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 241 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003217/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 martie 2012)

Subiect: Gripa aviară în Olanda

Peste 42 000 de curci dintr-o fermă olandeză au fost sacrificate duminică, 18 martie a.c., după ce prezența virusului H5 al gripei aviare a fost detectată la această crescătorie de păsări. Comisia este rugată să informeze Parlamentul despre eventualele măsuri avute în vedere.

Răspuns dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei
(7 mai 2012)

Directiva 2005/94/CE a Consiliului ([1]) stabilește măsurile minime care trebuie aplicate în Uniunea Europeană (UE) pentru combaterea gripei aviare. Gripa aviară, astfel cum este definită în directiva respectivă, poate fi cauzată de două grupuri diferite de virusuri, și anume de virusul înalt patogen al gripei aviare (HPAI) și de virusul slab patogen al gripei aviare (LPAI), clasificate astfel în funcție de capacitatea virusului de a provoca boli grave. LPAI declanșează o formă ușoară a bolii.

La 17 martie 2012, autoritățile veterinare din Țările de Jos au informat Comisia cu privire la o suspiciune de focar de LPAI de subtipul H5 într-o exploatație avicolă situată în provincia Limburg — o regiune cu o densitate mare de păsări de curte. Această situație a determinat autoritățile olandeze să pună în aplicare urgent și în mod eficient măsurile veterinare conforme cu directiva menționată mai sus, inclusiv sacrificarea, la 18 martie 2012, a tuturor păsărilor de curte prezente în exploatație ca o măsură de precauție.

Comisia a informat celelalte state membre, organizații internaționale și parteneri comerciali cu privire la apariția unui focar de LPAI în Țările de Jos.

Dovezile disponibile sugerează că autoritățile olandeze au reușit să izoleze infecția. Prin urmare, în această etapă, Comisia nu are în vedere nicio măsură suplimentară.

([1]) Directiva 2005/94/CE a Consiliului din 20 decembrie 2005 privind măsurile comunitare de combatere a influenței aviare și de abrogare a Directivei 92/40/CEE:
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:010:0016:0065:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003217/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(26 March 2012)

Subject: Avian influenza in the Netherlands

On Sunday, 18 March 2012, more than 42 000 turkeys from a Dutch farm were slaughtered after the presence of the H5 avian influenza virus was detected there. Can the Commission inform Parliament of any measures it envisages?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2012)

Council Directive 2005/94/EC ([1]) lays down the minimum measures to be applied in the European Union (EU) to control avian influenza. Avian influenza as defined in that directive can be caused by two different groups of viruses, namely highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) and low pathogenic avian influenza (LPAI) depending on the ability of the virus to cause serious disease. LPAI leads to a mild form of the disease.

On 17 March 2012 the Netherlands veterinary authorities informed the Commission of a suspected outbreak of LPAI of the H5 subtype in a poultry holding located in the province of Limburg — an area with a high density of poultry. This situation prompted the Dutch authorities to immediately and efficiently put in place the veterinary measures in the framework of the abovementioned Directive, including culling of all poultry present on the holding as a precautionary measure on 18 March 2012.

The Commission informed the other Member States, international organisations and trading partners about the LPAI outbreak in the Netherlands.

The evidence available suggests that the Dutch authorities have succeeded in containing the infection. Therefore, at this stage the Commission does not envisage any additional measures.

([1]) Council Directive 2005/94/EC of 20 December 2005 on Community measures for the control of avian influenza and repealing Directive 92/40/EEC; http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:010:0016:0065:EN:PDF.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003221/12
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(26. März 2012)

Betrifft: Projekt HAVEN

Das Projekt HAVEN dient der Koordinierung gemeinsamer EU-Bemühungen zur Bekämpfung von Straftaten im Bereich des Kindesmissbrauchs, die von Europäern außerhalb ihres Herkunfts- oder Aufenthaltslands begangen werden. Dazu zählt auch die Koordinierung internationaler Operationen europäischer Strafverfolgungsbehörden.

1. Welche Erfolge konnten im Bereich der Bekämpfung von Kinderpornografie und Kindersextourismus mithilfe von HAVEN 2010 erzielt werden?

2. Wie viele Hinweise sind seit der Einführung bereits eingegangen?

3. Wie stellt sich die Zusammenarbeit auf europäischer und auf internationaler Ebene in diesem Bereich dar?

4. Wo gibt es bei der Zusammenarbeit mit anderen Ländern Probleme?

5. Mit welchen Ländern gibt es keine Zusammenarbeit?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(15. Mai 2012)

Im Rahmen des Europol-Projekts HAVEN wurde von Europol in Zusammenarbeit mit den einzelstaatlichen Polizei-, Zoll- und Grenzschutzbehörden im März 2011 eine erste gemeinsame Maßnahme an den größten Flughäfen Deutschlands, der Niederlande und Schwedens durchgeführt. An einer zweiten gemeinsamen Maßnahme im Januar 2012 beteiligten sich Polizei-, Zoll- und Grenzschutzbehörden an verschiedenen Orten in Österreich, Bulgarien, Finnland, Frankreich, Ungarn, den Niederlanden, Slowenien und dem Vereinigten Königreich.

Die Zielgruppe der Behörden bestand im Wesentlichen aus Personen, die aus Ländern oder Städten zurückkehrten, die als Zielorte für europäischen Kindersextourismus und die sexuelle Ausbeutung von Kindern bekannt sind. Dabei wurden Reisende kontrolliert und befragt, Informationen mit anderen EU-Mitgliedstaaten ausgetauscht und Kontrollen von Transitreisenden vor ihrem Weiterflug in andere EU-Länder vorbereitet und durchgeführt.

Europol unterstützt die Zusammenarbeit der Polizeibehörden der Mitgliedstaaten bei der Bekämpfung von organisierter Kriminalität, Terrorismus und anderen schweren Verbrechen, die zwei oder mehrere Mitgliedstaaten betreffen. Außerdem arbeitet Europol mit fünfzehn Drittländern und einer Reihe von internationalen Organisationen und Einrichtungen zusammen ([1]).

([1]) Albanien, Australien, Bosnien und Herzegowina, Büro der Vereinten Nationen für Drogen- und Verbrechensbekämpfung, CEPOL (Europäische Polizeiakademie), ehemalige jugoslawische Republik Mazedonien, Eurojust, Europäische Beobachtungsstelle für Drogen und Drogensucht, Europäische Kommission, Europäische Zentralbank, Frontex, Interpol, Island, Kanada, Kolumbien, Kroatien, Moldau, Norwegen, OLAF (Europäisches Amt für Betrugsbekämpfung), Russische Föderation, Schweiz, Serbien, SitCen (Gemeinsames Lagezentrum der EU), Türkei, USA, Weltzollorganisation.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003221/12
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(26 March 2012)

Subject: Project HAVEN

Project HAVEN coordinates joint EU efforts to combat criminal activity in the area of child abuse committed by Europeans outside their country of origin or domicile. This also includes the coordination of international operations by European law enforcement authorities.

1. What successes were achieved in the area of combating child pornography and child sex tourism with the help of HAVEN in 2010?

2. How many cases have been reported since the project's launch?

3. How is cooperation managed in this area, both at European level and at international level?

4. Where do problems exist in relation to cooperation with other countries?

5. With which countries does no cooperation exist?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2012)

Within the Europol Project HAVEN, a first Joint Action day was organised in March 2011. It was conducted by Europol in cooperation with national police, customs and border authorities at the main airports in Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden. The second Joint Action took place in January 2012 and involved cooperation with police, customs and border authorities in different locations in Austria, Bulgaria, Finland, France, Hungary, the Netherlands, Slovenia, and the United Kingdom.

The authorities targeted persons primarily arriving from destinations known for 'child sex tourism' — countries and cities to which European child sex offenders travel to engage in child sexual exploitation. The authorities checked returning passengers and conducted interviews while several EU Member States assisted with information exchange, and prepared and carried out checks on passengers in transit from selected flights to other EU countries.

Europol supports police cooperation among Member States to combat organised crime, terrorism and other forms of serious crime affecting two or more Member States. Additionally, Europol cooperates with 15 third countries and a number of international organisations and bodies ([1]).

([1]) Albania, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, CEPOL (European Police College), Colombia, Croatia, Eurojust, European Central Bank, European Commission, European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Frontex, Iceland, Interpol, Moldova, Norway, OLAF (European Anti-Fraud Office), Russian Federation, Serbia, Switzerland, SITCEN (EU Joint Situation Centre), Turkey, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, USA, World Customs Organisation.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003224/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(26 Μαρτίου 2012)

Θέμα: Πολιτική της συνοχής — εταιρική σχέση με κράτη μέλη/πολιτειακές υποδιαρθρώσεις

Η πρόταση κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου (COM(2011)0615), η οποία περιλαμβάνει, μεταξύ άλλων, γενικές διατάξεις σχετικά με την αποστολή και τους σκοπούς της πολιτικής για τη συνοχή, προβλέπει τη συμμετοχή των περιφερειακών, τοπικών, αστικών και άλλων δημόσιων αρχών στις διαβουλεύσεις για την κατάρτιση της σύμβασης εταιρικής σχέσης (άρθρο 5). Ωστόσο, η σύμβαση εταιρικής σχέσης ορίζεται ως διμερής καταρτιζόμενη μεταξύ των κρατών μελών και της Επιτροπής.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Εκτιμά ότι η πρόβλεψη για την κατάρτιση ενός ευρωπαϊκού κώδικα δεοντολογίας (άρθρο 5) είναι επαρκές μέτρο, προκειμένου να διασφαλιστεί ότι τα συμφέροντα των τοπικών ενδιαφερομένων μερών λαμβάνονται υπόψη στο ακέραιο; Δεν θεωρεί ότι η θεσμοθέτηση πλήρως ενοποιημένων τριμερών συμβάσεων ανάμεσα στα κράτη μέλη, την Επιτροπή και τις αρμόδιες περιφερειακές, τοπικές, αστικές και άλλες δημόσιες αρχές συνιστά το πιο αποτελεσματικό μέτρο προς την κατεύθυνση αυτή;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Μαΐου 2012)

Η εταιρική σχέση αποτελεί μία από τις βασικές αρχές της υλοποίησης της πολιτικής για τη συνοχή. Με την πρόσφατη πρότασή της ([1]), η Επιτροπή κάνει για πρώτη φορά ένα πολύ σημαντικό βήμα επιμένοντας ότι στη διαδικασία επεξεργασίας, υλοποίησης, παρακολούθησης και αξιολόγησης των προγραμμάτων των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων θα πρέπει να συμμετέχουν εταίροι από όλα τα επίπεδα διακυβέρνησης. Η προσέγγιση της πολυεπίπεδης διακυβέρνησης ενισχύει την υλοποίηση της αρχής της εταιρικής σχέσης τόσο κάθετα — μεταξύ των τοπικών και των περιφερειακών αρχών, των εθνικών κυβερνήσεων και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης — όσο και οριζόντια, μεταξύ των διαφόρων αυτών των επιπέδων, των οικονομικών και κοινωνικών εταίρων και της κοινωνίας των πολιτών. Ο ευρωπαϊκός κώδικας δεοντολογίας σκοπό έχει να συμβάλει στον καθορισμό ελάχιστων στόχων και κριτηρίων για τη στήριξη της υλοποίησης της εταιρικής σχέσης και στη διευκόλυνση της ανταλλαγής πληροφοριών, εμπειριών, αποτελεσμάτων και ορθών πρακτικών μεταξύ των κρατών μελών.

Η στενότερη συνεργασία μεταξύ όλων των εθνικών, περιφερειακών και τοπικών επιπέδων διοίκησης ευνοεί μια συνεκτική και ολοκληρωμένη προσέγγιση για την υλοποίηση των ταμείων. Η εταιρική σχέση θα πρέπει να οργανωθεί σύμφωνα με τη θεσμική διάρθρωση κάθε κράτους μέλους καθώς και σύμφωνα με τις νομικές και δημοσιονομικές εξουσίες των διαφόρων εδαφικών επιπέδων στο πλαίσιο των ταμείων. Στα αποκεντρωμένα κράτη μέλη, οι περιφέρειες διαδραματίζουν καθοριστικό ρόλο στην οργάνωση της εταιρικής σχέσης.

Στην περίπτωση που έχουν συναφθεί συμφωνίες, όπως τα εδαφικά σύμφωνα για τη στρατηγική «Ευρώπη 2020», μεταξύ των διαφόρων επιπέδων διακυβέρνησης της κάθε χώρας, η Επιτροπή σκοπεύει να ενθαρρύνει τα κράτη μέλη να λαμβάνουν αποτελεσματικά υπόψη τους, κατά την προετοιμασία της οικείας σύμβασης εταιρικής σχέσης, τις ρυθμίσεις πολυεπίπεδης διακυβέρνησης που έχουν συμφωνηθεί στο εδαφικό σύμφωνο, προκειμένου να διασφαλίζεται η αποτελεσματική υλοποίηση της πολιτικής.

([1]) Έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής «Η αρχή της εταιρικής σχέσης όσον αφορά την υλοποίηση των ταμείων του κοινού στρατηγικού πλαισίου — στοιχεία για τη δημιουργία ενός ευρωπαϊκού κώδικα δεοντολογίας σχετικά με την εταιρική σχέση»· έγγραφο εργασίας των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής (2012)106 τελικό, 24.4.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003224/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papastamkos (PPE)
(26 March 2012)

Subject: Cohesion policy — Partnerships with Member States/State sub-divisions

The proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council (COM(2011) 0615) that includes general provisions on the purpose and scope of cohesion policy makes provision for participation by regional, local, urban and other public authorities in consultations on drawing up partnership agreements (Article 5). However, partnership agreements are defined as bilateral agreements between Member States and the Commission.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Does it think that the planned drafting of a European Code of Conduct (Article 5) is sufficient to ensure that the interests of local stakeholders are fully taken into consideration? Does it not think that the adoption of fully unified trilateral agreements between Member States, the Commission and the competent regional, local, urban and other public authorities would be the most effective way of achieving this end?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2012)

Partnership is one of the key principles of implementation of cohesion policy. With its recent proposal ([1]), the Commission has gone further than ever before in insisting that partners at all levels should be involved in the process of elaboration, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of structural funds programmes. The multi-level governance approach reinforces the implementation of the partnership principle both vertically — between local and regional authorities, national government and the European Union — and horizontally — between these different levels, economic and social partners and civil society. The European Code of Conduct is intended to set minimum objectives and criteria to support the implementation of the partnership principle and facilitating the sharing of information, experience, results and good practices among Member States.

Closer cooperation between all national, regional and local levels of administration favours a coherent and integrated approach to implementation of funds. Partnership is to be organised according to the institutional set-up of each Member State and the legal and budgetary powers of the different territorial levels within the scope of the funds. In decentralised Member States, regions will be key actors in the organisation of the partnership.

In cases where agreements such as the Territorial Pacts for Europe 2020 have been established between the country's different tiers of government, the Commission intends to encourage Member States to take effective account of the multi-level governance arrangements agreed in the Territorial Pact in the preparation of their Partnership Contract in order to ensure effective policy delivery.

([1]) Commission Staff Working Document 'The partnership principle in the implementation of the Common Strategic Framework Funds — elements for a European Code of Conduct on Partnership'; SWD(2012)106 final, 24.4.2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003232/12
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(26 mars 2012)

Objet: Négociations de la résolution finale du Sommet de la Terre «Rio+20» des Nations unies et droit fondamental à l'eau et à l'assainissement

L'Union européenne négocie actuellement, au sein de l'Organisation des Nations unies, la résolution finale du Sommet de la Terre «Rio+20».

Ce texte est fondamental en ce qu'il définit les orientations et principes que les Nations unies entendent donner à la lutte contre le réchauffement climatique et pour la promotion des droits humains et environnementaux.

Il doit donc faire preuve d'une grande ambition afin de défendre ces droits et doit, pour cela, bénéficier d'un soutien total de l'Union européenne contre toutes les tentatives visant à amoindrir sa portée.

Or, selon certaines informations, il semblerait que les institutions européennes proposent de supprimer la référence au droit humain à l'eau et à l'assainissement dans le texte de l'Organisation des Nations unies.

— Quelle est la position, dans ces négociations, de la délégation de l'Union européenne sur le droit à l'eau et à l'assainissement? Qui définit cette position au sein de l'Union européenne et à partir de quel mandat?

— La Commission considère-t-elle le droit à une eau saine et traitée comme un service qui doit être universel, ou comme un droit fondamental pour tout être humain et que l'Organisation des Nations unies doit promouvoir et défendre avec le soutien de l'Union européenne?

— La Commission considère-t-elle la décision de maintenir un monopole public de l'eau comme entravant l'objectif du droit à l'eau?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(25 mai 2012)

La position que défendra l'Union européenne à Rio+20, y compris dans le domaine de l'eau, est en cours d'élaboration et se fondera sur les conclusions du Conseil européen.

Comme l'a rappelé le Conseil des Droits de l'homme dans une résolution du 30 septembre 2010, c'est aux États membres que revient la responsabilité première d'assurer la pleine réalisation de tous les Droits de l'homme et ils peuvent choisir d'associer des acteurs non étatiques à la fourniture d'eau potable et de services d'assainissement. Il appartient dès lors aux États membres de veiller à ce que les prestataires de services non étatiques assument leurs responsabilités.

À l'occasion de la Journée mondiale et européenne de l'eau, qui s'est tenue le 22 mars 2012, M[me] Catherine Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante de l'Union européenne, a déclaré au nom de l'Union que la santé et une vie digne sont indissociables d'un accès à l'eau potable et à l'assainissement. Constatant que des millions de personnes n'ont toujours pas accès à une eau potable saine et sont dès lors privées d'un droit humain fondamental ([1]), l'Union européenne apporte une aide d'environ 400 millions d'euros par an, en faveur de quelque 35 pays partenaires, afin de contribuer à la construction d'infrastructures d'approvisionnement en eau potable et de systèmes de traitement des eaux usées dans le monde entier.

Au sein de l'Union européenne, la principale fonction de la Commission en ce qui concerne l'eau potable est de garantir la conformité avec les normes de qualité des eaux potables, dans le respect du droit de l'Union. C'est aux États membres qu'il appartient de décider de la répartition des services liés à l'utilisation de l'eau entre entités privées et entités publiques. La Commission n'a exprimé aucune préférence en la matière.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/129160.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003364/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(29 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Diritto di accesso universale all'acqua potabile

In occasione dell'ultimo vertice della terra «Rio+20», l'ONU ha redatto un documento in cui sottolinea dell'importanza del diritto di accesso universale all'acqua potabile e ai servizi igienico-sanitari in quanto essenziali alla piena soddisfazione del diritto alla vita e, in generale, dei diritti umani.

Secondo informazioni diffuse dal Consiglio dei canadesi, un'organizzazione della società civile attiva nella lotta contro la mercificazione dell'acqua, alcuni paesi europei contrari al riconoscimento formale del diritto all'acqua, di cui il Regno Unito è capofila, hanno proposto la cancellazione dalla bozza del documento di cui sopra di ogni riferimento al diritto umano all'acqua nonostante, in una risoluzione del 15 marzo scorso, il Parlamento europeo abbia espresso riconoscimento verso tale diritto umano sottolineando come l'accesso a un bene così importante sia non solo fondamentale ma soprattutto universale.

Considerato che da circa quarant'anni gli esponenti ai vertici della terra proclamano la loro volontà e affermano il loro impegno in favore dell'accesso universale all'acqua, dapprima entro il 1991 (obiettivo del decennio internazionale delle Nazioni Unite per l'acqua 1981-1991), poi entro il 2000 (nell'ambito dell'obiettivo dello sradicamento della povertà assoluta nel mondo) e ora entro il 2030, potrebbe la Commissione far sapere:

— se è a conoscenza del documento sopracitato;

— qual è la sua posizione in merito alla soppressione del riferimento al diritto umano all'accesso all'acqua nel testo ONU per Rio+20;

— come intende eventualmente intervenire a tutela di questo imprescindibile diritto alla vita dei cittadini?

Risposta congiunta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(25 maggio 2012)

La posizione dell'UE per la conferenza Rio+20, tra l'altro sulla questione dell'acqua, è in corso di elaborazione in base alle conclusioni del Consiglio europeo.

Una risoluzione del Consiglio per i diritti umani, del 30 settembre 2010, ha ricordato che la responsabilità di garantire che tutti i diritti umani siano pienamente realizzati spetta in primo luogo agli Stati membri, i quali possono decidere di coinvolgere attori non statali nella fornitura di acqua potabile e di servizi igienici. Spetta pertanto agli Stati membri assicurare che i fornitori privati di servizi adempiano alle loro responsabilità.

In occasione della Giornata mondiale ed europea dell'acqua, il 22 marzo 2012, l'Alta Rappresentante, Catherine Ashton, ha dichiarato a nome dell'Unione europea che l'acqua potabile sicura ed i servizi igienico-sanitari sono essenziali per una vita sana e dignitosa. Poiché milioni di persone non hanno ancora accesso all'acqua potabile pulita e sono, pertanto, private di un diritto umano fondamentale ([1]), l'UE stanzia quasi 400 milioni di euro l'anno, a favore di circa 35 paesi partner, per consentire la costruzione di infrastrutture destinate ai sistemi di distribuzione di acqua potabile e di raccolta delle acque reflue in tutto il mondo.

Nell'ambito dell'UE, la funzione principale della Commissione, per quanto riguarda l'acqua potabile, consiste nel garantire il rispetto delle norme di qualità per l'acqua potabile in conformità della normativa comunitaria. Spetta agli Stati membri decidere in che misura i servizi idrici debbano essere pubblici oppure privati. La Commissione non ha espresso preferenze in materia.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/129160.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003232/12
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(26 March 2012)

Subject: Negotiations on the final resolution for the Rio+20 United Nations Earth Summit and the basic right to water and sanitation.

The European Union is currently engaged in negotiations within the United Nations organisation on the final resolution for the Rio+20 Earth Summit.

This text is fundamental in that it defines the guidelines and principles that the United Nations intends to apply in the fight against global warming and in the promotion of human and environmental rights.

It must therefore demonstrate a great ambition to defend these rights and, in order to do so, must have the full support of the European Union against all attempts to reduce its impact.

Yet, according to certain information, it seems that the European institutions are proposing the removal of the reference to the human right to water and sanitation in the United Nations text.

— What is the position of the European Union delegation on the right to water and sanitation in these negotiations? Who defines this position within the European Union and what authority is it based on?

— Does the Commission consider the right to clean, treated water to be a service that should be universal or a basic right for every human being, which the United Nations should promote and defend with the support of the European Union?

— Does the Commission consider the decision to maintain a public monopoly on water a hindrance to the objective of the right to water?

Question for written answer E-003364/12
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Universal right of access to drinking water

At the last Earth Summit, 'Rio+20', the UN produced a document emphasising the importance of the universal right of access to drinking water and sanitation, which are essential in order to respect fully the right to life and human rights in general.

According to information disseminated by the Council of Canadians, a citizens' organisation active in the fight against the commercialisation of water, several European countries opposed to the formal recognition of the right to water, headed by the United Kingdom, have proposed that any reference to water as a human right be deleted from the above draft document, despite the fact that the European Parliament recognised it as a human right in a resolution of 15 March, emphasising how access to such an important resource is not only fundamental but, above all, universal.

Given that for approximately 40 years now, representatives at earth summits have been proclaiming their desire for universal access to water and reaffirming their commitment to it, initially by 1991 (target of the UN international drinking water decade 1981-1991), then by 2000 (as part of the aim to eradicate absolute poverty in the world) and now by 2030:

— Is the Commission aware of the abovementioned document?

— What is its position with regard to the deletion of the reference to the human right to access to water from the UN document for Rio+20?

— What measures is it envisaging with a view to safeguarding this essential element of the right to life?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

The EU position for Rio+20, including on water, is being developed on the basis of the conclusions of the European Council.

A resolution of the Human Rights Council on 30 September 2010 recalled that it is Member States that have the primary responsibility to ensure the full realisation of all human rights and that they may opt to involve non-state actors in the provision of safe drinking water and sanitation. It is then for Member States to ensure that non-state service providers fulfil their responsibilities.

On the occasion of the World and European Water Day on 22 March 2012, High Representative Catherine Ashton declared on behalf of the European Union that safe drinking water and sanitation are crucial for a healthy and dignified life. Given that millions of people are still without access to clean drinking water and thus deprived of a basic human right ([1]), the EU provides almost EUR 400 million per year, targeting some 35 partner countries, helping to build infrastructure for drinking and waste water systems worldwide.

Within the EU, the main function of the Commission in relation to drinking water is to ensure compliance with the quality standards for drinking water in accordance with EC law. It is for Member States to decide the degree to which water services should be public or private. The Commission has expressed no preference on this matter.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/129160.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003238/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(26 de Março de 2012)

Assunto: Uniformizar idade da juventude

Tendo em conta que:

— Em Portugal e Espanha, a idade da juventude está compreendida entre os 12 e os 30 anos, mas em outros Estados-Membros (por exemplo, a Suécia e a Polónia) o limite de idade é inferior, havendo sempre enormes dificuldades em saber as vantagens que os jovens possuem quando visitam outros países europeus;

— Segundo a página do «European Youth Card» na Internet, não existe uma idade de juventude consagrada a nível europeu, dado que as pessoas podem aceder a este cartão, caso tenham até 30 anos ou, em alguns Estados-Membros, idade inferior a 26 anos;

— A 23 de novembro de 2011, a Comissão Europeia anunciou o programa intitulado «Erasmus para Todos», que tem como objetivo dinamizar as áreas da educação, formação, juventude e desporto, tendo orçamentado 19 mil milhões de euros para abranger cerca de 5 milhões de pessoas;

— Segundo o ponto 9 do artigo 2.° da referida proposta, os jovens são «as pessoas com idades compreendidas entre os 13 e os 30 anos»;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

— Considera apropriado que exista uma tão grande disparidade na definição de juventude de uns Estados-Membros para outros?

— Qual a faixa etária da juventude que entende como sendo a mais apropriada? Se realmente for a consagrada na proposta de «Erasmus para Todos», ela será aplicada à generalidade dos programas europeus, ou apenas aos consagrados na referida proposta, nomeadamente nos domínios da educação, da formação, da juventude e do desporto?

— Não pondera a Comissão uniformizar a idade da juventude a nível europeu a todos os setores da sociedade, por forma a facilitar o acesso dos jovens a programas de financiamento ou a ter descontos nas mais diversas atividades culturais, desportivas ou societais nos diferentes Estados-Membros?

Resposta dada por Androulla Vassiliou em nome da Comissão
(11 de Junho de 2012)

Na observância do princípio da subsidiariedade, a Comissão não considera oportuno propor uma definição de «pessoa jovem» que possa aplicar-se universalmente na Europa; de resto, o artigo 165.° do TFUE exclui explicitamente uma tal harmonização de disposições legislativas ou regulamentares dos Estados-Membros. A Comissão considera legítimo que as administrações dos Estados-Membros envolvidas nas questões de juventude, tal como qualquer outra parte interessada, incluindo no âmbito de iniciativas privadas da sociedade civil, fixem limites de idade que correspondam aos objetivos específicos prosseguidos.

Neste espírito, a Comissão não considera que a definição proposta para o «Erasmus para Todos» deva ser de aplicação geral fora desse programa. Apenas visa permitir que se definam os critérios de elegibilidade para certas ações propostas no âmbito do referido programa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003238/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(26 March 2012)

Subject: Standardising the age of 'young people'

In Portugal and Spain, people are considered 'young' if they are aged between 12 and 30, but in other Member States (for example, Sweden and Poland), the upper age limit is lower, making it enormously difficult for young people to know what benefits they have when visiting other European countries.

According to the 'European Youth Card' website, there is no set Europe-wide age bracket into which a person must fall in order to be considered 'young'. In some Member States people can obtain the card if they are aged up to 30, whereas in others they have to be under 26.

On 23 November 2011, the Commission unveiled a programme called 'Erasmus for All', which is intended to boost the areas of education, training, youth and sport, and has a budget of EUR 19 000 million to encompass around 5 million people.

According to Article 2(9) of that proposal, young people are 'individuals aged between thirteen and thirty'.

Does the Commission consider it appropriate for the definition of a 'young person' to vary so widely from one Member State to another?

What does it consider to be the right age range for 'young people'? If the one laid down in the 'Erasmus for All' proposal is in fact considered most appropriate, will this be applied to European programmes in general or merely to those set out in the proposal itself, specifically in the areas of education, training, youth and sport?

Is the Commission not thinking of standardising the age of a 'young person' at European level so as to cover all sectors of society and hence facilitate young people's access to funding programmes or to discounts for all manner of cultural, sports, and social activities in the Member States?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(11 juin 2012)

Dans le respect du principe de subsidiarité, la Commission ne considère pas opportun de proposer une définition de la «personne jeune» qui puisse s'appliquer universellement en Europe; au demeurant, l'article 165 TFUE exclut explicitement une telle harmonisation de dispositions législatives ou règlementaires des États membres. La Commission considère légitime que les administrations des États membres concernées par les questions de jeunesse, de même que toute autre partie prenante, y compris dans le cadre d'initiatives privées de la société civile, fixent des limites d'âge qui correspondent aux objectifs particuliers qu'elles poursuivent.

Dans cet esprit la Commission ne considère pas que la définition proposée pour «Erasmus pour tous» doive être d'application générale en dehors de ce programme. Elle ne vise qu'à permettre de définir les critères d'éligibilité à certaines actions proposées dans le cadre de ce programme.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003243/12
a la Comisión
Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE) y Carmen Fraga Estévez (PPE)
(26 de marzo de 2012)

Asunto: Acuerdo entre la UE y Chile sobre la conservación de poblaciones de pez espada en el Pacífico sudoriental

A raíz de la reclamación presentada por la ANAPA, la Comisión realizó una investigación, de conformidad con el Reglamento (CE) n° 3286/94 del Consejo, sobre las prácticas chilenas que ocasionaban la denegación de acceso a los puertos de Chile a buques de pesca de pez espada en el Pacífico sudoriental. El informe resultante de esta investigación concluyó que estas prácticas no son compatibles con el artículo V del acuerdo GATT. La Comisión inició un procedimiento de solución de diferencias contra Chile. Al mismo tiempo, tanto la UE como Chile presentaron un recurso al Tribunal Internacional del Derecho del Mar (TIDM) que implicaba un litigio relativo a la conservación y la explotación sostenible de las poblaciones de pez espada en el Pacífico sudoriental, recurso que fue retirado por ambas partes en 2008.

La estrategia de la Comisión fue retirar el recurso de la OMC a consecuencia de la conclusión formal de un entendimiento entre la UE y Chile. Sin embargo, ya había retirado el recurso sin esperar al resultado del procedimiento de consentimiento. La Comisión de Pesca (PECH) del Parlamento se opuso a aceptar el texto propuesto para un entendimiento con Chile.

En su informe, la comisión PECH invitó a la Comisión a que, en su proyecto de recomendación, propusiera opciones alternativas, como la reanudación de la presión diplomática y jurídica de cualquier tipo sobre Chile para instarle a que cumpla con el Derecho internacional.

— ¿Por qué la Comisión privó deliberadamente a la UE de su influencia ante las autoridades chilenas cuando retiró el recurso de la OMC?

— ¿Cuál es la situación actual de las negociaciones con Chile?

— ¿Todavía trabaja la Comisión en los prerrequisitos especificados por el Parlamento en su proyecto de recomendación, y si es así, cuáles son las opciones alternativas de la Comisión?

— ¿Cambió la Comisión su estrategia con respecto a las negociaciones con Chile debido a que este país sigue sin querer firmar un acuerdo que sería beneficioso para ambas partes, es decir, la UE y Chile?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de julio de 2012)

La retirada de los recursos ante el Tribunal Internacional del Derecho del Mar (TIDM) y la Organización Mundial del Comercio (OMC) fue solicitada conjuntamente por la UE y Chile a raíz del Entendimiento entre la Unión Europea y la República de Chile relativo a la conservación de las poblaciones de pez espada en el Océano Pacífico Sudeste de 2008 y su anexo de 2009. Con anterioridad a ello, la Comisión había informado al PE de su intención de retirar los dos recursos conexos. El Consejo adoptó, el 3 de junio de 2010, la Decisión sobre la firma, en nombre de la Unión Europea, y aplicación provisional del Entendimiento ([1]). Chile ha sido invitado en varias ocasiones a firmarlo. No obstante, hasta ahora ha declinado hacerlo debido a sus reservas en relación con las disposiciones sobre la solución de diferencias y el desacuerdo con la Comisión acerca de la aplicación provisional del Entendimiento.

En este momento, no es posible introducir las modificaciones al texto negociado que sugiere el proyecto de recomendaciones del PE, debido a que, a raíz de la Decisión del Consejo antes mencionada, el texto del Acuerdo se considera definitivo. La introducción de cambios en el Entendimiento requeriría una nueva negociación sobre la base de una autorización formal del Consejo.

Actualmente, la Comisión no aprecia motivos para abrir nuevas negociaciones con Chile. Si Chile no llega a firmar el Entendimiento en sus términos actuales, pero manifiesta una firme intención de celebrar nuevas conversaciones con vistas a encontrar una solución permanente, la Comisión podrá considerar la posibilidad de proponer la revisión de determinadas disposiciones del Entendimiento o su ampliación, sobre la base de las consultas con los Estados miembros interesados y del sector, y teniendo en cuenta el proyecto de recomendaciones del PE.

La cuestión del acceso a los puertos chilenos por parte de los buques de pesca pelágica y los buques de abastecimiento de la UE está siendo abordada en el marco de la OROP del Pacífico Sur.

([1]) DO L 155 de 22.6.2010, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003243/12
to the Commission
Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE) and Carmen Fraga Estévez (PPE)
(26 March 2012)

Subject: Agreement between the EU and Chile on the conservation of swordfish stocks in the south-eastern Pacific

Following a complaint brought by ANAPA, the Commission carried out an investigation, pursuant to Council Regulation No 3286/94, into Chilean practices resulting in denial of access to that country's ports to vessels fishing for swordfish in the south-eastern Pacific. The report arising from this investigation concluded that these practices were inconsistent with Article V of the GATT agreement. The Commission initiated a WTO dispute settlement procedure against Chile. In parallel, both the EU and Chile submitted a case to ITLOS involving a dispute over the conservation and sustainable exploitation of swordfish stocks in the south-eastern Pacific, which was withdrawn by both sides in 2008.

The Commission's strategy was to withdraw the WTO case following the formal conclusion of an understanding between the EU and Chile. However, it had already withdrawn the court case without waiting for the outcome of the consent procedure. Parliament's Committee on Fisheries (PECH) withheld agreement to the proposed text for a understanding with Chile.

In its report, PECH invited the Commission, in its draft recommendation, to come up with alternative options, including the resumption of diplomatic and legal pressure of whatever kind on Chile to urge it to comply with international law.

— Why did the Commission deliberately deprive the EU of its leverage vis-à-vis the Chilean authorities when it withdrew the WTO case?

— What is the state of play regarding the negotiations with Chile?

— Is the Commission still working on the prerequisites specified by Parliament in its draft recommendation, and if so, what are the Commission's alternative options?

— Did the Commission change its strategy regarding negotiations with Chile on the grounds that Chile remains unwilling to sign an agreement which would be beneficial to both sides, i.e. the EU and Chile?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(11 July 2012)

The discontinuance of the ITLOS and WTO cases was requested jointly by the EU and Chile as a result of the 2008 EU-Chile Understanding concerning the conservation of swordfish stocks in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean and its Annex of 2009. Prior to that, the Commission informed the EP of its intentions to discontinue the two related cases. The Council adopted a decision on 3 June 2010 on the signing, on behalf of the European Union, and provisional application of the Understanding [1].Chile has been invited several times to sign it. Chile has so far declined on the grounds of reservations regarding the provisions on dispute settlement and disagreement with the Commission over the provisional application of the Understanding

At this stage, amendments to the negotiated text as suggested by the draft recommendations of the EP are not possible as, with the abovementioned Council Decision, the text of the Agreement is considered definitive. Changes to the Understanding would require a new negotiation, on the basis of a formal authorisation from the Council.

Currently, the Commission sees no grounds to open a new negotiation with Chile. If Chile eventually failed to sign the Understanding in its current form, but declared a serious intention to consider new negotiations with a view to find a permanent solution, the Commission may consider proposing revisiting certain provisions of the Understanding or broadening it, based on consultation of the concerned Member States and industry and taking into account the draft EP recommendations.

The issue of access to Chilean ports by EU pelagic fishing and supply vessels is being addressed in the frame of the South Pacific RFMO.

[1] OJ L 155/1 of 22 June 2010.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003248/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(27 de marzo de 2012)

Asunto: El derecho humano a la vivienda amenazado e incumplido por la lógica mercantil capitalista

A inicios de este mes de marzo, la Relatora Especial por el Derecho a la Vivienda de la Organización de las Naciones Unidas, Raquel Rolnik, visitó España para conocer de primera mano la lamentable situación y las constantes violaciones del derecho humano a la vivienda que sufren millones de familias en España.

«Asistimos al fracaso total de la mercantilización de la vivienda: ha pasado de cumplir una función social a convertirse en una mercancía para acabar siendo un activo financiero que sube y baja. Pero la gente no vive en un activo financiero. Además, a diferencia de otros productos financieros, la vivienda es un derecho humano», afirmó la relatora de las Naciones Unidas. Tal y como establece la Declaración Universal de los Derechos Humanos en su artículo 25 «toda persona tiene derecho a un nivel de vida adecuado que le asegure, así como a su familia, la salud, el bienestar, y en especial la alimentación, el vestido, la vivienda […]»

En los últimos años, y como consecuencia de la especulación, la crisis económica y la masiva destrucción de empleo, millones de personas han visto flagrantemente violado este derecho humano a la vivienda, teniendo que abandonar su casa y manteniendo además una injusta e ilegítima deuda con los bancos, aun habiéndose quedado estos con la propiedad de la vivienda. En palabras de la relatora especial, «la mercantilización generalizada de la vivienda ha fracasado y la crisis es una oportunidad de oro para replantear la gestión de las políticas de vivienda […] los gobiernos tienen la responsabilidad de proteger el derecho al acceso a una vivienda adecuada, puerta de entrada del resto de derechos humanos».

Teniendo en cuenta que tanto España como la Unión Europea son signatarios tanto del Pacto Internacional de Derechos Civiles y Políticos como del Pacto Internacional de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales, y considerando la defensa y el respeto por la garantía de los derechos humanos que, sobre el papel, identifica las políticas de la UE:

— ¿Piensa la Comisión llevar a cabo una regulación comunitaria que permita un efectivo cumplimiento del derecho de los ciudadanos y ciudadanas europeas a la vivienda?

— ¿Ha puesto en marcha la Comisión, o piensa poner en marcha, medidas efectivas para que todos los ciudadanos puedan acceder a una vivienda?

— ¿Considera la Comisión, a la luz del fracaso de la mercantilización de la vivienda, replantear la gestión de las políticas de vivienda para asegurar el acceso efectivo a una vivienda, así como regular a nivel comunitario la dación en pago con efectos retroactivos para evitar así la exclusión social y económica de millones de ciudadanos europeos?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de mayo de 2012)

En cuanto a las políticas de vivienda, las autoridades nacionales, regionales y locales de los Estados miembros son las competentes a la hora de afrontar la carencia de vivienda. La Comisión no tiene competencias para proponer, y menos aún aplicar, normativa en este asunto.

La UE no es signataria del Pacto Internacional de Derechos Civiles y Políticos ni del Pacto Internacional de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales. La protección de los derechos fundamentales está garantizada en la Unión mediante la Carta de Derechos Fundamentales de la UE. No obstante, conforme al artículo 51 de la Carta, su contenido está dirigido a los Estados miembros solo cuando apliquen normativa de la UE.

No obstante, la Comisión sigue prestando atención al asunto. En el Informe conjunto sobre protección social e inclusión social relativo a 2010 se invitó a los Estados miembros a desarrollar y aplicar planes de actuación para remediar la carencia de vivienda. En 2012, diez Estados miembros han abordado la carencia de vivienda en sus programas nacionales de reforma, que la Comisión analiza actualmente.

Entre las acciones directas de la UE cabe citar el apoyo a una evaluación de las estrategias en favor de la vivienda, a un nuevo proyecto sobre inmigrantes sin vivienda y a redes de ONG, y se prevé aumentar el apoyo a acciones piloto o

innovadoras. Para el período 2014-2020, la Comisión propone que las acciones para luchar contra la falta de vivienda puedan seguir accediendo a apoyo del FSE, y que los Estados miembros dediquen un mínimo del 5 % del total de FEDER al desarrollo urbano sostenible.

La Comisión es consciente de las dificultades que afrontan muchos europeos para obtener hipotecas y adquirir propiedad. La propuesta de directiva sobre el crédito hipotecario tiene por objetivo, entre otros, ayudar a los consumidores y a las familias a que obtengan hipotecas y que puedan así acceder a la propiedad de forma responsable. Esta propuesta actualmente es objeto de negociaciones en el Parlamento Europeo y en el Consejo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003248/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(27 March 2012)

Subject: The human right to housing threatened and undermined by capitalist market logic

In early March this year, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on adequate housing, Raquel Rolnik, visited Spain to see at first hand the lamentable situation and constant infringements of the human right to housing suffered by millions of families in Spain.

'We are witnessing a total failure of the commercialisation of housing, which has gone from playing a social role to becoming a commodity and has ended up as a financial asset with a value that rises and falls. But people do not live in a financial asset. Furthermore, unlike other financial products, housing is a human right', said the United Nations rapporteur. Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that 'Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing […]'.

In recent years, as a result of speculation, the economic crisis and massive job losses, millions of people have suffered from flagrant infringements of the human right to housing. They have had to leave their homes while remaining unfairly and unlawfully in debt to banks, even when the bank has taken possession of their home. In the words of the special rapporteur, 'the widespread commercialisation of housing has failed and the crisis is a golden opportunity to rethink housing policy management […] governments have the responsibility to protect the right of access to adequate housing, which is the gateway to the other human rights'.

Given that both Spain and the European Union are signatories to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and considering that EU policies are identified, on paper, with defending and respecting the guarantee of human rights:

— Does the Commission intend to implement a regulation to allow effective fulfilment of European citizens' right to housing?

— Has the Commission started, or does it plan to start, to implement effective measures to ensure that all citizens have access to housing?

— In view of the failure of the commercialisation of housing, does the Commission intend to rethink housing policy management to ensure effective access to housing and to regulate payments in kind with retroactive effect at EU level, in order to prevent the social and economic exclusion of millions of European citizens?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 May 2012)

As regards housing policies, Member States' national, regional and local authorities have the prime role in tackling homelessness. The Commission does not have the competence to propose, let alone to implement a regulation in this field.

The EU is not signatory to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights or the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Protection of fundamental rights is guaranteed in the European Union by the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. However, according to Article 51 of the Charter, its provisions are addressed to the Member States only when implementing Union law.

Nevertheless the Commission remains alert to the issue. The Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2010 called for Member States to develop and implement plans for action on homelessness. In 2012, ten Member States have addressed homelessness in their national reform programmes, which the Commission is now analysing.

Direct EU action includes support to an evaluation of housing-led strategies, to a new project on homeless migrants, and to NGO networks, with more piloting or innovation foreseen. The Commission proposes for the period 2014-2020 that actions to combat homelessness continue to be eligible for ESF support, and that Member States allocate 5 % or more of total ERDF to Sustainable Urban Development.

The Commission is aware of the difficulties faced by many Europeans to obtain mortgage credit and purchase property. The proposal for a 'Mortgage Credit Directive' aims, inter alia, to help consumers and families to obtain credit and thus access property in a responsible way. This proposal is currently subject to negotiations in the European Parliament and Council.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003326/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(28 Μαρτίου 2012)

Θέμα: Οι επιπτώσεις του κλίματος αβεβαιότητας στη ζωή και την υγεία των πολιτών — πρόληψη των αυτοκτονιών

Η αυτοκτονία αποτελεί ουσιαστικό πρόβλημα δημόσιας υγείας για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, ανάλογο με αυτό των τροχαίων ατυχημάτων, τόσο εξαιτίας των ανθρώπινων απωλειών όσο και ως έκφραση της κοινωνικής υποβάθμισης και της αβεβαιότητας. Ο συσχετισμός μεταξύ της οικονομικής κρίσης, της ανεργίας και των αυτοκτονιών καταδείχθηκε σαφέστατα όταν επήλθε η ύφεση του 1929, οπότε και καταγράφηκε σημαντική άνοδος του αριθμού των αυτοκτονιών. Στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, το ποσοστό των αυτοκτονιών μειώθηκε μεταξύ του 2000 και του 2008, με ετήσιο ρυθμό 1,9%.

Πρόσφατη έρευνα ([1]) καταδεικνύει ότι το ποσοστό των αυτοκτονιών στην Ευρώπη αυξήθηκε ραγδαία από την αρχή της οικονομικής και χρηματοπιστωτικής κρίσης. Συγκεκριμένα, την περίοδο 2007-2009, η ανεργία στην Ευρώπη αυξήθηκε κατά 35%, ενώ σε εννέα από τα είκοσι επτά κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ το ποσοστό των αυτοκτονιών αυξήθηκε κατά τουλάχιστον 5%. Στην Ελλάδα, μια χώρα που επλήγη ιδιαίτερα από την κρίση και στην οποία επιβλήθηκαν σκληρά μέτρα λιτότητας, καταγράφηκε 40% αύξηση των αυτοκτονιών κατά την περίοδο 2008-2011 ([2]) σύμφωνα με στοιχεία του Υπουργείου Υγείας. Το γεγονός αυτό καταδεικνύει ότι η κρίση και το κλίμα αβεβαιότητας έχουν σοβαρές επιπτώσεις στην υγεία και στη ζωή των ευρωπαίων πολιτών.

1. Διαθέτει η Επιτροπή πλήρη στοιχεία σχετικά με τις επιπτώσεις της οικονομικής υποβάθμισης και της κοινωνικής αποσταθεροποίησης στους ευρωπαίους πολίτες, κυρίως ως προς την υγεία τους;

2. Δεδομένου ότι το ζήτημα της θνησιμότητας από αυτοκτονία υποτιμάται σε μεγάλο βαθμό εξαιτίας της έλλειψης στοιχείων, προβλέπει η Επιτροπή τη συλλογή στοιχείων με σκοπό την περιγραφή της κατάστασης και την καταγραφή της πρόθεσης αυτοκτονίας στην Ευρώπη;

3. Προβλέπεται, ως προληπτικό μέτρο, να διεξαχθεί μια ευρωπαϊκή εκστρατεία ευαισθητοποίησης σε σχέση με τις επιπτώσεις της κρίσης και της αβεβαιότητας στην υγεία των ευρωπαίων πολιτών, όπως αυτές που πραγματοποιούνται για την καταπολέμηση της βίας; Για τον σκοπό αυτό, θα μπορούσε να καθιερωθεί μια ευρωπαϊκή ημέρα για την πρόληψη της αυτοκτονίας;

4. Σκοπεύει η Επιτροπή να ζητήσει από τα κράτη μέλη να εξασφαλίσουν τη διάθεση πληροφοριών και να προβλέψουν την παροχή βοήθειας στον εν λόγω τομέα;

Απάντηση του κ. Dalli εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Μαΐου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή (Eurostat) συγκεντρώνει στοιχεία για τα ποσοστά αυτοκτονιών στα κράτη μέλη τα οποία διατίθενται στον ιστότοπό της. Τα στοιχεία αυτά και οι ανταλλαγές με τα υπουργεία Υγείας των κρατών μελών δείχνουν ότι τα ποσοστά αυτοκτονιών διαφέρουν σημαντικά στην ΕΕ. Ο αντίκτυπος της κρίσης σε αυτό το ζήτημα επηρεάζεται από πολλαπλούς παράγοντες, μεταξύ των οποίων περιλαμβάνονται η ετοιμότητα και η επάρκεια ισχύ των συστημάτων υγείας και κοινωνικής προστασίας. Επιπροσθέτως, τα στοιχεία χρειάζεται να ερμηνευτούν με προσοχή, καθώς ο αριθμός των θανάτων με βάση το πιστοποιητικό αυτοκτονίας είναι πιθανό να είναι μικρότερος από τον πραγματικό σε ορισμένες χώρες για πολιτιστικούς και θρησκευτικούς λόγους.

Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί τον αντίκτυπο της κρίσης στην υγεία και την κοινωνία σε συνεργασία με τα κράτη μέλη στο πλαίσιο της επιτροπής για την κοινωνική προστασία. Επιπροσθέτως, η ομάδα των κυβερνητικών εμπειρογνωμόνων για την ψυχική υγεία και ευημερία εξετάζει τακτικά την κατάσταση όσον αφορά τις εξελίξεις στην ψυχική υγεία. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει σχεδιάσει πρόσθετες δραστηριότητες σε αυτόν τον τομέα.

([1]) «Effects of the 2008 recession on health: a first look at European data», (Επιπτώσεις της ύφεσης του 2008 στην υγεία: μια πρώτη ματιά στα ευρωπαϊκά δεδομένα) των David Stuckler, Sanjay Basu, Marc Suhrcke, Adam Coutts, Martin Mc Kee. Περιοδικό «The Lancet» 9/7/2011 τόμος 378 αριθ. 97-86 σελ.124-125.

([2]) «Sharp rise in suicides amid crisis», (Ραγδαία αύξηση των αυτοκτονιών εν μέσω κρίσεως) ekathimerini.com, 30 Ιουνίου 2011 http://www.ekathimerini.com/4dcgi/_w_articles_wsite1_1_30/06/2011_396649 (διαβάστηκε στις 1.9.2011).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003326/12
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Impact of job insecurity on the lives and health of citizens — suicide prevention

Suicide is a real public health issue in the European Union, comparable with road accidents in terms of loss of human life and the social breakdown and insecurity it expresses. The correlation between economic and financial crisis, unemployment and suicide was clearly established following the 1929 crisis, when a considerable increase in suicide was noted. In the European Union as a whole, the suicide rate fell by 1.9 % per year between 2000 and 2008.

According to a recent study ([1]), the suicide rate has risen sharply in Europe since the beginning of the economic and financial crisis. Between 2007 and 2009, unemployment grew by 35 % in Europe and in nine of the 27 EU Member States, the suicide rate increased by at least 5 %. In Greece, a country particularly affected by the crisis and subject to brutal austerity, an increase of 40 % in suicides was recorded for 2008-2011, according to data released by the Ministry of Health ([2]). This shows that the crisis and insecurity are having a significant impact on the lives and health of European citizens.

1. Does the Commission have consolidated data on the impact of the economic contraction and social destabilisation on European citizens, particularly regarding their health?

2. As suicide mortality is grossly underestimated due to lack of data, does the Commission plan to collect data in the EU to establish what the situation is with regard to suicides and suicide attempts in Europe?

3. Can a European campaign to raise awareness of the effects of the crisis and insecurity on the health of European citizens be envisaged as a preventive measure, like the campaigns on violence? To this end, could a European suicide prevention day be introduced?

4. Does the Commission plan to invite Member States to provide information and assistance in this area?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2012)

The Commission (Eurostat) collects data on suicide rates in the Member States which are available on its website. Such data and exchanges with Member States' Ministries of Health show that the rate of suicides differs significantly across the EU. The impact of the crisis on this issue is influenced by multiple factors, including the preparedness and strength of health and social protection systems. In addition, data needs to be interpreted with caution, as the number of deaths based on certification of suicide is likely to be underestimated in some countries due to cultural and religious considerations.

The Commission is monitoring the social and health impact of the crisis in cooperation with the Member States in the context of the Social Protection Committee. Moreover, the Group of Governmental experts in Mental health and Well-being regularly examines the situation regarding developments in mental health. The Commission has no plans for additional activities in this field.

([1]) 'Effects of the 2008 recession on health: a first look at European data' by David Stuckler, Sanjay Basu, Marc Suhrcke, Adam Coutts, Martin McKee. The Lancet, 9.7.2011, Vol. 378, No 97-86, p. 124-125.

([2]) 'Sharp rise in suicides amid crisis', ekathimerini.com, 30.6.2011. http://www.ekathimerini.com/4dcgi/_w_articles_wsite1_1_30/06/2011_396649 (consulted on 1.9.2011).

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003332/12
do Komisji
Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(28 marca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wpływ umów o wolnym handlu z Malezją, Indiami oraz Singapurem na gospodarki krajów UE

Jednym z najważniejszych instrumentów realizacji polityki handlowej UE są umowy o wolnym handlu negocjowane i zawierane z kluczowymi partnerami handlowymi na świecie. Mają one ogromny wpływ na gospodarkę całej UE i z zasady swej mają służyć jej wzmocnieniu poprzez zniesienie dotychczasowych barier handlowych w wymianie handlowej z krajami trzecimi. Podsumowując korzyści płynące dla UE z tych umów, należy niewątpliwie przyjrzeć się analizie skutków umów o wolnym handlu, nie tylko dla UE jako całości, ale także dla gospodarek poszczególnych państw członkowskich z rozbiciem na poszczególne gałęzie danej gospodarki: sektor przemysłowy, usługi oraz rolnictwo.

W związku z powyższym proszę o udostępnienie analizy przewidywanego wpływu umów o wolnym handlu z Malezją, Indiami oraz Singapurem na gospodarki poszczególnych państw członkowskich z uwzględnieniem poszczególnych sektorów danej gospodarki krajowej, takich jak sektor przemysłowy, usługi oraz rolnictwo.

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003333/12
do Komisji
Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(28 marca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wpływ FTA z Japonią, Kanadą i Ukrainą na gospodarki krajów UE

Jednym z najważniejszych instrumentów realizacji polityki handlowej UE są umowy o wolnym handlu negocjowane i zawierane z kluczowymi partnerami handlowymi na świecie. Mają one ogromny wpływ na gospodarkę całej UE i z zasady swej mają służyć jej wzmocnieniu poprzez zniesienie dotychczasowych barier handlowych w wymianie handlowej z krajami trzecimi. Podsumowując korzyści płynące dla UE z tych umów, należy niewątpliwie przyjrzeć się analizie skutków umów o wolnym handlu, nie tylko dla UE jako całości, ale także dla gospodarek poszczególnych państw członkowskich z rozbiciem na poszczególne gałęzie danej gospodarki: sektor przemysłowy, usługi oraz rolnictwo.

W związku z powyższym proszę o udostępnienie analizy przewidywanego wpływu FTA z Japonią, Kanadą i Ukrainą na gospodarki poszczególnych państw członkowskich z uwzględnieniem poszczególnych sektorów danej gospodarki krajowej: sektor przemysłowy, usługi oraz rolnictwo.

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji
(16 maja 2012 r.)

Komisja analizuje wpływ wszystkich umów o wolnym handlu między UE i państwami trzecimi na Unię Europejską jako całość, zanim zostaną one zawarte. Badania takie zawierają również szczegółowe analizy na szczeblu sektorowym, są jawne i znajdują się na stronie internetowej Dyrekcji Generalnej ds. Handlu: (http://ec.europa.eu/trade/analysis/).

Komisja posiada kompetencje w zakresie negocjowania umów handlowych w imieniu UE jako całości i nie analizuje wpływu takich porozumień o wolnym handlu na poszczególne państwa członkowskie UE. Ważne jest również, aby uznać, że produkcja w różnych krajach jest w coraz większym stopniu wzajemnie powiązana poprzez międzynarodowe łańcuchy dostaw. Dlatego też coraz trudniej jest dokładnie określić w tradycyjnej statystyce dotyczącej handlu, który kraj co wytwarza (zwłaszcza w UE, gdzie mamy dobrze funkcjonujący jednolity rynek).

Komisja zajmuje się dalej tą kwestią i sfinansowała ambitny projekt w celu stworzenia nowej bazy danych na potrzeby analizy handlu, która uruchomiona została w dniu 16 kwietnia 2012 r. na konferencji wysokiego szczebla na temat: „Konkurencyjność, handel, środowisko naturalne i miejsca pracy w Europie: Wnioski wyciągnięte z bazy danych World Input Output Database (WIOD)". Nowa baza danych umożliwi analizę przepływów handlowych z punktu widzenia międzynarodowych łańcuchów dostaw i określenie wkładu każdego kraju do wartości każdego rynkowego towaru i usługi. Początkowe analizy wykonane na tym zestawie danych potwierdzają, że w UE otwarciu rynku i silnej integracji z globalnymi łańcuchami dostaw towarzyszył imponujący potencjał eksportu wartości dodanej i tworzenia nowych miejsc pracy. Niezbędne są jednak dalsze analizy, w szczególności na szczeblu państw członkowskich. Dalsze informacje dostępne są na następującej stronie internetowej:
http://www.wiod.org/conferences/launch.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003332/12
to the Commission
Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: The impact of free trade agreements (FTAs) with Malaysia, India and Singapore on the economies of EU countries

Free trade agreements negotiated and concluded with key trade partners around the world are one of the most important instruments for implementing the EU's trade policy. They have a great impact on the economy of the entire EU and, essentially, are intended to strengthen it by removing existing trade barriers in trade with third countries. In summing up the benefits of these agreements for the EU, we should certainly look at the analysis of the effects of free trade agreements, not only for the EU as a whole, but also for the economies of individual Member States, including a breakdown into individual sectors of the given economy: the industrial sector, services and agriculture.

In relation to the above, I hereby request that an analysis of the expected impact of free trade agreements with Malaysia, India and Singapore on the economies of individual Member States be provided, taking into account the individual sectors of the given national economy, such as the industrial sector, services and agriculture.

Question for written answer E-003333/12
to the Commission
Paweł Zalewski (PPE)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: The impact of the FTAs with Japan, Canada and Ukraine on the economies of EU countries

Free trade agreements negotiated and concluded with key trade partners around the world are one of the most important instruments for implementing the EU's trade policy. They have a great impact on the economy of the entire EU and, essentially, are intended to strengthen it by removing existing trade barriers in trade with third countries. In summing up the benefits of these agreements for the EU, we should certainly look at the analysis of the effects of free trade agreements, not only for the EU as a whole, but also for the economies of individual Member States, including a breakdown into individual sectors of the given economy: the industrial sector, services and agriculture.

In relation to the above, I hereby request that an analysis of the expected impact of the FTAs with Japan, Canada and Ukraine on the economies of individual Member States be made available, taking into account the individual sectors of the given national economy: the industrial sector, services and agriculture.

Joint answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2012)

The Commission analyses the impact of all free trade agreements between the EU and third countries, before they are concluded, on the European Union as a whole. Such studies also contain detailed analysis at a sectoral level, they are public and are available on Directorate-General Trade's homepage (http://ec.europa.eu/trade/analysis/).

The Commission has the competence to negotiate trade agreements on behalf of the EU as a whole, and does not analyse the impact of such free trade agreements on individual EU Member States. It is also important to recognise that production is becoming increasingly intertwined through international supply chains. This makes it increasingly difficult to disentangle in traditional trade statistics precisely who produces what (especially so in the EU where we have a well functioning Single Market).

The Commission is following this topic and funded an ambitious project to put together a new database for trade analysis, which was launched on 16 April 2012 at a High-Level Conference on 'Competitiveness, trade, environment and jobs in Europe: Insights from the new World Input Output Database (WIOD)'. The new database will allow for the exploring of trade flows from the point of view of international supply chains and identify the contribution of each country to the value of each traded good and service. The initial analyses done with this dataset confirm that in the EU, openness and the extensive integration in global supply chains has been accompanied by an impressive capacity to export value added and create employment. However, further analysis is needed, especially at the level of Member States. Further information can be found at:
http://www.wiod.org/conferences/launch.htm.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-003460/12
à la Commission
Agnès Le Brun (PPE)
(29 mars 2012)

Objet: œufs non conformes

Les entreprises utilisatrices d'ovo-produits ont exprimé, ces derniers jours, leur inquiétude face à la pénurie d'œufs qui entraîne une envolée du prix de cette matière première, atteignant 75 % entre octobre 2011 et février 2012.

En novembre, la Commission européenne avait annoncé qu'environ 51 millions de poules européennes restaient tenues dans des cages non aménagées.

Elle menaçait d'ouvrir des procédures d'infraction contre au moins onze États de l'Union. Le retard accumulé suite à la mise en conformité, d'une partie des élevages, avec la directive Bien-être, rendue obligatoire au 1er janvier 2012, a aujourd'hui des conséquences socio-économiques désastreuses pour l'industrie alimentaire (pâtisseries, plats cuisinés, pâtes alimentaires, viennoiseries).

D'autre part, il existe une véritable distorsion de concurrence sur les produits finis contenant des œufs, entre les pays qui se sont mis aux normes et ceux qui ont beaucoup de retard. Les pays dont les exploitations ont davantage de retard dans la mise en conformité avec les règles communautaires, disposent d'ovo-produits non exportables, mais utilisés par les industriels qui produisent à moindre coût et exportent leurs produits finis sur les marchés européens.

Étant donné la pénurie, certaines entreprises pourraient procéder prochainement à des fermetures de lignes de production et à la mise au chômage technique d'une partie du personnel.

Face à cette situation exceptionnelle, la Commission envisage-t-elle de prendre des mesures urgentes pour redonner aux entreprises, à court terme, la possibilité de s'approvisionner en ovo-produit?

Pour parer les distorsions de concurrence, la Commission envisage-t-elle des mesures permettant une péréquation des exportations intracommunautaires en ovo-produit?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(31 mai 2012)

S'il est vrai que le prix des œufs était élevé au cours du premier trimestre de 2012, la période critique qu'ont connue les entreprises de transformation des œufs est à présent passée, et la demande d'œufs de table a également fléchi après la période des congés de Pâques. La production augmente et la demande baisse, ce qui a pour effet de stabiliser le marché des œufs.

Il n'est pas nécessaire d'améliorer l'accès aux importations en provenance de pays tiers au-delà de ce qui est déjà prévu par la législation en vigueur parce que l'utilisation par l'industrie de production d'œufs de l'UE du contingent tarifaire applicable aux importations d'œufs en coquille au taux réduit de 50 % est négligeable.

En ce qui concerne le marché intérieur, il n'existe aucune restriction: tous les États membres sont tenus de garantir que les œufs commercialisés sur leur territoire sont produits dans des exploitations qui sont conformes à la législation applicable.

En outre, encourager le commerce des œufs produits dans des cages de batterie non conformes, quelle que soit leur origine, serait perçu comme compromettant les efforts des producteurs qui respectent l'interdiction des cages de batterie.

En annexe figure le graphique de l'évolution des prix des œufs en coquille pour la consommation directe et pour l'industrie de la casserie de l'UE ainsi que du prix des œufs pour l'industrie de la casserie aux États-Unis.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003335/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 martie 2012)

Subiect: Impactul deficitului de ouă și produse derivate asupra producătorilor europeni

Asociația industriilor ciocolatei, biscuiților și produselor de cofetărie din Uniunea Europeană (CAOBISCO) apreciază că deficitul de ouă și derivate îi afectează activitatea și solicită măsuri de urgență pentru a garanta aprovizionarea și stabilitatea prețurilor.

Reprezentanții asociației arată că prețurile au crescut în medie cu 75% în ultimele șase luni, mai ales ca urmare a noilor norme UE în materie de bunăstare a păsărilor. Potrivit estimărilor CAOBISCO, cererea de ouă și produse derivate pe piața UE va depăși cu 20 la sută producția.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze care ar putea fi măsurile imediate pentru a asigura o aprovizionare suficientă a sectorului.

Răspuns comun dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(31 mai 2012)

Deși este adevărat că prețul ouălor a fost ridicat în primul trimestru al anului 2012, momentul critic pentru procesatorii de ouă a trecut, iar cererea de ouă pentru consum s-a relaxat după perioada vacanței de Paște. Creșterea producției și cererea redusă au contribuit la stabilizarea pieței ouălor.

Nu este necesar să se crească accesul la importurile din țări terțe într-o cantitate mai mare decât cea prevăzută în legislația actuală, deoarece utilizarea de către industria de profil din UE a contingentului tarifar actual pentru importurile de ouă în coajă la rata redusă de 50% este nesemnificativă.

În ceea ce privește piața internă, nu există nicio restricție: toate statele membre trebuie să se asigure că ouăle comercializate pe teritoriul lor sunt produse în sisteme care respectă legislația în vigoare.

De asemenea, încurajarea comercializării de ouă produse în baterii neconforme, indiferent de originea lor, ar fi percepută ca o subminare a eforturilor producătorilor care respectă interdicția de utilizare a bateriilor.

Vă transmitem în anexă graficul cu evoluția prețurilor la ouăle în coajă destinate consumului direct și industriei prelucrătoare în UE și a prețului la ouăle destinate industriei prelucrătoare în SUA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003335/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: The impact of the shortage of eggs and derivative products on European producers

The Association of *Chocolate, Biscuit and Confectionery Industries of the European Union* (CAOBISCO) considers that the shortage of eggs and derivative products is affecting their activities and requests urgent measures to guarantee supply and price stability.

Representatives of this association state that prices have risen on average by 75 % in the last six months, especially as a consequence of the new EU regulations on poultry welfare. According to CAOBISCO's estimates, the demand for eggs and derivative products in the EU market will exceed supply by 20 %.

The Commission is asked to specify what immediate measures could be taken in order to ensure an adequate supply for this sector.

Question for written answer P-003460/12
to the Commission
Agnès Le Brun (PPE)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Non-compliant eggs

Companies using egg products have recently expressed their concerns over egg shortages amid soaring prices. Between October 2011 and February 2012, the price of this commodity increased by 75%.

In November, the European Commission announced that around 51 million European hens were being kept in unenriched cages.

It threatened to initiate infringement proceedings against at least 11 Member States. This delay by several farms in complying with the Welfare Directive, made compulsory on 1 January 2012, is now having disastrous socioeconomic consequences for the food industry, affecting products such as confectionery, ready meals, pasta and pastries.

Moreover, there is a real distortion in competition between finished food products containing eggs in countries that have already fulfilled the requirements of the new legislation and those that are lagging well behind. The egg products of those countries still to comply with the EU regulations are not exportable. Instead, they are used by firms that produce more cheaply and export their finished products to the European markets.

Given this shortage, certain companies could soon begin closing their production lines and laying off some of their staff.

In these exceptional circumstances, will the Commission take urgent measures to provide businesses, in the short term, with the possibility of obtaining egg product supplies?

To safeguard against the distortion of competition, will the Commission consider measures for the equalisation of intra-EU exports of egg products?

Joint answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2012)

While it is true that the egg price was high in the first quarter of 2012, the critical moment for the egg processors has now passed and demand for table eggs has also slackened after the Easter holiday period, with increased production and reduced demand stabilising the egg market.

To increase the access to imports from Third Countries beyond what is already provided for in the current legislation is not necessary because the use by the EU egg industry of the current Tariff Rate Quota for imports of eggs in shell at the reduced duty of 50 % is negligible.

As regards the internal market, there is no restriction: All Member States must ensure that eggs marketed on their territory are produced in systems that are in compliance with the relevant legislation.

Furthermore, to encourage the trade in eggs that are produced in noncompliant battery cages, whatever their origin, would be seen as undermining the efforts of producers that comply with the battery cage ban.

Please find in the annex the graph with evolution of prices of eggs in shell for direct consumption and for the breaking industry in the EU and the price of eggs for the breaking industry in the USA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003344/12
to the Commission
Daniel Hannan (ECR)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Compulsory 'SME test' remains unused by EU Commission in 50 % of cases

The Commission wrote in February 2011 ([1]) that it would endeavour to further strengthen the application of the 'SME test' in its impact assessment procedure to ensure that impacts on SMEs are thoroughly analysed and taken into account in all relevant legislative and policy proposals.

A report ([2]) published in November 2011 by Eurochambres, the Association of European Chambers of Commerce and Industry, revealed that despite mandatory guidelines, which explicitly feature SMEs as a key issue to be examined, the SME test is still not routinely carried out. Half of the impact assessment reports analysed do not include an SME test; the SME test procedure lacks transparency, with little information on what has actually been done; the quality and content of the SME test varies greatly between the Commission Directorates-General. The quality of the test can be considered as good for only three of the nine impact assessment reports analysed; specific consultation of SME representatives is not common practice. They were not consulted or only superficially involved in the process in half of the cases.

As a result, decisions taken by the Commission are being based on a partial and incomplete picture of the impact that European legislation is having on SMEs. Given that 99 % of the EU's businesses are SMEs, the Commission must prioritise the improvement of its impact assessments and SME test, particularly if it is serious about reducing regulatory red tape in the single market.

What concrete measures has the Commission undertaken to improve the uptake of the SME test in its impact assessments for relevant legislative and policy proposals?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2012)

The 'SME-test' is an integrated part of the Commission Impact Assessment Guidelines in force since January 2009. A study commissioned by the Industry, Research and Energy Committee of the European Parliament on barriers and best practices in 'SME test' implementation ([3]) looked at whether these guidelines were respected and found that the Commission uses the 'SME test' consistently, and that strong measures have been taken to incorporate the test into impact assessments.

Measures include a strengthened SME help desk function and the active engagement of officials with SME expertise in impact assessment work. Also, the impact assessment Board systematically verifies the proportionality and quality of the analysis concerning SMEs. In 2011, it called for improvements in this respect in some 25 % of all impact assessments ([4]). As for consultations, to give SMEs more time to prepare their input, roadmaps on planned initiatives are available online ([5]) early in the policy process and consultations' minimum length has been extended to 12 weeks from 8.

Finally, the November 2011 Commission report ([6]) on 'Minimising regulatory burden for SMEs — Adapting EU regulation to the needs of micro-enterprises' announced further measures. These include the premise that micro-enterprises should a priori be excluded from the scope of proposed legislation unless the necessity and proportionality of their being covered can be demonstrated during the impact assessment phase; the consideration of adapted solutions and lighter regimes whenever micro-enterprises are covered; and better tailored opportunities for SMEs to give their views on existing and new policies.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/small-business-act/files/sba_review_en.pdf
([2]) http://www.cebre.cz/dokums_raw/resultssmetestbenchmark_final_2011_00853_01.pdf
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/JURI/studiesdownload.html?languageDocument=EN&file=4246.
([4]) SEC(2012) 101.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/planned_ia/roadmaps_2012_en.htm
([6]) COM(2011) 803 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003345/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(28. März 2012)

Betrifft: Käfigbetten in psychiatrischen Kliniken

Die Unterbringung von psychiatrischen Patienten in Käfigbetten ist in der Tschechischen Republik weiterhin eine akzeptable „Behandlung". Trotz Versprechen, etwa zu dem Zeitpunkt des EU-Beitritts im Jahr 2004 keine Käfigbetten mehr zuzulassen, weicht die Tschechische Republik unverblümt ihren Völkerrechtspflichten aus, wenn es um psychiatrische Patienten geht.

Berichten in der tschechischen Presse zufolge begehen Frauen in der psychiatrischen Klinik Dobrny nahe Pilsen in ihren Käfigbetten Selbstmord.

1. Besitzt die Kommission Kenntnis von der Behandlung von Menschen in Nervenkliniken und psychiatrischen Einrichtungen in der Tschechischen Republik und anderswo in Europa?

2. Wie kann die Kommission zur Verbesserung der Bedingungen beitragen, unter denen psychisch kranke Menschen gehalten werden?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(15. Mai 2012)

Nach Artikel 168 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union sind die Mitgliedstaaten für die Organisation des Gesundheitswesens und die medizinische Versorgung verantwortlich. Die Kommission erhebt in diesem Zusammenhang nicht systematisch Daten über die Behandlung von Patienten in Nervenkliniken und psychiatrischen Einrichtungen in der Tschechischen Republik oder in anderen EU-Ländern und ist nicht befugt, Käfigbetten in psychiatrischen Einrichtungen zu verbieten.

Sie unterstützt jedoch den Austausch und den Wissenstransfer zwischen Mitgliedstaaten, den im Gesundheitswesen tätigen Fachkräften, Patientenverbänden und der Zivilgesellschaft darüber, wie die psychiatrische Versorgung verbessert werden kann, und zwar durch den Europäischen Pakt für psychische Gesundheit und Wohlbefinden und Projekte im Rahmen des EU-Gesundheitsprogramms wie auch des 7. Rahmenprogramms für Forschung und Innovation. So soll mit dem Forschungsprojekt ROAMER ein umfassender konsensgestützter Fahrplan ausgearbeitet werden, mit dem die Forschung zur psychischen Gesundheit und zum psychischen Wohlbefinden gefördert und besser integriert werden soll ([1]) ([2]). Mit Mitteln aus den EU-Strukturfonds können die Mitgliedstaaten ferner bessere Bedingungen für die psychiatrische Versorgung schaffen.

Die Agentur der Europäischen Union für Grundrechte schließt derzeit die Untersuchung „Involuntary placement and involuntary treatment of persons with mental disorders" (Zwangseinweisung und -behandlung von Menschen mit psychischen Störungen) ab. Diese soll einen Überblick über die rechtlichen Rahmenbedingungen in den EU-Mitgliedstaaten geben. Auch einige konkrete persönliche Erfahrungen sollen darin berücksichtigt werden. Vorgestellt wird die Untersuchung auf der Konferenz zum Thema Autonomie und Eingliederung, die die Agentur für Grundrechte am 7. und 8. Juni 2012 in Kopenhagen veranstaltet.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ_RCN=12220413.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/docs/ev_20101108_invited_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003345/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Caging in psychiatric clinics

The caging of human beings continues to be acceptable 'treatment' for psychiatric patients in the Czech Republic. Despite promises to end caging around the time of EU accession in 2004 the Czech Republic openly shuns its international law duties when it comes to psychiatric patients.

According to reports in the Czech press, women commit suicide in their caged beds at Dobrny psychiatric clinic near Plzen.

1. Is the Commission aware of the treatment the people receive inside mental hospitals and psychiatric settings in the Czech republic and elsewhere in Europe?

2. How can the Commission contribute to the improvement of the conditions that mentally sick people are kept?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2012)

According to Article 168 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Member States have the responsibility for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care. In this context, the Commission does not systematically collect information about the treatment inside mental hospitals and psychiatric settings in the Czech Republic or elsewhere in Europe, and has no mandate to ban the use of cage beds in psychiatric settings.

The Commission does however support the exchange and knowledge between Member States, professionals, patient organisations and civil society on ways to improve psychiatric care, through the European Pact for Mental Health and Well-being and projects under the EU-Health Programme and the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Innovation. In this context, the Research project ROAMER aims to develop a comprehensive, consensus-based roadmap to promote and integrate mental health and well-being research in Europe ([1]) ([2]). In addition, the EU Structural Funds provide opportunities for Member States to use these funds to improve conditions in psychiatric care.

The Fundamental Rights Agency is also currently finalising a study on 'Involuntary placement and involuntary treatment of persons with mental disorders', which will provide an overview of legal frameworks in EU Member States. The study will also include a number of concrete personal experiences. This study will be presented at a Fundamental Rights Agency-conference on autonomy and inclusion, which will take place on 7-8 June 2012 in Copenhagen.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ_RCN=12220413.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/docs/ev_20101108_invited_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003346/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Pilot flying hours

Could the Commission state what changes are being proposed in relation to pilot flying hours, and when the proposals will be published?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2012)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-004232/2011 and P-004447/2011 ([1]) indicating its intentions to amend to current EU legislation governing flight time limitations ([2]) with the aim of improving safety and providing for further harmonisation and a level-playing field for all European airlines. Further harmonisation is particularly sought concerning areas that are not covered by the current rules, such as split duty, time zone differences, reduced rest, extension of the flight duty period due to augmented flight crew and standby.

For that purpose, the Commission has entrusted the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) with conducting an objective technical and scientific assessment and with submitting its final conclusions to the Commission. At present, EASA plans to present draft proposals to the Commission in late summer 2012.

Based on the EASA proposals, the Commission will assess whether amendments to the current rules need to be made and, if considered necessary, may adopt appropriate legislation through a regulatory procedure with scrutiny.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN.
([2]) Subpart Q of Annex III to Council Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 of 16 December 1991 on the harmonisation of technical requirements and administrative procedures in the field of civil aviation, OJ L 373, 31.12.1991, p. 4.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003347/12
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(28 maart 2012)

Betreft: Commissie tegen open kabel Nederland

Volgens berichten heeft eurocommissaris Kroes eerder deze maand tijdens een bijeenkomst met kabelaanbieders in Brussel gezegd dat Nederlandse wetgeving, bedoeld om het analoge kabelnetwerk open te stellen, voor Brussel onacceptabel is ([1]). Naar aanleiding hiervan heb ik de volgende vragen:

1. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat commissaris Kroes heeft gewaarschuwd dat de Europese Commissie Nederlandse wetgeving m.b.t. open toegang tot de kabel zal aanvechten?

2. Onderschrijft de Commissie de bewering van commissaris Kroes dat Nederland de kabel niet d.m.v. wetgeving mag openbreken?

3. Kan de Commissie uiteenzetten waarom het lidstaten kritiseert die gezonde concurrentie op het kabelnetwerk proberen te bewerkstelligen?

4. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het volstrekt legitiem is dat de Nederlandse wetgever optreedt om een open kabelnetwerk te creëren? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van Mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(23 mei 2012)

De Commissie kan de door Cable Europe afgegeven verklaring niet bevestigen. Volgens deze verklaring zou vicevoorzitter Kroes tijdens een bijeenkomst met kabelexploitanten hebben gezegd gekant te zijn tegen ontwerpwetgeving die de openstelling beoogt van het kabelnetwerk in Nederland. Deze verklaring werd onmiddellijk weerlegd door de Europese Commissie en vervolgens ingetrokken door Cable Europe. Tijdens de desbetreffende bijeenkomst had mevrouw Kroes verwezen naar het algemene beleid van actieve handhaving van de EU-voorschriften in geval van schending en had zij geen oordeel geveld over deze specifieke ontwerpwetgeving.

Een van de voornaamste doelstellingen van het Europees beleid inzake elektronische communicatienetwerken en -diensten is de concurrentie op dit gebied te bevorderen zodat consumenten meer keus krijgen en er ruimte komt voor innovatie. Het regelgevingskader voor elektronische communicatie ([2]) bepaalt dat onafhankelijke nationale regelgevende instanties (nri's) zoals de OPTA de concurrentie bij het aanbieden van elektronische communicatie moeten bevorderen onder meer „door ervoor te zorgen dat er in de sector elektronische communicatie geen verstoring of beperking van de concurrentie is, met inbegrip van de doorgifte van inhoud" (artikel 8, lid 2 van de kaderrichtlijn ([3])). Het regelgevingskader zorgt dienovereenkomstig voor een instrumentarium van concurrentiebevorderende maatregelen die onafhankelijke nationale regelgevende instanties moeten opleggen na specifieke marktanalyses. Voorts vormen de mededingingsregels van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie door een beoordeling achteraf een aanvulling op het regelgevingskader voor elektronische communicatie.

De diensten van de Commissie volgen het wetgevingsproces in Nederland op de voet en hebben de Nederlandse autoriteiten gevraagd de hierboven vermelde ontwerpwetgeving toe te lichten.

([1]) http://www.totaaltv.nl/nieuws/8375/Neelie_Kroes_ziet_niets_in_verplicht_openbreken_Nederlandse_kabel.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/policy/ecomm/index_en.htm
([3]) Richtlijn 2002/21/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 7 maart 2002 inzake een gemeenschappelijk regelgevingskader voor elektronische-communicatienetwerken en -diensten zoals gewijzigd bij Richtlijn 2009/140/EG.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003347/12
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Commission against opening up cable in the Netherlands

According to reports, during a meeting earlier this month with cable suppliers in Brussels, Commissioner Kroes said that Dutch legislation aiming to open up the analogue cable network is unacceptable to Brussels ([1]). In view of these reports, I have the following questions:

1. Can the Commission confirm that Commissioner Kroes has warned that the European Commission will challenge Dutch legislation with regard to open access to cable?

2. Does the Commission endorse Commissioner Kroes' assertion that the Netherlands may not open up the cable network by means of legislation?

3. Can the Commission explain why Member States are critical of this effort to create healthy competition in the cable network?

4. Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Party for Freedom (PVV) that it is completely legitimate for Dutch legislators to take action to bring about an open cable network? If not, why not?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2012)

The Commission does not confirm the statement issued by Cable Europe according to which Vice-President Kroes would have declared her opposition to draft legislation aiming at the opening of the cable networks in the Netherlands during a meeting with cable operators. The statement was in fact immediately denied by the European Commission and subsequently withdrawn by Cable Europe. During that meeting, Ms Kroes referred to the general policy of active enforcement of the EU rules in case breaches are detected and did not give her assessment of the specific draft legislation.

The promotion of competition in electronic communication networks and services, leading to more choice and innovation for consumers, is one of the main objectives of the European policy in this field. The regulatory framework for electronic communications ([2]) states that independent national regulatory authorities (NRAs) such as OPTA must promote competition in the provision of electronic communications *inter alia* by 'ensuring that there is no distortion or restriction of competition in the electronic communications sector, including the transmission of content' (Article 8(2) of the framework Directive ([3])). Accordingly, the regulatory framework provides for a toolbox of pro-competitive remedies to be imposed by independent national regulatory authorities following specific market analyses. In addition, the competition rules laid down by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union supplement, by an *ex post* review, the regulatory framework for electronic communications.

The Commission services are closely following the legislative process in the Netherlands and have requested clarifications from the Dutch authorities on the abovementioned draft legislation.

([1]) http://advanced-television.com/index.php/2012/03/09/kroes-holland-mustnt-force-cable-to-open-up; http://www.totaaltv.nl/nieuws/8375/Neelie_Kroes_ziet_niets_in_verplicht_openbreken_Nederlandse_kabel.html

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/policy/ecomm/index_en.htm

([3]) Directive 2002/21/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 March 2002 on a common regulatory framework for electronic communications networks and services as amended by Directive 2009/140/EC.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003348/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(28 maart 2012)

Betreft: Commissie start Europees centrum voor bestrijding cybercriminaliteit

Eurocommissaris Malmström heeft medegedeeld dat de Europese Commissie een Europees Centrum voor de bestrijding van cybercriminaliteit zal starten. Het centrum moet de strijd aanbinden met online identiteitsdiefstal, online fraude en seksuele uitbuiting van kinderen op het internet; ook moet het instaan voor de bescherming van profielen op sociale netwerken. In januari 2013 moet het centrum operationeel zijn; het zal in de gebouwen van Europol in Den Haag huizen.

Malmström over het centrum: „Het moet georganiseerde netwerken van cybercriminelen en daders van cyberdelicten identificeren en operationele steun bieden in concrete onderzoeken, door middel van forensische bijstand of door te helpen bij het opzetten van gezamenlijke onderzoeksteams."

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Commissie start Europees centrum voor bestrijding cybercriminaliteit" ([1])?

2. Op grond van welk(e) artikel(en) in de Verdragen heeft de Commissie het recht respectievelijk de bevoegdheid een dergelijk agentschap op te richten met een takenpakket dat de activiteiten van de autoriteiten van de lidstaten gaat controleren en aansturen? Op grond waarvan is de subsidiariteit in dezen niet in het geding?

3. Wat is de noodzaak van het Europees Centrum voor de bestrijding van cybercriminaliteit — vooral in het licht van reeds bestaande, soortgelijke nationale centra van expertise?

4. Wat zal het Europees Centrum voor de bestrijding van cybercriminaliteit kosten, en wat is de meerwaarde ten opzichte van de huidige praktijk?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(25 mei 2012)

Het idee om een Europees centrum voor de bestrijding van cybercriminaliteit op te richten werd in de eerste helft van 2010 opgevat door het Spaanse voorzitterschap van de EU en kwam tot uiting in conclusies van de Raad ([2]). De Commissie heeft op verzoek van de Raad onderzocht of het haalbaar is een dergelijk centrum, dat het zenuwcentrum moet worden van de strijd tegen cybercriminaliteit in Europa, op te richten. De Commissie heeft vervolgens in de EU-interneveiligheidsstrategie aangekondigd dat zij het centrum voor de bestrijding van cybercriminaliteit zou oprichten vanaf 2013. Dit werd bevestigd in haar mededeling van 28 maart 2012 ([3]), waarin ook de bevindingen van het haalbaarheidsonderzoek ([4]) (dat op dezelfde dag werd gepubliceerd) werden toegelicht.

Ook werd in deze mededeling bevestigd dat het Europees centrum voor de bestrijding van cybercriminaliteit bij Europol zal worden ondergebracht. Dit heeft als voordeel dat het reeds bestaande mandaat van Europol in verband met de bestrijding van cybercriminaliteit benut kan worden. In de loop van 2012 zullen de Commissie en Europol verder nagaan over welke middelen en organisatiestructuur het centrum moet kunnen beschikken.

([1]) http://www.nieuwsblad.be/article/detail.aspx?articleid=DMF20120328_113.
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/114028.pdf
([3]) COM(2012) 140.
([4]) final.http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/doc_centre/crime/docs/20120311_final_report_feasibility_study_for_a_european_cybercrime_centre.pdf#page=1&zoom=100.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003348/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Commission starts European centre for combating cyber crime

EU Commissioner Malmström has stated that the European Commission will start a European Centre for combating cyber crime. The centre must address online identity theft, online fraud and the sexual exploitation of children on the Internet; it must also guarantee the protection of profiles on social networks. The centre must be operational by January 2013; it will be housed in the Europol buildings in The Hague.

Ms Malmström says of the centre: 'It will identify organised cyber-criminal networks and prominent offenders in cyberspace. It will provide operational support in concrete investigations, be it with forensic assistance or by helping to set up cybercrime Joint Investigation Teams.'

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report 'Commission starts European centre for combating cyber crime' ([1])?

2. On the basis of which article(s) in the Treaties does the Commission have the right and the authority to set up such an agency, with tasks that will monitor and direct the activities of the Member States' authorities? On what grounds is the principle of subsidiarity in this matter not at issue?

3. What is the necessity for the European Centre for combating cyber crime — especially in view of the existence of similar national centres of expertise?

4. What will the European Centre for combating cyber crime cost, and what is the added value with regard to current practice?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

The idea to explore the possibility to set up a European Cybercrime Centre was initiated by the Spanish Presidency of the EU in the first half of 2010 in form of Council conclusions ([2]). The Council tasked the Commission with verifying the feasibility of establishing a European Cybercrime Centre that would become Europe's focal point in the fight against cybercrime. The European Commission took this commitment further and announced in the Internal Security Strategy that it would set up the Cybercrime Centre from 2013. This was confirmed in its communication on 28 March 2012 ([3]), where it also outlined the findings of the feasibility study that was published on the same day ([4]).

The communication confirmed that the European Cybercrime Centre shall be based at Europol, therefore using Europol's existing mandate to fight cybercrime. Further work will be carried out in 2012 by the Commission and Europol in determining the resources and actual structure of the Centre.

([1]) http://www.nieuwsblad.be/article/detail.aspx?articleid=DMF20120328_113.
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/jha/114028.pdf
([3]) COM(2012) 140 final.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/doc_centre/crime/docs/20120311_final_report_feasibility_study_for_a_european_cybercrime_centre.pdf#page=1&zoom=100.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003349/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(28 maart 2012)

Betreft: Wéér een boot met Noord-Afrikanen aangekomen op Lampedusa

Een boot met 38 Tunesische migranten is in de nacht van dinsdag 27 maart op woensdag 28 maart 2012 aangekomen op Lampedusa, de „toegangspoort" tot de EU. De immigranten werden naar een opvangcentrum op het eiland gebracht. Het opvangcentrum werd in september vorig jaar gesloten nadat Tunesiërs de gebouwen in brand hadden gestoken. De Italiaanse autoriteiten vrezen een nieuwe toevloed aan migranten op Lampedusa, nu de weersomstandigheden gunstiger worden. De migranten zelf verklaarden dat er nog altijd schepen vanuit Noord-Afrika vertrekken.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het verontrustende bericht „Boot met 38 Tunesische vluchtelingen aangekomen op Lampedusa" ([1])?

2. Welke actie heeft de Commissie ondernomen om de eindeloze stroom van migranten te stoppen?

3. Kan de Commissie aangeven wat Frontex concreet doet en heeft gedaan om de migrantenstromen tegen te houden? Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat Frontex tot op heden te weinig respectievelijk niets succesvols heeft gedaan?

4. Is het Italië toegestaan om migranten op grond van misdragingen te weigeren? Zo ja, beveelt de Commissie dat aan?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(30 mei 2012)

De Commissie is ervan op de hoogte dat illegale migranten en andere mensen die om internationale bescherming verzoeken onlangs op het eiland Lampedusa zijn aangekomen. De migratiedruk op Italië vanuit Noord-Afrika was uitzonderlijk hoog in 2011, maar uit de cijfers blijkt dat deze in 2012 tot dusver een stuk lager is.

Sinds 2011 zijn op korte tijd talrijke initiatieven ontplooid om deze stromen aan te pakken. Een aantal Noord-Afrikaanse landen die mensen hebben ontvangen die op de vlucht zijn voor het geweld, hebben financiële hulp gekregen om de situatie het hoofd te bieden. Ook aan de betrokken lidstaten is hulp verleend. Frontex heeft verschillende grensbewakingsoperaties gecoördineerd in het kader van het Europees patrouillenetwerk. Hierbij werd veel aandacht geschonken aan de routes naar Italië vanuit Tunesië (operatie Hermes).

Frontex is bereid Italië en andere lidstaten te steunen met operationele activiteiten in 2012 en herverdeelt waar nodig de technische middelen en deskundigen op een flexibele manier.

De EU boekt ook vooruitgang bij de ontwikkeling van samenwerking met Tunesië op het gebied van het beheer van migratiestromen en heeft onlangs een dialoog over migratie, mobiliteit en veiligheid op gang gebracht die later dit jaar moet leiden tot de vaststelling van een mobiliteitspartnerschap tussen de EU en Tunesië.

Alle EU-wetgeving op het gebied van asiel en immigratie bevat „openbare orde"-bepalingen op grond waarvan de lidstaten een verblijfstitel kunnen intrekken en onderdanen van derde landen die een bedreiging vormen voor de openbare orde of de openbare veiligheid, het land kunnen uitzetten. Deze bepalingen kunnen in sommige gevallen worden toegepast om op passende wijze de veiligheid te bevorderen, hoewel elk geval steeds individueel dient te worden beoordeeld.

([1]) http://www.knack.be/belga-algemeen/boot-met-38-tunesische-vluchtelingen-aangekomen-op-lampedusa/article-4000073575371.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003349/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Arrival of another boatload of North Africans at Lampedusa

A boat containing 38 Tunisian migrants arrived at Lampedusa, the 'gateway' to the EU, in the pre-dawn hours of Wednesday 28 March 2012. The immigrants were taken to a reception centre on the island. The reception centre was closed in September 2011 after Tunisians set the buildings on fire. The Italian authorities fear a new influx of migrants at Lampedusa now that the weather conditions are more favourable. The migrants themselves stated that there are always ships leaving North Africa.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the disturbing article 'Boatload of 38 Tunisian refugees arrived at Lampedusa'? ([1])

2. What action has the Commission taken in order to stop the endless flow of migrants?

3. Can the Commission indicate what tangible steps Frontex is taking and has taken in order to stem the flow of migrants? Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Party for Freedom (PVV) that, up to now, Frontex has done too little and has failed to achieve any success?

4. Is Italy allowed to refuse migrants on the grounds of misconduct? If so, does the Commission recommend that action?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The Commission is aware of the recent arrivals of irregular migrants and those seeking international protection on the Island of Lampedusa. Migratory pressures on Italy originating from North African countries were exceptionally high in 2011, but the numbers in 2012 are so far much lower.

Many initiatives have been rapidly put in place since 2011 to address those flows. A number of North-African countries that received people fleeing the violence have been provided with financial assistance to deal with the situation. Assistance was also provided to the Member States affected. Several border surveillance operations were coordinated by Frontex in the framework of the European Patrol Network, with a special focus on the routes from Tunisia to Italy (Operation Hermes).

Frontex stands ready to support Italy and other Member States with operational activities in 2012 and is envisaging flexible redeployment of technical means and experts where required.

The EU is also making progress towards developing cooperation with Tunisia on managing migration flows and has recently launched a Dialogue on migration, mobility and security, which should lead to the adoption of an EU Tunisia Mobility Partnership later this year.

All EU legislation in the field of asylum and immigration contains 'public order' clauses which allow Member States to withdraw residence permits and to return third-country nationals who constitute a threat to public policy or public security. An application of these clauses may in certain cases be an appropriate way of enhancing security, bearing in mind that an individual assessment must be carried out in all cases.

([1]) http://www.knack.be/belga-algemeen/boot-met-38-tunesische-vluchtelingen-aangekomen-op-lampedusa/article-4000073575371.htm

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003350/12
do Komisji
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(28 marca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Liberalizacja reżimu wizowego względem państwa Partnerstwa Wschodniego

W dniu 23 marca 2012 r. Wiceprzewodniczący Komisji Europejskiej i Komisarz UE ds. Przemysłu i przedsiębiorczości – Antonio Tajani – wezwał do złagodzenia wymogów wizowych dla turystów zagranicznych, zaczynając od obywateli Rosji, Chin i Brazylii. Pomysł ten argumentował potrzebą stymulowania wzrostu, którego Unia Europejska potrzebuje podczas wychodzenia z kryzysu.

Niezaprzeczalnym faktem jest, iż turyści z tych państw niezwykle chętnie odwiedzają państwa członkowskie Unii Europejskiej, co z pewnością ma znaczący wpływ na silną pozycję sektora turystyczno-hotelarskiego, jednakże również nie możemy zapominać o państwach bezpośrednio sąsiadujących z Unią Europejską, w tym szczególnie tych w ramach Partnerstwa Wschodniego (Armenia, Azerbejdżan, Białoruś, Gruzja, Mołdawia, Ukraina), które takich ułatwień nie posiadają.

Zwracam się więc do Komisji z pytaniami:

— Jak Komisja ocenia postęp w liberalizacji reżimu wizowego względem państw Partnerstwa Wschodniego?

— Czy Komisja zamierza wprowadzić podobne ułatwienia, jak te zaproponowane względem Rosji, Chin i Brazylii, również dla obywateli państw Partnerstwa Wschodniego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Cecilię Malmström w imieniu Komisji
(30 maja 2012 r.)

Od czasu przyjęcia przez Radę w październiku 2010 r. konkluzji w sprawie Partnerstwa Wschodniego osiągnięto postęp w kwestii liberalizacji reżimu wizowego w stosunku do naszych wschodnich partnerów. W dniu 22 listopada 2010 r. przedstawiono Ukrainie plan działania na rzecz liberalizacji reżimu wizowego, a w dniu 24 stycznia 2011 r. taki plan przedstawiono Mołdawii ([1]). W najbliższych tygodniach Komisja zamierza rozpocząć dialog w sprawie liberalizacji reżimu wizowego z Gruzją.

UE zawarła umowy dotyczące uproszczeń procedur wizowych z Republiką Mołdowy, Ukrainą i Gruzją w celu ułatwienia kontaktów międzyludzkich. Ogólne ułatwienia wynikające z tych umów są korzystne dla turystów: obniżona opłata za rozpatrzenie wniosku wizowego wynosi 35 EUR, a maksymalny okres jego rozpatrywania trwa na ogół 10 dni od momentu złożenia kompletnej dokumentacji. Wzrost liczby wniosków wizowych z powyższych krajów pokazuje, że umowy okazały się skuteczne. UE jest obecnie zaangażowana w rozszerzanie tych umów, tak aby zwiększyć korzyści dla osób z powyższych krajów składających wnioski wizowe. Dodatkowo Komisja negocjuje aktualnie umowy dotyczące uproszczeń procedur wizowych z Armenią i Azerbejdżanem w celu ułatwienia kontaktów z obywatelami tych krajów. Co więcej, w czerwcu 2011 r. zaproszono Białoruś do negocjacji w sprawie tego typu umowy, ale władze białoruskie jak dotąd nie odpowiedziały na tę inicjatywę.

Tymczasowo obywatele Rosji i Chin będą wciąż potrzebowali wiz, aby wjechać do strefy Schengen. Jednak w przypadku Rosji ułatwienia wizowe już zostały wprowadzone, a skuteczne wdrażanie wspólnych, ustalonych działań powinno prowadzić w perspektywie długoterminowej do zniesienia obowiązku wizowego przez obie strony. Obywatele Brazylii zostali zwolnieni z tego wymogu wiele lat temu.

([1]) Służby Komisji i Europejska Służba Działań Zewnętrznych regularnie przedstawiają sprawozdania na temat wdrażania tych planów. Drugie sprawozdanie na temat postępu zostało opublikowane w dniu 9 lutego 2012 r.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003350/12
to the Commission
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Liberalisation of the visa regime for the Eastern Partnership

On 23 March 2012, Vice-President of the European Commission and EU Commissioner for Industry and Entrepreneurship Antonio Tajani called for a relaxation of visa requirements for foreign tourists, starting with the citizens of Russia, China and Brazil. He justified this idea by the need to stimulate the growth that the European Union needs as it recovers from the crisis.

It is an undeniable fact that tourists from these countries are very willing to visit the Member States of the European Union, and it is certain that this has a significant impact on the strong position of the hotel and tourist industry. However, we must not forget the countries that share a border with the European Union, including in particular those which are part of the Eastern Partnership (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine), which do not enjoy such privileges.

I would like therefore to ask the Commission the following questions:

— How does the Commission assess the progress of visa regime liberalisation in respect of the countries of the Eastern Partnership?

— Does the Commission also intend to introduce a relaxation of visa requirements for citizens of Eastern Partnership countries similar to the one proposed for Russia, China and Brazil?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

Since the adoption of Council conclusions on the Eastern Partnership in October 2010, progress has been achieved towards visa liberalisation with our Eastern Partners. An Action Plan on Visa Liberalisation was presented to the Ukraine on 22 November 2010 and to the Republic of Moldova on 24 January 2011 ([1]). The Commission's intention is to start a visa liberalisation dialogue with Georgia in the coming weeks.

The EU has concluded visa facilitation agreements with the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine and Georgia in view of facilitating people-to-people contacts with their citizens. Tourists benefit from the general facilitations in these agreements: a reduced visa fee of EUR 35 and a maximum processing time of normally 10 days from the submission of a complete application. The increasing number of visa applications from these countries demonstrates the success of these agreements. The EU is currently engaged in upgrading these agreements to bring more benefits to the visa applicants from these countries. Furthermore, the Commission is currently negotiating visa facilitation agreements with Armenia and Azerbaijan in order to also facilitate contacts with their citizens. In addition, Belarus was invited in June 2011 to engage in negotiations on such an agreement but no answer has been received yet from their authorities.

For the time being, Russian and Chinese citizens will continue to require visas to enter the Schengen area. In the case of Russia, however, visa facilitations are already in place, and the successful implementation of an agreed set of common steps should lead, in the longer term, to the mutual elimination of the visa requirement. Brazilian citizens have been exempt from such requirement for many years now.

([1]) The Commission services and EEAS are reporting regularly on their implementation; the Second Progress Reports were issued on 9.2.2012.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003351/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 de março de 2012)

Assunto: Criação de uma rede de pequenas Agências de Notação Financeira

Na proposta de alteração ao Regulamento (CE) n.°.1060/2009 surge o compromisso de a Comissão estudar formas de financiamento comunitário para a criação de uma rede das Agências de Notação Financeira mais pequenas já a atuar no mercado.

Esta ideia não só ajudaria estas empresas a ganhar escala e a gerar eficiências como contribuiria para abrir um mercado, que é oligopolista, a novos intervenientes.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Quando pretende a Comissão apresentar os resultados deste estudo? Irá o mesmo dar origem a uma proposta a submeter ao Parlamento e ao Conselho?

2. Relativamente à utilização de financiamento comunitário para a formação desta rede, não crê a Comissão que tal possa gerar um inerente conflito de interesses se estas mesmas agências vierem a notar a dívida dos Estados-membros?

3. Como poderá a Comissão incentivar a criação deste tipo de redes sem recorrer ao financiamento direto? Que incentivos não financeiros podem ser criados?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(30 de maio de 2012)

Em termos gerais, é importante que a regulamentação das agências de notação de risco inclua regras proporcionadas aplicáveis aos pequenos e médios intervenientes no mercado, de forma a permitir e a incentivar a criação de redes.

Encontra-se em curso a avaliação das diversas possibilidades de financiamento das redes de pequenas e médias agências de notação de risco; os serviços da Comissão preveem terminar essa avaliação no final de 2012. Os principais elementos em análise são o interesse dos pequenos e médios intervenientes no mercado em participar nessas redes, a viabilidade, o âmbito necessário e a disponibilidade de financiamento da UE para as mesmas. A realização de outras iniciativas neste domínio dependerá dos resultados da avaliação.

Todas as soluções possíveis em matéria de financiamento terão de evitar potenciar eventuais conflitos de interesses.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003351/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Establishment of a network of small rating agencies

In connection with its proposed amendment of Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 the Commission is undertaking to explore forms of EU funding to finance a network of smaller rating agencies already active on the market.

This idea would not only help those companies to expand and become more efficient, but also enable the oligopolistic market to be to opened up to new players.

1. When will the Commission present the findings of its study on this subject? Will the study be followed by a proposal to Parliament and the Council?

2. With regard to the use of EU funding to set up such a network, does the Commission not believe that an inherent conflict of interests might arise if the agencies concerned were to rate Member States' debt?

3. How will the Commission be able to promote networks of this kind without using direct funding? What non-financial incentives can be created?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

Generally speaking, it is important that the regulation of rating agencies contains proportionate rules for small and medium-sized market participants in order to allow and encourage the creation of networks.

The assessment of different funding possibilities for networks of small and medium-sized rating agencies is ongoing and the Commission services hope to finalise this assessment by the end of 2012. The main elements being considered are the interest of small and medium-sized market players to participate in such networks, the feasibility, required scope and the availability of existing EU funding for such networks. Possible further action in this area will depend on the outcome of this assessment.

All possible funding solutions would need to avoid enhancing potential conflicts of interests.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003352/12
à Comissão
Edite Estrela (S&D)
(28 de março de 2012)

Assunto: Plano hidrológico espanhol

Tendo em conta as notícias referentes à intenção de o Governo espanhol aprovar um novo plano hidrológico para o país;

Tendo em conta que, em 2002, o Parlamento Europeu se pronunciou contra o anterior plano hidrológico apresentado pelo Governo do Partido Popular, por este incluir propostas não sustentáveis de gestão da água, tais como transvases;

Tendo em conta as exigências da diretiva quadro da água, em matéria de cooperação transfronteiriça, quer em relação à qualidade da água e quer à necessidade de garantir caudais mínimos, sobretudo em tempos de seca;

Pergunta à Comissão:

O novo Plano hidrológico espanhol respeita as exigências da diretiva quadro da água e garante os caudais mínimos dos rios partilhados com Portugal?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(5 de junho de 2012)

A Diretiva-Quadro Água ([1])não exige que os Estados-Membros apresentem planos nacionais e a Comissão não recebeu qualquer documento ou informação sobre um novo plano hidrológico espanhol. No entanto, a DQA exige que os Estados-Membros tivessem apresentado planos de gestão das bacias hidrográficas até 2009. Não tendo sido cumprida esta obrigação, a Comissão deu início a um processo por infração contra Espanha. Quando Espanha apresentar os seus planos de gestão de bacias hidrográficas, a Comissão avaliará os requisitos da legislação da UE no domínio da água.

([1]) DQA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003352/12
to the Commission
Edite Estrela (S&D)
(28 March 2012)

Subject: Spanish hydrological plan

Considering news reports that the Spanish Government is planning to adopt a new hydrological plan for the country;

Considering that, in 2002, the European Parliament stated that it opposed the previous hydrological plan presented by the government of the Popular Party, since it included unacceptable proposals for water management, such as transfers;

Considering the requirements of the Water Framework Directive, with regard to cross-border cooperation, both in relation to water quality and to the need to guarantee minimum flows, particularly in times of drought;

I would ask the Commission:

Does the new Spanish hydrological plan comply with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive and guarantee the minimum flows of rivers shared with Portugal?

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

The Water Framework Directive ([1]) does not require Member States to present National plans and the Commission has not received any document or information on a new Spanish Hydrological Plan. However, the WFD does require Member States to present River Basin Management Plans by 2009. Having failed to fulfil this obligation, the Commission has started an infringement procedure against Spain. When Spain presents its River Basin Management Plans, the Commission will assess the requirements of EU Water legislation.

([1]) WFD.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003353/12
a la Comisión
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D) y Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)
(29 de marzo de 2012)

Asunto: Control de las importaciones de carne de vacuno de alta calidad de EE.UU. y Canadá

En base a los Memoranda de Entendimiento acordados entre la UE, EE.UU. y Canadá para resolver el conflicto comercial originado después de que en 1988 la UE prohibiera las importaciones de carne hormonada, la UE ha abierto un contingente arancelario autónomo para las importaciones de carne de vacuno de calidad superior (modificando el Reglamento (CE) n° 617/2009 del Consejo).

Dado que esta apertura traerá como consecuencia el incremento de la importación de carne de vacuno de EE.UU. y Canadá, convendría saber ¿qué controles piensa realizar la Comisión para asegurar que la carne de vacuno de alta calidad importada respeta los estándares europeos en cuanto a seguridad alimentaria?

Por otra parte, ¿cómo piensa la Comisión reaccionar en caso de que los EE.UU o Canadá no respeten los acuerdos alcanzados en los Memoranda, por los cuales deben disminuir progresivamente las sanciones impuestas a ciertos productos europeos?

En caso de que se presente este caso, ¿está prevista la suspensión del contingente arancelario abierto?

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

Tras la firma del Memorándum de entendimiento con los Estados Unidos de América en 2009, la Unión abrió un contingente arancelario autónomo para las importaciones de carne de vacuno de calidad superior ([1]). Este contingente arancelario se abrió sobre una base *erga omnes*, lo que significa que no está reservado a productos de un origen específico.

Al igual que en los demás casos de importación de carne de vacuno de calidad superior fresca, refrigerada o congelada, se aplican a ese contingente las normas generales aplicables a las importaciones de productos de origen animal procedentes de terceros países, fijadas en los Reglamentos (CE) n° 853/2004 ([2]) y (CE) n° 854/2004 ([3]). De acuerdo con esas normas, todos los terceros países que deseen exportar carne a la Unión deben figurar en la lista de países a partir de los cuales están permitidas las importaciones de carne. Ello asegura que el país haya sido objeto de una inspección por la Oficina Alimentaria y Veterinaria (OAV) de la Comisión y haya demostrado que cumple los requisitos de salud pública y sanidad animal que establece la normativa de la UE para la producción de carne.

En la actualidad, los Estados Unidos de Amércia y Canadá han suspendido todas las sanciones relacionadas con el contencioso que mantenían con la UE en la OMC en relación con las *Medidas comunitarias que afectan a la carne y los productos cárnicos (hormonas)*. La reintroducción de aranceles más elevados para las exportaciones de la Unión se consideraría una retirada del Memorándum de entendimiento, según lo dispuesto en el artículo V.4 de este, en cuyo caso la Unión tendría derecho a suspender el contingente antes mencionado.

([1]) DO L 182 de 15.7.2009, p. 1.
([2]) DO L 139 de 30.4.2004, p. 55.
([3]) DO L 226 de 25.6.2004, p. 83.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003353/12
to the Commission
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D) and Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Checks on high-quality beef imports from the United States and Canada

On the basis of the memoranda of understanding agreed between the EU, the US and Canada to resolve the trade dispute resulting from the EU's 1988 ban on imports of hormone-treated beef, the EU has opened a stand-alone tariff quota for imports of high-quality beef (by amending Council Regulation (EC) No 617/2009).

The opening of this tariff quota will result in increased imports of beef from the US and Canada. Could the Commission therefore say what checks it plans to carry out to ensure that high-quality imported beef complies with the EU's food safety standards?

Furthermore, how will the Commission react if the US and Canada do not comply with the agreements reached in the memoranda, under which the sanctions imposed on certain EU products are to be progressively reduced?

If this were to happen, would the tariff quota now opened then be suspended?

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

Following the signature of a memorandum of understanding (MoU) with the United States of America in 2009, the Union established an autonomous tariff-rate quota for high-quality beef ([1]). This tariff-rate quota is opened on an *erga omnes* basis, which means that it is not allocated for product of a specific origin.

As in other cases of imported high-quality fresh, chilled or frozen beef, the general rules that apply to imports of products of animal origin from third countries and that are set out in Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 ([2]) and Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 ([3]) apply. In line with this legislation, all third countries wishing to export meat into the Union must be included in the list of countries authorised for the export of meat. This ensures the country has undergone an inspection by the Commission's Food and Veterinary Office (FVO), and has demonstrated that it fulfils the animal and public health requirements for the production of meat as laid down in the relevant EU legislation.

At the present stage the United States of America and Canada have suspended all sanctions related to the WTO dispute on Measures Concerning Meat and Meat Products (Hormones). A re-introduction of increased duties on Union exports would be considered a withdrawal from the MoU, as foreseen by its Article V.4. In such a case, the Union would be entitled to suspend the abovementioned quota.

([1]) OJ L 182, 15.7.2009, p. 1.
([2]) OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 55.
([3]) OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 83.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003354/12
a la Comisión
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D) y Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)
(29 de marzo de 2012)

Asunto: Conflicto comercial con EE.UU. sobre el embargo de carne europea debido a la EEB

Tal y como informó la Comisión Europea en marzo de este año, se estarían estudiando los planes de Estados Unidos de eliminar las restricciones que se aplican desde hace quince años al ganado vacuno europeo y sus productos derivados como consecuencia de la encefalopatía espongiforme bovina (EEB).

¿En qué consisten dichos planes? ¿En qué estado se encuentran las negociaciones con EE.UU.?

Respuesta del Sr. Dalli en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de mayo de 2012)

Como resultado de los esfuerzos de la UE para que la normativa de los EE.UU. sobre la encefalopatía espongiforme bovina (EEB) se ajuste a la de la Organización Mundial de Sanidad Animal (OIE) el *Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service* (Servicio de inspección zoosanitaria y fitosanitaria) del Departamento de Agricultura de los EE.UU. ha publicado recientemente ([1]) una propuesta de «disposiciones detalladas sobre la EEB». La propuesta está sometida a consulta pública hasta el 15 de mayo y constituye el primer paso de un posible cambio en la normativa pertinente de los EE.UU. El objetivo de las medidas propuestas es ajustar las disposiciones de los EE.UU. a la normativa de la OIE, que, en su caso, podría significar la reapertura del mercado de los EE.UU. al ganado vacuno europeo y sus productos derivados.

La Comisión ha iniciado un ejercicio coordinado con los Estados miembros con vistas a suministar a los EE.UU. una respuesta común de la UE a la mencionada normativa propuesta en el plazo previsto. La Comisión mantendrá un diálogo constante y regular con las autoridades de los EE.UU. a fin de abordar las inquietudes relativas al acceso de la UE al mercado.

([1]) http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2012-03-16/pdf/2012-6151.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003354/12
to the Commission
Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D) and Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Trade dispute with the United States over the ban on European beef due to BSE

In March 2012, the Commission announced that it would examine the United States' plans to lift the restrictions applied for the last 15 years to European beef and derivatives as a result of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE).

Can the Commission say what form these plans will take? At what stage are the negotiations with the United States?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(7 May 2012)

EU efforts for the alignment of the US Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) rules to those of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) have led the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service of the United States Department of Agriculture to recently publish ([1]) a proposed 'BSE comprehensive rule'. This is under public consultation until 15 May and constitutes the first step for a possible change of the US relevant rules. The objective of the envisaged measures is to bring the US provisions in line with OIE rules, which would eventually lead to the reopening of the US market to the EU bovine and beef export.

The Commission has initiated a coordinated exercise with the Member States with the view of providing the US with a common EU reply to the abovementioned proposed rule by the set deadline. The Commission will maintain a constant and regular dialogue with the US authorities to address the EU market access concerns.

([1]) http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2012-03-16/pdf/2012-6151.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003355/12
an die Kommission
Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE)
(29. März 2012)

Betrifft: Eisenbahnsicherheit — Mängel bei der Umsetzung von EU-Recht in Österreich

Die seit längerem umzusetzenden EU-Eisenbahnpakete sehen in der Sicherheitsrichtlinie 2004/49/EG und der Interoperabilitätsrichtlinie 2008/57/EG Vorgaben zur Eisenbahnsicherheit vor. Diese ist ein zentraler Vorteil der Schiene im Vergleich zu anderen Verkehrsträgern.

In diesen Richtlinien werden Aufgaben der Sicherheitsbehörde definiert, unter anderem:

— Die Sicherheitsbehörde stellt fest, dass die Bedingungen einer von ihr ausgestellten Sicherheitsbescheinigung von dessen Inhaber nicht mehr erfüllt werden (Artikel 10 der Richtlinie 2004/49/EG).

— Die Sicherheitsbehörde genehmigt und überprüft, ob strukturelle Teilsysteme entsprechend eingesetzt und instand gesetzt sind (Artikel 16 der Richtlinie 2004/49/EG).

— Die Sicherheitsbehörde überprüft die Einhaltung der Anforderungen an instand haltende Stellen (Artikel 14a der Richtlinie 2004/49/EG).

— Es sind Behörden für die Regelung und Überwachung der Eisenbahnsicherheit (Erwägung 22 der Richtlinie 2004/49/EG) einzurichten.

— Die Mitgliedstaaten prüfen vor der Inbetriebnahme, ob die Teilsysteme mit den TSI-Bestimmungen übereinstimmen, auch mit deren Anforderungen an Betrieb und Wartung (Artikel 15 der Richtlinie 2008/57/EG).

Die Sicherheitsbehörde in Österreich ist mit rund fünf Personen besetzt. Die Aufgaben der Sicherheitsbehörde laut den Richtlinien 2004/49/EG und 2008/57/EG erscheinen mit so wenig Personal nicht durchführbar. Es liegt daher nahe, dass die Aufgaben entweder nicht angemessen oder, anders als in den EU-Regelungen vorgesehen, nicht von der Behörde selbst durchgeführt werden. Weiters schreibt Artikel 16 der Richtlinie 2004/49/EG vor, dass die Mitgliedstaaten eine (!) Sicherheitsbehörde einrichten. Insofern wäre die Situation in Österreich mit über 130 zuständigen Behörden zu überdenken.

1. Sieht die Kommission die Personalausstattung und Behördenzersplitterung ebenfalls als problematisch an?

2. Was hat die Kommission gegenüber der Republik Österreich unternommen, um eine korrekte und vollumfängliche Umsetzung der Eisenbahnsicherheitsbestimmungen dieser Richtlinien sicherzustellen, und was plant sie in diesem Zusammengang weiter zu unternehmen?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(24. Mai 2012)

1. In der Richtlinie 2004/49/EG über die Eisenbahnsicherheit ([1]) und der Richtlinie 2008/57/EG über die Eisenbahninteroperabilität ([2]) werden die Aufgaben der nationalen Sicherheitsbehörden umrissen, ohne jedoch Vorgaben für die dafür erforderlichen Mittel und Ressourcen zu machen. Von den Mitgliedstaaten wird aber selbstverständlich erwartet, dass sie genügend Ressourcen zur Erfüllung dieser Aufgaben bereitstellen. Die Kommission ist sich darüber im Klaren, dass die Sicherheitsbehörden einiger Mitgliedstaaten nur über wenig Personal verfügen. Sie kann aber nur dann tätig werden, wenn ein eindeutiger Verstoß gegen die Bestimmungen der Richtlinie vorliegt. Diesem Aspekt wird durch andere Maßnahmen Rechnung getragen, etwa den Austausch bewährter Praktiken und gegenseitige Audits im Netz der nationalen Sicherheitsbehörden, das die Europäische Eisenbahnagentur eingerichtet hat und verwaltet.

([1]) ABl. L 164 vom 30.4.2004, S. 44-113.
([2]) ABl. L 191 vom 18.7.2008, S. 1-45.

2. Die Kommission prüft derzeit die ordnungsgemäße Anwendung der Richtlinie über die Eisenbahnsicherheit in den Mitgliedstaaten, darunter auch Österreich. Sollte sich zeigen, dass die EU-Rechtsvorschriften nicht ordnungsgemäß durchgeführt werden, wird sie weitere Schritte unternehmen und gegebenenfalls ein Vertragsverletzungsverfahren in Betracht ziehen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003355/12
to the Commission
Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Railway safety — deficiencies in the implementation of EC law in Austria

The EU's railway packages, which have been due for implementation for some time now, set down railway safety standards in the Railway Safety Directive 2004/49/EC and the Railway Interoperability Directive 2008/57/EC. This represents a central advantage for the railways in comparison with other modes of transport.

These directives outline the tasks of the safety authorities, which include:

— The safety authority is required to determine when the conditions of a safety certificate issued by it are no longer met by the holder (Article 10 of Directive 2004/49/EC).

— The safety authority shall approve and examine whether structural subsystems are used and repaired accordingly (Article 16 of Directive 2004/49/EC).

— The safety authority shall check compliance with requirements among maintenance operations (Article 14a of Directive 2004/49/EC).

— Authorities are to be set up to regulate and supervise railway safety (recital 22 of Directive 2004/49/EC).

— Prior to the project commissioning phase, the Member States shall check that the subsystems comply with the technical specifications for interoperability (TSIs) and with the relevant operating and maintenance requirements (Article 15 of Directive 2008/57/EC).

The safety authority in Austria comprises around five people. It would seem that the tasks of the safety authority as set down by Directives 2004/49/EC and 2008/57/EC cannot be implemented with such a small complement of staff. It is therefore obvious that the tasks are either not adequately implemented, or, contrary to EU regulations, are not carried out by the authority itself. Furthermore, Article 16 of Directive 2004/49/EC requires the Member States to establish one (!) safety authority. This means that the situation in Austria, where over 130 responsible authorities exist, needs to be reconsidered.

1. Does the Commission also regard the staffing levels and scattered areas of responsibility of the authorities as problematic?

2. What steps has the Commission taken in relation to the Republic of Austria in order to ensure the correct and complete implementation of the railway safety provisions of these directives and what does it plan to do in this context in the future?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(24 May 2012)

1. The Railway Safety Directive 2004/49/EC ([1]) and the Railway Interoperability Directive 2008/57/EC ([2]) outline the tasks of the national safety authorities, without prescribing the means and the resources required for their implementation. Member States are, of course, expected to deploy sufficient resources to fulfil these tasks. The Commission is aware of the limited number staff of the safety authority in several Member States, but an intervention is justified only by a clear violation of the provisions of the directives. This concern is being addressed by other measures, such as exchanging best practices and cross-auditing activities in the context of the Network of National Safety Authorities which has been set up and is managed by the European Railway Agency.

2. The Commission is currently evaluating the correct implementation of the Railway Safety Directive in the legislation of Member States, including Austria. If it is found that EU legislation has not been implemented correctly it will pursue the matter and if necessary consider the opportunity of an infringement procedure.

([1]) OJ L 164, 30.4.2004, p. 44-113.
([2]) OJ L 191, 18.7.2008, p. 1-45.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003356/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(29 Μαρτίου 2012)

Θέμα: Απόδραση στο χωριό από 1,5 εκατ. νέους στην Ελλάδα

Τη μετακόμισή τους στην περιφέρεια σχεδιάζουν 1,5 εκατ. κάτοικοι των μεγάλων αστικών κέντρων της Ελλάδας. Είναι νέοι ηλικίας 25 έως 44 ετών. Έχουν την πεποίθηση ότι έτσι θα ξεφύγουν από τις συνέπειες της οικονομικής ύφεσης και έτσι θα γίνουν μετανάστες μέσα στην ίδια τους τη χώρα, εγκαταλείποντας τα μεγάλα αστικά κέντρα της Αθήνας και της Θεσσαλονίκης.

Οι ασφυκτικές συνθήκες που έχουν προκαλέσει η οικονομική ύφεση, τα μέτρα λιτότητας και η ανεργία τούς ωθεί να εγκαταλείψουν τις μεγαλουπόλεις και να επιστρέψουν στην επαρχία.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει για να ενισχύσει την ελληνική ύπαιθρο, που στηρίζεται στην αλιεία, την κτηνοτροφία και τη γεωργία, με στόχο τη στροφή των νέων σε ανάλογα επαγγέλματα;

2. Υπάρχουν ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα τα οποία θα μπορούσαν να βοηθήσουν τον τομέα της απασχόλησης και να ενισχύσουν τον τομέα του γεωργικού τουρισμού και να χρηματοδοτήσουν επενδύσεις στους ως άνω τομείς οικονομικής δραστηριότητας;

Απάντηση του κ. Cioloş εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Ιουνίου 2012)

1. Η Ένωση στηρίζει την ελληνική αγροτική οικονομία μέσω διαφόρων πολιτικών. Η κοινή γεωργική πολιτική παρέχει άμεσες πληρωμές στις γεωργικές εκμεταλλεύσεις και συγχρηματοδοτεί το ελληνικό πρόγραμμα αγροτικής ανάπτυξης (ΠΑΑ) με 3,9 δισεκατ. ευρώ (2007/13), συμπεριλαμβανομένων των μέτρων για τους νέους που εγκαθίστανται ως αγρότες, για επενδύσεις, για τη βιολογική παραγωγή και για συστήματα ποιότητας. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Αλιείας συγχρηματοδοτεί μέτρα για τους αλιείς συμπεριλαμβανομένων των νέων, για διαφοροποίηση, για επανεκπαίδευση και για την απόκτηση αλιευτικών σκαφών για πρώτη φορά από νέους αλιείς, ή για αποζημίωση για τη μόνιμη διακοπή των αλιευτικών δραστηριοτήτων.

2. Το ελληνικό πρόγραμμα αγροτικής ανάπτυξης περιλαμβάνει μέτρα για τον εκσυγχρονισμό των αγροτικών μονάδων, τη μεταποίηση και την εμπορία γεωργικών προϊόντων καθώς και τη διαφοροποίηση, όπως ο γεωργικός τουρισμός, και το Ευρωπαϊκό Γεωργικό Ταμείο Αγροτικής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΓΤΑΑ) συγχρηματοδοτεί τις ενέργειες αυτές με 1,386 δισεκατ. ευρώ. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Αλιείας υποστηρίζει την αειφόρο ανάπτυξη και τη βελτίωση της ποιότητας της ζωής στις αλιευτικές περιοχές. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο (ΕΚΤ) στηρίζει την απασχόληση με 4,364 δισεκατ. ευρώ που προορίζονται για την Ελλάδα, εκ των οποίων 2,26 δισεκατ. ευρώ χορηγούνται στο επιχειρησιακό πρόγραμμα «Ανάπτυξη των ανθρώπινων πόρων» που υποστηρίζει, μεταξύ άλλων, την αναβάθμιση των δεξιοτήτων του εργατικού δυναμικού, συμπεριλαμβανομένων και των αγροτών, και τη στήριξη για την επιχειρηματικότητα (ίδρυση νέων επιχειρήσεων, παροχή συμβουλών κ.λπ.). Στον βαθμό που τα έργα είναι επιλέξιμα υπό το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ), οι νέοι που ασκούν δραστηριότητα σε τομείς όπως τα γεωργικά προϊόντα διατροφής, ο τουρισμός και ο πολιτισμός θα μπορούσαν να επωφεληθούν από τις παρεμβάσεις του ΕΤΠΑ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003356/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: 1.5 million young people in Greece seeking escape to the countryside

1.5 million inhabitants of the large urban centres in Greece, young people aged between 25 and 44, are planning to move to the countryside, convinced that in this way they will be able to evade the consequences of economic recession, thus becoming migrants in their own country, abandoning the big urban centres of Athens and Thessaloniki.

The restrictions created by economic recession, the austerity measures and unemployment is prompting them to leave the big cities and return to the provinces.

In view of this:

1. What measures does the Commission intend to take to underpin the Greek rural economy, which is based on fishing, stockbreeding and farming, so as to encourage young people to engage in such occupations?

2. Do European programmes exist to boost employment, strengthen agrotourism and finance investment in the above economic sectors?

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

1. The Union supports the Greek rural economy through several policies. The Common Agricultural Policy provides direct farm payments and co-finances the Greek Rural Development Programme (RDP) with EUR 3.9 billion (2007/13) including measures for young people setting up as farmers, for investments, for organic production and quality schemes. The European Fisheries Fund co-finances measures for fishers including young people for diversification, retraining and young fishers acquiring for the first time a fishing vessel or compensation for permanent cessation of fishing activities.

2. The Greek RDP includes measures for farm modernisation, processing and marketing of agricultural products and diversification such as Agrotourism and the European Agricultural Rural Development Fund (EARDF) co-finances these actions with EUR 1 386 billion. The European Fisheries Fund supports the sustainable development and improvement of the quality of life in fisheries areas. The European Social Fund (ESF) supports employment with EUR 4 364 billion earmarked for Greece, of which EUR 2,26 billion are allocated to the Operational Programme 'Human Resources Development' supporting i.a. the upgrading of skills of the workforce, including farmers, and support for entrepreneurship (start-ups, counselling etc.). Insofar as projects are eligible under the European Regional Development (ERDF), young people operating in sectors such as agri-food, tourism or culture could take benefit of ERDF interventions.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003357/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(29 Μαρτίου 2012)

Θέμα: Οι γυναίκες στο Αφγανιστάν

Στην φυλακή καταλήγουν τα θύματα και όχι οι θύτες στο Αφγανιστάν, μια χώρα κόλαση για τις γυναίκες που αντιμετωπίζουν καθημερινά την ενδοοικογενειακή βία, την κακοποίηση, την εξώθηση στην πορνεία. Παρά τον εφιάλτη που ζουν, οι γυναίκες είναι αυτές που καταλήγουν πίσω από τα σίδερα, ακόμη και όταν τις έχουν βιάσει, ενώ ο δράστης μπορεί να κυκλοφορεί ελεύθερος, όπως καταγγέλλει η ανθρωπιστική οργάνωση Human Rights Watch.

Μάλιστα, νόμος που ψηφίστηκε τον Αύγουστο του 2009, προβλέπει την ισότητα των γυναικών, περιλαμβανομένων -μεταξύ άλλων- και της ποινικοποίησης των υποχρεωτικών γάμων και τεκνοποίησης, της αγοραπωλησίας γυναικών είτε για γάμο, είτε για την διευθέτηση φιλονικίας, καθώς και του εξαναγκασμού σε αυτοκτονία.

Δυστυχώς, όμως, πολλοί από τους νόμους και τις υποσχέσεις για βελτίωση της θέσης των γυναικών μένουν, όπως αποδεικνύεται, ανεφάρμοστοι στην πράξη.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει για την προστασία των γυναικών αυτών, που παραβιάζονται βασικά ανθρώπινα δικαιώματά τους;

2. Προτίθεται να ασκήσει πίεση για την εφαρμογή των νομοθεσιών που θα βελτιώσουν τη θέση των γυναικών στο Αφγανιστάν;

Απάντηση της Ύπατης Εκπροσώπου/Αντιπροέδρου Ashton εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Ιουνίου 2012)

Ο ΕΕΕΕ/Προϊστάμενος της Αντιπροσωπείας στο Αφγανιστάν παρακολουθεί επιτόπου την κατάσταση στον τομέα των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, σε στενή συνεργασία με τους αρχηγούς αποστολών της ΕΕ, ιδίως σχετικά με την κατάσταση των γυναικών και κοριτσιών στη φυλακή, ένα ζήτημα που εξακολουθεί να προκαλεί μεγάλη ανησυχία. Ο ΕΕΕΕ/Προϊστάμενος της Αντιπροσωπείας, στο πλαίσιο αυτό, έχει λάβει γνώση της έκθεσης της οργάνωσης Human Rights Watch.

Βασιζόμενη στα τρέχοντα προγράμματα βοήθειας με έμφαση στη διακυβέρνηση, η ΕΕ θα συνεχίσει να δίνει προτεραιότητα στην ενδυνάμωση των κεντρικών δικαστικών οργάνων του Αφγανιστάν, καθότι αυτό παραμένει απολύτως αναγκαίο για τη διασφάλιση των δικαιωμάτων των θυμάτων βίας κατά των γυναικών. Η ΕΕ θα συνεχίσει επίσης να θέτει το ζήτημα απευθείας στην κυβέρνηση του Αφγανιστάν εφόσον αυτό ενδείκνυται, και ιδίως στο πλαίσιο των διαπραγματεύσεων σχετικά με τη συμφωνία συνεργασίας για σύμπραξη και ανάπτυξη.

Η αφγανική κυβέρνηση από την πλευρά της έχει αναλάβει σταθερές δεσμεύσεις για τη βελτίωση της θέσης των γυναικών στο πλαίσιο των διεθνών διασκέψεων που πραγματοποιήθηκαν το 2010 στο Λονδίνο και την Καμπούλ, τον Δεκέμβριο του 2011 στη διάσκεψη της Βόννης, καθώς και σε δήλωση της 18ης Ιανουαρίου 2012. Αυτές οι δεσμεύσεις θα επανεξεταστούν στη Διάσκεψη του Τόκιο στις 8 Ιουλίου 2012.

Από το 2001 και μετά, η ΕΕ έχει δαπανήσει πάνω από 31 εκατομμύρια EUR σε σχέδια που είτε αφορούν την άμεση στήριξη των γυναικών, είτε αντιμετωπίζουν πιο σφαιρικά την κοινωνική, πολιτιστική και οικονομική τους περιθωριοποίηση. Σ' αυτό το πλαίσιο, η ΕΕ στηρίζει τις κοινωνικές υπηρεσίες προς τις πλέον ευπαθείς ομάδες, οι οποίες περιλαμβάνουν παροχή συμβουλών, νομική συνδρομή και διαμεσολάβηση για γυναίκες που έρχονται σε σύγκρουση με τις παραδόσεις, συμπεριλαμβανομένων εκείνων που κατηγορούνται για «ανηθικότητα βάσει του νόμου». Άλλα προγράμματα καλύπτουν μακροπρόθεσμους στόχους, όπως η ενίσχυση των υφιστάμενων φορέων ώστε να καταστεί δυνατή η άσκηση κοινωνικής προστασίας και η προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των αφγανών γυναικών κάθε ηλικίας που κινδυνεύουν από ενδοοικογενειακή βία ή είναι θύματα της. Επιπλέον, η βία κατά των γυναικών θα εξεταστεί το 2012 από την ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη της στα αντίστοιχα προγράμματα βοήθειας, ενώ η ΕΕ είναι έτοιμη να αρχίσει διάλογο με άλλα ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη με στόχο την ενίσχυση των δικαιωμάτων των γυναικών που κατηγορούνται για «ανηθικότητα βάσει του νόμου».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003357/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Women in Afghanistan

In Afghanistan, a country which is hell for women, who every day endure domestic violence, maltreatment and incitement to prostitution, it is the victims, not the criminals, who end up in prison. Despite the nightmare through which they live, it is women that end up behind bars, even when they have been raped, while the rapist remains free. This state of affairs has been condemned by the humanitarian organisation Human Rights Watch.

A law that was passed in August 2009 in fact provides for the equality of women, including the criminalisation of forced marriage and childbearing, the sale and purchase of women — whether for marriage or for the settlement of disputes — and coerced suicide.

Unfortunately, however, many of these laws and promises for an improvement in the position of women remain a dead letter.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What measures will it take to protect these women, whose basic human rights are being violated?

2. Does it intend to exert pressure for implementation of the legislation to improve the position of women in Afghanistan?

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

The EUSR/HoD Afghanistan monitors the human rights situation on the ground in close consultation with EU HoMs, notably also with respect to the situation of women and girls in prison, which remains a great concern. The EUSR/HoD has, in this context, taken note of the report by Human Rights Watch.

Building on its ongoing assistance programmes with a focus on governance the EU will continue to give priority to assisting with strengthening Afghanistan's centralised justice institution,s as this remains indispensable to uphold the rights of victims of violence against women. The EU will also continue to bring up this issue directly with the Government of Afghanistan whenever appropriate and, notably, in the context of negotiations on the cooperation agreement on Partnership and Development.

The Afghan Government, for its part, has made firm commitments to improve the position of women in the context of the international conferences held in 2010 in London and Kabul, in December 2011 at the Bonn Conference and in a statement issued on 18 January 2012. These undertakings will come under review at the Tokyo Conference on 8 July 2012.

Since 2001, the EU has spent more than EUR 31 million on projects in direct support of women or addressing more broadly their social, cultural and economic marginalisation. In this context, the EU supports social services to the most vulnerable including counselling, legal aid and mediation for women in conflict with traditions including those accused of 'immorality under the law'. Additional programmes address long-term objectives, such as strengthening existing bodies to exercise social protection and protect the rights of Afghan women and girls at risk or victims of domestic violence. Furthermore, violence against women will be addressed in 2012 both by the EU and its Member States in their respective assistance programmes, while the EU is ready to engage with other stakeholders to seek to strengthen women's rights accused of 'immorality under the law'.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003358/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(29 Μαρτίου 2012)

Θέμα: Διαρροή φυσικού αερίου

Διαρροή φυσικού αερίου από εξέδρα άντλησης υδρογονανθράκων της εταιρείας Total σημειώθηκε την Τρίτη 27.3.2012 στη θαλάσσια περιοχή της Σκωτίας.

Σύμφωνα με ανακοινώσεις της εταιρείας, η διαρροή στην εξέδρα Elgin συνιστά ένα από τα χειρότερα ατυχήματα του είδους.

Η διαρροή εκτιμάται στους 23 τόνους αερίου και η πιθανότητα έκρηξης είναι μεγάλη.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει για την αντιμετώπιση του συγκεκριμένου ατυχήματος, καθώς και ατυχημάτων τέτοιου είδους, που καταστρέφουν τον παγκόσμιο θαλάσσιο πλούτο και εγκυμονούν κινδύνους για την υγεία, τη ζωή και τις περιουσίες των πολιτών;

2. Προτίθεται να επιβάλει κυρώσεις στις εταιρείες που δεν εφαρμόζουν τους κανόνες ασφαλείας κατασκευής εξέδρων εξόρυξης πετρελαίου και φυσικού αερίου, με απώτερο στόχο την προφύλαξη του περιβάλλοντος;

Απάντηση του κ. Oettinger εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Μαΐου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην απάντησή της στις γραπτές ερωτήσεις E-5252/10 του κ. Béchu και E-3501/10 του κ. Rossi [1]. Η Επιτροπή πάντως συνεχίζει να παρακολουθεί στενά την εξέλιξη του συμβάντος και σκοπεύει να συζητήσει με τις αρχές των κρατών μελών που είναι αρμόδιες για την ασφάλεια των υπεράκτιων εργασιών άντλησης υδρογονανθράκων, προκειμένου να ενημερωθεί για τους τρόπους αντιμετώπισης παρόμοιων συμβάντων στο ευρύτερο πλαίσιο της ΕΕ.

2. Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου στην κοινή της απάντηση στις γραπτές ερωτήσεις E-700/2012 και E-701/2012 του κ. Higgins [2] σχετικά με την πρότασή της για έναν κανονισμό σχετικά με την ασφάλεια των υπεράκτιων δραστηριοτήτων εξερεύνησης, εκμετάλλευσης και παραγωγής πετρελαίου και φυσικού αερίου. Η πρόταση αυτή που αποτελεί προς το παρόν αντικείμενο συζήτησης στο πλαίσιο μιας ομάδας εργασίας του Συμβουλίου περιλαμβάνει μια διάταξη για την επιβολή των κατάλληλων κυρώσεων προκειμένου να διασφαλισθεί η συμμόρφωση.

---

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003358/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Natural gas leak

On Tuesday 27 March 2012, there was a gas leak from a drilling rig owned by Total in the sea off Scotland.

According to statements by the company, the leak at the Elgin field represents one of the worst accidents of its kind to have occurred.

It is estimated that 23 tonnes of gas has escaped from the leak and there is high risk of an explosion.

Will the Commission answer the following:

1. What measures does it intend to take to deal with the accident in question, and accidents of this type in general, which destroy the world's marine resources and pose dangers to health, life and citizens' property?

2. Does it plan to impose penalties on companies which do not observe the safety regulations, whose aim is to protect the environment, for oil and natural gas drilling rig construction platforms?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

1. The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its replies to Written Questions E-5252/10 by Mr Béchu and E-3501/10 by Mr Rossi ([1]). As follow-up, the Commission continues to monitor closely the development of the incident and intends to discuss it with the Member States' authorities responsible for safety of offshore oil and gas activities in order to draw any relevant lessons learnt for the wider EU context.

2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its joint answer to Written Questions E-700/2012 and E-701/2012 by Mr Higgins ([2]) concerning its proposal for a regulation on the safety of offshore oil and gas prospection, exploration and production activities. The proposal, which is at present being discussed in a Council working party, includes a requirement for appropriate penalties in order to ensure compliance.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003359/12
to the Commission
Daniel Hannan (ECR)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Commission funding of HS2

— What proportion of the UK Government's high-speed railway project, 'HS2', would the Commission consider funding?

— Is there an upper limit on such funding?

— Upon what would the funding be contingent?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2012)

Under the current Union guidelines for the development of the Trans-European transport network (Decision No 661/2010/EU ([1])), 'HS2' is not included either in the 30 Priority projects, or in the horizontal issues. Therefore it can not be co-funded yet.

The possibility of HS2 receiving EU co-funding in the future would depend on the outcome of the ongoing co-decision procedure on the package for a new transport infrastructure policy, adopted by the Commission on 19 October 2011. It comprises a proposal for the revision of the TEN-T guidelines and a proposal for a Connecting Europe Facility ([2]).

The co-funding rates proposed by the Commission in the abovementioned package for a new transport infrastructure policy go up to 50 % of the costs for studies and up to 20 % for works for such a project which is not a cross-border section (where co-funding is proposed to go up to 40 % maximum).

([1]) 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.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/infrastructure/revision-t_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003360/12
to the Commission
Daniel Hannan (ECR)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Audit control procedures for regional funding projects

Could the Commission please confirm its practices regarding third-level control audits of regional funding projects?

Specifically, could it explain its policy regarding the action it takes where the first-level control systems in some parts of a project do not meet the Commission's standards, while the first-level control in other parts of the project is satisfactory? For instance, where several different projects are grouped together under one umbrella, such as the UK branch of the Interreg IV A 2 Seas Programme, would the Commission withhold funding from all the different projects falling under this umbrella, even though only some of them have unsatisfactory first-level control procedures?

If the answer is 'yes', can the Commission please explain how the affected projects, including those with satisfactory auditing procedures, would get their regional funding back on schedule as quickly as possible?

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

For Territorial Cooperation programmes, each Member State is responsible for the set-up of the necessary spending checks on their territory. These 'first level controls' are the first line of checks that ensure that projects are spending money correctly.

The Commission undertakes audits on the systems that Member States have put in place to carry out such checks. In the case of the Interreg IV A '2 Seas' Programme, the Commission found the system put in place by the United Kingdom to be unsatisfactory — therefore, it is not a question of the individual projects, but rather the overall checking system which is problematic. In order to protect the EU budget from the risks created by this situation, the Commission has stopped making payments for expenditure in the UK for this programme, until the UK and programme authorities have improved the system and resolved the identified weaknesses.

The programme authorities have stated that they expect to implement the needed improvements in the coming weeks, allowing the Commission to lift the interruption. Based on that information, the representatives of the national authorities involved in the Two Seas Monitoring Committee decided, on 16 April, to advance payments to all UK beneficiaries, including the Medway Queen Preservation Society, for spending claimed up to September 2011, using available cash resources in the programme.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003361/12
to the Commission
Daniel Hannan (ECR)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Commission fines for infringements of Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement

What is the total amount of the fines that the Commission has collected for infringements of Article 101 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and Article 53 of the EEA Agreement, and what happens to the proceeds from these fines?

If they are paid into the Community budget, are these amounts taken into consideration when the next EU budget is drafted?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2012)

1. Since the Lisbon Treaty entered into force, the Commission has definitively cashed fines which were imposed for infringements under Article 101 TFEU (and where applicable Article 53 of the EEA Agreement) for a total amount of EUR 902 809 204.87. This amount comprises the years 2010 and 2011.

2. Fines do not affect the expenditure side of the EU budget and in that sense are not taken into account when the EU budget is proposed and negotiated with the budgetary authority. However, cashed and definitive ([1]) fines are booked as budgetary income and subsequently reduce the GNI-based revenue called from Member States either in the year of booking via an amending budget or in the following year.

([1]) A fine becomes definitive either when it is paid by the company(s) on which it was imposed and no legal action against the fine decision has been filed or ii) when all legal actions against the fine decision are exhausted.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003362/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(29 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: L'UE chiarisca dove sono finiti i mille miliardi BCE alle banche

Il Presidente della BCE Mario Draghi, in un'intervista al quotidiano tedesco Bild il 22 marzo, ha risposto come segue alla domanda se l'iniezione di mille miliardi di liquidità nel sistema bancario non provochi inflazione: «In larga misura, le banche che hanno preso in prestito soldi dalla BCE non li hanno immessi nel circuito economico, ma li hanno usati per saldare degli obblighi pregressi. Perciò il denaro, dal punto di vista dell'inflazione, è contemporaneamente neutralizzato. Questa procedura non è inflazionistica.».

La Commissione non ritiene che questa dichiarazione del Presidente della BCE dimostri che la BCE fin dall'inizio sapeva che l'inondazione di denaro sarebbe stata irrilevante per il «credit crunch», cioè non sarebbe andato un euro alle imprese e che, per Draghi e la BCE, denaro che rifinanzia debiti (carta su carta) non sarebbe inflazionistico, mentre sarebbe inflazionistica l'immissione di denaro nell'economia reale?

In quale modo la Commissione intende intervenire per impedire al sistema bancario europeo di effettuare, con i fondi erogati dalla BCE, speculazioni sui titoli e, forse, addirittura sui derivati, anziché fornire sostegno all'economia reale e in particolare alle PMI?

Risposta data da Olli Rehn a nome della Commissione
(25 maggio 2012)

La politica monetaria nella zona euro è di competenza della BCE, la cui indipendenza è sancita dal trattato.

La Commissione non interpreta le dichiarazioni del presidente della BCE. La prospettiva in materia di inflazione sia della BCE che della Commissione (e in linea con i previsori privati) prevede che l'inflazione IPCA scenderà al di sotto del due per cento entro l'anno prossimo, in linea con la definizione della BCE della stabilità dei prezzi a medio termine.

Secondo la BCE ([1]), l'obiettivo principale delle operazioni di rifinanziamento a più lungo termine con scadenza a tre anni (LTRO, operazioni di rifinanziamento a più lungo termine) consisteva nell'alleviare le pressioni di finanziamento cui le banche erano sottoposte. Queste ultime potevano decidere in seguito riguardo all'uso migliore di detti fondi. Il mancato ricorso alle LTRO della BCE sarebbe stato molto più dannoso, poiché il denaro sarebbe potenzialmente defluito dall'economia reale. Allo stesso tempo, è necessario che le banche con problemi di bilancio compiano significativi sforzi di ristrutturazione, che dovrebbero tradursi in un settore bancario meglio capitalizzato e con una maggiore resilienza e dovrebbero migliorare ulteriormente le condizioni per un flusso di credito alle imprese private e alle famiglie.

Lo studio sui prestiti concessi dalle banche condotto dalla BCE nell'aprile 2012 rivela una significativa diminuzione del ricorso a standard di concessioni di credito eccessivamente rigorosi, concludendo che ciò rispecchia con ogni probabilità l'impatto positivo dei due LTRO a tre anni sulle condizioni di finanziamento delle banche.

([1]) Fonte: http://www.ecb.int/press/key/date/2011/html/sp111219.en.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003362/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: The EU should clarify where the trillion given to the banks by the ECB has gone

In an interview in the German newspaper *Bild* on 22 March, the President of the ECB, Mario Draghi, gave the following answer when asked whether injecting a trillion in liquidity into the banking system caused inflation. He said that to a large extent, the banks that borrowed money from the ECB did not put it into the economy, but used it to settle previous debts. In terms of inflation, the money is therefore simultaneously neutralised. The process is not inflationary.

Does the Commission not believe that this statement by the President of the ECB shows that the ECB knew from the outset that the great influx of money would be irrelevant to the credit crunch, that is to say that not one euro would go to businesses and that, according to Mr Draghi and the ECB, money that refinances debt (paper on paper) is not inflationary, while injecting money into the real economy would be inflationary?

What action does the Commission intend to take to prevent the European banking system from using funds provided by the ECB to speculate on securities and, perhaps, even on derivatives, instead of supporting the real economy and SMEs in particular?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

Monetary policy in the euro area is the competence of the ECB, whose independence is enshrined in the Treaty.

The Commission does not interpret statements of the President of the ECB. The inflation outlook of both the ECB and the Commission (and in line with private forecasters) expects annual HICP inflation to fall below two percent next year at the latest, in line with the ECB's definition of medium-term price stability.

According to the ECB ([1]), the main objective of the three-year longer-term refinancing operations (LTROs) was to ease the funding pressures that banks were experiencing. The banks then decide what the best use of these funds is. The counterfactual to the ECB's LTROs would have been much more disruptive, as money would potentially have flown out of the real economy. At the same time, significant restructuring efforts by banks with weak balance sheets need to be made, which should result in a better capitalised and more resilient banking sector and should further improve the conditions for credit to flow into private companies and households.

The ECB Bank Lending Survey of April 2012 finds that euro area banks reported a significant decline in the net tightening of credit standards and concludes that this was likely to reflect the positive impact of the two three-year LTROs on banks' funding conditions.

([1]) *Source:* http://www.ecb.int/press/key/date/2011/html/sp111219.en.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003363/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(29 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Vendita di medicinali online: aumento dei rischi per la salute

Il caso della giovane italiana deceduta dopo aver ingerito del sorbitolo acquistato online, ha provocato l'allerta sanitaria in Europa e ha riacceso i riflettori sul problema della vendita illegale dei farmaci online.

Nonostante in Italia la vendita di medicinali sul web sia vietata e sia possibile comprare soltanto alcuni prodotti autorizzati, negli ultimi anni si sono moltiplicati gli acquisti online di farmaci contraffatti o «senza etichetta» su siti poco attendibili.

Nel corso dell'anno 2010, 16 milioni e 800 mila internauti italiani hanno acquistato medicine online o consultato siti web che propongono prodotti farmaceutici a prezzi stracciati. Molto spesso si tratta di farmaci prodotti in Asia, contraffatti o contenenti ingredienti o dosaggi errati. Sul web è possibile acquistare integratori, analgesici, sedativi, steroidi anabolizzanti, farmaci antiobesità e addirittura la «pillola dei 5 giorni dopo», sebbene non sia ancora in commercio nelle farmacie italiane.

I rischi per i pazienti fai-da-te sono molto seri. Per risparmiare qualche euro si preferisce rivolgersi alle e-pharmacies non autorizzate aumentando il rischio di episodi avversi e gravi effetti collaterali. Il sorbitolo ingerito dalla giovane ragazza, infatti, conteneva nitrito di sodio con una concentrazione del 70 %. Il portale online sul quale era stato acquistato il prodotto letale ha bloccato le vendite in tutto il mondo; tuttavia, una donna ha perso la vita per la superficialità di un medico e gli scarsi controlli a livello nazionale ed europeo sui farmaci disponibili online.

Per evitare il ripetersi di altri episodi simili, è necessario intensificare i controlli e informare i cittadini sul pericolo dell'acquisto online di prodotti farmaceutici.

Dal momento che, in Europa e nel mondo, l'e-health sta conquistando spazi sempre più ampi e in futuro si prospetta un'informatizzazione sempre maggiore dei servizi relativi alla salute, chiedo alla Commissione, alla luce di quanto descritto e della nuova legislazione europea sulla farmacovigilanza, se intenda adottare soluzioni specifiche per tutelare i cittadini ed evitare l'acquisto in rete di farmaci dannosi e a volte letali.

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003369/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(29 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Maxi sequestro di mille tonnellate di sorbitolo

Sabato 24 marzo una ragazza di 28 anni si è sottoposta a un test per la valutazione di intolleranze alimentari in uno studio medico di Barletta. La donna, dopo aver ingerito una fiala di sorbitolo poco prima di sottoporsi al test, ha immediatamente avvertito dolore. Ha perso i sensi e dopo una decina di minuti è deceduta, nonostante l'intervento dei medici per soccorrerla. Altre due donne che erano con lei, e si stavano sottoponendo al medesimo trattamento, hanno avvertito sintomi identici e solo grazie alla tempestività dei soccorsi hanno evitato l'intossicazione.

Il sorbitolo utilizzato per il test era stato acquistato su eBay da due medici i quali hanno spiegato che l'acquisto di sorbitolo risulta essere lecito perché considerato integratore e non farmaco. I due avevano già effettuato altri acquisti simili in passato su internet e non avevano riscontrato alcun problema.

In seguito alla morte della ventottenne di Trani, i N.A.S. di Padova, dopo aver acquisito alcuni campioni della sostanza nell'azienda di Rovigo (l'azienda che aveva messo in commercio il prodotto), hanno effettuato un maxi sequestro di circa mille tonnellate di sorbitolo in due società tra Mantova e la stessa provincia di Rovigo. Anche eBay ha deciso di bloccare la vendita online di sorbitolo in tutto il mondo.

Le normative negli Stati membri per l'acquisto di farmaci on-line sono ancora fortemente eterogenee, nonostante l'approvazione della direttiva 2011/62/UE che impedisce l'ingresso di medicinali falsificati nella catena di fornitura legale e rievoca i rischi dell'acquisto di medicinali su internet.

Ciò premesso, potrebbe la Commissione far sapere se intende verificare che l'Italia abbia applicato correttamente la normativa europea di cui sopra, pubblicata nella Gazzetta ufficiale lo scorso febbraio 2011 e ad applicazione diretta negli Stati membri, considerato che continuano a registrarsi casi come quello citato che non garantiscono una protezione adeguata dei consumatori e causano il decesso del paziente?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003564/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(3 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Farmaci letali on line

Da qualche tempo abbiamo interpellato la Commissione sulla pericolosità della vendita on line di farmaci. Eppure, il fenomeno è in continua crescita, tanto da provocare la morte di una giovane donna a Barletta a seguito dell'assunzione di nitrito di sodio, contenuto in un prodotto acquistato su un sito internet, e il salvataggio in extremis, grazie alla professionalità dei medici, di altre due pazienti che avevano ingerito lo stesso farmaco. Il pericolo deriva dal fatto che, con l'acquisto on line, si fa ricorso a farmaci la cui vendita dovrebbe avvenire solo dietro prescrizione medica, per evitare di acquistare prodotti di cui non si conoscono i componenti né eventuali contraffazioni.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È a conoscenza di altri casi simili a quello italiano verificatisi nel resto dell'Unione?

2. L'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità ha denunciato che la crescita esponenziale della vendita on line di farmaci sta danneggiando il mercato. Visto che l'interesse per la salute è prioritario, cosa fa la Commissione per controllare la vendita di prodotti medici on line senza un controllo medico?

3. Non ritiene che certi siti debbano essere monitorati e chiusi, o che sia necessario chiedere direttamente ai provider gli eventuali danni?

Risposta congiunta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(24 maggio 2012)

Il 25 marzo l'Italia ha notificato, per il tramite del Sistema di allarme rapido per gli alimenti e i mangimi (RASFF), il decesso di una donna e l'ospedalizzazione di due persone in seguito all'ingestione di sorbitolo (un dolcificante) consumato durante un test di intolleranza alimentare presso un ambulatorio medico privato in Italia. Il prodotto ingerito è risultato essere nitrito di sodio puro.

In seguito a ciò le autorità del Regno Unito hanno sottoposto a inchiesta la società operante via internet che ha consegnato il prodotto incriminato ed hanno imposto immediatamente all'impresa il divieto di vendita via internet di qualsiasi sostanza chimica ad uso alimentare in attesa dei risultati dell'inchiesta. Informazioni sulle vendite e sugli acquirenti di questa impresa sono circolate attraverso il sistema RASFF.

Per quanto concerne le vendite illegali di medicinali sul web la Commissione sta lavorando all'attuazione della direttiva 2011/62/UE ([1]) che introduce regole per affrontare il problema della vendita al pubblico di medicinali illegali via internet. Tali regole si applicheranno un anno dopo la data di pubblicazione dello strumento di attuazione concernente la definizione di un logo comune che consenta l'identificazione delle «farmacie online» operanti legalmente. La Commissione ha iniziato i lavori preliminari su tale strumento e prevede di pubblicare entro la fine del 2012 un documento di consultazione.

Le regole per l'autorizzazione della vendita di medicinali continuano ad essere di competenza degli Stati membri che sono responsabili del loro controllo. Per quanto concerne i medicinali soggetti a prescrizione, la direttiva conferisce agli Stati membri la possibilità di vietarne la vendita da parte delle «farmacie online».

Per ulteriori particolari si rinviano gli onorevoli deputati alle risposte alle precedenti interrogazioni scritte E-007509/2011 ed E-003176/2012 dell'onorevole Rossi, E-000371/2012 dell'onorevole Muscardini, E-003261/2012 dell'onorevole Gardini, P-003511/2012 dell'onorevole Bizzotto ed E-002186/2012 dell'onorevole Luhan ([2]).

([1]) Direttiva 2011/62/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, dell'8 giugno 2011, che modifica la direttiva 2001/83/CE, recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano, al fine di impedire l'ingresso di medicinali falsificati nella catena di fornitura legale, GU L 174 dell'1.7.2011.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003363/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Online sale of medicines: increased health risks

The case of a young Italian woman who died after taking sorbitol that she bought online has caused a health alert in Europe and refocused attention on the problem of the illegal sale of drugs online.

Although the sale of medicines on the Internet is prohibited in Italy and only certain authorised products can be bought, online purchases of counterfeit and 'off-label' drugs from unreliable websites have increased in recent years.

In 2010, some 16.8 million Italian Internet users bought medicines online or visited websites offering cut-price pharmaceutical products. Very often these are pharmaceuticals produced in Asia, which are counterfeit or contain ingredients at incorrect doses. It is possible to buy online supplements, analgesics, sedatives, anabolic steroids, anti-obesity drugs and even the 'five days after pill', even though it is not yet on sale in Italian pharmacies.

The risks for DIY patients are very serious. To save a few euros, they would rather turn to unauthorised e-pharmacies, increasing the risk of adverse events and serious side-effects. The sorbitol taken by the young woman contained sodium nitrite at a concentration of 70 %. The online portal from which the deadly product had been bought has stopped sales worldwide. However, a woman has lost her life due to the carelessness of a doctor and scant controls at national and European level with regard to drugs available online.

To avoid a repeat of other similar episodes, it is necessary to step up controls and to inform citizens about the dangers of buying pharmaceutical products online.

Given that, in Europe and across the world, e-health is gaining ever more ground and the future promises increasingly extensive computerisation of health services, I would ask the Commission, in view of the above and the new European legislation on pharmacovigilance, whether it intends to adopt specific solutions to protect citizens and to prevent harmful, and sometimes lethal, drugs being bought online?

Question for written answer E-003369/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Massive seizure of 1 000 tonnes of sorbitol

On Saturday, 24 March 2012, a 28 year-old woman was tested for food intolerances at a doctor's surgery in Barletta. The woman, who had taken a dose of sorbitol in preparation for having the test, immediately complained of feeling pain. She lost consciousness and after around 10 minutes she died, despite the efforts of doctors to save her. Two other women who were with her, and who were also undergoing the same treatment, showed identical symptoms and avoided being poisoned thanks only to the promptness of the care they received.

The sorbitol used to carry out the test had been bought on eBay by two doctors, who explained that it is legal to purchase sorbitol in this way because it is regarded as a supplement and not a drug. They had previously made two similar purchases on the Internet and had not encountered any problems.

Following the death of the 28 year-old from Trani, and having purchased some samples from the company in Rovigo which had placed the relevant product on the market, the Padua police division in charge of investigating cases involving contaminated foodstuffs and beverages made a huge seizure of around 1 000 tonnes of sorbitol at two companies with premises in Mantua and the province of Rovigo. eBay has also decided to prohibit the sale of sorbitol on its site worldwide.

The rules governing the online purchase of drugs still differ very widely from one Member State to another, despite the entry into force of Directive 2011/62/EU, which seeks to prevent falsified medicinal products from entering the legal supply chain and emphasises the risks involved in buying drugs over the Internet.

In view of the above, can the Commission state whether it intends to check that Italy has correctly applied the directive referred to above, which was published in the Official Journal in February 2011 and is directly applicable in the Member States, given that cases are still coming to light, such as the one outlined above, that point to inadequate protection of consumers and result in patient deaths?

Question for written answer E-003564/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Deadly drugs available online

For some time we have been questioning the Commission about the danger of the online sale of drugs. Nevertheless, this phenomenon continues to grow and has now caused the death of a young woman in Barletta after she took sodium nitrite contained in a product purchased from a website. Two other patients who had taken the same drug were saved in extremis only thanks to the skill of the doctors treating them. The danger comes from the fact that drugs are now available online that should only be sold on medical prescription, so as to prevent the purchase of products containing unknown ingredients and possibly counterfeit drugs.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of cases elsewhere in the EU similar to that which occurred in Italy?

2. The World Health Organisation has reported that the proliferation of online pharmacies is damaging the market. Given that health is a priority, what is the Commission doing to control the online sale of medicines without medical supervision?

3. Does it not believe that certain sites should be monitored and closed or that it is necessary to hold providers directly responsible for any damages?

Joint answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(24 May 2012)

On 25 March Italy notified through the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF) the death of one woman and the hospitalization of two persons after ingestion of sorbitol (a sweetener) consumed during a food intolerance test in a private medical practice in Italy. The product ingested turned out to be pure sodium nitrite.

Following this, UK authorities investigated the Internet company delivering the incriminated product and immediately imposed a ban on the company's sale of any food grade chemicals via its Internet site pending the outcome of the investigations. Information on the sales/buyers from this company was circulated through RASFF.

Concerning illegal sales of medicines on the web, the Commission is working on the implementation of Directive 2011/62/EU ([1]) which introduces rules to address the illegal sales of medicines to the public over the Internet. Those will be applicable one year after the date of publication of the implementing act concerning the establishment of a common logo enabling the identification of legally operating 'online pharmacies'. The Commission has initiated the preliminary work on this act and a consultation paper is planned to be published by end 2012.

The rules for the authorisation of the sale of medicines remain under Member States' competence who stay responsible for their control. Concerning prescription medicinal products the directive gives the possibility to Member States to prohibit their sale via 'online pharmacies'.

For further details the Honourable Members are referred to the responses to previous written questions E-007509/2011 and E-003176/2012 by Mr Rossi, E-000371/2012 by Ms Muscardini, E-003261/2012 by Ms Gardini, P-003511/2012 By MS Bizzotto and to E-002186/2012 by Mr Luhan ([2]).

([1]) Directive 2011/62/EU of Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2011 amending Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, as regards the prevention of the entry into the legal supply chain of falsified medicinal products, OJ L 174, 1.7.2011.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003365/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Inchiesta su presunte irregolarità in relazione a finanziamenti da parte del FSE a università venete

Con riferimento all'interrogazione E-007753/2011 e alla relativa risposta, può la Commissione europea fornire informazioni sugli sviluppi dell'inchiesta condotta dal pubblico ministero di Padova sulle presunte irregolarità circa le modalità con cui i finanziamenti per la ricerca erogati dal Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) sono stati destinati alle università della Regione Veneto?

In particolare: l'inchiesta in oggetto ha confermato tali irregolarità? Se sì, di che natura? Quali misure verranno adottate?

Risposta data da László Andor a nome della Commissione
(15 maggio 2012)

Quale seguito all'interrogazione scritta E-007753/2011, il 5 settembre 2011 la Commissione ha scritto all'autorità di gestione del programma operativo FSE per il Veneto chiedendo le informazioni sull'inchiesta condotta dal pubblico ministero di Padova in merito alle presunte irregolarità menzionate nell'interrogazione scritta.

