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 300 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-006197/12
komissiolle
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE) ja Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(21. kesäkuuta 2012)

Aihe: Syanidin käyttö kaivoksissa

Toukokuussa 2010 Euroopan parlamentti hyväksyi päätöslauselman (P7_TA(2010)0145), jossa katsottiin, että syanidin käyttö kaivoksissa tulisi kieltää EU:ssa. Parlamentti painotti syanidin olevan erittäin myrkyllinen kemikaali, joka vesipuitedirektiivin liitteessä VIII kuuluu merkittävimpien pilaavien aineiden joukkoon.

Suomessa yhden Euroopan suurimmista kultakaivoksista Kittilässä omistava Agnico-Eagle Finland on sekä alueen asukkaille että poliittisille päättäjille vakuuttanut, että kaivoksen prosessi on suljettu eikä syanidia pääse ympäristöön lainkaan. Kuitenkin tuoreiden uutisten mukaan Kittilän kultakaivoksesta epäillään vuotaneen syanidia ympäristöluvan raja-arvot ylittävä määrä.

Nordic Mines on aloittanut kultakaivoksen Raahen Laivakankaalla. Se sai äskettäin luvan jätevesien johtamiseksi väliaikaisesti Tuoreenmaanojaan, siis luontoon. Kaivoksen tarkoitus on laskea jätevedet Perämereen, mutta sinne johtava putki ei ole vielä valmis. Putken valmistuttuakin kaivoksen ympäristövaikutukset saattavat ulottua laajalle, myös Ruotsin aluevesille, ja ne voivat ehkä vaikuttaa myös Perämeren ja siihen laskevien jokien, kuten Tornionjoen kalakantoihin. Biokemistin lausunnon mukaan meriputken lupahakemuksen tiedoissa on kuitenkin vakavia puutteita mm. syanidin osalta.

Esimerkki siitä, että lupaehtojen syanidimäärä voi ylittyä kaivoksen täydessä tuotannossa reilusti, on kaivosyhtiö Mondo Minerals, joka laski ainakin vuoden ajan Sotkamon Nuasjärveen myrkkyjä laittomasti. Sen vuonna 1997 aloittama kokeilu nikkelin rikastuksen tehostamisesta epäonnistui, kun käytetty natriumsyanidi ei hajonnutkaan prosessissa.

Aikooko komissio ehdottaa syanidin käytön kieltämistä kaivostoiminnassa, jotta saataisiin loppumaan syanidin aiheuttamat ympäristövahingot, joista osa aiheutuu ympäristölupaehtojen rikkomisesta?

Janez Potočnikin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(20. elokuuta 2012)

Kuten komissio toteaa vastauksessaan syanidia käyttävän kaivostekniikan yleisestä kieltämisestä Euroopan unionissa 5 päivänä toukokuuta 2010 annettuun Euroopan parlamentin päätöslauselmaan ([1]), komissio ei aio esittää tällaista yleistä kieltoa. Voimassa on jo kattavat säännöt, joilla varmistetaan, että kaivostoiminta on Euroopan unionissa turvallista, mukaan lukien direktiivit ympäristövaikutusten arvioinnista ([2]), strategisesta ympäristöarvioinnista ([3]) ja kaivannaisteollisuuden jätehuollosta ([4]). Kaivannaisteollisuuden jätehuollosta annettu direktiivi sisältää vaatimukset, mukaan lukien syanidipitoisuuksien hyvin tiukat raja-arvot, joilla varmistetaan kaivosjätealueiden turvallisuus.

Jäsenvaltioiden toimivaltaisten viranomaisten on varmistettava säännösten asianmukainen täytäntöönpano, täytäntöönpanon valvonta ja EU:n lainsäädännön mukaisuus. EU:n perussopimuksen valvojana komissio varmistaa, että EU:n voimassa olevan lainsäädännön kaikkia vaatimuksia noudatetaan täysimääräisesti.

([1]) Viite: P7_TA(2010)0145.
([2]) Neuvoston direktiivi 85/337/ETY tiettyjen julkisten ja yksityisten hankkeiden ympäristövaikutusten arvioinnista, EYVL L 175, 5.7.1985.
([3]) Euroopan parlamentin ja neuvoston direktiivi 2001/42/EY, annettu 27 päivänä kesäkuuta 2001, tiettyjen suunnitelmien ja ohjelmien ympäristövaikutusten arvioinnista, EYVL L 197, 21.7.2001.
([4]) Direktiivin 2006/21/EY (direktiivi kaivannaisteollisuuden jätehuollosta), EUVL L 102, 11.4.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-006197/12
to the Commission
Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE) and Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE)
(21 June 2012)

Subject: Use of cyanide in mines

In May 2010 Parliament adopted a resolution (P7_TA(2010)0145) in which it expressed the view that the use of cyanide in mines should be banned in the EU. It noted that cyanide is a highly toxic chemical classed in Annex VIII of the Water Framework Directive as a 'main pollutant'.

In Finland, Agnico-Eagle Finland, which owns one of Europe's biggest gold mines, in Kittilä, has given assurances to both local residents and political decision-makers that the mining carried out is a closed process and there is no way that cyanide can escape into the environment. However, according to recent reports, cyanide spills from the Kittilä gold mine are suspected to have exceeded the limit values laid down in the environmental permit.

Nordic Mines has started gold mining at Laivakangas, in the Raahe area. It has just been given permission to discharge effluents temporarily at Tuoreenmaanoja, in other words into the natural environment. The intention is to discharge the effluents into the Bothnian Bay, but the necessary pipeline is not yet ready. Even when the pipeline has been completed, the environmental impact of the mine could reach as far as Swedish territorial waters and possibly also make itself felt in the Bothnian Bay and the rivers flowing into it, and as regards the fish stocks of the Tornionjoki river. According to a biochemist's report, the supporting information for the pipeline permit application is, in any event, woefully inadequate, among other things where cyanide is concerned.

The fact that permitted cyanide levels can be far exceeded when mining production is at full capacity is illustrated by the example of Mondo Minerals, a mining company which illegally discharged toxic substances into the Nuasjärvi lake at Sotkamo for at least a year. Its enhanced nickel enrichment trial proved unsuccessful because the sodium cyanide used in the process failed to decompose.

Will the Commission propose that the use of cyanide in mining be prohibited in order to end the resulting environmental damage, which occurs partly because the terms of environmental permits are not complied with?

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

As detailed in the answer of the Commission to the Parliament Resolution of 5 May 2010 ([1]) on the possible introduction of a general ban on the use of cyanide mining technologies, the Commission does not intend to propose such a general ban. There is a comprehensive set of rules in place to ensure safe mining in the European Union, including Directives on Environmental Impact Assessment ([2]), on Strategic Environmental Assessment ([3]) and on the management of extractive waste ([4]). The directive on the management of extractive waste includes requirements to ensure the safety of mining waste facilities, including very strict limit values for cyanide concentrations.

The competent authorities of the Member States have to ensure proper implementation, enforcement and compliance with the EU legislation. As guardian of the Treaty, the Commission will ensure that all the requirements of the existing EU legislation are fully respected.

([1]) Reference: P7_TA(2010)0145.
([2]) Council Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 175, 5.7.1985.
([3]) Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programs on the environment, OJ L 197, 21.7.2001.
([4]) Directive 2006/21/EC (Directive on the management of extractive waste), OJ L 102, 11.4.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009066/12
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(9 October 2012)

Subject: Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II: European Arrest Warrant

Further to my previous Question E-004849/2012, the second part of which was not answered:

As a citizen of the EU, could Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II conceivably be the subject of a European Arrest Warrant?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2012)

The European arrest warrant, which has been adopted by all Member States of the European Union, is an entirely judicial procedure applicable to specific cases for the purposes of conducting a criminal prosecution or executing a custodial sentence with due respect to rights of persons concerned, including privilege or immunity.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009067/12
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(9 October 2012)

Subject: Women's rights in Saudi Arabia

Recent news reports have shown that women's basic rights are being continually stifled in Saudi Arabia. Several hundred women travelling from Nigeria to Saudi Arabia for Hajj were denied access to the country because they were travelling without a male guardian. The Saudi authorities have announced the creation of a women-only industrial city. While this may provide opportunities for employment, in effect it is likely to entrench women's separation and subjugation. Furthermore, just last week it emerged that IKEA had erased photographs of women from the Saudi version of its catalogue.

Human Rights Watch equates the treatment of women in Saudi Arabia to that of children — depriving them of their basic human rights as capable individuals.

1. Can the Commission outline what action has been undertaken (or is planned) by the Commission to reject and prevent EU complicity in women's suppression, in particular in trade practices (such as in the case of IKEA)?

2. Further, what is being done to mainstream gender equality in EU relations with Saudi Arabia?

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

As the principle of non-discrimination on the basis of gender is one of the fundamental principles of the EU, gender-related issues are regularly discussed by the EU with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The EU holds regular high-level exchanges of view with Saudi Arabia and the other five Gulf countries; the latest EU-GCC ([1]) Ministerial Meeting took place in June 2012. On that occasion the EU side recalled the crucial importance of respecting all human rights. A reference to this is made in the Co-Chairs' Joint Statement.

Even though the situation of women in Saudi Arabia remains problematic and often a source of concern, the EU took positive note of the decision taken by the Saudi King to allow women to be appointed to the Shura Council as of 2014, the possibility for them to vote and stand for office at the 2015 Municipal elections and, more recently, the decision to let women lawyers to argue clients' cases in courtrooms in the near future.

The EU expects swift and straightforward implementation of such decisions and at the same time will continue to discuss these matters with the Saudi authorities at all levels. The EU has also on numerous occasions informed that it stands ready to support reform, if and when requested.

([1]) GCC = Gulf Cooperation Council.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009068/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta / Alta Representante)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE) y Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(9 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Derechos laborales en Paraguay

La federación global de sindicatos nacionales, UNI Global Union, denunció en sus comunicados la violación de los derechos sindicales en Paraguay, después del golpe de Estado contra el Presidente Lugo.

Concretamente, la multinacional española Prosegur, empresa española líder en el sector de la seguridad privada, generó una serie de violaciones de convenios nacionales e internacionales, avalada por el Ministerio de Justicia y Trabajo de ese país. El día 18 de julio de 2012, 327 trabajadores de la empresa se sumaron a una huelga general dada la falta de respuestas de Prosegur a un proceso de negociación colectiva. El día 30 de julio de 2012, Prosegur procedió al despido masivo de los 327 trabajadores en huelga, violando abiertamente los convenios 87 sobre la Libertad Sindical y la Protección al Derecho de Sindicación y el convenio 98 sobre el Derecho de Sindicación y Negociación Colectiva ambos ratificados por el Gobierno de Paraguay ([1]).

Las declaraciones de la Vicepresidenta / Alta Representante, Sra. Ashton (23.6.2012) y del Presidente de la Delegación para las Relaciones con los Países de Mercosur del Parlamento Europeo sobre los recientes acontecimientos políticos en Paraguay (26.6.2012), expresan la preocupación por la falta de garantías democráticas y el proceso político contra el Presidente Lugo.

