of 20 December 2011 suggests to focus more attention on prevention and preparedness, and to develop a more pre-planned, predictable and coherent approach to disaster response.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006829/12
an die Kommission
Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE) und José Bové (Verts/ALE)
(9. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: In den Mitgliedstaaten erfolgte Umsetzung der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 619/2011 über vorhandene Spuren von nicht zugelassenen GVO

Mit der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 619/2011 wurden die Bestimmungen über nicht zugelassene genetisch veränderte Organismen (GVO) bei eingeführten Futtermitteln abgeändert. Bis Juli 2011 mussten eingeführte Futtermittel, die Spuren von nicht zugelassenen GVO enthielten, abgewiesen werden und konnten nicht in der Europäischen Union vermarktet werden. Mit der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 619/2011 gestattet die Kommission nunmehr die Einfuhr von Futtermitteln mit Spuren von nicht zugelassenen GVO bis zu einem Grenzwert von 0,1 %, sofern folgende Voraussetzungen erfüllt sind: eine Zulassung der GVO in der Europäischen Union ist seit mindestens drei Monaten anhängig, der entsprechende GVO wurde in einem Drittland zugelassen und der Antragsteller hat Testverfahren und Referenzmaterial vorgelegt. Mit diesen Bestimmungen werden die Rückverfolgbarkeit und die Transparenz nicht zugelassener GVO, die im Futtermittelsektor und in Teilen des Lebensmittelsektors eingesetzt werden, begrenzt. Die Mitgliedstaaten berichten nunmehr nur noch einmal jährlich (zum 30. Juni) über Futtermittel mit Spuren von nicht zugelassenen GVO unter dem Grenzwert.

1. Zu welchen Ergebnissen hat die Prüfung der Umsetzung der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 619/2011 durch die Mitgliedstaaten geführt?

2. Welche Mitgliedstaaten haben eine Kontamination von Futtermitteln mit nicht zugelassenen GVO unter dem Grenzwert von 0,1 % festgestellt? Welche GVO-Vorkommen wurden festgestellt, wie viele Fälle von Kontamination wurden gemeldet und aus welchen Ländern erfolgte die Einfuhr?

3. Welche Mitgliedstaaten haben eine Kontamination von Futtermitteln mit nicht zugelassenen GVO über dem Grenzwert von 0,1 % festgestellt? Welche GVO-Vorkommen wurden festgestellt, wie viele Fälle von Kontamination wurden gemeldet und aus welchen Ländern erfolgte die Einfuhr?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(31. August 2012)

In Anwendung der Überarbeitungsklausel in Artikel 8 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 619/2011 wurden die Mitgliedstaaten im Ständigen Ausschuss für die Lebensmittelkette und Tiergesundheit im Dezember 2011 aufgefordert, ihre Erfahrungen mit der Anwendung dieser Verordnung mitzuteilen. Kein Mitgliedstaat hat über negative Fälle berichtet.

Die Kommission prüft derzeit die von den Mitgliedstaaten im Rahmen der Berichterstattungsverpflichtung vorgelegten Daten, auf die die Herren Abgeordneten verweisen, und wird Bericht erstatten, sobald die Daten ausgewertet sind.

Zusätzlich zur rechtlichen Verpflichtung der Mitgliedstaaten, über Gehalte an GVO unter dem Grenzwert zu berichten, hat die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten aufgefordert, auch Angaben zu Anzahl, Art und Ursprung von GVO-Ereignissen zu machen, deren Gehalt über der in der Verordnung festgelegten Mindestleistungsgrenze liegt; sie wird Bericht erstatten, sobald die Daten vorliegen.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006829/12
à la Commission
Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE) et José Bové (Verts/ALE)
(9 juillet 2012)

Objet: Mise en œuvre du règlement (UE) nº 619/2011 sur la faible présence d'OGM non autorisés

Le règlement (UE) nº 619/2011 a modifié la réglementation concernant la présence d'organismes génétiquement modifiés (OGM) non autorisés dans les importations d'aliments pour animaux. Jusqu'en juillet 2011, les importations d'aliments pour animaux contenant des traces d'OGM non autorisés devaient être refusées et les produits ne pouvaient pas être commercialisés dans l'Union européenne. En adoptant le règlement (UE) nº 619/2011, la Commission européenne autorise à présent l'importation d'aliments pour animaux contenant moins de 0,1 % d'OGM non autorisés lorsque les conditions suivantes sont réunies: une procédure d'autorisation de l'OGM par l'Union européenne doit être en cours depuis plus de trois mois, sa commercialisation doit être autorisée dans un pays tiers et le demandeur doit fournir des méthodes et des matériaux de référence afin que des essais puissent être effectués. Cette réglementation limite la traçabilité des OGM non autorisés présents dans les aliments pour animaux ainsi que, dans certains cas, dans les denrées alimentaires, et ne permet pas une transparence totale en la matière. À présent, les États membres ne communiquent qu'une seule fois par an, pour le 30 juin, les résultats des analyses indiquant une teneur en OGM non autorisés inférieure à 0,1 % dans les aliments pour animaux.

1. Quels sont les résultats de l'évaluation de la mise en œuvre du règlement (UE) nº 619/2011 par les États membres?

2. Parmi les États membres, lesquels ont détecté des teneurs en OGM non autorisés inférieures à 0,1 % dans les aliments pour animaux? Quels OGM ont été détectés, combien de cas de contamination ont été signalés et de quels pays provenaient les importations?

3. Quels sont les États membres à avoir détecté des teneurs en OGM non autorisés supérieures à 0,1 % dans les aliments pour animaux? Quels OGM ont été détectés, combien de cas de contamination ont été signalés et de quels pays provenaient les importations?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(31 août 2012)

Conformément à la clause de révision contenue à l'article 8 du règlement (UE) nº 619/2011, lors d'une réunion du comité permanent de la chaîne alimentaire et de la santé animale, en décembre 2011, les États membres ont été invités à faire part de leurs expériences concernant l'application du règlement. Aucun État membre n'a signalé de difficultés particulières.

La Commission est en train d'examiner les informations transmises par les États membres au titre de l'obligation évoquée par l'Honorable Parlementaire, informations dont elle rendra compte dès qu'elle en aura achevé l'analyse.

Outre l'obligation juridique, pour les États membres, de communiquer les teneurs en OGM inférieures au seuil (limite de performance minimale requise) fixé dans le règlement, la Commission leur a également demandé d'indiquer, pour les teneurs supérieures à ce seuil, la quantité, la nature et l'origine des OGM détectés. La Commission rendra compte de ces informations dès qu'elles lui auront été transmises.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006829/12
to the Commission
Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE) and José Bové (Verts/ALE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Implementation in Member States of Regulation (EU) No 619/2011 on low-level presence of non-approved GMOs

Regulation (EU) No 619/2011 changed the rules on non-authorised genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in feed imports. Until July 2011, feed imports containing traces of non-authorised GM were to be rejected and could not be marketed in the European Union. With Regulation (EU) No 619/2011, the Commission now allows the import of feed with traces of non-authorised GMOs up to a threshold of 0.1%, provided the following conditions are met: EU authorisation of the GMO has been pending for at least three months, the GMO in question has been authorised in a third country, and the applicant has delivered methods and reference material for testing. These rules limit the traceability and transparency of non-approved GMOs used in the feed sector as well as in parts of the food sector. Now Member States only report once a year (by 30 June) on feed with traces of non-authorised GMOs below the threshold level.

1. What are the results of the assessment of the Member States' implementation of Regulation (EU) No 619/2011?

2. Which Member States have detected contamination of non-authorised GM feed below the threshold of 0.1%? Which GMO events were detected, how many contamination incidents were reported and which were the exporting countries?

3. Which Member States have detected contamination of non-authorised GM feed above the threshold of 0.1%? Which GMO events were detected, how many contamination incidents were reported and which were the exporting countries?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(31 August 2012)

In application of the review clause of Article 8 of Regulation (EU) No 619/2011, Member States were invited at the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health in December 2011 to comment on their experiences concerning the implementation of this regulation. No Member State reported any negative issues.

The Commission is currently in the process of reviewing the data submitted by Member States under the reporting obligations to which the Honourable Member refers and will report back once data have been analysed.

In addition to the legal obligation for Member States to report below the threshold level, the Commission has requested Member States to also provide information on the number, type and origin of GMO events, which have been detected above the Minimum Required Performance Level set in the regulation and will report back once data are available.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006830/12
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Export of stolen mobile phones

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned at the number of mobile phones being stolen and shipped to be used elsewhere in the world.

Could the Commission confirm:

1. whether it has any plans to ask mobile phone companies operating in the EU to block calls made from stolen mobile phones, as they are required to do in the UK?

2. whether it has any intentions to push for a global agreement to prevent the use of stolen mobile phones?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(12 September 2012)

The Commission continues to monitor closely EU-wide crime phenonema. Where Member States provide information on particular forms of crime, including the theft of mobile phones and illegal trading of stolen goods, Europol is capable of carrying out analyses and identify new trends. At present, however, the Commission is unaware of any evidence of the need for EU-level action in this area, and therefore has no plans to make a proposal.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006831/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Treatment of Arab minority by the Iranian Government

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned at the treatment of the Arab minority by the Iranian Government.

Could the Vice-President/High Representative:

1. raise the issue of Iran's human rights abuses against its Arab citizens with the Iranian Foreign Minister and with the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights?

2. urge the European Parliament's Foreign Affairs and Human Rights Committees to address the persecution of the Arab minority in Iran?

3. write to the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Navi Pillay, to urge a UN fact-finding mission to Al-Ahwaz/Khuzestan to investigate human rights abuses there?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the precarious situation of Ahwazi Arabs in Iran. Despite constitutional guarantees of equality, persons belonging to ethnic minorities in Iran are subject to discriminatory laws and practices, including land and property confiscations, denial of state employment, and restrictions on social, cultural, linguistic and religious freedoms. Common practices include imprisonment for conscience, unfair trial, corporal punishment and use of the death penalty, as well as systematic restrictions on movement and denial of certain civil rights.

The EU has used all tools available to raise awareness and call on Iran to respect the principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination. The EU and the HR/VP have issued statements and declarations on ethnic and religious intolerance in Iran and have undertaken demarches on individual cases.