Le autorità regionali competenti hanno risposto il 21 settembre 2011 affermando che non vi erano irregolarità che interessassero le procedure per l'assegnazione delle borse cofinanziate dal FSE per attività di ricerca presso l'università di Padova e che esse non avevano cambiato i criteri di assegnazione stabiliti nell'invito a presentare proposte.

Le autorità regionali non hanno ricevuto inoltre una notifica diretta dal pubblico ministero in merito a detta inchiesta e le uniche informazioni ricevute nel merito provenivano dai mass media. Esse monitoreranno tuttavia la situazione e terranno la Commissione informata sugli eventuali sviluppi futuri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003365/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Investigation into alleged irregularities regarding ESF funding for universities in the Veneto

With reference to Question E-007753/2011 and the reply thereto, can the European Commission state what progress has been made in the investigation by the Padua public prosecutor into alleged irregularities regarding the allocation of European Social Fund (ESF) appropriations to universities in the Veneto region for research purposes?

In particular: has the investigation in question confirmed the existence of such irregularities? If so, what are they? What measures are to be adopted?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2012)

As follow up to the Written Question E-007753/2011, on 5 September 2011 the Commission wrote to the managing authority of the ESF Operational Programme for Veneto, asking for information about the investigation started by the public prosecutor in Padua on the alleged irregularity which was mentioned in the written question.

The competent regional authorities replied on 21 September 2011 saying that there were no irregularities affecting the procedures for the awarding of ESF co-funded grants for research activities to Padua university, and that they did not change the awarding criteria established in the call for proposals.

Moreover, the regional authorities did not receive any direct notice from the public prosecutor about this investigation, and the only information they received on this issue comes from the media. Nevertheless, they will monitor the situation and will keep the Commission informed about any possible further development.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003366/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(29 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: La necropoli del Gaudo di Paestum

Diversi sono i media nazionali che, di recente, hanno portato a conoscenza di tutta l'Italia la condizione di degrado e di cattiva gestione di cui risulta essere vittima il sito archeologico della necropoli del Gaudo.

La necropoli del Gaudo è una preziosa testimonianza dell'età eneolitica, situata nei pressi di Paestum, in provincia di Salerno (Italia), con tombe a «camera» o a «grotticella», e probabilmente con altre tombe non ancora portate alla luce. Nonostante la rilevanza storico-archeologica della necropoli, attualmente il sito è abbandonato a se stesso: le tombe sono coperte non solo da rovi, ma anche da macerie, lastre di eternit, copertoni bruciati, materassi vecchi, elettrodomestici. In sostanza, la necropoli del Gaudo sembra essere ridotta ad una vera e propria discarica a cielo aperto.

Un impiego criminale del territorio, anche considerando che intorno ai 120 ettari di necropoli e templi sono state costruite abitazioni che hanno contribuito al deturpamento del territorio, in violazione di leggi nazionali che vieterebbero la realizzazione di edifici nel raggio di un chilometro dai templi di Paestum.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. quali misure si intendono adottare per salvaguardare il sito archeologico e se c'è la possibilità di accedere al programma LIFE per sostenere progetti ambientali che vadano a migliorare la situazione in cui versa la necropoli del Gaudo;

2. se, oltre all'articolo 4 del regolamento (CE) n.1080/2006 che prevede di cofinanziare investimenti per la tutela, la promozione e la preservazione del patrimonio culturale attraverso il FESR, per il caso descritto c'è possibilità di accedere al programma LIFE per sostenere progetti ambientali che vadano a migliorare la situazione?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(12 giugno 2012)

Affinché un progetto possa essere cofinanziato nell'ambito della componente tematica «Politica e governance ambientali» del programma LIFE+, deve trattarsi o di un progetto dimostrativo (azioni e metodi di attuazione pratica , sperimentazione, valutazione e diffusione che siano in qualche misura nuovi o poco familiari nello specifico contesto del progetto e che dovrebbero essere applicati a più ampio raggio in simili circostanze) o di un progetto innovativo (che mette in atto una tecnica o un metodo di conservazione mai applicato/sperimentato in precedenza o altrove e che offre potenziali vantaggi rispetto alle attuali migliori pratiche).

Poiché sembra che i progetti ambientali finalizzati a migliorare la situazione in cui versa la necropoli del Gaudo non rientrino in una delle categorie sopra citate, essi non possono beneficiare del sostegno del programma LIFE.

Per quanto riguarda i Fondi strutturali, l'articolo 4 del regolamento (CE) n. 1080/2006 ([1]) consente di finanziare progetti intesi a promuovere il turismo, inclusa la valorizzazione delle risorse naturali in quanto potenziale di sviluppo per un turismo sostenibile. Il programma 2007-2013 per la regione Campania prevede la possibilità di cofinanziare interventi di questo tipo nell'ambito del primo asse «Sostenibilità ambientale e attrattività culturale e turistica». Conformemente al principio della gestione condivisa applicato per l'amministrazione della politica di coesione, spetta alle autorità nazionali selezionare ed attuare i vari progetti. La Commissione invita pertanto l'onorevole parlamentare a mettersi direttamente in contatto con l'autorità di gestione del programma:

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1080/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 5 luglio 2006, relativo al Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale e recante abrogazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1783/1999, GU L 210 del 31.7.2006.

Regione Campania
Area Generale di Coordinamento
Rapporti con gli organi nazionali ed internazionali in materia di interesse regionale
Via Santa Lucia 81
I-80134 Napoli
Tel.: (39-0) 817962559
Fax.: (39-0) 817962381
E-mail.: staff.por@regione.campania.it

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003366/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Gaudo necropolis in Paestum

Recent reports in the Italian national media have highlighted the poor state of repair of the Gaudo necropolis and the mismanagement of this archaeological site.

The Gaudo necropolis, located near Paestum in the province of Salerno (Italy), is a precious testimony to the Aeneolithic age that has 'chamber' or *grotticella* tombs, and probably others yet to be discovered. Despite the historic and archaeological importance of the necropolis, the site is currently lying abandoned: the tombs are covered not only by brambles, but also by rubble, asbestos cement slabs, burned tyres, old mattresses and domestic appliances. Essentially, the Gaudo necropolis appears to have been reduced to an open-air rubbish tip.

This is a criminal use of the land, bearing in mind in addition that the houses built around the 120 hectares of necropolis and temples have further disfigured the landscape, in breach of the national laws which supposedly prohibit building within a radius of one kilometre of the Paestum temples.

In view of the above:

1. What measures will the Commission take to protect the archaeological site? Could the LIFE programme be used to support environmental projects to improve the state of the Gaudo necropolis?

2. Over and above Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006, whereby investment for the protection, promotion and preservation of cultural heritage may be co-financed under the ERDF, would it be possible in this case to provide support under the LIFE programme for environmental projects to improve the situation?

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

In order for a project to be co-financed under the LIFE+ Environment & Policy strand, this has to be either a demonstration project (putting into practice, testing, evaluating and disseminating actions and methods that are to some degree new or unfamiliar in the project's specific context and that should be more widely applied in similar circumstances) or an innovation project (applying a conservation technique or method that has not been applied/tested before or elsewhere and that offers potential advantages compared to current best practice).

As enviromental projects aimed to improve the state of the Gaudo necropolis do not seem to fall into one of these categories, they cannot be supported by the LIFE Programme.

As regards Structural Funds, Article 4 of the regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 ([1]) provides for the possibility to finance projects aimed at improving tourism, including the promotion of natural assets as potential for the development of sustainable tourism. The 2007-2013 programme for region Campania envisages the possibility to co-finance interventions of this type within the framework of Axis I 'Environmental sustainability and cultural and tourism appeal'. In line with the shared management principle used for the administration of cohesion policy, project selection and implementation is the responsibility of the national authorities. Therefore the Commission invites the Honourable Member to contact directly the managing authority of the programme:

Regione Campania
Area Generale di Coordinamento — Rapporti con gli organi nazionali ed internazionali in materia di interesse regionale
Via Santa Lucia 81
I-80134 Naples
Tel.: (39-0) 817962559
Fax.: (39-0) 817962381
E-mail.: staff.por@regione.campania.it

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the European Regional Development Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1783/1999, OJ L 210, 31.7.2006.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003367/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(29 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Effetti cancerogeni dei gas di scarico dei motori diesel

I gas di scarico dei motori diesel, classificati già nel 1989 come possibili cancerogeni dall'Agenzia internazionale per la ricerca sul cancro (IARC), aumentano le probabilità di morire di tumore ai polmoni. A dare la conferma sui possibili e a lungo sospettati danni per la salute provenienti dall'inquinamento sono due studi iniziati negli anni Ottanta i cui esiti sono stati pubblicati nei giorni scorsi su una prestigiosa rivista scientifica.

I ricercatori statunitensi — nei due studi — hanno analizzato i dati di oltre 12mila minatori che in otto miniere diverse utilizzavano macchinari con motori diesel, trovandosi a respirarne in varia misura i gas di scarico a livelli comunque generalmente più alti rispetto al resto della popolazione e ad altre categorie di lavoratori. Le loro conclusioni indicano che i minatori più esposti ai gas — quelli attivi a lungo sottoterra più di quelli addetti alle aree minerarie in superficie — hanno maggiori rischi sia di ammalarsi di tumore ai polmoni sia di morirne.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, s'interroga dunque la Commissione per sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza degli studi americani sugli effetti cancerogeni dei gas di scarico dei motori diesel;

2. se non intenda finanziare uno studio che approfondisca i dati scientifici rilevati dalle suddette ricerche.

Risposta data da Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(16 maggio 2012)

La Commissione europea è al corrente dei risultati delle ricerche statunitensi finanziate dagli Istituti nazionali di sanità e dal *National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health*, recentemente pubblicati sul *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* ([1]). I ricercatori dell'Università di Utrecht, che gestisce attualmente due importanti progetti di ricerca dell'Unione europea in materia di qualità dell'aria e salute (ESCAPE ([2]) e TRANSPHORM ([3])), sono tra gli autori degli studi statunitensi, offrendo collegamenti diretti con le attività di ricerca in corso finanziate dalla Commissione europea.

In particolare, mediante il Settimo programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (7°PQ, 2007-2013), la Commissione europea finanzia attualmente i progetti di ricerca summenzionati, analizzando rispettivamente gli effetti a lungo termine sulla salute umana dell'esposizione all'inquinamento atmosferico in Europa e l'impatto del particolato in sospensione nell'aria (PM) sulla salute umana. Entrambi i progetti affrontano la questione dei componenti PM, comprese le particelle dei gas di scarico dei motori diesel, responsabili di alcuni effetti sulla salute, mediante una serie di studi di coorte in corso sulla popolazione. I risultati di entrambi i progetti saranno disponibili entro la fine del 2012.

Per quanto riguarda specificamente la ricerca sul cancro ai polmoni, la Commissione europea ha destinato circa 23 milioni di euro mediante il 7° PQ. I progetti di ricerca comprendono principalmente la patogenesi, la diagnosi e il trattamento del cancro ai polmoni.

Per quanto riguarda la protezione della salute e della sicurezza dei lavoratori è previsto che il comitato scientifico per i limiti di esposizione professionale esegua una valutazione scientifica dei potenziali rischi per la salute dei lavoratori che possono derivare dall'esposizione professionale alle emissioni di scarico dei motori diesel.

([1]) Silverman et al. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2012 Mar 5. Attfield et al. . J Natl Cancer Inst. 2012 Mar 5/.
([2]) http://www.escapeproject.eu/.
([3]) http://www.transphorm.eu/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003367/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Carcinogenic effects of diesel engine exhaust gases

Diesel engine exhaust gases, classified as potential carcinogens by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) as long ago as 1989, increase the probability of dying from lung tumours. Two studies started in the 1980s, whose findings have been published recently in a prestigious scientific journal, confirm the long-held suspicions that this form of pollution can be damaging to health.

In both studies, US researchers analysed data from over 12 000 miners from 8 different mines who used machines with diesel engines, inhaling exhaust gases to varying extents but at levels that were generally higher than for the rest of the population and other categories of workers. Their conclusions show that the miners who were most exposed to the gases, those working underground for a long time, more so than those working in mining areas on the surface, were at higher risk both of developing lung tumours and of dying from them.

1. Is the Commission aware of the US studies on the carcinogenic effects of diesel engine exhaust gases?

2. Will it finance a study to thoroughly analyse the scientific data obtained from the aforementioned research?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2012)

The European Commission is aware of the results of the US studies financed by the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, recently published in the Journal of the National Cancer Institute ([1]). Researchers from the University of Utrecht, which currently runs two major EU research projects on air quality and health (ESCAPE ([2]) and TRANSPHORM ([3])), are among the authors of the US studies, providing direct links with ongoing research activities financed by the European Commission.

In particular, through the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013), the European Commission currently funds the abovementioned research projects, investigating respectively the long-term effects on human health of exposure to air pollution in Europe and the impact of airborne particulate matter (PM) on human health. Both projects address the issue of PM components, including diesel exhaust particles, responsible for health effects through a series of ongoing population cohort studies. The results of both projects will be available by the end of 2012.

Regarding lung cancer research more specifically, the European Commission has devoted some EUR 23 million throughout FP7. The research projects mainly cover the pathogenesis, diagnostic and treatment of lung cancer.

As regards the protection of the health and safety of workers it is intended that the Scientific Committee on Occupational Exposure Limits shall carry out a scientific evaluation of the possible risks to workers' health that may arise from occupational exposure to diesel engine exhaust emissions.

([1]) Silverman et al. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2012 Mar 5. Attfield et al. . J Natl Cancer Inst. 2012 Mar 5/.
([2]) http://www.escapeproject.eu/.
([3]) http://www.transphorm.eu/.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003371/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(29 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Bassa propensione dell'Europa a brevettare rispetto ai competitor internazionali

Secondo la WIPO, l'Organizzazione mondiale della proprietà intellettuale, il 2011 a livello mondiale è stato l'anno record nel campo dell'innovazione, registrandosi in questo settore una crescita del +11 % rispetto all'anno precedente. Questa, secondo la WIPO, è la miglior performance realizzatasi negli ultimi anni, ed il fatto che sia stata registrata in un periodo di crisi economica globale rappresenta la conferma che i brevetti sono una forza propulsiva per il rilancio dell'industria.

Sebbene il dato generale sia molto rassicurante, osservando più da vicino le classifiche si può notare come l'Unione europea e alcuni dei suoi Paesi membri, tra cui l'Italia, che ha registrato un aumento modesto del +0,5 % rispetto al 2010, rimangano un passo indietro rispetto a importanti competitor come gli Stati Uniti, la Cina e il Giappone. Inoltre, estrapolando altri dati pubblicati dalla WIPO è possibile comparare la differenza di quantità tra i brevetti internazionali e quelli europei: questi ultimi sono in netta minoranza.

Preso atto dei dati di cui sopra, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza della situazione sopra descritta e come spiega la bassa propensione dell'Europa a brevettare;

2. se ritiene che la bassa propensione brevettuale possa discendere da un problema di retaggio culturale e che, pertanto, diverse e mirate campagne di sensibilizzazione in Europa potrebbero rivelarsi strategiche;

3. quali strumenti ritiene possano essere utili per incentivare le imprese europee verso l'innovazione tutelata e protetta attraverso l'uso del brevetto.

Risposta data da Michel Barnier a nome della Commissione
(30 maggio 2012)

La Commissione desidera innanzitutto richiamare l'attenzione dell'onorevole parlamentare sul fatto che il raffronto tra il numero di brevetti ottenuti nei diversi paesi del mondo è un esercizio complesso, che richiede particolare cautela sotto il profilo metodologico. Sempreché si possa evidenziare una minore propensione a brevettare da parte delle imprese europee negli anni scorsi, questo può essere dovuto a svariati motivi, tra i quali le attuali difficoltà economiche. Innanzitutto, tuttavia, possono essere considerati deterrenti all'utilizzo del sistema dei brevetti in generale i costi elevati e la complessità dell'ottenimento di una tutela brevettuale per tutta l'UE.

La Commissione ha già individuato le misure fondamentali atte a favorire un maggior ricorso alla tutela brevettuale, ossia una notevole riduzione dei costi per ottenere tale tutela in Europa e una maggiore certezza giuridica derivante dal sistema brevettuale. La creazione di una tutela brevettuale unica e l'istituzione di un sistema unico di risoluzione delle controversie in materia di brevetti costituiscono pertanto una priorità economica, nonché politica, per la Commissione, poiché un progresso così determinante stimolerebbe gli investimenti nello sviluppo dei prodotti e accrescerebbe l'attrattiva del mercato UE per gli inventori, contribuendo quindi ad incrementare la competitività, la crescita e l'occupazione.

Inoltre la Commissione ha adottato una politica ([1]) intesa ad incoraggiare gli istituti superiori di ricerca e gli altri organismi che lavorano in quest'ambito a trasferire le conoscenze, come parte della loro missione volta a rafforzare i legami tra le imprese e il settore pubblico: missione che comporta una strategia della proprietà intellettuale a tutela dei risultati della ricerca che potrebbero essere sfruttati commercialmente. In tale politica è compresa una raccomandazione agli Stati membri e alle istituzioni interessate, destinata a sensibilizzare gli uni e le altre circa l'importanza del trasferimento delle le conoscenze dal mondo accademico alle imprese.

([1]) Raccomandazione della Commissione, del 10 aprile 2008, relativa alla gestione della proprietà intellettuale nelle attività di trasferimento delle conoscenze e al codice di buone pratiche destinato alle università e ad altri organismi pubblici di ricerca (notificata con il numero C(2008)1329), GU L 146 del 5.6.2008.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003371/12
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Europe's reluctance to take out patents by comparison with its international competitors

According to the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), 2011 was a record year for innovation throughout the world, with an 11 % increase in the number of patents registered by comparison with the previous year. This was the best performance in recent years, and the fact that it occurred during a period of global economic crisis confirms that patents are a driving force for industrial revival.

While this overall figure may be highly reassuring, a closer analysis of the results reveals that the European Union and several of its Member States, including Italy, which reported a modest increase of 0.5 % over 2010, remain one step behind their main competitors, namely the United States of America, China and Japan. What is more, extrapolating from further data published by the WIPO makes it possible to compare the numbers of patents taken out in other parts of the world and in Europe: the latter are very much in the minority.

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation described above, and how does it explain the reluctance to take out patents in Europe?

2. Does it believe that there might be cultural reasons for this reluctance and, if so, that targeted awareness-raising campaigns throughout Europe might prove to be strategically beneficial?

3. What instruments does it believe might be useful as incentives for European companies to develop innovations protected by patents?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The Commission would like first to draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that comparing the number of patents taken out in different parts of the world is a complex exercise, that calls for great caution from a methodological standpoint. To the extent that a lower inclination of EU companies to patent can be identified in the past years, this may be due to a variety of reasons, including the current difficult economic conditions. First and foremost however, the high cost and complexity of obtaining EU-wide patent protection can be deemed to act as a deterrent to using the patent system in general.

The Commission has already identified as key measures conducive to a greater use of patent protection a significant decrease in the costs of getting patent protection in Europe, and an increase in the legal certainty provided by the patent system. The creation of a unitary patent protection and the establishment of a unified patent litigation system therefore constitute both an economic and political priority for the Commission, as such a key achievement would encourage investment in product development, make the EU market more attractive for inventors and thus would contribute to greater competitiveness, growth and innovation.

Moreover, the Commission has a policy ([1]) of encouraging higher education institutes performing research and other research-performing organisations to undertake knowledge transfer as a part of a their mission to strengthen links between business and the public sector. This includes having an Intellectual Property strategy in protecting research results that could be exploited commercially. This policy includes a recommendation to Member States and the institutions concerned to raise awareness of the importance of transferring knowledge from academia to business.

([1]) Commission recommendation of 10 April 2008 on the management of intellectual property in knowledge transfer activities and Code of Practice for universities and other public research organisations (notified under document number C(2008) 1329), OJ L 146, 5.6.2008.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-003384/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(29. marca 2012)

Vec: EULEX Kosovo

Politický a bezpečnostný výbor na podporu právneho štátu v Kosove – misia EULEX – má viac ako 2000 pracovníkov, a to policajtov, sudcov, colníkov a odborníkov v oblasti štátnej správy. Do Kosova ich vysielajú jednotlivé členské štáty Európskej únie a ich cieľom je napomáhať rozvoj demokracie, udržanie stability a odstránenie organizovaného zločinu. Na prevzatí správy nad Kosovom sa Európska únia dohodla potom, ako táto bývalá juhosrbská provincia vyhlásila samostatnosť. Misia v Kosové pôsobí už štyri roky, no výsledky jej činnosti nie sú dostatočne uspokojivé, a to najmä v súvislosti s bojom proti organizovanému zločinu. Faktom totiž zostáva, že žiadny významný podozrivý z organizovaného zločinu zatiaľ obvinený nebol. Jedným z dôvodov je aj skutočnosť, že členské krajiny nechcú do Kosova posielať svojich najlepších odborníkov z oblasti polície a justície, alebo naopak tých, ktorí tam už pôsobia, sťahujú domov.

Akým spôsobom plánuje Komisia prispieť k dosahovaniu významnejších výsledkov misie EULEX v súvislosti s organizovaným zločinom?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie /vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(16. júla 2012)

V rámci misie EÚ na podporu právneho štátu v Kosove ([1]), EULEX, prebieha viac ako 370 vyšetrovaní. Sudcovia misie EULEX vyniesli viac ako 200 rozsudkov v širokom spektre súdnych prípadov vrátane korupcie a organizovaného zločinu. K závažným prípadom patria prebiehajúci proces vo veci Medicus a prípad rieky Tisza, v ktorom súd 7 obžalovaných odsúdil na trest odňatia slobody v celkovej výmere 66 rokov a na pokutu 450 000 EUR.

Kosovo sa zúčastňuje na procese stabilizácie a pridruženia pre západný Balkán iniciovanom EÚ. Komisia v rámci neho naďalej pracuje na mnohých iniciatívach v oblasti právneho štátu vrátane organizovaného zločinu.

V januári začala komisárka Malmströmová dialóg o liberalizácii vízového režimu s Kosovom; hlavnou témou rozhovorov je organizovaný zločin, ktorý je zároveň jasným orientačným bodom v rámci plánu liberalizácie vízového režimu, ktorý komisárka Malmströmová oficiálne odovzdala kosovským orgánom 14. júna.

Organizovaný zločin je aj na programe dialógu pre stabilizáciu a pridruženie medzi Komisiou a Kosovom, ktorý sa týka spravodlivosti, slobody a bezpečnosti, pričom zatiaľ posledné stretnutie sa uskutočnilo vo februári, a štrukturovaného dialógu s Kosovom o právnom štáte, ktorý začali komisár Füle a komisárka Malmströmová 30. mája.

Pokiaľ ide o misiu EULEX, Komisia sa naďalej veľmi intenzívne podieľa na strategickom preskúmaní mandátu misie EÚ na podporu právneho štátu v Kosove. Táto zaangažovanosť presahuje výmenu informácií a rozhovory o politike a dotýka sa technickej a finančnej pomoci, ktorú Komisia poskytuje v rámci nástroja predvstupovej pomoci. Súčasné rozhovory sa v rámci strategického preskúmania zameriavajú na referenčné porovnávanie a zosúladenie ďalšej pomoci IPA s prípadným postupným ukončením výkonných funkcií misie EULEX v oblastiach právneho štátu vrátane organizovaného zločinu.

([1]) Týmto označením nie sú dotknuté pozície k otázke štatútu a označenie je v súlade s rezolúciou BR OSN č. 1244 a so stanoviskom Medzinárodného súdneho dvora (ICJ) k vyhláseniu nezávislosti Kosova.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003384/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: EULEX Kosovo

The Political and Security Committee for the promotion of the rule of law in Kosovo — the EULEX mission — has more than 2 000 staff, consisting of police officers, judges, customs officials and experts in state administration. They are sent to Kosovo by the individual EU Member States, and their aim is to assist the development of democracy, to maintain stability and to eliminate organised crime. The EU decided to take over the administration of Kosovo after this former southern Serbian province declared independence. The mission in Kosovo has been in place for four years, but its results have not been very satisfactory, especially in relation to the fight against organised crime. It remains a fact that no significant organised crime suspect has yet been charged. One reason is also the fact that Member States do not want to send their best experts in policing and justice to Kosovo or, on the contrary, they are bringing home those already serving there.

How does the Commission intend to contribute to the achievement of more significant results by the EULEX mission in connection with organised crime?

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

The EU rule of law mission in Kosovo ([1]), EULEX, has more than 370 investigations ongoing. Over 200 verdicts have been handed down by EULEX judges in a wide range of cases including corruption and organised crime. Major cases include the ongoing Medicus trial and the Tisza river case where the court sentenced 7 defendants to a total of 66 years imprisonment and EUR 450 000 in fines.

Kosovo is part of the EU's Stabilisation and Association Process for the western Balkans. Within this framework, the Commission continues to work on a number of initiatives in the area of rule of law, including organised crime.

Last January, Commissioner Malmström launched the visa liberalisation dialogue with Kosovo; organised crime is a key topic for discussion and a distinct benchmark of the visa liberalisation roadmap, which was officially handed over to Kosovo authorities by Commissioner Malmström on 14 June.

Organised crime is also on the agenda of the Commission's Stabilisation and Association Dialogue on Justice, Liberty and Security with Kosovo, with the most recent meeting in February, and of the Structured Dialogue on the Rule of Law with Kosovo, launched by Commissioners Füle and Malmström on 30 May.

As concerns EULEX, the Commission continues to be very closely involved in the strategic review of the mandate of the EU's rule of law mission in Kosovo. This involvement goes beyond the exchange of information and discussion on policies, and touches upon technical and financial assistance that the Commission provides under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance. Within the framework of the strategic review, current discussions focus on benchmarking and aligning future IPA assistance with the possible gradual winding down of EULEX's executive responsibilities in areas of rule of law, including organised crime.

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

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-003392/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(29. marca 2012)

Vec: Prístup migrantov k sociálnym právam

Migrácia je fenomén dnešného globalizovaného sveta. Organizácia Spojených národov predpovedá, že na základe súčasných trendov sa v najbližších 40 rokoch zvýši počet migrujúcich ľudí na svete až o 40 %. Situácia v jednotlivých členských krajinách Európskej únie je v súvislosti s migračnými tokmi rôznorodá. Faktom však zostáva, že migranti patria v rámci Európskej únie medzi najzraniteľnejšie skupiny jej obyvateľov. To, že patria medzi najviac ohrozené skupiny v spoločnosti, spôsobuje aj fakt, že nemajú prístup k základným sociálnym právam, ako je právo na prácu, právo na vzdelanie alebo prístup k sociálnym službám. Súčasná finančná a hospodárska kríza a následné škrty a úsporné opatrenia zlú situáciu migrantov ešte umocnili. Ak chceme zabrániť sociálnemu vylúčeniu a chudobe migrantov, sociálne práva vrátane všeobecného prístupu ku kvalitným sociálnym službám a zdravotnej starostlivosti sú nevyhnutnou podmienkou.

— Akým spôsobom chce Komisia zabezpečiť riešenie problémov migrantov v rámci celej Európskej únie aj zo sociálneho hľadiska, a nie iba z hľadiska bezpečnosti a ochrany hraníc?

Odpoveď pána Andora v mene Komisie
(30. mája 2012)

Komisia je takisto toho názoru, že hospodárska kríza mala neprimeraný vplyv na migrantov, ktorí už sú viac ohrození chudobou a sociálnym vylúčením ako občania EÚ.

Komisia sa vo svojom oznámení s názvom „Európska platforma proti chudobe a sociálnemu vylúčeniu“ ([1]) zaviazala, že bude podnecovať zainteresované strany, aby navrhovali a vykonávali politické opatrenia a programy na riešenie chudoby a sociálneho vylúčenia zraniteľných skupín vrátane migrantov, a že bude presadzovať ich vykonávanie na vnútroštátnej, regionálnej a miestnej úrovni.

Komisia pripravuje štúdiu o chudobe a bezdomovstve medzi migrantmi a mobilnými občanmi EÚ s cieľom preskúmať potenciálne prekážky ich prístupu k sociálnej ochrane, porovnať právne a inštitucionálne ustanovenia členských štátov a vydať politické odporúčania.

Najlepším spôsobom, ako čeliť chudobe a sociálnemu vylúčeniu, je získať prácu. Uznáva sa to aj v stratégii Európa 2020 prostredníctvom cieľa zvýšiť mieru zamestnanosti na 75 %. Vyžaduje si to lepšiu integráciu legálnych migrantov. V rámci Európskeho sociálneho fondu je v súčasnosti vyčlenená 1,2 miliardy EUR na konkrétne opatrenia na zlepšenie prístupu migrantov k zamestnanosti a ich sociálneho začlenenia.

Okrem toho oznámenie Komisie s názvom „Európska agenda v oblasti integrácie štátnych príslušníkov tretích krajín“ ([2]) sa zameriava na opatrenia na podporu sociálnej aj hospodárskej účasti migrantov na trhoch práce a v spoločnostiach v celej EÚ a stanovujú sa v ňom silné záruky, pokiaľ ide o základné práva a rovnaké zaobchádzanie vrátane boja proti sociálnemu vylúčeniu a diskriminácii. Opatrenia na podporu sociálneho začlenenia zacielené na migrantov by sa mali zamerať na odstránenie možných prekážok, ktoré blokujú prístup migrantov k sociálnym a zdravotníckym službám, a mali by sa sústrediť na najzraniteľnejšie osoby.

([1]) „Európska platforma proti chudobe a sociálnemu vylúčeniu: európsky rámec pre sociálnu a územnú súdržnosť“ (KOM(2010) 758 v konečnom znení, 16. december 2010), pozri na: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0758:FIN:SK:PDF

([2]) KOM(2011) 455 v konečnom znení, 20. júl 2011, pozri na: http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/110720/1_EN_ACT_part1_v10.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003392/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Access of migrants to social rights

Migration is a phenomenon of today's globalised world. The United Nations predicts that, based on current trends, the number of migrants worldwide will grow by up to 40 % over the next 40 years. The situation regarding migration flows varies between individual EU Member States. The fact remains, however, that migrants are among the most vulnerable population groups in the EU. The fact that they are among the most threatened groups in society is also due to their lack of access to basic social rights, such as the right to work, the right to education or access to social services. The current financial and economic crisis and the consequent savings and cost-cutting measures have exacerbated the difficult situation of migrants. If we want to prevent social exclusion and poverty among migrants, social rights including universal access to quality social services and healthcare are an essential precondition.

— How does the Commission aim to secure an EU-wide solution to migrant problems that encompasses not just the perspective of securing and protecting borders but also the social angle?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The Commission shares the view that the economic crisis has disproportionately affected migrants, who are already at higher risk of poverty and social exclusion than EU citizens.

In its communication on the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion ([1]), the Commission committed itself to involving stakeholders in designing and implementing policy actions and programmes to address poverty and exclusion of vulnerable groups, including migrants, and to promoting their implementation at national, regional and local level.

The Commission is carrying out a study on destitution and homelessness among migrants and mobile EU citizens to look at potential obstacles to their access to social protection, compare Member States' legal and institutional provisions and make policy recommendations.

The best way out of poverty and exclusion is to get a job, as recognised by the Europe 2020 strategy's target of increasing the employment rate to 75 %. This includes better integration of legal migrants. Under the European Social Fund EUR 1.2 billion is currently earmarked for specific actions to improve migrants' access to employment and their social inclusion.

Furthermore, the Commission's communication on the 'European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals' ([2]) focuses on action to support migrants' social and economic participation in labour markets and societies across the EU and provides for strong guarantees for fundamental rights and equal treatment, including the fight against social exclusion and discrimination. Social inclusion measures targeted at migrants should aim to remove possible barriers blocking access to social and health services and address the most vulnerable.

([1]) 'The European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion: A European framework for social and territorial cohesion' (COM(2010) 758 final of 16 December 2010), at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0758:FIN:EN:PDF

([2]) COM(2011) 455 final of 20 July 2011, at: http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/110720/1_EN_ACT_part1_v10.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003402/12
an die Kommission
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Jo Leinen (S&D), Chris Davies (ALDE) und Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)
(29. März 2012)

Betrifft: Integrität des Mechanismus für die umweltverträgliche Entwicklung (Clean Development Mechanism, CDM)

Im Dezember 2011 veröffentlichte die Kommission eine Studie über die Integrität des Mechanismus für die umweltverträgliche Entwicklung ([1]). In der Studie werden besondere Bedenken gegenüber großen Wasserkraftprojekten im Rahmen des CDM im Hinblick auf deren Zusätzlichkeit und Beitrag zu einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung zum Ausdruck gebracht. Weitere Bedenken wurden zudem in Bezug auf die übermäßige Vergabe von Gutschriften und die nicht vorhandene Zusätzlichkeit von Kohlekraftwerksprojekten im Rahmen des CDM sowie von gemeinsam durchgeführten JI-Track-1-Projekten geäußert. Angesichts der Bedenken über die Umweltwirksamkeit dieser Projekte zu einem Zeitpunkt, zu dem das Überangebot den Zusammenbruch des europäischen CO_2-Markts herbeizuführen droht, würde eine Beschränkung der Berechtigung solcher Emissionsgutschriften zur Teilnahme am EU-Emissionshandelssystem zum Wegfall einer erheblichen Anzahl von Kompensationen führen, die einen weiteren Beitrag zur Stabilisierung des CO_2-Markts leisten könnten.

1. Welche Maßnahmen beabsichtigt die Kommission gegen die ausgemachten Mängel internationaler Emissionsgutschriften von Kohlekraftwerksprojekten, großen Wasserkraftprojekten und JI-Track-1-Projekten zu treffen?

2. In der Erklärung der Kommission ([2]) nach Veröffentlichung der Studie wird die Rolle eines politischen Dialogs zum CDM auf hoher Ebene zu den in der Studie erkannten Mängeln hervorgehoben. Allerdings ist nicht klar, wie das vorgeschlagene Gremium im Hinblick auf Maßnahmen auf Nachfrageseite vorgehen kann. Was unternimmt die Kommission, um sicherzustellen, dass die in der Studie vorgestellten Reformoptionen einschließlich solcher in Bezug auf Maßnahmen auf Nachfrageseite den Mitgliedern des Politikdialoggremiums zur Kenntnis gebracht werden?

3. Die Studie weist auf Schwachstellen der Kriterien der Weltkommission für Staudämme hin, die große Wasserkraftprojekte erfüllen müssen, um für die Teilnahme am EU-Emissionshandelssystem berechtigt zu sein. Wie gedenkt die Kommission diese Bedenken auszuräumen, um diese Kriterien zu stärken?

Antwort von Frau Hedegaard im Namen der Kommission
(25. Mai 2012)

Die Kommission möchte betonen, dass die Existenz der Studie über die Integrität des Mechanismus für umweltverträgliche Entwicklung (Clean Development Mechanism — CDM) nicht gleichzeitig bedeutet, dass neue Verwendungsbeschränkungen vorgeschlagen werden. Weitere Reformen des CDM sind erforderlich, jedoch sollten diese hauptsächlich auf UN-Ebene durchgeführt werden.

Die Kommission begrüßt daher den auf hoher politischer Ebene geführten Dialog über die Zukunft des CDM, in dessen Rahmen unter anderem erörtert wird, wie die Bewertung der Zusätzlichkeit und des Beitrags zu einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung verbessert werden kann. Die Dialogteilnehmer wurden über die Studie der Kommission in Kenntnis gesetzt.

Die Studie gibt zu bedenken, dass möglicherweise Probleme im Zusammenhang mit bestimmten großen Staudamm-Projekten auftreten könnten, merkt jedoch auch an, dass dabei nicht nur die Größe, sondern auch die lokalen Gegebenheiten eine Rolle spielen. Die Kommission erwartet, dass der CDM-Exekutivrat weiter daran arbeiten wird, das Vorgehen bei der Beurteilung der Zusätzlichkeit von Projekten zu verbessern. Sie ist zudem davon überzeugt, dass die Anforderungen der EU, Staudamm-Projekte gemäß den Leitlinien der Weltkommission für Staudämme zu beurteilen, zu einer erheblichen Verbesserung der unabhängigen Berichterstattung und Prüfung von Auswirkungen auf die Nachhaltigkeit geführt haben.

In Bezug auf Projekte mit sauberer Kohletechnologie geht die Kommission davon aus, dass der CDM-Exekutivrat eine geplante Überarbeitung der Methode bald abschließen wird. Die Kommission unterstützt zudem den Vorschlag des Ausschusses für die Überwachung der Gemeinsamen Umsetzung, die zwei JI-Track-Projekte miteinander zu verschmelzen, um diese als Standardmechanismus zu etablieren, wobei die als Tagung der Vertragsparteien des Kyoto-Protokolls dienende Konferenz der Vertragsparteien (CMP) die Aufsicht übernimmt und an sie Rechenschaft zu erstatten ist.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/ets/linking/studies_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/news/articles/news_2011121601_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003402/12
aan de Commissie
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Jo Leinen (S&D), Chris Davies (ALDE) en Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)
(29 maart 2012)

Betreft: Integriteit van het mechanisme voor schone ontwikkeling (CDM)

De Commissie heeft in december 2011 een onderzoek gepubliceerd inzake de integriteit van het mechanisme voor schone ontwikkeling ([1]). In het onderzoek wordt grote bezorgdheid geuit over grootschalige waterkrachtprojecten in het kader van het CDM met betrekking tot hun additionaliteit en hun bijdrage aan duurzame ontwikkeling. Bovendien bestaat er tevens bezorgdheid ten aanzien van de overfinanciering en niet-additionaliteit van steenkoolprojecten die in het kader van zowel CDM-projecten als de Joint Implementation Track 1-projecten worden uitgevoerd. Gezien de bestaande bezorgdheid over de milieu-integriteit van deze projecten in een tijd waarin een overschot de ineenstorting van de Europese koolstofmarkt dreigt te veroorzaken, zal een beperking van de voorwaarden van dergelijke koolstofcredits ter naleving van de EU-regeling voor de emissiehandel ervoor zorgen dat een groot aantal vergoedingen worden geschrapt. Dat kan een positieve bijdrage leveren aan het stabiliseren van de koolstofmarkt.

1. Welke maatregelen is de Commissie voornemens in te voeren om de vastgestelde tekortkomingen van internationale koolstofcredits afkomstig van steenkoolcentrales, grootschalige waterkrachtprojecten en JI Track 1-projecten aan te pakken?

2. De verklaring van de Commissie ([2]) naar aanleiding van de publicatie van het onderzoek onderstreept het belang van een beleidsdialoog op hoog niveau over het CDM teneinde de tekortkomingen die in het onderzoek zijn vastgesteld aan te pakken. Het is echter niet duidelijk hoe het nieuwe forum de maatregelen aan de vraagzijde kan aanpakken. Welke stappen onderneemt de Commissie om ervoor te zorgen dat de mogelijkheden tot hervorming die in het onderzoek worden gepresenteerd, waaronder de mogelijkheden die betrekking hebben op de maatregelen aan de vraagzijde, onder de aandacht van de leden van het Beleidsdialoogforum worden gebracht?

3. In het onderzoek zijn de zwakke punten van de criteria van de Wereldcommissie voor dammen vastgesteld waaraan grootschalige waterkrachtprojecten moeten voldoen teneinde in aanmerking te komen voor de EU-regeling voor de emissiehandel. Welke plannen heeft de Commissie om deze punten aan te pakken en ervoor te zorgen dat deze criteria worden versterkt?

Antwoord van mevrouw Hedegaard namens de Commissie
(25 mei 2012)

De Commissie wil benadrukken dat het bestaan van het onderzoek naar de integriteit van het CDM niet impliceert dat er nieuwe gebruiksbeperkingen zullen worden opgelegd. Verdere hervormingen van het CDM zijn nodig, maar deze moeten in de eerste plaats op VN-niveau plaatsvinden.

De Commissie verwelkomt daarom de politieke dialoog op hoog niveau over de toekomst van het CDM, in het kader waarvan onder meer zal worden besproken hoe de additionaliteit en de bijdrage aan duurzame ontwikkeling beter kunnen worden beoordeeld. De deelnemers aan de dialoog zijn op de hoogte gebracht van het onderzoek van de Commissie.

In het onderzoek wordt erkend dat bepaalde grote stuwdamprojecten aanleiding tot bezorgdheid kunnen geven, maar ook dat niet enkel de omvang doch ook de plaatselijke omstandigheden van belang zijn. De Commissie verwacht dat de raad van bestuur van het CDM doorgaat met zijn werkzaamheden ter verbetering van de wijze waarop de additionaliteit van de projecten wordt getest. Zij is er ook van overtuigd dat de onafhankelijke verslaglegging over en de verificatie van duurzaamheidseffecten aanzienlijk zijn verbeterd door de EU-voorschriften om stuwdamprojecten te beoordelen volgens de richtlijnen van de Wereldcommissie voor dammen.

Wat projecten met betrekking tot schone steenkooltechnologie betreft, verwacht de Commissie dat de raad van bestuur van het CDM weldr. een geplande herziening van de methode afrondt. Zij steunt ook het door de Stuurgroep gezamenlijke uitvoering (*Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee — JI*) naar voren gebrachte idee om de twee JI-sporen samen te voegen tot een regelgevend mechanisme dat opereert onder gezag van en verantwoording aflegt aan de Conferentie van de Partijen waarin de partijen bij het Protocol van Kyoto bijeenkomen (CMP).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/ets/linking/studies_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/news/articles/news_2011121601_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003402/12
to the Commission
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE), Jo Leinen (S&D), Chris Davies (ALDE) and Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Integrity of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)

In December 2011 the Commission published a Study on the Integrity of the Clean Development Mechanism ([1]). The study raises particular concerns about large hydro projects in the CDM with regard to their additionality and contribution to sustainable development. Further concerns have also been raised with regard to the over-crediting and non-additionality of coal power projects in the CDM as well as Track 1 Joint Implementation projects. Given the concerns about the environmental integrity of these projects at a time when over-supply is threatening the collapse of the European carbon market, a restriction of eligibility of such carbon credits for compliance in the EU ETS would remove a considerable amount of offsets that could further help stabilise the carbon market.

1. What measures does the Commission intend to put in place to address the identified shortcomings of international carbon credits from coal power, large hydro and JI Track 1 projects?

2. The Commission's statement ([2]) following the study's release highlights the role of a CDM high-level policy dialogue to address the shortcomings identified in the study. However, it is unclear how the proposed panel can address demand-side measures. What is the Commission doing to ensure that the reform options presented in the study, including those related to demand-side measures, are brought to the attention of the Policy Dialogue Panel members?

3. The study identifies weaknesses of the World Commission on Dams criteria with which large hydro projects must comply in order to be eligible for the EU ETS. What plans does the Commission have to address these concerns in order to strengthen these criteria?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

The Commission would like to stress that existence of the study on the integrity of the CDM does not imply that new use restrictions will be proposed. Further reforms of the CDM are necessary, but these should primarily take place at the UN level.

The Commission therefore welcomes the high-level policy dialogue about the future of the CDM, which will discuss, among others, how to improve the way additionality and the contribution to sustainable development are assessed. Members of the dialogue have been informed about the Commission study.

The study recognises there may be potential concerns with certain large hydro dam projects, but it also recognises that not only size but also local circumstances matter. The Commission expects the CDM Executive Board to continue its work on improving the way additionality of projects is tested. It is also confident that the EU requirements to assess hydro dam project according to the World Commission on Dams guidelines have significantly improved independent reporting and verification of sustainability impacts.

Regarding 'clean coal' projects, the Commission expects the CDM Executive Board to soon finalise a planned revision of the methodology. It also supports the idea put forward by the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee to merge the two JI tracks to become a standard setting mechanism under the authority of and with the accountability to the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/ets/linking/studies_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/clima/news/articles/news_2011121601_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003404/12
alla Commissione
Renate Weber (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) e Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)
(29 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Misure della Commissione relative al decreto emergenza nomadi e al censimento dei nomadi in Italia

Da maggio 2008 a novembre 2011, le autorità pubbliche italiane hanno esercitato i loro poteri derogatori per la gestione degli insediamenti dei rom, dei sinti e dei caminanti ai sensi del decreto emergenza nomadi (DEN), una situazione di emergenza che durò per tre anni e mezzo. Il 10 luglio 2008 il Parlamento ha adottato una risoluzione fondamentale sulla questione. Nel febbraio 2010, la revisione periodica universale dell'ONU ha formulato numerose raccomandazioni ([1]) che evidenziano gli effetti negativi del DEN. Nel giugno 2010, il Comitato europeo dei diritti sociali ha adottato una decisione ([2]) che condanna l'Italia per violazione del diritto dei rom alla parità di trattamento per quanto riguarda l'accesso a un alloggio, alla protezione sociale, giuridica ed economica e a quella contro la povertà e l'esclusione sociale. Nei primi mesi del 2012, dopo una serie di relazioni del Commissario per i diritti umani del Consiglio d'Europa, che esprimeva preoccupazione per la situazione, la commissione europea contro il razzismo e l'intolleranza ([3]) e il Comitato delle Nazioni Unite sull'eliminazione della discriminazione razziale ([4]) hanno altresì evidenziato nelle loro revisioni ufficiali gli effetti discriminatori delle misure d'emergenza in Italia. Nel novembre 2011, la Corte suprema amministrativa in Italia ha dichiarato la nullità e l'illegittimità del DEN ai sensi della normativa italiana. Tuttavia, come illustrato in una nota recente ([5]) dall'Open Society Justice Initiative, la corte italiana non ha riconosciuto il carattere discriminatorio dell'emergenza e non ha ordinato alcuna misura di riparazione o di compensazione per le politiche di identificazione, di sfratto, di rimpatrio e di segregazione attuate durante l'emergenza. Ancora più importante, la corte non ha disposto la cancellazione dei dati raccolti attraverso il censimento, che sono ancora in uso da parte delle autorità locali.

Può la Commissione:

1. chiarire se, a seguito della richiesta del Commissario Barrot di raccogliere i dati del censimento dei nomadi ai sensi della legge sulla protezione dei dati nel luglio 2008, ha mai controllato il modo in cui il censimento è stato attuato, come sono stati raccolti i dati, per quale scopo sono stati elaborati e dove sono stati archiviati;

2. chiedere all'Italia di fornire le prove che, ora che il decreto sull'emergenza nomadi è stato dichiarato nullo e illegittimo, i dati raccolti attraverso il censimento dei nomadi sono stati distrutti;

3. chiedere all'Italia di fornire informazioni sull'attuazione della decisione del Consiglio di Stato del novembre 2011 nonché sulle raccomandazioni dei numerosi organismi internazionali che hanno ammonito sul trattamento dei rom, dei sinti e dei caminanti in Italia;

4. fornire una relazione dettagliata sulle questioni di cui sopra e, qualora le autorità italiane non riescano a soddisfare le sue richieste di informazioni, dire se interverrà infine per avviare procedure d'infrazione contro l'Italia per le sue continue violazioni della direttiva sull'uguaglianza razziale (2000/43/CE) e della direttiva sulla protezione dei dati (1995/46/CE)?

Risposta data da Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(23 maggio 2012)

Il 17 luglio 2008 il Ministero dell'Interno italiano ha adottato linee guida per la raccolta di dati personali riguardo all'insediamento di comunità nomadi nelle regioni Campania, Lazio e Lombardia. La Commissione europea ha ripetutamente chiesto informazioni sullo scopo e sui risultati delle operazioni di censimento e sulle iniziative varate sulla base del censimento stesso, al fine di valutare se le linee guida fossero rispettate. L'Italia ha fornito informazioni atte a dimostrare che le linee guida erano state seguite e che i dati raccolti prima dell'adozione delle medesime erano stati distrutti. La risposta dell'Italia ha soddisfatto le esigenze della Commissione ([6]).

([1]) http://www.upr-info.org/database/index.php?limit=0&f_SUR=83&f_SMR=All&order=&orderDir=ASC&orderP=true&f_Issue=All&searchReco=&resultMax=25&response=&action_type=&session=&SuRRgrp=&SuROrg=&SMRRgrp=&SMROrg=
([2]) http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/country,,COEECSR,,ITA,,4d247efb2,0.html
([3]) http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/ecri/Country-by-country/Italy/ITA-CbC-IV-2012-002-ENG.pdf
([4]) http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/docs/CERD.C.ISR.CO.14-16.pdf
([5]) http://www.soros.org/initiatives/justice/litigation/ec-v-italy-20100910.
([6]) Il Garante per la protezione dei dati personali ha espresso un parere favorevole su tali Linee guida: cfr. http://www.garanteprivacy.it/garante/doc.jsp?ID=1537659

La direttiva 2000/43/CE sull'uguaglianza razziale ([7]) vieta la discriminazione basata sulla razza o sull'origine etnica in una serie di settori, compreso l'alloggio. L'Italia ha recepito la direttiva nella legislazione nazionale e la Commissione continua a controllare che essa sia attuata e applicata correttamente.

Attualmente la Commissione europea sta valutando le strategie nazionali di integrazione dei Rom che gli Stati membri si sono impegnati politicamente a elaborare al fine di affrontare la situazione difficile di tali popolazioni. Gli Stati membri dovevano presentare le rispettive strategie nazionali entro la fine di dicembre 2011 e l'Italia ha onorato il suo impegno. La relazione sulla valutazione sarà adottata nella primavera 2012 dalla Commissione europea e in seguito presentata al Parlamento europeo e al Consiglio.

([7]) Direttiva 2000/43/CE del Consiglio, del 29 giugno 2000, che attua il principio della parità di trattamento fra le persone indipendentemente dalla razza e dall'origine etnica.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003404/12
aan de Commissie
Renate Weber (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) en Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)
(29 maart 2012)

Betreft: Maatregelen van de Commissie inzake het Italiaanse Nomaden Noodtoestand Decreet en de tellingen

Italiaanse overheidsinstanties hebben van mei 2008 tot november 2011 derogatoire bevoegdheden gebruikt voor het beheer van kampen van Roma, Sinti en nomaden op grond van het „Nomaden Noodtoestand Decreet" (NED), een noodtoestand die drieënhalf jaar heeft geduurd. Het Europees Parlement heeft op 10 juli 2008 een kritische resolutie over deze kwestie aangenomen. In februari 2010 zijn er in de universele periodieke doorlichting van de VN talloze aanbevelingen ([1]) gedaan waarbij de schadelijke gevolgen van het NED werden benadrukt. Het Europees Comité voor sociale rechten heeft in juni 2010 een besluit ([2]) goedgekeurd waarin Italië wordt veroordeeld voor de schending van de rechten van de Roma op gelijke behandeling bij toegang tot huisvesting, sociale, juridische en economische bescherming en de bescherming tegen armoede en sociale uitsluiting. Begin 2012 heeft de Commissaris voor de mensenrechten van de Raad van Europa een reeks verslagen gepubliceerd waarin hij zijn bezorgdheid uit over de situatie. Vervolgens hebben ook de Europese Commissie tegen racisme en onverdraagzaamheid ([3]) en de VN-Commissie voor de uitbanning van rassendiscriminatie ([4]) in hun officiële beoordelingen van Italië de discriminerende effecten van de noodmaatregelen benadrukt. Het Italiaanse Hooggerechtshof heeft het NED in november 2011 nietig verklaard en geoordeeld dat het decreet in strijd is met de Italiaanse wet. Tijdens een recente voorlichtingsbijeenkomst ([5]) van de Open Society Justice Initiative is echter duidelijk geworden dat het Italiaanse hof het discriminerende karakter van de noodtoestand niet heeft erkend en heeft verzuimd een bevel te geven tot het instellen van maatregelen voor schadeloosstelling of compensatie voor het beleid van identificatie, uitzetting, repatriëring en rassenscheiding dat tijdens de noodtoestand ten uitvoer is gebracht. Maar nog belangrijker is dat het hof verzuimd heeft de vernietiging te gelasten van de gegevens die tijdens de tellingen zijn verzameld en die dus nog steeds door de lokale autoriteiten worden gebruikt.

Kan de Commissie:

1. antwoord geven op de vraag of zij, nadat Commissaris Barrot in juli 2008 had verzocht om de gegevens tijdens de tellingen van de nomaden volgens de wet inzake bescherming persoonsgegevens te verzamelen, ooit heeft gecontroleerd op welke wijze de gegevens werden verzameld en met welk doel en waar deze gegevens werden opgeslagen;

2. Italië verzoeken het bewijs aan te leveren dat, nu het Nomaden Noodtoestand Decreet onwettig en nietig is verklaard, de tijdens de tellingen van de nomaden verzamelde gegevens zijn vernietigd;

3. Italië verzoeken informatie te verstrekken over de tenuitvoerlegging van het besluit dat de Raad van State in november 2011 heeft genomen en over de aanbevelingen van talloze internationale instellingen die een waarschuwing hebben afgegeven over de behandeling van de Roma, Sinti en nomaden in Italië;

4. een gedetailleerd verslag verstrekken over bovenstaande zaken en is de Commissie voornemens om, mochten de Italiaanse autoriteiten verzuimen te voldoen aan de verzoeken om informatie, eindelijk stappen te ondernemen om een inbreukprocedure tegen Italië in te leiden wegens de voortdurende schending van de richtlijn inzake rassengelijkheid (2000/43/EG) en de richtlijn inzake de bescherming van persoonsgegevens (1995/46/EG)?

([1]) http://www.upr-info.org/database/index.php?limit=0&f_SUR=83&f_SMR=All ll& order=&orderDir=ASC&orderP=true true& f_Issue=All ll& searchReco=&resultMax=25&response=&action_type=&session=&SuRRgrp=&SuROrg=&SMRRgrp=&SMROrg=
([2]) http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/country,,COEECSR,,ITA,,4d247efb2,0.html
([3]) http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/ecri/Country-by-country/Italy/ITA-CbC-IV-2012-002-ENG.pdf
([4]) http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/docs/CERD. C. ISR. CO.14-16.pdf
([5]) http://www.soros.org/initiatives/justice/litigation/ec-v-italy-20100910

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie
(23 mei 2012)

Op 17 juli 2008 heeft de minister van Binnenlandse Zaken in Italië richtsnoeren vastgesteld voor het verzamelen van persoonsgegevens betreffende de vestiging van nomadengemeenschappen in de regio's Campania, Lazio en Lombardije. De Commissie heeft herhaaldelijk om informatie verzocht over het doel en de resultaten van de volkstellingen en over de op basis van de tellingen gelanceerde initiatieven om te beoordelen of aan de richtsnoeren werd voldaan. Italië heeft inlichtingen verstrekt om aan te tonen dat aan de richtsnoeren werd voldaan en dat gegevens die vóór het vaststellen van de richtsnoeren werden verzameld, vernietigd zijn. De antwoorden van Italië voldeden aan de verwachtingen van de Commissie ([6]).

Richtlijn 2000/43/EG inzake rassengelijkheid ([7]) verbiedt discriminatie op basis van raciale of etnische origine op een aantal gebieden, waaronder huisvesting. Italië heeft deze richtlijn in nationale wetgeving omgezet en de Commissie blijft toezien op de correcte tenuitvoerlegging en toepassing ervan.

De Europese Commissie beoordeelt momenteel de nationale strategieën voor de integratie van de Roma, die de lidstaten zouden ontwikkelen om de complexe situatie van de Roma aan te pakken. De lidstaten dienden hun nationale strategieën eind december 2011 in te dienen. Italië is zijn verplichting nagekomen. Het rapport over de beoordeling zal in het voorjaar van 2012 door de Europese Commissie worden goedgekeurd en vervolgens bij het Europees Parlement en de Raad worden ingediend.

([6]) De Italiaanse autoriteit voor gegevensbescherming (Garante) heeft een gunstig advies over deze richtsnoeren uitgebracht. http://www.garanteprivacy.it/garante/doc.jsp?ID=1537659.

([7]) Richtlijn 2000/43/EG van de Raad van 29 juni 2000 houdende toepassing van het beginsel van gelijke behandeling van personen ongeacht ras of etnische afstamming.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003404/12
adresată Comisiei
Renate Weber (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Sophia in't Veld (ALDE) şi Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)
(29 martie 2012)

Subiect: Măsurile Comisiei în legătură cu decretul de instituire a stării de urgență și recensământul privind populațiile nomade din Italia

În perioada mai 2008 – noiembrie 2011, autoritățile publice italiene au exercitat competențe derogatorii în vederea gestionării taberelor de romi, sinti și nomazi în conformitate cu termenii „decretului de instituire a stării de urgență privind populațiile nomade", o stare de urgență care a durat trei ani și jumătate. La 10 iulie 2008, Parlamentul a adoptat o rezoluție critică cu privire la această chestiune. Revizuirea periodică universală a ONU a făcut numeroase recomandări în februarie 2010 ([1]), evidențiind efectele negative ale decretului de instituire a stării de urgență privind populațiile nomade. În iunie 2010, Comitetul european pentru drepturile sociale a adoptat o decizie ([2]) prin care condamnă Italia pentru încălcarea dreptului romilor la egalitate de tratament în ceea ce privește accesul la locuințe, la protecție socială, juridică și economică, precum și la protecție împotriva sărăciei și a excluziunii sociale. La începutul anului 2012, în urma unei serii de rapoarte ale Comisarului pentru drepturile omului al Consiliului Europei care exprimau îngrijorarea cu privire la situație, Comisia europeană împotriva rasismului și intoleranței ([3]) și Comisia ONU pentru eliminarea discriminării rasiale ([4]) au subliniat, de asemenea, efectele discriminatorii ale măsurilor de urgență în recenziile lor oficiale cu privire la Italia. În noiembrie 2011, Curtea Supremă Administrativă a Italiei a declarat decretul de instituire a stării de urgență privind populațiile nomade ca fiind nul, lipsit de valabilitate și ilegal în conformitate cu legislația italiană. Cu toate acestea, după cum se arată într-o informare recentă ([5]) a Inițiativei juridice a Institutului pentru o Societate Deschisă, instanța italiană nu a recunoscut caracterul discriminatoriu al stării de urgență și nu a dispus nicio măsură de despăgubire sau compensatorie privind politicile de identificare, evacuare, repatriere și segregare puse în aplicare în așteptarea stării de urgență. Cel mai important este faptul că instanța nu a dispus ștergerea datelor colectate prin intermediul recensământului, date care sunt încă utilizate de către autoritățile locale.

Poate Comisia:

1. să furnizeze informații cu privire la faptul că a verificat modul în care a fost pus în aplicare recensământul, modul în care au fost colectate datele, scopul pentru care au fost prelucrate și locul în care au fost păstrate, după ce comisarul Barrot a cerut colectarea datelor recensământului privind populațiile nomade, în conformitate cu legislația privind protecția datelor, în iulie 2008?

2. să solicite Italiei să furnizeze dovezi în legătură cu distrugerea datelor colectate prin intermediul recensământului privind populațiile nomade, de vreme ce decretul de instituire a stării de urgență privind populațiile nomade a fost declarat ilegal, nul și lipsit de valabilitate?

3. să solicite Italiei să furnizeze informații cu privire la punerea în aplicare a Deciziei Consiliului de Stat din noiembrie 2011, precum și cu privire la recomandările numeroaselor organisme internaționale care au atras atenția în legătură cu tratamentul aplicat în Italia populațiilor de romi, sinti și nomazi?

4. să furnizeze un raport detaliat cu privire la chestiunile menționate anterior și, în cazul în care autoritățile italiene nu răspund solicitărilor sale de informații, va acționa Comisia, în cele din urmă, cu scopul de a inițiа proceduri privind încălcarea dreptului comunitar împotriva Italiei pentru încălcările în curs ale Directivei privind egalitatea rasială (2000/43/CE) și a Directivei privind protecția datelor (1995/46/CE)?

([1]) http://www.upr-info.org/database/index.php?limit=0&f_SUR=83&f_SMR=All&order=&orderDir=ASC&orderP=true&f_Issue=All&searchReco=&resultMax=25&response=&action_type=&session=&SuRRgrp=&SuROrg=&SMRRgrp=&SMROrg=
([2]) http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/country,,COEECSR,,ITA,,4d247efb2,0.html
([3]) http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/ecri/Country-by-country/Italy/ITA-CbC-IV-2012-002-ENG.pdf
([4]) http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/docs/CERD.C.ISR.CO.14-16.pdf
([5]) http://www.soros.org/initiatives/justice/litigation/ec-v-italy-20100910

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(23 mai 2012)

La 17 iulie 2008, Ministerul de Interne din Italia a adoptat orientări pentru colectarea datelor cu caracter personal în ceea ce privește stabilirea comunităților nomade în regiunile Campania, Lazio și Lombardia. Comisia a solicitat în repetate rânduri informații privind scopul și rezultatele acțiunilor de recenzare și privind inițiativele lansate pe baza recensământului pentru a evalua dacă au fost respectate orientările. Italia a furnizat informații pentru a demonstra conformitatea cu orientările și distrugerea datelor colectate înainte de adoptarea orientărilor. Răspunsurile oferite de Italia au îndeplinit așteptările Comisiei ([6]).

Directiva 2000/43/CE privind egalitatea rasială ([7]) interzice discriminarea pe bază de rasă sau origine etnică într-o serie de domenii, inclusiv în sectorul locuințelor. Italia a transpus această directivă în legislația sa națională și Comisia continuă să monitorizeze punerea în practică și aplicarea corectă a acesteia.

În prezent, Comisia Europeană evaluează strategiile naționale de integrare a romilor pentru care statele membre și-au asumat un angajament politic în vederea abordării situației complexe a romilor. Statele membre trebuiau să își prezinte strategiile naționale până la sfârșitul lunii decembrie 2011. Italia și-a onorat angajamentul. În primăvara anului 2012, Comisia Europeană va adopta raportul de evaluare, care ulterior va fi înaintat Parlamentului European și Consiliului.

([6]) Autoritatea de protecție a datelor din Italia (Garante) a emis un aviz favorabil cu privire la aceste orientări. http://www.garanteprivacy.it/garante/doc.jsp?ID=1537659

([7]) Directiva 2000/43/CE a Consiliului din 29 iunie 2000 de punere în aplicare a principiului egalității de tratament între persoane, fără deosebire de rasă sau origine etnică.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-003404/12
till kommissionen
Renate Weber (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) och Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)
(29 mars 2012)

Angående: Kommissionens åtgärder vad gäller det italienska nöddekretet och folkräkningen

Mellan maj 2008 och november 2011 utövade italienska offentliga myndigheter undantagsbefogenheter för att hantera romers, sinters och resandes läger enligt nöddekretet för nomader, en nödsituation som varade i tre och ett halvt år. Den 10 juli 2008 antog parlamentet en avgörande resolution i frågan. I februari 2010 gjordes ett stort antal rekommendationer ([1]) i FN:s periodiska översyn, som betonar de skadliga konsekvenserna av nöddekretet. I juni 2010 fattade Europeiska kommittén för sociala rättigheter ett beslut ([2]) som fördömer Italiens kränkning av romernas rätt till lika behandling vad gäller tillgång till bostäder, socialt, rättsligt och ekonomiskt skydd, skydd mot fattigdom och social utestängning. I början av 2012 efter en rad rapporter från Europarådets kommissarie för mänskliga rättigheter som uttryckte sin oro över situationen, belyste även Europeiska kommissionen mot rasism och intolerans ([3]) och FN:s kommitté för eliminering av rasdiskriminering ([4]) nödåtgärdernas diskriminerade inverkan i sina officiella granskningar av Italien. I november 2011 förklarade Italiens högsta förvaltningsdomstol att nöddekretet var ogiltigt och stred mot italiensk lag. Enligt en färsk genomgång ([5]) av Open Society Justice Initiative erkände emellertid inte den italienska domstolen nöddekretets diskriminerande karaktär och man underlät att utfärda beslut om upprättelse eller kompensation för politiken för identifiering, avhysning, repatriering och segregering som genomfördes enligt nöddekretet. Framför allt underlät domstolen att utfärda beslut om att radera de uppgifter som samlats in genom folkräkningen och som fortfarande används av lokala myndigheter.

Kan kommissionen

1. ge information om huruvida man någonsin kontrollerade på vilket sätt folkräkningen genomfördes, hur uppgifterna samlades in, i vilket syfte de bearbetades och var de förvarades sedan kommissionsledamot Jacques Barrot i juli 2008 begärde att uppgifter från folkräkningen av nomader skulle samlas in enligt dataskyddslagen?

2. begära att Italien bevisar att de uppgifter som samlades in vid folkräkningen av nomader har förstörts nu när nöddekretet för nomader har förklarats olagligt och ogiltigt?

3. begära att Italien ger information om genomförandet av statsrådets beslut från november 2011 samt om rekommendationerna av det stora antalet internationella organ som uppmärksammade behandlingen av romer, sinter och resande i Italien?

4. tillhandahålla en detaljerad rapport om frågorna ovan och, om de italienska myndigheterna underlåter att infria kommissionens begäran om information, kommer kommissionen äntligen att inleda ett överträdelseförfarande mot Italien för dess pågående kränkningar av direktivet om likabehandling oavsett ras (2000/43/EG) och dataskyddsdirektivet (1995/46/EG)?

Svar från Viviane Reding på kommissionens vägnar
(23 maj 2012)

Den 17 juli 2008 antog det italienska inrikesministeriet riktlinjer för insamling av personliga uppgifter avseende nomadgruppers bosättning i regionerna Kampanien, Lazio och Lombardiet. Kommissionen har vid upprepade tillfällen begärt uppgifter om syftet och resultaten av folkräkningen och om de initiativ som sattes i gång på grundval av denna för att bedöma huruvida riktlinjerna respekterades. Italien har tillhandahållit uppgifter som visar att riktlinjerna har följts och att de uppgifter som samlades in före antagandet av riktlinjerna har förstörts. Italiens svar motsvarade kommissionens förväntningar ([6]).

([1]) http://www.upr-info.org/database/index.php?limit=0&f_SUR=83&f_SMR=All&order=&orderDir=ASC&orderP=true&f_Issue=All&searchReco=&resultMax=25&response=&action_type=&session=&SuRRgrp=&SuROrg=&SMRRgrp=&SMROrg=
([2]) http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/country,,COEECSR,,ITA,,4d247efb2,0.html
([3]) http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/ecri/Country-by-country/Italy/ITA-CbC-IV-2012-002-ENG.pdf
([4]) http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/docs/CERD.C.ISR.CO.14-16.pdf
([5]) http://www.soros.org/initiatives/justice/litigation/ec-v-italy-20100910
([6]) Den italienska dataskyddsmyndigheten (Garante per la protezione dei dati personali) har avgett ett positivt yttrande om dessa riktlinjer. http://www.garanteprivacy.it/garante/doc.jsp?ID=1537659

Direktiv 2000/43/EG om jämlikhet mellan raser ([7]) förbjuder diskriminering på grund av ras eller etniskt ursprung på ett antal områden, inklusive boende. Italien har införlivat detta direktiv med sin nationella lagstiftning och kommissionen fortsätter att övervaka att det genomförs korrekt.

Kommissionen bedömer för närvarande de nationella strategier för integrering av romer, som medlemsstater politiskt förpliktade sig att utveckla för att ta itu med romers komplexa situation. Medlemsstaterna skulle ha inkommit med sina nationella strategier innan slutet av december 2011, och Italien fullgjorde sitt åtagande. Rapporten om bedömningen kommer att antas av EU-kommissionen under våren 2012 och sedan läggas fram för Europaparlamentet och rådet.

([7]) Rådets direktiv 2000/43/EG av den 29 juni 2000 om genomförandet av principen om likabehandling av personer oavsett deras ras eller etniska ursprung.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003404/12
to the Commission
Renate Weber (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Gianni Vattimo (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) and Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Commission measures on the Italian Nomad Emergency Decree and Census

From May 2008 to November 2011, Italian public authorities exercised derogatory powers to manage Roma, Sinti and Travellers' encampments under the terms of the 'Nomad Emergency Decree' (NED), an emergency which lasted for three and a half years. On 10 July 2008 Parliament adopted a critical resolution on the issue. In February 2010 the UN Universal Periodic Review made numerous recommendations ([1]) highlighting the detrimental effects of the NED. In June 2010, the European Committee of Social Rights adopted a decision ([2]) condemning Italy for violation of the right of Roma people to equal treatment in access to housing, social, legal and economic protection, protection against poverty and social exclusion. In early 2012, after a series of reports by the Council of Europe Commissioner on Human Rights expressing concern at the situation, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance ([3]) and the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination ([4]) also highlighted the discriminatory effects of the emergency measures in their official reviews on Italy. In November 2011, Italy's supreme administrative court declared the NED to be null and void and illegal under Italian law. However, as shown in a recent briefing ([5]) by the Open Society Justice Initiative, the Italian court did not acknowledge the discriminatory character of the emergency and failed to order any redress measure or compensation for the policies of identification, eviction, repatriation and segregation implemented pending the emergency. Most importantly, the court failed to order the deletion of the data collected through the census that are still being used by local authorities.

Can the Commission:

1. provide information on whether, after Commissioner Barrot requested that the nomad census data be collected according to data protection law in July 2008, it ever checked the way in which the census was being implemented, how the data were being collected, for what purpose they were processed and where they were kept?

2. request that Italy provide evidence that, now that the Nomad Emergency Decree has been declared as illegal and null and void, the data collected through the Nomad Census have been destroyed?

3. request that Italy provide information on the implementation of the November 2011 Council of State decision, as well as on the recommendations of the numerous international bodies which have warned on the treatment of Roma, Sinti and Travellers in Italy?

4. provide a detailed report on the above matters and, should the Italian authorities fail to meet its information requests, will the Commission finally act to initiate infringement proceedings against Italy for its ongoing violations of the Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC) and Data Protection Directive (1995/46/EC)?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2012)

On 17 July 2008 the Ministry of Interior in Italy adopted Guidelines for the collection of personal data regarding the settlement of nomad communities in the regions Campania, Lazio and Lombardia. The Commission has repeatedly requested information on the purpose and results of the census operations and on the initiatives launched on the basis of the census to assess whether the Guidelines were being respected. Italy has provided information to show compliance with the Guidelines and that data collected before the adoption of the Guidelines have been destroyed. The replies by Italy met the Commission's expectations ([6]).

([1]) http://www.upr-info.org/database/index.php?limit=0&f_SUR=83&f_SMR=All&order=&orderDir=ASC&orderP=true&f_Issue=All&searchReco=&resultMax=25&response=&action_type=&session=&SuRRgrp=&SuROrg=&SMRRgrp=&SMROrg=
([2]) http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/country,,COEECSR,,ITA,,4d247efb2,0.html
([3]) http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/ecri/Country-by-country/Italy/ITA-CbC-IV-2012-002-ENG.pdf
([4]) http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/docs/CERD.C.ISR.CO.14-16.pdf
([5]) http://www.soros.org/initiatives/justice/litigation/ec-v-italy-20100910.
([6]) The Italian Data Protection Authority (Garante) issued a favourable opinion on these guidelines; http://www.garanteprivacy.it/garante/doc.jsp?ID=1537659.

Directive 2000/43/EC on Racial Equality ([7]) prohibits discrimination on the basis of racial or ethnic origin in a number of areas, including housing. Italy has transposed this directive into its national law and the Commission continues to monitor its correct implementation and application.

The European Commission is currently assessing the National Roma Integration Strategies which Member States politically committed to develop to address the complex situation of Roma. The Member States were due to submit their national strategies by the end of December 2011. Italy honoured its commitment. The report on the assessment will be adopted in spring 2012 by the European Commission and then presented to the European Parliament and the Council.

([7]) Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003413/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(29 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Supermicroscopio per i nanofarmaci

Il campo della ricerca medica e sperimentale è in continua evoluzione e è stato collaudato un innovativo microscopio che riesce a visualizzare l'infinitamente piccolo, ad esempio una singola proteina.

Il risultato è l'integrazione di tre microscopi complementari tra loro che insieme concorrono a fornire un'informazione precisa e completa. Verrà usato anche per studi diagnostici grazie alla sua capacità di misurare l'elasticità della membrana cellulare, che è una sorta di marcatore tumorale: cellule sane e malate hanno infatti una differente elasticità, che dipende dalle proteine coinvolte nel citoscheletro. Uno degli utilizzi di questa innovativa scoperta è quello di approfondire la nanomedicina e di studiare i nanofarmaci contro i tumori. Grazie a questo strumento si potrebbero somministrare piccole quantità di farmaci in modo mirato direttamente nelle cellule cancerogene. Tale strumento, inoltre, permette di fare ricerca ancora più multidisciplinare perché integra le competenze di fisici, biologi e biotecnologi che lavorano insieme nei nostri laboratori.

Visto che i casi di tumori in Europa sono ancora troppo numerosi, e considerata l'importanza della ricerca medico-scientifica, può la Commissione far sapere se è a conoscenza di questo innovativo strumento e se intende adottare misure finalizzate al sostegno della nano medicina?

Risposta data da Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(16 maggio 2012)

Lo sviluppo e l'applicazione di strumenti innovativi per l'analisi, la misurazione e il controllo su scala atomica, molecolare e nanometrica ricevono un forte sostegno nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013), segnatamente dei temi nanoscienze, nanotecnologie, materiali e nuove tecnologie di produzione (NMP) e salute, nonché del programma specifico «Idee». Gli strumenti di nuova generazione integrano diversi metodi di analisi per misurare dimensioni, forma e topografia di nano-oggetti, analizzare la loro composizione chimica e definire le loro proprietà meccaniche, quali elasticità e resistenza meccanica. Tali strumenti sono estremamente importanti per il progresso della scienza e della tecnologia, ivi comprese la biologia e la medicina, poiché permettono di analizzare in dettaglio cosa accade su scala nanometrica (anche all'interno di cellule biologiche, quali quelle tumorali).

La Commissione finanzia progetti nel campo della nanomedicina nell'ambito del 7° PQ, con l'obiettivo di migliorare la diagnosi e sviluppare terapie più efficaci per malattie quali cancro, malattie cardiovascolari, diabete, morbo di Alzheimer, malattie autoimmuni e altre patologie. Grazie a tali progetti, le migliori competenze e le più avanzate metodologie di ricerca e strumentazioni di laboratorio sono riunite in seno ad équipe pluridisciplinari composte da farmacisti, tossicologi, clinici, esperti di nanotecnologie e altre discipline. Ad esempio, per il primo dei quattro inviti del 7° PQ, sono stati stanziati circa 265 milioni di EUR nell'ambito del tema NMP, in particolare per progetti di ricerca sull'applicazione delle nanotecnologie in medicina (nanomedicina) ([1]).

([1]) Esempi di progetti in cui vengono utilizzati strumenti per l'analisi, la misurazione e il controllo su scala nanometrica: FIBLYS — Building an analysing focused ion beam for nanotechnology (creazione di un raggio di ioni focalizzato per l'analisi nel settore delle nanotecnologie), (www.fiblys.eu); NANOSCALE — Exploring cellular dynamics at nanoscale (studio delle dinamiche cellulari su scala nanometrica), (www.nanoscale.eu/en/); BIOSCOPE — Self-reporting biological nanosystems to study and control bio-molecular mechanisms on the single molecule level (nanosistemi biologici di «self-reporting» per lo studio e l'esame dei meccanismi biomolecolari a livello monomolecolare), (www.bioscope.fkem1.lu.se/index.asp); Esempi di progetti di nanomedicina: SAVEME — A modular nanosystems platform for advanced cancer management: nano-vehicles, tumor targeting and penetration agents; molecular imaging, gene expression based personalised therapy (piattaforma di nanosistemi modulari per la gestione avanzata delle patologie tumorali: nanoveicoli, chemioterapie selettive e agenti di penetrazione; imaging molecolare e cure personalizzate basate sull'espressione genica, (http://fp7-saveme.com/); NAMDIATREAM — nanotechnological toolkits for multi-modal disease diagnostics and treatment monitoring (strumenti nanotecnologici per la diagnosi multimodale delle malattie e il monitoraggio delle terapie), (www.namdiatream.eu); SONODRUGS — Image controlled ultrasound induced drug delivery (somministrazione di farmaci indotta da ultrasuoni e monitorata mediante l'imaging), (www.sonodrugs.eu).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003413/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Super-microscope for nanodrugs

The field of medical and experimental research is continually evolving and an innovative microscope has been tested that can view the infinitely small, for example a single protein.

It is the result of the integration of three complementary microscopes that together can provide precise and complete information. It will also be used for diagnostic studies thanks to its ability to measure the elasticity of the cellular membrane, which is a kind of marker for tumours: healthy and sick cells have differing elasticity, which depends on the proteins involved in the cytoskeleton. One of the uses of this innovative discovery is to analyse nanomedicine in more depth and to study nanodrugs against tumours. Thanks to this instrument it would be possible to administer small quantities of medicines in a targeted way directly into carcinogenic cells. In addition, this instrument enables even more multidisciplinary research since it integrates the skills of physicists, biologists and biotechnologists who work together in our laboratories.

Given that tumour cases in Europe are ever more common, and considering the importance of medical scientific research, is the Commission aware of this innovative instrument and does it intend to adopt measures to support nanomedicine?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2012)

The development and application of innovative tools for analysis, measurement and control at atomic, molecular and nanoscale is strongly supported within the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) by the theme Nanosciences, Nanotechnologies, Materials and new Production Technologies (NMP) and Health as well as by the Ideas Specific Programme. Novel tools may combine several methods of analysis that measure the size, shape and topography of nano-objects, analyse their chemical composition and characterise their mechanical properties such as elasticity and strength. Such novel tools are very important to advance science and technology, including biology and medicine, since they allow to analyse in detail what happens at the nanoscale, (including within the biological cells such as cancer cells).

Under FP7, the Commission funds research projects in the field of nano-medicine for improving diagnosis and developing more effective therapies for diseases such as cancer, cardio-vascular diseases, diabetes, Alzheimer, auto-immune diseases and others. In these projects, the best expertise, research methods and state-of-the-art laboratory instrumentation is brought together in multi-disciplinary teams involving nanotechnologists, pharmacists, toxicologists, clinicians and others. For instance, in the first four calls of FP7, about EUR 265 million was provided by the NMP theme for research projects specifically addressing the application of nanotechnology in medicine (nano-medicine) ([1]).

([1]) Examples of projects involving tools for analysis, measurement and control at the nano-scale: FIBLYS — Building an analysing focused ion beam for nanotechnology, (www.fiblys.eu); NANOSCALE — Exploring cellular dynamics at nanoscale, (www.nanoscale.eu); BIOSCOPE — Self-reporting biological nanosystems to study and control bio-molecular mechanisms on the single molecule level, (www.bioscope.fkem1.lu.se/index.asp); Examples of nano-medicine projects: SAVEME — A modular nanosystems platform for advanced cancer management: nano-vehicles, tumor targeting and penetration agents; molecular imaging, gene expression based personalised therapy, (http://fp7-saveme.com/); NAMDIATREAM — nanotechnological toolkits for multi-modal disease diagnostics and treatment monitoring, (www.namdiatream.eu); SONODRUGS — Image controlled ultrasound induced drug delivery, (www.sonodrugs.eu).

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003419/12
a Bizottság számára
Deutsch Tamás (PPE)
(2012. március 29.)

Tárgy: Mezőgazdasági földterületek megszerzésére vonatkozó uniós rendelkezések

A mezőgazdasági földterületek tulajdonának megszerzésével kapcsolatos kérdések tisztázásáért fordulok a Bizottsághoz. Tudományos körökben is elterjedt, hogy a 2004-ben és 2007-ben csatlakozott országok esetében a mezőgazdasági földterületek tulajdonának megszerzésére vonatkozó uniós szabályok (a derogációs időszak lejártát követően is) az „EU tizenötöktől" gyökeresen eltérnek, és e „jogegyenlőtlenség" kiküszöbölésére többek között a csatlakozási szerződések felülvizsgálata lenne alkalmas.

Ezen szakmai álláspontok szerint az „EU tizenötök" az EUMSZ 345. cikkére hivatkozva kizárhatják az Unió beavatkozását a mezőgazdasági földtulajdon szabályozásából, így e tagállamok vonatkozó szabályozásának csak a nemzeti elbánásra vonatkozó elvnek kell megfelelnie. Számos szakember úgy véli, hogy a csatlakozási szerződésekben a tőke szabad mozgása fejezetben, a derogációban részesült, 2004-ben és 2007-ben csatlakozott államok esetében, ezen időszak lejártát követően az uniós jog kizárólag a tőkeérdekeknek megfelelő szabályozást tesz lehetővé.

