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 256 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005041/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(16 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Spray che ubriaca in pochi secondi

Un team di ricercatori francesi, con a capo il franco-americano David Edwards e il designer Philippe Starck, ha messo a punto uno strano spray in grado di dare una sensazione di ebbrezza in pochi secondi a chi lo utilizza.

A detta dei ricercatori lo spray permetterebbe di «essere ubriachi» senza però avere gli effetti negativi della sbronza. Inoltre, pare che la bomboletta sia a prova di etilometro.

Uno spruzzo di questo spray libera 0,075 millilitri di alcool in forma liquida, una quantità sufficiente per stimolare il cervello e ottenere la sensazione di ebbrezza.

Si tratta di un prodotto molto discusso che è già in vendita sul mercato al prezzo di 20 euro. Complice del suo successo è anche la dimensione ridotta e facilmente confondibile con un inalatore per asma.

Considerato che il consumo di alcool soprattutto tra i giovani ha raggiunto livelli allarmanti e che, per tale motivo, si cerca di sensibilizzare adolescenti e giovani ai rischi e alle conseguenze dell'alcolismo, può la Commissione far sapere se intende mettere in guardia i consumatori dall'utilizzo di tale prodotto e/o approfondire la ricerca sulla sua tossicità e sugli effetti collaterali?

Risposta congiunta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(27 giugno 2012)

La Commissione non è stata informata della commercializzazione del prodotto menzionato dall'onorevole deputato.

Dalle informazioni pubblicate dal fabbricante risulta che il prodotto contiene essenzialmente alcool, spezie e aromatizzanti ed è venduto quale spray per alimenti. Esse indicano anche che il prodotto è disponibile in Francia e che sarà immesso su altri mercati in una data successiva.

Come tutti i prodotti utilizzati negli alimenti quello in oggetto non può essere commercializzato a meno che non soddisfi le disposizioni della legislazione in materia di sicurezza alimentare.

In forza del regolamento (CE) n. 178/2002 ([1]) l'operatore stesso ha la responsabilità primaria di assicurare tale conformità sotto la supervisione delle autorità competenti degli Stati membri che devono immediatamente prendere le misure appropriate in caso di rischio per la salute pubblica.

Le eventuali restrizioni alla vendita di tali prodotti rientrano nella politica nazionale a tutela della salute pubblica e competono pertanto agli Stati membri.

([1]) GU L 31 dell'1.2.2002.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-004745/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(9 de maio de 2012)

Assunto: Spray inebriante WA|HH Quantum Sensations

Foi noticiado que cientistas franceses desenvolveram um spray — WA|HH Quantum Sensations — que simula os efeitos inebriantes do álcool, provocando uma embriaguez imediata e sem os efeitos comuns da ressaca e sem acusar registo nos rastreios utilizados para a deteção da presença de álcool no sangue.

Tendo em conta que a utilização abusiva de bebidas alcoólicas e outras substâncias inebriantes é um problema que afeta muitos jovens, estando associada a acidentes e a demais comportamentos de risco,

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento da existência deste spray? Que comentário lhe merece?

2. Notícias dão conta da intenção dos inventores de comercializarem este produto na UE. Tem conhecimento de que tal já aconteça em algum país da UE? Pondera tomar medidas no sentido de uma proibição generalizada da comercialização deste spray nos Estados-Membros?

3. Tal como já acontece com o tabaco e com as bebidas alcoólicas, pondera tomar medidas no sentido de restringir a comercialização destes produtos a determinadas faixas da população, nomeadamente a menores?

Resposta conjunta dada por John Dalli em nome da Comissão
(27 de junho de 2012)

A Comissão não foi alertada para o facto de o produto mencionado pelo Senhor Deputado estar a ser comercializado.

A informação publicada pelo fabricante mostra que o produto contém essencialmente álcool, especiarias e aromatizantes e que é vendido como um *spray* «alimentar». Indica igualmente que o produto está disponível em França e que, posteriormente, fará também parte da oferta noutros mercados.

Tal como qualquer outro produto utilizado no setor alimentar, o produto em causa não pode ser comercializado se não estiver em conformidade com os requisitos vigentes na legislação em matéria de segurança dos géneros alimentícios.

Em conformidade com o Regulamento (CE) n.° 178/2002 ([1]) a própria empresa é a principal responsável por garantir tal conformidade, sob a supervisão das autoridades competentes dos Estados-Membros, devendo estas últimas adotar de imediato medidas apropriadas em caso de risco para a saúde pública.

Quaisquer restrições à venda de tais produtos enquadram-se na política nacional de proteção da saúde pública e são, consequentemente, da competência dos Estados-Membros.

([1]) JO L 31 de 1.2.2002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004745/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(9 May 2012)

Subject: Intoxicating spray — WA|HH Quantum Sensations

It has been reported that French scientists have created a spray — WA|HH Quantum Sensations — that replicates the intoxicating effects of alcohol. This spray produces instant intoxication, but does not cause typical hangover symptoms and cannot be traced in tests used to detect the presence of alcohol in the blood.

Considering that the abuse of alcoholic beverages and other intoxicating substances is a problem that affects many young people and is associated with accidents and other dangerous behaviour, I would ask the Commission:

1. Is it aware of the existence of this spray? What comments does it have?

2. It has been reported that the creators intend to sell this product in the EU. Is it aware that this is already the case in any EU country? Does it plan to take measures to prohibit the sale of this spray in Member States?

3. As is the case with tobacco and alcoholic beverages, does it consider taking measures to restrict the sale of these products to certain groups of the population, in particular to minors?

Question for written answer E-005041/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Spray that causes drunkenness in a few seconds

A team of French researchers, headed by Franco-American David Edwards and designer Philippe Starck, has developed a strange spray that can give the user a feeling of drunkenness in just a few seconds.

According to the researchers, the spray makes it possible to 'be drunk' without the negative effects of heavy drinking. Furthermore, it appears that the spray would still allow the user to pass a breathalyser test.

One dose of this spray releases 0.075 millilitres of alcohol in liquid form, a sufficient quantity to stimulate the brain and produce a feeling of intoxication.

This product has provoked much discussion and is already on the market at a price of EUR 20. Another factor in its success is its small size, which allows it to be easily mistaken for an asthma inhaler.

Bearing in mind that alcohol consumption, particularly among young people, has reached alarming levels and that, for this reason, attempts are being made to raise awareness among adolescents and young people about the risks and consequences of alcoholism, can the Commission state whether it intends to warn consumers about the use of this product and/or conduct more in-depth research into its toxicity and side-effects?

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

The Commission has not been alerted to the marketing of the product mentioned by the Honorable Member.

The information published by the manufacturer shows that the product primarily contains alcohol, food spices and flavorings and that it is sold as food spray. It also states that the product is available in France, and indicates that it will be offered on other markets later.

Like any product used in food, the product in question can not be marketed unless it complies with the requirements of the legislation on food safety.

Under Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 ([1]) the operator himself has the primary responsibility for ensuring such compliance, under the supervision of the competent authorities of member states, which must immediately take appropriate measures in case of risk to public health.

Any restrictions on the sale of such products fall within the national policy of protection of public health and are therefore under the responsibility of Member States.

([1]) OJ L 31, 1.2.2002.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005030/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(16 Μαΐου 2012)

Θέμα: Ετοιμότητα της Επιτροπής σε ενδεχόμενο νέο κύμα Αφρικανών μεταναστών από Λιβύη

Ο υπουργός Εξωτερικών της Λιβύης Άσουρ μπιν Χάγιαλ κατά τη διάρκεια της επίσκεψής του στην Ιταλία τόνισε μεταξύ άλλων ότι «Η επιδείνωση της κατάστασης που προκάλεσε ο πόλεμος στη νότια Λιβύη ενδέχεται τώρα να προκαλέσει αύξηση της μετανάστευσης από την Αφρική προς την Ευρώπη. (…) Έχουμε ενδείξεις πως (η κατάσταση) μπορεί να επιδεινωθεί. Αφρικανοί μετανάστες έχουν φθάσει στα σύνορα Αιγύπτου-Λιβύης».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Εκτιμά ότι οι χώρες του Νότου στην ΕΕ, που ήδη φέρουν το σύνολο του βάρους της παράνομης μετανάστευσης προς την ΕΕ, διαθέτουν την τεχνική, υλική και οικονομική δυνατότητα να ανταπεξέλθουν στη περίπτωση που η προειδοποίηση του Λίβυου Υπ. Εξ. επιβεβαιωθεί;

— Λαμβάνει η Επιτροπή προληπτικά μέτρα για ένα τέτοιο ενδεχόμενο; Ποια είναι αυτά;

— Παρατηρεί την κινητικότητα στα σύνορα Αιγύπτου-Λιβύης; Ποια είναι η δική της εκτίμηση;

Κοινή απάντηση της κ. Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Ιουλίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή είναι προβληματισμένη με την πρόσφατη άνοδο των μεικτών μεταναστευτικών ροών από τη Λιβύη προς τα νότια σύνορα της ΕΕ, ιδίως την Ιταλία.

Ο αριθμός των αφίξεων παραμένει σχετικά χαμηλός, αλλά αποτελεί ένδειξη ότι, όταν το επιτρέψουν οι καιρικές συνθήκες, μετανάστες θα επιχειρήσουν να διασχίσουν τη Μεσόγειο για να φτάσουν στην Ευρώπη.

Πολλές πρωτοβουλίες έχουν αναληφθεί από το 2011 για την αντιμετώπιση αυτών των ροών, τη στήριξη των θιγόμενων κρατών μελών και τη διασφάλιση του σεβασμού των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων. Συγκεκριμένα, πραγματοποιήθηκαν ορισμένες επιχειρήσεις επιτήρησης των συνόρων υπό τον συντονισμό του Frontex στο πλαίσιο του ευρωπαϊκού δικτύου περιπολίας, με ειδική εστίαση σε διαδρομές από την Τυνησία και τη Λιβύη προς την Ιταλία (επιχείρηση Hermes).

Ο Frontex είναι έτοιμος να στηρίξει την Ιταλία με επιχειρησιακές δραστηριότητες που θα πραγματοποιηθούν το 2012 και προβλέπει την ευέλικτη αναδιάταξη των τεχνικών μέσων και των εμπειρογνωμόνων σε περιπτώσεις όπως οι ξαφνικές και μαζικές αφίξεις παράνομων μεταναστών και αιτούντων άσυλο. Η επιχείρηση Hermes θα επαναληφθεί την 1η Ιουλίου 2012.

Επιπλέον, η ΕΕ παρέχει σημαντική χρηματοδοτική στήριξη για την αντιμετώπιση της πρόκλησης των μεταναστευτικών ροών στο πλαίσιο του Ταμείου Εξωτερικών Συνόρων, του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Επιστροφής και του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου για τους Πρόσφυγες τα οποία εντάσσονται στο γενικό πρόγραμμα «Αλληλεγγύη και διαχείριση των μεταναστευτικών ροών». Η Ιταλία συγκαταλέγεται στους μεγαλύτερους δικαιούχους αυτών των Ταμείων.

Η Επιτροπή πιστεύει ότι, προκειμένου να αντιμετωπιστεί αυτό το φαινόμενο με διαρθρωτικό τρόπο, θα είναι πολύ σημαντικό να συμμετάσχει η ΕΕ σε διάλογο με τις λιβυκές αρχές (όταν το επιτρέψουν οι συνθήκες) προκειμένου να βελτιωθεί η διαχείριση των συνόρων και της μετανάστευσης και να στηρίξει η ΕΕ την προσπάθεια αυτή των λιβυκών αρχών. Η έναρξη διαλόγου με τη Λιβύη για τη μετανάστευση, την κινητικότητα και την ασφάλεια μπορεί επίσης να θεωρηθεί βήμα προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση και μπορεί να βασιστεί, μεταξύ άλλων, στα πορίσματα της πρόσφατης αξιολόγησης της ολοκληρωμένης διαχείρισης των συνόρων της Λιβύης.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-004985/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Necessità di un intervento dell'UE sul pericolo di nuove ondate migratorie provenienti dalla Libia

Nei giorni scorsi il ministro degli Esteri libico Ashour Bin Khayal ha allarmato il suo omonimo italiano circa il pericolo di una nuova ondata di sbarchi di clandestini di cui già si intravedono i segnali.

— Dati i precedenti, come e in che tempi intende intervenire la Commissione per prevenire questi flussi di clandestini che, com'è noto, approdano sulle coste più meridionali dall'Italia per poi raggiungere anche altri paesi dell'UE?

— Quale sarà il ruolo di Frontex in questa fase di prevenzione per rendere più efficace il meccanismo di coordinamento tra gli sforzi condotti a livello nazionale da parte dei singoli Stati e tra i paesi membri e l'UE?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005022/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(16 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Rischio di una nuova emergenza immigrazione proveniente dalla Libia

Il 12 maggio il Ministro degli esteri italiano Giulio Terzi ha avuto un incontro con l'omologo libico Ashour Bin Khaial, le cui dichiarazioni sul fronte immigrazione sono risultate decisamente allarmanti. Egli è infatti convinto che il flusso migratorio, che attualmente si sta per riversare in Libia, difficilmente riuscirà ad essere gestito e molto probabilmente si riverserà sulle coste italiane e di seguito in Europa. Si profila il ripetersi dell'emergenza immigrazione che l'Italia ha vissuto un anno fa.

— È la Commissione a conoscenza di tali notizie?

— Come intende supportare l'Italia nella gestione di quella che si profila come vera e propria emergenza?

— Ritiene necessario instaurare una collaborazione più stretta fra Europa e Libia in modo da poter supportare maggiormente il paese nella transizione democratica e approntare misure concrete in loco per gestire il flusso migratorio prima che si riversi entro i confini dell'UE?

Risposta congiunta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(11 luglio 2012)

Il recente aumento dei flussi migratori misti dalla Libia verso le frontiere meridionali dell'Unione europea, in particolare verso l'Italia, preoccupa la Commissione.

Benché gli arrivi siano ancora relativamente modesti, tutto lascia presupporre che quando le condizioni atmosferiche lo consentiranno i migranti cercheranno di attraversare il Mediterraneo per raggiungere l'Europa.

Dal 2011 sono state messe in atto numerose iniziative per far fronte a tali flussi, prestare assistenza agli Stati membri interessati e assicurare il rispetto dei diritti umani. In particolare, sono state avviate diverse operazioni di sorveglianza di frontiera coordinate da Frontex nell'ambito della rete europea di pattuglie, con particolare attenzione alle rotte dalla Tunisia e dalla Libia verso l'Italia (operazione Hermes).

Frontex è pronta a sostenere l'Italia con attività operative da realizzare nel 2012 e prevede la riassegnazione flessibile di mezzi tecnici ed esperti in caso di arrivi improvvisi e massicci di immigrati irregolari e di richiedenti asilo. L'operazione Hermes verrà ripresa il 1º luglio 2012.

L'UE fornisce inoltre un notevole sostegno finanziario per fronteggiare la sfida dei flussi migratori attraverso il Fondo per le frontiere esterne, il Fondo per i rimpatri e il Fondo europeo per i rifugiati, che fanno parte del programma generale «Solidarietà e gestione dei flussi migratori». L'Italia è tra i maggiori beneficiari di tali fondi.

La Commissione ritiene che per far fronte al fenomeno in modo strutturale sia essenziale che l'Unione europea si impegni in un dialogo con le autorità libiche (quando le circostanze lo consentano) per migliorare la loro gestione delle frontiere e della migrazione e sostenere la loro azione in questo ambito. A tal fine si potrebbe valutare la possibilità di instaurare un dialogo con la Libia in tema di migrazione, mobilità e sicurezza, che potrebbe ispirarsi, tra l'altro, ai risultati della recente valutazione del fabbisogno della Libia in materia di gestione integrata delle frontiere.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-004985/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 May 2012)

Subject: EU intervention required against the risk of fresh waves of Libyan migrants

In the last few days, the Libyan Foreign Minister Ashour Bin Khayal has alarmed his Italian counterpart with information on the prospect of more illegal immigrants landing in Italy, the signs of which have already been observed.

— How and in what time frame does the Commission intend to intervene to prevent these flows of illegal immigrants who, as we know, land on the southernmost coasts of Italy and then head for other EU countries?

— What role will Frontex play in this preventative phase to improve the efficiency of the coordinating mechanism both at national level within individual states and between EU Member States?

Question for written answer E-005022/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Risk of a new immigration emergency from Libya

On 12 May 2012, the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Giulio Terzi, met his Libyan counterpart, Ashour Bin Khaial, whose statements regarding immigration have been particularly alarming. He believes that the migratory flow that is about to enter Libya will be difficult for the country to manage and that there is a high likelihood it will continue to the Italian coast and then into Europe. A repeat of the immigration emergency experienced by Italy a year ago is looming.

— Is the Commission aware of this news?

— How does it intend to assist Italy in handling what is threatening to be an out-and-out emergency?

— Does it deem it necessary to establish closer cooperation between Europe and Libya in order to provide better assistance to the country during its transition to democracy and put in place concrete measures to manage the flow of immigrants before they cross EU borders?

Question for written answer E-005030/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Commission's preparedness for the possibility of a new wave of African immigrants from Libya

In the course of his visit to Italy, the Foreign Minister of Libya Ashour bin Khayal emphasised among other things that 'the worsening of the situation in southern Libya that has been brought about by the war may now to lead to an increase in emigration from Africa to Europe. (…) We have indications that (the situation) could deteriorate. African immigrants have reached the borders between Egypt and Libya'.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— Does it judge that the southern countries of the EU, that are already bearing the full brunt of illegal immigration towards the EU, possess the technical, material and economic means to cope effectively if the warning of the Libyan Foreign Minister proves to be justified?

— Is it taking preventive measures against such an eventuality? If so, what are these measures?

— Has it observed movements at the borders between Egypt and Libya? What is its assessment of the situation?

Joint answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(11 July 2012)

The Commission has been concerned by the recent surge in mixed migratory flows from Libya towards the EU's Southern borders, notably Italy.

The arrivals are still relatively small in number but an indication that, when weather conditions allow, migrants will attempt to cross the Mediterranean to reach Europe.

Many initiatives have been put in place since 2011 to address those flows, assist Member States affected and ensure respect for human rights. In particular, a number of border surveillance operations coordinated by Frontex in the framework of the European Patrol Network were launched, with a special focus on routes from Tunisia and Libya to Italy (Operation Hermes).

Frontex is ready to support Italy with operational activities to be implemented in 2012 and envisages the flexible redeployment of technical means and experts in cases such as sudden and massive arrivals of irregular migrants and asylum-seekers. Operation Hermes will be resumed on 1 July 2012.

In addition, the EU is providing substantial financial support to address the challenge of migration flows under the External Borders Fund, the Return Fund and the European Refugee Fund, all part of the General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows'. Italy is among the largest beneficiaries of these Funds.

The Commission believes that, in order to address this phenomenon in a structural manner, it will be very important for the EU to engage in a dialogue with the Libyan authorities (once conditions allow) to improve their border and migration management, and support them in this endeavour. The launch of a Dialogue on Migration, Mobility and Security with Libya may also be considered for that purpose and could draw on, *inter alia*, the findings of the recent Libya Integrated Border Management Needs Assessment.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-005033/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(16. maj 2012)

Om: Tyrkiets trusler mod Cypern

Vil Kommissionen i forlængelse af sit svar på spørgsmål E-003162/2012 oplyse, hvad den agter at foretage sig, såfremt Tyrkiet ikke »aktivt støtter de igangværende forhandlinger, der tager sigte på en retfærdig, samlet og varig løsning af Cypern-problemet inden for rammerne af FN i overensstemmelse med de relevante resolutioner fra FN's Sikkerhedsråd og de principper, som Unionen bygger på«?

Vil Kommissionen endvidere oplyse, om den vurderer Tyrkiets nuværende adfærd over for Cypern som udtryk for en sådan velvilje?

Samlet svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Štefan Füle
(17. juli 2012)

Kommissionen henviser til Den Europæiske Unions holdning ved det seneste associeringsråd med Tyrkiet, som fandt sted den 22. juni 2012, og ved hvilket det blev understreget, at Tyrkiets konkrete tilsagn om og bidrag til en samlet løsning på Cypernproblemet er meget vigtig. EU minder om Det Europæiske Råds konklusioner af 9. december 2011 for så vidt angår Tyrkiets erklæringer og trusler og giver udtryk for alvorlig bekymring og opfordrer til fuld respekt for den rolle, som spilles af Rådets formandsskab, et grundlæggende institutionelt kendetegn i EU, der er omhandlet i traktaten.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-006140/12
an die Kommission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE) und Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(21. Juni 2012)

Betrifft: Nichtanerkennung des EU-Ratsvorsitzes und das Einfrieren der Beziehungen mit der EU von offizieller türkischer Seite für das kommende Halbjahr

Die türkische Tageszeitung „Sabah" ([1]) veröffentlichte am 8. Juni 2012 Äußerungen der türkischen Minister für auswärtige Angelegenheiten bzw. für europäische Angelegenheiten, in denen sie unter anderem ankündigten, dass „keines der Ministerien oder anderen Institutionen der Republik Türkei mit dem EU-Ratsvorsitz in Zusammenhang mit Tätigkeiten des griechisch-zyprischen Ratsvorsitzes in Kontakt stehen werde". Die Äußerungen wurden bei einem gemeinsamen Pressetermin im Rahmen des Dritten Treffens des politischen Dialogs auf Ministerebene zwischen der EU und der Türkei gemacht, an dem die Hohe Vertreterin der EU für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik sowie das für Erweiterung zuständige Kommissionsmitglied teilnahmen.

Die Aussagen dienten als Bestätigung eines Rundschreibens des Büros des türkischen Ministerpräsidenten an alle Ministerien, Verwaltungsdienststellen und Diplomaten seiner Regierung mit der Anweisung, an keinen EU-Sitzungen teilzunehmen, bei denen der zyprische EU-Ratsvorsitz den Vorsitz führt oder an denen er teilnimmt. Das Rundschreiben wurde vom zyprischen Regierungssprecher als eine Provokation und Beleidigung der EU und ihrer Organe kritisiert.

Hinzu kommt, dass auf der 69. Sitzung des Gemischten Parlamentarischen Ausschusses (GPA) EU-Türkei am 13. Juni 2012 in Straßburg, bei der das für Erweiterung zuständige Kommissionsmitglied und der türkische Minister für europäische Angelegenheiten zugegen waren, sich sowohl der türkische Minister als auch der Kovorsitzende des GPA (ein Mitglied der türkischen Nationalversammlung) beharrlich weigerten, Fragen mehrerer MdEP, so auch des stellvertretenden Vorsitzenden des GPA, in Bezug auf die Einladung bzw. Anwesenheit eines Vertreters des zyprischen EU-Ratsvorsitzes zur bzw. bei der 70. Sitzung des GPA und seine damit verbundene Anerkennung zu beantworten.

1. Wie sieht die Reaktion der Kommission auf die öffentlichen Äußerungen der beiden Minister und das Rundschreiben des Büros des türkischen Ministerpräsidenten aus?

2. Welche konkreten Maßnahmen hat die Kommission diesbezüglich ergriffen? Hat sie der türkischen Regierung eine Protestnote übermittelt? Falls ja, wie hat die Türkei darauf reagiert?

3. Kann die EU und ihre Organe (einschließlich der Ausschüsse und anderer Gremien) gemäß den Verträgen eine solche Praxis (d. h. die Forderung, dass ein Vertreter des wechselnden EU-Ratsvorsitzes offiziellen EU-Treffen fernbleibt) eines beitrittswilligen oder eines anderen an EU-Verfahren beteiligten Staates direkt, indirekt, stillschweigend oder ausdrücklich akzeptieren?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(17. Juli 2012)

Die Kommission verweist auf den Standpunkt der Europäischen Union bei der letzten Tagung des Assoziationsrates EU-Türkei am 22. Juni 2012, auf der sie betonte, dass das konkrete Engagement der Türkei für eine umfassende Lösung der Zypernfrage entscheidend ist. Unter Hinweis auf die Schlussfolgerungen des Europäischen Rates vom 9. Dezember 2011 hinsichtlich der Äußerungen und Drohungen der Türkei brachte die EU ihre große Besorgnis zum Ausdruck und forderte, dass die Rolle des Ratsvorsitzes, die ein im Vertrag verankertes grundlegendes institutionelles Merkmal der EU ist, uneingeschränkt geachtet wird.

([1]) http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognize-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005956/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(14 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Τουρκία και Κυπριακή Προεδρία

Κανένα υπουργείο και κανένας θεσμός της Τουρκίας δεν θα έχει επαφή και δεν θα συμμετέχει σε οποιαδήποτε δραστηριότητα με την «Ελληνοκυπριακή Προεδρία» της ΕΕ, προειδοποίησε ο ΥΠΕΞ της Άγκυρας.

Με απειλές περί αποχής από κάθε εκδήλωση ή κοινοτική διαδικασία της Κυπριακής Προεδρίας της ΕΕ που ξεκινά την 1η Ιουλίου απειλεί τώρα η Άγκυρα, καθώς ο εκβιασμός προς την ΕΕ ώστε να περιορίσει τον ρόλο και τη θέση της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας στην ΕΕ δεν έφερε αποτέλεσμα.

Την τουρκική θέση εξέφρασε ο Τούρκος υπουργός Εξωτερικών Αχμέτ Νταβούτογλου στη διάρκεια των τακτικών επαφών που είχαν στην Κωνσταντινούπολη η επικεφαλής της εξωτερικής πολιτικής της ΕΕ, κα Άστον, και ο επίτροπος αρμόδιος για τη διεύρυνση Σ.Φούλε.

Η Τουρκία απειλούσε αρχικά ότι θα διακόψει κάθε σχέση με την ΕΕ εφόσον ανατεθεί η προεδρία της ΕΕ στην Κύπρο ενώ δεν θα έχει επιλυθεί ακόμη το Κυπριακό, αλλά το γεγονός ότι κάτι τέτοιο θα είχε σοβαρές συνέπειες και για την ίδια την Τουρκία υποχρέωσε την κυβέρνηση Ερντογάν να «μαλακώσει» τη στάση της.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή ποια είναι η επίσημη θέση της;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-006009/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εγκύκλιος Ερντογάν και Κυπριακή Προεδρία της ΕΕ

Με αφορμή την έναρξη της Προεδρίας της ΕΕ, ο πρωθυπουργός της Τουρκίας έστειλε εγκύκλιο σε όλα τα υπουργεία, τις γενικές διευθύνσεις και όλα τα τμήματα της δημόσιας υπηρεσίας, ενημερώνοντας, με τον τρόπο αυτό τους υπουργούς και όλους τους αξιωματούχους ότι δεν θα συμμετάσχουν σε οποιαδήποτε ευρωπαϊκή σύνοδο ή συνεδρίαση ομάδας εργασίας των οποίων θα προεδρεύει η «νότια Κύπρος».

Δεδομένου ότι η Τουρκία έχει καθεστώς «υποψήφιας προς ένταξη χώρας» και ότι ακόμα βρίσκονται σε εξέλιξη οι διαπραγματεύσεις για την επίλυση του Κυπριακού, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Γιατί η ΕΕ δεν αντιδρά με συγκεκριμένες δράσεις και κυρώσεις;

Γιατί ανέχεται τέτοιες προσβλητικές ενέργειες από μια υποψήφια προς ένταξη χώρα;

Πώς δικαιολογείται η στάση αυτή της Τουρκίας, η οποία αμφισβητεί διαρκώς τους ευρωπαϊκούς θεσμούς, δομές και αξίες;

Αυτές οι απαράδεκτες τουρκικές τακτικές, δεν αποτελούν απτή απόδειξη ότι, με αυτά τα δεδομένα, η εν λόγω χώρα δεν έχει καμία θέση στην ΕΕ;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-006140/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE) και Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(21 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Η επίσημη πρακτική της Τουρκίας να μην αναγνωρίζει την Προεδρία του Συμβουλίου της ΕΕ και το πάγωμα των σχέσεών της με την ΕΕ κατά το προσεχές εξάμηνο

Στις 8 Ιουνίου η τουρκική εφημερίδα Σαμπάχ ([1]) δημοσίευσε δηλώσεις του Υπουργού Εξωτερικών και του Υπουργού Ευρωπαϊκών Υποθέσεων, στις οποίες μεταξύ άλλων αναφέρθηκε ότι «κανένα υπουργείο ούτε θεσμικό όργανο της Τουρκικής Δημοκρατίας δεν θα έρθει σε επαφή με την Προεδρία της ΕΕ σε οποιαδήποτε δραστηριότητα συνδέεται με την ελληνοκυπριακή Προεδρία». Αυτές οι δηλώσεις έγιναν σε κοινή συνέντευξη Τύπου στο πλαίσιο της τρίτης συνεδρίασης πολιτικού διαλόγου Τουρκίας-ΕΕ, στην οποία παρευρίσκονταν η Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος Εξωτερικών Υποθέσεων και Πολιτικής Ασφαλείας καθώς και ο αρμόδιος για τη διεύρυνση Επίτροπος.

([1]) http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognize-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency

Αυτές οι δηλώσεις ήρθαν να επιβεβαιώσουν την εγκύκλιο από το Γραφείο του Τούρκου Πρωθυπουργού προς όλους τους υπουργούς, τις διοικητικές υπηρεσίες και τους διπλωμάτες της κυβέρνησής του, η οποία επιτάσσει να μην παρευρεθούν σε καμία συνεδρίαση της ΕΕ όπου προεδρεύει ή/και παρευρίσκεται η Κυπριακή Προεδρία του Συμβουλίου της ΕΕ. Αυτή η εγκύκλιος επικρίθηκε από τον Κύπριο κυβερνητικό εκπρόσωπο ως προκλητική και προσβλητική για την ΕΕ και τα θεσμικά της όργανα.

Επιπλέον, κατά την 69η συνεδρίαση της Μικτής Κοινοβουλευτικής Επιτροπής (ΜΚΕ) ΕΕ-Τουρκίας, η οποία πραγματοποιήθηκε στις 13 Ιουνίου στο Στρασβούργο και όπου ήσαν παρόντες ο αρμόδιος για τη διεύρυνση Επίτροπος και ο Τούρκος Υπουργός Εξωτερικών, τόσο ο Τούρκος Υπουργός όσο και ο συμπροεδρεύων της ΜΚΕ, ο οποίος είναι μέλος της Τουρκικής Εθνοσυνέλευσης, απέφευγαν συστηματικά να απαντήσουν στις ερωτήσεις διαφόρων βουλευτών του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του αντιπροέδρου της ΜΚΕ, σχετικά με την πρόσκληση, παρουσία και επομένως την αναγνώριση εκπροσώπου της κυπριακής Προεδρίας της ΕΕ στην 70ή συνεδρίαση της ΜΚΕ.

1. Ποια είναι η απάντηση της Επιτροπής στις δημόσιες δηλώσεις των δύο υπουργών και στην εγκύκλιο από το Γραφείο του Τούρκου Πρωθυπουργού;

2. Σε ποια συγκεκριμένη ενέργεια έχει προβεί η Επιτροπή επ' αυτού; Έχει προβεί σε διάβημα προς την τουρκική κυβέρνηση; Αν ναι, πώς αντέδρασε η τουρκική κυβέρνηση;

3. Έχοντας υπόψη τις Συνθήκες, μπορούν η ΕΕ και τα θεσμικά της όργανα (συμπεριλαμβανομένων των επιτροπών και άλλων οργάνων) να δέχονται, άμεσα ή έμμεσα, σιωπηρά ή ρητά, τέτοια πρακτική (δηλαδή το αίτημα να μην είναι παρών εκπρόσωπος της εκ περιτροπής Προεδρίας του Συμβουλίου της ΕΕ σε επίσημες συνεδριάσεις της ΕΕ) εκ μέρους υποψήφιου για ένταξη κράτους ή οποιουδήποτε κράτους συμμετέχει στις διαδικασίες της ΕΕ;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(17 Ιουλίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει στη θέση που πήρε η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στην τελευταία συνεδρίαση του Συμβουλίου Σύνδεσης με την Τουρκία, η οποία πραγματοποιήθηκε στις 22 Ιουνίου 2012, όπου τονίστηκε ότι είναι καθοριστικής σημασίας η Τουρκία να δεσμευτεί και να συνεισφέρει με συγκεκριμένο τρόπο για μια συνολική επίλυση του κυπριακού προβλήματος. Υπενθυμίζοντας τα συμπεράσματα του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου της 9ης Δεκεμβρίου 2011, σχετικά με τις τουρκικές δηλώσεις και απειλές, η ΕΕ εξέφρασε σοβαρές ανησυχίες και ζήτησε τον πλήρη σεβασμό του ρόλου της Προεδρίας του Συμβουλίου, η οποία αποτελεί θεμελιώδες θεσμικό χαρακτηριστικό της ΕΕ, προβλεπόμενο στη Συνθήκη.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006140/12
à la Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE) et Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(21 juin 2012)

Objet: Turquie: refus de reconnaître officiellement la présidence du Conseil de l'UE et gel des relations avec l'UE durant le deuxième semestre

Le 8 juin 2012, le quotidien turc Sabah ([1]) a publié les déclarations des ministres turcs des affaires étrangères et des affaires européennes dans lesquelles ils déclarent, entre autres, que «[…] aucun ministère, aucune institution de la République turque ne sera en contact avec la présidence européenne dans quelque activité que ce soit où la présidence chypriote grecque serait partie prenante». Ces déclarations ont été faites au cours d'une conférence de presse commune organisée dans le cadre de la troisième réunion de dialogue politique au niveau ministériel entre la Turquie et l'UE, à laquelle participaient la Haute représentante de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité et le commissaire européen chargé de l'élargissement.

Les déclarations servaient à confirmer la teneur d'une circulaire envoyée par le bureau du Premier ministre turc à tous les ministères, services administratifs et diplomates du gouvernement turc leur donnant instruction de n'assister à aucune session présidée par la présidence chypriote de l'UE, ou à laquelle elle serait partie prenante. Le porte-parole du gouvernement chypriote a critiqué la circulaire, estimant qu'elle constitue une provocation et une insulte à l'égard de l'Union européenne et de ses institutions.

De plus, lors de la 69e réunion de la commission parlementaire mixte (CPM) Turquie-UE qui s'est tenue à Strasbourg le 13 juin 2012, à laquelle assistaient le commissaire à l'élargissement et le ministre turc des affaires européennes, tant le ministre turc que le coprésident de la CPM, lui-même député à l'Assemblée nationale turque, ont systématiquement fait l'impasse sur les questions posées par plusieurs députés du Parlement européen, y compris le vice-président de la CPM, concernant l'invitation, la présence et, partant, la reconnaissance d'un représentant de la présidence chypriote de l'UE à la 70e réunion de la CPM.

1. Comment la Commission réagit-elle face aux déclarations publiques des deux ministres et à la circulaire émise par le bureau du premier ministre turc?

2. Quelle mesure concrète la Commission a-t-elle prise à cet égard? A-t-elle fait une démarche auprès du gouvernement turc? Dans l'affirmative, quelle a été la réponse de la Turquie?

3. S'agissant des traités, l'UE et ses institutions (y compris ses comités et autres organes) peuvent-elles accepter, directement ou indirectement, implicitement ou explicitement, de telles pratiques (notamment, le fait de refuser la présence, aux réunions officielles de l'UE, d'un représentant de la présidence tournante du Conseil de l'Union européenne) de la part d'un pays candidat à l'adhésion ou de tout autre pays concerné par les procédures de l'Union?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-006223/12
à la Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(22 juin 2012)

Objet: Présidence chrypriote et Turquie

Le 1er juillet 2012, Chypre prend la présidence tournante de l'UE.

Cet État membre de l'Union européenne voit, depuis 38 ans, 40 % de son territoire occupé militairement, y compris une partie de sa capitale Nicosie, par une puissance étrangère, la Turquie.

Il est ainsi précisé aux termes du protocole no 10 du Traité d'adhésion à l'Union européenne de 2003 que toute l'île de Chypre est dans l'Union européenne, y compris la partie échappant effectivement au contrôle de la République de Chypre, où l'acquis communautaire est simplement suspendu.

De plus, la Turquie avec laquelle l'Union est en négociation d'adhésion, bénéficie de «copieuses» subventions de l'Union européenne.

([1]) http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognize-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency

1. Quelle sera l'attitude de la Commission européenne vis-à-vis de la Turquie durant la présidence chypriote?

2. La Commission saisira-t-elle l'opportunité de cette présidence pour demander le respect du droit international, et en cas d'échec, pour prendre la seule mesure qui s'impose, à savoir la suspension sine die des négociations?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission

(17 juillet 2012)

La Commission renvoie à la position exprimée par l'Union européenne lors du dernier Conseil d'association avec la Turquie, qui s'est tenu le 22 juin 2012, à l'occasion duquel elle a souligné qu'il était essentiel que la Turquie contribue et s'engage concrètement à une résolution globale de la question chypriote. Rappelant les conclusions du Conseil européen du 9 décembre 2011, s'agissant des déclarations et des menaces de la Turquie, l'UE s'est déclarée profondément préoccupée et invite à respecter scrupuleusement le rôle de la présidence du Conseil, qui est un élément institutionnel fondamental de l'UE prévu dans les traités.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-006140/12
alla Commissione
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE) e Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(21 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Il non riconoscimento ufficiale turco della Presidenza del Consiglio dell'UE e il congelamento delle relazioni con l'UE nel prossimo semestre

L'8 giugno 2012, il quotidiano turco Sabah ([1]) ha pubblicato le dichiarazioni dei ministri turchi degli Affari esteri e degli Affari europei in cui affermano, tra l'altro, che «nessun ministro della Repubblica turca né alcuna istituzione intratterranno rapporti con la Presidenza dell'UE in merito a qualsiasi attività connessa alla Presidenza greco-cipriota». Le dichiarazioni sono state rese nel corso di una conferenza stampa congiunta nel quadro della terza riunione ministeriale di dialogo politico tra la Turchia e l'UE, alla presenza dell'Alto Rappresentante per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza dell'UE e il Commissario responsabile per l'allargamento.

Le dichiarazioni erano finalizzate a confermare una circolare indirizzata dall'ufficio del primo ministro turco a tutti i ministeri, ai servizi amministrativi e agli organi diplomatici del suo governo con l'istruzione di non partecipare a nessuna riunione dell'UE presieduta e/o presenziata dalla presidenza cipriota del Consiglio dell'UE. La circolare è stata criticata dal portavoce del governo cipriota come provocatoria e ingiuriosa nei confronti dell'UE e delle sue istituzioni.

Inoltre, in occasione della 69ª riunione della commissione parlamentare mista (CPM) UE-Turchia, tenutasi a Strasburgo il 13 giugno 2012, dove erano presenti il Commissario per l'allargamento e il ministro turco per gli Affari europei, sia il ministro turco che il co-presidente della CPM, che è un deputato dell'Assemblea nazionale turca, hanno evitato sistematicamente di rispondere alle domande di diversi deputati del PE, anche del Vicepresidente della CPM, relative all'invito, alla presenza e dunque al riconoscimento in occasione della 70ª riunione del CPM di un rappresentante della Presidenza cipriota dell'UE.

1. Qual è la reazione della Commissione alle dichiarazioni pubbliche dei due ministri e alla circolare dell'ufficio del primo ministro turco?

2. Quali misure concrete ha preso la Commissione a questo riguardo? Ha avviato una protesta diplomatica nei confronti del governo turco? In caso affermativo, qual è la risposta turca?

3. Visti i trattati, possono l'UE e le sue istituzioni (compresi i comitati e gli altri organi) accettare, direttamente o indirettamente, tale pratica (ovvero la richiesta che un rappresentante della presidenza di turno del Consiglio dell'UE non sia presente nelle riunioni ufficiali dell'UE) da parte di un paese candidato o di qualsiasi Stato interessato dalle procedure dell'UE?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(17 luglio 2012)

La Commissione fa riferimento alla posizione espressa dall'Unione europea in occasione dell'ultima sessione del Consiglio di associazione con la Turchia, del 22 giugno 2012, in cui sottolineava l'importanza fondamentale dell'impegno e del contributo concreto della Turchia per una soluzione globale del problema di Cipro. Richiamandosi alle conclusioni del Consiglio europeo del 9 dicembre 2011, per quanto riguarda le dichiarazioni e le minacce della Turchia, l'Unione europea ha espresso grave preoccupazione e ha invitato a rispettare pienamente il ruolo della presidenza del Consiglio, che costituisce un elemento istituzionale fondamentale dell'Unione previsto dal trattato.

([1]) http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognize-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-006140/12
do Komisji
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE) oraz Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(21 czerwca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Oficjalne nieuznanie przez Turcję prezydencji Rady UE i zamrożenie stosunków z UE przez następny okres prezydencji

W dniu 8 czerwca 2012 r. turecki dziennik Sabah ([1]) opublikował oświadczenia tureckich ministrów spraw zagranicznych i spraw europejskich, w których oznajmili oni m.in., że „żadne ministerstwo ani żadna instytucja Republiki Tureckiej nie będzie utrzymywać kontaktów z prezydencją UE w czasie jej sprawowania przez grecką część Cypru". Oświadczenia wydano podczas wspólnej konferencji prasowej w ramach trzeciego spotkania w sprawie dialogu politycznego między Turcją i UE na szczeblu ministerialnym z udziałem wysokiej przedstawiciel UE do spraw zagranicznych i polityki bezpieczeństwa oraz komisarza ds. rozszerzenia.

Oświadczenia stanowiły potwierdzenie pisma obiegowego wysłanego przez gabinet tureckiego premiera do wszystkich ministerstw, jednostek administracyjnych i dyplomatów tureckiego rządu, w którym poinstruowano ich, by nie uczestniczyli w żadnym ze spotkań UE pod przewodnictwem lub z udziałem cypryjskiej prezydencji Rady UE. Pismo to skrytykował rzecznik rządu cypryjskiego, nazywając je prowokacyjnym i obelżywym dla UE i jej instytucji.

Ponadto w czasie 69. posiedzenia wspólnej komisji parlamentarnej UE-Turcja w Strasburgu w dniu 13 czerwca 2012 r. z udziałem komisarza ds. rozszerzenia oraz tureckiego ministra spraw zagranicznych zarówno turecki minister, jak i współprzewodniczący wspólnej komisji parlamentarnej, będący też członkiem tureckiego Zgromadzenia Narodowego, systematycznie unikali odpowiedzi na pytania szeregu posłów do PE, w tym Wiceprzewodniczącego wspólnej komisji parlamentarnej, dotyczące zaproszenia, obecności i tym samym uznania przedstawiciela cypryjskiej prezydencji Rady UE podczas 70. posiedzenia tej komisji.

1. Jaka jest reakcja Komisji na ww. publiczne oświadczenia dwóch ministrów i pismo obiegowe gabinetu tureckiego premiera?

2. Jakie konkretnie działania podjęła Komisja w związku z zaistniałą sytuacją? Czy Komisja wystosowała démarche do rządu tureckiego? A jeżeli tak, to jaka była odpowiedź strony tureckiej?

3. Mając na uwadze Traktaty, czy UE i jej instytucje (w tym komitety i inne organy) akceptują – bezpośrednio lub pośrednio, w sposób dorozumiany lub wprost – taką praktykę, tj. wniosek kraju kandydującego lub jakiegokolwiek innego państwa uczestniczącego w procedurach UE o to, by przedstawiciel rotacyjnej prezydencji Rady UE nie uczestniczył w oficjalnych spotkaniach na szczeblu unijnym?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Štefana Füleg w imieniu Komisji
(17 lipca 2012 r.)

Komisja odwołuje się do stanowiska Unii Europejskiej przedstawionego podczas ostatniego posiedzenia Rady Stowarzyszenia z Turcją, które odbyło się w dniu 22 czerwca 2012 r. Podczas posiedzenia podkreślono, że zaangażowanie Turcji i jej konkretny wkład w kompleksowe rozwiązanie kwestii Cypru ma zasadnicze znaczenie. Przywołując konkluzje Rady Europejskiej z dnia 9 grudnia 2011 r., odnoszące się do wydawanych przez Turcję oświadczeń oraz gróźb z jej strony, UE wyraziła poważne zaniepokojenie i wezwała do pełnego poszanowania urzędu prezydencji Rady, która jest podstawowym instytucjonalnym elementem UE, zapisanym w Traktacie.

([1]) http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognize-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005033/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Turkey's threats against Cyprus

Following on from its answer to Question E-003162/2012, will the Commission indicate what it intends to do if Turkey does not actively support 'ongoing negotiations aimed at a fair, comprehensive and viable settlement of the Cyprus problem within the UN framework, in accordance with the relevant UN Security Council resolutions and in line with the principles on which the Union is founded'?

Will the Commission further indicate whether it considers Turkey's present attitude with regard to Cyprus compatible with the goodwill required for this purpose?

Question for written answer E-005956/12
to the Commission
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(14 June 2012)

Subject: Turkey and the Cyprus Presidency

The Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs has stated that no Turkish ministry or institution will come in contact or participate in any activity involving the 'Greek-Cypriot Presidency' of the EU.

Following its fruitless attempts to blackmail the EU in a bid to limit the role and the position of the Republic of Cyprus in the EU, Ankara is now threatening to distance itself from any event or EU proceedings organised by the Cyprus Presidency of the Council of the EU commencing on 1 July.

The position of Turkey was expressed by its Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ahmet Davutoglu, during his regular meetings in Istanbul with Baroness Ashton, the EU foreign policy chief, and Mr S. Füle**,** the Commissioner responsible for EU enlargement.

Turkey initially threatened to suspend all relations with the EU if Cyprus assumed the EU presidency whilst the Cyprus issue remained unresolved. However Mr Erdogan's Government was then forced to back down, given that such an action would have severe consequences for Turkey itself.

What is the Commission's official position on this matter?

Question for written answer P-006009/12
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 June 2012)

Subject: Circular from Mr Erdogan and Cyprus Presidency of the Council of the EU

Regarding the new EU Council Presidency, the Prime Minister of Turkey has sent a circular to all ministries, directorates-general and public service departments instructing ministers and all officials not to attend any EU conferences or working parties chaired by 'south Cyprus'. Given Turkey's status as a 'candidate country' and the ongoing negotiations seeking to resolve the Cyprus issue:

1. Can the Commission indicate why the EU is failing to take measures action and impose sanctions specifically in response to the above?

2. Why is it tolerating such offensive actions on the part of a candidate country?

3. What justification can be given for the stance adopted by Turkey, which is constantly calling into Question European institutions, structures and values?

4. Do these inadmissible tactics on the part of Turkey not provide tangible evidence that, as things stand, it has no place within the EU?

Question for written answer E-006140/12
to the Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE), Barbara Matera (PPE), Renate Sommer (PPE), Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE) and Philippe Boulland (PPE)
(21 June 2012)

Subject: Official Turkish non-recognition of the Presidency of the EU Council and the freezing of relations with the EU during next semester

On 8 June 2012, the Turkish daily Sabah ([1]) published statements by the Turkish Ministers of Foreign Affairs and European Affairs in which they, *inter alia*, declared that 'none of the Turkish Republic's ministries or any institutions will be in contact with the EU Presidency in any of the activities related to the Greek Cypriot Presidency'. The statements were made during a joint press meeting in the framework of the Third Ministerial Turkey-EU Political Dialogue Meeting attended by the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and the Commissioner for Enlargement.

The statements served to confirm a circular note issued by the office of the Turkish Prime Minister to all ministries, administrative services and diplomats of his government instructing them not to attend any EU session chaired and/or attended by the Cypriot Presidency of the EU Council. The circular note was criticised by the spokesman of the Cypriot Government as provocative and insulting to the EU and its institutions.

Moreover, during the 69th Meeting of the Joint Parliamentary Committee (JPC) EU-Turkey in Strasbourg on 13 June 2012, where the Commissioner for Enlargement and the Turkish Minister of European Affairs were present, both the Turkish Minister and the co-chairman of the JPC, who is a member of the Turkish National Assembly, systematically avoided answering questions from several MEPs, including the Vice-Chairman of the JPC, concerning the invitation, presence and thus recognition of a representative of the Cyprus EU Presidency at the 70th meeting of the JPC.

1. What is the Commission's reaction to the public statements of the two ministers and to the circular note from the Turkish Prime Minister's office?

2. What concrete action has the Commission taken in this regard? Has it lodged a démarche with the Turkish Government? If so, what was the Turkish response?

3. Having regard to the treaties, can the EU and its institutions (including committees and other organs) accept, directly or indirectly, implicitly or explicitly, such a practice (i.e. the request that a representative of the rotating Presidency of the EU Council not be present in official EU meetings) by a candidate country or by any state involved in the EU procedures?

Question for written answer E-006223/12
to the Commission
Philippe de Villiers (EFD)
(22 June 2012)

Subject: Cypriot Presidency and Turkey

On 1 July 2012, it will be Cyprus' turn to assume the European Union's rotating presidency.

For the last 38 years, 40 % of this European Union Member State's territory — including part of its capital, Nicosia — has been under military occupation by a foreign power, Turkey.

Protocol No°10 of the 2003 Treaty of Accession to the European Union establishes that the whole of the island of Cyprus is in the European Union, including those areas in which the Republic of Cyprus does not exercise effective control, where the application of the Community *acquis* has simply been suspended.

Furthermore, Turkey, with which the European Union is currently conducting accession negotiations, receives copious subsidies from the Union.

1. What will be the Commission's attitude to Turkey during the Cypriot Presidency?

([1]) http://english.sabah.com.tr/National/2012/06/08/we-will-not-recognise-southern-cyprus-eu-term-presidency

2. Will the Commission take the opportunity offered by this Presidency to demand compliance with international law and, if it is unsuccessful, to respond in the only appropriate way, namely by suspending negotiations *sine die*?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2012)

The Commission refers to the position of the European Union at the latest Association Council with Turkey which took place on 22 June 2012, at which it underlined that Turkey's commitment and contribution in concrete terms to a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem is crucial. Recalling the European Council conclusions of 9 December 2011, with regard to Turkish statements and threats, the EU expressed serious concern and calls for full respect of the role of the Presidency of the Council, which is a fundamental institutional feature of the EU provided for in the Treaty.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005046/12
to the Commission
Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Free movement

How many Member States have exportable family allowances under Regulation (EC) No 988/2009?

How many EU citizens are living in another EU country?

Has the Commission assessed the impact of transitional restrictions on A8 ([1]) and A2 ([2]) countries on a country-by-country basis?

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

All Member States must export the family benefits granted under their national legislation if the claimant: is subject to the legislation of the Member State in question for social security purposes; is covered by Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 ([3]); and fulfils the national conditions for the award of the benefit.

According to Eurostat's population statistics, on 1 January 2011 the number of EU citizens living in another EU country was estimated at around 12.7 million.

In three separate reports ([4]) in 2005, 2008 and 2011, the Commission analysed the way the transitional arrangements function with regard to the free movement of workers. In addition, the Commission services published reports on employment in 2008 and 2011 ([5]) which contain in depth analyses on free movement of workers.

All these abovementioned documents contain country-specific information on the type of labour market access granted to the citizens of the Member States that acceded in 2004 and 2007. They also provide information on the number of such EU citizens living in receiving Member States and their labour market status. Furthermore, the Commission has funded an external analysis by the National Institute of Economic and Social Research which contains country-specific case studies. It is now publicly available ([6]) on the website of the Commission.

([1]) The Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia.
([2]) Bulgaria and Romania.
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems, OJ L 166, 30.4.2004, p. 1.
([4]) COM(2006) 48 final of 8 February 2006, COM(2008) 765 final of 18 November 2008 and COM(2011) 729 final of 11 November 2011 respectively.
([5]) Chapter 3 of the 2008 Employment in Europe report (http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=113&langId=en&newsId=415&furtherNews=yes) and Chapter 6 of the 2011 Employment and Social Developments in Europe review (http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=738&langId=en&pubId=6176).
([6]) 'Labour mobility within the EU — The impact of enlargement and the functioning of the transitional arrangements', 2011. Main study and country case-studies available at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1108&furtherNews=yes

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005070/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(16 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Evaluación del impacto ambiental en proyectos de fractura hidráulica

En el contexto de la Estrategia Energética de Euskadi 2020, el Gobierno de la Comunidad Autónoma del País Vasco está impulsando la exploración de recursos de gas de esquisto en dicha comunidad, en concreto en la provincia de Alava-Araba. En uno de los emplazamientos, denominado Enara-16, se realizarán trabajos de prospección de extracción de gas sin haberse realizado previamente una evaluación de impacto ambiental de la actividad. El Parlamento Vasco resolvió instar al Gobierno vasco a iniciar la evaluación de impacto ambiental sobre el plan para la explotación de hidrocarburos en el permiso de Gran Enara. Hasta la fecha, el Gobierno vasco ha hecho caso omiso de dicha resolución.

El emplazamiento Gran Enara es parte de una zona de 1 400 km^2 donde a 2 000 metros de profundidad, se calcula, se encuentran unas reservas de gas de esquisto de 184,5 bcm. Sobre esa zona se haya el acuífero de Subijana, situado a 400 metros de profundidad, de vital importancia para la zona. El evidente riesgo de contaminación puede, por tanto, afectar a este bien natural.

La Directiva 2001/42/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 27 de junio de 2001, relativa a la evaluación de los efectos de determinados planes y programas en el medio ambiente reconoce la necesidad de la elaboración de estudios de evaluación de impacto ambiental en casos donde la naturaleza se vea amenazada.

— ¿Piensa la Comisión que el Gobierno vasco ha actuado en consonancia con las políticas europeas de protección medioambiental al no iniciar la evaluación de impacto ambiental del permiso de prospección del gas no convencional Gran Enara?

— ¿Considera la Comisión que, dado que sobre el yacimiento de gas no convencional arriba señalado existe un importante acuífero, la realización de una evaluación de impacto ambiental debe ser obligatoria para cualquier actuación en dicho yacimiento, incluso las de prospección o exploración?

— Si es así, ¿sería en este caso de obligada ejecución la Directiva 2001/42/CE relativa a la evaluación de los efectos de determinados planes y programas en el medio ambiente?

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

De conformidad con la Directiva 2011/92/UE ([1]), también llamada Directiva de evaluación del impacto ambiental (EIA), los proyectos de perforación a gran profundidad se contemplan en el anexo II.2.d, lo que implica que están sujetos a un control por parte de las autoridades competentes a fin de determinar si es necesaria una EIA, con arreglo al artículo 4, apartados 2 a 4, y sobre la base de los criterios que figuran en el anexo III de la Directiva. La decisión de selección también debe tener en cuenta los principios de precaución y prevención. Teniendo en cuenta estos principios, los proyectos de hidrocarburos no convencionales, incluidos los de prospección y exploración, estarían sujetos a una EIA si no puede confirmarse, a la luz de una información objetiva, que no van a tener repercusiones ambientales importantes. También implica que, en caso de duda en cuanto a la falta de efectos significativos, debe efectuarse una EIA ([2]).

La Directiva 2001/42/CE ([3]) se refiere a la evaluación de los efectos de determinados planes y programas en el medio ambiente, no a proyectos concretos. Tal como se establece en el artículo 3, apartado 1, y apartado 2, letra a), de esta Directiva, debe llevarse a cabo una evaluación ambiental en relación con los planes y programas, incluidos los energéticos, que tengan probablemente efectos importantes en el medio ambiente.

La Comisión recabará más información de las autoridades españolas para responder a las preguntas concretas planteadas por Su Señoría.

([1]) Directiva 2011/92/UE relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente (DO L 26 de 28.1.2012, p. 1).

([2]) Se puede consultar una nota de orientación sobre la aplicación de la Directiva EIA a los proyectos relacionados con la exploración y explotación de hidrocarburos no convencionales en el página web de la DG ENV: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/pdf/Annexe%202.pdf.pdf

([3]) Directiva 2001/42/CE (llamada Directiva sobre la evaluación ambiental estratégica — Directiva EAE) relativa a la evaluación de los efectos de determinados planes y programas en el medio (DO L 197 de 21.7.2001, p. 30).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005070/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Environmental impact assessment in fracking projects

In the context of the Euskadi 2020 Energy Strategy, the Government of the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country is pushing for the exploration of shale gas resources, particularly in the province of Alava-Araba. In one of the sites, known as Enara-16, exploratory works for the extraction of gas will be carried out without first performing an environmental impact assessment of the project. The Basque Parliament agreed to urge the Basque Government to initiate an environmental impact assessment of the plan to extract hydrocarbons under the Gran Enara licence. To date, the Basque Government has ignored this resolution.

The Gran Enara site is part of a 1 400 km^2 site where 184.5 bcm reserves of shale gas are believed to lie at a depth of 2 000 m. The Subijana aquifer lies in the same area, at a depth of 400 metres, and is of vital importance to the region. This natural resource could therefore be affected by the obvious risk of pollution.

Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment recognises the need for environmental impact assessments in cases where there is a threat to nature.

— Does the Commission believe that the Basque Government has acted in accordance with European environmental protection policies by not initiating an environmental impact assessment of the Gran Enara non-conventional gas exploration licence?

— Does the Commission believe that, given that an important aquifer is located in the abovementioned non-conventional gas field, it should be obligatory to carry out an environmental impact assessment for any activity on that site, including prospecting and exploration?

— If that is the case, should it be obligatory to apply Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment?

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

As per Directive 2011/92/EU ([1]) also known as the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive, deep drilling projects are covered by Annex II.2.d, which implies that they are subject to a screening by the competent authorities to determine whether an EIA is required, in accordance with Article 4(2)-(4) and on the basis of the criteria listed in Annex III of the directive. The screening decision must also take into account the precautionary and prevention principles. In the light of these principles, unconventional hydrocarbon projects, including for prospection and exploration, would be subject to an EIA if it cannot be excluded, on the basis of objective information, that the projects will have significant environmental effects. It also implies that in case of doubts as to the absence of significant effects, an EIA must be carried out ([2]).

Directive 2001/42/EC ([3]) relates to the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, not to individual projects. As per Article 3(1) and 3(2)(a) of this directive, an environmental assessment must be carried out for plans and programmes including those prepared for energy which are likely to have significant environmental effects.

The Commission will collect further information from the Spanish authorities in order to reply to the specific questions raised by the Honourable Member.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 26/1, 28.1.2012.
([2]) Guidance note on the application of the EIA Directive to projects related to the exploration and exploitation of unconventional hydrocarbon. Available on DG ENV's website: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/pdf/Annexe%202.pdfpdf
([3]) Directive 2001/42/EC (known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment — SEA Directive) on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, OJ L 197/30, 21.7.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005075/12
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Safety of brass seacocks

Directive 94/25/EC (as amended) on recreational craft requires compliance with certain harmonised standards. One of these standards relates to metal through-hull fittings (ISO 9093-1) and allows for the installation of brass seacocks in vessels used for marine travel.

Brass undergoes a corrosion process known as dezincification in seawater, which is exacerbated by galvanic and electrolytic action from commonly used electronic equipment. As a result, brass fittings may corrode in less than the five years stipulated in ISO 9093-1. As these fittings are located under the waterline and penetrate the hull, corrosion of brass seacocks can lead to vessels leaking water.

A report by the UK's Marine Accident Investigation Branch (part of the Department for Transport) into a leak in the vessel Random Harvest, in 1999, found that a brass through-hull fitting had failed due to dezincification and electrolytic action. The report stated: 'The MAIB considers that brass is not a suitable material for use in through-hull fittings immersed in seawater because it can suffer rapid corrosion through dezincification which is probably exacerbated by overtightening. Although the prevalence of such failures appears very small, the consequences can be very serious. The use of brass underwater through-hull fittings creates an unacceptable and unnecessary risk which can be avoided at a very low additional cost.'

There are three main alternatives to conventional brass that do not corrode at such rapid rates: DZR brass, bronze and plastic (such as Marelon).

1. Is the Commission aware of the issue of brass corroding in seawater within the five years of service stipulated in ISO 9093-1?

2. Given the findings and recommendations of the MAIB, and that electrical equipment is becoming more common on boats, will the Commission take action with a view to changing ISO 9093-1 to ensure that brass is not used for underwater through-hull fittings in marine vessels? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(5 July 2012)

Until today the issue of safety of brass seacocks due to brass corroding in seawater had not been brought to the Commission's attention.

The Commission would like to clarify that the Recreational Craft Directive 94/25/EC ([1]) does require, as provided in Article 3, that all products covered shall comply with the essential safety requirements set out in Annex I, which include a specific requirement on structural integrity. Harmonised standards have a non-mandatory status and are just one possible method to comply with the essential requirements of the directive.

The advantage for a manufacturer of compliance with harmonised standards is that these give presumption of conformity with the essential requirements (Article 5 of the directive). It is therefore important that the harmonised standards fully meet the essential requirements, which are ensured by a wide consultation process. Before the standard is adopted all Member States' competent authorities must comment and a specific assessment is carried out by the CEN consultant on the compatibility with the essential requirements.

Article 6 of the Recreational Craft Directive provides a safeguard mechanism which allows for measures to be taken to address possible failures in harmonised standards.

In light of the issues brought to the Commission's attention, the Commission has now started to investigate whether the risk resulting from the installation of brass seacocks in the hull below the waterline presents an unacceptable risk as reported by the United Kingdom Marine Accident Investigation Branch. Depending on the outcome of this investigation, it will take the necessary steps to remedy possible shortcomings in the relevant standard.

([1]) Directive 94/25/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 June 1994 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to recreational craft OJ L 164, 30.6.1994.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005082/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(16 May 2012)

Subject: Auditing and accountability of pre-accession funding for Macedonia

Will the Commission outline the auditing and accountability measures that are applied to ensure proper and appropriate use of monies made available as pre-accession funding for Macedonia?

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

The auditing and accountability measures for all countries benefiting from the Instrument of Pre-accession Assistance (IPA) are defined in the IPA Implementing Regulation (Com. Reg. 718/2007 ([1]). Each National Authorising Officer (NAO) makes an annual management declaration on the effective functioning of the management and control systems.

Furthermore, an independent Audit Authority in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia is responsible for verifying the effective and sound functioning of the management and control systems under decentralised management as well as for the reliability of the accounting information provided. An audit opinion is issued on the annual management declaration prepared by the NAO. The audit authority carries out every year an examination of procedures and operations according to international audit standards; in particular, it verifies a sample of tendering and disbursement activities.

The IPA programmes are also subject to monitoring and supervision by the Commission, including on-the-spot-checks by EU Delegation during project implementation. The Commission also carries out financial audits related to the management of the funds and functioning of the system at the different stages of project implementation. Any major finding detected by the auditors is systematically followed up.

In addition, the Commission and the beneficiary meet twice a year to assess the implementation of projects in the IPA Monitoring Committee.

([1]) Commission Regulation (EC) No 718/2007 of 12 June 2007 implementing Council Regulation (EC) No 1085/2006 establishing an instrument for pre-accession assistance (IPA) — OJ L 170, 29.6.2007.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005110/12
à la Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(21 mai 2012)

Objet: Prévention et lutte contre les risques d'inondation

Au cours des dernières décennies, l'Europe a connu de graves inondations aux conséquences dramatiques, avec de graves répercussions sur l'économie des pays mais, surtout, des pertes humaines. Les autorités nationales et européennes ont pris la responsabilité de conduire une politique d'action ainsi que de prévention et de gestion des risques. Cette action est menée sur un double plan, local et national. Une directive européenne relative à l'évaluation et à la gestion des risques d'inondation a été promulguée en 2007, avec la mise en place d'un réexamen des plans d'évaluation et de gestion tous les six ans.

1. Le texte de la directive fait appel au principe de solidarité en matière de gestion du risque. De quelle manière la Commission envisage-t-elle de répartir efficacement la gestion des risques d'inondation sur un même bassin hydraulique lorsqu'il s'étend sur plusieurs Étatsmembres?

2. La Commission peut-elle indiquer quels seront les rôles précis des collectivités territoriales dans l'évaluation des zones à risques?

3. Enfin, la prévention passe également par l'information du public. S'agit-il d'une mission de l'Union européenne? Le cas échéant, dans quel délai sera-t-elle envisagée et de quelle manière?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(16 juillet 2012)

La directive sur les inondations ([1]) impose aux États membres d'établir un plan de gestion unique des risques d'inondation par district hydrographique ou un ensemble de plans de gestion coordonnés pour les districts hydrographiques communs à plusieurs États membres. Ces plans devraient permettre aux États membres d'adopter une approche cohérente de la gestion des risques d'inondation à l'échelon des districts hydrographiques. La Commission déterminera si ces exigences sont respectées lors de l'évaluation des plans de gestion des risques, qui lui seront soumis avant la fin de 2015. Les États membres collaborent actuellement à l'application de la directive dans le contexte du groupe de travail «Directive Inondations» créé en vertu de la stratégie commune de mise en œuvre de la directive 2000/60/CE ([2]) établissant un cadre pour une politique communautaire dans le domaine de l'eau.

Il appartient aux États membres d'élaborer des dispositions administratives pour se conformer à la directive «Inondations». Certains ont choisi de laisser directement l'initiative aux collectivités locales tandis que d'autres ont préféré consulter ces collectivités dans le cadre des groupes d'intervenants ou parties concernées qui seront associés à l'élaboration des plans de gestion.

La sensibilisation du public au risque d'inondation représente une composante fondamentale de la capacité à faire face à ces situations et, par conséquent, de la gestion efficace de ce risque. Il incombe principalement aux États membres de mener des actions de sensibilisation, mais la Commission, par l'intermédiaire de l'instrument financier pour la protection civile, finance plusieurs exercices de protection civile à l'échelle de l'UE, dont plusieurs comprenant un scénario d'inondations. Ces exercices contribuent non seulement à améliorer l'état de préparation des États membres, mais également à sensibiliser les collectivités locales concernées et le public.

Un récent atelier du groupe de travail «Directive Inondations» consacré à la «participation des intervenants à la gestion du risque d'inondations» a abordé tous les aspects de la participation des parties intéressées à ce processus.

([1]) JO L 288 du 6.11.2007.
([2]) JO L 327 du 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005110/12
to the Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(21 May 2012)

Subject: Flood prevention and control

In recent decades, Europe has experienced severe floods, with catastrophic consequences. This has had significant implications for the economies of the countries affected and, most importantly, led to the loss of human lives. National and European authorities have begun implementing a policy to prevent and manage future risks, at both local and national level. With the introduction in 2007 of an EU Directive on the assessment and management of flood risks (Directive 2007/60/EC), it was decided that a review of the assessment and management plans would be conducted every six years.

1. The text of the directive calls for the principle of solidarity to be applied to risk management. How does the Commission aim to share the management of flood risks effectively among Member States sharing the same river basin?

2. Can the Commission outline the exact role of local authorities in assessing the areas at risk?

3. Flood prevention also depends on awareness-raising among the public. Is this the responsibility of the European Union? If so, when will this be carried out and what methods will be used?

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

Member States are required by the Floods Directive ([1]) to produce one single flood risk management plan in a river basin or a set of coordinated plans in districts shared between several Member States. This should allow Member States to take a consistent approach in the management of flood risks at river basin level. The Commission will assess compliance with these requirements when assessing the risk management plans to be delivered by the end of 2015. Currently Member States cooperate in the implementation of the directive in the Floods Directive working group established under the Common Implementation Strategy for Directive 2000/60/EC ([2]) establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy.

It is up to Member States to develop administrative arrangements for the Floods Directive. Some have chosen to attribute a proactive role to local authorities directly while others have chosen to consult local authorities as part of the interested parties/stakeholders groups to be involved in the preparation of the plans.

Flood risk awareness in the public is a key component of preparedness, and therefore of effective flood risk management. The responsibility for awareness raising lies mainly with the Member States, but the Commission, through the Civil Protection Financial Instrument, funds several EU civil protection exercises, including exercises with a scenario on floods, contributing this way not only to enhanced preparedness among the MS but also to awareness raising within the involved local authorities and the public.

A recent Floods Directive working group workshop on 'Stakeholder involvement in flood risk management' addressed all different aspects of involvement of interested parties in the process.

([1]) OJ L 288, 6.11.2007.
([2]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005124/12
to the Commission
Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)
(21 May 2012)

Subject: Funding for research into sport

Can the Commission state what levels of financial support it has provided to date under FP7 to support research into the policy area of sport and can it give some specific examples of the types of projects that have been supported in this regard?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2012)

Research into sport policies is financed principally under the Specific Programme 'Cooperation' of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013).

The FP7 Health Programme addresses research on physical activity and sports in relation with disease prevention and development. So far, six projects are supported for an overall contribution of EUR 23 million. One example is the DALII project ([1]) aiming at establishing the role of physical activity as a preventive measure against gestational diabetes development. Another example is PAPA ([2]) aiming at enhancing young peoples' health and well-being, via positive experiences in youth sport, involving collaboration between leading researchers and sporting leaders in the UK, Norway, Spain, France and Greece.

Within the topic 'The Anthropology of European Integration', the Socioeconomic Sciences and Humanities Programme provides EUR 2.4 million to the project FREE ('Football Research in an Enlarged Europe' ([3])). FREE seeks to understand the impact of football on identity dynamics, perception patterns and cultural change in Europe by investigating the history and impact of European competitions, football as transnational media event, gender, football, and trans/national identities as well as transformed governance structures and stakeholder empowerment.

In addition, the FP7 Specific Programme 'People' has awarded EUR 0.2 million to SPORT-BOUND ('Sport across international boundaries: building knowledge through shared understanding'). From 2012 to 2015, three universities from the UK, France and China will exchange research staff working on law in the sport sector.

([1]) www.dali-project.eu.
([2]) www.project.papa.org.
([3]) www.free-project.eu/Pages/Welcome.aspx.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005125/12
to the Commission
Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)
(21 May 2012)

Subject: Interest rate charged to Ireland under the EU-IMF programme

In November 2010, Ireland received EUR 67.5 billion in external financial support through the EU-IMF programme, in order to return its economy to sustainable growth and ensure a properly functioning banking system within the country.

The EU-IMF funding was provided through the European Financial Stability Fund, the European Financial Stability Mechanism and the International Monetary Fund, and via bilateral loans from the UK, Sweden and Denmark.

In July 2011, the European Council agreed to extend the length of time that Ireland was given to repay these loans and to lower the interest rate on them. Furthermore, in September 2011 the Commission adopted two proposals that would further reduce the interest rate margins and extend the maturities for loans granted to Ireland by the European Financial Stabilisation Mechanism.

Can the Commission state the current rate of interest being charged on each of these loans? Can it also state the original interest rate charged on each of the loans?

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

The heads of State or Government of the Euro area decided on 21 July 2011 to lower the interest rates and extend the maturities for EFSF loans to programme countries. Consequently, the European Commission (EFSM) and the UK also decided to apply lower interest rates for their loans. Denmark and Sweden had by then not agreed on the terms of their loans as their lending started only in 2012.

Prior to the decision of July 2011 margins were charged in addition to the interest costs. By eliminating these margins, the interest charged on the loans has been reduced by 2.925 % for the EFSM, 2.47 % for the EFSF and 2.29 % for UK loans.

Loans from the EFSM and EFSF are now provided at the cost of funding without any margin added. Loans from the EFSM to Ireland currently carry an average interest rate of 3.1 %, EFSF loans an average interest rate of 2.5 %. The interest rate on loans from the UK is the Sterling 7.5 year mid-swap rate, which stood at 1.8 % on 24 May 2012. Loans from Denmark and Sweden carry an interest rate equivalent to the 3 month Euribor plus 100 basis points, which equalled 1.7 % on 24 May 2012. The bilateral loans from the UK, Denmark and Sweden carry lower interest rates than EFSM/EFSF funding because they have shorter maturities.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005126/12
alla Commissione
Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE) e Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(21 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Licenziamento di dipendenti del Gruppo Safilo

Il Gruppo Safilo, secondo produttore mondiale di occhiali per giro d'affari e leader a livello globale nel segmento degli occhiali dell'alto di gamma, ha recentemente deciso di iniziare un piano di ristrutturazione aziendale nella regione Veneto, che porterebbe al licenziamento di 1 000 dipendenti, colpendo duramente l'economia locale.

Si tratta dell'ennesimo esempio di azienda europea che è costretta ad adottare misure come i licenziamenti o la delocalizzazione dei propri stabilimenti produttivi per fronteggiare la crisi economica.

Alla luce di quanto sta accadendo non solo in Veneto ma in molte regioni europee, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Quali strumenti ha a disposizione per aiutare le aziende europee che rischiano di dover adottare simili provvedimenti per far fronte alle attuali difficoltà economiche?

2. Qual è la sua strategia per affrontare simili emergenze che hanno pesanti ricadute economiche e sociali?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005243/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(23 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Esubero di mille lavoratori della Safilo Group S.p.A.

Lo scorso 11 maggio 2012, la Safilo S.p.A., azienda leader mondiale nella produzione di occhiali, ha annunciato il suo nuovo piano industriale, individuando circa 1000 esuberi fra i dipendenti degli stabilimenti italiani di Padova, Santa Maria di Sala in provincia di Venezia, Longarone in provincia di Belluno e Martignacco in provincia di Udine. La decisione è stata presa dai vertici aziendali anche a seguito del mancato rinnovo della licenza di uno dei marchi principali per cui Safilo produceva e che rappresentava da solo il 20 % del fatturato. In molte delle zone dove hanno sede tali aziende il tessuto sociale si regge sull'industria dell'occhiale e sull'indotto che essa crea, venendo meno i quali si determina una situazione di disagio economico che in alcuni casi è già drammatica.

— La Commissione è a conoscenza di queste circostanze?

— Ritiene possibile ipotizzare l'attivazione del FEG a favore dei 1000 lavoratori coinvolti nella vicenda?

— Quali strumenti intende proporre per la tutela concreta e immediata dei cittadini europei che si trovano, oggi, ad operare in un contesto di profonda crisi anche per le aree tradizionalmente economicamente più floride, mettendo a rischio occupazione e crescita?

— La Commissione intende promuovere una direttiva che, partendo dalla tutela della libera iniziativa, metta in evidenza i rischi della delocalizzazione, sottoponendola a un regime di controllo uniforme in tutti gli Stati membri, perché potenzialmente dannosa per il territorio ed i lavoratori?

— Ha pensato all'istituzione di un fondo di emergenza per sostenere le vittime della delocalizzazione?

Risposta congiunta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(16 luglio 2012)

La Commissione non era a conoscenza dei licenziamenti menzionati. Appare improbabile, tuttavia, che il Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) possa fornire assistenza ai lavoratori licenziati poiché essi non risulterebbero essere stati messi in esubero per motivi legati a modifiche strutturali importanti nel commercio mondiale, come è prescritto dal regolamento FEG ([1]).

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1927/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 20 dicembre 2006, che istituisce un Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione, GU L 406 del 30.12.2006, pag. 1.

I lavoratori licenziati potrebbero ricevere un sostegno dal Fondo sociale europeo in funzione del programma operativo Regione Veneto (2007-13), volto a fornire ai lavoratori un'assistenza alla formazione per consentire loro di riqualificarsi e di adattare le loro abilità professionali in modo da poter mantenere i loro posti di lavoro o trovarne di nuovi.

Nella sua risposta all'interrogazione E-4567/2012 ([2]) la Commissione ha insistito sulla necessità di gestire in modo proattivo le operazioni di ristrutturazione e di prepararle in anticipo. Al momento attuale essa non contempla l'ipotesi di istituire un nuovo fondo, come suggerito, o di proporre un nuovo strumento legislativo a tutela dei posti di lavoro. La normativa dell'UE ([3]) ([4]) prevede attualmente l'informazione e la consultazione dei rappresentanti dei lavoratori prima di licenziamenti collettivi nonché la consultazione dei lavoratori sulle modalità per evitare o ridurre il numero di licenziamenti, oltre a prevedere l'adozione di misure sociali d'accompagnamento.

Il Pacchetto Occupazione della Commissione ([5]) identifica un certo numero di misure strategiche volte ad aiutare i mercati del lavoro ad adeguarsi e a rendere le transizioni sul mercato del lavoro più sicure per i lavoratori interessati dai cambiamenti strutturali.

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

([3]) Direttiva 2002/14/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, dell'11 marzo 2002, che istituisce un quadro generale relativo all'informazione e alla consultazione dei lavoratori , GU L 80 del 23.3.2002, pag. 29.

([4]) Direttiva 98/59/CE del Consiglio, del 20 luglio 1998, concernente il ravvicinamento delle legislazioni degli Stati membri in materia di licenziamenti collettivi, GU L 225 del 12.8.1998, pag. 16.

([5]) 'Verso un ripresa fonte di occupazione' (COM(2012)173 def. del 18 aprile 2012).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005126/12
to the Commission
Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), Gabriele Albertini (PPE), Clemente Mastella (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Carlo Fidanza (PPE), Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE) and Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(21 May 2012)

Subject: Dismissal of employees at the Safilo Group

The Safilo Group, the world's second biggest manufacturer of sunglasses by turnover and a world leader in the high-end sunglasses sector, has recently decided to begin a corporate restructuring plan in the Veneto region, which will lead to 1 000 employees being laid off and will badly affect the local economy.

This is the latest example of a European company being forced to adopt measures such as dismissals or the relocation of production facilities to deal with the economic crisis.

In view of what is happening not only in the Veneto region but in many regions of Europe, can the Commission say:

1. what instruments it has at its disposal to help European companies that risk having to adopt similar measures to deal with current financial difficulties;

2. what strategy it is pursuing to deal with similar emergencies, which are having serious economic and social repercussions?

Question for written answer E-005243/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(23 May 2012)

Subject: Redundancy of a thousand employees of Safilo Group Spa

On 11 May 2012, Safilo Spa, a world leader in eyewear production, announced its new business plan, identifying around 1 000 redundancies among the employees at its Italian plants in Padua, Santa Maria di Sala in the province of Venice, Longarone in the province of Belluno and Martignacco in the province of Udine. The decision was taken by senior management following the non-renewal of the licence for one of the leading brands for which Safilo had previously produced and which alone accounted for 20 % of its turnover. In many of the areas where these businesses are based, the social fabric relies on the eyewear industry and the satellite industries it creates, and their disappearance is producing economic hardship that is, in some cases, already dramatic.

— Is the Commission aware of these circumstances?

— Would it be possible to mobilise the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund in favour of the 1 000 workers affected?

— What instruments will it propose to provide effective and immediate protection for EU citizens who now find themselves, even in the traditionally most prosperous areas, working in the context of a profound crisis that is threatening employment and growth?

— Does the Commission intend to promote a directive which, based on the premise of protecting free enterprise, highlights the risks of relocation, subjecting it to a uniform system of controls in all Member States, given the potential danger this poses to local communities and workers?

— Has it considered setting up an emergency fund to support the victims of relocation?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(16 July 2012)

The Commission was not aware of the redundancies referred to. It seems unlikely, however, that the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) could provide assistance to the redundant workers as they do not appear to have been laid off for reasons relating to changes in world trade patterns, as required by the EGF Regulation ([1]).

The workers laid off could be supported by the European Social Fund through the Veneto Region operational programme (2007-2013), which aims to provide workers with training assistance to enable them to requalify and adapt their vocational skills so they can keep their jobs or find new ones.

In its answer to Question E-4567/2012 ([2]) the Commission insisted on the need to anticipate restructuring operations and to prepare them in advance. It is not considering setting up a new fund at this stage, as is suggested, or proposing any new legislation to protect jobs. EC law ([3]) ([4]) currently provides for workers' representatives to be informed and consulted before collective redundancies take place and for workers to be consulted on ways of avoiding, or reducing the number of, redundancies and on the adoption of accompanying social measures.

The Commission's Employment Package ([5]) identifies a number of policy measures to help labour markets adjust and to render labour market transitions more secure for workers affected by structural change.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on establishing the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund, OJ L 406, 30.12.2006, p. 1.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp
([3]) Directive 2002/14/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2002 establishing a general framework for informing and consulting employees in the European Community, OJ L 80, 23.3.2002, p. 29.
([4]) Council Directive 98/59/EC of 20 July 1998 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies, OJ L 225, 12.8.1998, p. 16.
([5]) 'Towards a job-rich recovery' (COM(2012) 173 final of 18 April 2012).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005135/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(21 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Montagnard vietnamiti arrestati per attività «contro lo Stato»

Il 9 maggio l'agenzia di stampa AFP ha riferito che, nella regione degli Altipiani centrali del Vietnam, tre cristiani appartenenti alle tribù etniche di Ede e Gia Rai sono stati arrestati per attività «contro lo Stato» con l'accusa di «minare l'unità politica nazionale» nella provincia centrale di Gia Lai. Secondo il governo vietnamita, i tre uomini sarebbero membri del Fronte unito per la liberazione delle razze oppresse (FULRO), un'organizzazione fondata negli anni '50 con l'obiettivo di creare uno Stato indipendente per le tribù delle minoranze etniche nella regione degli Altipiani centrali. L'organizzazione, che ha sostenuto gli Stati Uniti durante la guerra del Vietnam, si sciolse nei primi anni '90. I tre uomini sono stati inoltre accusati di avere legami con il fondatore del FULRO, attualmente in esilio negli Stati Uniti.

Circa 2 000 cristiani appartenenti a tribù minoritarie sono fuggiti in Cambogia a seguito delle misure adottate dal governo vietnamita per reprimere le loro proteste. I Montagnard hanno protestato ripetutamente contro la confisca delle loro terre e la persecuzione religiosa che subiscono. La pratica religiosa in Vietnam è sottoposta a un rigido controllo da parte dello Stato.

1. È disposto il Vicepresidente/Alto rappresentante a chiedere alle autorità vietnamite di fornire informazioni sul caso delle persone di cui sopra, recentemente arrestate per il loro presunto coinvolgimento con il FULRO?

2. È il disposto Vicepresidente/Alto rappresentante a porre la questione della libertà religiosa e dei diritti delle minoranze etniche come tema prioritario all'ordine del giorno del prossimo dialogo UE-Vietnam sui diritti umani?

3. Con riferimento ai precedenti inviti rivolti dall'UE alle autorità vietnamite ad affrontare il tema della discriminazione nei confronti dei Montagnard, vi sono segnali che il governo stia lavorando per migliorare la situazione di questo e di altri gruppi religiosi?

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

L'AR/VP è a conoscenza degli arresti avvenuti l'8 maggio 2012 nella regione degli altipiani centrali del Vietnam (distretto di Mang Yang, provincia di Gia Lai). Risulta che siano state arrestate più di 60 persone, ma soltanto le tre personalità principali, ossia Runh, Byuk e John, sono state perseguite a termini di legge con l'accusa di «minare l'unità politica nazionale» violando l'articolo 87 del codice penale. La delegazione UE ad Hanoi ha espresso la propria preoccupazione in merito.

Nel corso dell'ultima sessione del dialogo UE-Vietnam sui diritti umani, tenutasi nel gennaio 2012 ad Hanoi, l'UE ha espresso le proprie preoccupazioni in merito a episodi di violenza contro i cristiani appartenenti a minoranze etniche, nonché a ritardi ed ostacoli nella registrazione di alcune congregazioni. In particolare, l'UE si è dimostrata fortemente preoccupata circa la possibilità di detenzione, processo e condanna di persone che tentano di esercitare i propri diritti alla libertà di espressione o di religione, tutelati dal Patto internazionale relativo ai diritti civili e politici (ICCPR), al quale il Vietnam ha aderito.