Por otro lado, el Artículo 19 del Acuerdo sobre cooperación al desarrollo del marco de cooperación entre la Comunidad Económica Europea y la República del Paraguay sigue vigente.

1. ¿Conocía la Vicepresidenta / Alta Representante el despido masivo de la empresa española Prosegur? ¿Qué opinión le merece?

2. Después de las declaraciones del 23.6.2012, ¿qué otros pasos ha tomado la Unión Europea y usted concretamente para impulsar la restauración democrática en Paraguay?

3. ¿Está incluyendo en sus diálogos políticos los derechos sindicales y laborales?

4. ¿Piensa presionar a las empresas europeas, en este caso a Prosegur, para que respete los derechos sindicales de los trabajadores paraguayos?

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

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta de la Comisión está siguiendo de cerca la actual situación en Paraguay y los sucesivos acontecimientos tras el proceso de destitución del Presidente Lugo. La UE se ha comprometido a apoyar el proceso democrático paraguayo y ha acogido con satisfacción la invitación del Gobierno de Paraguay a observar las elecciones generales de abril de 2013 que se celebrarán en el país. La decisión final sobre el envío de una misión de observación electoral dependerá de los resultados de la misión exploratoria que tendrá lugar a mediados de noviembre en Paraguay.

La Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta de la Comisión está siguiendo de cerca este asunto en Paraguay, ya que los derechos humanos y, en particular, los derechos laborales, constituyen un pilar básico de la política exterior de la UE. Por otra parte, la UE está prestando apoyo, en el marco del programa IEDDH y a través de una ONG europea (Progetto Sviluppo CGL), a una oficina de asesoramiento jurídico gratuito para los trabajadores que está proporcionando asesoramiento a Sitepropasa (Sindicato de Trabajadores y Empleados de la Empresa Prosegur, S. A.). Este asesoramiento se está proporcionando conjuntamente con UNI Global Union. Los asesores jurídicos redactaron una denuncia sobre prácticas antisindicales contra la empresa y el Gobierno de Paraguay que se entregará al Comité de Libertad Sindical de la OIT. La presente denuncia se presentará próximamente en Ginebra.

([1]) http://mail.uniglobalunion.org/apps/uni.nsf/pages/domainsearchen?OpenDocument&exURL=http://www.uniglobalunion.org/catalog.nsf/SearchResults?SearchDomain&Query=(paraguay)&SearchOrder=3&SearchWV=TRUE&SearchThesaurus=FALSE&SearchFuzzy=FALSE&Start=1&Count=10&SearchEntry=ResultEntry.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009068/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE) und Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(9. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Arbeitnehmerrechte in Paraguay

Die internationale Vereinigung nationaler Gewerkschaften, UNI Global Union, hat in ihren Kommuniqués die Verletzung von Gewerkschaftsrechten in Paraguay nach dem Staatsstreich gegen Präsident Lugo angeprangert.

So hat sich das spanische multinationale Unternehmen Prosegur, Marktführer im Bereich der privaten Sicherheit, mit Billigung des Justiz- und Arbeitsministeriums des Landes einer Reihe von Verstößen gegen nationale und internationale Übereinkommen schuldig gemacht. Am 18. Juli 2012 nahmen 327 Mitarbeiter des Unternehmens an einem Generalstreik in Folge des Ausbleibens einer Reaktion von Prosegur auf die erfolgten Tarifverhandlungen teil. Am 30. Juli 2012 entließ Prosegur alle 327 streikenden Mitarbeiter, was einen offensichtlichen Verstoß gegen das Übereinkommen Nr. 87 über die Vereinigungsfreiheit und den Schutz des Vereinigungsrechts sowie das Übereinkommen Nr. 98 über das Vereinigungsrecht und das Recht auf Kollektivverhandlungen darstellt; beide Übereinkommen sind von der Regierung Paraguays ratifiziert worden ([1]).

In der Erklärung der Vizepräsidentin/Hohen Vertreterin für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik Ashton vom 23. Juni 2012 und der Erklärung des Vorsitzenden der Delegation des Europäischen Parlaments für die Beziehungen mit den Ländern des Mercosur vom 26. Juni 2012 zu den jüngsten politischen Ereignissen in Paraguay wurde die Besorgnis über das Fehlen politischer Garantien und das politische Vorgehen gegen Präsident Lugo zum Ausdruck gebracht.

Andererseits ist Artikel 19 des Rahmenabkommens über Zusammenarbeit zwischen der Europäischen Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft und der Republik Paraguay, der die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit betrifft, weiterhin in Kraft.

1. War der Vizepräsidentin/Hohen Vertreterin für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik die Massenentlassung bei dem spanischen Unternehmen Prosegur bekannt? Welche Haltung nimmt sie dazu ein?

2. Welche anderen Schritte haben die Europäische Union und die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin nach den Erklärungen vom 23. Juni 2012 konkret unternommen, um auf die Wiederherstellung der Demokratie in Paraguay hinzuwirken?

3. Werden im Rahmen der politischen Dialoge mit Paraguay auch die Gewerkschafts- und Arbeitnehmerrechte erörtert?

4. Beabsichtigt die Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin, auf europäische Unternehmen, im vorliegenden Fall Prosegur, Druck auszuüben, damit diese die Gewerkschaftsrechte der Arbeiternehmer in Paraguay respektieren?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(22. November 2012)

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin verfolgt die Lage in Paraguay und die Entwicklungen nach dem Amtsenthebungsverfahren gegen Präsident Lugo mit großer Aufmerksamkeit. Die EU ist entschlossen, die Demokratie in Paraguay zu unterstützen und hat die Einladung der paraguayischen Regierung begrüßt, die für April 2013 angesetzten Parlamentswahlen in Paraguay zu beobachten. Die endgültige Entscheidung über die Entsendung einer Wahlbeobachtungsmission hängt von den Ergebnissen der Sondierungsgespräche ab, die Mitte November in Paraguay stattfinden.

([1]) http://mail.uniglobalunion.org/apps/uni.nsf/pages/domainsearchen?OpenDocument&exURL= http://www.uniglobalunion.org/catalog.nsf/SearchResults? SearchDomain&Query=(paraguay)&SearchOrder=3&SearchWV=TRUE&SearchThesaurus=FALSE&SearchFuzzy=FALSE&Start=1&Count=10&SearchEntry=ResultEntry.

Der Schutz der Menschenrechte und insbesondere der Arbeitnehmerrechte als Eckpfeiler der EU-Außenpolitik wird von der Hohen Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin in Paraguay aufmerksam verfolgt. Ferner unterstützt die EU im Rahmen des EIDHR-Programms und durch die europäische Nichtregierungsorganisation Progetto Sviluppo CGL ein kostenlos zugängliches Rechtsberatungsbüro für Arbeitnehmer, dessen Dienste auch von der PROSEGUR-Gewerkschaft SITEPROPASA (Sindicato de Trabajadores y Empleados de la Empresa PROSEGUR S.A.) in Anspruch genommen werden. Die Beratungsdienste werden in Zusammenarbeit mit der UNI Global Union bereitgestellt. Die Rechtsberater haben eine Beschwerde wegen gewerkschaftsfeindlicher Praktiken gegen das Unternehmen und die Regierung Paraguays verfasst, die dem IAO-Ausschuss für Vereinigungsfreiheit unterbreitet und in Kürze in Genf vorgelegt werden soll.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009068/12
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE) et Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(9 octobre 2012)

Objet: VP/HR — Droits du travail au Paraguay

La fédération mondiale des syndicats nationaux, UNI — Global Union, a dénoncé dans ses communiqués la violation des droits syndicaux au Paraguay, après le coup d'État contre le président Fernando Lugo.

Concrètement, la multinationale espagnole Prosegur, leader dans le secteur de la sécurité privée, a commis une série de violations de conventions nationales et internationales, avec l'aval du ministère de la justice et du travail de ce pays. Le 18 juillet 2012, en l'absence de réponse de la part de Prosegur aux demandes de négociations collectives, 327 travailleurs de cette entreprise ont lancé une grève générale. Le 30 juillet 2012, Prosegur a procédé au licenciement massif de ces 327 grévistes, violant ouvertement la convention nº 87 sur la liberté syndicale et la protection du droit syndical ainsi que la convention nº 98 sur le droit d'organisation et de négociation collective, toutes deux ratifiées par le gouvernement du Paraguay ([1]).

Les déclarations de la Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante Catherine Ashton du 23 juin 2012 et celles du président de la délégation pour les relations avec les pays du Mercosur du Parlement européen du 26 juin 2012 sur les récents événements politiques au Paraguay reflètent l'inquiétude que suscitent le manque de garanties démocratiques et le processus politique à l'œuvre à l'encontre du président Fernando Lugo.

Néanmoins, l'article 19 de l'accord-cadre de coopération entre la Communauté économique européenne et la République du Paraguay, relatif à la coopération au développement, est toujours en vigueur.

1. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante avait-elle connaissance du licenciement massif décidé par l'entreprise espagnole Prosegur? Quelle est son opinion à ce sujet?

2. Outre les déclarations du 23 juin 2012, quelles sont les démarches entreprises par l'Union européenne en vue de favoriser le rétablissement de la démocratie au Paraguay?

3. Les droits syndicaux et du travail sont-ils inclus dans ses dialogues politiques?

4. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante a-t-elle l'intention de faire pression sur les entreprises européennes, sur Prosegur en l'occurrence, pour que celle-ci respecte les droits syndicaux et les droits des travailleurs au Paraguay?

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

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante suit avec attention la situation au Paraguay et les conséquences de la procédure de destitution engagée à l'encontre du président Lugo. L'UE est déterminée à soutenir le processus démocratique au Paraguay et a accueilli favorablement l'invitation lancée par le gouvernement de ce pays d'observer les élections générales qui devraient se tenir en avril 2013. La décision définitive concernant le déploiement d'une mission d'observation électorale sera subordonnée aux résultats de la mission exploratoire organisée au Paraguay à la mi-novembre.

Les Droits de l'homme, qui englobent les droits des travailleurs, constituent un élément fondamental de la politique étrangère de l'UE et la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante s'intéresse de près à la situation dans ce domaine au Paraguay. En outre, l'Union européenne soutient, au titre du programme IEDDH et par l'intermédiaire d'une ONG européenne (Progetto Sviluppo CGL), un cabinet juridique qui fournit des conseils gratuits aux travailleurs, notamment aux membres du syndicat Sitepropasa (acronyme de Sindicato de Trabajadores y Empleados de la Empresa Prosegur S.A., syndicat de la société Prosegur). Ces conseils juridiques sont dispensés conjointement avec le syndicat mondial UNI. Les conseillers juridiques ont rédigé un recours pour pratiques antisyndicales à l'encontre de la société Prosegur et du gouvernement paraguayen, qui sera déposé prochainement à Genève, auprès du Comité de la liberté syndicale de l'OIT.