Álláspontunk szerint az „EU tizenötök" sem hivatkozhatnak az EUMSZ 345. cikkére ([1]) többek között a letelepedés szabadsága, és a tőke szabad mozgása be nem tartásának igazolására.

Véleményünk szerint a derogációs időszak lejártát követően a 2004-ben és 2007-ben csatlakozott államok a mezőgazdasági földek tulajdonának megszerzésére vonatkozó szabályozásainak – miként az „EU tizenötök" esetében is – a nemzeti elbánás szabályain túlmutató, elsősorban a tőke szabad mozgása szigorú kritériumainak kell megfelelniük a Bíróság vonatkozó gyakorlata értelmében ([2]). Azaz nem helytálló a „kettős jogalapra, illetve elbírálásra" vonatkozó elmélet az „EU tizenötök", és a 2004-ben és 2007-ben csatlakozott országok tekintetében. Ennek értelmében az „EU tizenötöknek" sem kizárólag a nemzeti elbánás kritériumainak kell megfelelniük, a 2004-ben és 2007-ben csatlakozott államok esetében (is) a tőke szabad mozgása korlátozható a szociális közérdek, a földterületek méltányos elosztása, spekuláció kiszűrése, és a vidéki népesség megtartása érdekében.

Mit kíván tenni a Bizottság a fent említett kérdések, félreértések tisztázása érdekében?

Michel Barnier biztos válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. május 25.)

Az ingatlanszerzés tőkemozgásnak minősül. Az Európai Unió Bírósága kimondta, hogy a tőke szabad mozgását kizárólag olyan nemzeti jogszabály korlátozhatja, amely az EUMSZ 65. cikkének (1) bekezdésében említett okokkal, illetőleg közérdekkel indokolható (az ítélkezési gyakorlat értelmében ilyen ok lehet a földhasználat tervezése, a területi gazdasági infrastruktúra védelme, az életképes mezőgazdasági gyakorlatok megőrzése, az életképes gazdálkodó közösségek fenntartása, a mezőgazdasági terület művelésének közvetlen hasznosítás útján történő megőrzése), feltéve, hogy a szóban forgó jogszabály alkalmas a kitűzött cél elérésére, és nem lépi túl a cél eléréséhez szükséges mértéket, összhangban az arányosság elvével. Ennek értékelését eseti alapon kell elvégezni. Ugyanakkor a 65. cikk (3) bekezdése értelmében ezek a kivételek nem szolgálhatnak a szabad tőkemozgásra vonatkozó önkényes megkülönböztetés vagy rejtett korlátozás eszközéül.

Noha a tulajdoni rend az EUMSZ 345. cikke értelmében továbbra is az egyes tagállamok hatáskörébe tartozik, az említett rendelkezésből nem következik az, hogy az adott rendszer mentesülne a Szerződés alapelvei alól. A Szerződésben foglalt szabadságok megkülönböztetés nélkül mindegyik tagállam esetében alkalmazandók.

Az említett rendelkezések egyformán vonatkoznak minden uniós tagállamra. Ugyanakkor egyes tagállamok számára a csatlakozási szerződések bizonyos ideiglenes és állandó kivételekről rendelkeznek.

([1]) Bíróság, Margarethe Ospelt, C-452/01, 24. pont.
([2]) Bíróság, C-452/01, 37-45. pont; Uwe Kay Festersen, C-370/05, 33. pont.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003419/12
to the Commission
Tamás Deutsch (PPE)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: European Union provisions relating to the acquisition of agricultural land

I wish to ask the Commission for clarification on matters relating to the acquisition of agricultural land. It is a widely held view, including in specialist circles, that the EU regulations relating to the acquisition of agricultural land applicable to the countries that acceded in 2004 and 2007 are fundamentally different (even after the expiry of the derogation period) from those applicable to the EU-15, and that, among other measures, a review of the Accession Treaties would be appropriate in order to eliminate this 'inequality before the law'.

According to these expert opinions, the EU-15 may exclude intervention by the European Union in the regulation of agricultural land ownership by reference to Article 345 of the TFEU, which means that the relevant provisions of these Member States need only comply with the principle of national treatment. Many experts consider that in the chapter on the free movement of capital of the Accession Treaties, the Member States which joined the EU in 2004 and 2007, to which the derogation applies, are only allowed under EC law — after the expiry of the derogation period — to create regulations consistent with the interests of capital.

In our view, however, the EU-15 too may not refer to Article 345 of the TFEU ([1]) in order to justify, among other things, non-compliance with the freedom of establishment and the free movement of capital.

In our opinion, after the expiry of the derogation period, the regulations of Member States that acceded to the EU in 2004 and 2007 relating to the acquisition of ownership of agricultural land — just like those of the EU-15 — must comply with criteria that look beyond the rules of national treatment, primarily with stringent criteria regarding the free movement of capital, in accordance with the relevant practice of the Court ([2]). In other words, the theory that the EU-15 and the Member States that joined the EU in 2004 and 2007 are subject to two different legal bases and types of treatment, is wrong. In this sense, the EU-15 are also not required to comply solely with the criteria of national treatment, and the Member States that joined the EU in 2004 and 2007 should also be able to restrict the free movement of capital in the social public interest and with a view to the fair distribution of land, to eliminating speculation and to retaining the rural population.

What does the Commission wish to do in the interest of clarifying the aforementioned issues and misunderstandings?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

The acquisition of real estate represents a capital movement. The European Court of Justice has stated that the free movement of capital may be restricted only by national rules which are justified by reasons referred to in Art. 65(1) TFEU or by overriding requirements in the general interest (according to case law, such reasons could include planning of land use, protection of regional economic infrastructure, preservation of viable agricultural operations, maintenance of viable farming communities, preserving the farming of agricultural land by means of owner-occupancy), provided that the national legislation in question is suitable for securing the objective which it pursues and does not go beyond what is necessary in order to attain that objective, in accordance with the principle of proportionality. This assessment has to be carried out on a case by case basis. Nevertheless, Article 65(3) affirms that all these exceptions shall not constitute a means of arbitrary discrimination or a disguised restriction on the free movement of capital.

Although the system of property ownership continues to be a matter for each Member State under Article 345 TFUE, that provision does not have the effect of exempting such a system from the fundamental principles of the Treaty. The Treaty freedoms are applicable to all Member States without any discrimination.

These provisions apply equally to all EU Member States. However, certain temporary or permanent exceptions are foreseen in the Accession Treaties for some Member States.

([1]) ECJ, Case C-452/01 (*Margarethe Ospelt*), point 24.
([2]) ECJ, Cases C-452/01, points 37-45, and C-370/05 (*Uwe Kay Festersen*), point 33.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-003420/12
a Bizottság számára
Deutsch Tamás (PPE)
(2012. március 29.)

Tárgy: Birtokpolitikai eszközök uniós joggal való összeegyeztethetősége

A Bíróság az Európai Bizottság kontra Spanyol Királyság ügyben ([1]) megállapította, hogy egy kényszerítő közérdek előmozdításával összefüggésben létrehozott véleményező bizottság, amelynek véleményének kötelező kikérését követően dönt a hatóság egy bizonyos tevékenység engedélyezéséről, nem tekinthető alkalmasnak a követett célok megvalósításának biztosítására, mert – többek között – a környezetvédelemmel és a fogyasztóvédelemmel kapcsolatos érdekek nem rendelkeznek képviselettel, míg a potenciális versenytársak képviselve vannak. A Bizottság szerint összeegyeztethető-e az uniós joggal, ha a termőföldek tulajdonának megszerzésére vonatkozó előzetes hatósági engedélyezési rendszerrel kapcsolatos döntéshozatalban, vagy véleményezésben az agrárkamarák is részt vesznek? (Tekintettel arra, hogy e szervezetek alkalmasnak látszanak a mezőgazdaságban – az alapító szerződések által is elismert – célkitűzések biztosítására.)

A Bíróság szintén megállapította ([2]), hogy egy letelepedés szabadságát korlátozó szabályozás csak abban az esetben tekinthető olyannak, mint amely a célkitűzéseket koherens, és szisztematikus módon próbálja meg elérni (azaz abban az esetben egyeztethető össze az uniós joggal), ha a szabályozás a meglévő „létesítményeket" is fokozatosan módosítaná az elérni kívánt célkitűzéseknek megfelelően. Ezen elvek alapján a Bizottság álláspontja szerint, amennyiben egy szabályozás a kis és közepes életképes birtokok létrejöttének elősegítése, a vidéki népesség megtartása érdekében intézkedéseket vezet be, akkor a kérdéses intézkedések csak abban az esetben lesznek összeegyeztethetőek az uniós joggal, ha a meglévő nagyobb méretű gazdaságokat is elkezdené fokozatosan lebontani/átalakítani?

Ha a Bizottság álláspontja szerint – az arányosság jogelve miatt – nem egyeztethető össze az uniós joggal ([3]) egy olyan szabályozás, amely a gazdálkodóknak elsőbbséget ad az újonnan belépő gazdálkodók előtt a mezőgazdasági földterületek megszerzésekor, fenntartja-e ezen álláspontját akkor is, ha egy szabályozás akkor biztosít elsőbbséget egy már meglévő gazdaságnak, ha méretéhez képest kis földterület hiányzik az életképességi határ eléréséhez?

Dacian Cioloş válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. június 4.)

A tisztelt képviselő úr által feltett három kérdés a mezőgazdasági termőföld-tulajdonlásra vonatkozik. Az első két kérdés a nemzeti joggal és a nemzeti hatáskörbe tartozó szempontokkal kapcsolatos.

A harmadik kérdés a Bizottságnak a C-516/10. számú ügyben ([4]) képviselt álláspontjára vonatkozik. A Bizottság nem vonta kétségbe a tényt, hogy a tagállamok közérdekű indokok alapján korlátozhatják a földterületek vásárlását. A Bizottság kifejtette, hogy az ez ügyben érintett rendelkezések a tőke szabad mozgására és a letelepedési jogra nézve aránytalan korlátozást jelentenek. Harmadik kérdésében a tisztelt képviselő úr azt kérdezte a Bizottságtól, megváltoztatná-e álláspontját, ha a kérdéses rendelkezések a jelenlegitől eltérőek lennének.

A harmadik kérdést illetően a Bizottságnak további információkra lenne szüksége a kérdés megértéséhez és a válaszadáshoz. A 3. lábjegyzetben említett osztrák ügyben az osztrák hatóságok a Bizottság kételyeit eloszlatóan módosították Vorarlberg tartomány vitatott jogszabályát. Következésképpen az intézkedést visszavonták és az ügy lezárásra került.

A nemzeti vitás ügyekkel összefüggésben az EUMSZ 267. cikke értelmében az Európai Unió Bírósága hatáskörrel rendelkezik előzetes döntés meghozatalára a Szerződések értelmezése, valamint az uniós intézmények jogi aktusainak érvényessége és értelmezése tekintetében, ha egy tagállam bírósága előtt ilyen kérdés merül fel.

([1]) Európai Unió Bírósága, C-400/08 P 110-111.
([2]) Európai Unió Bírósága, C-348/08.
([3]) Bizottságnak az Osztrák Köztársaság ellen benyújtott C-516/10. számú keresetlevele.
([4]) Európai Bizottság kontra Osztrák Köztársaság (C-516/10. sz. ügy).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003420/12
to the Commission
Tamás Deutsch (PPE)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Compatibility of land policy instruments with European Union law

In the case of the European Commission versus the Kingdom of Spain ([1]), the Court determined that an advisory committee created in relation to the promotion of an overriding public concern, the opinion of which must be obtained by the authority before making a decision concerning the authorisation of a certain activity, cannot be deemed suitable to achieve the objectives pursued because, among other things, interests related to environmental protection and consumer protection have no representation, while potential competitors do. Does the Commission think that it is compatible with EC law if chambers of agriculture also participate in the decision-making or advisory process involved in the system of prior authorisation used by the competent authority for the acquisition of ownership of agricultural land? (In view of the fact that these organisations seem to be suitable for ensuring achievement of the agricultural objectives also recognised by the Founding Treaties of the European Union.)

The Court also found ([2]) that a regulation restricting freedom of establishment can be viewed as being one that attempts to achieve the objectives in a coherent and systematic way (i.e. it is compatible with EC law) only if it also provides for the gradual change in existing 'facilities', in line with the objectives to be achieved. On the basis of these principles, does the Commission think that if a regulation introduces measures in the interest of promoting the creation of viable small and medium-sized farms and retaining rural population, the measures in question would be compatible with EC law only if they also initiated a gradual breaking up/transformation of existing larger farms?

If, according to the Commission's standpoint, a regulation that prioritises existing farmers over new entrant farmers where the acquisition of agricultural land is concerned is not compatible with EC law due to the principle of proportionality ([3]), does the Commission maintain its standpoint even when a regulation prioritises existing farms in cases where only a relatively small area of land — compared to their sizes — is needed for the farms to reach the limit of viability?

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

The three questions posed by the Honourable Member relate to agricultural land ownership. The two first questions mentioned deal with national law and aspects which are under national competence.

The third question referred to the Commission's position in Case C-516/10 ([4]). The Commission did not question the fact that Member States may restrict the purchase of plots of land on grounds of public interest. The Commission explained that the provisions in this case constitute a disproportionate restriction on the free movement of capital and the right of establishment. By his third question, the Honourable Member asked the Commission if its evaluation might be otherwise if the provisions in question were different.

As to the third question the Commission would need to have more information to understand the concern and to give a response. In the AT case referred to in footnote 3, the AT authorities have amended the disputed law of the Land Vorarlberg meeting the Commission's concerns. Consequently, the action has been withdrawn and the case closed.

In the context of national litigation, the Court of Justice of the European Union has jurisdiction to give preliminary rulings on the interpretation of the Treaties and the validity and interpretation of acts of the institutions of the Union where such a question is raised before any court or tribunal of a Member State, in accordance with Article 267 TFEU.

([1]) Court of the European Union, C-400/08 P 110-111.
([2]) Court of the European Union, C-348/08.
([3]) *Commission* v *Republic of Austria* (Case C-516/10).
([4]) *Commission* v *Republic of Austria* (Case C-516/10).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003422/12
aan de Commissie
Luca. Hartong (NI)
(29 maart 2012)

Betreft: Vakantiedagen EDEO

Uit een onderzoek van collega Gräßle ([1]) en berichten in de internationale pers ([2]) blijkt dat ambtenaren bij de EDEO een wel zeer royale en goudomrande vakantieregeling hebben. In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Wanneer gaat de Commissie deze goudomrande regeling voor ambtenaren bij de EDEO aanpakken en deze schandelijke verspilling van belastinggeld stoppen?

2. Kan de Commissie mij een gedetailleerd en actueel overzicht doen toekomen van de hoeveelheid ambtenaren die de EDEO momenteel in dienst heeft, hoeveel zij verdienen, wat hun nationaliteit is en wat hun emolumenten zijn?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(30 mei 2012)

De Commissie heeft bij de beperkte herziening van het statuut van de ambtenaren geen wijzigingen voorgesteld voor de vakantieregeling van bijlage X bij het statuut, waarin bijzondere en uitzonderlijke bepalingen zijn vastgesteld voor ambtenaren die werkzaam zijn in een derde land. Het geachte Parlementslid herinnert zich misschien dat bijlage X bij het statuut onderwerp van discussie is geweest bij de onderhandelingen over de verordening tot wijziging van het statuut in het kader van de oprichting van de EDEO, maar dat de wijzigingen van de vakantieregeling van deze bijlage uiteindelijk niet zijn goedgekeurd ([3]).

De Commissie wijst er op dat de salarissen en andere emolumenten van de ambtenaren van de EU zijn vastgelegd in het statuut van de ambtenaren en de regeling die van toepassing is op de andere personeelsleden van de Europese Unie. Vóór medio 2013 zal de hoge vertegenwoordiger overeenkomstig artikel 13, lid 3, van het EDEO-besluit een overzicht van het aantal ambtenaren van de EDEO en hun nationaliteit ter beschikking stellen.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=COMPARL&reference=PE-480.777&format=PDF&language=EN&secondRef=02.
([2]) O.a. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/9169761/17-weeks-holiday-a-year-for-Ashtons-EU-bureaucrats.html
([3]) Verordening (EU, Euratom) nr. 1080/2010 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 24 november 2010 tot wijziging van het statuut van de ambtenaren van de Europese Gemeenschappen en van de regeling die van toepassing is op de andere personeelsleden van deze Gemeenschappen, PB L 311 van 26 november 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003422/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: European External Action Service (EEAS) holidays

In view of an investigation by my fellow Member Ms Gräßle ([1]) and reports in the international press ([2]), it appears that civil servants at the EEAS have extremely generous and gilt-edged holiday arrangements. I have the following questions to ask in that context:

1. When is the Commission going to tackle this gilt-edged arrangement for civil servants at the EEAS and put an end to this disgraceful waste of taxpayers' money?

2. Can the Commission send me an exact, detailed and current overview of the number of civil servants that the EEAS currently employs, how much they earn, their nationality and their emoluments?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

Within the framework of the limited review of the Staff Regulations, the Commission has not proposed any changes to the leave regime of Annex X to the Staff Regulations which contains special and exceptional provisions applicable to officials serving in a third country. The Honourable Member may recall that Annex X to the Staff Regulations was subject to discussions when the regulation that amended the Staff Regulations for the purposes of the establishment of the EEAS ([3]) was negotiated but that changes to leave entitlements in this Annex were ultimately not agreed.

The Commission would like to recall that salaries and other emoluments of EU staff are laid down in the Staff Regulations and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Union. The information on the number of staff in the EEAS and their nationality will be given in a review that the High Representative, in accordance with Article 13(3) of the EEAS Decision, will provide before mid-2013.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=COMPARL&reference=PE-480.777&format=PDF&language=EN&secondRef=02.
([2]) Among others, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/9169761/17-weeks-holiday-a-year-for-Ashtons-EU-bureaucrats.html
([3]) Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1080/2010 of the Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 amending the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of those Communities, OJ L 311, 26.11.2010.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003425/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(29 de março de 2012)

Assunto: Apoios a PME's no Programa-Quadro «Horizonte 2020»

— Existem na União Europeia cerca de 23 mil Pequenas e Médias Empresas (PME's) que desempenham um papel fundamental na dinâmica empresarial, crescimento económico e geração de emprego na generalidade dos Estados-Membros;

— A 30 de novembro de 2011, a Comissão Europeia apresentou o Programa-Quadro «Horizonte 2020» que tem como objetivo estimular a investigação, a inovação e a competitividade na Europa;

— A Comissário Europeia para a Investigação, Inovação e Ciência, Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, referiu que «o Programa-Quadro "Horizonte 2020" estimula diretamente a economia e garante a nossa base científica e tecnológica e a nossa competitividade industrial para o futuro, oferecendo a promessa de uma sociedade mais inteligente, mais sustentável e mais inclusiva»;

— O Programa-Quadro «Horizonte 2020» possui um orçamento de 80 mil milhões de Euros, estando dividido em três grandes áreas temáticas, nomeadamente: Excelência Científica (24,5 mil milhões de Euros), Liderança Industrial (17,9 mil milhões de Euros) e Desafios Societais (31,7 mil milhões de Euros). O remanescente do valor financeiro do programa será orientado para o Instituto Europeu de Inovação e Tecnologia, Centro Comum de Investigação e outras áreas;

— As três grandes áreas temáticas incluem vários programas de apoio a PME's no valor global de 8,6 mil milhões de Euros, como é o caso do Programa Competitividade e Inovação, Venture Capital e Inovação nas PME's, mas não se compreende como é que se alcança o valor global em causa.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o valor global de financiamento para apoiar diretamente as PME's? Como se divide este valor global pelos vários subprogramas que serão constituídos?

2. Quais as áreas temáticas e os programas a que as PME's podem concorrer?

3. As empresas poderão concorrer individualmente a estes fundos comunitários ou terão de constituir consórcios entre várias empresas europeias para acederem aos fundos em causa?

4. Como irá proceder para a apresentação de propostas por parte das empresas e qual a orgânica que irá adotar para facilitar o acesso aos montantes disponíveis?

Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(25 de maio de 2012)

1. Na sua proposta de Programa-Quadro Horizonte 2000, a Comissão prevê que as PME beneficiem de um financiamento da ordem de 8,6 milhares de milhões de euros. Foi mantida a meta orçamental de 15 % do Sétimo Programa-Quadro de Investigação e Desenvolvimento Tecnológico (2007-2013). Cerca de 6,8 milhares de milhões de euros do total combinado dos orçamentos dos objetivos específicos dos pilares «Desafios Societais» e «Liderança em Tecnologias Facilitadoras e Industriais» serão, assim, atribuídos às PME. Este montante será complementado por 619 milhões de euros destinados a uma ação específica de promoção de PME executantes de I&D, baseada no Programa Comum Eurostars([1]), e a medidas de reforço da capacidade de inovação das PME e criação de melhores condições de enquadramento. Além disso, reforçou-se de forma significativa o recurso a instrumentos financeiros. O objetivo específico «Acesso a Financiamentos de Risco» prevê a atribuição às PME de um terço do orçamento (cerca de 1,2 milhares de milhões de euros).

2. As PME podem candidatar-se a todas as atividades apoiadas pelo Programa-Quadro Horizonte 2020. Contudo, a referida meta orçamental de 15 % aplica-se aos pilares «Desafios Societais» e «Liderança em Tecnologias Facilitadoras e Industriais».

([1]) http://www.eurekanetwork.org/activities/eurostars

3. O artigo 8.°, n.° 3, das Regras de Participação prevê que, no caso dos «instrumentos a favor das PME», a condição mínima é uma entidade jurídica. Quanto às componentes não abrangidas pelo referido artigo, aplicam-se as condições gerais que constam do artigo 8.°, n.° 1.

4. O processo de candidatura deve basear-se no artigo 10.° («Convites à Apresentação de Propostas») das Regras de Participação. A Comissão prevê o recurso intensivo a montantes fixos e a outras medidas de simplificação, como convites abertos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003425/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Support to small and medium enterprises (SMEs) under the Horizon 2020 Framework Programme

There are about 23 000 SMEs in the European Union and in the majority of Member States they play a critically important role in entrepreneurial dynamism, economic growth and employment creation.

On 30 November 2011, the European Commission presented the Horizon 2020 Framework Programme, which has the objective of stimulating research, innovation and competitiveness in Europe.

The Commissioner for Research, Innovation and Science, Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, said: 'Horizon 2020 provides direct stimulus to the economy and secures our science and technology base and industrial competitiveness for the future, promising a smarter, more sustainable and more inclusive society.'

The Horizon 2020 Framework Programme has a budget of EUR 80 million, divided into three overarching thematic areas, specifically: Scientific Excellence (EUR 24.5 billion), Industrial Leadership (EUR 17.9 billion) and Societal Challenges (EUR 31.7 billion). The remainder of the programme budget will be allocated to the European Institute of Innovation and Technology, Joint Research Centre and other areas.

The three overarching themes include various programmes for supporting SMEs to the total amount of EUR 8.6 billion, such as the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme, Venture Capital and Innovation in SMEs, although it is unclear how this total amount is reached.

I ask the Commission:

1. What is the total amount of direct support for SMEs? How will this total sum be divided between the various sub-programmes to be included?

2. What are the thematic areas and the programmes to which the SMEs can apply?

3. Can companies apply individually for these Community funds or will they have to form consortia of several European companies to access these funds?

4. What procedure will companies have to follow for presenting proposals and what organisation will be used for facilitating access to the sums available?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

1. The Commission foresees in its proposal for Horizon 2020 that SMEs will benefit from around EUR 8.6 billion funding. The 15 % budgetary target from the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) has been maintained. Around EUR 6.8 billion of the total combined budgets of the 'Societal Challenges' pillar and the 'Leadership in enabling and industrial technologies' specific objective will thus go to SMEs. This will be complemented by EUR 619 million for both a specific action promoting R & D performing SMEs, which builds on the Eurostars Joint Programme ([1]), and measures enhancing the innovation capacity of SMEs and creating better framework conditions. In addition, the use of financial instruments has been significantly scaled up. The specific objective 'Access to risk finance' has a budgetary target of one third going to SMEs (about EUR 1.2 billion).

2. SMEs can apply to all activities supported under Horizon 2020. However, the abovementioned 15 % budget target applies to both 'Societal Challenges' and 'Leadership in enabling and industrial technologies'.

3. Article 8.3 of the Rules for Participation foresees that for the 'SME instrument', the minimum condition shall be one legal entity. For the parts not covered by this article the general conditions of Article 8.1 shall apply.

4. The application process will be based on Article 10 'Calls for proposals' of the Rules for Participation. The Commission intends to make extensive use of lump sums as well as other simplification measures like open calls.

([1]) http://www.eurekanetwork.org/activities/eurostars

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003433/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(29. März 2012)

Betrifft: Radikalislamische Dschihad-Salafisten agieren ungehindert in Belgien

Wie sich aus aktuellen Pressemeldungen ergibt, gehörte der Attentäter von Toulouse den radikalislamischen Dschihad-Salafisten an. Stimmen der belgischen Staatssicherheit zufolge könne ein ähnlicher Anschlag jederzeit auch an einem beliebigen Ort Belgiens geschehen. Hier können die Dschihad-Salafisten, deren Gruppe sich Sharia4Belgium nennt, ungehindert agieren. Die Hassprediger von Sharia4Belgium, allen voran Fouad Belkacem, können hier unter dem Schutz des Gesetzes frei ihre Hetze gegen die westlichen Gesellschaften und ihre Grundwerte betreiben und somit als Brandbeschleuniger des islamischen Terrorismus in Europa wirken.

Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Ist der Kommission diese Gruppe bekannt? Wenn ja, über welche Netzwerke verfügt diese Gruppe in Europa? Mit welchen Organisationen in Europa arbeitet Sharia4Belgium zusammen?

2. Ist bekannt, aus welchen Quellen sich Sharia4Belgium finanziert?

3. Ist der Attentäter von Toulouse der erste bekannte Attentäter, der zu den Dschihad-Salafisten zählte?

4. Gibt es Pläne der Kommission, Tätigkeiten von islamistischen Gruppen, die sich gegen die westlichen Gesellschaften und ihre Grundwerte richten, zu unterbinden?

5. Gibt es Pläne, die Agitation der Dschihad-Salafisten zu unterbinden?

6. Gedenkt die Kommission, die EU-Staaten aufzufordern, alle Möglichkeiten der Ausweisung von radikalen Islamisten und Hasspredigern auszuschöpfen?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(31. Mai 2012)

Die Kommission betrachtet den Kampf gegen alle Formen der Radikalisierung und des gewalttätigen Extremismus, gleich, welche Gründe hierfür zugrunde liegen und in welcher Form sie auftreten, als prioritär für die innere Sicherheit. Zu diesem Zweck hat die Kommission das EU-Aufklärungsnetzwerk gegen Radikalisierung (RAN) ins Leben gerufen, das die wichtigsten Gruppen, die gegen Radikalisierung und gewalttätigen Extremismus kämpfen, miteinander in Verbindung bringt. Das Netzwerk wird sich insbesondere mit der Frage befassen, wie das Internet zur Radikalisierung beiträgt. Nähere Angaben zum RAN und den bisherigen Initiativen der Kommission finden sich in den Antworten auf die Schriftlichen Anfragen E-008264/2011 und E-4510/2010 ([1]).

Wie in den Antworten auf die Schriftlichen Anfragen E-009410/2011, E-011087/2011 und E-011307/2011 ([1]) dargelegt, überwacht die Kommission nicht selbst die Aktivitäten extremistischer Gruppierungen, sondern informiert sich mithilfe der auf EU-Ebene verfügbaren Instrumente. Hierzu gehört der EU-Tendenz- und Lagebericht, den Europol auf der Grundlage von Angaben seitens der Mitgliedstaaten, darunter auch Belgien, verfasst. Der Bericht für 2011 informiert über drei gescheiterte, vereitelte oder ausgeführte islamistische Anschläge in der EU ([2]). Der für die Zwecke derartiger Berichte verwendete Begriff lautet „islamistischer Terrorismus".

EU-Richtlinien im Bereich Asyl und Einwanderung enthalten Vorschriften zur „öffentlichen Ordnung", die es den Mitgliedstaaten gestatten, aus Sicherheitsgründen Aufenthaltstitel zu entziehen und Drittstaatsangehörige auszuweisen. Eine Anwendung dieser Vorschriften kann in bestimmten Fällen angemessen sein, um die Sicherheit zu erhöhen, wobei jedoch stets eine Einzelfallprüfung durchgeführt werden muss. Manchmal kann es im Interesse einer verstärkten Sicherheit sinnvoll sein, derartige Personen strafrechtlich zu verfolgen oder sie zu überwachen, statt sie in ein Drittland auszuweisen.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB
([2]) Te-Sat 2011: https://www.europol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/te-sat2011.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003433/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Radical Islamic Salafist jihadists operating unhindered in Belgium

According to current press reports, the attack in Toulouse was the work of a member of a radical Islamic Salafist jihadist group. Belgian state security authorities have indicated that a similar attack could occur anywhere throughout Belgium at any time. The Salafist jihadists, organised under the name Sharia4Belgium, can operate without hindrance in the country. Acting under the protection of the law, the hate preachers of Sharia4Belgium, chief among them, Fouad Belkacem, are free to peddle their rabble-rousing propaganda against western society and its fundamental values, thus fanning the flames of Islamic terrorism in Europe.

This gives rise to the following questions:

1. Is the Commission aware of this group? If so, what networks does this group have in Europe? With which organisations in Europe does Sharia4Belgium collaborate?

2. Is it known how Sharia4Belgium finances itself?

3. Is the Toulouse attacker the first known attacker to come from the Salafist jihadist group?

4. Does the Commission have any plans to prevent activities by Islamist groups against western society and its fundamental values?

5. Are there plans to prevent the agitation of Salafist jihadists?

6. Is the Commission considering calling on the EU Member States to explore every avenue to expel radical Islamists and clerics who preach hatred?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2012)

The Commission addresses all forms of radicalisation and violent extremism regardless of their motivation and *modus operandi* as one of the priorities for internal security. To this end, the Commission has launched the EU Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) which will connect key stakeholder groups involved in countering violent radicalisation and extremism. The use of the Internet in the process of radicalisation will certainly be one of the important issues to be examined by the Network. Details on the RAN and past initiatives from the Commission have been given in response to Written Questions E-008264/11 and E-4510/10 ([1]).

As explained in response to Written Questions E-009410/11, E-011087/11 and E-011307/11 ([1]), the Commission does not monitor activities of extremist groups, but relies on tools available at the EU level, such as the EU Terrorism Situation and Trend Report produced by Europol on the basis of information provided by Member States including Belgium. The 2011 Report informed about three failed, foiled or completed Islamist attacks in the EU ([2]). 'Islamist terrorism' is the terminology used for the purpose of such reports.

EU Directives in the area of asylum and immigration contain 'public order' clauses which allow Member States to withdraw residence permits and to return third-country nationals for security reasons. An application of these clauses may in certain cases be an appropriate way of enhancing security, bearing in mind that an individualised assessment must be carried out in all cases and that it may sometimes be in the interest of enhanced security to bring criminal charges against such persons or to keep them under surveillance rather than returning them to a third country.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.
([2]) Te-Sat 2011: https://www.europol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/te-sat2011.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003434/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(29. März 2012)

Betrifft: Endlager für schwach und mittelradioaktive Abfälle

In seiner Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-001410/2012 des Verfassers zu Standorten von Endlagern für hoch radioaktiven Abfall schreibt Kommissar Oettinger, dass es für schwach und mittelradioaktive Abfälle „bereits in mehreren Mitgliedstaaten Endlager gibt". Die Technische Plattform zur Verwirklichung der Endlagerung in geologischen Formationen (IGD-TP) ist nach Auskunft des Kommissars mit der „Endlagerung abgebrannter Brennstoffe, hoch radioaktiver Abfälle und sonstiger langlebiger radioaktiver Abfälle" befasst, nicht jedoch mit der Endlagerung schwach und mittelradioaktiver Abfälle.

In welchen Mitgliedstaaten der EU sind derzeit Endlager für schwach und mittelradioaktiven Abfall in Betrieb?

Welche Mitgliedstaaten, in denen mindestens ein Atomkraftwerk betrieben wird, verfügen nicht über ein solches Endlager?

Gibt es Mitgliedstaaten, die Endlager für radioaktiven Abfall, jedoch kein eigenes Atomkraftwerk betreiben?

In welchen Mitgliedstaaten befinden sich Endlager für schwach und mittelradioaktive Abfälle in der Planungs- oder Bauphase?

Besteht ähnlich der IGD-TP für hoch radioaktive Abfälle auch eine Plattform, die sich mit der weiteren Erforschung der Endlagerung von schwach und mittelradioaktiven Abfällen beschäftigt? Wenn nicht, gibt es nach Kenntnis der Kommission Institutionen in der EU, die ähnliche Aufgaben wahrnehmen?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(29. Mai 2012)

14 der 27 EU-Mitgliedstaaten haben Kernkraftwerke in Betrieb, die Kernkraftwerke von zwei weiteren EU-Mitgliedstaaten werden zurzeit stillgelegt ([1]). Die Tschechische Republik, Finnland, Frankreich, Ungarn, die Slowakische Republik, Spanien, Schweden und das Vereinigte Königreich verfügen über operative Endlager für kurzlebige schwach- und mittelradioaktive Abfälle aus der Kernenergienutzung und aus Radioisotopenanwendungen. Rumänien verfügt über ein operatives Endlager für kurzlebige schwach- und mittelradioaktive Abfälle aus Radioisotopenanwendungen ([2]).

Von den Mitgliedstaaten ohne Kernkraftwerke betreiben Estland, Lettland und Polen operative Endlager für kurzlebige schwach- und mittelradioaktive Abfälle aus Radioisotopenanwendungen ([2]).

In Planung und/oder im Bau befinden sich Endlager für schwach- und mittelradioaktive Abfälle in Belgien, Bulgarien, Finnland, Frankreich, Deutschland, Ungarn, Italien, Lettland, Litauen, Malta, Polen, Rumänien, der Slowakischen Republik, Slowenien, Spanien, Schweden und dem Vereinigten Königreich ([2]).

Zu langlebigen schwach- und mittelradioaktiven Abfällen wird die wissenschaftliche Forschung von der Technologieplattform für die Verwirklichung der Endlagerung in geologischen Formationen (IGD-TP) durchgeführt, die Endlagerung kurzlebiger schwach- und mittelradioaktiver Abfälle dagegen ist industriell ausgereift. Die Kommission kennt keine andere, der IGD-TP ähnliche Technologieplattform oder Einrichtung, die sich mit der Endlagerung kurzlebiger schwach- und mittelradioaktiver Abfälle befasst.

([1]) Die 14 Mitgliedstaaten, welche Kernkraftwerke betreiben, sind Belgien, Bulgarien, die Tschechische Republik, Finnland, Frankreich, Deutschland, Ungarn, die Niederlande, Rumänien, die Slowakische Republik, Slowenien, Spanien, Schweden und das Vereinigte Königreich. Italien und Litauen verfügen lediglich über Atomkraftwerke, die derzeit stillgelegt werden.

([2]) Siehe den Siebten Lagebericht zur Entsorgung radioaktiver Abfälle und abgebrannter Brennstoffe in der Europäischen Union, SEK(2011)1007 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003434/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Final repositories for low- and medium-level radioactive waste

In his answer to Written Question E-001410/2012 on locations of permanent repositories for highly radioactive waste, Commissioner Oettinger writes that repositories for low- and medium-level waste already exist in a number of Member States. According to the Commissioner, the Implementing Geological Disposal of Radioactive Waste Technology Platform (IGD-TP) is concerned with the 'permanent storage of spent fuel, high-level radioactive waste and other long-life radioactive waste', but not with the permanent storage of low- and medium-level radioactive waste.

In which EU Member States are final repositories for low- and medium-level waste currently in use?

Which Member States in which at least one nuclear power station is in operation do not have at least one such final repository?

Are there Member States that have final repositories for low-and medium-level waste, but have no nuclear power stations of their own?

In which Member States are final repositories for low- and medium-level waste currently in the planning or construction phases?

Is there a similar platform to the IGD-TP for high-level radioactive waste that is concerned with further research into final repositories for low- and medium-level waste? If not, does the Commission know whether there are institutions within the EU that are responsible for similar tasks?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(29 May 2012)

Fourteen of the 27 EU Member States have nuclear power plants in operation, while two other EU Member States have nuclear power plants under decommissioning ([1]). The Czech Republic, Finland, France, Hungary, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden and the UK have operational repositories for short-lived low and intermediate level waste from nuclear power production and radioisotope applications. Romania has an operational repository for such waste from radioisotope applications ([2]).

Among the Member States without nuclear power plants, Estonia, Latvia and Poland have operational repositories for short-lived low and intermediate level waste from radioisotope applications.

Repositories for low and intermediate level waste are planned and/or are under construction in Belgium, Bulgaria, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the UK.

Research on the disposal of long-lived low and intermediate level waste is covered by the Implementing Geological Disposal Technology Platform (IGD-TP), while the disposal of short-lived low and intermediate level waste is industrially mature. The Commission is not aware of any other technology platform or body similar to the IGD-TP, dealing with short-lived low and intermediate level waste disposal.

([1]) The 14 Member States which have nuclear power plants in operation are Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, the Netherlands, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the UK; Italy and Lithuania only have nuclear power plants under decommissioning.

([2]) See the Seventh Situation Report on Radioactive waste and Spent Fuel management in the European Union, SEC(2011) 1007 final.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003437/12
adresată Comisiei
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(29 martie 2012)

Subiect: Terenul comunal și principiile egalității de gen

Majoritatea economiilor africane se bazează pe agricultură, iar peste 70 % din populația Africii se bazează pe agricultura de subzistență.

Femeile africane cultivă pământul, plantează, îngrijesc, recoltează și pregătesc majoritatea alimentelor care provin de la exploatațiile agricole de mici dimensiuni. Prin activitatea lor, ele furnizează alimentele pentru consumul casnic și pentru piețele locale.

Cu toate acestea, în majoritatea țărilor africane, drepturile juridice de proprietate ale femeilor nu sunt protejate. În conformitate cu un raport al Inter Press Service, numai 1 % dintre femeile din Tanzania dețin titluri juridice de proprietate asupra terenului. În Zimbabwe, până la 20 % dintre femei dețin titluri de proprietate asupra terenului, dar, în ciuda acestei proporții mai ridicate, terenul comunal nu este împărțit în conformitate cu principiile egalității de gen.

Cum va consolida Comisia recunoașterea oficială a drepturilor femeilor la terenul comunal și cum va îmbunătăți emanciparea femeilor din mediul rural?

Răspuns dat de dl Piebalgs în numele Comisiei
(16 mai 2012)

Emanciparea femeilor în domeniul dezvoltării rurale și al agriculturii poate contribui la îndeplinirea Obiectivelor de dezvoltare ale mileniului (ODM). Dacă s-ar elimina disparitatea de gen numai la nivelul factorilor de producție agricolă, între 100 și 150 de milioane de oameni ar scăpa de foamete. Acesta este unul din obiectivele pentru perioada următoare ale „Agendei pentru schimbare”: să sprijine practicile durabile, acordând prioritate practicilor dezvoltate pe plan local și punând accentul pe agricultura la scară mică și pe mijloacele de subzistență rurale.

Feminizarea micii agriculturi oferă oportunități, dar poate conduce, de asemenea, la creșteri substanțiale ale volumului de muncă pentru unele femei, atât în producție, cât și pentru întreținerea locuinței.

În plus, asigurarea accesului femeilor la resurse și controlul asupra acestora, eliminarea inegalității de gen în sectorul agriculturii ar putea duce la creșterea veniturilor gospodăriilor și ar asigura îmbunătățirea semnificativă a sănătății, nutriției și nivelurilor de educație ale copiilor.

Cu toate acestea, diferențele dintre sistemele juridice și contradicțiile dintre dreptul cutumiar și dreptul pozitiv îngreunează lansarea unei reforme agricole care să fie cuprinzătoare și să țină seama de aspectele de gen.

Acesta este motivul pentru care, în 2010, au fost selectate pentru finanțare la nivel mondial șapte proiecte: în Angola, Sierra Leone, Mozambic, Zimbabwe, Ghana, dar și în America Latină, Cisiordania, Fâșia Gaza și Tadjikistan. Acestea beneficiază în total de 3,8 milioane EUR. Obiectivul lor este de a consolida capacitatea, de a îmbunătăți crearea de rețele între grupurile de la nivelul comunității și rețelele naționale de femei pentru a crește gradul de informare cu privire la drepturile de proprietate ale femeilor și pentru a promova o mai mare participare a femeilor la procesul de luare a deciziilor privind regimul proprietății.

În plus, recent a fost închisă o cerere de propuneri care va susține, la nivel mondial, cu până la 30 de milioane EUR, emanciparea socială și economică a femeilor din categoriile cele mai vulnerabile, inclusiv a femeilor din mediul rural.

De asemenea, Comisia ar dori să aducă în atenția distinsei deputate răspunsurile sale la întrebările anterioare cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-002974/2011 și E-009935/2011 adresate de domnul Rossi ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=RO

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003437/12
to the Commission
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Communal land and the principles of gender equality

Most African economies rely on agriculture, and more than 70 % of Africa's population is reliant on subsistence farming.

African women cultivate the land and plant, tend, harvest and prepare most of the food that comes from smallholdings. Through their activity they provide food for household consumption and for local markets.

Yet in most African countries, women's legal property ownership rights are not protected. According to an Inter Press Service report, only 1 % of women in Tanzania have legal land titles. In Zimbabwe, up to 20 % of women have land titles, but despite this higher proportion, communal land is not shared out in line with the principles of gender equality.

How will the Commission strengthen the official recognition of women's rights to communal land and improve the empowerment of rural women?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2012)

Empowering women in rural development and agriculture can help meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Closing the gender gap in agricultural inputs alone could lift 100 to 150 million people out of hunger. It is one of the 'Agenda for Change' next objectives: to support sustainable practices, giving priority to locally-developed practices and focusing on smallholder agriculture and rural livelihoods.

The feminisation of smallholder farming presents opportunities but can also result in huge productive and household maintenance workloads for some women.

In addition, ensuring women's access to resources and the control over them, eliminating gender inequality in agriculture, would raise household incomes and ensure significant improvements of child health, nutrition and educational levels.

However, different legal systems, contradiction between customary and positive laws, increase the difficulties in launching a comprehensive and gender-sensitive agricultural reform.

That is why, in 2010, seven projects have been selected for funding worldwide, as in Angola, Sierra Leone, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Ghana but also in Latin America and West Bank and Gaza Strip, Tajikistan, for a total amount of EUR 3.8 million. Their objective is to strengthen capacity, improve networking between community-based groups and national women's networks to raise awareness of women's property rights and to advocate for greater women's participation in decision making on property ownership.

Furthermore, a call for proposals has just been closed and will support, with up to EUR 30 million, the social and economic empowerment of the most vulnerable women, worldwide rural women included.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to answers to previous written questions E-002974/2011 and E-009935/2011 by Rossi ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003440/12
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD) e Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(29 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Abolizione del sistema dei diritti di impianto di nuovi vigneti a livello europeo

Il regolamento del Consiglio (CE) n. 479/2008, del 29 aprile 2008, prevede l'abolizione delle attuali regole sui diritti di impianto di vigneti a livello europeo a partire dalla fine del 2015, sulla base di quanto affermato nell'articolo 85 e negli articoli del Capo II, rubricato «regime transitorio dei diritti d'impianto».

Paesi quali Italia, Francia e Spagna, esponenti dell'eccellenza del settore vitivinicolo europeo, cui si sono attualmente affiancati altri ventidue Stati membri dell'UE, si sono opposti a tale normativa, chiedendo di poter continuare ad utilizzare il sistema attuale. Essi asseriscono, infatti, che le norme del regolamento, che prevedono la liberalizzazione degli impianti di nuovi vigneti al 31 dicembre 2015, non considerano gli effetti collaterali dello squilibrio nella produzione, della delocalizzazione della produzione vinicola verso aree geografiche più vantaggiose per quanto riguarda i costi di produzione e della migrazione dei vigneti dalle colline alla pianura. Ne risentirebbero fortemente, in ultima analisi, non soltanto la qualità dei vini europei, ma anche la cultura e le tradizioni locali di ciascun territorio che basi la propria economia principalmente sul mercato vitivinicolo, essendo le tecniche di produzione di ciascun vino profondamente connesse al clima e al tipo di terreno del peculiare luogo in cui i suoi vigneti vengono tradizionalmente coltivati. In relazione alla tutela di tali peculiarità, va considerata, infine, la fondamentale funzione di salvaguardia del territorio adempiuta dall'intera filiera vitivinicola.

Considerando gli esiti della riunione del Consiglio Agricoltura del 19 marzo 2012, durante il quale sono state espresse al Commissario europeo all'agricoltura, sig. Dacian Ciolos, le preoccupazioni dei produttori vitivinicoli in merito all'abolizione dei diritti d'impianto il 31 dicembre 2015 e considerando l'interrogazione numero E-004894/2011 presentata in data 11 maggio 2011, può dire la Commissione:

1. quali siano i progressi rispetto alla situazione presentata lo scorso anno;

2. se abbia svolto studi di impatto sulle conseguenze speculative che potrebbero investire gli operatori della filiera vitivinicola negli Stati membri dell'UE a seguito dell'abolizione dei diritti d'impianto;

3. come ritenga di poter salvaguardare la cultura e le tradizioni dei territori statali e regionali coinvolti, qualora entrasse in vigore il presente regolamento.

Risposta data da Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(31 maggio 2012)

Come sottolineano gli onorevoli parlamentari, taluni Stati membri produttori di vini, numerosi soggetti interessati a livello nazionale ed europeo nonché vari deputati europei hanno espresso a partire dallo scorso anno i loro timori circa la prossima fine del regime dei diritti di impianto dei vigneti. Per questa ragione nel 2012 è stato istituito un gruppo di alto livello onde organizzare un forum di discussione sul tema.

L'obiettivo di questo gruppo consiste nel valutare diversi aspetti del funzionamento di tale regime negli Stati membri nonché l'incidenza della sua abolizione sul settore e sul mercato del vino, incluse eventuali ripercussioni sull'occupazione dei suoli. Al termine dei lavori, il gruppo presenterà alla Commissione una relazione sui temi affrontati.

La fine di tale regime non è una misura isolata ma fa parte della riforma dell'OCM vino, adottata dal Consiglio nel 2008. La salvaguardia e la valorizzazione della qualità dei nostri vini, ricchi delle tradizioni e delle culture dei nostri territori, sono alcuni degli obiettivi di questa riforma che comporta un insieme di strumenti, destinati al settore vitivinicolo, per ristabilire l'equilibrio del mercato ed accrescere la competitività del settore, contribuendo in tal modo al mantenimento della nostra viticoltura regionale di qualità.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003440/12
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD) and Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Abolition of the system of rights to plant new vineyards in Europe

Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2008 of 29 April 2008 rescinds the current rules on the rights to plant vineyards in Europe from the end of 2015, based on the provisions of Article 85 and the articles of Chapter II, entitled 'Transitional planting right regime'.

Countries such as Italy, France and Spain, exponents of the excellence of the European wine sector, now joined by another 22 Member States, have opposed this legislation, asking for permission to continue using the current system. They argue that the rules of the regulation, which provide for the liberalisation of planting of new vineyards on 31 December 2015, do not take account of the knock-on effects of the imbalance in production, the relocation of wine production to more favourable areas in terms of production costs and the migration of the vineyards from the hills to the plains. After all, not only would the quality of European wines be greatly affected, but also the culture and local traditions of each region that bases its economy primarily on the wine market, since the production techniques of each wine are deeply connected to the climate and soil type of the specific location where the vineyards are traditionally planted. Lastly, in relation to protecting these distinct features, the fundamental role played by the entire wine industry in land conservation should be considered.

In view of the outcome of the meeting of the Agriculture Council on 19 March 2012, during which wine producers' concerns about the abolition of planting rights on 31 December 2015 were conveyed to the European Commissioner for Agriculture, Dacian Cioloş, and in view of question E-004894/2011, submitted on 11 May 2011, can the Commission state:

1. what progress has been made since the situation was raised last year?

2. whether it has carried out impact assessments of the speculative effects that operators in the wine sector in EU Member States could encounter following the abolition of planting rights?

3. how it intends to safeguard the culture and traditions of the state and regional territories involved, if this regulation enters into force?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M.Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(31 mai 2012)

Comme le soulignent les Honorables Parlementaires, des États membres producteurs de vin, de nombreux stakeholders au niveau national et européen ainsi que plusieurs députés européens ont exprimé depuis l'an dernier leurs préoccupations sur la fin prochaine du régime des droits de plantation de vignes. C'est pourquoi un groupe de haut niveau a été créé en 2012 pour organiser un forum de discussion sur le sujet.

L'objectif de ce groupe est d'évaluer différents aspects du fonctionnement de ce régime dans les États membres, ainsi que les impacts de son abolition pour le secteur et le marché du vin, y compris sur d'éventuels effets sur l'occupation des sols. À l'issue de ses travaux, le groupe présentera à la Commission un rapport sur les thèmes abordés.

La fin de ce régime n'est pas une mesure isolée; elle fait partie de la réforme de l'OCM vin, adoptée par le Conseil en 2008. La sauvegarde et la valorisation de la qualité de nos vins, riches en traditions et cultures issus de nos terroirs, sont des objectifs de cette réforme qui comporte un ensemble d'outils, à destination du secteur vitivinicole, pour rétablir l'équilibre du marché et augmenter la compétitivité de ce secteur, contribuant ainsi à la préservation de notre viticulture régionale de qualité.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003454/12
adresată Comisiei
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(29 martie 2012)

Subiect: Ce măsuri de combatere a consumului excesiv de alcool la nivelul UE are în vedere Comisia?

Conform unui raport realizat de Organizația Mondială a Sănătății (OMS), europenii sunt cei mai mari consumatori de alcool din lume, în condițiile în care beau echivalentul a 12,5 litri de alcool pur pe an.

Riscurile pentru sănătate cresc direct proporțional cu cantitatea de alcool consumată.

În acest context, țările nordice au înregistrat rata cea mai mare privind consumul periculos pentru sănătate. Raportul constată că, în Uniunea Europeană, aproape 12% din totalul deceselor înregistrate în 2004 în rândul persoanelor cu vârsta între 15 și 64 de ani au fost cauzate de alcool — ceea ce înseamnă că 1 din 7 decese în rândul bărbaților și 1 din 13 decese în rândul femeilor sunt cauzate de alcool.

La nivel mondial, aproximativ 2,5 milioane de oameni mor în fiecare an din cauza consumului de alcool, ceea ce reprezintă aproximativ 3,8% din totalul deceselor, potrivit datelor oferite de OMS.

Pe lângă flagelul social reprezentat de consumul de alcool, deteriorarea sănătății la nivel european duce și la costuri mai mari pentru asistența medicală. Ce măsuri de combatere a consumului excesiv de alcool la nivelul UE are în vedere Comisia?

Răspuns dat de dl. Dalli în numele Comisiei
(30 mai 2012)

În 2006, Comisia Europeană a adoptat Strategia UE de sprijinire a statelor membre în vederea reducerii efectelor nocive ale alcoolului ([1]). Una dintre cele cinci priorități ale acestei strategii este de a „informa, educa și sensibiliza publicul cu privire la impactul consumului dăunător și periculos de alcool și cu privire la practicile admisibile de consum".

UE își pune în aplicare strategia utilizând două instrumente: Forumul european privind alcoolul și sănătatea și Comitetul privind politicile și măsurile naționale privind alcoolul. Strategia este în prezent în curs de evaluare.

De la adoptarea strategiei, au avut loc numeroase acțiuni prin intermediul forumului și al comitetului. Aceste acțiuni includ 220 angajamente ([2]) din partea reprezentanților industriei, a ONG-urilor și a altor părți interesate, precum și măsuri de reglementare de către statele membre, cum ar fi creșterea limitelor de vârstă pentru vânzarea și servirea de băuturi alcoolice, limite de alcoolemie mai mici pentru șoferii tineri și restricții mai severe privind reclamele TV la băuturi alcoolice, în vederea protejării copiilor și tinerilor.

([1]) Comunicarea din 24 octombrie 2006, Strategia UE de sprijinire a statelor membre în vederea reducerii efectelor nocive ale alcoolului (COM (2006) 625 final), http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0625en01.pdf

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahf/index.jsp

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003454/12
to the Commission
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: What measures does the Commission envisage to combat excessive alcohol consumption in the EU?

According to a survey conducted by the World Health Organisation (WHO), Europeans are the heaviest consumers of alcohol in the world, since they drink the equivalent of 12.5 litres of pure alcohol per year.

Health risks increase in direct proportion to the amount of alcohol consumed.

In this context, the Nordic countries have registered the highest rate with regard to consumption constituting a health hazard. The report notes that, in the European Union, almost 12 % of all deaths recorded in 2004 among people aged between 15 and 64 years were caused by alcohol — which means that 1 in 7 deaths among men and 1 in 13 deaths among women are caused by alcohol.

According to the data provided by the WHO, about 2.5 million people die worldwide every year due to alcohol consumption, representing approximately 3.8 % of all deaths.

In addition to the social scourge represented by alcohol consumption, damage to health at the European level leads to even higher costs for healthcare. What measures does the Commission envisage to combat excessive alcohol consumption in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

In 2006 the European Commission adopted the EU Strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol related harm ([1]). One of the five priorities of this Strategy is to 'inform, educate and raise awareness on the impact of harmful and hazardous alcohol consumption, and on appropriate consumption patterns'.

The EU is implementing the strategy using two tools: the European Alcohol and Health Forum; and the Committee on National Alcohol Policy and Action. The strategy is currently being evaluated.

Since the adoption of the strategy, numerous actions have taken place through the Forum and the Committee. This includes 220 commitments ([2]) from industry, NGOs and other stakeholders, as well as regulatory action by Member States, such as higher age limits for selling and serving alcoholic beverages, lower blood alcohol limits for young drivers and tighter restrictions on television alcohol advertising to protect children and young people.

([1]) Communication of 24 October 2006, An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol related harm (COM(2006) 625 final), http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0625en01.pdf

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahf/index.jsp

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-003458/12
komissiolle
Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D)
(29. maaliskuuta 2012)

Aihe: Valko-Venäjän kisaisännyys jääkiekon maailmanmestaruuskisoissa 2014

Valko-Venäjä ei kunnioita ihmisoikeuksia eikä oikeusvaltion periaatteita. Maan tilanne on kuohuttanut eurooppalaisia jo pitkän aikaa ja saanut liikkeelle suuria massoja näyttämään mielipiteensä Valko-Venäjän toimia vastaan.

Euroopan parlamentti on tuominnut jyrkästi Valko-Venäjän ihmisoikeustilanteen ja viimeisimmän kehityksen, jossa maa on ajautunut käyttämään kuolemanrangaistusta ja jopa toimeenpannut teloituksia.

Tällainen ei ole millään tavalla hyväksyttävää ja varsinkin Euroopan unionin täytyy etummaisena painottaa tilanteen vakavuutta. Tällainen ei pitäisi olla mahdollista Euroopan keskiössä.

Vuoden 2014 jääkiekon maailmanmestaruuskisojen isännöinti on myönnetty Valko-Venäjälle. Suosittu urheilu kerää miljoonia katsojia seuraamaan kisoja joko paikan päälle tai televisioruudun kautta. Kansainvälisessä urheilussa on aina välitetty sanomaa reilusta pelistä, ja varsinkin nuorten maailmankuvaan tällä on iso merkitys. Tässä tilanteessa ei ole hyväksyttävää, että maailmanmestaruuskisat käydään sellaisessa valtiossa kuin Valko-Venäjä.

Onko komissiolla aikomuksena muodostaa kanta asiaan ja pyrkiä tällä tavoin mielipiteiden kautta vaikuttamaan Valko-Venäjän toimintaan? Eikö Euroopan parlamentin ehdoton mielipide siitä, ettei kisoja voi isännöidä maa, jossa ihmiset eivät saa elää vapaasti, täytyisi huomioida myös kaikilla Euroopan unionin poliittisilla tasoilla?

Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(15. kesäkuuta 2012)

EU on edelleen erittäin huolestunut Valko-Venäjällä tapahtuvista ihmisoikeusloukkauksista sekä demokratian ja oikeusvaltioperiaatteen laiminlyönnistä ja pahoittelee, että sortotoimet jatkuvat edelleen.

Ulkoasiainneuvosto teki 23. maaliskuuta 2012 yhteenvedon Valko-Venäjää koskevista näkökohdista ja toimintalinjoista. Tässä yhteydessä ulkoasiainneuvosto päätti pitää kansainvälisen jääkiekkoliiton sekä kansalliset jääkiekkoliitot tietoisina syvästä huolestaan siitä, ettei Valko-Venäjä kunnioita ihmisoikeuksia eikä demokratian periaatteita ja ettei se noudata oikeusvaltioperiaatetta.

Korkea edustaja, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashton seuraa tilanteen kehittymistä.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003458/12
to the Commission
Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D)
(29 March 2012)

Subject: Belarus as host of the 2014 Ice Hockey World Championship

Belarus respects neither human rights nor the rule of law. The situation in Belarus has long been a cause for concern for Europeans, inspiring mass demonstrations against the country's actions.

The European Parliament has roundly condemned the human rights situation in Belarus and the latest development, in which the country has resorted to capital punishment and executions have even been carried out.

This is totally unacceptable, and the European Union must take the lead in highlighting the seriousness of the situation. Such things should not be allowed to happen in the middle of Europe.

Belarus has been selected to host the 2014 Ice Hockey World Championship. This popular sport attracts millions of spectators, who will follow the championship either by attending matches or by watching them on television. International sport has always attempted to spread the word about fair play, a concept that has a significant impact on the world-view of young people in particular. That being the case, it is unacceptable to hold the world championship in a country such as Belarus.

Will the Commission take a stand on this matter and in that way, by bringing its views to bear, seek to influence Belarus's actions? Parliament categorically maintains that the championship should not be hosted by a country in which people are not allowed to live freely. Should not that opinion be taken into account within the EU at every other political level?

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

The EU remains gravely concerned about the continued lack of respect for human rights, democracy and rule of law in Belarus, and regrets that further repressive measures are taking place.

On 23 March 2012, the Foreign Affairs Council outlined its concerns and policies as regards Belarus. In this context, the Foreign Affairs Council agreed to keep International and National Ice Hockey Federations informed about its deep concerns as regards the lack of respect by Belarus for human rights, the rule of law and democratic principles.

On this basis, HR/VP Ashton remains engaged on this matter.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-003468/12
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(30 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Inclusione di Valle Grotari (Marano Lagunare (UD)) nelle aree della rete Natura 2000 (SIC IT3320037 e ZPS IT3320037 «Laguna di Marano e Grado»)

Valle Grotari (circa 13 ettari), è un'ex valle da pesca, abbandonata dalla metà degli anni '80. Dal 1991, come conseguenza della definitiva chiusura delle paratie mobili verso la laguna e del ristagno di acque meteoriche, si è sviluppato il canneto ed è risultato favorito l'insediamento di colonie di aironi (Ardeidae). Oggi è uno dei pochi fragmiteti del Nord Adriatico di ampia estensione non soggetti a marea. È uno dei tre potenziali siti riproduttivi regionali del tarabuso (Botaurus stellaris) (l'unico in cui si è accertata la nidificazione nel 2003).

Il ristagno di acqua piovana ha dato vita a un'abbondante fauna anfibia (da tutelare secondo la direttiva Habitat, articolo 12, e la Convenzione di Berna): Hyla intermedia, Rana klepton esculenta, Bombina variegata, Triturus carnifex. Ciò ha favorito la nidificazione di una consistente popolazione di tarabusino (*Ixobrychus minutus*) (15 coppie) e altri *Ardeidae*, con colonie riproduttive importanti a livello regionale: airone rosso (*Ardea purpurea*) (20 coppie), airone cenerino (*Ardea cinerea*) (50 coppie), nitticora (*Nycticorax nycticorax*) (6 coppie). Nella valle nidificano regolarmente il falco di palude (*Circus aeruginosus*) (1-2 coppie), l'oca selvatica (Anser anser) e il moriglione (Aythya ferina). Quasi tutte queste specie sono comprese nell'allegato I della direttiva Uccelli 2009/147. La check-list dell'avifauna conta ben 200 specie osservate, di cui 57 comprese nell'allegato I della direttiva Uccelli 2009/147, 39 specie certamente nidificanti e 4 probabili nidificanti.

Valle Grotari per la sua valenza è oggi inserita nella ZICO 062, una «zona importante per la conservazione degli uccelli» (in inglese IBA: Important Bird Area) sulla quale vigono le tutele disposte dalla direttiva Uccelli 2009/147, ma, rispondendo ai requisiti di «Natura 2000», potrebbe essere di certo designata come SIC («sito di importanza comunitaria») o come ZPS («zona di protezione speciale»). Ciononostante il Comune di Marano Lagunare (in provincia di Udine), proprietario dell'area, intende venderla a soggetti privati per realizzare una darsena da diporto con alberghi e residenze turistico-abitative, secondo un piano adottato nel 2004 che, nonostante il riscontro di incidenza negativa, è stato approvato dalla Regione Friuli-Venezia Giulia, con la prescrizione di banali forme di compensazione. Sull'argomento il WWF ha presentato una denuncia alla Commissione europea in data 19.5.2011.

Alla luce di quanto esposto, la Commissione non ritiene che, se tale progetto fosse realizzato, il sito in questione verrebbe irreversibilmente compromesso e che per tale motivo esso andrebbe urgentemente inserito nel limitrofo sito d'importanza comunitaria SIC IT3320037 e zona di protezione speciale ZPS IT3320037 «Laguna di Marano e Grado», i cui perimetri sono adiacenti all'area di cui si chiede l'inserimento?

Risposta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(21 maggio 2012)

Secondo le informazioni di cui dispone la Commissione, il sito Natura 2000 IT3320037 «Laguna di Marano e Grado» copre già una superficie superiore a 16 000 ettari e ospita numerose popolazioni delle specie (in particolare uccelli e anfibi) citate dall'onorevole parlamentare ed elencate negli allegati delle direttive «Uccelli» ([1]) e «Habitat» ([2]).

Le zone di protezione speciale sono selezionate e designate direttamente dagli Stati membri, mentre gli elenchi dei siti di importanza comunitaria sono adottati dalla Commissione in base alle proposte presentate dagli Stati membri.

Spetta pertanto alle autorità nazionali competenti valutare se, al fine di conseguire gli obiettivi di conservazione del sito Natura 2000 IT3320037, sia necessaria e opportuna un'ulteriore estensione della sua superficie.

([1]) Direttiva 2009/147/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 30 novembre 2009, concernente la conservazione degli uccelli selvatici (GU L 20 del 26.1.2010, pag. 7) che codifica la direttiva 79/409/CEE del Consiglio, del 2 aprile 1979, concernente la conservazione degli uccelli selvatici (GU L 103 del 25.4.1979).

([2]) GU L 206 del 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003468/12
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(30 March 2012)

Subject: Inclusion of Valle Grotari (in Marano Lagunare in the province of Udine) in Natura 2000 network areas (SCI IT3320037 and SPA IT3320037 'Laguna di Marano e Grado')

Valle Grotari (approximately 13 hectares) is a former fishing valley, abandoned since the mid-1980s. Since 1991, as a result of the definitive closure of the mobile flood walls near the lagoon and the stagnation of meteoric water, a reed bed has developed, which has encouraged a colony of herons (*Ardeidae*) to become established. Today, it is one of the few reed beds in the North Adriatic not affected by tides. It is one of three potential regional breeding grounds for the great bittern (*Botaurus stellaris*) (the only one at which nesting was verified in 2003).

Stagnating rainwater has given life to an abundant array of amphibious fauna (to be protected in accordance with Article 12 of the Habitats Directive and with the Berne Convention): *Hyla intermedia*, *Rana klepton esculenta*, *Bombina variegata*, *Triturus carnifex*. This has encouraged nesting by a substantial population of little bittern (*Ixobrychus minutus*) (15 pairs) and other *Ardeidae*, with significant breeding colonies on a regional level of purple heron (*Ardea purpurea*) (20 pairs), grey heron (*Ardea cinerea*) (50 pairs), and black-crowned night heron (*Nycticorax nycticorax*) (6 pairs). The valley is a regular nesting site for the marsh harrier (*Circus aeruginosus*) (1-2 pairs), greylag goose (*Anser anser*) and the common pochard (*Aythya ferina*). Virtually all these species are included in Annex I to the Birds Directive 2009/147/EC. The checklist of birds includes 200 observed species, 57 of which are listed in Annex I to the Birds Directive 2009/147/EC, 39 species that are certainly nesting and 4 probably nesting.

In view of its value, Valle Grotari is now included within Important Bird Area (IBA) No 062, which is covered by the protections laid down by the Birds Directive 2009/147/EC, but since it satisfies the requirements of 'Natura 2000', it could be classified as an SCI (site of Community importance) or SPA (Special Protection Area). Nonetheless, the municipality of Marano Lagunare (in the province of Udine), which owns the area, intends to sell it to private investors to build a marina for pleasure craft, with hotels and tourist and residential accommodation, according to a plan adopted in 2004 that, despite the negative reaction, has been approved by the regional authorities of the Friuli-Venezia Giulia region, with trivial compensation being provided. In this regard, the WWF filed a complaint with the European Commission on 19 May 2011.

In view of the above, does the Commission believe that, were this project to be undertaken, the site in question would be irreversibly compromised and it should therefore be urgently included within the neighbouring site of Community importance (SCI IT3320037) and special protection area (SPA IT3320037) 'Laguna di Marano e Grado', the borders of which are adjacent to the area for which inclusion is sought?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2012)

According to the information available to the Commission, the Natura 2000 site IT3320037 'Laguna di Marano e Grado' already covers an area of over 16 000 ha and includes significant populations of the species (namely birds and amphibians) mentioned by the Honourable Member and included in the annexes of the Birds ([1]) and Habitats ([2]) Directives.

Special Protection Areas are selected and designated directly by Member States, while the lists of Sites of Community Importance are adopted by the Commission on the basis of the proposals submitted by the Member States.

It is therefore up to the competent national authorities to assess whether, in order to achieve the conservation objectives of the Natura 2000 site IT3320037, a further extension of its area is necessary and appropriate.

([1]) Directive 2009/147/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds (OJ L 20/7, 26.1.2010) that codifies Council Directive 79/409/EEC of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds (OJ L 103, 25.4.1979).

([2]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-003470/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(30. marts 2012)

Om: EUROGENDFOR

Hvad kan Europa-Kommissionen oplyse om politiorganisationen EUROGENDFOR generelt og om organisationens historie, organisation, regelgrundlag, budget og styrketal specielt?

Vil Kommissionen tillige oplyse, hvorledes EURGENDFOR forholder sig til EU-medlemsstaternes normale politistyrker, herunder paramilitære politistyrker og Europol, i forhold til operationer, informations- og efterretningsudveksling og andre aktiviteter?

Kan EUROGENDFOR efter Kommissionens opfattelse operere, herunder udveksle efterretningsoplysninger, i hele verden, i hele EU eller kun i de stater, som samarbejder i EUROGENDFOR?

Samlet svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Cecilia Malmström
(16. maj 2012)

Den europæiske gendarmeristyrke er ikke et EU-organ. Europa-Kommissionen er ikke involveret i eller har kompetence i forhold til styrkens missioner, opgaver, interne organisation eller operationer. Kommissionen er derfor heller ikke i stand til at oplyse detaljer om disse, herunder aspekter som organisationens budget eller våbenforsyning.

Den europæiske gendarmeristyrke er oprettet af fem EU-medlemsstater (Frankrig, Nederlandene, Spanien, Portugal og Italien) ved en traktat mellem landene den 18. oktober 2007. Det erklærede mål var, at EU-medlemsstater som havde en national politistyrke med militær status, skulle kunne blive medlem af organisationen. I 2008 tiltrådte Rumænien som sjette medlem.

Der kan findes yderligere information på EGF's hjemmeside:
http://www.eurogendfor.eu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003470/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(30 March 2012)

Subject: European Gendarmerie Force (Eurogendfor)

What information can the European Commission provide on the Eurogendfor police organisation in general and on its history, structure, underlying rules, budget and manpower numbers in particular?

Will the Commission also provide information on the relation between Eurogendfor and the EU Member States' ordinary police forces, including paramilitary police forces and Europol, with respect to operations, exchange of information and intelligence, and other activities?

Is it the understanding of the Commission that Eurogendfor may operate and exchange intelligence in the entire world, in the entire EU or only in the states that cooperate within Eurogendfor?

Question for written answer E-003548/12
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: European Gendarmerie Force budget

Could the Commission please advise me of the current annual budget for the European Gendarmerie Force?

Question for written answer E-003551/12
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: European Gendarmerie Force — operational deployments

Could the Commission please provide me with a list of all operational deployments of the European Gendarmerie Force since its inauguration on 23 January 2006?

Question for written answer E-003552/12
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: European Gendarmerie Force — Weaponry

Could the Commission please provide details of weapons and munitions that have been procured for the use of the European Gendarmerie Force?

Please advise as to the number of weapons, listed by type, that are currently issued to the EGF, and the number of weapons that are currently in storage.

Please also advise as to the cost of these weapons and munitions.

Joint answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2012)

The European Gendarmerie Force (EGF) is not an EU body. The European Commission has no involvement in or competence for the missions, tasks, internal organisation or operations of EGF. The Commission is therefore not in a position to provide details of these matters, including aspects concerning the EGF's budget or weapons procurement.

The European Gendarmerie Force is an initiative of five EU Member States (France, the Netherlands, Spain, Portugal and Italy) and was established by a treaty between those countries on 18 October 2007. Their stated intention was for membership of the EGF to be open to those EU Member States which have a national police force with military status. In 2008 Romania jointed as the sixth member.

Further information can be found at the website of the EGF
http://www.eurogendfor.eu

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003480/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(30. März 2012)

Betrifft: Lobby- und Interessengruppenkontake zum Thema ACTA

Die Kommission hat im Namen der Europäischen Union und ihrer Mitgliedstaaten an den zwischenstaatlichen Verhandlungen über das Abkommen zur Bekämpfung von Produkt- und Markenpiraterie (ACTA) teilgenommen. Nach Meinung des Fragestellers rechtfertigen die Brisanz des Abkommens sowie das bestehende öffentliche Interesse daran auch den zusätzlichen Aufwand, den die Kommission zur Beantwortung der folgenden Fragen möglicherweise aufbringen muss.

Seit die Kommission an den Verhandlungen über das ACTA beteiligt ist:

1. Welche Lobby- oder Interessengruppen kontaktierten die Kommission zum Thema ACTA?

2. Welche dieser Kontakte erfolgten vor Beginn der Verhandlungen?

3. Welche dieser Kontakte erfolgten, während das ACTA noch in der Entwurfs- und Verhandlungsphase war?

4. Wird die Kommission Lobbyvorschläge und -kommentare, die sie während der ACTA-Verhandlungen erhalten hat, veröffentlichen?

5. Mit welchen Lobby- oder Interessengruppen zum Thema ACTA trafen sich Vertreter der Kommission?

6. Welche dieser Treffen erfolgten, während das ACTA noch in der Entwurfs- und Verhandlungsphase war?

7. Wie viele Einzelpersonen kontaktierten die Kommission mit Fragen oder Bedenken zum Thema ACTA, entweder direkt die zuständigen Generaldirektionen oder über den Bürgerinformationsdienst Europe Direct oder ähnliche Kanäle?

Antwort von Karel De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(8. Juni 2012)

Seit die Kommission vor fünf Jahren ihre Absicht zur Aufnahme der ACTA-Verhandlungen bekannt gegeben hatte, wurde sie von mehreren Hunderten Vertretern von Unternehmen, Wirtschaftsverbänden und Nichtregierungsorganisationen sowie Privatpersonen und selbst Drittländern mit einem Interesse an ACTA kontaktiert und trat mit ihnen zusammen. Bei vielen anderen Vorgängen handelt die Kommission ähnlich. Der Herr Abgeordnete wird verstehen, dass die Kommission keine Datenbank sämtlicher Organisationen und Einzelpersonen führt, die sie zu einem bestimmten Thema kontaktieren, und dass es kein besonders effizienter Einsatz der Mittel wäre, in dieser Phase mit einer solch detaillierten Liste zu beginnen.

Es gab zwei Anträge auf Zugang zu Dokumenten gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1049/2001 ([1]), die von der Kommission beantwortet wurden und einen detaillierten Überblick über die vom Herrn Abgeordneten angeforderten Informationen für bestimmte Verhandlungsabschnitte geben. Bei diesen Anträgen ging es auch um von Lobbyisten oder Interessengruppen eingegangene Unterlagen.

Grundsätzlich veröffentlicht die Kommission keine Eingaben von Lobbyisten oder Interessengruppen, es sei denn, sie sind im Rahmen einer öffentlichen Konsultation eingegangen. Außerdem ist eine solche Veröffentlichung unter bestimmten Voraussetzungen auf einen Antrag auf Zugang zu Dokumenten hin möglich.

Die Kommission kann dem Herrn Abgeordneten versichern, dass sie die ACTA-Verhandlungen vollkommen unabhängig, wie in solchen Fällen üblich, und im Einklang mit den Verhandlungsrichtlinien des Rates geführt hat.

([1]) ABl. L 145 vom 31.5.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003480/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(30 March 2012)

Subject: Contacts with lobby and interest groups in relation to the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA)

The Commission has taken part in the intergovernmental negotiations on the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) on behalf of the European Union and its Member States. In the author's opinion, the sensitive nature of the agreement and the high level of public interest justify the additional effort the Commission may need to expend in answering the following questions.

Since the Commission has been involved in the ACTA negotiations:

1. Which lobby or interest groups have contacted the Commission in relation to ACTA?

2. Which of these contacts took place before the start of negotiations?

3. Which of these contacts took place while ACTA was still in the draft or negotiation phase?

4. Will the Commission publish the lobbyists' proposals and comments it received during the ACTA negotiations?

5. With which lobby or interest groups did representatives of the Commission meet in relation to ACTA?

6. Which of these meetings took place while ACTA was still in the draft or negotiation phase?

7. How many individuals contacted the Commission with questions or concerns in relation to ACTA, either directly through the responsible Directorates-General, or through the Europe Direct citizens' information service, or similar channels?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(8 June 2012)

In the five years since the Commission announced its intention to negotiate ACTA, it has been contacted by, and has held meetings with, several hundreds of representatives from companies, business associations, non-governmental organisations, private citizens and even third country governments with an interest in ACTA. This practice has been similar to many other files handled by the Commission. The Honourable Member will understand that the Commission does not keep a database of all the entities or individuals that contact it on a specific subject, and that it would not be the most efficient use of resources to start compiling such a detailed list at this stage.

There were two requests of access to documents made pursuant to Regulation (EC) 1049/2001 ([1]), to which the Commission replied, which provide a detailed overview of the information requested by the Honourable Member for certain periods of the negotiation. These requests also concern documents received from lobbyists or interest groups.

As a general practice, the Commission does not publish submissions by lobbyists or interest groups, unless they are received under a public consultation process. Such publication may also take place, under certain conditions, following a request for access to documents.

The Honourable Member can rest assured that, as usual, the Commission has conducted the ACTA negotiations in full independence, and according to the negotiating guidelines provided by the Council.

([1]) OJ L 145, 31.5.2001.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003505/12
adresată Comisiei
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(30 martie 2012)

Subiect: Antibioticele și agricultura

Produsele antimicrobiene sunt utilizate în mod obișnuit atât în tratarea, cât și în prevenirea bolilor la animalele de la care se obțin alimente. Aceste practici reprezintă o amenințare reală la adresa sănătății umane. Pot fi transmise bacterii rezistente la antibiotice persoanelor care lucrează cu animale și cu carnea crudă. Acestea se pot transmite și prin alimente insuficient preparate termic sau prin mediu, aer, apă sau sol.

Deoarece bacteriile rezistente la antibiotice călătoresc odată cu alimentele dincolo de frontiere, este necesar să se întreprindă acțiuni la nivel regional și global.

Aș dori să adresez Comisiei următoarele întrebări:

1. Cum intenționează să reducă utilizarea neesențială de antibiotice în exploatațiile agricole?

2. În UE, antibioticele de pe rețetele de uz veterinar încă se pot utiliza ca „stimulente de creștere” și ca o asigurare ieftină împotriva posibilității izbucnirii unei epidemii. Cum va monitoriza Comisia acest aspect? Are o strategie prin care să pună capăt situației în care veterinarii profită de pe urma vânzărilor directe de antibiotice?

3. Standardele ecologice din SUA interzic în totalitate utilizarea de antibiotice în exploatațiile agricole. Are și UE planuri privind măsuri similare în viitorul apropiat? Când?

4. Având în vedere modurile diferite de prescriere a antibioticelor în statele membre, cum intenționează Comisia să monitorizeze atât cantitățile de antibiotice utilizate, cât și modul de prescriere a acestora?

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

Comisia a adoptat un plan de acțiune împotriva riscului tot mai mare reprezentat de rezistența la antimicrobiene ([1]). Este de așteptat ca unele dintre acțiunile prevăzute să ducă la o reducere a utilizării neesențiale a antibioticelor.

Din 2006, este în vigoare în UE o interdicție a utilizării antimicrobienelor pentru stimularea creșterii. Astfel, antibioticele nu pot fi utilizate decât în scopuri terapeutice, după examinarea și prescrierea unei rețete de către un medic veterinar. Autoritatea competentă din statul membru în cauză se asigură că sunt respectate cerințele legale. Legislația UE privind furajele cu conținut medicamentos și medicamentele de uz veterinar este în curs de revizuire, iar Comisia se va asigura că problema rezistenței la antimicrobiene va fi abordată în mod corespunzător.

Planul de acțiune al Comisiei cuprinde toate tipurile de producție, fără a face vreo diferențiere între agricultura convențională și cea ecologică. Comisia nu are intenția de a interzice folosirea în scopuri terapeutice a antibioticelor în standardele pentru agricultura ecologică ([2]).

În 2009, Comisia a solicitat Agenției Europene pentru Medicamente (EMA) să ia inițiativa colectării de date privind utilizarea antimicrobienelor în cazul animalelor. Primul raport privind Ancheta europeană asupra consumului de antimicrobiene de uz veterinar a fost publicat în septembrie 2011 ([3]).

([1]) COM (2011) 748 final, 15.11.2011.
([2]) Din cunoștințele Comisiei, în agricultura din SUA, utilizarea fără scop terapeutic a antibioticelor este încă permisă.
([3]) EMA/238630/2011, Tendințe în vânzările de agenți antimicrobieni de uz veterinar în nouă țări europene, Utilizarea antimicrobienelor, p. 173. A se vedea la: .
http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Report/2011/09/WC500112309.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003505/12
to the Commission
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)
(30 March 2012)

Subject: Antibiotics and farming

Antimicrobials are routinely used in food-producing animals for both the treatment and prevention of disease. These practices pose a real threat to human health. Antibiotic-resistant bacteria can be transmitted to humans working with animals and raw meat. They can also be transmitted through undercooked food or through the environment via air, water or soil.

As resistant bacteria travel with the food across borders, action needs to be taken at regional and global levels.

I would like to ask the Commission the following:

1. How does it intend to reduce the non-essential use of antibiotics on farms?

2. Veterinary prescription antibiotics can still be used in the EU as 'growth promoters' and as cheap insurance against the possibility of a disease outbreak. How will the Commission monitor this aspect? Does it have a strategy to put an end to veterinarians profiting from direct sales of antibiotics?

3. US organic standards impose a total ban on the use of antibiotics on farms. Does the EU have plans for a similar measure in the near future? When?

4. Given the differences in antibiotic prescription patterns in the Member States, how does the Commission intend to monitor both the quantities of antibiotics used and the way they are prescribed?