Unfortunately, the three Ahwazi Arab men mentioned in the question have been executed. The HR/VP spokesperson issued a statement of public condemnation of the execution of three Ahwazi Arab men, on grounds which reliable reports suggest were political.

The EU has expressed on numerous occasions its concern about the position of minorities in Iran and has called on Iran to refrain from discriminatory policies. On capital punishment, the EU has called on Iran, as it does on all states which insist on maintaining the death penalty, to halt pending executions and to introduce a moratorium.

The EU will continue to monitor the situation of vulnerable individuals and groups in Iran and call on the country to abide by its international obligations and cease its discriminatory policies.s

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006832/12
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Cam Bank of Spain

I have been contacted by a constituent who has put his life savings in an account run by Cam Bank of Spain. On investing the money he was told in writing that his savings would be instantly accessible and repayment would be guaranteed, but he is currently being denied access to his funds.

Given that my constituent was given a written guarantee regarding access to his funds, could the Commission inform me what rights depositors with the bank have and if there is any EC law which obliges Sabadell, the new owner of the bank, to provide access to the funds invested with them?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The terms and conditions of the contract between the referred constituent and the bank are crucial to determine what rights this person has and what type of account/service he has entered into.

If the account in question has features of a payment account, i.e. its focus is to execute payment transactions, this account would fall under the scope of the PSD ([1]) and the provider would be obliged to transfer funds, if requested by the user. Savings accounts ([2]) can qualify as payment accounts within the meaning of the PSD. On the contrary, fixed term deposits would not be covered by this directive.

If the money was invested in a financial instrument (such as bonds) the MiFID ([3]) organisational and conduct of business rules would apply ([4]). However, the issue of the exact qualification of the service/financial instrument and of the possible misleading information provided by the credit institution requires the assessment of the specific circumstances of each case and falls under the competence of national competent authorities and courts.

EU depositors are protected by the DGS Directive ([5]). If deposits are unavailable (i.e. they are due and payable but have not been paid by a bank under the applicable legal and contractual conditions), the depositors shall be reimbursed by the DGS up to a certain amount. The DGS Directive is applicable to various deposits, e.g. checking and saving accounts, term deposits, etc. Some amounts entrusted to a bank may not qualify as deposits but as investment products, in which case they are covered by the ICS Directive ([6]). The determination that a deposit is unavailable or that the firm is unable to meet its obligations arising out of investors' claims is made by the competent authorities or by the judicial authority in accordance with national procedures.

([1]) Payment Services Directive 2007/64/EC.
([2]) Saving accounts where the user can place and withdraw funds without any additional intervention or agreement of his payment service provider.
([3]) Markets in Financial Instruments Directive 2004/39/EC.
([4]) Such rules clarify the conditions under which credit institutions may provide information about the financial instruments, including appropriate guidance and warnings on the risks associated with investments in those instruments, information about costs and associated charges).
([5]) Directive on Deposit Guarantee Schemes. Directive 94/19/EC as amended by Directive 2009/14/EC stipulates that deposits are protected up to EUR 100 000 per depositor per bank.
([6]) Directive on Investor Compensation Schemes. Directive 97/9/EC provides for a coverage level of at least EUR 20 000 per investor and per firm.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006833/12
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(9. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Wirksamkeit von Strafzahlungen bei Verstößen gegen die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005

Gemäß Artikel 25 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 über den Schutz von Tieren beim Transport sind die Mitgliedstaaten für Strafen bei Verstößen gegen die geltenden Bestimmungen sowie für deren Durchsetzung verantwortlich. Darüber hinaus besagt Artikel 25, dass die Sanktionen wirksam, verhältnismäßig und abschreckend sein müssen. In der Praxis hat sich jedoch gezeigt, dass die Strafen bei Verstößen gegen die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 in den Mitgliedstaaten sehr unterschiedlich sind.

Zu diesem Schluss kommen auch der Bericht „Schwäche des Tieres beim Transport — Verhängung monetärer Strafen — Eine vergleichende Studie über die Wirksamkeit und Abschreckung von Geldstrafen bei Verstößen gegen die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 unter den Hauptakteuren der EU“ und der Bericht „DG SANCO 2011/6052 MR — Abschlussbericht über die FVO Mission in Portugal vom 17.-25. Mai 2011“. Dazu heißt es auf Seite 9, dass „die langsamen administrativen Verfahren der Sanktionierung ihre Wirksamkeit schwächen“.

Welche Maßnahmen zur Überprüfung werden derzeit von der Kommission durchgeführt (bitte getrennt antworten), um

1. die einheitliche Anwendung von Geldstrafen bei Verstößen gegen die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 in den Mitgliedstaaten sicherzustellen und

2. die einheitliche Wirksamkeit der Strafen und die abschreckende Wirkung von Sanktionen bei Verstößen gegen die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 in den Mitgliedstaaten zu gewährleisten?

3. Wie wird die Kommission vorgehen, um die geltenden Regeln und Sanktionen der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 durchzusetzen und eine Überprüfung der Kriterien durchzuführen, bei der sichergestellt ist, dass die Sanktionen klar festgelegt, wirksam, verhältnismäßig und abschreckend sind?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(24. August 2012)

1. Die Mitgliedstaaten entscheiden, welches Maß an Sanktionen wirksam, verhältnismäßig und abschreckend ist. In Artikel 25 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 über den Schutz von Tieren beim Transport ([1]) wird nicht ausdrücklich verlangt, dass die von den Mitgliedstaaten festgelegten Sanktionen einheitlich sind.

2. Ob die von einem Mitgliedstaat festgelegten Sanktionen wirksam, verhältnismäßig und abschreckend sind, lässt sich nur im konkreten Fall eines Verstoßes oder eines Vergehens und angesichts dessen Schwere bewerten. Die abschreckende Wirkung kann daran gemessen werden, ob ein Vergehen wiederholt wird oder nicht. Die nominelle Höhe der Sanktionen ist nicht Gegenstand der Audits der Kommission, bei denen die Einhaltung der Tierschutzvorschriften der EU durch die Mitgliedstaaten bewertet wird ([2]). Vielmehr ist dies einer der Faktoren, nach denen sich bestimmen lässt, ob das EU-Recht vorschriftsmäßig durchgeführt wird.

Da im geltenden EU-Recht eine Bestimmung fehlt, welche die Kommission ermächtigt, in die Sanktionen nach der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 einzugreifen, hat sie nicht vor, Schritte in Verbindung mit der Verhängung von Sanktionen durch die Mitgliedstaaten zu unternehmen.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 des Rates über den Schutz von Tieren beim Transport und damit zusammenhängenden Vorgängen, ABl. L 3 vom 5.1.2005.

([2]) Diese Audits werden vom Lebensmittel- und Veterinäramt (FVO) der Generaldirektion Gesundheit und Verbraucher der Kommission durchgeführt, das seinen Sitz in Grange (Irland) hat.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006833/12
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Effectiveness of fines for infringements of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005

Under Article 25 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport, the Member States are responsible for penalties for infringements of the regulation and for ensuring that its provisions are implemented. Article 25 also stipulates that the penalties must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive. In practice, however, it has become clear that the penalties for infringements of the regulation in the various Member States differ significantly.

This is also the conclusion reached in a report entitled 'Weakness in the animal-transport monetary sanctions: a comparative study of the effectiveness, proportion and dissuasiveness of the monetary penalties applicable to infringements of Regulation EC 1/2005 among major players of the EU' and in the DG SANCO report No 2011/6052 MR 'Final Report of an Audit carried out in Portugal from 17 to 25 May 2011'. The point is made on page 9 of the latter report that 'slowness in the procedure for administrative sanctions renders them not sufficiently dissuasive'.

What monitoring measures is the Commission currently undertaking with a view to the following (please answer separately on each point):

1. ensuring the uniform use of fines for infringements of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 in the Member States;

2. providing for the uniform effectiveness of penalties for infringements of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 in the Member States and for such penalties to have a dissuasive effect?

How will the Commission proceed in order to enforce the rules and penalties applicable under Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, and to review the criteria for ensuring that the penalties are clearly laid down and are effective, proportionate and dissuasive?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

1. The competence to decide on which level of penalty is effective, proportionate and dissuasive lies with the Member States. Article 25 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport ([1]) does not explicitly require that the penalties laid down by the Member States are uniform.

2. Whether a Member State's penalty is effective, proportionate and dissuasive can only be evaluated if linked to a precise infringement or offence and contrasted against the gravity of the specific infringement or offence. In addition, the degree of dissuasiveness might be judged by the lack of repetition of the offence. The level of penalties as such is not singled out and evaluated during Commission audits of Member State's compliance with the requirements of EU animal welfare legislation ([2]). Instead, it remains one of the factors that would determine whether the EC law is properly implemented.

Given the fact that the applicable EU legislation has not provided the Commission with any empowerment in relation to penalties under Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, the Commission is not planning to take any specific action in relation to the Member States' use of penalties.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations, OJ L 3, 5.1.2005.
([2]) These audits are carried out by the Commission via its inspection service of Directorate General for Health and Consumers (FVO, Food and Veterinary Office), located in Grange, Ireland.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006834/12
to the Commission
Struan Stevenson (ECR)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Dual pricing structure for Maltese and non-Maltese residents

As the Commission is aware, the Maltese Government continues to practise a dual pricing scheme with regard to water and electricity bills, whereby non-Maltese EU citizens are charged more than the Maltese.

This type of discrimination is typical of the Maltese Government and I have previously written to Commissioner Reding (October 2011) regarding the discriminatory two-tier bus fare scheme for non-Maltese and Maltese residents.

The Commission stated in its reply to Written Question E-005535/2011 that:

'As regards, in particular, rebates for water and electricity tariffs in Malta, the Commission has contacted the Maltese authorities in order to request further information on this issue and is awaiting their reply.'

Could the Commission state:

1. whether the Maltese authorities have responded to its request for further information regarding rebates for water and electricity tariffs in Malta?

2. what steps it intends to carry out in order to ensure that the Maltese authorities fully uphold the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of nationality enshrined in Article 18 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and in Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005545/2012 ([1]).