Pur avendo compiuto, con il sostegno dell'UE, apprezzabili progressi nell'adeguamento della propria legislazione alle norme internazionali in questo ambito, il governo del Vietnam ha riconosciuto l'attuazione diseguale del quadro giuridico nazionale sulla libertà di religione e di credo a livello locale. Il governo del paese ha segnalato di aver intensificato gli sforzi volti a migliorare la conoscenza di tale legislazione da parte delle autorità locali e ha inoltre compiuto notevoli progressi verso la normalizzazione delle sue relazioni con il Vaticano. L'UE ha incoraggiato il Vietnam ad invitare il relatore speciale delle Nazioni Unite sulla libertà di religione e di credo, in quanto la sua visita si tradurrebbe in raccomandazioni che aiuterebbero il paese a compiere ulteriori progressi in questo ambito.

Tali questioni rimarranno prioritarie nell'ordine del giorno della prossima sessione del dialogo UE-Vietnam sui diritti umani.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005135/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(21 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Vietnamese Montagnards arrested for 'anti-state' activities

On 9 May, the AFP news agency reported that in Vietnam's Central Highlands, three Christians belonging to the ethnic Ede and Gia Rai tribes were arrested for 'anti-state activity', accused of 'undermining national political unity' in central Gia Lai province. According to the Vietnamese government, the men are members of the United Front for the Liberation of Oppressed Races (FULRO), an organisation founded in the 1950s with the aim of creating an independent state for ethnic minority tribes in the Central Highlands. The organisation, which supported the United States during the Vietnam War, disbanded in the early 1990s. The men were also accused of being linked to the founder of FULRO, who is now living in exile in the United States.

Roughly 2 000 Christian minority-tribe members went to Cambodia after the Vietnamese government took measures to crush their protests. The Montagnards have regularly protested against the confiscation of their land and the religious persecution they suffer. Religious practice in Vietnam is strictly under state control.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to ask the Vietnamese authorities to provide information on the case of the individuals, mentioned above, who recently were arrested for their alleged involvement with FULRO?

2. Is the VP/HR prepared to put the issue of religious freedom and ethnic minority rights as a priority subject on the agenda for the next EU-Vietnam human rights dialogue?

3. In reference to previous calls by the EU for the Vietnamese authorities to address the subject of discrimination against the Montagnards, are there any signs that the government is working to improve conditions for this and for other religious groups?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the arrests which took place on 8 May 2012 in the Central Highlands of Vietnam (Mang Yang District, Gia Lai province). Apparently more than 60 people were arrested but only the three leading figures were officially prosecuted (namely Runh, Byuk and Jonh) for violating Article 87 of the Criminal Code on 'undermining national unity policies'. The EU Delegation in Hanoi has expressed concern about these cases.

During the last EU-Vietnam human rights dialogue which took place in January 2012 in Hanoi, the EU raised its concern about reports of violence against Christians belonging to ethnic minorities as well as delays and obstacles in the registration of some congregations. The EU notably expressed its strong concern that people could be detained, prosecuted or sentenced for trying to exercise their rights to freedom of expression or freedom of religion as guaranteed under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), to which Vietnam is a party.

Although it has taken welcome steps, with EU support, to bring its legislation in line with international standards in that field, the Government of Vietnam has acknowledged the uneven implementation of the national legal framework on Freedom of Religion and Belief at local level. It has indicated that it has intensified efforts aimed at improving awareness of such legislation among local authorities. The Government has also made significant progress to normalise relations with the Vatican. The EU has encouraged Vietnam to invite the UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief. Such a visit would generate recommendations that would help Vietnam to improve its record in that field.

These issues will remain a priority on the agenda of the next round of the EU-Vietnam human rights dialogue.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005141/12
à la Commission
Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE)
(21 mai 2012)

Objet: Mise en œuvre de la législation européenne sur le site du Delta du Danube, classé «Natura 2000», en Roumanie

La commission des pétitions s'est récemment rendue en Roumanie pour prendre connaissance des préoccupations d'un certain nombre de pétitionnaires quant à des cas de non-respect de la législation européenne en matière de conservation de la nature, causant de graves dégâts au site du Delta du Danube, classé Natura 2000, qui devrait être protégé en vertu de la législation européenne. Par exemple, le projet d'aménagement de la plage de Sulina, situé dans le Delta du Danube (SPA/SCI) mais concernant lequel aucune évaluation appropriée n'a été menée en vertu de la directive «Habitats», cause de graves dommages aux habitats qui devraient être protégés.

— La Commission pourrait-elle indiquer quelles mesures sont prises pour éviter de causer de nouveaux dommages à Sulina et au Delta dans son ensemble et remédier aux dommages causés à ce jour? Pourrait-elle également indiquer quelle réponse elle a reçue à l'avis motivé transmis en janvier 2011 concernant Sulina?

— Pourquoi la Commission n'a-t-elle pas encore demandé aux autorités roumaines de mettre un terme à tout nouvel investissement dans la région concernée tant qu'aucune évaluation des impacts environnementaux des projets existants et prévus sur les habitats et espèces du Delta du Danube n'a été menée?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(2 juillet 2012)

L'enquête de la Commission sur cette affaire est en cours. À la suite des informations envoyées par la Roumanie en 2011, des précisions supplémentaires sont nécessaires concernant la procédure applicable et les renseignements fournis par la Roumanie — en particulier la version définitive de l'étude d'incidences et les conséquences négatives de l'aménagement prévu sur les habitats concernés. La Commission a adressé un avis motivé complémentaire à la Roumanie le 31 mai 2012 ([1]). L'État membre dispose d'un délai de deux mois pour y répondre. La Commission évaluera les informations supplémentaires que la Roumanie fournira dans le but de vérifier la compatibilité de ce projet avec les sites protégés Natura 2000 et prendra, au besoin, toutes les mesures qui s'imposent.

La Commission n'est actuellement pas au fait d'autres cas de projets de développement susceptibles d'avoir d'importantes incidences négatives sur les sites Natura 2000 dans le delta du Danube. La législation de l'UE relative à la protection de la nature n'interdit pas les activités à caractère économique sur les sites désignés dans le cadre des directives «Habitats» (92/443/CEE ([2])) et «Oiseaux» (2009/147/CE ([3])). La Roumanie est tenue de soumettre à une évaluation appropriée tous les projets de développement susceptibles d'avoir un effet substantiel sur les sites Natura 2000. Il incombe aux autorités compétentes de Roumanie de s'assurer de la conformité de ces évaluations. La Commission examinera tout manquement supposé à la législation de l'UE dans le domaine de l'environnement porté à sa connaissance.

([1]) Le communiqué de presse: http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/539&format=HTML&aged=0&language=FR&guiLanguage=fr
([2]) JO L 206 du 22.7.1992, p. 1.
([3]) JO L 20 du 26.1.2010, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005141/12
to the Commission
Sandrine Bélier (Verts/ALE)
(21 May 2012)

Subject: Implementation of EU legislation at the Danube Delta Natura 2000 site in Romania

The Committee on Petitions recently visited Romania to hear the concerns of a number of petitioners over breaches of EU nature conservation legislation resulting in serious damage to the Danube Delta Natura 2000 site, which should be protected under EU legislation. For example, the Sulina beach development project, which is located within the Danube Delta SPA/SCI but for which no appropriate assessment has been carried out under the Habitats Directive, is causing serious damage to habitats that should be protected.

— Can the Commission advise what steps are being taken to prevent further damage to Sulina and to the Delta as a whole, and to reverse the damage that has so far occurred? Can it also state what response it has received to the Reasoned Opinion it sent in January 2011 regarding Sulina?

— Why has the Commission not yet required the Romanian authorities to halt all further investment in the area until proper assessments of the environmental impact of existing and planned projects on the habitats and species present in the Danube Delta have been completed?

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

The Commission's investigation of this case is ongoing. Following the information sent by Romania in 2011, further clarifications are needed regarding the applicable procedure as well as information Romania submitted — in particular the final version of their impact study and the negative impact of the development on the relevant habitats. The Commission has addressed Romania an additional reasoned opinion on 31 May 2012 ([1]). Romania has been given two months to reply. The Commission will assess all additional information to be provided by Romania with a view to clarifying the compatibility of this project with the protected Natura 2000 sites and will take any appropriate step as necessary.

The Commission is currently not aware of other cases of development projects that may have significant negative effects on Natura 2000 in the Danube Delta. EU Nature legislation does not ban economic activities on sites designated under the Habitats (92/43/EEC ([2])) or the Birds (2009/147/EC ([3])) Directives. Romania is obliged to subject to appropriate assessment all development projects that are likely to have a significant effect on Natura 2000. The compliance of the assessments is a matter for relevant competent authorities in Romania. The Commission will examine any alleged failures to comply with the EU environmental legislation that are brought to its attention.

([1]) See press release: http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/539&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en.
([2]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([3]) OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005377/12
to the Commission
Marta Andreasen (EFD)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: Second follow-up question on Structural Fund assistance to Liverpool City Council

I refer to the answers to my Questions P-008791/2011, of 23 September 2011, and P-001376/2012, of 6 February 2012, on Structural Fund assistance for the City of Liverpool Cruise Terminal.

On 22 May 2012, the United Kingdom Government, in the person of parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Transport Mike Penning, announced in a written ministerial statement that subject to state aid clearance from the European Commission, the restrictions preventing the Liverpool Cruise Terminal facilities from being used for 'turnaround' operations would be relaxed. In return, the grant funding previously received from the UK Government would be almost entirely repaid.

The ministerial statement makes no mention of repayment of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) contribution to the project.

I understand that the UK grant funding which is now to be repaid formed the match funding to this ERDF funding. I also understand that the original restrictions on this project applied equally to the ERDF funding, and I believe that the proposed change of use represents a substantial modification to the project in accordance with Article 30(4) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 ([1]).

Furthermore, I understand that temporary turnaround facilities have already been constructed on the site, and that the Cruise and Maritime Voyages vessel *Ocean Countess* intends to use these facilities for turnaround purposes on 29 May 2012, in breach of the funding conditions. An article on the subject in the *Liverpool Daily Echo* newspaper states that 'so far the EU has not shown any inclination to demand back any of its money'.

1. Is the Commission aware of these latest developments?

2. Can the Commission confirm that it will urgently examine the question of repayment of ERDF funds in the light of the repayment of the UK Government grant and of the change of use?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the statement on 22 May 2012 by Under-Secretary of State for Transport Mike Penning on the City of Liverpool Cruise Terminal stating that the condition precluding turnaround will be lifted and part of the original grant will be subject to repayment. Moreover, the Commission has taken note of the press coverage on the City of Liverpool Cruise Terminal being used for turnaround cruises as of 29 May 2012.

The Commission is in contact with the United Kingdom authorities and has reminded them of their obligation to comply with EU state aid rules. As far as the ERDF funding is concerned, the Commission has written to the United Kingdom authorities requesting information to assess the change in use of the terminal in terms of its compliance with Article 30.4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999. Should the conditions of the ERDF initial grant offer letter no longer be complied with, a recovery of the ERDF grant might be necessary.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=P-2011-008791&language=EN#def1#def1.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005378/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(29 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Ejemplo de tranvía insostenible económicamente tras 40 millones en subvenciones europeas por una línea de apenas 3,5 kilómetros

Tras 40 millones de inversión de la Junta, vía subvenciones europeas, el primer tranvía de Andalucía dejará de funcionar el próximo 4 de junio. La línea, de apenas 3,5 kilómetros entre Vélez-Málaga y Torre del Mar, impulsada por el exalcalde socialista, se inauguró en octubre de 2006 y presenta un déficit de 2 millones de euros. Las previsiones de usuarios eran muy optimistas: 1,2 millones de viajeros anuales. Nada más lejos de la realidad. Las cifras han ido descendiendo cada año. En 2011 apenas hubo 676 000 pasajeros. Fue el año más negativo. Por el efecto de la novedad, en 2007, el primer año de completo funcionamiento, se contabilizaron 922 135 usuarios; en 2008, 782 126 usuarios; 701 599 en 2009 y 701 064 en 2010.

El escaso éxito en la afluencia de viajeros ha provocado que el Ayuntamiento de Vélez-Málaga, quien se encarga de su mantenimiento, haya decidido suspender el servicio entre los dos núcleos de población. *«No estoy en contra del tranvía, pero es insostenible económicamente»*, señala el alcalde de la localidad, del Partido Popular. *«Se planteó muy mal desde el principio»*, sostiene el concejal de Transportes. *«Para que no hubiera déficit tendría que haber una población mínima de 300 000 habitantes y aquí sólo viven 80 000 personas y por el territorio donde pasa el tranvía apenas 60 000 personas»*, indica la concejal, quien reconoce que para que la línea tuviera éxito necesitaría un 3 % de crecimiento anual para el equilibrio de los costes ([1]).

Hay que tener en cuenta asimismo la respuesta E-003896/2012, del Sr. Kallas: *«Teniendo presente la actual situación de las finanzas públicas en España, es de vital importancia realizar un análisis costo-beneficio plenamente transparente de todo nuevo proyecto de infraestructuras. España debe concentrar la inversión en infraestructuras en proyectos que aporten un valor añadido considerable, como la terminación de los corredores fundamentales para que estén vinculados estrechamente y de manera más eficaz al mercado interior, o la interconexión de polos clave teniendo en cuenta el elevado coste de oportunidad de los fondos públicos.»*

¿Esta la Comisión al corriente de este proyecto? ¿Que tipo de análisis coste-beneficio se utilizó para financiar con fondos europeos una línea de dudosa rentabilidad como la que aquí se describe?

¿Piensa la Comisión que estos presupuestos son coherentes con las prioridades para el transporte marcadas por la Comisión en el marco de la revisión de los TEN-Ts?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de julio de 2012)

El FEDER cofinanció el tranvía entre Vélez-Málaga y Torre del Mar dentro del programa del FEDER Andalucía 2000-2006. El coste total del proyecto ascendió a 20 millones de euros, de los cuales la contribución del FEDER representó 15 millones de euros. El proyecto fue finalizado con éxito y el tranvía empezó a funcionar en 2006.

Según el principio de gestión compartida, los Estados miembros son responsables del proceso de selección, gestión y ejecución de los proyectos en el marco de los programas. La Comisión solo examina y aprueba directamente los proyectos de gran envergadura con un coste total superior a 50 millones de euros.

Las autoridades españolas informaron a la Comisión de que el proyecto cumplía los criterios de selección incluidos en la documentación del programa. Su objetivo era dotar a la zona de un sistema de transporte público más rápido, más seguro y respetuoso con el medio ambiente con el fin de reducir la presión del tráfico y conectar Vélez-Málaga con la línea de ferrocarril de la Costa del Sol entre Nerja y Estepona, una zona turística y densamente poblada.

En el análisis de costes y beneficios, que incluía previsiones de la demanda, se estimaba un máximo de 1,2 millones de usuarios después de varios años de funcionamiento. El primer año se registraron más de 922 000 pasajeros. Desgraciadamente, a partir de 2008 las repercusiones de la crisis económica se hicieron sentir con gran fuerza, entre ellas una reducción del número de visitantes, lo que explica que el número de usuarios se haya estabilizado en los últimos años en torno a 700 000.

([1]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/espana/2012/05/29/el-primer-tranvia-andaluz-a-dique-seco-tras-40-millones-en-subvenciones-europeas-98894.

La pregunta relativa a la relación con las políticas de transporte en el marco de la revisión de las RTE-T no es procedente, ya que este proyecto no recibió financiación alguna del programa RTE-T ni de las prioridades de las RTE-T con arreglo a la política de cohesión. Sin embargo, la Comisión considera que la política de cohesión puede, y debe, apoyar proyectos de transporte sostenible, especialmente en las zonas urbanas densamente pobladas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005378/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: An example of a tramway that is economically unsustainable, after EUR 40 million in EU subsidies were spent on a line just 3.5 kilometres long

Despite an investment of EUR 40 million in EU subsidies by the regional government of Andalusia in Andalusia's first tramway, it will cease to operate on 4 June 2012. The line is just 3.5 kilometres long and runs between Vélez-Málaga and Torre del Mar. It was promoted by the former socialist mayor and inaugurated in October 2006. It now has a deficit of EUR 2 million. Forecasts of user numbers were overly optimistic: 1.2 million passengers annually. That figure was never realised and in fact numbers have fallen each year. In 2011, the worst year to date, there were just 676 000 passengers. Due mainly to its novelty value, 922 135 people used the railway in 2007, the first full year of operation. The numbers in subsequent years were 782 126 in 2008, 701 599 in 2009 and 701 064 in 2010.

As a result of poor passenger numbers, the City Council of Vélez-Málaga, which is responsible for its maintenance, has decided to suspend the service between the two towns. 'I am not against the tramway, but it is not economically sustainable,' stated the city's mayor, a member of the Partido Popular party. 'It was badly conceived from the start,' argued the Councillor for Transport. 'A minimum population of 300 000 would be needed to avoid a deficit; we have 80 000 inhabitants and only 60 000 of those live in the area served by the tram,' said the councillor, who acknowledges that for the line to be successful a 3% annual increase in numbers would be needed to balance costs ([1]).

Mr Kallas' answer to Question E-003896/2012 should also to be taken into account: 'Given the current state of public finances in Spain, it is critically important to carry out a fully transparent cost-benefit analysis for any new infrastructure project. An issue for Spain is to concentrate infrastructure investment on projects providing a substantial added value such as the completion of the key corridors to be closely and more efficiently linked to the internal market, or the interconnection of key poles taking into account the high opportunity cost of public funds.'

Is the Commission aware of this project? What kind of cost-benefit analysis took place before EU funds were committed to a tramline whose profitability was so dubious?

Does the Commission believe that this expenditure is in keeping with the transport priorities it set out in the review of TEN-T?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(21 July 2012)

The ERDF co-financed the tramway between Vélez-Málaga and Torre del Mar within the 2000-06 Andalusia ERDF programme. The total cost of the project amounted to EUR 20 million, of which EUR 15 million was an ERDF contribution. The project was successfully completed and the tramway started operating in 2006.

Under the shared management principle, responsibility for the actual selection, management and implementation of projects within programmes lies with the Member States. Only major projects whose total cost exceeds EUR 50 million are directly examined and approved by the Commission.

The Spanish authorities have informed the Commission that the project fulfilled the selection criteria in the programme documents. Its aim was to provide the area with a faster, safer and more environmentally-friendly public transport system in order to alleviate the traffic pressure and connect Vélez-Málaga with the Costa del Sol railway line between Nerja and Estepona, in a densely populated and tourist area.

A cost-benefit analysis which included demand forecasts estimated a maximum of 1.2 million users after several years of operation. The first year saw more than 922 000 passengers. Unfortunately, from 2008 on, the impact of the economic crisis was heavily felt, including the reduction in the number of visitors. This explains why the number of users has stabilised around 700 000 in recent years.

([1]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/espana/2012/05/29/el-primer-tranvia-andaluz-a-dique-seco-tras-40-millones-en-subvenciones-europeas-98894.

The question concerning the link with transport policies under the review of TEN-T is not relevant, as this project did not receive funding from the TEN-T programme, nor from the TEN-T priorities under cohesion policy. However, the Commission considers that cohesion policy can, and should, support sustainable transport projects, especially in densely populated urban areas.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005379/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(29 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Rapper iraniano sottoposto a minacce di morte

Shahin Najafi, un rapper iraniano, è stato accusato di apostasia dalle autorità religiose sciite iraniane in seguito all'uscita della sua canzone facente riferimento ad Ali al-Naqi al-Hadi, decimo degli imam sacri agli sciiti musulmani. L'autorità religiosa iraniana, l'ayatollah Lotfallah Safi-Golpayegani, ha emesso una *fatwa* (condanna a morte) contro chiunque offenda tale figura religiosa. Secondo quanto riportato da un sito Internet islamico, un individuo proveniente da uno Stato arabo sul Golfo Persico avrebbe offerto una taglia di 100 000 dollari statunitensi a chiunque uccida Najafi, che ora vive in Germania dopo aver lasciato l'Iran a seguito delle minacce ricevute per aver tenuto concerti di nascosto. Le massime autorità religiose iraniane, che hanno l'autorità di emettere la *fatwa*, agiscono indipendentemente dallo Stato, ma chiunque emetta tale condanna a morte gode dell'impunità secondo la legge iraniana.

Attualmente Najafi si nasconde in Germania ed è protetto dalla polizia tedesca. Nelle sue canzoni il rapper spesso affronta temi come le disuguaglianze sociali e la situazione legata ai diritti umani in Iran. Afferma di non pentirsi della canzone e rifiuta di scusarsi, sostenendo che invocare il nome di un santo rientra nella libertà d'espressione e non costituisce un'offesa religiosa.

1. È il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante a conoscenza del suddetto caso?

2. Ha il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante intenzione di presentare rimostranze al governo iraniano al fine di revocare la *fatwa* contro Shahin Najafi?

3. Allo stato attuale, qual è il tipo di sostegno offerto dall'UE, se previsto, agli artisti nel Medio Oriente, come Najafi, minacciati a causa del loro lavoro?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante è a conoscenza del caso di Shahin Najafi, uno dei numerosi esempi di oppressione sistematica della libertà di espressione in Iran. Nelle sue dichiarazioni l'Alta Rappresentante ha esortato l'Iran a porre fine alla persecuzione dei membri della comunità artistica iraniana. Un simile trattamento è incompatibile con i principi internazionali sui diritti umani che l'Iran ha sottoscritto liberamente. Il diritto alla libertà di espressione in forma artistica e per iscritto è sancito dall'articolo 19 del Patto internazionale relativo ai diritti civili e politici.

Inoltre, gli Stati membri dell'UE, tramite la loro applicazione delle norme in materia di asilo politico, hanno una lunga tradizione di accoglienza che rende l'UE un rifugio sicuro per artisti e intellettuali perseguitati, nonché per le vittime dei regimi autoritari.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005379/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Iranian rapper facing death threats

An Iranian rapper called Shahin Najafi has been called an apostate by Iranian Shia clerics after he released a song with references to Ali al-Naqi al-Hadi, who is the tenth of the Shia Muslim holy imams. Iranian cleric Ayatollah Lotfallah Safi-Golpayegani issued a fatwa against anyone insulting this religious figure. An Islamist website reported that an individual from an Arab state on the Persian Gulf has offered a USD 100 000 bounty to anyone who kills Mr Najafi, who now lives in Germany, having fled Iran after he was threatened for holding underground concerts. Senior clerics in Iran, who have the authority to issue fatwas, act independently of the government, but anyone who carries out a death fatwa is granted impunity under Iranian law.

At present Najafi has gone into hiding and is being protected by German police. Najafi often sings about Iran's social inequalities and human rights situation. He says he does not regret the song and refuses to apologise, arguing that invoking a saint's name is freedom of expression and not a religious insult.

1. Is the High Representative/Vice-President aware of the case described above?

2. Is the High Representative/Vice-President willing to make representations to the Iranian Government to overturn the fatwa against Shahin Najafi?

3. At present, what kind of support, if any, does the EU provide to creative artists in the Middle East, such as Najafi, who are threatened as a result of their work?

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

The High Representative is aware of the case of Mr Shahin Najafi, one of the numerous examples of systematic oppression of the freedom of expression in Iran. In her statements, the High Representative has called on Iran to put an end to the persecution of all members of Iran's artistic community. Such treatment is incompatible with the international human rights principles that Iran has freely signed up to. The right to freedom of expression through art and writing is enshrined in Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

In addition, the EU Member States, through their application of political asylum regimes, have a long tradition of making the EU a safe haven for persecuted artists and intellectuals and for victims of authoritarian regimes.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005380/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(29 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Posible impuesto a la deuda de las entidades bancarias

Ante la nacionalización total o parcial de distintas entidades de la banca europea, como Bankia en el Estado español, ha crecido la preocupación sobre el modo de financiar tales operaciones. En el marco legislativo y regulatorio actuales, tales operaciones serían o bien financiadas a través de un incremento en la emisión de deuda pública nacional, o bien a través de un préstamo por parte del Fondo Europea de Estabilidad Financiera, que también es en parte financiado mediante aportaciones de los distintos Estados miembros.

En este marco, es relevante estudiar modos de financiar los rescates del sector bancario y financiero mediante métodos que no supongan una nueva carga al contribuyente. Por este motivo es interesante la propuesta de un prestigioso economista profesor en la Universidad de Columbia, que tiene como objetivo crear un nuevo impuesto sobre la deuda bancaria ([1]).

Este impuesto tendría como objetivo grabar aquellas instituciones bancarias que incurrieran en deuda, de tal modo que los ingresos fueran destinados de forma finalista a financiar un fondo de rescate bancario de escala europea. De este modo, cuanto más deuda tuviera un banco (y, por lo tanto, más vulnerable fuera) más pagaría, rebajando la carga económica para el contribuyente de su mala gestión financiera como entidad. Los tipos impositivos podrían estar ligados, por ejemplo, al riesgo que la entidad bancaria en cuestión dejara de pagar intereses sobre su deuda.

1. ¿Considerará la Comisión hacer un estudio sobre la viabilidad y consecuencias de tal propuesta?

2. En caso que el resultado del dicho estudio fuera positivo, ¿consideraría la Comisión la posibilidad de hacer una propuesta legislativa en esta línea?

Respuesta del Sr. Šemeta en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de julio de 2012)

1. En el documento de trabajo titulado «Innovative Finance at a Global Level» (SEC(2010) 409 final, apartado 3.1.1), la Comisión analizó un impuesto o tasa basados en el nivel de deuda de los bancos. Desde entonces, varios Estados miembros han introducido tasas o impuestos bancarios con el objetivo de que la base imponible refleje la proporción de la deuda en el pasivo del balance. El anexo IX del documento de trabajo de la Comisión SWD(2012) 166/3 proporciona una visión de conjunto de las tasas bancarias existentes.

2. Debe ser posible acometer la resolución de un banco sin comprometer la estabilidad financiera y sin recurrir al dinero de los contribuyentes. Las propuestas que la Comisión presentó el 6 de junio ([2]) garantizarían que esto fuera así. En primer lugar, las autoridades responsables de la resolución deben estar en condiciones de recapitalizar determinadas obligaciones del balance de los bancos. En segundo lugar, la Comisión propone crear un Sistema Europeo de Acuerdos de Financiación de Resoluciones que se financiaría con contribuciones *ex ante* de los bancos y empresas de inversión. Estas contribuciones se ajustarían en función de su perfil de riesgo, teniendo en cuenta, entre otras cosas, el grado de aplancamiento. Por último, en el marco de los trabajos tendentes a la realización de una auténtica unión económica y monetaria, la Comisión tiene la intención de presentar propuestas para la creación de un supervisor bancario europeo único, así como de un régimen de resoluciones y de un régimen de garantía de depósitos a nivel europeo.

([1]) http://www.salaimartin.com/randomthoughts/item/305-c%C3%B3mo-financiar-el-fondo-de-rescate-bancario-impuestos-sobre-la-deuda.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/bank/crisis_management/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005380/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: Possible tax on bank debt

In view of the total or partial nationalisation of various European banks, such as Bankia in Spain, there is growing concern over how to finance such operations. Under the current legislative and regulatory framework, such operations would be financed either through an increase in the issue of national public debt, or through a loan from the European Financial Stability Fund, which is also partly funded by contributions from Member States.

In this context, it is important to consider methods of funding bailouts of the banking and finance sector that do not amount to yet another burden on the taxpayer. For this reason, the proposal by a prestigious economist at Columbia University that a new tax on bank debt be created is an interesting one. ([1])

This tax would be levied on banks that incur debt, and the revenue would ultimately be used to finance a Europe-wide bank rescue fund. Thus, the more debt a bank were to incur (and, therefore, the more vulnerable it became) the more it would pay. This would reduce the economic burden on the taxpayer arising from the mismanagement of financial institutions. Tax rates could be linked, for example, to the risk of a bank no longer being able to pay interest on its debt.

1. Will the Commission make a study of the feasibility and consequences of this proposal?

2. If the results of this study prove positive, would the Commission consider framing a legislative proposal along these lines?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2012)

1. A tax or levy based on the debt level of banks has been analysed by the Commission in the Staff Working Document 'Innovative Finance at a Global Level' SEC(2010) 409 final (Section 3.1.1). Since then, a number of Member States have introduced bank levies or taxes based on the idea that the tax base reflects the share of debt on the liability side of the balance sheet. An overview of existing bank levies can be found in Annex IX of the impact assessment SWD(2012) 166/3.

2. Banks must be resolvable without jeopardising financial stability and without recourse to taxpayers' money. The Commission proposals of 6 June ([2]) would ensure this. First, resolution authorities must be able to bail-in certain liabilities on banks' balance sheets. Second, the Commission proposes to set up a European System of Resolution Financing Arrangements which would be funded by *ex-ante* contributions from banks and investment firms. Those contributions would be adjusted in proportion to their risk profile, taking into account among other things the degree of leverage. Finally, in the context of the work towards the achievement of a genuine Economic and Monetary Union the Commission intends to present proposals for a single European supervisor for banks as well as the establishment of a European deposit insurance scheme and a resolution scheme.

([1]) http://www.salaimartin.com/randomthoughts/item/305-c%C3%B3mo-financiar-el-fondo-de-rescate-bancario-impuestos-sobre-la-deuda.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/bank/crisis_management/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005381/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta / Alta Representante)
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Thomas Mann (PPE), Edward McMillan-Scott (ALDE) y Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE)
(29 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Nuevas restricciones de las reuniones sociales y actividades religiosas tibetanas en Lhasa tras las autoinmolaciones

Dos hombres se envolvieron en un mar de llamas fuera de un templo budista muy concurrido por turistas y peregrinos en Lhasa el 27 de mayo de 2012, con lo que se inició la nueva oleada de autoinmolaciones para protestar contra el régimen chino en la celosamente vigilada capital tibetana.

La agencia oficial de noticias china, Xinhua, dio los nombres de estas personas: Dargye, del distrito de Aba en la zona tibetana de la provincia de Sichuan, al sudeste de China, y Tobgye Tseten, del distrito de Xiahe, que vivía en una comunidad tibetana de la provincia de Gansu al noroeste del país. Tobgye Tseten falleció, mientras que Dargye quedó gravemente herido, pero se encuentra en estado estable y es capaz de hablar, según Xinhua.

Desde febrero de 2009, cuando tuvo lugar la primera autoinmolación en el Tíbet, 37 personas se han prendido fuego, según el Centro Tibetano para los Derechos Humanos y la Democracia (CTDHD). Esa cifra incluye el incidente más reciente ocurrido en Lhasa. En las 36 autoinmolaciones producidas desde marzo de 2011 han muerto 28 personas, añade este grupo.

Estas autoinmolaciones tienen por objetivo dar a conocer las restricciones impuestas por China a la práctica del budismo y pedir el retorno del exilio del líder espiritual tibetano, el Dalai Lama. La mayoría de ellas han tenido lugares en zonas de China con una gran población tibetana, pero solamente una se ha producido en el propio Tíbet y ninguna en la capital. Las autoridades chinas han confirmado algunas de las autoinmolaciones ocurridas el año pasado, pero no todas.

Estas dos inmolaciones en el corazón de la capital tibetana sin duda pondrán en una situación embarazosa a los dirigentes chinos de la región, que han prometido dar prioridad a la estabilidad social y la unidad étnica. Ese mandato resulta especialmente urgente este año, ya que China se prepara para la transición decenal de dirigentes en el otoño y no desea que esta ocasión se vea empañada. Es probable que las inmolaciones provoquen nuevas restricciones de las reuniones sociales y actividades religiosas tibetanas en Lhasa, como ha ocurrido en otros lugares.

El 28 de mayo de 2012, Radio Free Asia informó que Lhasa se encontraba bajo estrecha vigilancia policial y paramilitar tras las inmolaciones y que la situación era sumamente tensa.

En vista de lo antes expuesto y teniendo en cuenta que el tema de las autoinmolaciones en el Tíbet se ha debatido en el marco del COHOM y el COASI, así como en el diálogo sobre derechos humanos entre la UE y China, ¿emitirá la Vicepresidenta y Alta Representante Ashton una declaración pública para manifestar su preocupación por las violaciones de los derechos humanos y la falta de respeto de los mismos en el Tíbet?

Por otra parte, ¿no considera la Alta Representante que el aún no designado Representante Especial de la UE para los Derechos Humanos debería tener un mandato especial respecto al Tíbet?

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

La Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta concede gran importancia a la situación de los derechos humanos en el Tíbet. El 29 de mayo de 2012, durante el último diálogo UE-China sobre derechos humanos, la UE planteó su preocupación sobre la serie de autoinmolaciones, el impacto en la conservación de la cultura tibetana del rápido desarrollo económico, los informes sobre la dispersión violenta de manifestaciones de tibetanos, la repercusión de los reasentamientos masivos de nómadas, el aumento del control del Gobierno sobre los monasterios tibetanos y las restricciones de acceso al Tíbet. Al margen del diálogo se entregó una lista de casos de especial preocupación entre los que figuraban los asuntos tibetanos.

La UE pidió a las autoridades chinas que abordaran las causas profundas de la insatisfacción del pueblo tibetano y que garantizaran el respeto de sus derechos humanos, incluido el derecho a la libertad de expresión y de reunión, así como a disfrutar de su cultura y de sus costumbres, a profesar su religión y a utilizar su lengua.

La UE también manifestó su preocupación sobre el Tíbet en la Cumbre UE-China de 14 de febrero de 2012. Las dos últimas gestiones sobre el Tíbet tuvieron lugar el 9 de diciembre de 2011 y el 7 de marzo de 2012. Las preocupaciones de la UE sobre el Tíbet también se manifestaron en el Consejo de Derechos Humanos de principios de marzo. Con el fin de mejorar la situación sobre el terreno la UE seguirá interpelando a China sobre estas cuestiones. El mandato del futuro Representante Especial de la Unión Europea para los Derechos Humanos está aún pendiente de aprobación por el Consejo. Aunque de carácter general, constituirá, desde la perspectiva de la PESC, un nuevo canal para vigilar la evolución de la situación tanto en China como en otras partes del mundo y para manifestar nuestras preocupaciones. La AR/VP, en la sesión plenaria del Parlamento Europeo de 12 de junio de 2012, realizó una declaración sobre el Tíbet.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005381/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Thomas Mann (PPE), Edward McMillan-Scott (ALDE) und Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE)
(29. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Weitere Beschränkungen für tibetische gesellschaftliche Zusammenkünfte und religiöse Aktivitäten in Lhasa nach Selbstverbrennungen

Am 27. Mai 2012 setzten sich zwei Männer vor einem bei Touristen und Pilgern beliebten Tempel in Lhasa selbst in Brand. Damit hat die aktuelle Welle von Selbstverbrennungen als Zeichen des Protests gegen die chinesische Herrschaft zum ersten Mal die streng überwachte Hauptstadt Tibets erreicht.

Die staatliche Nachrichtenagentur Chinas, Xinhua, identifizierte die beiden als Dargye, aus dem Landkreis Aba im tibetischen Gebiet der südwestchinesischen Provinz Sichuan, und Tobgye Tseten aus dem Landkreis Xiahe in einem tibetisch besiedelten Gebiet der Provinz Gansu im Nordwesten des Landes. Tobgye Tseten starb, während Dargye schwer verletzt wurde, sich jedoch laut Xinhua in stabiler Verfassung befindet und sprechen kann.

Seit der ersten Selbstverbrennung in Tibet im Februar 2009 haben sich laut Angaben des Tibetischen Zentrums für Menschenrechte und Demokratie 37 Personen selbst in Brand gesetzt. Diese Zahl umfasst auch den jüngsten Vorfall in Lhasa. Von den 36 Personen, die sich seit März 2011 selbst in Brand gesetzt haben, sind 28 Menschen ums Leben gekommen, so die Gruppe weiter.

Diese Selbstverbrennungen zielen darauf ab, Aufmerksamkeit auf die Einschränkungen zu lenken, die China dem Buddhismus auferlegt, und die Rückkehr des Dalai Lama, des geistlichen Oberhaupts der Tibeter, aus dem Exil zu fordern. Sie ereigneten sich größtenteils in stark tibetisch geprägten Gebieten Chinas. In Tibet selbst gab es jedoch nur eine Selbstverbrennung, und in der Hauptstadt keine. Die chinesischen Behörden haben einige, jedoch nicht alle Selbstverbrennungen des letzten Jahres bestätigt.

Die beiden Selbstverbrennungen im Herzen der tibetischen Hauptstadt sind mit Sicherheit eine Blamage für die kommunistische Führung der Region, die sich insbesondere gesellschaftliche Stabilität und ethnische Einheit als vorrangiges Ziel gesetzt hat. Diese Aufgabe ist in diesem Jahr von besonderer Dringlichkeit, da China sich auf den alle zehn Jahre stattfindenden Führungswechsel im Herbst vorbereitet und nicht möchte, dass dieses Ereignis überschattet wird. Es ist auch zu vermuten, dass die Verbrennungen strenge neue Einschränkungen für tibetische gesellschaftliche Zusammenkünfte und religiöse Aktivitäten in Lhasa nach sich ziehen werden, wie es auch andernorts der Fall war.

Radio Free Asia berichtete am 28. Mai 2012, dass Lhasa nach den Selbstverbrennungen von Polizeikräften und paramilitärischen Kräften streng überbewacht werde und die Situation sehr angespannt sei.

Kann und wird die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin Ashton in Anbetracht dessen und im Hinblick auf die Tatsache, dass Selbstverbrennungen in Tibet von der COHOM und der COASI sowie im Rahmen des Menschenrechtsdialogs zwischen der Europäischen Union und China erörtert werden, eine eindeutige öffentliche Stellungnahme veröffentlichen, in der sie ihre Besorgnis über die Menschenrechtsverletzungen und den mangelnden Respekt für Menschenrechte in Tibet zum Ausdruck bringt?

Ist die Hohe Vertreterin zudem nicht der Ansicht, dass der noch zu ernennende Sonderbeauftragte der EU für Menschenrechte in Bezug auf Tibet ein besonderes Mandat erhalten sollte?

Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(9. Juli 2012)

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin misst der Menschenrechtssituation in Tibet große Bedeutung zu. Beim letzten Menschenrechtsdialog zwischen der EU und China am 29. Mai 2012 äußerte die EU ihre Besorgnis wegen der Serie von Selbstverbrennungen, der Auswirkungen der raschen wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung auf die Bewahrung der tibetischen Kultur, der Berichte über die gewaltsame Auflösung von Demonstrationen von Tibetern, der Folgen der Massenumsiedlung von Nomaden, der verstärkten staatlichen Kontrolle über die tibetischen Klöster und des eingeschränkten Zugangs zu Tibet. Am Rande des Dialogs wurde eine Liste mit bedenklichen Einzelfällen, die auch Tibeter betrafen, übergeben.

Die EU hat die chinesischen Behörden dazu aufgefordert, bei den eigentlichen Ursachen für die Unzufriedenheit des tibetischen Volkes anzusetzen und die Wahrung der Menschenrechte der Tibeter sicherzustellen, einschließlich des

Rechts auf freie Meinungsäußerung und Versammlungsfreiheit, des Rechts, ihr eigenes kulturelles Leben zu pflegen, sich zu ihrer eigenen Religion zu bekennen und sie auszuüben und ihre eigene Sprache zu sprechen.

Die EU hat ihre Besorgnis auch auf dem Gipfeltreffen EU-China am 14. Februar 2012 zum Ausdruck gebracht. Die letzten zwei Demarchen zu Tibet wurden am 9. Dezember 2011 bzw. am 7. März 2012 unternommen. Anfang März hat die EU ihre Bedenken in Bezug auf Tibet außerdem im Menschenrechtsrat der Vereinten Nationen geäußert. Die EU wird China weiterhin mit diesen Themen konfrontieren, um die Situation vor Ort zu verbessern. Das Mandat des zukünftigen EU-Sonderbeauftragten für Menschenrechte muss noch vom Rat genehmigt werden. Obwohl es allgemeiner Natur ist, wird es im Rahmen der Gemeinsamen Außen— und Sicherheitspolitik eine neue Möglichkeit bieten, die Entwicklungen in China sowie in anderen Teilen der Welt zu verfolgen und Besorgnis zu äußern. Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin hat auf der Plenartagung des Europäischen Parlaments am 12. Juni 2012 eine Erklärung zu Tibet abgegeben.

(Eestikeelne versioon)

Kirjalikult vastatav küsimus E-005381/12
komisjonile (Asepresident / Kõrge esindaja)
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Thomas Mann (PPE), Edward McMillan-Scott (ALDE) ja Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE)
(29. mai 2012)

Teema: VP/HR — Uued piirangud Tiibeti rahvakogunemistele ja ususündmustele Lhasas pärast enesesüütamisi

27. mail 2012. aastal süütasid turistide ja palverändurite hulgas populaarse budistliku templi ees Lhasas end kaks meest. See oli esimene kord, kui hiljutine eneseohverduslaine protestiks Hiina võimu vastu hoolikalt valvatud Tiibeti pealinna jõudis.

Hiina riigiuudiste agentuuri Xinhua andmetel olid need kaks meest Dargye, Hiina Sichuani provintsi kaguosas asuvast Tiibeti ala Aba maakonnast, ja Tobgye Tseten, riigi kirdeosa Gansu provintsi Tiibeti kogukonna Xiahe maakonnast. Xinhua andmetel Tobgye Tseten suri ja Dargye sai raskelt vigastada, kuid on stabiilses seisundis ning võimeline rääkima.

Tiibeti inimõiguste ja demokraatia keskuse (TCHRD) andmetel on alates esimesest enesesüütamisest Tiibetis 2009. aasta veebruaris end põlema süüdanud 37 inimest. See arv hõlmab ka viimast juhtumit Lhasas. Nende andmetel on alates 2011. aasta märtsist toimunud 36 enesesüütamise tagajärjel surnud 28 inimest.

Nende enesesüütamiste eesmärk on juhtida tähelepanu Hiina piirangutele budismi suhtes ning kutsuda pagendusest tagasi Tiibeti vaimne juht Dalai laama. Enamik enesesüütamisi on toimunud Hiina Tiibeti aladel, kuid ainult üks Tiibetis ja mitte ühtegi pealinnas. Hiina ametivõimud on kinnitanud mõningaid enesesüütamisi eelmisel aastal, kuid mitte kõiki.

Topeltenesesüütamised Tiibeti pealinna südames valmistavad kindlasti piinlikkust piirkonna kommunistlikule juhtkonnale, kes on lubanud seada esmatähtsaks ühiskondliku stabiilsuse ja etnilise ühtsuse. See mandaat on eriti survetavaldav sel aastal, kuna Hiina valmistub kord kümne aasta jooksul toimuvaks võimuvahetuseks sügisel ning ei soovi, et kõnealune juhtum seda õõnestaks. Enesesüütamised toovad sarnaselt teiste piirkondadega tõenäoliselt ka Lhasas kaasa uued karmid piirangud Tiibeti rahvakogunemistele ja ususündmustele.

Raadio Vaba Aasia teatas 28. mail 2012. aastal, et pärast enesesüütamisi oli Lhasa politseijõudude ja omakaitseüksuste range kontrolli all ning olukord oli väga pingeline.

Arvestades eeltoodut ja teades, et Tiibeti enesesüütamiste probleemi on arutatud inimõiguste töörühmas ja Aasia ja Okeaania töörühmas ning ELi ja Hiina inimõiguste alase dialoogi raames, siis kas komisjoni asepresident ning liidu välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja Catherine Ashton võiks, ja kas ta kavatseb, väljastada sõnaselge avaliku teadaande inimõiguste rikkumise ja inimõiguste austamise puudumise kohta Tiibetis?

Lisaks, kas kõrge esindaja ei leia, et veel ametisse nimetamata ELi inimõiguste eriesindajal peaks olema Tiibeti suhtes erivolitus?

Komisjoni nimel vastanud Euroopa Liidu välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja ning komisjoni asepresident Catherine Ashton
(9. juuli 2012)

Liidu välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja ja komisjoni asepresident pöörab inimõiguste olukorrale Tiibetis suurt tähelepanu. EL väljendas oma muret ELi ja Hiina inimõiguste alase dialoogi viimase vooru raames 29. mail 2012, juhtides tähelepanu sellistele probleemidele nagu arvukad enesesüütamised, kiire majandusarengu mõju Tiibeti kultuuri säilitamisele, tiibetlaste meeleavalduste vägivaldne laialiajamine, nomaadide massilise ümberasustamise tagajärjed, valitsuse suurem kontroll Tiibeti kloostrite üle ja Tiibeti külastamise piirangud. Dialoogivooru raames anti üle nimekiri muret tekitavatest, sealhulgas tiibetlastega seotud juhtumitest.

EL on kutsunud Hiina ametivõime üles tegelema Tiibeti elanike rahulolematuse põhjustega ning tagama, et kaitstakse nende inimõigusi, sealhulgas nende õigust sõna— ja kogunemisvabadusele ning õigust oma kultuurile, religioonile ja keelele.

Samuti väljendas EL oma muret 14. veebruaril 2012. aastal toimunud ELi ja Hiina tippkohtumisel. Kaks viimast demarši Tiibeti küsimuses esitati 9. detsembril 2011 ja 7. märtsil 2012. EL avaldas muret seoses olukorraga Tiibetis ka märtsi alguses toimunud inimõiguste nõukogu istungil. EL kavatseb ka edaspidi teha Hiinaga koostööd, et parandada

olukorda Tiibetis. Ülemkogu ei ole veel heaks kiitnud ELi inimõiguste eriesindaja volitusi. Ühise välis— ja julgeolekupoliitika seisukohast on tegemist üldises mõttes uue võimalusega jälgida Hiinas ja mujal maailmas toimuvat ning väljendada ELi muret. Liidu välisasjade ja julgeolekupoliitika kõrge esindaja ja komisjoni asepresident tegi Tiibetit käsitleva avalduse 12. juunil 2012 toimunud täiskogu istungil.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005381/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE), Thomas Mann (PPE), Edward McMillan-Scott (ALDE) and Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE)
(29 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — New restrictions on Tibetan social gatherings and religious activities in Lhasa following self-immolations

Two men engulfed themselves in a burst of flames outside a Buddhist temple popular with tourists and pilgrims in Lhasa on 27 May 2012, marking the first time the recent wave of self-immolations to protest against Chinese rule has reached the tightly guarded Tibetan capital.

China's state news agency, Xinhua, named the two as Dargye, from Aba County in the Tibetan area of south-west China's Sichuan Province, and Tobgye Tseten, from Xiahe County in a Tibetan community of the country's north-western Gansu Province. Tobgye Tseten died, while Dargye was seriously injured but is in a stable condition and able to talk, according to Xinhua.

Since February 2009, when the first self-immolation occurred in Tibet, 37 people have set themselves on fire, according to the Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy (TCHRD). That figure includes the latest incident in Lhasa. Of the 36 self-immolations since March 2011, 28 people have died, the group adds.

These self-immolations aim to draw attention to China's restrictions on Buddhism and to call for the return from exile of the Tibetan spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama. Most have taken place in heavily Tibetan areas of China, but only one has occurred in Tibet itself and none in the capital. Chinese authorities have confirmed some of the self-immolations over the past year, but not all.

The twin immolations in the heart of the Tibetan capital are certain to embarrass the region's communist leadership, which has pledged to prioritise social stability and ethnic unity. That mandate is especially pressing this year, as China is preparing for a once-in-a-decade leadership transition in the autumn and does not want the occasion to be undermined. The immolations are also likely to prompt tough new restrictions on Tibetan social gatherings and religious activities in Lhasa, as they have elsewhere.

Radio Free Asia reported on 28 May 2012 that Lhasa was under heavy police and paramilitary guard following the immolations, and that the situation was very tense.

In the light of the above, and bearing in mind that the issue of self-immolations in Tibet has been discussed by the COHOM and the COASI and during the EU-China human rights dialogue, could — and will — Vice-President/High Representative Ashton issue a clear public statement of concern regarding the human rights violations and lack of respect for human rights in Tibet?

Moreover, does the High Representative not consider that the still-to-be-appointed EU Special Representative for Human Rights should have a particular mandate in relation to Tibet?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President attaches great importance to the human rights situation in Tibet. The EU raised its concerns at the last EU-China human rights dialogue on 29 May 2012 regarding the series of self-immolations, the impact of rapid economic development on the preservation of Tibetan culture, reports of violent dispersal of demonstrations by Tibetans, the impact of the mass resettlement of nomads, increased government control over Tibetan monasteries, and restrictions on access to Tibet. A list of individual cases of concern, including Tibetans, was handed over at the margins of the dialogue.

The EU called upon the Chinese authorities to address the root causes of the dissatisfaction of Tibetan people and to ensure that their human rights are respected, including their right to freedom of expression and freedom of assembly, as well as to enjoy their own culture, profess and practise their own religion, and to use their own language.

The EU also raised its concern on Tibet at the EU-China summit on 14 February 2012. The two latest demarches on Tibet took place on 9 December 2011 and 7 March 2012. EU concerns on Tibet were also expressed at Human Rights Council in early March. The EU will continue to engage China on these issues in order to improve the situation on the

ground. The mandate of the future EU Special Representative for Human Rights is yet to be approved by the Council. Although of a general nature, it will, from a CFSP perspective, provide a new channel to monitor developments in China as in other parts of the world and to voice our concerns. . A statement on Tibet by the HR/VP has been made in the EP Plenary on 12 June 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005382/12
to the Commission
Roger Helmer (EFD)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Trade data

Could the Commission please supply the following trade statistics for imports of goods by individual Member States (i.e. separately for all 27 Member States) from outside the EU in 2010:

1. aggregate value of imports of agricultural produce,

2. aggregate value of import duties on agricultural produce,

3. aggregate value of imports of industrial goods,

4. aggregate value of import duties on industrial goods,

5. aggregate value of imports of passenger motor cars, and

6. aggregate value of import duties on passenger motor cars?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

The European Commission does not compile trade statistics for imports of goods by individual Member States. Moreover, the European Commission wishes to point out to the Honourable Member that the purpose of Parliamentary questions can not be to obtain factual information that is otherwise available, neither to substitute for research work that can be fulfilled by other entities.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005384/12
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Free movement of goods

In certain Member States, including the UK, tobacco and alcohol purchased for personal use can be seized at the discretion of customs officers.

1. Could the Commission advise me as to whether such actions might contravene legislation concerning the free movement of goods?

2. Please clarify which legislation is applicable and whether there are any threshold quantities.

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

1. Individuals may bring back excise goods (tobacco and alcoholic beverages) bought tax paid in a Member State without further charges, when the goods are transported by the individuals themselves and are for their own use. Where Member States suspect such goods are not for own use, they must consider certain specified criteria before concluding that these goods are commercial.

Where a person brings back commercial excise goods and fails to comply with the applicable formalities, the Member States may apply reasonable and proportionate sanctions, in accordance with general principles of EC law.

In the past there have been complaints about UK practice in this area and the Commission asked the UK to address observations on its application of EC law. Details of exchanges, and of the resulting changes in UK Legislation and practice, can be found at: http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/06/860&format=HTML&aged = 0&language =en&guiLanguage=en

2. The criteria for concluding whether excise goods are for personal use, including guidelevels can be found here: http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/travellers/within_eu/index_en.htm

For travellers entering the European Union from a third country the following quantitative restrictions apply: http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/travellers/enter_eu/index_en.htm

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005385/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(30 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Remuneración a ejecutivos en entidades rescatadas con dinero público

Después del anuncio de nacionalización de BFA, matriz de Bankia, ha salido a la luz la noticia que uno de sus ex-directivos que dejó el banco el año pasado recibirá 13,91 millones en concepto de indemnización ([1]).

La noticia llega después que BFA haya reconocido que las pérdidas para el año 2011 fueron de más de 7 000 millones de euros, las mayores en la historia de la banca española en lugar de los más de 300 millones que supuestamente se habían anunciado como beneficios ([2]).

Esta indemnización fue acordada cuando él era ejecutivo de Bancaja, una de las entidades que se fusionaron para formar BFA.

A la luz de la directiva CRD III 2010/76/EU y de las negociaciones en curso para la aprobación de CRDIV,

1. ¿Qué piensa la Comisión sobre esta indemnización teniendo en cuenta las pérdidas que ha sufrido BFA?

2. ¿Qué opina la Comisión sobre esta indemnización teniendo en cuenta la legislación europea vigente 2010/76/EU?

3. ¿Piensa la Comisión proponer medidas durante las negociaciones para que CRD IV incluya provisiones para evitar en el futuro situaciones como ésta?

Respuesta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(19 de julio de 2012)

La Directiva 2010/76/UE ([3]) (DRC III) autoriza a los supervisores bancarios a aplicar y hacer cumplir una serie de requisitos relativos a las prácticas y políticas de remuneración de los bancos (por ejemplo, en materia de prestaciones de pensión discrecionales), a fin de que estas prácticas sean compatibles con una gestión de riesgos sólida y eficaz y fomenten dicha gestión. Estas normas están en vigor en los Estados miembros desde el 1 de enero de 2011. La Autoridad Bancaria Europea ha emitido orientaciones al respecto y ha publicado un primer estudio sobre el estado de aplicación en abril de 2012.

En el caso de los bancos que disfrutan de una ayuda estatal excepcional son aplicables requisitos adicionales. En tales casos, la remuneración variable debe limitarse estrictamente a un porcentaje de los ingresos netos cuando dicho tipo de remuneración es incompatible con el mantenimiento de una base de capital sólida y el cese de la ayuda estatal en el momento oportuno. Por otro lado, las autoridades competentes deben exigir a las entidades de crédito que reestructuren su sistema de remuneración en consonancia con una gestión de riesgos sólida y el crecimiento a largo plazo, no debiéndose pagar una remuneración variable a los dirigentes de la entidad a menos que ello se justifique.

Por otra parte, la Directiva DRC III requiere que los pagos derivados de la rescisión de un contrato reflejen los resultados alcanzados a lo largo del tiempo y estén diseñados de forma tal que no recompensen el fracaso.

La Comisión no está en condiciones de presentar observaciones sobre los casos individuales, que incumben a las autoridades nacionales de supervisión correspondientes.

La Comisión continuará su seguimiento de la aplicación de los requisitos legales vigentes, y está participando activamente en los debates acerca de la remuneración en el marco de las actuales negociaciones para la directiva DRC IV. La Comisión no dudará en proponer nuevas medidas en caso necesario.

([1]) http://www.expansion.com/2012/05/29/empresas/banca/1338283160.html?a=1a0dbbff2883483b536630f8291b11c8&t=1338287303.
([2]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2012/05/28/bfa-eleva-a-7263-millones-sus-perdidas-en-2011-las-mayores-de-la-historia-de-la-banca-98908/.
([3]) Directiva 2010/76/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 24 de noviembre de 2010, por la que se modifican las Directivas 2006/48/CE y 2006/49/CE en lo que respecta a los requisitos de capital para la cartera de negociación y las retitulizaciones y a la supervisión de las políticas de remuneración — Texto pertinente a efectos del EE; DO L 329 de 14.12.2010, pp. 3-35.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005385/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Compensation of executives from publicly bailed-out institutions

Following the announcement that Bankia's parent company BFA is to be nationalised, it has been reported that an executive who left the bank last year will receive EUR 13.91 million in compensation ([1]).

The news comes after BFA announced losses of more than EUR 7 000 million in 2011 — the largest in Spanish banking history — instead of the previously predicted EUR 300 million profit ([2]).

This compensation was agreed while the executive was still working at Bancaja, an institution in the BFA merger.

In light of the Capital Requirements Directive (CRD III — Directive 2010/76/EU) and the ongoing negotiations for CRD IV:

1. How does the Commission view this compensation, bearing in mind the losses suffered by BFA?

2. What is the Commission's opinion of this compensation in view of current European legislation, namely Directive 2010/76/EU?

3. Does the Commission intend, during the above negotiations, to propose measures to ensure that CRD IV includes provisions to prevent this happening again?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

Directive 2010/76/EU ([3]) (CRD III) empowers banking supervisors to apply and enforce a range of requirements on the remuneration policies and practices of banks (including discretionary pension benefits) so that these practices are consistent with and promote sound and effective risk management. These rules are in force in Member States since 1 January 2011. EBA has issued guidelines on this matter and published a first implementation survey in April 2012.

For banks that benefit from exceptional government support, additional requirements apply. In these cases, variable remuneration should be strictly limited as a percentage of the net revenue where the variable remuneration is inconsistent with the maintenance of a sound capital base and a timely exit from the government support. Moreover, competent authorities should require credit institutions to restructure remuneration in a manner aligned with sound risk management and long-term growth and no variable remuneration should be paid to persons directing the business of the institution unless justified.

Furthermore, CRD III requires that payments relating to the early termination of a contract reflect performance achieved over time and are designed in a way that does not reward failure.

The Commission is not in a position to comment on individual cases, which are the responsibility of the national supervisory authorities concerned.

The Commission will continue to monitor the application of the existing legal requirements and is taking an active role in the discussions around remuneration in the context of the ongoing negotiations on CRD IV. The Commission will not hesitate to propose further action as necessary.

([1]) http://www.expansion.com/2012/05/29/empresas/banca/1338283160.html?a=1a0dbbff2883483b536630f8291b11c8&t=1338287303.
([2]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2012/05/28/bfa-eleva-a-7263-millones-sus-perdidas-en-2011-las-mayores-de-la-historia-de-la-banca-98908/.
([3]) Directive 2010/76/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 amending Directives 2006/48/EC and 2006/49/EC as regards capital requirements for the trading book and for re-securitisations, and the supervisory review of remuneration policies Text with EEA relevance , OJ L 329, 14.12.2010, p. 3-35.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-005386/12
до Комисията
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Антония Първанова (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Françoise Castex (S&D) и Charles Goerens (ALDE)
(30 май 2012 г.)

Относно: Клаузата на САЩ за „забрана на абортите“, която да се прилага за хуманитарната помощ

Американската агенция за международно развитие (USAID) поддържа клаузата за „забрана на абортите“, която обхваща както информацията относно абортите, така и медицинските услуги, и се отнася до агенциите за предоставяне на хуманитарна помощ. Тази забрана включва отказ на услуги по извършване на аборт на жени и момичета, изнасилени и забременели по време на въоръжени конфликти. Фактът, че САЩ са най-големият доставчик на хуманитарна помощ в света, им е предоставил възможността да определят политиката на третиране на жертвите на изнасилване по време на война. Поради това тази политика на САЩ има преки последствия за всички хуманитарни действия, в които USAID участва активно или пасивно, и би могла да компрометира проектите за хуманитарна помощ, спонсорирани от Генералната дирекция на Комисията „Хуманитарна помощ и гражданска защита“ (ECHO), Комисията и държавите членки, както и да застраши правомощията на ЕС да оформя своята собствена политика за подпомагане на развитието като цяло.

— Счита ли Комисията, че тази политика на USAID е довела до лишаване на жените, които са забременели в резултат на изнасилване при военен акт, от възможността да им бъде направен безопасен аборт?

— Ще се съгласи ли Комисията, че тези жени и момичета са двойно наказани, най-напред като са изнасилени и след това като им се отказва достъп до безопасно прекратяване на нежеланата бременност?

— Ще се съгласи ли Комисията, че ЕС има моралното задължение да оказва подкрепа на тези жени и момичета, включително възможност за безопасен аборт?

— Счита ли Комисията, че жените и момичетата, които са изнасилени при въоръжен конфликт, имат право на медицински грижи и внимание, както е посочено в Женевските конвенции и допълнителните протоколи ([1])? Това право включва ли възможността за безопасен аборт?

— Клаузата на САЩ за „забрана на абортите“ засяга ли пряко или косвено хуманитарните усилия на ЕС и ООН, след като се прилага за всички американски съвместно спонсорирани хуманитарни дейности? Комисията може ли да посочи каква част от финансирането от ЕС е засегната от клаузата на САЩ за „забрана на абортите“?

— Комисията възнамерява ли да гарантира, че условията на САЩ за клауза за „забрана на абортите“ не се прилагат за финансиране на развитието на ЕС?

— Ще повдигне ли Комисията този въпрос пред САЩ и ще призове ли президента, г-н Обама, да отмени тази клауза?

Отговор, даден от г-жа Георгиева от името на Комисията
(17 юли 2012 г.)

Комисията взе под внимание Резолюцията на Европейския парламент от 13 март 2012 г. относно равенството между жените и мъжете в Европейския съюз — 2011 г., включително параграф 61 ([2]).

Комисията предоставя принципна и основана на нуждите хуманитарна помощ, която не е обект на никакви едностранни ограничения, налагани от други донори.

Такава помощ включва оказване на конфиденциални медицински грижи на жертви на изнасилване и други форми на насилие, свързано с пола, в рамките на минималните първоначални услуги за репродуктивно здраве, предоставяни по време на кризи. Спешната контрацепция се използва и при жертви на изнасилване в рамките на профилактиката след експозиция. Профилактиката трябва да се осъществи до 72 часа след инцидента, което означава, че жертвите трябва да

([1]) Член 3, общ за Женевските конвенции, членове 10 и 16 от Допълнителен протокол I; членове 7 и 10 от Допълнителен протокол II.

([2]) „61. Припомня на Комисията и държавите членки за поетите от тях ангажименти да приложат резолюция 1325 на Съвета за сигурност на ООН относно жените, мира и сигурността, и настоятелно призовава предоставянето на хуманитарна помощ на ЕС да бъде осъществено ефективно и независимо от ограниченията върху хуманитарната помощ, налагани от САЩ, особено чрез гарантиране на възможности за извършване на аборт за жени и момичета, които са жертва на изнасилване при въоръжени конфликти.“

имат достъп до здравни грижи. Поради логистични ограничения и ограничения, свързани със сигурността, бързият достъп до медицински грижи все още е предизвикателство, с което Комисията продължава да се бори.

Освен това понастоящем Комисията изготвя нови инструменти за повишаване на информираността относно свързаните с пола специфики на хуманитарните действия, включително оценка на предложения, мониторинг и оценяване, за да се гарантира, че хуманитарната помощ на ЕС отговаря ефективно на специфичните нужди на половете, включително жертвите на изнасилване.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005386/12
an die Kommission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Françoise Castex (S&D) und Charles Goerens (ALDE)
(30. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Klausel der Vereinigten Staaten gegen Schwangerschaftsabbrüche bei humanitärer Hilfe

Die Behörde der Vereinigten Staaten für internationale Entwicklung (United States Agency for International Development — USAID) hält weiterhin an ihrer Klausel gegen Schwangerschaftsabbrüche — die sowohl für Informationen als auch medizinische Leistungen in Bezug auf Schwangerschaftsabbrüche gilt — für Organisationen, die humanitäre Hilfe leisten, fest. Diese Regelung verbietet unter anderem Schwangerschaftsabbrüche bei Frauen und Mädchen, die im Zuge von bewaffneten Konflikten vergewaltigt und geschwängert wurden. Da die Vereinigten Staaten der weltweit größte Geber humanitärer Hilfe sind, sind sie in der Lage, zu bestimmen, wie mit Opfern von Vergewaltigungen in Kriegsgebieten umgegangen werden soll. Diese Politik der USA hat daher direkte Auswirkungen auf sämtliche humanitäre Maßnahmen, an denen USAID aktiv oder passiv beteiligt ist, und könnte humanitäre Hilfsprojekte gefährden, die vom Amt für humanitäre Hilfe der Kommission (ECHO), der Kommission und den Mitgliedstaaten gefördert werden, sowie allgemein die Fähigkeit der EU beeinträchtigen, ihre eigene Entwicklungshilfepolitik zu gestalten.

— Ist die Kommission der Meinung, dass die Politik von USAID dazu geführt hat, dass Frauen, die infolge einer als Kriegsinstrument begangenen Vergewaltigung schwanger wurden, die Möglichkeit eines sicheren Schwangerschaftsabbruchs verwehrt wird?

— Teilt die Kommission die Auffassung, dass diese Frauen und Mädchen insofern doppelt bestraft werden, als sie zuerst vergewaltigt werden und ihnen danach der Zugang zu einem sicheren Abbruch der daraus resultierenden ungewollten Schwangerschaft verweigert wird?

— Ist die Kommission ebenfalls der Ansicht, dass die EU eine moralische Verpflichtung hat, diese Frauen und Mädchen zu unterstützen, was auch die Möglichkeit eines sicheren Schwangerschaftsabbruchs einschließt?

— Vertritt die Kommission die Auffassung, dass Frauen und Mädchen, die im Zuge bewaffneter Konflikte vergewaltigt werden, ein Recht auf medizinische Versorgung und Behandlung haben, so wie es in den Genfer Abkommen und Zusatzprotokollen ([1]) festgelegt ist? Schließt dies einen sicheren Schwangerschaftsabbruch ein?

— Hat die Klausel gegen Schwangerschaftsabbrüche der USA direkte oder indirekte Auswirkungen auf humanitäre Maßnahmen der EU und der Vereinten Nationen, da sie für alle humanitären Aktivitäten gilt, die von den USA mitfinanziert werden? Kann die Kommission Angaben dazu machen, welche Finanzierungsmaßnahmen der EU von der US-Klausel gegen Schwangerschaftsabbrüche betroffen sind?

— Beabsichtigt die Kommission, dafür zu sorgen, dass die Fördermittel der EU für Entwicklungshilfe nicht den Bedingungen der US-Klausel gegen Schwangerschaftsabbrüche unterliegen?

— Wird die Kommission diese Angelegenheit gegenüber den USA zur Sprache bringen und Präsident Obama auffordern, diese Klausel aufzuheben?

([1]) Gemeinsamer Artikel 3 der Genfer Abkommen; Artikel 10 und 16 von Zusatzprotokoll I; Artikel 7 und 10 von Zusatzprotokoll II.

Antwort von Frau Georgieva im Namen der Kommission
(17. Juli 2012)

Die Kommission hat die Entschließung des Europäischen Parlaments vom 13. März 2012 zur Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern in der Europäischen Union — 2011, einschließlich des Absatzes 61 ([2]), zur Kenntnis genommen.

Die Kommission stellt auf Grundsätzen beruhende, bedarfsorientierte humanitäre Hilfe bereit, die keinen einseitig auferlegten Beschränkungen anderer Geber unterliegt.

Diese Unterstützung beinhaltet vertrauliche stationäre Versorgung der Überlebenden von Vergewaltigung und anderen Formen geschlechtsbezogener Gewalt als Teil des Mindestpakets erster Versorgungsleistungen (Minimum Initial Service Package) zur Sicherung der reproduktiven Gesundheit in Krisen. Bei Überlebenden von Vergewaltigung wird auch Notfallverhütung als Teil der Postexpositionsprophylaxe (PEP) verwendet. Das PEP-Paket muss innerhalb von 72 Stunden nach dem Vorfall ausgegeben werden, was bedeutet, dass die Opfer Zugang zur Gesundheitsversorgung haben müssen. Aufgrund von logistischen und Sicherheitsproblemen bleibt der schnelle Zugang zu medizinischer Behandlung eine Herausforderung, an der die Kommission weiterhin arbeitet.

Außerdem entwickelt die Kommission derzeit neue Instrumente zur verbesserten Berücksichtigung geschlechtsspezifischer Fragen bei humanitären Maßnahmen, einschließlich der Bewertung der Vorschläge, des Monitoring und der Evaluierung, um sicherzustellen, dass die humanitäre Hilfe der EU den spezifischen Bedürfnissen der verschiedenen Geschlechtsgruppen und insbesondere auch der Opfer von Vergewaltigungen Rechnung trägt.

([2]) „61. erinnert die Kommission und die Mitgliedstaaten an ihre Verpflichtung, die Resolution 1325 des VN-Sicherheitsrats umzusetzen, und fordert nachdrücklich, dass die von den USA auferlegten Beschränkungen für humanitäre Hilfe nicht mehr für die humanitäre Hilfe der EU gelten sollen, insbesondere durch die Gewährung des Zugangs zu Schwangerschaftsunterbrechungen für Frauen und Mädchen, die im Rahmen bewaffneter Konflikte Opfer von Vergewaltigungen geworden sind".

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005386/12
à la Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Françoise Castex (S&D) et Charles Goerens (ALDE)
(30 mai 2012)

Objet: Clause «anti-avortement» des États-Unis appliquée à l'aide humanitaire

L'Agence pour le développement international des États-Unis (USAID) soutient une clause «anti-avortement» — recouvrant à la fois les informations et les services médicaux relatifs à l'avortement — qui s'étend à toutes les agences délivrant une aide humanitaire. Cette interdiction comprend le refus de l'avortement pour les femmes et les filles victimes de viols et fécondées pendant un conflit armé. Le fait que les États-Unis représente le plus grand fournisseur d'aide humanitaire dans le monde leur ont permis de définir la politique relative au traitement des victimes de viols au cours de conflits. Cette politique américaine a donc des répercussions directes pour toutes les actions humanitaires dans lesquelles l'USAID de près ou de loin et pourrait compromettre les projets d'aide humanitaire sponsorisés par l'Office d'aide humanitaire de la Commission (ECHO), la Commission et les États membres, et mettre en péril le pouvoir de l'UE pour façonner le développement de sa propre politique d'aide en général.

— La Commission estime-t-elle que cette politique de l'USAID a abouti au refus de la possibilité d'un avortement sûr pour les femmes dont la grossesse est le résultat d'un viol perpétré comme un acte de guerre?

— Est-elle d'accord pour dire que ces femmes et ces filles sont doublement punies: tout d'abord par le fait d'avoir été violées et ensuite par le fait de se voir refuser la possibilité de mettre un terme en toute sécurité à la grossesse non désirée qui découle de ce viol?

— Convient-elle du fait que l'UE a une obligation morale de soutenir ces femmes et ces filles, y compris l'option d'un avortement sûr?

— Est-elle d'avis que les femmes et les filles victimes de viols pendant un conflit armé ont le droit à une attention et à des soins médicaux, comme précisé dans les conventions de Genève et ses protocoles additionnels ([1])? Ce droit comprend-t-il l'option d'un avortement sûr?

— La clause «anti-avortement» des États-Unis touche-t-elle directement ou indirectement les efforts humanitaires de l'UE et des Nations unies, étant donné qu'elle s'applique à toutes les activités humanitaires sponsorisées conjointement par les États-Unis? La Commission peut-elle indiquer quels sont les fonds européens qui sont touchés par la clause «anti-avortement» des États-Unis?

— La Commission envisage-t-elle de garantir que les fonds de développement de l'UE ne sont pas soumis aux conditions de la clause «anti-avortement» des États-Unis?

— La Commission portera-t-elle cette question devant les États-Unis et poussera-t-elle le président Obama à annuler cette clause?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Georgieva au nom de la Commission
(17 juillet 2012)

La Commission a pris bonne note de la résolution du Parlement européen, du 13 mars 2012, sur l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes au sein de l'Union européenne — 2011, notamment de son paragraphe 61 ([2]).

La Commission fournit une aide humanitaire fondée sur des principes et des besoins et n'est soumise à aucune restriction unilatérale imposée par d'autres donateurs.

Une telle aide comprend des soins médicaux confidentiels pour les victimes de viol, et d'autres formes de violences liées au genre, dans le cadre du service minimum initial de santé génésique en temps de crises. La contraception d'urgence est également utilisée chez les victimes de viol dans le cadre de la prophylaxie post-exposition (PPE). La

([1]) Article 3 commun aux conventions de Genève; articles 10 et 16 du protocole additionnel I; articles 7 et 10 du protocole additionnel II.

([2]) «61. rappelle à la Commission et aux États membres qu'ils se sont engagés à mettre en œuvre la résolution 1325 du Conseil de sécurité des Nations unies sur les femmes, la paix et la sécurité, et demande instamment que l'aide humanitaire de l'Union européenne soit mise en œuvre de manière complètement autonome, sans dépendre des restrictions imposées par les États-Unis, notamment en assurant l'accès à l'avortement pour les femmes et les filles victimes de viol durant un conflit armé».

procédure PPE doit être appliquée dans les 72 heures suivant l'incident, ce qui signifie que les victimes doivent avoir accès à des soins médicaux. Pour des raisons logistiques et de sécurité, un accès rapide à des soins médicaux reste un défi que la Commission s'emploie à relever.

De plus, la Commission met actuellement en place de nouveaux outils visant à améliorer la prise en compte des questions de genre dans le cadre d'actions humanitaires, notamment lors de l'examen de propositions, de la surveillance et de l'évaluation, afin de s'assurer que l'aide humanitaire de l'Union européenne tienne compte efficacement des besoins spécifiques des différents genres, notamment des victimes de viol.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005386/12
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Françoise Castex (S&D) en Charles Goerens (ALDE)
(30 mei 2012)

Betreft: „Geen abortus"-clausule van de Verenigde Staten toegepast op humanitaire hulp

Het United States Agency for International Development (USAID) hanteert een „geen abortus"-clausule — die zowel informatie over abortus als medische diensten afdekt — die ook van toepassing is op agentschappen die humanitaire hulp verlenen. Dit verbod omvat onder meer het ontzeggen van abortusdiensten aan vrouwen en meisjes die tijdens gewapende conflicten verkracht worden en zwanger raken. Doordat de Verenigde Staten de grootste verlener van humanitaire hulp ter wereld zijn, konden zij het beleid inzake de behandeling van slachtoffers van oorlogsverkrachtingen bepalen. Dit beleid van de VS heeft bijgevolg rechtstreekse gevolgen voor alle humanitaire projecten waarbij USAID actief of passief betrokken is, en het zou de projecten voor humanitaire hulp die door het Humanitair Bureau van de Commissie (ECHO), de Commissie en de lidstaten gesponsord worden en, meer in het algemeen, de bevoegdheid van de EU om haar eigen beleid voor ontwikkelingssamenwerking uit te werken, in gevaar kunnen brengen.

— Is de Commissie van mening dat dit USAID-beleid ertoe geleid heeft dat vrouwen die zwanger raken ten gevolge van verkrachting als oorlogsdaad niet langer de mogelijkheid krijgen om te kiezen voor een veilige abortus?

— Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat deze vrouwen en meisjes twee keer gestraft worden, een eerste keer doordat zij verkracht zijn en een tweede keer doordat zij geen toegang krijgen tot een veilige afbreking van de daaruit voortvloeiende ongewenste zwangerschap?

— Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat de EU de morele verplichting heeft om deze vrouwen en meisjes te steunen, onder meer door hen de mogelijkheid te bieden om op een veilige manier abortus te plegen?

— Is de Commissie van mening dat vrouwen en meisjes die verkracht worden in gewapende conflicten recht hebben op medische zorgen en behandeling, zoals bepaald in het Verdrag van Genève en de aanvullende protocols ([1])? Betekent dit eveneens dat zij voor een veilige abortus moeten kunnen kiezen?

— Heeft de „geen abortus"-clausule van de Verenigde Staten rechtstreeks of onrechtstreeks gevolgen voor de humanitaire hulp van de EU en de VN, aangezien zij van toepassing is op alle humanitaire activiteiten die mede door de VS gesponsord worden? Kan de Commissie aangeven welke EU-financiering getroffen wordt door de „geen abortus"-clausule van de VS?

— Is de Commissie voornemens te garanderen dat de ontwikkelingsfinanciering van de EU niet onderworpen wordt aan de voorwaarden van de „geen abortus"-clausule van de VS?

— Zal de Commissie deze kwestie aankaarten bij de VS en er bij president Obama op aandringen om deze clausule in te trekken?

Antwoord van mevrouw Georgieva namens de Commissie
(17 juli 2012)

De Commissie heeft nota genomen van de resolutie van het Europees Parlement van 13 maart 2012 over de gelijkheid van vrouwen en mannen in de Europese Unie — 2011, en met name van punt 61 ([2]).

De Commissie verleent humanitaire hulp die op beginselen en behoeften is gebaseerd, onafhankelijk van door andere donoren eenzijdig gestelde voorwaarden.

Deze bijstand omvat ook vertrouwelijke medische zorg aan slachtoffers van verkrachting en andere vormen van genderspecifiek geweld, in het kader van het zogeheten Minimum Initial Service Package of Reproductive Health in Crises. Ook noodanticonceptiemiddelen worden verstrekt aan slachtoffers van verkrachting als profylaxe na

([1]) Gemeenschappelijk artikel 3 van de Verdragen van Genève; artikel 10 en 16 van aanvullend protocol I; artikel 7 en 10 van aanvullend protocol II.
([2]) „61. herinnert de Commissie en de lidstaten aan hun engagement om de UNSCR 1325 over vrouwen, vrede en veiligheid uit te voeren, en dringt erop aan dat het bieden van humanitaire hulp door de EU effectief onafhankelijk wordt gemaakt van de beperkingen voor humanitaire hulp opgelegd door de VS, in het bijzonder door vrouwen en meisjes die het slachtoffer zijn van verkrachting in gewapende conflicten toegang te bieden tot abortus.".

blootstelling. Aangezien de profylaxe binnen 72 uur na het incident moet worden toegediend, moeten de slachtoffers toegang hebben tot gezondheidszorg. Snelle toegang tot medische zorg is vanuit logistiek en veiligheidsoogpunt nog steeds een grote uitdaging, die de Commissie erg ter harte blijft nemen.

Voorts ontwikkelt de Commissie momenteel nieuwe instrumenten ter verbetering van het genderbewustzijn bij humanitaire acties, onder meer voor de beoordeling van voorstellen, het toezicht en de evaluatie. Dit moet verzekeren dat de humanitaire hulp van de Unie tegemoet komt aan de specifieke behoeften van verschillende gendergroepen, met inbegrip van slachtoffers van verkrachting.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005386/12
adresată Comisiei
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Françoise Castex (S&D) şi Charles Goerens (ALDE)
(30 mai 2012)

Subiect: Clauza „fără avorturi" aplicată de Statele Unite ajutoarelor umanitare

Agenția Statelor Unite pentru Dezvoltare Internațională (USAID) susține o clauză „fără avorturi" – care vizează atât informații privind avorturile, cât și servicii medicale în acest sens – care se extinde la agențiile care furnizează ajutor umanitar. Această interdicție include refuzarea serviciilor pentru avort femeilor și fetelor violate și rămase însărcinate în contextul conflictelor armate. Faptul că Statele Unite sunt cel mai mare furnizor de ajutor umanitar din lume i-a permis să definească politica privind tratarea victimelor violurilor comise pe timp de război. Prin urmare, această politică a SUA are consecințe directe pentru toate acțiunile umanitare în care USAID este implicată în mod activ sau pasiv și ar putea compromite proiectele de ajutor umanitar sponsorizate de Oficiul pentru Ajutor Umanitar (ECHO) al Comisiei, de Comisie și de statele membre și ar putea periclita competența UE de a-și forma propria politică de asistență pentru dezvoltare, în general.

— Consideră Comisia că această politică a USAID duce la refuzul unei opțiuni de avort în condiții de siguranță pentru femeile care au rămas însărcinate ca urmare a violurilor comise ca acte de război?

— Este de acord Comisia că aceste femei și fete sunt pedepsite de două ori, în primul rând pentru că au fost violate, iar în al doilea rând pentru că li se refuză accesul la o întrerupere în condiții de siguranță a sarcinii nedorite rezultate?

— Este de acord Comisia că UE are datoria morală de a oferi sprijin acestor femei și fete, inclusiv opțiunea unui avort în condiții de siguranță?

— Consideră Comisia că femeile și fetele care sunt violate în contextul conflictelor armate au dreptul să li se ofere îngrijire medicală și atenție, conform prevederilor din Convențiile de la Geneva și din protocoalele suplimentare ([1])? Este inclusă aici și opțiunea pentru un avort în condiții de siguranță?

— Clauza „fără avorturi" aplicată de Statele Unite afectează direct sau indirect eforturile umanitare ale UE și ale ONU, având în vedere că se aplică tuturor activităților umanitare cosponsorizate de SUA? Poate preciza Comisia care finanțări acordate de UE sunt afectate de clauza „fără avorturi" aplicată de Statele Unite?

— Intenționează Comisia să se asigure că finanțarea pentru dezvoltare acordată de UE nu face obiectul condițiilor prevăzute de clauza „fără avorturi" aplicată de Statele Unite?

— Va aduce Comisia în discuție această chestiune cu SUA și îl va îndemna pe președintele Obama să abroge această clauză?

Răspuns dat de dna Georgieva în numele Comisiei
(17 iulie 2012)

Comisia a luat act de rezoluția Parlamentului European din 13 martie 2012 referitoare la egalitatea dintre femei și bărbați în Uniunea Europeană – 2011, inclusiv alineatul 61 al acesteia ([2]).

Comisia asigură ajutor umanitar bazat pe principii și necesități și nu se supune niciunei restricții impuse unilateral de către alți donatori.

Această asistență include îngrijire clinică confidențială pentru victimele unui viol și altor forme de violență pe criterii de gen, ca parte a pachetului minim inițial de servicii legate de sănătatea reproducerii în situații de criză. Mijloacele de contracepție de urgență sunt folosite, de asemenea, pentru victimele unui viol ca parte a profilaxiei post-expunere. Trusele de profilaxie post-expunere trebuie distribuite în decursul a 72 ore de la incident, ceea ce înseamnă că victimele trebuie să aibă acces la asistență medicală. Având în vedere constrângerile în materie de logistică și securitate, accesul rapid la îngrijirea medicală rămâne o provocare la care Comisia caută în continuare soluții.

([1]) Articolul comun 3 din Convențiile de la Geneva; articolele 10 și 16 din Protocolul suplimentar I; articolele 7 și 10 din Protocolul suplimentar II.

([2]) „alineatul 61 reamintește Comisiei și statelor membre de angajamentul acestora de a implementa Rezoluția 1325 a Consiliului de Securitate al ONU privind femeile, pacea și securitatea, și solicită ca acordarea ajutorului umanitar al UE să fie cu adevărat independentă de restricțiile privind ajutorul umanitar impuse de Statele Unite ale Americii, în special prin asigurarea accesului la avort pentru femeile și fetele care sunt victime ale violurilor în conflictele armate".

Mai mult, Comisia elaborează în prezent noi instrumente pentru a spori atenția acordată aspectelor legate de gen în cadrul acțiunilor umanitare, inclusiv evaluarea propunerilor, supravegherea și evaluarea, pentru a se asigura că ajutorul umanitar acordat de UE răspunde în mod eficient nevoilor specifice atât în cazul bărbaților, cât și al femeilor, inclusiv în cazul victimelor unui viol.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-005386/12
komissiolle
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Françoise Castex (S&D) ja Charles Goerens (ALDE)
(30. toukokuuta 2012)

Aihe: Yhdysvaltojen abortin vastaista lauseketta sovelletaan humanitaariseen apuun

Yhdysvaltain kehitysyhteistyövirasto (USAID) hyväksyy abortin vastaisen lausekkeen, johon sisältyy sekä abortista tiedottaminen että siihen liittyvät terveyspalvelut ja joka ulottuu humanitaarista apua tarjoaviin virastoihin. Kieltoon kuuluu myös abortin kieltäminen naisilta ja tytöiltä, jotka on raiskattu ja jotka ovat tulleet raskaaksi aseellisessa konfliktissa. Yhdysvallat ovat maailman suurin humanitaarisen avun toimittaja, mikä on antanut sille mahdollisuuden määritellä sotaraiskauksien uhrien kohtelupolitiikan. Yhdysvaltojen politiikalla on näin ollen suora vaikutus kaikkeen humanitaariseen toimintaan, johon USAID aktiivisesti tai passiivisesti osallistuu, ja se voi vaarantaa komission humanitaarisen avun ja pelastuspalveluasioiden pääosaston (ECHO), komission ja jäsenvaltioiden rahoittamat humanitaariset avustushankkeet sekä EU:n mahdollisuudet muodostaa oma yleinen kehitysapupolitiikkansa.