([1]) http://mail.uniglobalunion.org/apps/uni.nsf/pages/domainsearchen?OpenDocument&exURL= http://www.uniglo balunion.org/catalog.nsf/SearchResults?SearchDomain&Query=(paraguay)&SearchOrder=3&SearchWV=TRUE& SearchThesaurus=FALSE&SearchFuzzy=FALSE&Start=1&Count=10&SearchEntry=ResultEntry

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009068/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE) and Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(9 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Labour rights in Paraguay

The global federation of national trade unions, UNI Global Union, has released statements criticising the way in which trade union rights have been violated in Paraguay following the coup d'État against President Lugo.

More specifically, the Spanish multinational Prosegur, the leading Spanish company in the private security sector, has taken decisions, with the agreement of the Paraguayan Justice and Employment Ministry, that have breached the provisions of national and international conventions on a number of occasions. On 18 July 2012, 327 Prosegur employees took part in a general strike to protest against the company's lack of response to their invitation to participate in a collective bargaining process. On 30 July 2012, in what was a clear violation of Convention No 87 concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise and Convention No 98 concerning the Application of the Principles of the Right to Organise and to Bargain Collectively, both of which have been ratified by the Paraguayan Government ([1]), Prosegur sacked all 327 employees involved in the strike.

The statements issued by Vice-President/High Representative Baroness Ashton (23 June 2012) and the Chair of Parliament's Delegation for relations with the Mercosur countries on the recent political events in Paraguay (26 June 2012) demonstrate the concern felt at the lack of democratic guarantees in the country and the impeachment proceedings against President Lugo.

Article 19 (on development cooperation) of the framework Agreement for cooperation between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Paraguay also still applies.

1. Was the VP/HR aware of the mass dismissal of Prosegur employees? What is her view on the matter?

2. Following the statements issued on 23 June 2012, what other steps have the VP/HR and the EU taken to encourage a return to democratic practice in Paraguay?

3. Are trade union and labour rights being discussed in the political dialogue with Paraguay?

4. Do you intend to put pressure on European companies, in this case Prosegur, to ensure that the trade union rights of Paraguayan workers are safeguarded?

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

The HR/VP is following closely the situation in Paraguay and the developments after the process of impeachment to President Lugo. The EU is committed to supporting the Paraguayan democratic process and has welcomed the invitation by the Paraguayan government to observe the April 2013 general elections in the country. The final decision on the deployment of an Election Observation Mission will depend on the results of the exploratory mission that take place in Paraguay in mid November.

Human rights, including labour rights, are a cornerstone of EU foreign policy and the HR/VP is closely following this case in Paraguay. Furthermore, the EU is supporting, under the EIDHR programme and through an European NGO (Progetto Sviluppo CGL), a fee-free legal advisory office for workers that has been counselling SITEPROPASA (Sindicato de Trabajadores y Empleados de la Empresa PROSEGUR S.A., Spanish acronym for PROSEGUR labour union. This counselling is jointly being done with UNI Global Union. The legal advisors drafted a complaint appeal in anti-union practices against the company and the Paraguayan government that will be submitted to the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association. This complaint will be presented shortly in Geneva.

([1]) http://mail.uniglobalunion.org/apps/uni.nsf/pages/domainsearchen?OpenDocument&exURL=http://www.uniglobalunion.org/catalog.nsf/SearchResults?SearchDomain&Query=(paraguay)&SearchOrder=3&SearchWV=TRUE&SearchThesaurus=FALSE&SearchFuzzy=FALSE&Start=1&Count=10&SearchEntry=ResultEntry.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009069/12
aan de Raad
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL) en Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(9 oktober 2012)

Betreft: Blasfemiewetten binnen de Europese Unie

De recente golf van geweld in de moslimwereld die volgde op het online plaatsen van een video waarin Mohammed wordt afgebeeld heeft ertoe geleid dat veel EU-leiders de vrijheid van meningsuiting verdedigen tegen beschuldigingen van blasfemie. Tegelijkertijd hebben sommige lidstaten in de EU nog steeds blasfemiewetten en passen zij deze ook toe, wat blijkt uit de recente arrestatie van een 27-jarige man door de Griekse autoriteiten ([1]) en de vervolging van een artiest door de Spaanse autoriteiten voor een werk dat hij tientallen jaren geleden produceerde ([2]).

De Venetië-commissie, in haar verslag van 23 oktober 2010 en de Parlementaire Vergadering van de Raad van Europa, in haar Aanbeveling 1805 (2007) van 29 juni 2007, wezen erop dat blasfemiewetten nog steeds bestaan in een minderheid van de EU-lidstaten (Oostenrijk, Denemarken, Finland, Griekenland, Italië, Ierland en Nederland) en dat zij nauwelijks toegepast worden en dat iets soortgelijks als blasfemie — „religieuze belediging" — nog steeds een overtreding is in een groot aantal lidstaten (Cyprus, de Tsjechische Republiek, Denemarken, Spanje, Finland, Duitsland, Griekenland, Italië, Litouwen, Nederland, Polen, Portugal en Slowakije). Zowel de Venetië-commissie als de Parlementaire Vergadering adviseerde om de overtredingen van blasfemie en religieuze belediging af te schaffen gezien de artikelen 10 (vrijheid van meningsuiting) en 9 (vrijheid van gedachte, geweten en godsdienst) van het EVRM ([3]), die ook weerspiegeld worden in artikel 11 en 10 van het Handvest van de grondrechten van de EU. Artikel 20, lid 2, van het IVBPR bepaalt dat „het propageren van op nationale afkomst, ras of godsdienst gebaseerde haatgevoelens die aanzetten tot discriminatie, vijandigheid of geweld, (…) bij de wet wordt verboden".

1. Is de Raad van mening dat wetten tegen blasfemie en religieuze belediging in strijd zijn met de vrijheid van meningsuiting?

2. Is de Raad van mening dat de arrestatie en veroordeling van EU-burgers op verdenking van blasfemie in overeenstemming is met de EU-verdragen en het Handvest van de grondrechten?

3. Vraagt de Raad om afschaffing van blasfemiewetten in het kader van zijn externe beleid?

4. Zal de Raad in internationale organisaties zoals de VN een wereldwijde ban bepleiten op blasfemiewetten?

5. Hoe wil de Raad ervoor zorgen dat vrijheid van meningsuiting niet beperkt kan worden door wetten tegen blasfemie en religieuze belediging, zowel in de EU als daarbuiten?

Antwoord
(30 januari 2013)

Bij al haar optredens is de Europese Unie gehouden de grondrechten te eerbiedigen, overeenkomstig de EU-Verdragen, het EU-Handvest van de grondrechten en andere instrumenten van internationaal recht. Onder de laatstgenoemde is het Europees Verdrag tot bescherming van de rechten van de mens van bijzonder belang. Dit is ook van toepassing op de lidstaten wanneer zij het Unierecht ten uitvoer brengen.

Vrijheid van meningsuiting, gekoppeld aan de even belangrijke vrijheid van godsdienst of overtuiging, is een essentieel grondrecht, aangezien zij één van de fundamentele vereisten is voor de daadwerkelijke uitoefening van de democratie.

Wat betreft enkele van de specifieke punten die door de geachte Parlementsleden in de vragen 1, 2, 4 en 5 aan de orde worden gesteld: deze zijn door de Raad niet besproken, aangezien het niet aan de Raad is commentaar te geven op interne wettelijke bepalingen van de lidstaten of de gevolgen daarvan.

([1]) http://www.rtbf.be/info/societe/detail_grece-arrete-pour-blaspheme-pour-avoir-caricature-un-moine-sur-facebook?id=7844541.
([2]) http://www.guardian.co.uk/film/2012/may/28/spanish-artist-cook-christ-film.
([3]) De PACE stelde dat gezien de grote diversiteit aan religieuze overtuigingen in Europa en het democratische principe van de scheiding van de staat en religie, blasfemiewetten herzien moet worden door de lidstaten en parlementen en dat blasfemie, als een belediging naar jegens religie, niet beschouwd zou mogen worden als een strafbaar feit.

Ten aanzien van de vragen van de geachte Parlementsleden betreffende de activiteiten van de Raad jegens derde landen op dit gebied (vragen 3 en 5), merkt de Raad op dat, ingevolge artikel 21 van het Verdrag betreffende de Europese Unie, er bij het optreden van de Unie op internationaal niveau onder meer naar wordt gestreefd het universele en ondeelbare karakter van de mensenrechten en de fundamentele vrijheden te bevorderen. De grondrechten en de fundamentele vrijheden staan derhalve hoog op de agenda's voor dialoog met de partners van de EU en worden in de passende fora aan de orde gesteld.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009069/12
do Rady
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL) oraz Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(9 października 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Przepisy dotyczące bluźnierstwa obowiązujące w państwach Unii Europejskiej

W reakcji na niedawną falę przemocy w świecie muzułmańskim, będącą skutkiem zamieszczenia w Internecie nagrania wideo przedstawiającego Mahometa, wielu przywódców UE stanęło w obronie wolności słowa i poglądów, a przeciwko oskarżeniom o bluźnierstwo. Jednocześnie w niektórych państwach członkowskich UE nadal obowiązują i stosowane są przepisy dotyczące bluźnierstwa, czego przykładem jest niedawne aresztowanie 27-letniego mężczyzny w Grecji ([1]) i oskarżenie w Hiszpanii pewnego artysty w związku z filmem powstałym przed kilkudziesięcioma laty ([2]).

Komisja Wenecka Rady Europy w raporcie z dnia 23 października 2010 r. i Zgromadzenie Parlamentarne Rady Europy w zaleceniu 1805 (2007) z dnia 29 czerwca 2007 r. zauważają, że w kilku (stanowiących mniejszość) państwach członkowskich UE (w Austrii, Danii, Finlandii, Grecji, Włoszech, Irlandii i Holandii) nadal obowiązują rzadko stosowane przepisy o bluźnierstwie, a z kolei w wielu państwach członkowskich UE (w Czechach, Danii, Hiszpanii, Finlandii, Niemczech, Grecji, Włoszech, Holandii, Polsce, Portugalii, na Słowacji, Litwie i Cyprze) w dalszym ciągu za przestępstwo uznawane jest zachowanie podobne do bluźnierstwa, a mianowicie obraza uczuć religijnych. Zgodnie z art. 10 (dot. wolności wypowiedzi) i art. 9 (dot. wolności myśli, sumienia i religii) Konwencji o ochronie praw człowieka i podstawowych wolności ([3]) Komisja Wenecka i Zgromadzenie Parlamentarne Rady Europy zalecają zniesienie przepisów kwalifikujących bluźnierstwo i obrazę uczuć religijnych jako przestępstwa, przy czym artykuły te odzwierciedlono również w art. 10 i 11 Karty praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej. Według art. 20 ust. 2 Międzynarodowego paktu praw obywatelskich i politycznych prawo powinno zakazywać wyłącznie szerzenia nienawiści narodowej, rasowej lub religijnej, stanowiącego zachętę do dyskryminacji, aktów wrogości lub przemocy.