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006835/12
alla Commissione
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(9 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Accesso ai mutui casa

Analizzando il mercato dell'immobile in Italia, una recentissima ricerca di Assofin, Crif e Prometeia ha stabilito che nel primo trimestre 2012 le erogazioni di mutui immobiliari per l'acquisto di nuove abitazioni sono crollate del 47 %. Secondo l'analisi, a scoraggiare la richiesta di finanziamenti per la casa abbiamo l'aumento dei tassi d'interesse applicati ai nuovi contratti e, ovviamente, anche l'irrigidimento dei criteri di concessione. Il calo più deciso è però riservato agli altri mutui (per ristrutturazione, liquidità, consolidamento del debito, surroga e sostituzione): dopo il — 24,9 % del 2011, nei primi tre mesi del 2012 sono scesi dell'80 % rispetto allo stesso periodo del 2011. Sul versante del credito, secondo il rapporto, nel corso del 2011 si è assistito a una conferma del trend negativo delle erogazioni di credito al consumo (-2,2 %), un trend che è diventato più marcato nella seconda parte dell'anno e che si è consolidato nel corso del primo trimestre 2012 (-11 % rispetto al 2011).

In riferimento alla risposta della Commissione del 24 gennaio 2012 all'interrogazione E-010502/2011, si rileva come la Commissione non abbia risposto al quesito sollevato in quell'interrogazione, e chiedo nuovamente:

— come valuta la Commissione l'impatto sul settore dei mutui ipotecari del pacchetto di proposte di direttive e di regolamento sui requisiti di capitale delle banche (CDR IV) alla luce dell'attuale crisi economica e finanziaria?

— in che modo i negoziati hanno tenuto conto della situazione estremamente negativa?

Risposta di Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(20 agosto 2012)

L'impatto delle nuove regole patrimoniali bancarie ([1]) sul settore del credito ipotecario dell'UE deve essere misurato prendendo come riferimento il cosiddetto scenario di base. In altri termini, l'impatto stimato dovrebbe essere misurato come l'impatto registrato in aggiunta agli altri sviluppi del mercato che si verificherebbero indipendentemente dall'entrata in vigore delle nuove regole ([2]).

In base alla valutazione d'impatto della Commissione che accompagna la sua proposta, lo stock di prestiti UE ([3]) dovrebbe scendere dell'1,8 % durante il periodo tra il 2020 e il 2030. Nel breve termine l'impatto dovrebbe essere persino più limitato a causa delle disposizioni transitorie proposte. Per quanto riguarda i prestiti ipotecari, il requisito patrimoniale complessivo dell'8 % non cambierà rispetto all'attuale livello. Il requisito del 3,5 % per il capitale di base di classe 1 ([4]) si applicherà a partire dal 2013 e salirà gradualmente al 4,5 % entro il 2015. La riserva di conservazione del capitale del 2,5 % sarà introdotta in quattro quote annuali dello 0,625 % solo a partire dal 2016. Le nuove regole saranno attuate gradualmente con un periodo di transizione compreso tra il 2013 e il 2019, volto specificamente a limitare l'impatto delle nuove regole nei prossimi anni, tenuto conto delle tensioni perduranti nel settore finanziario e dell'impatto sull'economia reale. A titolo generale, la Commissione fa notare che banche più solide e meglio capitalizzate rappresentano un vantaggio per tutti i consumatori e un prerequisito per riconquistare la fiducia dei mercati e ritornare ad una crescita sostenibile.

Come osservato dall'onorevole parlamentare, le proposte della Commissione sono attualmente negoziate dai colegislatori. La Commissione svolge un ruolo attivo in questo processo e spera in una rapida conclusione dei negoziati, prestando la debita attenzione all'impatto delle nuove regole sull'economia reale e sui consumatori.

([1]) Le proposte CRD 4 della Commissione.
([2]) Come, ad esempio, il calo dell'attività di erogazione di mutui ipotecari dovuto alla mancanza di fiducia del mercato e all'irrigidimento dei criteri di erogazione delle banche non dovuto ad alcun obbligo regolamentare.
([3]) Compresi i mutui ipotecari.
([4]) Che conta ai fini del rispetto del requisito patrimoniale complessivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006835/12
to the Commission
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Access to home loans

A recent survey of the property market in Italy conducted by Assofin, Crif and Prometeia shows that mortgage lending slumped by 47% in the first quarter of 2012. According to the survey, people were put off applying for home loans by the higher interest rates applied to new loans and, of course, the more stringent lending conditions. The biggest decrease, however, came in other types of loan (renovation, liquidity, debt consolidation, surrogate and substitution). After dropping by 24.9% in 2011, these slumped by 80% in 2012 compared to the same period in 2011. As regards consumer credit, the report shows that the downward trend in consumer credit lending in 2011 (-2.2%) accelerated in the second half of the year and continued into the first quarter of 2012 (-11% compared to the same period in 2011).

With reference to the Commission's answer of 24 January 2012 to Written Question E-010502/2011, in which it did not answer the issue raised, the Commission is again asked to state:

— what its assessment is of the impact on the mortgage sector of the package of proposals for directives and regulations on the subject of banks' capital requirements (CDR IV) in the context of the current economic and financial crisis?

— in what way the negotiations took into account the extremely adverse situation?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2012)

The impact on the EU mortgage sector of the new capital rules for banks ([1]) has to be measured against the so-called 'baseline' scenario. This means that the estimated impact should be measured as the impact which would occur in addition to other developments in the market which would take place regardless of the entry into force of any new rules ([2]).

According to the Commission's impact assessment that accompanied the proposal, the EU stock of loans ([3]) is estimated to drop by 1.8% during the period between 2020 and 2030. In the short term, the impact should be even more limited because of the transitional provisions proposed. As regards mortgage loans, the total capital requirement of 8% will not change compared to the current level. The 3.5% common equity tier 1 capital requirement ([4]) will apply as of 2013 and rise gradually to 4.5% by 2015. The 2.5% capital conservation buffer will be introduced in four annual instalments of 0.625% from 2016 only. The new rules will be implemented gradually with a transition period from 2013 to 2019, specifically designed to limit the extent of impact of the new rules over the coming years, taking into account continuous tensions in the financial sector and the impact on the real economy. As a general remark, the Commission would like to underline that more solid and better capitalised banks is an advantage for all consumers and a pre-requisite for market confidence and return to sustainable growth.

As noted by the Honourable Member, the Commission's proposals are currently being negotiated by the co-legislators. The Commission is taking an active role in this process and hopes for a speedy outcome of the negotiations, paying due attention to the impact of the new rules on the real economy and on consumers.

([1]) The Commission's CRD 4 proposals.
([2]) Such as, for example, a decline in mortgage lending activity due to lack of market confidence and banks' tightening of lending standards without any regulatory obligation to do so.
([3]) Including mortgages.
([4]) Which counts towards meeting the total capital requirement.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-006836/12
till kommissionen
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(9 juli 2012)

Angående: Tvångsarbete för barn i Uzbekistan

Den 15 december 2011 antog Europaparlamentet en resolution om de utvidgade bestämmelserna i EU:s partnerskap och samarbetsavtal med Uzbekistan. I resolutionen påpekas bland annat den allvarliga situationen vad gäller de mänskliga rättigheterna i Uzbekistan.

Resolutionen betonar särskilt, i 14 specifika punkter, vikten av kraftfulla åtgärder mot användningen av tvångsarbete för barn i Uzbekistan. Resolutionen understryker att Europaparlamentet ”inte kommer att ge sitt godkännande förrän ILO-observatörer getts tillstånd av de uzbekistanska myndigheterna att göra en noggrann granskning utan att hindras, och har bekräftat att konkreta reformer har genomförts och gett påtagliga resultat på ett sådant sätt att praxis med tvångsarbete för barn och annat tvångsarbete i praktiken är på väg att avskaffas på nationell, regional och lokal nivå.”

Jag skulle vilja veta vilka åtgärder kommissionen vidtagit för att följa upp denna resolution, och hur den uzbekiska regeringen har reagerat på dessa åtgärder?

Svar från Karel De Gucht på kommissionens vägnar
(14 augusti 2012)

Under årens lopp har EU noga följt situationen för mänskliga rättigheter, inklusive barnarbete, i Uzbekistan. Man har tagit upp frågan om tvångsarbete för barn vid ett flertal tillfällen, även på högsta nivå, antingen som ett led i den strukturerade dialogen om de mänskliga rättigheterna eller inom ramen för den politiska dialogen. Kommissionen kommer att fortsätta göra det i framtiden.

Uzbekistan bjöd in kommissionen och Internationella arbetsorganisationen (ILO) till ett internationellt seminarium i Tasjkent den 2 maj 2012. I anslutning till denna händelse diskuterade kommissionen och ILO vägen framåt med de uzbekiska myndigheterna. Med kommissionens aktiva stöd kommer dessa diskussioner att fortsätta med sikte på att låta ILO övervaka genomförandet av ILO-konventionerna i Uzbekistan.

Vid mötet för den tionde samarbetskommittén EU-Uzbekistan, vilket ägde rum i Tasjkent den 19 juli 2012, upprepade kommissionen sin ståndpunkt för de uzbekiska myndigheterna.

Samtidigt kan även EU:s övergripande strategi för att stödja en hållbar ekonomisk och social utveckling i landet ha positiva, indirekta effekter. Diversifiering av jordbruksproduktionen och ekonomisk utveckling i landsbygdsområden är de centrala målsättningarna för ett kommande program för utvecklingssamarbete som ska genomföras i Uzbekistan.

Frågan om barnarbete har också en viktig roll i den nyligen antagna EU-strategin för mänskliga rättigheter för Uzbekistan.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006836/12
to the Commission
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Forced child labour in Uzbekistan

On 15 December 2011 the European Parliament adopted a resolution on extending the provisions of the EU's Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with Uzbekistan. The resolution highlighted among other things the serious human rights situation in Uzbekistan.

In particular, in 14 specific points, the resolution stresses the importance of strong measures to combat forced child labour in Uzbekistan. It states that Parliament 'will only consider the consent if the ILO observers have been granted access by the Uzbek authorities to undertake close and unhindered monitoring and have confirmed that concrete reforms have been implemented and yielded substantial results in such a way that the practice of forced labour and child labour is effectively in the process of being eradicated at national, viloyat [regional] and local level'.