– Katsooko komissio, että kyseinen USAID:n politiikka on johtanut siihen, että sotatoimena käytetyn raiskauksen johdosta raskaaksi tulleilta naisilta evätään mahdollisuus turvalliseen aborttiin?

– Katsooko komissio, että näitä naisia ja tyttöjä rangaistaan kahdesti, ensin raiskauksella ja toiseksi epäämällä heiltä mahdollisuus raiskauksen aiheuttaman ei-toivotun raskauden turvalliseen keskeyttämiseen?

– Katsooko komissio, että EU:lla on moraalinen velvollisuus tukea näitä naisia ja tyttöjä ja suoda heille mahdollisuus turvalliseen aborttiin?

– Onko komissio sitä mieltä, että aseellisissa konflikteissa raiskatuilla naisilla ja tytöillä on oikeus lääkintähoitoon ja huomioon, kuten Geneven yleissopimuksissa ja lisäpöytäkirjoissa todetaan([1])? Sisältyykö tähän mahdollisuus turvalliseen aborttiin?

– Yhdysvaltojen abortin vastaista lauseketta sovelletaan kaikkeen Yhdysvaltojen yhteisrahoittamaan humanitaariseen toimintaan, joten vaikuttaako se suoraan tai epäsuorasti EU:n ja YK:n humanitaarisiin hankkeisiin? Voiko komissio ilmoittaa, mihin EU:n rahoitukseen Yhdysvaltojen abortin vastainen lauseke vaikuttaa?

– Pyrkiikö komissio varmistamaan, että Yhdysvaltojen abortin vastaisen lausekkeen ehdot eivät kohdistu EU:n kehitysrahoitukseen?

– Aikooko komissio ottaa asian esille Yhdysvaltojen kanssa ja vaatia presidentti Obamaa kumoamaan lauseke?

Kristalina Georgievan komission puolesta antama vastaus
(17. heinäkuuta 2012)

Komissio on ottanut huomioon Euroopan parlamentin 13. maaliskuuta 2012 antaman päätöslauselman naisten ja miesten tasa-arvosta Euroopan unionissa 2011 sekä sen 61 kohdan([2]).

Komissio tarjoaa periaatteellista ja tarveperusteista humanitaarista apua, johon ei sovelleta minkäänlaisia yksipuolisia rajoituksia, kuten muiden avunantajien myöntämään apuun.

Apu käsittää muun muassa luottamuksellisen kliinisen hoidon raiskauksen ja muun sukupuoleen perustuvan väkivallan uhreille osana apupakettia, joka on tarkoitettu lisääntymisterveyden suojelemiseen kriisitilanteissa. Lisäksi raiskauksen uhreille tarjotaan jälkiehkäisyä osana hiv-tartunnan ehkäisemiseksi annettavaa altistumisen jälkeistä estolääkitystä. Estolääkitys on annettava 72 tunnin kuluessa altistumisesta, mikä tarkoittaa sitä, että raiskauksen uhreilla on oltava mahdollisuus saada terveydenhoitoa. Logistiikkaan ja turvallisuuteen liittyvistä syistä nopea hoitoon pääsy on ongelmallista, mutta komissio pyrkii ratkaisemaan tämän haasteen.

([1]) Geneven yleissopimusten yhteinen 3 artikla, I lisäpöytäkirjan 10 ja 16 artikla, II lisäpöytäkirjan 7 ja 10 artikla.

([2]) "61. muistuttaa komissiota ja jäsenvaltioita niiden sitoumuksesta panna täytäntöön naisia, rauhaa ja turvallisuutta koskeva YK:n turvallisuusneuvoston päätöslauselma 1325 ja kehottaa painokkaasti erottamaan EU:n humanitaarisen avun antamisen Yhdysvaltain määräämistä humanitaarista apua koskevista rajoituksista varmistamalla erityisesti aseellisissa konflikteissa raiskauksen uhreiksi joutuneille naisille ja tytöille mahdollisuuden turvautua aborttiin".

Komissio myös kehittää parhaillaan uusia keinoja ottaa sukupuolinäkökohdat paremmin huomioon humanitaarisissa toimissa, muun muassa ehdotusten arvioinnissa, seurannassa ja arvioinnissa, varmistaakseen, että EU:n humanitaarisella avulla vastataan tehokkaasti sukupuoliryhmien ja varsinkin raiskausten uhrien erityistarpeisiin.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005386/12
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), Renate Weber (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE), Véronique Mathieu (PPE), Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), Norbert Neuser (S&D), Françoise Castex (S&D) and Charles Goerens (ALDE)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: United States' 'no abortion' clause applied to humanitarian aid

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) upholds a 'no abortion' clause — covering both abortion information and medical services — which extends to agencies providing humanitarian aid. This prohibition includes the denial of abortion services to women and girls raped and impregnated in armed conflict. The fact that the United States is the world's largest provider of humanitarian aid has enabled it to define the treatment policy for victims of war rape This US policy therefore has direct consequences for all humanitarian actions in which USAID is actively or passively involved, and could compromise humanitarian aid projects sponsored by the Commission's Humanitarian Office (ECHO), the Commission and Member States, as well as jeopardising the EU's power to shape its own development assistance policy in general.

— Does the Commission believe that this USAID policy has led to the option of safe abortion being withheld from women who have become pregnant as a result of rape as an act of war?

— Does the Commission agree that these women and girls are doubly punished, firstly by being raped and secondly by being denied access to a safe termination of the resulting unwanted pregnancy?

— Does the Commission agree that the EU has a moral obligation to give support to these women and girls, including the option of safe abortion?

— Is the Commission of the opinion that women and girls who are raped in armed conflict are entitled to medical care and attention, as stated in the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols ([1])? Does this include the option of safe abortion?

— Does the United States' 'no abortion' clause directly or indirectly affect EU and UN humanitarian efforts, since it applies to all US co-sponsored humanitarian activities? Can the Commission indicate what EU funding is affected by the US 'no abortion' clause?

— Does the Commission intend to ensure that EU development funding is not subject to the conditions of the US 'no abortion' clause?

— Will the Commission raise the matter with the US and urge President Obama to rescind this clause?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2012)

The Commission took good note of the European Parliament Resolution of 13 March 2012 on equality between women and men in the European Union — 2011, including its paragraph 61 ([2]).

The Commission provides principled and needs-based humanitarian aid and it is not subject to any restrictions unilaterally imposed by other donors.

Such assistance includes confidential clinical care for survivors of rape and other forms of gender-based violence, as part of the Minimum Initial Service Package of Reproductive Health in Crises. Emergency contraception is also used for rape survivors as part of the Post-Exposure Prophylaxis (PEP). The PEP kit must be given within 72 hours after the incident, meaning that victims must have access to healthcare. Due to logistical and security constraints, quick access to medical care remains a challenge that the Commission continues to address.

Furthermore, the Commission is currently developing new tools to improve gender sensitivity of humanitarian actions including the assessment of proposals, monitoring and evaluation in order to ensure that EU humanitarian aid effectively addresses the specific needs of different gender groups, including victims of rape.

([1]) Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions; Articles 10 and 16 of Additional Protocol I; Articles 7 and 10 of Additional Protocol II.

([2]) '61. Reminds the Commission and the Member States of their commitment to implement UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, and urges the provision of EU humanitarian aid to be made effectively independent from the restrictions on humanitarian aid imposed by the USA, in particular by ensuring access to abortion for women and girls who are victims of rape in armed conflicts'.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005387/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(30 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Areszt dla byłego więźnia politycznego

29 maja Wasil Parfiankou, działacz sztabu wyborczego byłego kandydata na prezydenta Białorusi Uładzimira Niaklajeua, został skazany na 6 miesięcy więzienia. Parfiankou, ułaskawiony w 2011 r. więzień polityczny, został oskarżony o naruszanie warunków zwolnienia. Opozycjonista codziennie po godzinie 22 miał być w domu, 3 razy spóźnił się o kilka minut.

Działacze praw człowieka zgodnie twierdzą, że postępowanie karne przeciwko aktywiście jest motywowane politycznie, a jego celem jest zmuszenie Parfiankoua do zaprzestania jego opozycyjnej działalności i zastraszenie innych działaczy politycznych i społecznych przed wyborami parlamentarnymi, które odbędą się na Białorusi jesienią tego roku.

Władze białoruskie wywierają coraz większą presję na działaczy opozycyjnych, aktywiści są prześladowani i zastraszani. Więźniowie polityczni są ponownie zamykani w aresztach, na opozycjonistów nakładane są kary grzywny.

W związku z tym zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w sprawie motywowanego politycznie postępowania i wyroku dla Wasila Parfiankoua?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(9 lipca 2012 r.)

UE jest głęboko zaniepokojona utrzymującym się brakiem poszanowania praw człowieka, demokracji i praworządności na Białorusi i ubolewa nad tym, że wobec członków opozycji politycznej oraz przedstawicieli społeczeństwa obywatelskiego nadal stosowane są środki represji.

Dnia 15 kwietnia 2012 r. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wezwała w swoim oświadczeniu władze Białorusi do bezwarunkowego uwolnienia wszystkich więźniów politycznych oraz do usunięcia wszelkich ograniczeń uniemożliwiających im korzystanie z ich praw obywatelskich i politycznych.

Unii Europejskiej znane są doniesienia dotyczące zatrzymania i skazania Wasila Parfiankoua na sześć miesięcy pozbawienia wolności i zwróci baczną uwagę na wynik odwołania. UE informowała kanałami dyplomatycznymi o swoich zastrzeżeniach dotyczących tej sprawy i innych analogicznych przypadków przy wielu okazjach.

UE zdecydowana jest poczynić wszelkie kroki niezbędne do doprowadzenia do zwolnienia i rehabilitacji wszystkich więźniów politycznych i będzie nadal wzywać Białoruś do powstrzymania się od dalszego zastraszania i prześladowania opozycji i społeczeństwa obywatelskiego.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005387/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Detention of a former political prisoner

On 29 May 2012, Vasil Parfiankou, an activist for the electoral campaign of the former Belarusian presidential candidate Vladimir Niaklajeu, was sentenced to six months in prison. Parfiankou, a political prisoner pardoned in 2011, was charged with violation of his parole. The opposition member was supposed to be home by 22:00 every day, but was several minutes late on three occasions.

Human rights activists unanimously agree that the criminal proceedings against the activist are politically motivated, and that their aim is to force Parfiankou to stop his opposition activities and intimidate other political and social activists before the parliamentary elections, which are to be held in Belarus this autumn.

The Belarusian authorities are stepping up the pressure on opposition activists, who are being persecuted and intimidated. Political prisoners are again being detained, and fines are imposed on members of the opposition.

In view of the above, does the Commission intend to intervene in the matter of the politically motivated proceedings and judgment handed down to Vasil Parfiankou?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 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 repressive measures continue to be taken against members of the political opposition and civil society representatives.

On 15 April 2012, the High Representative/Vice-President in a statement called on the authorities of Belarus to release unconditionally all political prisoners and to remove all restrictions on the enjoyment of their civil and political rights.

The EU is aware of reports concerning the arrest and sentencing of Vasil Parfiankou to six months imprisonment and will pay close attention to the outcome of his appeal. The EU has communicated its concern on this and other similar cases on several occasions, through diplomatic channels.

The EU remains committed to taking whatever steps are needed to obtain the release and rehabilitation of all political prisoners, and will continue to encourage Belarus to refrain from continued intimidation and persecution of the opposition and civil society.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005388/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(30 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Represje wobec Europejskiej Białorusi

Andriej Mouczan, działacz prodemokratycznego ruchu Europejska Białoruś, został dotkliwie pobity przez milicję po tym jak na znak solidarności z więźniem politycznym Siarhiejem Kawalenką, wyszedł na ulicę z biało-czerwono-białą flagą, która pozostaje symbolem narodowym białoruskiej opozycji. Stan zdrowia tego białoruskiego opozycjonisty jest bardzo poważny.

Europejska Białoruś jest ruchem, który dąży do wprowadzenia demokratycznych reform w swoim kraju. Jej działaczy spotykają za to represje i prześladowania. Unia Europejska powinna jednak zwrócić szczególną uwagę na działaczy Europejskiej Białorusi, którym należy się wsparcie i ochrona.

— W tym kontekście pragnę zapytać Komisję, jakie widzi możliwości interwencji w sprawie Andrieja Mouczana oraz Europejskiej Białorusi?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(13 lipca 2012 r.)

Komisji Europejskiej i Wysokiej Przedstawiciel znane są doniesienia dotyczące poważnego przypadku złego traktowania przez władze białoruskie opozycjonisty Andrieja Mouczana i wniesionych przeciwko niemu oskarżeń. Wydarzenia te wpisują się w szerszy obraz najnowszych doniesień o szykanowaniu przedstawicieli białoruskiego społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i opozycji poprzez znęcanie się, nakładanie grzywien lub wydawanie wyroków na podstawie sfałszowanych oskarżeń.

Komisja i Wysoka Przedstawiciel będą nadal uważnie śledzić rozwój wydarzeń na Białorusi i reagować w odpowiedni sposób na doniesienia o szykanowaniu przedstawicieli społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i opozycji politycznej, w tym przedstawicieli organizacji „Europejska Białoruś".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005388/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Repression against European Belarus

Andrei Mouchan, an activist in the pro-democratic European Belarus movement, was severely beaten by police after he went out into the street to show solidarity with political prisoner Siarhei Kavalenka. Mr Mouchan was carrying a white/red/white flag, which remains the national symbol of the Belarusian opposition. He is in a very serious condition.

The aim of the European Belarus movement is to bring democratic reform to Belarus. For this its activists face repression and persecution. The European Union should pay particular attention to European Belarus activists, who deserve support and protection.

— What scope does the Commission see for intervention in the case of Andrei Mouchan and European Belarus?

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

The European Commission and the High Representative are aware of reports of the severe mistreatment by the Belarusian authorities of opposition activist Andrey Molchan and of the charges subsequently brought against him. These events fit into a broader picture of recent reports of harassment of representatives of Belarusian civil society and opposition by way of mistreatment and administrative fines or sentences on trumped up charges.

The Commission and the High Representative will continue to follow events in Belarus closely and react as appropriate to reports of harassment of representatives of civil society and the political opposition, including those of the organisation 'a European Belarus'.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005389/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(30 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Napaść na rosyjskiego dziennikarza

Wieczorem 28 maja w Moskwie znany w Rosji dziennikarz radiowy i telewizyjny Siergiej Asłanian został brutalnie pobity i wielokrotnie pchnięty nożem. Lekarze określają jego stan jako ciężki. Sprawcy napadu nie ujęto.

Asłanian był związany z radiem Echo Moskwy, obecnie współpracuje z państwową rozgłośnią Majak. Przypuszcza się, że Asłanian został pobity za swoją niedawną wypowiedź na antenie Majaka na temat Mahometa. Dziennikarz miał powiedzieć, że Mahomet „nie był działaczem religijnym, lecz biznesmenem". Niektórzy muzułmanie uznali wypowiedź za prowokacyjną i obraźliwą dla proroka. Wierni z Tatarstanu złożyli nawet w Prokuraturze Generalnej Federacji Rosyjskiej skargę na dziennikarza.

Zawód dziennikarza w Rosji jest określany mianem „zawodu wysokiego ryzyka". O swoje życie obawiają się szczególnie niezależni dziennikarze.

1. W jaki sposób Komisja planuje prowadzić dalszy dialog z Rosją w kontekście licznych napaści na dziennikarzy?

2. Czy na najbliższym szczycie Unia-Rosja 3 i 4 czerwca zostanie poruszona kwestia napaści na dziennikarzy?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(6 lipca 2012 r.)

UE potępia atak na Siergieja Asłaniana. Sytuacja dziennikarzy w Rosji, którzy często napotykają ograniczenia i utrudnienia podczas wykonywania swojego zawodu, wzbudza ogromne zaniepokojenie Wysokiej Przedstawiciel i całej Komisji. W deklaracji z dnia 17 listopada 2010 r. Wysoka Przedstawiciel i Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji Catherine Ashton wyraziła w imieniu UE zaniepokojenie sytuacją dziennikarzy w Rosji.

Wolność mediów i swobodny przepływ informacji należą do praw podstawowych, o których mowa zarówno w europejskiej Konwencji o ochronie praw człowieka i podstawowych wolności, ratyfikowanej również przez Rosję, jak i w konstytucji Federacji Rosyjskiej. W swoich kontaktach z władzami rosyjskimi UE podkreśla, jak to miało miejsce ostatnio podczas szczytu w Sankt Petersburgu w dniach 3 i 4 czerwca 2012 r., że zawarte w tych dokumentach gwarancje powinny być podtrzymywane i przestrzegane.

Kwestie odnoszące się do wolności wyrażania opinii i wolności mediów zostały uwzględnione w ostatniej rundzie konsultacji UE-Rosja w zakresie praw człowieka. Odniesiono się do nich także podczas szczytu UE-Rosja, który odbył się w dniu 15 grudnia 2011 r. w Brukseli. Kwestie dotyczące mediów wybrano także jako główny temat dorocznej konferencji dotyczącej praw człowieka, zorganizowanej dnia 12 kwietnia 2011 r. przez delegaturę UE w Moskwie.

UE nieustannie apeluje do rządu rosyjskiego, aby zagwarantował on poszanowanie wolności mediów, zgodnie z przyjętymi przez Rosję międzynarodowymi zobowiązaniami, oraz aby zapewnił dziennikarzom bezpieczne warunki pracy, tak by nie musieli się zmagać z niepotrzebnymi ograniczeniami ani zastraszaniem.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005389/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Attack on a Russian journalist

On the evening of 28 May 2012 in Moscow, well-known Russian radio and television journalist Sergei Aslanyan was brutally beaten and repeatedly stabbed with a knife. Doctors describe his condition as serious. The perpetrator of the attack was not apprehended.

Aslanyan was associated with the Ekho Moskvy radio station, and is currently working with the state broadcasting company Mayak. It is believed that Aslanyan was beaten for his recent on-air statement on Mayak about Mohammed. The journalist reportedly said that Mohammed 'was not a religious activist, but a businessman'. Some Muslims deemed this statement to be provocative and offensive to the prophet. The faithful from Tatarstan even filed a complaint against the journalist at the Office of the Prosecutor General of Russia.

In Russia, journalism is described as a 'high risk profession'. Independent journalists are particularly fearful for their lives.

1. How does the Commission plan to conduct further dialogue with Russia in the context of the numerous attacks on journalists?

2. Will the matter of attacks on journalists be addressed at the next EU-Russia summit on 3 and 4 June 2012?

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

The EU condemns this attack on Mr Aslanyan. The situation of journalists in Russia, who often face restrictions and obstacles while carrying out their professional activities, is of serious concern to the High Representative and the Commission. The HR/VP expressed concerns, on behalf of the EU, with the situation of journalists in Russia in a declaration of 17 November 2010.

Freedom of media and information is a fundamental right, enshrined in both the European Convention of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, to which Russia is a party, as well as in the Constitution of the Russian Federation. The EU stresses in its contacts with the Russian authorities, as it has done most recently at the St Petersburg Summit of 3 and 4 June 2012, that the guarantees provided therein should be upheld and respected.

Issues pertaining to freedom of expression and media have been addressed at the last round of the EU-Russia human rights consultations. They have also been addressed at the 15 December 2011 EU-Russia Summit, which took place in Brussels. Media issues were also chosen as the main topic of the annual human rights conference organised by the EU Delegation in Moscow, which took place on 12 April 2011.

The EU continues urging the Russian government to ensure that freedom of the media is respected, in line with Russia's international obligations, and that journalists can work safely in the country, without undue retrictions or intimidation.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005390/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(30 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Massacro di Hula in Siria

Dall'11 marzo 2011 ammontano ormai a 13 mila i decessi in Siria a seguito degli scontri che imperversano nel Paese.

L'ultimo atto ha visto l'esercito siriano attaccare la città di Hula con carri armati ed artiglieria pesante il 25 maggio scorso: secondo il rapporto degli osservatori dell'ONU vi sono stati 92 morti, tutti civili, fra i quali 32 bambini e centinaia di feriti e si registrano testimonianze di massacri sommari perpetrati dall'esercito.

Italia, Spagna e Germania hanno reagito a quest'ultimo atto di violenza contro la popolazione civile da parte del governo siriano con l'espulsione degli ambasciatori e di alcuni diplomatici.

— Qual è la posizione della Commissione di fronte a questo ennesimo caso di violenza?

— Quali politiche intende porre in atto per rispondere alla situazione in Siria?

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

Nelle dichiarazioni del 27 maggio 2012 e del 7 giugno 2012 e nel discorso pronunciato dinanzi al Parlamento il 13 giugno 2012, l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente (AR/VP) ha condannato duramente i terribili massacri di Houla e Al-Qubeir, sollecitando indagini immediate per garantire che i responsabili di tali atrocità siano consegnati alla giustizia. L'AR/VP accoglie pertanto con favore le indagini condotte dall'Organizzazione delle Nazioni Unite su entrambe le stragi e sostiene pienamente l'istituzione di una commissione d'inchiesta da parte del Consiglio dei diritti umani delle Nazioni Unite.

Per ridurre il rischio crescente di una guerra civile e di un conflitto settario, la comunità internazionale deve intensificare i suoi sforzi a sostegno dell'inviato speciale Kofi Annan e del suo piano di pace. A tal fine l'AR/VP ha esortato il Consiglio di sicurezza dell'ONU ad esercitare una pressione più incisiva ed efficace sul regime attraverso l'adozione di sanzioni nell'ambito del Capitolo VII.

Allo stesso tempo l'UE continua a fornire sostegno alla missione di supervisione dell'ONU in Siria (UNSMIS) e ha stanziato 32 milioni di euro per far fronte alle esigenze umanitarie all'interno del paese e nelle nazioni confinanti. La Commissione ha inoltre appena approvato una misura speciale di 23 milioni di euro a sostegno della società civile in Siria e dei rifugiati siriani che si trovano nei paesi confinanti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005390/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Houla massacre in Syria

Since 11 March 2011, there have been 13 000 deaths in Syria following the violence in the country.

The latest action on 25 May saw the Syrian army attack the town of Houla with tanks and heavy artillery. According to UN observers there were 92 deaths — all civilians — including 32 children. Hundreds were wounded. Witnesses say the massacres were perpetrated by the army.

Italy, Spain and Germany have reacted to this latest act of violence by the Syrian Government against the civilian population by expelling ambassadors and certain diplomats.

— What is the Commission's position on this latest case of violence?

— What policies does it intend to implement to respond to the situation in Syria?

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

In her statements of 27 May 2012 and 7 June 2012 as well as in her speech before Parliament on 13 June 2012, the HR/VP strongly condemned the appalling massacres in Houla and Al-Qubeir. She called for a swift investigation to ensure that the perpetrators of these atrocities will be brought to justice. Hence, she welcomes the United Nations (UN) investigations into both massacres and fully supports the UN Human Rights Council in setting up a Committee of Investigation.

To ease the growing risk of civil war and sectarian conflict, the International Community needs to step up its efforts in support of Special Envoy Kofi Annan and his peace plan. To this end, the HR/VP has called on the UN Security Council to exert more robust and effective pressure on the regime by adopting sanctions under Chapter VII.

In parallel, the EU continues to provide support to the UN Supervision Mission is Syria (UNSMIS) and has also allocated EUR 32 million to address humanitarian needs inside Syria and in neighbouring countries. Moreover, the Commission just approved a EUR 23 million special measure to support civil society within Syria and Syrian refugees in neighbouring countries.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005391/12
to the Commission
Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Live animal transport: problems with heat stress and dehydration

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires vehicles used to transport live animals for more than eight hours to be equipped with a ventilation system capable of maintaining temperatures between 5 °C and 30 °C with a +/- 5 °C tolerance.

In practice, mechanical fans are the only form of ventilation in these vehicles. At most, they circulate air, but they do not reduce temperatures. Nevertheless, these vehicles have been and continue to be granted certificates of approval by Member States' competent authorities.

Many animals suffer from heat stress and dehydration inside these vehicles during the hot summer months, with temperatures rising to over 35 °C, particularly in southern Europe. This affects all animals, but may be particularly severe for animals which are not used to high temperatures.

In 2010, Ireland rightly prohibited live animal transport between Ireland and Greece during July and August 'due to high temperatures, humidity and the length of the journey involved'.

In light of this situation, I would be grateful for answers to the following:

1. How does the Commission intend to rectify the systematic and ongoing failure by Member States to enforce Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005?

2. Does the Commission agree that the establishment of a maximum eight-hour journey limit, as already requested by Parliament and by over one million European citizens, could help prevent the most extreme cases of dehydration and heat stress?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

1. The main responsibility to ensure proper enforcement of EU-legislation rests with the Member States. However, as concluded in the Commission report on animal welfare during transport ([1]), enforcement of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport ([2]) remains a major challenge. The report therefore considers a number of actions aimed at improving enforcement. These include the harmonised use of the navigation systems and increased cooperation with the competent authorities of the Member States ([3]).

In addition to the actions described in the report, the Commission regularly audits Member States' compliance with the requirements of the EU legislation on animal welfare during transport via the Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission . Where a Member State fails to comply with EC law, the Commission has powers to try to bring the infringement to an end and, where necessary, may refer the case to the European Court of Justice.

2. Any journey, regardless of its length, that is carried out in non-compliance with the rules could lead to suffering for the animals. The main tool to prevent this is to ensure proper enforcement of the current rules which therefore remains the priority for the Commission.

([1]) 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.
([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations; OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.
([3]) Chapter 3, points a and d, of the report.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-005392/12
til Kommissionen
Anne E. Jensen (ALDE)
(30. maj 2012)

Om: Dyrlægers modstridende vurderinger resulterer i sanktioner til chauffører

Danske vognmænd har gjort undertegnede medlem af Europa-Parlamentet Anne E. Jensen opmærksom på konsekvenserne af Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 1/2005 af 22. december 2004 om beskyttelse af dyr under transport og dermed forbundne aktiviteter og om ændring af direktiv 64/432/EØF og 93/119/EF og forordning (EF) nr. 1255/97 som følge af modstridende vurderinger af dyrenes helbredsmæssige tilstand fra dyrlæger ved transportens afgang og ankomst. Forordningen pålægger chaufførerne ansvar for dyrenes tilstand, og dette har resulteret i sanktioner mod chaufførerne.

Der henvises til artikel 21, litra c), artikel 26, stk. 4, litra b), og artikel 36, nr. 3, litra c), i den ovenstående forordning.

Ifølge vognmændene har der været episoder, hvor chauffører er blevet sanktioneret, efter at dyrlægen ved gården har godkendt dyrenes helbredsmæssige tilstand til transport til slagtning. Derefter har slagteriets dyrlæge erklæret selvsamme dyr for uegnet til transport, og chaufføren er derefter blevet sanktioneret.

Hvordan forholder Kommissionens sig til, at fagfolks modstridende vurderinger resulterer i sanktioner mod en tredjepart, der ikke har de faglige forudsætninger for at vurdere, om forordningen bliver overtrådt?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af John Dalli
(17. august 2012)

I henhold til Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 1/2005 om beskyttelse af dyr under transport ([1]) skal chauffører have tilstrækkelig viden om kravene i forordningen. Heri indgår bestemmelserne om egnethed til transport, jf. kapitel 1 i bilag I til forordningen.

Hvis forordningens bestemmelser overtrædes, skal de kompetente myndigheder og/eller de nationale domstole håndhæve forordningen. Kommissionen tager ikke individuelle sager op og griber kun ind, hvis den kompetente myndighed i en medlemsstat synes systematisk at undlade at håndhæve EU-lovgivningen korrekt. Kommissionen har ikke i øjeblikket oplysninger, der tyder på, at dette er tilfældet i Danmark.

([1]) Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 1/2005 om beskyttelse af dyr under transport og dermed forbundne aktiviteter (EUT L 3 af 5.1.2005, s. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005392/12
to the Commission
Anne E. Jensen (ALDE)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Conflicting veterinary assessments are resulting in penalties for drivers

Danish hauliers have raised the issue of the consequences of conflicting veterinary assessments of animal health at departure and destination during transport operations arising from Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations, and amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 93/119/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1255/97. The regulation makes the drivers responsible for the animals' condition and this has resulted in penalties being imposed on them.

Reference is made to Article 21(c), Article 26(4)(b) and Article 36(3)(c) of the regulation.

The hauliers insist that there have been occasions where drivers have been penalised after the veterinarian at the farm had assessed the animals' condition and approved transport for slaughter. The veterinarian at the slaughterhouse had subsequently declared the same animals unsuitable for transport and the driver was penalised.

What is the position of the Commission in cases where conflicting professional assessments result in the imposition of penalties on a third party who does not have the specialist qualifications to assess whether an infringement of the regulation has taken place?

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

Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport ([1]) prescribes that road vehicle drivers shall have some knowledge of its requirements. This includes the provisions on fitness for transport, laid down in Annex I, Chapter 1 of the regulation.

In case of non-compliance with the regulation, it is for the competent authorities and/or national courts to enforce the regulation. The Commission does not intervene in relation to individual cases, but only where there appears to be a systematic failure of the competent authority of the Member State to properly enforce EU-legislation. At present the Commission has no indications that this is the case in Denmark.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations; OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-005393/12
til Kommissionen
Anne E. Jensen (ALDE)
(30. maj 2012)

Om: Øget risiko for arbejdsskader for chauffører

Danske vognmænd har gjort undertegnede medlem af Europa-Parlamentet Anne E. Jensen opmærksom på, at Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 1/2005 af 22. december 2004 om beskyttelse af dyr under transport og dermed forbundne aktiviteter og om ændring af direktiv 64/432/EØF og 93/119/EF og forordning (EF) nr. 1255/97 siden 2005 har øget risikoen for arbejdsskader for de berørte chauffører.

Chaufføren forpligtes i overstående forordning, kapitel III, pkt. 1.12 (d), til at adskille kønsmodne han- og hundyr inden transporten, hvilket øger chaufførernes risiko for arbejdsskader som følge af den pålagte håndtering af de ophidsede dyr.

Hvordan forholder Kommissionen sig til den øgede fare for chaufførerne som følge af kravet om adskillelse af han- og hundyr i forordning (EF) nr. 1/2005 af 22. december 2004?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af John Dalli
(10. juli 2012)

Personalets sikkerhed er af stor betydning for Kommissionen, og Kommissionen er opmærksom på de risici, der er forbundet med transport af dyr. Disse risici kan og bør minimeres ved at sikre en ordentlig uddannelse af personalet, ved at anvende det rigtige udstyr og ved at gøre dyrene klar til den planlagte transport.

I henhold til artikel 6, stk. 5, i forordning (EF) nr. 1/2005 ([1]) om beskyttelse af dyr under transport skal chauffører være i besiddelse af et kompetencebevis udstedt i overensstemmelse med bilag IV til samme forordning. I bilag IV, punkt 2, litra f), pointeres det, at den uddannelse, der er nødvendig for at få attesten, skal omfatte sikkerhedsmæssige hensyn for de personer, der håndterer dyrene.

Kapitel II, punkt 1.4, i bilag I til nævnte forordning foreskriver, at skillevægge i transportmidler skal være tilstrækkeligt solide til at modstå presset fra dyrenes vægt, og at alt udstyr skal kunne betjenes hurtigt og nemt. I henhold til kapitel III, punkt 1.3, skal pålæsningsfaciliteter være indrettet på en sådan måde, at dyrene ikke kommer til skade, og således at deres ophidselse og ængstelse under flytningen begrænses mest muligt. Mindre stress for dyrene ville også mindske risikoen for, at de personer, der håndterer dyrene, kommer til skade.

Betydningen af at gøre dyr klar til forsendelser er beskrevet i udtalelsen fra Den Videnskabelige Komité for Dyrs Sundhed og Trivsel, som blev vedtaget i marts 2002 ([2]). Ifølge udtalelsen skal dyr gøres behørigt klar til en forsendelse under hensyntagen til dyreart og transportens varighed. Som Kommissionen forstår det, bør dyr, der skal holdes adskilt under rejsen, holdes adskilt helt fra starten af forberedelserne til transporten, idet dette ville give mindre stress ved selve pålæsningen.

([1]) Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 1/2005 om beskyttelse af dyr under transport og dermed forbundne aktiviteter (EUT L 3 af 5.1.2005, s. 1).
([2]) Rapport om dyrs velfærd under transport (heste, svin, får og kvæg) fra Den Videnskabelige Komité for Dyrs Sundhed og Trivsel. Vedtaget den 11. marts 2002 (http://ec.europa.eu/food/fs/sc/scf/out149_en.pdf).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005393/12
to the Commission
Anne E. Jensen (ALDE)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Increased risk of accidents at work for lorry drivers

Danish lorry drivers have drawn to my attention the fact that Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations and amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 93/119/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1255/97 has increased the risk of accidents at work for the drivers concerned since 2005.

Under Chapter III, point 1.12(d) of Annex I to the abovementioned regulation, drivers are required to separate sexually mature male animals from females before transport, which increases the risk of accidents at work for the drivers, as they are required to handle animals that are in a state of excitement.

What is the Commission's view of the increased danger to drivers resulting from the requirement to separate male from female animals under Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(10 July 2012)

The safety of personnel is of great importance for the Commission, and the Commission is aware of the risks involved when animals are being transported. These risks can and should be minimised by ensuring proper training of the personnel, having the correct equipment and preparing the animals for the planned journey.

According to Article 6(5) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 ([1]) on the protection of animals during transport drivers must hold a certificate of competence, which should be granted in accordance with Annex IV to the regulation. Point 2(f) of Annex IV highlights that the training needed to receive the certificate must include safety considerations for personnel handling animals.

Point 1(4) of Chapter II of Annex I to the regulation states that partitions of means of transport should be strong enough to withstand the weight of the animals and that fittings shall be designed for quick and easy operation. According to point 1(3) of Chapter III, facilities for loading shall be constructed so as to prevent injury and minimise excitement and distress during animal movements. Reduced stress for the animals would also decrease the risk of injury for the staff handling the animals.

The importance of preparing animals for the journey was described in the opinion of the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal welfare, adopted in March 2002 ([2]). According to the opinion animals must be adequately prepared for the journey, taking the species and the length of the journey in to account. It is the understanding of the Commission that animals that will be kept separate during the journey should be separated throughout the preparation stage for transport as this would lead to a less stressful situation at the time of loading.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations; OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.
([2]) The welfare of animals during transport (details for horses, pigs, sheep and cattle) — Report of the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare. Adopted on 11 March 2002; http://ec.europa.eu/food/fs/sc/scah/out71_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005394/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(30. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Förderung von „Lindau 21“

Im Rahmen der Bahnachse München-Memmingen-Lindau-Bregenz-Zürich soll in Lindau-Reutin unter dem Titel „Lindau 21“ ein neuer Durchgangsbahnhof entstehen, welcher die Fahrtzeit zwischen München und Zürich deutlich reduzieren soll. Nach einem Volksentscheid im März 2012 soll der neue Bahnhof den alten Kopfbahnhof der Stadt als Hauptbahnhof ersetzen. Die Kosten für das Projekt werden Medienberichten zufolge auf etwa 65 Mio. EUR beziffert.

1. Wird das Projekt „Lindau 21“ mit europäischen Fördermitteln mitfinanziert? Wenn ja, in welcher Höhe werden Fördergelder für das Bahnhofsprojekt bereitgestellt?

2. Wird das Bahnhofsprojekt im Rahmen des TEN-T-Netzes der Europäischen Kommission geführt? Wenn ja, wird es dem Kernnetzwerk oder dem erweiterten Netzwerk zugeordnet?

3. Welchen wirtschaftlichen oder sozialen Nutzen verspricht sich die Kommission von dem Bahnhofsprojekt?

4. Mit welchen Fahrzeitverkürzungen rechnet die Kommission auf der Strecke München-Zürich?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(28. Juni 2012)

1.-2. Der Abschnitt München-Memmingen-Lindau-Bregenz-Zürich ist Teil des bestehenden transeuropäischen Verkehrsnetzes und wurde auch in den Kommissionsvorschlag über neue Leitlinien für den Aufbau des transeuropäischen Verkehrsnetzes (TEN-V) aufgenommen, der am 19.10.2011 angenommen wurde ([1]). Der Abschnitt wurde in das künftige Gesamtnetz eingegliedert. Der Kommissionsvorschlag durchläuft zurzeit das Mitentscheidungsverfahren und am 22.3.2012 wurde vom Rat eine „allgemeine Ausrichtung“ erreicht.

Für den sogenannten „Lindau 21“ gibt es keine Finanzierung durch TEN-V. Die deutschen Behörden können bei künftigen TEN-V-Aufforderungen Fördermittel beantragen, soweit dies mit den Zielen der zukünftigen Aufforderungen übereinstimmt. Die Auswahlkriterien für die künftigen Aufforderungen im Zuge der kommenden Finanziellen Vorausschau werden von den Ergebnissen einer Reihe laufender Mitentscheidungsverfahren abhängen, darunter insbesondere die Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ ([2]) und die Kommissionsvorschläge zu den Strukturfonds.

3.-4. Für alle Vorhaben, die von der Kommission kofinanziert werden sollen, muss eine positive Kosten-Nutzen-Analyse nachgewiesen werden. Es fällt in die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten, diese Analyse durchzuführen.

Die Fahrtdauer ist ein wichtiges Element einer solchen Kosten-Nutzen-Analyse. Ein Durchgangsbahnhof kann zu einer erheblichen Reduzierung der Fahrtzeiten führen. Allerdings spielen auch andere Faktoren wie das Signalgebungssystem, Betriebsvorschriften, Kapazitäten und die Geschwindigkeit eine wichtige Rolle für die Fahrtzeiten und müssen in die Analyse einbezogen werden.

([1]) KOM(2011)650.
([2]) KOM(2011)665.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005394/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Funding for the 'Lindau 21' project

As part of the Munich-Memmingen-Lindau-Bregenz-Zurich rail axis, a new through station is to be built in Lindau-Reutin ('Lindau 21' project), significantly reducing journey times between Munich and Zurich. Following a referendum held in March 2012, the new station is to replace the old terminal station as the city's main railway station. According to media reports, the project will cost around EUR 65 million.

1. Will the 'Lindau 21' project be part-financed from EU funds? If so, how much EU funding will be made available?

2. Is the station project to be implemented as part of the Commission's TEN-T network project? If so, will it be part of the core network or the extended network?

3. What economic or social benefits does the Commission expect the station project to generate?

4. By how much does the Commission expect journey times between Munich and Zurich to be cut?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

1-2 The section Munich-Memmingen-Lindau-Bregenz-Zurich is part of the existing TEN-T network and is retained in the Commission proposal for new Guidelines for the trans-European transport network (TEN-T) adopted on 19 October 2011 ([1]). This section has been included into the future comprehensive network. The Commission proposal is currently in co decision procedure and a 'general approach' has been reached by the Council on 22 March 2012.

There is no TEN-T funding involved for the so called 'Lindau 21'. The German authorities can apply for funding in future TEN-T calls if it will fit into the targets of future calls. The eligibility for future calls during the oncoming financial perspectives will depend on the outcome of a range of co decision procedures ongoing, amongst which notably the Connecting Europe Facility ([2]) and the Commission proposals for the structural funds.

3-4 All projects to be co funded by the Commission have to demonstrate a positive cost-benefit analysis. It falls within the competencies of the Member States to perform such an analysis.

Journey times are an important factor of such cost-benefit analysis. A through station can result in significant cuts in journey times. However, also other factors, such as the signalling system, operational rules, capacities and speed do play an important role in journey times and have to be taken into account in such analysis.

([1]) COM(2011)650.
([2]) COM(2011)665.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005395/12
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE) e Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(30 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Nesso tra il rapporto speciale 301 e l'integrazione del mercato europeo

Ogni anno, dal 1989, l'Ufficio del rappresentante per il Commercio degli Stati Uniti elabora il rapporto speciale 301 che valuta i quadri giuridici in materia di diritti di proprietà intellettuale di paesi terzi. I paesi indicati nel rapporto come «paesi stranieri prioritari» possono essere soggetti a ritorsioni commerciali da parte del governo degli Stati Uniti finché quest'ultimo non si sia accertato che la protezione dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale sia adeguata.

Gli Stati Uniti continuano a includere in tali elenchi Stati membri dell'Unione europea, anche come paesi stranieri prioritari ([1]), il che significa che vi sono Stati membri attualmente esposti al rischio di sanzioni commerciali unilaterali da parte degli Stati Uniti.

L'Unione europea e alcuni governi hanno tentato, senza successo, di contestare tale pratica presso l'organo di conciliazione dell'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio (causa DS 152), il quale, nel gennaio del 2000, ha stabilito che tali sanzioni unilaterali, imposte contro paesi terzi dal governo degli Stati Uniti, sono conformi alle norme dell'OMC ([2]).

Dal 2000 è stata introdotta nell'UE una nuova legislazione sul rispetto dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale (segnatamente la direttiva sul rispetto dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale, 2004/48/CE ([3])). Essa comprende misure di attuazione uniforme in tutti gli Stati membri e può giustificare un nuovo esame degli elenchi del rapporto speciale 301, forse anche per quanto concerne la loro conformità agli accordi dell'OMC.

1. Intende la Commissione adire nuovamente l'organo di conciliazione dell'OMC?

2. In caso negativo, come può la Commissione garantire che il mercato interno mantenga una struttura solida se le sue parti costitutive sono esposte singolarmente a minacce di terzi?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(26 giugno 2012)

Nella causa portata dinanzi all'organo di conciliazione dell'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio (OMC) a cui si riferisce l'onorevole parlamentare, gli Stati Uniti hanno assunto un impegno (in un cosiddetto *Statement of Administrative Action*) di non adottare misure non coerenti con i propri obblighi previsti dall'accordo OMC. Dato che attualmente non vi sono indicazioni che gli Stati Uniti abbiano revocato o annullato il loro impegno, la Commissione non intende per il momento adire nuovamente l'organo di conciliazione dell'OMC.

La Commissione osserva che il rapporto speciale 301 degli Stati Uniti definisce effettivamente alcuni Stati membri come problematici a causa del livello locale di prodotti contraffatti. Tuttavia, per quanto risulta alla Commissione, gli Stati Uniti non hanno imposto sanzioni a tali Stati membri. I problemi menzionati dagli Stati Uniti nel rapporto speciale 301 vengono affrontati piuttosto nel contesto di un dialogo e di uno scambio d'informazioni con lo Stato membro in questione e/o tramite la Commissione.

Per quanto riguarda la seconda domanda posta dagli onorevoli parlamentari, la Commissione non ritiene che il rapporto speciale 301 possa incidere sulla struttura del mercato interno. Gli onorevoli parlamentari indicano giustamente che a livello UE, la direttiva del 2004 ([4]) ha armonizzato le misure, le procedure e i mezzi di ricorso di natura civile per i casi di violazione dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale.

([1]) http://www.ustr.gov/about-us/press-office/reports-and-publications/2012-2.
([2]) http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds152_e.htm
([3]) GU L 157 del 30.4.2004, pag. 45.
([4]) Direttiva 2004/48/CE del Parlamento e del Consiglio, del 29 aprile 2004, sul rispetto dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale, GU L 157 del 30.4.2004.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-005395/12
till kommissionen
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE) och Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(30 maj 2012)

Angående: Förhållandet mellan den särskilda rapporten ”301” och integreringen av EU:s marknad

Sedan 1989 har kontoret för Förenta staternas representant i handelsfrågor varje år utarbetat en särskild rapport, ”301”, där ramverk för skyddet av immateriella rättigheter i tredjeländer utvärderas. Den amerikanska regeringen kan tillämpa handelssanktioner mot de länder som i rapporten anges som prioriterade länder tills dess att regeringen har förvissat sig om att ett tillräckligt skydd av immateriella rättigheter säkerställs.

Det har kommit till vår kännedom att Förenta staterna fortfarande placerar enskilda EU-medlemsstater på dessa listor, och att de till och med anges som prioriterade länder ([1]), vilket innebär att enskilda medlemsstater för närvarande riskerar att drabbas av ensidiga handelssanktioner från Förenta staterna.

EU och flera regeringar har utan framgång protesterat mot detta i Världshandelsorganisationens tvistlösningsorgan (mål DS 152). I januari 2000 fastställde detta organ att de ensidiga sanktionerna från den amerikanska regeringens sida mot tredje part är förenliga med Världshandelsorganisationens (WTO) bestämmelser ([2]).

Sedan 2000 har ny lagstiftning om skyddet för immateriella rättigheter (närmare bestämt direktivet om säkerställande av skyddet för immateriella rättigheter, 2004/48/EG ([3])) införts i EU. I direktivet ingår gemensamma genomförandeåtgärder för medlemsstaterna, och den nya lagstiftningen kan innebära att listorna i den särskilda rapporten ”301” bör omprövas, förmodligen även när det gäller deras överensstämmelse med WTO-avtal.

1. Överväger kommissionen att på nytt ta upp denna fråga i WTO:s tvistlösningsorgan?

2. Hur kan kommissionen annars säkerställa att den inre marknaden förblir strukturellt stabil när dess enskilda beståndsdelar utsätts för hot från tredje part?

Svar från Karel De Gucht på kommissionens vägnar
(26 juni 2012)

I det tvistemål inom Världshandelsorganisationen som parlamentsledamöterna hänvisar till har Förenta staterna (i ett så kallat *Statement of Administrative Action*) åtagit sig att inte fatta beslut som är oförenliga med de skyldigheter man har enligt WTO-avtalet. Eftersom det inte finns något som pekar på att Förenta staterna skulle vägra att fullgöra eller dra tillbaka sina åtaganden överväger kommissionen för närvarande inte att ta upp ytterligare ett ärende i den här frågan i WTO:s tvistlösningsorgan.

Kommissionen noterar att några medlemsstater, enligt rapporten ”301” från Förenta staternas företrädare i handelsfrågor, anses vara problematiska med anledning av den mängd piratkopierade varor som finns inom deras gränser. Kommissionen har dock inga uppgifter om att Förenta staterna ska ha infört sanktioner mot dessa medlemsstater. De frågor som Förenta staterna behandlar i 301-rapporten syftar snarare till dialog och informationsutbyte med den berörda medlemsstaten och/eller genom kommissionen.

Vad gäller parlamentsledamöternas andra fråga anser inte kommissionen att 301-rapporten kan inverka på den inre marknadens struktur. Precis som ledamöterna påpekar har direktivet om skyddet för immateriella rättigheter ([4]) från 2004 harmoniserat EU:s civilrättsliga bestämmelser, förfaranden och åtgärder i händelse av överträdelse av immaterialrätten.

([1]) http://www.ustr.gov/about-us/press-office/reports-and-publications/2012-2.
([2]) http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds152_e.htm
([3]) EUT L 157, 30.4.2004, s. 45.
([4]) Europaparlamentets och rådets direktiv 2004/48/EG av den 29 april 2004 om säkerställande av skyddet för immateriella rättigheter (EUT L 157, 30.4.2004).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005395/12
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (PPE) and Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: The relationship between the Special 301 Report and the integration of the European market

Every year since 1989, the Office of the United States Trade Representative has drafted a 'Special 301 Report' evaluating the intellectual property rights frameworks of third countries. Countries identified in the Special 301 Report as 'priority foreign countries' may be subject to trade retaliations from the US Government until such time as it is satisfied that intellectual property rights protection is adequate.

It has come to our attention that the United States still places individual European Union Member States on these lists, even as priority foreign countries ([1]), meaning that individual Member States are currently subject to the risk of unilateral trade sanctions from the United States.

The European Union and a number of governments unsuccessfully tried to challenge this practice in the Dispute Settlement Body of the World Trade Organisation (case DS 152), which determined in January 2000 that these unilateral sanctions imposed against third parties by the US Government are consistent with WTO rules ([2]).

Since 2000, new legislation on intellectual property rights enforcement (namely the Enforcement Directive, 2004/48/EC ([3])) has been introduced in the EU. This includes uniform implementation measures across the Member States and may warrant fresh consideration of the Special 301 Report lists, probably also with respect to their conformity with WTO agreements.

1. Is the Commission contemplating bringing a new case before the WTO Dispute Settlement Body?

2. If not, how can the Commission ensure that the internal market remains structurally sound when its constituent parts are individually exposed to threats from third parties?

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

In the dispute settlement case of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) to which the Honourable Member refers, the United States (US) made an undertaking (in a so-called Statement of Administrative Action) not to make determinations inconsistently with its obligations under the WTO Agreement. As there are currently no indications that the US has repudiated or removed its undertaking, the Commission is at present not contemplating bringing a further case before the WTO Dispute Settlement Body on this subject.

The Commission would note that the US 301 Report indeed mentions some Member States as problematic because of the local level of counterfeit goods. However, to the Commission's knowledge, the US has not imposed sanctions on these Member States. The concerns which the US raises in the 301 Report are rather addressed in the context of a dialogue and exchange of informatioin with the Member State in question and/or via the Commission.

As regards the second question by the Honourable Members, the Commission does not consider that the 301 Report may impact the structure of the internal market. The Honourable Members rightly indicate that at EU level, the Enforcement Directive ([4]) from 2004 has harmonised civil measures, procedures and remedies in the event of infringement of intellectual property rights.

([1]) http://www.ustr.gov/about-us/press-office/reports-and-publications/2012-2.
([2]) http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dispu_e/cases_e/ds152_e.htm
([3]) OJ L 157, 30.4.2004, p. 45.
([4]) 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.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005398/12
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: New terroirs and vine planting rights

Do vine planting rights penalise new entrants from both non-traditional wine-making Member States and non-traditional wine-making regions and areas — new terroirs — in traditional wine-making Member States?

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

The transitional planting rights regime currently in force at EU level does not apply in Member States where it did not apply by 31 December 2007, according to Article 85l (*de minimis*) of the Single CMO Regulation. Therefore, the regime does not penalise entrants to the sector in the 11 Member States that do not apply the regime, which traditionally have low or no wine production.

As for the 16 traditional wine-making Member States applying the regime, although the EU rules do not explicitly exclude any part of their territories from vine plantings they may adopt 'stricter national rules' under Article 85m of the Single CMO Regulation. These stricter rules and more generally the availability of free planting rights may, in a certain way, create barriers to new entrants in wine-growing areas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005399/12
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Consumer interest in vine planting rights

Do consumers need representing on the high level group on wine, which will be assessing vine planting rights? If so, who represents them and if not, why not?

Question for written answer E-005400/12
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: The cost of vine planting rights

Has the Commission conducted any assessment of whether total economic activity will increase or decrease as a result of liberalising vine planting rights, and do vine planting rights increase or reduce the cost of wine, before taxation, to consumers?

Joint answer given by Mr Ciolo̧ on behalf of the Commission
(22 June 2012)

The High Level Group (HLG) on wine planting rights was established with a view to create a forum of discussion to assess different aspects of the functioning of the transitional planting rights regime in specific Member States and regions, as well as the effects of the end of the regime for the wine sector and wine market. It follows the concerns expressed by a number of wine producing Member States, of Members of Parliament and of certain sectorial organisations, related to the end of the transitional planting rights regime at EU level from 2016 onwards.

The members of the HLG include representatives from all 27 Member States, as well as active stakeholder organisations at European level representing the production, processing and trade levels of the wine supply chain. Based also on experience during the HLG on milk, consumer organisations appear less active regarding CAP instruments.

In the context of the HLG discussions, the Commission will prepare working documents related to the functioning of planting right regimes in different Member States, as well as on some of the effects of the end of this regime (including at regional level), to be presented to the members of the group. Furthermore, a number of experts will also be invited to present the result of their studies on the same thematic.

The HLG will present its recommendations at the end of 2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005401/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(30 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Necessità di un intervento dell'UE a tutela dei serbi cristiani in Kosovo

Da fonti di stampa si apprende che la Chiesa ortodossa russa ha denunciato un gruppo di giovani albanesi che ha picchiato e lanciato pietre a un monaco in un monastero serbo Ortodosso in Kosovo, per la precisione il monastero dei santi Cosma e Damiano vicino alla città di Orahovac, ufficialmente sotto la protezione della polizia del Kosovo.

Inoltre, il giorno dell'incidente, un gruppo albanese musulmano ha diffuso volantini con minacce di violenza contro i serbi cristiani che si rifiutano di lasciare il Kosovo.

La Commissione europea come intende tutelare le minoranze religiose e i luoghi di culto in Kosovo, in particolare i serbi cristiani?

È evidente che questo episodio smentisce le precedenti rassicurazioni della Commissione sullo stato di miglioramento dell'efficienza della polizia del Kosovo.

La Commissione intende rafforzare l'impegno della Kfor circa la custodia dei siti religiosi e storici?

Intende altresì rivedere la dichiarata decisione di addivenire ad una riduzione delle forze Eulex presenti in Kosovo?

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

L'Unione europea intende sostenere la tutela delle minoranze religiose e dei luoghi di culto in Kosovo ([1]) tramite le funzioni di controllo, guida e consulenza svolte da EULEX nei confronti delle forze di polizia del Kosovo per l'adempimento dei loro compiti di tutela dei siti del patrimonio religioso e culturale. La Forza per il Kosovo (KFOR) sta trasmettendo gradualmente le sue competenze per la protezione dei luoghi di culto serbi alla polizia del Kosovo, dopo averne attentamente valutato la capacità di assumere realmente tali responsabilità. Questa trasmissione di competenze è svolta con la consultazione di EULEX.

Inoltre, EULEX controlla, guida e offre consulenza alla polizia, ai pubblici ministeri e ai tribunali del Kosovo per la gestione di reati commessi per motivi etnici o religiosi.

In seguito alla prossima chiusura dell'Ufficio civile internazionale, l'Unione europea potrebbe dover assumere maggiori responsabilità, tra cui un ruolo più importante nei meccanismi di sorveglianza e di risoluzione delle controversie. In questa prospettiva, il rappresentante speciale dell'UE ha recentemente assunto personale internazionale che sarà incaricato di trattare tali questioni. L'ufficio del rappresentante speciale mantiene contatti regolari e diretti con la Chiesa ortodossa serba per venire a conoscenza delle sue preoccupazioni e intervenire, se necessario, presso le autorità del Kosovo. Queste ultime, da parte loro, hanno dato prova di serietà nell'assumere la responsabilità di proteggere la Chiesa ortodossa serba.

Il Consiglio ha recentemente adottato un nuovo mandato per EULEX fino al 2014.

Grazie a tutte le iniziative citate, l'UE proseguirà e rafforzerà il suo coinvolgimento nella tutela del patrimonio culturale e dei diritti delle minoranze in Kosovo.

([1]) Tale designazione non pregiudica la posizione riguardo allo status ed è in linea con la risoluzione 1244/99 del Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite e con il parere della Corte internazionale di giustizia (CIG) sulla dichiarazione di indipendenza del Kosovo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005401/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: EU intervention needed to protect Serbian Christians in Kosovo

Press sources indicate that the Russian Orthodox Church has denounced a group of young Albanians who attacked and threw stones at a monk in the Monastery of Saints Cosmas and Damian near the town of Orahovac in Kosovo. This Orthodox Serbian monastery is officially under Kosovan police protection.

Furthermore, on the day of the incident, a Muslim Albanian group distributed leaflets containing threats of violence against Serbian Christians who refuse to leave Kosovo.

How does the European Commission intend to protect the religious minorities and places of worship in Kosovo, in particular Serbian Christians?

It is clear that this episode gives the lie to the Commission's previous reassurances on the improving effectiveness of the police in Kosovo.

Does the Commission intend to strengthen the efforts of KFOR to protect religious and historic sites?

Does it also intend to review the decision which has been announced to reduce the EULEX forces present in Kosovo?

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

The EU intends to sustain the protection of the religious minorities and places of worship in Kosovo ([1]) through EULEX's tasks of monitoring, mentoring and advising (MMA) the Kosovo Police (KP) in their duties of protecting religious and cultural heritage sites. The Kosovo Force (KFOR) is progressively handing over responsibilities for protecting Serbian religious sites to the KP. This is done after thorough assessments of the KP's ability to effectively take such responsibilities over. EULEX is consulted on such hand over.

In addition, EULEX monitors, mentors and advises the KP, the prosecution and the courts when it comes to the handling of ethnically/religiously motivated crimes.

The upcoming closure of the International Civilian Office (ICO) will mean that the EU may have to take up increased responsibilities, which may include an increased role in oversight and dispute settlement mechanisms. In that regard, the EU Special Representative (EUSR) has recently recruited international staff members who will be dealing with such issues. The office of the EUSR maintains regular, direct contact with the Serbian Orthodox Church to hear their concerns and intervene with the Kosovo authorities when necessary. The Kosovo authorities have demonstrated seriousness in assuming responsibilities to provide protection for the Serbian Orthodox Church.

A revised mandate for EULEX until 2014 was recently adopted by the Council.

Through all the above measures, the EU will continue and strengthen its involvement in cultural heritage protection/minority rights in Kosovo.

([1]) This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1244 and the International Court of Justice (ICJ) Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005432/12
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: EU ecological homogeneity

In the context of (a) putative legislation on alien invasive species and (b) the EU's geographical size and ecological diversity, will a species classified as native to part of the EU be judged native to the whole of the EU, and will a species classified as alien and invasive in part of the EU also be judged alien and invasive in the whole of the EU?

Question for written answer E-005435/12
to the Commission
John Stuart Agnew (EFD)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Alien invasive species definition

Will the Commission set out the criteria by which a species is defined as alien and invasive? How long does a species have to be in an area before it moves from classification as alien to classification as native?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(28 June 2012)

As outlined in the communication on an EU biodiversity strategy to 2020 ([1]), the Commission is developing a dedicated legislative instrument on invasive alien species. In that context the Commission is analysing all definitions needed in view of an unambiguous implementation of future legislation.

([1]) COM(2011) 244 final.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005454/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(30 de mayo de 2012)

Asunto: Posidonia mediterránea

Recientemente se han presentado en unas jornadas organizadas dentro del proyecto Life +Posidonia Andalucía, los resultados de un estudio según el cual las praderas submarinas de posidonia oceánica almacenan más carbono que los bosques tropicales. De acuerdo con el estudio *Seagrass Ecosystems as Globally Significant Carbon Stocks* coordinado por James W. Fourqurean (Florida International University), las praderas de posidonia son eficaces sumideros de carbono, actúan como atenuantes del cambio climático contribuyendo a disminuir la concentración de gases de efecto invernadero en la atmósfera.

Actualmente contienen más del 10 % de todo el carbono que absorben los océanos cada año. Según un cálculo del estudio, en el mercado global de carbono el valor de los stocks sólo en las Islas Baleares, rodeadas de praderas de posidonia oceánica muy extensas y de gran exuberancia, rondarían los 4 000 millones de euros. Por desgracia, las praderas de Posidonia españolas han sufrido fuertes regresiones en los últimos 40 años, especialmente en Cataluña, las Islas Baleares y la Comunidad Valenciana. Estos alarmantes retrocesos están asociados a la pesca ilegal de arrastre, a la modificación de la línea de costa, a los dragados ilegales, al vertido de residuos, al desarrollo de actividades recreativas y el turismo, a la introducción de especies exóticas o al fondeo libre intensivo.

1. ¿Comparte la Comisión el contenido del estudio?

En vista de la elevada potencialidad de las praderas de posidonia mediterránea para la lucha contra el cambio climático,

2. ¿Va a llevar a cabo la Comisión alguna acción para garantizar su protección como parte de la estrategia 2020?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(20 de julio de 2012)

La Comisión está al corriente del proyecto LIFE «Conservación de las praderas de *Posidonia oceanica* en el litoral andaluz», aprobado por la Comisión en septiembre de 2010.

Uno de los requisitos establecidos en la Directiva Marco del Agua (DMA, 2000/60/CE ([1])) es conseguir un buen estado ecológico de todas las aguas de aquí a 2015, incluidas las aguas costeras. Por lo tanto, hay que proteger las praderas de *Posidonia oceanica* para alcanzar un buen estado ecológico de las aguas costeras del Mediterráneo. Además, la Directiva marco sobre la Estrategia Marina (2008/56/CE ([2])) exige a los Estados miembros conseguir un buen estado ecológico de sus mares para 2020. Las praderas de *Posidonia oceanica* se consideran hábitats prioritarios a efectos de conservación en virtud de la Directiva de hábitats (92/43/CEE ([3])). Por último, la Unión Europea, en su calidad de parte en el Convenio de Barcelona, ha ratificado el Protocolo sobre las zonas especialmente protegidas y la diversidad biológica en el Mediterráneo y coopera con otras partes, incluida España, de cara a su aplicación. Las autoridades españolas deben cerciorarse de que se cumplen las obligaciones de las directivas medioambientales de la UE.

La Comisión no ha recibido aún los planes hidrológicos de cuenca españoles, que deben incluir los programas de medidas necesarias para alcanzar los objetivos medioambientales de la DMA para 2015. En julio de 2011, la Comisión decidió llevar a España ante el Tribunal de Justicia Europeo (asunto C-403/11) por no haber adoptado ni notificado a la Comisión sus planes hidrológicos de cuenca.

([1]) DO L 327 de 22.12.2000.
([2]) DO L 164 de 25.6.2008.
([3]) DO L 206 de 22.7.1992.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005454/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(30 May 2012)

Subject: Mediterranean Posidonia

A recent conference organised as part of the Life Posidonia Andalucia project presented the results of a study showing that Posidonia Oceanica underwater meadows store more carbon than tropical forests. According to the 'Seagrass Ecosystems as Globally Significant Carbon Stocks' study, coordinated by James W. Fourqurean (Florida International University), Posidonia meadows are effective carbon sinks that act to mitigate climate change and help to reduce the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

They currently contain more than 10 % of all the carbon absorbed by the oceans each year. According to a calculation made in the study, the global carbon market value of the reserves in the Balearic Islands alone, which are surrounded by very extensive and luxuriant meadows of Posidonia Oceanica, would be around EUR 4 000 million. Unfortunately, Spanish Posidonia meadows have deteriorated alarmingly over the past 40 years, especially in Catalonia, the Balearic Islands and Valencia, as a consequence of illegal trawler fishing and dredging, modification of the coastline, waste dumping, the development of recreational and tourism activities, the introduction of exotic species and intensive anchoring activity.

1. Is the Commission aware of the contents of the above study?

2. Will the Commission be taking any action to ensure the protection of Mediterranean Posidonia as part of the 2020 strategy, given its great potential in the fight against climate change?

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

The Commission is aware of LIFE project 'Conservation of Posidonia oceanica meadows in Andalusian Mediterranean Sea', approved by the Commission in September 2010.

The requirements set out in the Water Framework Directive (WFD 2000/60/EC ([1])) include achieving good ecological status in all waters by 2015, including coastal waters. The Posidonia oceanica beds should therefore be protected in order to achieve a good ecological status of Mediterranean coastal waters. Moreover, the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD 2008/56/EC ([2])) requires Member States to achieve good environmental status of their seas by 2020. Posidonia oceanica beds are identified as a priority habitat type for conservation under the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC ([3])). Finally, the EU, as Party to the Barcelona Convention, has ratified the Convention's Protocol concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean and cooperates with the other Parties, including Spain, for its implementation. Spanish authorities should ensure that the obligations of the EU environmental directives are complied with.

The Commission has not yet received the Spanish River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs), which should include the programmes of measures necessary to achieve the WFD environmental objectives by 2015. In July 2011, the Commission decided to take Spain to the European Court of Justice (Case C-403/11) for failing to adopt and report its RBMPs to the Commission.

([1]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([2]) OJ L 164, 25.6.2008.
([3]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005469/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI) en Barry Madlener (NI)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Al-Shabaab heeft terreurcel in Nederland

Mohamed Farah al-Ansari, oud-commandant van de Somalische terreurbeweging Al-Shabaab, zegt dat Al-Shabaab Somaliërs uit de diaspora heeft opgeleid om als „slapende cellen" terreuracties voor te bereiden in Nederland, Groot-Brittannië en de Verenigde Staten.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Al-Shabaab heeft terreurcel in NL" ([1])?

2. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat dergelijke terroristen niet in Nederland en überhaupt niet in de EU thuishoren? Zo ja, wat doet de Commissie momenteel en wat is de Commissie voornemens te gaan doen om te voorkomen dat dergelijke terroristen de EU kunnen binnenkomen? Kan de Commissie verklaren hoe dergelijke terroristen toch binnen hebben kunnen komen?

3. Beschikt de Commissie over verdere gegevens over hoeveel islamitische terroristen zich in de EU bevinden?

4. Uit het Europees Ontwikkelingsfonds ontvangt Somalië 215,8 miljoen euro ([2]). Is de Commissie ertoe bereid alle EU-ontwikkelingsgeld aan Somalië onmiddellijk te stoppen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(18 juli 2012)

Zoals uitgelegd in antwoord op schriftelijke vragen E-4276/12, E-3833/12, E-3294/12, E-9410/11, E-11087/11 en E-11307/11 ([3]), heeft de Europese Unie noch de bevoegdheid noch de operationele capaciteit om toezicht te houden op de activiteiten van specifieke groeperingen (zoals terroristische cellen of „eenzame wolven") op haar grondgebied.

De Commissie is derhalve niet in staat om toelichting te geven bij de huidige of vroegere activiteiten van Al-Shabaab in Nederland of in de Europese Unie.

Zoals verklaard in antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-3833/12, zij er evenwel op gewezen dat de EU, overeenkomstig de terrorismebestrijdingsstrategie van 2005 en de interneveiligheidsstrategie van 2010, de lidstaten bij de bestrijding van terrorisme steunt via wetgevende en niet-wetgevende initiatieven.

De EU heeft, als onderdeel van een EU-brede alomvattende aanpak die op actieve diplomatie, veiligheidssteun en ontwikkelingshulp is gebaseerd, tot dusver meer dan 500 miljoen EUR in ontwikkelingshulp voor Somalië geïnvesteerd voor de periode 2008 tot en met 2013. Bovendien is voor dezelfde periode ongeveer 200 miljoen EUR vastgelegd als reactie op de ernstige humanitaire crises.

De EU is niet van plan aan deze hulp ten behoeve van de Somalische bevolking een einde te maken. Aangezien geen EU-steun rechtstreeks aan de Somalische politieke instellingen wordt verleend in de vorm van begrotingssteun, zou het stoppen van deze hulp alleen ten koste gaan van de Somalische bevolking en de kwetsbaarste mensen die in een conflictsituatie leven.

De EU draagt bij tot de bestrijding van terrorisme door de onderliggende oorzaken van terrorisme in Somalië aan te pakken op het gebied van bestuur, de rechtsstaat, onderwijs en economische ontwikkeling. Bovendien houdt de EU een constante en intensieve politieke dialoog met de Somalische autoriteiten, het maatschappelijk middenveld en andere belanghebbenden, ook over mensenrechtenkwesties.

([1]) http://nos.nl/artikel/377525-alshabaab-heeft-terreurcel-in-nl.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/acp/country-cooperation/somalia/somalia_en.htm
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005469/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI) and Barry Madlener (NI)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Al-Shabaab has a terrorist cell in the Netherlands

Mohamed Farah al-Ansari, former commander of the Somalian terrorist movement Al-Shabaab, has said that Al-Shabaab has trained members of the Somalian diaspora as 'sleeper cells' to prepare for terrorist actions in the Netherlands, Great Britain and the United States.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report 'Al-Shabaab has a terrorist cell in the Netherlands'? ([1])

2. Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Freedom Party (PVV) that such terrorists do not belong in the Netherlands or even in the EU? If so, what is the Commission currently doing? What does the Commission intend to do in order to prevent such terrorists from being able to enter the EU? Can the Commission explain how such terrorists have been able to enter the EU?

3. Does the Commission have further information concerning how many Islamic terrorists are within the EU?

4. Somalia has received EUR 215.8 million from the European Development Fund ([2]). Is the Commission prepared to stop all EU development funding for Somalia immediately? If not, why not?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2012)

As explained in response to Written Questions E-4276/12, E-3833/12, E-3294/12, E-9410/11, E-11087/11 and E-11307/11 ([3]), the European Union has neither the competence nor the operational capacity to monitor the activities of specific targets (e.g. terrorist cells or 'lone wolves') on its territory. Therefore, the Commission is not in the position to comment on Al-Shabaab's present or past activities in neither the Netherlands nor the European Union.

Moreover, as explained in response to Written Question E-3833/12, it is worth noting that, in accordance with the 2005 Counter Terrorism Strategy and the 2010 Internal Security Strategy, the EU supports Member States in the field of counter-terrorism through legislative and non-legislative initiatives.

Concerning the EU support to Somalia, as part of an EU-wide comprehensive approach based on active diplomacy, security support and development assistance, the EU has so far invested more than EUR 500 million for the period 2008 to 2013 on development aid. In addition, during the same period, around EUR 200 million has been committed in response to the severe humanitarian crises.

The EU does not intend to stop such assistance that goes to the benefit of the Somali population. Indeed, since no EU aid is provided directly to the Somali political institutions in the form of budget support, stopping such assistance would only be to the detriment of the Somali population and of the most vulnerable people living in conflict situation.

The EU contributes to counter terrorism by addressing root causes of terrorism in Somalia in the areas of governance, rule of law, education and economic development. In addition, the EU maintains a constant and intensive political dialogue with Somali authorities, civil society and other relevant stakeholders including on the subject of human rights issues.

([1]) http://nos.nl/artikel/377525-alshabaab-heeft-terreurcel-in-nl.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/acp/country-cooperation/somalia/somalia_en.htm
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005474/12
aan de Commissie
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Rio+20 conferentie over duurzame ontwikkeling

In juni 2012 vindt in Rio de Janeiro de VN-conferentie Rio+20 over duurzame ontwikkeling plaats. Onlangs heeft het Europees Parlement besloten om geen officiële delegatie te sturen, met name vanwege de hoge kosten die hieraan verbonden zouden zijn. De Europese Commissie zal wel met een delegatie afreizen. In mededeling COM(2011)0363 geeft de Commissie haar ambities weer. In maart 2012 heeft de Europese Raad conclusies aangenomen over de inzet van de EU bij de conferentie.

1. Wat is de inhoudelijke inzet van de Commissie bij de Rio+20 conferentie? Hoe denkt de Commissie dit ambitieniveau te verwezenlijken?

2. Hoeveel commissarissen zullen namens de Europese Commissie voor de Europese Unie bij deze conferentie aanwezig zijn en hoeveel ambtenaren zullen hen vergezellen?

3. Is dit hoge ambitieniveau van de Commissie niet ook door een kleinere delegatie te verwezenlijken?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(19 juli 2012)

1. De Commissie heeft toegewerkt naar de verwezenlijking van een aantal doelstellingen overeenkomstig de conclusies van de Europese Raad van 2 maart 2012, die als volgt kunnen worden samengevat:

— bevorderen van de wereldwijde transitie naar een groene economie;

— streven naar duidelijke operationele doelen, afspraken en concrete maatregelen op internationaal niveau binnen overeengekomen tijdschema's;

— bijdragen tot een sterker mondiaal institutioneel kader voor duurzame ontwikkeling, waarbij het UNEP moet worden opgewaardeerd tot een gespecialiseerde organisatie;

— stimuleren van het werk aan mondiale en coherente post-2015-doelen voor duurzame ontwikkeling.

Zoals bij alle multilaterale onderhandelingen werden deze doelstellingen nagestreefd door middel van intensieve onderhandelingen in een samenstel van werkgroepen en plenaire zittingen, bilaterale discussies met derde landen, alsmede door het bevorderen van Europese beleidsmaatregelen en belangen in een aantal gespecialiseerde evenementen en openbare debatten. Bij het nastreven van deze doelstellingen is er ook contact geweest met de vertegenwoordigers van het maatschappelijk middenveld en leden van de pers.

2. De inspanningen en activiteiten om deze doelstellingen te verwezenlijken zijn ter plaatse ontplooid door voorzitter Barroso, de commissarissen Potočnik, Hedegaard, Piebalgs en Cioloş en 57 andere ambtenaren.

3. Dit is een passende grootte voor de delegatie van de Commissie voor een multilaterale top van deze aard, de brede waaier van behandelde onderwerpen en de uit te voeren taken. De Commissiedelegatie was kleiner dan vele delegaties van afzonderlijke landen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005474/12
to the Commission
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Rio+20 conference on sustainable development

The UN conference on sustainable development (Rio+20) will take place in Rio de Janeiro in June 2012. The European Parliament recently decided not to send an official delegation, particularly because of the high costs involved. However, a delegation from the Commission will be going.. The Commission set out in its communication COM(2011)0363 what it hopes to achieve. In March 2012, the European Council adopted conclusions on the EU's priorities for the conference.

1. What, specifically, does the Commission hope to do at the Rio+20 conference? How does it propose to achieve these goals?

2. How many Commissioners will be representing the EU at the conference, and how many officials will be accompanying them?

3. Could the Commission's ambitious goals not be achieved by a smaller delegation?

Answer given by M. Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

1. The Commission has been working towards a number of objectives in accordance with the European Council Conclusions on 2 March 2012, which can be summarised as:

— to advance global transition towards a green economy;

— to work towards clear operational targets and concrete actions at national and international level within agreed timeframes;

— to contribute to a strengthened global institutional framework for sustainable development, which should include the upgrading of UNEP to a specialised Agency;

— to advance the work on global and coherent post 2015 goals for sustainable development.

As with any multilateral negotiation, these objectives were pursued through intensive negotiations in a combination of working groups and plenary sessions, bilateral discussions with third countries, as well as through promoting European policies and interests in a number of specialized events and public discussions. Pursuing these objectives also required engagement with the representatives of civil society and members of the press.

2. The objectives and activities were pursued on the spot by President Barroso, Commissioners Potočnik, Hedegaard, Piebalgs and Cioloş and 57 officials.

3. The size of the Commission's delegation is appropriate for a multilateral summit of this nature, the wide variety of subjects covered and the tasks entrusted to it. It was smaller than many delegations representing individual countries.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-005491/12
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE)
(2012. május 31.)

Tárgy: A kkv-k strukturális alapokhoz való hozzáféréséről

A gazdasági növekedésben és a munkahelyteremtésben fontos szerepet játszó kis— és középvállalkozásokról, azok pontos meghatározásáról és a strukturális alapokhoz való hozzáférésükről rendeztek külön vitát a Tanács és a Bizottság képviselőinek részvételével 2012. május 22-én az Európai Parlamentben. A vita során ismételten bebizonyosodott, hogy a vállalkozások finanszírozása továbbra is fennálló probléma. Az Unió kis— és középvállalkozásai számára nehézséget okoz ugyanis az elegendő és megfelelő tőkéhez való hozzáférés, annak érdekében, hogy kibővítsék és továbbfejlesszék tevékenységüket. A vitán felszólalók aggodalmát megerősítve mindemellett számos uniós tanulmány is jelentős problémaként azonosítja a jelentkezéssel, a jelentéstétellel és a könyvvizsgálati követelményekkel járó adminisztratív terheket, a projektek előfinanszírozásának szükségességét, és hogy az alapok és a programok szabályai nincsenek harmonizálva.

Mindezek alapján a következő kérdéseket szeretném feltenni a Bizottságnak:

Támogatja-e a Bizottság, hogy a kkv-k strukturális forrásokhoz való jobb hozzáférését hátráltató forráshiány— és likviditási problémákat a források előfinanszírozásával oldja meg? A Bizottság elképzelései szerint milyen formában, s milyen időtávban (válság idejére átmeneti vagy végleges jelleggel) lehetne megvalósítani az előfinanszírozást? Kezelhető-e az előfinanszírozás a projektfinanszírozás egyik speciális formájaként?

Johannes Hahn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. július 3.)

A 2007-2013-as időszakban érvényes kohéziós politika értelmében nincs korlátozva, hogy a nemzeti hatóságok a tevékenységeket előfinanszírozzák. A Bizottság előfinanszírozást nyújt a tagállamok számára, hogy likviditásuk biztosítva legyen a kedvezményezettek kifizetéséhez, az előlegeket is beleértve. A Bizottság hasonló megoldásokat javasolt továbbá a 2014-2020-as időszakra is.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005491/12
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: SME access to Structural Funds

On 22 May 2012, a debate was held in the European Parliament with the participation of representatives of the Council and Commission concerning SMEs, which play an important role in economic growth and job creation, on how SMEs are defined precisely and on their access to the Structural Funds. It was repeatedly made clear during the debate that enterprise funding remains a problem. Specifically, SMEs in the EU find it difficult to gain access to sufficient and appropriate capital to expand and develop their businesses. Moreover, backing up the concerns expressed by speakers during the debate, numerous EU studies also identify the following as serious problems: administrative burdens imposed by application procedures, reporting and accounting requirements, the need for project pre-funding, and lack of harmonisation between the rules applying to funds and programmes.

In view of this, can the Commission answer the following:

Is the Commission in favour of pre-funding resources in order to resolve the lack of resources and liquidity, both of which are problems that hamper SMEs in gaining better access to the Structural Funds? In what form and within what timeframe (either as an interim measure during the crisis or permanently) does the Commission consider that it could implement pre-funding? Can pre-funding be treated as a special form of project funding?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2012)

The pre-financing of operations by national authorities is not restricted under cohesion policy in the 2007-2013 period. The Commission provides pre-financing to Member States to ensure that they have the liquidity necessary to make payments, including advance payments, to beneficiaries. The Commission has proposed similar arrangements for the 2014-2020 period.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005495/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Frodi connesse ai fondi comunitari

Un articolo pubblicato recentemente su un quotidiano italiano rivela che le frodi commesse a seguito dell'erogazione di finanziamenti europei sono molo diffuse su tutto il territorio nazionale. In particolare, dal 2008 al 2011 il controvalore in denaro delle irregolarità intercettate è stato di 1,3 miliardi di EUR. Un contributo comunitario su dieci in Italia finisce per innescare un'indagine penale. Si tratta di cifre allarmanti, soprattutto se si pensa che, mentre la media europea delle irregolarità sui finanziamenti europei si aggira intorno al 3,5 %, in Italia è dell'11 %.

Le frodi sono di vario genere, le più comuni sono quelle riguardanti l'obiettivo dei contributi. Una volta su quattro il trucco è di ignorare la finalità per la quale erano stati erogati i finanziamenti. Altre volte invece si tratta di progetti realizzati e non utilizzati, come scuole di formazione mai frequentate, piattaforme fantasma per l'allevamento dei pesci, società create e subito chiuse dopo aver incassato i fondi.

Si assiste a una dispersione di denaro incredibile. La guardia di finanza e l'OLAF con il loro lavoro cercano di evitare e/o scoprire queste frodi ma i milioni di euro perduti sono ancora troppi.

Considerato che il nuovo programma Hercule II getta le basi per indagini e controlli più efficienti sull'impiego dei fondi europei, chiedo alla Commissione quale sia la strategia di lotta alle frodi prevista per l'Italia.

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(19 luglio 2012)

Non risulta alla Commissione che il tasso di irregolarità commesse in Italia rappresenti l'11 % dei fondi dell'Unione europea: i tassi segnalati dal paese riguardano infatti lo 0,10 % dei fondi agricoli e il 3,1 % dei fondi di coesione ([1]). Le cifre presentate nella relazione della Commissione sono di per sé puramente indicative, giacché non si conosce con precisione il livello delle frodi.

La Commissione rinvia inoltre l'onorevole parlamentare alle sue comunicazioni in materia di strategia antifrode ([2]) e di lotta contro la corruzione ([3]) nell'UE, nonché alla propria risposta all'interrogazione E-2243/12 dell'on. Casa ([4]).

La Commissione ricorda che, a norma dell'articolo 325 del TFUE, gli Stati membri devono adottare misure adeguate per combattere le frodi e le altre irregolarità lesive degli interessi finanziari dell'UE e segnalare tempestivamente le irregolarità riscontrate. La risposta della Commissione all'interrogazione E-1340/12 dell'on. Messerschmidt ([5]) fornisce ulteriori dettagli sulle norme della gestione concorrente.

Una disposizione nelle proposte legislative per la politica di coesione dell'UE nel periodo 2014-2020 prevede che le autorità di gestione degli Stati membri predispongano misure antifrode tenendo conto dei rischi individuati. Analogamente, nelle proposte legislative per la politica agricola nel periodo 2014-2020 si afferma che gli Stati membri adottano le disposizioni legislative, regolamentari e amministrative ed ogni altra misura necessaria per offrire una prevenzione efficace delle frodi, con particolare riferimento ai settori in cui il rischio è più elevato.

Quanto al programma Hercule II, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione E-7967/11 della on. Angelilli ([6]). La Commissione ha proposto di proseguire il programma Hercule nell'ambito del quadro finanziario pluriennale 2014-2020, migliorando la metodologia di attuazione (ad esempio l'elaborazione di una strategia che fissi le priorità delle azioni finanziate per agevolare l'attuazione del programma di lavoro annuale Hercule, che sarà oggetto di discussione con gli Stati membri).

([1]) Si veda la relazione della Commissione presentata a norma dell'articolo 325; tabella AG6 «Expenditure, irregularity and fraud rates, financial years 2006-2010» (Spese, tassi di irregolarità e frodi per gli esercizi finanziari 2006-2010) per le spese nel settore agricolo e tabella SF7 «Programming period 2002-2006 — overall situation and main indicators by Member State» (Periodo di programmazione 2002-2006 — situazione generale e principali indicatori per Stato membro) per le spese nel settore del Fondo di coesione, http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/reports-commission/2010_ann2_en.pdf

([2]) COM(2011)376 definitivo e SEC(2011)787

([3]) COM(2011)308 definitivo.

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

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

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005495/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Fraudulent use of EU funds

A recent article in an Italian daily newspaper has revealed widespread fraud regarding the use of EU funding in Italy, that was detected between 2008 and 2011, amounting to EUR 1 300 million. Essentially, one in ten EU grants ends up triggering a criminal investigation. These figures are alarming, particularly given that the European average for irregularities regarding EU funding stands at around 3.5%, whereas in Italy it is 11%.

While the nature of the fraud varies, it most commonly relates to the grant's intended purpose, which was simply ignored in one-quarter of cases. Other cases involve projects that are completed but not put to use, such as training colleges that remain empty, fictitious fish-breeding platforms, and specially-created companies that wind up as soon as funding is received.

Huge sums of money are being lost in this way. The Italian Finance Police and European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) are doing their best to prevent and/or detect this fraud. However, excessive amounts, running to millions of euro, are still being lost.

Given that the new Hercule II programme provides for more efficient investigation and monitoring of EU fund use, can the Commission indicate what anti-fraud strategy is being proposed for Italy?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

The Commission would state that the Italian rate of irregularities does not represent 11% of the EU funds, the rates reported by Italy amounts to 0.10% of the Agricultural funds and 3.1% of the Cohesion funds ([1]). By nature, the figures presented in the Commission report are only indicative, as the precise level of fraud remains unknown.

The Commission would also invite the Honourable Member to refer to its communications on an anti-fraud strategy ([2]), on Fighting Corruption in the EU ([3]), and its reply to Question E-2243/12 by Mr Casa ([4]).