1. Czy Rada jest zdania, że przepisy przeciwko bluźnierstwu i obrażaniu uczuć religijnych są sprzeczne z wolnością wypowiedzi?

2. Czy Rada jest zdania, że aresztowanie i skazywanie obywateli UE za bluźnierstwo jest zgodne z traktatami UE i Kartą praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej?

3. Czy w swojej polityce zewnętrznej Rada wzywa do zniesienia przepisów o bluźnierstwie?

4. Czy Rada w organizacjach międzynarodowych, takich jak ONZ, opowie się za ogólnoświatowym zakazem przepisów o bluźnierstwie?

5. W jaki sposób Rada zadba o to, by przepisy zakazujące bluźnierstwa i obrażania uczuć religijnych nie ograniczały wolności wypowiedzi w UE i poza nią?

Odpowiedź
(30 stycznia 2013 r.)

Unia Europejska we wszystkich swoich działaniach ma obowiązek szanować prawa podstawowe, zgodnie z Traktatami UE, Kartą praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej i innymi aktami prawa międzynarodowego. Pośród tych ostatnich szczególne znaczenie ma Europejska konwencja praw człowieka. Powyższe ma zastosowanie do państw członkowskich, gdy wykonują przepisy prawa Unii.

Prawo wolności wypowiedzi, w powiązaniu z równie istotną wolnością religii lub przekonań, jest jednym z zasadniczych praw podstawowych, ponieważ chroni ono jeden z podstawowych wymogów skutecznego funkcjonowania demokracji.

([1]) http://www.rtbf.be/info/societe/detail_grece-arrete-pour-blaspheme-pour-avoir-caricature-un-moine-sur-facebook?id=7844541.
([2]) http://www.guardian.co.uk/film/2012/may/28/spanish-artist-cook-christ-film.
([3]) Zgromadzenie Parlamentarne Rady Europy stwierdziło, że „w związku z rosnącą różnorodnością wyznań w Europie i demokratyczną zasadą rozdziału państwa od Kościoła państwa członkowskie i parlamenty powinny dokonać przeglądu przepisów dotyczących bluźnierstwa" i że „bluźnierstwo, będące obrazą uczuć religijnych, nie może zostać uznane za przestępstwo w rozumieniu przepisów prawa karnego".

Jeżeli chodzi o pewne konkretne kwestie podniesione przez P.T. posłów w pytaniach 1, 2, 4 i 5 – Rada nie omawiała takich zagadnień, ponieważ komentowanie wewnętrznych przepisów praw krajowych lub ich skutków nie należy do Rady.

W odniesieniu do pytań P.T. posłów dotyczących działań Rady w tej dziedzinie w stosunku do państw trzecich (pytania 3 i 5), Rada pragnie zauważyć, że zgodnie z art. 21 Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej w działaniach na arenie międzynarodowej Unia zamierza wspierać m.in. powszechność i niepodzielność praw człowieka i podstawowych wolności. Dlatego kwestie podstawowych praw i wolności mają wysoki priorytet w dialogu z partnerami UE i są w odpowiednich przypadkach podnoszone.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009069/12
to the Council
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), Cornelis de Jong (GUE/NGL) and Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(9 October 2012)

Subject: Blasphemy laws within the European Union

The recent wave of violence in the Muslim world following the online posting of a video depicting Mohammed has led numerous EU leaders to defend freedom of expression and opinion against accusations of blasphemy. At the same time, in the EU, some Member States still have and implement blasphemy laws, as demonstrated by the recent arrest of a 27-year-old man by the Greek authorities ([1]) and the prosecution of an artist by the Spanish authorities for a work he produced decades ago ([2]).

The Venice Commission, in its report of 23 October 2010, and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, in its Recommendation 1805 (2007) of 29 June 2007, pointed out that blasphemy laws are still in place in a minority of EU Member States (Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Italy, Ireland and the Netherlands) and are rarely implemented, and that something similar to blasphemy — 'religious insult' — is still an offence in a large number of Member States (Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Spain, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal and Slovakia). Both the Venice Commission and the Parliamentary Assembly recommended abolishing the offences of blasphemy and of insult to religious feelings, in view of Articles 10 (freedom of expression) and 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion) of the ECHR ([3]), which are also mirrored in Articles 11 and 10 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. Article 20(2) of the ICCPR stipulates that 'any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law'.

1. Does the Council consider that laws against blasphemy and religious insult are contrary to freedom of expression?

2. Does the Council consider that the arrest and conviction of EU citizens on charges of blasphemy is compatible with the EU Treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights?

3. Does the Council call for the abolition of blasphemy laws in its external policies?

4. Will the Council advocate a worldwide ban on blasphemy laws within international organisations such as the UN?

5. How will the Council ensure that freedom of expression cannot be restricted by laws against blasphemy and religious insult both within and outside the EU?

Reply
(30 January 2013)

In all of its action, the European Union is required to respect fundamental rights, in accordance with the EU treaties, the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and other instruments of international law. Amongst the latter, the European Convention on Human Rights has particular importance. This also applies to Member States when they are implementing Union law.

Freedom of expression, linked with the equally important freedom of religion or belief, is a vital fundamental right, since it safeguards one of the basic requirements for the effective exercise of democracy.

As regards some of the specific points raised by the Honourable Members in questions 1, 2, 4 and 5, the Council has not discussed such matters, as it is not for the Council to comment on internal national legal provisions or their consequences.

([1]) http://www.rtbf.be/info/societe/detail_grece-arrete-pour-blaspheme-pour-avoir-caricature-un-moine-sur-facebook?id=7844541.
([2]) http://www.guardian.co.uk/film/2012/may/28/spanish-artist-cook-christ-film.
([3]) The PACE stated that 'in view of the greater diversity of religious beliefs in Europe and the democratic principle of the separation of state and religion, blasphemy laws should be reviewed by member states and parliaments' and that 'blasphemy, as an insult to a religion, should not be deemed a criminal offence'.

As regards the Honourable Members' questions concerning the activities of the Council vis-à-vis third countries in this field (questions 3 and 5), the Council would observe that, pursuant to Article 21 of the Treaty on European Union, the Union's actions on the international scene seek, amongst other things, to advance the universality and indivisibility of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Fundamental rights and freedoms therefore rank high on the agendas for dialogue with EU partners and are raised in appropriate instances.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-009070/12
adresată Comisiei (Vicepreședintelui/Înaltului Reprezentant)
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(9 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: VP/HR — Implicarea în Myanmar

Este salutar faptul că guvernul din Filipine a încheiat recent un acord cadru cu Frontul Islamic de Eliberare Moro, creându-se astfel condiții pentru încheierea unui conflict care durează de peste 40 de ani în regiunea Mindanao.

O felicit pe Vicepreședinta / Înaltul Reprezentant Ashton și SEAE pentru contribuția la acest succes.

În același timp, aș dori să întreb dacă Vicepreședinta / Înaltul Reprezentant Ashton consideră că ar fi utilă angajarea, în continuare, a experienței și expertizei UE în gestionarea conflictelor și într-un alt stat din Sud-Estul Asiei, în care de aproape un an au loc reforme democratice remarcabile. Este vorba de Myanmar, unde autoritățile au ajuns la acorduri de încetare a focului cu o parte din grupările etnice insurgente și acum este necesară demararea procesului de pace și reconciliere.

Răspuns dat de dna Ashton, Înalt Reprezentant/Vicepreședinte în numele Comisiei
(30 noiembrie 2012)

Uniunea Europeană urmărește cu deosebită atenție schimbările istorice din Myanmar/Birmania și este pe deplin conștientă de faptul că progresele înregistrate în domeniul reformelor politice, sociale și economice vor depinde de continuarea procesului de reconciliere națională, inclusiv a procesului de pace cu grupurile etnice înarmate. UE subliniază importanța includerii tuturor părților interesate relevante în procesul de pace.

UE colaborează deja cu autoritățile centrale și locale și cu ceilalți factori care doresc să sprijine procesul de instaurare a păcii și stabilității în regiunile etnice și să ofere o perspectivă pe termen lung pentru dezvoltarea acestora.

În luna septembrie, la New York, Înaltul Reprezentant/Vicepreședintele a avut ocazia să discute cu președintele U Thein Sein perspectivele de pace etnică, precum și contribuția UE.

În cursul vizitei sale la Myanmar/Birmania din 3 noiembrie 2012, președintele Comisiei a comunicat decizia UE de a acorda Centrului pentru pace din Myanmar (*Myanmar Peace Centre*), înființat recent, o finanțare inițială în valoare de 700 000 EUR; această finanțare va fi urmată în timp util de un pachet financiar mai substanțial.

UE și-a propus deja să intensifice sprijinul pe care îl acordă procesului de pace, inclusiv ajutorul pentru populațiile dezrădăcinate și contribuția la dezvoltarea socio-economică a zonelor etnice; în 2013, sprijinul pe care UE îl va acorda pentru realizarea acestor obiective se va ridica la valoarea totală de 30 de milioane EUR.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009070/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)
(9 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Involvement in Myanmar

The fact that the Philippine Government has recently signed a framework agreement with the Moro Islamic Liberation Front, hence creating the conditions for ending a conflict that has lasted over 40 years in the Mindanao Region, is to be welcomed.

The Vice-President/High Representative and the EEAS should be congratulated for the contribution they have made to this.

Can the Vice-President/High Representative state whether she feels it would be worthwhile turning the EU's experience and expertise to also managing conflicts in another South-East Asian country, in which remarkable democratic reforms have been made in the course of the past year or so? The country in question is Myanmar, where they authorities have reached a ceasefire agreement with some of the insurgent ethnic groups and a peace and reconciliation process now needs to be launched.

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

The European Union is following with close attention the historic changes in Myanmar/Burma and is fully conscious that progress in political, social and economic reforms will depend on moving forward in national reconciliation, including in the peace process with the armed ethnic groups. The EU stresses the importance of including all relevant stakeholders in the peace process.

The EU is already collaborating with the central and local authorities and others concerned to support the process of bringing peace and stability to ethnic regions and to open a long-term perspective for their development.

The HR/VP had the opportunity to discuss the prospects for ethnic peace and the EU's contribution with President U Thein Sein in September in New York.

During his visit to Myanmar/Burma on 3 November 2012, the President of the Commission announced the EU's decision to provide start-up funding worth of EUR 700,000 for the recently established Myanmar Peace Centre; this will be followed by a more substantial financial package in due course.

The EU has already made plans to increase its support to the peace process, including aid to uprooted peoples and contribution to the socioeconomic development of ethnic areas; in 2013, the EU's relevant support will amount to a total of EUR 30 million.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-009071/12
adresată Comisiei
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(9 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: Situația liberei circulații a cetățenilor români în Marea Britanie

În 2012 s-au acumulat situațiile aduse la cunoștința Ambasadei României la Londra care semnalau bariere administrative majore, impuse de autoritățile britanice cetățenilor români în cazul solicitării certificatelor de înregistrare în baza Directivei 2004/38/CE.