What measures has the Commission taken to follow up this resolution, and how has the Uzbek Government reacted to these measures?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2012)

Over the years, the EU has been closely following the situation of human rights, including child labour, in Uzbekistan. It has raised its concerns on forced child labour on numerous occasions, including at the highest level, be it as part of the structured dialogue on human rights or under its political dialogue. The Commission will continue to do so in the future.

Uzbekistan invited the Commission and the UN International Labour Office (ILO) to an international seminar in Tashkent on 2 May 2012. In the margins of this event, the Commission and the ILO discussed with the Uzbek authorities the way forward. With the active support of the Commission, these discussions continue with a view to allow the ILO to observe implementation of ILO Conventions in Uzbekistan.

On the occasion of the 10th EU-Uzbekistan Cooperation Committee, which was held in Tashkent on 19 July 2012, the Commission reiterated its position to the Uzbek authorities.

Meanwhile, the overall EU approach for supporting the sustainable economic and social development of the country may also have indirect positive effects. Diversification of the agricultural production and economic development in rural areas are in fact the key objectives of a forthcoming development cooperation programme to be implemented in Uzbekistan.

The issue of child labour also features prominently in the recently adopted EU Human Rights strategy for Uzbekistan.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-006837/12
a la Comisión
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(9 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: Contrataciones en las Islas Canarias

Distintos medios de comunicación en Canarias se han hecho eco de las declaraciones del Gobierno de Canarias en las que se afirma que «La Unión Europea ha admitido que las administraciones públicas puedan exigir la contratación de trabajadores residentes en las islas a las empresas adjudicatarias de concursos públicos».

Igualmente, el Gobierno afirma que «Bruselas entiende que este requisito no produce discriminación alguna».

1. ¿Ha autorizado la Comisión al Gobierno de Canarias expresamente para que se pueda exigir la contratación de residentes en las islas a las empresas adjudicatarias de concursos públicos?

2. De ser esto así, ¿considera la Comisión que no se produciría discriminación ni directa ni indirecta en relación con las libertades de establecimiento y de prestación de servicios?

3. De haberse producido esta autorización, ¿cuáles son los términos exactos de dicha autorización?

4. Dicha exigencia sería conforme al principio de no discriminación por razón de nacionalidad consagrado en el Tratado.

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de agosto de 2012)

La Comisión desea informar a Su Señoría de que no tiene constancia de ninguna petición del Gobierno de las Islas Canarias para ser autorizado a exigir la contratación de trabadores residentes en las islas a las empresas adjudicatarias de contratos públicos.

La Comunicación de la Comisión «Las regiones ultraperiféricas de la Unión Europea: hacia una asociación en pos de un crecimiento inteligente, sostenible e integrador» ([1]) contempla lo siguiente: «Los órganos de contratación de las regiones ultraperiféricas pueden exigir a las empresas a las que se concede un contrato público que contraten mano de obra local, siempre y cuando no exista discriminación directa ni indirecta en relación con la libertad de establecimiento y de prestación de servicios y se eviten los conflictos de intereses.».

Esta Comunicación reconoce la situación específica de las regiones ultraperiféricas, que puede tenerse en cuenta en la contratación pública, pero sin que ello afecte a las libertades básicas y al correcto funcionamiento del mercado interior. Por esta razón, los órganos de contratación de las regiones ultraperiféricas no pueden interpretar el texto anterior como una autorización de exigir en sus licitaciones la contratación de mano de obra local para la ejecución de sus contratos públicos, sino que deben evaluar cuidadosamente caso por caso si los requisitos laborales que prevean pueden dar lugar a cualquier discriminación directa o indirecta.

([1]) COM(2012) 287.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006837/12
to the Commission
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(9 July 2012)

Subject: Employment in the Canary Islands

Various media sources in the Canary Islands have reported statements made by the regional government to the effect that 'the EU has allowed public administrations to require that companies awarded public contracts employ residents of the islands'.

The Canary Islands Government has also claimed that 'Brussels understands that this requirement does not involve any form of discrimination'.

1. Has the Commission expressly authorised the Government of the Canary Islands to require that companies awarded public contracts employ residents of the islands?

2. If so, does the Commission consider this not to involve any direct or indirect discrimination in terms of freedom of establishment and provision of services?

3. If such an authorisation has been granted, what are its exact terms?

4. Does this requirement comply with the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of nationality enshrined in the Treaty?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(10 August 2012)

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that it is not aware of any request of the Government of the Canary Islands to be authorised to require employment of residents of the islands by the companies which are awarded public contracts.

The Commission's Communication 'The outermost regions of the European Union: towards a partnership for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth' ([1]) provides that 'Contracting authorities in the OR may require the hiring of local labour by the enterprises to which a public contract has been awarded, as long as there is no direct or indirect discrimination regarding the freedom of establishment and freedom to provide services and conflicts of interests are prevented and avoided.'

The above Communication recognises the specific situation of OR, that may be taken into account in public procurement, but without affecting the basic freedoms and the good functioning of the internal market. For this reason, contracting authorities in the OR cannot interpret the above paragraph as a general permission to require in their tenders the hiring of local labour for the execution of their public contracts, but they need to assess carefully on a case by case basis if the specific labour requirements they envisage may create any direct or indirect discrimination.

([1]) COM(2012) 287.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-006838/12
an die Kommission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(10. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Luftfahrt — Stellungnahme 1/2012 der EASA zu nicht-kommerziellen komplexen Flugzeugen (NCC)

Die Europäische Agentur für Flugsicherheit (EASA) hat neue Vorschriften für den Betrieb von nicht-kommerziellen komplexen Flugzeugen (non-commercial complex, NCC) zur weiteren Behandlung im Komitologie-Verfahren vorgelegt.

Bei der Definition der Kategorie NCC geht die EASA dabei deutlich über die von der ICAO geforderte Definition hinaus und bezieht auch mehrmotorige TurboProp-Flugzeuge in diese Kategorie mit ein. In Verbindung mit der Einzelvorschrift NCC.Pol.125 und dem hierin geforderten Rahmen für die Berechnung der notwendigen Startstrecke (bzw. Accelerate-Stop-Distance) wird dies bei einem Inkrafttreten der Vorschrift dazu führen, dass die für die Geschäftsfliegerei wichtigen und besonders sicheren zweimotorigen TurboProp-Flugzeuge nicht mehr von typischen europäischen Regionalflughäfen aus operieren dürfen, was zu einer Bedrohung für die gesamte Branche und vorgehaltene Infrastruktur wird.

1. Ist sich die Kommission der Tatsache bewusst, dass die Definition der Kategorie NCC seitens der EASA nicht ICAO-konform ausgestaltet wurde?

2. Hat die Kommission Kenntnis darüber, wie viele Flugzeughalter und Regionalflughäfen in Europa betroffen sein werden und, hat die Kommission die möglichen Auswirkungen dieser Vorschrift einer wirtschaftlichen Folgenabschätzung unterzogen?

3. Sieht die Kommission in dem einzigen offensichtlichen Ausweg für betroffene Flugzeughalter, dem Ersatz zweimotoriger durch einmotorige TurboProp-Flugzeuge (die nicht von diesen neuen Vorschriften betroffen sind), einen Sicherheitsgewinn für die allgemeine Luftfahrt in Europa?

4. Erwägt die Kommission bei der Abfassung ihrer Verordnung eine Abweichung von dem Entwurf der EASA?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(13. August 2012)

1. Das Europäische Parlament und der Rat haben sich 2008 bei der Annahme der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 216/2008 über den Anwendungsbereich und die Grundsätze künftiger EU-Vorschriften für den nichtgewerblichen Luftverkehr geeinigt, auch über Begriffsbestimmungen und Kriterien für die Bewertung der Komplexität von Luftfahrzeugen. Diese Begriffsbestimmungen haben in einigen Bereichen zur Folge, dass die Durchführungsbestimmungen strenger sein müssen als die von der Internationalen Zivilluftfahrt-Organisation (ICAO) festgelegten Richtlinien.

2. Die von der EASA erstellten Abschlussunterlagen zum nichtgewerblichen Luftverkehr mit technisch komplexen motorgetriebenen Luftfahrzeugen sind das Ergebnis eines dreijährigen umfassenden Konsultationsverfahrens mit den betroffenen Interessengruppen und werden durch die Folgenabschätzung der EASA ergänzt, die auf der EASA-Webseite veröffentlicht ist und auch die wirtschaftlichen Folgen berücksichtigt. Besonderes Augenmerk wird auch den möglichen Auswirkungen auf die allgemeine Luftfahrt gewidmet, die Gegenstand der Mitteilung der Kommission vom 11. Januar 2008 zur „Agenda für eine nachhaltige Zukunft der allgemeinen Luftfahrt und der Geschäftsreiseluftfahrt“ ([1]) ist.

3. Die Kommission möchte betonen, dass für den Betrieb von Luftfahrzeugen aller Kategorien strenge Regeln für die jeweilige Kategorie gelten. Das dem nichtgewerblichen Luftverkehr innewohnende höhere Risiko beim Betrieb technisch komplexer motorgetriebener Luftfahrzeuge ist das maßgebende Kriterium für die Festlegung strengerer Anforderungen für den Start, auf die der Herr Abgeordnete Bezug nimmt. Im Legislativverfahren wird die Notwendigkeit berücksichtigt sicherzustellen, dass alle neuen verbindlichen Vorschriften einerseits einfach, verhältnismäßig und kosteneffektiv sind und andererseits der Komplexität der betreffenden Tätigkeit und dem Risiko für Fluggäste und Dritte Rechnung tragen.

4. Die EASA-Stellungnahme Nr. 01/2012 zum nichtgewerblichen Luftverkehr wurde am 1. Februar 2012 veröffentlicht und durchläuft zurzeit das übliche Ausschussverfahren.

([1]) KOM(2007)869 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006838/12
to the Commission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Air travel — EASA Opinion No 1/2012 on non-commercial complex (NCC) aircraft

The European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) has put forward new rules on the operation of non-commercial complex (NCC) aircraft for further discussion under the comitology procedure.