The Commission would recall that under Article 325 TFEU, Member States are required to take appropriate measures to counter fraud and other irregularities detrimental to the EU's financial interests and to report the irregularities discovered in a timely manner. The Commission reply to Question E-1340/12 by Mr Messerschmidt ([5]) gives further details on the rules of shared management.

A provision in the legislative proposals for EU Cohesion Policy 2014-2020, foresees that Member States' managing authorities must put in place anti-fraud measures taking into account the risks identified. Likewise in the legislative proposals for the Agricultural Policy 2014-2020 it is stated that Member States shall adopt all legislative, regulatory and administrative provisions and take any other measures necessary to offer effective prevention against fraud, especially as regards the areas with a higher level of risk.

In relation to Hercule II, the Commission would invite the Honourable Member to consult its reply to Question E-7967/11 by Mrs Angelilli ([6]). The Commission has proposed to continue the Hercule programme under the Multi Annual Financial Framework for 2014-2020 with an improved methodology for implementation (e.g. the development of a strategy containing the priorities for actions financed to facilitate the implementation of the Hercule annual work programme which will be discussed with the Member States).

([1]) See Article 325 of the report of the Commission, table AG6 "Expenditure, irregularity and fraud rates, financial years 2006-2010" for expenditure in the are of agriculture; and table SF7 "Programming period 2002-2006 — over situation and main indicators by Member State" for expenditure in the area of Cohesion fund, http://ec.europa.eu/anti_fraud/documents/reports-commission/2010_ann2_en.pdf
([2]) COM(2011) 376 final and SEC(2011) 787.
([3]) COM(2011) 308 final.
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/
([5]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/
([6]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005496/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Truvada, la pillola che previene l'HIV

Un comitato consultivo negli Stati Uniti ha dato il via libera per l'utilizzo del farmaco antiretrovirale Truvada, anche per le persone più a rischio, farmaco prima in uso solo dai pazienti affetti dall'HIV. Truvada è un farmaco antiretrovirale usato per il trattamento di adulti con infezione da virus dell'immunodeficienza umana di tipo 1 (HIV-1), un virus che provoca la sindrome da immunodeficienza acquisita (AIDS) e il medicinale può essere ottenuto soltanto con prescrizione medica.

Entrambi i principi attivi, emtricitabina e tenofovir, agiscono allo stesso modo, bloccando l'attività della trascrittasi inversa, un enzima prodotto dall'HIV che permette a quest'ultimo di infettare le cellule e di riprodursi. Truvada, assunto in associazione con un altro farmaco antivirale, riduce la quantità di HIV nel sangue mantenendola a un livello basso; non cura l'infezione da HIV o l'AIDS, ma può ritardare i danni prodotti al sistema immunitario e l'insorgenza di infezioni e malattie associate all'AIDS. I principi attivi, assunti in combinazione con altri farmaci antivirali, hanno ridotto la carica virale nella maggior parte dei pazienti e sono risultati più efficaci dei medicinali di confronto. Nel 2011 uno studio ha dimostrato che nelle coppie in cui solo uno dei due partner era affetto da HIV, Truvada abbinato all'uso del preservativo permette una riduzione della possibilità di infezione del 75 %.

Considerato che il costo di un anno di trattamento con Truvada è molto elevato (circa 11 000 euro) e che, secondo alcuni esperti, promuovere l'utilizzo di questo farmaco significa alimentare false sicurezze e far assumere comportamenti maggiormente a rischio, può la Commissione rendere nota la sua opinione in merito?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(3 agosto 2012)

Il Truvada, il prodotto medicinale menzionato dall'onorevole deputato, è stato autorizzato dalla Commissione europea nel 2005.

Le informazioni sul prodotto attualmente autorizzate ([1]) sia all'indirizzo degli operatori sanitari che dei pazienti contiene una dichiarazione in base alla quale non è comprovato che i farmaci antiretrovirali, compreso il Truvada, evitino il rischio di trasmissione del HIV attraverso il contatto sessuale o la contaminazione sanguigna. Il sommario della relazione pubblica di valutazione europea reso disponibile al pubblico menziona che il Truvada non cura le infezioni da HIV o l'AIDS, ma può ritardare il danno al sistema immunitario e lo sviluppo di infezioni e malattie associate all'AIDS. Inoltre, il Truvada può essere ottenuto esclusivamente su prescrizione e il trattamento col Truvada deve essere iniziato da un medico che abbia esperienza nel trattamento dell'infezione da HIV.

La legislazione farmaceutica dell'UE ([2]) vieta la pubblicità dei medicinali venduti al pubblico esclusivamente su prescrizione medica. È consentita la pubblicità diretta alle persone qualificate a prescrivere o fornire un simile prodotto, ma tale pubblicità deve essere compatibile con le informazioni sul prodotto approvate dalle autorità competenti. Il controllo della pubblicità dei medicinali rientra nelle competenze degli Stati membri.

In base a quanto detto sopra la Commissione non ha motivo per ritenere che il trattamento con questo medicinale possa creare in generale un erroneo senso di sicurezza o incoraggiare comportamenti a rischio.

([1]) C(2011)5604 del 27/07/2011, registro comunitario dei medicinali per uso umano http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/alfregister.htm

([2]) Direttiva 2001/83/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 6 novembre 2001, recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano e successive modifiche.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005496/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Truvada, the HIV-prevention pill

A United States advisory committee has green-lighted use of the anti-retroviral drug Truvada, including for those most at risk. It is the first drug used exclusively by patients affected by HIV. Truvada is an anti-retroviral drug used to treat adults infected with human immunodeficiency virus type 1 (HIV-1), a virus that causes acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS). The medicine can only be obtained with a prescription.

Both active ingredients, emtricitabine and tenofovir, work in similar ways by blocking reverse transcriptase activity, an enzyme produced by HIV that allows it to infect cells and reproduce. Truvada, taken in combination with another anti-viral medicine, reduces the amount of HIV in the blood and keeps levels low. Truvada does not cure HIV or AIDS, but it may delay damage to the immune system and the development of AIDS-associated infections and diseases. The active ingredients, taken in combination with other anti-viral drugs, have reduced the viral load in most patients and have been more effective than comparator medicines. A 2011 study showed that in couples where only one partner is affected by HIV, Truvada, used in combination with a condom, reduces the likelihood of infection by 75%.

Considering that the cost of one year's treatment with Truvada is extremely high (around EUR 11 000) and that, according to some experts, promoting this drug fuels a false sense of security and encourages more risky behaviour, could the Commission comment on this matter?

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

The medicinal product mentioned by the Honourable Member, Truvada, has been authorised by the European Commission since 2005.

The currently approved product information ([1]) both for healthcare professionals and patients contains a statement that antiretrovirals, including Truvada, have not been proven to prevent the risk of HIV transmission through sexual contact or contamination with blood. The summary of the European Public Assessment Report available for the public mentions that Truvada does not cure HIV infection or AIDS, but it may delay the damage to the immune system and the development of infections and diseases associated with AIDS. Furthermore, Truvada can only be obtained with a prescription and treatment should be started by a medical doctor who has experience in the management of HIV infection.

EU pharmaceutical legislation ([2]) bans any advertising of a prescription-only medicinal product to the general public. Advertising to persons qualified to prescribe or supply such a product is allowed, but must be compatible with the product information approved by the competent authorities. The control of the advertising of medicinal products is a competence of the Member States

Based on the above, the Commission does not have reasons to assume that treatment with this medicine is generally likely to create a false sense of safety or encourage riskier behaviour.

([1]) C(2011)5604 of 27/07/2011, Community register of medicinal products for human use http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/alfregister.htm

([2]) Directive 2001/83/ec of the European parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use as amended.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005497/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Risparmiando con l'agenda digitale nella Pubblica Amministrazione

In Italia l'agenda digitale è un tema saliente, poiché esiste un deficit di banda larga sia fra gli utenti, che tra le imprese. La scarsa utilizzazione delle tecnologie ICT è anche un problema di alfabetizzazione delle persone e soprattutto di arretratezza della Pubblica Amministrazione.

L'agenda digitale richiede un impulso verso l'innovazione e il potenziamento dei servizi tecnologici, poiché un buon utilizzo del digitale è indispensabile per rilanciare l'economia, aprire nuovi mercati e avviare processi di modernizzazione.

Se si decidesse di fare dell'innovazione del digitale uno dei pedali di stimolo alla crescita e al risparmio si otterrebbero dei risultati ottimali. In particolare, ci sarebbe un risparmio di 19 miliardi di euro entro il 2013, ottenendo un taglio del rapporto tra deficit e Pil dal 3.9 % attuale all'1.5 % e favorendo un aumento del Pil tra lo 0.69 % e l'1.3 %. Inoltre, la riduzione della spesa pubblica per gli acquisti della pubblica amministrazione porterebbe un risparmio di 4 miliardi di euro, soprattutto mediante le gare telematiche. Si avrebbe un miglioramento dell'efficienza con la crescita delle procedure in digitale e meno con faldoni cartacei fino ad arrivare ad un ulteriore risparmio di 15miliardi di euro.

Considerando i risparmi che potrebbe apportare l'uso del digitale nella Pubblica Amministrazione, oltre che ai benefici in termini ambientali per il minore impiego di carta, chiedo alla Commissione se intenda promuovere il digitale anche all'interno delle istituzioni pubbliche e integrare in via telematica l'utente all'istituzione, in vista della nuova programmazione pluriennale.

Risposta di Neelie Kroes a nome della Commissione
(27 giugno 2012)

La risposta alla domanda dell'onorevole parlamentare è affermativa.

Per il prossimo quadro finanziario pluriennale (2014-2020), la proposta della Commissione prevede circa 2 miliardi di euro per i servizi pubblici interconnessi online in settori chiave quali la giustizia e la sanità. Il finanziamento proposto fa parte della componente dell'infrastruttura di servizi digitali del meccanismo per collegare l'Europa (CEF). Il progetto di regolamento CEF prevede di fornire un sostegno alla diffusione delle infrastrutture di servizi digitali, la loro interoperabilità e il coordinamento a livello europeo, il loro funzionamento, la loro manutenzione e l'aggiornamento.

Inoltre, il prossimo quadro finanziario pluriennale prevede Orizzonte 2020, un programma di finanziamento di 80 miliardi di euro per la ricerca e l'innovazione (2014-2020). La ripartizione del bilancio nel quadro di Orizzonte 2020 è pienamente in linea con la strategia Europa 2020 in cui l'attuazione dell'agenda digitale europea è una priorità. Nella sua architettura attuale, Orizzonte 2020 permetterà di lanciare ulteriori ricerche o studi pilota per l'innovazione nel settore pubblico, nell'ambito del sesto pilastro «Società inclusive, innovative e sicure». Il finanziamento proposto per il sesto pilastro è pari a 3,8 miliardi di euro. La componente dell'innovazione del settore pubblico di Orizzonte 2020 dovrà essere ulteriormente potenziata nelle prossime fasi di sviluppo dei programmi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005497/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Savings from the digital agenda in public administration

The digital agenda is a prominent issue in Italy, since there is a broadband deficit for businesses and consumers alike. The low use of ICT also creates problems of low computer literacy in the population and, above all, of backwardness on the part of the public administration.

The digital agenda requires a drive towards innovation and the strengthening of technology services, since effective use of digital opportunities is essential for turning the economy around, opening up new markets and launching modernisation initiatives.

If the decision were taken to make digital innovation a key driver for growth and efficiency savings, excellent results could be achieved. In particular, EUR 19 billion would be saved by the end of 2013, bringing the deficit-to-GDP ratio from its current level of 3.9% to 1.5% and helping to boost GDP by between 0.69% and 1.3%. Furthermore, the reduction in public expenditure for public administration procurement expenses would save EUR 4 billion, primarily through the adoption of online tendering processes. Efficiency improvements from increased use of digital procedures instead of paper would save a further EUR 15 billion.

In view of the potential savings from the use of digital technologies in public administration, in addition to the environmental benefits of reduced paper consumption, does the Commission intend to promote the digital agenda in public institutions in particular and to bring users and institutions together online, given the new multi-annual programming?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(27 June 2012)

The answer to the question of the Honourable Member is Yes.

For the next multiannual financial framework (2014-2020), the European Commission's proposal includes some 2 billion euro for interconnected online public services in key areas, such as justice and health. The proposed funding is part of the Digital Service Infrastructure component of the Connecting Europe Facility (CEF). The Draft CEF Regulation foresees to provide support to the deployment of digital service infrastructure, their interoperability and coordination at European level, their operation, maintenance and upgrading.

In addition, the next multiannual financial framework proposes Horizon 2020: a 80 billion euro research and innovation funding programme (2014-2020). The budget distribution within Horizon 2020 is fully aligned with Europe 2020 where implementing the Digital Agenda for Europe is a priority. As drafted today, the Horizon 2020 will enable to launch further research or piloting for public sector innovation planned within the pillar 6 Inclusive, innovative and secure societies. The proposed funding for pillar 6 is EUR 3.8 billion. The public sector innovation component of Horizon 2020 will need to be further developed in the next phases of the programme development.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005498/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Ingredienti dei cosmetici dannosi per la salute

Tutti i cosmetici in Europa hanno un'etichetta che indica gli ingredienti in ordine decrescente per quantità totale contenuta. La prima sostanza è pertanto quella in percentuale maggiore. Occorre sempre leggere molto attentamente le etichette in quanto un prodotto può essere composto da sostanze che, seppur presenti in scarsa quantità, possono essere nocive per la salute. Gli ingredienti da evitare sono circa una ventina perché essi, pur agendo a livello cutaneo superficiale, possono penetrare in profondità. Si tratta dei conservanti come parabeni e urea, i tensioattivi schiumogeni come SLS e SLES, gli emulsionanti DEA, MEA, PEG ecc., i siliconi, i derivati del petrolio, l'alcool e i coloranti. Tali sostanze potrebbero causare irritazioni della pelle, allergie o addirittura liberare formaldeide o nitrosamine che sono palesemente cangerogene.

Inoltre, in molte aziende cosmetiche, il nichel entra a far parte dei prodotti durante la loro fabbricazione. Nonostante le fabbriche siano tenute a rispettare regole di buona produzione affinché il nichel sia presente al minimo, può sempre capitare che tale agente inquinante entri in contatto col prodotto.

Considerato che i consumatori non sono sempre attenti alla composizione dei cosmetici e che le industrie tendono ad utilizzare ingredienti non naturali in quanto risultano più economici e apparentemente più performanti, intende la Commissione prevedere nuove misure per sensibilizzare i consumatori e le imprese all'utilizzo di prodotti naturali?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(9 agosto 2012)

La Direttiva sui cosmetici 76/768/CEE del 27 luglio 1976 stabilisce che la responsabilità per la sicurezza dei prodotti cosmetici commercializzati nell'UE fa capo al produttore. Spetta a questi valutare la sicurezza del prodotto nel rispetto delle prescrizioni di legge indicate nella direttiva, riassumendo poi i risultati nella documentazione informativa obbligatoria da conservare a disposizione delle autorità nazionali.

La direttiva regolamenta inoltre alcuni ingredienti che richiedono particolare attenzione. Tali ingredienti figurano negli allegati alla direttiva. L'allegato II comprende le sostanze il cui impiego è proibito nei cosmetici e l'allegato III elenca le sostanze assoggettate a determinate limitazioni e condizioni. Le sostanze impiegate come coloranti, conservanti o filtri UV sono consentite nei cosmetici solo se figurano negli allegati IV, VI e VII alla direttiva, previa adeguata valutazione della sicurezza a cura del Comitato scientifico della sicurezza dei consumatori (CSSC).

È ammessa l'eventuale presenza accidentale di una modica quantità di una sostanza proibita, derivante da impurità degli ingredienti naturali o sintetici, dal processo produttivo, dall'immagazzinamento o dalla confezione, quando risulti tecnicamente inevitabile pur in presenza di buone prassi produttive, ma solo a condizione che tale presenza non metta in pericolo la salute umana nelle condizioni d'uso normali e ragionevolmente prevedibili.

Si rammenta infine che gli ingredienti naturali non sono intrinsecamente più sicuri di quelli sintetici. Alcuni ingredienti naturali, quali gli oli essenziali, possono causare allergie cutanee. Il compito della Commissione non è promuovere i cosmetici naturali ma garantire che tutti i prodotti cosmetici commercializzati nell'UE siano sicuri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005498/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Cosmetic ingredients harmful to health

All cosmetics in Europe carry a label indicating the ingredients in descending order of total quantity contained. The highest percentage ingredient is therefore listed first. The labels must always be read very carefully, since a product may contain substances which, despite minute quantities, can be harmful to health. There are some 20 ingredients that should be avoided because, even though they act on the skin's surface, they can penetrate the skin more deeply. These are preservatives such as parabens and urea, foaming surfactants such as SLS and SLES, the emulsifiers DEA, MEA, PEG, etc., silicones, petroleum derivatives, alcohol and colourants. These substances may cause skin irritations, allergies, or even release formaldehyde or nitrosamine, known carcinogenics.

Furthermore, many cosmetics companies' products acquire nickel traces during manufacture. Although factories are obliged to comply with good manufacturing practice to ensure minimum nickel levels, this toxic substance can still come into contact with products.

Since consumers do not always pay attention to cosmetic ingredients, and since manufacturers tend to use non-natural ingredients for economic and effect reasons, does the Commission intend to introduce new measures to raise consumers' and companies' awareness of natural products?

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

Under the current Cosmetics Directive (76/768/EEC), the manufacturer is responsible for the safety of cosmetic products placed on the EU market. The manufacturer carries out the safety assessment of the product in accordance with the legal requirements set out in the directive, and this is summarised in the mandatory product information file, kept at the disposal of the national authorities.

In addition, the directive regulates certain ingredients of significant concern. These ingredients are listed in annexes to the directive. Annex II contains substances which are banned for use in cosmetics, and Annex III lists substances subject to specific restrictions and conditions. Substances used as colouring agents, preservatives or UV-filters are allowed in cosmetics only if listed in Annexes IV, VI and VII to the directive after a proper safety assessment carried out by the Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety (SCCS).

The unintended presence of a small quantity of a prohibited substance, stemming from impurities in natural or synthetic ingredients, the manufacturing process, storage or migration from packaging, which is technically unavoidable in good manufacturing practice, is only permitted provided that such presence is safe for human health under normal and reasonably foreseeable conditions of use.

Lastly, it should be mentioned that natural ingredients are not necessarily safer than synthetic ones. Some natural ingredients, such as essential oils, can cause skin allergies. It is not the task of the Commission to promote natural cosmetics but to ensure that all cosmetic products placed on the EU market are safe.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005499/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Spending review sanitaria europea — nuove prospettive con i dati sulla crescita demografica

La spesa sanitaria italiana, al centro dell'attenzione della spending review dell'attuale governo, è aumentata meno che nell'eurozona ma due volte più che in Germania, con un incremento del 50 % dal 2001, salendo dal 6,3 al 7,6 % del Pil. Tuttavia la frazione di persone anziane (sopra i 65 anni) in Italia e Germania è la stessa: il 21 % del totale. I dati sulla spesa sanitaria — segnalati in una recente indagine pubblicata su una rivista indipendente — per la spending review europea (e italiana) in corso parlano chiaro: dal 2001 fino al 2010, la spesa sanitaria nell'eurozona è aumentata del 51 % in euro correnti, il che corrisponde a un aumento di poco più di un punto in percentuale sul Pil. Nello stesso periodo, la spesa sanitaria tedesca è aumentata solo del 26 % (+0,5 in percentuale sul Pil tedesco: dal 6,7 al 7,2 %). Nel resto dell'eurozona senza la Germania, la spesa sanitaria è invece aumentata del 64 % (+1,3 % sul Pil degli altri 16 paesi, dal 6,3 al 7,6 %). Per quanto riguarda i paesi attualmente sull'orlo del default, la spesa sanitaria è aumentata del 128 % in Grecia (+2,4 in percentuale sul Pil), del 96 % in Spagna (+1,4 in percentuale sul Pil), dell'83 % in Irlanda (+2,3 sul Pil) e «solo» del 40 % in Portogallo (+0,6 sul Pil). In Francia la spesa è aumentata del 42 %, cioè di poco meno di un punto in percentuale rispetto al Pil.

Con l'adozione comune dell'euro, la spesa pubblica è esplosa in tutti i paesi dell'eurozona, tranne che in Germania. In alcuni casi (Spagna e Irlanda) l'esplosione è avvenuta insieme con e a causa della grande recessione del «2008-2009» che ha prodotto la necessità di salvataggi bancari, sussidi di disoccupazione, assistenza sociale ai nuovi poveri.

Nel panorama internazionale ed europeo voci autorevoli — fra cui il Nobel Paul Krugman, l'editor economico del Financial Times, Martin Wolfe e molti economisti italiani — si oppongono all'austerità fiscale. A loro avviso, l'aumento della spesa pubblica e l'accumulo dei debiti pubblici successivi sono il risultato piuttosto che la causa della crisi attuale.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione comunicare se sono in corso studi specifici al riguardo o indicare dove reperire i dati procapite della spesa sanitaria europea, in modo da poter fornire un quadro di raffronto fra i diversi paesi?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(18 luglio 2012)

La Commissione (Eurostat) raccoglie dati sulla spesa dei governi per funzione (COFOG) nel contesto del Sistema europeo dei conti (ESA 95). Gli Stati membri sono tenuti per legge a trasmettere i dati entro dodici mesi dalla fine del periodo di riferimento, il che significa che gli ultimi dati pervenuti a fine dicembre 2011 riguardano il 2010.

L'allegato 1 presenta i dati sulla spesa dei governi per la sanità (COFOG) per il periodo 2001-2010 (espressi sia in percentuale del PIL che in milioni di euro). Questo allegato include anche gli stessi dati per la protezione sociale poiché tale funzione include in particolare le spese legate alla malattia, alla disabilità e anche alla vecchiaia ([1]).

Inoltre, la Commissione (Eurostat) raccoglie dati in relazione al Sistema europeo di statistiche integrate della protezione sociale (ESSPROS). L'allegato 2 presenta informazioni più dettagliate in merito alla spesa per le funzioni di protezione sociale espresse in euro per abitante e in percentuale del PIL per il periodo 2000-2009.

La Commissione (Eurostat) fornisce inoltre informazioni dettagliate sulla spesa per l'assistenza sanitaria sulla base di un questionario congiunto Eurostat-OCSE-OMS con definizioni e classificazioni che seguono il Sistema dei conti sanitari (SHA) ([2]). I dati SHA sono attualmente disponibili per 22 Stati membri, mancano l'Irlanda, la Grecia, l'Italia, Malta e il Regno Unito. Essi sono classificati per categoria di erogatore (ICHA-HP), categoria di funzione (ICHA-HC) e agente finanziatore (ICHA-HF).

Tutti i dati sono pubblicati su Eurobase ([3]). Le informazioni provenienti da ESA95**,** ESSPROS, e SHA provengono da diverse fonti e sono complementari e utili per gli utenti.

([1]) Per ulteriori dettagli relativi alla classificazione COFOG si rinvia al manuale COFOG.
([2]) Per ulteriori dettagli concernenti la classificazione SHA si rinvia alle linee guida SHA.
([3]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search_database (dati COFOG alla voce: Economy & finance/Government statistics/Annual Government Statistics/General Government Expenditure by function (COFOG); (dati ESSPROS alla voce: Population and social conditions/Living conditions and welfare/Social protection/Social protection expenditure /Expenditure); (dati SHA alla voce: Population and social conditions/Health/Public health/Health care expenditure)

Nel 2010 la Commissione ha pubblicato in collaborazione con l'OCSE una relazione congiunta «Health at a Glance Europe 2010» ([4]). Essa contiene un capitolo consacrato alla spesa sanitaria e al finanziamento della sanità. La versione 2012 della relazione dovrebbe essere pubblicata entro il dicembre 2012.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/reports/european/health_glance_2010_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005499/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: European health spending review — new perspectives with democratic growth data

Italian health spending, the current government's spending review focus, has risen by less than the euro area average but twice as much as in Germany, with a 50 % rise since 2001 from 6.3 to 7.6 % of GDP. However, the proportion spent on the elderly (aged over 65) in Italy and Germany is the same, 21 % of the total. Health spending data — highlighted in a recent independent journal survey — for the current European (and Italian) spending review speaks for itself: from 2001 to 2010, health spending in the euro area rose by 51 % in current euros, corresponding to an increase of slightly more than 1 % of GDP. In the same period, German health spending rose by just 26 % (+0.5 % of GDP), from 6.7 to 7.2 %. In the rest of the euro area except Germany, health spending increased by 64 % (+1.3 % of GDP for the other 16 countries, from 6.3 to 7.6 %). Health spending rose in potential default countries by 128 % in Greece (+2.4 % of GDP), 96 % in Spain (+1.4 % of GDP), 83 % in Ireland (+2.3 % of GDP) and 40 % in Portugal (+0.6 % of GDP). In France, spending increased by 42 %, representing a rise of less than 1 % of GDP.

Since adopting the euro, public health spending has rocketed in all euro area countries except Germany. In some cases (Spain and Ireland), this spending boom was both accompanied and caused by the great recession of 2008-2009, resulting in the need to bailout banks, and grant unemployment benefits and social welfare to the new poor.

On the international and European stage, authoritative voices — including those of Nobel prize-winner Paul Krugman, *Financial Times* economics commentator Martin Wolfe and many Italian economists — are being raised against fiscal austerity. They believe the increase in public spending and the consequent public debt accumulation are the result, not the cause, of the current crisis.

In view of the above, can the Commission state whether there is specific research being carried out in this area, or indicate where per-capita data on European health spending can be found, to enable a comparison to be drawn up between the various countries?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2012)

The Commission (Eurostat) collects data on general government expenditure by function (COFOG) within the European system of accounts Transmission programme (ESA 95). The legal requirement for transmission of data by EU Member States is twelve months after the end of the reference period, which means that the latest data received at the end of December 2011 relate to 2010.

Annex A presents data on general government expenditure for the Health COFOG function for the period 2001-2010 (both expressed in % of GDP and millions of euro). This Annex also includes the same data for Social Protection as this function notably includes expenditure related to sickness, disability and also to old age ([1]).

In addition, the Commission (Eurostat) collects data on the European System of Integrated Social Protection Statistics (ESSPROS). Annex A presents more detailed information of the expenditure on social protection functions expressed in euro per inhabitant and as % of GDP for the period 2000-2009.

Furthermore, the Commission (Eurostat) provides detailed information on healthcare expenditure based on a joint Eurostat-OECD-WHO questionnaire with definitions and classifications following the System of Health Accounts (SHA) ([2]). SHA data is currently available for 22 EU Member States, missing Ireland, Greece, Italy, Malta and the UK. It is classified by provider category (ICHA-HP), function category (ICHA-HC) and financing agent (ICHA-HF).

All data are published on Eurobase ([3]). The information from ESA95, ESSPROS, and SHA originates from different sources and can be seen as complementary and useful for users.

([1]) Further details concerning the COFOG classification can be found in the COFOG manual.
([2]) Further details concerning the SHA classification can be found in the SHA guidelines.
([3]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/statistics/search_database (COFOG data under: Economy & finance / Government statistics / Annual Government Statistics / General Government Expenditure by function (COFOG); (ESSPROS data under: Population and social conditions / Living conditions and welfare / Social protection / Social protection expenditure /Expenditure) (SHA data under: Population and social conditions / Health / Public health / Healthcare expenditure).

In 2010 the Commission published in collaboration with the OECD a joint report 'Health at a Glance Europe 2010' ([4]). It included a chapter on Health Expenditure and Financing. The 2012 version of this report is due to be released by December 2012.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/reports/european/health_glance_2010_en.HTM

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-005500/12
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE)
(2012. május 31.)

Tárgy: Az Európai Számvevőszék jelentése a strukturális alapokról

A számvevőszéki ellenőrzés alapját elsősorban 40 program felülvizsgálata képezte, amely programokban jelentős hiányosságokra derült fény. Az ellenőrzés célja annak megállapítása volt, hogy a Bizottság kielégítő módon kezelte-e a tagállamok irányítási és kontrollrendszereiben megállapított hiányosságokat. A Számvevőszék összességében arra a megállapításra jutott, hogy a Bizottság általában megfelelő intézkedéseket hoz, amennyiben hiányosságokat állapít meg az irányítási és kontrollrendszerekben, ezek végrehajtásának folyamata azonban elhúzódik. Emellett a Bizottság részben sikerrel biztosította a pénzügyi korrekciók helyes alkalmazását, továbbá különböző mértékben tudott megbizonyosodni arról, hogy intézkedései az egyes tagállamok irányítási és kontrollrendszereiben javulást eredményeztek. A tagállami hatóságok a nem támogatható, finanszírozásból kizárt kiadásokat új kiadásokkal tudták helyettesíteni, és tartalékkal rendelkeztek a jövőbeni pénzügyi korrekciók ellensúlyozására.

Mindezek alapján a következő kérdéseket szeretném feltenni a Bizottságnak:

1. Eleget tesz-e Bizottság a Számvevőszék azon javaslatának miszerint csökkentenie kell a hiányosságok megállapításától a korrekciós intézkedések végrehajtásáig terjedő adminisztratív eljárás időtartamát? Ha nem, milyen időtávon belül tervezi ezt megvalósítani?

2. Nem érzi-e úgy a Bizottság, hogy jelenleg nem helyez megfelelő hangsúlyt az ellenőrző hatóságok munkájára irányuló ellenőrzéseire?

3. Mikorra tudja a Bizottság biztosítani azt, hogy a lezárás előtt végrehajtott pénzügyi korrekciók kiterjedjenek az elégtelen irányítási és kontrollrendszerek keretében felmerült valamennyi kiadásra?

Johannes Hahn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. július 18.)

1. A Bizottság minden esetben figyelembe veszi a Számvevőszék jelentéseiben foglalt ajánlásokat; a szóban forgó ajánlást pedig már végrehajtotta. A 2008. évi Cselekvési Terv óta a pénzügyi korrekciókról szóló határozatok elfogadásához kapcsolódó jogi eljárások gyorsultak, a határidők rövidültek. A számvevőszéki ellenőrzési mintában számos olyan pénzügyi korrekció szerepelt, melyet a 2008-as Cselekvési Tervet megelőzően hajtottak végre.

2. A Bizottság 2007-2013-as időszakra érvényes ellenőrzési stratégiájának keretében elsődleges fontosságot tulajdonít annak, hogy ellenőrizze a nemzeti ellenőrzési hatóságok munkáját. Felülvizsgálja a legnagyobb kockázatnak kitett ellenőrző hatóságok munkáját, ami lehetővé teszi számukra, hogy munkájukat annak érdekében javítsák, hogy éves ellenőrzési véleményeiket a Bizottság megbízhatóbban alkalmazhassa. A Bizottság minden ellenőrzési hatósággal egyeztette és megosztotta az iránymutatásokat. Azokban az esetekben, amikor egy adott ellenőrzési hatóság munkájának megbízhatóságával kapcsolatosan kétségek merülnek fel, a Bizottság a közvetlen bizonyosság megszerzése érdekében saját maga végez ellenőrzéseket.

Az egységes ellenőrzési módszer, valamint a fenti vizsgálat eredményei alapján a Bizottság 58 programot érintően már 22 olyan ellenőrzési hatóságot választott ki, melyek kellő biztosítékot nyújtanak ahhoz, hogy a Bizottság elsősorban a véleményükre támaszkodjon; bizottsági ellenőrzésre esetükben csak akkor kerül sor, ha bizonyítékok támasztják alá a rendszer hiányosságait. Várhatóan 2012-ben a hasonló megbízható minősítéssel bíró ellenőrző hatóságok köre legalább tízzel bővül.

3. A Bizottság gondoskodik arról, hogy a pénzügyi korrekciók a végrehajtás időtartama alatt hibás irányítási és kontrollrendszerek keretében felmerült valamennyi kiadásra kiterjedjenek. Mindemellett a programok lezárásakor végső ellenőrzést is végrehajtanak annak biztosítása érdekében, hogy a pénzügyi korrekciók kiterjedjenek az érintett kiadások esetlegesen fennmaradó részére, és amennyiben szükséges, a végleges korrekciókra átalány alapon kerül sor.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005500/12
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: European Court of Auditors' report on Structural Funds

The European Court of Auditors' audit was mainly based on a review of 40 programmes in which significant deficiencies had been identified. The aim of the audit was to assess whether the Commission had satisfactorily dealt with deficiencies identified in Member States' management and control systems. The Court of Auditors concluded that the Commission generally takes appropriate action whenever deficiencies are identified, but that the implementation process is lengthy. In addition, the Commission had some success in ensuring that financial corrections were correctly applied, but had varying success in ensuring that its actions led to improvements in Member States' management and control systems. Member State authorities managed to replace ineligible expenses excluded from funding with new expenses and had reserves available to offset future financial adjustments.

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

1. Is the Commission adhering to the Court of Auditors' proposal to reduce the administrative procedure duration, from identifying deficiencies to implementing corrective actions? If not, within what timeframe does it envisage doing this?

2. Does the Commission feel that it is failing to give sufficient priority to the audit authorities' work?

3. By when can the Commission ensure that financial corrections made prior to closure cover all expenditure incurred under inadequate management and control systems?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2012)

1. The Commission always takes the recommendations of the Court of Auditors' reports into account and has already implemented this recommendation. Since the 2008 Action Plan, it has accelerated legal proceedings and defined deadlines for the adoption of financial correction decisions. The Court's audit sample included a significant number of financial corrections that were implemented before the 2008 Action Plan.

2. The Commission gives a high priority to auditing the work of the national audit authorities under its audit strategy for the 2007-13 period. It reviews the work of those audit authorities most at risk allowing them to improve their work so that the Commission can subsequently rely on their annual audit opinions. The Commission has discussed and shared guidance notes with all audit authorities. In cases where limited reliance can be placed on the work of audit authority, the Commission conducts its own audits to obtain direct assurance.

Following the single audit approach and results of the above enquiry, the Commission has already notified selected 22 audit authorities covering 58 programmes showing sufficient assurance for the Commission to rely principally on their opinion and that it will carry out its own audits only if there is evidence to suggest shortcomings in the system. In 2012, it expects that at least ten additional audit authorities will qualify for this conclusion.

3. The Commission ensures that financial corrections cover all expenditure incurred under deficient management and control systems during the implementing period. In addition, at closure, a final check is done to ensure that all possible remaining affected expenditure is covered by financial corrections, and if necessary final corrections are made by flat rate.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-005501/12
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE)
(2012. május 31.)

Tárgy: A fiatalok és a tartós munkanélküliség

A görög és spanyol fiatalok munkanélküliségi rátája 50% fölé ugrott, miközben a német mutató – a maga 8%-ával – közel húszéves mélypontra süllyedt. Kérdés, hogy az eurózóna meddig bírja ezt a fajta aszimmetriát. Az minden tekintetben tarthatatlan, hogy egy euróövezeti tagországban a fiatalok 50 százaléka munka nélkül maradjon, miközben a politikusok sorozatos megszorításokat kényszerítenek a társadalomra. Ezt a fajta feszültséget sem az adott ország, sem a teljes eurózóna nem viselheti el sokáig, főleg úgy, hogy a statisztikai adatokat szemlélve egyelőre semmi jele annak, hogy a spanyol vagy a görög tendenciák megfordulnának.

Mindezek alapján a következő kérdéseket szeretném feltenni a Bizottságnak:

1. A Bizottság szerint van-e esély a fiatalok munkanélkülisége okozta válság legyőzésére úgy, hogy a munkahelyteremtés a fiatalok számára a politikai döntéshozatalban még mindig nem elsődleges prioritás, s mindemellett szinte minimális növekedés tapasztalható a beruházások számában?

2. Milyen intézkedéseket kíván tenni a Bizottság? Milyen új programokat (pl. egyéb ösztönzők felajánlása a fiatalokat foglalkoztató vállalkozásoknak, a fiatalok képzettsége és a munkaerő-piaci kereslet között fennálló eltérések csökkentése, valamint olyan vállalkozói programok, amelyek segítik a készségek fejlesztését) tervez indítani rövid távon e rendkívüli probléma azonnali orvoslására?

Andor László válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. július 19.)

A fiatalkori munkanélküliség olyan problémát jelent az Európai Unióban, melynek megoldásához – annak érdekében, hogy a fiatalok foglalkoztatásának helyzetében fenntartható javulás következzen be – egyértelműen szükséges, hogy javuljon az általános gazdasági és foglalkoztatási helyzet, különösen a leginkább érintett tagállamokban. A Bizottság nemrégiben „Út a munkahelyteremtő fellendülés felé” címmel foglalkoztatási csomagot ([1]) fogadott el, mely vázolja, hogy a foglalkoztatási szakpolitikák miként járulnak hozzá ahhoz, hogy a munkaerő a növekedés mozgatórugójává váljon. A csomag három fő területre összpontosít: a szakpolitikai erőfeszítések súlypontját a munkaerőpiac keresleti oldalára helyezi, ezáltal is elősegítve a munkahelyteremtést; dinamikusabb európai munkaerőpiacra törekszik, valamint a foglalkoztatási szakpolitikák fokozottabb európai szintű összehangolására és ellenőrzésére ösztönöz.

A fiatalok foglalkoztatását elősegítő szakpolitikák a 2011 decemberében indult „Több lehetőséget a fiataloknak” kezdeményezés ([2]) alapján teljes mértékben követik ezt a megközelítést. E kezdeményezés végrehajtásának jelenlegi állását tekintve a Bizottság felhívja a tisztelt képviselő figyelmét a 2012. áprilisi időközi jelentésre ([3]). Mindemellett a Bizottság május 30-án előterjesztette országspecifikus ajánlásokra tett javaslatait ([4]), beleértve a fiatalok foglalkoztatására és az ahhoz kapcsolódó területekre vonatkozó számos javaslatot, melyek meghatározzák, hogy az egyes tagállamoknak milyen lépéseket kell megtenniük.

A Bizottság továbbra is uniós szintű fellépések révén támogatja a tagállami szakpolitikákat. A Bizottság 2012. évi munkaprogramja két, az ifjúsági garanciákkal, valamint a szakmai gyakorlatok minőségével kapcsolatos konkrét kezdeményezésről rendelkezik. Az Európai Parlament is szorgalmazta mindkét kezdeményezést. A már folyamatban lévő, „Az első EURES állásod” elnevezésű előkészítő intézkedés ([5]) 2012–2013-ban várhatóan mintegy 5000 fiatal nemzetközi munkavállalását segít elő.

([1]) COM(2012)173.
([2]) COM(2011)933.
([3]) SWD(2012) 98.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm
([5]) További információ: http://ec.europa.eu/social/yourfirsteuresjob

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005501/12
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Young people and long-term unemployment

The youth unemployment rate in Greece and Spain has risen above the 50 % mark, whereas in Germany, it has fallen to its lowest level for nearly 20 years at 8 %. How long can the euro area tolerate this kind of anomaly? It is intolerable in every respect that 50 % of young people remain jobless in a Member State within the euro area, while politicians enforce a succession of restrictions on society. Neither the country in question, nor the euro area as a whole, will be able to tolerate such tension for long, especially as, based on statistical analysis, there is no indication of any swift trend reversal in Spain or Greece.

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

1. Does the Commission think that there is any chance of overcoming the crisis caused by youth unemployment, given that job creation for young people is not the main priority in the political decision-making process, not to mention that there has been minimal growth in investment levels?

2. What action is the Commission intending to take? What new short-term programmes does it plan to initiate to remedy this extreme problem (for example, offering further incentives to companies employing young people, reducing the current mismatch between the young people's qualifications and labour-market requirements, as well as introducing company programmes which promote skill enhancement)?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

Tackling the youth unemployment problem in the EU clearly requires an improvement of the general economic and employment context, especially in the Member States most concerned, in order to generate a sustainable improvement in the youth unemployment situation. The Commission has recently adopted an employment package 'Towards a job-rich recovery' ([1]) showing how employment policies can make it possible for labour to be a driver of growth. The package is built around three main areas: focusing policy efforts on the demand-side of the labour market and supporting job creation; a more dynamic European labour market, and stronger coordination and monitoring of employment policies at EU level.

Policies promoting youth employment are fully embedded into this approach on the basis of the Youth Opportunities Initiative ([2]) launched in December 2011. Concerning the state of play of implementation of this initiative, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to the interim report ([3]) of April 2012. Furthermore, the Commission has presented on 30 May its proposals for country-specific recommendations ([4]), including a considerable number of recommendations on youth employment and related areas, indicating the necessary steps to be taken by each Member State.

The Commission will continue to support Member States' policies with EU level action. The Commission Work Programme for 2012 foresees two specific initiatives on youth guarantees and on the quality of traineeships. Both initiatives have been called for by the European Parliament as well. The ongoing preparatory action 'Your first EURES job' ([5]) is expected to promote around 5 000 transnational job placements for young workers in 2012-2013.

([1]) COM(2012)173.
([2]) COM(2011)933.
([3]) SWD (2012) 98.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm
([5]) Further info at: http://ec.europa.eu/social/yourfirsteuresjob

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-005502/12
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE)
(2012. május 31.)

Tárgy: Az utalványokhoz kapcsolódó hozzáadottértékadó-szabályok módosításáról

Az Európai Bizottság 2012. május 10-én javaslatot terjesztett elő a hozzáadottérték-adózás uniós szabályainak módosítására azzal a céllal, hogy valamennyi utalványtípus egyformán adózzon minden tagállamban. Jelenleg az utalványokhoz kapcsolódó ügyletek tekintetében nem léteznek uniós hozzáadottértékadó-szabályok, a tagállamok saját eljárásokat alakítottak ki. Jelenleg amennyiben az utalványt más tagállamban bocsátották ki, mint ahol beváltják, nem mindig egyértelmű, hogy mely országban kell az utalványokhoz kapcsolódó ügyleteket megadóztatni. Az új szabályozás világosan elhatárolná egymástól az utalványokat és az egyéb fizetési eszközöket, és az Európai Bizottság elképzelései szerint 2015. január elsején lépne hatályba.

Mindezek alapján a következő kérdéseket szeretném feltenni a Bizottságnak:

1. Készített-e a Bizottság teljes körű hatásvizsgálatot, s ha igen, akkor a rendelkezésre álló adatok alátámasztják-e, hogy az utalványok adóztatása terén mindenképpen uniós szintű fellépésre van szükség?

2. A Bizottság szerint a tagállamok rendelkeznek-e ma azokkal az eszközökkel, amelyekkel egyoldalúan kezelni tudják az utalványok adóztatása területén tapasztalható adóztatási aszimmetriákat?

3. A hozzáadottérték-adózást érintő, utalványokkal kapcsolatos problémák technikai jellegéből adódóan konzultált-e a Bizottság az érintett tagállamokkal és vállalkozásokkal Šemeta biztos úr bejelentését megelőzően?

4. A nemzetállami sajátosságokból adódó különbséget figyelembe vette-e a Bizottság, s ha igen, ezeket milyen formában próbálja kezelni?

Algirdas Šemeta válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. július 19.)

1. Az utalványok hozzáadottérték-adózására vonatkozó uniós szabályokat létrehozó irányelvjavaslathoz hatásvizsgálat is tartozik. A vizsgálat azt a következtetést vonta le, hogy az azonosított problémák — nevezetesen a kettős adóztatás vagy éppen az adómentesség, az adózás elkerülése és az innováció akadályozása — a héa-irányelv módosításával kezelhetők leghatékonyabban, ami uniós szintű fellépést tesz szükségessé.

2. A hatásvizsgálat megállapította, hogy az egységes szabályozás hiánya vezetett oda, hogy a tagállamok önkényes és eseti megoldásokat alkalmaznak az utalványok hozzáadottérték-adóztatásával kapcsolatban, ami óhatatlanul adózási aszimmetriákat hoz létre a fogyasztók kárára.

3. A hatásvizsgálat beszámol azon széleskörű konzultációkról, amelyeket a Bizottság a javaslat előkészítése során az érdekelt felekkel folytatott.

4. Az irányelvjavaslatban vázolt intézkedések nem mutatnak túl azon, ami az utalványokkal végrehajtott, és különösen a több tagállamot érintő műveletek hozzáadottérték-adóztatására vonatkozó szabályok következetes alkalmazásának biztosításához szükséges. Így a tagállamok feladata megtenni a Tanács által elfogadandó előírásoknak való megfeleléshez szükséges intézkedéseket.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005502/12
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Amending the VAT rules relating to vouchers

The European Commission tabled a proposal on 10 May 2012 to amend the EU rules on value added tax, with the aim of establishing a standard taxation method for every type of voucher in every Member State. There are currently no EU VAT rules which apply to voucher-related transactions. Member States have developed their own procedures. At the moment, if vouchers are redeemed in a different country from where they were issued, it is not always clear in which country the voucher-related transactions should be taxed. The new Regulation would clearly differentiate between vouchers and the other payment instruments, and the European Commission envisages that it would come into force on 1 January 2015.

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

1. Has the Commission carried out a comprehensive impact assessment, and if so, do the available data support the idea that EU-level action is definitely required in voucher taxation?

2. Does the Commission think that Member States currently have available the instruments enabling them to deal with the anomalies experienced in voucher taxation?

3. Due to the technical nature of the issues relating to vouchers and VAT, did the Commission consult with the Member States and companies concerned prior to Commissioner Šemeta's report?

4. Has the Commission taken into account the difference due to states' unique characteristics, and if so, how is it attempting to deal with them?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

Firstly, the impact assessment, which accompanies the proposal for a directive setting up rules as regards the VAT treatment of vouchers, concludes that the most effective way to deal with the identified shortcomings, such as double or non-taxation, tax avoidance and barriers to innovation, is amending the VAT Directive and this can only be achieved by action at EU level.

Secondly, the impact assessment shows that the lack of any common rule has led the Member States to develop uncoordinated ad-hoc solutions as regards the VAT treatment of vouchers, which has resulted in mismatches in taxation, to the detriment of consumers.

Thirdly, the impact assessment also reports on the extensive consultations with all relevant stakeholders that have been undertaken by the Commission in the preparation of this proposal.

Finally, the measures laid down in the directive proposal go no further than what is needed to ensure a consistent application of VAT to transactions involving vouchers in particular where cross-border operations are concerned. It is then for Member States to take the necessary steps to comply with the provisions eventually adopted by the Council.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-005503/12
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE)
(2012. május 31.)

Tárgy: Az európai közbeszerzési szabályrendszer felülvizsgálatáról és modernizálásáról

A 2011 áprilisában kiadott „Egységes piaci intézkedéscsomag" célul tűzte ki az európai közbeszerzési szabályrendszer felülvizsgálatát és modernizálását a közbeszerzések hatékonyabb működése és a közbeszerzés stratégiai célú felhasználása lehetőségének javítása érdekében. 2010 és 2011 folyamán két Zöld könyv is készült az elektronikus közbeszerzés EU-n belüli alkalmazásának kiterjesztéséről és az EU közbeszerzési politikájának modernizálásáról. 2011. december 20-án a Bizottság elfogadta az úgynevezett közbeszerzési csomagot, amely a közbeszerzési és koncessziós irányelvek tervezetét foglalja magában. A 2012. február 20-i Versenyképességi Tanácson a miniszterek eszmecserét folytattak, melynek témája a hirdetmény közzétételével induló tárgyalásos eljárás, illetve a szociális, és egyéb speciális szolgáltatásokra vonatkozó könnyített eljárásrend volt. Az Európai Tanács elnöke, Herman Van Rompuy állam- és kormányfőknek címzett, 2012. április 26-i levelében kiemelte, hogy a közbeszerzési csomaggal kapcsolatos munkával is gyorsabban kell haladni, hogy határidőre, tehát az év vége előtt megszülessen a megállapodás.

Mindezek alapján a következő kérdéseket szeretném feltenni a Bizottságnak:

Egyetért-e a Bizottság a dán elnökség azon megközelítésével, amely szerint a szervezeti részletkérdések meghatározása a tagállamok feladata lenne, az irányelv csupán a feladatok azonosítását tartalmazná, mint például ellenőrzés, jelentéstétel és iránymutatások? A Bizottság szerint szükséges-e a listát bővíteni, avagy szűkíteni?

Michel Barnier válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. július 17.)

Az EU közbeszerzési szabályozásának modernizálását célzó irányelvek együttdöntési eljárás keretében az Európai Parlament és a Tanács elé kerültek elfogadásra. Ezzel kapcsolatban ismeretes, hogy a tagállamok túlnyomó többsége ellenzi a Bizottság által javasolt konkrét felügyeleti intézkedéseket, különösen az előírások betartásának ellenőrzésével és összehangolásával megbízandó független nemzeti testület létrehozását. Ebben a helyzetben a Tanács dán elnöksége úgy határozott, hogy kompromisszumos javaslatot terjeszt elő, amely kevesebb feladatot határoz meg, és a tagállamokra bízza a szükséges struktúrák és eszközök meghatározását.

Az eljárás jelenlegi szakaszában a Bizottság kitart eredeti javaslata mellett. A jelenleg hatályos irányelvek felülvizsgálata során ([1]) ugyanis kiderült, hogy nem minden tagállam ellenőrzi rendszeresen és módszeresen a közbeszerzési szabályok végrehajtását és betartását, így sérül a közösségi jog hatékony és egységes alkalmazása. Ez komoly aggodalomra ad okot, elsősorban a regionális források területén, ahol a közbeszerzés felel a számszerűsíthető hibák jelentős részéért. A Bizottság azon a véleményen van, hogy a közbeszerzési szabályok alkalmazását mindenképpen javítani kell, és ehhez minden szükséges intézkedést meg kell hozni.

([1]) A 2004/17/EK és a 2004/18/EK irányelvekkel kapcsolatos értékelő jelentés a következő címen érhető el: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005503/12
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Reviewing and modernising EU public procurement regulations

The Single Market Act published in April 2011 set as its goal to review and modernise EU public procurement regulations with the aims of making the public procurement system operate more efficiently and improving the opportunity to use public procurement for strategic purposes. Two green papers were also drafted in 2010 and 2011 on increasing the use of e-procurement within the EU and on updating the EU's public procurement policy. The Commission adopted the Public Procurement Package, which contains the draft public procurement and concessions Directives, on 20 December 2011. On 20 February 2012, ministers exchanged views at the Competition Council, which addressed negotiated procedures with publication of a contract notice and the simplified procedure for social and other special services. In his letter of 26 April 2012 addressed to Heads of State and Government, the President of the European Council, Herman Van Rompuy, stressed that the work on the Public Procurement Package also needs to progress more quickly so that the agreement is drafted by the deadline, i.e. before the end of the year.

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

Does the Commission agree with the Danish Presidency's approach whereby Member States would be entrusted with determining the organisational details, and the directive would merely identify the tasks, such as monitoring, reporting and providing guidelines? Does the Commission think that the list needs to be increased or reduced?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(17 juillet 2012)

La procédure de co-décision visant l'adoption par le Parlement européen et le Conseil des directives de modernisation des règles sur les marchés publics est en cours. Dans ce contexte, une large majorité d'États membres s'est opposée aux mesures de gouvernance spécifiques proposées par la Commission, et notamment à la mise en place d'un organe indépendant unique national en charge de tâches liées au contrôle et à la coordination de la mise en œuvre des règles. Face à cette situation, la Présidence danoise du Conseil a effectivement proposé un compromis qui limite les tâches à accomplir et laisse les États membres libres de choisir les structures et moyens nécessaires à cette fin.

À ce stade de la procédure, la Commission maintient sa proposition. En effet, l'évaluation des directives en vigueur ([1]), a mis en évidence que tous les États membres n'assurent pas régulièrement et systématiquement le suivi de la mise en œuvre et du fonctionnement des règles de passation des marchés publics et que l'application efficace et uniforme du droit communautaire s'en trouve compromise. Cela pose des problèmes très sérieux notamment dans le cadre des fonds régionaux où les marchés publics représentent une partie substantielle du taux d'erreurs quantifiables. La Commission est d'avis que l'application des règles doit absolument être améliorée et qu'il faut établir tous les moyens requis à cette fin.

([1]) Le rapport d'évaluation des directives 2004/17/CE et 2004/18/CE est disponible à l'adresse web suivante: (http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/index_fr.htm).

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-005504/12
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE)
(2012. május 31.)

Tárgy: Az európai gazdasági növekedési modell kiigazításáról

Az európai gazdasági növekedési modell évtizedeken keresztül a gazdasági konvergencia modellje volt, és több százmillió embernek hozta el a jólétet. Ezen a modellen azonban igazítani kell, de semmiképpen sem szabad azt elvetni. Ez a fő következtetése a Világbank új jelentésének is, amely a „Golden Growth: Restoring the Luster of the European Economic Model" címet viseli. Európának komoly kihívásokkal kell szembenézni az adósságválság és a demográfiai folyamatok miatt, és ez sok európait arra késztet, hogy új növekedési modellt szorgalmazzon. Az utóbbi két évtized tapasztalatai alapján kimutatható, hogy az európai gazdasági modellnek a következő hat területre kell koncentrálnia: kereskedelem, pénzügyek, vállalkozások, innováció, munkaerő és kormányzat. Az európai államok nagy része jól teljesít a kereskedelem és a pénzügyek területén, viszonylag jó a helyzet a vállalkozások és az innováció területein is, miközben a munkaerőpiac és a kormányzás minősége jellemzően hagy maga után kívánnivalót. A jelentés három területtel kapcsolatban fogalmaz meg ajánlásokat: (1) újra kell indítani az európai konvergencia-motort, azaz fel kell zárkóztatni a szegényebb államokat, (2) újra fel kell építeni az „Európa" márkanevet, illetve (3) újra meg kell határozni, hogy miképp maradhat meg Európa a világ „lifestyle" szuperhatalmának, amely a legmagasabb életminőséget képes biztosítani polgárai számára.

Az Bizottság figyelembe vette-e a Világbank ajánlásait, s ha igen, milyen formában tervezi azokat megvalósítani? Képes-e azonnal lépéseket tenni a Bizottság a jelenkor aktuális problémáira, s szükség esetén képes-e újragondolni, átdolgozni a korábbi stratégiákat?

Olli Rehn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. szeptember 12.)

A Világbank *„Golden Growth: Restoring the Lustre of the European Economic Model"* című jelentése fontos és tanulságos dokumentum, amelyet a Bizottság alaposan ismer.

Tudni kell azonban, hogy az Európa 2020 stratégiával összhangban a Bizottság már az említett jelentés megjelenése előtti két évben is komoly erőfeszítéseket tett az európai növekedési modell kiigazítása érdekében. Ezenfelül a Világbank ajánlásai, vagyis hogy Európának a növekedés újbóli elindításához hat fő gazdasági területre, a kereskedelem, a pénzügy, a vállalkozások, az innováció, a munkaerőpiac és a kormányzás területére kell koncentrálnia, teljes összhangban állnak az EU saját pénzügyi és gazdasági válságkezelési és a növekedés fokozására irányuló stratégiájával, amelyet a Bizottság 2012. évi növekedési jelentése ([1]), Schuman-napi nyilatkozata ([2]) és nemrég kiadott „Intézkedések a stabilitás, a növekedés és a munkahelyteremtés érdekében" című közleménye ([3]) tovább árnyal. A Világbank jelentésében kiemelt célok, vagyis a belső piac hatékonyságának növelése, a regionális gazdasági integráció fokozása, az államadósság csökkentése, a társadalombiztosítási rendszerek reformja, valamint a foglalkoztatás védelmére vonatkozó jogszabályok felülvizsgálata olyan témák, amelyek egyaránt szerepelnek az Európa 2020 stratégiában és a Bizottság három említett hivatalos dokumentumában. Ezenkívül a Bizottság erőfeszítései kiterjednek egyéb létfontosságú kérdésekre is, mint a pénzügyi védőhálók vagy az uniós bankszektor megerősítése, amelyek a jelen helyzetben sürgős, ám a Világbank jelentésében részletesen nem tárgyalt tennivalók. A Bizottság munkadokumentumai ismertetik a válságból való kilábalás érdekében tett szerteágazó intézkedéseket.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/annual_growth_survey_hu.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/magyarorszag/news/current_issues/20120509_a_bizottsag_nyilatkozata_a_novekedesert_hu.htm
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/eccomm2012_hu.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005504/12
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Adjusting the European economic growth model

Economic convergence has been the European economic growth model for decades, providing prosperity to hundreds of millions of people. While this model should certainly not be abandoned, it needs to be adjusted. That is the main conclusion in the World Bank's latest report entitled Golden Growth: Restoring the Lustre of the European Economic Model. Europe faces major challenges due to the debt crisis and demographic trends, which is prompting many Europeans to call for a new growth model. Based on two decades' experience, the European economic model needs to focus on the following six areas: trade, finance, enterprise, innovation, labour and government. Most European states perform well in trade and finance, and the situation on enterprise and innovation is fairly good. On the other hand, the quality of the labour market and government could be improved. The report makes recommendations in three areas: (1) the European convergence machine needs to be restarted, in other words the poorer countries need to be helped to catch up; (2) 'brand Europe' needs to be rebuilt; and (3) a reassessment needs to be made of what it takes for Europe to remain the world's lifestyle superpower, capable of providing its citizens with the highest quality of life.

Has the Commission considered the World Bank's recommendations, and if so, how does it plan to implement them? Is the Commission able to take any immediate steps to tackle current problems, and if necessary, can it rethink and adapt previous strategies?

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

The World Bank's *Golden Growth: Restoring the Lustre of the European Economic Model* is an important report with many lessons which has been extensively read by the Commission.

It must be understood however, that with the Europe 2020 strategy, the Commission has already been hard at work trying to adjust Europe's growth model two years before the World Bank produced its report. Furthermore, the World Bank's recommendations that Europe focus its efforts to reignite growth on six principal economic activities — trade and finance, enterprise and innovation, and labour markets and government services — are fully in line with the Europe 2020 strategy for solving the fiscal and economic crisis and returning to a faster growth trajectory, a strategy which is further refined in the Commission's Annual Growth Survey 2012 ([1]), its Schuman Day Statement ([2]) and its recent communication, 'Action for stability, growth and jobs' ([3]). The focus in the World Bank report on the making the internal market more efficient, continuing to enhance regional economic integration, reducing public debt, reforming social security and adjusting employment protection laws are all issues that can be found in the Europe 2020 strategy as well as all three official Commission documents. Furthermore, the Commission's efforts also take in critical issues such as financial backstops and a stronger EU banking sector, urgent issues today which the World Bank treats does not discuss in detail. The Commission's current thinking informs all the actions it is already taking to exit the crisis.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2012_en.pdf
([2]) See http://www.europa-eu-un.org/articles/en/article_12160_en.htm
([3]) See http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/eccomm2012_en.pdf

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005505/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Nabucco

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het artikel in de NRC van 26 mei jl. waarin de directeur van British Petroleum (BP) stelt dat de oorspronkelijke Nabucco pijpleiding wat BP betreft van tafel is?

2. Zo neen waarom niet?

3. Zo ja, Wat voor conclusie trekt de Commissie, die één van de drijvende krachten is achter dit project, uit dit bericht?

4. Welke beleidsconclusies trekt de Commissie uit het Nabucco debacle? Te denken valt aan de strikte regulering door de Commissie van het traject en niet op het doel van de pijplijn, namelijk de levering van gas.

5. Wat betekent de teloorgang van het Nabucco project voor de levering van gas uit Azerbeidzjan, een land met een reserve aan aardolie en -gas zo groot als dat van Noorwegen?

6. Wat betekent de teloorgang van het project voor de gaslevering uit Turkmenistan en Oezbekistan, met name gezien de activiteiten van China (die wel een pijplijn heeft aangelegd) in die gebieden?

7. Is de Commissie met mij van mening dat de South Stream pijplijn geen alternatief is voor Nabucco omdat de South Stream enkel en alleen Russisch gas levert?

8. Wat betekent de teloorgang van het Nabucco project voor de gasvoorziening in Zuidoost Europa, met name voor Bulgarije en Roemenië die afhankelijk zijn van één aardgasleverancier, namelijk Rusland?

9. Wat betekent de teloorgang van het Nabucco project voor de positie van Bulgarije als potentiële gas-hub?

10. Hoe hoog zijn de kosten voor de EU van de investeringen in Nabucco tot nu toe en hoe hoog zijn de nog te verwachten kosten om het project uit het moeras te trekken?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(16 juli 2012)

De Shah Deniz ([1])-partners hebben gekozen voor de trans-Adriatische pijpleiding (TAP) naar Italië in februari 2012 en Nabucco-West naar Oostenrijk in juni 2012 als de twee transportmogelijkheden binnen de EU. Volgens de Shah Deniz-partners wordt het definitieve besluit over de pijpleidingen, met inbegrip van het deel in Turkije, begin 2013 worden genomen. Er is dus nog geen formele afwijzing van de „klassieke" Nabucco, die loopt van de oostgrens van Turkije naar Baumgarten in Oostenrijk.

De voorselectie van de pijpleidingopties binnen de EU en de ondertekening door Turkije en Azerbeidzjan in juni 2012 van de intergouvernementele overeenkomst en de Host Government Agreement (HGA) betreffende de trans-Anatolische gaspijpleiding in Turkije garanderen dat de pijpleidingen in elke configuratie gas uit het Shah Deniz-veld naar Europa zullen brengen. Voorts wordt daardoor ook mogelijk dat andere gasbronnen uit de Kaspische regio ([2]), het Midden-Oosten en het oostelijke Middellandse-Zeegebied uiteindelijk Europa bevoorraden, waardoor de diversifiëring van de bevoorrading in Zuidoost-Europa, Bulgarije inbegrepen, wordt vergroot.

De Commissie steunt alle transportoplossingen buiten de EU die verenigbaar zijn met onze beleidsdoelstellingen: een specifieke, uitbreidbare pijpleiding die grote hoeveelheden gas naar de EU brengt en ondersteund wordt door een duidelijk en transparant rechtskader.

([1]) Het Shah Deniz-gasveld is gelegen in Azerbeidzjan en is eigendom van een consortium dat is samengesteld uit SOCAR, BP, Statoil, Total, LUKoil, NIOC en TPAO. De levering in 2017 of 2018 van 10 miljard kubieke meter per jaar uit dit veld aan de EU zal leiden tot de openstelling van de zuidelijke gascorridor met het oog op het transport van gas uit het bekken van de Kaspische Zee, Centraal-Azië, het Midden-Oosten en het oostelijke Middellandse-Zeegebied naar de Unie om de diversifiëring van de gasvoorziening te verbeteren.

([2]) Waaronder Azerbeidzjan, Turkmenistan en mogelijk ook Oezbekistan.

Wat de financiële steun aan de Nabucco-pijpleiding betreft, kon de Commissie via het Europees energieprogramma voor herstel (EEPR) 200 miljoen euro voor het project uittrekken. Tot dusver is echter nog geen betaling verricht, in afwachting van een besluit over de levering van gas aan deze pijpleiding.

Ten slotte is de Commissie het eens met het standpunt dat het South Stream-project niet hetzelfde effect op de diversifiëring van de gasbevoorrading heeft als de projecten van de zuidelijke gascorridor, aangezien hierdoor alleen maar de aanvoerroute wordt gediversifieerd, niet de gasbron.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005505/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Nabucco

1. Is the Commission familiar with the article in the *NRC* newspaper of 26 May 2012, in which the Director of British Petroleum (BP) states that the original Nabucco pipeline is off the table for BP?

2. If not, why not?

3. If so, what does the Commission conclude is one of the driving forces behind this?

4. What policy conclusions does the Commission draw from the Nabucco affair? The Commission's strict regulation of the trajectory and not the purpose of the pipeline, namely the gas supply, spring to mind.

5. What does the Nabucco project's loss mean for the gas supply from Azerbaijan, which has an oil and gas reserve as great as Norway's?

6. What does the project's loss mean for the gas supply from Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, in particular given China's activities (it has laid a pipeline) in those regions?

7. Does the Commission share my opinion that the South Stream pipeline is no alternative for Nabucco because the South Stream exclusively supplies Russian gas?

8. What does the Nabucco project's loss mean for gas supplies in south-eastern Europe, in particular for Bulgaria and Romania, who depend on one petroleum supplier, namely Russia?

9. What does the Nabucco project's loss mean for Bulgaria's position as a potential gas hub?

10. What are the EU's investment costs in Nabucco to date and what are the expected costs to rescue the project?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(16 July 2012)

The Shah Deniz ([1]) partners have preselected the Trans-Adriatic Pipeline (TAP) to Italy in February 2012 and Nabucco-West to Austria in June 2012 as the two transport options within the EU. According to the Shah Deniz partners, the final decision on the pipelines, including the section in Turkey, is expected in early 2013. Thus, there hasn't been any formal rejection of Nabucco 'classic', going from the Eastern border of Turkey to Baumgarten (Austria).

The preselection of pipeline options within the EU, together with the signature by Turkey and Azerbaijan, in June 2012, of the Inter Governmental Agreement and the Host Government Agreement on the Trans-Anatolian Gas Pipeline in Turkey assure that the pipelines, in any configuration, will deliver Shah Deniz gas to Europe. In addition, it makes it possible for other gas sources from the Caspian Region ([2]), the Middle East and the East Mediterranean Basin, to eventually supply Europe, thus supporting supply diversification in South-East Europe, including Bulgaria.

The Commission supports all transport solutions outside the EU that are compatible with our policy objectives: a dedicated, scalable pipeline bringing large volumes of gas to the EU and supported by a clear and transparent legal framework.

As far as financial support to Nabucco is concerned, the European Energy Programme for Recovery (EEPR) allowed the Commission to allocate EUR 200 million to the project. However, up to now, no payment has been made, pending a decision on supply of gas to this pipeline.

([1]) The Shah Deniz gas field is located in Azerbaijan and owned by a consortium composed of SOCAR, BP, Statoil, Total, LUKoil, NIOC and TPAO. The delivery of 10 billion cubic meters per year from this field by 2017 or 2018 to the EU will entail the opening of the Southern Gas Corridor aiming at the transmission of gas from the Caspian Basin, Central Asia, the Middle East and Eastern Mediterranean Basin to the Union to enhance diversification of gas supply.

([2]) Including Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan and potentially Uzbekistan.

Finally, the Commission shares the perspective that the South Stream project does not have the same impact on gas supply diversification as Southern Gas Corridor projects, since it only diversifies the delivery route, but not the source of the gas.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005506/12
do Komisji
Rafał Trzaskowski (PPE)
(31 maja 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Dyrektywa 69/335/EWG i zasada „standstill"

Czy Rzeczpospolita Polska podnosząc z dniem akcesji do Unii Europejskiej, czyli z dniem 1 maja 2004 r. stawkę opodatkowania podatkiem kapitałowym czynności utworzenia oraz podwyższenia kapitału zakładowego spółek z 0,1 % do 0,5 % naruszyła reguły prawa unijnego wynikające z dyrektywy 69/335/EWG, tj. w szczególności zasadę „standstill" wyrażoną w orzecznictwie Trybunału Sprawiedliwości UE, m.in. w wyroku z dnia 16 czerwca 2011 r. w sprawie Logstor ROR (C-212/10)?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Algirdasa Šemetę w imieniu Komisji
(31 lipca 2012 r.)

Wyrok Trybunału Sprawiedliwości z dnia 16 czerwca 2011 r. w sprawie C-212/10 dotyczy zwolnienia z podatku kapitałowego niektórych transakcji, o których mowa w art. 4 ust. 2 dyrektywy Rady 69/335/WE, tj. zaciągnięcia pożyczki przez spółkę kapitałową, jeśli wierzyciel uprawniony jest do udziału w zyskach spółki, a następnie ich ponownego objęcia podatkiem. Zgodnie z ustaleniami sądu krajowego, opodatkowanie tych operacji zostało zniesione z dniem przystąpienia Polski do Unii. Trybunał Sprawiedliwości stwierdził, że – biorąc pod uwagę warunki art. 4 ust. 2 dyrektywy 69/335/EWG – Polska nie może podjąć decyzji o jego późniejszym przywróceniu.

Pytanie zadane przez Szanownego Pana Posła dotyczy działań innych niż zaciągnięcie pożyczki, którego dotyczy sprawa C-212/10, a mianowicie utworzenia spółki kapitałowej i podwyższenia jej kapitału. Działania te nie wchodzą w zakres art. 4 ust. 2 dyrektywy 69/335/EWG (w przypadku utworzenia spółki kapitałowej) albo przynajmniej niekoniecznie mieszczą się w tym zakresie (w przypadku podwyższenia kapitału).

Ponadto w wyroku Trybunału nie stwierdzono, czy wzrost opodatkowania, o jakim mowa w pytaniu zadanym przez Szanownego Pana Posła, jest jako taki niezgodny z dyrektywą 69/335/EWG. Z kolei stawka 0,5 % jest zgodna z art. 7 dyrektywy 69/335/EWG.

W związku z tym na podstawie informacji przedstawionych w zapytaniu Szanownego Pana Posła nie można stwierdzić, że doszło do naruszenia przepisów dyrektywy 69/335/WE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005506/12
to the Commission
Rafał Trzaskowski (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Directive 69/335/EEC and the 'standstill' proviso

Did Poland breach EU legal regulations contained in Directive 69/335/EEC and, in particular, the 'standstill' proviso referred to in the case-law of the Court of Justice of the European Union, *inter alia*, in the judgment of 16 June 2011 in case Logstor ROR (C-212/10), by increasing the rate of capital duty payable from 0.1% to 0.5% on the establishment of, or increase in, a company's initial capital on the day of accession to the European Union, that is, on 1 May 2004?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2012)

The judgment of the Court of Justice of 16 June 2011 in Case C-212/10 concerns the exemption from capital duty of certain transactions mentioned in Article 4(2) of the Council Directive 69/335/EC, i.e. a loan taken up by a capital company, if the creditor is entitled to a share in the profits of the company, and their subsequent reintroduction to the tax. According to the findings of the national Court, taxation on these operations had been waived as from the date of Poland's accession to the Union. The Court of Justice held that, given the terms of Article 4(2) of Directive 69/335/EEC, Poland could then not decide to reintroduce it subsequently.

The question of the Honourable Member refers to operations different from the loan concerned by Case C-212/10, namely the formation of a capital company and the increase in the capital of such company. These operations did either not fall under Article 4(2) of Directive 69/335/EEC (in the case of the formation of a capital company) or did at least not necessarily fall under this provision (in the case of capital increases).

Moreover, the judgment of the Court does not establish that increases in taxation such as those mentioned in the question raised by the Honorable Member are, as such, incompatible with Directive 69/335/EEC. In turn, a rate of 0.5% complies with Article 7 of Directive 69/335/EEC.

Therefore, the elements provided in the question of the Honourable Member do not establish the existence of an infringement of the provisions of Directive 69/335/EC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005507/12
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Ceramic tableware and kitchenware from China

I have been contacted by a constituent who intends to close his business if the cost of sourcing ceramic tableware and kitchenware from China increases due to EU anti-dumping duties.

Can the Commission confirm:

1. What plans it has to impose import tariffs on ceramic tableware and kitchenware from China and other countries in the Far East?

2. What assessment has been made of the impact on businesses like my constituent's that employ many graduates in design and marketing roles, particularly with regard to business closures and job losses?

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

On 16 February 2012, the Commission initiated an anti-dumping investigation on imports of ceramic tableware and kitchenware originating in the People's Republic of China. Provisional measures, if any, would be imposed by 15 November 2012 at the latest and definitive measures, if any, by 15 May 2013 or six months after the imposition of provisional measures at the latest. Given that this proceeding is currently ongoing and at an early stage, it is not known yet whether there will be any measures and their level.

No pre-determined decision or 'plans' could ever be envisaged in the Commission's proceedings. Commission findings are the result of a proper and impartial investigation to which all interested parties can contribute.

In the course of the proceeding, the Commission will be making an assessment of whether it is in the Union interest to impose measures, in view of their impact on the economic interests of the Union as a whole. The Honourable Member can be reassured that the impact on relevant design and marketing businesses, particularly with regard to business closures and job losses, is part of that Union interest analysis.

Currently the Commission is not conducting any investigation on imports of ceramic tableware and kitchenware originating in other countries.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005508/12
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Registering cosmetics products through an EU-wide IT portal

I have been contacted by a constituent who runs a cosmetics business. Her contract manufacturer has informed her that a new EC law will be passed, which will require all existing health and beauty products to be re-registered through an EU IT portal as of July 2012.

My constituent tells me that cosmetic products in the UK already conform to EU legislation in terms of product testing, ingredients and labelling. She feels that the new law is no more stringent than the existing ones and appears to be simply adding another layer of bureaucracy, which will only increase product development costs, especially for start-up companies.

Can the Commission explain:

1. Why it has introduced these additional registration requirements?

2. What additional planned compulsory requirements it intends to place upon cosmetics manufacturers and distributors at EU level?

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

Directive 76/768/EEC ([1]) (Cosmetics Directive) was recast into Regulation (EC) No.1223/2009 ([2]) (Cosmetics Regulation).

The purpose of the regulation is to strengthen the safety of cosmetic products by clarifying the requirements for safety assessment, by defining more precisely the obligations of responsible persons and distributors and by simplifying procedures, e.g. through a centralized electronic notification, thus making the internal market for cosmetic products a reality.

Electronic notification is not intended to add an additional layer of bureaucracy, but to simplify procedures and reduce costs, while improving the information provided. This electronic notification will become mandatory as of 11 July 2013.

The Cosmetics Directive refers to two types of notification: a notification to the competent authorities of the Member State of manufacture, or first importation, and another, which the Member States may require for 'purposes of prompt and appropriate medical treatment'. Under the Cosmetics Regulation, centralized notification via the Cosmetic Products Notification Portal (CPNP) replaces both requirements of the directive. This means that a company selling its product in all 27 EU Member States will now have to notify only once.

The CPNP was developed in close cooperation with the competent authorities, national poison centres and industry, taking into account the needs of SMEs.

([1]) OJ L 262, 27.9.1976, p.169.
([2]) OJ L 342, 22.12.2009, p. 59.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005509/12
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Funding for counter-radicalisation projects

I have been contacted by a community organisation in my constituency which works with young Muslims in the UK and in Somalia to prevent them from being radicalised and trained as suicide bombers.

The organisation is concerned about a radical group known as al-Shabab, which controls large parts of Somalia and regularly appeals to young Somalis and other Muslims in the West to join them in what they call their global jihad. The organisation tells me that more than 20 young people of Somali origin have joined from Europe, some of whom have acted as suicide bombers in Somalia.

The organisation is now seeking funding for an international project called 'Islam and Peace Development' that it is setting up in order to run and implement counter-radicalisation projects in the UK and other EU countries, and in Somalia.

The community organisation has done some research and identified two potential sources: 'Preventing Violent Extremism funds' and 'European Social Fund — youth development'.

Is the Commission able to suggest who the project managers should contact to secure EU funding for their counter-radicalisation projects?

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

The Commission is providing financial support to actions aimed at preventing radicalisation and violent extremism through the Prevention of and Fight against Crime Programme (ISEC) ([1]).

More specifically, the Honourable Member is invited to communicate to any interested parties in his constituency that the Commission has published a Targeted Call for Proposals in the field of 'Radicalisation leading to terrorism and the role of victims of terrorism in preventing radicalisation (RAD)' ([2]). The deadline for submitting project applications expires on 2 August 2012 (14:00 CET).

Further information on the application process and requirements may be obtained at the dedicated Commission website: http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/isec/call_2012_2/funding_isec_call_2012_2_en.htm

Questions may be also sent by e-mail to the address listed below, indicating clearly the reference of the Call: e-mail address: HOME-ISEC@ec.europa.eu

---

([1]) Council Decision 2007/125/JHA of 12 February 2007: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2007:058:0007:0012:EN:PDF

([2]) ISEC 2012 Targeted Call for Proposals (RAD): http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/isec/call_2012_2/RAD%20Call%20for%20Proposals%202012_final.pdf#zoom=100

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005510/12
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Proposed 'Green Investment Bank' in the UK

I have been contacted by a constituent who is concerned about the application of European law to the British Government's proposal to create a 'Green Investment Bank' with capitalisation of GBP 3 billion.

My constituent believes that the purpose of the bank would be to provide easier terms than would be available in the commercial finance market for investments of taxpayers' money in politically favoured projects.

Can the Commission confirm:

1. Whether it is aware of the remit of the 'Green Investment Bank'?

2. Whether there will be a full investigation into whether the Green Investment Bank's terms of operation comply with EC law?

3. When it would expect any such investigation to be concluded?

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

The Commission is aware of the intention of the UK authorities to start a Green Investment Bank.

Informal contacts are taking place with the UK authorities to determine the scope of the Green Investment Bank project and the applicable EC law. So far, no formal notification has been made and it would be premature to speculate about the timing of any investigation of the project.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005511/12
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Alleged shooting of cuckoos, golden orioles, bee-eaters, marsh harriers, honey buzzards and ospreys as well as turtle doves and quail in Malta

I have been contacted by a constituent who has recently returned from Malta where she spent a week taking part in the Spring Watch camp organised by Birdlife Malta. The purpose of the camp was to monitor the activities of Maltese hunters, who my constituent claims like to shoot down birds as they migrate from Africa back to Europe to breed.

My constituent tells me that apparently it is legal for hunters to shoot turtle doves and quail, although both these species are of conservation concern in Europe, but in reality she feels that the vast majority of so-called 'hunters' shoot at any bird they see, including cuckoos, golden orioles, bee-eaters, marsh harriers, honey buzzards and ospreys. My constituent claims to have seen this deliberate flouting of the law during her week at the Spring Watch camp and tells me there are numerous photographs and reports of alleged illegal activity on the Birdlife Malta website ([1]).

Could the Commission confirm:

1. Whether it is aware of what my constituent alleges is the killing of protected species under the guise of 'hunting'?

2. What measures are being taken to bring this alleged illegal practice to an end in Malta?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the hunting activities in Malta. The directive 2009/147/EC ([2]) ('Birds Directive') aims to protect all bird species in the wild, in the European Union. Hunting of certain species is allowed as long as it complies with the principle of wise use and the strict provisions of Article 7 of the directive. In addition, derogations may be granted under strict conditions for the reasons listed in Article 9.

The implementation of the Birds Directive and enforcement of the legislation are the responsibility of the Member States. However, given reports of abusive practices in some countries, the Commission has initiated a dialogue on illegal killing and trapping of birds with Member States, Birdlife International and the Federation of the Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the EU (FACE) to address the issue. The Commission has already initiated an infringement procedure against Malta on hunting issues, which has led to the EU Court of Justice condemning this Member State. The Commission is following up on the situation with the relevant authorities and stakeholders.

([1]) http://www.birdlifemalta.org/.
([2]) Council Directive 2009/147/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005512/12
to the Commission
Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Internet safety for children

The recent *EU Kids Online* survey entitled 'Risks and safety on the Internet' revealed that 14 % of 9-16-year-olds have in the past 12 months seen images online that are obviously sexual.

A British parliamentary inquiry, on the subject of children accessing inappropriate material on the Internet, has suggested that an opt-in content filtering system for adult material on the Internet would provide greater safety for young people.

In view of these studies, can the Commission state whether:

1. Any research has been conducted on the effectiveness of Internet content filtering software in (1) preventing children from viewing pornographic material and (2) not overblocking material that should be acceptable under the filtering policy in place?

2. It considers a model based on industry self-regulation as sufficient to protect children?

3. It is considering taking any further action in order to prevent children from viewing harmful content online?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(29 June 2012)

The Commission, through the Safer Internet Programme, is funding the SIP-BENCH ([1]) project for benchmarking of filtering tools and services regarding their effectiveness, usability, functionality and security. A database where parents can search for the parental control tools that are best suited to their needs is available at www.yprt.eu/sip

Results of SIP-BENCH show that some parental control tools tested are effective at blocking adult content. However the tools are less efficient at filtering content related to violence, racism, gambling and self-harm. The balance between effectiveness and over blocking is an issue that still needs to be tackled ([2]).

The Commission adopted a communication for a European Strategy for a Better Internet for Children on 02 May 2012 ([3]) that sets out a set of measures for empowering and protecting children online, including a wider use of parental controls that should be efficient on any type of content on all Internet-enabled devices available in Europe. The Commission will continue to support the benchmarking of parental control tools. It also sets out the ambition to have a generally applicable, transparent, and consistent approach to age rating and content classification EU-wide in order to prevent children from seeing inappropriate content online.

In particular, one of the 5 working points the CEO Coalition to make Internet a better place for children ([4]) set up in 2011 is parental controls.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/projects/filter_label/index_en.htm
([2]) For full details please refer to the 3rd cycle results of SIP-BENCH II.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0196:FIN:EN:PDF
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/self_reg/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-005513/12
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(31 mai 2012)

Objet: Élevages touchés par la tuberculose bovine en France

La tuberculose bovine est une maladie chronique pouvant se transmettre à l'homme ainsi qu'à d'autres animaux comme les porcins, les bisons et les cervidés.

La tuberculose bovine a largement régressé depuis 1955, au point que la France a été déclarée indemne depuis 2001.

Néanmoins, en 2011, 185 foyers de tuberculose bovine ont été recensés en France, dont 22 en Côte-d'Or dans une zone où il n'y avait pas eu de contamination en 2010.

La Commission réalise-t-elle un suivi de l'évolution de la tuberculose bovine en Europe?

Pouvons-nous considérer que l'Union européenne est indemne à cette maladie? Quels sont les pays les plus touchés et quels sont ceux qui sont considérés indemnes à la maladie?

De quelle manière la Commission peut-elle encourager les États membres à mettre en œuvre toutes les méthodes de dépistage et d'analyse de nature à objectiver et à éradiquer cette maladie?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(9 juillet 2012)

La Commission suit attentivement la situation en matière de tuberculose bovine dans l'Union. La liste des États membres et des régions de ceux-ci officiellement indemnes de cette maladie est établie dans la décision 2003/467/CE de la Commission ([1]) et est régulièrement mise à jour en fonction de la situation épidémiologique et de l'évaluation des demandes présentées par les États membres pour obtenir le statut «officiellement indemne».

Le rapport annuel sur les maladies à déclaration obligatoire des animaux de l'espèce bovine et de l'espèce porcine, consultable sur le site web de la Commission ([2]), et le rapport sur les tendances et les sources des zoonoses, des agents zoonotiques et des foyers de toxi-infection alimentaire en 2010, rédigé par l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (EFSA) et le Centre européen de prévention et de contrôle des maladies (ECDC) ([3]), donnent également un aperçu de la situation.

L'Union européenne soutient financièrement les programmes d'éradication de la tuberculose bovine appliqués par les États membres dans le contexte de la décision 2009/470/CE du Conseil relative à certaines dépenses dans le domaine vétérinaire ([4]). La Commission apporte également une aide technique aux États membres par l'intermédiaire du sous-groupe de la task-force chargée du suivi de l'éradication des maladies animales dans l'Union ([5]).

L'éradication définitive de maladies chroniques telles que la tuberculose bovine requiert une gestion dynamique, car des régions officiellement indemnes pourraient être réinfectées pour de nombreuses raisons. La surveillance mise en place devrait être adaptée pour détecter les causes de réinfection et éviter que des réinfections accidentelles et non maîtrisables entraînent la propagation de la maladie.

([1]) JO L 156 du 25.6.2003, p. 74.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/liveanimals/porcine/final_report_2010_en.pdf
([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/2597.pdf
([4]) JO L 155 du 18.6.2009, p. 30.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/eradication/taskforce_en.htm#tuber.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005513/12
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Livestock affected by bovine tuberculosis in France

Bovine tuberculosis is a chronic disease which can be transmitted to humans and to other animals such as pigs, bison and deer.