Principalele deficiențe privesc reținerea în original a documentelor de identitate ale cetățenilor români de către autoritățile britanice (UK Border Agency) și termenul de procesare a solicitărilor de emitere a certificatelor de înregistrare care, de regulă, depășește 7 luni, iar în unele cazuri durează 9 luni, în condițiile în care pentru alți cetățeni UE termenul este o lună.

Din cauza restricțiilor pe piața muncii impuse cetățenilor români de Marea Britanie până la 31 decembrie 2013, un număr redus de cetățeni români sunt eligibili pentru emiterea unei autorizații de muncă, pentru a-și exercita dreptul de ședere în calitate de lucrător.

Poate Comisia să ne informeze cu privire la măsurile luate pentru clarificarea și soluționarea acestor situații care reprezintă în mod clar o alterare a principiului liberei circulații a persoanelor, principiu de bază al UE, înscris în tratat și susținut de Directiva 2004/38/CE privind libera circulație a cetățenilor UE și a membrilor lor de familie pe teritoriul statelor membre?

Poate Comisia să ne informeze care sunt evoluțiile semnificative în acest sens?

Răspuns dat de dna Reding în numele Comisiei
(13 noiembrie 2012)

Comisia cunoaște problemele legate de eliberarea documentelor de ședere în Regatul Unit cu care se confruntă adesea lucrătorii bulgari și români (A2). În conformitate cu legislația Regatului Unit, lucrătorii A2 nu primesc pe parcursul primelor 12 luni de ședere aceleași documente de ședere de care beneficiază lucrătorii din alte state membre ale UE.

În aprilie 2012, în temeiul articolului 258 din TFUE, Comisia a emis un aviz motivat și a declarat că legislația UE permite Regatului Unit să mențină, temporar, un sistem de permise de muncă, dar că lucrătorii A2 trebuie să primească aceleași documentele de ședere de care beneficiază ceilalți cetățeni ai UE. Aceasta a hotărât ca Regatul Unit să aibă la dispoziție două luni pentru a se conforma legislației UE. Răspunsul Regatului Unit din iulie 2012 a confirmat că legislația acestuia va fi modificată pentru a se conforma avizului motivat referitor la eliberarea documentelor de ședere pentru lucrătorii A2.

În plus, în ianuarie 2012, Comisia a început să analizeze împreună cu autoritățile din Regatul Unit timpii de așteptare necesari pentru ca lucrătorilor A2 să li se elibereze documentele de ședere în Regatul Unit. În răspunsul din aprilie 2012, autoritățile Regatului Unit au insistat asupra faptului că normele UE care garantează eliberarea imediată a documentelor de ședere pentru cetățenii UE nu se aplică în cazul lucrătorilor A2 întrucât documentele care sunt emise nu intră în domeniul de aplicare a legislației UE privind libera circulație a cetățenilor UE. În răspuns se precizează, de asemenea, că, în 2012, eliberarea documentelor de ședere pentru lucrătorii A2 a durat, în medie, 46 de zile.

După concesia făcută de Regatul Unit în răspunsul la avizul motivat, Comisia va continua să colaboreze cu autoritățile din Regatul Unit pentru a găsi o soluție care să fie în beneficiul tuturor cetățenilor UE.

Autoritățile Regatului Unit impun lucrătorilor A2 să furnizeze, alături de cererea privind șederea, un document de călătorie original care este returnat odată ce documentul de ședere este eliberat. Autoritățile Regatului Unit au asigurat Comisia că dispun de facilități pentru returnarea documentelor de călătorie în cazul în care este necesară o călătorie urgentă.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009071/12
to the Commission
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(9 October 2012)

Subject: Situation as regards the free movement of Romanian citizens in the United Kingdom

A number of cases have been reported to the Romanian Embassy in London in 2012 that illustrate the significant administrative barriers that the British authorities have created for Romanian citizens who apply for registration certificates under Directive 2004/38/EC.

The main shortcomings concern the fact that the British authorities (UK Border Agency) keep Romanian citizens' original identity documents and the time taken between processing applications and issuing registration certificates, which generally exceeds seven months but in some cases takes as long as nine months, whereas other EU citizens have to wait for one month.

Owing to the labour market restrictions that the United Kingdom has imposed on Romanian citizens until 31 December 2013, few Romanian citizens are eligible for work permits enabling them to exercise the right to stay and work in the country.

Can the Commission say what steps have been taken to clarify and resolve these situations that clearly undermine the principle of free movement, which is one of the principles on which the EU is based and which is enshrined in the Treaty and upheld in Directive 2004/38/EC on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States?

Can the Commission say what significant developments have taken place in this connection?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the problems Bulgarian and Romanian (A2) workers often encounter with the issuance of United Kingdom residence documents. Under United Kingdom law, A2 workers are not provided during the first 12 months of their stay with the same residence documents as workers from other EU Member States.

In April 2012, the Commission issued a Reasoned Opinion under Article 258 TFEU and argued that while EC law allows the United Kingdom to temporarily keep in place a work-permit scheme, A2 workers must be provided the same residence documents as other EU citizens. It gave the United Kingdom two months to comply with EC law. The United Kingdom reply of July 2012 confirmed that United Kingdom laws would be changed to comply with the Reasoned Opinion in relation to the issue of residence documents for A2 workers.

In addition, in January 2012 the Commission started to investigate with the United Kingdom authorities the waiting times for A2 workers to be issued with United Kingdom residence documents. In their reply of April 2012, the United Kingdom authorities insisted that EU rules guaranteeing that residence documents are issued to EU citizens immediately do not apply to A2 workers as the documents that are issued fall outside the scope of EC law on free movement of EU citizens. The reply also stated that in 2012 it took on average 46 days to issue residence documents to A2 workers.

Following United Kingdom's concession in their reply to the Reasoned Opinion, the Commission will continue to work together with the United Kingdom authorities to find a solution for the benefit of all EU citizens.

The United Kingdom authorities require A2 workers to provide an original travel document with their residence applications which is returned once the residence document is issued. The United Kingdom authorities assured the Commission that they have in place facilities to return the travel documents if urgent travel is needed.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009073/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(9 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εκταμίευση πόρων της ΕΕ για την Ελλάδα

Η Επιτροπή είχε αναλάβει το Νοέμβριο του 2008 μια σημαντική πρωτοβουλία για τις λεγόμενες «χώρες συνοχής» της ΕΕ. Οι χώρες αυτές —οι οποίες αντιμετωπίζουν έντονη οικονομική κρίση— δεν θα χρειαζόταν να καταβάλουν το ποσοστό της εθνικής συμμετοχής τους στο ΕΣΠΑ (ή το αντίστοιχο ΚΠΣ για κάθε χώρα) και θα εισέπρατταν με γρήγορες διαδικασίες κοινοτικούς πόρους. Στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας οι πόροι αυτοί είναι 4 δισ. ευρώ ετησίως.

Αυτό σημαίνει ότι τα 4 δισ. αντιστοιχούν στο 2% του ελληνικού ΑΕΠ και, με ένα πολλαπλασιαστή δημοσίων επενδύσεων ίσο με 2, θα μπορούσαν να οδηγήσουν σε πρόσθετη ανάπτυξη πάνω από 4%, κάτι που θα αντιστάθμιζε σημαντικό ποσοστό της υφέσεως που περνά σήμερα η Ελλάδα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ζήτησε η Ελλάδα την εκταμίευση αυτών των πόρων και ποια τα ποσά που έλαβε για κάθε έτος μετά το 2008;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει την πρωτοβουλία στην οποία αναφέρεται ο κ. βουλευτής.

Το 2011 η Επιτροπή αποφάσισε να αυξήσει το ποσοστό συγχρηματοδότησης της ΕΕ για τα ελληνικά προγράμματα από 75% κατά μέσο όρο σε 85%. Ως εκ τούτου, 488 εκατομμύρια ευρώ επιπλέον έχουν καταβληθεί στην Ελλάδα για χρηματοδοτικές συνεισφορές έως και σήμερα.

Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με τον κανονισμό (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1311/2011 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 13ης Δεκεμβρίου 2011 ([1]), προστέθηκε μια διάταξη που επιτρέπει στα κράτη μέλη που λαμβάνουν οικονομική βοήθεια να επωφεληθούν προσωρινά από το 10% των συμπληρωματικών πληρωμών που προέρχονται από τις χρηματοδοτικές συνεισφορές της Επιτροπής. Όσον αφορά την Ελλάδα, η διάταξη αυτή μπορεί να εφαρμοστεί για τις δαπάνες που δηλώνονται στην Επιτροπή το διάστημα μεταξύ Μαΐου 2010 και 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2013. Ως αποτέλεσμα, έχουν καταβληθεί έως και σήμερα 650 εκατομμύρια ευρώ επιπλέον για χρηματοδοτικές συνεισφορές στην Ελλάδα.

([1]) Κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1311/2011 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 13ης Δεκεμβρίου 2011 για την τροποποίηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1083/2006 του Συμβουλίου όσον αφορά ορισμένες διατάξεις σχετικά με τη χρηματοοικονομική διαχείριση για ορισμένα κράτη μέλη που αντιμετωπίζουν ή απειλούνται από σοβαρές δυσκολίες όσον αφορά τη χρηματοοικονομική τους σταθερότητα, ΕΕ L 337 της 20.12.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009073/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(9 October 2012)

Subject: EU funding for Greece

In November 2008, the Commission launched a major initiative for the EU 'cohesion countries', i.e. countries in the throes of an economic crisis, exempt from national contributions to the NSRF (or the corresponding CSF for each country) and eligible for rapid Community funding, amounting to EUR 4 billion annually in the case of Greece.

EUR 4 billion corresponds to 2% of Greek GDP and, with a public investment multiplier effect of two, could generate additional growth of over 4%, a significant contribution to offsetting the recession currently afflicting Greece.

In view of this:

— Can the Commission indicate whether Greece has applied for this funding and how much it received each year after 2008?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2012)

The Commission is not aware of the initiative mentioned by the Honourable Member.

In 2011, the Commission decided to raise the EU co-financing rate of the Greek programmes from an average of 77% to 85%. As a result, an additional EUR 488 million in contributions have been paid to Greece up to now.