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

The Commission has adopted an action plan against the rising threat of antimicrobial resistance ([1]). Some of the actions foreseen are expected to result in a reduction of the non-essential use of antibiotics.

Since 2006, in the EU there is a ban on antimicrobial growth promoters. Thus, antibiotics can only be used for therapeutic purposes after examination and prescription by a veterinarian. The Competent Authority of the Member States shall ensure that the legal requirements are complied with. The EU legislation on medicated feed and veterinary medicinal products is currently under revision and the Commission will ensure that the issue of antimicrobial resistance will be addressed appropriately.

The Commission Action Plan covers all types of production without differentiating between conventional and organic farming. The Commission has no plan to ban the therapeutic use of antibiotics in the standards for organic farming ([2]).

In 2009 the Commission asked the European Medicines Agency (EMA) to take a lead in collecting data on the use of antimicrobials in animals. The first report on European Surveillance of Veterinary Antimicrobial Consumption was published in September 2011 ([3]).

([1]) COM(2011) 748 final of 15.11.2011.
([2]) According to Commission knowledge, in US farming, the non-therapeutic use of antibiotics is still allowed.
([3]) EMA/238630/2011, Trends in the sales of veterinary antimicrobial agents in nine European Countries Antimicrobial use, p. 173. See at: http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Report/2011/09/WC500112309.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-003516/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(2. april 2012)

Om: Offentlige udbud I

I moderniseringen af direktivet om offentlige udbud lægger Kommissionen op til, at der kan stilles krav til de tilbudsgivende virksomheder om at udarbejde beregninger over levetidsomkostningerne ved produktet.

Hvis en virksomhed foretager en fejlagtig beregning, der fører til lavere forventede levetidsomkostninger, vil de komme til at stå bedre i vurderingen af det økonomisk mest fordelagtige tilbud.

— Kan Kommissionen afklare, hvem der i givet fald kommer til at stå med ansvaret for en levetidsomkostningsberegning, hvor forudsætninger ikke holder, fordi de enten har været fejlagtige fra starten, eller der er opstået uforudsete hændelser undervejs i levetiden? Eksempelvis udefrakommende påvirkninger eller uforudset stor slitage. Vil det være den tilbudsgivende virksomhed eller den ordregivende myndighed, som skal dække en eventuel fejlagtig beregning?

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-003517/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(2. april 2012)

Om: Offentlige udbud II

I moderniseringen af direktivet om offentlige udbud lægger Kommissionen op til, at der kan stilles krav til de tilbudsgivende virksomheder om at udarbejde beregninger over levetidsomkostningerne ved produktet.

— I hvilket omfang vil Kommissionen stille standarder til rådighed for de ordregivende myndigheder, så de ikke selv skal udarbejde metoder til beregning af levetidsomkostningerne ved hver enkelt opgavetype?

— I hvilket omfang vil Kommissionen stille krav til de ordregivende myndigheder om at beskrive den forventede brug af de bestilte varer og den forventede slitage. Det kan eksempelvis være vedrørende nedslidningsgraden af et nyt gulv i en gymnastiksal, hvor der vil være stor forskel på slitagen, i forhold til hvor mange børn der bruger gymnastiksalen. Slitagegraden vil afhænge af materialevalget, men vil også have en indirekte påvirkning på rengørings- samt opvarmningsbehovet. I hvilket omfang forventer Kommissionen, at den form for indirekte omkostninger skal indgå i en levetidsomkostning ved et byggeprojekt?

— Hvis der ikke stilles standarder til rådighed, vil det højst sandsynligt føre til voldsomt øgede administrative byrder for de ordregivende myndigheder samt de tilbudsgivende virksomheder. I hvilket omfang deler Kommissionen denne bekymring?

Samlet svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Michel Barnier
(30. maj 2012)

Forslagene om reformer af direktiverne om offentlige udbud ([1]) giver ganske rigtigt mulighed for at vurdere omkostningerne ved tilbud ud fra levetidsomkostningerne.

Disse direktiver fastlægger dog kun proceduren for indgåelse af kontrakten. Ved fejlagtig beregning af omkostningerne reguleres ansvarsfordelingen mellem den ordregivende myndighed og tilbudsgiveren af den nationale lovgivning.

De ordregivende myndigheder er ikke forpligtede til at inddrage levetidsomkostningerne. Det står dem frit for at anvende dem eller at lade være, hvis de vurderer, at den administrative byrde er for stor.

([1]) KOM(2011)0896 endelig og KOM(2011)0895 endelig.

Kommissionen giver det ærede parlamentsmedlem ret i, at det er nødvendigt at fastsætte regler for beregning af levetidsomkostningerne. Det kunne være både europæiske, nationale eller regionale regler. Reglerne bør være tilpasset de enkelte produkter, idet omkostningerne ved brug i høj grad varierer. Forslagene til direktiverne om offentlige udbud indeholder derfor ikke én enkelt metode, men henviser til den sektorspecifikke lovgivning, som i de kommende år vil udvikle sine egne metoder. Den første sektorspecifikke lovgivning er direktiv 2009/33/EF (om renere og mere energieffektive køretøjer) ([2]).

([2]) EUT L 120 af 15.5.2009, s. 5.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003516/12
to the Commission
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Public procurement I

As part of the modernisation of the Public Procurement Directive, the Commission is proposing that contracting entities should be required to provide calculations of the life-cycle costs of products.

If a business makes a faulty calculation which leads to lower expected life-cycle costs, this will give it an advantage when an assessment is made of what is the most financially attractive tender.

— Can the Commission explain who will be liable if a life-cycle cost calculation does not hold true, either because it was incorrect from the start or because unforeseen events have occurred during the life-cycle of the product — for example external factors or unexpectedly severe wear and tear? Would the tenderer or the contracting entity have to bear the consequences of a faulty calculation?

Question for written answer E-003517/12
to the Commission
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Public procurement II

As part of the modernisation of the Public Procurement Directive, the Commission is proposing that contracting entities should be required to provide calculations of the life-cycle costs of products.

— To what extent will the Commission provide standards for contracting authorities so that they do not have to devise life-cycle costing methods themselves for every single type of work?

— To what extent will the Commission require contracting authorities to describe the expected use of the goods ordered and expected wear and tear? An example could be the degree of wear of a new floor in a gymnasium, which would be subject to differing degrees of wear and tear depending on the number of children using the hall. The degree of wear and tear will depend on the choice of materials, but usage will also have an indirect effect on cleaning and heating requirements. To what extent does the Commission expect such indirect costs to be included in the life-cycle costs for a construction project?

— If no standards are available, it is highly likely that there will be a sharp increase in the administrative burden for contracting authorities and tenderers. To what extent does the Commission share this concern?

(Version française)

Réponse commune donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(30 mai 2012)

Les propositions de réforme des directives sur les marchés publics ([1]) prévoient en effet la possibilité d'évaluer le coût des offres sur la base du coût du cycle de vie.

Ces directives ne réglementent que la procédure d'attribution du contrat. Les responsabilités respectives du pouvoir adjudicateur et du soumissionnaire pour les conséquences d'erreurs de calcul des coûts sont régies par le droit national.

Les pouvoirs adjudicateurs ne sont pas obligés d'utiliser le coût du cycle de vie; ils en ont simplement la possibilité et demeurent libres de ne pas l'utiliser s'ils estiment que la charge administrative est trop élevée.

([1]) COM(2011) 896 final; COM(2011) 895 final.

La Commission partage l'opinion de l'Honorable Parlementaire sur la nécessité de définir des méthodes standard pour l'évaluation du coût du cycle de vie. Il peut s'agir de standards européens, nationaux ou régionaux. Ceux-ci doivent être de plus adaptés aux spécificités du produit en question, étant donné les coûts d'utilisation qui varient considérablement. C'est pourquoi les propositions de directives sur les marchés publics ne prévoient pas de méthodologie unique. Elles renvoient aux législations sectorielles qui développeront ces méthodologies spécifiques dans les années à venir. La première de ces législations sectorielles est la directive 2009/33/CE («véhicules propres») ([2]).

([2]) JO L 120 du 15.5.2009, p. 5.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-003518/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(2. april 2012)

Om: Offentlige udbud III

Af det medfølgende materiale til direktivet om modernisering af offentlige udbud fremgår det, at direkte grænseoverskridende udbud stod for 3,6 % af værdien af de udbudte kontrakter.

— Kan Kommissionen oplyse, hvor stor en del af disse kontrakter, der havde en værdi på mere end 1 mio. EUR?

— Eller formuleret anderledes. Kan Kommissionen oplyse, hvor stor en andel af de grænseoverskridende udbud der ikke ville være blevet grænseoverskridende, hvis tærskelværdien for EU-udbud havde været 1 mio. EUR i stedet for den eksisterende tærskelværdi på ca. 200 000 EUR?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Michel Barnier
(28. maj 2012)

Det ærede medlem henviser til en tærskelværdi på ca. 200 000 EUR, som gælder for kontrakter vedrørende tjenesteydelser og vareindkøb, der indgås af decentrale offentlige myndigheder. De resultater, der omtales i dette svar, vil på grund af metodemæssige forskelle måske ikke helt kunne sammenlignes med resultaterne af den undersøgelse ([1]), som det ærede medlem omtaler.

Tallene fra Tenders Electronic Daily (TED) ([2]) viser, at i de tre år, der er omfattet af undersøgelsen (2007-2009), indgik de decentrale offentlige myndigheder i medlemsstaterne ca. 800 individuelle kontrakter om varer og tjenesteydelser af en værdi på over 1 000 000 EUR på direkte grænseoverskridende grundlag. Disse kontrakter havde en værdi af ca. 8,6 mia. EUR i alt. Der blev indgået over 2 000 kontrakter med en værdi på mellem 200 000 og 1 000 000 EUR, svarende til ca. 900 mio. EUR i alt. Disse tal kan ikke sammenlignes direkte med den samlede procentsats for grænseoverskridende kontrakter i undersøgelsen, som omfatter flere andre kategorier af kontrakter, der er underlagt forskellige tærskelværdier.

Endelig bemærker Kommissionen, at kontrakter til en værdi på ca. 40 mia. EUR — herunder f.eks. kontrakter, der ikke er direkte grænseoverskridende — ikke længere vil være underlagt kravene i direktiverne, hvis tærsklen for den relevante kategori af kontrakter hæves til 1 000 000 EUR. Den deraf manglende gennemsigtighed vil i uforholdsmæssig grad kunne ramme mindre virksomheder, som ofte afgiver tilbud på mindre kontrakter. Da EU's forpligtelser inden for rammerne af WTO's aftale om offentlige indkøb (GPA) desuden falder ind under direktiverne, kan EU blive nødt til at tilbyde sine GPA-partnere erstatning op til et tilsvarende beløb.

([1]) Se: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/docs/modernising_rules/cross-border-procurement_en.pdf
([2]) http://ted.europa.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003518/12
to the Commission
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Public procurement III

The accompanying material to the directive on modernising public contracts states that direct cross-border tenders accounted for 3.6 % of the value of public contracts.

— Can the Commission say how large a portion of these contracts had a value of over EUR 1 million?

— Or formulated another way: can the Commission state how large a portion of cross-border contracts would not have been cross-border had the threshold for EU public contracts been EUR 1 million instead of the present threshold of approximately EUR 200 000?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2012)

The Honourable Member refers to a threshold of about EUR 200 000, which applies to services and supply contracts awarded by sub-central government authorities. The results reported in this reply may not be comparable to those of the study ([1]) to which the Honourable Member's question refers due to methodological differences.

The data extracted from Tenders Electronic Daily (TED) ([2]) suggests that in the three years covered by the study (2007-2009), sub-central government authorities in Member States awarded approximately 800 individual contracts for goods and services with values above EUR 1 000 000 on a direct cross border basis. These were worth about EUR 8.6 billion in aggregate. There were over 2000 contracts with values between EUR 200 000 and EUR 1 000 000, worth about EUR 900 million in aggregate. These numbers cannot be compared directly with the overall percentage of cross-border contracts reported in the study, which includes several other categories of contracts subject to different thresholds.

Finally, the Commission notes that contracts worth about EUR 40 billion — including for example those awarded on an indirect cross-border basis — would no longer be subject to the requirements of the directives if the threshold for the relevant category of contracts were raised to EUR 1 000 000. The consequent loss of transparency would disproportionately impact smaller companies, which tend to bid for lower value contracts. Moreover, as the EU's commitments in the context of the WTO Government Procurement Agreement (GPA) are linked to the scope of the directives, the EU would potentially have to offer its GPA partners compensation up to a similar amount.

([1]) See at: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/docs/modernising_rules/cross-border-procurement_en.pdf
([2]) http://ted.europa.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003525/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Poverty in the EU

With more than 80 million people in the EU at risk of poverty, including 20 million children and 8 % of the working population, the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion sets a framework for action aimed at achieving the EU target of lifting at least 20 million people out of poverty and social exclusion by 2020.

— What progress has the Commission made in tackling the issue of child poverty in the EU as part of the Europe 2020 strategy?

— Has the Commission reviewed policy relating to the Europe 2020 strategy in order to measure its effectiveness in reducing poverty within the EU?

— How does the Commission propose to tackle the issue of poverty further, with specific reference to those Member States that are experiencing financial crises and implementing severe austerity measures?

— Has the Commission formulated any further policy regarding the situation of the working poor in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

The inclusion of a poverty reduction target in the Europe 2020 strategy led a number of Member States to set specific sub-targets relating to child poverty. A majority of them mentioned child poverty as an important challenge in their National Reform Programme (NRP) and the Joint Assessment Framework also focuses on monitoring child poverty.

The Commission is preparing a recommendation on child poverty this year that will set out common principles to support and monitor Member States' policies.

During the European Semester, the Commission reviews Member States' commitment and progress keeping in mind the overall poverty reduction goals of the Europe 2020 strategy. Social implications have been taken into account when preparing the adjustment policies to help ensuring that reforms are conducted in a socially responsible way. The countries themselves are ultimately responsible for the design of the measures.

In-work poverty has been identified as a major challenge in the 2008 recommendation on active inclusion. The Commission has developed indicators on in-work poverty and uses these to support, where relevant, the formulation of Country Specific Recommendations to Member States.

Finally, the recently adopted Employment Package ([1]) is emphasising the need of decent and sustainable wages. Setting minimum wages at appropriate levels can help prevent growing in-work poverty. Nevertheless, wage floors need to be sufficiently adjustable, with the involvement of the social partners to reflect overall economic developments. Moreover, the Package refers to the use of in-work benefits to alleviate in-work poverty, although, low-wage traps should be avoided.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/andor/headlines/news/2012/04/20120418_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003531/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(2 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Inadempimenti finanziari dello Stato italiano verso la Sardegna

Il Parlamento regionale della Sardegna ha votato un ordine del giorno secondo il quale «il Consiglio Regionale, preso atto delle ripetute violazioni dei principi di sussidiarietà e di leale collaborazione da parte del Governo e dello Stato italiano nei confronti della Regione Sardegna, delibera di avviare… la verifica dei rapporti di lealtà istituzionale sociale e civile con lo Stato, che dovrebbero essere a fondamento della presenza e della permanenza della Regione Sardegna nella Repubblica italiana». Dal 2004 la Regione Sardegna ha aperto formalmente, con lo Stato centralista italiano, una vertenza riguardante la mancata corresponsione di quanto dovuto sulla base dei patti vigenti in materia fiscale, in quanto «i sette decimi dell'Irpef e delle altre imposte (Iva, accise) che sarebbero dovuti rientrare nel bilancio regionale alla voce entrate non sarebbero stati versati dal 1991».

Tale vertenza risulta tuttora aperta e, motivando questo suo atteggiamento con l'attuale crisi finanziaria, lo Stato italiano continua a non adempiere ai suoi doveri finanziari verso la Sardegna.

Può dire la Commissione se intende, anche alla luce di tali inadempimenti dello Stato italiano rispetto ai propri doveri finanziari verso la Regione Sardegna, sostenere progetti di sviluppo produttivo e occupazionale di questa importante regione europea?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(7 giugno 2012)

Le questioni finanziarie tra l'Italia e la regione Sardegna non rientrano nelle competenze della Commissione.

Per quanto concerne l'attività economica e la creazione di posti di lavoro nella regione Sardegna, i Fondi strutturali recano un contributo significativo alla regione con i programmi del Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale e del Fondo sociale europeo. Tali programmi includono finanziamenti sostanziali a sostegno delle piccole e medie imprese e dell'occupazione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003531/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Failure by Italy to meet its financial obligations regarding Sardinia

The Sardinian Regional Council has adopted an agenda, according to which, in view of the repeated infringements by the Government and the Italian State of the principles of subsidiarity and open cooperation with the Region of Sardinia, it has decided to examine relations with the State in terms of social and civil institutional loyalty, which should form the basis for the Region of Sardinia being and remaining part of the Republic of Italy. In 2004, the Region of Sardinia formally initiated proceedings against the centralist Italian State for failure to pay what it owes under the tax agreements in force, 0.7 % of personal income tax and other taxes (VAT, excise duty), which should have been recovered in the regional budget as income, not having been paid since 1991.

These proceedings are still ongoing and, using the current financial crisis to justify its position, the Italian State is still failing to fulfil its financial obligations with regard to Sardinia.

Can the Commission say whether, also in view of the Italian Government's failure to fulfil its financial obligations with regard to the Region of Sardinia, it will support development projects for industry and employment in this important European region?

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

The financial issues between Italy and the region of Sardinia do not fall within the competence of the Commission.

As regards economic activity and job creation in the region of Sardinia, the Structural Funds contribute significantly in the form of the programmes of the European Regional Development Fund and the European Social Fund in the region. These programmes include substantial funds in support of small and medium-sized enterprises and employment.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003534/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(2 de abril de 2012)

Assunto: Duplicação do limite para a ajuda «de minimis» — seca em Portugal

A Ministra da Agricultura, Mar, Ambiente e Ordenamento do Território, de Portugal, no início de março, anunciou publicamente que ia solicitar à Comissão Europeia autorização para se duplicar o limite para a ajuda «de minimis».

Em aditamento à pergunta (P-002478/2012) anteriormente formulada sobre o problema da seca em Portugal, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Confirma a receção deste pedido?

2. Em que data foi o pedido recebido?

3. Que resposta deu ou vai dar a Comissão a este pedido?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(15 de maio de 2012)

A Comissão recebeu efetivamente, a 17 de março, um pedido de flexibilização do limiar dos auxílios *de minimis*. A este propósito, a Comissão salientou que os atuais montantes dos auxílios em questão são fixados pelo Regulamento (CE) n.° 1535/2007 da Comissão([1]), para os produtores primários, e pelo Regulamento (CE) n.° 1998/2006 da Comissão([2]), para as empresas de transformação e comercialização de produtos agrícolas, bem como para as atividades industriais em geral. A Comissão precisou igualmente que ambos os regulamentos expiram no final de 2013 e que, no âmbito da respetiva revisão, os limiares dos auxílios *de minimis* serão reexaminados e, se necessário, alterados.

([1]) JO L 337 de 21.12.2007, p. 35.
([2]) JO L 379 de 28.12.2006, p. 5.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003534/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Doubling of the limit for *de minimis* aid — drought in Portugal

At the start of March, the Portuguese Minister of Agriculture, Sea, Environment and Spatial Planning publicly announced that she was going to request permission from the European Commission to double the limit for *de minimis* aid.

As a follow-up to a question (P-002478/2012) that I have previously asked on the problem of drought in Portugal, can the Commission state:

1. Does it confirm receipt of this request?

2. On what date was the request received?

3. What answer did or will the Commission give to this request?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Cioloş au nom de la Commission
(15 mai 2012)

La Commission a effectivement reçu, le 17 mars, une demande de flexibilisation du plafond des aides *de minimis*. À ce propos, la Commission a souligné que les montants actuels des aides en question sont fixés par le règlement (CE) nº 1535/2007 de la Commission ([1]), pour les producteurs primaires, et par le règlement (CE) nº 1998/2006 de la Commission ([2]), pour les entreprises de transformation et de commercialisation de produits agricoles, ainsi que pour les activités industrielles en général. La Commission a également précisé que ces deux règlements expireront à la fin de 2013 et que, dans le cadre de leur révision, les plafonds des aides *de minimis* seront réexaminés et modifiés si nécessaire.

([1]) JO L 337 du 21.12.2007, p. 35.
([2]) JO L 379 du 28.12.2006, p. 5.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-003535/12
adresată Comisiei
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(2 aprilie 2012)

Subiect: Protecția minorităților în Serbia

Îndeplinirea integrală a criteriilor de la Copenhaga este o condiție esențială pentru statele care doresc să adere la UE.

Cum intenționează Comisia să urmărească modul în care Serbia respectă drepturile persoanelor aparținând minorităților naționale, inclusiv cele la autoidentificare, păstrarea identității etnice și culturale, educație în limba română ale vlahilor din Valea Timocului?

Răspuns dat de dl Füle în numele Comisiei
(4 iunie 2012)

Comisia monitorizează îndeaproape situația minorităților în toate statele care doresc să adere la UE, inclusiv în Serbia. Respectarea și protecția minorităților face parte din criteriile de la Copenhaga de aderare la Uniunea Europeană. În avizul din octombrie 2011 privind cererea Serbiei de aderare la UE, Comisia a confirmat existența cadrului legislativ pentru protecția minorităților; au avut loc alegeri pentru nouăsprezece consilii ale minorităților, care au competențe în domeniile culturii, mijloacelor de informare în masă, educației și utilizării limbilor minorităților. Cu toate acestea, este necesar să se îmbunătățească punerea în aplicare a drepturilor garantate constituțional și să se asigure aplicarea acestora în mod consecvent, pe întreg teritoriul Serbiei, în special în ceea ce privește educația și informarea în limbile minorităților.

Comisia este la curent cu preocupările legate de situația minorității vlahe din Serbia de Est, inclusiv din Valea Timocului. Comisia salută protocolul bilateral încheiat între România și Serbia la 1 martie 2012 și încurajează ambele țări să abordeze problemele minorităților în contextul activității comisiei lor bilaterale privind minoritățile.

Comisia se angajează să continue monitorizarea progreselor realizate de Serbia în direcția îmbunătățirii situației minorităților, în strânsă cooperare cu organizațiile europene competente, cum ar fi Consiliul Europei și Înaltul Comisar pentru Minoritățile Naționale al OSCE. Următorul raport referitor la aceste aspecte va fi raportul anual privind progresele înregistrate în Serbia, care urmează să fie publicat în octombrie 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003535/12
to the Commission
Elena Băsescu (PPE)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Protection of minorities in Serbia

Full compliance with the Copenhagen criteria is a prerequisite for states that wish to join the EU.

How does the Commission intend to monitor the manner in which Serbia is respecting the rights of national minorities, including the rights to self-identification, preservation of ethnic and cultural identity and education in the Romanian language for the Vlachs of the Timok Valley?

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

The Commission is closely monitoring the situation of minorities in all aspiring EU Member States, including Serbia. Respect for and protection of minorities is part of the Copenhagen criteria for accession to the European Union. The Commission has reported, in its October 2011 Opinion on Serbia's EU membership application, that the legislative framework for minority protection is in place; elections have taken place for nineteen minority councils with competences over cultural, media, education and use of minority language issues. However, the implementation of the constitutionally guaranteed rights remains to be improved and consistently ensured throughout the whole territory of Serbia especially when it comes to education and information in minority languages.

The Commission is aware of concerns about the situation of the Vlach minority in Eastern Serbia, including the Timoc valley. It has welcomed the bilateral protocol reached between Romania and Serbia on 1 March 2012 and encourages both countries to address minority issues in the context of their bilateral commission on minorities.

The Commission is committed to continuing monitoring the progress made by Serbia towards improving the situation of minorities in close cooperation with the relevant European organisations such as the Council of Europe and the OSCE High Commissioner on national Minorities. The next report on these issues will be the annual progress report on Serbia to be issued in October 2012.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-003536/12
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE)
(2 april 2012)

Betreft: PNR-overeenkomst EU-VS

De rechtsgrondslag voor het besluit van de Raad om de overeenkomst tussen de EU en de VS inzake de overdracht van PNR-gegevens te sluiten wordt gevormd door artikel 82, lid 1, onder d) en artikel 87, lid 2, onder a) van het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de Europese Unie (VWEU), met betrekking tot justitiële en politiële samenwerking. Deze artikelen hebben betrekking op de samenwerking tussen de justitiële of gelijkwaardige autoriteiten en politiesamenwerking in strafzaken en het voorkomen, opsporen en onderzoeken van strafbare feiten.

Artikel 4, lid 1, van de overeenkomst tussen de EU en de VS bepaalt dat PNR-gegevens mogen worden gebruikt voor de bestrijding van terrorisme en grensoverschrijdende criminaliteit die met een gevangenisstraf van drie jaar of meer worden bedreigd. Artikel 4, leden 2, 3 en 4, maakt ook andere toepassingen van PNR-gegevens mogelijk.

1. De overdracht van PNR-gegevens geschiedt door een commerciële entiteit, die de gegevens doorgeeft aan verschillende en niet-gespecificeerde overheidsinstanties. Kan de Commissie uitleggen hoe dit kan worden aangemerkt als samenwerking tussen justitiële of gelijkwaardige autoriteiten of politiesamenwerking zoals bedoeld in artikel 82, lid 1, onder d) en artikel 87, lid 2, onder a) van het VWEU?

2. Kan de Commissie meedelen of zij van mening is dat artikel 4, leden 2, 3 en 4, van de overeenkomst het gebruik van PNR-gegevens voor immigratie- en douanecontroles en volksgezondheidsdoeleinden uitdrukkelijk uitsluit? Kan de Commissie in detail uitleggen hoe zij tot deze conclusie is gekomen?

3. Is de Commissie van mening dat elk van de in artikel 4, leden 2, 3 en 4, van de overeenkomst genoemde doeleinden kan worden aangemerkt als een „strafzaak" of een „strafbaar feit" als bedoeld in artikel 82, lid 1, onder d) en artikel 87, lid 2, onder a) van het VWEU?

4. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat immigratie- en douanecontroles of volksgezondheidsdoeleinden niet vallen onder de in artikel 3, lid 2, van Richtlijn 95/46/EG neergelegde uitzondering ([1]) voor „de verwerking van persoonsgegevens (…) met het oog op de uitoefening van een activiteit die buiten de werkingssfeer van het Gemeenschapsrecht valt (…), en in ieder geval verwerkingen van gegevens in verband met openbare veiligheid, defensie, der staatsveiligheid (waaronder de economie van de Staat, wanneer deze behandeling in verband staat met vraagstukken van staatsveiligheid), en de activiteiten van de Staat op strafrechtelijk gebied"? Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat het gebruik van PNR-gegevens voor de doeleinden in de zin van artikel 4, leden 2, 3 en 4, van de overeenkomst derhalve binnen het toepassingsgebied van het Gemeenschapsrecht kunnen vallen, en daarom ook binnen het toepassingsgebied van Richtlijn 95/46/EG?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(30 april 2012)

In antwoord op haar vraag, verwijst de Commissie het geachte Parlementslid naar de brief die commissaris Malmström op 16 april 2012 aan haar heeft gericht, en die op de website is geplaatst: http://j.mp/reply16april.

([1]) PB L 281 van 23.11.1995, blz. 31.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003536/12
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: EU-US PNR Agreement

The legal bases for the Council decision to conclude the EU-US Agreement on the transfer of PNR data are Articles 82(1)(d) and 87(2)(a) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, regarding police and justice cooperation. These articles concern cooperation between judicial or equivalent authorities and police cooperation in relation to proceedings in criminal matters, and the prevention, detection and investigation of criminal offences.

Article 4(1) of the EU-US Agreement authorises the use of PNR data for the purposes of counter-terrorism or combating serious transnational crime, punishable by a sentence of imprisonment of three years or more. Article 4(2), (3) and (4) allows for additional use of PNR data.

1. The transfer of PNR data is from a commercial entity to various and unspecified government agencies. Can the Commission clarify how this qualifies as cooperation between judicial or equivalent authorities, or police cooperation, as intended in Articles 82(1)(d) and 87(2)(a) TFEU?

2. Can the Commission clarify whether, in its opinion, Article 4(2), (3) and (4) of the Agreement would explicitly exclude the use of PNR data for purposes such as immigration and customs controls, or public health? Can the Commission explain in detail how it arrives at this conclusion?

3. Does the Commission consider that each of the purposes mentioned in Article 4(2), (3) and (4) of the Agreement qualifies as a 'criminal matter' or a 'criminal offence' as mentioned in Articles 82(1)(d) and 87(2)(a) TFEU?

4. Would the Commission agree that purposes such as immigration and customs checks or public health would not fall within the exemption laid down in Article 3(2) of Directive 95/46/EC [1] for 'the processing of personal data (…) in the course of an activity which falls outside the scope of Community law (…), and in any case [for] processing operations concerning public security, defence, State security (including the economic well-being of the State when the processing operation relates to State security matters) and the activities of the State in areas of criminal law'? Does the Commission agree that the use of PNR data for the purposes described in Article 4(2), (3) and (4) of the Agreement may therefore fall within the scope of Community law, and hence within the scope of Directive 95/46/EC?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 April 2012)

In reply to her question, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the letter sent to her by Commissioner Malmström on 16 April 2012 which has been put on the website: http://j.mp/reply16april

[1] OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, p. 31.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-003538/12
Komisijai
Justas Vincas Paleckis (S&D)
(2012 m. balandžio 2 d.)

Tema: Dėl kabotažo paslaugas teikiančių darbuotojų

1996 m. gruodžio 16 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyva 96/71/EB dėl darbuotojų komandiravimo paslaugų teikimo sistemoje tapo svarbiu instrumentu užtikrinant komandiruojamų darbuotojų apsaugą – minimalias įdarbinimo ir darbo sąlygas. Tačiau vis dar kyla daug klausimų dėl šios Direktyvos taikymo transporto sektoriaus paslaugoms, ypač vykdant kabotažą. Komisijos tarnybų dokumente „Teisinės sistemos, reglamentuojančios darbuotojų komandiravimą paslaugų teikimo sistemoje, poveikio vertinimas ir peržiūra“ (Nr. SWD(2012) 0063) bei kitose analizėse nurodoma, kad Direktyvos taikymo klausimai šioje srityje yra neišspręsti, o valstybės narės skirtingai įgyvendina Direktyvą ir komandiruojamiems darbuotojams iš transporto sektoriaus taiko skirtingas nuostatas. Dėl tokios situacijos yra sudaromos kliūtys teikti transporto paslaugas, sukuriamos nevienodos sąlygos paslaugų teikėjams veikti, o transporto sektoriaus komandiruojami darbuotojai negali būti tikri dėl savo socialinių ir ekonominių teisių skirtingose valstybėse narėse.

— Ar Komisija ketina persvarstyti Direktyvos taikymą teikiant transporto sektoriaus ir kabotažo paslaugas?

— Kokių priemonių Komisija numato imtis, kad valstybių narių taikoma praktika įgyvendinant Direktyvą kabotažo paslaugas teikiančių komandiruojamų darbuotojų atžvilgiu būtų suvienodinta?

L. Andoro atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. gegužės 25 d.)

Direktyvoje 96/71/EB ([1]) neatmetama galimybė ją taikyti transporto ir kabotažo paslaugoms. Priimdamos direktyvą Taryba ir Komisija pareiškė ([2]), kad, remiantis direktyvos 1 straipsnio 3 dalies a punktu, darbuotojas, kuris paprastai dirba dviejų ar daugiau valstybių narių teritorijoje ir yra įmonės, profesionaliai savo sąskaita teikiančios tarptautinio keleivių arba krovinių vežimo paslaugas geležinkelių, kelių, oro ar vandens transportu, mobilusis darbuotojas, nekomandiruojamas pagal paslaugų sutartį.

2012 m. kovo 21 d. Komisija priėmė Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyvos pasiūlymą ([3]) dėl Direktyvos 96/71/EB dėl darbuotojų komandiravimo paslaugų teikimo sistemoje vykdymo užtikrinimo. Šiuo pasiūlymu nekeičiama Direktyvos 96/71/EB taikymo sritis, tačiau siekiama pagerinti jos praktinį įgyvendinimą, taikymą ir vykdymo užtikrinimą, įskaitant transporto ir kabotažo paslaugų srityje.

([1]) 1996 m. gruodžio 16 d. Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos direktyva 96/71/EB dėl darbuotojų komandiravimo paslaugų teikimo sistemoje, OL L 18, 1997 01 21, p. 1.
([2]) Žr. Tarybos dok. 10048/96 ADD 1 3 punktą.
([3]) 2012 m. kovo 21 d. COM(2012) 131 galutinis.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003538/12
to the Commission
Justas Vincas Paleckis (S&D)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Regarding workers providing cabotage services

Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services has become an important instrument for guaranteeing the protection of posted workers — minimum employment and working conditions. However, many questions still remain in regards to the application of this directive to services in the transport sector, particularly when carrying out cabotage. The Commission Staff Document, 'Impact Assessment, Revision of the legislative framework concerning the posting of workers in the context of the provision of services' (No SWD(2012) 63) and other analyses indicate that issues regarding the application of the directive in this area are unresolved, and that the Member States do not implement the directive consistently and apply different provisions to posted workers from the transport sector. As a result of this situation, there are barriers to the provision of transport services, service providers are unable to operate on a level playing field and posted workers in the transport sector cannot be sure of their social and economic rights in different Member States.

— Does the Commission intend to review the application of the directive for the provision of transport sector and cabotage services?

— What action does the Commission plan to take to ensure that Member States' practices are harmonised with respect to posted workers providing cabotage services when implementing the directive?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

Directive 96/71/EC ([1]) does not exclude transport and cabotage services as such from its scope. When the directive was adopted, the Council and the Commission stated ([2]) that a worker who is normally employed in the territory of two or more Member States and who forms part of the mobile staff of an undertaking engaged in operating international passenger or goods transport services by rail, road, air or water professionally on its own account is not posted under a service contract in accordance with Article 1(3)(a) of the directive.

On 21 March 2012 the Commission adopted a proposal ([3]) for a directive on the enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services. That proposal does not change the scope of Directive 96/71/EC, but seeks to improve its implementation, application and enforcement in practice, including in the area of transport and cabotage services.

([1]) Directive 96/71/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 1996 concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services, OJ L 18, 21.1.1997, p. 1.
([2]) See Council doc. 10048/96 ADD 1, point 3.
([3]) COM(2012) 131 final of 21 March 2012.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-003539/12
Komisijai
Justas Vincas Paleckis (S&D)
(2012 m. balandžio 2 d.)

Tema: Dėl jaunimo nedarbo

Šiuo metu jaunimo nedarbas dvigubai didesnis nei suaugusiųjų. Valstybėse narėse 20-40 proc. jaunuolių, kurių amžius nuo 15 iki 24 metų, nei mokosi, nei stažuojasi, nei dirba. 2010 m. rudenį Europos Komisija pristatė iniciatyvą „Judus jaunimas“, pagal kurią siekiama gerinti jaunimo švietimą ir galimybes įsidarbinti ES. Vienas iš pagalbos, kurią ES numato jaunimui, pavyzdžių – stažuočių programos pereinamuoju laikotarpiu tarp mokslų baigimo ir pirmojo darbo. Šiam tikslui įgyvendinti Komisija įsipareigojo sudaryti kokybišką stažuočių sistemą ir kartu pašalinti teisines ir administracines kliūtis tarptautinėms stažuotėms rengti. Šią sistemą planuota pristatyti 2012 m., tačiau Europos kokybiškos stažuočių sistemos sudarymas nebuvo įtrauktas į Komisijos 2012 m. darbo programą.

— Kokią įtaką, Komisijos nuomone, sprendžiant jaunimo nedarbo problemas ir įgyvendinant strategijoje „Europa 2020“ numatytus užimtumo tikslus daro tai, kad į darbo programą neįtrauktas kokybiškų stažuočių sistemos sudarymas?

— Kaip Komisija ketina užtikrinti jaunimo dalyvavimą rengiant kokybiškų stažuočių sistemą, taip pat formuluojant bendrąsias jos nuostatas ir sąlygas?

— Ar Komisija yra numačiusi priemonių, kuriomis būtų perteikta jaunimo, jau dalyvavusio stažuočių programose, patirtis ir užtikrintos geresnės galimybės kokybiškoms stažuotėms rengti?

L. Andoro atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. gegužės 30 d.)

1. Kokybiška stažuočių sistema yra Komisijos 2012 m darbo programos dalis. 2012 m. gruodžio mėn. tikimasi priimti Tarybos rekomendacijos dėl sistemos pasiūlymą

2. 2012 m. balandžio 18 d. pradėtos viešos konsultacijos. Šios konsultacijos, vyksiančios iki liepos mėn., užtikrins, kad jaunimas ir visos kitos suinteresuotosios šalys galėtų dalyvauti kuriant sistemą. Be to, Komisija kaip kitu informacijos šaltiniu naudosis Europos stažuočių kokybės chartija, pristatyta Europos jaunimo forumo.

3. Kalbant apie buvusių stažuotojų patirtį, 2012 m. gegužės mėn. bus parengtas išsamios stažuočių tvarkos valstybėse narėse apžvalgos tyrimas. Šis tyrimas – be kita ko – paremtas pokalbiais su buvusiais stažuotojais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003539/12
to the Commission
Justas Vincas Paleckis (S&D)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Regarding youth unemployment

Unemployment among young people is currently double that for mature adults. In the Member States, 20-40% of young people aged between 15 and 24 are not in education, training or work. In autumn 2010, the European Commission presented the 'Youth on the Move' initiative which aims to improve young people's education and employability in the EU. Internship programmes in the transition period between leaving education and commencing employment are one example of the help planned by the EU for young people. To achieve this objective, the Commission has committed itself to creating a quality framework for internships and removing legal and administrative barriers to organising international internships. This framework is scheduled to be introduced in 2012, but the creation of a quality framework for internships was not included in the Commission Work Programme for 2012.

— What impact, in the Commission's opinion, does the failure to include the creation of a framework for quality internships in the Work Programme have on addressing youth unemployment issues and achieving the Europe 2020 targets for employment?

— How does the Commission intend to ensure that young people are involved in setting up a framework for quality internships, and also in developing its common provisions and conditions?

— Has the Commission provided for measures that would pass on the experience of young people who have already participated in internship programmes and would ensure better opportunities to organise quality internships?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

1. The Quality Framework for Traineeships is part of the Commission's Work Programme for 2012. A proposal for a Council Recommendation on the framework is expected in December 2012.

2. On 18 April 2012 a public consultation was launched. This consultation, which is open until July, will ensure that young people and all other stakeholders can contribute to the development of the framework. Furthermore, the Commission will use the European Quality Charter on Internships, as presented by the European Youth Forum, as another source of information.

3. Regarding the experiences of ex-trainees, the study on a comprehensive overview of traineeship arrangements in the Member States will be available as of May 2012. This study is based — among other things — on interviews conducted with ex-trainees.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003540/12
an die Kommission
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL) und Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)
(2. April 2012)

Betrifft: Vorschnelle Ablehnung der 8-Stunden-Begrenzung durch die Kommission

1. Ist die Kommission darüber informiert, dass sich eine breite Mehrheit des Europäischen Parlaments mit der schriftlichen Erklärung 49/2011 für eine 8-Stunden-Begrenzung für Tiertransporte ausgesprochen hat?

2. Inwieweit fühlt sich die Kommission an den Willen einer Parlamentsmehrheit gebunden? Inwieweit fühlt sich die Kommission im Falle der 8-Stunden-Begrenzung an den Wunsch des Europäischen Parlaments gebunden?

3. Wie bewertet die Kommission die fast 1,1 Millionen Unterschriften für die Aktion „8 hours", und inwieweit ist die Kommission bereit, auf den Wunsch dieser 1,1 Millionen Bürger einzugehen?

4. Am 22. März 2012 wurde die Kommission bei der Debatte zum Thema Tiertransporte im ENVI-Ausschuss durch einen Beamten vertreten. Ist das Kommissionsmitglied darüber informiert, dass dieser Beamte gegenüber dem Parlament erklärt hat, dass die Kommission nicht bereit sei, die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 zum Schutz von Tieren beim Transport anzupassen, obwohl sich bei der Debatte zeigte, dass die Mehrheit des ENVI-Ausschusses dies will, und obwohl sich eine Mehrheit des Gesamtparlaments für eine 8-Stunden-Begrenzung ausgesprochen hat und auch 1,1 Millionen EU-Bürger eine 8-Stunden-Begrenzung wollen? Stimmt der Kommissar diesen Äußerungen zu?

5. Was muss auf politischer Ebene noch geschehen, damit die Kommission eine 8-Stunden-Begrenzung einführt und die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 im Sinne des Tierschutzes verbessert?

6. Bewertet die Kommission die 1,1 Millionen Unterschriften für die Aktion „8 hours" anders als eine Bürgerinitiative? Wenn ja, ist die Kommission bereit, eine 8-Stunden-Begrenzung einzuführen, wenn eine Million Bürger dies bei einer offiziellen Bürgerinitiative fordern?

7. Worauf stützt die Kommission das Recht, den Wunsch sowohl des Volkes als auch der Volksvertretung zu ignorieren?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(31. Mai 2012)

1. Die Kommission kennt die schriftliche Erklärung und wird dem Europäischen Parlament gemäß den in der Rahmenvereinbarung zwischen dem Europäischen Parlament und der Kommission festgelegten Verfahren eine schriftliche Stellungnahme zum Follow-up senden.

2. Die Kommission schätzt die Meinung des Europäischen Parlaments und prüft sorgfältig dessen Initiativen; sie ist jedoch verpflichtet, alle Faktoren zu berücksichtigen und alle betroffenen Parteien zu konsultieren.

3,6. Die Kommission legt großen Wert auf die Wünsche der EU-Bürgerinnen und -Bürger. Diese Petition wurde der Kommission jedoch noch nicht unterbreitet, so dass sie nicht als europäische Bürgerinitiative angesehen werden kann. Gemäß Artikel 11 Absatz 4 EUV und Artikel 24 AEUV werden die Verfahren und Bedingungen für Bürgerinitiativen durch eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates festgelegt. Diese Verordnung wurde im Februar 2011 erlassen und gilt ab 1. April 2012 ([1]). Da die fragliche Petition vor der Anwendbarkeit der Verordnung eingeleitet wurde und nicht den darin festgelegten Bedingungen entspricht, kann die Kommission diese nicht als Bürgerinitiative gemäß Artikel 11 Absatz 4 EUV ansehen.

Sollte eine Bürgerinitiative, in der die Einführung einer 8-Stunden-Begrenzung für Tiertransporte gefordert wird, gemäß Artikel 9 der Verordnung vorgelegt werden, so wird die Kommission diese sorgfältig gemäß Artikel 10 der Verordnung prüfen und innerhalb von drei Monaten eine Mitteilung mit ihren rechtlichen und politischen Schlussfolgerungen zu der Bürgerinitiative sowie ihr weiteres Vorgehen bzw. den Verzicht auf ein weiteres Vorgehen und die Gründe hierfür darlegen.

([1]) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 211/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 16. Februar 2011 über die Bürgerinitiative, ABl. L 65 vom 11.3.2011.

4. Die zum Ausdruck gebrachte Meinung entspricht den Ansichten, die die Kommission in ihrem Bericht über den Schutz von Tieren beim Transport ([2]) vom November 2011 vertreten hat.

5,7. Bevor sie neue Rechtsvorschriften vorschlägt, führt die Kommission in der Regel eine Folgenabschätzung durch, konsultiert die betroffenen Parteien und befasst sich mit dem Wunsch des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates.

([2]) Bericht der Kommission an das Europäische Parlament und den Rat über die Auswirkungen der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1/2005 über den Schutz von Tieren beim Transport, KOM(2011)700 endg.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003540/12
aan de Commissie
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL) en Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)
(2 april 2012)

Betreft: Voortijdige afwijzing 8-uurslimiet door Commissie

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van het feit dat een ruime meerderheid van het Europees Parlement via Schriftelijke verklaring 49/2011 heeft verklaard vóór een 8-uurslimiet voor diertransporten te zijn?

2. In hoeverre voelt de Commissie zich gehouden aan de wil van een Parlementsmeerderheid? In hoeverre voelt de Commissie zich in het geval van de 8-uurslimiet gehouden aan de wens van het Europees Parlement?

3. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de bijna 1,1 miljoen handtekeningen voor de actie „8 hours" en in hoeverre is de Commissie bereid om iets met de wens van deze 1,1 miljoen burgers te doen?

4. Op 22 maart 2012 werd de Commissie vertegenwoordigd door een ambtenaar tijdens het debat over diertransporten in de ENVI-commissie. Is de commissaris op de hoogte van het feit dat deze ambtenaar tegenover het Parlement heeft verklaard dat de Commissie niet bereid is om Verordening (EG) nr. 1/2005 voor de bescherming van dieren tijdens transport aan te passen, ondanks het feit dat tijdens het debat bleek dat een meerderheid van de ENVI-commissie dit wel wil, een meerderheid van het gehele Parlement heeft aangegeven vóór een 8-uurslimiet te zijn, en ook 1,1 miljoen EU-burgers een 8-uurslimiet willen? Is de commissaris het eens met de gedane uitlatingen?

5. Wat moet er op politiek vlak nog gebeuren opdat de Commissie overgaat tot het invoeren van een 8-uurslimiet en het verbeteren van Verordening (EG) nr. 1/2005 ten gunste van het dierenwelzijn?

6. Beoordeelt de Commissie de 1,1 miljoen handtekeningen voor de actie „8 hours" anders dan een zogenaamd burgerinitiatief? Zo ja, is de Commissie bereid een 8-uurslimiet in te voeren als 1 miljoen burgers dit via een officieel burgerinitiatief vragen?

7. Waarop baseert de Commissie het recht om de wens van zowel volk als volksvertegenwoordiging te negeren?

Antwoord van de heer Dalli namens de Commissie
(31 mei 2012)

1. De Commissie is op de hoogte van de schriftelijke verklaring en zal het Parlement overeenkomstig de procedures van het kaderakkoord tussen het Parlement en de Commissie een schriftelijke uiteenzetting van de follow-up toezenden.

2. De Commissie hecht waarde aan het standpunt van het Parlement en neemt de initiatieven van het Parlement zorgvuldig in overweging, maar zij moet alle factoren tegen elkaar afwegen en alle betrokken partijen raadplegen.

3,6. De Commissie besteedt veel aandacht aan de wensen van EU-burgers. Deze petitie is echter nog niet bij de Commissie ingediend en kan niet als een Europees burgerinitiatief worden beschouwd. Volgens artikel 11, lid 4, VEU en artikel 24 VWEU moeten de procedures en voorwaarden voor de indiening van burgerinitiatieven worden vastgesteld in een verordening van het Parlement en de Raad. Deze verordening is in februari 2011 vastgesteld en is vanaf 1 april 2012 van toepassing ([1]). Omdat met de petitie is begonnen voordat de verordening van toepassing werd en niet aan de voorwaarden van de verordening wordt voldaan, kan de Commissie de petitie niet als een burgerinitiatief in de zin van artikel 11, lid 4, VEU beschouwen.

Als er overeenkomstig artikel 9 van de verordening een burgerinitiatief wordt ingediend waarin om een achtuurslimiet voor diertransporten wordt gevraagd, zal de Commissie dit overeenkomstig artikel 10 van de verordening zorgvuldig behandelen en binnen drie maanden een mededeling goedkeuren waarin zij haar juridische en politieke conclusies meedeelt en vermeldt welke maatregelen zij, indien van toepassing, gaat nemen, alsook de redenen voor haar besluit om al dan niet maatregelen te nemen.

([1]) Verordening (EU) nr. 211/2011 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 16 februari 2011 over het burgerinitiatief; PB L 65 van 11.3.2011.

4. ingenomen standpunten komen overeen met het standpunt van de Commissie dat is weergegeven in haar verslag over dierenwelzijn tijdens het vervoer uit november 2011 ([2]).

5,7. In het algemeen voert de Commissie een effectbeoordeling uit en raadpleegt zij de betrokken partijen en neemt zij ook de wens van het Parlement en de Raad in overweging alvorens nieuwe wetgeving voor te stellen.

([2]) Verslag van de Commissie aan het Europees Parlement en de Raad over de gevolgen van Verordening (EG) nr. 1/2005 van de Raad inzake de bescherming van dieren tijdens het vervoer. COM(2011) 700 definitief.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003540/12
to the Commission
Kartika Tamara Liotard (GUE/NGL) and Sabine Wils (GUE/NGL)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Premature rejection of eight-hour limit by Commission

1. Is the Commission aware that a large majority of the European Parliament, via Written Declaration No 49/2011, declared themselves in favour of an eight-hour limit for animal transportation?

2. To what extent does the Commission feel bound by the will of a Parliamentary majority? In the case of the eight-hour limit, to what extent does the Commission feel bound by the wishes of the European Parliament?

3. How does the Commission view the almost 1.1 million signatures for the 'eight hours' campaign and to what extent is the Commission prepared to do something about the wishes of these 1.1 million citizens?

4. On 22 March 2012, the Commission was represented by one of its officials during the debate over animal transportation in the Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety. Is the Commission aware that this official declared to the Parliament that the Commission is not prepared to adjust Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 for the protection of animals during transportation, despite the fact that during the debate it appeared that a majority of the Environment Committee does want this to happen, a majority of the entire Parliament has indicated its support for an eight-hour limit and 1.1 million EU citizens also want an eight-hour limit? Does the Commissioner agree with the statements made?

5. What still has to happen at a political level in order to convince the Commission to introduce an eight-hour limit and to improve Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 for the benefit of animal welfare?

6. Does the Commission view the 1.1 million signatures for the 'eight hours' campaign as being different from a so-called citizens' initiative? If so, is the Commission prepared to introduce an eight-hour limit if 1 million citizens request this via an official citizens' initiative?

7. On what does the Commission base the right to ignore the will of both the people and the people's representatives?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of the written declaration and will forward to Parliament a written statement on follow-up in accordance with the procedures set out in the framework Agreement between the Parliament and the Commission.

2. The Commission values Parliament's opinion and carefully considers its initiatives but is duty-bound to consider all factors and to consult all concerned parties.

3, 6. The Commission pays great attention to EU citizens' wishes. However this petition has not yet been submitted to the Commission and cannot be considered as a European citizens' initiative. Article 11.4 TEU and Article 24 TFEU state that the procedures and conditions required for citizens' initiatives shall be determined in a regulation of the Parliament and the Council. This was adopted in February 2011 and applies from 1 April 2012 ([1]). Since this petition was launched before the regulation's application and does not comply with the conditions set out therein, the Commission cannot consider it a citizens' initiative as foreseen in Article 11.4 TEU.

Should a citizens' initiative asking for the introduction of an eight hour journey limit be submitted in accordance with Article 9 of the regulation, the Commission will carefully examine it in accordance with Article 10 of the regulation and adopt within three months a communication setting out its legal and political conclusions, the action it intends to take, if any, and its reasons for taking or not taking that action.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 211.2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 on the citizens' initiative; OJ L 65, 11.3.2011.

4. e views expressed reflect the Commission's view as expressed in its report on animal welfare during transport ([2]) of November 2011.

5, 7. As a general rule, the Commission carries out an impact assessment and consults the concerned parties while considering the will of the Parliament and of the Council, before proposing any new legislation.

([2]) Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the impact of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport. COM(2011) 700 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-003541/12
aan de Commissie
Wim van de Camp (PPE)
(2 april 2012)

Betreft: Erasmus-prestatiebeurs

Op dit moment is het Eramsus-programma voor studenten niet afhankelijk van behaalde studiepunten. Uit mediaberichten (zie Volkskrant van 30 maart 2012 ([1])) blijkt dat de CDA-delegatie in het Europees Parlement wil dat het Erasmus-programma voor studenten afhankelijk wordt van studieresultaten. In de toekomst moet het Erasmus-programma voor studenten prestatiebeurzen gaan verstrekken.

Schriftelijke vragen:

1. Heeft de Commissie kennis genomen van berichten in de media over Europese prestatiebeurzen?

2. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het Erasmus-programma een belangrijke rol vervult in de kennisuitwisseling tussen Europese studenten?

3. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het niet meer van deze tijd is om studiebeurzen toe te kennen onafhankelijk van studieresultaten?

4. Kan de Commissie aangeven hoeveel Europese studiepunten studenten gemiddeld halen tijdens een Erasmus-uitwisseling?

5. Indien de Commissie geen beschikbare gegevens heeft voor vraag 4, is zij dan bereid om met een onderzoek te komen die in kaart brengt hoeveel Europese studiepunten studenten gemiddeld halen tijdens een Erasmus-uitwisseling?

6. Ziet de Commissie mogelijkheden om Erasmus-beurzen om te bouwen of aan te vullen tot prestatiebeurzen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Vassiliou namens de Commissie
(14 mei 2012)

De Europese Commissie is op de hoogte van de mediaberichten over Europese prestatiebeurzen. In de context van het nieuwe „Erasmus voor iedereen"-voorstel raadpleegt zij deskundigen over de mogelijkheid om de academische waarde van Erasmus-perioden te vergroten, met name door de erkenningsgraad van de studies tijdens dergelijke perioden in het buitenland te verhogen. Volgens het 2010 PRIME-onderzoeksproject van het Erasmus Student Network behalen 73 % van de Erasmus-studenten een volledige erkenning, met een gemiddelde van 30 ECTS-studiepunten voor een periode van 6 maanden; 24 % van de studenten behalen een gedeeltelijke erkenning en 3 % geen erkenning.

Nu moeten de nationale bureaus (NB's) en instellingen voor hoger onderwijs beslissen aan welke criteria er moet worden voldaan bij het toekennen van Erasmus-beurzen. Volgens het PRIME-project eisen 28 % van de onderzochte instellingen voor hoger onderwijs van hun studenten dat zij een minimumaantal ECTS-studiepunten behalen om hun beurs te behouden. 3-4 % van de studenten moeten hun beurs volledig of gedeeltelijk terugbetalen omdat zij niet voldoen aan die eis.

De toekenning van ECTS-studiepunten zal in de toekomst beter worden gecontroleerd door middel van een nieuwe Europese databank die de eindresultaten van studenten bij hun thuiskomst zal verzamelen; hierdoor zal men de doeltreffendheid van de verschillende methoden om mobiliteitsbeurzen toe te kennen kunnen evalueren.

Studiepunten zijn echter niet het enige positieve effect van de Erasmus-mobiliteit. Een studie- of opleidingsperiode helpt niet enkel bij het verwerven van sectorspecifieke vaardigheden die tot studiepunten voor officiële studieresultaten leiden, maar ook van uiterst waardevolle transversale vaardigheden zoals aanpassingsvermogen, probleemoplossing en de vaardigheid om in multiculturele teams te werken, waaraan geen studiepunten zijn verbonden.

([1]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2824/Politiek/article/detail/3233605/2012/03/30/CDA-wil-Europese-prestatiebeurs-voor-uitwisselingsprogramma.dhtml.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003541/12
to the Commission
Wim van de Camp (PPE)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Erasmus performance grant

Currently, the Erasmus programme for students is not dependent on study points achieved. According to media reports (see *Volkskrant* of 30 March 2012 [1]), the Netherlands Christian Democrat (CDA) delegation in the European Parliament wants the Erasmus programme for students to become dependent on study results. In the future, it believes that the Erasmus programme for students should award performance grants.

Written questions:

1. Is the Commission aware of reports in the media about European performance grants?

2. Does the Commission share the view that the Erasmus programme fulfils an important role in the exchange of knowledge between European students?

3. Does the Commission share the view that it is no longer in the spirit of the times to confer study grants independently of study results?

4. Can the Commission indicate how many European credits students obtain on average during an Erasmus exchange?

5. If the Commission does not have any data available for question 4, is it then prepared to arrange research that will indicate how many European credits students obtain on average during an Erasmus exchange?

6. Does the Commission see possibilities to convert or to augment Erasmus grants for them to become performance grants?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2012)

The European Commission is aware of media reports about European performance grants. In the context of the new Erasmus for All proposal, it is consulting experts on how to strengthen the academic value of Erasmus periods, in particular by improving the recognition rate of study during such periods abroad According to the 2010 PRIME research project by the Erasmus Student Network, 73% of the Erasmus students achieve full recognition, with an average of 30 ECTS for a period of six months; 24% of students achieve a partial recognition and 3% no recognition.

Currently, it is up to national agencies (NAs) and higher education institutions to decide the criteria on which to award Erasmus grants. According to the PRIME project, 28% of the surveyed HEIs impose a minimum of ECTS credits to be achieved by the students in order to keep their grant; 3-4% of students have to pay back their grant or part of it because of failure to comply with such requirements.

Monitoring the award of ECTS credits will be reinforced in the future through a new European database which will collect final reports from students upon their return home; this will enable an evaluation of the effectiveness of the different approaches to awarding mobility grants.

Credits, however, are only part of the positive outcome of Erasmus mobility. A study or traineeship period helps not only in gaining sector-specific competences leading to credits for formal study results, but also invaluable transversal competences such as adaptability, problem-solving, and capacity to work in multicultural teams, with no associated credits.

---

[1] http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2824/Politiek/article/detail/3233605/2012/03/30/CDA-wil-Europese-prestatiebeurs-voor-uitwisselingsprogramma.dhtml.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003542/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(2. April 2012)

Betrifft: Limitierung von Werbung für ungesunde Produkte

In der Schlussfolgerung seines Berichts A/HRC/29/59 vom 26. Dezember 2011 empfiehlt der UN-Sonderberichterstatter für das Recht auf Nahrung, Olivier de Schutter, den Staaten zur Verbesserung der öffentlichen Gesundheit: „Verabschiedung gesetzlicher Regelungen über die Vermarktung von Lebensmitteln als wirksamstes Mittel zur Verringerung des Verkaufs von Nahrungsmitteln mit hohen Anteilen an gesättigten Fettsäuren, trans-Fettsäuren, Natrium und Zucker (HFSS-Nahrungsmittel) an Kinder, wie von der WHO empfohlen, und Beschränkung der Vermarktung dieser Lebensmittel an andere Bevölkerungsgruppen".

1. Stimmt die Kommission der Auffassung zu, dass HFSS-Nahrungsmittel der Volksgesundheit schaden?

2. Verfügt die Kommission über eine eigene Definition von „ungesunden Nahrungsmitteln"?

3. Wie beurteilt die Kommission die Empfehlung de Schutters, und sieht sie das Verbot oder teilweise Verbot von Werbung für ungesunde Nahrungsmittel (HFSS oder nach eigener Definition) als eine Möglichkeit zur Bekämpfung der zunehmenden Übergewichtsproblematik an?

4. Wird die Kommission eine Richtlinie über ein Verbot oder eine Limitierung von Werbung für ungesunde Nahrungsmittel (inklusive Getränken), etwa ähnlich der Einschränkung von Tabakwerbung durch die Richtlinie 2003/33/EG, vorschlagen?

5. Bei welchen anderen Produkten oder Dienstleistungen könnte eine Limitierung der Werbemöglichkeiten der öffentlichen Gesundheit zu Gute kommen? Plant die Kommission entsprechende Regulierungen?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(25. Mai 2012)

Es gibt keine offizielle europäische Definition von „ungesunden Nahrungsmitteln". Der Kommission ist jedoch bewusst, dass die übermäßige Aufnahme von Nährstoffen wie gesättigten und Transfettsäuren, Zucker und Salz schädliche Folgen für die Gesundheit hat.

Das Weißbuch der Kommission „Ernährung, Übergewicht, Adipositas: Eine Strategie für Europa" ([1]) befasst sich mit der Veränderung der Zusammensetzung von Lebensmitteln sowie mit der Werbung für Lebensmittel. Der Umsetzung der Strategie dienen sowohl die Zusammenarbeit der Mitgliedstaaten in der Hochrangigen Gruppe für Ernährung und Bewegung, durch die beispielsweise ein gemeinsamer Rahmen zur Verringerung des Salzkonsums ([2]) geschaffen wurde, als auch Selbstregulierungsinitiativen der in der EU-Aktionsplattform für Ernährung, körperliche Bewegung und Gesundheit vertretenen Interessengruppen ([3]). Ein Beispiel für Aktionen von Interessengruppen ist der EU-Pledge ([4]), eine Selbstverpflichtung führender Unternehmen zu einer EU-weiten Beschränkung der an Kinder unter zwölf Jahren gerichteten Werbung für Lebensmittel und Getränke. Infolge dieser Initiative ging die Fernsehwerbung für sämtliche Produkte der Unterzeichnerunternehmen auf allen Kanälen um über ein Drittel zurück ([5]).

Zudem verpflichtet die Richtlinie über audiovisuelle Mediendienste ([6]) die Mitgliedstaaten und die Kommission dazu, bei der an Kinder gerichteten Werbung für Nahrungsmittel und Getränke, insbesondere solche mit hohem Fett-, Salz- und Zuckergehalt, einen auf Selbstregulierung beruhenden Ansatz zu fördern. Dies schließt gesetzliche Regelungen der Mitgliedstaaten nicht aus. Einige haben sich für diese Option entschieden, die meisten setzen indessen Selbstregulierungsregeln um. Die Kommission wird die Umsetzung dieser Bestimmungen weiter überwachen und bewerten, es existiert jedoch kein Zeitplan für ein Verbot oder eine weitere Beschränkung der Werbung für solche Produkte.

Schließlich muss die Industrie gemäß der Verordnung über nährwert- und gesundheitsbezogene Angaben über Lebensmittel ([7]) dafür sorgen, dass alle gesundheitsbezogenen Angaben wissenschaftlich abgesichert sind.

([1]) KOM(2007)279 endg. vom 30.5.2007.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/nutrition_salt_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_de.htm
([4]) http://www.eu-pledge.eu/
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/implementation_report_en.pdf
([6]) Richtlinie über audiovisuelle Mediendienste, 2010/13/EU: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:095:0001:0024:DE:PDF
([7]) ABl. L 404 vom 30.12.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003542/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Limiting advertising for unhealthy products

In the conclusion to his report A/HRC/29/59, dated 26 December 2011, Olivier de Schutter, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, recommends that, in order to improve public health, countries should 'adopt statutory regulation on the marketing of food products, as the most effective way to reduce marketing of foods high in saturated fats, trans-fatty acids, sodium and sugar (HFSS foods) to children, as recommended by the WHO, and restrict marketing of these foods to other groups.'

1. Does the Commission agree with the opinion that HFSS foods are damaging to public health?

2. Does the Commission have its own definition of 'unhealthy foods'?

3. How does the Commission assess Mr de Schutter's recommendation and does it regard the banning or partial banning of advertising of unhealthy foods (HFSS or according to its own definition) as a way of combating the increasing problem of obesity?

4. Does the Commission intend to propose a directive regarding a ban or limit on the advertising of unhealthy foods (including drinks) similar to the restriction on tobacco advertising by Directive 2003/33/EC?

5. For which other products or services could a limit on advertising opportunities benefit public health? Is the Commission planning the relevant regulations?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

There is no formal European definition of 'unhealthy food'. However, the Commission recognises the negative health consequences of excessive intake of nutrients such as saturated and trans fat, sugar and salt.

The Commission's 'Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related health issues' ([1]) addresses food reformulation and advertising. It is implemented through cooperation among Member States in the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity, with, for example, a common framework for salt reduction ([2]); and through self-regulatory initiatives by stakeholders in the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([3]). One example of stakeholders' action is the EU Pledge ([4]), whereby a group of leading companies have committed themselves to restricting food and beverage advertising to children under the age of 12 across the EU. This initiative has led to over one third less TV advertising for all of the signatories' products on all channels ([5]).

In addition, the Audiovisual Media Services Directive ([6]) calls on Member States and the Commission to encourage a self-regulatory approach on advertising foods and beverages to children, in particular those high in fat, salt and sugars. This does not exclude statutory regulation by the Member States — an option chosen by some of them — although the majority implements self-regulatory rules. The implementation of these provisions will be further monitored and assessed by the Commission; however, there is not timetable to ban or further limit the advertising for such products.

Finally, the regulation on nutrition and health claims on foods ([7]) obliges industry to ensure that every health claim is scientifically substantiated.

([1]) COM(2007) 279 final, 30.5.2007.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/nutrition_salt_en.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([4]) http://www.eu-pledge.eu/.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/implementation_report_en.pdf
([6]) Audiovisual Media Services Directive, 2010/13/EU, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:095:0001:0024:EN:PDF.
([7]) OJ L 404, 30.12.2006.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003543/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(2. April 2012)

Betrifft: Berücksichtigung der öffentlichen Gesundheit bei Agrarsubventionen

In der Schlussfolgerung seines Berichts A/HRC/29/59 vom 26. Dezember 2011 schreibt Olivier de Schutter, der UN-Sonderberichterstatter für das Recht auf Nahrung: „Die Steuerzahler haben fehlgeleitete Subventionen zu tragen, die der Agrar- und Lebensmittelindustrie Anreize bieten, intensiv verarbeitete Lebensmittel abzusetzen und dafür weniger Obst und Gemüse zu günstigeren Preisen verfügbar zu machen".

De Schutter empfiehlt, Agrarsubventionssysteme zu überprüfen und so zu ändern, dass ihr Einfluss auf die Gesundheit der Bevölkerung nicht mehr negativ ausfällt. Er spricht sich dafür aus, Produkte mit hohem Fett- oder Zuckergehalt weniger zu subventionieren und die Subventionen für gesündere Produkte, wie zum Beispiel frisches Gemüse, entweder auf demselben Niveau zu belassen oder sogar zu erhöhen.

1. Wie beurteilt die Kommission die Subventionen im Rahmen der gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik der EU (GAP) hinsichtlich ihres Einflusses auf die öffentliche Gesundheit? Hat die Kommission den Effekt auf das Niveau der Preise für gesunde und ungesunde Produkte bei bisherigen Subventionsallokationen beachtet?

2. Wird die Kommission bei den Vorschlägen für das nächste GAP-Budget den Effekten der Subventionen auf die öffentliche Gesundheit — dem Einfluss auf das Niveau der Preise für gesunde und ungesunde Produkte — mehr Beachtung schenken als bisher?

3. Wird die Kommission Änderungen des Subventionssystems vorschlagen, um den Effekten der Subventionen auf die öffentliche Gesundheit stärkeres Gewicht zu geben?

Antwort von Herrn Cioloş im Namen der Kommission
(4. Juni 2012)

1. Im EU-Vertrag ist verankert, dass bei der Festlegung und Umsetzung der politischen Ziele der Europäischen Union, auch im Bereich der Agrarpolitik, ein hoher Gesundheitsschutz sicherzustellen ist. In dem besonderen Fall der Agrarpolitik wird dies unter anderem durch Informationskampagnen und Förderinstrumente gewährleistet. Darüber hinaus wurden spezielle Programme wie das Schulobstprogramm ins Leben gerufen, um bereits im Kindesalter gesunde Ernährungsgewohnheiten zu fördern, indem die Bereitstellung von Obst, Gemüse und Bananenerzeugnissen für Schulkinder mitfinanziert wird. Des Weiteren wurden auf EU-Ebene große Anstrengungen unternommen, um den Obst- und Gemüseverzehr zu erhöhen.

2. Im Zuge der aufeinander folgenden Reformen hat die gemeinsame Agrarpolitik (GAP) für mehr Marktorientierung der Landwirtschaft gesorgt und die Erzeugereinkommen gestützt, so dass die Erzeuger ihre Entscheidungen hauptsächlich aufgrund von Marktsignalen und nicht aufgrund von staatlicher Unterstützung treffen.

Fragen der öffentlichen Gesundheit sind in die Ausarbeitung der neuen Vorschläge für die GAP-Reform eingeflossen. In Anbetracht der Tatsache, dass die allgemeine Tendenz der direkten Beihilfen nach wie vor in Richtung einer Entkopplung von Direktzahlungen geht, ist es jedoch nicht möglich, die Auswirkungen der direkten Beihilfen nach Erzeugnisart zu unterscheiden.

3. Derzeit beabsichtigt die Kommission nicht, weitere Änderungen des Beihilfesystems vorzuschlagen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003543/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Consideration of public health in agricultural subsidies

In the conclusion to his report A/HRC/29/59, dated 26 December 2011, Olivier de Schutter, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, writes: 'Taxpayers pay for misguided subsidies that encourage the agrifood industry to sell heavily processed foods at the expense of making fruits and vegetables available at lower prices.'

De Schutter recommends reviewing agricultural subsidy systems and changing them so that they no longer have a negative impact on public health. He favours lowering subsidies for products with a high fat or sugar content and maintaining, or even increasing, subsidies for healthier products, such as fresh vegetables.

1. How does the Commission assess the subsidies within the framework of the EU's common agricultural policy (CAP) in terms of their influence on public health? Has the Commission previously considered the impact of subsidy allocations on price levels for healthy and unhealthy products?

2. When making its proposals for the next CAP budget, will the Commission pay greater attention to the effects of subsidies on public health, specifically the impact on price levels for healthy and unhealthy products?

3. Will the Commission propose changes to the subsidy system in order to give greater weight to the impact of subsidies on public health?

Answer given by Mr Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(4 June 2012)

1. The EU treaty requires that in the definition and implementation of the Union policies, including agricultural policy, a high level of human health protection is ensured. In the specific case of agricultural policy, this is ensured, among other things, by information campaigns and promotion policy instruments. In addition, special schemes such as the school fruit scheme have been developed to promote healthy eating habits at an early age by co-funding the supply of fruit and vegetables and banana products to school children; also, important efforts have been done at EU level to promote fruit and vegetable consumption.

2. Through successive reforms the CAP has increased market orientation for agriculture while providing income support to producers. As a result, producer decisions are mainly based on market signals rather than public support.

Public health concerns have been taken into consideration in the preparation of the new proposals for the CAP Reform. However, taking into account that the general orientation of the direct support remains towards the decoupling of direct payments, there is no possibility to distinguish the effects of the direct support according to the type of product.

3. At this stage, the Commission does not intend to propose further changes to the subsidy system.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003544/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(2. April 2012)

Betrifft: Kommissionspläne zu Transfettsäuren in Nahrungsmitteln

In seinem Bericht A/HRC/29/59 vom 26. Dezember 2011 empfiehlt der UN-Sonderberichterstatter für das Recht auf Nahrung, Olivier de Schutter, den Staaten, zur Verbesserung der öffentlichen Gesundheit den kompletten Ersatz von Transfettsäuren in verarbeiteten Lebensmitteln durch mehrfach ungesättigte Fettsäuren anzustreben.

1. Wäre ein solcher Ersatz von Transfettsäuren durch mehrfach ungesättigte Fettsäuren in verarbeiteten Lebensmitteln nach Einschätzung der Kommission förderlich für die Gesundheit der EU-Bevölkerung?

2. Hält die Kommission eine solche Empfehlung für technisch und rechtlich umsetzbar?

3. Wenn die Kommission die Umsetzung für möglich hält, was hält die Kommission für einen realistischen Zeitraum, in dem die EU-Nahrungsmittelindustrie ihre Produktionsweise entsprechend transformieren könnte? Wird die Kommission, wenn sie dies nicht beantworten kann, eine entsprechende Studie in Auftrag geben?

4. Gedenkt die Kommission eine Regulierung, die den kompletten Ersatz von Transfettsäuren in verarbeiteten Lebensmitteln durch mehrfach ungesättigte Fettsäuren festlegt, vorzuschlagen?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(31. Mai 2012)

Der Verzehr von Transfettsäuren ist neben der Aufnahme von gesättigten Fettsäuren und der Gesamtfettaufnahme als Risikofaktor für die Entstehung von Herz-Kreislauf-Erkrankungen bekannt.

Gemäß Artikel 30 Absatz 7 der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 ([1]) des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates muss die Kommission bis zum 13. Dezember 2014 einen Bericht über Transfettsäuren in Lebensmitteln und in der generellen Ernährung der Bevölkerung der Union vorlegen. Mit diesem Bericht sollen die Auswirkungen geeigneter Mittel bewertet werden, die den Verbrauchern die Möglichkeit an die Hand geben könnten, sich für eine gesündere generelle Ernährung zu entscheiden. Die Kommission wurde aufgefordert, dem Bericht gegebenenfalls einen entsprechenden Gesetzgebungsvorschlag beizufügen.

Die Kommission befürwortet Selbstregulierungsmaßnahmen, um den Gehalt von Transfettsäuren in Lebensmitteln weiter zu verringern. Im Rahmen der EU-Plattform für Ernährung, Bewegung und Gesundheit existieren Selbstverpflichtungen, den Gehalt an Transfettsäuren durch Reformulierung der Produkte zu verringern[2].

([1]) ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011, S. 18.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_de.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003544/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Commission plans in relation to trans-fatty acids in foods

In Report A/HRC/29/59, dated 26 December 2011, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Olivier de Schutter, recommended that countries should seek to have trans-fatty acids in processed food completely replaced with poly-unsaturated fatty acids in order to improve public health.

1. In the Commission's assessment, would replacement of trans-fatty acids with poly-unsaturated fatty acids in processed food be beneficial to public health in the EU?

2. Does the Commission believe that such a recommendation is technically and legally feasible?

3. If the Commission believes that this is possible, what does it consider to be a realistic period for the EU food industry to change its production practices accordingly? If the Commission is unable to answer this question, will it have a study carried out on this?

4. Is the Commission considering proposing regulations for complete replacement of trans-fatty acids in processed foods with poly-unsaturated fatty acids?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2012)

Consumption of trans fats is, along with saturated fat and overall fat intake, known to be a risk factor for the development of cardiovascular disease.

Article 30.7 of European Parliament and Council Regulation (EU) No 1169/20011 ([1]) require the Commission to submit by 13 December 2014 a report on the presence of trans fats in foods and in the overall diet of the Union population. The aim of the report is to assess the impact of appropriate means that could enable consumers to make healthier overall dietary choices. The Commission is also asked to accompany this report with a legislative proposal, if appropriate.

The Commission is encouraging self-regulatory action in order to further decrease the content of trans fats in food products. There are commitments in the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health that concern the reformulation of products to reduce the content of trans fats ([2]).

([1]) OJ L 304/18, 22.11.2011.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003545/12
an die Kommission
Martin Kastler (PPE)
(2. April 2012)

Betrifft: Erfolgsmodell des Pensionssicherungsvereins und paneuropäische Betriebsrente

Das Europäische Parlament bringt in seinem Bericht über das Grünbuch „Pensionen“ (P7_TA(2011)0058) klar zum Ausdruck, „dass innerhalb der Vielfalt der Altersversorgungssysteme eine Diversifizierung der Vorsorgemodelle durch eine Mischung aus staatlichen (erste Säule) und arbeitsplatzbezogenen (meistens zweite Säule) Systemen die beste Gewähr für ein angemessenes Ruhestandseinkommen bietet“ (Ziffer 17) und betont, „dass die zweite und die dritte Säule bei der Verringerung des Drucks eine ergänzende Rolle zu spielen haben“. Es „wünscht daher, dass die Entwicklung sektoraler, sektorübergreifender und/oder territorialer Fonds dazu beiträgt, dass die Arbeitnehmer in KMU in verstärktem Maße in Rentensysteme eingebunden werden, was als Beispiel eines bewährten Verfahrens dienen könnte“ (Ziffer 3). Es fordert von der EU-Kommission „zu prüfen, ob Pensions-Sicherungs-Vereine, wie sie in Luxemburg und Deutschland zur Absicherung der zweiten Säule im Rahmen von ‚book reserve schemes‘ bestehen, anderen Mitgliedstaaten als Absicherungsmodell empfohlen werden können“.

1. Wie ist es um den Ausbau der so entscheidenden zweiten Säule der Betriebsrenten in den europäischen Mitgliedstaaten bestellt?

2. Welche Systeme weisen — auch über längere Zeiträume ihres Bestehens — verlässliche Sicherheit und verlässlichen Insolvenzschutz auf?

3. Gibt es konkrete Pläne, Überlegungen oder wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse dazu, das in Deutschland und Luxemburg erfolgreiche Modell des Pensionssicherungsvereins in einer Art „Europäischer Pensionssicherungsverein“ umzusetzen?

4. Beschäftigt sich die Kommission mit den Modellen der „paneuropäischen Betriebsrente“, und gibt es dazu Erkenntnisse oder Expertisen?

Antwort von Herrn Andor im Namen der Kommission
(25. Mai 2012)

1. Der Ausschuss für Sozialschutz hat 2008 einen Überblick über „Privately managed funded pension provision and their contribution to adequate and sustainable pensions“ (Privat verwaltete kapitalgedeckte Altersversorgungssysteme und ihr Beitrag zu angemessenen und tragfähigen Renten und Pensionen) vorgelegt. Ein Abschnitt dieses Überblicks behandelt Reformen zur Gewährleistung einer angemessenen Deckung und angemessener Beiträge ([1]). In jüngerer Zeit (2010) befassten sich der Ausschuss für Sozialschutz und der Ausschuss für Wirtschaftspolitik mit Renten- und Pensionssystemen ganz allgemein, darunter private Systeme, und diskutierten insbesondere politische Optionen für den Aufbau einer kapitalgedeckten Altersvorsorge. Zu diesem Bericht gibt es Länderprofile mit einer Beschreibung der Rolle privater Systeme ([2]).

2. Eine von der Kommission in Auftrag gegebene Studie aus dem Jahr 2010 beschreibt, wie die Ansprüche im Falle einer Insolvenz in den Mitgliedstaaten geschützt sind ([3]).

3. Es gibt keine Pläne, einen „Europäischen Pensionssicherungsverein“ nach dem Muster Deutschlands und Luxemburgs aufzubauen. Die Insolvenzrichtlinie ([4]) schützt den Anspruch der Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer auf betriebliche Zusatzpensionen bzw. -renten im Falle der Insolvenz des Unternehmens. Obwohl die Richtlinie die Modalitäten und den Umfang des zu gewährleistenden Schutzes nicht festlegt, hat der EuGH ([5]) entschieden, dass eine Garantie von weniger als der Hälfte der Leistungen, auf die eine Arbeitnehmerin bzw. ein Arbeitnehmer Anspruch hat, der Richtlinie widerspricht.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=743&langId=en.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=752&newsId=958&furtherNews=yes.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=706&langId=de&intPageId=198.
([4]) Richtlinie 2008/94/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 22. Oktober 2008 über den Schutz der Arbeitnehmer bei Zahlungsunfähigkeit des Arbeitgebers. ABl. L 283 vom 28.10.2008, S. 36.
([5]) Urteil des EuGH vom 25. Januar 2007; Rechtssache C 278/05 (Carol Marilyn Robins u. a. gegen Secretary of State for Work and Pensions). Slg. 2007, S. I-1053.

4. Die Kommission befasst sich derzeit nicht mit Modellen für paneuropäische Betriebsvorsorgesysteme, verweist jedoch darauf, dass die Richtlinie über die Tätigkeiten und die Beaufsichtigung von Einrichtungen der betrieblichen Altersversorgung (IORP-Richtlinie) einen europäischen Rechtsrahmen für die Einrichtung von Renten- und Pensionsträgern schafft, die grenzüberschreitend tätig sind. Darüber hinaus unterstützt die Kommission ein Projekt zur Einrichtung paneuropäischer Zusatzpensionsfonds für Forscherinnen und Forscher. Arbeitgeberinnen und Arbeitgeber von Forschungspersonal sollen Informationen zur Einrichtung eines solchen Pensionsfonds für ihre Forscherinnen und Forscher erhalten, um Hindernisse für deren Mobilität und die grenzüberschreitende Zusammenarbeit abzubauen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003545/12
to the Commission
Martin Kastler (PPE)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Successful model of the pension insurance association and pan-European occupational pensions

In its report on the 'Pensions' Green Paper (P7_TA(2011)0058), the European Parliament clearly states that 'within the range of pension systems, diversification of pension income from a mix of public (first pillar) and work-related (in most cases second pillar) schemes, can provide a guarantee of adequate pension provision' (Paragraph 17) and emphasises 'that the second and third pillars have a supplementary role to play in reducing pressure'. It 'wishes therefore to see the development of sectoral, intersectoral and/or territorial funds to increase affiliation of workers in SMEs to pension systems, which could serve as an example of best practice' (paragraph 3). It calls on the EU Commission to examine 'whether pension insurance associations, such as those that exist in Luxembourg and Germany to protect the book reserve second pillar schemes, can be recommended to other Member States to protect the security mechanism'.