Since 1955, bovine tuberculosis has declined considerably, to the extent that France has been declared free from the disease since 2001.

Nevertheless, in 2011, 185 instances of bovine tuberculosis were reported in France, of which 22 were found in an area of the Côte-d'Or region where there had been no contamination in 2010.

Is the Commission monitoring changes to bovine tuberculosis in the EU?

Can it be assumed that the EU is free from this disease? What countries are most affected by this disease and what countries are considered free from it?

How can the Commission encourage Member States to implement every available screening and analytical method in order to detect and eradicate this disease?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(9 July 2012)

The Commission is following closely the bovine tuberculosis (bTB) situation in the EU. The list of Member States, and regions thereof, officially free from bTB is set out in Commission Decision 2003/467/EC ([1]), and is regularly updated depending on the epidemiological situation and on the assessment of the applications submitted by the Member States for the recognition of their official status.

An overview of the situation is also provided in the Annual Report on notifiable diseases of bovine animals and swine that is available on the Commission website ([2]) and on the report on Trends and Sources of Zoonoses, Zoonotic Agents and Food-borne Outbreaks in 2010 produced by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) ([3]).

The EU financially supports the bTB eradication programmes implemented by the Member States in the context of Council Decision 2009/470/EC ([4]) on expenditure in the veterinary field. The Commission also provides technical support to Member States via the subgroup of the Task Force on monitoring animal disease eradication in the EU ([5]).

Definitive eradication of diseases of chronic nature such as bovine tuberculosis requires a dynamic management as areas which are officially free could be reinfected for many reasons. Surveillance in place should be adapted to detect these events and to avoid that accidental and uncontrollable reinfections, cause the spread of the disease on a larger scale.

([1]) OJ L 156, 25.6.2003, p. 74.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/liveanimals/porcine/final_report_2010_en.pdf
([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/2597.pdf
([4]) OJ L 155, 18.6.2009, p. 30.
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/eradication/taskforce_en.htm#tuber.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005514/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Carbon footprint biobrandstof

Ik dank de heer Oettinger voor zijn antwoorden op mijn vragen over de CO_2 uitstoot als gevolg van biobrandstof (E-003603/2012).

Uit zijn antwoord maak ik op dat verschillende biobrandstoffen een verschillend carbon footprint achterlaten. Daarbij ontkent commissaris Oettinger niet dat sommige biobrandstoffen een hogere CO_2 uitstoot tot gevolg hebben dan het gebruik van (sommige) fossiele brandstoffen. Ook stelt de commissaris in zijn antwoord dat de Commissie van mening is dat biomassa een belangrijke bijdrage zal leveren aan het koolstofarm maken van de energiesector. Ten derde schrijft de commissaris dat de Commissie zich buigt over aanvullende duurzaamheidseisen met betrekking tot vaste biomassa.

Naar aanleiding van de antwoorden van commissaris Oettinger heb ik een aantal vervolgvragen om verwarring rond dit onderwerp te voorkomen.

1. Waarop baseert de Commissie de stelling dat biomassa een bijdrage zal leveren aan het koolstofarm maken van de energiesector, zonder de resultaten van de wetenschappelijke studies betreffende de CO2- emissies van biomassa af te wachten?

2. Is het daarom verstandig om dit uitgangspunt sterk te nuanceren?

3. Waarom beperkt de Commissie zich tot vaste biomassa bij zijn bezinning op aanvullende duurzaamheidseisen? Het is immers algemeen bekend dat het gebruik van biodiesel een veel grotere carbon footprint achterlaat dan het gebruik van bio-ethanol. Is het daarom te overwegen om ook de vloeibare bio-energiedragers bij de bezinning van de commissie te betrekken?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(13 augustus 2012)

Het standpunt dat de Commissie in haar antwoord op vraag E-003603/2012 van het geachte Parlementslid ([1]) heeft verwoord, wordt gestaafd door een speciaal verslag van de Intergouvernementele Werkgroep inzake klimaatverandering (IPCC) ([2]).

Wil biomassa verder op beduidende schaal worden ingezet, dan zijn extra maatregelen (waaronder het terugdringen van de uitstoot van broeikasgassen) nodig om de duurzaamheid daarvan te garanderen. Overeenkomstig de conclusies van een verslag van 2010 ([3]) onderzoekt de Commissie thans of er verbindende EU-duurzaamheidscriteria moeten worden vastgesteld voor vaste en gasvormige biomassa die voor verwarming, koeling en elektriciteitsproductie wordt gebruikt.

Bij de richtlijn hernieuwbare energie ([4]) zijn bindende EU-duurzaamheidscriteria ingevoerd voor biobrandstoffen en vloeibare biomassa. Gebruikmakend van de beste beschikbare wetenschappelijke kennis legt de Commissie momenteel de laatste hand aan een effectbeoordeling van de beleidsopties om de indirecte gevolgen van biobrandstoffen voor veranderingen in het bodemgebruik te minimaliseren. De Commissie neemt zich voor dit verslag meteen na de voltooiing ervan te publiceren, tezamen met wetgevingsvoorstellen tot wijziging van de richtlijn hernieuwbare energie en de richtlijn brandstofkwaliteit.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Special report on renewable energy sources and climate change mitigation, http://srren.ipcc-wg3.de.
([3]) COM(2010) 11 definitief — Verslag betreffende de duurzaamheidseisen voor het gebruik van vaste en gasvormige biomassa bij elektriciteitsproductie, verwarming en koeling.
([4]) Directive 2009/28/EC. The Fuel Quality Directive (2009/30/EC) contains same sustainability criteria for biofuels.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005514/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Biofuels' carbon footprint

I thank Mr Oettinger for answering my questions on CO_2 emissions from biofuel (E-003603/2012).

I conclude from his answer that each biofuel has a unique carbon footprint. In addition, Commissioner Oettinger does not deny that some biofuels result in higher CO_2 emissions than some fossil fuels. He also states that the Commission believes that biomass will make a major contribution to the decarbonisation of the energy sector. Thirdly, the Commissioner wrote that the Commission is tackling additional sustainability requirements in relation to solid biomass.

Following Commissioner Oettinger's response, I have some follow-up questions to avoid confusion on this subject.

1. On what does the Commission base its position that biomass will make a major contribution to the decarbonisation of the energy sector, without waiting for the results from scientific studies on CO_2 emissions from biomass?

2. Is it therefore wise to strongly qualify this starting point?

3. Why does the Commission limit itself to solid biomass when considering additional sustainability requirements? It is generally known that biodiesel leaves a much larger carbon footprint than bioethanol. Is it therefore conceivable that liquid bio-energy carriers will also be considered by the Commission?

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

The Commission's position expressed in response to Question E-003603/2012 by the Honourable Member ([1]) is backed by a special report of the IPCC ([2]).

Significant further use of biomass requires additional measures to ensure its sustainability (including greenhouse gas savings). In accordance with the conclusions of a 2010 Report ([3]), the Commission is currently analysing whether there is a need to introduce EU mandatory sustainability criteria for solid and gaseous biomass used in heating, cooling and electricity.

On biofuels and bioliquids, EU legally binding sustainability criteria have been established by the Renewable Energy Directive ([4]). Based on the best available science, the Commission is currently finalising an impact assessment on policy options for minimising indirect land-use change impacts of biofuels. The Commission plans to publish this report as soon as it is finalised, with legislative proposals to amend the Renewable Energy and Fuel Quality Directives.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Special report on renewable energy sources and climate change mitigation, http://srren.ipcc-wg3.de.
([3]) COM(2010)11 final, Report on sustainability requirements for the use of solid and gaseous biomass sources in electricity, heating and cooling.
([4]) Directive 2009/28/EC. The Fuel Quality Directive (2009/30/EC) contains same sustainability criteria for biofuels.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005515/12
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Vervolgvragen extra beveiligingskosten EEAS

Op 12 maart stelde ik vragen aan de Commissie inzake extra beveiligingskosten EEAS (E-002785/2012) waarop door uw Commissie werd gereageerd op 30 mei. Ik stel overigens vast dat dit ruim buiten de formele beantwoordingstermijn is die daarvoor staat. Mevrouw Ashton geeft via de Commissie antwoord op mijn vragen 2 en deels 4, maar laat antwoord op vraag 3 achterwege. Graag wens ik alsnog nadrukkelijk antwoord te krijgen van uw Commissie c.q. mevrouw Ashton op mijn originele vraag 3, die ik hierbij herhaal:

Kan de Commissie aangeven of de reden van „volledige" bescherming in de genoemde plaatsen te maken heeft met het islamitisch karakter van die landen (met uitzondering van Haïti en Israël)?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(5 juli 2012)

De veiligheidsmaatregelen, waaronder volledige bescherming, worden vastgesteld op basis van een risicobeoordeling. Religie maakt geen deel uit van de criteria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005515/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Follow-up question regarding additional security costs of the European External Action Service (EEAS)

On 12 March 2012, I asked the Commission about the EEAS' additional security costs (E-002785/2012). The Commission replied on 30 May 2012. I note that this is well outside the formal time frame for answering questions.

Baroness Ashton replied, through the Commission, to question 2 and in part to question 4, but not to question 3. I would still very much like to receive an explicit answer from the Commission and/or Baroness Ashton to my original question 3, which I repeat here:

Can the Commission say whether the reason for 'full' protection in the places referred to is that the countries concerned (except Haiti and Israel) are Islamic?

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

The security measures, including close protection, are decided following a risk assessment. Religion is not part of the criteria.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005516/12
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Vervolgvragen inzake vakantiedagen EEAS

Op 30 mei gaf uw Commissie een reactie op mijn vragen van 29 maart (E-003422/2012) inzake een wel zeer royale en goudomrande vakantieregeling van EEAS ambtenaren. De heer Sefcovic gaf daarin op geen enkele wijze een inhoudelijk antwoord op mijn vragen. In dat kader dus de volgende vervolgvragen:

1. Wat gaat de Commissie doen om deze goudomrande vakantieregeling van EEAS ambtenaren te verlagen, om deze schandelijke verspilling van belastinggeld te stoppen?

2. Wanneer gaat de Commissie het Statuut van de ambtenaren aanpassen tot minimaal bevriezing van de (EEAS) ambtenarensalarissen op de nullijn, zoals de meeste ambtenaren in lidstaten als Nederland?

3. Is de Commissie eigenlijk wel voorstander van transparantie, gezien de weigering van de hoge vertegenwoordiger om informatie inzake het aantal ambtenaren en hun nationaliteit ter beschikking te stellen aan een gekozen volksvertegenwoordiger, die als primaire taak het controleren van overheden heeft?

Antwoord van de heer Šefčovič namens de Commissie
(20 juli 2012)

1. Het geachte Parlementslid zal op de hoogte zijn van het feit dat de verlofdagen van personeelsleden in de delegaties thans zijn vastgelegd in een verordening van de Raad waarbij het statuut van de ambtenaren van de Europese Unie is vastgesteld. Het geachte Parlementslid zal eveneens ervan op de hoogte zijn dat de Commissie in juni 2011 een aantal wijzigingen in de bepalingen van het statuut heeft voorgesteld en zal ongetwijfeld ook bekend zijn met de amendementen op het voorstel van de Commissie voor een herziening van het statuut die de Commissie juridische zaken heeft goedgekeurd (EP document A7-0156/2012) en die onder meer wijzigingen inhouden van de op EDEO-ambtenaren toepasselijke bijlage X bij het statuut.

2. De salarissen van EU-ambtenaren worden aangepast volgens een methode die nauwkeurig aansluit bij de maatregelen die in een aantal steekproefsgewijs gekozen lidstaten, waaronder Nederland, van overheidswege worden genomen. In Nederland zijn de salarissen in de publieke sector in de periode juli 2010-juli 2011 met 2 % gestegen als gevolg van een stijging van de eindejaarsuitkering. De cijfers voor de periode juli 2011-juli 2012 zijn nog niet beschikbaar.

3. Het spijt de Commissie dat zij alleen maar haar antwoord op de vraag van het geachte Parlementslid van 29 maart 2012 (E-003422/2012 ([1])) kan herhalen: „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/QP-WEB/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005516/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Follow-up questions on European External Action Service (EEAS) holidays

On 30 May, the Commission responded to my questions from 29 March (E-003422/2012) concerning extremely generous and gilt-edged holiday entitlements for EEAS officials. Mr Šefčovič did not in any way provide a substantive reply to my questions. Therefore, please see these follow-up questions:

1. What will the Commission do to reduce gilt-edged leave entitlements for EEAS officials, in order to stop this disgraceful waste of tax money?

2. When will the Commission modify the Staff Regulations to at least include the freezing of the salaries of the EEAS officials to the zero line, in line with most officials in Member States such as the Netherlands?

3. Is the Commission actually an advocate for transparency, given that the High Representative refused to make information available about the number of officials and their nationalities to an elected representative whose primary task is to monitor governments?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(20 July 2012)

1. The Honourable Member will be aware that the current leave entitlements of staff in delegations are laid down in a Council Regulation laying down the Staff Regulations for officials of the European Union. The Honourable Member will also be aware that the Commission proposed in June 2011 to change a number of provisions of the Staff Regulations and he will undoubtedly also be aware of the amendments voted by the JURI Committee to the Commission's proposal for a review of the Staff Regulations (EP document A7-0156/2012) which *inter alia* foresee modifications of Annex X to the Staff Regulations that applies to EEAS officials.

2. The salaries of EU officials are adapted by a method which follows precisely the measures taken by the public authorities in a sample of Member States which includes the Netherlands. For the Netherlands, the salaries in the public sector increased in the period July 2010 to July 2011 by 2.0% due to an increase in a year-end allowance. The figures for the period July 2011-July 2012 are not available yet.

3. The Commission regrets that it cannot but repeat its answer to the Honourable Member's question of 29 March 2012 (E-003422/2012 ([1])): '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/QP-WEB/.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005517/12
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Vervolgvragen E-008048/2011 betreffende Zuid Afrika

Naar aanleiding van de antwoorden van de Commissie op de vragen met referentie E-008048/2011, heeft de PVV de volgende vervolgvragen:

1. In haar antwoord geeft de Commissie aan dat sinds de afschaffing van de apartheid in 1994 wisselende resultaten zijn bereikt wat de sociale stabiliteit en de cohesie in Zuid-Afrika betreft. Mag de PVV hieruit concluderen dat de Commissie van mening is dat tijdens het apartheidsregime er een betere sociale stabiliteit en cohesie heerste in Zuid-Afrika? Kan zij in dat licht uw woordkeuze van „wisselend" nader specificeren?

2. Kan de PVV concluderen dat de Commissie 980 miljoen euro weinig geld vindt omdat dit wordt uitgedrukt als „slechts" 0,4 % van het BNI van Zuid-Afrika?

3. Kan de Commissie toezeggen dat in het kader van de voorbereidingen van het volgende Meerjarig Financieel Kader van de EU (2014-2020) bij de hulp aan Zuid-Afrika, het behoud van de eigen identiteit, veiligheid en onafhankelijkheid van het Afrikaner volk specifiek aandacht zal krijgen?

4. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat het toebedelen van zelfs maar EUR 1 belastinggeld aan het corrupte en discriminatoire ANC-regime in Zuid-Afrika totaal absurd is gezien de huidige opstelling van dit regime jegens het Afrikaner volk?

5. Kan de Commissie de PVV een overzicht geven van alle toegekende subsidies in de huidige programmaperiode?

Antwoord van de heer Piebalgs namens de Commissie
(19 juli 2012)

1. Sinds de afschaffing van de apartheid kent Zuid-Afrika positieve resultaten en vooruitgang wat betreft sociale stabiliteit en samenhang, waardoor de levensomstandigheden van de bevolking vergeleken met vroeger zijn verbeterd. Er moet echter nog meer gebeuren om armoede en ongelijkheid terug te dringen, aangezien het land nog steeds te kampen heeft met blijvende gevolgen van het apartheidssysteem. De Commissie wijst het geachte Parlementslid op het omvattende diagnose-overzicht dat door de nationale planningcommissie in Zuid-Afrika is opgesteld, alsook op het nationale ontwikkelingsplan — Visie 2030 voor meer details ([1]).

2. De ontwikkelingssamenwerking van de EU vertegenwoordigt inderdaad slechts een klein percentage van het BNI ([2]) en de begroting van Zuid-Afrika. De motivering voor dit programma is echter niet het geldbedrag op zich, maar de toegevoegde waarde ervan, namelijk activiteiten voor innovatie, proefprojecten die op grotere schaal kunnen worden overgedaan, de ontwikkeling van capaciteit, de uitwisseling van vaardigheden en kennis, het nemen van risico's.

3. De EU is voornemens de MDG's ([3]) verder te steunen en mede kwesties aan te kaarten die van belang zijn voor de Zuid-Afrikaanse bevolking in haar geheel, vooral de meest kwetsbaren en de armsten, zoals de strijd tegen de armoede, ongelijkheid of uitsluiting, en maatregelen voor sociale integratie en menselijke ontwikkeling. Op die manier steunt de EU gelijke kansen en volgt zij een beleid van non-discriminatie.

4. Het algemene doel van de ontwikkelingssamenwerking van de EU met Zuid-Afrika is het terugdringen van armoede en ongelijkheid. In deze context richten de werkzaamheden van de EU zich op de creatie van werkgelegenheid en capaciteitsontwikkeling. Zij omvatten tevens programma's voor een beter bestuur en de consolidering van een democratische maatschappij.

([1]) http://www.info.gov.za/view/DownloadFileAction?id=147192.
([2]) BNI = Bruto Nationaal Inkomen.
([3]) MDG's = Millenniumdoelstellingen voor ontwikkeling.

5. Een overzicht van de samenwerking met Zuid-Afrika voor de lopende programmeringsperiode (2007-2013) staat in de bijlage I, die rechtstreeks naar het geachte Parlementslid en het secretariaat van het Parlement wordt gezonden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005517/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Follow-up questions to Question E-008048/2011 regarding South Africa

From the Commission's replies to the questions with reference number E-008048/2011, the Dutch Party for Freedom (PVV) has these follow-up questions:

1. In its answer, the Commission says since the abolition of apartheid in 1994, mixed results have been achieved in social stability and cohesion in South Africa. Can the PVV conclude that the Commission is of the opinion that during the apartheid regime, there was better social stability and cohesion in South Africa? If so, can it be more specific about the choice of the word 'mixed'?

2. Can the PVV conclude that the Commission finds EUR 980 million to be not a lot of money, as this is expressed as 'just' 0.4% of South Africa's GNI?

3. Can the Commission promise that within the framework of the next EU Multiannual Financial Framework (2014-2020) for EU aid to South Africa, the retention of the identity, security and independence of the Afrikaner people shall receive special attention?

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the allocation of even EUR 1 of tax money to the corrupt and discriminatory ANC regime in South Africa is totally absurd, given the current position of this regime towards the Afrikaner people?

5. Can the Commission give the PVV an overview of all subsidies allocated in the current programme period?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

1. Since the abolition of apartheid, South Africa has witnessed positive results and progress in social stability and cohesion improving the lives of the population compared to the situation prevailing before. However, more needs to be done to reduce poverty and inequality as the country continues to suffer from the lasting consequences of the apartheid system. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the comprehensive Diagnostic Overview compiled by the South African National Planning Commission, as well as the National Development Plan — Vision 2030 for more details ([1]).

2. The EU's development cooperation indeed only represents a small percentage of South Africa's GNI ([2]) and budget. However, it is not the money itself, but the value added it brings that motivates this programme, namely activities involving innovation, pilot programmes which can be replicated at a larger scale, capacity development, the sharing of skills and knowledge, and risk taking.

3. The EU would continue to support the MDGs ([3]) and help address issues that are of interest to the whole South African population, in particular the most vulnerable and poor, such as the fight against poverty, inequality or exclusion and that are in favour of social inclusion and human development. In doing so, the EU favours equal treatment and follows a policy of non-discrimination.

4. The overall objective of EU development cooperation with South Africa is to reduce poverty and inequality. In this context, the EU's work focuses on employment creation and capacity development. It also includes programmes to improve governance and the consolidation of a democratic society.

5. An overview of the cooperation with South Africa for the current (2007-13) programming period can be found in Annex A, which is sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

([1]) http://www.info.gov.za/view/DownloadFileAction?id=147192.
([2]) GNI = Gross National Income.
([3]) MDGs = Millennium Development Goals.

(Slovenska različica)

Vprašanje za pisni odgovor E-005518/12
za Komisijo
Alojz Peterle (PPE)
(31. maj 2012)

Zadeva: Raziskave na področju homeopatije in gospodarske ovire

Sedanje zahteve za izdajo dovoljenja za promet s homeopatskimi zdravili so takšne, da se dovoljenje za ta zdravila zelo redko izda v skladu z Direktivo 2001/83/ES. To potrjuje tudi dejstvo, da doslej še ni bilo izdano dovoljenje za promet s homeopatskimi zdravili v skladu z vseevropskim usklajenim postopkom izdaje dovoljenja (člena 16(1) in 8(3)(i) Direktive 2001/83/ES). Zaradi navedenega pa raziskovalci, proizvajalci in industrija sploh niso zainteresirani za raziskave na področju homeopatije.

Pri rednem postopku izdaje dovoljenja za promet z zdravili morajo proizvajalci navadno izvesti tri faze kliničnih preskušanj. Zlasti v tretji fazi kliničnega preskušanja se ne upoštevajo posebnosti homeopatskih zdravil, saj preskušanje klinične učinkovitosti proizvodov „kot celote“ ne zadošča. Namesto tega se zahtevajo dodatna preskušanja, ki so zlasti povezana s prispevkom vsake zdravilne učinkovine v celotnem proizvodu. V praksi se izkaže, da zadevni proizvajalci tega skoraj ne morejo uresničiti.

Če bi spremenili zahteve za izdajo dovoljenja in jih prilagodili posebnostim homeopatije – ter tako omogočili preskušanje klinične učinkovitosti proizvoda „kot celote“ –, bi okrepili interes za raziskave na področju homeopatije. Raziskave na področjih, ki jih zajema homeopatija, so že postregle z odličnimi rezultati v zvezi z analizo genoma, zlasti pri vnetnih procesih, ki so med drugim pomemben dejavnik pri veliko kroničnih in resnih boleznih, med katere spadajo rak, sladkorna bolezen, Alzheimerjeva bolezen in bolezni dihal.

Pri zahtevah za izdajo dovoljenja iz Priloge 1 k Direktivi 2001/83/ES, ki se nanašajo na učinkovitost, se posebnosti homeopatije ne upoštevajo.

1. Ali je Komisija seznanjena, da zahteve za izdajo dovoljenja proizvajalcem praktično in finančno onemogočajo izvajanje sedanjih preskušanj za izdajo dovoljenja, čeprav bi lahko predložili rezultate kliničnih preskušanj za učinkovitost proizvoda „kot celote“ in imajo homeopatska zdravila odličen varnostni profil?

2. Ali je Komisija seznanjena, da sedanje zahteve za izdajo dovoljenja odvračajo sponzorje, raziskovalce, proizvajalce in industrijo od raziskav na področju homeopatije, kar negativno vpliva na napredek znanosti in medicine?

Odgovor komisarja Johna Dallija v imenu Komisije
(4. julij 2012)

Komisija prosi, da si spoštovani član Evropskega parlamenta ogleda njen odgovor na prejšnje pisno vprašanje E-003839/2012 Marian Harkin ([1]).

Poleg tega je Komisija začela študijo o dostopnosti zdravil za uporabo v humani medicini v EU. Eden glavnih ciljev študije je ugotoviti, kako se lahko sedanji zakonodajni okvir uporabi za razrešitev težav glede dostopnosti. Homeopatska zdravila so zajeta v področju uporabe študije.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=SL.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005518/12
to the Commission
Alojz Peterle (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Research in the field of homeopathy and economic obstacles

The current authorisation requirements for homeopathic medicinal products are such that these products are hardly ever authorised under Directive 2001/83/EC. This is evidenced by the fact that no homeopathic medicinal products have to date been authorised under the Europe-wide harmonised authorisation procedure (Articles 16(1) and 8(3)(i) Directive 2001/83/EC). This makes research activity in the field of homeopathy highly unattractive for researchers, manufacturers and the industry.

The regular authorisation procedure for medicinal products generally requires manufacturers to carry out three phases of clinical trials. The third clinical trial phase in particular fails to take into account the particularities of homeopathic medicinal products, since clinical efficacy testing of the products 'as a whole' is not sufficient. Additional tests, relating in particular to the contribution made by each active ingredient contained in the whole product, are required instead. In practice, this is an almost impossible task for the manufacturers concerned to accomplish.

By amending the authorisation requirements and adapting them to the particularities of homeopathy — allowing clinical efficacy testing for the product 'as a whole' — research interest within the field of homeopathy would be raised. Research in the fields covered by homeopathy has already produced great results in genome analysis, particularly in inflammatory processes which are important *inter alia* for many chronic and severe diseases including cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's and respiratory diseases.

The particularities of homeopathy are not considered within the efficacy-related authorisation requirements set out in Annex A of Directive 2001/83/EC.

1. Is the Commission aware of the fact that these authorisation requirements make it practically and financially impossible for manufacturers to carry out the current authorisation tests, even though clinical test results for efficacy of the product 'as a whole' could be brought forward, and homeopathic medicinal products display excellent safety profiles?

2. Is the Commission aware of the fact that the current authorisation requirements deter sponsors, researchers, manufacturers and the industry from conducting research in the field of homeopathy, with negative repercussions for scientific and medicinal progress?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(4 July 2012)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answer to the previous Written Question E-003839/2012 by Ms Harkin ([1]).

In addition, the Commission has launched a study on the availability of medicinal products for human use in the EU. One of the main objectives of the study is to identify how the current regulatory framework can be used to alleviate issues with availability. Homeopathic medicinal products are in the scope of the study.

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

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005519/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Vier mannen terdoodveroordeeld in Gazastrook

Op 11 april 2012 heb ik de Commissie schriftelijke vraag E-003688/2012 gesteld over drie executies in de Gazastrook. Volgens Hamas zijn twee van de drie mannen geëxecuteerd voor moord; de derde wegens zogenaamde collaboratie met Israël. Tot op heden heeft de Commissie nog niet op mijn vragen gereageerd.

Zoals in vraag E-003688/2012 reeds aangehaald, mogen doodvonnissen volgens de Palestijnse wet alleen worden uitgevoerd met toestemming van de president. Maar omdat Hamas Abbas niet erkent, is die toestemming nooit gegeven.

Momenteel staat nog vier mannen in Gazastrook de doodstraf te wachten.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Four men face execution in Gaza" ([1])?

2. Kan de Commissie zich inzake de (op stapel staande) executies in de Gazastrook uitspreken? Is de Commissie voornemens hiertegen actie te ondernemen? Zo ja, wat? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie ertoe bereid de voorliggende vraag en vraag E-003688/2012 te beantwoorden én actie te ondernemen vóórdat de vier terdoodveroordeelde mannen daadwerkelijk worden geëxecuteerd?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(16 juli 2012)

De EU onderhoudt principieel geen contacten met Hamas. Zij volgt vermeende mensenrechtenschendingen in de Gazastrook echter op de voet en maakt zich ernstige zorgen over deze kwesties. De vertegenwoordigers van de EU bij de Palestijnse Autoriteit en de consuls-generaal in Jeruzalem hebben in plaatselijke verklaringen de uitvoering van de doodstraf in de Gazastrook veroordeeld. Zoals vermeld in het antwoord van de Commissie op schriftelijke vraag E-003688/2012 ([2]) hebben de EU-missies in Jeruzalem en Ramallah op 10 april 2012 een dergelijke verklaring afgelegd waarin zij de op 7 april 2012 in de Gazastrook uitgevoerde terechtstelling van drie mensen veroordelen.

Tijdens de bilaterale dialoog met de Palestijnse Autoriteit (PA) in het kader van het Europese nabuurschapsbeleid komt de kwestie van de doodstraf geregeld ter sprake. Tijdens de laatste vergadering van het subcomité voor de mensenrechten, goed bestuur en rechtsstaat van de EU en de PA die op 8 mei 2012 in Brussel werd gehouden, heeft de EU de PA geprezen voor het in stand houden van het feitelijke moratorium op de doodstraf en heeft zij de PA aangespoord om de doodstraf officieel af te schaffen bij de aanneming van een nieuw wetboek van strafrecht. De EU heeft ook aangegeven te betreuren dat de doodstraf in de Gazastrook wordt uitgevoerd en heeft er bij de PA op aangedrongen de feitelijke autoriteiten in de Gazastrook aan te sporen een einde te maken aan deze praktijk.

([1]) http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/MDE21/001/2012/en/7f6178f7-5ff6-465e-ae8b-a0ddb6245522/mde210012012en.html
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005519/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Four men sentenced to death in the Gaza Strip

On 11 April 2012, I put to the Commission my Written Question E-003688/2012 concerning three executions in the Gaza Strip. According to Hamas, two of the three men were executed for murder; the third for so-called collaboration with Israel. To date, the Commission has not yet responded to my questions.

As already cited in Written Question E-003688/2012, according to Palestinian law, death sentences may only be carried out with the President's consent. However, because Hamas does not acknowledge President Abbas, this consent has never been given.

Currently, four men are still on death row in the Gaza Strip.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report 'Four men face execution in Gaza'? ([1])

2. Can the Commission make a statement on upcoming executions in the Gaza Strip? Does the Commission intend to take action against them? If so, what action? If not, why not?

3. Is the Commission prepared to answer this question and Written Question E-003688/2012, as well as take action before the four sentenced men are actually executed?

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

The EU maintains a no-contact policy with Hamas. However, the EU follows closely allegations of human rights abuses taking place in the Gaza Strip and is seriously concerned about these claims. The EU representatives to the Palestinian Authority and the Consuls General in Jerusalem have, in local statements, condemned the execution of the death penalty in the Gaza Strip. As outlined in the Commission's answer to Written Question E-003688/2012 ([2]) the EU missions in Jerusalem and Ramallah last issued such a statement on 10 April 2012 condemning the execution of three persons in the Gaza Strip on 7 April 2012.

In its bilateral dialogue with the Palestinian Authority within the European Neighbourhood Policy framework, the issue of death penalty is raised regularly. In the latest EU-PA subcommittee on Human Rights, Good Governance and Rule of Law held in Brussels on 8 May 2012 the EU commended the PA for maintaining the de facto moratorium on the death penalty and urged the PA to move towards a de jure abolition in the process of adopting a new penal code. The EU also deplored the carrying out of death sentences in the Gaza Strip and urged the PA to press the de facto authorities in the Gaza Strip to stop the practice.

([1]) http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/MDE21/001/2012/en/7f6178f7-5ff6-465e-ae8b-a0ddb6245522/mde210012012en.html
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/home.jsp

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005521/12
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(31 mai 2012)

Subiect: Sprijin pentru managementul pădurilor

Pădurea joacă un rol extrem de important în captarea gazelor cu efect de seră și în eliberarea oxigenului, contribuind astfel la combaterea efectelor încălzirii globale.

De asemenea, ea ajută la fixarea solului dar și la reintroducerea în circuitul economic și ecologic a terenurilor degradate.

Având în vedere propunerea Comisiei privind regulamentul FEADR din pachetul legislativ privind reforma PAC după 2013,

1. Poate Comisia spune dacă este posibilă creșterea sumei acordate proprietarilor de păduri din fondurile de dezvoltare rurală după anul 2013 la cel puțin 300 de euro/ha, luând în considerare beneficiile acesteia asupra biodiversității și contribuția sa la contracararea efectelor încălzirii climatice?

2. Poate Comisia îndemna statele membre să folosească o parte din veniturile provenite din ETS, pentru politicile forestiere?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(24 iulie 2012)

Comisia recunoaște beneficiile pe care gestionarea durabilă a pădurilor le poate oferi cu privire la schimbările climatice și la ecosisteme; acestea sunt tratate pe larg în propunerile Comisiei în ceea ce privește politica de dezvoltare rurală de după 2013.

Măsura intitulată „servicii de silvomediu, servicii climatice și conservarea pădurilor” ar urma să ofere sprijin până la o valoare maximă normală de 200 EUR/hectar. Această valoare ar oferi în mod normal un sprijin corespunzător. Cu toate acestea, propunerile Comisiei prevăd o primă mai mare „în cazuri excepționale, ținând cont de circumstanțe specifice, care trebuie justificate în programele de dezvoltare rurală”. Comisia nu consideră necesar ca în prezent să se facă judecăți preliminare cu privire la modul de creștere a primelor în astfel de cazuri.

În temeiul măsurii propuse intitulate „investiții în dezvoltarea zonelor forestiere și ameliorarea viabilității pădurilor”, prevederea unui sprijin temporar pe suprafață menit să acopere costurile de întreținere ca urmare a împăduririlor sau a instituirii de sisteme agroforestiere nu va fi supusă unui nivel standard maxim prestabilit.

În ceea ce privește utilizarea veniturilor provenite din sistemul de comercializare a certificatelor de emisii pentru politica în domeniul forestier, ar trebui subliniat faptul că este vorba de o decizie politică ce ține de competența statelor membre.

Cu privire la aspectele și cerințele generale referitoare la utilizarea veniturilor provenite din licitații, Comisia aduce în atenția distinsului membru răspunsul său la întrebarea E-005590/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005521/12
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Support for forest management

The forest plays an extremely important role in capturing greenhouse gases and releasing oxygen, thus helping to combat the effects of global warming.

Furthermore, it helps with soil binding and with the reintroduction of degraded lands into the economic and ecological circuits.

Given the Commission's proposal regarding the EAFRD regulation as part of the post-2013 CAP package on legislative reform:

1. Is it possible to increase the amount granted to forest owners from the rural development funds after 2013 to at least EUR 300 per/ha, taking into account the benefits forests bring to biodiversity and their contribution to mitigating the effects of global warming?

2. Can the Commission urge the Member States to use a part of the revenue from the Emissions Trading System for forestry policies?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(24 July 2012)

The Commission recognises the benefits that sustainable forestry can deliver with regard to climate change and ecosystems; these are reflected extensively in the Commission's proposals for a post-2013 rural development policy.

The measure 'Forest-environmental and climate services and forest conservation' would offer support up to a normal maximum of 200 EUR/hectare. This value would usually offer adequate support. However, the Commission's proposals allow for a higher premium 'in exceptional cases, taking into account specific circumstances to be justified in the rural development programmes'. The Commission does not think it appropriate at present to prejudge how high premia could rise in such cases.

Under the proposed measure 'Investments in forest area development and improvement of the viability of forests', provision for temporary area-based support to cover the costs of maintenance following afforestation or the establishment of agro-forestry systems will not be subject to a predetermined standard maximum level.

With regard to the use of revenue from the Emissions Trading Scheme for forestry policy, it should be underlined that this is a political decision which falls within Member States' competence.

As regards the general aspects and requirements for the use of auction revenues, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to Question E-005590/2012 ([1]).

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005522/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(31 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Azioni riguardo all'accordo di Roma dell'11 maggio 2012 sulla regolamentazione delle transazioni fondiarie nei paesi poveri

Nel primo trimestre 2012, 2,5 milioni di ettari sono stati ceduti da parte di comunità locali a grandi imprese multinazionali a discapito delle popolazioni più povere del pianeta che nell'ultimo decennio hanno visto aumentare la pressione per l'abbandono delle loro terre dietro miseri compensi o addirittura, essendo prive di documentazione scritta, attraverso l'esproprio.

La FAO ha affrontato le rilevanti implicazioni che tale fenomeno ha sui regimi alimentari dei popoli più poveri del pianeta e l'11 maggio scorso, a Roma, è stata firmata all'unanimità una risoluzione fra i 124 Paesi che fanno parte del Comitato per la sicurezza alimentare mondiale per raggiungere una regolamentazione globale in merito alle transazioni fondiarie, che si occuperà non solo dei terreni, ma anche delle foreste e delle zone di pesca del mondo. Tale regolamentazione prevede soltanto sanzioni morali a difesa delle popolazioni offese.

— Quali azioni intende intraprendere la Commissione per la tutela dei territori acquisiti alle popolazioni più povere e, al contempo, per preservare il diritto delle imprese europee a effettuare acquisizioni?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(3 agosto 2012)

Secondo la Commissione gli investimenti esteri sono essenziali per ridurre la povertà, ma devono contribuire anche alla sussistenza della popolazione locale, alla sicurezza alimentare, all'equità, al buon governo e alla sostenibilità ambientale. L'accesso sicuro e il diritto alla terra sono fondamentali per proteggere i gruppi vulnerabili e controbilanciano l'eventuale impatto negativo dell'acquisizione e dei contratti d'affitto a lungo termine della terra.

Per la programmazione i donatori europei seguono gli «Orientamenti dell'UE a sostegno dell'elaborazione di una politica fondiaria e dei relativi processi di riforma nei paesi in via di sviluppo» (2004). Nel 2009 la Commissione ha riconvocato il gruppo di lavoro dell'UE sulle questioni legate ai terreni, mentre nel 2010 ha promosso una revisione del proprio sostegno alla riforma delle questioni e delle politiche fondiarie riguardante progetti in 37 paesi.

L'UE ha contribuito a sviluppare le Linee guida volontarie sulla gestione responsabile della terra, dei territori di pesca e delle foreste (VGGT), adottate dal Comitato per la sicurezza alimentare mondiale (CFS) nel maggio 2012. I punti chiave delle VGGT si ispirano fortemente alle raccomandazioni della Relazione europea sullo sviluppo della proprietà terriera del 2011-2012 e alla necessità di riconoscere i diritti legittimi e informali. Riconoscono inoltre che gli investimenti responsabili in agricoltura sono essenziali per migliorare la sicurezza alimentare, ma non devono provocare danni e devono rispettare i principi dei diritti umani, della trasparenza e della responsabilità.

I principi per gli investimenti responsabili in agricoltura (PRAI), che terranno conto, tra l'altro, dei principi definiti nel 2010 dall'Organizzazione per l'alimentazione e l'agricoltura (FAO), dalla Conferenza delle Nazioni Unite per il commercio e lo sviluppo (UNCTAD), dal Fondo internazionale per lo sviluppo agricolo (IFAD) e dalla Banca mondiale, saranno elaborati attraverso un processo consultivo guidato dal CFS e saranno pienamente coerenti con le VGGT.

L'UE fornisce sostegno finanziario per attuare il quadro e gli orientamenti di politica fondiaria scaturiti dal vertice dell'Unione africana del 2010; nel corso dell'ultima riunione del G8 ha annunciato l'intenzione di fornire un cospicuo sostegno finanziario per attuare le VGGT in Africa e orientare i PRAI.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005522/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Action regarding the Rome Agreement of 11 May 2012 on governance of land tenure in poor countries

In the first quarter of 2012, 2.5 million hectares of land changed hands from local communities to large multinational corporations, to the detriment of the poorest people on the planet. In the last 10 years, these groups have come under increasing pressure to abandon their land for derisory compensation or, indeed, in the absence of written documentation, by expropriation.

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation has addressed the major implications of this problem for the diet of those affected. On 11 May 2012 in Rome, a resolution was signed unanimously by all 124 member countries of the Committee on World Food Security with a view to agreeing a global framework for the governance of land tenure, which will cover not only lands but also forests and fisheries worldwide. Under these guidelines the only protection for the people affected is moral sanctions.

— What action does the Commission intend to take to protect territories owned by the poorest peoples and, at the same time, to safeguard European companies' right to acquire land?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

The Commission believes that foreign investment is key to poverty reduction, but must also support local livelihoods, food security, equity, good governance and environmental sustainability. Secure access and rights to land are essential to protect vulnerable groups and offset any negative impacts of acquisition and long-term leases of land.

The 'EU Guidelines for support to land policy design and land policy reform processes in developing countries' (2004) guide European donors in programming. In 2009 the Commission re-convened the EU Working Group on Land Issues and, in 2010, sponsored a review of its support to land issues and policy reform covering projects in 37 countries.

The EU helped develop Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests (VGGTs), adopted by the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in May 2012. Key points of the VGGTs correspond closely to the recommendations of the 2011-2012 European Report on Development on land tenure, and the need to recognise legitimate and informal rights, while acknowledging that responsible investment in agriculture is essential to improve food security but should do no harm and respect principles of human rights, transparency and accountability.

Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture (PRAI), which will take account amongst others the ones developed in 2010 by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the World Bank, will be elaborated through a consultative process led by the CFS and be fully consistent with the VGGTs.

The EU provides financial support to implement the framework and Guidelines on Land Policy from the African Union summit in 2010, and, at the last G8 meeting, announced an intention to give substantial financial support to operationalisation of VGGTs in Africa and to piloting the PRAI.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005523/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(31 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Industria petrolifera europea di fronte alla concorrenza di Russia, Cina e India

In Europa si assiste al preoccupante fenomeno della chiusura di raffinerie petrolifere nonostante la capacità di raffinazione europea resti inferiore di circa due milioni e mezzo di barili rispetto ai consumi interni.

Nel frattempo si verifica un crescente arrivo di prodotti raffinati da Russia, Cina e India. Questo è dovuto in parte alle loro normative ecologiche assai meno rigide e da agevolazioni e sussidi statali che consentono a tali prodotti di essere economicamente più vantaggiosi sui mercati europei. Ad esempio, sono garantiti margini alle raffinerie cinesi per il 5 % sul costo del greggio, vi sono esenzioni fiscali («tax holiday») per le raffinerie indiane e compensazioni (2 dollari al barile) per quelle saudite.

Il rischio di dipendere da prodotti raffinati extra-europei rimane alto, anche in considerazione del fatto che aziende russe, cinesi e indiane stanno acquistando raffinerie sul territorio europeo.

1. È la Commissione cosciente di questo fenomeno che è preoccupante da un punto di vista strategico?

2. Quali forme di tutela intende adottare per salvaguardare la capacità europea di raffinazione?

3. Ritiene opportuno sanzionare i prodotti raffinati derivati da processi ecologicamente difformi dagli standard europei?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(17 luglio 2012)

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza dei fenomeni relativi alle raffinerie menzionati dall'onorevole parlamentare. Il 15 maggio 2012 ha infatti convocato una tavola rotonda a livello UE dedicata a questo argomento, per discutere con gli Stati membri, i settori industriali coinvolti e diversi membri del Parlamento europeo le sfide alle quali l'industria di raffinazione UE è chiamata a far fronte. Si è concluso che sarebbe opportuno istituire un forum su base regolare, allo scopo di discutere e monitorare l'impatto degli sviluppi del mercato e della normativa UE sulla sicurezza dell'approvvigionamento e sulla competitività del settore.

2. Al momento la Commissione non ritiene necessario adottare misure di tutela. Riconosce tuttavia la necessità di prestare attenzione all'impatto sull'industria europea della raffinazione esercitato dalle politiche e dalle norme UE, in particolare da quelle che mettono il settore in posizione di svantaggio competitivo rispetto alle raffinerie non-UE.

3. La Commissione non è a favore di una differenziazione dei prodotti petroliferi in base ai paesi di provenienza. Tale differenziazione potrebbe aver luogo esclusivamente se le prassi adottate dei paesi partner, che sono membri dell'OMC, fossero ritenute incompatibili con le prassi dell'OMC. Quanto alle specifiche dei carburanti, tutti i combustibili importati nell'UE devono rispettare le stesse specifiche cui sono soggetti i prodotti provenienti dall'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005523/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: European oil industry facing competition from Russia, China and India

In Europe, there is a worrying trend of oil refinery closures, even though Europe's refining capacity stands at about 2.5 million barrels less than its internal consumption.

At the same time, increasing quantities of refined products are being imported from Russia, China and India. This is due partly to their considerably less stringent environmental regulations and partly to the state subsidies and relief that make these products cheaper for European markets. For example, Chinese refineries are assured a 5% margin on crude oil costs, Indian refineries benefit from tax holidays and there are subsidies (of USD 2 a barrel) for their Saudi Arabian counterparts.

The risk of depending on refined products from outside Europe remains high, especially considering that Russian, Chinese and Indian companies are acquiring refineries on European soil.

1. Is the Commission aware of these developments, which are a cause for strategic concern?

2. What protective measures does it intend to adopt to safeguard European refining capacity?

3. Does the Commission believe in penalising refined products produced using processes that fail to meet European environmental standards?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of the developments in the refining sector that the Honourable Member refers to. It convened an EU Refining Roundtable on 15 May 2012 in order to discuss with Member States, industries and a number of Members of the Parliament the challenges faced by the EU refining industry. It was concluded that a regular forum should be established to discuss and monitor the impacts of market developments and EU regulation on security of supply and on competitiveness of the industry.

2. The Commission does not see it necessary to adopt protective measures at present. Nevertheless, it is recognised that attention needs to be given to the combined impact of policies and EU legislation that affect the EU refining sector, in particular those that end up placing the industry at a competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis non-EU refiners.

3. The Commission is not in favour of differentiating between petroleum products from different countries of origin. Such differentiation could only occur if the practices by the partner countries, which are World Trade Organisation (WTO) members, were to be considered WTO incompatible. With regard to fuel specifications, all fuel products imported into the EU have to meet the same specifications as products produced in the EU.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005524/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(31 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Abrogazione delle esenzioni fiscali per alti burocrati e diplomatici

Il vergognoso caso di alti burocrati e diplomatici internazionali che mantengono scandalose esenzioni fiscali è intollerabile dal momento che queste stesse persone sono proprio coloro che dirigono la politica restrittiva o pretesa tale con cui vengono richiesti tagli di spesa e sacrifici spesso oltre il limite della sopportabilità a quanti lavorano e producono.

La Commissione può informare circa l'esistenza di un regolamento che tratta questi privilegi?

La Commissione non ritiene che il mantenimento immotivato di questi privilegi toglie ogni credibilità e autorità morale a chi lo detiene?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(11 luglio 2011)

Si rammenta all'onorevole parlamentare che, contrariamente a quanto avviene in alcune istituzioni internazionali, i funzionari dell'Unione europea e i membri delle istituzioni non beneficiano di alcuna esenzione in materia di imposte sul reddito.

Le retribuzioni dei funzionari e dei membri delle istituzioni sono soggette a un'imposta comunitaria fissata dal regolamento n. 260/68 relativo alle condizioni e alla procedura d'applicazione dell'imposta a profitto delle Comunità europee (Gazzetta ufficiale L 56 del 4.3.1968). Tale imposta presenta una struttura progressiva, con un'aliquota marginale riferita all'ultimo scaglione pari al 45 % dello stipendio, aliquota superiore alla maggior parte delle aliquote d'imposta sul reddito applicate dagli Stati membri dell'Unione europea.

Inoltre, le retribuzioni sono soggette a un prelievo speciale supplementare del 5,5 %, che scadrà il 31 dicembre 2012. Nel quadro della revisione dello statuto dei funzionari, la Commissione ha proposto l'introduzione di un nuovo prelievo speciale, denominato «prelievo di solidarietà», la cui aliquota è pari al 6 %. Il gettito proveniente dalle imposte e dal prelievo speciale sopra citati viene versato nel bilancio dell'Unione e contribuisce a finanziare le politiche dell'Unione.

Detta misura fa parte di un pacchetto di proposte di risparmi quali la riduzione del 5 % degli effettivi delle istituzioni europee, la compensazione di tale riduzione con un aumento dell'orario lavorativo settimanale a 40 ore, l'aumento dell'età pensionabile a 65 anni ed altre misure.

Per quanto riguarda le imposte diverse dall'imposta sulle retribuzioni corrisposte dalle istituzioni europee, i funzionari sono soggetti alle imposte nazionali come qualsiasi altro cittadino.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005524/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Repeal of tax exemptions for senior bureaucrats and diplomats

The shameful situation arising from the outrageous tax exemptions enjoyed by senior bureaucrats and international diplomats is all the more intolerable since these are the very people who devise restrictive or supposedly restrictive policies under which often unsustainable spending cuts and sacrifices are demanded of people who work and produce.

Can the Commission provide details of any regulation that covers these privileges?

Does the Commission not consider that the unjustified continuation of these privileges removes all credibility and moral authority from those who enjoy them?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(11 juillet 2012)

Il est porté à l'attention de l'Honorable parlementaire que les fonctionnaires de l'Union européenne et les membres des Institutions ne bénéficient d'aucune exemption en matière d'impôt sur le revenu contrairement à ce qui prévaut dans certaines institutions internationales.

Ainsi le traitement des fonctionnaires et membres des institutions sont soumis à un impôt communautaire fixé par le règlement nº 260/68 portant fixation des conditions et de la procédure d'application de l'impôt établi au profit des Communautés européennes (JO L 56 du 04/03/1968). Cet impôt présente une structure progressive dont le taux marginal de la dernière tranche s'élève à 45 % du traitement, taux supérieur à la plupart des taux d'imposition sur le revenu des pays membres de l'Union européenne.

En outre, les salaires sont soumis à un prélèvement spécial supplémentaire qui s'élève actuellement à 5,5 % et vient à échéance le 31 décembre 2012. La Commission a proposé dans le cadre de la révision du Statut des fonctionnaires un nouveau prélèvement spécial, appelé «prélèvement de solidarité», et de l'augmenter à 6 %. Les recettes de l'impôt et du prélèvement spécial mentionnés ci-dessus sont versés au budget de l'Union et contribue à financer les politiques de l'Union.

Cette mesure s'inscrit dans une série d'autres propositions d'économies telles que la réduction des effectifs des institutions européennes de 5 %, la compensation de cette réduction des effectifs par une augmentation du temps de travail hebdomadaire à 40 heures, l'augmentation de l'âge de la retraite à 65 et d'autres mesures.

En ce qui concerne les impôts autres que ceux sur la rémunération payée par les institutions européennes, les fonctionnaires sont soumis aux impôts nationaux comme tout autre citoyen.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005525/12
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Transparantie van EU-subsidies

In 2010 oordeelde het Europees Hof van Justitie ([1]) dat „de privacy van natuurlijke personen voorgaat op transparantie bij de EU". Het Hof stelde dat de lidstaten niet verplicht zijn om bepaalde informatie te publiceren, zoals de bedragen die aan landbouwers werden uitbetaald uit GLB-fondsen en de naam, woonplaats en, in voorkomend geval, postcode van die landbouwers, zoals vereist krachtens Verordening (EG) nr. 259/2008 van de Commissie ([2]).

Volgens een artikel dat door de EUobserver ([3]) werd gepubliceerd, hebben 1 539 begunstigden, hoofdzakelijk overheidsinstanties, in 2011 elk meer dan 1 miljoen euro ontvangen. Dat komt overeen met 3,8 miljard euro aan GLB-financiering.

1. Is de Commissie het niet eens met de PVV dat, aangezien het hier om belastinggeld gaat, de Europese burgers het recht hebben om te weten wie subsidies krijgt uit hoofde van het GLB? Indien niet, waarom niet?

2. Is de Commissie het niet eens met de PVV dat als de lidstaten niet vereist zijn informatie te publiceren over de begunstigden, dat de deur op een kier laat voor corrupte en/of ondoeltreffende besteding van de GLB-financiering? Indien niet, waarom niet?

3. Een van de overheidsinstanties die subsidies heeft ontvangen, is de regering van een Spaanse autonome regio, de Junta de Andalucía, die meer dan 100 miljoen euro aan landbouwsubsidies kreeg in 2011. Is de Commissie het, gezien de aantijgingen dat ambtenaren van de Junta de Andalucía EU-subsidies gebruikten om feestjes, drank en cocaïne te betalen ([4]) ([5]), niet eens met de PVV dat de toekenning van EU-subsidies net transparanter moet verlopen, in plaats van minder transparant?

4. Is de Commissie, gezien het hoge foutenpercentage dat zij heeft vastgesteld ten aanzien van de structuurfondsen in Spanje ([6]), het voorts niet eens met de PVV dat de Europese subsidies, zowel uit hoofde van het GLB als uit hoofde van de structuurfondsen, onvoldoende transparant zijn en te weinig meetbare resultaten opleveren?

5. Is de Commissie het niet eens met de PVV dat zowel het GLB als de Structuurfondsen opnieuw in handen van de lidstaten geplaatst moeten worden, aangezien dat de administratieve last zal beperken en bijgevolg de algemene efficiëntie van de financiering zal verhogen?

Antwoord van de heer Cioloş namens de Commissie
(11 juli 2012)

Zoals het geachte Parlementslid weet, heeft het Hof bepaalde delen van de transparantiebepalingen voor de landbouwsector ongeldig verklaard voor zover deze bepalingen ten aanzien van natuurlijke personen voorzien in de verplichte bekendmaking van persoonsgegevens betreffende iedere begunstigde, zonder dat daarbij een onderscheid wordt gemaakt op basis van relevante criteria. Het Hof heeft het beginsel transparantie niet in twijfel getrokken — getuige zijn uitspraak dat de betrokken wetgeving een door de Unie erkende doelstelling van algemeen belang nastreeft ([7]).

Omwille van de rechtszekerheid heeft de Commissie bij Uitvoeringsverordening (EU) nr. 410/2011 ([8]) de bestaande uitvoeringsverordening gewijzigd om het toepassingsgebied ervan te beperken tot uitsluitend rechtspersonen. De gegevens over de rechtspersonen zijn dus nog steeds beschikbaar in de databanken van de EU-lidstaten: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/funding/index_nl.htm.

De Commissie werkt momenteel aan een nieuw voorstel waarin rekening wordt gehouden met de bezwaren van het Hof op het gebied van gegevensbescherming.

([1]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?docid=84481&mode=req & pageIdex=1&dir=&occ=first & part=1&text=&doclang=NL&cid=2118426
([2]) http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:076:0028:0030:NL:PDF
([3]) http://euobserver.com/19/116211
([4]) http://www.theolivepress.es/spain-news/2012/01/11/junta-de-andalucia-chief-spent-eu-grants-on-cocaine/
([5]) http://www.theolivepress.es/spain-news/2012/04/06/andalucia-cocaine-chauffeur-in-custody/
([6]) Bron beschikbaar op aanvraag.
([7]) Punt 71 van het arrest.
([8]) PB L 108 van 28.4.2011, blz. 24.

Krachtens de basisvoorschriften voor het GLB is de Commissie verantwoordelijk voor het beheer van het ELGF en het ELFPO. Normaal gezien doet de Commissie echter zelf geen betalingen aan begunstigden. Volgens het beginsel van gedeeld beheer is deze taak gedelegeerd aan de lidstaten, die voor het verrichten van betalingen aan de begunstigden gebruik maken van betaalorganen. Voordat de betaling wordt verricht, moeten deze betaalorganen nagaan of de steunaanvraag voldoet aan de subsidiabiliteitsvoorwaarden. Zo ja, dan worden de uitgaven door de betaalorganen betaald en vervolgens door de Commissie vergoed. De verantwoordelijkheid om misbruik van EU-geld aan te pakken, berust bij de lidstaten. De Commissie ziet er aan de hand van audits op toe dat de lidstaten individuele gevallen van onregelmatigheden behandelen overeenkomstig de EU-regels. Blijken zij dat niet te doen, dan worden de betrokken uitgaven uitgesloten van EU-financiering.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005525/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Transparency in EU subsidies

In 2010 the European Court of Justice ruled ([1]) in favour of a 'natural person's' privacy over EU transparency, by stating that Member States are not obliged to publish information such as the amounts awarded to farmers from CAP funds, together with their names, municipality of residence and, where available, postcode, as required in Commission Regulation (EC) No 259/2008 ([2]).

According to an article published by the EU observer ([3]), 1 539 beneficiaries, most of them public bodies, received more than EUR 1 million each in 2011. This represents EUR 3.8 billion of CAP funding.

1. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that, since taxpayers' money is involved, European citizens have the right to know who is receiving CAP subsidies? If not, why not?

2. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that not requiring Member States to publish information on beneficiaries leaves more room for corrupt and/or ineffective spending of CAP funds? If not, why not?

3. One of the public body benefactors is the government of a Spanish autonomous region, the Junta de Andalucía, which received EUR 100 million in EU farm subsidies in 2011. Given the allegations that Junta de Andalucía officials spent EU subsidies on parties, drinks and cocaine ([4]) ([5]), does the Commission agree with the PVV that more, not less, transparency is needed when granting EU subsidies?

4. Furthermore, considering the high level of error detected by the Commission with regard to Structural Funds in Spain ([6]), does the Commission agree with the PVV that European subsidies, both from the CAP and Structural Funds, lack transparency and adequate measurable results?

5. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that both the CAP and Structural Funds should be placed back in the hands of the Member States, since this will ease the administrative burden and therefore increase overall funding efficiency?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(11 July 2012)

As the Honourable Member knows, the Court invalidated parts of the transparency provisions in the agricultural sector since, with regard to natural persons, those provisions impose an obligation to publish personal data relating to beneficiaries without drawing a distinction based on relevant criteria. The Court did not question the principle of transparency as such since it held that the contested legislation pursues an objective of general interest recognised by the European Union ([7]).

The Commission has, for the sake of legal security, modified the existing implementing Regulation to restrict its scope to legal persons only through Implementing Regulation (EU) N° 410/2011 ([8]). Data of legal persons are therefore still available in the EU Member States data bases: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/funding/index_en.htm

The Commission is currently preparing a new proposal taking account of the objections of the Court as regards the data protection concerns.

([1]) http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?docid=84481&mode=req&pageIdex=1&dir=&occ=first&part=1&text=&doclang=EN&cid=2118426
([2]) http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:076:0028:0030:EN:PDF
([3]) http://euobserver.com/19/116211
([4]) http://www.theolivepress.es/spain-news/2012/01/11/junta-de-andalucia-chief-spent-eu-grants-on-cocaine/
([5]) http://www.theolivepress.es/spain-news/2012/04/06/andalucia-cocaine-chauffeur-in-custody/
([6]) Source available upon request.
([7]) Point 71 of the ruling.
([8]) OJ L 108, 28.4.2011, p. 24.

Under the basic rules for the financial management of the CAP, the Commission is responsible for the management of the EAGF and the EAFRD. However, the Commission itself normally does not make payments to beneficiaries. According to the principle of shared management, this task is delegated to the Member States, who themselves work through paying agencies responsible for making payments to the beneficiaries. Prior to doing so, they must check the eligibility of the aid applications. The expenditure is made by the paying agencies and then reimbursed by the Commission. Finally, it falls within Member States' competence to tackle the misuse of EU funding. The Commission ensures through auditing that treatment by Member States of individual irregularity cases is in conformity with EU rules. Where this is not the case, the expenditure concerned is excluded from EU financing.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005526/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)
Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)
(31. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Sicherheit und Menschenrechte in Gilgit-Baltistan

Die Verschlechterung der allgemeinen Sicherheitslage in Südasien und insbesondere in Pakistan hat dazu geführt, dass das bislang relativ unbekannte Gebiet Gilgit-Baltistan in Jammu und Kaschmir — eine Provinz, die entgegen dem Bestreben der ansässigen Bevölkerung nach Unabhängigkeit von Islamabad aus regiert wird — zunehmend ins Bewusstsein der Weltöffentlichkeit rückt. Die immer stärkere Präsenz chinesischer Truppen macht die Lage noch komplizierter, da durch die Anwesenheit einer dritten Atommacht in einer der unbeständigsten Regionen der Welt zusätzliche Gefahr ausgeht.

Welche Maßnahmen könnten ergriffen werden, um das Recht der Bevölkerung von Gilgit-Baltistan auf Selbstbestimmung zu fördern und zu schützen? Wäre es möglich, erfahrene Sicherheitsexperten mit der Durchführung einer eingehenden Untersuchung der Sicherheitslage in der Region zu betrauen?

Zusätzlichen Grund zur Sorge geben die zahlreichen Berichte über Menschenrechtsverletzungen im Gebiet von Gilgit-Baltistan und Akte von Terrorismus und Gewalt durch bewaffnete militärische Gruppen.

Schätzt die VP/HR die Lage so ein, dass die Regierung Pakistans internationalen Medien und Menschenrechtsorganisationen unverzüglichen und uneingeschränkten Zugang nach Gilgit-Baltistan gewährt? Falls nicht, wie könnte dies nach Ansicht der VP/HR garantiert und durchgesetzt werden?

Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(25. Juli 2012)

Der Vizepräsidentin/Hohen Vertreterin ist die Lage in Gilgit-Baltistan, das Teil eines größeren zwischen Pakistan und Indien umstrittenen Gebiets ist, bekannt. Der Erlass von 2009 zur Stärkung der Handlungsfähigkeit und der Selbstverwaltung in Gilgit-Baltistan trat im September 2009 in Kraft und leitete Reformen der Verwaltung, des Finanz- und Justizwesens ein. Gilgit-Baltistan hat jetzt, wie die anderen vier pakistanischen Provinzen, einen Ersten Minister, allerdings ohne verfassungsrechtlich zu einer Provinz ernannt worden zu sein. Die in Gilgit-Baltistan am 12. November 2009 abgehaltenen Wahlen sind ein erster Schritt in Richtung politischer Vertretung und demokratischer Regierungsführung.

Obwohl die EU nicht direkt in die inneren Angelegenheiten eines Partnerlandes eingreifen kann, kann sie ihre Besorgnis darüber zum Ausdruck bringen, wie sehr Menschenrechtsverletzungen, Extremismus und Terrorakte der Entwicklung eines Landes schaden. Die EU führt bereits einen regelmäßigen Dialog mit Pakistan und hat an die pakistanischen Behörden appelliert, Maßnahmen zu erlassen, die im Einklang mit internationalen Menschenrechtsnormen und -übereinkünften die körperliche Unversehrtheit gewährleisten und die Rechte aller pakistanischen Bürger schützen. Nach der Verabschiedung des Maßnahmenplans EU-Pakistan wird der bestehende Dialog durch regelmäßige Sektordialoge über Sicherheit, einschließlich Terrorismusbekämpfung, und Menschenrechte verstärkt. Die Bekämpfung des gewaltsamen Extremismus soll auch im Rahmen des Dialogs behandelt werden.

Darüber hinaus fördert die EU Projekte, mit denen der Zugang zur Justiz und die Qualität der Rechtsdurchsetzung in Pakistan verbessert werden sollen, insbesondere durch die Unterstützung von Polizei und Strafverfolgungsbehörden. Nach Annahme der EU-Strategie zur Terrorismusbekämpfung und Sicherheit für Pakistan durch den Rat für Auswärtige Angelegenheiten im Juni 2012 sollen die EU-Maßnahmen zur Förderung von Sicherheit und Terrorismusbekämpfung in Pakistan verstärkt werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005526/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Security and human rights in Gilgit-Baltistan

As the general security situation deteriorates in South Asia and particularly in Pakistan, the world is becoming increasingly aware of the, as yet, relatively unknown area of Gilgit-Baltistan in Jammu and Kashmir — a province which is administered from Islamabad despite the wishes of the region's peoples to be independent. The increasing presence of Chinese troops further complicates the situation, adding another dangerous component with the involvement of a third nuclear power in one of the world's most volatile regions.

What measures could be taken to promote and uphold the right of self-determination for the people of Gilgit-Baltistan? Would it be possible to appoint senior security experts to conduct a thorough study of the security situation in the region?

The numerous reports of human rights violations in the Gilgit-Baltistan area and incidents of terrorism and violence perpetrated by armed military groups are a further cause for concern.

Does the VP/HR consider that the government of Pakistan allows international media and human rights organisations immediate and unrestricted access to Gilgit-Baltistan? If not, how does the VP/HR feel this could be guaranteed and enforced?

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

The Vice-President/High Representative is aware of the situation in Gilgit Baltistan, which is part of a larger territory disputed between Pakistan and India. The Gilgit-Baltistan (Empowerment and Self Governance) Order 2009 entered into force in September 2009, introducing administrative, financial and judicial reforms. Gilgit-Baltistan now has a Chief Minister as do the four provinces of Pakistan, without however constitutionally being made a province. The elections held in Gilgit-Baltistan on 12 November 2009 constitute a first step towards political representation and democratic governance.

While the EU cannot intervene directly in the internal affairs of a partner country, it can convey its concern at the damage that human rights violations, extremism and incidents of terrorism do to a country's development. The EU already engages in regular dialogue with Pakistan and has called on the Pakistani authorities to adopt measures to ensure the physical security and protect the rights of all Pakistani citizens in line with international human rights standards and conventions. Following adoption of the EU-Pakistan Engagement Plan, the existing dialogue will be enhanced by regular sector dialogues on security, including counter-terrorism, as well as human rights. Countering violent extremism is expected to be part of the dialogue.

At the same time the EU is supporting projects which are intended to improve access to justice and also to improve the quality of law enforcement in Pakistan, not least with the police and prosecution services. After the adoption of the EU counter terrorism /Security Strategy for Pakistan by the June 2012 Foreign Affairs Council, it is expected that EU activities in support of security and counter-terrorism in Pakistan will be reinforced.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005527/12
an die Kommission
Göran Färm (S&D) und Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(31. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Verletzung von Gewerkschaftsrechten in Montenegro

In Montenegro ist es zu schwerwiegenden Verletzungen von Gewerkschaftsrechten gekommen, nachdem eine neu gegründete Gewerkschaft für Radio- und Fernsehjournalisten eine Reihe von Korruptionsfällen aufgedeckt hat. Nachdem die beteiligten Gewerkschafter ihre Untersuchungsergebnisse den Justizbehörden und der Öffentlichkeit präsentiert hatten, wurden sie vom Nationalen Rundfunk- und Fernsehrat von Montenegro entlassen.

Dem Gewerkschaftsvorsitzenden Radomir Pajović wurde am 23. Mai 2012 vom Generaldirektor Rade Vojvodić im Anschluss an ein Disziplinarverfahren gekündigt, ohne dass ihm eine Schuld nachgewiesen werden konnte.

Anstatt die Arbeit der neuen Gewerkschaft für Radio und Fernsehen zu unterstützen, hat der Rat drastische Maßnahmen gegen sie verhängt und ihre tägliche Arbeit ernsthaft behindert. Die Gewerkschaft legt derzeit eine offizielle Beschwerde bei der Regierung von Montenegro ein.

1. Hat die Kommission Kenntnis von den oben erwähnten Vorkommnissen?

2. Falls ja, hat eine eingehende Untersuchung dazu stattgefunden?

3. Zu welchen Ergebnissen führte diese Untersuchung?

4. Welche Schritte wurden unternommen, um solche Maßnahmen, die eine Verletzung der Grundprinzipien des europäischen Rechts und der Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union darstellen, zu unterbinden?

5. Welche Maßnahmen sind für die Zukunft geplant, um den montenegrinischen Bürgern grundlegende Menschenrechte zu garantieren?

6. Wird die Kommission die Untersuchungsergebnisse künftig bei der Ausarbeitung des Fortschrittsberichts über Montenegro sowie der Berichte über das Europäische Nachbarschaftsinstrument und das Instrument für Heranführungshilfe (IPA II) berücksichtigen, bevor sie sie dem Europäischen Parlament vorlegt?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(16. Juli 2012)

Die Kommission verfolgt aufmerksam den betreffenden Fall, über den sie von Vertretern der neuen Gewerkschaft für Radio und Fernsehen von Montenegro bereits informiert worden ist.

Die Kommission schenkt den Entwicklungen in den Bereichen Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Gewerkschaftsrechte in Montenegro sowie in allen anderen Ländern, die der Europäischen Union beitreten wollen, große Beachtung. Sie erwartet von diesen Ländern die Achtung der Grundrechte und der Grundsätze, auf die sich die Union stützt und die auch in den einschlägigen internationalen Übereinkommen verankert sind. Es obliegt den zuständigen nationalen Behörden, einschließlich der Gerichte, die angemessene und wirksame Anwendung der Rechtsvorschriften über Gewerkschafts- und Grundrechte unter Berücksichtigung der besonderen Umstände jedes einzelnen Falles sicherzustellen. Die Kommission kann weder den Sachverhalt spezifischer Fälle beurteilen, noch sich zu diesen äußern und hat deshalb in diesem Fall den Vertretern dieser Gewerkschaft nahegelegt, sich an das zuständige nationale Gericht zu wenden.

Die Kommission wird die Situation in Montenegro weiterhin verfolgen, unter anderem in Bezug auf die Umsetzung des Arbeitsrechts. Ihre Erkenntnisse finden ihren Niederschlag in den jährlichen Fortschrittsberichten. Etwaige Bedenken werden regelmäßig im Dialog mit den montenegrinischen Behörden zur Sprache gebracht. Die künftigen Beitrittsverhandlungen werden im Rahmen des Verhandlungskapitels 19 „Sozialpolitik und Beschäftigung“ eine genaue Überwachung des sozialen Dialogs beinhalten. Montenegro wird seine Normen in diesem Bereich angleichen müssen.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-005527/12
till kommissionen
Göran Färm (S&D) och Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(31 maj 2012)

Angående: Montenegros brott mot fackliga rättigheter

Det har skett allvarliga brott mot fackliga rättigheter i Montenegro. En nybildad fackförening för radio- och tv-journalister avslöjade vissa fall av korruption. Efter att ha presenterat resultaten av sin granskning för de rättsliga myndigheterna och för allmänheten blev de inblandade fackligt anslutna entledigade av radio- och tv-styrelsen i Montenegro.

Fackföreningens ordförande Radomir Pajović entledigades den 23 maj 2012 av generaldirektör Rade Vojvodić efter ett disciplinärt förfarande utan att bevis för hans skuld hade lagts fram.

I stället för att underlätta fackföreningens arbete för radio och tv har styrelsen beslutat sig för att vidta kraftiga åtgärder mot den nya fackföreningen, och har på ett allvarligt sätt hindrat dess dagliga arbete. Fackföreningen har ingett ett officiellt klagomål till Montenegros regering.

1. Är kommissionen medveten om dessa händelser?

2. Om så är fallet, har en fullständig utredning av ärendet gjorts?

3. Vad var resultatet av denna utredning?

4. Vilka åtgärder har man vidtagit för att förhindra brott mot den europeiska rättens grundläggande principer och Europeiska unionens stadga om de grundläggande rättigheterna?

5. Vilka framtida åtgärder planeras för att garantera medborgarnas grundläggande mänskliga rättigheter i Montenegro?

6. Kommer kommissionen att införa resultaten i framtida utkast till lägesrapporten om Montenegro, det europeiska grannskapsinstrumentet och instrumentet för stöd inför anslutningen (IPA II) innan man översänder dessa till Europaparlamentet?

Svar från Štefan Füle på kommissionens vägnar
(16 juli 2012)

Kommissionen följer noggrant ärendet i fråga efter att tidigare ha informerats om det av representanter från den nya fackföreningen för radio och television i Montenegro.

Kommissionen ägnar stor uppmärksamhet åt utvecklingen vad gäller rättsstatsprincipen och fackliga rättigheter i Montenegro, liksom i alla andra länder som vill ansluta sig till Europeiska unionen. Dessa länder förväntas visa respekt för de grundläggande rättigheterna och de principer som unionen bygger på, också i enlighet med relevanta internationella konventioner. Behöriga nationella myndigheter, även domstolarna, ska se till att lagarna om fackliga rättigheter och de grundläggande rättigheterna tillämpas på ett korrekt och ändamålsenligt sätt, samt ta hänsyn till varje falls specifika omständigheter. Kommissionen kan inte bedöma eller kommentera fakta i specifika ärenden, och har i detta ärende därför uppmuntrat fackföreningens representanter att väcka talan vid behörig nationell domstol.

Kommissionen kommer att fortsätta övervaka situationen i Montenegro, däribland tillämpningen av arbetsrätten, och resultaten publiceras i de årliga lägesrapporterna. Frågor tas regelbundet upp i dialogen med Montenegros myndigheter. De framtida anslutningsförhandlingarna kommer att medföra en nära övervakning av den sociala dialogen inom förhandlingskapitlet (nr 19) ”Socialpolitik och sysselsättning”. Montenegro kommer att behöva anpassa sina bestämmelser på detta område.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005527/12
to the Commission
Göran Färm (S&D) and Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Violation of trade union rights in Montenegro

There have been serious violations regarding trade union rights in Montenegro. A newly founded trade union for radio and television journalists uncovered certain cases of corruption. After presenting the findings of these investigations to the judicial authorities and to the public, the trade unionists involved were dismissed by the board of Radio and Television Montenegro.

The president of the trade union, Radomir Pajović, was dismissed on 23 May 2012 by the Director-General, Rade Vojvodić, following a disciplinary procedure, without any proof of guilt.

Instead of facilitating its work for radio and television, the board decided to take drastic measures against the new trade union and has seriously hindered its everyday activities. The trade union is currently filing an official complaint to the government of Montenegro.

1. Is the Commission aware of the incidents mentioned above?

2. If so, has there been a full investigation?

3. What were the findings of this investigation?

4. What steps have been taken to stop such actions which violate the basic principles of European law and the European Charter of Fundamental Rights?

5. What action is planned for the future to guarantee fundamental human rights to the citizens of Montenegro?

6. Will the Commission include the findings in future drafts of the progress report on Montenegro, the European Neighbourhood Instrument and the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA II) before submitting them to the European Parliament?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(16 July 2012)

The Commission is closely following the case in question, of which it has been already informed by the representatives of the New Trade Union of Radio and Television of Montenegro.

The Commission pays great attention to the developments in the area of rule of law and trade union rights in Montenegro, as well as in all other countries wishing to join the European Union. It expects those countries to respect the fundamental rights and principles underpinning the Union, also in accordance with the relevant international conventions. It is for the competent national authorities, including the courts, to ensure that the laws on trade unions' rights and on fundamental rights are correctly and effectively applied, having regard to the specific circumstances of each case. The Commission cannot assess the facts of and comment on specific cases and therefore, in this case, encouraged the representatives of this trade union to address the competent national court.

The Commission will continue to monitor the situation in Montenegro, including with regard to the implementation of the Labour Law. Its findings are reflected in the annual progress reports. Concerns are regularly raised in the dialogue with the authorities of Montenegro. The future accession negotiations will entail a close monitoring of social dialogue under the negotiating Chapter 19 'Social Policy and Employment'; Montenegro will have to align its standards in this area.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-005528/12
Komisijai
Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Konrad Szymański (ECR) ir Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(2012 m. birželio 1 d.)

Tema: Žmogaus embriono kamieninių ląstelių moksliniai tyrimai pagal programą „Horizontas 2020“

Komisijos pasiūlyme dėl kitos bendrosios mokslinių tyrimų ir inovacijų programos „Horizontas 2020“ pateikta nuostata dėl mokslinių tyrimų, susijusių su žmogaus embriono kamieninėmis ląstelėmis, finansavimo. Tokie moksliniai tyrimai uždrausti trijose valstybėse narėse: Lietuvoje, Lenkijoje ir Slovakijoje. Kaip Komisija pagrindžia siūlymą skirti ES finansavimą mokslinių tyrimų veiklai, kuri ne visose valstybėse narėse teisėta? Ar Komisija remia kokius nors kitus mokslinius tyrimus ar veiklą, kurie neteisėti kai kuriose valstybėse narėse?

Be to, vienas iš programos „Horizontas 2020“ tikslų yra apsaugoti Europos konkurencingumą pasaulyje. Pagal Europos Sąjungos Teisingumo Teismo sprendimą byloje Brüstle prieš Greenpeace nė vienas iš žmogaus embriono kamieninių ląstelių sukurtas išradimas jokiu būdu negali atitikti reikalavimų patento suteikiamai teisinei apsaugai gauti. Ar, Komisijos manymu, pasiūlymas toliau finansuoti mokslinius tyrimus, kuriems neįmanoma suteikti intelektinės nuosavybės apsaugos, tinkamas ir suderinamas su programos „Horizontas 2020“ tikslais?

M. Geoghegan-Quinn atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. rugpjūčio 9 d.)

Naujausio tyrimo duomenimis, 18 valstybių narių leidžia vykdyti mokslinius tyrimus, susijusius su žmogaus embrioninių kamieninių ląstelių linijomis, 3 valstybės narės tokius tyrimus draudžia, o likusios šią sritį reglamentuojančių teisės aktų neturi ([1]).

Siūlomose programos „Horizontas 2020“ dalyvavimo taisyklėse pateikiama tokia nuostata dėl žmogaus embrioninių kamieninių ląstelių: *Kai tinka, pasiūlyme dėl žmogaus embrioninių kamieninių ląstelių mokslinių tyrimų pateikiama išsami informacija apie licencijavimo ir kontrolės priemones, kurių imsis valstybių narių kompetentingos institucijos, taip pat išsami informacija apie pateiksimus etikos patvirtinimus* ([2]).

Į programos „Horizontas 2020“ pasiūlymą įtrauktas toks apribojimas: *Mokslinių tyrimų veikla, kuri draudžiama visose valstybėse narėse, nefinansuojama. Jokia veikla nefinansuojama valstybėje narėje, kur tokia veikla yra uždrausta* ([3]). Tai reiškia, kad įgyvendinant programą „Horizontas 2020“ būtų užtikrintas šeštosios ir septintosios bendrųjų programų ([4]) koncepcijos tęstinumas, t. y. būtų remiama mokslinių tyrimų veikla tik valstybėse narėse, kuriose tokia veikla leidžiama.

Komisija nemano, kad trys programos „Horizontas 2020“ prioritetai – pažangus mokslas, pramonės pirmavimas ir visuomenės uždaviniai – prieštarauja „Brüstle“ byloje priimtam Europos Sąjungos Teisingumo Teismo sprendimui ([5]), pagal kurį žmogaus embrioninių kamieninių ląstelių naudojimu grindžiami išradimai negali būti saugomi patentais. Sprendime nekalbama apie šios rūšies mokslinių tyrimų teisėtumą.

([1]) Europos mokslo fondo „Mokslo politikos informacinis leidinys“ Nr. 38 (2010 m. gegužės mėn.).
([2]) COM(2011) 810 galutinis; 2011 11 30, 12 straipsnio 2 dalis.
([3]) COM(2011) 809 galutinis; 2011 11 30, 16 straipsnio 4 dalis.
([4]) Mokslinių tyrimų ir technologinės plėtros šeštoji ir septintoji bendrosios programos (BP6 (2002–2006 m.) ir BP7 (2007–2013 m.)).
([5]) Sprendimas C-34/10.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005528/12
do Komisji
Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Konrad Szymański (ECR) oraz Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(1 czerwca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Badania nad ludzkimi zarodkowymi komórkami macierzystymi prowadzone w ramach programu „Horyzont 2020"

We wniosku Komisji dotyczącym kolejnego programu ramowego w zakresie badań i innowacji „Horyzont 2020" zawarte są ustalenia dotyczące finansowania badań, w których wykorzystuje się ludzkie zarodkowe komórki macierzyste. Badania takie zakazane są w trzech państwach członkowskich: na Litwie, w Polsce i na Słowacji. Jak Komisja uzasadnia finansowanie przez UE działalności badawczej, która nie jest legalna we wszystkich państwach członkowskich? Czy Komisja wspiera jakiekolwiek inne badania lub działania, które są nielegalne w niektórych państwach członkowskich?

Ponadto jednym z celów programu „Horyzont 2020" jest zapewnienie globalnej konkurencyjności Europy. Zgodnie z orzeczeniem Trybunału Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej w sprawie Brüstle przeciwko Greenpeace żaden wynalazek oparty na wykorzystaniu ludzkich zarodkowych komórek macierzystych nie może zostać objęty ochroną patentową. Czy Komisja jest zdania, że dalsze finansowanie badań, wobec których nie można zastosować ochrony własności intelektualnej, jest słuszne i zgodne z celami programu „Horyzont 2020"?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Máire Geoghegan-Quinn w imieniu Komisji
(9 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Zgodnie z najnowszymi ustaleniami 18 państw członkowskich zezwala na badania nad liniami ludzkich zarodkowych komórek macierzystych, w 3 państwach są one zakazane, a w pozostałych nie istnieją odnośne szczegółowe przepisy ([1]).

W przypadku ludzkich zarodkowych komórek macierzystych proponowane zasady uczestnictwa w programie „Horyzont 2020" przewidują, co następuje: *Wszystkie wnioski o finansowanie badań przy wykorzystaniu ludzkich zarodkowych komórek macierzystych zawierają w stosownych przypadkach informacje dotyczące środków w zakresie zezwoleń i kontroli, jakie zostaną podjęte przez właściwe organy państw członkowskich, jak również informacje dotyczące zatwierdzeń w zakresie zgodności z zasadami etycznymi, które zostaną udzielone* ([2]).

Wniosek dotyczący programu „Horyzont 2020" zawiera następujący przepis ograniczający: *Nie przyznaje się środków na finansowanie działań w zakresie badań, które są zakazane we wszystkich państwach członkowskich. Nie należy finansować działania w państwie członkowskim, w którym takie działanie jest zakazane* ([3]). Oznacza to, że ramach programu „Horyzont 2020" będzie kontynuowane to samo podejście jak w przypadku 6PR i 7PR ([4]) oraz że wspierane będą działania badawcze jedynie w tych państwach członkowskich, które na nie zezwalają.

Komisja nie uważa, aby trzy priorytety programu Horyzont 2020 – doskonała baza naukowa, wiodąca pozycja w przemyśle i wyzwania społeczne – były sprzeczne z wyrokiem Trybunału Sprawiedliwości Unii Europejskiej w sprawie „Brüstle" ([5]), który w szczególności wyłącza spod ochrony patentowej wynalazki oparte na ludzkich zarodkowych komórkach macierzystych. Wyrok ten nie dotyczy legalności badań tego typu.

([1]) Badanie Europejskiej Fundacji Naukowej „Science Policy Briefing" nr 38 (maj 2010 r.).
([2]) COM(2011) 810 final; 30.11.2011 r., art. 12 ust. 2.
([3]) COM(2011) 809 final; 30.11.2011 r., art. 16 ust. 4.
([4]) Szósty i siódmy program ramowy badań i rozwoju technologicznego (6PR w latach 2002-2006, 7PR w latach 2007-2013).
([5]) Sprawa C-34/10.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-005528/12
Komisii
Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Konrad Szymański (ECR) a Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(1. júna 2012)

Vec: Výskum ľudských embryonálnych kmeňových buniek v rámci programu Horizont 2020

Návrh Komisie týkajúci sa ďalšieho rámcového programu pre výskum a inovácie Horizont 2020 zabezpečuje financovanie výskumu, ktorého predmetom by boli aj ľudské embryonálne kmeňové bunky. Takýto výskum je zakázaný v troch členských štátoch: v Litve, Poľsku a na Slovensku. Ako Komisia odôvodňuje financovanie z prostriedkov EÚ takých výskumných činností, ktoré nie sú legálne vo všetkých členských štátoch? Existujú iné druhy výskumu alebo činností, ktoré majú podporu Komisie a ktoré sú v niektorých členských štátoch nezákonné?

Okrem toho jedným z cieľov programu Horizont 2020 je zabezpečiť Európe konkurencieschopnosť v celosvetovom meradle. Podľa rozhodnutia Súdneho dvore EÚ v prípade Brüstle v Greenpeace nemôže byť žiaden vynález pochádzajúci z ľudských embryonálnych kmeňových buniek chránený patentom. Domnieva sa Komisia, že pokračovanie vo financovaní výskumu, ktorý nemôže získať ochranu v rámci práva duševného vlastníctva, je primerané a v súlade s cieľmi programu Horizont 2020?