In addition, by Regulation (EU) No 1311/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 ([1]), a provision was introduced which allows the Member States under financial assistance to benefit temporarily from a 10% top-up on payments from EU contributions. For Greece, this provision is applicable to the expenditure declared to the Commission between May 2010 and 31 December 2013. As a result, an additional EUR 650 million in contributions have been paid to Greece up to now.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1311/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 as regards certain provisions relating to financial management for certain Member States experiencing or threatened with serious difficulties with respect to their financial stability, OJ L 337, 20.12.2011.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009074/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(9 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εγκλήματα πολέμου της Τουρκίας στην Κύπρο

Συνεχώς αποκαλύπτονται τάφοι αγνοουμένων της τραγωδίας που δημιούργησε η Τουρκία στην Κύπρο με την βάρβαρη εισβολή της το 1974. Σε μια από τις τελευταίες περιπτώσεις αποκαλύφτηκαν τάφοι όπου υπήρχε ακόμη και μωρό 4 μηνών! Η ΕΕ ήταν στο παρελθόν ιδιαίτερα επικριτική για ενέργειες που αφορούν εγκλήματα πολέμου π.χ. στην πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβία, αλλά στην περίπτωση της Τουρκίας έχει υιοθετήσει μια άλλη, πολύ πιο ήπια συμπεριφορά.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Γιατί δεν έχει τεθεί ως όρος για την ένταξη της Τουρκίας στην ΕΕ η παράδοση όσων βαρύνονται με εγκλήματα πολέμου (και εν ψυχρώ δολοφονίες όπως του Τ. Ισαάκ και του Σ. Σολωμού το 1996) στο Διεθνές Ποινικό Δικαστήριο της Χάγης;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή έχει υπόψη της τον επείγοντα χαρακτήρα του θέματος των αγνοουμένων στην Κύπρο. Για τις πληγείσες οικογένειες είναι βασικής σημασίας το να γνωρίζουν τη μοίρα των αγαπημένων τους.

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο των Δικαιωμάτων του Ανθρώπου επιβεβαίωσε ότι οι τουρκικές αρχές δεν διεξήγαγαν αποτελεσματικές έρευνες με στόχο τον εντοπισμό και τον προσδιορισμό της τύχης των αγνοούμενων Ελληνοκυπρίων, οι οποίοι εξαφανίστηκαν υπό συνθήκες επικίνδυνες για τη ζωή τους. Επείγει, λοιπόν, να συμμορφωθεί πλήρως η Τουρκία με αυτή την απόφαση, το ταχύτερο δυνατό.

Εν τω μεταξύ, η Επιτροπή συνεχίζει να υποστηρίζει πλήρως το έργο της Επιτροπής Αγνοουμένων (ΕΑ) στην Κύπρο. Η Επιτροπή Αγνοουμένων αποτελεί τη μόνη θεσμικά κατοχυρωμένη δικοινοτική επιτροπή στην Κύπρο και ένα από τα πλέον επιτυχημένα μέτρα οικοδόμησης εμπιστοσύνης. Η εντολή της Επιτροπής Αγνοουμένων είναι καθαρά ανθρωπιστική, να διαπιστώσει τη μοίρα των αγνοουμένων. Η επιτροπή αυτή δεν επιδιώκει τη διαπίστωση των αιτίων θανάτου ή την απόδοση ευθυνών για το θάνατο αγνοουμένων. Από το 2007, χορηγήθηκαν 7,5 εκατ. ευρώ από την ΕΕ για τη στήριξη του έργου της επιτροπής αυτής, πράγμα που καθιστά την ΕΕ τον μεγαλύτερο χορηγό. Άλλα 2 εκατ. ευρώ διατέθηκαν από τον προϋπολογισμό του 2012 για την ΕΑ. Οι σοροί 330 αναγνωρισμένων αγνοουμένων έχουν επιστραφεί στις οικογένειές τους, εκ των οποίων 264 Ελληνοκύπριοι και 66 Τουρκοκύπριοι.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009074/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(9 October 2012)

Subject: Turkish war crimes in Cyprus

The burial places of the unknown victims of Turkey's brutal invasion of Cyprus in 1974 are constantly being discovered. The most recent of these discoveries include the remains of a four-month-old infant! While in the past the EU strongly censured war crimes, for example in former Yugoslavia, it appears to be showing greater indulgence with regard to Turkey.

In view of this:

Why has the Commission not demanded that Turkey hand over to the International Criminal Court at The Hague those charged with war crimes (and the cold-blooded murder of individuals such as T. Isaak and S. Solomos in 1996) as a condition for EU membership?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2012)

The Commission is aware of the urgency of the issue of missing persons in Cyprus. For the families concerned it is crucial to determine the fate of their loved ones.

The European Court of Human Rights has confirmed that Turkish authorities had failed to conduct an effective investigation aimed at clarifying the whereabouts and fate of Greek Cypriot missing persons who disappeared in life-threatening circumstances. It is urgent for Turkey to rapidly follow up this judgment in full.

In the meantime, the Commission continues to support fully the work of the Committee on Missing Persons (CMP) in Cyprus. The CMP is the only institutionalised, bi-communal committee in Cyprus and one of the most successful confidence building measures. The mandate of the CMP is purely humanitarian, to establish the fate of missing persons. The Committee does not attempt to establish the cause of death or attribute responsibility for the death of missing persons. Since 2007, EUR 7.5 million of EU funding have been provided to support the work of the Committee, making the EU the single largest donor. Additional EUR 2 million have been earmarked under the 2012 budget for the CMP. The remains of 330 identified missing individuals have been returned to their families, among which were 264 Greek Cypriots and 66 Turkish Cypriots.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009075/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(9 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αύξηση αυτοκτονιών στην Νότια Ευρώπη

Σύμφωνα με επίσημα στοιχεία, στην Ελλάδα, την τελευταία τριετία, περισσότεροι από 2 300 άνθρωποι έβαλαν τέλος στην ζωή τους, εξαιτίας κυρίως των οικονομικών προβλημάτων που αντιμετώπιζαν. Τους μήνες Απρίλιο, Μάιο, και Ιούνιο οι αυτοκτονίες ανήλθαν σε 60, ενώ, σύμφωνα με έρευνα του Παγκόσμιου Οργανισμού Υγείας που πραγματοποιήθηκε τον Ιανουάριο, σημειώνονται περίπου τρεις αυτοκτονίες κάθε δύο ημέρες.

Σύμφωνα με την επιστημονική έρευνα του περιοδικού των ΗΠΑ «American Journal of Public Health», η αύξηση των αυτοκτονιών είναι: στην Ιταλία +52%, στην Ελλάδα +24%, στην Ιρλανδία +16% (περίοδος 2007-2009). Οι ειδικοί επισημαίνουν ότι πρόκειται για πολίτες στους οποίους προκλήθηκε ισχυρό ψυχολογικό σοκ ένεκα των οικονομικών προβλημάτων που κλήθηκαν να αντιμετωπίσουν και το φαινόμενο που χαρακτηρίζεται από την επιστημονική κοινότητα ως «αυτοκτονίες συνδεδεμένες με την οικονομική κρίση» αναμένεται να ενταθεί, καθώς εντείνονται οι πολιτικές αυστηρής οικονομικής λιτότητας, με ταυτόχρονη κατάργηση του κοινωνικού κράτους, σε αρκετές περιπτώσεις, όπως στην Ελλάδα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει προκειμένου να αποτρέψει την αυξανόμενη τάση αυτοκτονιών που τείνει να λάβει μορφή ευρωπαϊκής επιδημίας;

— Πώς θα εξασφαλιστεί το όραμα της ενωμένης Ευρώπης αν εκλείψει το θεμελιώδες δικαίωμα στην απασχόληση, την κοινωνική ασφάλιση και την διαφύλαξη της ανθρώπινης αξιοπρέπειας των πολιτών που δοκιμάζονται σκληρά, ως αποτέλεσμα αδυναμιών και λαθών των δυνάμεων που κυβέρνησαν μια χώρα;

Απάντηση του κ. Šefčovič εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(27 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή παραπέμπει τον κ. βουλευτή στις απαντήσεις της E-002077/2012, E-000761/2012, E-006349/2012, E-006873/12, E-006908/12 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=all#sidesForm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009075/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(9 October 2012)

Subject: Increasing number of suicides in Southern Europe

According to official figures, over 2300 people have been driven to suicide over the last three years, principally by financial problems, with 60 people ending their lives in April, May and June. According to research by the World Health Organisation in January, around three suicides occur every two days.

According to a scientific survey by the American Journal of Public Health, the number of suicides has increased by 52% in Italy, 24% in Greece and 16% in Ireland (2007-2009), those concerned being under severe psychological pressure caused by financial problems. The phenomenon which experts are starting to refer to as 'suicide by economic crisis' is expected to grow worse as austerity measures continue to bite more deeply, while the welfare safety net is being pulled away in countries such as Greece.

In view of this:

— What steps will the Commission take to prevent the growing wave of suicides in Europe which is threatening to assume epidemic proportions?

— How can Europe present a united front if the basic rights of hard-pressed citizens to employment, social security and human dignity are not respected because of past failings and errors on the part of those governing the country?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(27 November 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its replies to E-002077/2012, E-000761/2012, E-006349/2012, E-006873/12, E-006908/12 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=all#sidesForm.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009076/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(9 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εκδηλώσεις για τις «Ήμερες Απασχόλησης»

Εκατοντάδες «Ημέρες Απασχόλησης» διοργανώνονται όλο τον χρόνο σε όλη την Ευρώπη. Οι εκδηλώσεις αυτές αποτελούν ιδανική ευκαιρία για όσους εγκαταλείπουν το σχολείο, πτυχιούχους και άτομα με επαγγελματική εμπειρία να μάθουν τι δουλειές υπάρχουν σε άλλες ευρωπαϊκές χώρες. Κορυφαία εκδήλωση ήταν η «Ευρωπαϊκή Ημέρα Απασχόλησης» που διοργανώθηκε στις Βρυξέλλες το Σάββατο 6 Οκτωβρίου, από τις 10.00 έως τις 17.00 στο Μπερλεμόν, έδρα της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής.

Στο πρόγραμμα της «Ημέρας Απασχόλησης» που διοργανώνεται σε όλες τις χώρες της ΕΕ και παρουσιάζεται μέσω του ημερολογίου εκδηλώσεων της δικτυακής πύλης EURES, περιλαμβάνονται προγραμματισμένες ημερίδες ξεκινώντας από τον Οκτώβριο του 2012 έως και τον Μάρτιο του 2013, σε χώρες όπως Ιταλία, Ισπανία, Κύπρος, Γαλλία, Ελβετία, Σουηδία, Αυστρία, Γερμανία, Βουλγαρία, Ουγγαρία, Δανία, Τσεχία.

Η Ελλάδα δοκιμάζεται για 5η συνεχόμενη χρονιά από τα μέτρα σκληρής λιτότητας που επιβάλλονται στους πολίτες της. Σύμφωνα με στοιχεία της Ελληνικής Στατιστικής Αρχής, την υψηλότερη ταχύτητα ανόδου στην ΕΕ καταγράφει η ανεργία στην Ελλάδα, που κατέγραψε το Μάιο νέο ρεκόρ αφού εκτοξεύθηκε σε ποσοστό 23,1%. Το μεγαλύτερο ποσοστό ανεργίας παρατηρείται στα άτομα ηλικίας 15-24 ετών (54,9%) και ακολουθούν τα άτομα ηλικίας 25-34 ετών (31,6%).