1. What provisions are in place for the expansion of the vitally important second pillar of occupational pensions in the European Member States?

2. Which systems offer reliable security and protection against insolvency — even in the longer term?

3. Are specific plans, ideas or scientific findings available regarding how the pension insurance association model, which has been successful in Germany and Luxembourg, can be implemented in a kind of 'European pension insurance association'?

4. Is the Commission considering models for a 'pan-European occupational pension' and does it have access to information or expertise in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

1. An overview on 'Privately managed funded pension provision and their contribution to adequate and sustainable pensions' has been presented by the Social Protection Committee in 2008. It includes a section on reforms to ensure adequate coverage and contributions ([1]). More recently, in 2010, the SPC and the Economic Policy Committee looked at overall pension systems, including private schemes, and discussed in particular policy options for managing the build-up of funded pensions. This report was accompanied by country profiles describing the role of private schemes ([2]).

2. Insolvency protection arrangements in the Member States are described in a study commissioned in 2010 by the Commission ([3]).

3. There are no plans to develop a European Pensions Insurance Association of the kind used in Germany and Luxembourg. The Employer Insolvency Directive ([4]) provides for the protection of employees' rights to supplementary occupational pensions in the event of the insolvency of their employer. Although the directive does not specify the modalities and the level of protection that has to be provided, the ECJ has ruled that a guarantee of less than half of the benefits to which an employee is entitled does not comply with the directive ([5]).

4. The Commission is not considering models for pan-European occupational pension plans, but recalls that the directive on Institutions for Occupational Retirement Provision does create a European legal framework for putting in place pension institutions that operate across borders. Moreover, the Commission supports a project to set up pan-European supplementary pensions funds for researchers. It aims at providing information to employers of researchers about setting up such a pension fund for their researchers with a view to remove obstacles to their mobility and cross-border cooperation.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=743&langId=en
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=752&newsId=958&furtherNews=yes
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=706&langId=en&intPageId=198
([4]) Directive 2008/94/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2008 on the protection of employees in the event of the insolvency of their employer. OJ L 283, 28.10.2008, p. 36.
([5]) Judgment of the Court of 25 January 2007. Case C-278/05 (*Carol Marilyn Robins and Others* v *Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*) [2007] ECR I-1053.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003546/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(2 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Οι συνεχείς περικοπές των συντάξεων συνιστούν απειλή για την κοινωνική συνοχή και την πραγματική οικονομία

Σύμφωνα με σχετική έκθεση -που ψηφίστηκε ομόφωνα- της Επιτροπής για την Κοινωνική Πολιτική και την Υγεία, της Συνέλευσης του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης, υποστηρίζεται, μεταξύ άλλων, ότι οι περικοπές συντάξεων αλλά και η γενικότερη τάση για τη χορήγηση όλο και μικρότερων συντάξεων απειλούν την κοινωνική συνοχή πολλών ευρωπαϊκών κρατών. Ταυτόχρονα στην «Πράσινη Βίβλο για Επαρκή, Βιώσιμα και Ασφαλή Ευρωπαϊκά Συνταξιοδοτικά Συστήματα» επισημαίνεται ότι οι συνταξιούχοι αποτελούν μια σημαντική καταναλωτική ομάδα και το διαθέσιμο εισόδημά τους «τροφοδοτεί» είτε άμεσα είτε έμμεσα την πραγματική οικονομία. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο και με βάση αφενός το διακηρυγμένο στόχο της ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση της φτώχειας και αφετέρου την κοινή επιδίωξη της διαμόρφωσης ενός αξιοπρεπούς επιπέδου διαβίωσης για τους απόμαχους της εργασίας, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Πώς κρίνει το γεγονός των διαδοχικών μειώσεων των συντάξεων στα κράτη μέλη που αντιμετωπίζουν σοβαρά δημοσιονομικά προβλήματα, καθώς και τις επιπτώσεις του τόσο στο βιοτικό επίπεδο των συνταξιούχων όσο και στην αγορά, μέσα από τη ραγδαία υποβάθμιση της αγοραστικής και καταναλωτικής τους δύναμης;

— Πώς αξιολογεί την κοινωνικά άδικη και οικονομικά αναποτελεσματική λογική των συνεχών και οριζόντιων μειώσεων των συντάξεων ως αντισταθμιστικό μέτρο της ανεπάρκειας στην καταπολέμηση της φοροδιαφυγής και της εισφοροδιαφυγής;

— Με δεδομένη τη μεγάλη αύξηση του ποσοστού της φτώχειας, προκρίνει τη θεσμοθέτηση ελάχιστης εγγυημένης σύνταξης ίσης με το εθνικό όριο της φτώχειας, ιδιαίτερα για τα κράτη μέλη που δεν διαθέτουν μηχανισμό ελάχιστου εγγυημένου εισοδήματος;

— Πόσο συμβατή με την προοπτική διασφάλισης επαρκών συντάξεων είναι η πλήρης απορρύθμιση της αγοράς εργασίας και η άναρχη επέκταση των ευέλικτων μορφών εργασίας που επιχειρείται βίαια σε χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(29 Μαΐου 2012)

1. Η οργάνωση των συνταξιοδοτικών συστημάτων αποτελεί αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών. Ωστόσο, όπως αναφέρεται στη Λευκή Βίβλο για επαρκείς, ασφαλείς και βιώσιμες συντάξεις ([1]), η Επιτροπή επιδιώκει να υποστηρίζει τις μεταρρυθμίσεις. Η επίπτωση των συνταξιοδοτικών μεταρρυθμίσεων στο βιοτικό επίπεδο των συνταξιούχων παρακολουθείται από την επιτροπή κοινωνικής προστασίας, η οποία θα εκδώσει την πρώτη έκθεσή της σχετικά με την επάρκεια των συντάξεων πριν από το καλοκαίρι.

2. Η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να εκτιμήσει σε ποιο βαθμό η φοροδιαφυγή και εισφοροδιαφυγή μπορούν, σε ορισμένες χώρες, να υπονομεύσουν τη βιωσιμότητα των συντάξεων. Η κυριότερη πίεση στη βιωσιμότητα των συνταξιοδοτικών συστημάτων σε όλη την Ευρώπη είναι πιθανόν να προέρχεται από τη γήρανση του πληθυσμού. Ως εκ τούτου, η Λευκή Βίβλος παρουσιάζει τις βασικές πολιτικές απαντήσεις, όπως, μεταξύ άλλων, η εξασφάλιση του ότι υφίσταται η δέουσα ισορροπία μεταξύ του χρόνου εργασίας και του χρόνου συνταξιοδότησης και της αναγνώρισης του ότι τα άτομα, κατά μέσο όρο, ζουν περισσότερο.

3. Τα διαθέσιμα στοιχεία δεν επιτρέπουν την εξαγωγή οριστικών συμπερασμάτων για τις τάσεις της φτώχειας μεταξύ των ηλικιωμένων. Ωστόσο, υπάρχουν σαφείς ενδείξεις ότι η ικανότητα των συνταξιοδοτικών συστημάτων για την προστασία των ηλικιωμένων από τη φτώχεια πρέπει να ενισχυθεί σε πολλές χώρες. Αν και προβλέπονται ήδη σε πολλές χώρες εγγυημένες ελάχιστες συντάξεις, είναι σημαντικό να διατηρείται περιορισμένος ο αριθμός των ατόμων που αναγκάζονται να βασίζονται σ' αυτές, με την εκπόνηση συνταξιοδοτικών συστημάτων τα οποία επιτρέπουν στα άτομα να κατοχυρώνουν επαρκή συνταξιοδοτικά δικαιώματα.

4. Όλα τα συνταξιοδοτικά συστήματα βασίζονται τελικά στη δύναμη της υποκείμενης οικονομίας που τα χρηματοδοτεί. Επομένως, στο μέτρο που οι μεταρρυθμίσεις στην αγορά εργασίας βοηθούν τις οικονομίες να δώσουν νέα ώθηση στην ανάπτυξη και την απασχόληση, συμβάλλουν επίσης στην ύπαρξη επαρκών και βιώσιμων συντάξεων.

([1]) COM(2012)55 τελικό της 16ης Φεβρουαρίου 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003546/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Continued pension cuts represent a threat to social cohesion and the real economy

A report by the Social Policy and Public Health Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, which was adopted unanimously, maintains *inter alia*, that pension cuts and the general trend of granting increasingly small pensions are threatening the social cohesion of many EU Member States. At the same time, the 'Green Paper towards adequate, sustainable and safe European pension systems' points out that pensioners constitute an important consumer group and that their available income 'feeds' the real economy, either directly or indirectly. In this context and on the basis of the EU's stated objective, on the one hand, of combating poverty and, on the other hand, the shared ambition of creating dignified standards of living for pensioners, will the Commission say:

— What view does it take of the successive pension cuts in Member States facing serious financial problems and their impact on the living standards of pensioners and on the market through the abrupt reduction to their purchasing and consumer power?

— What is its assessment of the socially unjust and economically ineffective logic of the continuous and horizontal cuts in pensions as a measure to compensate for the failure to combat tax and contribution evasion?

— Given the large increase in the poverty rate, does it favour the introduction of a guaranteed minimum pension equal to national poverty thresholds, particularly for Member States which do not have a guaranteed minimum income mechanism?

— How compatible are the complete deregulation of the labour market and the explosion in flexible forms of work, which are being sought by force in countries such as Greece, with the prospect of ensuring adequate pensions?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 May 2012)

1. The organisation of pension systems is the responsibility of the Member States. However, as stated in the White Paper on adequate, safe and sustainable pensions ([1]), the Commission does seek to support reform. The impact of pension reforms on the living standards of pensioners is monitored by the Social Protection Committee, which will issue its first pensions adequacy report before this summer.

2. The Commission is unable to assess the extent to which tax and contribution evasion may, in some countries, undermine the affordability of pensions. The main pressure on the affordability of pension systems across Europe is likely to result from demographic ageing. Therefore, the White Paper sets out the key policy responses, including ensuring that there is an appropriate balance between the time spent in work and the time spent in retirement, recognising that people are, on average, living longer.

3. The available data does not allow for any definitive conclusions to be drawn on poverty trends among older people. However, there are clear indications that the capacity of pension systems to protect older people from poverty may have to be strengthened in several countries. Although guaranteed minimum pensions already exist in many countries, it is important to keep the number of people who have to rely on them small, by designing pension systems that allow people to earn sufficient pension rights.

4. All pension systems ultimately rely on the strength of the underlying economy which funds them. So, insofar as labour market reforms help economies return to the path of growth and jobs, they also help ensure that pensions are both adequate and sustainable.

([1]) COM(2012) 55 final of 16 February 2012.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003547/12
προς το Συμβούλιο
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(2 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: PCE/PEC — Έκκληση Ευρωπαίων ηγετών για ανάπτυξη

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

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

Ο Πρόεδρος του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου ερωτάται:

1. Θεωρεί ότι τα συμπεράσματα του πιο πρόσφατου Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου (1-2 Μαρτίου 2012) καλύπτουν επαρκώς τις ανησυχίες που εκφράζονται στην προαναφερθείσα επιστολή των Ευρωπαίων ηγετών;

2. Ποιες θεωρεί ότι είναι οι ευθύνες σε εθνικό και ποιες σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο, τόσο για τη δημοσιονομική εξυγίανση κρατών μελών όσο και για το σχεδιασμό μέτρων που ενθαρρύνουν την ανάπτυξη και την απασχόληση και την συνοχή στην Ένωση;

3. Ποια τα βήματα, σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο, για την υλοποίηση μίας συντονισμένης πρωτοβουλίας οικονομικής ανάπτυξης;

Απάντηση
(6 Ιουνίου 2012)

Το Συμβούλιο δεν είναι αρμόδιο να απαντά σε ερωτήσεις που αφορούν τον Πρόεδρο του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου, καθώς το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο αποτελεί διαφορετικό θεσμικό όργανο.

([1]) http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/joint-letter-to-president-van-rompuy-and-president-barroso/.
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/12/161&format=HTML&aged=0&language=FR&guiLanguage=en.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003547/12
to the Council
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: PCE/PEC — Appeal by EU leaders for growth

On 20 February 2012, 12 EU leaders sent a letter to the President of the European Council, Herman Van Rompuy, calling for the adoption of a strategy to restore growth. Specifically, they called for a strategy to open up the markets of the Member States to each other and boost business mobility and growth.

The letter emphasises that action must be focused on eight priorities for boosting recovery, including the energy, services and research sectors, as well as the development of trade relations with countries such as China and Russia ([1]). At the same time, on 6 March 2012 at a conference in Paris, the Commissioner for Internal Market and Services, Michel Barnier, stressed the urgent need for a united 'European initiative for growth' ([2]).

Will the President of the European Council answer the following:

1. Does it consider that the conclusions of the most recent European Council (1-2 March 2012) adequately cover the concerns expressed by the aforementioned letter from EU leaders?

2. Who does it consider responsible, at national and EU level respectively, for financial reform in the Member States and the drafting of measures to encourage growth, employment and cohesion in the EU?

3. What steps need to be taken on an EU level to implement a united European initiative for economic growth?

Reply
(6 June 2012)

It is not for the Council to answer questions concerning the President of the European Council, since the European Council is a separate institution.

([1]) http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/joint-letter-to-president-van-rompuy-and-president-barroso/.
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/12/161&format=HTML&aged=0&language=FR&guiLanguage=en.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003549/12
aan de Commissie
Judith A. Merkies (S&D) en Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(2 april 2012)

Betreft: Wifi-verbinding in vliegtuigen

Mobiel bellen en internetten is vaak nog onmogelijk op vliegtuigen en treinen. Veel spoormaatschappijen investeerden al in Wifi-verbindingen op treinen, maar het grootste deel van de treinen rijdt nog webloos rond. De Nederlandse spoorwegmaatschappij NS maakte in maart 2010 een begin met de uitrusting van al haar treinen met gratis internet aan boord via een Wifi-verbinding.

De Commissie heeft zichzelf tot doel gesteld om in 2015 tot een digitale interne markt te komen. Een van de acties in dat kader is de promotie van mobiel internet via tabletcomputers, mobiele telefoons en smartphones. De ondersteuning voor het aanleggen van breedbandverbindingen en het recent vastgestelde spectrumbeleid zijn onderdelen van het digitale Europese marktbeleid.

Bij vliegtuigen is het complexer. Als een vliegtuigmaatschappij mobiele diensten wil aanbieden aan haar klanten moet ze daarvoor beroep doen op een satellietsysteem of een Air To Ground-systeem.

Air To Ground zou een goedkopere en snellere oplossing zijn dan het bellen via satellieten en is erg succesvol in de VS. In de EU is dit moeilijk te realiseren. Daarvoor moet een akkoord gesloten worden over waar de operator gevestigd wordt, welke wetgeving geldt en op welke frequentie het Air to Ground-systeem gaat werken.

— Wat gaat de Commissie doen om mobiel bellen en internetten ook mogelijk te maken op vliegtuigen?

— Overweegt de Commissie de regeling van een Air To Ground systeem in Europa?

— Op welke manier heeft de Commissie in haar nieuwe spectrumbeleid rekening gehouden met het faciliteren van mobiel bellen en internetten in de lucht en een Air To Ground-systeem in Europa?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie

(30 mei 2012)

De beschikking van de Commissie betreffende geharmoniseerde spectrumgebruiksvoorwaarden voor mobiele communicatiediensten aan boord van vliegtuigen (MCA-diensten) in de Europese Unie ([1]) harmoniseert de technische voorwaarden voor de beschikbaarheid en het doelmatig gebruik van radiospectrum voor mobiele communicatiediensten aan boord van vliegtuigen in de Unie. Dit zou een spoedige ontwikkeling en toepassing van MCA-diensten in de Unie moeten vergemakkelijken.

Om het toepassingsgebied van systemen en diensten die momenteel beschikbaar zijn beter op elkaar af te stemmen, heeft de Commissie de CEPT in oktober 2011 opdracht gegeven de technische compatibiliteit te onderzoeken van mobiele draadloze communicatiesystemen in vliegtuigen evenals andere mogelijke technologieën zoals LTE ([2]) of WiMax ([3]). Inzet van dergelijke technologieën zou de connectiviteit voor passagiers in vliegtuigen verder verbeteren en de doelstellingen van de digitale interne markt in de EU beter ondersteunen.

([1]) Zie Beschikking 2008/294/EG van de Commissie van 7 april 2008.
([2]) Long Term Evolution (evolutie op lange termijn).
([3]) Worldwide interoperability for microwave access (wereldwijde interoperabiliteit voor microgolftoegang).

In het kader van de openbare raadpleging van de Europese Commissie over de invoering van technische voorwaarden voor harmonisatie in de terrestrische 2 GHz-band ([4]), hebben sommige belanghebbenden belangstelling aan de dag gelegd voor een ai-to-groundsysteem in Europa, maar de sociaaleconomische voordelen en de economische haalbaarheid werden in die context niet aangetoond. Air-to-ground-breedbandconnectiviteit werd als zodanig in het recent vastgestelde eerste meerjarenprogramma voor het radiopspectrumbeleid ([5]) niet expliciet als prioritair beschouwd, ook al zou dat uit het oogpunt van de mededinging op het gebied van infrastructuur wel voordelen kunnen opleveren.

Overeenkomstig artikel 8 van het programma voor het radiospectrumbeleid zal de Commissie in samenwerking met de lidstaten een inventaris opmaken van de bestaande spectrumtoepassingen en nagaan hoeveel spectrum voor deze toepassingen in de toekomst vereist is. In dat kader kan worden gedacht aan de potentiële behoefte aan spectrum op basis van gedeeld gebruik van een air-to-groundsysteem in Europa.

([4]) Zie de reacties voor deze openbare raadpleging:http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/policy/ecomm/radio_spectrum/_archived_pages/consultations/2ghz_pc_responses/index_en.htm

([5]) Zie Besluit nr. 243/2012/EU van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 14 maart 2012 tot vaststelling van een meerjarenprogramma voor het radiospectrumbeleid.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003549/12
to the Commission
Judith A. Merkies (S&D) and Saïd El Khadraoui (S&D)
(2 April 2012)

Subject: Wi-Fi connection in aeroplanes

Calling on mobile phones and using the Internet is often still impossible on aeroplanes and trains. Many rail companies have already invested in Wi-Fi connections on trains, but the majority of trains still offer no Internet access. The Dutch rail company NS made a start in March 2010 by equipping all its trains with free Internet on board via a Wi-Fi connection.

The Commission has set itself a goal to establish a digital internal market in 2015. One of the campaigns within that framework is the promotion of mobile Internet via tablet computers, mobile telephones and smart phones. The support for the installation of broadband connections and the recently established spectrum policy are elements of the digital European market policy.

The situation is more complex with aeroplanes. If an airline wants to offer mobile services to its customers, it has to resort to a satellite system or an air-to-ground system.

Air-to-ground would be a cheaper and faster solution than calling via satellites and it is very successful in the US. This solution, however, is difficult to put into effect in the EU. An agreement must be made beforehand about where the operator will be established, which legislation is valid and at which frequency the air-to-ground system will work.

— What is the Commission going to do in order to make it possible to call on mobile phones and use the Internet on aeroplanes too?

— Is the Commission considering the arrangement of an air-to-ground system in Europe?

— In what way has the Commission, in its new spectrum policy, taken into account the provision of airborne mobile phone and Internet facilities and an air-to-ground system in Europe?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

Commission Decision on harmonised conditions of spectrum use for the operation of mobile communication services on aircraft (MCA services) in the European Union ([1]) harmonises the technical conditions for the availability and efficient use of radio spectrum for mobile communication services on aircraft in the Union. This should facilitate timely deployment and uptake of MCA services within the Union.

With a view to extending the scope of compatible systems and services currently available, the Commission issued a Mandate to CEPT in October 2011 to study the technical compatibility of airborne UMTS systems, as well as other feasible technologies like LTE ([2]) or WiMax ([3]), the inclusion of which would further improve the connectivity for airborne passengers and further support the objectives of the EU digital internal market.

When it comes to the arrangement of an air-to-ground system in Europe, some stakeholders have expressed interest in such a system during the European Commission's public consultation on the introduction of technical harmonisation conditions in the terrestrial 2 GHz band ([4]), but the socioeconomic benefits and business case were not substantiated in that context. Air-to-ground broadband connectivity as such is not an explicit priority in the recently adopted first multiannual Radio Spectrum Policy Programme ([5]), although it could bring benefits viewed from the perspective of infrastructure competition.

As established by Article 8 of the Radio Spectrum Policy Programme the Commission will, in cooperation with the Member States, organise an inventory of existing spectrum uses and emerging needs for spectrum in the future, in which context the potential need for spectrum on a shared basis of an air-to-ground system in Europe can be considered.

([1]) See Commission Decision 2008/294/EC of 7 April 2008.
([2]) Long Term Evolution.
([3]) Worldwide interoperability for microwave access.
([4]) See the responses to this public consultation: http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/policy/ecomm/radio_spectrum/_archived_pages/consultations/2ghz_pc_responses/index_en.htm
([5]) See Decision No 243/2012/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March 2012 establishing a multiannual radio spectrum policy programme.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003550/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(3. April 2012)

Betrifft: Wassermangel in Europa

Das österreichische Bundesministerium für Land- und Forstwirtschaft, Umwelt und Wasserwirtschaft bezeichnet Wasser als „unsere wichtigste Lebensgrundlage". Weiter führt das Ministerium aus: „Es ist unverzichtbare Ressource für die Landwirtschaft, den Freizeit- und Tourismusbereich sowie die Energiewirtschaft und Lebensraum für Fauna und Flora".

Der Wassermangel Europas ist ein Problem für viele Länder. Das Europäische Parlament behandelt neue Rechtsvorschriften für den Bereich der Wasserwirtschaft, damit dieses wertvolle Gut als öffentlich und frei anerkannt wird. Wollen wir keine Unruhe zwischen europäischen Ländern im Falle eines Wassermangels, muss die Gesellschaft neue Lösungen finden, damit Wasser gespart und effizienter und besser genutzt wird. Die Behandlung von Abwasser ist auch sehr wichtig, wenn wir Wasser wieder verwenden wollen.

1. Welche Sensibilisierungsprogramme hat die Kommission bereits entwickelt, um die Bevölkerung Europas über bessere und effiziente Wasserhandlungsmethoden zu unterrichten?

2. Unterstützt die Kommission neue Projekte für eine effizientere Behandlung von Abwasser?

3. In der Wasserrahmenrichtlinie 2000/60/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 23. Oktober 2000 zur Schaffung eines Ordnungsrahmens für Maßnahmen der Gemeinschaft im Bereich der Wasserpolitik heißt es, dass Wasser keine übliche Handelsware, sondern ein ererbtes Gut ist. Welche Maßnahmen hat die Kommission ergriffen, um der Privatisierung des Wassers entgegenzuwirken?

4. Das Recht auf einwandfreies und sauberes Trinkwasser und Sanitärversorgung wird in der Resolution 64/292 der UN-Generalversammlung vom Juli 2010 und in der Resolution A/HRC/15/L.14 des UNO-Menschenrechtsrats vom September 2010 anerkannt. Beabsichtigt die Kommission, dieses Recht in die Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union aufzunehmen?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(6. Juni 2012)

Die Kommission wird weiterhin die Entwicklung neuer und effizienterer Abwasserbehandlungsverfahren fördern. Neben einer großen Zahl von Projekten, die bereits mit EU-Forschungsmitteln und im Rahmen von LIFE unterstützt werden, befindet sich derzeit eine europäische Innovationspartnerschaft für Wasser in der Planung.

Mit dieser Initiative werden die Entwicklung und Verbreitung von innovativen Technologien im Bereich der Wasserwirtschaft gefördert. Des Weiteren waren bei der Konferenz zur Grünen Woche 2012 einige Sitzungen neuen Entwicklungen und ihrem Beitrag zur Schaffung von Wasserressourcen gewidmet ([1]).

Gemäß Artikel 345 AEUV lassen die Verträge die Eigentumsordnung in den verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten unberührt. Da diese Angelegenheit in Händen der Mitgliedstaaten liegt, ist die Kommission weder für noch gegen die Erhaltung des staatlichen Wassermonopols. In der Tat unterscheidet sich die Art des Eigentums der Ressource Wasser und der Verteilnetze erheblich, nicht nur zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten, sondern auch innerhalb der Mitgliedstaaten auf regionaler und lokaler Ebene.

Hinsichtlich der Aufnahme des Rechts auf Trinkwasser in die Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union möchte die Kommission darauf hinweisen, dass in Artikel 35 der Charta bereits die Integration eines hohen Umweltschutzniveaus in die Politik der Europäischen Union festgelegt ist. In jedem Fall kann die Kommission sich nicht zu den Absichten des Rates äußern.

([1]) http://www.greenweek-2012.eu/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003550/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Water shortages in Europe

The Austrian Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, the Environment and Water Management refers to water as 'our most important life support system'. The Ministry continues: 'It is a vital resource for agriculture, the leisure and tourism sector and the energy industry, as well as a habitat for flora and fauna.'

The shortage of water in Europe is a problem for many countries. The European Parliament is discussing new legal provisions for the area of water management, ensuring that this valuable asset is recognised as free, public property. If we want to avoid disputes between European countries when it comes to water shortages, society must find new solutions to enable water to be conserved and used more efficiently and effectively. The treatment of waste water is also very important if we wish to recycle water.

1. What awareness programmes has the Commission already developed to inform the population of Europe about better and more efficient water treatment methods?

2. Does the Commission support new projects for the more efficient treatment of waste water?

3. Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (Water Framework Directive) states that water is not a commercial product like any other, but is, rather, part of our heritage. What measures has the Commission taken to counteract the privatisation of water?

4. The right to pure, hygienic drinking water and sanitary provisions is recognised in Resolution 64/292 of the UN General Assembly, dated July 2010 and Resolution A/HRC/15/L.14 of the UN Human Rights Council, dated September 2010. Does the Council intend including this right in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union?

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

The Commission will continue to promote the development of new and more efficient waste water treatment processes. In addition to the large number of projects already supported by EU Research funds as well as by the LIFE Instrument, a European Innovation Partnership on Water is being developed.

This initiative will foster the development and dissemination of innovative technologies in the field of water management. Moreover, the 2012 Green Week Conference dedicated some sessions to discuss new developments and their contribution to the generation of water resources ([1]).

Article 345 of the TFEU indicates that the Treaties shall in no way prejudice the rules in Member States governing the system of property ownership. Since this matter is left to Member States, the Commission is neither in favour nor against maintaining a public monopoly on water supply. In fact, the type of ownership of water resources and distribution networks varies considerably, not only across Member States but also within Member States, at regional and local scale.

As regards the inclusion of the right to water into the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, the Commission would like to underline that Article 35 of the Charter already asks for the integration of a high level of environmental protection into the policies of the Union. In any event, Commission cannot express itself on the Council's intention to act.

([1]) http://www.greenweek-2012.eu/ .

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003553/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej / Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Aresztowania w Kosowie i Serbii

Czterech kosowskich Serbów, w tym burmistrz miejscowości Vitina, zostało aresztowanych przez kosowską policję, gdy próbowali wjechać do Kosowa przez przejście graniczne Bela Zemlja. Następnie oskarżono ich o „podżeganie do nienawiści i nietolerancji wśród grup etnicznych". Mieli oni przy sobie materiały przeznaczone na wybory, które, jak twierdzą kosowscy Serbowie, odbędą się w dniu 6 maja 2012 r. na kontrolowanych przez Serbów obszarach północnego Kosowa. O ile planowane wybory zostały potępione przez przedstawicieli misji Unii Europejskiej w zakresie praworządności w Kosowie (EULEX) z uwagi na to, że są sprzeczne z prawem międzynarodowym, o tyle nie ma jasności co do tego, w jaki sposób posiadanie materiałów wyborczych może stanowić przestępstwo. W odpowiedzi w dniu 28 marca 2012 r. na przejściu granicznym w okolicach miejscowości Gnjilane w Kosowie serbska straż graniczna aresztowała dwóch kosowskich Albańczyków.

W jaki sposób EULEX reaguje na rosnące niepokoje i napięcia między władzami Kosowa i Serbii?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(15 czerwca 2012 r.)

Organizacja Bezpieczeństwa i Współpracy w Europie (OBWE) z powodzeniem przyczyniła się do usprawnienia organizacji serbskich wyborów parlamentarnych i prezydenckich w dniu 6 maja 2012 r. oraz drugiej rundy serbskich wyborów prezydenckich w dniu 20 maja 2012 r. w Kosowie*. Dzięki doskonałej współpracy pomiędzy wszystkimi właściwymi podmiotami na szczeblu lokalnym i międzynarodowym oraz ich przygotowaniu wybory te przebiegły bez zgłoszenia żadnych incydentów zagrażających bezpieczeństwu.

Przeprowadzenie serbskich wyborów lokalnych zostało uznane przez Misję Tymczasowej Administracji Organizacji Narodów Zjednoczonych w Kosowie (UNMIK) za niemożliwe. Zatem jakakolwiek próba jednostronnego zorganizowania takich wyborów nie była zgodna z rezolucją Rady Bezpieczeństwa ONZ 1244.

Aresztowanie czterech kosowskich Serbów, w tym burmistrza miejscowości Vitina, którego mandat nie jest uznawany ani przez UNMIK ani przez rząd Kosowa, było uważnie śledzone przez EULEX w ramach jego mandatu w zakresie mentoringu, monitoringu i doradztwa. Czterech kosowskich Serbów w końcu zwolniono z aresztu. Jeśli chodzi o aresztowania kosowskich Albańczyków w Serbii, EULEX równie uważnie śledził stosowny przypadek i wreszcie ułatwił ich powrót do Kosowa.

** Użycie tej nazwy nie ma wpływu na stanowiska w sprawie statusu Kosowa i jest zgodne z rezolucją Rady Bezpieczeństwa ONZ 1244 oraz opinią Międzynarodowego Trybunału Sprawiedliwości na temat ogłoszenia przez Kosowo niepodległości.*

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003553/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Arrests in Kosovo and Serbia

Four Kosovo Serbs, including the mayor of the town of Vitina, were arrested by Kosovo police as they tried to cross back into Kosovo at the Bela Zemlja border post and subsequently charged with 'incitement to hatred and intolerance among ethnic groups'. They were carrying materials for elections that Kosovo Serbs say will be held in Serb-controlled areas of northern Kosovo on 6 May 2012. While the planned elections have been condemned by the EU Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (EULEX) as being contrary to international law, it is not clear how possessing election materials might constitute a criminal offence. In response, Serbian border police arrested two Kosovo Albanians at a border crossing near Gjilan, Kosovo, on 28 March 2012.

How is the EULEX mission responding to the growing unrest and escalating tensions between the authorities in Kosovo and Serbia?

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

The Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) successfully facilitated the organisation of Serbian parliamentary and presidential elections on 6 May 2012, and the second round of the Serbian presidential elections on 20 May 2012 in Kosovo*. Due to excellent cooperation and preparation between all relevant local and international actors in Kosovo, these elections passed without any reported security incident.

The holding of Serbian local elections was judged by the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) as not possible. Therefore, any attempt to unilaterally organise such elections was not compliant with UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1244.

The arrest of the four Kosovo Serbs, including the mayor of Vitina, whose mandate is neither recognised by UNMIK nor by the Government of Kosovo, was closely followed by EULEX within its mentoring, monitoring and advising mandate The four Kosovo Serbs were eventually released. As to the arrests of Kosovo Albanians in Serbia, EULEX equally closely followed up on the case and in the end facilitated their return to Kosovo

* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with the UNSCR 1244 and the International Court of Justice (ICJ) Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003554/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Azerbejdżan: sprawa Vugara Gonagova i Zaura Guliyeva

Vugar Gonagov i Zaur Guliyev pracują dla regionalnej stacji telewizyjnej Xayal TV z siedzibą w Qubie w Azerbejdżanie. W dniu 13 marca 2012 r. zostali zatrzymani, tymczasowo aresztowani na dwa miesiące i przeniesieni do Ministerstwa Spraw Wewnętrznych w Baku bez możliwości skorzystania z pomocy adwokata. Ich rodziny nie otrzymały informacji o ich miejscu pobytu. Władze w żaden sposób nie wyjaśniły ich sytuacji ani braku dostępu do adwokata, co stanowi naruszenie prawa Azerbejdżanu i prawa międzynarodowego. Wreszcie Vugarowi Gonagovi zezwolono na krótkie spotkania z jego adwokatem Elchinem Sadigovem, które odbyły się w dniach 28 i 30 marca. Jednak w dniu 30 marca Vugar Gonagov oznajmił Elchinowi Sadigovi, że nie chce, aby ten w dalszym ciągu go reprezentował, i że skorzysta z pomocy adwokata z urzędu. Elchin Sadigov powiedział przedstawicielom organizacji Human Rights Watch, że jego zdaniem policja zmusiła Vugara Gonagova do zrezygnowania z usług niezależnego adwokata.

— Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zna sprawę Vugara Gonagova i Zaura Guliyeva?

— W jaki sposób UE zamierza wspierać reformy w zakresie praw człowieka w Azerbejdżanie?

— W jaki sposób jest to realizowane w kontekście Partnerstwa Wschodniego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(14 czerwca 2012 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodnicząca jest świadoma wydarzeń, które miały miejsce w dniu 1 marca 2012 r. w Qubie, w wyniku których zatrzymano dwóch dziennikarzy stacji telewizyjnej Xayal TV: Vugara Gonagova i Zaura Guliyeva. Wydział ds. Badania Poważnych Przestępstw w Urzędzie Prokuratora Generalnego wszczął przeciwko nim postępowanie karne, zarzucając im organizowanie niepokojów społecznych i branie w nich udziału (art. 233 kodeksu karnego) oraz nadużycie władzy (art. 309.2). Sąd ds. Poważnych Przestępstw skazał obu dziennikarzy na dwa miesiące tymczasowego aresztu. Potencjalnie grożą im trzy lata więzienia. Złożyli oni wniosek o zwolnienie z aresztu do czasu rozpoczęcia procesu, który jednak został odrzucony. Jeden z nich, Zaur Guliyev, ma podobno problemy zdrowotne. Do chwili obecnej odmawia mu się jednak leczenia.

UE wielokrotnie podnosiła tę kwestię i wyrażała obawy związane z sytuacją dotyczącą wolności słowa, w tym także z warunkami pracy dziennikarzy w Azerbejdżanie, w szczególności podczas spotkania Rady Współpracy UE-Azerbejdżan w dniu 25 listopada 2011 r. oraz odbywającego się w tym samym dniu spotkania Podkomitetu ds. Praw Człowieka UE-Azerbejdżan. Przy okazji wizyty komisarza odpowiedzialnego za rozszerzenie i europejską politykę sąsiedztwa w Baku w dniach 2-3 kwietnia 2012 r. sprawa ta była specjalnie poruszana w rozmowach z władzami. Delegatura UE w Baku śledzi rozwój wydarzeń i potencjalne reakcje.

Sprawozdanie okresowe w ramach europejskiej polityki sąsiedztwa dotyczące Azerbejdżanu ([1]), przyjęte w dniu 15 maja 2012 r., ocenia wypełnianie przez Azerbejdżan zobowiązań podjętych w ramach planu działania UE-Azerbejdżan, w tym w zakresie demokracji i praw człowieka.

([1]) Opublikowane w języku angielskim na stronie: http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/docs/2012_enp_pack/progress_report_azerbaijan_en.pdf.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003554/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Azerbaijan: the case of Vugar Gonagov and Zaur Guliyev

Vugar Gonagov and Zaur Guliyev work for Xayal TV, a regional station based in Guba, Azerbaijan. They were detained on 13 March 2012, remanded in custody for two months and transferred to the Interior Ministry in Baku, without access to a lawyer. Their families were not informed of their whereabouts. The authorities have provided no explanation for their conditions or lack of access to a lawyer, which violate Azerbaijani and international law. Mr Gonagov was finally allowed brief meetings with his lawyer, Elchin Sadigov, on 28 and 30 March. However, on 30 March Mr Gonagov told Mr Sadigov that he no longer wanted Mr Sadigov to represent him and that he would accept a state-appointed lawyer. Mr Sadigov told Human Rights Watch that he believes the police put pressure on Mr Gonagov to refuse the services of an independent lawyer.

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case of Vugar Gonagov and Zaur Guliyev?

— What does the EU intend to do to promote human rights reforms in Azerbaijan?

— How is this being pursued in context of the Eastern Partnership?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President is well aware of the incidents in Guba on 1 March 2012, which resulted in the detention of two journalists from Xayal TV, Vugar Gonagov and Zaur Guliyev. A criminal case was launched against them by the Department of Investigation on Grave Crimes at the General Prosecutor's Office, under charges of organising and involvement in social disorder (Article 233 of Criminal Code) and abuse of power (Article 309.2). The Court of Grave Crimes sentenced both journalists to 2 months of pre-trial detention. They face possible imprisonment of up to 3 years. They applied for their release until the trial starts, but their request was denied. One of the two, Zaur Guliyev, is reportedly having health problems. However, he has been denied treatment to date.

The EU has repeatedly raised the issue and expressed its concerns at the situation of freedom of expression, including the working conditions of journalists in Azerbaijan, notably at the EU-Azerbaijan Cooperation Council meeting on 25 November 2011 and at the EU-Azerbaijan Human Rights Sub-Committee meeting on the same day. On the occasion of the visit of Commissioner responsible for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy to Baku on 2-3 April 2012, this case was specifically raised with the authorities. The EU Delegation in Baku is following up developments and possible reactions.

The European Neighbourhood Policy Progress Report on Azerbaijan ([1]), adopted on 15 May 2012, assesses the compliance of Azerbaijan with its commitments taken in the EU-Azerbaijan Action Plan, including in the domain of democracy and human rights.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/docs/2012_enp_pack/progress_report_azerbaijan_en.pdf

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003555/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Bahrajn: sprawa Abdulhadiego al-Khawaji

Abdulhadi al-Khawaja jest jednym z 14 bahrańskich działaczy, którzy w marcu i kwietniu 2011 r. zostali aresztowani w związku z udziałem we wcześniejszych antyrządowych protestach. Amnesty International jest zdania, że wszystkie te osoby są więźniami sumienia. Od dnia 8 lutego 2012 r. Abdulhadi al-Khawaja prowadzi strajk głodowy. W więzieniu poddawano go torturom i znęcano się nad nim: został ciężko pobity i grożono mu gwałtem. W rezultacie trafił do szpitala wojskowego, gdzie został poddany kilku operacjom głowy i twarzy, w wyniku których w jego szczęce umieszczono 18 płytek i 36 śrub. Ledwo jest w stanie jeść. Sąd wojskowy skazał Abdulhadiego al-Khawaję i sześć innych osób z grupy aresztowanych na karę dożywotniego pozbawienia wolności. Osobom tym nie zapewniono rzetelnego procesu sądowego.

— Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel zna sprawę Abdulhadiego al-Khawaji i pozostałych 14 bahrańskich działaczy?

— Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel podkreśliła ostatnio, że niezbędne jest to, by wszystkie strony w sposób konstruktywny przyczyniały się do realizacji procesu pojednania w kraju, w tym poprzez wdrożenie zaleceń sformułowanych w sprawozdaniu sporządzonym przez Bahrańską Niezależną Komisję Śledczą. Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel podkreśliła ponadto, że UE ponownie wyraziła poparcie dla realizacji tego procesu.

— Jakie inne działania może podjąć UE, aby zapewnić sprawiedliwe traktowanie działaczy politycznych w Bahrajnie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(4 czerwca 2012 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji Catherine Ashton jest w pełni poinformowana o sprawie pana Abdulhadiego Al Khawaji, pozostałych 14 działaczy oraz innych obywateli bahrajńskich, w tym pracowników medycznych szpitala Salmanya, którym wytoczono procesy i którzy zostali w 2011 r. skazani przez sądy bezpieczeństwa narodowego.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji nie ustaje w wysiłkach, by pomóc w znalezieniu zadowalającego rozwiązania w sprawie pana Al Khawaji, w tym poprzez nawiązanie bezpośredniego kontaktu z władzami bahrajńskimi oraz poprzez publikowanie oświadczeń. Ostatnie oświadczenie dotyczące sprawy pana Al Khawaji, wydane przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji w imieniu UE, opublikowano w dniu 17 kwietnia 2012 r. W najostrzejszych słowach wyrażono w nim zaniepokojenie dotyczące stanu zdrowia pana Al Khawaji oraz wezwano do jego uwolnienia ze względów humanitarnych.

Wysoka Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji kilkakrotnie zwróciła się do władz bahrajńskich o rewizję procesów, które toczyły się przed sądami bezpieczeństwa narodowego, oraz o nawiązanie dialogu z opozycją, który musi stać się nieodłącznym elementem krajowego procesu pojednania.

UE w dalszym ciągu będzie apelować do wszystkich stron w Bahrajnie, aby w sposób konstruktywny zaangażowały się w ten proces, bez uprzedzeń i w całkowicie pokojowej formie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003555/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Bahrain: the case of Abdulhadi al-Khawaja

Abdulhadi al-Khawaja is one of 14 Bahraini activists arrested in March and April 2011 following their involvement in anti-government protests earlier that year. Amnesty International considers all of them to be prisoners of conscience. Mr al-Khawaja has been on hunger strike since 8 February 2012. He has been subjected to torture and other ill-treatment during his time in prison, including being severely beaten and threatened with rape. As a result of this ill-treatment, he was admitted to a military hospital for several operations on his head and face, leaving him with 18 plates and 36 screws in his jaw. He is barely able to eat. Mr al-Khawaja and six others in the group were sentenced to life imprisonment by a military court. They have not been given a fair trial.

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the case of Abdulhadi al-Khawaja and the other 14 Bahraini activists?

— The Vice-President/High Representative recently stressed that it is indispensable that all sides contribute constructively to the national reconciliation process, including by implementing the recommendations of the report issued by the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry. She also underlined that the EU had reiterated its support for the process.

— What other steps can the EU take to ensure the fair treatment of political activists in Bahrain?

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

High Representative/Vice-President (HR/VP) Ashton is fully aware of the case of Mr Abdulhadi Al Khawaja, the other 14 activists and all the other Bahraini citizens, including the medical staff of the Salmanya Hospital, that were tried and sentenced in 2011 by the National Safety Courts.

The HR/VP and her services have spared no efforts to help bring about a positive solution to the case of Mr Al Khawaja, including through direct contacts with the Bahraini authorities and, publicly, through statements. The latest Declaration by the HR/VP on behalf of the EU on Mr Al Khawaja's case, was issued on 17 April 2012. It expressed concern about the health conditions of Mr Al Khawaja in the strongest terms and asked for his liberation on humanitarian grounds.

The HR/VP has asked the Bahraini authorities several times to review the trials carried out by the National Safety Courts and to embark on a meaningful dialogue with the opposition which must be an indispensable element of the national reconciliation process.

The EU will continue to call upon all sides in Bahrain to engage in this process constructively, without pre-conditions and in a totally peaceful manner.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003556/12
do Komisji
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Negocjacje dotyczące DCFTA między UE i Mołdawią

W dniu 16 marca 2012 r. parlament Mołdawii wybrał Nicolaego Timoftiego na prezydenta Mołdawii, który został zaprzysiężony przez Trybunał Konstytucyjny w dniu 19 marca 2012 r. Wydarzenie to doprowadziło do zakończenia prawie trzyletniego impasu, w trakcie którego żadnemu kandydatowi nie udało się zebrać niezbędnej większości 3/5 głosów w parlamencie (61 posłów). Zakończenie tego impasu politycznego może dać mołdawskiemu rządowi więcej możliwości w realizacji proeuropejskich aspiracji.

Mając na uwadze to, że w dniu 5 grudnia 2011 r. UE i Republika Mołdawii rozpoczęły negocjacje dotyczące pogłębionej i kompleksowej umowy o wolnym handlu (DCFTA) w ramach bardziej kompleksowego układu o stowarzyszeniu, jaki jest obecny stan tych negocjacji?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji
(3 maja 2012 r.)

Komisja z zadowoleniem przyjęła niedawny wybór Nicolae Timoftiego na stanowisko prezydenta Republiki Mołdowy, co rozwiązało trwający od dłuższego czasu impas polityczny. Przewodniczący Barroso spotka się z prezydentem elektem w dniu 27 kwietnia 2012 r., aby porozmawiać na temat dwustronnych relacji UE-Mołdawia, w tym o pogłębionej i kompleksowej strefie wolnego handlu (DCFTA).

DCFTA UE-Mołdawia jest częścią układu o stowarzyszeniu, który UE negocjuje z Mołdawią od 2010 r. Zarówno UE, jak i Republika Mołdowy prowadziły ścisłą współpracę, aby zapewnić spełnienie warunków niezbędnych do rozpoczęcia negocjacji w sprawie DCFTA. W rezultacie, w oparciu o pozytywną ocenę Komisji, w grudniu 2011 r. Rada dała zielone światło do rozpoczęcia negocjacji.

W styczniu 2012 r. odbyło się techniczne spotkanie przygotowawcze („runda zerowa"), podczas którego strony ustaliły parametry negocjacji i wymieniły opinie na temat ich zakresu i sposobów. Wynikiem spotkania było rozpoczęcie negocjacji na szczeblu politycznym przez komisarza ds. handlu Karela de Guchta oraz mołdawskiego premiera Vladimira Filata w dniu 27 lutego 2012 r. w Mołdawii.

Pierwsza runda negocjacji w sprawie DCFTA odbyła się w dniach 20-22 marca 2012 r. Jej celem było omówienie tzw. dokumentów problemowych, w których zdefiniowane są: ogólne podejście, treść i zakres przyszłych rozdziałów DCFTA.

Kalendarz uzgodniony na 2012 r. jest ambitny i zaplanowano w nim już cztery rundy negocjacji. Kolejna odbędzie się w Brukseli w dniach 11-16 czerwca 2012 r. i będzie pierwszą rundą opartą na negocjowanym tekście.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003556/12
to the Commission
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: EU-Moldova DCFTA negotiations

On 16 March 2012 the Parliament of Moldova elected Nicolae Timofti as President of Moldova; he was sworn into office by the Constitutional Court on 19 March 2012. This election puts an end to almost three years of political deadlock, during which no candidate had managed to achieve the necessary 3/5 majority in Parliament (61 MPs). This break in the political gridlock may give the Moldovan Government greater opportunity to pursue its pro-European agenda.

Bearing in mind that on 5 December 2011 the EU and the Republic of Moldova launched negotiations on a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) as part of the wider Association Agreement, what is the current state of play regarding these negotiations?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(3 May 2012)

The Commission welcomes the recent election of Nicolae Timofti as the new President of the Republic of Moldova which puts an end to a long political deadlock. President Barroso will meet the newly elected President on 27 April 2012 to discuss EU-Moldova bilateral relations, including the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA).

The EU-Moldova DCFTA is part of the Association Agreement which the EU is negotiating with Moldova since 2010. Both the EU and Moldova have worked closely together to make sure that the necessary conditions for launching the DCFTA negotiations were fulfilled. Consequently, and based on the Commission's positive assessment, in December 2011 the Council gave the green light to start the negotiations.

In January 2012, a technical preparatory meeting took place ('zero round') during which the parties set parameters for the negotiations and exchanged views on the scope and modalities for the negotiations. This was followed by the political launch of the negotiations by Trade Commissioner De Gucht and Moldovan Prime Minister Filat on 27 February 2012 in Moldova.

The first DCFTA negotiation round took place on 20-22 March 2012, and was aimed at discussing the so called issues papers, which define the general approach, content and scope of the future DCFTA chapters.

An ambitious calendar has been established for 2012 and four rounds of negotiations have already been scheduled. The next round will take place in Brussels (11-16 June 2012) and will be the first round based on a negotiating text.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003557/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Prawa człowieka w Turkmenistanie

Zdecydowane kroki podjęte przez turkmeński rząd w celu ograniczania wolności wypowiedzi, represjonowanie przez niego działaczy na rzecz społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, stosowanie tortur wobec więźniów i znęcanie się nad nimi oraz brak niezawisłego sądownictwa to tylko niektóre z zastrzeżeń sformułowanych w najnowszym przeglądzie Komitetu Praw Człowieka ONZ. W odniesieniu do ograniczania wolności słowa i społeczeństwa obywatelskiego komitet wyraził zaniepokojenie związane z tym, że rząd „nieustannie narusza prawo do wolności wypowiedzi", „nęka i zastrasza dziennikarzy i obrońców praw człowieka" oraz „kontroluje korzystanie z Internetu i blokuje dostęp do niektórych stron internetowych".

— Biorąc pod uwagę wysokość środków finansowych, jakie UE przekazała Turkmenistanowi (który w latach 2007-2010 otrzymał wsparcie w postaci programów realizowanych na szczeblu krajowym o wartości 22 milionów EUR, a w latach 2002-2006 otrzymał 15,25 miliona EUR, przede wszystkim na modernizację organów celnych, reformę systemu rejestrowania danych statystycznych, edukację oraz reformy sektora wiejskiego i gospodarcze), jaka jest strategia UE na rzecz propagowania praw człowieka w Turkmenistanie?

— Jakie konkretne działania są podejmowane obecnie lub planuje się podjąć w przyszłości?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(9 lipca 2012 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca podziela obawy Szanownego Pana Posła dotyczące sytuacji w zakresie praw człowieka w Turkmenistanie: rzeczywiście, aby osiągnąć międzynarodowe standardy w zakresie praw człowieka, wiele pozostaje jeszcze do zrobienia. Dotarły jednak do nas pozytywne sygnały z Turkmenistanu, który pragnie bliżej współpracować z UE na rzecz reform wspierających. W tym kontekście należy wspomnieć o wizycie Międzynarodowego Komitetu Czerwonego Krzyża w tym kraju, jaka miała miejsce na początku tego miesiąca. Był to pierwszy przypadek umożliwienia tej organizacji wstępu do zakładu poprawczego dla nieletnich od lipca 2011 r., kiedy to zezwolono jej na wizytę w jednostce medycznej tego zakładu, co stanowi kolejny pozytywny krok.

Zaangażowanie UE w Turkmenistanie, w tym na rzecz praw człowieka, może zostać znacząco zwiększone po wejściu w życie umowy o partnerstwie i współpracy, ponieważ umowa ta obejmować będzie kwestie praw człowieka jako niezbędny element dwustronnych relacji. Ponadto poszerzy zakres kwestii, w które UE będzie mogła się zaangażować wspólnie z tym krajem, jak również zwiększy liczbę forów, na których kwestie te będą mogły być omawiane, m.in. o komisję międzyparlamentarną.

W zakresie pomocy technicznej UE finansuje obecnie program na rzecz zwiększania zdolności krajowych Turkmenistanu w zakresie wspierania i ochrony praw człowieka (2,2 mln EUR). Ten trzyletni program UE, wdrażany wspólnie z UNDP oraz OHCHR, stanowi pierwszą tego typu interwencję w zakresie praw człowieka w Turkmenistanie prowadzoną w ramach szeroko zakrojonej współpracy między darczyńcami. Szczególne działania podejmowane w ramach tej interwencji ukierunkowane są na wzmocnienie i zinstytucjonalizowanie systemu sprawozdawczości, jak również – na podstawie sprawozdań organów traktatowych – na monitorowanie przestrzegania praw człowieka zgodnie z międzynarodowymi normami oraz wdrażania tych norm w praktyce.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003557/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Human rights in Turkmenistan

The Turkmen Government's clampdown on freedom of expression, its repression of civil society activism, torture and ill-treatment in places of detention and the lack of an independent judiciary are just a few of the concerns voiced by a recent UN Human Rights Committee review. With regard to repression of free speech and civil society, the committee voiced concern about the fact that the government 'systematically does not respect the right to freedom of expression', 'harass[es] and intimidate[s] journalists and human rights defenders', and 'monitors the use of the Internet and blocks access to some websites'.

— Considering the amount of EU funding granted to Turkmenistan (which is supported by national-level programmes worth EUR 22 million over the 2007-2010 period, and received EUR 15.25 million over the 2002-2006 period, in particular for customs modernisation, statistics reform, education and rural and economic reform), what is the EU's strategy for promoting human rights in Turkmenistan?

— What concrete action are we currently taking, or planning to take in the future?

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

The HR/VP Ashton shares the concerns of the Honourable Member of Parliament about the human rights situation in Turkmenistan: there is indeed a long way to go to meet international human rights standards. However, we have received positive signals from Turkmenistan willing to engage further with the EU in supporting reforms. In this context, the visit of the International Committee of the Red Cross in the country, earlier this month, is important to mention. It was the first time has been granted access to juvenile correctional facilities since they visited the medical unit of a determined facility in July 2011 and was a further positive step forward.

Our engagement with Turkmenistan, including human rights, can be significantly enhanced once the PCA comes into force since it will enshrine human rights as an essential element of our bilateral relations. Moreover, it will widen the range of issues in which the EU would be able to engage with the country as well as increase the fora to discuss them, among which an Inter-Parliamentary Committee.

On the technical assistance, the EU is currently financing the programme 'Strengthening the national capacity of Turkmenistan to promote and protect human rights' (EUR 2.2 M). This 3 years-EU programme, jointly implemented with UNDP and OHCHR, is the first donor wide cooperation intervention on human rights issues in Turkmenistan. Specific activities of this intervention are aimed at strengthening and institutionalizing the system of reporting and following to treaty body reports to monitor compliance of human rights with international standards and their practical implementation.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003558/12
do Komisji
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Udzielanie unijnej pomocy humanitarnej w południowo-wschodniej Azji

W ostatnim czasie Komisja przeznaczyła dodatkowe 11 milionów euro na rzecz osób poszkodowanych w powodziach, które w 2011 r. dotknęły region południowo-wschodniej Azji. Łącznie daje to 24 miliony euro, które Komisja przeznacza na pomoc humanitarną dla osób znajdujących się w najbardziej niekorzystnej sytuacji wśród 7,5 miliona osób poszkodowanych przez tajfuny, burze i powodzie, które nawiedziły ten region pod koniec ubiegłego roku. Z tych dodatkowych środków finansowych skorzystają mieszkańcy czterech krajów: Filipin, Laosu, Kambodży i Wietnamu.

Jakie są największe wyzwania związane ze skutecznym udzielaniem tej pomocy na dotkniętych obszarach?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Kristalinę Georgijewą w imieniu Komisji
(16 maja 2012 r.)

Ze względu na tajfuny, cyklony tropikalne i powodzie, które w 2011 r. poważnie dotknęły region Azji Południowo-Wschodniej, Komisja przeznaczyła 24 mln EUR na pomoc w sytuacjach kryzysowych, a także na pierwsze działania na rzecz odbudowy dla najbardziej potrzebujących z liczby siedmiu milionów ofiar katastrof w krajach dotkniętych powodziami.

Skala katastrofy, która była największą powodzią w delcie Mekongu od 2000 r., spowodowała wyczerpanie zdolności reagowania krajów dotkniętych katastrofą, dlatego też zwróciły się one o międzynarodową pomoc humanitarną. W celu uniknięcia nakładania się pomocy i zapewnienia większej komplementarności unijna pomoc humanitarna udzielona została we współpracy z organami krajowymi poszkodowanych państw, jak również ze wspólnotą międzynarodową.

Największe problemy we wdrażaniu pomocy to fakt, że zasoby większości poszkodowanych krajów są zbyt ograniczone, aby skutecznie sprostać sytuacji kryzysowej oraz potrzebom pierwszych działań na rzecz odbudowy, w tym potrzebom osób najbardziej potrzebujących, a także aby umożliwić odpowiednie inwestycje w zakresie programów gotowości na wystąpienie klęski żywiołowej dla społeczności zamieszkujących terytoria, gdzie one występują. Krajowe zdolności reagowania w tych krajach są w stanie zapewnić zaledwie najpilniejszą pomoc w bezpośrednim następstwie klęski żywiołowej, podczas gdy w zakresie podjęcia pierwszych działań na rzecz odbudowy dla najbardziej potrzebujących lub podniesienia gotowości na klęski żywiołowe potrzebna jest często pomoc zewnętrzna.

Dodatkowe wyzwanie stanowi konieczność sprawniejszego przejścia od działań humanitarnych do bardziej długofalowej interwencji humanitarnej na rzecz rozwoju, zarówno w przypadku władz krajowych, jak i społeczności międzynarodowej, aby umożliwić społeczności dotkniętej katastrofą bardziej zrównoważoną odbudowę.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003558/12
to the Commission
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Implementation of EU humanitarian assistance in south-east Asia

The Commission recently allocated a further EUR 11 million to the victims of the 2011 floods in south-east Asia. This brings to EUR 24 million the Commission's humanitarian assistance to the most vulnerable among the 7.5 million people hit by the typhoons, storms and floods that affected the region towards the end of last year. The new funding will benefit people in four countries: the Philippines, Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam.

What are the greatest challenges in effectively implementing this aid on the ground?

Answer given by Mrs Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2012)

In response to the typhoons, tropical storms and flooding that seriously affected South East Asia in 2011, the Commission has allocated EUR 24 million to support the emergency response and early recovery of the most vulnerable among the seven million people affected in the flood-hit countries.

Due to the scale of the disaster (i.e. the worst flooding in the Mekong Delta since 2000), the national response capacities of the affected countries were stretched to the limit and international humanitarian assistance was, therefore, requested. The EU's humanitarian assistance was coordinated with the affected national authorities as well as with the international community to avoid overlap and to improve complementarity.

The major challenges in implementation are the limited resources of most of these countries to effectively meet the emergency and early recovery needs of the most vulnerable, and to enable adequate investment in disaster preparedness programmes to make disaster-prone communities more resilient. The national response capacities in these countries are barely able to cover more than the emergency needs in the immediate aftermath of a natural disaster, while external support to the most vulnerable affected people is often needed for early recovery and increased resilience.

An additional challenge is the need to improve the transition between humanitarian and more long-term development interventions both by the national authorities and the international community in order to allow affected communities to recover in a sustainable way.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003559/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(3. April 2012)

Betrifft: Wasserknappheit in Pakistan

Wasserknappheit ist bereits ein weltweites Problem. Klimawandel und steigender CO_2-Ausstoß haben bereits in verschiedenen Ländern zu Wassermangel geführt. Dieses Problem hat seinen natürlichen Ausgang in Terrorangriffen und Kriegen zwischen aneinandergrenzenden Ländern, die Wasserknappheit als militärisches Werkzeug benutzen. Das bekannteste Beispiel ist die Rivalität zwischen Israel und der Palästinensischen Behörde, als das Westjordanland von der israelischen Regierung abgeriegelt wurde.

Die pakistanische Bevölkerung erleidet gerade eine Krise der Wasserknappheit, die durch den Bau hoher Staudämme durch die indische Regierung in den westlichen Flüssen verursacht wird. Die Regierung der Islamischen Republik von Pakistan hat dieses Vorgehen bereits dem UN-Sicherheitsrat gemeldet und beschuldigt Indien, die grundlegenden Menschenrechte auf Wasserversorgung und Abwasserentsorgung zu bedrohen, die durch die Resolution 64/294 der Generalversammlung der Vereinten Nationen am 28. Juli 2010 anerkannt wurden.

1. Ein Leitartikel im *Nawa-i-Waqt*, einer pakistanischen Zeitung, warnte im April 2011, dass „Pakistan Indien vermitteln sollte, dass es wegen des Wasserproblems zu einem Krieg kommen könnte, und dieses Mal würde es sich um einen Atomkrieg handeln", und dass die Dschihadisten gedroht hätten, die indischen Dämme zu sprengen. Ist die Kommission sich infolge dessen der Möglichkeit eines neuen Konflikts zwischen zwei aneinandergrenzenden Nationen bewusst?

2. Was tut die Kommission dafür, zukünftigen Konflikten durch Wasserknappheit in empfindlichen Ländern wie Pakistan vorzubeugen, wenn man im Hinterkopf behält, dass die Kommission seit 1976, dem Anfang der Zusammenarbeit zwischen der EU und Pakistan, mehr als 500 Millionen EUR in Projekte und Programme hat fließen lassen, womit sie der größte Zuschussgeber dieses südasiatischen Landes ist?

Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(13. Juli 2012)

Der EU sind die Spannungen bekannt, die in Südasien wegen des Zugangs zu Wasser herrschen. Indien und Pakistan haben einen Vertrag über die Nutzung der Wasserreserven des Indus geschlossen. Es ist wichtig, dass beide Seiten die in diesem Vertrag vorgesehenen Mechanismen für die Beilegung von Differenzen auf diplomatischem Wege nutzen.

Die EU, die die Entwicklungen zwischen Pakistan und Indien auch ganz allgemein verfolgt, ist erfreut, dass die Länder Fortschritte erzielt haben, nachdem sie Ende 2011 beschlossen hatten, ihre Handelsbeziehungen zu normalisieren. Zuvor hatten sich beide Seiten intensiv um die Klärung einer Reihe schwieriger Fragen bemüht. Pakistan wird Indien voraussichtlich spätestens Ende dieses Jahres die Meistbegünstigung einräumen. Die EU begrüßt außerdem die Anzeichen für eine Zusammenarbeit der beiden Länder in politischen und sicherheitspolitischen Angelegenheiten.

Nach der Verabschiedung des Maßnahmenplans EU-Pakistan und der Einleitung des strategischen Dialogs in Islamabad am 5. Juni 2012 soll eine Reihe neuer Sektordialoge aufgenommen werden, so auch über die Zusammenarbeit bei der integrierten Wasserwirtschaft. Da Pakistan in den Jahren 2010 und 2011 von verheerenden Überschwemmungen heimgesucht wurde, wird sich der Dialog über Wasserwirtschaft zunächst auf den Hochwasserschutz konzentrieren. Er kann sich im Einklang mit der Mitteilung der Kommission über Wasserbewirtschaftung in der Politik von Entwicklungsländern (2002) ([1]) jedoch auch auf allgemeinere Fragen wie die Sicherheit der Wasserversorgung erstrecken.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2002:0132:FIN:DE:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003559/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Water shortage in Pakistan

Water shortage is already a worldwide problem. Climate change and increasing emissions of CO_2 gases have already caused a lack of water in various countries. This problem has a natural outlet in terrorist attacks and wars between bordering countries which use water shortage as a military tool. The best-known case is the rivalry between Israel and the Palestinian Authority, as the West Bank has been isolated by the Israeli Government.

The Pakistani population is experiencing a water shortage crisis owing to the building of high dams on the Western Rivers by the Indian Government. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan has already denounced this action to the UN Security Council, accusing India of threatening the fundamental human right to water and sanitation recognised through Resolution 64/292 by the United Nations General Assembly on 28 July 2010.

1. An editorial in *Nawa-i-Waqt*, a Pakistani newspaper, warned in April 2011 that 'Pakistan should convey to India that a war is possible on the issue of water and this time war will be a nuclear one', and the jihadis threatened to blow up India's dams. In the wake of these events, is the Commission aware of the possibility of a new conflict between the two bordering nations?

2. What is the Commission doing to prevent future conflicts resulting from water shortages in sensitive countries like Pakistan, bearing in mind that since the beginning of EU-Pakistan cooperation in 1976 the Commission has committed more than EUR 500 million to projects and programmes, becoming the biggest grant donor to this southern Asian country?

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

The EU is well aware of the tensions in South Asia over access to water. There is treaty between India and Pakistan on the use of the waters of the Indus and it is important that both sides use the mechanisms foreseen in that treaty to address differences through diplomacy.

More generally, the EU follows developments between Pakistan and India and is encouraged by the recent progress following the decision at the end of 2011 to normalize trade relations. This follows intensive efforts on both sides to address a series of difficult issues. Pakistan is expected to grant India MFN status by the end of this year. The EU is also encouraged by signs of cooperation on political and security matters between the two nations.

Following the adoption of the EU-Pakistan Engagement Plan with Pakistan, and the launch of the strategic dialogue in Islamabad on 5 June 2012, a range of new sector dialogues are expected to start, including cooperation on integrated water management. Dialogue on water management will initially focus on flood protection in the wake of the devastating 2010 and 2011 floods in Pakistan. But in line with the Commission's Communication on water management in developing countries (2002) ([1]), dialogue can also be expected to cover broader issues such as water security.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2002:0132:FIN:EN:PDF.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003560/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(3. April 2012)

Betrifft: Militärstützpunkte auf Sardinien

Sardinien war und ist Schauplatz von Militäroperationen der Land-, See- und Luftstreitkräfte, in deren Rahmen auch Waffen getestet und alte Waffenbestände vernichtet werden. Die für NATO-Operationen genutzten Militärgebiete sind stark mit radioaktiven Stoffen, Partikeln industriell verwendeter Schwermetalle, abgereichertem Uran, Thorium-232 und Kadmium belastet. Infolgedessen sind in den betroffenen Gebieten viele Bewohner an Krebs oder Leukämie erkrankt, bei Säuglingen wurden genetische Anomalien festgestellt.

Die Tumore treten vorwiegend im hämolymphatischen System und in der Schilddrüse auf. Am häufigsten sind Leukämieerkrankungen in den Dörfern Escalaplano, Quirra und Perdasdefogu. Seit 1956, dem Jahr, in dem zwischen dem italienischen Verteidigungsministerium und den Behörden der Region Sardinien eine entsprechende Vereinbarung geschlossen wurde, sind Tonnen von Munition gezündet worden, so dass unterirdische Wasserläufe, das Erdreich und die Luft verseucht wurden.

1. Ist der Kommission bekannt, welche furchtbaren und gefährlichen Folgen die Militäroperationen der NATO an der Ostküste Sardiniens, insbesondere in der Umgebung des Stützpunkts Quirra, haben?

2. Wenn ja, was hat die Kommisison bisher unternommen, um die Richtigkeit der beigebrachten Informationen zu prüfen und die Zustände in dem betroffenen Gebiet zu überwachen?

3. Wie sorgt die Kommission dafür, dass die italienischen und sardischen Behörden das Gebiet unverzüglich dekontaminieren und Aufräumarbeiten in die Wege leiten?

4. Sind der Kommission vergleichbare verdeckte Naturkatastrophen in Europa, insbesondere in Österreich, bekannt, die durch militärische Versuche und Waffentests ausgelöst wurden und der Gesundheit von EU-Bürgern schaden könnten?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(25. Mai 2012)

1.-3. Der Gerichtshof hat geurteilt, dass der Euratom-Vertrag und das davon abgeleitete Recht nicht auf militärische Tätigkeiten anwendbar sind ([1]).

Die Überwachung des Gehalts der Luft, des Wassers und des Bodens an Radioaktivität liegt in nationaler Zuständigkeit. Der jeweilige Mitgliedstaat ist dafür verantwortlich, für die Einhaltung der geltenden Sicherheitsstandards (einschließlich der Dosisgrenzwerte für die Bevölkerung) zu sorgen ([2]). Nach den Informationen, die sie von den Mitgliedstaaten erhält, liegen der Kommission keine Anhaltspunkte dafür vor, dass das von der Frau Abgeordneten genannte Gebiet kontaminiert ist.

In der Datenbank der Kommission zur radiologischen Umgebungsüberwachung (REM — Radiological Environmental Monitoring) sind keine Werte für Uran in Umweltproben aus Sardinien enthalten. Im Rahmen des Überprüfungsplans der Kommission gemäß Artikel 35 des Euratom-Vertrags und in Fortführung ihrer 2010 aufgenommenen Arbeiten ist für 2013 ein Besuch Sardiniens (und anderer italienischer Regionen) geplant, bei dem der Zustand der Überwachungseinrichtungen für Umgebungsradioaktivität in diesen Gegenden nachgeprüft werden soll.

4. Der Kommission sind solche radiologischen Probleme nicht bekannt.

([1]) Rechtssache C 65/04 vom 9. März 2006, Kommission gegen Vereinigtes Königreich.
([2]) Artikel 35 Euratom-Vertrag.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003560/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Military bases in Sardinia

Sardinia has been the venue for land-, sea- and air-based military activities, including weapons testing and the destruction of old weapons arsenals. The military areas used for NATO activities are highly polluted with radioactive materials, industrial heavy metal particles, depleted uranium, thorium-232 and cadmium. As a result, there have been numerous cases of cancer and leukaemia among the residents of the areas concerned, as well as genetic abnormalities in infants.

The tumours principally occur in the haemolymphatic system and the thyroid. The villages of Escalaplano, Quirra and Perdasdefogu have the highest rates of leukaemia. Since 1956, when an agreement was reached between the Italian Ministry of Defence and the Sardinian regional authorities, tonnes of munitions have been exploded, contaminating underground rivers, the soil and the air.

1. Is the Commission aware of the negative and dangerous effects on the soil, air and water of NATO's military activities along Sardinia's east coast, particularly around the Quirra base?

2. If so, what has the Commission already done to investigate the accuracy of the information provided and to monitor the condition of the area concerned?

3. What is the Commission doing to urge the Italian and Sardinian authorities to decontaminate and clean up the area?

4. Is the Commission aware of similar hidden natural disasters in Europe, especially in Austria, which have been caused by military experiments and weapons testing and could affect the health of EU citizens?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

1-3. The Court of Justice has ruled that the Euratom Treaty and its secondary legislation do not apply to activities or practices of military nature ([1]).

As regards the monitoring of the level of radioactivity in the air, water and soil, this is a national responsibility, while it is also the responsibility of the Member State concerned to ensure compliance with the applicable safety standards ([2]) (including dose limits for members of the public). The Commission has no evidence, according to the information it receives from Member States that the area referred to by the Honourable Member is contaminated.

The Commission's REM (Radiological Environmental Monitoring) database does not contain any values for uranium (or another radionuclide relevant to this matter) in environmental samples from Sardinia. Within the Commission's verification schedule under Article 35 of the Euratom Treaty and in continuation of work started in 2010, a visit to Sardinia (and other Italian regions) is foreseen for 2013 with a view to verifying the state of the monitoring facilities for environmental radioactivity in these areas.

4. The Commission is not aware of any such radiological issues.

([1]) Case C-65/04 of 9 March 2006, *Commission* v *UK*.
([2]) Article 35 of the Euratom Treaty.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003561/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(3. April 2012)

Betrifft: Wasserwirtschaft und Privatisierung von Wasser

Vor zwei Jahren hat die Generalversammlung der Vereinten Nationen abgestimmt, den Zugang zu sauberem Wasser als ein Grundrecht anzuerkennen. 41 Länder haben den Antrag nicht unterstützt. Achtzehn dieser Enthaltenden waren EU-Regierungen, einschließlich der des Vereinigten Königreichs, Polen, Schweden, Dänemark, den Niederlanden und Irland.

1. Ist sich die Kommission der enormen Gewinne bewusst, die die Wasserindustrie und diegroßen Firmen, so wie Nestlé, durch den Verkauf von Tafelwasser und Süßigkeiten machen?

2. Welchen Standpunkt vertritt die Kommission zur Privatisierung der Wasserversorgung in der EU?

3. Überwacht die Kommission den Preis für Leitungswasser in der EU? Falls ja, wie teuer ist Leitungswasser in den verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten?

4. Erwägt die Kommission die Einführung gemeinsamer Preise für Wasser in der EU?

Antwort von Herrn Potočnik im Namen der Kommission
(24. Mai 2012)

Die Kommission ist sich der wirtschaftlichen Bedeutung von Tätigkeiten im Zusammenhang mit der Bereitstellung von Trinkwasser einschließlich Tafelwasser bewusst.

Gemäß Artikel 345 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union (AEUV) ([1]) lassen die Verträge die Eigentumsordnung in den verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten unberührt. Die Entscheidung darüber, ob die Wasserversorgung privatisiert werden sollte oder nicht, liegt daher bei den Mitgliedstaaten, und die Kommission hat sich zu dieser Frage nicht geäußert. Sobald ein Mitgliedstaat ein Unternehmen privatisiert hat, kann er jedoch keine Sonderrechte einführen, um weiterhin die Kontrolle über dieses Unternehmen auszuüben. Er muss dann die Grundsätze des freien Kapitalverkehrs ([2]) und der freien Niederlassung ([3]) beachten.

Die Kommission überwacht nicht den Preis für Leitungswasser in der EU.

Die Kommission hat nicht die Absicht, die Einführung gemeinsamer Preise für Wasser in der EU vorzuschlagen. Gemäß Artikel 9 der Wasserrahmenrichtlinie ([4]) müssen die Mitgliedstaaten dafür sorgen, dass die Wassergebührenpolitik angemessene Anreize für die Benutzer darstellt, Wasserressourcen effizient zu nutzen. Die Kommission prüft derzeit die von den Mitgliedstaaten gemäß der Wasserrahmenrichtlinie ausgearbeiteten Bewirtschaftungspläne für die Einzugsgebiete, die u. a. Angaben darüber enthalten sollten, wie Artikel 9 umgesetzt wurde. Im Rahmen des für November 2012 geplanten Konzepts für den Schutz der europäischen Wasserressourcen („Blueprint to Safeguard Europe's Water Resources") wird die Kommission einen Bericht über die eingegangenen Bewirtschaftungspläne für die Einzugsgebiete vorlegen.

([1]) ABl. C 83 vom 30.3.2010.
([2]) Artikel 63 AEUV.
([3]) Artikel 49 AEUV.
([4]) ABl. L 327 vom 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003561/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Water industry and privatisation of water

Two years ago the United Nations General Assembly voted to recognise access to clean water as a fundamental right. Forty-one countries did not support the motion. Eighteen of these abstainers were EU governments, including those of the UK, Poland, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands and Ireland.

1. Is the Commission aware of the huge profits which the water industry and major companies, such as Nestlé, derive from sales of bottled water and confectionery?

2. What is the Commission's stance on the privatisation of water supplies in the EU?

3. Does the Commission monitor the price of tap water in the EU? If so, how expensive is tap water in different Member States?

4. Is the Commission considering imposing common prices for water in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(24 May 2012)

The Commission is aware of the economic importance of activities linked to the provision of drinking water, including bottled water.

Article 345 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ([1]) establishes that the Treaties shall in no way prejudice the rules in Member States governing the system of property ownership. Therefore, it is for Member States to decide whether water supply should be privatised or not, and the Commission has expressed no view on this matter. However, once a Member State has privatised a company, it cannot introduce special rights in order to retain control of that company. It must thus comply with the principles of free movement of capital ([2]) and freedom of establishment ([3]).

The Commission does not monitor the price of tap water in the EU.

The Commission is not considering any proposal to impose common prices for water in the EU. Under Article 9 of the Water Framework Directive ([4]) (WFD), Member States are required to put in place water pricing policies that provide an adequate incentive for users to use water efficiently. The Commission is currently assessing the river basin management plans developed by the Member States under the WFD which are expected to, *inter alia*, provide information on how Article 9 has been implemented. The Commission will provide a report on the river basin management plans received in the framework of its Blueprint to Safeguard Europe's Water Resources planned for November 2012.

([1]) OJ C 83, 30.3.2010.
([2]) Article 63 of the TFEU.
([3]) Article 49 of the TFEU.
([4]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003562/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(3. April 2012)

Betrifft: Privatisierung des Wassers in Griechenland

Thessalonikis Wasserversorger EYATH ist für den kommenden September als Teil der kontraproduktiven Schocktherapie, die in Griechenland eingeführt wurde, zum Verkauf anvisiert worden.

Nach Auffassung der Kommission:

1.was wird die Auswirkungen der Maßnahme sein?

2.sollte die Wasserversorgung in öffentlicher Hand verbleiben, um die griechische Wirtschaft zu unterstützen?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(23. Mai 2012)

Privatisierungen unterstützen den Schulden- und Subventionsabbau sowie die Verringerung weiterer Transfers und staatlicher Garantien für Unternehmen im Staatsbesitz. Zudem können sie die Effizienz der Unternehmen erhöhen und damit zur Steigerung der Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der Wirtschaft insgesamt beitragen und ausländische Direktinvestitionen unterstützen.

Der Privatisierungsplan Griechenlands betrifft staatliche Unternehmen, Konzessionen und Immobilien. Wie Sie richtig schreiben, umfasst er auch EYATH (Wasserversorger für Thessaloniki) und EYDAP (Wasserversorger für Athen). Weitere Einzelheiten zum Privatisierungsplan finden sich in Abschnitt 4.3 des letzten Berichts der Kommission zur Einhaltung der Verpflichtungen durch Griechenland, der unter http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/op94_en.htm abrufbar ist.

Nach Ansicht der Kommission sollte die Privatisierung von Versorgungsunternehmen und damit auch von Wasserversorgern erst nach Einführung eines geeigneten Regulierungsrahmens erfolgen, um einen Missbrauch durch private Monopole zu vermeiden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003562/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Privatisation of water in Greece

Thessaloniki's water provider, EYATH, has been targeted for sale by this coming September as part of the counterproductive shock therapy being introduced in Greece.

In the Commission's view:

1. what will be the effect of this measure?

2. should the provision of water be kept in public hands in order to support the Greek economy?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2012)

Privatisation contributes to the reduction of debt, as well as to the reduction of subsidies, other transfers or state guarantees to state-owned enterprises. It also has the potential of increasing the efficiency of companies and, by extension, the competitiveness of the economy as a whole, while attracting foreign direct investment.

Greece's Privatisation Plan includes state-owned enterprises, concessions and real estate. As the Honourable Member rightly points out, EYATH (Thessaloniki water provider) is included in the Privatisation Plan. This is also the case of EYDAP (Athens water provider). The Honourable Member may find more details on the Privatisation Plan in Section 4.3 of the Commission's latest Compliance Report on Greece, available at:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/op94_en.htm

The Commission believes that the privatisation of public utilities, including water supply firms, should take place once the appropriate regulatory framework has been prepared to avoid abuses by private monopolies.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003563/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(3 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Calo delle adozioni

Le recenti statistiche dicono che, da qualche tempo, sta diminuendo sempre più la richiesta di adottare bambini, mentre cresce il numero delle coppie che fanno ricorso alla fecondazione assistita per avere un figlio proprio. In particolare, sono sempre meno le richieste di adozione internazionale a causa dei tempi lunghi, dei costi e del rischio di adottare bambini piuttosto grandi, spesso con problemi di salute e raramente provenienti da Paesi europei. Mentre continua ad aumentare nei paesi dell'Unione il numero dei bambini in attesa di adozione sia per abbandono che per motivi sociali.

Considerato che nei Paesi dell'Unione vi sono migliaia di bambini adottabili, non ritiene la Commissione di dover dare vita a una specifica adozione europea all'interno dei 27 paesi membri, con un iter di massima garanzia ma celere nelle pratiche, così da garantire a tanti bambini abbandonati negli istituti una stabilità affettiva e un futuro sereno?

Risposta data da Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(30 maggio 2012)

L'adozione internazionale è attualmente regolata da leggi nazionali e da convenzioni internazionali, in particolare la Convenzione dell'Aia del 29 maggio 1993 sulla protezione dei minori e sulla cooperazione in materia di adozione internazionale, a cui aderiscono tutti gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea.

La Commissione sostiene la sua adeguata attuazione partecipando regolarmente alle Commissioni speciali, convocate nell'ambito della Conferenza dell'Aia di diritto internazionale privato, con la finalità di rafforzare la cooperazione internazionale in questo settore.

La Commissione reputa che, al momento attuale, la corretta applicazione della Convenzione del 1993 costituisca un quadro giuridico sufficiente per le adozioni internazionali. Poiché la Convenzione si applica anche alle adozioni tra gli Stati membri, la Commissione ritiene che le questioni in materia di adozioni transfrontaliere all'interno dell'UE vengano adeguatamente trattate dalla Convenzione.

La Commissione non prevede pertanto di istituire un sistema specifico per le adozioni europee. Inoltre, le preoccupazioni espresse dall'onorevole parlamentare sono relative alle norme e alle procedure che regolano le adozioni nazionali, che rientrano quindi nella competenza degli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003563/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Fall in adoptions

Recent statistics show that applications to adopt children have been on the decline for some time, while the number of couples seeking assisted fertilisation to have their own child has been growing. In particular, applications for international adoption are steadily decreasing due to the long waits, the costs and the risk of adopting relatively older children, often with health problems and rarely coming from a European country. Meanwhile, the number of children awaiting adoption in the European Union, both due to abandonment and for social reasons, continues to rise.