The definition of NCC aircraft as a category in EASA's proposal is considerably broader than that required by the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), including as it does multi-engine turboprop aircraft. In association with regulation No NCC.Pol.125, stipulating parameters for the calculation of required take-off distance (and accelerate-stop distance), this will have the effect, when the rules come into force, of making it impossible for the particularly safe twin-engine turboprop aircraft that are so important for business travel to continue flying out of typical European regional airports — thus putting the entire sector and the relevant infrastructure at risk.

1. Is the Commission aware that EASA's definition of the NCC category is not consistent with that of ICAO?

2. Does the Commission know how many aircraft owners and regional airports in Europe will be affected, and has it carried out an economic impact assessment in relation to the possible consequences of the rules in question?

3. In the Commission's view, does the only obvious solution for the aircraft owners affected — namely to replace twin-engine turboprop aircraft with single-engine aircraft (which do not come under the new rules) — represent a safety gain for air travel in Europe generally?

4. In drafting its regulation on the matter, would the Commission consider departing from EASA's proposed provisions?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(13 August 2012)

1. The European Parliament and the Council in 2008 agreed , when adopting Regulation 216/2008 on the scope and the principles concerning future EU rules on non-commercial air operations, including definitions and criteria for assessing the complexity of aircraft. These definitions imply in some areas that implementation rules may, have to be stricter than standards set by the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO).

2. The final deliverables prepared by EASA on non-commercial operations with complex motor-powered aircraft resulted from a three-year, extensive consultation process with the stakeholders concerned and are accompanied by EASA's regulatory impact assessment, published on the EASA website, which also covered the economic implications. Particular attention is also paid to the potential impact on general aviation as presented in the communication of the Commission of 11 January 2008, 'An Agenda for Sustainable Future in General and Business Aviation' ([1]).

3. The Commission wishes to underline that each aircraft category operates under strict rules designed for that category. The higher risk inherent in non-commercial operations with complex motor-powered aircraft is the leading criterion for determining the more stringent requirements for take-off mentioned by the Honourable Member. In the course of the legislative process, due regard is paid to the need to ensure that any new binding rule is on the one hand simple, proportionate, cost-effective and, on the other, reflects the complexity of the activity in question and the risk to passengers and third parties.

4. The EASA Opinion No 01/2012 on non-commercial operations was published on 1st February 2012 and is now going through the normal comitology process.

([1]) COM(2007)869 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-006839/12
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Subsidies paid towards vessels benefitting from fisheries partnership agreements

1. Will the Commission confirm that it maintains a record of all EU vessels fishing under fisheries partnership agreements, including their name, flag, external marking, details of the owner of the vessel, subsidies of any kind paid towards the vessel's construction or equipping, and record of any IUU infringements, as well as similar details for EU vessels fishing under agreements between individual Member States and third countries?

2. If the Commission does not keep such records, will it explain how it is able properly to monitor the use of EU funds and respect for EU requirements?

3. If such records are maintained, will it publish them now in response to this question or provide details of where they can be publicly inspected?

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

In accordance with Regulation 1006/2008 of 29 September 2008, Member States have the obligation to support their applications for fishing authorisations under Fisheries Partnership Agreements (FPA) with information that includes in particular the EU fishing fleet register identification number and the international radio call sign of the vessel concerned.

The information is kept in the EU fishing authorisation information system for all EU fishing vessels entitled to fish under FPAs. In accordance with Regulation 1006/2008, this data is made available on a secure website for authorised users involved in the management and control of authorisations. As regards information on IUU infringements, the same Regulation provides that fishing authorisations may not be granted to vessels that are included in an IUU vessel list or have been subject to sanction proceedings during the past 12 months.

The data provided does not include information on the public financial support to vessel owners under the European Fisheries Fund. Such information is kept in Member State databases and can be made available on request within the context of the monitoring of the implementation of the fund. In addition, under the obligation of information and publicity, Member States shall publish the list of beneficiaries, the name of the operations and the amount of public funds allocated. However, following recent case law of the European Court of Justice, in order to protect the privacy of natural persons, their names shall be excluded from the information published. It is therefore not possible for the Commission to provide records on the amount of public support specifically provided to vessels fishing under FPAs.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-006840/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(10 de julio de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Violación de los Derechos Humanos en Perú: Estado de emergencia, represión, violencia policial y detenciones ilegales: Cinco personas asesinadas en las protestas del Conga

Durante las últimas manifestaciones masivas en contra del proyecto minero de Conga (Cajamarca, Perú) que tuvieron lugar el pasado fin de semana, cinco personas fueron asesinadas, entre ellas un niño menor de edad, y más de una treintena heridas mientras protestaban contra el proyecto minero de Cajamarca.

Estos asesinatos se enmarcan dentro del contexto de represión y violencia que están sufriendo las comunidades locales de las provincias de Cajamarca, Hualgayoc y Celendín por su firme y mayoritario rechazo a los proyectos mineros que varias multinacionales quieren ejecutar en estos territorios. Concretamente, existe un rechazo mayoritario entre el campesinado, que lleva ya más de un mes en huelga indefinida, al megaproyecto Conga, de la transnacional Newmont Mining Corporation, que de ejecutarse afectará a cinco valles, destruirá 34 hectáreas de lagunas y cinco cabeceras de cuenca, 260 hectáreas de bofedales y 17 200 de pajonales, siendo negativamente afectados alrededor de 12 000 campesinos y campesinas.

Todos los sectores políticos, sociales y religiosos de la región se oponen a este proyecto puesto que supone el expolio, la destrucción del medio ambiente y el empeoramiento de la situación de los campesinos y campesinas de estas regiones. Frente a esto, Organismos internacionales, como la Comisión Interamericana de Derechos Humanos, y organizaciones no gubernamentales en defensa de los derechos humanos, están exigiendo al Gobierno peruano que se esclarezcan los hechos de violencia y se adopten los mecanismos necesarios para evitar la violencia de los agentes públicos en actos de protesta, marchas y manifestaciones.

Teniendo en cuenta la gravedad de la situación, que la Unión Europea está a las puertas de firmar un Acuerdo Comercial con Colombia y Perú, que supuestamente se sustenta y legitima en el respeto y el avance de los derechos humanos y los principios democráticos;

1. ¿Ha expresado formal y públicamente la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante su preocupación por la represión en las regiones citadas, así como por las graves consecuencias sociales, económicas y medioambientales que tendrá la ejecución del megaproyecto minero?

2. ¿Ha expresado la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante la necesidad de que el Gobierno peruano permita, promueva y facilite la participación ciudadana en la toma de decisiones, respetando su voluntad, como premisas básicas de un modelo democrático?

3. ¿Ha exigido la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante el fin de la violencia represiva policial contra las comunidades locales y la investigación de los asesinatos cometidos?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(24 de agosto de 2012)

El tema de los conflictos sociales ligados a la inversión en la minería, como el proyecto Conga, fue planteado al más alto nivel por los Presidentes del Consejo Europeo y de la Comisión Europea durante la visita del Presidente Humala a las instituciones de la UE de los días 12 y 13 de junio de 2012. También se debatió esta cuestión entre los Diputados del Parlamento Europeo y el Presidente Humala cuando este visitó el Parlamento Europeo en Estrasburgo. Los líderes de la UE hicieron hincapié en la importancia de promover en Perú un desarrollo socioeconómico integrador y se congratularon de los progresos realizados en el aumento de la participación ciudadana en el proceso de toma de decisiones en proyectos de extracción como Conga, por ejemplo, la reciente promulgación de una ley sobre la consulta previa a los pueblos indígenas, que ha sido también elogiada, entre otros, por la Comisión Interamericana de Derechos Humanos. El Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior toma nota de que, tras la remodelación del Gobierno el 23 de julio de 2012, el nuevo Primer Ministro, Juan Jiménez Mayor, ha puesto de manifiesto el firme compromiso del Gobierno de abordar la cuestión de los conflictos sociales mediante un diálogo reforzado. En su discurso sobre el estado de la nación el 28 de julio de 2012, el Presidente Humala reconoció la necesidad de mejorar el marco jurídico y político de Perú a fin de conciliar las actividades extractivas con los intereses legítimos en la conservación de los recursos naturales y también de mejorar la prevención y la gestión de los conflictos sociales en el país.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006840/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Human rights violations in Peru: state of emergency, repression, police brutality and illegal detentions: five people murdered in protests against Conga project

During the most recent large-scale protests against the Conga mining project (Cajamarca, Peru) that took place last weekend, five protestors were killed — one of whom was under 18 years old — and over thirty were injured.

These acts of murder fit into a wider context of repression and violence against the local communities of Cajamarca, Hualgayoc and Celendín provinces for their widespread rejection of the mining projects that a number of multinationals wish to carry out on their territory. Specifically, the rural population is largely opposed to the multinational Newmont Mining Corporation's huge Conga project and is more than one month into an indefinite strike against this project that would stretch across five valleys and would destroy 34 hectares of lakes, five river basin headwaters, 260 hectares of wetlands and 17 200 hectares of scrubland, affecting the lives of some 12 000 peasants.

The project is opposed by all sectors of society — from the political to the religious spheres — in the region, since it would entail plundering natural resources, destroying the environment and harming the rural population. International organisations such as the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and human rights NGOs are also calling on the Peruvian Government to throw light on these acts of violence and set up systems to prevent the use of violence by the security forces at demonstrations, protests and marches.

In view of the gravity of the situation, and given that the EU is poised to sign a trade agreement with Colombia and Peru, which supposedly enshrines respect for and the advancement of human rights,

1. Has the Vice-President/High Representative expressed her concern at the violent repression in these regions and at the serious social, economic and environmental consequences of this mining project?

2. Has the Vice-President/High Representative stressed the need for the Peruvian Government to allow, facilitate and encourage the public's involvement in the decision-making process, making respect for its will a fundamental principle of democracy?

3. Has the Vice-President/High Representative called for an end to police brutality against these local communities and for an investigation into these murders?