Odpoveď pani Geoghegan-Quinnovej v mene Komisie
(9. augusta 2012)

Podľa najnovšej štúdie, ktorá je k dispozícii, 18 členských štátov povoľuje výskum línií ľudských embryonálnych kmeňových buniek, 3 ho zakazujú a v ostatných neexistujú v tejto oblasti nijaké špecifické právne predpisy ([1]).

V prípade ľudských embryonálnych kmeňových buniek, sa v navrhovaných pravidlách účasti na programe Horizont 2020 uvádza: *Každý návrh na výskum ľudských embryonálnych kmeňových buniek musí vo vhodných prípadoch obsahovať podrobné údaje o licenčných a kontrolných opatreniach, ktoré prijmú príslušné orgány členských štátov, ako aj podrobné údaje o etických povoleniach, ktoré budú udelené* ([2]).

Návrh Horizont 2020 obsahuje toto obmedzenie: *Financovanie sa neposkytuje na výskumné činnosti, ktoré sú zakázané vo všetkých členských štátoch. V členskom štáte sa nefinancuje nijaká činnosť, ak je zakázaná* ([3]). To znamená, že v rámci Horizontu 2020 by sa pokračovalo v rovnakom prístupe ako v RP6 a RP7 ([4]) a výskumné činnosti by sa podporovali len v tých členských štátoch, ktoré ich povoľujú.

Komisia sa domnieva, že tri priority programu Horizont 2020 – excelentná veda, vedúce postavenie priemyslu a spoločenské výzvy – nie sú v konflikte s rozsudkom Súdneho dvora Európskej únie vo veci „Brüstle“ ([5]), ktorý predovšetkým vylučuje možnosť patentovania vynálezov odvodených z ľudských embryonálnych kmeňových buniek. Tento rozsudok sa nezaoberá zákonnosťou takéhoto druhu výskumu.

([1]) Brífing Európskej nadácie pre vedu o politike v oblasti vedy 38 (máj 2010).
([2]) KOM(2011) 810 v konečnom znení; 30.11.2011, článok 12 ods. 2.
([3]) KOM(2011) 809 v konečnom znení; 30.11.2011, článok 16 ods. 4.
([4]) Šiesty a siedmy rámcový program pre výskum a technologický rozvoj (RP6 2002 – 2006; RP7 2007 – 2013).
([5]) Vec C-34/10.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005528/12
to the Commission
Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE), Konrad Szymański (ECR) and Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(1 June 2012)

Subject: Human embryonic stem cell research within Horizon 2020

The Commission's proposal for the next Framework Programme for Research and Innovation 'Horizon 2020' contains provision for the funding of research involving human embryonic stem cells. Such research is outlawed in three Member States: Lithuania, Poland and Slovakia. How does the Commission justify EU funding for research activities which are not legal in all Member States? Are there any other types of research or activities supported by the Commission which are illegal in some Member States?

Furthermore, one of the aims of Horizon 2020 is to secure Europe's global competitiveness. Pursuant to the European Court of Justice decision in the case Brüstle v Greenpeace, no invention derived from human embryonic stem cells may ever be eligible for patent protection. Does the Commission consider continuing to fund research which is unable to gain intellectual property protection to be appropriate and consistent with the aims of Horizon 2020?

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

According to the most recent study available, 18 Member States permit research on human embryonic stem cell lines, 3 prohibit it and the rest have no specific legislation ([1]).

In the case of human embryonic stem cells, the proposed Horizon 2020 participation rules state: *Any proposal for research on human embryonic stem cells shall include, as appropriate, details of licensing and control measures that will be taken by the competent authorities of the Member States as well as details of the ethical approvals that will be provided* ([2]).

The Horizon 2020 proposal includes the following restriction: *No funding shall be granted for research activities that are prohibited in all the Member States. No activity shall be funded in a Member State where such activity is forbidden* ([3]). This means that Horizon 2020 would continue the same approach as FP6 and FP7 ([4]) and would only support research activities in Member States which permit them.

The Commission does not consider the three priorities of Horizon 2020 — Excellent science, Industrial leadership and Societal challenges — to conflict with the CJEU judgment in the 'Brüstle' case ([5]), notably excluding from patentability inventions derived from human embryonic stem cells. The judgment does not address the legality of this type of research.

([1]) European Science Foundation Science Policy Briefing 38 (May 2010).
([2]) COM(2011) 810 final; 30.11.2011, Article 12 paragraph 2.
([3]) COM(2011) 809 final; 30.11.2011, Article 16 paragraph 4.
([4]) Sixth and Seventh Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development (FP6, 2002-2006; FP7, 2007-2013).
([5]) Case C-34/10.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005529/12
an die Kommission
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE) und Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL)
(31. Mai 2012)

Betrifft: Rechte der Kurden im Rahmen der Positiv-Agenda mit der Türkei und deren zukünftiger Verfassung

Am 17. Mai 2012 wurde in Ankara die neue „Positiv-Agenda" auf den Weg gebracht, deren Ziel es ist, den Beitrittsprozess der Türkei am Leben zu erhalten. Die Positiv-Agenda soll keinen Ersatz für den Beitrittsprozess der Türkei darstellen, sondern diesen insbesondere in folgenden Bereichen erweitern und unterstützen: Angleichung an EU-Rechtsvorschriften; politische Reformen und Grundrechte; Visa, Mobilität und Migration; Handel; Energie; Terrorismusbekämpfung und außenpolitischer Dialog. Im Rahmen der Positiv-Agenda werden Arbeitsgruppen gebildet werden, um den Prozess der Angleichung der Türkei an EU-Politiken und -Standards im Zusammenhang mit acht Kapiteln zu beschleunigen. Am 17. Mai wurde die erste Arbeitsgruppe geschaffen, die sich mit Kapitel 23 über Justiz und Grundrechte sowie Korruptionsbekämpfung befasst.

In diesem Zusammenhang bitten wir um Beantwortung folgender Fragen:

1. In seiner Rede beim Auftakttreffen mit der Türkei zu Kapitel 23 sagte Kommissionsmitglied Füle, dass mehr für den Schutz der Angehörigen von Minderheiten sowie für kulturelle Rechte getan werden müsse. Bedeutet dies, dass die kurdische Bevölkerung in der Türkei in der Lage sein wird, die Inhalte der Bildungspolitik mitzubestimmen, dass die kurdische Sprache im Bildungsbereich zugelassen werden muss und dass Kurdisch im politischen Leben frei verwendet werden kann? Welche anderen Schutzrechte und kulturellen Rechte für Kurden sollten garantiert werden? Wie kann die Kommission dafür sorgen, dass diese Rechte Wirklichkeit werden?

2. Was die Schaffung eines neuen unabhängigen Hohen Rats der Richter und Staatsanwälte anbelangt, bevorzugt die Kommission ein System, das die garantierte Vertretung von Minderheiten wie der Kurden im Hohen Rat vorschreibt?

3. Bei der anstehenden Ausarbeitung einer neuen türkischen nicht diskriminierenden und pluralistischen Verfassung muss eine friedliche Lösung der Kurdenfrage im Mittelpunkt stehen. Die Annahme einer solchen Verfassung erfordert jedoch einen nationalen Konsens in strittigen Fragen wie Staatsbürgerschaft, das Anti-Terror-Gesetz, Unterricht in kurdischer Sprache und eine Absenkung der 10 %-Sperrklausel bei nationalen Wahlen. Vertritt die Kommission die Auffassung, dass diese Fragen im Rahmen der neuen Verfassung geklärt werden müssen? Ist die Kommission der Meinung, dass eine Lösung der Kurdenfrage auch durch die neue zivile Verfassung herbeigeführt werden muss?

4. Wie ist die Reaktion der Kommission darauf, dass ein Gericht in Diyarbakir unlängst die Sacharow-Preisträgerin Leyla Zana zu zehn Jahren Haft verurteilt hat? Welche Auswirkungen wird dies auf die Beitrittsgespräche mit der Türkei haben?

Antwort von Herrn Füle im Namen der Kommission
(20. Juli 2012)

Die Kommission hat stets betont, dass eine ausgewogene und faire Lösung in der Kurdenfrage gefunden werden muss. Sie hat mit Bedauern zur Kenntnis genommen, dass die demokratische Öffnung von 2009, die insbesondere auf eine Lösung in der Kurdenfrage abzielte, nicht fortgesetzt wurde. Zwar gibt es Fortschritte bei den kulturellen Rechten, doch sind nach wie vor weitere Anstrengungen erforderlich. Die Inhaftierung von gewählten Volksvertretern und Menschenrechtsaktivisten gibt Anlass zur Sorge und behindert die lokale Regierungsführung. Die Wahrheit über die außergerichtlichen Hinrichtungen und Folterungen im Südosten in den 1980er und 1990er Jahren muss erst noch durch ordnungsgemäße Verfahren ans Licht gebracht werden. Landminen und das System der Dorfwächter geben nach wie vor Anlass zur Sorge.

Die Kommission hat wiederholt hervorgehoben, dass im Südosten der Türkei Frieden, Demokratie und Stabilität geschaffen werden müssen, um die soziale, wirtschaftliche und kulturelle Entwicklung voranzubringen. Dies kann nur über die einvernehmliche Umsetzung konkreter Maßnahmen zur Stärkung der sozialen, wirtschaftlichen und kulturellen Rechte der Bevölkerung in dieser Region erreicht werden. Das laufende Verfahren zur Verfassungsänderung bietet den Rahmen dafür, die Kurdenfrage in umfassender und partizipatorischer Weise anzugehen.

Die neue Verfassung muss die Rechtsstaatlichkeit und die Grundrechte aller türkischen Bürger im Einklang mit den europäischen Standards konsolidieren und stärken.

Zudem hofft die Kommission, dass das angekündigte vierte Reformpaket für die Justiz allen Bürgern der Türkei ermöglichen wird, ihre Rechte im Einklang mit der Europäischen Menschenrechtskonvention und der Rechtsprechung des Europäischen Gerichtshofs für Menschenrechte uneingeschränkt wahrzunehmen.

Hinsichtlich des kürzlich ergangenen Urteils im Fall Leyla Zana verweist die Kommission auf ihre Antworten auf frühere Anfragen (E-005321/2012, P-005430/2012, E-005520/2012 und E-005584/2012) ([1]).

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

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005529/12
aan de Commissie
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE) en Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Koerdische rechten in het kader van de positieve agenda met Turkije en de toekomstige grondwet van dat land

Op 17 mei 2012 werd in Ankara de nieuwe „positieve agenda" gelanceerd, die bedoeld is om het toetredingsproces van Turkije nieuw leven in te blazen. De positieve agenda is niet bedoeld als vervanging, maar wel als aanvulling op en steun voor het toetredingsproces van Turkije, met name op de volgende gebieden: afstemming op de EU-wetgeving; politieke hervormingen en grondrechten; visa, mobiliteit en migratie; handel; energie; terrorismebestrijding en dialoog inzake buitenlands beleid. In het kader van de positieve agenda zullen werkgroepen worden opgericht om de afstemming van het Turkse beleid op de beleidslijnen en normen van de EU voor acht hoofdstukken te versnellen. Op 17 mei werd.d. eerste werkgroep, de werkgroep over hoofdstuk 23, die zich bezighoudt met rechten inzake rechtspraak, grondrechten en corruptiebestrijding, gelanceerd.

In dit verband stellen we de volgende vragen:

1. In de toespraak van commissaris Füle op de lanceringsvergadering met Turkije voor hoofdstuk 23, werd gezegd dat er „meer gedaan moet worden om mensen die tot een minderheid behoren, te beschermen en de culturele rechten te bevorderen". Betekent dit dat de Koerdische bevolking in Turkije de inhoud van het onderwijsbeleid zal kunnen bepalen, dat onderwijs in het Koerdisch moet kunnen en dat het Koerdisch vrij gebruikt mag worden in de politiek? Welke andere culturele rechten en rechten ter bescherming van de Koerden moeten gegarandeerd worden? Hoe kan de Commissie ervoor zorgen dat deze rechten geëerbiedigd worden?

2. Is de Commissie, wat de oprichting van een nieuwe, onafhankelijke Hoge Raad van rechters en officieren van justitie betreft, voorstander van een stelsel dat garandeert dat minderheden, zoals de Koerden, vertegenwoordigd zijn in de Hoge Raad?

3. Wanneer er binnenkort een nieuwe, niet-discriminerende, pluralistische grondwet voor Turkije wordt opgesteld, moet men streven naar een vreedzame oplossing voor het Koerdische vraagstuk. De goedkeuring van zulke grondwet vereist evenwel een nationale consensus over twistpunten zoals burgerschap, de antiterrorismewet, onderwijs in het Koerdisch en het verlagen van de nationale kiesdrempel van 10 %. Is de Commissie niet van mening dat deze vraagstukken moeten worden opgelost in het kader van de nieuwe grondwet? Is de Commissie niet van mening dat er eveneens een oplossing voor het Koerdische vraagstuk gevonden moet worden via de nieuwe grondwet?

4. Wat is de reactie van de Commissie op het feit dat de winnares van de Sacharovprijs, Leyla Zana, onlangs tot 10 jaar cel veroordeeld is door een rechtbank in Diyarbakir? Welke gevolgen zal dit hebben voor de toetredingsgesprekken met Turkije?

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

De Commissie heeft steeds benadrukt dat een evenwichtige en eerlijke oplossing voor de Koerdische kwestie moet worden gevonden. Zij heeft tot haar spijt vastgesteld dat de „democratische opening" van 2009, die met name een oplossing voor de Koerdische kwestie moest bieden, niet verder is gevolgd. Hoewel er vooruitgang is geboekt op het gebied van culturele rechten, zijn verdere inspanningen nodig. De aanhouding van verkozen vertegenwoordigers en mensenrechtenverdedigers geeft reden tot bezorgdheid en belemmert het lokale bestuur. Een volledig verslag over buitengerechtelijke executies en foltering in het zuidoosten in de jaren '80 en '90 moet nog worden vastgesteld overeenkomstig de wettelijk voorziene procedure. Landmijnen en het systeem van dorpswachten zijn nog steeds een bron van zorg.

De Commissie heeft bij herhaling benadrukt dat het zuidoosten van Turkije vrede, democratie en stabiliteit, alsook sociale, economische en culturele ontwikkeling nodig heeft. Dit kan slechts worden verwezenlijkt via een consensus over concrete maatregelen waarmee de sociale, economische en culturele rechten van de mensen die in de regio wonen, worden uitgebreid. De lopende herziening van de grondwet biedt een kader om de Koerdische kwestie op een inclusieve en participatieve wijze aan te pakken.

De nieuwe grondwet moet de rechtsstaat en de grondrechten van alle Turkse burgers consolideren en versterken, in overeenstemming met de Europese normen.

De Commissie hoopt ook dat het aangekondigde vierde justitiële hervormingspakket ertoe zal bijdragen dat alle burgers van Turkije hun rechten ten volle kunnen uitoefenen in overeenstemming met het Europees Verdrag voor de rechten van de mens en de jurisprudentie van het Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens.

Wat de recente uitspraak in de zaak Leyla Zana betreft, verwijst de Commissie naar haar antwoorden op eerdere vragen E-005321/2012, P-005430/2012, E-005520/2012 en E-005584/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005529/12
to the Commission
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE), Bart Staes (Verts/ALE) and Jürgen Klute (GUE/NGL)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Kurdish rights in the positive agenda with Turkey and its future constitution

On 17 May 2012 the new 'positive agenda', which aims to keep the accession process of Turkey alive, was launched in Ankara. The positive agenda aims not to replace, but to complement and support Turkey's accession process, mainly in the following areas: alignment with EU legislation; political reforms and fundamental rights; visas, mobility and migration; trade; energy; counter-terrorism and dialogue on foreign policy. Under the positive agenda working groups will be set up to accelerate the process of Turkey's alignment with EU policies and standards under eight chapters. On 17 May the first working group, on Chapter 23, dealing with judicial and fundamental rights and anti-corruption, was launched.

In this context, we ask the following questions:

1. In Commissioner Füle's speech at the Chapter 23 kick-off meeting with Turkey, it was said that 'more needs to be done for the protection of persons belonging to minorities, and for cultural rights'. Does this mean that the Kurdish population in Turkey will be able to determine the content of education policy, that the Kurdish language must be allowed in education, and that Kurdish can be used freely in politics? Which other Kurdish protective and cultural rights should be guaranteed? How can the Commission push for them to become reality?

2. As regards the establishment of a new, independent High Council of judges and prosecutors, does the Commission favour a system that would impose a guaranteed representation of minorities, like the Kurds, in the High Council?

3. The upcoming drafting of a new Turkish non-discriminatory, pluralist constitution must seek a peaceful resolution of the Kurdish question. Approval of such a constitution, however, requires national consensus on contentious issues such as citizenship, the anti-terror law, Kurdish-language education and lowering the 10 % national electoral threshold. Does the Commission believe these issues need to be resolved within the framework of the new constitution? Does the Commission believe a solution to the Kurdish issue must also be reached via the new civil constitution?

4. What is the Commission's reaction to the recent sentencing of Sakharov Prize winner Leyla Zana to 10 years in prison by a court in Diyarbakir? How will this influence the accession talks with Turkey?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(20 July 2012)

The Commission has continuously stressed that a balanced and fair solution to the Kurdish issue needs to be found. It has noted with regret that the 2009 democratic opening, aimed at addressing the Kurdish issue in particular, was not followed through. Although there has been progress on cultural rights, further efforts still have to be made. The detention of elected representatives and human right defenders raise concern and hamper local government. Full account about extra-judicial killings and torture in the south-east in the 1980s and 1990s has yet to be established following the due process of law. Landmines and the village guard system are still causes for concern.

The Commission has repeatedly underlined that the south-east of Turkey needs peace, democracy and stability as well as social, economic and cultural development. This can only be achieved via consensus on concrete measures expanding the social, economic and cultural rights of the people living in the region. The ongoing revision of the constitution offers a framework to address the Kurdish issue in an inclusive and participatory manner.

The new constitution needs to consolidate and reinforce the rule of law and fundamental rights of all Turkish citizens, in line with European standards.

The Commission is also hopeful that the announced fourth judicial reform package will help allowing all citizens of Turkey to fully enjoy their rights in accordance with the European Convention on Human Rights and the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights.

As regards the recent ruling in the Leyla Zana case, the Commission would like to refer to its reply to previous Questions E-005321/2012, P-005430/2012, E-005520/2012 and E-005584/2012 ([1]).

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

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005530/12
aan de Commissie
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(31 mei 2012)

Betreft: Rechten van dove passagiers in luchtvaart

Een groepje van 4 dove jongeren boekt online een vliegtuigticket. Zij krijgen echter spoedig een e-mailbericht waarin staat „de luchtvaartmaatschappij heeft echter laten weten op deze vlucht om de veiligheid te kunnen garanderen maximaal 2 slechthorende onbegeleide mensen te kunnen toestaan." Vervolgens worden hun 3 mogelijkheden aangeboden: 1) Ze moeten vergezeld worden door een begeleider; 2) Ten minste twee van de reizigers moeten toch voldoende horen om verantwoord te kunnen reizen, m.a.w. deze reizigers moeten voldoende kunnen horen om ook de gesproken aanwijzingen van het cabinepersoneel op te kunnen volgen, en zo de veiligheid van henzelf en ook de andere reizigers te kunnen garanderen; 3) de vlucht kan voor 2 reizigers worden omgeboekt naar een ander tijdstip; Hierbij gelden minimale wijzigingskosten van 70 euro per persoon.

De jongeren wensen echter niet begeleid te worden aangezien zij zich zelfstandig kunnen verplaatsen en niet beperkt zijn qua mobiliteit, ze willen samen reizen en begrijpen niet dat ze geweigerd worden om veiligheidsredenen. Dit is blijkbaar geen alleenstaand geval.

In die context graag volgende vragen aan de Commissie:

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van gelijkaardige weigeringen? Ontving zij (of Solvit) nog andere klachten terzake?

2. Hoe evalueert de Commissie deze situatie in het licht van Verordening (EG) nr. 261/2004 en Verordening (EG) nr. 1107/2006? Acht zij de opgegeven reden (veiligheid) geldig en proportioneel? Zo ja waarom, zo neen waarom niet? Kunnen de nodige aanwijzingen niet op een andere manier worden gecommuniceerd?

3. Erkent de Commissie dat deze casus een mogelijke „loophole" in de bestaande wetgeving illustreert?

4. Zal de Commissie deze kwestie mee in beschouwing nemen in het kader van de lopende herziening van de betrokken wetgeving, teneinde de noodzakelijke verbeteringen aan te brengen zodat dergelijke situaties in de toekomst worden vermeden? Wat wil de Commissie concreet voorstellen?

5. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie het feit dat aan passagiers wordt gevraagd aan te geven of zij doof/slechthorend zijn? Is dit conform de wetgeving? Kunnen passagiers hiertoe worden verplicht?

6. Indien passagiers bij de boeking niet aanduiden dat ze doof/slechthorend zijn, kan het reisbureau/de luchtvaartmaatschappij dan een klacht indienen tegen hen?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(13 juli 2012)

1. De Commissie heeft recentelijk via haar officiële kanalen ([1]) geen klachten ontvangen in verband met de rechten van dove vliegtuigpassagiers. Zij ontvangt ieder jaar een tiental klachten op het gebied van de rechten van gehandicapte passagiers of personen met beperkte mobiliteit. Ondertussen lijkt het onderhavige geval te zijn opgelost.

2. Overeenkomstig Verordening (EG) nr. 1107/2006 ([2]) mogen luchtvaartmaatschappijen om redenen van een handicap boekingen van gehandicapten weigeren om te voldoen aan de veiligheidseisen die zijn vastgesteld in de internationale, EU- of nationale wetgeving of door de autoriteit die de vergunning tot vluchtuitvoering aan de betrokken luchtvaartmaatschappij heeft afgegeven. Ook mogen zij eisen dat een gehandicapte wordt begeleid door een andere persoon. Luchtvaartmaatschappijen moeten wel voorzien in transparante en toegankelijke gegevens betreffende de veiligheid. Ook moeten zij hun besluit, zoals dat waaraan de geachte Afgevaardigde refereert, op verzoek schriftelijk motiveren binnen vijf werkdagen na dat verzoek. De Commissie is niet in staat om op het onderhavige geval commentaar te leveren. De nationale handhavingsinstanties zijn verantwoordelijk voor de afhandeling van klachten van passagiers.

([1]) Via het SOLVIT-netwerk of Uw Europa — Advies; per brief gestelde vragen van burgers die direct of via het Europe Direct Contactcentrum (EDCC) zijn ontvangen.

([2]) Verordening (EG) nr. 1107/2006 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 5 juli 2006 inzake de rechten van gehandicapten en personen met beperkte mobiliteit die per luchtvervoer reizen, PB L 204 van 26.7.2006, blz. 1.

In haar mededeling van 11 april 2011 ([3]) heeft de Commissie echter erkend dat er te veel situaties van instapweigering op grond van onduidelijke veiligheidseisen voorkomen. Om onduidelijke situaties 3. te verduidelijken, heeft de Commissie op 14 juni 2012 richtsnoeren voor de toepassing van de verordening bekendgemaakt om luchtvaartmaatschappijen te helpen de toepassing te verbeteren ([4]).

4. De onderhavige herziening heeft geen betrekking heeft op Verordening (EG) nr. 1107/2006. Zie ook het antwoord op vraag 3.

5. Passagiers zijn niet verplicht om bij het reserveren aan te geven dat zij doof of slechthorend zijn. Als gehandicapte passagiers bijstand nodig hebben, wordt hun echter sterk aangeraden om dit ten minste 48 uur vóór de reis aan de luchtvaartmaatschappijen mee te delen. Indien zij dit niet doen, zijn luchtvaartmaatschappijen en beheersorganen van luchthavens slechts verplicht zich alle redelijkerwijze mogelijke inspanningen te getroosten om medewerking te verlenen.

6. Nee. Zie het antwoord op vraag 5.

([3]) Verslag van de Commissie aan het Europees Parlement en de Raad inzake de werking en het effect van Verordening (EG) nr. 1107/2006 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 5 juli 2006 inzake de rechten van gehandicapten en personen met beperkte mobiliteit die per luchtvervoer reizen. COM(2011)166 def.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/air/doc/prm/2012-06-11-swd-2012-171_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005530/12
to the Commission
Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Rights of deaf passengers in air travel

A group of four young deaf people booked an airline ticket online. Soon after they received an e-mail stating that 'the airline company has made it known that in order to be able to guarantee safety on this flight, a maximum of two hearing-impaired unescorted individuals will be permitted.' They were then offered three options: (1) They must be accompanied by an escort; (2) At least two of the passengers must be able to hear sufficiently in order to be able to travel safely (in other words, these travellers must be able to hear sufficiently in order to be able to follow spoken instructions from cabin personnel, and therefore be able to guarantee their own safety and that of their fellow passengers); (3) Rebook the flight for another time for two of the passengers; a minimum rebooking fee of EUR 70 per person would apply in this case.

These young people do not wish to be escorted given that they are capable of moving around independently and are not restricted in terms of mobility. They wish to travel together and do not understand that they are being refused for safety reasons. This is apparently not an isolated case.

In view of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is the Commission aware of similar refusals? Has it (or Solvit) received any similar complaints?

2. How does the Commission evaluate this situation in light of Provision (EC) No 261/2004 and Provision (EC) No 1107/2006? Does it consider the supplied reason (safety) as valid and proportional? If yes, why? If not, why not? Can the necessary instructions not be communicated in a different manner?

3. Does the Commission recognise that this case illustrates a possible 'loophole' in the existing legislation?

4. Will the Commission take this matter into consideration within the scope of the current review of the relevant legislation, with the objective of introducing the necessary improvements to avoid similar situations in the future? What does the Commission wish to propose in concrete terms?

5. How does the Commission assess the fact that passengers are asked to indicate whether they are deaf/hearing-impaired? Is this in accordance with legislation? Can passengers be obliged to do this?

6. Can the travel agent/airline company file a complaint against the passengers if they do not indicate whether they are deaf/hearing-impaired at the time of booking?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(13 July 2012)

1. The Commission has not recently received through any of its official channels ([1]) complaints related to the rights of deaf passengers travelling by air. It receives a dozen complaints per year related to the rights of disabled air passengers or passengers with reduced mobility. In the meantime, the current case seems to have been solved.

2. According to Regulation 1107/2006 ([2]) air carriers may refuse, on the grounds of disability, to accept a reservation from a disabled person in order to meet safety requirements established by international, EU or national law or by the authority that issued their operator's certificate. They may also require that a disabled person be accompanied by another person. Air carriers must, however, provide transparent and accessible information about their safety rules. They must also motivate their decision such as the one referred to by the Honourable Member, including on request in writing within five working days of the request. The Commission is not in a position to comment on the case at stake. It is for the National Enforcement Bodies (NEBs) to handle passenger complaints.

([1]) Solvit network or questions received by Your Europe Advice, letters from citizens received directly or via the Europe Direct Contact Centre (EDCC).

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 concerning the rights of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility when travelling by air, 26.7.2006, OJ L 204, p. 1.

3. In its communication of 11 April 2011 ([3]), the Commission recognised that there are too many denied boarding situations on the basis of unclear safety reasons. To clarify unclear situations, the Commission published on 14 June 2012 guidelines on the application of the regulation in order to help air carriers to improve application ([4]).

4. The current review does not concern Regulation 1107/2006. See also answer to question 3.

5. Disabled passengers are not obliged to indicate at the time of booking whether they are deaf/hearing impaired. However, if they need assistance they are strongly advised to notify air carriers at least 48 hours in advance of travel. If they do not do so, airlines and airport managing bodies are only obliged to make all reasonable efforts to provide assistance.

6. No. See answer to question 5.

([3]) Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the functioning and effects of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 concerning the rights of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility when travelling by air, COM(2011) 166 final.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/passengers/air/doc/prm/2012-06-11-swd-2012-171_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005531/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti comunitari a favore della società cooperativa sociale onlus «Agorà»

La società cooperativa sociale onlus senza fini di lucro «Agorà», con sede a Roma, svolge la funzione di centro servizi, mira cioè innanzi tutto a creare un raccordo tra domanda e offerta lavorativa e a servire l'interesse generale della comunità attraverso la gestione di servizi sociosanitari, educativi e di vario genere.

I soci della cooperativa mettono a disposizione le proprie competenze offrendo agli utenti servizi quali:

— assistenza infermieristica e sociosanitaria e interventi di prevenzione, cura, riabilitazione e inserimento nell'ambito della famiglia, della scuola e dell'ambiente di lavoro;

— studio e verifica dei bisogni territoriali;

— attività di consulenza, soprattutto per le fasce sociali deboli;

— organizzazione e svolgimento di corsi di formazione professionale;

— promozione, avviamento, finanziamento e sviluppo delle attività di associazioni cooperative;

— organizzazione e gestione di servizi di informazione e promozione culturale, sociale, ambientale e sportiva;

— gestione, diretta e associata, di strutture e residenze sociali, sanitarie e sociosanitarie per le fasce di popolazione emarginate;

— attività di promozione di turismo sociale e agriturismo in forma diretta, associata e consortile;

— costituzione di fondi per lo sviluppo tecnologico e per la ristrutturazione e il potenziamento aziendale.

Premesso che tale cooperativa sociale promuove molteplici servizi di varia natura, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. quali finanziamenti comunitari potrebbero sostenere le attività sopra esposte;

2. un quadro generale della situazione.

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(23 luglio 2012)

Il Fondo sociale europeo (FSE) è il fondo dell'UE che può sostenere questo tipo di attività. Concretamente, per quanto concerne Roma il programma operativo del FSE per la regione Lazio (2007-2013) può sostenere alcune delle attività menzionate nell'interrogazione, più in particolare quelle relative all'organizzazione e alla gestione di corsi di formazione professionale. La regione Lazio è responsabile della gestione e dell'implementazione del programma e può fornire tutte le informazioni necessarie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005531/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Possible EU funding for the non-profit social cooperative 'Agorà'

The non-profit social cooperative 'Agorà', based in Rome, acts as a service centre focusing primarily on matching labour supply and demand, while serving the general interests of the community by operating health, social, educational and various other services.

The cooperative's members make their skills available by offering users services such as:

— nursing, health and social services, including social integration initiatives and preventive, therapeutic and rehabilitative treatments within the family home, at school and at work;

— researching and identifying needs in the local area;

— consultancy services, mainly for the vulnerable strata of society;

— organising and running professional training courses;

— promoting, launching, funding and developing the work of other cooperative associations;

— organising and running promotional and informational services on cultural, social, environmental and sporting themes;

— running (directly and through partnership arrangements) day and residential social and/or health facilities for marginalised groups;

— promoting social tourism and agritourism directly, in partnerships or through consortia;

— establishing funds for technological development and for restructuring and strengthening local businesses.

Since this social cooperative offers such a wide range of services, can the Commission provide:

1. Information on which EU funds could support the above activities?

2. A general overview of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

The European Social Fund (ESF) is the EU fund which can support this type of activities. Concretely for Rome, the ESF operational programme for the Lazio Region (2007-2013) can support some of the activities identified in the question, more specifically those concerning the organisation and running of professional training courses. The Lazio Region is responsible for the management and implementation of the programme and can provide all the necessary information.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005532/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti per il complesso immobiliare «Il Poggetto»

Il complesso immobiliare «Il Poggetto» è adiacente al centro storico di Monte Roberto, uno dei Castelli di Jesi, in una zona di notevole interesse turistico, culturale ed economico.

Lo stesso complesso presenta interesse dal punto di vista del patrimonio storico.

Sul terreno si trovano bosco autoctono, ulivi secolari e si applica il metodo della coltura biologica, certificata da 10 anni dall'ente di controllo «Suolo e salute».

I diversi edifici che compongono il complesso immobiliare sono in parte da ristrutturare e/o ricostruire.

La struttura può essere parte di un ampio progetto finalizzato a realizzare un centro di soggiorno e cura per il benessere psicofisico basato sulle risorse del territorio che, situato a media altitudine (350 metri sul livello del mare), è adatto per ospiti di ogni età.

La finalità del progetto è creare posti di lavoro e favorire lo sviluppo di Monte Roberto capoluogo, nell'entroterra della provincia di Ancona, offrendo ospitalità al di fuori delle mete più frequentate sulla costa.

Il complesso immobiliare si presta a differenti tipi di utilizzazione e trasformazione in una struttura per:

— ricettività di tipo turistico con alloggi in mini appartamenti con o senza ristorazione;

— anziani autosufficienti ed assistiti;

— assistenza all'handicap;

— cure e terapie legate alla natura come la pet-therapy;

— ricerca e studio legati alla conoscenza e alla salvaguardia dell'ambiente autoctono, delle erbe spontanee, delle acque, delle colture come l'ulivo e la vite, del bosco naturale ecc;

— ritiri sportivi.

Ciò premesso, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. Quali di queste proposte possono divenire oggetto di finanziamenti europei?

2. Esistono finanziamenti comunitari destinati alla valorizzazione del patrimonio artistico?

3. Può fornire un quadro generale della situazione?

Risposta data da Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(19 luglio 2012)

Nelle regioni che fanno parte dell'obiettivo «Competitività regionale e occupazione», come le Marche, il Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) cofinanzia progetti di protezione e valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale se essi fanno parte di una strategia a favore dello sviluppo socioeconomico e se la promozione dei beni culturali si orienta, in tali regioni, verso uno sviluppo del turismo sostenibile. Per le Marche, il programma 2007-2013 prevede tale possibilità in seno alla priorità V «Promozione del territorio».

I progetti rvocati dall'onorevole parlamentare possono essere ammissibili a condizione che siano conformi agli obiettivi summenzionati e alle disposizioni specifiche del programma. In base al principio di gestione condivisa applicato alla gestione della politica di coesione, la selezione dei progetti e la loro attuazione compete alle autorità nazionali. Per maggiori informazioni, la Commissione suggerisce pertanto all'onorevole parlamentare di contattare direttamente l'autorità che gestisce il programma:

Autorità di Gestione POR Marche
Via Tiziano, 44 — 60125 Ancona
e-mail funzione.politichecomunitarie@regione.marche.it
Tel.: +390718063801, Fax +390718063037.

Informazioni sui progetti relativi al patrimonio culturale, cofinanziati dai Fondi strutturali a livello UE, sono reperibili al seguente indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/projects/stories/index_it.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005532/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Possible funding for the 'Il Poggetto' building complex

The 'Il Poggetto' building complex is adjacent to the historic centre of Monte Roberto in the Castelli di Jesi area, which is of considerable tourist, cultural and economic importance.

The complex itself is of historical heritage interest.

The land contains indigenous woodland and centuries-old olive trees, with organic farmland that has been certified for 10 years by the accreditation body 'Suolo e salute' [Soil and health].

Several buildings in the complex need to be renovated or rebuilt.

Proposals include the structure as part of a wide-ranging project to create a residential treatment centre promoting mental and physical wellbeing using the resources in the local area, whose relatively low altitude (350 metres above sea level) makes it suitable for guests of all ages.

The aim of the project is to create jobs and encourage development in and around Monte Roberto, at the heart of the Ancona province, by offering hospitality away from the most popular destinations on the coast.

The building complex lends itself to a range of uses, and could be converted for:

— tourist accommodation with mini-apartments, with or without restoration;

— sheltered accommodation for independent elderly people and those needing care;

— services for disabled people;

— nature-based treatments and therapies, such as pet therapy;

— research and studies relating to knowledge and protection of the indigenous environment, wild herbs, water, crops such as olives and grapes, natural woodlands, etc.;

— sports camps.

Can the Commission state:

1. Which of these proposals would qualify for European funding?

2. Is there any EU funding available for cultural heritage enrichment projects?

3. What is the general situation in this field?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

In Regional Competitiveness and Employment objective regions, such as Marche, the European Regional Development Fund provides the possibility to co-finance projects protecting and enhancing cultural heritage if they are part of a strategy to support socioeconomic development and if the promotion of cultural assets is in line with the development of sustainable tourism for the regions. The 2007-13 programme for Marche includes this possibility under the priority V 'Promotion of territories'.

The projects mentioned by the Honourable Member could be eligible provided they comply with the abovementioned objective and the specific provisions of the programme. 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. For more information, the Commission therefore suggests that the Honourable Member contact directly the managing authority of the programme:

Autorità di Gestione POR Marche
Via Tiziano, 44 — 60125 Ancona
e-mail funzione.politichecomunitarie@regione.marche.it,
Phone +390718063801, Fax +390718063037

Information on cultural heritage projects co-financed under the Structural Funds at EU level is available at the following address: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/projects/stories/index_it.cfm

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-005533/12
adresată Comisiei
Iosif Matula (PPE)
(31 mai 2012)

Subiect: Educația școlară timpurie

Tot mai multe state au adoptat ca prioritate educația școlară timpurie. Studiile arată că investițiile în educația preșcolară și îngrijirea copiilor de vârstă mică aduc profituri mai mari decât fondurile alocate oricărui alt ciclu școlar: primii ani de învățământ reduc costurile educaționale ulterioare și cresc considerabil șansele în viață ale copiilor, fie că vorbim de integrare socială, de reducere a sărăciei, de mobilitate sau egalitate de gen.

Între vârsta de cinci și opt ani, copiii sunt foarte activi în descoperirea lumii din jurul lor, iar îndrumarea de către personalul specializat este esențială în dezvoltarea socială, intelectuală, creativă și emoțională.

Beneficiile educației timpurii sunt atât de natură socială, cât și economică și, prin urmare, aceasta este o necesitate și nicidecum un lux.

Având în vedere faptul că încă nu există acest tip de educație în unele dintre statele membre UE — iar în altele este în fază incipientă — și luând în calcul suveranitatea țărilor Uniunii în ceea ce privește domeniul educației, aș dori să adresez Comisiei Europene următoarele întrebări:

1. Care este stadiul actual al educației școlare timpurii la nivelul Uniunii Europene?

2. În ce fel vedeți rolul viitor al învățământului preșcolar în Europa?

3. Ce măsuri are în vedere Comisia pentru a încuraja statele membre să dezvolte sistemul educațional timpuriu?

Răspuns dat de dna Vassiliou în numele Comisiei
(3 iulie 2012)

Agenda UE pentru drepturile copilului ([1]) subliniază faptul că asigurarea accesului tuturor copiilor la educația și îngrijirea copiilor preșcolari (EICP) este baza succesului învățării pe tot parcursul vieții, al integrării sociale, al dezvoltării personale și al capacității ulterioare de inserție profesională. Comisia sprijină statele membre în vederea îmbunătățirii furnizării și calității EICP prin intermediul metodei deschise de coordonare.

În plus, în cursul actualei perioade de programare 2007-2013, sprijinul pentru infrastructurile pentru îngrijirea copiilor este eligibil pentru finanțare din Fondul european de dezvoltare regională. Pentru UE-27, s-a stabilit o sumă totală de 568 664 352 EUR în cadrul categoriei 77.

În 2002, Consiliul European ([2]) a stabilit obiective pentru furnizarea de servicii de îngrijire a copilului pe teritoriul UE ([3]).

În plus, Consiliul a convenit un criteriu de referință european conform căruia, până în 2020, cel puțin 95% dintre copiii cu vârsta cuprinsă între 4 ani și vârsta pentru înscrierea obligatorie la școala primară ar trebui să beneficieze de EICP ([4]). Procentul respectiv se situează în prezent la 91,7% (conform datelor din 2009).

Comisia a adoptat o comunicare ([5]) privind EICP în 2011, care a fost urmată de concluziile Consiliului. Statele membre au fost invitate să asigure un acces echitabil și generalizat la servicii EICP de înaltă calitate și să investească în EICP ca măsură de stimulare a creșterii. Comisia a fost invitată, printre altele, să sprijine schimbul de bune practici și să extindă baza de exemple din acest domeniu.

([1]) COM (2011) 60 final.
([2]) Concluziile Președinției, Consiliul European de la Barcelona din 2002, SN 100/1/02 REV 1; http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/71025.pdf
([3]) Statele membre ar trebui să elimine constrângerile la adresa participării femeilor la forța de muncă și să se străduiască, luând în considerare cererea de servicii de îngrijire a copilului și în concordanță cu modelele naționale de furnizare a serviciilor respective, până în anul 2010, să ofere servicii de îngrijire a copilului pentru:
— cel puțin 90% dintre copiii cu vârsta cuprinsă între 3 ani și vârsta obligatorie de școlarizare și
— cel puțin 33% dintre copiii cu vârsta sub 3 ani.
([4]) Cadrul strategic pentru cooperarea europeană în domeniul educației și formării profesionale (ET 2020), JO 2009/C 119/02.
([5]) Comunicare privind educația și îngrijirea copiilor preșcolari: să oferim tuturor copiilor noștri cea mai bună pregătire pentru lumea de mâine [COM(2011) 66].

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005533/12
to the Commission
Iosif Matula (PPE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Early years' education

More and more countries have made early years education a priority. Studies show that investment in pre-school education and the provision of care for young children yields greater benefits than the funding allocated to any other stage of education. The first years of children's education reduce subsequent educational costs and considerably increase their chances in life in terms of social integration, reduced risk of poverty, mobility and gender equality.

Between the ages of five and eight, children are very actively engaged in discovering the world around them, and the guidance of specialised staff is essential in their social, intellectual, creative and emotional development.

The benefits of early years' education are both social and economic and, as such, it is a necessity and not a luxury.

Given that this type of education does not exist in some EU Member States and in others is only in its infancy, and since EU countries have sovereign rights in the field of education, can the Commission state:

1. What the current state of play is concerning early years education across the EU;

2. How it views the future role of pre-school education in Europe;

3. What measures it is considering to encourage Member States to develop the early years' education system?

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

The EU Agenda for the Rights of the Child ([1]) emphasises that giving all children access to early childhood education and care (ECEC) is the foundation for successful lifelong learning, social integration, personal development and later employability. The Commission supports Member States to improve the supply and quality of ECEC through the Open Method of Coordination.

In addition, during the current programming period 2007-2013 support to childcare facilities is eligible under the European Regional Development Fund. For the EU-27 a total of EUR 568,664,352 is decided under Category c7.

In 2002 the European Council ([2]) set objectives for childcare provision across the EU ([3]).

In addition, the Council has agreed a European benchmark that by 2020 at least 95 % for children between 4 years old and the age of starting compulsory education should participate in ECEC ([4]). The rate currently stands at 91.7 % (2009 data).

The Commission adopted a communication ([5]) on ECEC in 2011 which was followed by Council conclusions. Member States were invited to ensure equitable, generalised access to high-quality ECEC services and to invest in ECEC as a growth enhancing measure. The Commission was invited *inter alia* to support the exchange of good practice and to broaden the evidence-base.

([1]) COM(2011) 60 final.
([2]) Presidency Conclusions, Barcelona European Council 2002, SN 100/1/02 REV 1, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/71025.pdf
([3]) Member States should remove disincentives to female labour force participation and strive, taking into account the demand for childcare services and in line with the national patterns of childcare provision, to provide childcare by 2010 to:
– at least 90 % of children between 3 years old and the mandatory school age, and
– at least 33 % of children under 3 years of age.
([4]) A strategic framework of European cooperation in education and training (ET 2020), OJ 2009/C 119/02.
([5]) Communication on early childhood education and care: providing our children with the best start for the world of tomorrow (COM(2011) 66).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-005534/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 maggio 2012)

Oggetto: Livelli di cromo esavalente nell'acqua potabile

Premesso che:

— è ormai accertata la pericolosità per l'uomo e per l'ambiente del cromo esavalente,

— sono provati clinicamente i suoi effetti cancerogeni, mutageni e teratogeni sull'uomo e sugli animali,

— tutti gli organismi internazionali pongono quale limite massimo per le acque di falda superficiali un livello di cromo esavalente pari a 5 ppm,

l'interrogante pone i quesiti di seguito riportati.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza del fatto che in alcuni paesi dell'Unione, in particolare in Italia, nelle acque destinate a uso umano e considerate potabili vengono autorizzati livelli di cromo totale (quindi cromo trivalente ed esavalente) di 50 ppm? Il cromo trivalente non è pericoloso per gli organismi umani e animali ma, quando si trova in acqua, diventa per il 90 % cromo esavalente; sappiamo quindi con certezza che, quando si parla di cromo totale in un'acqua potabile, il 90 % sarà rappresentato da cromo esavalente e solamente il 10 % da cromo trivalente. Pertanto, imporre un limite di 50 ppm di cromo totale per le acque potabili destinate a uso umano significa autorizzare la presenza di 40 ppm di cromo esavalente estremamente pericoloso per l'uomo. Tale valore è otto volte superiore al limite massimo consentito per il cromo esavalente presente nelle acque di falda superficiali. È evidente che i paesi che hanno una legislazione come quella descritta permettono, di fatto, l'avvelenamento delle rispettive popolazioni.

2. Intende la Commissione monitorare attentamente le legislazioni nazionali che permettono il paradosso descritto? Come intende intervenire per salvaguardare la salute delle popolazioni interessate?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(5 luglio 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dell'inquinamento da cromo nell'Italia settentrionale e in alcune regioni della Grecia ed ha affrontato la questione nelle risposte alle interrogazioni scritte E-002339/2011 dell'onorevole Theodoros Skylakakis e E-009019/2011 dell'onorevole Michail Tremopoulos.

Oltre ad aver risposto in merito, la Commissione sta attualmente valutando le relazioni degli Stati membri sulla qualità dell'acqua potabile riguardanti i dati del periodo 2008-2010. A seconda delle informazioni in materia, comunicate nelle suddette relazioni, la Commissione deciderà quali siano i provvedimenti più adeguati da adottare.

Anche se passando da un approvvigionamento idrico proveniente da una fonte inquinata a un approvvigionamento idrico sicuro si risolveranno i problemi di qualità dell'acqua potabile, rimane l'obbligo di adottare misure correttive per quanto riguarda le fonti di acqua inquinata a norma della direttiva-quadro sulle acque ([1]). La direttiva stabilisce l'obbligo di conseguire/mantenere un «buono stato» di tutte le acque in generale, entro il 2015.

In tale contesto, nella *relazione della Commissione ai sensi dell'articolo 3, paragrafo 7, della direttiva 2006/118/CE sulla definizione di valori soglia per le acque sotterranee* ([2]), l'Italia riferisce di aver fissato il valore parametrico di 50 microgrammi/l di cromo totale e di 5 microgrammi/l di cromo esavalente nelle acque sotterranee.

In conclusione la Commissione è del parere che le autorità italiane siano consapevoli della situazione del cromo esavalente nel loro paese e si siano impegnate ad adottare le necessarie azioni correttive.

([1]) Direttiva 2000/60/CE, GU L 327 del 22.12.2000.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/groundwater/pdf/IT.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005534/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Hexavalent chromium levels in drinking water

Hexavalent chromium has been shown to be hazardous to human health and the environment and has been clinically demonstrated to have carcinogenic, mutagenic and teratogenic effects on humans and animals.

Given that all international bodies have set a maximum limit for hexavalent chromium in surface groundwater of 5 ppm, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware that, in some EU countries (Italy in particular), water is considered fit for human consumption with total permitted chromium levels (i.e. trivalent and hexavalent chromium) of 50 ppm? Trivalent chromium is not hazardous for humans or animals, but when in water 90% of it turns into hexavalent chromium. It is therefore certain that, of the total chromium in drinking water, 90% will be hexavalent chromium, and only 10% will be trivalent chromium. Hence, setting a limit of 50 ppm total chromium in drinking water for human consumption equates to permitting levels of 40 ppm of hexavalent chromium, which is highly dangerous for human health. This amount is eight times higher than the maximum permitted limit for hexavalent chromium in surface groundwater. Clearly, countries with the legislative arrangements described above are effectively sanctioning the poisoning of their own people.

2. Does the Commission intend to monitor strictly national laws that permit this abnormal situation? What action will it be taking to protect the health of the people affected?

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

The Commission is aware of chromium pollution in northern Italy and some areas of Greece and has referred to it in answers to Written Questions E-002339/2011 by Theodoros Skylakakis and E-009019/2011 by Michail Tremopoulos.

In addition to those answers, the Commission is currently assessing the reports by the Member States on drinking water quality covering data from 2008-2010. Depending on the information provided in these reports in relation to chromium, the Commission will decide upon the appropriate steps to take.

Whilst change of water supply from a polluted source to a safe supply will solve drinking water quality problems, there remains the obligation of taking remedial action on the polluted sources of water under the Water Framework Directive ([1]). This directive sets the obligation to achieve/maintain 'good status' for all waters as a rule by 2015.

In this context, as per Report from the Commission in accordance with Article 3.7 of the Groundwater Directive 2006/118/EC on the establishment of groundwater threshold values ([2]), Italy reported having set the parametric value of 50 micrograms/l for chromium total and 5 micrograms/l for Chromium VI, in ground water.

In conclusion, it is our understanding that the Italian authorities are aware of the situation of chromium VI in their country and have committed to undertake necessary remedial actions.

([1]) Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/groundwater/pdf/com_staff_wd_166-10.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005540/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: Prevention of premature births

The causes of premature birth are still not clearly understood, with approximately half (45-50 %) of all premature births occurring spontaneously, without any known cause. Of the rest, about 30 % are caused by PROM — premature rupture of membranes — and another 15 to 20 % are because of medical issues arising with the mother or the baby, like pre-eclampsia. Premature births are a great threat to the health of both mothers and their infants.

The prevalence of preterm birth in the EU ranges from 5.5 % to 11.4 %, meaning that on average half a million babies are born prematurely in Europe every year.

1. Can the Commission clarify what actions it has taken in the area of prematurity prevention?

2. Does the Commission plan to make funding available for research and development in the area of premature delivery prevention?

3. What measures has the Commission targeted on the European public in terms of education and awareness-raising regarding the risks of premature delivery?

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

1. The Commission has funded two projects on pre-term birth:

— EuroNeoStat ([1]) I (2006-2008) developed a European Information System for monitoring short and long-term morbidity in order to improve quality care of pre-term babies of very low gestation and birth weight.

— EuroNeoStat II (2009-31.10.2012) concentrates on quality improvement tools and quality assessment to improve the care and reduce adverse outcomes of very low birth weight.

Moreover, the Commission is currently funding the Europeristat project (2011-31.3.2014). This project will update the first European Perinatal Health Report with new data and information to produce the second report on perinatal health in Europe.

All these projects help to improve knowledge about pre-term birth before and after delivery. The Commission is helping to disseminate information through a publication 'Health for the EU in 20 success stories' ([2]).

2. Within the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-13), no project directly addresses the question of prematurity prevention so far. However, six research projects worth EUR 18 million address the issue of pathological pregnancies (e.g. pre-eclampsia, foetal growth retardation, gestational diabetes) which are indirect causes of premature deliveries. In addition, five projects worth over EUR 20 million address the quality of care of pre-term neonates.

3. The Commission is raising awareness about the risks of smoking especially in the age group 25 to 34 with the EU-wide anti-smoking campaign 'Ex-smokers are unstoppable' as tobacco is a risk factor leading to pre-term deliveries or very low birth weight.

([1]) http://www.euroneonet.eu/paginas/publicas/euroneo/euroNeoStat/index.html
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/docs/success_stories_hp_2008-2013_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005541/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(31 May 2012)

Subject: The need for premature birth aftercare

Prematurity is defined by the World Health Organisation (WHO) as when a baby is born before 37 weeks of gestation. It is the single major and often most preventable cause associated with infant mortality and morbidity in the European Union. Within the EU, premature deliveries account for 5.5-11.4 % of all births.

During the newborn period, it is not always possible to identify whether preterm infants will develop health or educational problems later in life. Formal follow-up and aftercare services are needed for children and families affected by prematurity. The fact that prematurely-born infants are at a greater risk of developing medical complications later in life, including chronic conditions such as respiratory illnesses and diabetes, necessitates high-quality care throughout an individual's life.

Prematurity does not only have a significant impact on individuals and their families, it also has high societal cost implications. One example of the cost of preterm birth to society is the incidence of cerebral palsy, which occurs in 2.3 of every 10 000 newborns. The lifetime cost of this illness has been estimated to amount to a minimum of EUR 750 000 per child, totalling more than EUR 7 billion per year.

1. Does the Commission plan to make funding available for the development of dedicated follow-up and aftercare services for premature babies and their families?

2. Does the Commission plan to take measures to encourage further research in the field of chronic conditions, focusing in particular on the consequences of prematurity?

3. Does the Commission plan to develop EU-wide measures for the protection of premature babies and how their health conditions are managed after discharge?

4. What measures is the Commission taking to promote resources and services that provide information and support to families affected by premature birth?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(11 July 2012)

According to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the definition of health policies and the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care is primarily the responsibility of individual Member States (Article 168 of the Treaty). As such, the EU does not have the competence to adopt EU-wide measures for the protection of premature babies and how their health conditions are managed after discharge. The Health Programme work plan for 2012 does not foresee funding for the development of follow-up and aftercare services for premature babies and their families.

Within the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013), 5 research projects have been supported (representing EUR 20.5 million). They address the prematurity consequences on the health of the developing child, concentrating on optimal care of premature babies in order to optimise their future health status.

The Commission has also funded projects in the area of preterm birth, in particular EuroNeoStat I & II ([1]). These projects are intended to help Member States to improve their policies in the area of preterm birth, for example through defined standard indicators, such as degree of prematurity or birth weight, or other factors such as whether the mother was given medication to help support the baby's lungs.

([1]) http://www.euroneonet.eu/paginas/publicas/euroneo/euroNeoStat/index.html

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-005560/12
komissiolle
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(1. kesäkuuta 2012)

Aihe: Lähi-idän kristittyjen asemasta

Vielä sata vuotta sitten kristityt muodostivat viidesosan Lähi-idän ja Pohjois-Afrikan väestöstä, mutta tällä hetkellä kristittyjen määrä on laskenut alle viiteen prosenttiin. Viime aikoina kristittyjen kokema syrjintä ja suoranainen vaino ovat olleet syynä monien muuttamiseen alueen ulkopuolelle. Alueella käytyjen sotien ja konfliktien seurauksena kristittyjen asema on huonontunut edelleen ja useat esimerkit osoittavat, että heidän ihmisoikeuksiaan on rikottu. Kuitenkin kristityillä voisi olla merkittävä rooli tämän alueen yhteiskuntien elämässä.

Millä tavalla komissio on tiedostanut Lähi-idän ja Pohjois-Afrikan kristittyjen tukalan tilanteen? Mitä toimenpiteitä komissio aikoo toteuttaa kristittyjen syrjinnän ja vainon lopettamiseksi? Kuinka komissio tukee tämän alueen kristittyjä, niin että he voisivat jäädä kotiseudulleen? Millä tavalla komissio aikoo vaikuttaa alueen hallituksiin ja alueen maiden viranomaisiin varmistaakseen, että kristityillä on turvatut elinolot ja että heidän ihmisoikeutensa ja uskonnonvapautensa toteutuvat?

Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(25. heinäkuuta 2012)

Yleismaailmallisiin oikeuksiin kuuluva uskonnon- ja uskonvapaus on tärkeässä asemassa EU:n ihmisoikeuspolitiikassa.

Varapuheenjohtaja Ashton on ulkoasioiden neuvoston helmikuussa 2011 hyväksymien päätelmien mukaisesti tuominnut terroriteot ja muun väkivallan mainitulla alueella ja koko maailmassa. Tuomittavaa on erityisesti kristittyjen ja heidän hartaudenharjoituspaikkojensa, islaminuskoisten pyhiinvaeltajien ja muiden uskonnollisten yhteisöjen vainoaminen.

Euroopan unioni käyttää kaikkia diplomaattisia ja yhteistyön välineitä käsitellessään uskonnon- ja uskonvapauteen liittyviä asioita kahdenvälisesti. Uskonnon- ja uskonvapaudesta sekä syrjinnän torjunnasta käytävä vuoropuhelu on osa EU:n ja sen eteläisten naapurien välistä säännöllistä yhteydenpitoa ihmisoikeuksia käsittelevien alakomiteoiden vuotuisissa kokouksissa. Kaikkia EU:n edustustoja on kehotettu seuraamaan uskonnon- ja uskonvapauden noudattamista ja ottamaan nämä asiat tarvittaessa esille, jotta uskonnon- ja uskonvapauden noudattamisesta tulee EU:n edustuston ja asemamaan kahdenkeskisten suhteiden tärkeä osa.

EU on viime aikoina lisännyt kahdenvälistä vuoropuhelua Euroopan naapuruuspolitiikan kumppanimaiden kanssa kaikilla tasoilla. Painopisteenä on ollut keskinäinen poliittinen vastuu, jotta voidaan edetä kohti demokratian ja perustuslaillisten uudistusten korkeampaa tasoa. EU on sitoutunut tukemaan menestyvien kansalaisyhteiskuntien kehittämistä, jotta ne voivat seurata viranomaisten toimintaa. Kansalaisyhteiskunnan järjestöjen pitäisi pystyä tukemaan uudistuksia ja osallistumaan toimintaan ihmisoikeuksien kaltaisilla kansalaisille keskeisen tärkeillä aloilla. Uskonnon- ja uskonvapaus kuuluu tärkeimpiin ihmisoikeuksiin.

EU on mainitulla alueella merkittävä humanitaarisen avun ja peruspalvelujen tarjoaja siellä, missä on suuria heikossa asemassa olevia vähemmistöryhmiä. Tukea annetaan myös kristittyjen yhteisöille.

Kansainvälisillä foorumeilla EU turvautuu monenvälisiin sitoumuksiin, joilla muodostetaan yksimielisyys uskonnon- ja uskonvapautta koskevista normeista ja torjutaan uskonnollista suvaitsemattomuutta ja väkivaltaa.

EU pyrkii jatkossakin kaikin tavoin varmistamaan, että kaikkien ihmisten uskonnon- ja uskonvapautta noudatetaan maailmanlaajuisesti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005560/12
to the Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(1 June 2012)

Subject: The position of Christians in the Middle East

As recently as a century ago, Christians constituted a fifth of the population of the Middle East and North Africa, but the proportion has now dropped to below 5 %. In recent times, many Christians have moved away from the region as a consequence of discrimination and outright persecution. Due to the wars and other conflicts being fought in the region, the position of Christians has further deteriorated and, in numerous cases, their human rights have been breached. Christians could nevertheless play a significant role in the life of societies in this region.

How did the Commission become aware of the difficult situation facing Christians in the Middle East and North Africa? What action does the Commission intend to take to stop the discrimination and persecution of Christians? In what ways is the Commission supporting Christians in this region to enable them to remain in their homes? How does the Commission intend to use its influence with the governments and national authorities of the region to ensure that Christians have safe living conditions and that their human rights and freedom of religion are respected?

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

As a universal human right, freedom of religion and belief (FoRB) is a high priority under EU's human rights policy.

The HR/VP, in line with the February 2011 Foreign Affairs Council conclusions, has condemned violence and acts of terrorism worldwide and in the region, in particular against Christians and their places of worship, Muslim pilgrims and other religious communities.

The EU uses the full range of its diplomatic and cooperation instruments to address FoRB on a bilateral basis. Dialogue on freedom of religion, belief and non-discrimination is part of the regular exchanges between the EU and its Southern Neighbours in the framework of the annual Sub-committees on Human Rights. All EU Delegations have been requested to monitor the state of FoRB and to engage on such issues whenever necessary in order to make FoRB an integral part of the EU's bilateral relations with their host country.

Lately, the EU has stepped up its bilateral dialogues with the ENP countries at all levels with a strong focus on mutual political accountability in order to advance towards higher standards of democracy and constitutional reform. In this vein, the EU is committed to supporting the development of thriving civil societies that will be able to monitor governmental activities. They should be able to support reforms and become involved in areas close to citizens' fundamental concerns such as human rights, of which FoRB is an important component.

The EU is an important provider of humanitarian aid and basic services in the region in areas with dense and vulnerable minority populations, including important Christian communities.

In international fora, the EU has recourse to multilateral engagement to gather consensus on FoRB standards and against religious intolerance and violence.

The EU will remain mobilised so as to ensure that that FoRB is respected everywhere and for everyone.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005566/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(1 June 2012)

Subject: Obligations of Member States in relation to upholding the rights of EU citizens and their spouses

In relation to Parliamentary Question E-9939/2010, will the Commission clarify what assistance and support an EU citizen and their non-EU spouse can expect from their Member State's authorities when their spouse's rights are not upheld in a court of law in another EU Member State?

What actions are available to citizens and their spouses to ensure that their rights within the EU are upheld?

Can the Commission provide information on how they can assist such EU citizens and their spouses?

Answer given by Mme Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 July 2012)

As already outlined in our reply to Question E-9939/2010 ([1]), the safeguard of the procedural rights of suspect and accused persons remains a priority of the Commission.

In the area of procedural rights a directive on the right to interpretation and translation in criminal proceedings ([2]) and a directive on the right to information in criminal proceedings ([3]) have already been adopted. These legal instruments apply to all suspects and accused persons concerned by criminal proceedings in the Member States irrespective of their nationality. The directives will have to be transposed into national law by 27 October 2013 and 2 June 2014 respectively.

A legislative proposal for a directive on the right of access to a lawyer in criminal proceedings and on the right to communicate upon arrest was adopted by the Commission on 8 June 2011 ([4]). This proposal is currently being discussed in Council and European Parliament.

Following upon its Action Plan Implementing the Stockholm Programme ([5]) the Commission is currently preparing two impact assessment studies in respect of possible initiatives (1) legal proposals for special safeguards for suspected and accused children and other suspected and accused persons who are vulnerable and (2) legal aid.

A Green Paper on the application of EU criminal justice legislation in the field of detention was published in June 2011 and the Commission is currently analysing the contributions sent in reply to this Green Paper.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB.
([2]) Directive 2010/64/EU of 20 October 2010, OJ L 280, 26.10.2010, p. 1.
([3]) Directive 2012/13/EU of 22 May 2012, OJ L 142, 1.6.2012, p. 1.
([4]) COM(2011) 326 final.
([5]) COM(2010) 171 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-005580/12
an die Kommission
Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE)
(4. Juni 2012)

Betrifft: Beihilfenkontrolle von Quersubventionen in öffentlichen Unternehmensverbünden der Entsorgungswirtschaft — Beschwerdeverfahren SA33163(2011/CP)

Dieser Anfrage liegt eine Beschwerde über Wettbewerbsbehinderungen durch staatliche Beihilfen zugrunde, die zugunsten eines öffentlichen Unternehmens im Bundesland Nordrhein-Westfalen gewährt worden sind. In diesem Fall besteht der Verdacht, dass Leistungen zu Konditionen angeboten wurden, die unter den tatsächlich entstehenden Kosten liegen. Die entstehenden Defizite werden dann unter Verstoß gegen beihilferechtliche Vorgaben von den kommunalen Gesellschaftern durch eigene Finanzmittel aufgefangen. Diese Art der Rekommunalisierung verdrängt nicht nur private Entsorgungsunternehmen, sondern schreckt auch potenzielle Wettbewerber aus anderen Mitgliedstaaten von einem Marktzutritt ab. Zudem besteht auch in anderen Mitgliedstaaten die Gefahr, dass die Kommunen versuchen, Unternehmensdienstleistungen aus öffentlichen Mitteln zu subventionieren. Das Verfahren stellt somit einen Präzedenzfall mit weitreichenden Folgen dar.

1. Welche Maßnahmen hat die Kommission bereits ergriffen, um das Vorliegen einer unzulässigen Beihilfe zu überprüfen?

2. Wurde die deutsche Bundesregierung bereits aufgefordert, die Kalkulation des in den Fall involvierten öffentlichen Unternehmens zu erläutern und nachzuweisen, dass die Kalkulation so gestaltet ist, dass eine Beihilfe ausgeschlossen ist?

3. Wann ist mit der abschließenden Entscheidung der Kommission zu rechnen?

Antwort von Herrn Almunia im Namen der Kommission
(12. Juli 2012)

In der Sache, die der Herr Abgeordnete in seiner Anfrage anspricht, steht die Kommission bereits in engem Kontakt mit den Beteiligten, um den Sachverhalt zu klären und zu prüfen, ob sich Fragen hinsichtlich der Vereinbarkeit mit dem Binnenmarkt stellen.

In diesem Zusammenhang möchte die Kommission betonen, wie wichtig es ist, gleiche Wettbewerbsbedingungen für die Entsorgungswirtschaft in der gesamten Europäischen Union zu gewährleisten, die mit den geltenden Beihilfevorschriften im Einklang stehen. Jedoch kann sich die Kommission während einer laufenden Untersuchung nicht näher zu der betreffenden Sache äußern.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005580/12
to the Commission
Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE)
(4 June 2012)

Subject: State aid controls in cross-subsidisation involving public-affiliated corporate groups in the waste management industry/complaints procedure SA33163(2011/CP)

This question is based on a complaint about obstacles to competition due to state aid provided to a public company in the German state of North Rhine-Westphalia. In this case, there is a suspicion that services were offered at below-cost rates. The relevant deficits are then absorbed by the local authority shareholders using their own financial resources, in breach of state aid provisions. This type of deprivatisation by stealth not only squeezes out private waste management companies, but also frightens off potential competitors from other Member States. In addition, there is also a danger that the local authorities in other Member States will try to subsidise business services using public funds. The case thus sets a precedent with far-reaching consequences.

1. What steps has the European Commission taken to establish whether this constitutes state aid?

2. Has the Commission already asked the German Government to explain how the public company involved calculated its figures and to prove that the figures were calculated in such a way that there was no need for state aid?

3. When is a final decision to be expected from the Commission?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(12 July 2012)

The Commission is in close contact with the parties involved in the case mentioned in the Honourable Member's question, with a view to clarifying the relevant facts and to assess whether they raise any issue of compatibility with the internal market.

In this respect, the Commission wishes to emphasise the importance of ensuring a level playing field in the waste management industry across the European Union, in line with the applicable state aid rules. However, pending the ongoing examination, the Commission is not in a position to provide any further comment in respect of the case at issue.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-005583/12
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(4. juni 2012)

Om: Dansk oversættelse af vandrammedirektivet

I den danske oversættelse af EU's vandrammedirektiv (2000/60/EF) er »water services« oversat til »forsyningsforpligtelser«. Det fremgår blandt andet af direktivets betragtning 15:

»*Vandforsyning er en forsyningspligtydelse som defineret i Kommissionens meddelelse »Forsyningspligtsydelser i Europa««* (EFT C 281 af 26.9.1996, side 3).

Ifølge den engelske, tyske og svenske sprogversion ([1]) er der dog signifikante tegn på, at den danske oversættelse er forkert. Denne fejloversættelse har ført til, at de danske myndigheder aldrig har foretaget tilbundsgående beregninger af, hvilke økonomiske konsekvenser vandplanerne får for dansk landbrug.

Siden 2007 har Kommissionen gentagne gange advaret Danmark om, at den forkerte oversættelse og fortolkning af begrebet »forsyningspligtydelse« resulterer i, at store dele af vandrammedirektivet bliver indført forkert i Danmark.

Kan Kommissionen uddybe, hvori dens advarsler siden 2007 til de danske myndigheder består? Og kan Kommissionen endvidere oplyse, hvad de danske myndigheder har svaret Kommissionen, når denne har advaret de danske myndigheder? Hvilke skridt vil Kommissionen tage for at sikre, at de berørte parters retssikkerhed opretholdes og ikke lider skade som følge af den danske fejlimplementering?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Janez Potocnik
(17. juli 2012)

Kommissionen er bekendt med den danske oversættelse af begrebet »water services« i direktiv 2000/60/EF ([2]), som er offentliggjort i den Europæiske Unions Tidende. Kommissionen har i forbindelse med en sag om manglende overensstemmelse mod Danmark fået oplyst, at dansk lov anvender et begreb, der svarer til de engelske, tyske og svenske udgaver. Denne sag vedrørende manglende overensstemmelse blev afsluttet i 2011, eftersom den anvendte terminologi var korrekt.

Den snævre tolkning af begrebet »water service« (tjenesteydelser vedrørende vand), således at kun drikkevandsforsyning og spildevandsbehandling er omfattet, er dog genstand for en traktatbrudssag (2006/4636), og Danmark modtog en begrundet udtalelse herom i oktober 2011.

([1]) Engelsk oversættelse: Water services; Tysk oversættelse: Wasserdienstleistungen; Svensk oversættelse: Vattentjänster.
([2]) EUT L 327 af 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005583/12
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(4 June 2012)

Subject: Danish translation of the Water Framework Directive

In the Danish translation of the EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EU), 'water services' is translated as *forsyningsforpligtelser*. This is also stated in Recital 15 of the directive:

'The supply of water is a service of general interest as defined in the Commission communication on services of general interest in Europe' (OJ C 281, 29.9.1996, p. 3).

However, according to the English, German and Swedish versions ([1]) there are indications that the Danish translation is incorrect. This incorrect translation has meant that the Danish authorities have never undertaken the exhaustive calculations of the economic effect of Aquatic Plans on Danish agriculture.

Since 2007, the Commission has repeatedly warned Denmark that the incorrect translation and interpretation of the term *forsyningspligtydelser* has resulted in large parts of the Water Framework Directive being incorrectly implemented in Denmark.

Can the Commission explain the contents of its warnings to the Danish authorities since 2007? And can the Commission also state how the Danish authorities have replied to these warnings? What steps has the Commission taken to ensure the legal certainty of the affected parties is not adversely affected as a result of the incorrect Danish implementation?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the translation into Danish of the term 'water services' in the Danish version of the EU Official Journal for Directive 2000/60/EC ([2]). In the context of a non-conformity procedure against Denmark, the Commission has been informed that Danish law uses a term corresponding to the English, German and Swedish versions. That non-conformity case was closed in 2011, as the terminology used was correct.

However, the narrow interpretation of the term 'water service' *tjenesteydelser vedrørende vand*) as limited to drinking water supply and waste water treatment, is subject to an infringement procedure (2006/4636) and Denmark received a Reasoned Opinion in October 2011.

([1]) English translation: Water services; German translation: *Wasserdienstleistungen*; Swedish translation: *Vattentjänster*.
([2]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005590/12
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(4 iunie 2012)

Subiect: Veniturile generate de ETS

În cadrul pachetului privind acțiunile împotriva schimbărilor climatice și energiile regenerabile din 2008, statele membre au acceptat un angajamente fără caracter obligatoriu de a cheltui jumătate din veniturile generate de schema UE de comercializare a certificatelor de emisii pentru a aborda schimbările climatice.

A realizat Comisia vreo evaluare a cheltuirii de către statele membre a veniturilor generate de ETS?

Răspuns dat de dna Hedegaard în numele Comisiei
(10 iulie 2012)

În conformitate cu Directiva ETS ([1]), statele membre trebuie să utilizeze cel puțin 50% din veniturile rezultate din licitarea certificatelor generale [inclusiv toate veniturile provenite din activitățile de licitare menționate la articolul 10 alineatul (3) paragraful 2 literele (b) și (c) din directivă] și 100% din veniturile generate de licitarea certificatelor pentru aviație (sau o sumă echivalentă) pentru măsuri în direcția diminuării schimbărilor climatice. De asemenea, statele membre trebuie să prezinte Comisiei rapoarte cu privire la utilizarea acestor venituri.

Modificările aduse ETS, introduse prin pachetul de măsuri privind clima și energia din 2008, se refereau în esență la etapa 3 a ETS, mai exact la perioada 2013-2020. Până în prezent, statele membre nu au licitat certificate pentru această perioadă și, ca atare, nu există venituri, nici cheltuieli aferente care ar trebui urmărite. În data de 23 noiembrie 2011, Comisia a adoptat, însă, o propunere de regulament privind un mecanism de monitorizare și de raportare a emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră, precum și de raportare, la nivel național și al Uniunii, a altor informații relevante pentru schimbările climatice ([2]), care precizează, *inter alia*, modul în care aceste informații vor fi raportate pe viitor, transparent și detaliat. Propunerea de regulament este în momentul de față în curs de adoptare în cadrul Parlamentului European și al Consiliului Uniunii Europene.

([1]) JO L 275 din 25.10.2003, modificată ultima dată prin Directiva 2009/29/CE a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului din 23 aprilie 2009 de modificare a Directivei 2003/87/CE în vederea îmbunătățirii și extinderii sistemului comunitar de comercializare a cotelor de emisie de gaze cu efect de seră, JO L 140 din 5.6.2009. Pentru versiunea consolidată a directivei, a se vedea: . http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2003L0087:20090625:EN:PDF

([2]) COM(2011) 789 final; .http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011PC0789:EN:NOT

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005590/12
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(4 June 2012)

Subject: ETS revenues

As part of the 2008 Climate and Energy Package, Member States agreed to a non-binding commitment to spend half of the revenues from the Emissions Trading Scheme on tackling climate change.

Has the Commission made any assessment of the Member States' expenditure of ETS revenues?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(10 July 2012)

Under the ETS Directive ([1]), Member States should use at least 50 % of the revenues generated by the auctioning of general allowances (including all revenues from the auctioning referred to in paragraph 2, points (b) and (c) of Article 10(3) of that directive) and 100 % of the revenues generated by the auctioning of aviation allowances (or an equivalent amount) to support climate change mitigation. In addition, Member States shall report on the use of those revenues to the Commission.

The changes to the ETS introduced by the 2008 Climate and Energy Package concerned in essence phase 3 of the ETS, i.e. the period 2013-2020. So far Member States have auctioned no allowances in respect of these years and there are therefore not yet any revenues for which the expenditure could be tracked. However, the Commission has adopted on 23 November 2011 a proposal for a regulation on a mechanism for monitoring and reporting greenhouse gas emissions and for reporting other information at national and Union level relevant to climate change ([2]), specifying, *inter alia*, how this information will be transparently and comprehensively reported in the future. The proposed regulation is currently under discussion for adoption in the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union.

([1]) OJ L 275 of 25.10.2003, as last amended by Directive 2009/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 amending Directive 2003/87/EC so as to improve and extend the greenhouse gas emission allowance trading scheme of the Community, OJ L 140 of 5.6.2009. For the consolidated version of the directive see: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2003L0087:20090625:EN:PDF

([2]) COM(2011)789 final; http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011PC0789:EN:NOT

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-005598/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(4 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Suġġett: Tagħlim Kmieni tal-Lingwa

Fid-Dokument ta' Ħidma tal-Persunal tagħha "It-tagħlim tal-lingwa fil-livell ta' skola ta' qabel il-primarja: iktar effiċjenza u sostenibbiltà", il-Kummissjoni tenfasizza l-effetti ta' benefiċċju li t-tagħlim kmieni tal-lingwa (ELL) għandu fuq l-iżvilupp personali u soċjali tat-tfal kif ukoll fuq l-għarfien interkulturali tagħhom. Mandankollu, tinnota wkoll riżorsi u opportunitajiet li mhumiex mifruxa b'mod ugwali fir-rigward tal-aċċess għall-ELL (it-tagħlim kmieni tal-lingwa).

Il-Kummissjoni qiegħda tippjana biex tieħu miżuri adegwati biex ittaffi d-disparitajiet bil-għan li jkunu żgurati iktar opportunitajiet ugwali fil-futur?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Vassiliou f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(3 ta' Awwissu 2012)

Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea tippromwovi t-tagħlim tal-lingwi għal kulħadd u, bħalma kien osservat mill-Onorevoli MPE, hi enfasizzat fid-Dokument ta' Ħidma tal-Istaff tagħha dwar it-tagħlim bikri tal-lingwi, l-importanza ta' bidu bikri biex ikun żgurat li l-istudenti kollha jilħqu livell tajjeb ta' kompetenza lingwistika sa tmiem l-edukazzjoni obbligatorja biex ikunu jistgħu japprofondixxu u jwessgħu l-ħiliet skont l-ħtiġijiet u x-xewqat tagħhom.

Din il-gwida politika hija indirizzata lill-Istati Membri. Id-disponibilità ta' riżorsi xierqa u opportunitajiet hija r-responsabbiltà tal-awtoritajiet nazzjonali, reġjonali u lokali, kif previst fl-Artikolu 165 tat-Trattat dwar il-Funzjonament tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea se tappoġġa s-segwitu ta' progress fil-kwistjoni permezz ta' Grupp ta' Ħidma li għadu kif twaqqaf mal-Istati Membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005598/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(4 June 2012)

Subject: Early language learning

In its Staff Working Paper 'Language learning at pre-primary school level: making it efficient and sustainable' the Commission highlights the beneficial effects that early language learning (ELL) has on children's personal and social development and their intercultural awareness. However, it also points to unequally distributed resources and opportunities with regard to access to ELL.

Is the Commission planning to take appropriate measures that would alleviate the disparities with the aim of ensuring more equal opportunities in the future?

Answer given by Mme Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

The European Commission promotes language learning for all and, as noted by the honourable MEP, underlined in its Staff Working Document on early language learning (ELL) the importance of an early start to ensure that all pupils reach a good level of language competence by the end of compulsory education, enabling them to deepen and broaden their skills according to their needs and desires.

This policy guidance is addressed to the Member States. The provision of appropriate resources and opportunities is the responsibility of national, regional and local authorities, as foreseen in Article 165 of the treaty on the functioning of the European Union. The European Commission will support the follow up of progress on the issue through a Working Group which has just been put in place with the Member States.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-005600/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(4 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Suġġett: L-obeżità

Skont statistiki reċenti mill-Eurostat, l-għadd ta' ċittadini tal-UE li għandhom piż żejjed jew li huma obeżi żdied b'rata allarmanti matul dawn l-aħħar għaxar snin. Konsegwentement, iktar minn 50 % tal-popolazzjoni tal-UE bħalissa għandha piż żejjed jew hija obeża. Fil-White Paper tagħha dwar Strateġija għall-Ewropa dwar kwistjonijiet ta' saħħa marbuta man-Nutriment, il-Piż Żejjed u l-Obeżità (COM(2007)0279), il-Kummissjoni tistabbilixxi approċċ integrat sabiex tindirizza n-nutrizzjoni u l-problemi tas-saħħa li għandhom x'jaqsmu mal-piż.

Fid-dawl tar-relevanza li dejjem qed tiżdied ta' dawn il-kwistjonijiet, il-Kummissjoni qed tippjana li tintroduċi iktar miżuri maħsuba biex inaqqsu r-rati tal-obeżità fl-UE?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Dalli f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(17 ta' Awwissu 2012)

Il-Kummissjoni Ewropea hija konxja mil-livelli ta' obeżità u l-piż żejjed fl-Unjoni Ewropea.

Il-Kummissjoni qed tissorvelja l-implimentazzjoni tal-"Istrateġija għall-Ewropa dwar Kwistjonijiet ta' Saħħa marbuta man-Nutrizzjoni, il-Piż Żejjed u l-Obeżità-" ([1]) f'kooperazzjoni mill-qrib mal-WHO Europe. Il-progress minn Stati Membri individwali jista' jiġi eżaminat permezz tal-Bażi ta' Dejta Ewropea dwar in-Nutrizzjoni, l-Obeżità u l-Attività Fiżika (NOPA) ([2]).

L-Istrateġija hija implimentata permezz ta' inizjattivi tal-Kummissjoni kif ukoll permezz tal-kooperazzjoni fost l-Istati Membri fil-Grupp ta' Livell Għoli ([3]) dwar in-Nutrizzjoni u l-Attività Fiżika, u permezz ta' inizjattivi volontarji meħuda minn partijiet interessati multisettorjali fil-Pjattaforma tal-UE għal Azzjoni fuq id-Dieta, l-Attività Fiżika u s-Saħħa ([4]). Inizjattivi bħal dawn ivarjaw mill-promozzjoni ta' dieta tajba għas-saħħa u l-promozzjoni ta' attività fiżika sat-tnaqqis tal-melħ u ta' kontenut nutrittiv ieħor mill-ikel, u billi l-ittikkettjar tal-ikel nutrittiv isir obbligatorju.

L-ewwel Rapport ta' Progress ġie ppubblikat f'Diċembru 2010 ([5]). Żieda fid-disponibilità ta' għażliet tajbin għas-saħħa permezz ta' inizjattivi ta' riformulazzjoni tal-ikel u l-iskalabbiltà u l-aċċelerament ta' inizjattivi awto-regolatorji fil-kummerċjalizzazzjoni u r-reklamar tal-ikel għat-tfal huma oqsma identifikati għall-azzjoni fit-tieni fażi tal-Istrateġija. Din is-sena, il-Kummissjoni nediet il-proċess ta' valutazzjoni tal-Istrateġija li se jkun disponibbli matul l-ewwel tliet xhur tal-2013.

([1]) COM(2007) 279 finali, 30.5.2007.
([2]) http://data.euro.who.int/nopa/.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/implementation_report_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005600/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(4 June 2012)

Subject: Obesity

According to recent statistics from Eurostat, the number of EU citizens who are overweight or obese has increased at an alarming rate over the past decade. As a result, over 50 % of the EU population is currently overweight or obese. In its White Paper on a Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related health issues (COM(2007) 0279), the Commission sets out an integrated approach towards addressing nutrition and weight-related health problems.

In view of the increasing relevance of these issues, is the Commission planning to introduce any further measures aimed at reducing obesity rates in the EU?

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

The European Commission is aware of the obesity and overweight levels in the European Union.

The Commission monitors the implementation of the 'Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues' ([1]) in close cooperation with WHO Europe. Progress by individual Member States can be examined via the European Database on Nutrition, Obesity and Physical Activity (NOPA) ([2]).

The strategy is implemented through Commission initiatives as well as cooperation among Member States in the High Level Group ([3]) on Nutrition and Physical Activity, and through voluntary initiatives taken by multi-sectoral stakeholders in the EU Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health ([4]). Such initiatives range from promoting healthy eating and physical activity to reducing salt and other nutrients content from food, and by making nutritional food labelling obligatory.

A first Progress Report was published in December 2010 ([5]). Increasing the availability of healthy options through food reformulation initiatives and scaling up and speeding up the self-regulatory initiatives in food marketing and advertising to children are identified areas for action in the second phase of the strategy. The Commission has launched this year the evaluation process of the strategy which will be available during the first quarter of 2013.

([1]) COM(2007)279 final, 30.5.2007.
([2]) http://data.euro.who.int/nopa/
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/high_level_group/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/platform/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/docs/implementation_report_en.pdf

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-005601/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(4 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Suġġett: Ftalati

Id-Direttiva 2005/84/KE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill ta' Diċembru 2005 tenfasizza l-fatt li "tfal bħala organiżmi li qed jiżviluppaw huma partikolarment vulnerabbli għal sustanzi tossiċi għar-riproduzzjoni" u tipprojbixxi l-użu ta' ċertu tipi ta' ftalati fil-ġugarelli tat-tfal u f'oġġetti intiżi għat-tfal.

Il-Kummissjoni qiegħda tieħu xi miżura addizzjonali biex tipproteġi t-tfal li għadhom ma twieldux mill-effetti ta' kimiċi li jfixklu s-sistema endokrinali, per eżempju, billi jillimitaw l-espożizzjoni tan-nisa tqal għal dawn it-tip ta' ftalati?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Potočnik f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(1 ta' Awwissu 2012)

L-attivitajiet tal-Kummissjoni fir-rigward tas-sustanzi li jfixxklu s-sistema endokrinali huma deskritti fl-Istrateġija Komunitarja għas-Sustanzi li jfixklu s-Sistema Endokrinali ([1]).

Il-Kummissjoni bħsiebha teżamina mill-ġdid u, jekk ikun meħtieġ, tirrevedi l-istrateġija eżistenti sal-bidu tal-2013. Din se tqis il-vulnerabbilità partikolari tat-trabi fil-ġuf għas-sustanzi li jfixklu s-sistema endokrinali.