Considering the thousands of children awaiting adoption in EU countries, does the Commission not believe it is necessary to create a specific European adoption system for the 27 Member States, with a procedure that offers every guarantee yet is swift in practice, so as to guarantee emotional stability and a secure future for the many children abandoned in institutions?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

International adoption is currently governed by national laws and international conventions, in particular the Hague Convention of 29 May 1993 in Protection of Children and Cooperation in respect of inter-country Adoption to which all the Member States of the European Union are party.

The Commission supports its proper implementation by participating on a regular basis to the Special Commissions organised in the context of the Hague Conference on Private International Law with a view to strengthening international cooperation in this matter.

The Commission considers that, currently, the correct application of the 1993 Convention offers a sufficient legal framework for international adoptions. Since the Convention applies to adoptions between Member States the Commission believes that it adequately addresses problems relating to cross-border adoptions within the European Union.

Therefore, the Commission does not envisage a specific European adoption system. Moreover, the concerns expressed by the Honourable Member are related with rules and procedures governing national adoptions which is a subject of Member States competence.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003565/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(3 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Coloranti senza etichettatura

Si chiama «cake design», cioè «arte di decorare le torte», è tradizione negli Stati Uniti e in Gran Bretagna ma da qualche tempo è diventata una moda anche in altri paesi europei come l'Italia, dove si sta diffondendo sempre più. Alcune recenti inchieste, però, hanno dimostrato che le etichette dei coloranti adoperati per decorare le torte non indicano la scadenza né recano alcuna traduzione nella lingua del Paese in cui vengono venduti, impedendo ai consumatori di conoscere i componenti e il grado di pericolosità qualora fossero ingeriti dai bambini.

Può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È a conoscenza di questi prodotti?

2. Come intende procedere se, a livello dell'etichettatura dei coloranti, non sono osservati l'obbligo di scadenza e di traduzione nella lingua del Paese in cui essi vengono venduti?

Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(31 maggio 2012)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza dei casi segnalati dall'onorevole deputato.

La legislazione generale dell'UE in tema di etichettatura degli alimenti ([1]) definisce un elenco di indicazioni obbligatorie da riportare sugli alimenti forniti in quanto tali ai consumatori finali. L'elenco comprende anche la data di durata minima o, nel caso di alimenti estremamente deperibili, la data «da consumarsi preferibilmente entro». La legislazione stabilisce inoltre che le informazioni obbligatorie relative agli alimenti devono figurare in un linguaggio facilmente comprensibile per i consumatori come stabilito dagli Stati membri per il proprio territorio. Per tale motivo qualsiasi decorazione per dolci «commestibile» deve soddisfare i requisiti summenzionati.

Gli Stati membri hanno la responsabilità di far rispettare la normativa UE relativa agli alimenti e di verificare, attraverso l'organizzazione di controlli ufficiali, che le disposizioni pertinenti della stessa siano rispettate dagli operatori commerciali. Per parte sua la Commissione ha la responsabilità di assicurare che la legislazione dell'UE sia adeguatamente applicata su tutto il territorio dell'UE e di prendere misure appropriate qualora le azioni adottate a livello nazionale non siano sufficienti per far fronte al rischio in questione.

([1]) Direttiva 2000/13/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 20 marzo 2000, relativa al ravvicinamento delle legislazioni degli Stati membri concernenti l'etichettatura e la presentazione dei prodotti alimentari, nonché la relativa pubblicità, GU L 109 del 6.5.2000, pag. 29.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003565/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Unlabelled colourings

Cake design, which is the art of decorating cakes, is a traditional activity in the United States and Great Britain and has been fashionable for some time in other European countries such as Italy, where it is becoming increasingly widespread. However, several recent studies have shown that the labelling for colourings used to decorate cakes does not indicate an expiry date or bear any translation in the language of the country in which they are sold, thus preventing consumers from ascertaining the ingredients and the level of risk if they are ingested by children.

Could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of these products?

2. What action will it take if the labelling of colourings does not comply with the obligation to show an expiry date and a translation in the language of the country in which they are sold?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2012)

The Commission is not aware of the cases reported by the Honourable Member.

The general EU food labelling legislation ([1]) establishes a list of mandatory particulars to be provided on foods delivered as such to the final consumers. This list also includes the date of minimum durability or, in the case of foods which are highly perishable, the 'use by' date. Furthermore, the legislation provides that the mandatory food information shall appear in a language easily understood by the consumer, defined by the Member States within their own territory. Therefore, any 'edible' cake decoration should meet the abovementioned requirements.

Member States are responsible for the enforcement of EU food law and verify, through the organisation of official controls, that the relevant requirements thereof are fulfilled by business operators. From its side, the Commission has the responsibility to ensure that EU legislation is properly implemented across the whole EU and take appropriate measures if action taken at national level is not sufficient to counteract the concerned risk.

([1]) Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs, OJ L 109, 6.5.2000, p. 29.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003566/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Rifiuti RAEE Professionali: quadro normativo italiano incompleto

La direttiva 2002/95/CE è stata recepita in Italia con il decreto legislativo 151/2005. Nel gennaio 2011 si è implementato il cosiddetto sistema «New waste», che prevede la creazione di uno standard europeo di identificazione del produttore di ogni RAEE e soprattutto la responsabilità individuale per i RAEE professionali nuovi.

I produttori non sono però in grado di rispettare la normativa vigente in quanto il legislatore italiano non ha mai redatto gli strumenti attuativi necessari, cioè il decreto tariffe e il decreto garanzie, il che li rende potenzialmente sanzionabili. Bisogna sottolineare che l'adozione di tali decreti non comporterebbe per lo Stato aggravi finanziari, i quali sono tutti a carico dei produttori, bensì permetterebbe di rendere operativo, ad esempio, il Comitato di vigilanza e controllo, attualmente impossibilitato a svolgere i propri compiti ispettivi volti ad assicurare il corretto svolgimento del sistema di smaltimento dei RAEE.

Confindustria ANIE, in collaborazione con la Camera di commercio di Milano e la Unioncamere, ha rilasciato una guida che interpreta il decreto legislativo 151/2005. La guida si rivolge ai produttori RAEE dando consigli di «buon senso» all'interpretazione della normativa, cercando di colmare il vuoto legislativo.

— La Commissione è a conoscenza della situazione italiana?

— Negli altri Stati membri il recepimento della direttiva 2002/95/CE ha causato problemi simili al caso italiano?

— Come intende agire la Commissione nei confronti dell'Italia e a supporto delle aziende interessate?

Risposta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(30 maggio 2012)

La Commissione è venuta a conoscenza della questione in oggetto grazie all'interrogazione scritta dell'onorevole parlamentare.

Il problema esposto, relativo al recepimento della direttiva 2002/96/CE sui rifiuti di apparecchiature elettriche ed elettroniche (RAEE) ([1]), parrebbe essere specifico all'Italia.

La Commissione indagherà sulla questione.

([1]) GU L 37 del 13.2.2003, pag. 24.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003566/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Professional waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE): incomplete Italian legislative framework

Directive 2002/95/EC was transposed into Italian law by Legislative Decree No 151/2005. In January 2011, the 'new waste' system was introduced, which provides for the creation of a standard European system for identifying all WEEE producers and, above all, establishes the principle of individual responsibility for new professional WEEE.

Producers are unable to comply with the legislation in force, however, since the Italian legislator has never drafted the necessary implementing instruments, namely the decree on tariffs and the decree on warranties, which means they could potentially be penalised. It should be emphasised that the adoption of these decrees would not generate any costs for the State, all of which would be borne by producers, but it would, for example, make it possible to bring the supervisory and inspection committee into operation, which is currently unable to perform its role in ensuring that the WEEE disposal system is functioning properly.

Confindustria ANIE, in cooperation with the Milan chamber of commerce and Unioncamere, the Italian Federation of Chambers of Commerce, has issued a guide explaining Legislative Decree No 151/2005. The guide is aimed at WEEE producers, giving them 'common sense' advice on how to interpret the legislation, in an attempt to fill the legislative void.

Is the Commission aware of the situation in Italy?

Has the transposition of Directive 2002/95/EC in other Member States caused problems similar to those which have arisen in Italy?

What action does the Commission intend to take vis-à-vis Italy to support the companies concerned?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The Commission has become aware of this issue through the question of the Honourable Member.

The problem described appears to be a specific Italian problem in the transposition of Directive 2002/96/EC on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) ([1]).

The Commission will investigate this matter.

([1]) OJ L 37, 13.2.2003.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003567/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Estrazioni di gas di scisto in Polonia: rischi per l'ambiente

La Polonia si è lanciata in un progetto europeo di estrazione del gas di scisto mediante la tecnica della fratturazione idraulica.

Dubbi circa l'impatto ambientale sono stati espressi da studi effettuati alla Cornell University: pare che le emissioni non controllate di metano in fase di fratturazione avranno sull'ambiente un impatto più forte rispetto a quello dell'estrazione del carbone e saranno maggiori del 22-44 % rispetto a quelle derivanti dall'estrazione di metano convenzionale.

Attualmente in Polonia sono state rilasciate 111 licenze per l'esplorazione e l'identificazione di giacimenti, alcuni pozzi estrattivi sono già stati scavati e in 2 di essi si è proceduto con la fratturazione. È prevista la realizzazione di almeno 100 pozzi entro la fine del 2013. Come si evince dalla risposta all'interrogazione E-001603/2012 presentata dal collega Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), la Direzione generale per l'ambiente ha promosso uno studio per vagliare i rischi, i cui risultati saranno resi noti nell'estate 2012.

— Ritiene la Commissione che nei siti estrattivi attualmente in essere siano rispettati tutti gli standard di sicurezza previsti?

— Essa reputa sicuro procedere con le attività di trivellazione prima che siano resi noti i risultati dello studio promosso dall'Unione?

Risposta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(21 maggio 2012)

Conformemente all'attuale quadro normativo nell'UE compete agli Stati membri garantire, sulla scorta di una congrua valutazione, di regimi di concessione e autorizzazione e di attività di monitoraggio e ispezione, che l'esplorazione e lo sfruttamento di fonti energetiche (inclusi quelli che si basano su pratiche di fratturazione idraulica) siano conformi al quadro normativo in oggetto, ivi comprese le disposizioni sulla tutela della salute umana e ambientale. Conformemente all'articolo 191 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea (TFUE), lo sviluppo della politica dell'Unione in materia ambientale si basa anche sui principi della precauzione e dell'azione preventiva.

La Commissione ha avviato diverse attività volte a raccogliere ulteriori dati scientifici su potenziali implicazioni e rischi ambientali correlati all'uso combinato di trivellazioni orizzontali e fratturazione idraulica, come avviene ad es. per il gas di scisto. Per ulteriori informazioni su tali attività si rimanda alla risposta all'interrogazione parlamentare 1707/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003567/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Shale gas extraction in Poland: environmental risks

According to press reports Poland is taking part in a European project to extract shale gas, which is natural gas, predominantly methane, contained in shale rocks. The method used is known as hydraulic fracturing (water, containing chemical additives as required, is applied at high pressure).

Studies carried out at Cornell University have raised questions concerning the environmental impact of this procedure, suggesting that uncontrolled methane emissions in the fracturing phase would be greater than those produced by carbon extraction and as much as 22-44 % greater than those produced by conventional methane extraction. It should be borne in mind, in this connection, that methane is a greenhouse gas 30 times more effective at retaining heat than carbon dioxide.

By contrast, the Polish Minister for the Environment maintains that monitoring carried out during test extractions has shown that, if conducted in compliance with safety standards, extractions do not create a risk of groundwater contamination or give rise to uncontrolled methane emissions.

Is the Commission aware of the situation outlined above?

Is it aware of the environmental problems linked to this extraction method?

Does it intend to encourage additional studies on the issue to ensure that the environment and public health are not placed at risk?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2012)

Under the current EU regulatory framework, it is up to Member States to ensure — via appropriate assessment, licensing and permitting regimes as well as through monitoring and inspections activities — that any exploration or exploitation of energy sources, including those using hydraulic fracturing practices, complies with the requirements of the existing legal framework in the EU, including provisions on the protection of human health and the environment. The precautionary and prevention principles are part of the guiding principles for the development of the EU's environmental policy, as set out in Article 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU).

The Commission has launched a number of activities to gather further scientific knowledge about potential environmental impacts and risks related to the combined use of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, such as for shale gas. Further details on such activities can be found in the answer to question 1707/2012.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003568/12
do Komisji
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(3 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Lokalizacja ferm drobiarskich w pobliżu miejsc zamieszkania ludzi

— Czy do Komisji wpływały skargi z Polski dotyczące uciążliwej lokalizacji ferm drobiarskich w pobliżu miejsc zamieszkania ludzi; jeśli tak, to czy Komisja podejmowała jakieś działania wobec tych skarg?

— Czy Komisja przedstawiała jakieś swoje zastrzeżenia wobec rządu Polski w związku z niedostosowaniem polskich przepisów prawnych do przepisów Unii Europejskiej w zakresie emisji uciążliwych zapachów?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Janeza Potočnika w imieniu Komisji
(1 czerwca 2012 r.)

Do Komisji nie wpłynęły dotąd jakiekolwiek skargi z Polski dotyczące uciążliwych zapachów generowanych przez fermy drobiarskie.

Nie ma obecnie wiążącego unijnego instrumentu prawnego w zakresie ochrony środowiska, który dotyczyłby w szczególności emisji zapachów, w tym zapachów generowanych przez fermy drobiarskie. Przepis dotyczący konieczności zapobiegania, kontrolowania lub ograniczania uciążliwych zapachów można znaleźć w dyrektywie w sprawie odpadów ([1]). Jej art. 13 lit. b) wzywa państwa członkowskie do prowadzenia gospodarowania odpadami bez powodowania uciążliwości przez hałas i zapachy. W tym kontekście Komisja zdaje sobie sprawę z tego, że ustawodawstwo polskie może nie w pełni przetransponowało art. 13 dyrektywy w sprawie odpadów i obecnie zajmuje się tą kwestią w porozumieniu z organami krajowymi.

([1]) Dyrektywa Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady 2008/98/WE z dnia 19 listopada 2008 r. w sprawie odpadów oraz uchylająca niektóre dyrektywy (Dz.U. L 312 z 22.11.2008).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003568/12
to the Commission
Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Situating of poultry-breeding farms close to places of human habitation

— Has the Commission received any complaints from Poland regarding the problem of poultry-breeding farms being located close to places of human habitation? If so, has the Commission taken any action with regard to those complaints?

— Did the Commission raise its concerns with the Polish Government regarding that country's failure to transpose EU legislation on odour emissions into national legislation?

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

The Commission has not received, so far, any complaint from Poland on odours generated by poultry-breeding farms.

There is currently no environmental EU legal instrument that deals specifically with the emissions of odours, including those generated by poultry-breeding farms. A provision on the need to prevent, control or reduce odours can be found in the Waste Directive ([1]). Its Article 13(b) calls on Member States to ensure that waste management is carried out without causing a nuisance through noise or odours. In this respect the Commission is aware of the fact that Polish legislation may not have completely transposed Article 13 of the Waste Directive and it is currently addressing this issue with national authorities.

([1]) Directive 2008/98/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives, OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-003569/12
till kommissionen (Vice-ordföranden / Höga representanten)
Alf Svensson (PPE)
(3 april 2012)

Angående: VP/HR – En ansats för utvecklingssamarbetet baserad på mänskliga rättigheter

Frågan gäller uppföljningen av kommissionens och vice ordförandens/den höga representantens gemensamma meddelande av den 12 december 2011, med titeln ”Human Rights and Democracy at the Heart of EU External Action – Towards a more effective Approach”.

I stycket om utvecklingssamarbete står uttryckligen, och jag citerar, att ”country human rights strategies, and a Human Rights Based Approach should ensure that human rights and democracy is reflected across the entire development cooperation process”.

Det här är som jag ser det verkligen ett genombrott för EU:s bistånd. Vi vet att med ökad tillgång till de mänskliga fri- och rättigheterna minskar människors ekonomiska fattigdom garanterat. Den omvända korrelationen – att minskad ekonomisk fattigdom skulle leda till ökad tillgång till de mänskliga rättigheterna – är dock inte given. Och pekuniär rikedom utan mänskliga fri- och rättigheter är ju inte mycket värt i något längre perspektiv, det vet vi alla.

Vilka konkreta förändringar vill den höga representanten för utrikes frågor nu se i metoderna för programplanering och genomförande, för att EU:s biståndsinsatser från och med nu verkligen i praktiken ska byggas på en ansats baserad på mänskliga fri- och rättigheter?

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-003577/12
till kommissionen
Alf Svensson (PPE)
(3 april 2012)

Angående: En ansats baserad på mänskliga rättigheter i utvecklingssamarbetet

Frågan gäller uppföljningen av kommissionens och vice ordförandens/den höga representantens gemensamma meddelande av den 12 december 2011, med titeln ”Human Rights and Democracy at the Heart of EU External Action – Towards a more effective Approach”.

I stycket om utvecklingssamarbete står uttryckligen, och jag citerar, att ”country human rights strategies, and a Human Rights Based Approach should ensure that human rights and democracy is reflected across the entire development cooperation process”.

Det här är som jag ser det verkligen ett genombrott för EU:s bistånd. Vi vet att med ökad tillgång till de mänskliga fri- och rättigheterna minskar människors ekonomiska fattigdom garanterat. Den omvända korrelationen – att minskad ekonomisk fattigdom skulle leda till ökad tillgång till de mänskliga rättigheterna – är dock inte given. Och pekuniär rikedom utan mänskliga fri- och rättigheter är ju inte mycket värt i något längre perspektiv, det vet vi alla.

Vilka konkreta förändringar görs nu i metoderna för programplanering och genomförande, för att EU:s biståndsinsatser från och med nu verkligen i praktiken ska byggas på en ansats baserad på mänskliga fri- och rättigheter?

Samlat svar från den höga representanten/vice ordförande Catherine Ashton på kommissionens vägnar
(4 juli 2012)

Efter ikraftträdandet av Lissabonfördraget, som sätter mänskliga rättigheter, demokrati och rättsstatsprincipen i centrum för EU:s utrikespolitik, samt tillhörande politiska uttalanden, är den huvudsakliga uppgiften nu att omsätta dessa i praktiken på ett effektivt och konsekvent sätt.

Förbindelserna mellan EU och dess partnerländer grundar sig på och främjar gemensamma värderingar som mänskliga rättigheter, demokrati och rättsstatsprincipen, liksom principer för ägandeskap och ömsesidig ansvarighet. Under programplaneringen kommer civilsamhället att rådfrågas. EU:s nya strategi om budgetstöd lägger betoning på partnerländernas engagemang för grundläggande värderingar i linje med huvudmålen i *Agendan för förändring,* vilka är mänskliga rättigheter, rättsstatsprincipen, god samhällsstyrning och hållbar tillväxt.

Denna strategi, som grundar sig på mänskliga rättigheter, kommer också att spela en viktigare roll i infrastruktur- och miljöprojekt; exempelvis kommer berörda personer att kunna uttrycka sina åsikter och behov, vilket bidrar till att uppmuntra respekten för deras mänskliga rättigheter.

I utkastet till förordning om ett nytt europeiskt instrument för demokrati och mänskliga rättigheter har kommissionen föreslagit ett instrument som är mer flexibelt och har större fokus på de länder där situationen för mänskliga rättigheter och demokrati är mest kritisk. Förslaget inför mer flexibilitet i tillämpningen (direkt tilldelning av medel i de svåraste situationerna). Dessutom kommer EU:s valobservatörsuppdrag att bättre integreras med tredjeländers demokratiska cykel och i större utsträckning fokusera på uppföljning av rekommendationer.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003569/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Alf Svensson (PPE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — A human-rights based approach in development cooperation

The question concerns the follow-up on the Joint Communication of the Commission and Vice-President/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy of 12 December 2011 entitled 'Human rights and democracy at the heart of EU external action — towards a more effective approach'.

In a paragraph on development cooperation, it is expressly stated, and I quote, that 'country human rights strategies and a Human Rights Based Approach should ensure that human rights and democracy are reflected across the entire development cooperation process'.

As I see it, this is truly a breakthrough for EU assistance. We know that with greater access to human rights and freedoms, there is a guaranteed reduction in people's economic poverty. However, the inverse correlation — that a reduction in economic poverty would lead to increased access to human rights — is not a given. And pecuniary wealth without human rights and freedoms is, of course, not worth much in any longer-term perspective, as we all know.

What concrete changes does the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy now wish to see in the methods for programming and their implementation, in order to make sure that, from now on, EU assistance interventions will in practice really be built on an approach that is based on human rights and freedoms?

Question for written answer E-003577/12
to the Commission
Alf Svensson (PPE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: A human-rights based approach in development cooperation

The question concerns the follow-up on the Joint Communication of the Commission and Vice-President/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy of 12 December 2011 entitled 'Human rights and democracy at the heart of EU external action — towards a more effective approach'.

In a paragraph on development cooperation, it is expressly stated, and I quote, that 'country human rights strategies and a Human Rights Based Approach should ensure that human rights and democracy are reflected across the entire development cooperation process'.

As I see it, this is truly a breakthrough for EU assistance. We know that with greater access to human rights and freedoms, there is a guaranteed reduction in people's economic poverty. However, the inverse correlation — that a reduction in economic poverty would lead to increased access to human rights — is not a given. And pecuniary wealth without human rights and freedoms is, of course, not worth much in any longer-term perspective, as we all know.

What concrete changes are now being made in the methods for programming and their implementation, in order to make sure that, from now on, EU assistance interventions will in practice really be built on an approach that is based on human rights and freedoms?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(4 July 2012)

Following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, which puts human rights, democracy and the rule of law at the heart of EU external action, and related EU policy statements, the main task now is to put them into practice in an effective and consistent way.

Relations between the EU and partner countries are based on and will promote shared values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law as well as the principles of ownership and mutual accountability. In the programming process, civil society will be consulted. The EU's new approach Budget Support puts an emphasis on the commitment of the partner country to fundamental values in line with the main pillars defined in Agenda for Change which are human rights, rule of law and good governance together with inclusive and sustainable growth.

The human rights-based approach will also be strengthened in infrastructure and environmental projects, making sure, for example, that affected people are able to express their views and needs, therefore encouraging respect for their human rights.

Furthermore, the Commission has proposed, in the draft Regulation of the new European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, to make the instrument more flexible with a stronger focus on most difficult countries where human rights and democracy are most at risk. It introduces more flexibility in implementation (direct award of grant in most difficult situations). The EU Election Observation Missions will also be better integrated into third country's democratic cycle with greater focus on the follow-up of recommendations.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-003570/12
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(3 de abril de 2012)

Asunto: Participaciones preferentes de entidades financieras españolas

Según las estimaciones de la Comisión Nacional del Mercado de Valores, la cuantía de las participaciones preferentes negociadas en estos momentos supera los 11 000 millones de euros. Según la página web del organismo regulador se trata de productos «complejos de riesgo elevado» con una liquidez limitada.

Sin embargo, distintas asociaciones de consumidores denuncian que varias entidades financieras podrían haber comercializado a lo largo de la última década y durante la crisis estos valores como productos garantizados carentes de riesgo. De hecho, la CNMV ha abierto recientemente expedientes sancionadores a cuatro de los dieciocho emisores de participaciones preferentes, al tiempo que su presidente reconocía la existencia de «problemas puntuales» en su colocación.

Los cambios en la valoración de las entidades en proceso de reestructuración han afectado a la rentabilidad de las participaciones preferentes que han emitido. En algunos casos su negociación ha llegado a ser suspendida. En otros, las entidades emisoras han ofrecido el canje por productos alternativos como acciones. En estos momentos la principal fuente de incertidumbre afecta a los tenedores de participaciones preferentes emitidas por entidades que han contado o cuentan con apoyo del estado como Novacaixagalicia, Unim o la Caja de Ahorros del Mediterráneo.

— ¿Dispone la Comisión de alguna información al respecto?

— ¿Puede afirmar la Comisión que el proceso de comercialización de las participaciones preferentes se ha hecho conforme a la legislación de la UE en vigor?

— ¿Está la Comisión trabajando con las autoridades competentes para garantizar que los planes de acompañamiento a las ayudas de Estado garanticen los derechos de los consumidores que han invertido en estos productos?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de junio de 2012)

La Comisión es consciente de la situación de las participaciones preferentes y está siguiendo de cerca esta cuestión. No obstante, como quiera que los casos a los que Su Señoría hace referencia están en curso, la Comisión no está en condiciones de entrar en detalles por motivos de confidencialidad.

La Directiva 2004/39/CE (MiFID) regula la prestación de servicios de inversión por parte de las empresas de inversión y las entidades de crédito en lo que respecta a los instrumentos financieros, estableciendo la información que las empresas de inversión tienen que facilitar a sus clientes ([1]). No obstante, la cuestión de si la venta de participaciones preferentes por entidades de crédito específicas podría incumplir este marco se incluye dentro de la competencia principal de las autoridades y los tribunales nacionales competentes.

La Comisión siempre ha establecido tres requisitos para los bancos en fase de reestructuración en toda Europa: el primero de ellos, contar con un plan creíble para volver a la viabilidad, el segundo, reducir los costes para el Estado al mínimo necesario y garantizar un adecuado reparto de las cargas, y, por último, limitar el impacto negativo sobre la competencia.

Para garantizar que la ayuda estatal se limita al mínimo necesario, y para evitar el riesgo moral, la Comisión insta a los bancos que están obligados a realizar una reestructuración a gestionar su posición de capital de manera muy prudente, y evitar la utilización de las ayudas estatales en beneficio de inversores que invirtieron en instrumentos financieros de alto riesgo. Este planteamiento garantiza que los costes de reestructuración de una institución financiera beneficiaria de ayuda son pagados por los accionistas de la institución de que se trate y, en particular, por los titulares de acciones e instrumentos subordinados, y no constituyen una carga únicamente para los contribuyentes y los consumidores.

([1]) Artículo 19, apartado 3.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003570/12
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Preference shares of Spanish financial institutions

According to estimates by the Spanish National Securities Market Commission (CNMV), the amount of preference shares traded at present exceeds EUR 11 000 million. According to the regulatory body's website, these are products that are 'complejos de riesgo elevado' [complex and high-risk] with limited liquidity.

Nevertheless, various consumer associations complain that, over the course of the past decade and during the crisis, several financial institutions may have marketed these securities as guaranteed products lacking risk. In fact, the CNMV has recently opened penalty proceedings against 4 of the 18 issuers of preference shares, with its president acknowledging the existence of 'problemas puntuales' [specific problems] in their issuance.

Changes in the valuation of institutions undergoing restructuring have affected the profitability of the preference shares they have issued. In some cases, trading of these shares has been suspended. In other cases, the issuing institutions have offered to exchange them for alternative products such as stock. At present, the main source of uncertainty affects the holders of preference shares issued by institutions that have received or are receiving state aid, such as Novacaixagalicia, Unim or Caja de Ahorros del Mediterráneo.

— Does the Commission have any information about this matter?

— Can the Commission confirm that the process of marketing preference shares was carried out in accordance with the EU legislation in force?

— Is the Commission working with the competent authorities to ensure that the plans accompanying state aid ensure the rights of consumers who have invested in these products?

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

The Commission is aware of the situation of the preference shares and is closely following this. However, as the cases to which the Honourable Member refers are ongoing, the Commission is not in a position to enter into details for confidentiality reasons.

Directive 2004/39/EC (MiFID) regulates the provision of investment services by investment firms and credit institutions in relation to financial instruments, setting out the information that investment firms have to provide to their clients. ([1])However, the question whether the sale by specific credit institutions of preference shares might not comply with this framework falls under the primary competence of national competent authorities and courts.

The Commission has consistently required three elements from banks under restructuring across Europe: first to have a credible plan for returning to viability, second to reduce the cost to the State to the minimum necessary and ensure appropriate burden-sharing, and finally to limit the negative impact on competition.

To ensure that state aid is limited to minimum necessary and to avoid moral hazard, the Commission asks those banks which are required to undergo restructuring to manage their capital position in a very prudent way, and to avoid using state aid for the benefit of investors who invested in risky financial instruments. That approach ensures that the restructuring costs of an aided financial institution are met by the stakeholders of the institution concerned, and in particular equity and subordinated capital-holders, and do not just burden tax payers and consumers.

([1]) Article 19(3).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003571/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(3. April 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Pharmazeutische Patentrechte europäischer Unternehmen in Indien

Am 13.3.2012 hat Indien den deutschen Konzern Bayer dazu gezwungen, ein medizinisches Patent an einen lokalen Hersteller weiterzureichen. Diese Entscheidung wurde damit begründet, dass Bayer das darauf basierende Medikament zu für die lokale Bevölkerung unerschwinglichen Preisen vertreibe. Beobachter vermuten, dass diese Entscheidung möglicherweise einen Präzedenzfall darstellt und Indien zukünftig weitere Patentrechte entziehen wird.

1. Wurde die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin vor der Entscheidung des indischen Patentamts von Bayer oder einer Industriegruppe gebeten oder gedrängt, Druck auf Indien auszuüben, um die Maßnahme zu verhindern?

2. Wurde die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin seit der Entscheidung gebeten oder gedrängt, solchen Druck auszuüben, um die Entscheidung umzukehren?

3. Waren die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin oder ein Bediensteter des Auswärtigen Dienstes der EU (EAD) bisher mit der indischen Regierung oder einer indischen Behörde zu diesem Thema in Kontakt? Wenn ja, welche Position vertrat die Hohe Vertreterin beziehungsweise der EAD in diesem Gespräch?

4. Wenn noch kein Kontakt zu diesem Thema stattfand, wird die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin mit der indischen Regierung dazu in Kontakt treten?

Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(26. Juni 2012)

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin wurde weder von Bayer noch von einer anderen Industriegruppe ersucht, Druck auf Indien auszuüben, um diese Zwangslizenzierung zu verhindern.

Auch seit der Entscheidung des indischen Patentamts wurde die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin nicht ersucht, solchen Druck auszuüben.

Es hat zu diesem Thema keine Kontakte der Hohen Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin oder eines anderen Bediensteten des EAD mit der indischen Regierung oder einer anderen indischen Behörde gegeben. Das Übereinkommen über handelsbezogene Aspekte der Rechte des geistigen Eigentums (TRIPS-Übereinkommen) verpflichtet die indische Regierung nicht, die EU vor solchen Entscheidungen über Zwangslizenzierungen zu konsultieren.

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin beabsichtigt nicht, in dieser Sache unmittelbar mit der indischen Regierung in Kontakt zu treten, da die Angelegenheit in den Anwendungsbereich des TRIPS-Übereinkommens fällt. Ferner werden innerhalb der Kommission alle handelsbezogenen Angelegenheiten zwischen der EU und Indien von der Generaldirektion Handel bearbeitet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003571/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Pharmaceutical patent rights of European enterprises in India

On 13 March 2012, India forced German company Bayer to pass on a medical patent to a local manufacturer. The reason given for this decision was that Bayer was selling the medicinal product based on the patent at prices that were unaffordable for the local population. Observers suspect that this decision may provide a precedent and that, in future, India will withdraw other patent rights.

1. Prior to the decision by the Indian Patent Office, was the Vice-President/High Representative requested or urged by Bayer or any other industry group to put pressure on India to prevent this measure?

2. Since the decision by the Indian Patent Office, has the Vice-President/High Representative been requested or urged to exert such pressure to have this decision reversed?

3. Has the Vice-President/High Representative or a member of the European External Action Service (EEAS) had contact with the Indian Government or any Indian authorities on this issue? If so, what position did the High Representative or the EEAS take during this meeting?

4. If there has been no contact on this issue to date, does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to enter into contact with the Indian Government on this issue?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President was not requested by Bayer or any other industry group to put pressure on India to prevent this measure of compulsory licensing.

The HR/VP has not been requested to exert such pressure since the decision by the Indian Patent Office.

There has been no contact by the HR/VP or any member of EEAS with the Government of India or any Indian authorities on this issue. Under the Agreement on Trade-related aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) agreement there is no obligation for the Government of India to consult the EU in advance of decisions on compulsory licensing.

The HR/VP does not intend to enter into direct contact with the Government of India on this issue because this matter falls under the TRIPs agreement. Furthermore, within the Commission all trade-related issues between the EU and India are followed by the Commission (Directorate General responsible for Trade).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003572/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(3. April 2012)

Betrifft: Pharmazeutische und medizinische Patente in der EU

Am 13.3.2012 hat Indien den deutschen Konzern Bayer dazu gezwungen, ein medizinisches Patent an einen lokalen Hersteller weiterzureichen. Diese Entscheidung wurde damit begründet, dass Bayer das darauf basierende Medikament zu für die lokale Bevölkerung unerschwinglichen Preisen vertreibe. Beobachter vermuten, dass diese Entscheidung möglicherweise einen Präzedenzfall darstellt und Indien zukünftig weitere Patentrechte entziehen wird.

1. Wie beurteilt die Kommission diese Entscheidung des indischen Patentamts und das zugrundeliegende Gesetz?

2. Plant die Kommission, in die Preisgestaltung im medizinischen und pharmazeutischen Sektor einzugreifen, zum Beispiel durch die Einführung EU-weiter Höchstpreise für medizinische Produkte oder Medikamente oder durch die Einführung maximaler Gewinnmargen für Pharmaunternehmen?

3. Bestehen derzeit EU-Rechtsrahmen, die es ermöglichen, Pharmaunternehmen Patente zu entziehen oder sie zur Weitergabe von Informationen über Produktionsprozesse zu zwingen, zum Beispiel beim Ausbruch einer Epidemie oder Pandemie? Wenn nicht, erwägt die Kommission, eine solche Möglichkeit einzuführen?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(16. Mai 2012)

1. Der Kommission ist die Tatsache einer von Indien erteilten Zwangslizenz für die Herstellung eines mit einem Patent geschützten Medikaments bekannt. Diese erzwungene Lizenzierung ist offensichtlich auf der Grundlage von Paragraf 84 des indischen Patentgesetzes erfolgt. Das Übereinkommen über handelsbezogene Aspekte der Rechte des geistigen Eigentums (TRIPS) der Welthandelsorganisation (WTO) gestattet nach Maßgabe der Doha-Erklärung zum TRIPS-Übereinkommen und zur öffentlichen Gesundheit den WTO-Mitgliedstaaten, Zwangslizenzen für Arzneimittel zu erteilen, wenn eine Reihe von Bedingungen erfüllt werden. Die Kommission prüft gegenwärtig die indische Entscheidung, eine Zwangslizenz zu erteilen, insbesondere im Hinblick auf deren Zulässigkeit nach den geltenden WTO-Regelungen.

2. Die EU greift nicht direkt in die Preisgestaltung von Medikamenten ein. Vielmehr liegt es in der Zuständigkeit der einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten, ihre eigenen Erstattungsregelungen für medizinische Produkte umzusetzen. Seit über zwanzig Jahren besteht jedoch eine EU-Rechtsvorschrift, mit der die Transparenz und Objektivität einzelstaatlicher Entscheidungen im Zusammenhang mit Preisgestaltung und Preiserstattung gewährleistet werden soll (Richtlinie 89/105/EWG ([1])).

3. Im Anschluss an die Annahme der Doha-Erklärung zu TRIPS und öffentlicher Gesundheit sowie des WTO-Beschlusses vom August 2003 über die Gewährung von Zwangslizenzen für die Ausfuhr hat die EU die Verordnung 816/2006 ([2]) erlassen. Die Verordnung gewährt Unternehmen, die pharmazeutische Erzeugnisse für die Ausfuhr in Entwicklungsländer herstellen, die über unzulängliche eigene Fertigungskapazitäten verfügen und Probleme im Bereich der öffentlichen Gesundheit aufweisen, das Recht, Zwangslizenzen zu erteilen. (Die Verordnung zielt darauf ab, Wettbewerbsverzerrungen für die Wirtschaftsteilnehmer im Binnenmarkt zu verhindern und durch die Anwendung einheitlicher Regeln die Wiedereinführung *aufgrund dieser Zwangslizenzen hergestellter pharmazeutischer Ergebnisse in die EU zu vermeiden).*

([1]) ABl. L 40 vom 11.2.1989.
([2]) ABl. L 157 vom 9.6.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003572/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Pharmaceutical and medicinal patents in the EU

On 13 March 2012, India forced German company Bayer to pass on a medical patent to a local manufacturer. The reason given for this decision was that Bayer was selling the medicinal product based on the patent at prices that were unaffordable for the local population. Observers suspect that this decision may provide a precedent and that, in future, India will withdraw other patent rights.

1. How does the Commission assess this decision by the Indian Patent Office and the underlying legislation?

2. Does the Commission plan to intervene in relation to pricing in the medicines and pharmaceuticals sector, for example by introducing EU-wide maximum prices for medical products or medicines or by introducing maximum profit margins for pharmaceuticals companies?

3. Do legal frameworks exist in the EU that allow patents to be withdrawn from pharmaceuticals companies or force these companies to pass on information about production processes, for example in the event of the outbreak of an epidemic or pandemic? If not, would the Commission consider introducing such a provision?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of the compulsory license issued by India for the production of a patented medicine. This compulsory licence appears to be based on Section 84 of the Indian Patent Act. The World Trade Organisation (WTO) Agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), as clarified by the Doha Declaration on TRIPs and Public Health allows WTO Members to grant compulsory licenses provided a number of conditions are fulfilled. The Commission is currently examining the Indian decision to grant a compulsory licence, notably from the perspective of its compliance with WTO rules.

2. The EU does not directly intervene on the issue of pricing of medicines, and it is for individual Member States to implement their own reimbursement regimes for medicinal products. However, EU legislation has been in place for more than twenty years to ensure the transparency and objectivity of pricing and reimbursement decisions in the Member States (Directive 89/105/EEC ([1])).

3. Further to the adoption of the Doha Declaration on TRIPs and Public Health, and the August 2003 WTO decision on compulsory licences for export, the EU has adopted Regulation 816/2006 ([2]). This regulation allows for the granting of compulsory export licences to companies intending to manufacture medicinal products for export to developing countries which do not have sufficient production capacity of their own and which are facing public health problems. (*The regulation aims to prevent distortion of competition among operators in the single market and to apply uniform rules in order to avoid the reimport into the EU of pharmaceutical products manufactured under the compulsory licences).*

([1]) OJ L 40, 11.2.1989.
([2]) OJ L 157, 9.6.2006.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003573/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(3. April 2012)

Betrifft: Patenttrolle und Änderung des Patentsystems

Einige große internationale Konzerne, insbesondere die amerikanischen Konzerne Apple und Microsoft, haben in EU-Staaten in den letzten Monaten gehäuft Patentrechtsklagen gegen Konkurrenten eingereicht. Einige Beobachter meinen, diese Patentrechtsklagen und beantragte Verkaufsverbote würden nur dazu benutzt, um Konkurrenten wirtschaftliche Schäden zuzufügen, und dienten nicht dazu, Rechte an Erfindungen und Innovationen zu schützen.

Gleichzeitig nahmen Medienberichten zufolge die Beschwerden über „Patenttrolle" (Unternehmen, die andere Unternehmen mit Patentrechtsklagen für allgemein gehaltene Patente überziehen oder diese durch Androhung solcher Klagen erpressen) auch in der EU zu.

1. Stimmt die Kommission der Auffassung zu, dass Patentrechtsklagen derzeit gelegentlich missbraucht werden, um Konkurrenten wirtschaftlichen Schaden zuzufügen?

2. Kennt die Kommission europäische Fälle von „Patenttrollen", die allgemein gehaltene Patente zur Erpressung nutzen?

3. Ist die Kommission der Meinung, dass die derzeitige Patentrechtssituation, insbesondere was die oben beschriebenen Fälle betrifft, der EU-Wirtschaft schadet? Wie bewertet die Kommission insbesondere den Effekt des jetzigen Patentrechtssystems auf kleine und mittlere Unternehmen (KMU)?

4. Verhindert das Risiko von Patentrechtsklagen nach Ansicht der Kommission Innovation, und/oder erschwert es Unternehmensgründungen?

5. Ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass angesichts der derzeitigen Situation das EU-Patentrecht überarbeitet werden sollte? Wenn ja, wann wird die Kommission entsprechende Vorschläge unterbreiten?

6. Wenn nein, mit welchen anderen Maßnahmen will die Kommission den Missbrauch von Patenten unterbinden?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(14. Juni 2012)

Zu 1 und 4: Der Missbrauch von Rechten des geistigen Eigentums kann Innovation behindern oder Neulingen, insbesondere KMU, den Zugang zum Markt versperren. In ihrer Mitteilung zur IPR-Strategie ([1]) stellt die Kommission fest, dass die Wettbewerbsvorschriften energisch verteidigt und rigoros angewandt werden müssen, um derartige Missbräuche zu verhindern.

Zu 2: Der Begriff „Patenttroll" ist in der EU weder näher bestimmt noch genau definiert. In den meisten Fällen wird darunter ein nicht produzierendes Unternehmen verstanden, das ein Patent erwirbt und gegen ein oder mehrere des Missbrauchs beschuldigte Unternehmen durchsetzt, dabei oftmals aggressiv oder opportunistisch vorgeht und im allgemeinen nicht die Absicht hat, die patentierte Erfindung weiterzuentwickeln, herzustellen oder zu vermarkten. In der Praxis sind die Gründe, aus denen Unternehmen ihre Patentrechte nicht nutzen, vielfältig und erfordern deshalb eine nuanciertere Analyse ([2]).

Zu 3: Das derzeitige europäische Patentsystem sieht eine Reihe von Schutzmaßnahmen gegen „Patenttrolle" vor. Nach einer Studie der Kommission aus dem Jahr 2011 ([3]) ist die Qualität des Patentsystems in der EU vor allem dank eines strengen Prüfverfahrens bei der Erteilung europäischer Patente hoch. Darüber hinaus erlassen die Gerichte in der EU nicht automatisch Verfügungen und ist der zugesprochene Schadenersatz bei Patentverletzungsverfahren in der Regel geringer als beispielsweise in den USA. Dies wird allgemein als Abschreckung für „Patenttrolle" angesehen.

([1]) Mitteilung der Kommission „Ein Binnenmarkt für Rechte des geistigen Eigentums", KOM(2011)287 endg.
([2]) Weitere Einzelheiten u. a. in Abschnitt 5.3.1.2 einer neueren für die Kommission erstellten Studie, unter: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/innovation/files/creating-financial-market-for-ipr-in-europe_en.pdf.
([3]) Studie über die Qualität des Patentsystems in Europa, abrufbar unter: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/indprop/docs/patent/patqual02032011_en.pdf.

Zu 5: Die Einführung eines einheitlichen Patentschutzes in der EU und die Schaffung eines gemeinsamen Patentgerichtshofs würden insbesondere die Rechtssicherheit erhöhen und durch zentralisierte Verfahren für den Widerruf eines Patents einen wirksameren Schutz vor „Patenttrollen“ ermöglichen.

Zu 6: Die Kommission wird die Lage weiter verfolgen, um zu bewerten, ob weitere spezifische Maßnahmen erforderlich sein könnten, und gleichzeitig gegen einzelne Verstöße gegen das EU-Wettbewerbsrecht vorgehen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003573/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Patent trolls and changes to the patent system

Some large international concerns, in particular US companies Apple and Microsoft, have filed a large number of patent suits against competitors in EU Member States in recent months. Some observers believe that these patent suits and applications for a prohibition of sales are simply intended to inflict economic damage on competitors, rather than protecting rights to inventions and innovations.

At the same time, according to reports in the media, there has been an increase in complaints in the EU relating to 'patent trolls' (companies who impede other companies with patent suits for generally held patents or who blackmail these companies with threats of such suits).

1. Does the Commission agree that patent suits are occasionally abused in order to inflict economic damage on competitors?

2. Is the Commission aware of European cases of 'patent trolls' that use generally held patents for blackmailing purposes?

3. In the opinion of the Commission, does the current situation in relation to patent law, in particular the cases describe above, damage business in the EU? How does the Commission assess the effect of the current patent law system on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in particular?

4. In the opinion of the Commission, does the risk of patent suits impede innovation and/or make it more difficult to establish businesses?

5. Is the Commission of the opinion that, in view of the current situation, EU patent law should be revised? If so, when will the Commission submit appropriate proposals?

6. If not, what other measures will the Commission use to prevent the abuse of patents?

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

1 and 4. The abuse of intellectual property rights can hamper innovation or exclude new entrants, especially SMEs, from markets. In its communication on the IPR Strategy ([1]), the Commission identified the need for strong protection and rigorous application of competition rules to prevent such abuses.

2. The extent or even the definition of a 'patent troll' is not clearly established in the EU. Most commonly it is understood as a phenomenon of non-practicing entities which buy and enforce patents against one or more alleged infringers, often in an aggressive or opportunistic manner, generally with no intention to further develop, manufacture or market the patented invention. In reality however, the reasons why certain entities do not practice their patent rights may be found in differentiated situations, thereby requiring a nuanced analysis ([2]).

3. The current European patent system provides for a number of safeguards against the activity of 'patent trolls'. According to a Commission study ([3]) of 2011, the quality of the patent system in the EU is high, in particular thanks to a stringent examination procedure for granting European patents. In addition, the courts in the EU do not issue automatic injunctions and the assigned damage in infringement procedures tends to be lower than, for example, in the US. This generally is considered to be a deterrent to 'patent trolls'.

5. The introduction of a unitary patent protection in the EU and the creation of a common court for patent-related litigation would in particular increase the legal certainty and would allow a more effective defence against any 'patent trolls' due to the centralised patent revocation procedure.

([1]) Communication from the Commission 'A Single Market for Intellectual Property Rights', COM(2011) 287 final.
([2]) For more details, please consult, e.g., Section 5.3.1.2 of a recent study for the Commission, published at: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/innovation/files/creating-financial-market-for-ipr-in-europe_en.pdf
([3]) Study on the quality of the patent system in Europe, at http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/indprop/docs/patent/patqual02032011_en.pdf

6. Whilst taking action against individual abuses under EU competition law the Commission will continue to monitor the situation in order to assess whether other specific measures might be required.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003574/12
to the Commission
Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Funding for research into arthritis

How much money has been provided to date under FP7 for research into arthritis? What types of research project are involved?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(22 May 2012)

Research on arthritis has been a constant priority within the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013). Through its various programmes, FP7 is currently supporting 34 research projects (representing more than EUR 100 million) on different forms of arthritis, such as rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, psoriatic arthritis, or juvenile idiopathic arthritis. Issues addressed by the supported projects include, for instance, the development of new or improved medicinal products for the treatment of arthritis, the investigation of genetic and biochemical markers of the disease, the *in silico* modelling of cartilage degradation, the use of nanotechnology and stem cell therapy approaches for the repair of damaged tissue by arthritis, the pathogenesis of arthritis, and the use of diagnostic and prognostic factors to translate the results into clinical application.

In addition, research aiming at developing future treatments for early intervention against rheumatoid arthritis is being addressed by the BTCure project ([1]) (EUR 16 million of the 32 come from FP7). This project is supported by the Innovative Medicines Initiative (IMI) ([2]), a public-private partnership between the EU and the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations (EFPIA), aiming at developing better and safer medicines for patients.

([1]) http://btcure.eu/
([2]) http://imi.europa.eu/index_en.html

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-003576/12
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(3 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Pomoc Komisji dla zwalnianych pracowników Huty Tadeusza Sendzimira w Krakowie

W ostatnich tygodniach firma Arcelor Mittal poinformowała o zwolnieniach w krakowskiej hucie im Tadeusza Sendzimira. Jest to część planu, o którym Parlament Europejski dyskutował w październiku 2011 r., kiedy to koncern informował o planach masowych zwolnień w europejskich zakładach.

1. Jak wysokie środki i kiedy Komisja zamierza przeznaczyć z funduszy Europejskiego Funduszu Społecznego w celu pomocy zwalnianym w Krakowie hutnikom? Ile osób zostanie objętych pomocą?

2. Czy Rząd Polski wystąpił do Komisji o uruchomienie środków z Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji (EFG) dla osób zwalnianych w krakowskiej hucie? Kiedy Komisja może wpłacić środki pomocowe dla zwalnianych?

3. Jak Komisja zamierza wspierać powrót na rynek pracowników z sektorów przemysłu ciężkiego zwalnianych ze względu na kryzys i niekorzystne dla tego typu przedsiębiorstw zapisy pakietu klimatyczno-energetycznego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(25 maja 2012 r.)

1. Komisja nie odpowiada za przydział środków z Europejskiego Funduszu Społecznego (EFS) na konkretne działania. Wybór projektów leży całkowicie w gestii danego państwa członkowskiego. Komisja nie posiada żadnych informacji o przygotowywaniu przez Polskę wniosku o finansowanie z EFS w celu wspierania zwolnionych pracowników z Huty Tadeusza Sendzimira. Komisja zwróciła się jednak do właściwych organów krajowych o przekazanie takich informacji. W oczekiwaniu na odpowiedź tych organów Komisja może potwierdzić, że istnieje możliwość udzielenia przez EFS zwolnionym pracownikom pomocy zgodnie z zasadami kwalifikowalności ustanowionymi na poziomie krajowym. Więcej informacji na temat zakresu programu EFS i instytucji odpowiedzialnych za jego realizację znaleźć można na stronie internetowej EFS:
http://www.efs.gov.pl/strony/kontakt.aspx

2. Komisja nie posiada informacji o przygotowywaniu przez Polskę wniosku o finansowanie z Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji (EFG). Informacji na temat tego, czy istnieją plany złożenia takiego wniosku, Szanowny Pan Poseł zasięgnąć może u osoby wyznaczonej do kontaktów w zakresie EFG dla Polski ([1]).

3. Zdaniem Komisji konieczne jest osiągnięcie bardziej efektywnego wdrożenia istniejących najlepszych praktyk dotyczących restrukturyzacji przedsiębiorstw. Komisja opublikowała zieloną księgę ([2]) w tej sprawie i dokonuje obecnie przeglądu uwag otrzymanych od zainteresowanych stron, państw członkowskich i instytucji UE, po czym podejmie inicjatywy w tej dziedzinie.

([1]) Dane kontaktowe dostępne są na stronie internetowej EFG pod adresem: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=pl.
([2]) COM(2012) 7, „Restrukturyzacja i przewidywanie zmian: wnioski wynikające z ostatnich doświadczeń".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003576/12
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Commission aid for workers laid off from the Tadeusz Sendzimir Steel Mill in Kraków

In recent weeks, ArcelorMittal has released information concerning redundancies at the Tadeusz Sendzimir Steel Mill in Kraków. This is part of a plan that was discussed by the European Parliament in October 2011, when ArcelorMittal revealed its plans for mass redundancies at its European plants.

1. How much funding does the Commission intend to allocate from the European Social Fund in order to help workers made redundant from the Kraków mill, and when will this funding be made available? How many people will receive such assistance?

2. Has the Polish Government requested that the Commission mobilise funds from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) for the laid-off Kraków steel mill workers? When will the Commission be able to disburse this assistance for laid-off workers?

3. How does the Commission intend to support the return to the labour market of workers in the heavy industry sector who are made redundant as a result of the crisis and of the Climate and Energy Package's provisions, which are unfavourable to such enterprises?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

1. The Commission is not responsible for allocation of funding from the European Social Fund (ESF) to operations. The selection of projects is entirely the responsibility of the Member State. The Commission is not aware of any application being prepared by Poland to request funding from the ESF to support redundant workers from the Sendzimir Mill, however, the Commission requested such information from relevant national authorities. Pending their reply, the Commission can confirm that the ESF could potentially provide assistance to redundant workers according to eligibility rules established at national level. More information on the scope of the ESF programme and institutions responsible for implementation can be found on the website (http://www.efs.gov.pl/strony/kontakt.aspx).

2. The Commission is not aware of any application being prepared by Poland to request funding from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF). To find out whether there are plans to submit such an application, the Honourable Member is advised to get in touch with the EGF Contact Person for Poland ([1]).

3. The Commission considers it necessary to achieve a more effective implementation of existing best practices on company restructuring. It has published a Green Paper ([2]) on this matter and is reviewing contributions from stakeholders, Member States and EU institutions, before launching initiatives in this area.

([1]) Contact details are available on the EGF website at http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=pl.
([2]) COM(2012) 7, 'Restructuring and anticipation of change, what lessons from the economic crisis?'.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-003578/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(3. april 2012)

Om: Hviderusland

Den politiske situation i Hviderusland er blevet alvorligt forværret siden præsidentvalget den 19. december 2010 med repressive foranstaltninger over for medlemmer af den demokratiske opposition, de frie medier, civilsamfundsaktivister og menneskerettighedsforkæmpere på trods af gentagne opfordringer fra det internationale samfund til omgående at bringe disse foranstaltninger til ophør.

Det har medført, at man i USA har vedtaget »the Belarus Democracy and Human Rights Act«, der kræver, at Det Internationale Ishockeyforbund afblæser planerne om VM i Hviderusland, indtil man frigiver politiske fanger.

— Tal fra Kommissionen viser, at handlen mellem Hviderusland og EU er i fremgang i 2010 og 2011.

— Har Kommissionen nogen planer om at indføre handelsrestriktioner mod Hviderusland, indtil de tager de nødvendige skridt som beskrevet i det ovenstående?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af den højtstående repræsentant / næstformand Catherine Ashton
(19. juni 2012)

Europa-Kommissionen er fortsat stærkt bekymret over den fortsatte mangel på respekt for menneskerettigheder, demokrati og retsstatsprincipper i Hviderusland og beklager, at der træffes yderligere undertrykkende foranstaltninger.

De både politisk og økonomisk restriktive foranstaltninger, som EU har truffet efter præsidentvalget den 19. december 2010, er rettet mod de ansvarlige for valgsvindelen den 19. december 2010 og de efterfølgende voldelige anslag mod den demokratiske opposition, civilsamfundet og repræsentanter for de uafhængige massemedier, mod de ansvarlige for de alvorlige menneskerettighedskrænkelser og undertrykkelsen af civilsamfundet og den politiske opposition, mod personer og organismer, som nyder godt af eller støtter regimet, og mod dem, som støtter regimet eller har fordel af det.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003578/12
to the Commission
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Belarus

The political situation in Belarus has seriously deteriorated since the presidential elections on 19 December 2010, with repressive measures being taken against members of the democratic opposition, the free press, civil society activists and human rights defenders, in spite of repeated requests from the international community to end these immediately.

In the US, this has resulted in the passing of the Belarus Democracy and Human Rights Act, which demands that the International Ice Hockey Federation postpones its plans to hold the Ice Hockey World Championships in Belarus until the country frees political prisoners.

— Figures from the Commission show that trade between Belarus and the EU increased in 2010 and 2011.

— Does the Commission have any plans to introduce trade restrictions against Belarus until the necessary steps described above have been taken?

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

The European Commission remains gravely concerned about the continued lack of respect for human rights, democracy and rule of law in Belarus, and regrets that further repressive measures are taking place.

The restrictive — political as well as economic — measures that the EU has adopted after the 19 December 2010 Presidential elections are targeting persons responsible for the fraudulent Presidential elections of 19 December 2010 and the subsequent violent crackdown on democratic opposition, civil society and representatives of independent mass media; persons responsible for serious violations of human rights and repression against civil society and the political opposition; as well as persons and entities benefitting from or supporting the regime and against those supporting the regime or drawing benefits from it.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003579/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(3 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Θαλάσσια έρευνα

Η έρευνα διαδραματίζει σημαντικό ρόλο στην εξέλιξη του τομέα της αλιείας καθώς μια βιώσιμη και καινοτόμα αλιεία θα συμβάλει τόσο στην περιβαλλοντική όσο και στην κοινωνικοοικονομική πλευρά της Κοινής Αλιευτικής Πολιτικής.

Το κενό επιστημονικών γνώσεων για τα θαλάσσια οικοσυστήματα, στα οποία δραστηριοποιούνται οι ευρωπαίοι αλιείς, και για τις επιπτώσεις της αλιευτικής δραστηριότητας, είναι μεγάλο.

Η βελτίωση του συστήματος συλλογής επιστημονικών πληροφοριών και η αποτελεσματική χρήση των θαλάσσιων δεδομένων για την προστασία των ακτών και την αξιολόγηση των ιχθυοαποθεμάτων θα ενισχύσει την ευρωπαϊκή προστιθέμενη αξία και την ανταγωνιστικότητα της ΕΕ στην παγκόσμια αλιευτική σκηνή.

Στο πρόγραμμα «Ορίζοντας 2020», προβλέπεται γενικός προϋπολογισμός ύψους 4,7 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ για το κεφάλαιο «επισιτιστική ασφάλεια, βιώσιμη γεωργία, έρευνα στον τομέα της θάλασσας και της ναυτιλίας και της βιοοικονομίας», στο οποίο εμπίπτουν η γεωργία, η δασοκομία, η ασφαλής διατροφή, οι υδρόβιοι πόροι, η βιοτεχνολογία, κ.ά.

Με βάση τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πώς θα διανεμηθεί αυτός ο προϋπολογισμός στις διαφορετικές κατηγορίες;

2. Προβλέπονται ξεχωριστές γραμμές προϋπολογισμού;

3. Προβλέπονται άλλοι τρόποι στήριξης της θαλάσσιας έρευνας εντός του προγράμματος, εκτός από το μέρος III — Κοινωνικές προκλήσεις; Ποιες μπορούν να είναι οι συνέργειες των κονδυλίων αυτών με δράσεις που χρηματοδοτούνται από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία;

4. Τι ποσοστό του FP7 προορίζεται για θαλάσσια έρευνα και μέσα από ποιες δράσεις διατίθεται; Ποιες είναι οι μεγαλύτερες προκλήσεις που αντιμετωπίζει η θαλάσσια έρευνα και πώς έχουν συνεισφέρει στην κατανόησή μας για τα θαλάσσια οικοσυστήματα τα προγράμματα του FP7;

Απάντηση της κας Geoghegan-Quinn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(1 Ιουνίου 2012)

1.-2. Η έρευνα στους τομείς της αλιείας και της υδατοκαλλιέργειας αποτελεί κύριο στοιχείο της πρότασης για το πρόγραμμα πλαίσιο «Ορίζοντας 2020», που αποσκοπεί στην καλύτερη κατανόηση του τρόπου με τον οποίο μπορεί να γίνει η βιώσιμη εκμετάλλευση των έμβιων υδάτινων πόρων και να μεγιστοποιηθούν τα κοινωνικοοικονομικά οφέλη από τις θάλασσες της Ευρώπης. Επίσης, θα εξεταστούν οι περιβαλλοντικές επιπτώσεις των εν λόγω δραστηριοτήτων, η επίδραση της αλλαγής του κλίματος και τα νέα εργαλεία διαχείρισης. Έως τώρα δεν έχει ληφθεί απόφαση για την κατανομή των πιστώσεων του προϋπολογισμού με σκοπό την αντιμετώπιση της πρόκλησης.

3. Η έρευνα στον τομέα της θάλασσας αποτελεί επίσης αντικείμενο των κοινωνιακών προκλήσεων «Δράση για το κλίμα, αποδοτική χρήση των πόρων και πρώτες ύλες» (αλληλεπιδράσεις κλίματος — ωκεανών, επιπτώσεις της αλλαγής του κλίματος και προσαρμογή, βιώσιμη διαχείριση των θαλάσσιων οικοσυστημάτων), «Ασφαλής, καθαρή και αποδοτική ενέργεια» και «Έξυπνες, οικολογικές και ενοποιημένες μεταφορές». Λαμβάνεται επίσης υπόψη στον πυλώνα «βιομηχανική υπεροχή» σε συνάρτηση με τις κύριες τεχνολογίες γενικής εφαρμογής (βιοτεχνολογίες), δεδομένου ότι η εν λόγω έρευνα θα αποτελέσει καθοριστικό παράγοντα για την επίτευξη της «Γαλάζιας Ανάπτυξης».

Οι οριζόντιες δραστηριότητες στον τομέα της θάλασσας και της ναυτιλίας που δρομολογήθηκαν εντός του 7ου προγράμματος πλαισίου για την έρευνα και την τεχνολογική ανάπτυξη (7ο ΠΠ, 2007-2013), όπως οι προσκλήσεις υποβολής προτάσεων «Ωκεανοί του μέλλοντος», θα ενισχυθούν περαιτέρω εντός του προγράμματος πλαισίου «Ορίζοντας 2020» μέσω της στρατηγικής προσέγγισης των θεμάτων που είναι κοινά στις διάφορες προκλήσεις και πυλώνες. Προβλέπεται επίσης συντονισμός με την Πρωτοβουλία Κοινού Προγραμματισμού «Υγιείς και παραγωγικές θάλασσες και ωκεανοί», όπου τα κράτη μέλη έχουν την κύρια ευθύνη συντονισμού των ερευνητικών προσπαθειών τους.

Για την προώθηση της καινοτομίας θα αξιοποιηθούν επίσης οι συνέργειες που αναπτύσσονται με τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία, όπως το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Θάλασσας και Αλιείας, το οποίο είναι αυτή τη στιγμή υπό συζήτηση.

4. Όσον αφορά το 7ο ΠΠ στο σύνολό του, η μέση ετήσια συνεισφορά της ΕΕ για την έρευνα στον τομέα της θάλασσας και της ναυτιλίας με βάση τα στοιχεία για την περίοδο 2007-2008 υπερβαίνει τα 350 εκατ. ευρώ.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003579/12
to the Commission
Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Marine research

Research plays an important role in the development of the fisheries sector, as a viable and innovative fishing industry will contribute to both the environmental and the socioeconomic side of the common fisheries policy.

There is a large gap in scientific knowledge of the marine ecosystems where EU fishing activity is conducted, and on the consequences of such activity.

Improvement in the system of scientific information-gathering and in effective utilisation of marine data for the purpose of protecting the coasts and evaluating fish stocks will strengthen European added value and the EU's competitiveness in the global fisheries scene.

In the 'Horizon 2020' programme, there is a provision for a general budget of EUR 4.7 billion for the chapter on 'Food security, sustainable agriculture, marine and maritime research, and the bioeconomy', categories encompassing farming, forestry, secure nutrition, aquatic resources, biotechnology, etc.

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

1. How will these budgeted resources be distributed between the different categories?

2. Are any separate funding streams envisaged?

3. Are any other means of supporting marine research provided for by the programme, other than those cited in part III — Social challenges? What synergies can there be between the abovementioned funds and actions supported by the Structural Funds?

4. What proportion of FP7 funding has been earmarked for marine research and through what activities is it to be made available? What are the greatest challenges faced by marine research and how have the FP7 programmes contributed to our understanding of marine ecosystems?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(1 June 2012)

1. and 2. Fisheries and aquaculture research are key areas in the Horizon 2020 proposal aiming at better understanding how to sustainably exploit aquatic living resources and maximise socioeconomic benefits from Europe's seas. The environmental impact of such activities, the effect of climate change and new management tools will also be tackled. So far, no decision has been made on a budget breakdown within the challenge.

3. Marine research is also tackled in the societal challenges 'Climate Action, Resources Efficiency and Raw Materials' (climate-ocean interactions, climate change impacts & adaptation, sustainable management of marine ecosystems), 'Secure, Clean and Efficient Energy' and 'Smart, Green and Integrated Transport'. It is considered in the 'Industrial leadership' pillar too, in relation to key enabling technologies (biotechnologies), since this research will be key to deliver the 'Blue Growth'.

The cross-cutting marine and maritime activities launched in the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) such as 'The Ocean of Tomorrow' calls will be further strengthened in Horizon 2020 by implementing a strategic programming approach on issues that cut across the different challenges and pillars. Coordination is also foreseen with the Joint Programme Initiative 'Healthy and Productive Seas and Oceans' where Member States are in the lead to coordinate their research efforts.

Synergies with the Structural Funds such as the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund currently under discussion will also be used to promote innovation.

4. Regarding FP7 as a whole, the average annual EU contribution for marine and maritime research based on 2007-2008 figures is superior to EUR 350 million.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003580/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Car-sharing in the EU

The White Paper entitled 'Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area — Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system' (COM(2011) 0144) states: 'A higher share of travel by collective transport, combined with minimum service obligations, will allow increasing [sic] the density and frequency of service, thereby generating a virtuous circle for public transport modes. Demand management and land-use planning can lower traffic volumes.'

— How does the Commission propose to integrate car-sharing into its current environmental policy framework?

— Does the Commission have any plans to implement transport policy promoting the use of car-sharing in urban centres across the EU?

— Does the Commission propose to supply further funding to European cities where car-sharing is already in operation?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2012)

In the Transport White Paper ([1]), the Commission proposes a gradual phasing out of conventionally fuelled cars in cities by 2050. This will require a greater use of collective transport, walking and cycling as well as alternative transport systems and fuels in conventional cars.

The collective use of private cars in the form of car-sharing represents an effective measure which improves energy efficiency and accessibility without requiring new technologies. Studies show that car-sharing can replace between four and eight private cars.

The Commission will continue its initiatives aimed at encouraging citizens to be less car-dependent, such as the Civitas Initiative and the Intelligent Energy Europe (IEE) programme (which can include the enhancement of existing car-sharing schemes).

Car sharing schemes are regarded as one of the innovative concepts in urban mobility. In the implementation of the Transport White Paper, Initiative 31 on Urban Mobility Plans and Initiative 32 on Road User Charging and Access Restrictions, the Commission will take full account of the potential benefits of car-sharing.

The transition from a primarily car based personal mobility in cities to a mobility based on walking and cycling, high quality public transport and less and cleaner passenger vehicles is the central strategic mobility challenge for cities in the years to come. Car-sharing has a role to play. However, no initiatives related explicitly and solely to car-sharing are planned.

It is primarily the responsibility of local actors to develop the strategies for more sustainable transport systems that best fit their cities' and regions' particular circumstances. The Commission remains committed to providing support through the Civitas Initiative and the IEE programme.

([1]) COM(2011)144, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0144:FIN:EN:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003581/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement

Recently, the Commission referred the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement to the European Court of Justice. The Commission took this decision so that it could ask the Court whether ACTA is incompatible — in any way — with the EU's fundamental rights and freedoms, such as freedom of expression and information, or with data protection and the right to property where intellectual property is concerned.

— As the Commission is aware, the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement has been the subject of much public interest. In this regard, can the Commission give an indication of the proposed timeline for the European Court of Justice's ruling on the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement?

— Furthermore, the Commission has previously stated that ACTA is an 'enforcement treaty' and that, therefore, current legislation will not need to be amended in order to comply with it. Can the Commission clarify how ACTA will be implemented in the Member States if current legislation is not amended?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

The Commission is unable to give a precise reply regarding the timeline for the European Court of Justice's ruling on the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement, but in the past, similar rulings have rarely taken less than 18 months and sometimes considerably more time.

The EU already complies with the obligations set out in the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA) on the basis of existing applicable legislation, including the:

— Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) (Civil) Enforcement Directive ([1]);

— IPR Customs Regulation ([2]);

— Copyright in the Information Society Directive ([3]);

— e-commerce Directive ([4]);

— Data Protection Directives ([5]);

— Telecom Reform package of 2009 ([6]).

— national legislation in each Member State implementing the above directives;

— national rules in each Member State on penal enforcement measures (an area where there is not yet any EU *acquis*).

([1]) Directive 2004/48/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the enforcement of intellectual property rights, OJ L 157, 30.4.2004.
([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1383/2003 of 22 July 2003 concerning customs action against goods suspected of infringing certain intellectual property rights and the measures to be taken against goods found to have infringed such rights, OJ L 19, 2.8.2003.
([3]) Directive 2001/29/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 on the harmonisation of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society, OJ L 167, 22.6.2001.
([4]) Directive 2000/31/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2000 on certain legal aspects of information society services, in particular electronic commerce, in the internal market ('Directive on electronic commerce'), OJ L 178, 17.7.2000.
([5]) Directive 95/46/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 281, 23.11.1995.
([6]) Regulation (EC) No 1211/2009 of Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 establishing the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC) and the Office Text with EEA relevance, OJ L 337, 18.12.2009, Directive 2009/136/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 amending Directive 2002/22/EC on universal service and users' rights relating to electronic communications networks and services, Directive 2002/58/EC concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector and Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004 on cooperation between national authorities responsible for the enforcement of consumer protection laws, OJ L 337, 18.12.2009 and Directive 2009/140/EC of Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 amending Directives 2002/21/EC on a common regulatory framework for electronic communications networks and services, 2002/19/EC on access to, and interconnection of, electronic communications networks and associated facilities, and 2002/20/EC on the authorisation of electronic communications networks and services, OJ L 337, 18.12.2009.

ACTA will have to be implemented by the EU and its Member States in full respect of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU.

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, E-003582/12
Komisijai
Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE)
(2012. gada 3. aprīlis)

Temats: Trichinella pārbaudes mazās kautuvēs

Regulas (EK) Nr. 882/2004 (EC) Nr. 882/2004 ([1]) 12. pantā noteiktās akreditācijas prasības nākotnē radīs lielas grūtības mazu laboratoriju, kurās veic *Trichinella* pārbaudes, akreditācijai, jo šīs prasības ir neproporcionālas gan no finanšu, gan kvalitātes nodrošināšanas viedokļa.

— Vai Komisija varētu sniegt skaidras norādes par progresu, kas pašreizējā Regulas (EK) Nr. 882/2004 12. panta pārskatīšanas procesā panākts saistībā ar problēmas risinājumu attiecībā uz mazu kautuvju *Trichinella* laboratoriju akreditāciju?

— Vai Komisija apsvērtu iespēju ierosināt pastāvīgas atkāpes piemērošanu šīm mazajām laboratorijām? Vai Komisija apsvērtu iespēju vajadzības gadījumā pagarināt pašreizējo pārejas pasākumu periodu (pārejas periodam beidzoties 2013. gada 31. decembrī), kas noteikts Regulā (EK) Nr. 1162/2009 ([2])?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Džons Dalli
(2012. gada 23. maijs)

Veicot Komisijas darba programmā 2012. gadam ([3]) izziņoto ietekmes novērtējumu (patlaban – vispārējam priekšlikumam par oficiālo kontroles pasākumu pārskatīšanu), tiek izskatīts jautājums par atkāpes piemērošanu akreditācijas prasībām, kas jāievēro dažos konkrētos gadījumos, piemēram, kautuvēm vai medījumu apstrādes uzņēmumiem pievienotajām laboratorijām, kurās izdara *Trichinella* analīzes.

Vajadzības gadījumā Komisija var pienācīgā kārtībā apsvērt iespēju pagarināt pašreizējo pārejas periodu, lai tas būtu spēkā arī pēc 2013. gada 31. decembra.

([1]) OV L 165, 30.4.2004., 1. lpp.
([2]) OV L 314, 1.12.2009., 10. lpp.
([3]) COM(2011) 777 galīgā redakcija, vol. ½, 15.11.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003582/12
to the Commission
Kārlis Šadurskis (PPE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Trichinella tests in small slaughterhouses

The accreditation requirements under Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 ([1]) will pose a major challenge for the accreditation of small laboratories conducting Trichinella testing in the future, as they are disproportionate from both a financial and quality-assurance point of view.

— Could the Commission give any clear indications as to the progress made with regard to solving the issue of the accreditation of Trichinella laboratories in small slaughterhouses under the current review of Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004?

— Would the Commission consider proposing a permanent derogation for these small laboratories? Where necessary, would the Commission consider extending the current transitional measures (with a transition period ending on 31 December 2013) laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1162/2009 ([2])?

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

The issue of derogation of accreditation requirements for some specific cases, like the Trichinella laboratories attached to slaughterhouses or game handling establishments, is being considered in the context of the ongoing impact assessment on the overall proposal on the review of official controls announced in the Commission Work Programme 2012 ([3]).

If necessary, the Commission may consider in due course an extension of the current transitional period beyond 1st January 2014.

([1]) OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1.
([2]) OJ L 314, 1.12.2009, p. 10.
([3]) COM(2011)777 final Vol ½ of 15.11.2011.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-003583/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 avril 2012)

Objet: Dangers pour les enfants de médicaments à base de codéine

L'agence fédérale belge des médicaments et des produits de santé (AFMPS) a annoncé le 20 mars 2012 que, dès la fin de cette année, les médicaments contenant de la codéine ou l'un de ses dérivés ne seront plus délivrés que sur présentation d'une ordonnance médicale. D'autre part, l'âge limite minimum pour certains antitussifs et expectorants contenant de la codéine sera désormais fixé à six ans, en raison des effets secondaires et de l'efficacité discutable de ces médicaments.

La Commission peut-elle faire savoir si de telles dispositions sont également envisagées dans d'autres États membres et, dans le cas contraire, pourquoi, au nom du principe de précaution, de telles mesures ne sont pas prises dans l'ensemble des États membres?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(6 juin 2012)

Au sein de l'Union européenne, les autorisations de mise sur le marché des médicaments peuvent être accordées soit par la Commission au niveau de l'Union, soit par les États membres à l'échelon national. Dans le cas des médicaments contenant de la codéine, les autorisations de mise sur le marché sont accordées par les États membres selon des procédures variables et ne sont par conséquent pas pleinement harmonisées à l'échelle de l'Union.

La population pour laquelle un médicament est indiqué (groupe d'âge, par exemple) figure dans le Résumé des caractéristiques du produit. Ces informations font l'objet d'une harmonisation dans tous les États membres concernés par la demande dans le cas d'une procédure de reconnaissance mutuelle ou d'une procédure décentralisée, à l'issue de l'évaluation scientifique. À l'inverse, elles ne sont pas harmonisées pour les produits qui reçoivent une autorisation de façon indépendante, au niveau national.

La décision relative à la classification d'un médicament en matière de délivrance (avec ou sans ordonnance) est en revanche prise individuellement par chaque État membre lorsque celui-ci accorde une autorisation de mise sur le marché.

La Commission a veillé à ce que la Belgique informe tous les États membres de sa décision et des éléments qui la motivent, afin que leurs autorités compétentes respectives puissent examiner la nécessité de modifier la classification, sur leur territoire, des médicaments contenant de la codéine.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003583/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Dangers to children from codeine-based medicines

The Belgian Federal Agency for Medicines and Health Products announced on 20 March 2012 that, from the end of this year, medicines containing codeine or any of its derivatives will be available on prescription only. In addition, some cough suppressants and expectorants containing codeine will no longer be recommended for the under-sixes, due to the side effects and the questionable efficacy of these medicines.

Are such steps also planned in other Member States? If the answer is no, why, given the precautionary principle, are measures of this kind not being taken in all Member States?

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

Marketing authorisation for a medicinal product in the EU can be granted by the Commission at EU level, or by Member States at national level. Medicinal products containing codeine have marketing authorisations granted by the Member States in different procedures and therefore are not fully harmonised in the EU.

The population for which a product is indicated, e.g. an age group, is part of the Summary of Product Characteristics. This product information is harmonised in all Member States concerned by the application in case of a mutual recognition or a decentralised procedure, as an outcome of the scientific assessment. By contrast, it is not harmonised for products authorised independently at national level.

Decision on classification of the supply, with or without a prescription, on the other hand, is taken individually by each Member State for a product when a marketing authorisation is granted.

The Commission has ensured that Belgium informed all Member States of their decision and the underlying reasons, so that the competent authority of each Member State can consider the need to amend the classification of medicinal products containing codeine on their territory.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003586/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(3. April 2012)

Betrifft: Türkei lässt Weiterreise von Wirtschaftsflüchtlingen in die EU zu

80 % der illegalen Einwanderer in die EU kommen über die türkisch-griechische Grenze. Obwohl die Türkei von der Europäischen Union jährlich Fördermittel in Höhe von ca. 900 Mio. EUR erhält, unternimmt die türkische Regierung nichts, um den Zustrom von Wirtschaftsflüchtlingen über die türkisch-griechische Grenze zu unterbinden. Griechenland ist unterdessen mit den Grenzkontrollen völlig überfordert. Um die EU-Außengrenze wirksam zu schützen, schlug Griechenland die Errichtung eines Grenzzaunes vor. Eine Mitfinanzierung durch die EU wurde abgelehnt. Die europäische Grenzschutzagentur Frontex ist gezwungen, mit einem Jahresbudget von etwa 83 Millionen Euro jährlich auszukommen.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten:

1. Aus welchem Grund will sich die Kommission am Bau eines Grenzschutzzaunes an der griechischen EU-Außengrenze nicht finanziell beteiligen?

2. Ist die Unterbindung der Weiterreise von Wirtschaftsflüchtlingen durch die Türkei in die EU Thema bei den Beitrittsverhandlungen?

3. Inwiefern wirkt die Kommission auf die Türkei ein, um sie zum Stopp der Weiterreise von Wirtschaftsflüchtlingen zu bewegen?

4. Hält es die Kommission nicht für sinnvoller, die beträchtlichen Zuwendungen an die in Grenzschutzfragen kooperationsunwillige Türkei lieber den Staaten mit EU-Außengrenzen bzw. Frontex zur Verfügung zu stellen?

5. Zieht es die Kommission grundsätzlich in Erwägung, Frontex bzw. Staaten mit besonders exponierten Außengrenzen ein höheres Budget zur Grenzsicherung bereitzustellen?

6. Welche Kosten entstehen der EU und den Mitgliedstaaten jährlich durch die illegale Einwanderung über die griechische EU-Außengrenze?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission
(30. Mai 2012)

Nach Ansicht der Kommission bietet die Errichtung einer technischen Anlage entlang einem Abschnitt der griechisch-türkischen Landgrenze keinen wirksamen Schutz vor irregulärer Migration. Daher hat sich die Kommission gegen eine Finanzierung des Grenzschutzzauns aus dem Außengrenzenfonds ausgesprochen.

Die Kommission hat Griechenland Hilfe bei der Bewältigung des Zustroms irregulärer Migranten aus der Türkei zugesagt und steht dazu. So hat sie bereits verschiedene technische Systeme eingeführt und finanzielle Hilfe in erheblichem Umfang geleistet ([1]). Ergänzend zu diesen Anstrengungen gilt es insbesondere, die von Frontex koordinierten laufenden Aktionen an der griechisch-türkischen Grenze auszudehnen, die Zusammenarbeit zwischen den verschiedenen Agenturen und Behörden — vor allem zwischen Frontex, Europol und EASO — zu verstärken und Griechenland beim Aufbau eines effizienten Grenzmanagementsystems und einer wirksamen Rückkehrpolitik weiter zu unterstützen.

Allerdings wären sämtliche Maßnahmen in der EU ohne eine bessere Zusammenarbeit mit der Türkei unzulänglich. Der Abschluss und die Anwendung eines EU-Rückübernahmeabkommens mit der Türkei, das auch Bestimmungen über die Rückübernahme von beim Transit aufgegriffenen irregulären Migranten aus Drittstaaten enthält, hat nach wie vor Priorität.

([1]) Im Zeitraum 2007-2011 hat Griechenland 171,2 Mio. EUR aus dem Außengrenzenfonds und dem Rückkehrfonds erhalten. 2012 wurden dem Land aus diesen beiden Fonds weitere 82 Mio. EUR zur Verfügung gestellt.

Darüber hinaus hilft die EU der Türkei finanziell beim Ausbau der Kapazitäten zur Verhütung und Bekämpfung der irregulären Migration in die und aus der Türkei. Die Aufnahme der Türkei in die EU wird u. a. davon abhängen, ob die Türkei bei der Umsetzung der von der EU verlangten Maßnahmen Fortschritte vorweisen kann.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003586/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Turkey permits economic refugees to enter the EU

Eighty per cent of illegal immigrants enter the EU via the border between Turkey and Greece. Despite the fact that Turkey receives funding of around EUR 900 million from the European Union each year, the Turkish Government is doing nothing to stop the flow of economic migrants across the Turkish-Greek border. Meanwhile, Greece is completely overwhelmed with its border control duties. It proposed building a border fence in order to provide effective protection at the EU's external frontier. The EU refused to co-finance such a move. Frontex, the European border management agency is required to get by with an annual budget of about EUR 83 million.

In this regard, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. What is the reason for the Commission's refusal to co-finance the construction of a border security fence at the EU's external frontier in Greece?