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

The topic of social conflict linked to investment in mining, such as the Conga project, was raised at the highest level, by the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission, during the visit of President Humala to the EU institutions on 12 and 13 June 2012. There were also discussions on the issue between Honourable Members of the European Parliament and President Humala when the latter visited the EP in Strasbourg. The EU leaders stressed the importance of promoting inclusive socioeconomic development in Peru and welcomed progress achieved in enhancing public involvement in the decision-making process for extractive projects like Conga, for example the recent enactment of a law on prior consultation of indigenous peoples that has also been praised by, among others, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. The European External Action Service notes that, following a Cabinet reshuffle on 23 July 2012, the new Prime Minister, Juan Jiménez Mayor, has pledged the government's strong commitment to address the issue of social conflicts through enhanced dialogue. In his state of the nation address on 28 July 2012, President Humala acknowledged the need to improve further Peru's legal and policy framework with a view to reconciling extractive activities with legitimate interests in preserving natural resources, and also to improve the prevention and management of social conflict in the country.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-006841/12
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(10. juli 2012)

Om: Pesticidrester i frugt, grønt og kornprodukter

Danske medier bragte den 7. juli en række indslag om fund af pesticidrester i mad. En gennemgang af Fødevarestyrelsens stikprøvekontroller for 2011 viser, at der findes pesticider i hver anden frugt, grøntsag eller kornprodukt. I nogle af prøverne er grænseværdierne overskredet, i visse tilfælde med helt op til 80 procent. En række nye amerikanske undersøgelser viser, at pesticider er skadelige — særligt for fostre. Det er tilsyneladende især hjernen, som ikke kan tåle pesticiderne. Frugt, grønt og kornprodukter indeholder ofte også flere slags pesticider, men som det er i dag, foretages EU's risikovurderinger imidlertid kun på enkeltstofniveau, hvor der ikke tages højde for den samlede sundhedsskadelige effekt af pesticidrester. Endelig har indslagene i de danske medier afsløret, at der er forskel på, dels hvor meget landmændene i de enkelte medlemsstater anvender pesticider (og dermed på, hvor mange rester, der er i fødevarerne), dels på omfanget af medlemsstaternes stikprøvekontroller. Sverige og Tyskland tjekker for eksempel for betydeligt flere typer af pesticider end Danmark.

Mit spørgsmål er derfor: I lyset af de nye oplysninger og fund, hvornår har Kommissionen så tænkt sig at revurdere niveauet for pesticiders grænseværdier, så de tager hensyn til mulige skadevirkninger på mennesker og fostre, herunder også den effekt, der kan opstå ved lang tids påvirkning? Har Kommissionen snarlige planer om at indarbejde cocktaileffekter i risikovurderingen af pesticider? Og endelig: Hvornår vil Kommissionen fremsætte forslag om at ensrette og forbedre pesticidkontrollen på EU-niveau, så borgerne alle steder kan være sikre på, at der holdes tilstrækkeligt øje med fødevarernes sundhed?

Hvis f.eks. danske forbrugere skal være sikre på, at der ikke forekommer gift eller kun forekommer meget lave doser af gift i maden, skal de enten købe økologisk eller danskproducerede grøntsager. At forbrugerne ikke kan være trygge ved alle fødevarer på det indre marked, finder jeg dybt bekymrende. Hvad vil Kommissionen gøre for at styrke forbrugernes tillid til, at europæisk frugt og grønt ikke er giftholdige?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af John Dalli
(24. august 2012)

I EU's gældende lovgivning om maksimalgrænseværdier for pesticider i fødevarer (forordning (EF) nr. 396/2005) ([1]) er der allerede taget hensyn til beskyttelse af sårbare befolkningsgrupper, f.eks. børn og fostre, og langvarig daglig eksponering gennem et helt liv. Lovgivningen indeholder også bestemmelser om en gennemgang af de eksisterende maksimalgrænseværdier, og denne er i gang.

Vedrørende samlet risikovurdering, dvs. for at tage hensyn »cocktailvirkninger«, konkluderede det relevante ekspertpanel under Den Europæiske Fødevaresikkerhedsautoritet, at indførelsen af sådanne nye metoder kræver yderligere undersøgelser. Når en valideret metode er til rådighed, vil Kommissionen og medlemsstaterne tage stilling til gennemførelsen af den.

I henhold til ovennævnte lovgivning sker kontrol af pesticidrester efter en tostrenget tilgang: et samordnet EU-kontrolprogram og nationale kontrolprogrammer. Dette giver mulighed for en harmoniseret kontrol, samtidig med at medlemsstaterne har fleksibilitet til at koncentrere en del af deres aktiviteter efter nationale behov, f.eks. på baggrund af forskelle i kostvaner eller landbrugspraksis.

Kommissionen vil gerne forsikre det ærede medlem om, at fødevarer på markedet overalt i EU skal opfylde de samme strenge kriterier for pesticidrester, uanset deres oprindelse. Kommissionen vil fortsætte samarbejdet med Den Europæiske Fødevaresikkerhedsautoritet og medlemsstaterne om at bevare disse høje standarder, således at forbrugerne kan have tillid til, at deres fødevarer er sikre.

([1]) Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 396/2005 af 23. februar 2005 om maksimalgrænseværdier for pesticidrester i eller på vegetabilske og animalske fødevarer og foderstoffer og om ændring af Rådets direktiv 91/414/EØF (EUT L 70 af 16.3.2005, s. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006841/12
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Pesticide residues in fruit, vegetables and cereal products

On 7 July there were a number of reports in the Danish media concerning pesticide residues found in food. The Danish Veterinary and Food Administration's spot-checks for 2011 show that there are pesticides in every second item of fruit, vegetables and cereal products. In some of the samples the limit value was exceeded, in some cases by as much as 80%. A number of new American studies show that pesticides are harmful, particularly to unborn babies, with the brain apparently being particularly vulnerable. Furthermore, fruit, vegetables and cereal products often contain several kinds of pesticide, but as things stand at present the EU risk assessments are carried out only at single-substance level, where no account is taken of the combined adverse effect of pesticide residues on health. Finally, the Danish media reports also revealed that it makes a difference, firstly, how many farmers in the individual Member States use pesticides (and thus how many residues the foodstuffs contain) and, secondly, to what extent the Member State carries out spot checks. Sweden and Germany, for example, check for significantly fewer types of pesticide than Denmark.

I should therefore like to ask:

In the light of the new information and findings, when does the Commission envisage reviewing the level for pesticide limit values so that they take account of possible adverse effects on humans and unborn babies, including the effects which may arise from long-term exposure? Has the Commission any plans to include 'cocktail effects' in its risk assessment of pesticides in the near future? And finally, when will the Commission submit proposals to harmonise and improve pesticide checks at EU level, so that people everywhere can be certain that adequate attention is being paid to ensuring the wholesomeness of food?

If Danish consumers, for example, want to be sure that their food contains no toxins, or only very low doses, they have to buy either organic or Danish-produced vegetables. I find it deeply worrying that consumers cannot be sure about all foodstuffs on the internal market. What will the Commission do to enhance consumer confidence that European fruit and vegetables are not toxic to eat?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

Current EU legislation on maximum residue levels of pesticides in food (Regulation (EC) No 396/2005) ([1]) already takes into account the protection of sensitive groups within the population, e.g. children and the unborn, and long-term daily exposure over a lifetime. The legislation also provides for a review of existing maximum residue levels, which is ongoing.

Regarding cumulative risk assessment, i.e. to include 'cocktail effects', the relevant expert panel of the European Food Safety Authority concluded that the application of such new methodologies still requires further work. Once a validated approach is available, the Commission and Member States will consider its implementation.

Under the abovementioned legislation, checks on pesticide residues follow a two-tier approach: a coordinated EU control programme and national control programmes. This allows for harmonised controls while giving Member States the flexibility to focus part of their activities according to national requirements, e.g. given the differences in dietary consumption or agricultural practices.

The Commission would like to reassure the Honourable Member that food products on the market anywhere in the EU must comply with the same strict criteria on pesticide residues, regardless of their origin. The Commission will continue working with the European Food Safety Authority and the Member States to maintain these high standards so that consumers can be confident about the safety of their food.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 of the Parliament and of the Council of 23 February 2005 on maximum residue levels of pesticides in or on food and feed of plant and animal origin and amending Council Directive 91/414/EEC, OJ L 70, 16.3.2005.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006842/12
an die Kommission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(10. Juli 2012)

Betrifft: Überarbeitung der Richtlinie über Tabakerzeugnisse (2001/37/EG)

Die Richtlinie über Tabakerzeugnisse befindet sich gerade im Revisionsprozess. Gesundheitskommissar John Dalli hatte Anfang des Jahres angekündigt, dass der Vorschlag im 4. Quartal 2012 an das Parlament übergeben wird. Der zyprische Gesundheitsminister hat jedoch beim Austausch mit dem ENVI-Ausschuss am 9. Juli 2012 bekannt gegeben, dass der Vorschlag unter zyprischer Ratspräsidentschaft nicht mehr beraten werden wird.

1. Hat sich der Zeitplan im Hinblick auf den Vorschlag seitens der Kommission geändert? Wenn ja, was sind die Gründe für diese neuerliche Verschiebung des Vorlegens des Vorschlags?

2. Wann kann das Europäische Parlament mit einem Vorschlag von der Kommission rechnen?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(23. August 2012)

Die zeitliche Planung für die Überarbeitung der Richtlinie 2001/37/EG über Tabakerzeugnisse ([1]) ist unverändert. Die Kommission möchte den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-002441/2012 ([2]) verweisen, die nach wie vor Gültigkeit hat.

([1]) Richtlinie 2001/37/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 5. Juni 2001 zur Angleichung der Rechts- und Verwaltungsvorschriften der Mitgliedstaaten über die Herstellung, die Aufmachung und den Verkauf von Tabakerzeugnissen, ABl. L 194 vom 18.7.2001.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-002441&language=DE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006842/12
to the Commission
Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Revision of the Tobacco Products Directive (2001/37/EC)

The Tobacco Products Directive is currently under revision. Commissioner for Health John Dalli announced at the beginning of the year that the proposal would be submitted to Parliament in the fourth quarter of 2012. However, the Cyprus Minister for Health stated, in an exchange with the ENVI Committee on 9 July 2012, that the proposal would not be discussed further during the Cyprus Council Presidency.