Skont ir-REACH ([2]), minbarra r-restrizzjonijiet eżistenti li jikkonċernaw il-ġugarelli u l-oġġetti tal-kura tat-tfal (l-Anness XVII, l-entrati 51 u 52), erba' ftalati (DEHP, BBP, DBP u DIBP) huma elenkati fl-Anness XIV u ser ikunu soġġetti għal proċedura ta' awtorizzazzjoni, li għandha ssaħħaħ il-limitazzjoni tal-użu tagħhom.

([1]) COM(1999)706 finali.

([2]) Ir-Regolament (KE) Nru 1907/2006 tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tat-18 ta' Diċembru 2006 dwar ir-reġistrazzjoni, il-valutazzjoni, l-awtorizzazzjoni u r-restrizzjoni ta' sustanzi kimiċi (REACH), li jistabbilixxi Aġenzija Ewropea għas-Sustanzi Kimiċi, li jemenda d-Direttiva 1999/45/KE u li jħassar ir-Regolament (KEE) Nru 793/93 tal-Kunsill u r-Regolament (KE) Nru 1488/94 tal-Kummissjoni kif ukoll id-Direttiva 76/769/KEE tal-Kunsill u d-Direttivi tal-Kummissjoni 91/155/KEE, 93/67/KEE, 93/105/KE u 2000/21/KE , ĠU L 396, 30.12.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005601/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(4 June 2012)

Subject: Phthalates

Directive 2005/84/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of December 2005 highlights the fact that 'children as developing organisms are particularly vulnerable to reprotoxic substances' and prohibits the use of certain types of phthalates in children's toys and in articles intended for children.

Is the Commission taking any additional measure to protect unborn children from the effects of endocrine-disrupting chemicals, for instance, by limiting the exposure of pregnant women to these types of phthalates?

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

Activities of the Commission as regards the endocrine disruptors are described in the Community Strategy for Endocrine Disruptors ([1]).

The Commission intends to review and if necessary to revise the existing strategy by the beginning of 2013. This will take into account the particular vulnerability of unborn children to endocrine disruptors.

Under REACH ([2]), in addition to the existing restrictions concerning toys and childcare articles (Annex XVII, entries 51 and 52), four phthalates (DEHP, BBP, DBP and DIBP) are listed in Annex XIV and will be subject to authorisation, procedure that should strengthen the limitation of their uses.

([1]) COM(1999)706 final.

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency, amending Directive 1999/45/EC and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 793/93 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 as well as Council Directive 76/769/EEC and Commission Directives 91/155/EEC, 93/67/EEC, 93/105/EC and 2000/21/EC, OJ L 396, 30.12.2006.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-005605/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(4 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Suġġett: Mard li ma jittieħidx

Skont l-Organizzazzjoni Dinjija tas-Saħħa, l-indirizzar ta' epidemiji ta' mard li ma jittieħidx (NCDs) hu essenzjali għal xjuħija b'saħħitha fil-futur peress illi NCDs (mard li ma jittieħidx) jammontaw għal sehem dejjem iktar kbir tal-piż tal-mard fost il-popolazzjonijiet li qed jixjieħu.

Peress li numru ta' NCDs (mard li ma jittieħidx) għandhom l-istess fatturi komuni ta' riskju, jigifieri, dieta ħażina, l-alkoħol, it-tabakk u l-inattività fiżika, il-Kummissjoni qiegħda tikkunsidra miżuri li jindirizzaw l-epidemija tal-NCD (mard li ma jittieħidx) billi tqajjem kuxjenza ta' dawn l-erba' fatturi ta' riskju b'mod partikolari?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Dalli f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(20 ta' Lulju 2012)

Il-Kummissjoni hija konxja bis-sħiħ dwar l-isfidi sinifikanti li jinħolqu mill-bidliet demografiċi fl-UE. Il-popolazzjoni li qed tixjieħ, u ż-żieda mistennija fil-prevalenza tal-mard kroniku, se jirrikjedu bidla lejn approċċ preventiv, b'attenzjoni partikolari fuq il-promozzjoni tas-saħħa, u rwol akbar taċ-ċittadini fil-ġestjoni ta' saħħithom.

F'dan ir-rigward, il-Kummissjoni qed timplimenta s-Sħubija Ewropea bi prova għal Innovazzjoni dwar it-Tixjiħ Attiv u b'Saħħtu li għandha l-għan li ttejjeb is-saħħa u l-kwalità tal-ħajja tal-persuni, b'mod partikolari għall-persuni akbar fl-età; u li tappoġġa s-sostenibbiltà u l-effikaċja fuq żmien twil tas-sistemi soċjali u tas-saħħa tal-Ewropa.

Fir-rigward tas-sensibilizzazzjoni dwar il-fatturi ewlenin tar-riskju għall-mard kroniku, il-Kummissjoni implimentat kampanji dwar il-prevenzjoni tat-tabakk għal għadd ta' snin. F'Ġunju 2011, il-Kummissjoni niedet kampanja ġdida ta' tliet enin madwar l-UE kollha "Dawk li qatgħu t-tipjip ma jżommhom xejn" li sadanittant laħqet żewġ miljun persuna permezz ta' Facebook. Aktar minn 200 000 persuna qed jużaw l-istrument tal-kampanja bbażat fuq l-internet l-"iCoach" biex jgħinhom jaqtgħu t-tipjip.

Fir-rigward tan-nutrizzjoni u l-attività fiżika u l-ħsara relatata mal-alkoħol, il-Kummissjoni qed timplimenta strateġiji politiċi b'kooperazzjoni mill-qrib mal-Istati Membri u l-partijiet interessati ([1]). Għadd ta' impenni tal-partijiet interessati fil-Pjattaforma tal-UE dwar id-dieta, l-attività fiżika u s-saħħa u fil-Forum Ewropew għall-Alkoħol u s-Saħħa għandhom l-għan li jżidu l-għarfien taċ-ċittadini. Madankollu, il-Kummissjoni bħalissa mhu qed twettaq l-ebda kampanja wiesgħa għas-sensibilizzazzjoni f'dawn l-oqsma.

Barra minn hekk, il-Kummissjoni niedet proċess ta' riflessjoni mal-Istati Membri biex jiġu identifikati n-nuqqasijiet u l-ħtiġijiet għal azzjoni ulterjuri f'livell tal-UE fl-indirizzar tal-mard kroniku.

([1]) COM (2007) 279 u COM (2006) 625.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005605/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(4 June 2012)

Subject: Non-communicable diseases

According to the World Health Organisation, addressing epidemics of non-communicable diseases (NCDs) is pivotal with regard to healthy ageing in the future, as NCDs account for an increasingly large share of the burden of disease amongst ageing populations.

Given that a number of NCDs share common risk factors, namely poor diet, alcohol, tobacco and physical inactivity, is the Commission considering any measures that tackle the NCD epidemic by raising awareness of these four risk factors in particular?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(20 July 2012)

The Commission is fully aware of the significant challenges that are posed by demographic changes in the EU. The ageing population, and the expected increase in prevalence of chronic diseases, will make it necessary to shift towards a preventive approach, with a focus on promoting health, and an increased role of citizens in managing their health.

In this respect the Commission is implementing the pilot European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing which aims to improve people's health and quality of life, particularly for older people; and to support the long-term sustainability and efficiency of Europe's health and social systems.

Concerning awareness raising on the main risk factors of chronic diseases, the Commission has implemented campaigns on tobacco prevention for a number of years. In June 2011, the Commission launched a new three year EU-wide campaign 'Ex-smokers are unstoppable' which in the meantime has reached out to 2 million people via Facebook. Over 200 000 people are also using the campaign's web-based tool 'i-coach' for help to stop smoking.

Regarding nutrition and physical activity and alcohol related harm, the Commission is implementing policy strategies in close cooperation with Member States and stakeholders ([1]). A number of stakeholder commitments under the EU Platform on diet, physical activity and health and under the European Alcohol and Health Forum aim at raising citizens' awareness. The Commission is however currently not undertaking any broad awareness raising campaigns in these areas.

Moreover, the Commission has launched a reflection process with the Member States to identify gaps and needs for further action at EU level in addressing chronic diseases.

([1]) COM(2007) 279 and COM(2006) 625.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-005607/12
lill-Kummissjoni
David Casa (PPE)
(4 ta' Ġunju 2012)

Suġġett: L-immaniġġjar tal-iskart

Fid-Direttiva 2008/98/KE tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill, l-użu mill-ġdid u r-riċiklaġġ tal-iskart huma karatteristiċi fil-ġerarkija li tistabbilixxi l-prijoritajiet għal-leġiżlazzjoni u politika dwar il-prevenzjoni u l-immaniġġjar. L-Istati Membri huma għalhekk mitluba jintroduċu miżuri biex jippromwovu l-użu mill-ġdid u r-riċiklaġġ tal-iskart.

Il-Kummissjoni tista' tirrapporta dwar eżempji tal-aħjar prattika fir-rigward tal-użu mill-ġdid u r-riċiklaġġ tal-iskart li ħarġu mill-Istati Membri minn mindu daħlet fis-seħħ din id-direttiva?

Tweġiba mogħtija minn M. Potočnik f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(16 ta' Lulju 2012)

Qabel tmiem is-sena, il-Kummissjoni se tippubblika r-rapport tagħha dwar l-implimentazzjoni tad-Direttiva 2008/98/KE ([1]) dwar l-iskart u li tħassar ċerti Direttivi. Il-Kummissjoni dan l-aħħar ippubblikat ukoll studju dwar l-użu ta' strumenti ekonomiċi b'rabta mal-immaniġġjar tal-iskart ([2]).

Dan l-istudju jinkludi diversi eżempji tal-aħjar prattiki applikati f'ċerti Stati Membri, pereżempju dwar it-taxxi u l-projbizzjonijiet fir-rigward tal-irdim u l-inċinerazzjoni, l-iżvilupp ta' skemi ta' "pay-as-you-throw" u l-introduzzjoni ta' skemi ta' responsabbiltà estiża tal-produttur. Dawn l-istrumenti wrew li huma effettivi fil-promozzjoni tal-ewwel stadji fil-ġerarkija tal-iskart u hija l-intenzjoni tal-Kummissjoni li tippromwovi l-użu tagħhom fl-Istati Membri.

Firxa ta' studji relatati mal-immaniġġjar tal-iskart, inkluż l-użu mill-ġdid u r-riċiklaġġ, huma disponibbli fuq http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/studies/index.htm.

([1]) ĠU L 312, 22.11.2008.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/use.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005607/12
to the Commission
David Casa (PPE)
(4 June 2012)

Subject: Waste management

In Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, re-use and recycling of waste features in the waste hierarchy that sets the priorities for waste prevention and management legislation and policy. Member States are consequently called upon to introduce measures to promote the re-use and recycling of waste.

Can the Commission report on any best practice examples with regard to the re-use and recycling of waste that have emerged from Member States since the entry into force of this directive?

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

Before the end of the year the Commission will publish its report on the implementation of Directive 2008/98/EC ([1]) on waste and repealing certain directives. The Commission has also recently published a study on the use of economic instruments in relation to waste management ([2]).

This study includes several examples of best practices applied in certain Member States for instance concerning landfill and incineration taxes and bans, the development of 'pay-as-you-throw' schemes and the introduction of extended producer responsibility schemes. These instruments have proven to be effective in promoting the first steps of the waste hierarchy and it is the intention of the Commission to promote their use in Member States.

A range of studies relating to waste management, including reuse and recycling, can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/studies/index.htm

([1]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/use.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005617/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(4 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κίνδυνος για τη θαλάσσια βιοποικιλότητα λόγω υπεραλίευσης

Η θαλάσσια βιοποικιλότητα απειλείται από την υπεραλίευση και την καταστροφή του θαλάσσιου περιβάλλοντος. Η εμπορική υπερεκμετάλλευση των παγκόσμιων αλιευτικών αποθεμάτων είναι πολύ μεγάλη. Αποτέλεσμα είναι ότι ο πληθυσμός πολλών ειδών έχει μειωθεί σε κλάσματα του αρχικού πληθυσμού τους, ενώ πάνω από το μισό της παγκόσμιας αλιείας έχει εξαντληθεί. Παράλληλα, το 30 % έως το 35 % του κρίσιμου θαλάσσιου περιβάλλοντος, όπως θαλάσσια λιβάδια και κοραλλιογενείς ύφαλοι, εκτιμάται ότι έχει καταστραφεί.

Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία του ΟΗΕ, η ανθρώπινη παρέμβαση στο θαλάσσιο οικοσύστημα αποτελεί την μεγαλύτερη απειλή για την διατήρησή του. Περίπου το 1 % μόλις του θαλάσσιου περιβάλλοντος προστατεύεται, και τα οικοσυστήματα εκείνα που έχουν σημειώσει κάποια ανάκαμψη ήταν εκείνα όπου οι ανθρώπινες απειλές μειώθηκαν ή σταμάτησαν.

Δεδομένου ότι, το θαλάσσιο περιβάλλον και η συντήρησή του είναι ζωτικής σημασίας για τον άνθρωπο, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Με ποιο τρόπο μπορεί να περιορίσει την υπεραλίευση και να επεκτείνει τις προστατευόμενες θαλάσσιες περιοχές ώστε να μειωθεί η ρύπανση των ωκεανών και οι επιπτώσεις της κλιματικής αλλαγής;

2. Έχει προβεί σε διαβουλεύσεις ή και σε συνεργασίες με διεθνείς οργανισμούς, όπως τα Ηνωμένα Έθνη, για τη βελτίωση της διαχείρισης και διατήρησης των ωκεανών;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(1 Αυγούστου 2012)

Η υπεραλίευση είναι ένα από τα σημαντικότερα προβλήματα που πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστούν με τη μεταρρύθμιση της Κοινής Αλιευτικής Πολιτικής (ΚΑΠ). Η πρόταση για τη νέα ΚΑΠ ([1]) έχει ως στόχο να έχει, μέχρι το 2015, εξασφαλιστεί ότι η εκμετάλλευση των θαλάσσιων βιολογικών πόρων θα επαναφέρει και θα διατηρεί τα αποθέματα των αλιευόμενων ειδών πάνω από τα επίπεδα με τη μέγιστη βιώσιμη απόδοση.

Η οδηγία 2008/56/ΕΚ ([2]) αποβλέπει στην επίτευξη, έως το 2020, καλής περιβαλλοντικής κατάστασης όλων των ευρωπαϊκών θαλασσών και στην προστασία των πόρων από τους οποίους εξαρτώνται οι σχετικές με τη θάλασσα οικονομικές και κοινωνικές δραστηριότητες. Στο νομοθετικό της πλαίσιο κατοχυρώνεται η οικοσυστημική προσέγγιση όσον αφορά τη διαχείριση των ανθρώπινων δραστηριοτήτων που έχουν αντίκτυπο στο θαλάσσιο περιβάλλον, ενσωματώνοντας τις έννοιες της προστασίας του περιβάλλοντος και της αειφόρου χρήσης, συμπεριλαμβανομένων περιορισμών για την υπεραλίευση και την ανάπτυξη των προστατευόμενων θαλάσσιων περιοχών. Σύμφωνα με την οδηγία 2009/147/ΕΚ ([3]) και την οδηγία 92/43/ΕΚ ([4]) τα κράτη μέλη υποχρεούνται επίσης να ορίσουν τις θαλάσσιες προστατευόμενες περιοχές εντός των υδάτων τους μέσω του δικτύου Natura 2000 και οφείλουν να εξασφαλίσουν τη βιώσιμη διαχείρισή τους.

Η ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη της δραστηριοποιούνται σε διάφορα πολυμερή φόρουμ που σχετίζονται με την προστασία του θαλάσσιου περιβάλλοντος. Σε αυτά περιλαμβάνονται περιφερειακές οργανώσεις διαχείρισης της αλιείας ([5]), περιφερειακές θαλάσσιες συμβάσεις ([6]) και, σε επίπεδο ΟΗΕ, η CBD ([7]). Η ΕΕ και τα κράτη μέλη της συνεργάζονται με άλλα μέρη της CBD για τον εντοπισμό, μεταξύ άλλων, οικολογικά ή βιολογικά ευαίσθητων περιοχών στους ωκεανούς με στόχο την ενίσχυση της προστασίας τους σύμφωνα με το διεθνές δίκαιο. Επιπλέον, σημαντικό απότέλεσμα της πρόσφατης διάσκεψης του Ρίο +20 ήταν μια απόφαση σχετικά με τις διαπραγματεύσεις με στόχο τη σύναψη συμφωνίας εφαρμογής βάσει της UNCLOS ([8]) για την προστασία της θαλάσσιας βιοποικιλότητας σε περιοχές πέραν της εθνικής δικαιοδοσίας.

([1]) COM(2011)425 τελικό.
([2]) Οδηγία 2008/56/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 17ης Ιουνίου 2008, περί πλαισίου κοινοτικής δράσης στο πεδίο της πολιτικής για το θαλάσσιο περιβάλλον (οδηγία-πλαίσιο για τη θαλάσσια στρατηγική), ΕΕ L 164 της 25.6.2008.
([3]) Οδηγία 2009/147/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 30ής Νοεμβρίου 2009, περί της διατηρήσεως των αγρίων πτηνών, ΕΕ L 20 της 26.1.2010.
([4]) Οδηγία 92/43/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου της 21ης Μαΐου 1992 για τη διατήρηση των φυσικών οικοτόπων [ενδιατημάτων] καθώς και της άγριας πανίδας και χλωρίδας, ΕΕ L 206 της 22.7.1992.
([5]) Π.χ. ICCAT, NEAFC, GFCM, κ.λπ.
([6]) Π.χ. OSPAR, HELCOM, BARCON.
([7]) Σύμβαση για τη βιολογική ποικιλομορφία.
([8]) Σύμβαση των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για το δίκαιο της θάλασσας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005617/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(4 June 2012)

Subject: Threats to marine biodiversity from overfishing

Marine biodiversity is threatened by overfishing and destruction of the marine environment. Commercial over-exploitation of international fish stocks is very high. As a result the population of many species has diminished to a fraction of their initial figures and more than half of the world's fish stocks have disappeared. Meanwhile, 30 % to 35 % of the critical marine environment, such as seagrass beds and coral reefs, is estimated to have been destroyed.

According to United Nations data, human intervention in the marine ecosystem represents the greatest threat to its preservation. Only around 1 % of the marine environment is protected, and the ecosystems that have achieved some recovery are those where the threat from humans has been reduced or stopped.

Given that the marine environment and its preservation are of vital importance to human beings, can the Commission answer the following:

1. In what way can it restrict overfishing and expand marine protected areas so as to reduce ocean pollution and limit the effects of climate change?

2. Has it initiated consultations and/or collaboration with international bodies such as the United Nations to improve ocean management and preservation?

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

Overfishing is one of the major problems that need to be tackled with the reform of the common fisheries policy (CFP). The proposal for the new CFP ([1]) aims to ensure, by 2015, that exploitation of marine biological resources restores and maintains stocks of harvested species above levels which can produce the maximum sustainable yield.

Directive 2008/56/EC ([2]) aims to achieve good environmental status of all European seas by 2020 and to protect the resource base upon which marine-related economic and social activities depend. Its legislative framework enshrines the ecosystem approach to the management of human activities that have an impact on the marine environment, integrating the concepts of environmental protection and sustainable use, including limitations to overfishing and the development of marine protected areas. In accordance with Directive 2009/147/EC ([3]) and Directive 92/43/EC ([4]), Member States are also required to designate marine protected areas within their waters through the Natura 2000 network and must ensure their sustainable management.

The EU and its Member States are active in a number of multilateral fora related to the protection of the marine environment. These include Regional Fisheries Management Organisations ([5]), Regional Seas Conventions ([6]) and, at UN level, the CBD ([7]). The EU and its Member States are working with other CBD Parties to identify *inter alia*, ecologically or biologically sensitive areas in the oceans, with a view to their enhanced protection in line with relevant international law. Furthermore, an important outcome of the recent Rio+20 conference was a decision on negotiations on an implementing agreement under Unclos ([8]) for the protection of marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction.

([1]) COM(2011) 425 final.
([2]) Directive 2008/56/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 2008 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy (Marine Strategy Framework Directive), OJ L 164, 25.6.2008.
([3]) Directive 2009/147/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2009 on the conservation of wild birds, OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.
([4]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([5]) e.g. ICCAT, NEAFC, GFCM, etc.
([6]) e.g. OSPAR, Helcom, BARCON.
([7]) Convention on Biological Diversity.
([8]) UN Convention on Law Of the Seas.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-005620/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(5 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Situazione discriminatoria nella restituzione ai cittadini italiani di beni regolarmente ereditati in Slovenia

Nel 2010 lo scrivente ha presentato alla Commissione un'interrogazione parlamentare sul mancato riconoscimento dei diritti di successione ai cittadini italiani provenienti dall'ex «zona B», da parte della Slovenia.

In quella sede ho sottolineato che non solo in Slovenia, secondo i dati dell'ultimo censimento disponibile, vivono 3 762 abitanti di nazionalità italiana, ma anche che questo paese è membro dell'Unione europea dal maggio 2004. Ciononostante, la Repubblica slovena continua imperterrita a non voler riconoscere le leggi sulla successione ai cittadini italiani e procede nazionalizzando i beni che da questi sono regolarmente ereditati. A distanza di due anni, la presente interrogazione è arricchita di un nuovo e inammissibile elemento: la palese discriminazione nella restituzione ai cittadini di nazionalità italiana di beni regolarmente ereditati in Slovenia. In particolare, è possibile portare degli esempi concreti di casi documentati in cui eredità che, in passato sono state persino nazionalizzate, sono state regolarmente riconosciute a cittadini sloveni, ma non a cittadini italiani; con il palesarsi di un'evidente e inequivocabile situazione discriminatoria.

La principale conseguenza di questa spiacevole situazione è che i beni che dovrebbero essere regolarmente ereditati dai cittadini di nazionalità italiana, oppure restituiti a seguito di una nazionalizzazione rivelatasi illegale, possano repentinamente essere messi all'asta e, pertanto, divenire definitivamente irrecuperabili.

Alla luce della grave situazione sopra descritta di violazione dei diritti successori di cittadini italiani, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se condivide le preoccupazioni dello scrivente circa la gravità della violazione commessa da uno Stato membro dell'Unione europea;

2. se, anche alla luce dei nuovi elementi sopra descritti, ritiene opportuno intervenire per risolvere la situazione dei cittadini italiani ingiustamente discriminati nei loro diritti successori;

3. se può indicare, in questi anni, quali azioni ha messo in atto oppure intende mettere in atto nell'immediato futuro per contribuire a risolvere questo annoso problema?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(9 luglio 2012)

L'onorevole parlamentare solleva la questione della violazione dei diritti di successione di cittadini italiani che vivono in Slovenia in un territorio storicamente conteso tra Italia e Slovenia.

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta alla sua interrogazione scritta E-5537/2009 ([1]).

In applicazione dell'articolo 51, paragrafo 1, della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, le disposizioni di quest'ultima si applicano agli Stati membri esclusivamente nell'attuazione del diritto dell'Unione. Come l'onorevole parlamentare saprà, le questioni successorie rientrano attualmente nel diritto nazionale degli Stati membri.

Nella sua risposta, tuttavia, la Commissione ha precisato di avere adottato una proposta di regolamento in materia di successioni (COM(2009)154). Il regolamento, adottato da poco, sarà d'applicazione fra tre anni. Pur non incidendo sul diritto sostanziale degli Stati membri in fatto di successioni, esso prevede norme in materia di competenza, legge applicabile, esecuzione delle decisioni e degli atti pubblici in materia di successioni, nonché la creazione di un certificato successorio europeo. Consentirà in particolare al futuro testatore di scegliere la legge del proprio paese quale legge applicabile alla sua successione. Nella fattispecie, i cittadini italiani potranno scegliere la legge italiana. Le informazioni relative a detta normativa sono disponibili sul sito Internet della Commissione: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/civil/family-matters/successions/index_en.htm.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005620/12
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(5 June 2012)

Subject: Discrimination in restitution to Italian citizens of lawfully inherited assets in Slovenia

In 2010, I submitted a parliamentary question to the Commission on Slovenia's failure to observe the succession rights of Italian citizens from the former 'Zone B'.

In my question, I pointed out that Slovenia has been a member of the European Union since May 2004 and that, according to data from the latest available census, 3 762 Italian nationals reside there. Despite this, the Republic of Slovenia is undeterred in its failure to observe succession laws in respect of Italian citizens and continues to nationalise assets which they have lawfully inherited. Two years on, a new and unacceptable development has made my question even more relevant: clear discrimination in restitution to Italian citizens of lawfully inherited assets in Slovenia. Concrete examples of documented cases can be cited in which inheritances not previously nationalised have been lawfully granted back to Slovenian citizens but not to Italian citizens. This constitutes a clear and unequivocal case of discrimination.

The main consequence of this unpleasant situation is that assets which should have been lawfully inherited by citizens with Italian nationality, or returned following a proven case of illegal nationalisation, can suddenly be auctioned off and therefore become permanently unrecoverable.

In view of the serious violation of the rights of succession of Italian citizens described above, can the Commission say:

1. Whether it shares my concerns regarding the gravity of the violation committed by an EU Member State?

2. Whether, in view of the new factors described above, it considers it appropriate to intervene to resolve the situation of Italian citizens affected by unfair discrimination over their succession rights?

3. Whether it can state what actions have been taken in recent years or what actions it intends to take in the immediate future to contribute towards resolving this longstanding problem?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(9 juillet 2012)

L'Honorable Parlementaire pose la question de la violation des droits en matière de succession de citoyens italiens vivant en Slovénie dans une zone territoriale qui historiquement a fait l'objet de dispute entre l'Italie et la Slovénie.

L'Honorable Parlementaire voudra bien se reporter à la réponse que la Commission a donnée à sa question écrite E-5537/2009 ([1]).

En application de l'article 51 (1) de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne, les dispositions de la Charte s'adressent aux États membres uniquement lorsqu'ils mettent en œuvre le droit de l'Union. Comme le sait l'Honorable Parlementaire, les questions de nature successorale relèvent actuellement du droit national des États membres.

Toutefois, dans sa réponse, la Commission a précisé avoir adopté une proposition de règlement sur les successions (COM(2009)154). Ce règlement vient d'être adopté et entrera en application dans trois ans. Il n'affectera pas le droit matériel des États membres en matière successorale mais prévoit des règles de compétence, de loi applicable, de circulation des décisions et des actes authentiques en matière successorale ainsi qu'un certificat successoral européen. Il permettra, notamment, au futur défunt de choisir la loi de sa nationalité comme loi applicable à sa succession. En l'espèce, les citoyens italiens pourront choisir la loi italienne. Les informations relatives à cette législation sont disponibles sur le site Internet de la Commission:
(http://ec.europa.eu/justice/civil/family-matters/successions/index_en.htm).

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

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-005623/12
Komisi
Libor Rouček (S&D)
(5. června 2012)

Předmět: Žádost Kyperské republiky o zápis názvu výrobku jako chráněného označení původu

V červenci roku 2009 obdržela Komise žádost o zápis názvu „halloumi“, který označuje sýr vyráběný na Kypru, jako chráněného označení původu podle nařízení (ES) č. 510/2006. Úřady Kyperské republiky později žádost stáhly a znovu ji předložily v květnu roku 2012.

Pokud však bude této žádosti vyhověno, bude to pravděpodobně mít negativní vliv na výrobce v severní části Kypru, vzhledem k tomu, že by byl z označení vyloučen stejný produkt vyráběný v turecké části Kypru pod názvem „hellim“ a neprocházel by příslušnou kontrolou jako „národní“ produkt, což by mělo za následek omezení možnosti jeho vývozu a zároveň by to mohlo představovat prostředek nekalé hospodářské soutěže. Výroba sýru „hellim“ pokrývá přibližně 20 % vývozu z turecké části Kypru.

1. Je si Komise vědoma možných dopadů zmíněné žádosti na společenství turecké části Kypru a její hospodářství?

2. Jak hodlá Komise předejít možným diskriminačním následkům uvedené žádosti?

Odpověď pana Cioloşe jménem Komise
(26. července 2012)

Evropská komise si je vědoma obav výrobců produktu „Halloumi/Helim“ z turecké části Kypru, pokud jde o zápis produktu „Halloumi“ jako chráněného označení původu (CHOP).

Pan pravděpodobně ví, že vláda Kyperské republiky žádost v dubnu roku 2012 stáhla. V případě, že by vláda Kyperské republiky předložila novou žádost o zápis, měly by být podle čl. 5 odst. 5 nařízení (ES) č. 510/2006 ([1]) zainteresované subjekty z turecké části Kypru zapojeny do procesu předběžných konzultací, který musí proběhnout na vnitrostátní úrovni.

Tato otázka byla vznesena během nedávné návštěvy člena Komise odpovědného za rozšíření a evropskou politiku sousedství na Kypru ve dnech 19. a 20. června.

([1]) „Členský stát zahájí […] vnitrostátní řízení o námitce, přičemž odpovídajícím způsobem zajistí zveřejnění uvedené žádosti a poskytne dostatečnou lhůtu, během níž může každá fyzická nebo právnická osoba s oprávněným zájmem, která je usazená nebo má bydliště na území tohoto členského státu, podat proti žádosti námitku. … Členský stát zajistí, aby rozhodnutí ve prospěch žádosti [o zaslání žádosti Komisi] bylo zveřejněno a aby každá fyzická nebo právnická osoba s oprávněným zájmem měla možnost odvolání. …“.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005623/12
to the Commission
Libor Rouček (S&D)
(5 June 2012)

Subject: Cyprus Protected Designation of Origin (PDO) application

In July 2009, the Commission received an application to register 'halloumi', a type of cheese produced on the island of Cyprus, with a Protected Designation of Origin, pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 510/2006. The application was later withdrawn by the Republic of Cyprus authorities and resubmitted in May 2012.

If successful, however, the application is likely to have a damaging effect on producers in the northern part of Cyprus, insofar as 'hellim', a Turkish Cypriot name for the same product, would be excluded from the designation and left without a suitable 'national' inspection procedure, thereby limiting its export potential and raising concerns of unfair competition. The production of 'hellim' accounts for approximately 20 % of Turkish Cypriot exports.

1. Is the Commission aware of the aforementioned application's implications for the Turkish Cypriot community and economy?

2. What is the Commission prepared to do to prevent the potentially discriminatory effects of the application?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2012)

The European Commission is aware of the concerns of Turkish Cypriot producers of Halloumi/Helim as regards the registration of Halloumi as a Protected Designation of Origin (PDO).

As the Honourable Member might know, the government of the Republic of Cyprus withdrew the application in April 2012. In case a new application for registration would be submitted by the government of the Republic of Cyprus, the Turkish Cypriot stakeholders should be involved in the framework of the prior consultation process which has to take place at national level, pursuant to Article 5, paragraph 5 of Regulation (EC) No 510/2006 ([1]).

The issue was raised during the recent visit to Cyprus of the Member of the Commission responsible for Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy on 19 and 20 June.

([1]) '…the Member State shall initiate a national objection procedure ensuring adequate publication of the application and providing for a reasonable period within which any natural or legal person having a legitimate interest and established or resident on its territory may lodge an objection to the application. … The Member State shall ensure that its favourable decision [to forward and application to the Commission] is made public and that any natural or legal person having a legitimate interest has means of appeal. …'.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005624/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(5 juni 2012)

Betreft: Turkse musicus Fazil Say wordt ervan beschuldigd de islam te hebben beledigd

1. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de nieuwsberichten „Turkish pianist charged with insulting Islam" ([1]) en „Turkish pianist Fazil Say charged over Islam „insult"" ([2])?

2. Hoe luidt de aanklacht tegen Fazil Say, op grond van welke rechtsbeginselen wordt hij vervolgd en hoe beoordeelt de Commissie die rechtsbeginselen?

3. Deelt de Commissie de constatering dat sprake is van een nieuwe aanval van de islamiserende Turkse staat op de vrijheid van meningsuiting? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Welke consequenties heeft de zaak Fazil Say voor het EU-toetredingsproces van Turkije?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(18 juli 2012)

De Commissie volgt de rechtszaak tegen Fazil Say met bezorgdheid. Het openbaar ministerie heeft in de tenlastelegging tegen hem 9 maand tot 1,5 jaar gevangenisstraf gevraagd wegens het aanzetten tot haat of het denigreren en bespotten van religieuze waarden. Het 19e Strafvredegerecht van Istanbul heeft de tenlastelegging aanvaard en de eerste hoorzitting is gepland voor 18 oktober 2012.

De vrijheid van meningsuiting en de vrijheid van gedachte, geweten en godsdienst, die ook de vrijheid om niet te geloven omvat, zijn grondrechten waarop de Commissie toezicht houdt in het kader van haar beoordeling van de vorderingen van Turkije bij het voldoen aan de politieke criteria. De Commissie heeft bij diverse gelegenheden gewezen op de dringende noodzaak dat Turkije tekortkomingen in dit verband aanpakt. De Commissie zal deze zaak op de voet blijven volgen.

([1]) http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4237094,00.html
([2]) http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/turkish-pianist-fazil-say-charged-over-islam-insult-7811445.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005624/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(5 June 2012)

Subject: Turkish musician Fazil Say accused of insulting Islam

1. What is the Commission's view of the news reports 'Turkish pianist charged with insulting Islam' ([1]) and 'Turkish pianist Fazil Say charged over Islam "insult"' ([2])?

2. What is the charge against Fazil Say, on the basis of which legal principles is he being prosecuted and what is the Commission's view of these legal principles?

3. Does the Commission share the observation that this is a new attack on freedom of speech by the Islamising Turkish state? If not, why not?

4. How does the Fazil Say case affect Turkey's EU accession process?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2012)

The Commission is following with concern the lawsuit against Fazil Say. The prosecution prepared an incitement against him requesting from 9 months to 1.5 years imprisonment for indictment to hatred or denigration and insulting religious values. The Istanbul 19th Criminal Court of Peace has accepted the indictment and scheduled the first hearing for 18 October 2012.

Freedom of expression and freedom of thought, conscience and religion, which includes also the freedom not to believe, are fundamental rights monitored by the Commission in its appreciation of Turkey's progress towards meeting the political criteria. The Commission has on various occasions underlined the urgent need for Turkey to address shortcomings in this regard. The Commission will continue to closely follow this case.

([1]) http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4237094,00.html
([2]) http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/turkish-pianist-fazil-say-charged-over-islam-insult-7811445.html

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-005644/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(5 de Junho de 2012)

Assunto: Robert Mugabe

Segundo notícia veiculada pelo jornal Público, «as Nações Unidas decidiram escolher o Presidente do Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe, como um dos seus líderes para o turismo. Uma escolha que está a levantar uma onda de indignação junto de ativistas dos direitos humanos.»

Mugabe, de 88 anos, é acusado de corrupção, de violação dos direitos humanos, e ainda de estar a levar o país à bancarrota.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento desta situação? Como a qualifica?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(17 de Agosto de 2012)

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente está a par das notícias segundo as quais Robert Mugabe teria sido nomeado pelas Nações Unidas como líder para o turismo, como mencionado pelo Senhor Deputado.

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente tomou igualmente conhecimento da nota de informação emitida pela Organização Mundial de Turismo das Nações Unidas (UNWTO), em maio de 2012, em resposta à cobertura de imprensa da 20.ª assembleia geral da UNWTO realizada em Victoria Falls, Zâmbia/Zimbabwe. Nesta nota, a UNWTO afirma que foi apresentada a todos os Chefes de Governo, incluindo o Presidente Robert Mugabe, uma carta aberta com o objetivo de sensibilizar para o potencial do turismo em matéria de desenvolvimento, criação de emprego e crescimento económico. A UNWTO declara também que não tem um programa de embaixadores e o facto de receber a carta aberta não implica para o destinatário qualquer compromisso jurídico ou atribuição de título oficial.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005644/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(5 June 2012)

Subject: Robert Mugabe

According to reports in the newspaper *Público*, the United Nations has chosen Robert Mugabe, the President of Zimbabwe, as a 'leader for tourism'. This has triggered protests from human rights campaigners.

Mugabe, who is 88 years old, is accused of corruption, human rights violations and leading the country into bankruptcy.

Is the Commission aware of this situation? How does it view it?

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

The HR/VP is aware of media reports of Robert Mugabe being appointed as leader for tourism by the United Nations, as referred to by the Honourable Member.

The HR/VP has also taken note of the Information Note which was released by the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) in May 2012 in response to the press coverage of the 20th UNWTO General Assembly in Victoria Falls, Zambia/Zimbabwe. In this note the UNWTO states that an open letter with the aim to raise awareness of the potential of tourism for development, job creation and economic growth was presented to all heads of government worldwide, including President Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe. UNWTO also states that it does not have an Ambassadors Programme and that receiving the open letter does not imply any legal commitment or official title attribution to the recipient.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005656/12
to the Commission
Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)
(5 June 2012)

Subject: Definition of SME status

Can the Commission state whether a company can be said to conform to the SME definition adopted by the Commission in its Recommendation 2003/361/EC solely on the basis of the size of the company's staff and turnover?

Alternatively, is it the case in all circumstances that, if an upstream enterprise holds a shareholding of more than 25 % in an SME, this disqualifies the smaller company, even though it only employs — for example — 100 people, from attaining SME status as defined in Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(25 June 2012)

Recommendation 2003/361/EC comprises three main criteria for establishing the status of an enterprise, i.e. the number of employees, the balance sheet total and the annual turnover. While the number of employees is a mandatory criterion, enterprises are free to choose which one of the two financial ceilings (i.e. either balance sheet total or annual turnover) should be applied to establish their status.

A firm which is part of a group of enterprises may need to include employee/balance sheet/turnover data from that group also in order to establish its status. According to Article 6, the data of any 'partner' enterprises situated immediately upstream or downstream has to be added in proportion to the percentage of capital or voting rights. The same Article also requires that 100 % of the data of any enterprises which are directly or indirectly 'linked' to that enterprise has to be added.

However, as long as the data of the group does not exceed the employee and financial ceilings, the enterprise remains an SME.

The SME Definition User Guide provides further explanations and a number of illustrative examples on how to establish the data of a group of enterprises.

The SME Definition Website and the User Guide are available at http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/facts-figures-analysis/sme-definition/index_en.htm. For specific questions regarding the application of the SME definition the Commission has also established a help desk, which is available under the email address entr-sme-definition@ec.europa.eu.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005659/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(5 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Contaminación radiactiva del atún de aleta azul (Thunnus orientalis)

Los efectos nocivos sobre la naturaleza de la catástrofe de Fukushima todavía se hacen sentir. Algunos estudios recientes han demostrado que los peces se contaminan mientras se encuentran en aguas japonesas y que esta contaminación se mantiene durante sus migraciones. La revista *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*' ha publicado un artículo al respecto escrito por Daniel J. Madigan et al.

Durante el estudio al que se hace referencia en el artículo, se examinó el tejido muscular de 15 atunes de aleta azul (*Thunnus orientalis*) capturados en las costas de San Diego en agosto de 2011 —solo unos pocos meses después del accidente de la planta nuclear de Fukushima Daiichi— y se detectó radiactividad.

Todos los peces examinados en el estudio presentaban unos elevados niveles de los isótopos radiactivos cesio-134 y cesio-137. Las concentraciones detectadas eran aproximadamente 10 veces superiores a la radiactividad total observada por este elemento en ejemplares de atún capturados antes del accidente.

Los niveles de radiactividad están muy por debajo de los límites permitidos y son inferiores a los niveles emitidos por otros radioisótopos naturalmente presentes en el medio ambiente, como el potasio-40. Los científicos han calculado incluso el nivel de radiactividad que presentaría el atún antes de cruzar el Pacífico —teniendo en cuenta que se habría reducido con el paso del tiempo— y han estimado que podría haber sido un 50 % superior. Aún así, el atún cumpliría los requisitos legales para un consumo seguro.

Los atunes capturados en los próximos meses se someterán a nuevos análisis, dado que han pasado mucho más tiempo en aguas japonesas y cabe pensar que presenten unos niveles de contaminación muy diferentes.

¿Se plantea la Comisión la posibilidad de realizar investigaciones similares con otras especies migratorias que frecuentan las aguas japonesas?

¿Tiene previsto la Comisión imponer algún control sobre el pescado importado por la UE cuyas migraciones atraviesan las aguas japonesas?

¿Existe algún riesgo para los consumidores europeos?

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

Las conclusiones de Madigan *et al*. confirman las de una reunión de expertos UE-Japón celebrada en Bruselas el 3 de octubre del año pasado. Madigan *et al*. estiman que la contaminación del atún en la zona está por debajo de los límites de seguridad para el consumo, lo que concuerda con las mediciones efectuadas por el Ministerio de Agricultura, Silvicultura y Pesca de Japón. La contaminación fuera de la zona cae con una semivida de unos 58 días, ya que los peces excretan los radionucleidos.

A raíz de las recomendaciones de la reunión de expertos de la UE y Japón, la comunicación del Sistema de Alerta Rápida para los Productos Alimenticios y los Alimentos para Animales de la UE de 3 de enero de 2012 recomienda como medida de precaución que las muestras de las importaciones de pescado pelágico migratorio como el atún capturado en la zona de pesca 61, que abarca la zona del Pacífico desde la costa de Japón hacia el este hasta la mitad del Pacífico, hacia el norte hasta el Estrecho de Bering y hacia el sur hasta el paralelo 20° N, sea objeto de seguimiento por parte de los Estados miembros en el momento de su importación. Los servicios de la Comisión controlan los resultados de este seguimiento para garantizar que no haya riesgo para los consumidores europeos. Hasta la fecha, la medición en el momento de la importación confirma de forma sistemática que la contaminación de los productos pesqueros del Pacífico apenas es detectable y que está muy por debajo del nivel máximo admisible.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005659/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(5 June 2012)

Subject: Radioactive contamination in bluefin tuna (Thunnus orientalis)

The Fukushima disaster's harmful impact on nature is still being felt. Recent studies show that fish are being contaminated while in Japanese waters and remain contaminated during their migrations. The journal Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences' has published an article on the subject by Daniel J. Madigan et al.

During the study on which the article is based, muscle tissue from 15 bluefin tuna (*Thunnus orientalis*) taken from waters off San Diego in August 2011 — just a few months after the accident at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant — was examined, and radioactivity detected.

All of the fish examined in the study showed elevated levels of the radioactive isotopes caesium -134 and -137. The measured concentrations were about 10 times the total caesium radioactivity seen in tuna specimens taken before the accident.

The levels of radioactivity are well within permitted limits, and below the levels emitted by other radioisotopes that occur naturally in the environment, such as potassium-40. The scientists even calculated how much radioactivity might have been present in the fish before they swam across the Pacific — bearing in mind that the level would have fallen over time — and estimated that it could have been 50 % higher than background levels; the fish would still have met the legal requirements for safe consumption, however.

Tuna caught in the coming months will be subjected to new tests, as they will have spent much longer in Japanese waters and could conceivably show very different levels of contamination.

Does the Commission consider that similar investigations should be extended to other migratory species that frequent Japanese waters?

Is the Commission planning any monitoring of fish imported by the EU whose migration routes pass through Japanese waters?

Are there any risks for European consumers?

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

The results from Madigan et al. confirm the findings of an EU-Japan expert meeting held in Brussels on 3 October last year. Madigan et al. estimate that the contamination of tuna inside the zone is below safe limits for European consumption. This agrees with Japanese Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries measurements. Contamination outside the zone falls with a half-life of about 58 days as the radionuclides are excreted from the fish.

Following recommendations from the EU-Japan expert meeting, the EU Rapid Action Alert System for Food and Feed communication of 3 January 2012 recommended as a precautionary measure that samples of imports of migratory pelagic fish such as tuna caught in fisheries area 61, which covers the Pacific area from the Japanese coast eastwards to halfway across the Pacific, northwards to the Bering Strait and southwards to the 20°N latitude, be monitored by Member States at import. Results of this monitoring are checked by Commission services to ensure that there is no risk to European consumers. To date, the measuring at import consistently confirms that contamination of fish products from the Pacific has been barely detectable and far below the maximum permissible level.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-005662/12
komissiolle
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(5. kesäkuuta 2012)

Aihe: Kansallinen rinnakkaisvaluutta Kreikkaan

Kreikan tilanne on nyt niin vakava ja sen velka niin toivoton, että epäperinteisiäkin ratkaisuja olisi harkittava. Ratkaisu rahaliiton ongelmiin ei välttämättä ole kriisimaiden eroaminen eurosta tai parempikuntoisten maiden pelastautuminen omaksi alueekseen, koska tämä menetelmä on hidas ja arvaamaton.

Suomalainen Taloussanomat uutisoi 19. huhtikuuta kreikkalaisesta Voloksen kaupungista, jossa on kokeiltu rinnakkaisvaluuttaa. Kaupungin pormestarin mukaan tilanne on luonut uutta optimismia. Kahden rahajärjestelmän rinnakkaiselo on osoittautunut mahdolliseksi, eikä kyse ole harmaasta taloudesta, sillä vaihdannaistaloudesta pidetään kirjaa keskustietokoneella. Kokeilun on todettu tarjonneen monille ulospääsyn syvästä taloudellisesta ja sosiaalisesta kriisistä. Käytännössä kaksoisvaluuttajärjestelmässä on kyse hallitusti toteutetusta sisäisestä devalvaatiosta, jolla voidaan ehkä myös turvata työn mielekkyyden moraali ja rauhan säilyttäminen. Kansallinen rinnakkaisvaluutta voisi olla joko laskennallinen järjestelmä tai Kreikan tapauksessa konkreettinen drakman seteli. Se kuitenkin elvyttäisi paikallista taloutta ja työllisyyttä ja estäisi hintojen nousupainetta.

Onko komissio harkinnut euron seuraksi kansallista rinnakkaisvaluuttaa, joka toimisi suhdannepoliittisena vastavoimana ja elvyttäjänä? Vastikään samantasoisen ajatuksen esitti Deutsche Bankin pääkansantaloustieteilijä Thomas Mayer.

Tavallinen kreikkalainen työtätekevä ihminen voisi ostaa päivittäistavaroita ja selvitä vaikeimman yli drakmoilla. Samalla Kreikan talous palaa sinne, missä sen luontainen kilpailuetu on. Kreikan taloudesta 15 prosenttia tulee matkailuelinkeinosta, ja tälle alueelle saataisiin aikaiseksi rinnakkaisvaluutan avulla järkevä devalvoituminen. Tästä olisi lisäksi välillistä hyötyä maataloudelle ja kauppamerenkululle. Näin maa voisi maksaa luottojaan takaisin EU-maille ja pankeille välttäen samalla sisäisen sekasorron. Kun kriisi on ohi, tyylikäs paluu yksiselitteiseen euroon olisi mahdollinen.

Olli Rehnin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(17. elokuuta 2012)

Komissio tekee tiivistä yhteistyötä Kreikan kanssa auttaakseen sitä korjaamaan taloutensa heikkoudet, palauttamaan kasvun ja luomaan työpaikkoja. Samalla komissio on täysin sitoutunut säilyttämään euroalueen eheyden, joka horjuisi vakavalla tavalla, jos erilaisia ”rinnakkaisvaluuttoja” tai ”näennäisvaluuttoja” otettaisiin käyttöön.

Kysyjän mainitsemat vaihtoehdot eivät olisi ratkaisu Kreikan talouselämän keskeisiin ongelmiin ja mukautustarpeisiin, vaan niihin liittyisi huomattavia riskejä ja haittoja. Välittömät kustannukset olisivat korkeat (esim. ulkomaanvelan määrän ja pankkien varautumisjärjestelytarpeiden kannalta) ja taloudelle aiheutuisi vakavia ja laajapohjaisia häiriöitä. Tämä ei olisi Kreikan eikä muidenkaan euroalueen maiden etujen mukaista. Ei ole syytä etsiä turhaan nopeita ratkaisuja, vaan pyrkiä yhdessä toteuttamaan tarvittavat uudistukset Kreikan kilpailukyvyn palauttamiseksi ja maan palauttamiseksi kestävän kasvun polulle.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005662/12
to the Commission
Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE)
(5 June 2012)

Subject: A national parallel currency for Greece

The situation in Greece is now so serious, and its debt so hopeless, that unconventional solutions should be considered. The solution to the monetary union's problems is not necessarily the detachment of crisis countries from the euro or the fleeing of the better rated countries into their own area, because this method is slow and unpredictable.

The Finnish newspaper *Taloussanomat* reported on 19 April from the Greek city of Volos, which has tried using a parallel currency. According to the city's mayor, the trial has generated new optimism. The parallel existence of two currency systems has shown itself to be viable. There is no question of this being an underground economy because the records of the barter economy are kept on a central computer. The trial has been found to offer many people a way out of a deep economic and social crisis. In practice, the dual-currency system is a controlled implementation of internal devaluation, which could also be used to safeguard working morale and maintain peace. A national parallel currency could either be a computational system or, as in the case of Greece, the re-introduction of an actual drachma note. In any case, it would revive the local economy and employment levels and avoid the pressure to increase prices.

Has the Commission considered a national parallel currency alongside the euro, which would function as a countercyclical political balance and reviving force? Recently, a similar idea was presented by the senior economist Thomas Mayer of Deutsche Bank.

The average working Greek person could purchase groceries and use drachmas to make it through the most difficult times. At the same time, the Greek economy would return to where its natural competitive advantage lies. Tourism makes up 15 % of Greece's economy; the parallel currency could lead to a prudent devaluation for this sector. In addition, this arrangement would provide an indirect benefit for the farming and the commercial shipping industry. This way, the country could pay its debts to EU countries and banks while avoiding internal chaos. When the crisis is over, a dignified and smooth return to a single euro currency would be possible.

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

The Commission works closely with Greece to support its efforts to overcome underlying weaknesses in the economy and restore growth and job creation, while remaining fully committed to preserving the integrity of the Euro area. The latter would be severely undermined by introducing any type of 'parallel' or 'quasi-currency'.

On substance, such options would not bypass the fundamental challenges and adjustment needs facing the Greek economy, while generating significant risks and drawbacks. This includes high immediate costs (including in terms of external debt levels and the need for banking sector backstops) but also severe and broad-based disturbances in the economy. This is neither in the interest of Greek citizens nor of the Euro area as a whole. Rather than seeking elusive quick-fixes, joint efforts should be directed at undertaking necessary reforms to restore competitiveness and bring Greece back on a sustainable growth path.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-005693/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(6 Ιουνίου 2012)

Θέμα: Άρση ποινής και ρήτρας αποκλεισμού των Ελληνικών Ναυπηγείων ΑΕ, στο πλαίσιο τόνωσης της ελληνικής οικονομίας

Η εξαιρετικά δυσμενής οικονομική κατάσταση της Ελλάδας έχει επηρεάσει, μεταξύ άλλων, και τον τομέα της ναυπηγοεπισκευαστικής βιομηχανίας. Χαρακτηριστικό είναι ότι τα τελευταία χρόνια έχουν ναυπηγηθεί 653 πλοία ελληνικής ιδιοκτησίας στην Κορέα και στην Κίνα και μόνο ένα στην Ελλάδα.

Την περιορισμένη απόδοση της συγκεκριμένης βιομηχανίας επιβαρύνει ακόμα περισσότερο η διακοπή του εμπορικού τμήματος των Ελληνικών Ναυπηγείων ΑΕ (ΕΝΑΕ), ενός από τα τρία μεγαλύτερα ναυπηγεία στην Ελλάδα, κατόπιν σχετικής απόφασης της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής στο πλαίσιο της ανάκτησης παράνομων κρατικών ενισχύσεων από το ελληνικό δημόσιο προς την εν λόγω επιχείρηση.

Επιπλέον, την αποκλειστική στρατιωτική δραστηριότητα των ΕΝΑΕ παρακωλύει και ρήτρα αποκλεισμού από τη δυνατότητα ναυπήγησης και επισκευής πολεμικών πλοίων άλλων χωρών, γεγονός που καθιστά το πληγωμένο οικονομικά ελληνικό πολεμικό ναυτικό τον μοναδικό «πελάτη» της επιχείρησης.

Έχοντας υπόψη την απάντηση στην ερώτηση E-2114/2012 αλλά κυρίως την εξαιρετικά δυσμενή οικονομική κατάσταση της Ελλάδας και τα πρωτοφανή ποσοστά της ανεργίας, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Προτίθεται να συζητήσει την επανεξέταση –έστω και προσωρινή– της 15ετούς ποινής που έχει επιβληθεί στα Ελληνικά Ναυπηγεία ΑΕ για μη-στρατιωτικές δραστηριότητες ώστε να ανακάμψει ο κλάδος στην Ελλάδα;

2. Δεδομένου ότι ο επικεφαλής της Ομάδας Δράσης της ΕΕ στην Ελλάδα έχει επανειλημμένως τονίσει τη σημασία της τόνωσης της ανάπτυξης, είναι δυνατόν, στο πλαίσιο αυτό, να αρθεί η προαναφερθείσα ρήτρα ώστε να μπορούν τα ΕΝΑΕ να αναλαμβάνουν και συμβόλαια για ναυπήγηση ή επισκευή πολεμικών πλοίων από άλλες χώρες;

3. Είναι ενήμερη για το μέτρο της εκ περιτροπής εργασίας για τους 1 200 εργαζομένους που χρησιμοποιούν οι νέοι ιδιοκτήτες των ναυπηγείων ως μέσον άσκησης πίεσης προς την ελληνική κυβέρνηση για να πληρώσει προκαταβολικά τις εργασίες που είχαν συμφωνηθεί κατά την πώληση της επιχείρησης;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Ιουλίου 2012)

1. Όπως έχει επισημάνει η Επιτροπή στις απαντήσεις της σε προηγούμενες γραπτές ερωτήσεις που αφορούν τα Ελληνικά Ναυπηγεία (ΕΝΑΕ) ([1]), είναι πολύ σημαντικό να λαμβάνεται υπόψη το πλαίσιο στο οποίο η Επιτροπή και τα ΕΝΑΕ δεσμεύτηκαν να περιορίσουν τις δραστηριότητες του ναυπηγείου σε στρατιωτικές παραγγελίες. Τα τελευταία δεκαπέντε χρόνια η Ελλάδα επανειλημμένως χορήγησε παράνομες και ασύμβατες ενισχύσεις στα ΕΝΑΕ παρέχοντας τους αθέμιτο πλεονέκτημα έναντι των ανταγωνιστών τους. Το 2008, η Επιτροπή ζήτησε από την Ελλάδα να ανακτήσει αυτές τις ενισχύσεις (πάνω από 230 ευρώ συν τους τόκους). Μετά από αίτηση της Ελλάδας, και λαμβάνοντας υπόψη λόγους εθνικής ασφάλειας, η Επιτροπή δέχτηκε, το 2010, περιορισμένη ανάκτηση, με αντάλλαγμα αριθμό δεσμεύσεων για τη μείωση των στρεβλώσεων του ανταγωνισμού στη μη στρατιωτική αγορά (ιδίως στον περιορισμό του ναυπηγείου σε στρατιωτικές δραστηριότητες για 15 χρόνια).

2. Η Επιτροπή πιστεύει ότι, για να στηρίξει την ανάπτυξη και την απασχόληση, η Ελλάδα πρέπει να ανακτήσει τη χρηματοοικονομική και φορολογική σταθερότητα, να εφαρμόσει μια σειρά διαρθρωτικών μεταρρυθμίσεων και να βελτιώσει την απορρόφηση και την αποδοτικότητα των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων της ΕΕ. Όσον αφορά το ζήτημα της κρατικής ενίσχυσης που θέτει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην ερώτησή του, στο παρόν στάδιο δεν έχει πραγματοποιηθεί καμία ανάκτηση (ούτε καν περιορισμένη). Υπό αυτές τις συνθήκες, και απουσία πλήρους ανάκτησης, δεν δικαιολογείται η άρση του περιορισμού των μη στρατιωτικών δραστηριοτήτων.

3. Η Επιτροπή δεν μπορεί να σχολιάσει το πρόγραμμα εργασιών του ναυπηγείου, θα ήθελε ωστόσο να υπενθυμίσει ότι μια από τις δεσμεύσεις της Ελλάδας, στο πλαίσιο εφαρμογής της απόφασης, είναι ότι δεν θα χορηγηθεί άλλη ενίσχυση στα ΕΝΑΕ.

([1]) Βλ. E-2114/2012 και E-3696/2012 στη διεύθυνση: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EL

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005693/12
to the Commission
Georgios Koumoutsakos (PPE)
(6 June 2012)

Subject: Waiving of penalty and exclusion clause for Hellenic Shipyards S.A. to stimulate the Greek economy

The exceptionally unfavourable economic situation in Greece has also influenced the shipbuilding industry, among other things. It is typical that out of Greek-owned ships, 653 were constructed in Korea and China and currently only one constructed in Greece.

Shipbuilding's limited output is even further exacerbated by the closure of the commercial department of Hellenic Shipyards S.A., one of the three largest shipyards in Greece, pursuant to the European Commission's relevant decision in the context of recovering illegal state aid from the shipyard by the Greek public sector.

Moreover, the exclusively military character of production at the Hellenic Shipyards S.A. is obstructed by the exclusion clause disallowing construction and repair of warships belonging to other countries, so that the economically incapacitated Greek navy becomes the enterprise's sole customer.

Considering the answer to question No E-2114/2012, but above all the particularly unfavourable economic situation in Greece and the unprecedented levels of unemployment, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Does it intend to discuss re-examination — if only provisional — of the 15-year prohibition of non-military activities imposed on Hellenic Shipyards S.A., to help the sector recover in Greece?

2. Given that the Head of the EU Task Force for Greece has repeatedly emphasised stimulating growth, is it possible, in this context, for the abovementioned clause to be waived so that Hellenic Shipyards S.A. can contract construction or repair of warships of other countries?

3. Is it aware of the measure of rotating shift work for the 1 200 people employed by the shipyards' new owners as a means of exerting pressure on the Greek Government to pay in advance for work commissioned at the time that the company was being sold?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(20 July 2012)

1. As noted by the Commission in the previous answers to written questions concerning the Hellenic Shipyards (HSY) ([1]), it is important to keep in mind the context in which Greece and HSY committed to limit the yards' activities to military orders. Over the past fifteen years, Greece repeatedly provided unlawful and incompatible aid to HSY giving it an unfair advantage over its competitors. In 2008, the Commission requested Greece to recover this aid (more than EUR 230 million plus interest). At Greece's request and taking into account reasons of national security, the Commission accepted in 2010 a limited recovery, in exchange for a number of commitments to minimise competition distortions in the civil market (in particular the limitation of the yard to military activities for 15 years).

2. The Commission believes that to support growth and employment, Greece needs to regain financial and fiscal stability, implement a series of structural reforms and improve the absorption and efficiency of EU structural funds. As regards the state aid issue raised in the Honourable Member's question, at this stage, no recovery (even limited) has been realised. In these circumstances and in the absence of a full recovery, lifting the ban on civil activities is not justified.

3. The Commission cannot comment on the shipyards' working schedule. The Commission would however like to recall that one of Greece's commitments is that no new aid will be granted to HSY in the context of the implementation of the decision.

([1]) See E-2114/2012 and E-3696/2012 in http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005703/12
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(6 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: Seguridad y salud en buques pesqueros

Con fecha 1 de junio se ha sabido que la Comisión Europea emitió un dictamen motivado en relación al no cumplimento del Estado español de la Directiva 93/103/EC sobre mínimos estándares de seguridad y salud en el trabajo en buques pesqueros.

En dicho dictamen se anuncia que la Comisión Europea da 2 meses para que el Estado español enmiende su legislación para que esté acorde con esta Directiva.

En este sentido:

— ¿Podría indicar la Comisión si la no aplicación de esta Directiva ha empeorado las condiciones de los trabajadores-tripulantes de estos buques? ¿Ha recibido la Comisión alguna denuncia al respecto?

— ¿Podría explicar cuáles son los incumplimientos en los que el Estado español ha incurrido?

— ¿Está la Comisión pensando en algún tipo de sanción?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de julio de 2012)

Con arreglo a lo dispuesto en la Directiva 93/103/CE ([1]), el armador de un buque de pesca tiene una serie de responsabilidades en cuanto a la salud y la seguridad a bordo. En su dictamen motivado complementario dirigido a España el 1 de junio de 2012 ([2]), la Comisión consideró que la definición de «armador» de la Directiva no había sido incorporada correctamente al ordenamiento jurídico español.

En la Directiva se establece que el armador de un buque de pesca es «el propietario registrado del buque, excepto cuando el buque sea fletado con cesión de la gestión náutica o sea gestionado […] por una persona física o jurídica distinta del propietario registrado en virtud de un acuerdo de gestión». La Comisión considera que los criterios por los que se determina quién es el armador de un buque en el ordenamiento jurídico español no corresponden a los de la Directiva.

La Comisión no ha recibido denuncia alguna sobre las condiciones de trabajo de los pescadores en España. Sin embargo, cuando no está claramente definido quién es responsable en la práctica de que se apliquen las normas de salud y seguridad en los buques de pesca, existe el riesgo de que dichas normas no se apliquen.

España cuenta ahora con dos meses para adaptar su legislación en consonancia con la Directiva; de no hacerlo así, la Comisión podría llevar a España ante el Tribunal de Justicia. La Comisión no tiene autoridad para imponer sanción alguna a España en relación con este asunto.

([1]) Directiva 93/103/CE del Consejo, de 23 de noviembre de 1993, relativa a las disposiciones mínimas de seguridad y de salud en el trabajo a bordo de los buques de pesca, DO L 307 de 13.12.1993, p. 1.

([2]) Tras el dictamen motivado enviado a España el 22 de marzo de 2010 con respecto a la Directiva 93/103/CE, la Comisión emitió un dictamen motivado complementario aduciendo más motivos para considerar que la legislación española no se ajusta a la definición de «armador» de un buque pesquero establecida por la Directiva.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005703/12
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(6 June 2012)

Subject: Health and safety on board fishing vessels

We learnt on 1 June that the Commission had issued a reasoned opinion on Spain's failure to comply with Directive 93/103/EC concerning the minimum health and safety standards for work on board fishing vessels.

The opinion stated that the Commission was giving Spain two months to bring its legislation into line with this directive.

In this regard:

— Could the Commission say whether the failure to apply this directive has worsened conditions for workers and crew on these vessels? Has the Commission received any complaint on this matter?

— Could the Commission indicate where Spain has been guilty of non-compliance?

— Is the Commission considering imposing any sanction?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2012)

The owner of a fishing vessel has certain responsibilities regarding health and safety on board pursuant to Directive 93/103/EC ([1]). In its additional reasoned opinion addressed to Spain on 1 June 2012 ([2]), the Commission took the view that the definition of 'owner' in the directive had not been correctly transposed into Spanish law.

The directive provides that the owner of the fishing vessel is the registered owner of the vessel, unless the latter has been chartered by demise or is managed by a natural or legal person other than the registered owner under a management agreement. The Commission considers that the criteria for determining the owner of a fishing vessel in Spanish law do not correspond to those in the directive.

The Commission has received no complaints regarding the working conditions of fishermen in Spain. However, in the absence of a clear definition of the person responsible in practice for applying the health and safety rules on fishing vessels, there is a risk that those rules will not be applied.

Spain now has two months to bring its legislation into line with the directive, failing which the Commission may refer Spain to the Court of Justice. The Commission has no authority to impose any penalty on Spain in this matter.

([1]) Council Directive 93/103/EC of 23 November 1993 concerning the minimum safety and health requirements for work on board fishing vessels, OJ L 307, 13.12.1993, p. 1.

([2]) Following the reasoned opinion sent to Spain on 22 March 2010 concerning Directive 93/103/EC, the Commission issued an additional reasoned opinion adducing further grounds for considering that the Spanish legislation was not in line with the directive's definition of 'owner' of a fishing vessel.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005705/12
alla Commissione
Guido Milana (S&D)
(6 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Tonno radioattivo

Con riferimento all'interrogazione scritta da me presentata sulle «Informazioni sul luogo d'origine dei prodotti ittici nelle conserve di pesce e sul pesce in scatola a rischio nucleare», e alla luce degli studi effettuati dopo il disastro di Fukushima da ricercatori della Hopkins Marine Station dell'Università di Stanford e della School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences dellUniversità di Stony Brook, pubblicati nei giorni scorsi, che confermano l'allarme che tonni portatori di radioattività stanno arrivando negli oceani e verosimilmente arriveranno anche nel Mediterraneo, loro luogo di riproduzione;

— Potrebbe la Commissione precisare quali tempestive misure intende prendere al fine di garantire che i consumatori europei siano adeguatamente protetti e informati?

Risposta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione
(27 luglio 2012)

La Commissione ha seguito attentamente la situazione e ha preso le misure adeguate ad assicurare la sicurezza del pesce e dei prodotti ittici provenienti dall'area interessata. In seguito alle raccomandazioni emerse dalla riunione di esperti UE-Giappone del 3 ottobre 2011, in data 3 gennaio 2012 è stata emessa una notifica attraverso il sistema di allarme rapido per gli alimenti e i mangimi, che raccomanda alle autorità competenti degli Stati membri di campionare, a titolo precauzionale, le importazioni di pesci migratori pelagici, quali i tonni catturati nella zona di pesca 61. Tale zona, che copre l'area del Pacifico dalla costa giapponese fino a metà del Pacifico in direzione est, fino allo Stretto di Bering in direzione nord e fino al 20° di latitudine nord in direzione sud, deve essere oggetto di attenti controlli all'importazione da parte degli Stati membri.

Ad oggi, la contaminazione dei prodotti ittici provenienti da questa regione misurata all'importazione è a malapena rilevabile e risulta molto inferiore al livello massimo ammissibile. La contaminazione dei pesci catturati al di fuori di questa zona dovrebbe essere addirittura inferiore poiché essa si riduce con una emivita di circa 58 giorni, in quanto il pesce espelle i radionuclidi. Per ulteriori dettagli si rimanda inoltre alla risposta all'interrogazione E-005699/2012 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005705/12
to the Commission
Guido Milana (S&D)
(6 June 2012)

Subject: Radioactive tuna

With reference to the written question I submitted regarding information on the origin of fish products in potentially radioactive tinned fish, and in view of the recently published studies carried out after the Fukushima disaster by researchers at Stanford University's Hopkins Marine Station and Stony Brook University's School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, which confirm the concern that radioactive tuna are arriving in oceans and will probably also come to the Mediterranean, which is their breeding ground:

— Could the Commission clarify which prompt measures it will take to ensure that consumers are adequately protected and informed?

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

The Commission has been closely monitoring the situation and taken the appropriate measures to ensure the safety of fish and fish products from the concerned area. Following recommendations from the EU-Japan expert meeting on 3 October 2011, a notification was issued through the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed on 3 January 2012 recommending to the competent authorities in the Member States to sample as a precautionary measure imports of migratory pelagic fish such as tuna caught in fisheries area 61, which covers the Pacific area from the Japanese coast eastwards to halfway across the Pacific, northwards to the Bering Strait and southwards to the 20°N latitude, be monitored closely by Member States at import.

To date, contamination of fish products from this region measured at import has been barely detectable and far below the maximum permissible level. Contamination from fish caught outside this zone is expected to be even lower because it drops with a half-life of about 58 days as the fish excretes the radionuclides. Please refer also to the answer to Question E-005699/2012 ([1]) for further details.

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

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-005709/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6. juni 2012)

Om: Tilstedeværelse af tysk politi grænseovergangen ved Karlsruhe

Vil Kommissionen som opfølgning på sit svar i E-003475/2012 meddele, om den har kendskab til, hvor ofte tysk politi er til stede ved grænseovergangen mellem Frankrig og Tyskland ved Karlsruhe?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Cecilia Malmström
(11. juli 2012)

Kommissionen har ingen faktuelle oplysninger om, hvor ofte tysk politi er til stede ved den indre grænseovergang mellem Frankrig og Tyskland ved Karlsruhe.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005709/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6 June 2012)

Subject: Presence of German police at the border crossing at Karlsruhe

As a follow-up to its answer E-003475/2012, can the Commission state whether it knows how often German police are present at the border crossing between France and Germany at Karlsruhe?

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

The Commission has no factual information on how often the German Police is present at the internal border crossing point between France and Germany near Karlsruhe.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-005710/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6. juni 2012)

Om: Rabat på turistrejser i EU

De europæiske økonomier er under pres, ikke mindst i Sydeuropa, hvor lande som Grækenland, Spanien, Portugal og Italien trues af regulært sammenbrud.

Et konkret og effektivt forslag, der kunne hjælpe disse lande, ville være at indføre en mærkbar rabat på turistrejser inden for EU. I Grækenland er således 20 % af befolkningen beskæftiget i turisterhvervet, der i januar og februar 2012 led et tab på 44,7 % i forhold til året før. En sådan rabat ville derfor kunne skaffe arbejdspladser til mange unge, der i dag er arbejdsløse, hvilket ikke mindst er tilfældet i Spanien.

Rabatten kan finansieres ved reduktion i landbrugsstøtten, nedlæggelse af strukturprogrammer eller ved at differentiere momsen på pakkerejser henholdsvis i og uden for EU.

Agter Kommissionen på denne baggrund at søge dette forslag fremmet i forbindelse med budgetforhandlingerne og diverse hjælpepakker?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Antonio Tajani
(31. juli 2012)

Den økonomiske krise har fået de nationale regeringer i EU-medlemsstaterne, Den Europæiske Centralbank og Kommissionen til at yde en intens og vedvarende indsats. Alle har arbejdet tæt sammen for at støtte væksten og beskæftigelsen, sikre den finansielle stabilitet og etablere et bedre forvaltningssystem med henblik på fremtiden.

Det Europæiske Råd ([1]) har vedtaget en vækst- og beskæftigelsespagt, som omfatter foranstaltninger, der skal øge konkurrenceevnen og sætte nyt liv i væksten.

Ideen med en rabat på turistrejser inden for Unionen, som det ærede medlem har foreslået, er meget ambitiøs og vidtrækkende. En sådan foranstaltning kan imidlertid ikke foreslås på kommissionsniveau, da turisme frem for alt falder ind under den nationale/regionale kompetence. Kommissionen gør dog en aktiv indsats i forbindelse med den bæredygtige og jobskabende vækst inden for turistindustrien, herunder arbejde med foranstaltninger, der skal øge den internationale turiststrøm til Europa, særlig fra de nye vækstøkonomier.

Desuden investeres der væsentlige EU-midler fra strukturfondene for at forbedre turistinfrastrukturen og konkurrenceevnen ([2]). Disse suppleres af støtte til turistaktiviteter (mindre infrastruktur- og fritidsprojekter, udvikling og markedsføring af turisttjenester i forbindelse med ferie på landet), som tilvejebringes via ELFUL under politikken for udvikling af landdistrikterne ([3]).

Med hensyn til de potentielle finansieringsformer i forbindelse med denne foranstaltning ønsker Kommissionen dog at påpege, at momsen er en forbrugsafgift, som indebærer, at aktiviteter i forbindelse med turistindustrien uden for Unionen ikke generelt er underlagt moms i Unionen.

([1]) Konklusionerne fra Det Europæiske Råd den 28. og 29. juni 2012 findes på adressen: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/131388.pdf

([2]) I den nuværende programperiode (2007-2013) allokerer medlemsstaterne og regionerne — eller de har planer om at allokere — mindst 12,3 mia. EUR fra EFRU til turistrelaterede aktiviteter, som udgør ca. 3,57 % af strukturfondenes samlede udgifter.

([3]) I 2007-2013 har medlemsstaterne og regionerne allokeret 1 234 579 637 EUR fra ELFUL til turistrelaterede aktiviteter.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005710/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6 June 2012)

Subject: Discount on tourist travel in the EU

European economies are under pressure, not least of all in southern Europe, where countries like Greece, Spain, Portugal and Italy face collapse on a regular basis.

A concrete and effective proposal to help these countries would be the introduction of a sizable discount on tourist travel within the EU. In Greece, 20% of the population works in tourism. This sector suffered a 44.7% loss in January and February 2012 compared to the previous year. A discount would create jobs for many young people who are currently unemployed, which is a particular problem in Spain.

The discount can be financed by reducing agricultural aid, by dismantling structural programmes or by charging a differential VAT rate on package tours within and outside the EU.

Does the Commission therefore intend to back this proposal in connection with budget negotiations and various aid packages?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2012)

The economic crisis has prompted intense and sustained action by the EU's national governments, the European Central Bank and the Commission. All have been working closely together to support growth and employment, ensure financial stability, and put in place a better governance system for the future.

The European Council ([1]) agreed on a 'Compact for Growth and Jobs' encompassing actions to enhance competitiveness and revive growth.

The idea of a discount on tourist travel within the EU proposed by the Honourable Member is very ambitious and far-reaching. Such measure can however not be proposed at the Commission's level, because tourism is above all a national/regional competence. The Commission is nonetheless actively addressing the challenge of sustainable and jobs-rich growth in tourism, including work on measures meant to increase international inbound tourist arrivals to Europe, especially from emerging countries.

Moreover, substantial amounts of EU Structural Funds are invested to improve tourism infrastructure and competitiveness ([2]). These are completed by support of tourism activities (small-scale and recreational infrastructure, development and marketing of tourism services relating to rural tourism) provided through the EAFRD under the Rural Development Policy ([3]).

As regards the potential ways of financing the measure, the Commission would like to point out that VAT is a consumption tax which implies that in general activities relating to tourism outside the EU are not subject to VAT in the EU.

([1]) European Council Conclusions of 28/29 June 2012 accessible at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/131388.pdf

([2]) In the current programming period (2007-13), Member States and regions are allocating/have planned to allocate at least EUR 12.3 billion ERDF into tourism-related activities, which is about 3.57% of total Structural Funds expenditure.

([3]) In 2007-13, the Member States and regions have allocated to tourism-related activities EUR 1.234.579.637 from the EAFRD.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-005711/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6. juni 2012)

Om: Ulovlig handel med gødning og sprøjtegifte

Det er kommet frem i den danske presse ([1]), at danske landmænd i en række tilfælde af kriminelle bagmænd er blevet forsynet med ulovlig gødning og sprøjtegifte, herunder IPU (Isoproturon), som er forbudt i en række EU-lande, herunder i Danmark allerede fra 1999. Det er yderligere kommet frem, at (danske) landmænd i Slovakiet, Polen og Letland også er blevet forsynet med disse midler ad samme vej. Der er derfor al mulig grund til at tro, at problemet er generelt for hele EU, ikke mindst i Østeuropa, der ikke råder over samme kontrol- og sanktionsmuligheder som de medlemsstater, hvor midlerne er ulovlige, herunder Danmark?

— Kan Kommissionen bekræfte, at der er tale om et generelt problem i EU, og ligger Kommissionen inde med data, der evt. kan belyse dette kvantitativt?

— Skulle sidstnævnte ikke være tilfældet, agter Kommissionen da at søge problemets omfang kortlagt?

— Hvilke initiativer agter Kommissionen i øvrigt at iværksætte for at komme disse ulovligheder til livs, herunder i form af øgede kontrolmuligheder og stærkere sanktioner?

— Er Kommissionen enig i, at fratagelse og tilbagebetaling af landbrugsstøtte kan være et effektivt sanktionsmiddel, og er Kommissionen parat til at gøre dette muligt?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af John Dalli
(18. juli 2012)

I henhold til bestemmelserne i forordning (EF) nr. 1107/2009 ([2]) må der kun anvendes plantebeskyttelsesmidler, der er godkendt til en bestemt anvendelse i en medlemsstat. Medlemsstaterne har pligt til at håndhæve denne bestemmelse på deres område og regelmæssigt rapportere til Kommissionen herom.

Kommissionen har hidtil ikke modtaget oplysninger om ulovlig indførsel eller anvendelse af isoproturon fra Danmark eller fra andre medlemsstater. Dette kan skyldes, at aktivstoffet er godkendt til brug i plantebeskyttelsesmidler i et flertal af medlemsstaterne og derfor kan anvendes lovligt på disses områder.

Kommissionen overvåger medlemsstaternes overholdelse af kravet om at håndhæve bestemmelserne i forordning (EF) nr. 1107/2009 gennem jævnlige kontrolbesøg foretaget af Levnedsmiddel- og Veterinærkontoret og gennem drøftelser i Den Stående Komité for Fødevarekæden og Dyresundhed.

Betalinger under den fælles landbrugspolitik er knyttet til overholdelse af lovkrav til landbrugsaktiviteter gennem den såkaldte krydsoverensstemmelsesordning. Hvis en landmand, der modtager betalinger under den fælles landbrugspolitik, ikke overholder lovkravene, kan betalingerne nedsættes eller i de alvorligste tilfælde helt bortfalde.

Korrekt anvendelse af plantebeskyttelsesmidler er en juridisk forpligtelse, og medlemsstaterne råder derfor over et retsgrundlag ([3]) til at kræve hel eller delvis tilbagebetaling af landbrugsstøtte, hvis landmændene anvender ulovlige plantebeskyttelsesmidler på deres jord.

([1]) http://politiken.dk/erhverv/ECE1645915/ulovlig-goedning-og-gift-saelges-i-stor-stil/.
([2]) EUT L 309 af 24.11.2009.
([3]) Artikel 4 i Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 73/2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005711/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(6 June 2012)

Subject: Illicit trade in fertilisers and biocidal sprays

The Danish press has reported ([1])a number of cases where criminals have supplied Danish farmers with IPU (Isoproturon), which is prohibited in a number of EU Member States, including Denmark since 1999. It has further been revealed that (Danish) farmers in Slovakia, Poland and Latvia have also been supplied with these substances in the same manner. The problem therefore is believed to be a general one throughout the EU, not least of all in Eastern Europe, which does not have the same inspection and penalty measures as those Member States in which the substances are illegal, including Denmark.

— Can the Commission confirm that this is a general problem in the EU and does the Commission have access to data that might clarify quantities?

— If not, does the Commission intend to investigate the extent of the problem?

— What initiatives does the Commission intend to instigate to tackle these illegal activities, including in the form of increased inspections and stricter penalties?

— Does the Commission agree that the removal and repayment of agricultural aid can be an effective penalty and is the Commission prepared to enable this measure?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2012)

According to the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 ([2]), only plant protection products which are authorised for a certain use in a Member State may be used. It is the obligation of Member States to enforce this provision in their territory, and to regularly report on the outcome to the Commission.

The Commission has so far not received any information on the illegal importation or use of isoproturon from Denmark, nor from other Member States. This might be due to the fact that the active substance is authorised for use in plant protection products in a majority of Member States, and can therefore be legally used in those territories.

The Commission monitors the compliance of Member States in enforcing the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 via regular inspections by the Food and Veterinary Office and via discussions in the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health.

Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) payments are linked to the respect of statutory requirements for agricultural activity through the so called system of cross compliance. If a farmer benefiting from CAP payments does not respect the listed statutory requirements CAP payments can be reduced or, in the most severe cases, entirely cancelled.

Since the proper use of plant protection products is a legal obligation, Member States dispose of a legal basis ([3]) for imposing a reimbursement — partial or total — of agricultural aids paid when farmers use illegal plant protection products on their lands.

([1]) http://politiken.dk/erhverv/ECE1645915/ulovlig-goedning-og-gift-saelges-i-stor-stil/.
([2]) OJ L 309, 24.11.2009.
([3]) Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005712/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Associazione «Borgo Antico»

L'Associazione Borgo Antico nasce ad Andria come associazione di volontariato non profit. È promotrice della salvaguardia, del recupero e della valorizzazione dell'Andria antica attraverso manifestazioni periodiche di sensibilizzazione contro l'incuria e il fenomeno di annichilimento dei cittadini che la abitano. Il centro storico attualmente abitato da un ceto mediobasso è preda di ritrovi di malfattori e microcriminali che minano la crescita culturale e sociale del borgo intaccando il quieto vivere dell'intera città. Contro tale ghettizzazione l'associazione Borgo Antico si muove trasversalmente per spronare quotidianamente l'intervento delle istituzioni attraverso l'organizzazione di feste, gite, escursioni e spettacoli per le vie del centro storico per limitare il più possibile i fenomeni di asocialità.

Alla luce di quanto precede, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. Se l'Associazione ha in precedenza fatto richiesta in precedenza di finanziamenti europei;

2. In caso di risposta negativa, se è possibile per la suddetta associazione, visto l'impegno profuso contro le ingiuste disparità socioculturali e in virtù dell'interesse della Comunità europea a salvaguardare i propri cittadini da fenomeni di discriminazione e ghettizzazione, nonché a salvaguardare i beni artistici e culturali di ogni città europea, usufruire di finanziamenti diretti a migliorare le manifestazioni organizzate e a rispondere al meglio alla richiesta di aiuto sociale?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(23 luglio 2012)

Nel quadro della gestione condivisa applicata per amministrare la politica di coesione, la Commissione esamina ed approva unicamente i progetti di maggiore portata i cui costi complessivi superano i 50 milioni di EUR. Gli Stati membri sono competenti per la selezione e la realizzazione di tutti gli altri progetti.

I progetti suggeriti dall'on. Silvestri potrebbero rientrare nel programma finanziato dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale per la regione Puglia, sotto la priorità «Progetti integrati di rinnovamento urbano e rurale», a condizione di rispettare l'obiettivo e le disposizioni specifiche del programma. Per ulteriori informazioni, la Commissione suggerisce all'on. Silvestri di contattare direttamente l'autorità di gestione del programma.

Autorità di gestione POR Puglia
Viale Japigia, 145
70126 BARI
adgfesr@regione.puglia.it

Per quanto concerne l'attuale programma culturale, l'Associazione Borgo Antico non ha fatto richiesta di finanziamenti in qualità di responsabile del progetto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005712/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 June 2012)

Subject: 'Borgo Antico' Association

The Borgo Antico Association was created in Andria as a non-profit voluntary association. It supports the protection, restoration and promotion of ancient Andria through periodic events to raise awareness of its neglect and destruction by its very own citizens. The historic town centre is currently inhabited by lower-middle class people and frequented by wrongdoers and petty criminals who are undermining the cultural and social development and eroding peaceful existence throughout the town. The Borgo Antico Association is taking extensive action to stop this formation of a ghetto, encouraging institutions to become involved by organising feasts, tours, excursions and shows through the streets of the historic centre in order to limit social deterioration as much as possible.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. whether the Association has previously requested European financing;

2. if not, whether it is possible for the aforementioned association, given its commitment to fighting social and cultural disparities and given the interest of the European Union in protecting its citizens against discrimination and the formation of ghettos, as well in safeguarding the artistic and cultural assets of every European city, to benefit from funding in order to improve the organised events and respond as effectively as possible to the demand for social help?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2012)

In the context of shared management used for the administration of cohesion policy, only major projects whose total cost exceeds EUR 50 million are examined and approved by the Commission. Member States are responsible for selecting and implementing all other projects.