2. Do the accession negotiations with Turkey cover the prevention of economic refugees from entering the EU?

3. To what extent is the Commission seeking to exert influence on Turkey to stop economic refugees from entering the EU?

4. Does the Commission not believe it would make more sense to divert the considerable sums paid to Turkey, which seems unwilling to cooperate on border security issues, to states with EU external frontiers or to Frontex?

5. Would the Commission consider in principle providing a larger border security budget to Frontex or states with particularly exposed external frontiers?

6. What is the annual cost to the EU and the Member States through the illegal entry of immigrants via the EU's external frontier in Greece?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The Commission considers that the construction of a technical barrier along a section of the Greek/Turkish land border is not an effective measure to counter irregular migration. Therefore the Commission has not accepted that the fence should be financed under the External Borders Fund (EBF).

The Commission is fully committed to assist Greece in tackling irregular migration flows from Turkey and to this end has already put in place several measures of technical nature and provided considerable financial support ([1]). Those efforts need to be reinforced, notably by expanding the current operations at the Greek/Turkish border coordinated by Frontex, by increasing inter-agency cooperation, particularly between Frontex, Europol and EASO, and by continuing to assist Greece in building an efficient border management system and return policy.

Any action taken within the EU borders would not be sufficient without parallel, enhanced cooperation with Turkey. The conclusion and implementation of an EU readmission agreement with Turkey, including provisions for the readmission of third-country nationals intercepted as irregular migrants who transited through its territory, remains a priority.

In addition, the EU is providing financial assistance to Turkey to enhance its capacity to prevent and fight irregular migration to and from its territory. Progress made by Turkey in fulfilling EU's requirements in this area will represent a key factor in allowing Turkey's candidacy towards accession to move forwards.

([1]) In the period of 2007-2011, Greece received EUR 171.2 million under the EBF and the Return Fund and additional EUR 82 million were allocated to Greece under these two Funds in 2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003587/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(3. April 2012)

Betrifft: Gefährdung der Verbraucher aufgrund von mangelnden Testkriterien beim EU-Reifenlabel

Das ab November 2012 verbindliche EU-Reifenlabel wird von einer Reihe von Interessengruppen, darunter dem ÖAMTC (Österreichischer Automobil-, Motorrad- und Touring Club), massiv kritisiert. Grund hierfür sind unzureichende Testkriterien, die etwa den Aspekt der Einsparung von Kraftstoff gegenüber Sicherheitsaspekten überbewerten. Auch wird beim EU-Reifenlabel nicht zwischen Sommer- und Winterreifen unterschieden. Für den Verbraucher, der das EU-Reifenlabel als Qualitätssiegel wahrnimmt, ergibt sich damit eine deutliche Informationslücke. In die Gesamtbewertung von Reifen bezieht etwa der ÖAMTC bis zu 20 verschiedene Testkriterien ein. Das EU-Reifenlabel greift in den Testkriterien also zu kurz, und der Verbraucher wird mangelhaft über die Eigenschaften des Reifens informiert.

Kann die Kommission dazu folgende Fragen beantworten?

1. Ist der Kommission bewusst, dass das EU-Reifenlabel die Eigenschaften von Reifen nur mangelhaft darstellt?

2. Gedenkt die Kommission, die Bewertungskriterien zu erweitern und zwischen Sommer- und Winterreifen zu unterscheiden?

3. Sind der Kommission die Testkriterien des ÖAMTC bekannt?

4. Erwägt die Kommission, das EU-Label für den Verbraucher aufzuwerten, indem das Label an die Testkriterien des ÖAMTC angeglichen oder anderweitig sinnvoll ausgeweitet wird?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(25. Mai 2012)

Das EU-Reifenkennzeichnungssystem schreibt die Angabe der wichtigsten Reifeneigenschaften hinsichtlich Energieeffizienz (Kraftstoffverbrauch), Sicherheit (Nasshaftung) und Gesundheit (Rollgeräusch) vor. Diese drei Leistungskriterien sind ebenfalls bereits in der geltenden Verordnung [1] über die Typgenehmigung aufgeführt.

Die Verbraucher werden in der Lage sein, Daten aus zahlreichen anderen Quellen zu nutzen, um sich über Reifen und deren Leistungen zu informieren. Dagegen wäre eine Verpflichtung für die Reifenhersteller, jeden Reifen, der auf dem EU-Markt in Verkehr gebracht wird, auf mehr als 20 Leistungsmerkmale zu testen und eine entsprechende Kennzeichnung vorzusehen, eine Belastung, welche die Kosten der Reifenherstellung deutlich erhöhen und sich letztlich auch in den Endverbraucherpreisen niederschlagen würde, ohne deutliche zusätzliche Vorteile zu bringen.

Was die Sommer- und Winterreifen betrifft, so geht die Kommission davon aus, dass der Verbraucher beim Reifenkauf in der Regel zwischen einem Satz Sommerreifen oder einem Satz Winterreifen wählen wird, und es deshalb hier keinen Bedarf für eine unterschiedliche Klassifizierung gibt.

---

[1] Verordnung (EG) Nr. 661/2009 über die Typgenehmigung von Kraftfahrzeugen, Kraftfahrzeuganhängern und von Systemen, Bauteilen und selbstständigen technischen Einheiten für diese Fahrzeuge hinsichtlich ihrer allgemeinen Sicherheit, ABl. L 200, 31.7.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003587/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Consumers are placed at risk due to inadequate test criteria for the EU tyre label

The tyre label that is to become mandatory within the EU in November 2012 has been heavily criticised by a number of interest groups, among them the ÖAMTC (the Austrian Automobile, Motorcycle and Touring Club). The reason for this is the lack of adequate test criteria, placing greater value on aspects such as fuel economy, rather than safety aspects. The EU tyre label likewise fails to differentiate between summer and winter tyres. Thus, there is a clear information deficit for consumers, who regard the EU tyre label as a mark of quality. In its overall assessment of tyres, the ÖAMTC, for example, applies up to 20 different test criteria. The EU tyre label thus does not go far enough in its test criteria and the consumer does not receive enough information about the properties of the tyre.

Can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is the Commission aware that the EU tyre label does not adequately reflect the properties of tyres?

2. Is the Commission considering extending the criteria for assessing tyres and differentiating between summer and winter tyres?

3. Is the Commission aware of the ÖAMTC test criteria?

4. Is the Commission considering upgrading the EU label for consumers by bringing the label into line with the test criteria of the ÖAMTC, or by extending it in some other meaningful way?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(25 May 2012)

The EU tyres labelling scheme requires the display of information on the most important tyre features linked to energy efficiency (fuel economy), safety (wet grip) and health (rolling noise). These three performance criteria are also already contained in current Regulation ([1]) for type approval.

Consumers will be able to use information coming from many other sources to improve their knowledge about tyres and their performances. However, requiring tyre manufacturers to test and assign a grade for more than 20 performance characteristics for every tyre placed on the EU market would be a burden which would considerably increase the cost of tyre production, and finally be reflected in the price to end users for relatively little added benefit.

Concerning summer and winter tyres, the Commission considers that when a consumer is faced with the choice of purchasing tyres, he or she will choose between a set of summer tyres, or a set of winter tyres so there is no need to use different grading scales for them.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 661/2009 concerning type-approval requirements for the general safety of motor vehicles, their trailers and systems, components and separate technical units intended therefor, OJ L 200, 31.7.2009.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003588/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE) και Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(3 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ενίσχυση από Frontex για αντιμετώπιση λαθρομετανάστευσης και ο ρόλος της Τουρκίας

Ιδιαίτερη βαρύτητα έχουν οι δηλώσεις που έκανε ο ο εκπρόσωπος της Frontex στις 2 Απριλίου 2012 τονίζοντας ότι «σε ολόκληρη την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν υπάρχει παρόμοια κατάσταση με την ελληνική και ότι η Ελλάδα χρειάζεται βοήθεια καθώς δεν μπορεί να αντιμετωπίσει μόνη της τόσο μεγάλη εισροή μεταναστών».

Υπογράμμισε επίσης ότι «ο έλεγχος των συνόρων από μόνος του δεν μπορεί να λύσει το πρόβλημα της παράνομης μετανάστευσης στην Ελλάδα σημειώνοντας ότι μόνο μέσω της συμφωνίας και της συνεργασίας με τις γειτονικές χώρες και τις χώρες προέλευσης των μεταναστών θα υπάρξει καλύτερη διαχείριση των συνόρων, χαρακτηρίζοντας περίπλοκη την κατάσταση μεταξύ Ελλάδας και Τουρκίας».

Δεδομένων α) της μεγάλης βαρύτητας των εν λόγω δηλώσεων του εκπροσώπου της Frontex και β) του γεγονότος ότι η Ελλάδα αποτελεί χώρα-σύνορο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Συμφωνεί με τις διαπιστώσεις αυτές; Εάν συμφωνεί, δεδομένης της σοβαρότητας της κατάστασης, πιστεύει ότι πρέπει να προτείνει νέες δράσεις ή ακόμα και έκτακτη χρηματοδότηση -πέραν των προβλεπόμενων πόρων- για την αντιμετώπιση του προβλήματος της παράνομης μετανάστευσης;

— Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη την απάντηση της Επιτροπής στην ερώτηση E-011958/2011, όπου αναφέρεται ότι η Τουρκία συνεχίζει να συνάπτει συμφωνίες απαλλαγής από την υποχρέωση θεώρησης με χώρες που βρίσκονται στη μαύρη λίστα της ΕΕ, θεωρεί ότι η μη συμμόρφωση με τα πρότυπα της ΕΕ αποτελεί αιτία κωλύματος των διαπραγματεύσεων;

— Σε ποιο άλλο μέτρο προτίθεται να προβεί προκειμένου η Τουρκία να σταματήσει να χρησιμοποιεί πρακτικές οι οποίες, σύμφωνα με την προαναφερθείσα απάντηση, «αυξάνουν τον κίνδυνο να χρησιμοποιείται το τουρκικό έδαφος ως χώρα διέλευσης για παράνομη μετανάστευση»;

— Είναι ικανοποιημένη με τον τρόπο που η Τουρκία αξιοποιεί την χρηματοδότηση που λαμβάνει μέσω της Συνιστώσας Ι του Μηχανισμού Προενταξιακής Βοήθειας (IPA), και αν όχι, σε ποιες ενέργειες πιστεύει ότι πρέπει να προβεί;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Ιουνίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή έχει δεσμευθεί πλήρως να βοηθήσει την Ελλάδα να αντιμετωπίσει τα παράνομα μεταναστευτικά ρεύματα. Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με δράσεις αντιμετώπισης αυτού του ζητήματος, η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να παραπέμψει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην απάντηση της στην ερώτηση E-001772/2012 ([1]).

Ως χώρα υποψήφια προς ένταξη στην ΕΕ, η Τουρκία θα πρέπει να έχει συμμορφώσει πλήρως τη νομοθεσία και τις πρακτικές της με το κεκτημένο της ΕΕ κατά τη στιγμή της ένταξης. Επιπλέον, υπενθυμίζεται ότι, σύμφωνα με τον κανονισμό (ΕΚ) Αριθ. 539/2001 ([2]) του Συμβουλίου, οι Τούρκοι υπήκοοι υποχρεούνται να διαθέτουν θεώρηση κατά τη διέλευση των εξωτερικών συνόρων της ΕΕ. Συνεπώς, η έλλειψη συμμόρφωσης με την πολιτική θεωρήσεων της ΕΕ, σ' αυτό το στάδιο, δεν είναι λόγος να σταματήσουν οι διαπραγματεύσεις ένταξης. Η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε ακόμη να παραπέμψει στην απάντηση της στην ερώτηση E-003189/2012 ([1]).

Σχετικά με την προενταξιακή βοήθεια, παρά τις όποιες καθυστερήσεις των διαδικασιών των προγραμμάτων οικονομικής βοήθειας του μηχανισμού προενταξιακής βοήθειας (ΜΠΒ), η εφαρμογή των σχεδίων στον τομέα της διαχείρισης των συνόρων αυτή τη στιγμή προχωράει κανονικά. Περισσότερες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τη συνολική εφαρμογή της οικονομικής βοήθειας του ΜΠΒ βρίσκονται στην ετήσια έκθεση σχετικά με τη χρηματοδοτική βοήθεια για τη διεύρυνση: http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/press_corner/key-documents/financial_assistance/2010/com-2011-647.pdf

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp
([2]) ΕΕ L 81 της 21.3.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003588/12
to the Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE) and Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Backing from Frontex in dealing with illegal immigration and the role of Turkey

Very significant declarations were made by the representative of Frontex on 2 April 2012 when he stressed that 'in the whole of the European Union there is no situation comparable with that of Greece' and that 'Greece needs assistance because it cannot deal with such a large influx of migrants on its own'.

He also underlined that 'border control alone cannot solve the problem of illegal immigration in Greece', noting that 'it is only through agreement and cooperation with neighbouring countries and the immigrants' countries of origin that there will be better management of the borders'. He characterised the situation between Greece and Turkey as complex.

Given (a) the extreme gravity of the statements in question by the representative of Frontex and (b) the fact that Greece is a border country of the European Union, will the Commission answer the following:

— Does it agree with these findings? If it agrees, given the seriousness of the situation, does it believe that it should propose new actions or even emergency funding — above and beyond the projected resources — to deal with the problem of illegal immigration?

— Taking into account the Commission's answer to Question E-011958/2011, where it is mentioned that Turkey continues to conclude visa exemption with countries on the EU's negative list, does it consider that non-compliance with EU norms is a reason for barring negotiations?

— What other measures does it intend to take to urge Turkey to stop resorting to practices which, according to the abovementioned answer increase 'the risk that the Turkish territory is used as a transit country for irregular migration'?

— Is it satisfied with the manner in which Turkey utilises the funding it receives through Component I of the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA), and if not, what actions does it believe it should take?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 June 2012)

The Commission is fully committed to assist Greece in tackling irregular migration flows. For more information on actions to address this issue, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Question E-001772/2012 ([1]).

As a candidate country to the EU, Turkey will have to fully align its legislation and practices with the EU *acquis* by the time of accession. Further, it is recalled that, in accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 539/2001 ([2]), Turkish nationals are required to be in possession of a visa when crossing the EU external borders. Therefore the lack of compliance with the EU visa policy at this stage is not a reason to bar accession negotiations. The Commission would also refer to its answer to Question E-003189/2012[1].

As regards pre-accession assistance, despite some delays in the tendering procedures of the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA) financial assistance programmes, currently the implementation of the projects in the area of border management is ongoing well. More details concerning the overall implementation of IPA financial assistance can be found in the annual report on the Financial Assistance for Enlargement:

http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/press_corner/key-documents/financial_assistance/2010/com-2011-647.pdf

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp
([2]) OJ L 81, 21.3.2001.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-003589/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(3 Απριλίου 2012)

Θέμα: Πρόταση για παροχή κινήτρων για μερική ή ολική εξόφληση δανείων στην Ελλάδα

Με βάση την απόφαση του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου της 26ης Οκτωβρίου 2011 και τις προτάσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Αρχής Τραπεζών (ΕΑΤ), θα δοθούν επιπρόσθετα, στα 10 δισ. που έχουν ήδη δοθεί, τουλάχιστον 30 δισ. ευρώ για την ενίσχυση των ελληνικών τραπεζών, προκειμένου να αντιμετωπίσουν, αφενός, τις επιπτώσεις του κουρέματος των ελληνικών ομολόγων και, αφετέρου, να ικανοποιήσουν την απόφαση της ΕΑΤ για αύξηση της κεφαλαιακής επάρκειας (Core Tier 1) των ευρωπαϊκών τραπεζών στο 9 % μέχρι τον Ιούνιο του 2012. Ο τρόπος που έχει επιλεγεί από την ΕΕ για την ενίσχυση των ελληνικών τραπεζών, μέσω του ΕΤΧΣ, αφορά την αύξηση του μετοχικού κεφαλαίου των τραπεζικών ιδρυμάτων που το έχουν ανάγκη. Ανεξάρτητα από τις απόψεις που μπορεί να έχει κανείς για την ενίσχυση των τραπεζών, οι τρόποι ενίσχυσης που φαίνεται να έχουν μέχρι στιγμής υιοθετηθεί, δεν αντιμετωπίζουν την κύρια αιτία της κρίσης του χρηματοπιστωτικού συστήματος, που είναι η έλλειψη ρευστότητας των τραπεζών, αλλά και η αδυναμία εξυπηρέτησης των δανείων που ήδη έχουν αναλάβει τα νοικοκυριά και οι μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις (ΜΜΕ).

Από την άποψη αυτή, λοιπόν, θα ήταν πολλαπλά ωφέλιμο για την ελληνική οικονομία, ένα τμήμα των συνολικών 40 δισ., του ΕΤΧΣ, να δοθεί ως κίνητρο σε νοικοκυριά και ΜΜΕ, για μερική ή ολική εξόφληση των δανείων τους. Δηλαδή, για κάθε, π.χ. 10 000 ευρώ εξόφλησης ενός δανείου, να υπάρχει κίνητρο ύψους 3 000 ευρώ από τα κεφάλαια του ΕΤΧΣ. Μια τέτοια ενέργεια θα είχε δυο πολύ βασικές επιπτώσεις στην ελληνική οικονομία. Από τη μια, θα αύξανε τη ρευστότητα του τραπεζικού συστήματος, αφού μια επιδότηση, π.χ. 30 ευρώ, στην εξόφληση δανείων θα κινητοποιούσε επιπρόσθετους πόρους 100 ευρώ, οι οποίοι σήμερα έχουν αποσυρθεί λόγω του φόβου δυσμενών οικονομικών εξελίξεων (επαναπατρισμός κεφαλαίων) και από την άλλη θα διευκόλυνε χιλιάδες νοικοκυριά και επιχειρήσεις, αποτρέποντας έτσι την οικονομική και κοινωνική τους κατάρρευση.

Με δεδομένο ότι η υιοθέτηση μιας τέτοιας πρότασης, εκτός των ανωτέρω, θα αποτελούσε και πράξη δικαιοσύνης προς τον ελληνικό λαό, ο οποίος καλείται να εξοφλήσει και το πακέτο βοήθειας 130 δισ., στο οποίο περιλαμβάνονται τα 40 δισ. του ΕΤΧΣ, αλλά και ότι θα μπορούσε να διευκολύνει τις τράπεζες να δεχτούν και την οριστική διαγραφή χρέους για στεγαστικά δάνεια, που είναι αδύνατο να εξυπηρετηθούν, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Προτίθενται οι υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής, που είναι υπεύθυνες για τις οικονομικές και νομισματικές υποθέσεις στην ΕΕ, να εξετάσουν τη δυνατότητα εφαρμογής της παραπάνω πρότασης;

— Πώς τη σχολιάζουν; Μπορούν να διαβουλευθούν σχετικά με την ελληνική κυβέρνηση;

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

Η Ελληνική Κυβέρνηση έχει δεσμευθεί να παράσχει την αναγκαία στήριξη για την αποκατάσταση της εμπιστοσύνης στο ελληνικό τραπεζικό σύστημα. Θα χρειασθούν καλά στοχοθετημένες ενέργειες ανακεφαλαιοποίησης παράλληλα με τις νομικές αλλαγές προκειμένου να διευκολύνουν την στρατηγική. Οι ελληνικές αρχές προτίθενται να στηρίξουν τη ρευστότητα του τραπεζικού συστήματος με τη δημιουργία ενός βιώσιμου ιδιωτικού τραπεζικού τομέα με ικανοποιητική κεφαλαιοποίηση που μπορεί να στηρίξει την οικονομική ανάκαμψη και τη βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη. Το ισχυρό τραπεζικό σύστημα θα είναι τότε σε θέση να προσελκύσει καταθέσεις και ρευστότητα από τις κεφαλαιαγορές. Όπως αναφέρεται στο τελευταίο Μνημόνιο Συνεννόησης, που συνήψαν οι ελληνικές αρχές με την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, η οποία ενεργεί εξ ονόματος των κρατών μελών της ζώνης του ευρώ, θα δοθεί χρόνος στις τράπεζες για να αντλήσουν κεφάλαια από την αγορά, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη παράλληλα το ρυθμιστικό πλαίσιο και τις απαιτήσεις που καθορίζονται από την Επιτροπή Κεφαλαιαγοράς της Ελλάδας.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, μαζί με τα άλλα δυο μέλη της Τρόικας, έχουν διεξαγάγει σχετικές συζητήσεις με την Ελληνική Κυβέρνηση. Ωστόσο, η πρόταση για την επιδότηση της αποπληρωμής των δανείων με χρήματα του Έλληνα φορολογούμενου με σκοπό να αυξηθεί η ρευστότητα δεν προβλέπεται, μέχρι σήμερα, ούτε από το Πρόγραμμα Δημοσιονομικής Προσαρμογής, ούτε από το καταστατικό του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Χρηματοοικονομικής Σταθερότητας ούτε από τις ελληνικές αρχές.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003589/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Proposal for provision of incentives for partial or full repayment of debts in Greece

On the basis of the European Council Decision of 26 October 2011 and the proposals of the European Banking Authority (EBA), a further EUR 30 billion at least, in addition to the EUR 10 billion already provided, will be paid to bail out Greek banks, to enable them on the one hand to face the consequences of the haircut on Greek bonds and, on the other hand, to comply with the EBA's decision to increase the capital adequacy ratio (Core Tier 1) of European banks to 9 % by June 2012. The method chosen by the EU to support Greek banks, through the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF), takes the form of increasing the share capital of the banks that are in need of this. Irrespective of the views one might have on bailing out banks, the means of support that appear so far to have been adopted do not address the principal cause of the crisis in the financial system, which is the lack of bank liquidity and the inability of households and small and medium-sized enterprises to repay the loans they have already contracted.

From this viewpoint it would therefore, in a number of ways, be beneficial to the Greek economy for part of the EFSF's total EUR 40 billion to be given as an incentive to households and SMEs, for the partial or full repayment of their loans. That is to say, for each EUR 10 000 of loan repayment, there would be an incentive to the amount of EUR 3 000 from EFSF capital. Such a move would have two very basic consequences for the Greek economy. On the one hand, it would increase the liquidity of the banking system, because a subsidy, for example, of EUR 30, would mobilise additional resources of EUR 100 for the repayment of loans which have currently been withdrawn due to the fear of unfavourable economic developments (repatriation of capital), and on the other hand, it would make life easier for thousands of households and business, averting their economic and social ruin.

Given that the adoption of such a policy, apart from the abovementioned benefits, would also constitute an act of justice towards the Greek people, who are also expected to repay a EUR 130 billion aid package, including the EUR 40 billion of the EFSF, and that it would additionally make it easier for banks to accept the definitive write-off of debts on housing loans that cannot be repaid, will the Commission answer the following:

— Will the Commission services responsible for economic and monetary matters in the EU examine the possibility of implementing the abovementioned proposal?

— Do they have any observations on the proposal? Can they undertake the relevant discussions with the Greek Government?

Answer given by Commissioner Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(6 June 2012)

The Greek Government is committed to provide the necessary support to restore confidence in the Greek banking system. Well-targeted recapitalisation actions will be needed, alongside legal changes, in order to facilitate the strategy. The Greek authorities intend to support banking system liquidity by creating a viable and well-capitalised private banking sector that can support economic recovery and sustainable growth. The strong banking system will then be able to attract deposits and liquidity from the capital markets. As stated in the latest Memorandum of Understanding agreed upon by the Greek authorities as well as the European Commission, acting on behalf of the euro area Member States, banks will be given time to raise capital from the market, while taking into account the regulatory framework and the requirements set by the Hellenic Capital Market Commission.

The European Commission, along with the other Programme partners, have undertaken relevant discussions with the Greek Government, however, the proposal to subsidise loan repayments at the expense of the Greek tax payer in order to facilitate the flow of liquidity, is to date, not envisaged by the Programme, the European Financial Stability Facility statutes, nor by the Greek authorities.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003590/12
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(3 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Siccità in Toscana

Negli ultimi mesi in molte regioni italiane stiamo assistendo al manifestarsi di gravi forme di siccità; la situazione risulta particolarmente difficile in Toscana, dove la regione ha decretato negli scorsi giorni lo stato di emergenza a causa del perdurare di questo fenomeno.

Questa situazione di emergenza non è purtroppo nuova per il territorio toscano, ma rappresenta addirittura il terzo grave episodio nell'arco degli ultimi dieci anni.

Oltre a creare danni ingentissimi al settore agricolo, a causa della carenza di acqua necessaria a irrigare le coltivazioni, la siccità porta con sé anche altri gravi problemi: nei primi tre mesi di quest'anno si sono infatti registrati moltissimi incendi, ben 289 episodi, quasi quanti quelli derivanti dalla somma degli incendi verificatisi nei primi tre mesi riferiti a ogni anno dal 2007 al 2011 (291 casi), prendendo cioè in considerazione un arco di tempo quattro volte più esteso.

La siccità, oltre alle cause naturali quali la mancanza di precipitazioni, è anche dovuta a diversi altri fattori, come ad esempio la presenza di reti idriche obsolete e inefficienti o una gestione dell'acqua a volte poco accurata sia dal punto di vista domestico che da quello agricolo e produttivo.

1. La Commissione europea è a conoscenza di questa situazione emergenziale in Toscana e in altre regioni italiane?

2. Quali misure intende attuare per risolvere la situazione attuale e prevenire in futuro il verificarsi di simili circostanze?

3. Quali strumenti può utilizzare per tutelare il territorio da questo tipo di fenomeno?

4. Non ritiene inoltre doveroso aiutare gli Stati membri a sostenere un'opera di revisione generale dei sistemi di conduzione idrica?

5. Non ritiene infine importante intraprendere una campagna di sensibilizzare per i cittadini e le imprese per prevenire ogni possibile spreco di acqua?

Risposta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(30 maggio 2012)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza del problema della siccità in Italia.

2. La situazione attuale dovrebbe essere affrontata a livello nazionale. Il Fondo di solidarietà dell'UE può fornire assistenza finanziaria in caso di catastrofi gravi.

Per far fronte alla sfida rappresentata dalla siccità e dalla scarsità di risorse idriche, la Commissione ha adottato una comunicazione ([1]) in cui ha presentato le scelte politiche che dovranno essere effettuate a livello europeo, nazionale e regionale. L'attuazione della comunicazione è stata seguita in relazioni annuali.

Il programma di sviluppo rurale della Toscana non prevede misure per il ripristino del potenziale agricolo danneggiato da calamità naturali. Qualora le autorità regionali richiedessero di introdurre una tale misura, i servizi della Commissione valuterebbero la richiesta nel minor tempo possibile, tenendo conto della normativa in materia di sviluppo rurale.

([1]) COM(2007)414 definitivo.

3. La corretta attuazione della direttiva quadro in materia di acque (DQA) ([2]) contribuirà a limitare le conseguenze della siccità; nel contempo, la messa in atto della suddetta comunicazione, nonché lo sviluppo di piani specifici di gestione delle situazioni di siccità potrebbero ridurre ulteriormente gli effetti della siccità.

4. La Commissione adotterà un piano per la salvaguardia delle risorse idriche europee nel novembre 2012. Presterà inoltre particolare attenzione alle sfide principali per la gestione delle risorse idriche, tra cui gli effetti della siccità, e definirà indirizzi politici ai fini di un intervento.

5. Una campagna di sensibilizzazione è già in corso nel quadro dell'iniziativa sull'uso efficiente delle risorse, il cui obiettivo è sensibilizzare sulla necessità di utilizzare le scarse risorse naturali in modo intelligente. Inoltre, la DQA prevede consultazioni di tutte le parti interessate, anche consultazioni pubbliche, sulle questioni significative in materia di gestione delle risorse idriche e sui progetti di piani di gestione dei bacini idrografici.

([2]) Direttiva 2000/60/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 23 ottobre 2000, che istituisce un quadro per l'azione comunitaria in materia di acque, GU L 327 del 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003590/12
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(3 April 2012)

Subject: Drought in Tuscany

We have witnessed the emergence of severe drought in many regions of Italy in recent months. The situation is particularly difficult in Tuscany, where, in recent days, the regional authorities have decreed a state of emergency due to the persistence of this phenomenon.

Unfortunately this is not the first time Tuscany has experienced this type of emergency; it is actually the third serious drought in the past 10 years.

In addition to the extensive damage caused to the agricultural sector through the shortage of water needed to irrigate crops, the drought also brings other serious problems with it. A large number of fires were recorded in the first three months of this year, as many as 289 incidents in fact; almost as many as the total number of fires reported in the first three months of each year from 2007 to 2011 (291 cases), a period four times longer.

In addition to natural causes such as the lack of precipitation, the drought is also caused by several other factors, such as obsolete and inefficient water networks or a water management system that is, at times, not very careful, either in the domestic or in the agricultural and manufacturing sectors.

1. Is the European Commission aware of this emergency in Tuscany and other Italian regions?

2. What measures does it intend to implement to resolve the current situation and to prevent similar situations occurring in the future?

3. What tools can be used to protect the country from this kind of phenomenon?

4. Does it not also feel a sense of duty to assist the Member States in supporting a general overhaul of the water systems?

5. Finally, does it not consider it important to undertake an awareness-raising campaign for citizens and businesses to prevent any possible water wastage?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of the drought problems in Italy.

2. The current situation should be dealt at national level. The EU Solidarity Fund may provide financial assistance in the event of major disasters.

To address the challenge posed by droughts and water scarcity the Commission adopted a communication ([1]) presenting policy options to be addressed at European, national and regional levels. The implementation of the communication was followed-up in yearly reports.

The Rural Development Programme for Tuscany does not include the measure for the restoration of agricultural potential damaged by natural disaster. If a request to activate such a measure is introduced by the Regional Authorities, the Commission services will evaluate such demand within the shortest time possible taken into account the legislation on rural development.

3. While proper implementation of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) ([2]) will contribute to mitigating the impacts of droughts, the implementation of the abovementioned Communication, and the development of specific Drought Management Plans could further decrease the effects of droughts.

([1]) COM(2007) 414 final.
([2]) Directive 2000/60/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

4. The Commission will adopt a 'Blueprint' to safeguard European waters in November 2012. It will also focus on the key challenges for water resources management, including the impacts of droughts, with the identification of policy options for action.

5. An EU awareness raising campaign is already ongoing in the framework of the Resource Efficiency initiative. It is designed to raise awareness about the need to use scarce natural resources wisely. In addition, the WFD requires all interested parties, including the public, to be consulted on significant water management issues and on draft River Basin Management Plans.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-003591/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4. april 2012)

Om: Stjålne mobiltelefoner og IMEI-systemet

Hvilke overvejelser gør Kommissionen sig for at sikre, at mobiltelefoner, der markedsføres i EU, er tilsluttet IMEI-databasen, så stjålne telefoner lettere findes?

Spørgeren anerkender det store arbejde, Kommissionen gør for at sikre lavere mobiltakster i EU. Det er glædeligt og godt for forbrugerne. Desværre er der fortsat et stort marked for stjålne mobiltelefoner. Spørgeren finder, at der må gøres mere for at imødegå denne udvikling, eksempelvis ved at foretage bedre registrering. Kommissionen bedes derfor i sit svar oplyse, hvilke initiativer man planlægger i denne forbindelse, herunder om man overvejer at inddrage det omtalte IMEI-system.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Antonio Tajani
(15. juni 2012)

Erhvervslivet anmodede i 2002 Kommissionen om at overveje at indføre lovkrav til sikker identifikation af mobiltelefoner som led i forebyggelsen af tyveri. Der blev følgelig afholdt drøftelser med producenter og operatører i det stående udvalg under R&TTE-direktivet ([1]), som i 2004 førte til to frivillige foranstaltninger:

— bedre sikkerhed for den internationale identitet for mobilstationsudstyr (IMEI), som skulle indføres og opretholdes af producenterne

— forebyggelse af adgang til mobile tjenester fra stjålne mobiltelefoner (blacklisting), som skal udføres af mobiloperatørerne på grundlag af et dataudvekslingssystem, der blev iværksat og administreres af GSM Association (GSMA).

Den seneste evaluering af disse foranstaltninger (februar 2011) viste følgende:

— Næsten alle mobiltelefoner, der sælges i EU, har sikker IMEI.

— Det er meget varieret, i hvilket omfang de forskellige mobiloperatørers deltager i det system til udveksling af data, som koordineres af GSMA, og i gennemførelsen af blacklisting af stjålne mobiltelefoner i hele EU.

IMEI er kommet med i mobiltelefoner, og der er således ikke behov for yderligere tiltag fra Kommissionens på dette felt. Hvad angår udveksling af oplysninger om stjålne mobiltelefoner og blacklisting af dem, vil Kommissionen, da der mangler et lovgrundlag for EU-omfattende harmoniserede foranstaltninger, fortsat gøre medlemsstaterne opmærksomme på behovet for at sikre fuld deltagelse fra mobiloperatørerne i udvekslingen af data og deres bestræbelser på at forebygge brug af stjålne mobiltelefoner. Derudover vil Kommissionen fortsat overvåge sikkerheden med IMEI-systemet.

([1]) Europa-parlamentets og Rådets direktiv 1999/5/EF af 9. marts 1999 om radio- og teleterminaludstyr samt gensidig anerkendelse af udstyrets overensstemmelse.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003591/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Stolen mobile telephones and the IMEI system

What initiatives is the Commission planning to ensure that mobile telephones marketed in the EU are included in the International Mobile Equipment Identity (IMEI) database, making it easier to find stolen mobile telephones?

The author acknowledges the extensive work undertaken by the Commission to ensure lower mobile telephone tariffs in the EU. This is welcome news and beneficial for consumers. Unfortunately there is still a large market for stolen mobile telephones. The author feels that more must be done to prevent this development, for example by implementing better registration. In its response, the Commission is therefore asked to state what initiatives are being planned in connection with this, including whether involvement of the abovementioned IMEI system is being considered.

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(15 June 2012)

Following a request from industry to the Commission in 2002 to consider the introduction of a legal requirement for the secure identification of mobile telephones in the framework of a theft prevention scheme, discussions with manufacturers and operators on the margins of the standing committee of the R&TTE Directive ([1]) concluded in 2004 on two voluntary measures:

— enhanced security of the International Mobile Equipment Identity (IMEI) to be introduced and maintained by manufacturers;

— prevention of access to mobile services by stolen handsets (blacklisting) to be performed by mobile operators on the basis of a data exchange system put in place and administered by the GSM Association (GSMA).

The latest assessment of these measures (February 2011) revealed the following situation:

— virtually all mobile telephones sold in the EU include a secure IMEI;

— the level of participation of different mobile operators in the system for data exchange coordinated by GSMA and the level of implementation of blacklisting of stolen handsets is very diverse across the EU.

The inclusion of the IMEI on mobile telephones has been achieved, therefore no further Commission initiative in this area is required. With regard to the exchange of information on stolen mobile telephones and their blacklisting, in the absence of a legal base allowing EU-wide harmonised measures, the Commission will continue to bring to the attention of Member States the need to ensure full participation of mobile operators in the exchange of relevant data as well as their commitment in preventing use of stolen mobile telephones. In addition, the Commission will continue to monitor the security of the IMEI.

([1]) Directive 1999/5/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 1999 on radio equipment and telecommunications terminal equipment and the mutual recognition of their conformity.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003592/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(4 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Recepimento della direttiva 2009/28/CE in Italia: possibile il configurarsi di aiuti di Stato?

In Italia è stata recepita la direttiva 2009/28/CE sulla promozione dell'energia da fonti rinnovabili, con il decreto legislativo n. 28 del 3 marzo 2011.

Dopo un tortuoso iter di modifiche del sopracitato decreto legislativo, che in prima stesura aveva apportato un duro colpo al settore del fotovoltaico, viene promulgata la legge n. 27 del 24 marzo 2012, ai fini della conversione in legge, con modificazioni, del decreto legge del 24 gennaio 2012.

L'articolo 65, comma 1, della legge 27/2012 prevede la sospensione degli incentivi statali (ex decreto legislativo n. 28 del 3 marzo 2011) per la realizzazione di impianti solari fotovoltaici su terreno agricolo privato, ma, di contro, al comma 2 troviamo subito una deroga: «Il comma 1 non si applica agli impianti realizzati e da realizzare su terreni nella disponibilità del demanio militare», terreni dati in gestione alla società «Difesa Servizi S.p.A.», con socio unico il Ministero della difesa italiano.

— La Commissione ne è a conoscenza?

— Può la Commissione riferire com'è la situazione negli altri Stati membri?

— La Commissione ravvisa che tale norma porti uno squilibrio nel mercato fra investitore privato e pubblico e si possa quindi configurare come aiuto di Stato?

Risposta data da Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(30 maggio 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza delle modifiche apportate dalla legge n. 27/2012 agli incentivi finanziari previsti per i progetti relativi alla realizzazione di impianti fotovoltaici in Italia. Occorre rilevare che il mix di tecnologie basate su fonti rinnovabili e i regimi di sostegno ad esso collegati differiscono tra i vari Stati membri, a cui spetta curarne la progettazione in funzione delle condizioni nazionali, conformemente alla normativa europea pertinente.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003592/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Transposal of Directive 2009/28/EC in Italy: might it result in state aid?

Directive 2009/28/EC on **the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources was transposed in Italy under** Legislative Decree No 28 of 3 March 2011.

Following a tortuous process of amendment of the aforementioned Legislative Decree, the first draft of which had dealt a severe blow to the photovoltaic sector, Law No 27 of 24 March 2012 was enacted for the entry into force of the Decree Law of 24 January 2012 with amendments.

Article 65(1) of Law 27/2012 provides for the suspension of government incentives (under Legislative Decree No 28 of 3 March 2011) for the construction of solar photovoltaic plants on private agricultural land. However in paragraph 2 we immediately find a waiver stating that paragraph 1 shall not apply to plants built or to be built on land owned or leased by the military. This land is managed by the company 'Difesa Servizi S.p.A.', the sole shareholder of which is the Italian Ministry of Defence.

— Is the Commission aware of this?

— Can the Commission report on the situation in the other Member States?

— Does the Commission recognise that this law will lead to an imbalance in the market between public and private investors and may therefore constitute state aid?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The Commission is aware of the changes being made to financial incentives for solar PV projects in Italy in Law 27/2012. It should be noted that the renewable energy technology mix and the related support schemes vary amongst Member States, which are responsible for designing them according to national conditions, in compliance with the relevant European legislation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-003593/12
à Comissão
Carlos Coelho (PPE)
(4 de abril de 2012)

Assunto: Crianças de rua

De acordo com dados do Instituto de Apoio à Criança, em Portugal foram encontradas no ano passado mais de 100 crianças nas ruas de Lisboa, para além de muitas outras denúncias de menores que fugiram das instituições ou simplesmente deambulavam pela cidade. O fenómeno das crianças de rua afeta mais de 100 milhões de crianças em todo o mundo, estando em causa o seu direito à alimentação, à saúde, à educação e à não discriminação. No próximo dia 12 de abril, celebra-se o Dia Internacional das Crianças de Rua, através do qual se pretende dar voz às crianças vítimas deste flagelo.

Neste sentido, solicito à Comissão os seguintes esclarecimentos:

1. Quais as iniciativas previstas pela Comissão para sensibilizar os cidadãos europeus para este problema social?

2. Que medidas, projetos ou fundos europeus têm sido canalizados, ou se prevê que venham a ser afetados, para apoiar os Estados-Membros (sobretudo, num período de crise económica e financeira) a combater o fenómeno das crianças de rua?

3. Qual é a prioridade dada a esta matéria no quadro das ajudas ao desenvolvimento e da política de cooperação e vizinhança da UE, para ajudar os países fora da UE em que este problema encontra maior expressão?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(30 de maio de 2012)

A Comissão está a tratar o problema das crianças da rua no contexto do esforço global de luta contra a pobreza infantil ([1]) e os sem-abrigo e através do apoio à integração dos ciganos ([2]).

A Comissão está a ponderar outras vias de aumentar o valor e incentivar os esforços dos Estados-Membros destinados a desenvolver e pôr em prática planos de ação nacionais ou regionais a favor dos sem-abrigo segundo as orientações identificadas no Relatório Conjunto sobre Proteção Social e Inclusão Social de 2010 ([3]).

Recorre-se ao programa Progress para financiar o trabalho em matéria de políticas direcionadas para a habitação dos sem-abrigo, para estudar as relações entre os sem-abrigo e a migração e para apoiar a principal rede europeia de ONG que desenvolvem atividades neste domínio, a Feantsa.

A Comissão também incentiva os órgãos do poder local a fazer uma maior utilização do FEDER e do FSE para abordar a questão dos sem-abrigo. No âmbito do Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para 2014/2020, a Comissão propõe que em cada Estado-Membro se atribuam pelo menos 20 % do financiamento total do FSE à inclusão social e ao combate à pobreza. Propõe-se ainda que pelo menos 5 % dos recursos totais do FEDER sejam atribuídos a ações de desenvolvimento urbano sustentável.

A erradicação da pobreza, incluindo a prossecução dos Objetivos de Desenvolvimento do Milénio (ODM), é o objetivo central da política de desenvolvimento da UE. O problema das crianças da rua é tratado pelo ODM n.° 7 — Meta 7 D, que prevê «alcançar, até 2020, uma melhoria significativa nas vidas de pelo menos 100 milhões de habitantes de bairros de lata».

([1]) A adoção da Recomendação da Comissão sobre Pobreza Infantil está prevista para finais de 2012.
([2]) Ver a proposta da Comissão de um quadro europeu para as estratégias nacionais de integração dos ciganos até 2020, (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0173:FIN:PT:PDF).
([3]) Ver: (http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=757&langId=en).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003593/12
to the Commission
Carlos Coelho (PPE)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Street children

According to data from Portugal's Child Support Institute, more than 100 children were found to be living on the street in Lisbon last year and there were other reports of minors who had run away from institutions or were simply roaming the city. More than 100 million children around the world are living as street children. This undermines their right to food, health, education and freedom from discrimination. The International Day for Street Children is being celebrated on 12 April 2012 and is intended to provide a platform for the children forced into this situation to speak out.

With this in mind, I ask the Commission:

1. What are the initiatives planned by the Commission to raise awareness among European citizens about this social problem?

2. What European measures, projects or funds have been channelled, or are expected to be allocated, to support Member States in addressing the street children issue (particularly during this period of economic and financial crisis)?

3. What is the priority given to this issue in the context of development aid and EU cooperation and neighbourhood policy in order to assist those countries outside the EU where this problem is much more significant?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The Commission is addressing the problem of street children as part of its overall effort to fight child poverty ([1]) and homelessness and through its support for the integration of the Roma people ([2]).

The Commission is considering other ways to add value and encouragement to the Member States' efforts to develop and implement national or regional plans for action on homelessness along the lines identified in the 2010 Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion ([3]).

Funding from the Progress programme is used to support work on housing-led policies to tackle homelessness, to study the links between homelessness and migration, and to support the major European NGO network active in this field FEANTSA.

Furthermore, the Commission encourages local authorities to make greater use of the ERDF and ESF to tackle homelessness. Under the Multiannual Financial Framework for 2014-2020, the Commission proposes that in each Member State at least 20% of total ESF financing should be allocated to social inclusion and to fighting poverty. It is also proposed that at least 5% of total ERDF resources are allocated to actions for Sustainable Urban Development.

Poverty eradication, including the pursuit of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), is the central objective of EU development policy. The problem of street children is addressed through MDG Goal No 7 — Target 7d, which plans to 'achieve significant improvement in [the] lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers, by 2020'.

([1]) The adoption of the Commission Recommendation on Child Poverty is planned for the end of 2012.
([2]) See the Commission proposal for an EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0173:en:NOT.
([3]) See http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=757&langId=en.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003594/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(4. April 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — EU-Sanktionen gegen Syrien

Als Reaktion auf die Massaker in Syrien und im Anschluss an die erfolglosen diplomatischen Interventionen einer Vielzahl von Staaten haben die EU-Außenminister eine Reihe von Sanktionen gegen Damaskus beschlossen. UN-Sanktionen scheiterten bisher am Veto Chinas und Russlands.

Als problematisch wird gewertet, dass die Opposition in Syrien zerstritten ist und es keinen überzeugenden Plan für eine Post-Assad-Ära gibt. Auch nach dem Machtwechsel in Libyen und Ägypten finden trotz massiver finanzieller Unterstützung für den Demokratisierungsprozess Menschenrechtsverletzungen unter den neuen Machthabern statt.

1. Ist seitens der EU-Außenminister eine weitere Verschärfung der Sanktionen geplant bzw. angedacht?

2. Inwieweit wird weiterhin versucht, China und Russland hinsichtlich ihres Vetos gegen UN-Sanktionen umzustimmen?

Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(25. Juni 2012)

Die EU hat im Mai 2011 restriktive Maßnahmen gegen Syrien verhängt und diese seitdem 15-mal aktualisiert und ausgeweitet. Die Sanktionen werden mit Blick auf die Lage in Syrien ständig überprüft und die EU wird auch weiterhin zusätzliche Maßnahmen verhängen, solange die Unterdrückung in Syrien andauert.

Die EU dringt bei der internationalen Gemeinschaft auf ein gemeinsames Vorgehen bei Anwendung und Umsetzung der restriktiven Maßnahmen gegen das syrische Regime und seine Anhänger. Dazu engagiert sie sich im Rahmen internationaler Foren wie der Arbeitsgruppe zu Sanktionen von „Friends of the Syrian People".

Die EU hat auch beständig auf entschlossene Maßnahmen der Vereinten Nationen, unter anderem des VN-Sicherheitsrats, im Hinblick auf Syrien gedrungen. Entsprechend begrüßt sie die Resolutionen 2042 und 2043 des Sicherheitsrats zur Entsendung einer Beobachtermission nach Syrien (UNSMIS), um die Umsetzung des Waffenstillstands und aller weiteren Elemente des Sechs-Punkte-Plans des gemeinsamen Entsandten der Vereinten Nationen und der Arabischen Liga, Kofi Annan, zu überwachen. Die EU hat betont, dass es sich bei Beobachtermission und Sechs-Punkte-Plan nicht um ein unbefristetes Angebot handelt, und daran erinnert, dass der VN-Sicherheitsrat auch weiterhin mit der Krise in Syrien befasst bleibt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003594/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Sanctions against Syria

In reaction to the massacres in Syria and following the failed diplomatic interventions by a large number of states, the EU's Foreign Ministers have decided on a number of sanctions against Damascus. So far, UN sanctions have failed due to vetoes from China and Russia.

The fact that the opposition in Syria is split and that there is no convincing plan for a post-Assad era is seen as problematic. In addition, following the changes in power in Libya and Egypt, human rights violations are occurring under the new regimes, despite massive financial aid for the democratisation process.

1. Are EU Foreign Ministers planning or considering more stringent sanctions?

2. To what extent is an attempt still being made to change the minds of the Chinese and Russians in relation to their vetoing of UN sanctions?

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

The EU adopted restrictive measures on Syria in May 2011, which it has updated and extended 15 times since. The sanctions are kept under constant review in relation to the situation in Syria and the EU will continue to adopt additional measures as long as the repression continues.

The EU urges the international community to join its efforts in taking steps to apply and enforce restrictive measures on the Syrian regime and its supporters. To this end, it engages in international fora such as the Friends of the Syrian People Group and its working group on sanctions.

The EU has also constantly pressed for strong UN action on Syria, including by the UN Security Council (UNSC). It therefore welcomes the adoption of UNSC resolutions 2042 and 2043 authorising the deployment of an observer mission to Syria (UNSMIS) to supervise the implementation of the ceasefire and all other points set forth in the six point plan by Joint UN-Arab League Envoy Kofi Annan. The EU has underlined that UNSMIS and the six point plan are not an open-ended offer and recalled that the UNSC remains seized of the crisis in Syria.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003595/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(4 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Violazione delle sanzioni contro la Repubblica islamica dell'Iran da parte delle imprese britanniche

Il 20 marzo 2012 i media britannici hanno riferito che quest'anno, secondo la HM Revenue and Customs (Amministrazione fiscale e doganale), 84 imprese intrattengono relazioni commerciali con l'Iran a fronte dei 64 e 65 casi accertati nei due anni precedenti. Dai dati emerge che negli ultimi cinque anni il numero di aziende che hanno cercato di vendere merci all'Iran è quasi raddoppiato. Il quotidiano *The Scotsman* ha rilevato che dal 2007 ben 297 imprese hanno violato le norme dell'EU che vietano la vendita di determinati prodotti all'Iran. David Gauke, ministro del Tesoro britannico, ha fatto presente che il 95 % delle infrazioni è stato rilevato alla frontiera britannica e ha dichiarato che l'incremento dei casi è «imputabile all'aumento» dei prodotti oggetto di sanzioni.

1. Alla luce di quanto precede, quali misure intende prendere il Vicepresidente/l'Alto Rappresentante per impedire una violazione delle sanzioni da parte delle imprese dell'UE che desiderano fare affari con l'Iran?

2. Quali penali vengono inflitte alle imprese dell'UE che violano le sanzioni?

3. Ritiene il Vicepresidente/l'Alto Rappresentante che l'incremento del numero di imprese che intrattengono relazioni commerciali con l'Iran possa incidere sull'efficacia delle sanzioni attualmente in vigore?

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

Spetta principalmente alle autorità competenti negli Stati membri adottare le misure necessarie all'attuazione effettiva delle sanzioni. In particolare, le pene per la violazione delle misure restrittive dell'UE sono comminate a livello nazionale dagli Stati membri, in conformità alla normativa nazionale vigente. La Commissione e l'Alta Rappresentante, nell'esercizio delle proprie competenze in virtù dei trattati e con il supporto dei servizi pertinenti, continueranno a sostenere e a monitorare l'attuazione uniforme, coerente ed effettiva delle misure restrittive da parte degli Stati membri.

Si fa presente che le misure restrittive dell'UE sono mirate e riguardano solamente gli scambi di determinati beni, lasciando pertanto la possibilità al commercio legittimo con l'Iran di proseguire. Un aumento del numero di aziende che intrattengono relazioni commerciali con l'Iran non rappresenta quindi di per sé una motivazione per mettere in dubbio l'efficacia delle misure.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003595/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Sanctions busting by British firms with the Islamic Republic of Iran

On 20 March 2012, the British media reported that, according to HM Revenue and Customs, at least 84 firms have been found engaging in business with Iran so far this year. This compares with 64 and 65 cases in each of the previous two years. The figures reveal that the number of firms caught trying to sell goods to Iran has almost doubled over the past five years. *The Scotsman* noted that since 2007 a total of 297 firms have been found to have breached EU rules banning the sale of certain products to Iran. The UK's Treasury Minister, David Gauke, noted that 95 % of breaches are detected at the British border and said that the rise in incidences is 'attributable to the increase in scope' of goods covered by sanctions.

1. In light of the above, what steps is the VP/HR prepared to take to prevent sanctions busting by EU companies wanting to do business with Iran?

2. What are the penalties imposed on EU firms found engaged in sanctions busting?

3. Does the VP/HR believe that the rise in the number of firms found doing business with Iran could have an impact on the effectiveness of the sanctions currently in place?

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

It is primarily the responsibility of relevant authorities in Member States to take the necessary measures for actual enforcement of the sanctions. In particular, penalties for a violation of EU restrictive measures are imposed at national level by the Member States in accordance with relevant national legislation. The Commission and the High Representative, in the exercise of their respective responsibilities under the Treaties and supported by relevant services, will continue to support and monitor the uniform, consistent and effective implementation of the restrictive measures by the Member States.

It should be noted that EU restrictive measures are targeted, and only concern trade in certain goods; the measures thus leave scope for legitimate trade with Iran to continue. A rise in the number of firms doing business with Iran would therefore in itself be no reason to question the effectiveness of the measures.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003596/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(4. April 2012)

Betrifft: Finanzierung der Alzheimerforschung

Da die Bevölkerung in Europa immer älter wird, nimmt in demselben Maß auch die Anzahl der europäischen Bürger mit Alzheimererkrankung zu. Zwar hat die EU beim Thema „Gesundheit" ([1]) bereits finanzielle Unterstützung für die Forschung vorgesehen, jedoch wurden noch keine konkreten Daten oder Zahlen zu den genauen Beträgen veröffentlicht, die im EU-Haushalt für die Bekämpfung von Alzheimer vorgesehen sind.

1. Kann die Kommission genau angeben, welcher Betrag auf Programme mit Bezug zu Alzheimer entfällt, und zwar bezogen auf:

— das Siebte Rahmenprogramm für Forschung und technologische Innovation (RP7);

— das Rahmenprogramm für Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und Innovation (CIP);

— die Strukturfonds;

— Horizon 2020;

— die Fazilität „Connecting Europe"?

2. Kann die Kommission angeben, wie die Finanzierung auf die Mitgliedstaaten verteilt wird, insbesondere auf abgelegene und weniger entwickelte Regionen?

Antwort von Frau Geoghegan-Quinn im Namen der Kommission
(31. Mai 2012)

1. Die Unterstützung für die Forschung über neurodegenerative Erkrankungen war eine Priorität beim siebten Rahmenprogramm für Forschung und technologische Entwicklung (RP7, 2007-2013) ([2]), es wurden etwa 320 Mio. EUR für diesen Bereich bereitgestellt, davon etwa 115 Mio. EUR für Alzheimer.

Im Vorschlag der Kommission für „Horizont 2020" ist bei den Herausforderungen das Einzelziel „Gesundheit, demografischer Wandel und Wohlergehen" ausgewiesen, in dessen Rahmen auch Forschungen zu Alzheimer möglich sein sollten ([3]).

Weder im Rahmenprogramm für Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und Innovation noch bei der Fazilität „Connecting Europe" (2014-2020) sind besondere Maßnahmen zur Bekämpfung von Alzheimer vorgesehen.

Die Alzheimerforschung könnte aber durch die Kohäsionspolitik unterstützt werden. Es ist Sache der Mitgliedstaaten, im Rahmen ihrer nationalen oder regionalen Programme Projekte auszuwählen, die optimal zur Erreichung der Ziele dieser Politik beitragen, wobei sie für die Einhaltung der geltenden Vorschriften und die Verfolgung der Projekte sorgen müssen. Die Aufgabe der Kommission besteht darin, die Einhaltung der EU-Rechtsvorschriften zu gewährleisten.

2. Bisher erhalten Rechtspersonen aus 20 Mitgliedstaaten innerhalb des RP7 Unterstützung für die Alzheimerforschung. Die Kommission wird der Frau Abgeordneten und dem Sekretariat des Parlaments die verlangten Detailinformationen umgehend übermitteln. Die unterschiedliche Beteiligung hat ihre Ursache in verschiedenen Faktoren wie nationales Interesse und Investitionen in diesem Bereich, Vorhandensein von Fachwissen und spezifischen Infrastrukturen, die das Interesse der Wissenschaftler an einem bestimmten Thema beeinflussen könnten. Bei „Horizont 2020" sind mehrere Maßnahmen vorgesehen, um die Beteiligung in ganz Europa zu erhöhen.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/index_en.cfm?pg=budget
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/home_de.html
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:de:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003596/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Alzheimer's research funding

The more the population of Europe is ageing, the more European citizens are getting Alzheimer's disease. The EU has already earmarked financial support for research under the Health theme ([1]), but no real data or figures for the precise amounts allocated from the EU budget for tackling Alzheimer's have been published.

1. Can the Commission specify the precise amount allocated to programmes linked to Alzheimer's, under:

— the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Innovation (FP7);

— the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP);

— the Structural Funds;

— Horizon 2020;

— the Connecting Europe Facility?

2. Can the Commission state how this funding is shared out among the Member States, especially in remote and less developed regions?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(31 May 2012)

1. Support to research on neurodegenerative diseases was a priority in the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) ([2]) with about EUR 320 million dedicated to this area, including some EUR 115 million on Alzheimer's.

The Commission's proposal for Horizon 2020 identifies the 'health, demographic change and well-being' challenge which is likely to provide opportunities for research on Alzheimer's ([3]).

No action specifically addresses Alzheimer's in the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme or in the Connecting Europe Facility (2014-2020).

Research on Alzheimer's could be supported by cohesion policy. Member States are responsible for the selection of projects under national or regional programmes, which may best contribute to the objectives of this policy, ensuring respect of applicable rules and keeping a record of these projects. The Commission's responsibility is to ensure compliance with the EU legislation.

2. So far, legal entities from 20 Member States receive FP7 support for research on Alzheimer's. The Commission is sending directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's secretariat the requested detailed information. Variation in the participation depends on several factors such as national interest and investment in this area, existence of expertise and dedicated infrastructure which may influence scientists' interest in a specific subject. Several measures are foreseen under Horizon 2020 to widen participation across Europe.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/index_en.cfm?pg=budget
([2]) http://cordis.europa.eu/home_en.html
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0809:FIN:en:PDF

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-003597/12
a Bizottság számára
Herczog Edit (S&D)
(2012. április 4.)

Tárgy: Koncentrált és kompakt mosószerek

A polgárok és a nem kormányzati szervezetek sok évet vártak a csökkentett víz- és sótartalmú, fokozottan környezetbarát mosószerekre. Az ipar koncentrált és kompakt mosószerek gyártására irányuló innovációs és fejlesztési erőfeszítései a nagy arányú fogyasztói elégedettséggel találkoztak. E mosószerek a teljesítmény és a kényelem tekintetében megfelelnek a legfontosabb fogyasztói igényeknek. Ezenfelül e termékek segítségével a fogyasztók tudatos polgárokként viselkedhetnek, mivel használatukkal jelentős mennyiségű vizet és energiát takarítanak meg, kevesebb vegyi anyagot és csomagolóanyagot használnak és csökken a szállítás igénybevételének szükségessége is.

– A Bizottság elkötelezett az ilyen koncentrált és kompakt mosószerek kifejlesztésének ösztönzése mellett?

– A Bizottság véleménye szerint a vegyi anyagokra vonatkozó uniós keretszabályozás megfelelő ösztönzőket biztosít-e az e területen zajló innováció további serkentésére?

– Milyen intézkedéseket javasol a Bizottság annak érdekében, hogy az anyagok és keverékek osztályozásáról, címkézéséről és csomagolásáról szóló európai uniós rendelet szigorú alkalmazása ne veszélyeztesse az ilyen innovációk környezetvédelmi hasznát?

Antonio Tajani válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. május 23.)

A Bizottság 2005 óta támogatja a mosó- és tisztítószeripar „Charter for Sustainable Cleaning" (Charta a fenntartható tisztításért) elnevezésű, önkéntes kezdeményezését ([1]), amely ösztönzi a környezetbarát mosószerek forgalomba hozatalát, a mosószer-koncentrátumokat és kompakt mosószereket is beleértve. Emellett a környezetbarát mosószerek olyan, termékekhez kapcsolódó eszközökből profitálhatnak, mint az uniós ökocímke és a zöld közbeszerzés.

A vegyi anyagokkal kapcsolatos uniós jogszabályokat a REACH rendelettel ([2]) felülvizsgálták, ennek célja az emberi egészség és a környezet magas szintű védelme, ugyanakkor a versenyképesség és az innováció fokozása. A vegyi anyagok kockázatainak értékeléséért és kezeléséért maga a vegyipar felelős, amely ösztönzi az innovatív vegyi anyagokkal kapcsolatos kutatást.

Az anyagok és keverékek osztályozására, címkézésére és csomagolására vonatkozó CLP-rendelet ([3]) az uniós jogba integrálja a vegyi anyagok osztályozásának és címkézésének globálisan harmonizált rendszerének (GHS) nemzetközi szinten elfogadott kritériumait. Általános elvként az emberi egészségre vagy a környezetre veszélyes anyagokat tartalmazó keverékeket szigorúbban kell osztályozni, ha bizonyos koncentrációs küszöböt meghaladnak, és ez a mosószer-koncentrátumokat is érintheti.

A még szigorúbb osztályozás olyan innovatív összetevők használatával kerülhető el, amelyek nincsenek osztályozva, vagy kevésbé veszélyes kategóriákba tartoznak. Végül, a GHS környezetvédelmi címkézéssel kapcsolatos különös rendelkezések és mentességek lehetőségét kínálja, amennyiben a környezeti terhelés bizonyíthatóan csökkenne. A CLP-rendelet 29. cikkének (4) bekezdése ennek megfelelően rendelkezik a környezetre veszélyesként osztályozott bizonyos keverékek tekintetében. A Bizottság azonban még nem dolgozta ki azt, hogy lehetne-e azt az EU összefüggésben alkalmazni, és ha igen, milyen módon.

([1]) Az iparág önkéntes kezdeményezésének chartájáról bővebb információ a következő honlapon található: http://www.cleanright.eu
([2]) A vegyi anyagok regisztrálásáról, értékeléséről, engedélyezéséről és korlátozásáról szóló 1907/2006/EK rendelet.
([3]) Az anyagok és keverékek osztályozásáról, címkézéséről és csomagolásáról szóló 1272/2008/EK rendelet.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-003597/12
to the Commission
Edit Herczog (S&D)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Concentrated and compacted detergents

Citizens and NGOs waited many years for more environmentally friendly detergents with limited salt and water content. Innovation and development efforts by the industry to produce concentrated and compacted laundry detergents are achieving high consumer satisfaction ratings. They are meeting key consumer needs in terms of performance and convenience. In addition, these products help consumers to be good citizens as they deliver significant reductions in water, energy, chemicals, packaging and transport use.

— Is the Commission committed to encouraging the development of such concentrated and compacted detergents?

— Does the Commission think that the EU legislative framework on chemicals is providing sufficient incentives to further stimulate innovation in this area?

— What measures will the Commission propose to ensure that the environmental benefits of such innovations will not be jeopardised by strict application of the European Regulation on the Classification, Labelling and Packaging of Substances and Mixtures?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(23 May 2012)

Since 2005 the Commission has supported the detergent industry's voluntary initiative 'Charter for Sustainable Cleaning', which encourages placing on the market more environmentally friendly detergents, including concentrated & compacted detergents ([1]). Additionally, environmentally friendly detergents can benefit from product-related instruments such as the European Union (EU) Ecolabel and Green Public Procurement.

EU legislation on chemicals has been revised with the REACH Regulation ([2]), aiming at a high level of protection of human health and the environment while enhancing competitiveness and innovation. Industry itself is responsible for assessing and managing the risks of chemicals, which is an incentive for research towards innovative chemicals.

The CLP Regulation ([3]) integrates the internationally agreed criteria of the Globally Harmonised System of classification and labelling of Chemicals (GHS) into EC law. As a general principle, mixtures containing substances that are considered hazardous to human health or the environment have to be classified more severely when certain concentration thresholds are exceeded, which could concern concentrated detergents.

More severe classification can be avoided by using innovative ingredients that are not classified, or are in less severe hazard categories. Lastly, GHS includes the possibility of specific provisions or exemptions in relation to environmental labelling where it can be demonstrated that there would be a reduction in the environmental impact. Art. 29 (4) of the CLP Regulation provides accordingly for such possibility in relation to mixtures classified as hazardous to the environment. However the Commission has not yet elaborated on whether and how it could be applied in the EU context.

([1]) More information on this Industry voluntary charter is available at: http://www.cleanright.eu.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 on Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals.
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 12/72/2008 on the classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-003598/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(4. April 2012)

Betrifft: Interkultureller Ansatz und Dialog zwischen Roma und Nicht-Roma

Die Roma-Gemeinschaft ist mit geschätzten 10-12 Millionen Menschen die größte Minderheit in Europa. Viele Roma sind von Armut und sozialer Ausgrenzung betroffen. Grundbedürfnisse wie Bildung, Wohnung, Gesundheitsversorgung und Zugang zum Arbeitsmarkt werden bei Weitem nicht erfüllt.

1. Wie kann die Kommission den sogenannten „interkulturellen Ansatz und Dialog" zwischen Roma und Nicht-Roma herstellen?

2. Wie kann die Kommission ein deutliches Signal an die Mitgliedstaaten senden, damit diese mit allen politischen und rechtlichen Mitteln in dieser Menschenrechtsfrage und gegen diese gravierende Form von Rassismus tätig werden?

3. Rassistisch motivierte Gewalt und Belästigung, wie sie in Bulgarien und der Tschechischen Republik zu beobachten sind, belegen das Versagen der Mitgliedstaaten bei der Schaffung eines Klimas, in dem alle Bürger ihre Menschenrechte in vollem Umfang wahrnehmen können. Welchen Beitrag kann die Kommission zu diesen Zielen leisten?

4. Im Nationalen Integrationsplan von Österreich, der sich unter anderem der Bekämpfung der Diskriminierung von Einwanderern und Minderheiten widmet, werden den Behörden verschiedene mögliche Maßnahmen empfohlen, wie beispielsweise die Einrichtung von Integrationsräten sowie Antirassismusschulungen für Polizei, Behörden und Schulen. Keine der in diesem Plan aufgeführten Maßnahmen beziehen sich speziell auf die Integration der Roma, womit er dem allgemeinen Ansatz entspricht, auf keine bestimmten ethnischen Gruppen abzuzielen. Kann die Kommission diesen Plan unterstützen? Falls ja, wie?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(28. Mai 2012)

Die zehn gemeinsamen Grundprinzipien zur Integration der Roma beziehen sich explizit auf den interkulturellen Ansatz und Dialog. Damit soll eine Änderung der Denkweise der Bevölkerungsmehrheit angeregt und besser erläutert werden, warum die Einbeziehung der Roma für alle vorteilhaft ist.

Die meisten von den Mitgliedstaaten vorgelegten nationalen Strategien zur Integration der Roma heben hervor, dass ein besseres Verständnis der Roma-Kultur notwendig ist, um Stereotypen zu bekämpfen und konkrete Maßnahmen in diesem Bereich vorzuschlagen.

Nach Ansicht der Kommission sollte die Wahrung der Menschenrechte mit der Verbesserung der sozioökonomischen Situation der Roma einhergehen. Im EU-Rahmen für nationale Strategien zur Integration der Roma heißt es: „Die Mitgliedstaaten (müssen) sicherstellen, dass die Roma nicht diskriminiert, sondern wie alle anderen EU-Bürger behandelt werden und alle in der EU-Grundrechtecharta verankerten Rechte gleichberechtigt ausüben können".

Der Rahmenbeschluss 2008/913/JI ([1]) des Rates verpflichtet die Mitgliedstaaten, die öffentliche Aufstachelung zu Gewalt oder Hass auf der Grundlage der Rasse, Hautfarbe, Religion, Abstammung oder nationalen oder ethnischen Herkunft unter Strafe zu stellen. Dieses Instrument untersagt hassmotivierte Verbalangriffe und Gewalttaten gegen Roma. Die Mitgliedstaaten müssen den Wortlaut der Bestimmungen übermitteln, mit denen sie diese Verpflichtungen in ihr nationales Recht umsetzen. Der Rat überprüft vor dem 28. November 2013, inwieweit die Mitgliedstaaten den Bestimmungen dieses Rahmenbeschlusses nachgekommen sind.

([1]) Rahmenbeschluss 2008/913/JI des Rates vom 28. November 2008 zur strafrechtlichen Bekämpfung bestimmter Formen und Ausdrucksweisen von Rassismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit, ABl. L 328, S. 55.

Der Nationale Integrationsplan von Österreich ist in der österreichischen Strategie erwähnt. Die in diesem Plan aufgeführten Maßnahmen zielen zwar nicht speziell auf die Roma ab, doch sie beziehen sich gleichermaßen auf Roma und sonstige Opfer von Rassismus und Diskriminierung. Wie in den zehn gemeinsamen Grundprinzipien zur Integration der Roma dargelegt, müssen politische Integrationsmaßnahmen explizit — jedoch nicht ausschließlich — auf die Roma gerichtet sein.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003598/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Intercultural approach and dialogue between Roma and non-Roma

The Roma community is Europe's largest minority, with an estimated 10-12 million people. Poverty and social exclusion affect many Roma people. Fundamental needs such as education, housing, healthcare and access to the labour market are far from being met.

1. How can the Commission build the so-called 'intercultural approach and dialogue' between Roma and non-Roma people?

2. How should the Commission send a strong signal to Member States to address this serious form of racism and human rights issue by all political and legal means?

3. Violence and racially-based harassment, as witnessed in Bulgaria and the Czech Republic, underline the failure of Member States to foster a climate in which all their citizens can enjoy and fully exercise their human rights. How can the Commission contribute to these goals?

4. Austria's National Integration Plan, which is partly dedicated to combating discrimination against immigrants and minorities, recommends various possible measures to the authorities, such as the establishment of integration councils and anti-racism training in the police force, administrations and schools. None of the measures listed in this plan — which is consistent with the general approach of not targeting ethnic groups — are targeted specifically at integration of the Roma. Can the Commission support this Plan? If so, how?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(28 May 2012)

The Ten Common Basic Principles for Roma Inclusion explicitly refer to the intercultural approach and dialogue. The aim is to help to induce a change in the mindset of the majority population and to explain better that Roma integration is beneficial to all.

Most of the national strategies for Roma inclusion submitted by the Member States underline that a better understanding of Roma culture is necessary to fight stereotypes and propose concrete actions in this field.

The Commission believes that the respect of fundamental rights and the improvement of the socioeconomic situation of Roma people should go hand in hand. The EU Framework highlights that 'Member States need to ensure that Roma are not discriminated against but treated like any other EU citizens with equal access to all fundamental rights'.

Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA ([1]) obliges Member States to penalise the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred based on race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin. This instrument bans hate speech and hate crime against Roma. Member States shall transmit the text of the provisions transposing these obligations into their national law. The Council shall, by 28 November 2013, assess the extent to which Member States have complied with the provisions of the framework Decision.

The Austrian National Integration plan is mentioned in the Austrian strategy. The measures listed in the plan are not specifically targeted at the Roma people but they are concerned by these measures just like any other victims of racism and discrimination. As the Ten Common Basic Principles for Roma Inclusion explain, policy responses for inclusion need to be explicitly but not exclusively targeted at Roma.

([1]) Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law, OJ L 328, p. 55.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003599/12
to the Commission
Chris Davies (ALDE)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Recycling of paper publications

The Commission will be aware that it is increasingly common practice for publishers of newspapers and magazines to distribute their products, and accompanying promotional literature, in sealed plastic wrappers.

— Will the Commission provide an assessment of the effect of this practice on the recycling of paper products, addressing in particular whether paper wrapped in plastic can easily be recycled and assessing whether consumers are willing to separate the (perhaps unwanted and unrequested) paper contents from their plastic covers in order to facilitate recycling?

— If the Commission's judgment is that the practice reduces the likelihood of paper products being recycled, will it propose restrictions and other such measures as may be necessary in order to ensure that the maximum possible quantity of paper products is recycled?

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

The Commission is well aware of this issue. No systematic assessment is foreseen at European level to analyse the possible effects of this practice on the recycling of paper products. Overall paper recycling rates are relatively high in the EU (around 65%) ([1]) albeit with important differences between Member States, essentially linked to the general organisation of waste management. Current EU waste legislation encourages producer responsibility schemes, and some Member States have introduced such systems for these publications, so that actors placing publications on the market have to contribute to the financing of the separate collection and recycling of their products. This could give an incentive to design easy-to-recycle publications. However, the Commission does not currently plan to propose specific legislative measures in this area.

([1]) *Source:* Confederation of European Paper Industries.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-003600/12
alla Commissione
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(4 aprile 2012)

Oggetto: Gestione del programma di aiuto agli indigenti

Con riferimento al programma di aiuto agli indigenti che prevede lo stanziamento di 500 milioni di euro ([1]) per il 2012, di cui 95 milioni destinati all'Italia, può la Commissione chiarire come vengono distribuite tali risorse, specificando in particolare quanto segue?

— Tale supporto è versato agli Stati Membri o direttamente ad associazioni che si occupano dell'assistenza agli indigenti? Nel primo caso, ai governi nazionali vengono indicati criterisecondo i quali distribuire gli aiuti?

— Dispone la Commissione di una lista di associazioni che ricevono tali aiuti, anche qualora fosse lo Stato Membro a individuarle? È possibile disporre di tale lista per l'Italia?

— Se gli aiuti sono affidati alla gestione privata, come vengono scelte le associazioni? Quali sono i costi che possono essere coperti dagli aiuti?

Risposta data da Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(30 maggio 2012)

Le risorse messe a disposizione degli Stati membri che partecipano al programma europeo di aiuto alimentare sono distribuite agli indigenti attraverso organismi designati da ciascuno Stato membro ([2]). Secondo il quadro giuridico del programma gli organismi in questione non sono imprese commerciali.

Gli Stati membri dispongono di notevole libertà nella pianificazione e attuazione del programma di distribuzione delle derrate alimentari a livello nazionale, anche per quanto riguarda la selezione degli organismi beneficiari secondo criteri specifici degli Stati membri stessi. In Italia, la selezione degli organismi caritativi che distribuiscono l'aiuto è fatta in base ai criteri definiti nella decisione AGEA n. 164 del 12 maggio 2006. L'elenco degli organismi designati è pubblicato nella decisione AGEA n. 210 del 1º marzo 2007.

La Commissione rimborsa agli Stati membri le spese ammissibili effettivamente sostenute. Tra i costi ammissibili nell'ambito del programma rientrano quelli concernenti le derrate alimentari prelevate dalle scorte d'intervento, le derrate alimentari acquistate sul mercato, il trasporto delle derrate alimentari nelle scorte d'intervento da uno Stato membro all'altro, il trasporto delle derrate alimentari fino ai magazzini degli organismi designati nonché le spese amministrative, di trasporto e di stoccaggio sostenute dagli organismi designati ([3]).

([1]) REGOLAMENTO DI ESECUZIONE (UE) N. 208/2012 DELLA COMMISSIONE del 9 marzo 2012 che modifica il regolamento di esecuzione (UE) n. 562/2011 recante adozione del piano di ripartizione tra gli Stati membri delle risorse da imputare all'esercizio finanziario 2012 per l'esecuzione delle forniture di derrate alimentari provenienti dalle scorte d'intervento a favore degli indigenti nell'Unione europea e recante deroga ad alcune disposizioni del regolamento (UE) n. 807/2010.

([2]) Regolamento (UE) n. 121/2012 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 15 febbraio 2012, recante modifica dei regolamenti del Consiglio (CE) n. 1290/2005 e (CE) n. 1234/2007, GU L 44 pag. 1.

([3]) Articolo 27, paragrafo 7, del regolamento 1234/2007, modificato dal regolamento 121/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003600/12
to the Commission
Giancarlo Scottà (EFD)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Management of the aid programme for deprived persons

With reference to the aid programme for deprived persons, for which EUR 500 000 000 ([1]) has been earmarked for 2012, EUR 95 000 000 of which is destined for Italy, can the Commission clarify how these resources are distributed, with specific reference to the following:

— Is this aid paid to the Member States or directly to organisations that manage the distribution of aid to deprived persons? In the former case, are there any criteria under which national Governments have to distribute the aid?

— Does the Commission have a list of organisations that receive the aid, even if the Member State is responsible for identifying them? Would it be possible to have this list for Italy?

— If the aid is entrusted to private management, how are the organisations chosen? What costs can be covered by the aid?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(30 May 2012)

The resources made available to the participating Member States within the European Food Aid programme are distributed to the most deprived persons through organisations designated by each Member State ([2]). According to the legal frame of the scheme, those organisations shall not be commercial undertakings.

Member States dispose of significant freedom in planning and implementing the food distribution programme at national level, including also the selection of the beneficiary organisations according to their specific selection criteria. In Italy, the selection of the charitable organisations distributing the aid is made on the basis of the criteria defined in the AGEA Decision No 164 of 12 May 2006. The list of the designated organisations is published in the AGEA Decision No 210 of 1 March 2007.

The Commission reimburses the Member States for the eligible expenditure actually paid. Eligible expenditure under the scheme includes costs related to food products released from intervention stocks, food products purchased on the market, the transport of food products in intervention stocks between Member States, the transport of food products to the storage depots of the designated organisations as well as administrative, transport and storage costs incurred by the designated organisations ([3]).

([1]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 208/2012 of 9 March 2012 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 562/2011 adopting the plan allocating to the Member States resources to be charged to the 2012 budget year for the supply of food from intervention stocks for the benefit of the most deprived persons in the European Union and derogating from certain provisions of Regulation (EU) No 807/2010.
([2]) Regulation 121/2012 of 15 February 2012, amending Council Regulations (EC) No 1290/2005 and (EC) No 1234/2007, OJ L 44, p. 1.
([3]) Article 27, paragraph 7, of Regulation 1234/2007, as modified by Regulation 121/2012.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-003601/12
aan de Raad
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(4 april 2012)

Betreft: Grensoverschrijdende misdaad

De georganiseerde criminaliteit stijgt in West-Europa en daalt fors in Midden- en Oost-Europa. Die trend is zichtbaar sinds de verruiming van het interne Europese handelsverkeer en de uitbreiding van de Europese Unie. „We exporteren niet alleen goederen, maar ook onze misdaad", zegt Agata Tonder-Nowak, hoofdonderzoekster georganiseerde misdaad van de landelijke politie in Warschau ([1]).

Naar aanleiding hiervan werden aan de Commissie vragen gesteld ([2]); in haar antwoord daarop geeft zij aan over cijfermateriaal te beschikken, maar weigert zij deze te interpreteren.

1. Beschikt de Raad, net als de Commissie, over cijfers met betrekking tot grensoverschrijdende misdaad binnen de EU van meerdere jaren en de verschuiving daarin per lidstaat? Beschikt de Raad mogelijk over aanvullend cijfermateriaal? Zo ja, is de Raad ertoe bereid deze te verstrekken?

2. Bevestigt de Raad dat Polen en andere Midden- en Oost-Europese landen hun misdaad exporteren? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Bevestigt de Raad dat Europese politici bewust de aard en de omvang van de Oost-Europese misdaad hebben toegedekt in de aanloop naar de toetreding van Oost-Europese landen tot de EU ([3])? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Welke conclusies trekt de Raad uit voornoemde feiten?

Antwoord
(6 juni 2012)

Het is niet aan de Raad commentaar te geven op artikelen in de pers.

Wat gegevens en statistische informatie over grensoverschrijdende criminaliteit binnen de EU betreft, stellen bevoegde agentschappen van de EU, zoals Europol of het Europees Waarnemings-centrum voor drugs en drugsverslaving, regelmatig rapporten op en analyseren zij tendensen met betrekking tot verschillende soorten misdrijven.

([1]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2686/Binnenland/article/detail/3077381/2011/12/15/Mobiele-bendes-Oost-Europa-massaal-richting-westen.dhtml.
([2]) E-002317/2012.
([3]) http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Nederland/332049/Politici-verzwegen-bewust-omvang-OostEuropese-misdaad.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-003601/12
to the Council
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(4 April 2012)

Subject: Cross-border crime

Organised crime is rising in Western Europe and falling dramatically in central and eastern Europe. This trend has been noticeable since the enlargement of the European internal market and of the European Union. 'We not only export goods, but also our crime,' says Agata Tonder-Nowak, Head Investigator of Organised Crime from the national police in Warsaw ([1]).

On this topic, questions were put to the Commission ([2]); in its answer, it indicates that it possesses statistical information, but refuses to interpret it.

1. Does the Council, like the Commission, possess data regarding cross-border crime within the EU covering several years and changes therein per Member State? Does the Council possibly possess supplementary statistical information? If so, is the Council prepared to provide this data?

2. Does the Council confirm that Poland and other Central and Eastern European countries are exporting their crime? If not, why not?

3. Does the Council confirm that European politicians deliberately covered up the nature and extent of Eastern European crime in the run-up to the accession of Eastern European countries to the EU? ([3]) If not, why not?

4. What conclusions does the Council draw from the aforementioned facts?

Reply
(6 June 2012)

It is not for the Council to comment on articles appearing in the press.

As regards data and statistical information on cross-border crime within the EU, relevant EU agencies such as Europol or the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction regularly issue reports and analyse trends regarding different types of crimes.

([1]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2686/Binnenland/article/detail/3077381/2011/12/15/Mobiele-bendes-Oost-Europa-massaal-richting-westen.dhtml.
([2]) E-002317/2012.
([3]) http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Nederland/332049/Politici-verzwegen-bewust-omvang-OostEuropese-misdaad.htm