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Γιατί απουσιάζει η Ελλάδα από τις προγραμματισμένες «Ημέρες Απασχόλησης» που διεξάγονται σε όλα σχεδόν τα κράτη μέλη;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(28 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή στηρίζει ενεργά τη δημόσια υπηρεσία απασχόλησης ΟΑΕΔ ([1]) στην Ελλάδα με σκοπό να βοηθήσει τα άτομα που αναζητούν εργασία, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της βοήθειας μέσω δραστηριοτήτων στο πλαίσιο του ευρωπαϊκού δικτύου υπηρεσιών απασχόλησης (EURES). Ενώ η Επιτροπή προωθεί τη διοργάνωση της εκδήλωσης «Ημέρες Απασχόλησης» στο πλαίσιο της δικτυακής πύλης EURES, οι υπηρεσίες απασχόλησης του εκάστοτε κράτους μέλους φέρουν την ευθύνη για τη λήψη αποφάσεων σχετικά με τις κατάλληλες δραστηριότητες που πρέπει να υλοποιηθούν ώστε να διευκολυνθεί η κινητικότητα.

Στο πλαίσιο της τρέχουσας επιχειρήσεως για το EURES στην Ελλάδα, έχουν προγραμματιστεί 12 εκδηλώσεις επαγγελματικής ενημέρωσης, οι οποίες θα πραγματοποιηθούν το τελευταίο τρίμηνο του 2012.

Επιπλέον, στις 6 Οκτωβρίου του τρέχοντος έτους, δύο Έλληνες σύμβουλοι του EURES συμμετείχαν στην «Ευρωπαϊκή Ημέρα Απασχόλησης» στις Βρυξέλλες και ο ένας εξ αυτών ήταν διαθέσιμος για πληροφορίες τόσο στο χώρο διεξαγωγής της εκδήλωσης όσο και στο διαδίκτυο. 1 174 επισκέπτες από την Ελλάδα συμμετείχαν ηλεκτρονικά στην εκδήλωση, εκ των οποίων οι 209 πραγματοποίησαν συνεντεύξεις με εργοδότες.

([1]) Για περισσότερες πληροφορίες επισκεφτείτε την ιστοσελίδα www.oaed.gr.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009076/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(9 October 2012)

Subject: European Job Days

Hundreds of Job Days are being organised everywhere in Europe throughout the year, providing an ideal opportunity for school leavers, graduates and those with professional experience to discover what employment opportunities are available in other European countries. The principal event was the European Job Day held from 10.00 to 17.00 on Saturday 6 October in the Berlaymont Building, seat of the Commission in Brussels.

Details of the Job Days, which are being organised in all EU Member States, are contained on the Eures portal and include events organised in countries such as Italy, Spain, Cyprus, France, Switzerland, Sweden, Austria, Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, Denmark and the Czech Republic, running from October 2012 until March 2013.

The citizens of Greece have now been bearing the burden of austerity measures for five years in succession. According to the Greek Statistical Office, unemployment levels are rising faster in Greece than anywhere else in the EU, spiralling to 23.1% in May, a new record. The highest unemployment levels are affecting those in the 15-24 age group (54.9%), followed by those in the 25-34 age group (31.6%).

In view of this:

Can the Commission explain why Greece is being excluded from the projected European Job Days, which are to be hosted by practically all the Member States?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2012)

The Commission actively supports the public employment office OAED ([1]) in Greece to help jobseekers, including via activities within the network of European Employment Services (EURES). While the Commission promotes the organisation of Job Days in the context of EURES, it is up to the employment services of the Member States to decide upon the appropriate form activities to facilitate mobility may take.

Under the current grant for EURES-Greece, 12 recruitment events have been planned for the last quarter of 2012.

Moreover, on 6th October this year, two Greek EURES advisers participated at the European Job Day Brussels, one of whom was both onsite and online available for information. There were 1174 visitors from Greece participating virtually to the event, of which 209 had an interview with employers.

([1]) For further information see www.oaed.gr.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009077/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(9 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Derechos humanos en Honduras

En el marco de la actual tramitación del Acuerdo de Asociación Unión Europea-América Central por este Parlamento, el deterioro de los derechos humanos en Honduras es un hecho preocupante.

En octubre de 2010 se le remitió una misiva de organizaciones representantes de la sociedad civil hondureña en la que se le alertaba sobre el aumento de la violencia en el país, en particular las amenazas, el hostigamiento y los asesinatos de defensores de los derechos humanos, líderes sociales, periodistas y miembros de la oposición.

Desde junio de 2009 a la actualidad se han registrado al menos 132 asesinatos que permanecen en absoluta impunidad.

1. ¿Qué medidas puede proponer la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante para fortalecer el diálogo político sobre los derechos humanos con el Gobierno de Honduras?

2. ¿Cree posible condicionar los programas de cooperación europeos, especialmente el Programa de Apoyo al Sector de Seguridad (PASS), a avances reales en el campo de los derechos humanos y a una participación y un diálogo más activo con la sociedad civil hondureña?

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

La Unión Europea está comprometida con la promoción y protección de los derechos humanos a nivel global en todos los ámbitos de sus relaciones exteriores. La relación de la Unión con Honduras no constituye una excepción al respecto.

Los derechos humanos, la justicia y la seguridad son elementos clave en el diálogo político y de cooperación de la UE con el Gobierno de Honduras. La cooperación de la UE en este país adopta un enfoque global para estas cuestiones, e incluye programas clave como el *Proyecto de Apoyo al Sector Justicia* (PASS) y el *Programa de Apoyo a los Derechos Humanos en Honduras* (PADH).

La Comisión reconoce la importancia de la sociedad civil como parte interesada en estos asuntos, por ello ha sido incluida en los proyectos de cooperación mencionados. Además de esto, los servicios de la Comisión y el SEAE ([1]) mantienen un diálogo y una consulta continuos con la sociedad civil organizada a nivel nacional e internacional. Esta relación tiene lugar, por ejemplo, en forma de consultas sobre las prioridades de cooperación, de diálogos en materia de derechos humanos, de reuniones *ad hoc* con los defensores de los derechos humanos, y de declaraciones que en el ámbito local la UE emite en asuntos concretos.

El 24 de octubre de 2012, los Jefes de la Misión de la UE en Honduras se reunieron con defensores de los derechos humanos para debatir la estrategia local de la UE sobre derechos humanos y protección de dichos defensores. Esta estrategia tiene por objeto reforzar el Estado de Derecho y el sistema nacional para la promoción y protección de los derechos humanos, la protección de los defensores de los derechos humanos, y la protección de los derechos de los grupos vulnerables.

La condicionalidad de la ayuda a los progresos en materia de derechos humanos también se trató con representantes de la sociedad civil, que son conscientes de que este asunto se trata mejor a nivel de diálogo político, que en el marco de proyectos individuales.

([1]) SEAE = Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009077/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Raimon Obiols (S&D)
(9 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Human rights in Honduras

In the context of the current approval by the European Parliament of the EU-Central America Association Agreement, the worsening human rights situation in Honduras is a matter for concern.

In October 2010, Parliament received a letter from organisations representing Honduran civil society warning of escalating violence in the country, and particularly the threatening, harassment and killing of human rights defenders, social leaders, journalists and members of the opposition.

Between June 2009 and the present date, the number of recorded killings perpetrated with total impunity stands at least 132.

1. What measures can the Vice-President/High Representative propose to strengthen the political dialogue on human rights with the Government of Honduras?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative think it possible to make European cooperation programmes, especially the Programme of Support to the Security Sector (PASS), conditional on real progress in the field of human rights as well as the participation of, and a more active dialogue with, Honduran civil society?

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

The European Union is committed to global human rights promotion and protection in every area of its external relations. The relation of the Union with Honduras is no exception in this regard.

Human rights, justice and security are key elements in the EU's political dialogue and cooperation with the Government of Honduras. EU cooperation in this country adopts a comprehensive approach to these issues, and includes key programmes such as *Proyecto de Apoyo al Sector Justicia* (PASS) and *Programa de Apoyo a los Derechos Humanos en Honduras* (PADH).

The Commission recognises civil society as an important stakeholder in these fields, and has thus involved it in the abovementioned cooperation projects. In addition to this, the Commission services and the EEAS ([1]) keep a continuous dialogue and consultation with both national and international organised civil society. This takes place, for instance, in the forms of consultations on cooperation priorities, a human rights dialogue, ad hoc meetings with human rights defenders, and local statements issued by the EU on specific cases.

On 24 October 2012, the EU Heads of Mission in Honduras held a meeting with human rights defenders (HRD) to discuss the EU local strategy on human rights and the protection of HRD. This strategy aims at strengthening the rule of law and the national system for human rights promotion and protection, protecting HRD, and protecting the rights of vulnerable groups.

The conditionality of aid to progress on human rights has also been discussed with civil society representatives, who are aware that this issue is better addressed at the level of political dialogue, than in the framework of individual projects.

([1]) EEAS = European External Action Service.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung P-009078/12
an die Kommission
Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE)
(10. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Öffentliche Auftragsvergabe — Beschaffung umweltfreundlicher Fahrzeuge: Beschwerde CHAP(2011)01991

Im Juli 2011 hat ein österreichischer Staatsbürger eine Beschwerde eingereicht (CHAP(2011)01991), mit der er die Europäische Kommission auf eine mögliche Vertragsverletzung seitens Österreichs in Bezug auf die Beschaffung umweltfreundlicher Fahrzeuge (2009/33/EG) aufmerksam machte. Im Juli 2012 wurde ihm schließlich mitgeteilt, dass man beabsichtigte, das Beschwerdeverfahren einzustellen. Als Grundlage für diese Entscheidung wurde lediglich eine Stellungnahme des österreichischen Bundeskanzleramtes angeführt, in der die ministeriellen Ausnahmegenehmigungen gerechtfertigt und als konform mit der Richtlinie 2009/33/EG erklärt wurden.

Die Europäische Kommission folgte der Argumentation einer nationalen Behörde — ohne dem Beschwerdeführer mitzuteilen, ob sie selbst die Kompatibilität der Ausnahmegenehmigungen mit der Richtlinie überprüft hat, d. h. ohne auf den Inhalt der Beschwerde selbst einzugehen. Dies ist umso erstaunlicher, da man grundsätzlich davon ausgehen kann, dass ein Bürger, der sich mit einer Beschwerde an die Europäische Kommission wendet, den nationalen Rechtsweg bereits ausgeschöpft hat. Aus diesem Sachverhalt ergeben sich für mich folgende Fragen:

1. Hält es die Kommission für ausreichend, Entscheidungen in einem Beschwerdeverfahren lediglich auf die Argumentation von Behörden von Mitgliedstaaten zu gründen, gegen die sich die Beschwerden richten — ohne dem Beschwerdeführer detailliert darzulegen, warum die Kommission selbst keinen Verstoß gegen EU-Recht erkennen kann?

2. Ist eine solche Vorgehensweise vereinbar mit dem erklärten Ziel einer stärkeren Partizipation der europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger?