The projects suggested by the Honourable Member could fall within the scope of the European Regional Development Fund programme for the Puglia region, under the priority for 'integrated projects for urban and rural regeneration', provided they comply with the objective and the specific provisions of the programme. For more information, the Commission suggests that the Honourable Member contacts directly the managing authority of the programme:

Autorità di Gestione POR Puglia
Viale Japigia, n. 145
70126 BARI
adgfesr@regione.puglia.it

Concerning the current Culture Programme, the Borgo Antico Association has not applied for funding as project leader.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005714/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Vasi sanguigni in provetta

Ottenuti i primi vasi sanguigni in provetta: sono 3D e si sviluppano, interagiscono e rispondono allo stress in modo simile a quello dei vasi sanguigni naturali. La ricerca è stata effettuata da un gruppo di studiosi di una università americana. Per ottenere i vasi sanguigni artificiali, i ricercatori hanno prima costruito un'impalcatura: piccoli canali di collagene, dalla struttura a forma di nido d'ape, nei quali sono state iniettate cellule umane che rivestono le pareti interne dei vasi sanguigni (cellule endoteliali) prelevate da cordone ombelicale. Dopo due settimane le cellule si sono moltiplicate andando a formare dei micro-canali che hanno generato una rete di vasi. In seguito i vasi artificiali sono stati impiegati per eseguire una serie di test: sono stati irrorati di cellule vascolari del cervello e cellule delle arterie per studiare le interazioni fra i vasi e le cellule che li rivestono nel corpo umano. Per verificare poi se il sistema fosse in grado di trasportare sangue, nei vasi è stato immesso del sangue umano, che è stato trasportato in modo uniforme e veloce.

I vasi artificiali potrebbero essere utilizzati per testare farmaci e la tecnica potrebbe condurre alla realizzazione di tessuti artificiali vascolarizzati per la medicina rigenerativa. Il sistema potrebbe essere utile anche per lo studio della progressione dei tumori più aggressivi, che sviluppano metastasi. I ricercatori hanno, infatti, esposto i vasi ad una proteina ritenuta responsabile di stimolare la crescita dei nuovi vasi sanguigni che nutrono le cellule tumorali. Dopo il trattamento si sono formati vasi che presentano le stesse caratteristiche dei vasi sanguigni delle metastasi.

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, si chiede alla Commissione:

1. È a conoscenza del nuovo studio che ha portato alla creazione dei vasi sanguigni in provetta?

2. Vista l'importanza della ricerca e la necessità di svilupparla, non ritiene che si debba finanziare tramite il settimo programma quadro (7° PQ) oppure tramite il programma quadro per la competitività e l'innovazione?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(17 agosto 2012)

La Commissione è al corrente della ricerca sull'ingegneria tissutale relativa ai vasi sanguigni.

Nell'ambito del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7°PQ, 2007-2013) è stato sostenuto un progetto di ricerca in questo campo. Si tratta del progetto Grail ([1]) «*Tissue in host engineering guided regeneration of arterial intimal layer*», coordinato da Explora Biotech srl, Roma, che ha ottenuto un finanziamento di circa sei milioni di euro.

In linea con la decisione sul programma quadro per la competitività e l'innovazione (CIP), tale programma non sostiene questa tipologia di ricerca.

([1]) www.thegrail-project.eu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005714/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 June 2012)

Subject: Test-tube blood vessels

The first test-tube blood vessels have been produced: they are 3D and develop, interact and respond to stress in a similar way to natural blood vessels. The research was conducted by researchers at a US university. To obtain the artificial blood vessels, the researchers first built scaffolding: small honeycomb-structured, collagen channels, which were injected with the human cells that line blood vessels' inner walls (endothelial cells), obtained from umbilical cords. After two weeks, the cells proliferated to form micro-channels that generated a network of blood vessels. Later, the artificial vessels were used to perform a series of tests: they were sprayed with vascular brain cells and artery cells to study the interaction between the blood vessels and the cells that coat them in the human body. Human blood was inserted into the vessels to verify whether the system was capable of carrying blood and this was carried in a fast, uniform way.

Artificial vessels could be used to test drugs and may lead to the creation of artificial vascularised tissue for regenerative medicine. The system might also be useful for studying the progression of more aggressive tumours that develop secondaries. Researchers exposed the vessels to a protein believed to be responsible for stimulating the new blood vessel growth that feeds cancer cells. After treatment, the vessels formed with the same characteristics as the vessels in the metastasis.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. If it is aware of the new study that led to the creation of the test-tube blood vessels.

2. Considering the importance of the research, does it believe that it should be funded through the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) or through the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme?

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

The Commission is aware of research on tissue engineering of blood vessels.

The Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-13) has so far supported one research project in this field. It is the Grail project ([1]) entitled 'Tissue in host engineering guided regeneration of arterial intimal layer', coordinated by Explora Biotech SRL, Rome, and it received a grant of around EUR 6 million.

In line with the decision on the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP), this programme does not support this kind of research.

([1]) www.thegrail-project.eu.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005715/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Regolamentazione della produzione del gelato artigianale

In assenza di una normativa europea che stabilisca quando si può parlare di «gelato artigianale», l'immagine della produzione di tale prodotto, è affidata all'azienda che produce gelato con ingredienti artigianali, con risultati buoni ma non sempre eccellenti.

Questa situazione non piace ai veri gelatieri alla ricerca di una certificazione e di regole precise per valorizzare la loro professionalità, come la presenza di un laboratorio all'interno nel punto vendita e il consumo in giornata (nell'arco delle 24 ore dalla produzione). Un altro elemento importante riguarda l'uso di ingredienti che devono essere preferibilmente freschi (soprattutto la frutta). È anche possibile acquistare la frutta, prepararla e conservarla in freezer a —18°C e utilizzarla quando serve. La realtà però non è così lineare e la figura dell'artigiano è molto diversificata. C'è un ristrettissimo numero di gelaterie che prepara tutto in casa. In seconda battuta troviamo un gruppo di artigiani che utilizza un semilavorato, venduto da aziende gelatiere specializzate, composto da una base neutra senza additivi e emulsionanti.

Alla luce di quanto precede, si interroga la Commissione per sapere, se in base al regolamento, che sarà applicato dal 13 dicembre 2014, anche per il gelato artigianale l'utilizzazione non autorizzata o impropria della denominazione e del marchio di riconoscimento potrà configurare il reato di frode alimentare.

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(18 luglio 2012)

La Commissione rinvia l'on. deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-002813/2012 ([1]).

In assenza di disposizioni UE che disciplinino la produzione di gelato «artigianale» spetta agli Stati membri valutare, caso per caso, il carattere potenzialmente fuorviante e l'eventuale uso improprio di tale informazione alimentare volontaria. Lo stesso regime si applica anche in forza del nuovo regolamento sulla fornitura di informazioni alimentari ai consumatori.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-002813+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005715/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 June 2012)

Subject: Regulation of homemade ice cream production

In the absence of European legislation establishing when ice cream can be described as 'homemade', it is viewed simply as a product made by companies that use homemade ingredients, with good, but not always excellent, results.

Real ice cream makers seeking certification and precise rules that highlight their professional skills, including the requirement for retail outlets to have their own workshop and for the product to be consumed on the same day (within 24 hours of production), are unhappy about this situation. Another important requirement is for ingredients (especially fruit) to be fresh, although fruit can also be purchased, prepared and stored in a freezer at -18 °C and used when needed. The reality, however, is not so clear-cut and the characteristics of ice cream makers can vary considerably. Very few ice cream shops prepare everything in store. Some ice cream makers use a semi-finished product, sold by specialist ice cream companies, which consists of a neutral base without additives and emulsifiers.

In view of the above, can the Commission state whether, under the regulation applicable as from 13 December 2014, the unauthorised or improper use of 'homemade ice cream' denominations and labels will be classified as food fraud?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-002813/2012 ([1]).

In the absence of EU provisions regulating 'homemade' ice cream production, it is up to the Member States to assess, on a case-by-case basis, the potential misleading character and misuse of such voluntary food information. The same regime applies also under the new regulation on the provision of food information to consumers.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-002813+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=EN.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005716/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: Finanziamenti per la lotta al crimine organizzato

Uno dei principali freni allo sviluppo economico di alcune zone dell'Italia meridionale è l'ombra onnipresente della criminalità organizzata. Ci sono stati dei finanziamenti stanziati dall'UE per l'Italia con lo scopo di sostenere iniziative intese a convertire i beni sequestrati, a creare nuovi posti di lavoro — soprattutto per giovani — e ad alimentare nuove speranze in zone a lungo afflitte da alti tassi di disoccupazione e di criminalità.

Principale ostacolo allo sviluppo del meridione, la criminalità organizzata va sradicata per consentire di stimolare la produttività e attirare verso l'Italia del sud investimenti assolutamente necessari.

Alla luce di quanto precede, potrebbe la Commissione dettagliare:

1. le migliori pratiche, sviluppate attraverso i fondi stanziati dall'UE, nella lotta alla criminalità,

2. in che modo l'UE, attraverso la politica di coesione, pensa di sostenere le autorità nazionali nella loro lotta alla mafia per il periodo 2014-2020?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(11 luglio 2012)

La Commissione ha finanziato e finanzia numerosi progetti in vari settori della prevenzione e della lotta contro la criminalità organizzata attraverso i propri programmi finanziari, quali AGIS e attualmente ISEC. Una descrizione dettagliata di tali progetti è consultabile al seguente indirizzo:
http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/isec/funding_isec_en.htm.

I progetti vi sono elencati per settore d'intervento anziché per paese, ed alcuni possono effettivamente essere classificati come «migliori pratiche», ad esempio AGIS 2004/182: Tema: Nuove strategie di lotta al riciclaggio di denaro o JLS/2008/ISEC-FPA/C1/006: «L'Unione Europea offre eccellenza in materia di indagini finanziarie», finalizzato a redigere un manuale sulle indagini finanziarie in cinque lingue: inglese, tedesco, italiano, spagnolo e francese.

Nel corso del periodo di programmazione 2007-2013 il FESR ([1]) cofinanzia, attraverso i programmi regionali, numerosi progetti volti al miglioramento della sicurezza in Calabria, Campania, Puglia e Sicilia. Il FESR cofinanzia inoltre il programma nazionale «Sicurezza per lo sviluppo» con uno stanziamento di circa 579 milioni di euro. Il programma è finalizzato al miglioramento della sicurezza di cittadini e imprese nelle regioni sopracitate per contribuire allo sviluppo di aree caratterizzate da un alto tasso di criminalità. Esempi di progetti finora cofinanziati sono riportati al seguente indirizzo: http://www.sicurezzasud.it/

Per quanto riguarda il periodo di programmazione 2014-2020 sono ancora in corso negoziati tra la Commissione, il Consiglio e il Parlamento in merito ai futuri regolamenti relativi alla politica di coesione, in base ai quali verranno negoziati il contratto di partenariato e i programmi italiani. Al momento non ci sono quindi informazioni disponibili sulla particolare tipologia di sostegno menzionata dall'onorevole parlamentare.

([1]) Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005716/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 June 2012)

Subject: Funding the fight against organised crime

One of the main obstacles to economic development in certain areas of southern Italy is the ubiquitous presence of organised crime. The EU has allocated funding to Italy to support schemes to convert seized property, create new jobs — especially for young people — and nurture new hope in areas long afflicted by high rates of unemployment and criminality.

As the main obstacle to the development of the south, organised crime must be eradicated in order to stimulate productivity and attract vital investment to southern Italy.

In view of the above, can the Commission specify:

1. The best practices, developed using EU funds, in the fight against crime;

2. How the EU intends to support the national authorities, through cohesion policies, in their fight against the mafia between 2014 and 2020.

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

The Commission has funded numerous projects in various fields of preventing and fighting organised crime through its financial programmes such as AGIS and currently ISEC. The Honourable Member can find a list with details on these projects following this link: http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/funding/isec/funding_isec_en.htm

The projects are listed by policy area rather than by country. Some of these can indeed be labelled 'best practices' e.g. AGIS 2004/182: Spotlight: New Approaches to Fighting Money Laundering or JLS/2008/ISEC-FPA/C1/006 —"European Union Delivering Excellence in Financial Investigation", whose aim was to draw up a financial investigations manual in five languages: English, German, Italian, Spanish and French.

In the 2007-2013 programming period, the ERDF ([1]) co-finances several projects designed to improve security through the Regional Programmes of Calabria, Campania, Apulia and Sicily. In addition, the ERDF co-finances the National Programme 'Security for development' with an allocation of around EUR 579 million. The Programme aims at improving the security of citizens and businesses in the abovementioned regions in order to contribute to the development of areas characterised by a high degree of criminality. Examples of projects co-financed so far can be found in the following website: http://www.sicurezzasud.it/

As concerns the 2014-2020 programming period, negotiations between the Commission, the Council and the Parliament are still ongoing on the future Cohesion policy regulations upon which the Italian Partnership Contract and Programmes will be negotiated. No information is therefore available at the moment on the specific type of support mentioned by the Honourable Member.

([1]) European Regional Development Fund.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-005717/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 giugno 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Libertà di espressione in Russia

Dopo la Duma ieri, il Consiglio della Federazione russa ha approvato oggi la legge che porta fino a 24 000 euro le multe per le persone che partecipano o organizzano manifestazioni non autorizzate. A favore si sono pronunciati 132 senatori, con 1 voto contrario e 1 astensione.

Il provvedimento è contrario alla Costituzione, secondo gli oppositori che preparano una nuova protesta per il 12 giugno: il temuto «giro di vite» arriva dopo un inverno che ha visto le più grandi proteste di piazza in Russia negli ultimi 20 anni, dirette soprattutto contro Vladimir Putin, ora rieletto presidente.

Ieri l'opposizione ha inscenato l'ennesima protesta davanti all'edificio del Parlamento, mentre la polizia fermava una trentina di persone. Il responsabile del Consiglio per i diritti umani del Cremlino, Mikhail Fedotov, è tornato a esprimersi contro la legge, anticipando la richiesta di veto al presidente. Il portavoce di Putin, Dmitry Peskov, ha precisato che Putin «prenderà in considerazione» anche questa opinione.

Alla luce di quanto precede, potrebbe il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante precisare:

1. se è al corrente della vicenda,

2. in che modo intende intervenire per garantire il diritto alla libertà di espressione in Russia,

3. quali attività diplomatiche sono state intraprese in precedenza dall'Unione europea in Russia?

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

L'AR/VP ha risposto con una dichiarazione, rilasciata il 12 giugno 2012, alla nuova legge sulle manifestazioni in Russia, esprimendo preoccupazione per ciò che considera come «misure al fine di limitare la possibilità di tenere manifestazioni pubbliche» in Russia, nonché per i tentativi di intimidire i leader della protesta. Ha esortato il governo russo a garantire che la nuova legge sulle manifestazioni pubbliche sia conforme alle norme europee, come da espressa intenzione del presidente Putin. L'AR/VP ha inoltre ricordato che la legislazione in materia di manifestazioni pubbliche dovrebbe tutelare innanzitutto la libertà di riunione e ha incoraggiato il governo russo e la società civile a impegnarsi in un dialogo costruttivo sulla promozione di norme democratiche e sulle riforme future.

L'UE discute regolarmente questioni relative alla libertà di espressione con la Russia, in occasione delle consultazioni semestrali UE-Russia in materia di diritti umani, degli incontri ministeriali e dei vertici UE-Russia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005717/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(6 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Freedom of expression in Russia

Following the Duma yesterday, the Russian Federation Council approved a law that will inflict fines of up to EUR 24 000 on people who take part in or organise unauthorised demonstrations. 132 senators voted in favour; one voted against and there was one abstention.

The measure is contrary to the Constitution, according to opponents preparing a new protest for 12 June 2012. The dreaded crackdown comes after the biggest street protests in Russia for 20 years, mostly directed at Vladimir Putin, now re-elected President.

Yesterday, the opposition staged another protest outside the Parliament building, while the police arrested around 30 people. The head of the Kremlin's Human Rights Council, Mikhail Fedotov, spoke out against the law once again, anticipating the demand for a veto to the President. Putin's spokesman, Dmitry Peskov, said that Putin 'will also consider this opinion'.

In view of the above, could the Vice-president/High Representative clarify:

1. If she is aware of the situation.

2. How she intends to intervene in order to guarantee freedom of expression in Russia?

3. What previous diplomatic actions have been undertaken by the European Union in Russia?

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

The HR/VP has reacted with a statement, issued on June 12, 2012, to the new law on manifestations in Russia. HR/VP expressed concern about what she saw as 'the attempts to limit the scope for public rallies' in Russia, and about attempts to intimidate protest leaders. She called on the Russian government to ensure that the new law on public rallies met European standards, as was the expressed intention of President Putin. She also recalled that legislation governing public rallies should first and foremost guarantee freedom of assembly, and encouraged the Russian government and civil society to engage in a constructive dialogue on promotion of democratic standards and future reforms.

Issued of freedom of expression are raised with Russia on a regular basis, from the twice-yearly EU-Russia human rights consultations, to Ministerial meetings, to EU-Russia Summits.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-005718/12
à la Commission
Dominique Vlasto (PPE)
(7 juin 2012)

Objet: Préservation de la culture de la lavande en Europe

La culture de la lavande est l'une des spécificités agricoles européennes. L'Europe en est le premier producteur mondial, loin devant la Chine. Cette production de qualité est assurée essentiellement par la France et la Bulgarie, et les huiles essentielles produites par les lavandiers sont principalement destinées à la parfumerie fine et aux cosmétiques.

Aujourd'hui, cette filière d'exception est directement menacée par le réchauffement climatique. Depuis 2003, les épisodes caniculaires ont durement touché les plantations et favorisé le développement de la cicadelle, un insecte qui est porteur d'une bactérie dévastatrice pour la lavande (le phytoplasme du Stolbur). Quand la lavande est contaminée par cette bactérie, les canaux de circulation de la sève se bouchent et la plante meurt par asphyxie. L'utilisation d'un antibiotique contre la bactérie étant interdite en France, l'arrachage reste la seule alternative, avec pour conséquence une perte sèche pour les exploitations et un désastre pour la biodiversité européenne.

Entre 2005 et 2010, la France a ainsi perdu plus de la moitié des surfaces cultivées. L'enjeu socio-économique est fort, car la plante emblématique de la région de Provence représente en France plus de 50 millions d'euros de chiffre d'affaires et 10 000 emplois directs. C'est aussi une part de l'identité régionale, la beauté et la diversité des paysages européens qui sont en jeu.

1. Dans le cadre de la politique phytosanitaire et/ou du Feader, quelle aide la Commission peut-elle apporter aux lavandiers pour prévenir la contamination et la propagation du phytoplasme du Stolbur dans leurs champs?

2. Dans le cadre du 7e PCRD et/ou de LIFE+, dans quelle mesure la Commission pourrait-elle soutenir le fonds pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine de lavande en Provence, récemment lancé à Manosque (Alpes de Haute-Provence) et qui vise à soutenir la recherche sur le dépérissement de la lavande et sur des variétés adaptées aux évolutions du climat (sécheresse et canicule)?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(17 juillet 2012)

Tout comme son principal vecteur, le phytoplasme du stolbur de la pomme de terre (l'agent responsable du dépérissement de la lavande) est largement disséminé en région méditerranéenne. De ce fait, il n'est pas réglementé au niveau européen en tant qu'organisme de quarantaine de la lavande, et les mesures qui pourraient être prises contre cette bactérie ne peuvent donc bénéficier du système de participation financière de l'Union européenne dans le cadre de la lutte phytosanitaire ([1]).

Les lavandiers n'ont pas droit à une aide au titre du volet «Nature et biodiversité» de l'instrument européen LIFE+ puisque la directive «Habitats» ne s'applique pas à la lavande et que LIFE+ ne concerne pas les espèces cultivées mais uniquement les systèmes et les habitats naturels ainsi que la flore sauvage.

Conformément à l'article 68 du règlement (CE) n° 73/2009 du Conseil ([2]), la France a mis en place à la fois un régime d'assurance cultures, servant notamment à couvrir les plantes à parfum, aromatiques et médicinales, et des fonds de mutualisation visant à indemniser les agriculteurs qui ont subi des pertes économiques en raison de maladies végétales.

En ce qui concerne la politique de développement rural, la Commission ne voit aucune possibilité, pour la période en cours (2007-2013), de soutenir la lutte contre le stolbur de la pomme de terre à des fins purement économiques. Pour la prochaine période, elle a proposé d'inclure dans cette politique des outils de gestion des risques, comportant un soutien aux mesures de protection contre les retombées des maladies des plantes dans certaines circonstances.

([1]) Directive 2000/29/CE du Conseil du 8 mai 2000 concernant les mesures de protection contre l'introduction dans la Communauté d'organismes nuisibles aux végétaux ou aux produits végétaux et contre leur propagation à l'intérieur de la Communauté (JO L 169 du 10.7.2000, p. 1), articles 22 et 23.

([2]) JO L 30 du 31.1.2009, p. 16.

Le dernier appel à propositions du 7e programme-cadre en matière de recherche agricole ne contient aucun sujet sur le dépérissement de la lavande ou son amélioration génétique aux fins d'adaptation au changement climatique. Des recherches dans ces domaines sont néanmoins envisageables dans le contexte du prochain programme-cadre européen «Horizon 2020».

(English version)

Question for written answer P-005718/12
to the Commission
Dominique Vlasto (PPE)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Preserving lavender growing in the EU

Lavender cultivation is a uniquely European agricultural activity. Europe is the world's largest lavender producer, far ahead of China. This high-quality product is predominantly grown in France and Bulgaria, and lavender essential oils are mainly used for fine fragrances and cosmetics.

This unique industry is currently under direct threat from global warming. Since 2003, plantations have been hard hit by heat waves, which promote leafhopper population growth. These insects carry the *stolbur phytoplasma* bacterium, which devastates lavender crops. When lavender is infected with this bacterium, the channels through which sap circulates become blocked and the plant suffocates. Since anti-bacterial antibiotics are prohibited in France, the only alternative is to grub up the plants, which causes a net loss for holdings and is a disaster for European biodiversity.

Between 2005 and 2010, France lost over half of its lavender plantations in this way. The socioeconomic stakes are high, since lavender, the plant which symbolises Provence, accounts for over EUR 50 million in turnover and 10 000 direct jobs in France. An aspect of regional identity and of the beauty and diversity of European landscapes is also at risk.

1. What aid can the Commission grant to lavender growers under plant health policy and/or the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) to help them sprevent *stolbur phytoplasma* infection and propagation in their fields?

2. To what extent could the Commission provide support, under the Seventh Framework Programme and/or LIFE+, for the Fund to Safeguard the Cultural Heritage of Lavender in Provence, which was recently launched in Manosque (Alpes de Haute-Provence) and aims to support research on lavender decline and on varieties adapted to climate change (drought and heat waves)?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2012)

Potato stolbur phytoplasma, the causal agent of lavender decline, as well as its main vector, are widespread in the Mediterranean area. Consequently it is not regulated in the EU as a quarantine pest of lavender and control measures that could be taken against it cannot benefit from the EU plant health co-financing system ([1]).

Funding to growers from the EU LIFE Nature & Biodiversity programme would not be possible, since lavender is not covered by the Habitats Directive, and LIFE Nature & Biodiversity only targets natural systems, natural habitats and wild flora, and not domestic plants.

Under Article 68 of Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 ([2]), France implements both a crop harvest insurance scheme, which covers in particular perfume, aromatic and medicinal plants, and mutual funds to pay compensation to farmers for economic losses due to plant diseases.

With regard to rural development policy, the Commission sees no possibility in the current period of 2007-2013 to support the control of potato stolbur with purely economic objectives in mind. For the post-2013 period, the Commission has proposed that a 'risk management' measure be included in the rural development policy, with support for protection against the consequences of plant diseases under certain circumstances.

The last call for proposals of FP7 concerning agricultural research does not contain topics on lavender decline and lavender breeding for adaptation to climate change. However, research on the subject could be possible under the next EU Framework programme, Horizon 2020.

([1]) Council Directive 2000/29/EC of 8 May 2000 on protective measures against the introduction into the Community of organisms harmful to plants or plant products and against their spread within the Community (OJ L 169, 10.7.2000, p. 1), Articles 22 and 23.

([2]) OJ L 30, 31.1.2009, p. 16.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005719/12
aan de Commissie
Thijs Berman (S&D)
(7 juni 2012)

Betreft: Follow-up van het verslag van de Commissie CONT over Haïti

Van 22 t/m 26 februari 2012 heeft een delegatie van de Commissie CONT van het Parlement Haïti bezocht om verslag uit te brengen over het beheer van de EU-steun na de aardbeving in 2010. In haar aanbeveling verklaarde deze delegatie onder meer het volgende ([1]):

Hoewel er 18 ministers en 19 staatssecretarissen zijn, is geen van hen verantwoordelijk voor huisvesting en bestaat er geen omvattende strategie voor (sociale) huisvesting. Voorts zijn sommige projecten niet duurzaam en moeten alle projecten van de afgelopen 15 jaar geëvalueerd worden om na te gaan hoe duurzaam zij geweest zijn. Bovendien is er een probleem met de traceerbaarheid van middelen en moet er daarom meer nadruk gelegd worden op de strijd tegen corruptie en een betere controle van de uitgaven door de Commissie en de Haïtiaanse overheid. Tot slot bestaat er onvoldoende coördinatie tussen humanitaire hulp en ontwikkelingshulp.

1. Wat was de reactie van de Commissie op de aanbevelingen van de CONT-delegatie?

2. Heeft de Commissie er bij de Haïtiaanse overheid op aangedrongen om een omvattende strategie voor (sociale) huisvesting uit te werken? Indien niet, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie voornemens een beoordeling uit te voeren van de projecten die de afgelopen 15 jaar zijn uitgevoerd in Haïti?

4. Wat voor maatregelen denkt de Commissie te treffen om een betere traceerbaarheid en verantwoording voor ontwikkelingssteun te garanderen?

5. Is de Commissie voornemens de begrotingssteun aan de Haïtiaanse regering te koppelen aan de prestaties van die regering op deze domeinen?

6. Hoe denkt de Commissie een betere coördinatie tussen humanitaire hulp en ontwikkelingshulp te verzekeren?

Antwoord van de heer Piebalgs namens de Commissie
(3 augustus 2012)

1. Na hun bezoek aan Haïti hebben zowel de commissaris als vertegenwoordigers van de diensten van de Commissie leden van het Europees Parlement ontmoet. Als gevolg daarvan werden wijzigingen aangebracht in de aanbevelingen van de kwijtingsverslagen voor 2010 (zie punt 3). De Commissie zal ernaar streven deze te volgen, maar er zijn verdere verduidelijkingen nodig, waarvoor om een ontmoeting met de parlementsleden en hun medewerkers zal worden verzocht.

2. Diverse donoren, onder wie ook de EU, hebben erop gewezen dat er een strategie en een duidelijke prioriteitenstelling inzake huisvesting nodig zijn. Begin 2011 werd een donorgroep met de EU gevormd, onder de leiding van de Wereldbank en het Habitat-programma van de Verenigde Naties. De EU is verheugd over de oprichting van de „Unité pour la construction, le logement et les bâtiments publics" in Haïti die de opdracht kreeg een beleid uit te stippelen.

3. Het vijftienjarenperspectief is in de kwijtingsverslagen voor 2010 verlaten, gezien de problemen die dit na de aardbeving zou opleveren. De Commissie zal een lijst van projecten en een evaluatie van de duurzaamheid ervan verstrekken volgens een vijfjarenperspectief.

4. De Commissie streeft ernaar te verzekeren dat alle projecten strikt overeenkomstig het financieel reglement ten uitvoer worden gelegd. Alle contracten en betalingen worden vooral en achteraf streng gecontroleerd. De uitkeringen van begrotingssteun worden gebaseerd op een alomvattende analyse, zowel op delegatieniveau als op centraal niveau, waarbij de prestaties worden gemeten aan overeengekomen indicatoren, meer bepaald inzake het beheer van de overheidsfinanciën.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201204/20120418ATT43235/20120418ATT.43235NL.pdf

5. Toekomstige begrotingssteun zal gebeuren overeenkomstig het geactualiseerde beleid dat in mei 2012 door de Raad is aangenomen, met strengere eisen inzake verantwoordingsplicht voor overheidsmiddelen, met inbegrip van door de EU en andere donoren verstrekte middelen.

6. Met de huidige instrumenten wordt reeds de overgang gemaakt van humanitaire noodhulp naar rehabilitatie en ontwikkeling en er zal speciale aandacht gaan naar de programmering van het elfde Europees Ontwikkelingsfonds.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005719/12
to the Commission
Thijs Berman (S&D)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Follow-up to CONT committee report on Haiti

From 22 to 26 February 2012 a delegation from Parliament's CONT committee travelled to Haiti to report back whether EU aid had been well managed and controlled after the earthquake of 2010. In its recommendation this delegation said, amongst other things, the following ([1]):

Although there are 18 ministers and 19 secretaries of state, none of them is responsible for housing and there is no comprehensive strategy for (social) housing. Furthermore, some projects are not sustainable and all projects from the last 15 years should be assessed to see how sustainable they have been. Moreover, there is a problem with the traceability of funds and a need for more emphasis on the fight against corruption and better control of expenditure by the Commission and the Haitian authorities. Finally, there is insufficient coordination between humanitarian aid and development aid.

1. How has the Commission responded to the recommendations made by the CONT delegation?

2. Has the Commission urged the Haitian authorities to work out a comprehensive strategy for (social) housing? If not, why has this not been done?

3. Will the Commission make an assessment of the projects carried out in Haiti in the last 15 years?

4. What kind of actions will the Commission take to ensure better traceability and accountability of development funds?

5. Will the Commission link the budget support that it gives to the Haitian Government to their performance on these issues?

6. How will the Commission ensure better coordination between humanitarian aid and development aid?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(3 August 2012)

1. The Commissioner as well as Commission Services met with Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) following their Haiti visit. Subsequently, modifications were introduced to the recommendations in the 2010 Discharge Reports (see point 3). The Commission will seek to follow these, but some further clarifications are required, for which a meeting with the MEPs and their staff will be requested.

2. Donors, including the EU, have stressed the need for a strategy and clear priority-setting on housing. Early in 2011, a donor group including the EU was formed, with the World Bank and United Nations Habitat in the lead. The EU welcomes the creation of the Haitian 'Unité pour la Construction, le Logement et les Bâtiments publics' mandated with the drafting of a policy.

3. The 15 year perspective has been dropped in the 2010 Discharge Reports in view of the problems this would pose after the earthquake. The Commission will provide a list of projects and an assessment of their sustainability in a five year perspective.

4. The Commission seeks to ensure that all projects are implemented strictly in accordance with the Financial Regulation. All contracts and payments shall be subject to strict *ex ante* and *ex post* controls. Budget support disbursements shall be based on comprehensive analyses, both at the Delegation and Headquarters level, with performance assessed against agreed indicators, notably on Public Finance Management.

5. Future budget support will follow the updated policy endorsed by the Council in May 2012 which includes stricter requirements on accountability of public resources, including those provided by the EU and other donors.

6. Transition from humanitarian emergency aid to rehabilitation and development is already being implemented with the current instruments and special attention will be given in the programming of 11th European Development Fund (EDF).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/document/activities/cont/201204/20120418ATT43235/20120418ATT.43235EN.pdf

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-005720/12
do Komisji
Piotr Borys (PPE)
(7 czerwca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Homeopatyczne produkty lecznicze

Homeopatyczne produkty lecznicze nie mają praktycznie żadnych działań niepożądanych, a wskaźnik ryzyko-korzyść jest w ich przypadku bardzo dobry. W kilku badaniach wykazano, że skojarzone lub zamienne podawanie homeopatycznych produktów leczniczych i innych produktów leczniczych wywiera korzystny wpływ na zdrowie człowieka.

Wskutek powszechnego, nieprzerwanego stosowania innych produktów leczniczych u pacjentów coraz częściej wykształca się odporność na niektóre środki antybiotyczne zawarte w tych produktach. Homeopatyczne produkty lecznicze mogłyby przyczynić się do zmniejszenia częstości występowania odporności na środki antybiotyczne, gdyby istniała możliwość częstszego stosowania homeopatycznych produktów leczniczych jako „pierwszego leku" lub w skojarzeniu z innymi produktami leczniczymi.

Ponadto w kilku badaniach wykazano, że wydatki systemu publicznej opieki zdrowotnej na produkty lecznicze można zmniejszyć o 30 % poprzez wprowadzenie możliwości wykorzystania homeopatycznych produktów leczniczych łącznie z innymi produktami leczniczymi.

Jeśli konsumenci i podmioty świadczące usługi opieki zdrowotnej mają dokonywać właściwego wyboru pomiędzy innymi produktami leczniczymi i homeopatycznymi produktami leczniczymi, niezbędne są wyczerpujące informacje i odpowiednie standardy skuteczności. Zgodnie z obecnymi wymogami dotyczącymi pozwoleń na dopuszczenie do obrotu, które są takie same jak dla innych produktów leczniczych, dla żadnego homeopatycznego produktu leczniczego nie wydano pozwolenia na mocy art. 16 ust. 1 w powiązaniu z art. 8 ust. 3 lit. i) dyrektywy 2001/83/WE. Zamiast tego zharmonizowane procedury w odniesieniu do homeopatycznych produktów leczniczych określone w przedmiotowej dyrektywie dotyczą jedynie rejestracji, co oznacza, że konsumentom, pacjentom i podmiotom świadczącym usługi opieki zdrowotnej nie można podać żadnych wskazań dotyczących produktu, choć można udostępnić wyniki badań klinicznych wykazujących „ogólną" skuteczność homeopatycznych produktów leczniczych.

1. Czy Komisja zdaje sobie sprawę, że umożliwienie konsumentom i podmiotom świadczącym usługi opieki zdrowotnej wyboru pomiędzy oddzielnym, skojarzonym lub zamiennym stosowaniem homeopatycznych produktów leczniczych i innych produktów leczniczych mogłoby znacznie ograniczyć koszty funkcjonowania systemu zabezpieczenia społecznego oraz wiele działań niepożądanych?

2. Czy Komisja zdaje sobie sprawę, że dostosowanie wymogów dotyczących pozwoleń na dopuszczenie do obrotu do szczególnych cech homeopatii – łącznie z akceptacją klinicznych badań „ogólnej" skuteczności produktu – zachęciłoby producentów do przeprowadzania większej liczby badań w dziedzinie homeopatii, co doprowadziłoby do udostępnienia większej liczby informacji na temat produktu pacjentom i podmiotom świadczącym usługi opieki zdrowotnej, a w związku z tym ogólnie do częstszego stosowania homeopatycznych produktów leczniczych, co miałoby korzystny wpływ w odniesieniu do kosztów funkcjonowania systemu opieki zdrowotnej, zdrowia człowieka i częstości występowania odporności na środki antybiotyczne?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johna Dallego w imieniu Komisji
(17 sierpnia 2012 r.)

Komisja uprzejmie prosi Pana Posła o zapoznanie się z odpowiedzią udzieloną na wcześniejsze pytanie pisemne E-003839/2012 ([1]).

Ponadto pragnę poinformować, że Komisja rozpoczęła badanie dotyczące dostępności w UE produktów leczniczych stosowanych u ludzi. Jednym z głównych celów tego badania jest określenie, w jaki sposób można wykorzystać obecne ramy prawne, aby zmniejszyć problemy związane z dostępnością. Zakres badania obejmuje homeopatyczne produkty lecznicze.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005720/12
to the Commission
Piotr Borys (PPE)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Homeopathic medicinal products

Homeopathic medicinal products show hardly any side-effects and their risk-benefit profiles are very good. Several studies show that a combined or alternative administration of homeopathic and other medicinal products has positive effects on human health.

Due to the general, undifferentiated administration of other medicinal products, patients increasingly develop resistances to certain antibiotic agents within these products. Homeopathic medicinal products could help reduce the incidence of antibiotic resistance if there were greater opportunity for administration of homeopathic products as 'first medication' or in combination with other medicinal products.

Moreover, several studies indicate that public health system expenditure on medicines could be reduced by 30% by introducing the option of using homeopathic medicinal products alongside other medicinal products.

If consumers and healthcare providers are to be given a proper choice between other medicinal and homeopathic products, comprehensive information and appropriate efficacy standards are necessary. Under the current authorisation requirements for homeopathic medicinal products, which are the same as for other medicinal products, no homeopathic product has been authorised pursuant to Article 16(1) in connection with Article 8(3)(i) of Directive 2001/83/EC. Instead, the harmonised procedures provided for in the directive in relation to homeopathic products, only concern registration ,which means that no indication regarding the product may be given to consumers, patients and healthcare providers, although clinical trial results showing the efficacy of homeopathic products 'as a whole' can be made available.

1. Is the Commission aware that affording consumers and healthcare providers the possibility of choosing between a separate, combined or alternative administration of homeopathic and other medicinal products could radically reduce social security system costs and the number of undesired side-effects?

2. Is the Commission aware that adapting the authorisation requirements to the particularities of homeopathy — accepting clinical efficacy testing for the product 'as a whole' — would encourage manufacturers to do more research in the field of homeopathy, which would lead to more information being available on the product for patients and healthcare providers and therefore to an overall increase in the use of homeopathic products, with positive effects on healthcare system costs, human health and the incidence of antibiotic resistance?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answers to previous Written Question E-003839/2012 ([1]).

In addition, the Commission has launched a study on the availability of medicinal products for human use in the EU. One of the main objectives of the study is to identify how the current regulatory framework can be used to alleviate issues with availability. Homeopathic medicinal products are in the scope of the study.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005721/12
to the Commission
Emma McClarkin (ECR)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Interreg IV A

Interreg IV A supports cross-border cooperation with the aim of reducing disparities between regions, including in the field of health, which is increasingly recognised as a priority area in cohesion policy. However, patients' health is increasingly threatened by substandard, counterfeit or off-label products, as has been demonstrated by recent cases such as the PIP breast implant scandal or the Mediator case.

1. What are the standards and procedures at EU level and within Interreg IV A to ensure a high level of patient safety?

2. How does the Commission ensure that recipients of European funding follow European laws and regulations in respect of both the procurement and use of products for medical purposes?

3. Is the Commission or any recipient of EU funding under Interreg IV A aware of occasions now or in the past when funding from Interreg has been used to purchase equipment, medicinal products or medical devices which are unapproved under European regulations for the use they are put to?

4. Has EU money under Interreg IV A been used to fund PIP breast implants or the off-label use of Mediator (benfluorex)?

5. What are the standards for patient consent under Interreg IV A? Has the Commission developed a written consent form as best practice to be used for projects for Interreg IV A?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2012)

Cross-border cooperation, as supported under Interreg, focuses on economic and social development of border regions exclusively. It therefore differs from the concept of cross-border healthcare, which concerns the crossing of borders by patients, but is not limited to border regions alone. There are 53 Interreg cross-border programmes across Europe, each implemented jointly by the neighbouring countries concerned.

Most health projects supported under Interreg concentrate on practical elements, such as facilitating access to doctors or hospitals on the other side of the border, which may be much closer to the patient than facilities in their own Member State, or the provision of joint services (thus avoiding health authorities on both sides of a border buying the same equipment).

Under the principle of shared management, the selection of projects and their monitoring is the responsibility of the relevant programme authorities. The Commission, therefore, does not have details on the content of each individual project supported by the Interreg cross-border programmes. However, given the aims and objectives of Interreg, it is unlikely that there are any projects which include the purchase of medicinal products or which deal with individual patients.

It is possible that some medical devices may have been purchased (in order to provide shared services across a border). In such cases, the programme authorities are responsible for ensuring that such purchases are carried out in accordance with all applicable legislation.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-005722/12
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(7 iunie 2012)

Subiect: Cercetarea din domeniul apicol și instrumentele de gestionare a riscului

Având în vedere că mortalitatea în rândul albinelor este în creștere în state membre precum Spania, Franța și Italia, poate Comisia spune dacă prevede ca o parte din bugetul alocat pentru cercetare în cadrul noii Politici Agricole Comune să fie destinată cercetării privind cauzele mortalității albinelor?

De asemenea, ținând seama de faptul că măsurile de management al riscului din Pilonul I al PAC nu au acoperit până acum sectorul apicol, ia Comisia în considerare posibilitatea de a acoperi prin fondurile mutuale și riscurile din sectorul apicol după intrarea în vigoare a noii Politici Agricole Comune?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(18 iulie 2012)

Comisia a adoptat, la 6 decembrie 2010, o comunicare ([1]) care prezintă o serie de măsuri specifice în vederea îmbunătățirii cunoștințelor referitoare la mortalitatea albinelor, propunându-și în special să coordoneze mai bine știința și cercetarea. În februarie 2011, laboratorul Sophia Antipolis (ANSES) din Franța a fost desemnat ca laborator UE de referință în domeniul sănătății albinelor pentru crearea unei rețele care să includă laboratoarele de referință din statele membre și pentru realizarea unui program-pilot de supraveghere care să estimeze gradul de mortalitate a albinelor. Contribuția UE la punerea în aplicare a studiilor de supraveghere a pierderilor de roiuri de albine este de 3 750 000 EUR.

În lumina reformei politicii agricole comune (PAC), fondurile mutuale pentru bolile animalelor și ale plantelor și pentru incidentele de mediu prevăzute, în general, în propunerea privind dezvoltarea rurală nu exclud sectorul apicol. Rămâne la latitudinea statelor membre să stabilească dacă sectorul apicol este acoperit de fondurile mutuale și să definească normele privind constituirea și gestionarea acestora, în special privind acordarea plăților compensatorii către agricultori în caz de criză și privind administrarea și monitorizarea respectării acestor norme.

În plus, noua propunere privind PAC prevede și alte măsuri care ar putea fi utilizate pentru a susține sectorul apicol.

([1]) Comunicarea Comisiei către Parlamentul European și către Consiliu privind sănătatea albinelor [COM(2010) 714 final din 6.12.2010].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005722/12
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Apicultural research and risk management tools

Given the increase in bee mortality in Member States such as Spain, France and Italy, does the Commission intend to earmark funding from the new common agricultural policy's research budget for investigation into the causes thereof?

Furthermore, given that risk management measures under the first pillar of the CAP have hitherto not covered the bee-keeping sector, is the Commission considering the possibility of extending mutual funds to risks in this sector also, following the entry into force of the new common agricultural policy?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2012)

The Commission adopted on 6 December 2010 a communication ([1]) which outlines a number of specific actions to improve the knowledge of bee mortality, in particular by seeking to better coordinate science and research. In February 2011 the Sophia Antipolis Laboratory (ANSES) -France was designated as the EU Reference Laboratory for bee health in order to create a network with the reference laboratories in the Member States and to undertake a pilot surveillance programme to estimate the extent of bee mortality. The EU contribution for the implementation of the surveillance studies on honeybee colony losses is set at 3 750 000 euros.

In the light of the reform of the common agricultural policy (CAP), the mutual funds for animal and plant diseases and environmental incidents in general foreseen in the proposal on Rural Development do not exclude the bee-keeping sector. It would be for Member States to determine whether the bee-keeping sector could be covered by the mutual funds and to define the rules for the their constitution and management , in particular for the granting of compensation payments to farmers in the event of crisis and for the administration and monitoring of compliance with these rules.

Furthermore, other measures that could be used to support the bee-keeping sector have been provided in the new CAP proposal.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on Honeybee Health (COM(2010)714 final, 6.12.2010).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-005723/12
aan de Commissie
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(7 juni 2012)

Betreft: „Weigering van terugbetaling van onrechtmatige, met de „standstill" bepalingen artikel strijdige leges door Nederland"

In haar uitspraak van 2.9.2011 heeft de Afdeling bestuursrechtspraak van de Raad van State bepaald dat een verzoek om restitutie van teveel betaalde leges, voor de verlening of verlenging van verblijfsvergunningen voor Turkse staatsburgers, na die uitspraak slechts mogelijk is indien een beslissing om verlening of verlenging van een verblijfsvergunning geen formele rechtskracht heeft gekregen ([1]). Het gevolg is dat, slechts Turkse staatsburgers die binnen de wettelijke bezwaartermijn van 4 weken na verlening van een verblijfsvergunning een bezwaarprocedure waren begonnen tegen de oplegging van de veel te hoge leges in aanmerking kunnen komen voor restitutie van teveel betaalde leges.

Turkse staatsburgers voor wie de wettelijke bezwaartermijn reeds is verlopen, kunnen door deze uitspraak geen aanspraak meer maken op restitutie van teveel betaalde leges. In het verleden was het echter praktisch zinloos om een dergelijk bezwaarprocedure in te stellen. Door deze uitspraak wordt duizenden Turkse burgers een „effectief rechtsmiddel" onthouden om restitutie van onrechtmatige gevorderde leges te krijgen. Bovendien komt de Afdeling bestuursrechtspraak met genoemde uitspraak terug op eerdere, voor Turkse staatsburgers gunstiger, eigen rechtspraak op dit punt ([2]). Dit komt neer op een „nieuwe beperking" zoals verboden in artikel 13 van besluit nr. 1/80 van de Associatieraad EEG-Turkije en artikel 41 lid 1 van het Additionele Protocol (PB L 293, 29.12.972). Het Hof van Justitie oordeelde in de zaak Sahin (C-242/06) en in de zaak Commissie/Nederland (C-92/07) dat het heffen van leges die onevenredig zijn aan het bedrag dat wordt gevraagd van gemeenschapsburgers in strijd is met de beide in vorige zin genoemde „standstill" bepalingen.

1. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de uitspraak van 2.9.2011 in het licht van beide genoemde „standstill" bepalingen en de relevante jurisprudentie van het Hof van Justitie inzake die bepalingen?

2. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie, dat door de uitspraak van 2 september 2011 vele Turkse staatsburgers geen „effectief rechtsmiddel", zoals opgenomen in artikel 47 van het Handvest en artikel 13 EVRM, tot hun beschikking hebben en het hun feitelijk onmogelijk is gemaakt restitutie van teveel betaalde leges te vorderen?

3. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de gevolgen van de uitspraak van 2 september 2011 in het kader van artikel 17 (1) van het Handvest alsmede artikel 1 Protocol 1 van het EVRM met betrekking tot de teveel betaalde leges door Turkse staatsburgers?

4. Kan de Commissie aangeven of zij de Nederlandse autoriteiten gaat aanspreken op de situatie ontstaan door de uitspraak van 2 september 2011? Zo nee, kan de Commissie aangeven waarom niet?

Voorlopig antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(26 juli 2012)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van de situatie in Nederland met betrekking tot de restitutie van teveel betaalde leges voor de verlening of verlenging van een verblijfsvergunning voor Turkse burgers en onderzoekt de zaak volgens de gebruikelijke procedures. De kwestie is complex en daarom is meer tijd vereist om deze gedetailleerde analyse te vervolledigen. De Commissie zal het geachte Parlementslid tijdig op de hoogte brengen van het resultaat van dit onderzoek.

Aanvullend antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(21 december 2012)

De Commissie zal contact opnemen met de Nederlandse autoriteiten. Gelet op de complexiteit van de in uw vragen aan de orde gestelde kwestie en het gebrek aan een precedent op dit gebied en gezien de noodzaak van een nauwkeurige analyse van de kwestie in het kader van de jurisprudentie over Besluit 1/80 van de Associatieraad EEG-Turkije, is de Commissie deze kwestie nog aan het onderzoeken en kan zij daarom geen volledig antwoord geven op uw vragen.

([1]) 201007667/1/V3, 2 september 2011, LJN: BR6949, http://zoeken.rechtspraak.nl/detailpage.aspx?ljn=BR6949.
([2]) 200803390/1, 29 april 2009, LJN:BI4040, http://zoeken.rechtspraak.nl/detailpage.aspx?ljn=BI4040.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005723/12
to the Commission
Judith Sargentini (Verts/ALE)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: 'Refusal of the Netherlands to reimburse illicit fees is in conflict with the standstill conditions article'

In its judgment of 2 September 2011, the Administrative Jurisdiction Department of the Dutch Council of State determined that a request for restitution of overpaid fees for granting or extending residency permits for Turkish citizens is only possible after that judgment if a decision for the granting or extension of a residency permit has not come into force ([1]). As a consequence, only Turkish citizens who had begun an appeal procedure against the imposition of the excessively high fees within the legal objection period of four weeks after the granting of a residency permit can be considered for restitution of overpaid fees.

Turkish citizens for whom the legal objection period has already expired can no longer appeal for restitution of overpaid fees following this decision. Initiating such an objection procedure used to be practically pointless. Because of this decision, thousands of Turkish citizens are denied an 'effective legal remedy' to obtain restitution of unlawfully levied fees. Moreover, the Administrative Jurisdiction Department's judgment mentioned earlier has revoked its own earlier decision, which was more favourable for Turkish citizens ([2]). This means a 'new restriction' as prohibited in Article 13 of Decision No 1/80 of the EEC-Turkey Association Council and Article 41(1) of the Additional Protocol (OJ L293, 29.12.972). In the *Sahin* case (C-242/06) and in the *European Commission* v *Netherlands* case (C-92/07), the European Court of Justice ruled that the levying of fees which are disproportionate to the amount requested from Community citizens is in conflict with both standstill conditions mentioned in the previous sentence.

1. What is the Commission's view of the judgment of 2 September 2011 in view of both standstill conditions and the relevant jurisprudence of the Court of Justice in relation to these conditions?

2. What is the Commission's view of the situation that, as a result of the judgment of 2 September 2011, many Turkish citizens do not have access to an 'effective legal remedy', as included in Article 47 of the Charter and Article 13 of the European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR) and that restitution for the overpaid legal fees has been made effectively impossible for them to obtain?

3. What is the Commission's view of the consequences of the judgment of 2 September 2011 with respect to Article 17(1) of the Charter, as well as Article 1, Protocol 1 of the ECHR in relation to the overpaid legal fees by Turkish citizens?

4. Can the Commission indicate whether it will call the Dutch authorities to task with regard to this situation created by the judgment of 2 September 2011? If not, why not?

Preliminary answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2012)

The Commission is aware of the situation in the Netherlands with regard to the restitution of overpaid fees for granting or extending residence permits for Turkish citizens and is examining the case following the usual procedures. Due to the complexity of the matter, further time is required to complete this detailed analysis. The Commission will inform the Honourable Member of the outcome of this deliberation in due course.

Supplementary answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(21 December 2012)

The Commission will contact the Dutch authorities. However, due to the complexity of the matter brought forward in your questions, to the fact that there is no precedent in this area, as well as to the need to very carefully analyse the case against the background of the jurisprudence on Decision 1/80 of the EEC- Turkey Association Council, the Commission is still examining this issue and is therefore not in a position to provide a full answer to your questions.

([1]) 201007667/1/V3, 2 September 2011, LJN: BR6949, http://zoeken.rechtspraak.nl/detailpage.aspx?ljn=BR6949.
([2]) 200803390/1, 29 April 2009, LJN:BI4040, http://zoeken.rechtspraak.nl/detailpage.aspx?ljn=BI4040.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-005724/12
Komisi
Pavel Poc (S&D)
(7. června 2012)

Předmět: Napájení zvířat během přepravy na dlouhé vzdálenosti

Nařízení Rady (ES) č. 1/2005 o ochraně zvířat stanovuje v příloze I kapitole V bodě 1.4 intervaly napájení, které jsou požadovány pro jednotlivé druhy zvířat přepravovaných na dlouhé vzdálenosti. Například pro napojení dobytka, ovcí a koz musí být mezi čtrnáctihodinovými intervaly přepravy poskytnut odpočinek v délce nejméně jedné hodiny. Koně a osli musí být během 24hodinové doby přepravy napájeni každých osm hodin.

V nařízení Rady (ES) č. 1/2005 není požadováno, aby byla zvířata během doby napájení vyložena z přepravních vozů.

1. Je podle Komise reálné se domnívat, že kontrolní úřady členských států jsou schopny přiměřeným způsobem ověřit, zda byla zvířata během přepravy na dlouhou vzdálenost skutečně napojena?

2. Pokud je odpověď na předchozí otázku kladná, jak jsou tyto kontroly v praxi prováděny?

3. Domnívá se Komise – s ohledem na informace získané během uplynulých let –, že je možné, že všechna zvířata přepravovaná na dlouhé vzdálenosti (tedy po dobu delší než 8 hodin) jsou napájena přiměřeným způsobem, podle požadavků nařízení? Není-li tomu tak, má Komise v úmyslu navrhnout přezkum nařízení, kterým bude přeprava na dlouhé vzdálenosti ukončena, aby byly splněny požadavky samotného nařízení a článku 13 SFEU?

Odpověď Johna Dalliho jménem Komise
(17. srpna 2012)

Body 1. a 2. Audit práce příslušných orgánů členských států provádí kontrolní útvar Komise v rámci Generálního ředitelství pro zdraví a spotřebitele (Potravinový a veterinární úřad, FVO), který sídlí v irském Grange. Nebylo zjištěno žádné konkrétní pochybení příslušných orgánů při poskytování odborné přípravy pro ověření, zda byla zvířata během přepravy na dlouhou vzdálenost napojena.

3. Komise si je vědoma jednotlivých případů, kdy zvířata neměla během přepravy dostatek vody. Takové případy byly hlášeny ve zprávě Komise o dobrých životních podmínkách zvířat během přepravy ([1]), která byla přijata v listopadu 2011.

V současné době Komise neuvažuje o změně nařízení č. 1/2005 ([2]).

([1]) Zpráva Komise Evropskému parlamentu a Radě o dopadu nařízení Rady (ES) č. 1/2005 o ochraně zvířat během přepravy. KOM(2011) 700 v konečném znění.

([2]) Nařízení Rady (ES) č. 1/2005 o ochraně zvířat během přepravy a souvisejících činností; Úř. věst. L 3, 5.1.2005, s. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005724/12
to the Commission
Pavel Poc (S&D)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: Watering of animals during long-distance transport

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals lays down in Annex I, Chapter V, point 1.4 the watering intervals required for different animal species transported on long-distance journeys. For example, a break of at least one hour is required to water cattle, sheep and goats in between two transport periods of 14 hours. Horses and donkeys must be given water every eight hours during a 24-hour transport period.

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 does not require that the animals be unloaded from the truck during these watering intervals.

1. Is the Commission of the opinion that it is realistic to think that the inspection authorities of the Member States are in a position to adequately verify if the animals have in fact been watered during long-distance transports?

2. If the answer to question no 1 is positive, how are these checks carried out in practice?

3. In consideration of the information it has acquired over the years, does the Commission consider it possible that all animals transported over long-distance journeys (i.e., over eight hours) are adequately watered as required by the regulation? If this is not the case, is the Commission going to propose a review of the regulation that will stop long-distance transports in order to comply with the requirements of the regulation itself and of Article 13 TFEU?

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

1-2. The Commission inspection service of Directorate General for Health and Consumers (FVO, Food and Veterinary Office), located in Grange, Ireland, audits the work of the competent authorities of the Member States. They have not identified particular failure of the competent authorities to provide training to verify that animals have been watered during long-distance transports.

3. The Commission is aware of individual cases where animals have not received enough water during transport. Such cases were reported in the Commission Report on animal welfare during transport ([1]), adopted in November 2011.

For the time being, the Commission does not consider amending Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 ([2]).

([1]) 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.

([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations; OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005725/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Gay Mitchell (PPE)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Funding cuts for the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA)

There are over five million registered Palestine refugees living in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and the occupied Palestinian territory. Employing nearly 31 000 local staff, UNRWA works for Palestine refugees in the Near East, providing basic education, healthcare, relief, camp infrastructure and improvement, community support, microfinance and emergency response. I have learnt that the allocation for the budget line for Palestine, UNRWA and the Middle East Peace Process included in the 2013 draft budget from the Commission has been reduced significantly compared with last year's initial allocation.

UNRWA, with the crucial support of the European Commission, needs to continue to fulfil its internationally assigned mandate in advocating and providing for the human development aspirations of Palestine refugees through its staff. However, this would be seriously impeded by the proposed cuts in the budget line.

1. Will the Vice-President/High Representative address this issue?

2. How is it proposed that Palestine refugees will receive adequate support and that their needs will be met in the years to come?

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

Having contributed over EUR 1.3 billion in support to UNRWA from the EU budget between 2000 and 2011, the EU is fully aware of the indispensable work carried out by this UN agency.

The initial draft allocation to the budget line 'Palestine, UNRWA and the Middle East Peace Process' in 2012 was also EUR 200 million. This amount was reinforced by EUR 100 million towards the end of 2011 through reallocations approved by the Budgetary Authority enabling the 2012 allocation to the Palestinian people to be de-facto maintained at the same level (EUR 300 million) of the 2011 allocation.

The 2013 draft budget proposes a reinforcement of the entire European Neighbourhood Policy Instrument (ENPI) of EUR 51.7 million compared to the financial programming (reinforcement of EUR 44.5 million compared to the 2012 draft budget) and the main reason behind this increase was to maintain the support to the Palestinian people, including to Palestine refugees through UNRWA, at least at the level of the 2012 draft budget.

As mentioned in the political presentation of the Draft Budget 2013, the focus will continue to be on assistance supporting the ability of the Palestinian Authority to provide essential services to the Palestinian people, to Palestinian state-building, to Palestine refugees through UNRWA as well as to the reconstruction efforts in Gaza. UNRWA is also eligible for funding from other thematic instruments and budget lines in addition to the ENPI.

While remaining fully committed to UNRWA's mandate, the EU continues to call for more equitable burden sharing and is engaged in ongoing discussions with UNRWA aimed towards enhancing donors' understanding and clarity of UNRWA's budget.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005726/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(7 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Violencia y represión política en Ruanda: Victoire Ingabire, más de un año y medio encarcelada por su lucha a favor de la democracia y los derechos humano

En estos días, la líder y candidata presidencial por el partido ruandés «Fuerzas Democráticas Unificadas» , Victoire Ingabire, cumple más de año y medio encarcelada injustamente en la prisión central de Kigali, mientras se enfrenta a tres acusaciones —negación del genocidio, divisionismo y colaboración con grupo armado— que carecen de fundamentación jurídica real y que pueden conllevar su encarcelamiento de por vida sin que existan en su juicio unas garantías mínimas para su defensa, con numerosas pruebas falsas, constantes amenazas, intimidaciones y represalias contra los abogados defensores y los testigos de la defensa.

En octubre de 2010, y tras haber sido sometida a arresto domiciliario después de intentar en vano registrar al partido «Fuerzas Democráticas Unificadas» para las elecciones presidenciales de agosto —en las que venció, sin ninguna observación electoral internacional, el partido de Kagame con un 93 % de los votos— Victoire Ingabire fue encarcelada acusada falsamente de colaborar con el grupo terrorista Fuerzas Democráticas de Liberación de Ruanda (FDLR) y de negar el genocidio de 1994.

Ingabire, quien en numerosas ocasiones, antes y después de su encarcelamiento, ha reconocido el genocidio de 1994 contra los tutsis, revindica que, antes y después de este genocidio, se cometieron crímenes contra la humanidad que afectaron a los otros componentes de la población ruandesa (tal y como recoge la Resolución de 955/1994) y lucha por que se investiguen y enjuicie a todos los responsables de estos crímenes.

Tal y como denuncian decenas de asociaciones y ONG, detrás de su cautiverio se encuentra la represión política que ejerce sistemáticamente el Gobierno de Kagame y el partido en el poder, el Frente Patriótico Ruandés (FPR), quienes utilizan discrecionalmente leyes aprobadas por su Gobierno para evitar la existencia de partidos o movimientos opositores fuertes.

1. ¿Está la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante informada sobre este caso y dispone de más información sobre la situación de encarcelamiento en la que se encuentra Victoire Ingabire?

2. ¿Se ha dirigido formalmente, o piensa dirigirse, la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante al Gobierno de Kagame para mostrar su preocupación por la situación de Victoire Ingabire?

3. ¿Piensa la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante investigar el caso expuesto e implementar todas las medidas a su alcance para que Victoire Ingabire sea liberada inmediatamente y se le asegure un juicio justo?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de julio de 2012)

La UE está siguiendo muy de cerca el juicio a Victoire Ingabire. Se trata del primer caso de estas características, en el que una ciudadana ruandesa, que goza del estatus de refugiado en los Países Bajos, volvió a Ruanda con pasaporte ruandés. El juicio ha sido seguido por las embajadas de varios Estados miembros de la UE y diversas organizaciones de derechos humanos y ONG.

En los Países Bajos la Sra. Ingabire intervino activamente en política. Al llegar a Ruanda pronunció un discurso ante el monumento conmemorativo del genocidio, en Kigali, en el que realizó unas declaraciones destinadas a llamar la atención sobre las dificultades que afligen a la población hutu, mayoritaria en Ruanda. Como se trataba de declaraciones polémicas y puesto que la legislación ruandesa prohíbe hacer referencia explícita al origen étnico, el discurso fue calificado como «divisionista» y se consideró que fomentaba una «ideología genocida».

La Sra. Ingabire fue arrestada en abril de 2010, y se le concedió la libertad bajo fianza al día siguiente con la condición de que no abandonara Kigali. Fue arrestada de nuevo en octubre de 2010, al añadirse al auto de procesamiento acusaciones más graves de apoyo al terrorismo.

El juicio, que comenzó en septiembre de 2011, está siendo muy lento, a pesar de lo cual la defensa ha podido presentar sus alegaciones. Las autoridades ruandesas han hecho cuanto estaba en su mano para garantizar que las condiciones de detención de la Sra. Ingabire cumplan las normas internacionales.

La naturaleza híbrida de la legislación ruandesa (basada en el Derecho Civil, pero cada vez más influida por el Derecho Consuetudinario) ha provocado un cierto grado de inseguridad jurídica, que debería aclararse cuando se pronuncie el veredicto, previsto para el 7 de septiembre de 2012, tras lo cual podrá finalizarse el análisis del asunto.

Asimismo la acusada dispondrá del derecho de recurso. Le garantizo que la UE continuará siguiendo este asunto y tomará las medidas necesarias una vez finalizado el juicio.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005726/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Violence and political repression in Rwanda: Victoire Ingabire Umuhoza imprisoned for over 18 months for fighting for democracy and human rights

The leader and presidential candidate of the United Democratic Forces of Rwanda (UDF) party, Victoire Ingabire Umuhoza, has now been imprisoned without cause in Kigali Central Prison for over 18 months. She faces three charges — genocide denial, divisionism and collaboration with armed groups — which lack any real legal basis and for which she could be imprisoned for life. Moreover, she believes she lacks any minimum safeguards for her defence: there have been numerous false testimonies, and defence lawyers and witnesses have suffered threats, intimidation and reprisals.

Having suffered house arrest after trying in vain to register the UDF for the August 2010 presidential elections, which Paul Kagame's party won with 93% of the vote and which had no international election observers, Victoire Ingabire Umuhoza was imprisoned in October of that year and falsely accused of collaborating with the terrorist group the Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR) and denying the 1994 genocide.

Ms Ingabire Umuhoza, who has on numerous occasions before and since her imprisonment acknowledged the 1994 genocide against the Tutsis, claims that crimes against humanity were committed against other elements of the Rwandan population before and after this genocide — as set out in UN Security Council Resolution 955 (1994) — and fights for the perpetrators of these crimes to be investigated and brought to trial.

As dozens of associations and NGOs report, behind her imprisonment is the political repression systematically exercised by the Kagame Government and the ruling party, the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), who discretionally use laws passed by their government to block the existence of strong opposition parties or movements.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative informed of this case and does she have more information about Victoire Ingabire Umuhoza's imprisonment?

2. Has or will the Vice-President/High Representative formally contact the Kagame Government to express her concern about Victoire Ingabire Umuhoza's situation?

3. Will the Vice-President/High Representative investigate this case and take all the steps she can to have Victoire Ingabire Umuhoza freed immediately and to ensure she has a fair trial?

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

The EU is closely monitoring Victoire Ingabire's trial. The case is the first of its kind as a Rwandan citizen who also has refugee status in the Netherlands, returned to Rwanda on a Rwandan passport. The trial has been followed by several EU Member States' embassies, various human rights' organisations and NGOs.

In the Netherlands, Ms Ingabire became politically active. On entering Rwanda, Ms Ingabire held a speech at the Kigali Genocide Memorial and made the statements, which were aimed at asking attention for the plight of the majority Hutu population in Rwanda. As the declarations were controversial in content and since it is forbidden by Rwandan law to make explicit reference to ethnicity, these acts were labelled 'divisionism' and seen as promoting 'genocide ideology'.

Ms Ingabire was arrested in April 2010, but was granted bail the next day, on condition that she would restrict her movements to the town of Kigali. She was again arrested in October 2010, on the ground that more serious charges of support to terrorism had been added to the indictment.

The trial began in September 2011 and has proceeded very slowly, but the defence has been able to present its case. The Rwandan authorities have been doing their outmost to make sure that the terms of Ingabire's detention conditions are up to international standards.

The hybrid nature of Rwandan law (civil law basis, with more and more influence of common law) has created some legal uncertainty, which should be clarified with the verdict expected to be delivered on the 7 September 2012, following which an analysis of the court case can be completed.

The defendant will also have the right to an appeal. I assure you that EU will continue to monitor the case and will take the required actions following the completion of the trial.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005727/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(7 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Israel compra a Alemania tres submarinos con capacidades nucleares

El Estado de Israel ha firmado recientemente un contrato con Alemania en el que se establece la compra de tres submarinos Dolphin construidos en los astilleros de Kiel (norte de Alemania) y cuya entrega se producirá ente 2012 y 2017. Dichos submarinos, que se añaden a los tres que Israel había comprado con anterioridad, están equipados con un dispositivo hidráulico que permite instalar y accionar cabezas nucleares. Del mismo modo, un tercio de la financiación de los mismos (135 millones de euros) corre a cargo de los contribuyentes alemanes.

Según las declaraciones del ex-Secretario de Estado Lothar Rühl y el ex-funcionario de Defensa Hans Rühle, las prácticas israelíes son bien conocidas por el Gobierno alemán. Asimismo, documentos del Ministerio de Exteriores certifican que Alemania es conocedora del programa atómico de Israel desde 1961. Si bien la operación está vinculada a que Israel frene la construcción de colonias en Cisjordania y permita la construcción de una depuradora en la franja de Gaza, la venta de estos submarinos por parte de Alemania constituye un apoyo implícito a la formación del arsenal flotante israelí, habida cuenta de su programa nuclear y de que los tres primeros submarinos ya estarían equipados con misiles de crucero.

1. Ante estos hechos, ¿no considera la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante que la firma de este contrato por parte de Alemania conlleva un problema de credibilidad para el conjunto de la UE a la hora de impedir que países como Irán se hagan con la tecnología suficiente para construir armamento nuclear? ¿Considera la Vicepresidenta / Alta Representante que esta venta supone una violación del Código de conducta de la Unión Europea en materia de exportación de armas?

2. Teniendo en cuenta el reiterado incumplimiento del Acuerdo de Asociación y la escasa voluntad política demostrada una y otra vez por el actual Gobierno de Israel para avanzar en las negociaciones de paz con Palestina, corroborada por su política de hechos consumados, de rearme y de continuación de la construcción de asentamientos de colonos en los territorios palestinos, ¿piensa la Vicepresidenta / Alta Representante solicitar que se congele el Acuerdo de Asociación como medida eficaz de presión para que Israel cumpla con las obligaciones contraídas y respete el Derecho Internacional?

3. ¿Puede informar la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante de si ha impulsado medidas para sacar adelante un Tratado Internacional para prohibir y destruir ecológicamente todo el arsenal nuclear mundial?

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

Según la normativa de la UE que regula la exportación de armas (Posición Común 2008/944/PESC del Consejo ([1])), la decisión sobre si autorizar o denegar las exportaciones de armas sigue siendo una responsabilidad nacional de los Estados miembros. Aunque la decisión final sobre la autorización de exportación de armas es competencia nacional, la Posición Común exige que los Estados miembros evalúen las solicitudes de licencia de exportación de armas con arreglo a los ocho criterios establecidos en la propia Posición Común.

Respecto a las armas nucleares, el Tratado sobre la no proliferación de las armas nucleares (TNP) sigue siendo para la UE la piedra angular del régimen mundial de no proliferación nuclear y la base fundamental para lograr el desarme nuclear, de acuerdo con el artículo VI del TNP. La UE participa de forma activa en los esfuerzos mundiales por lograr un mundo más seguro para todos y crear las condiciones necesarias para un mundo sin armas nucleares, conforme a los objetivos del TNP, fomentándose la estabilidad internacional y basándose en el principio de una seguridad sin restricciones para todos. En consecuencia, la Unión Europea está estudiando activamente, sin demora y de forma sopesada, la aplicación del Plan de Acción con visión de futuro incluido en el Documento Final de la Conferencia de examen del TNP de 2010. Además, la UE apoya fervientemente las Recomendaciones de la Conferencia de examen del TNP de 2010 de celebrar una conferencia en 2012 sobre la creación de una zona libre de armas nucleares y de todas las armas de destrucción masiva en Oriente Medio, y ha contribuido en este proceso.

La posición sobre el Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Israel figura en la respuesta a la pregunta parlamentaria E-010294/2011 ([2]).

([1]) Posición Común 2008/944/PESC del Consejo, de 8 de diciembre de 2008, por la que se definen las normas comunes que rigen el control de las exportaciones de tecnología y equipos militares. DO L 335 de 13.12.2008.

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005727/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Israel buys three nuclear-capable submarines from Germany

The State of Israel has recently signed a contract with Germany providing for the purchase of three Dolphin submarines, built in the north-German shipyards of Kiel, which will be delivered between 2012 and 2017. These submarines, in addition to the three Israel previously purchased, are equipped with a hydraulic system enabling them to carry and launch nuclear warheads. Moreover, the German taxpayer has provided a third of the funding for these submarines — EUR 135 million.

According to ex-Secretary of State Lothar Rühl and the ex-Defence Official, Hans Rühle, the German Government is well aware of Israeli practices. Furthermore, documents from the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs show that it has known about Israel's nuclear programme since 1961. While this transaction is linked to Israel halting settlement building in the West Bank and allowing the construction of a water treatment plant in the Gaza Strip, Germany selling these submarines constitutes implicit support for Israel establishing a floating arsenal, given that the latter has a nuclear programme and that the first three submarines are probably equipped with cruise missiles.

1. In view of the above, does the Vice-President/High Representative believe that Germany signing this contract will harm the EU's credibility to block countries like Iran from obtaining sufficient technology to build nuclear weapons? Does the Vice-President/High Representative consider this sale a breach of the EU's Code of Conduct on arms exports?

2. The current Israeli Government has repeatedly violated the EU-Israel Association Agreement, and has demonstrated time and again a lack of political will to make progress on peace talks with Palestine through its policies of *faits accomplis*, rearmament and continued settlement construction in Palestinian territory. In view of this, is the Vice-President/High Representative considering suspending the EU-Israel Association Agreement, as an effective means of pressuring the country to meet its agreed obligations and to respect international law?

3. Can the Vice-President/High Representative state whether she has pushed for measures to make progress with an international treaty banning nuclear weapons and decommissioning the world's entire arsenal thereof in an environmentally-friendly way?

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

Under the EU framework regulating arms exports (Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP ([1])) the decision to grant or deny an export authorisation remains a national responsibility. While the final decision on the authorisation of an arms export remains a national responsibility, the Common Position requires that arms export applications reviewed by Member States be assessed against the eight criteria set out in the Common Position itself.

With regard to nuclear weapons, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) remains for the EU the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime and the essential foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament in accordance with Article VI of the NPT. The EU is actively contributing to the global efforts to seek a safer world for all and create the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons in accordance with the goals of the NPT, in a way that promotes international stability, and based on the principle of undiminished security for all. The European Union is therefore actively pursuing, without delay and in a balanced manner, the implementation of the forward-looking Action Plan set out in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. Furthermore, the EU strongly supports the recommendations by the 2010 NPT Review Conference for the holding of a conference in 2012 on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all weapons of mass destruction, and has contributed to this process.

The position on the EU-Israel Association Agreement is provided in the reply to previous Written Question E-010294/2011 ([2]).

([1]) Council Common Position 2008/944/CFSP of 8 December 2008 defining common rules governing control of exports of military technology and equipment, OJ L 335, 13.12.2008.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005728/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(7 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Entierro del asesinado joven saharaui Said Dambar por parte de la policía marroquí sin investigación ni consentimiento de su familia

El joven saharaui Said Dambar fue asesinado el 22 de diciembre de 2010 a manos de la policía marroquí. Las autoridades justifican el disparo que acabó con la vida de Said recurriendo al sempiterno argumento del ajuste de cuentas. La familia se negó a que el cuerpo del joven fuera enterrado sin una investigación justa que incluyera la autopsia del cuerpo y, debido a la drástica negativa de la policía marroquí, su cadáver ha permanecido 17 meses y 15 días en la morgue del hospital de la ciudad.

El lunes 4 de junio a las 8.30 horas las autoridades de ocupación de El Aaiún irrumpieron en casa de la familia para exigir a la madre de Said, Jira Ahmed Embarek, que firmara una orden del tribunal en la que se establecía que el cadáver debía ser enterrado a las 9.00 horas. Según un comunicado emitido por la familia, cuando la madre se negó a firmar dicha orden, los agentes la arrojaron al suelo y afirmaron que «era su problema hacer caso omiso» porque el cuerpo sería enterrado con orden o sin ella. Ese mismo día, Said fue enterrado en el cementerio de Jat Eramla en presencia únicamente de los agentes marroquíes.

Al igual que sucediera recientemente con el asesinato de Hamdi Etarfaoui, diversas organizaciones pro-derechos humanos y activistas saharauis apuntan a un nuevo crimen político, condenan los abusos que las autoridades marroquíes ejercen contra la población saharaui y exigen el esclarecimiento de las circunstancias del asesinato.

1. En el marco del diálogo entre la UE y Marruecos, establecida por el Acuerdo de Asociación entre ambas partes, ¿ha solicitado la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante información a Marruecos por la violencia sufrida por saharauis perpetrada impunemente por cuerpos policiales y población marroquí en los Territorios Ocupados del Sahara Occidental?

2. Ante la gravedad de estos hechos que no son investigados con garantías y cuyas responsabilidades penales no son depuradas, ¿va la Comisión a estudiar la activación de mecanismos de presión sobre Marruecos mientras no cese la persecución y represión de la población saharaui? ¿No considera que Marruecos está violando flagrantemente la cláusula segunda del Acuerdo de Asociación que exige que ambos actores actúen respetando constantemente los principios democráticos básicos y los derechos humanos tanto en sus asuntos internos como externos?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-005729/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(7 de junio de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Huelga de hambre de Lafkir Kaziza por la liberación de los presos políticos saharauis de Gdeim Izik

En el año 2010 miles de saharauis decidieron hacer frente a la fuerza de ocupación marroquí instalando en las afueras de El Aaiún el campamento de Gdiem Izik con el objetivo de reivindicar la mejora de sus condiciones de vida y la celebración de un legítimo referéndum de autodeterminación. Por su parte, el ejército marroquí decidió contraatacar desmantelando el campamento a sangre y fuego provocando decenas de muertos, heridos, detenidos y desaparecidos.

Uno de las victimas de esa masacre fue Lafkir Kaziza, un joven saharaui de 21 años que fue detenido y torturado hasta el punto de perder la movilidad de uno de sus hombros. Kaziza fue de visita a España para dar a conocer su caso y la terrible represión que sufre su pueblo en los Territorios Ocupados del Sáhara Occidental. No obstante, tras su llegada su madre fue detenida por agentes marroquíes que amenazaron a su familia con encarcelar o hacer desaparecer al joven si osaba volver.

Ante tan tremendas injusticias, Kaziza decidió iniciar el día 1 de junio una huelga de hambre para reclamar la liberación inmediata de los 22 presos políticos saharauis de la prisión de Sale, encarcelados tras los sucesos de Gdeim Izik y aún a la espera de juicio, así como la repetición de los juicios del resto de presos políticos saharauis bajo observancia internacional y garantizando su derecho a la tutela judicial efectiva.

1. En el marco del diálogo entre la UE y Marruecos, establecida por el Acuerdo de Asociación entre ambas partes, ¿ha solicitado la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante información a Marruecos por la violencia sufrida por saharauis perpetrada impunemente por cuerpos policiales y población marroquí en los Territorios Ocupados del Sahara Occidental?

2. Considerando que el Parlamento Europeo ha condenado la violenta disolución del Campamento de Gdeim Izik y ha solicitado la liberación de los presos políticos saharauis, ¿se ha interesado o tiene previsto interesarse la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante por el caso de Kaziza Lefkir y de los presos políticos saharauis?

3. Ante estos hechos, ¿no considera la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante que Marruecos está violando flagrantemente la cláusula segunda del Acuerdo de Asociación que exige que ambos actores actúen respetando constantemente los principios democráticos básicos y los derechos humanos tanto en sus asuntos internos como externos?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Füle en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de julio de 2012)

La Comisión lamenta profundamente los incidentes que han tenido lugar y pide a todas las partes que no recurran al uso de la violencia.

La Comisión apoya la Resolución 2044 (2012) del Consejo de Seguridad de las Naciones Unidas, de 24 de abril de 2012, por la que se prorroga el mandato de la Minurso en el Sáhara Occidental. La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta observa, en particular, que la Resolución subraya «la importancia de mejorar la situación de los derechos humanos en el Sáhara Occidental y en los campamentos de Tinduf» y alienta «a las partes a que colaboren con la comunidad internacional» en este sentido. Recuerda que la Resolución 1979(2011), de 27 de abril de 2011, acogió con satisfacción la creación de un Consejo Nacional de Derechos Humanos en Marruecos y el componente relativo al Sáhara Occidental, así como el compromiso de Marruecos de garantizar plenamente y sin reservas el acceso a todos los procedimientos especiales del Consejo de Derechos Humanos de la ONU.

Los derechos humanos están presentes en el núcleo del diálogo político de la UE con Marruecos y son abordados regularmente en las reuniones de los organismos conjuntos establecidos en virtud del Acuerdo de Asociación. La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta considera que, en general, Marruecos está avanzando hacia el respeto de los principios relativos a los derechos humanos, aunque son necesarias nuevas mejoras. El fortalecimiento de las libertades fundamentales y los principios democráticos gracias a la nueva Constitución y la creación del Consejo Nacional de Derechos Humanos son aspectos positivos de la evolución a este respecto.

La Comisión sigue la situación general de los 22 detenidos de la cárcel de Sale a través de la Delegación de la UE en Rabat.

La Comisión no considera que la suspensión del Acuerdo de Asociación UE-Marruecos sirva a los intereses de ninguna de las partes. Las relaciones UE-Marruecos han contribuido a un amplio proceso de reformas democráticas en ese país, que siguen impulsando y apoyando.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-005728/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Burial of the murdered young Sahrawi Said Dambar by Moroccan police without investigation or family's consent

The young Sahrawi Said Dambar was murdered by Moroccan police on 22 December 2010. The authorities used the age-old argument of settling of scores to explain the shot that ended Said Dambar's life. The young man's family refused to allow his body to be buried without a fair investigation including an autopsy but, owing to the drastically negative attitude of the Moroccan police, the body remained in the city hospital's morgue for 17 months and 15 days.

On Monday 4 June at 8.30, the occupying authorities in Laayoune barged into the family home and demanded that Said Dambar's mother, Jira Ahmed Embarek, sign a court order stating that the body had to be buried at 9.00. According to the family's statement, the officers threw his mother to the ground when she refused to sign the order and said that 'if she ignored it, that was her problem' because the body would be buried with or without the order. That same day, Said Dambar's body was buried in the Jat Eramla cemetery, witnessed only by Moroccan police officers.

As with the recent murder of Hamdi Etarfaoui, various human rights organisations and Sahrawi activists point to this political crime against the Sahrawi people, condemning the Moroccan authorities' abuses and demanding that the circumstances of the murder be explained.

1. In the context of the EU-Morocco dialogue established by the Association Agreement between the two parties, has the Vice-President/High Representative requested information from Morocco on the violence perpetrated with impunity against the Sahrawi people by the Moroccan police force and the Moroccan population in the occupied territories of Western Sahara?

2. Investigations into these events are not covered by safeguards and no action is taken against their criminal perpetrators. Given their seriousness, will the Commission take measures to exert pressure on Morocco until the persecution and repression of the Sahrawi people stops? Does it not consider Morocco to be in clear breach of Article 2 of the Association Agreement, requiring both parties always to respect basic democratic principles and fundamental human rights in both internal and external affairs?

Question for written answer E-005729/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(7 June 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Hunger strike by Lafkir Kaziza for the release of the Sahrawi political prisoners at Gdeim Izik

In 2010, thousands of Sahrawis decided to respond to the Moroccan occupation force by setting up the Gdeim Izik camp on the outskirts of Laayoune to call for an improvement in their living conditions and a legitimate referendum on self-determination. The Moroccan Army decided to counter-attack, dismantling the camp and wreaking violence, which left dozens dead, injured, imprisoned or missing.

One of the victims of this massacre was Lafkir Kaziza, a 21-year old Sahrawi who was arrested and tortured to the point of losing mobility in one of his shoulders. Kaziza visited Spain to publicise his case and the terrible repression suffered by his people in the occupied territories of Western Sahara. However, after his arrival, his mother was arrested by Moroccan agents who threatened his family with imprisonment or death for the young man if he dared return.

On 1 June, Kaziza, faced with such tremendous injustice, decided to go on a hunger strike to demand the immediate release of the 22 Sahrawi political prisoners in Sale Prison, who had been imprisoned after the events of Gdeim Izik and who were still awaiting trial, and the retrial of the remaining Sahrawi political prisoners under international observation, guaranteeing their right to effective justice.

1. In the course of the EU-Morocco dialogue, established by the Association Agreement between both parties, has the Vice-President/High Representative requested information from Morocco on the violence suffered by the Sahrawi people, perpetrated with impunity by the Moroccan police and people in the occupied territories of Western Sahara?

2. As Parliament has condemned the violent break-up of the Gdeim Izik camp and has called for the release of the Sahrawi prisoners, has or will the Vice-President/High Representative taken/take an interest in the case of Kaziza Lefkir and the Sahrawi political prisoners?

3. In light of these acts, does the Vice-President/High Representative believe that Morocco is blatantly violating Article 2 of the Association Agreement that requires both parties to constantly respect basic democratic principles and fundamental human rights in both their domestic and external affairs?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2012)

The Commission deeply regrets the incidents that have taken place and calls on all parties to refrain from violence.

It supports UN Security Council Resolution 2044 (2012) of 24 April 2012 extending the mandate of MINURSO in the Western Sahara. The HR/VP notes in particular that the Resolution underlines 'the importance of improving human rights situation in Western Sahara and the Tindouf camps' and encourages 'the parties to work with the international community' in this sense'. She recalls that Resolution 1979 (2011) of 27 April 2011 welcomed the establishment of a National Council for Human Rights in Morocco and the proposed component regarding Western Sahara, and the commitment of Morocco to ensure unqualified and unimpeded access to all Special Procedures of the UN Human Rights Council.

Human rights are at the core of the EU-Morocco political dialogue and are regularly addressed in the meetings of the joint bodies established under the Association Agreement. The HR/VP considers that overall Morocco is making progress towards more compliance with the human rights principles, although further improvements are necessary. The strengthening of fundamental freedoms and democratic principles by the new Constitution and the establishment of the National Council for Human Rights are positive developments in this regard.

The Commission is following the general situation of the 22 detainees in Sale Prison through the EU Delegation in Rabat.

The Commission does not consider that suspending the EU-Morocco Association Agreement will serve the interests of either party. EU-Morocco relations have contributed and continue to encourage and support to a wide process of democratic reform in that country.