1. Has the timetable regarding the proposal changed from the Commission's point of view? If so, why has the submission of the proposal again been postponed?

2. When can Parliament expect to receive a proposal from the Commission?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(23 August 2012)

The timetable regarding the revision of the Tobacco Products Directive 2001/37/EC ([1]) has not changed. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-002441/2012 ([2]) which is still valid.

([1]) Directive 2001/37/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 5 June 2001 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco products — Commission statement, OJ L 194, 18.7.2001.

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2012-002441&language=EN.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006843/12
alla Commissione
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(10 luglio 2012)

Oggetto: Bassi tassi di natalità in Europa

In tutta Europa si registra una riduzione dei tassi di natalità e delle dimensioni delle famiglie. Attualmente tutti gli Stati membri presentano un tasso di natalità globale inferiore a due figli per donna, cosicché la popolazione europea è caratterizzata da un crescita molto lenta o da un iniziale declino.

Da uno studio condotto in quindici paesi europei emerge una prova cruciale: nel 2011 sul totale dei paesi presi in esame, undici hanno fatto registrare una riduzione del tasso di natalità. In Spagna, ad esempio, il tasso di natalità è passato dall'1,46 del 2008 all'1,38 nel 2011, mentre in Norvegia dall'1,95 del 2010 ha raggiunto l'1,88 nel 2011.

La ricerca in materia rimane controversa. Se infatti alcuni studi dimostrano che l'incertezza economica incide negativamente sul tasso di natalità, altri arrivano alla conclusione opposta, vale a dire che la recessione fa aumentare il numero delle nascite.

Un altro dato interessante riguarda l'età a cui le donne fanno figli. Negli anni Settanta, in genere, le donne avevano il primo figlio tra i ventidue e i venticinque anni. Oggi invece l'età si è notevolmente alzata, ed è compresa tra i ventisette e i ventinove anni. Si riscontra pertanto una tendenza a posticipare la creazione di una famiglia. Una soluzione interessante sarebbe quella di ricompensare le donne che decidono di avere più di un figlio.

1. Ha provveduto la Commissione ad effettuare ricerche in merito a questa problematica e ai suoi possibili effetti sulla crescita economica nell'UE?

2. Ha la Commissione elaborato un piano per contrastare la diminuzione dei tassi di natalità? In caso contrario, intende la Commissione valutare l'elaborazione di tale piano d'azione?

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

1. Nel 2011 la Commissione ha finanziato una nuova tornata di indagini Eurobarometro sulle dimensioni delle famiglie ([1]). Informazioni su altri progetti di ricerca finanziati dall'UE in tema di fertilità sono reperibili sul sito web dell'Alleanza europea per le famiglie (www.europa.eu/familyalliance). La relazione del 2012 sull'invecchiamento usa le proiezioni della popolazione realizzate da Eurostat nel 2010 per analizzare l'eventuale impatto del cambiamento demografico sul mercato del lavoro, sul PIL e sulla spesa pubblica degli Stati membri dell'UE e della Norvegia tra il 2010 e il 2060 ([2]).

2. I dati di Eurostat sul tasso complessivo di fertilità per il 2010 indicano un calo rispetto al 2008 per quanto concerne dodici Stati membri, una situazione di stagnazione in due paesi e un aumento in altri dodici ([3]). I risultati dell'indagine Eurobarometro confermano che i cittadini europei vorrebbero avere più figli di quanti hanno attualmente. Questo è il motivo per cui creare le condizioni a sostegno delle persone che desiderano realizzare il loro desiderio di avere bambini rimane un punto importante della strategia volta a trasformare in un'opportunità l'attuale sfida demografica ([4]). Dalle statistiche ([5]) emerge che la fertilità è maggiore nei paesi che hanno realizzato con maggiore anticipo la transizione verso una maggiore parità tra i sessi e una maggiore partecipazione delle donne al mondo del lavoro, poiché ciò ha consentito una creazione più flessibile e meno tradizionale dei nuclei familiari e dei pattern di natalità. Ciò suggerisce che una migliore conciliazione tra vita privata e lavoro è possibile se si dispone di validi regimi di maternità, paternità e congedo parentale, di servizi per l'infanzia abbordabili, di un sostegno finanziario e di orari flessibili sul luogo di lavoro che tengano conto delle esigenze familiari (ad esempio, lavoro part-time). Le misure volte a conciliare il lavoro e la vita familiare sono promosse anche nell'ambito della strategia della Commissione per la parità tra le donne e gli uomini ([6]) e nel quadro della Strategia Europa 2020: in tale contesto, vengono indirizzate a diversi Stati membri ([7]) raccomandazioni in tema di conciliazione tra vita privata e lavoro e di disponibilità e qualità dei servizi per l'infanzia.

([1]) http://www.oeaw.ac.at/vid/download/edrp_2_2012.pdf
([2]) Cfr. http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/2012-ageing-report_en.htm
([3]) Mancano i dati relativi ad uno Stato membro. Cfr.: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/product?code=demo_find.
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52006DC0571:EN:NOT.
([5]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/documents/Tab/report.pdf
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/strategy_equality_women_men_en.pdf
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006843/12
to the Commission
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Low birth rates in Europe

Across Europe, birth rates are falling and families are getting smaller. The overall birth rate is now less than two children per woman in every Member State. As a consequence, Europe's population is either growing very slowly or beginning to decrease.

A critical piece of evidence was presented in a study conducted in 15 countries in Europe. In 2011, there was a reduction in the birth rate in 11 of the 15 countries concerned. For example, in Spain the birth rate decreased from 1.46 in 2008 to 1.38 in 2011, and in Norway, a Nordic country, it fell from 1.95 in 2010 to 1.88 in 2011.

Research on this topic is controversial. Some studies show that economic uncertainty is bad for birth rates, and others maintain the opposite, i.e. that recession increases the number of births.

Another interesting piece of data concerns the age at which women have children. In the 1970s, women generally had their first child between the ages of 22 and 25; nowadays they are markedly older, between 27 and 29. That suggests that people are postponing starting their families. An interesting solution would be to reward women who decide to have more than one child.

1. Has the Commission carried out research into this problem and its possible effects on economic growth in the EU?

2. Has the Commission drawn up a plan with a view to addressing the problem of falling birth rates? If not, will the Commission consider drawing up an action plan?

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

1. In 2011, the Commission funded a new round of Eurobarometer questions on family size ([1]). Information regarding other EU funded research projects related to fertility issues can be found on the website of the European alliance for families (www.europa.eu/familyalliance). The 2012 Ageing Report uses the Eurostat 2010 population projections to look at the possible impact of demographic changes on the labour market, GDP and public expenditure of EU Member States and Norway from 2010 up to 2060 ([2]).

2. Eurostat figures on total fertility rate for 2010 show decreases compared to 2008 for twelve Member States, stagnation in two and increases in twelve ([3]). The Eurobarometer results confirmed that Europeans would like to have more children than they actually have. This is why creating 'conditions in support of people who wish to realise their desire to have children' remains an important point in the strategy to turn the current demographic challenge into an opportunity ([4]). Statistics ([5]) show that fertility is higher in those countries that made an earlier transition to more gender equality and female participation in employment, since this allowed for more flexible, less traditional family forming and child-bearing patterns. This suggests that better reconciliation is possible with good maternity, paternity and parental-leave schemes, affordable childcare, cash support and flexible, family-friendly hours at the workplace (e.g. part time working). Measures to reconcile work and family life are also promoted in the Commission's Strategy for equality between women and men ([6]) and in the framework of the Europe 2020 strategy: in this context, recommendations on reconciliation and childcare availability and quality are addressed to several Member States ([7]).

([1]) http://www.oeaw.ac.at/vid/download/edrp_2_2012.pdf
([2]) See http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/2012-ageing-report_en.htm
([3]) Data from one Member State are missing. See: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/product?code=demo_find.
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52006DC0571:EN:NOT.
([5]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/documents/Tab/report.pdf
([6]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/strategy_equality_women_men_en.pdf
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006846/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(10 juillet 2012)

Objet: Erpum: Renvoi de réfugiés vers des pays à hauts risques

Un projet, soutenu financièrement par la Commission européenne, permet d'expulser plus rapidement les jeunes Afghans dont les demandes d'asile ne sont pas admissibles.

La secrétaire d'État belge à l'asile, à l'immigration et à l'intégration sociale, Maggie De Block (Open Vld) ainsi qu'une minorité d'autres de ses homologues européens (Royaume-Uni, Norvège, Suède, Pays-Bas), souhaitent pouvoir expulser les jeunes demandeurs d'asile.

Elle s'appuie sur un projet, baptisé *European Return Platform for Unaccompanied Minors* (Erpum) et soutenu financièrement par la Commission européenne à concurrence d'un million d'euros pour la Belgique, qui permet, en effet, d'expulser plus rapidement les jeunes Afghans dont les demandes d'asile ne sont pas intégralement admissibles.

Mi-juillet 2012, un jeune Afghan de 20 ans qui réside depuis 4 ans en Belgique, Parwais Sangari, a été expulsé.

1. Comment l'Europe (les États membres signataires mais aussi la Commission) peut-elle cautionner ce genre de traitement alors que dans le même temps, les autorités afghanes déclarent ne pas pouvoir garantir la sécurité des êtres humains que nous leur renvoyons?

2. Ne serait-il pas plus en adéquation avec nos valeurs européennes et plus humain d'intégrer les demandeurs d'asile au moins le temps que l'Afghanistan ne soit plus le pays le plus dangereux du monde (comme le déclarent les dernières études européennes sur le sujet)?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006894/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 juillet 2012)

Objet: Plate-forme européenne pour le retour des mineurs non accompagnés (ERPUM): violation de l'article 3 de la convention européenne des Droits de l'homme

Un projet, soutenu financièrement par la Commission, permet d'expulser plus rapidement les jeunes Afghans dont les demandes d'asile ne sont pas admissibles.

Celui-ci a été baptisé «Plate-forme européenne pour le retour des mineurs non accompagnés» *(European Return Platform for Unaccompanied Minors* — ERPUM) et est soutenu financièrement par la Commission, à concurrence d'un million d'euros pour la Belgique, qui permet, en effet, d'expulser plus rapidement les jeunes Afghans dont les demandes d'asile ne sont pas intégralement admissibles.

Compte tenu de ce qui précède, la Commission peut-elle dire:

— si, dans le cas de nombre de ces expulsions (entre autre celle de Parwais Sangari), il n'y aurait pas violation flagrante de l'article 3 de la convention européenne des Droits de l'homme (CEDH), de la convention des Nations unies relative aux droits de l'enfant et de la charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne?

— en quoi, dans la négative, l'ERPUM ne va pas à l'encontre de l'article de la CEDH?

Réponse commune donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(29 août 2012)

Le projet Erpum offre un cadre pour la coopération directe entre un certain nombre d'États membres et les autorités de pays tiers concernant la pratique associée au retour des mineurs non accompagnés auprès de leurs parents/tuteurs ou d'autres formes d'accueil structuré dans le pays d'origine. Ce projet met l'accent sur les moyens de faciliter le renvoi dans des conditions humaines des mineurs concernés, y compris par l'élaboration de méthodes permettant de retrouver leur famille.

Pour ce qui est du retour des mineurs, les États membres sont liés par la Convention européenne des Droits de l'homme et la Convention des Nations unies relative aux droits de l'enfant. Dans le cadre de l'application du droit de l'UE et notamment de la directive 2008/115/CE (la directive retour), les États membres sont liés par la Charte des Droits Fondamentaux de l'Union européenne, en particulier par l'article 19, qui pose le principe de non-refoulement. Selon la directive retour, «[a]vant que soit prise une décision de retour concernant un mineur non accompagné», il ou elle doit avoir droit à «l'assistance d'organismes compétents autres que les autorités chargées d'exécuter le retour». De plus, «les autorités de cet État membre s'assurent qu'il sera remis à un membre de sa famille, à un tuteur désigné ou à des structures d'accueil adéquates dans l'État de retour». En outre, l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant constitue toujours une considération primordiale lors d'une décision de retour et le principe de non-refoulement doit toujours être respecté.

Étant donné que la Commission ne possède pas les données du dossier de M. Sangari, cette dernière n'est pas en mesure de donner son avis quant à son renvoi. Il y a lieu toutefois de faire observer que M. Sangari n'est pas mineur.

Enfin, la Commission tient à préciser que la Belgique ne fait pas partie du projet Erpum.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006846/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: ERPUM project — Returning refugees to high-risk countries

A project entitled European Return Platform for Unaccompanied Minors (ERPUM), which receives financial support from the Commission, provides a basis for the faster deportation of young Afghans whose asylum applications have been rejected.

The Belgian Minister for Asylum, Immigration and Social Integration, Maggie De Block (from the Open VLD party), as well as a small number of her European counterparts (in the UK, Norway, Sweden and the Netherlands), want to be able to deport young asylum-seekers.

Ms de Block hopes to do so via the ERPUM project, for which Belgium receives up to EUR 1 million in funding from the Commission, and which, essentially, makes it possible to deport more quickly young Afghans whose asylum applications are not admissible in every respect.

A 20-year old Afghan, Parwais Sangari, was deported from Belgium in mid-July 2012, despite having lived there for four years.

1. Why is Europe (both the signatory Member States and the Commission) supporting this approach when the Afghan authorities have said that they cannot guarantee the safety of the people we repatriate?

2. Would it not be more humane and consistent with our European values to integrate asylum-seekers, at least whilst Afghanistan remains at the top of the list of the world's most dangerous countries (as the most recent European studies suggest)?

Question for written answer E-006894/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(11 July 2012)

Subject: European Return Platform for Unaccompanied Minors — ERPUM: violation of Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights

There is a project, receiving financial support from the Commission, that makes it possible to speed up the deportation of young Afghans whose asylum applications are out of order.

This project has been christened 'European Return Platform for Unaccompanied Minors' (ERPUM) and receives funding from the Commission to the tune of EUR 1 million for Belgium, making it possible to speed up the deportation of young Afghans whose asylum applications are not fully in order.

In the light of the above, can the Commission say:

— whether in the case of many of these deportations (including the deportation of Parwais Sangari) there has not been a flagrant violation of Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union?

— if not, how it is that ERPUM does not contravene the said article of the ECHR?

Joint answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(29 August 2012)

The ERPUM project provides a basis for direct cooperation between a number of Member States with third country authorities in the practical work involved in returning unaccompanied minors to their parents/guardians or other forms of organised reception in the country of origin. The project focuses on means of facilitating humane return, including the development of methods for tracing the minor's family.

In carrying out returns, the Member States are bound by the European Convention on Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. When applying EC law, notably Directive 2008/115/EC (the Return Directive), Member States are bound by the Union's Charter of Fundamental Rights, in particular its Article 19 laying down the principle of non-refoulement. The Return Directive requires that, 'before deciding to issue a return decision in respect of an unaccompanied minor', he/she must be granted 'assistance by appropriate bodies other than the authorities enforcing return', and must be 'satisfied that he or she will be returned to a member of his or her family, a nominated guardian or adequate reception facilities in the country of return'. In addition, the best interests of the child must always be a primary consideration when deciding on a return, and the principle of non-refoulement must always be respected.

Having no details on the file of Mr Sangari, the Commission is not in the position to comment on his removal. However, it should be noted that Mr Sangari is not a minor.

The Commission would also note that Belgium is not participating in the ERPUM project.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006849/12
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(10 juillet 2012)

Objet: Risques potentiels des bulles gonflables récréatives

Les bulles géantes gonflables sont de plus en plus présentes dans les parcs de loisirs et les fêtes foraines. Composées de deux enveloppes en PVC gonflable, elles permettent à leurs occupants d'avancer de façon amusante sur l'eau ou sur la terre. Ces nouvelles attractions très en vogue présenteraient toutefois des dangers importants d'après une étude réalisée par la Commission française de sécurité des consommateurs (CSC) (autorité administrative indépendante) en date de juin 2012.

Dans son étude, la CSC avertit que la pratique de cette nouvelle activité «*entraîne des risques d'éjection du cylindre, de chocs entre les occupants d'une même bulle, de maux de tête et étourdissements, de suffocation voire d'asphyxie dans les sphères fermées*».

L'étude fait aussi état de l'existence de risques dans le cas où la bulle géante permet d'avancer en milieu aquatique. La bulle étant gonflée avec un compresseur lors de chaque utilisation, l'occupant ne peut plus s'en extraire tout seul, notamment en cas de problème.

Cette enquête met également en lumière de grosses lacunes en termes de sécurité et d'information des consommateurs. Est également avancé «*l'absence de délimitation et de sécurisation des terrains sur lesquels évoluent les bulles gonflables ainsi que l'insuffisance des consignes de sécurité communiquées aux usagers*».

Enfin, la CSC a souligné dans son avis «*qu'il n'existe actuellement aucune réglementation propre aux activités proposées impliquant l'introduction d'une ou plusieurs personnes à l'intérieur d'une structure gonflable mobile*».

En outre, «*les produits eux-mêmes ne sont soumis à aucune norme spécifique et la norme NF EN 15649 parties 1, 2 et 6 consacrée aux objets de loisirs flottants paraît à ce jour mal adaptée aux risques spécifiques présentés par ces produits*».

1. La Commission a-t-elle connaissance d'études menées à l'échelle européenne concernant les dangers liés à l'utilisation de ces bulles gonflables récréatives?

2. Si les résultats de plusieurs études soulignaient ces mêmes risques pour le consommateur, la Commission envisagerait-elle de proposer une réglementation spécifique en la matière?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(24 août 2012)

La Commission n'a pas connaissance d'autres études menées au niveau de l'UE concernant les dangers des bulles gonflables en milieu aquatique. Une discussion sur les aspects liés à la sécurité des bulles gonflables en milieu aquatique a été engagée avec les États membres à l'occasion de la réunion du Réseau pour la sécurité des consommateurs, en mai 2011. Lors de cette réunion, la Commission a invité instamment les États membres à notifier, au moyen de RAPEX, la présence de ces produits sur le marché s'ils sont considérés comme dangereux.

La Commission transmettra l'étude de la Commission française de la sécurité des consommateurs aux États membres pour examen et, le cas échéant, de nouvelles discussions seront entreprises lors d'une prochaine réunion.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006849/12
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(10 July 2012)

Subject: Potential risks of recreational water walking balls

Giant inflatable water walking balls are increasingly being found in amusement parks and funfairs. They consist of two layers of inflatable PVC and enable their occupants to 'walk' in a fun way on water or land. These popular new attractions could, however, present significant hazards according to a study by the French Consumer Safety Commission (CSC) (an independent administrative authority) carried out in June 2012.

In its study, the CSC warns that this new activity could involve the risk of being ejected from the sphere, collisions between the occupants of a single ball, headaches and dizziness, and suffocation or even asphyxiation in the closed spheres.

The study also mentions the risks inherent in walking on water in the giant balls. The balls are inflated with a compressor each time they are used, so the occupants cannot get out by themselves if anything goes wrong.

This study also highlights major shortcomings in terms of safety and consumer information. It says that the giant balls are used in areas which are not demarcated or secured in any way and that insufficient safety instructions are given to users.

Lastly, the CSC noted in its opinion that there were currently no specific regulations governing the activities in question, which placed 'one or more persons within a mobile inflatable structure'.

Furthermore, the study notes that the products themselves are not subject to any specific standard and the NF EN 15649 standard, parts 1, 2 and 6, concerning floating leisure articles, currently appears to be inappropriate in terms of the specific risks posed by these products.

1. Is the Commission aware of any studies conducted at EU level concerning the dangers of using these recreational inflatable balls?

2. If the results of several studies were to highlight the same risks to consumers, would the Commission consider proposing a specific regulation on the matter?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(24 August 2012)

The Commission is not aware of any other studies conducted at EU level concerning the dangers of water walking balls. A discussion on the safety aspects of water walking balls was held with the Member States at the Consumer Safety Network meeting in May 2011. At that meeting the Commission urged Member States to notify such products through RAPEX if they are found on the market and considered to be dangerous.

The Commission will forward the study of the French Consumer Safety Commission to Member States for their consideration and for possible further discussion at a future meeting.