3. Kann die Kommission in Aussicht stellen, dem Beschwerdeführer eine ausführliche und auf die Details der Beschwerde eingehende Begründung für das Einstellen des Beschwerdeverfahrens nachzureichen?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(13. November 2012)

Die Kommission hat alles getan, um diese Beschwerde angemessen und objektiv zu behandeln. Nach Erhalt des ersten Schreibens des Beschwerdeführers bat die Kommission die österreichischen Behörden offiziell um eine Stellungnahme, die sie sehr genau prüfte, bevor sie zu dem Schluss kam, dass Österreich die Richtlinie 2009/33/EG ([1]) ordnungsgemäß umgesetzt hat. Auf dieser Grundlage unterrichtete die Kommission den Beschwerdeführer, dass ein Verstoß gegen die Richtlinie 2009/33/EG ausgeschlossen werden konnte.

In der Folge erhielt die Kommission von dem Beschwerdeführer ein weiteres Schreiben mit Unterlagen, die nach seiner Auffassung eine Verletzung des EU-Rechts belegten. Nach eingehender Prüfung dieser Unterlagen kam die Kommission zu dem Ergebnis, dass der beschriebene Sachverhalt (gelegentlicher unangemessener Einsatz bestimmter Fahrzeuge) keinen Verstoß gegen die Richtlinie 2009/33/EG beinhaltete, jedoch gegen die nationalen Verkehrsvorschriften verstoßen könnte. Daher stellte die Kommission das Vertragsverletzungsverfahren ein und legte dem Beschwerdeführer nahe, sich an die zuständigen österreichischen Behörden zu wenden, wenn seiner Ansicht nach die österreichischen Verkehrsvorschriften verletzt wurden.

Die Kommission ging bei der Behandlung dieser Beschwerde respektvoll vor und widmete ihr die Aufmerksamkeit, die sie den Bedürfnissen und Erwartungen der europäischen Bürger generell entgegenbringt. Sie begrüßt es, wenn sie von Bürgern kontaktiert wird, die Informationen bzw. Erläuterungen zu den geltenden Rechtsvorschriften erbitten, sich zu diesen äußern oder Vorschläge für weitere Initiativen formulieren, und ermutigt sie dazu.

([1]) Richtlinie 2009/33/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 23. April 2009 über die Förderung sauberer und energieeffizienter Straßenfahrzeuge, ABl. L 120 vom 15.5.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009078/12
to the Commission
Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Public procurement of environmentally friendly vehicles — Complaint CHAP(2011) 01991

In July 2011 an Austrian citizen lodged a complaint (CHAP(2011) 01991) in which he drew the Commission's attention to a possible infringement of the Treaty by Austria regarding the procurement of environmentally friendly vehicles (Directive 2009/33/EC). In July 2012 he was eventually informed that it was intended to close the complaint procedure. This decision was based simply on a position by the Austrian Federal Chancellery which stated that the ministerial derogations were justified and found to comply with Directive 2009/33/EC.

The European Commission accepted the arguments presented by a national authority without informing the complainant whether it had even checked the compatibility of the derogations with the directive, i.e. without even examining the substance of the complaint. This is all the more surprising as it can basically be assumed that a citizen who addresses a complaint to the European Commission has already exhausted all means of national redress.

1. Does the Commission consider it sufficient to base decisions in a complaint procedure purely on the arguments of the Member State authorities against which the complaint has been made — without giving the complainant any detailed explanation as to why the Commission itself cannot identify any breach of EC law?

2. Is this sort of approach consistent with the stated aim of greater involvement of European citizens?

3. Can the Commission offer the complainant an in-depth justification for the decision to close the complaint procedure that examines the details of the complaint?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2012)

The Commission has to draw the attention of the Honourable Member on the fact that possible effort has been made to treat this complaint in an appropriate and equitable way. After the first letter received from the citizen, the Commission sought clarifications officially from the Austrian authorities, and examined these clarifications very closely before concluding that Austria transposed Directive 2009/33/EC ([1]) correctly. On these grounds the Commission informed the citizen that any infringement of Directive 2009/33/EC could be excluded.

Further to this response, the citizen addressed a second letter to the Commission, providing documentation he considered to constitute evidence of infringement of EU legislation. After carefully examining this documentation, the Commission concluded that the facts presented by the citizen (occasional improper use of certain vehicles) do not constitute an infringement of the directive 2009/33/EC, but might imply violation of national traffic regulations. Therefore the Commission closed the infringement case and suggested the citizen to address the competent national authorities if he considers that there has been a violation of such law.

The approach used by the Commission in handling this case has been respectful and consistent with the attention the Commission endeavours to pay to citizens' needs and expectations. The Commission welcomes and indeed encourages citizens to contact its services to request information/clarifications or express comments on the legislation in force as well as to provide suggestions for initiatives yet to be taken.

([1]) Directive 2009/33/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of clean and energy-efficient road transport vehicles, OJ L 120, 15.5.2009, p. 5-12.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-009079/12
adresată Comisiei
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(10 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: Comunicarea Comisiei către Consiliu și Parlamentul European privind evaluările complexe de risc și securitate ale centralelor nucleare (COM(2012)0571)

În contextul publicării recente a Comunicării Comisiei privind evaluările complexe de risc și securitate ale centralelor nucleare doresc să întreb următoarele:

1. Care sunt măsurile concrete pe care Comisia le are în vedere pentru a controla securitatea centralelor nucleare aflate în apropierea granițelor Uniunii Europene?

2. Care sunt măsurile concrete pe care Comisia le propune pentru supravegherea și controlul securității depozitelor de deșeuri radioactive, având în vedere că și aceste depozite pot fi afectate în urma unor evenimente naturale extreme?

3. Care sunt măsurile concrete prin care Comisia va determina proprietarii centralelor nucleare să acționeze cu responsabilitate și transparență în aplicarea recomandărilor Comisiei formulate în urma testelor de stres și totodată să informeze populația cu privire la acțiunile concrete întreprinse și la riscurile potențiale existente?

Răspuns dat de dl Oettinger în numele Comisiei
(3 decembrie 2012)

1. Țările învecinate cu Uniunea Europeană (UE) care dispun de centrale nucleare în stare de funcționare (Armenia, Federația Rusă, Elveția și Ucraina) au fost asociate la testele de stres efectuate la nivelul UE și, în calitate de părți contractante la Convenția privind securitatea nucleară, trebuie să respecte toate standardele internaționale relevante. În plus, proiectele de cooperare în curs de desfășurare cu Armenia și Ucraina vizează să îmbunătățească în continuare securitatea nucleară. Comisia nu are competența de a întreprinde activități specifice de monitorizare a centralelor nucleare aflate în afara granițelor UE.

2. Testele de stres care se efectuează la nivelul UE au fost elaborate ca urmare a evenimentelor care au avut loc la centrala nucleară Fukushima Daiichi în martie 2011 și au fost concepute, prin urmare, ca reevaluări specializate ale marjelor de securitate ale centralelor nucleare și ale bazinelor de depozitare a combustibilului uzat ([1]). În consecință, deși depozitele de combustibil uzat de la fața locului au făcut parte din teste, siturile de depozitare a deșeurilor radioactive, ca atare, nu au făcut obiectul testelor. Cu toate acestea, în conformitate cu Directiva 2011/70/Euratom a Consiliului ([2]), statele membre trebuie să se asigure că respectivul cadru național obligă deținătorii de autorizații, sub controlul reglementar al organismului de reglementare competent, să evalueze cu regularitate securitatea instalațiilor de gestionare a deșeurilor radioactive într-un mod sistematic și verificabil, prin intermediul unor evaluări corespunzătoare.

3. În comunicare, Comisia anunță că va lucra în vederea elaborării unor propuneri legislative, însă aceste propuneri nu au fost încă finalizate. Unul dintre obiective va fi acela de a spori transparența. În plus, autoritățile naționale de reglementare vor elabora planuri naționale de acțiune pentru implementarea recomandărilor formulate pe baza testelor de stres, care urmează să fie puse la dispoziție până la sfârșitul anului 2012. Aceste planuri vor fi supuse metodologiei de evaluare *inter pares*, pentru a verifica dacă recomandările sunt implementate în mod uniform și transparent în întreaga Europă.

([1]) A se vedea la: http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20tests%20specifications_0.pdf
([2]) Directiva 2011/70/Euratom a Consiliului din 19 iulie 2011 de instituire a unui cadru comunitar pentru gestionarea responsabilă și în condiții de siguranță a combustibilului uzat și a deșeurilor radioactive, JO L 199, 2.8.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009079/12
to the Commission
Minodora Cliveti (S&D)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Communication from the Commission to the Council and European Parliament on the comprehensive risk and safety assessments (stress tests) of nuclear power plants in the European Union and related activities (COM(2012)0571)

Concerning the recent communication on the comprehensive risk and safety assessments of nuclear power stations:

1. What specific measures are being envisaged by the Commission to monitor the safety of nuclear power stations situated near EU borders?

2. What specific measures does the Commission recommend for the supervision and monitoring of the safety of radioactive waste storage sites given that they might be affected by extreme natural events?

3. What specific measures are being envisaged by the Commission to ensure that nuclear power plant owners act in a responsible and transparent manner in implementing Commission regulations drawn up following stress tests and inform the public regarding specific measures taken and potential risks existing?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2012)

1. European Union (EU) neighbouring countries operating nuclear power plants (Armenia, the Russian Federation, Switzerland and Ukraine) have been associated with the EU stress tests process and, as Contracting Parties to the Convention on Nuclear Safety, should comply with all relevant international standards. In addition, ongoing cooperation projects with Armenia and Ukraine aim at further improving nuclear safety. The Commission has no competence to undertake specific monitoring activities in nuclear power plants outside EU borders.

2. EU stress tests were developed in light of the events that occurred at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant in March 2011 and were thus targeted reassessments of the safety margins of nuclear power plants and spent fuel pools ([1]). Therefore, although on-site spent fuel storages were part of the tests, radioactive waste storage sites as such were not. However, according to Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom ([2]), Member States shall ensure that the national framework requires licence holders, under the regulatory control of the competent regulatory body, to regularly assess the safety of radioactive waste facilities in a systematic and verifiable manner, through appropriate assessments.

3. In the communication the Commission announces that it will work on legislative proposals, but they are not yet proposed. One of the aims will be to improve transparency. Furthermore, national regulators will draw up national action plans for the implementation of the recommendations from the stress tests, to be made available by the end of 2012. The peer review methodology will be applied to these plans in order to verify that the recommendations are consistently implemented in a transparent way throughout Europe.

([1]) See at: http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20tests%20specifications_0.pdf .
([2]) Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom of 19 July 2011 establishing a Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste, OJ L 199, 2.8.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009080/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Internet domain names in Slovakia

One of my constituents has advised me that the main Internet domain name registry in Slovakia, called SK-nic, appears to be undertaking anti-competitive practices.

At present, registrations for the .sk Internet domain name are only permitted for Slovak citizens or for companies registered in Slovakia. This should be contrasted with what happens with the .co.uk Internet domain name in the United Kingdom, for which applicants need not have any connection to the UK.

It would seem that the market for Internet domain investors wishing to register domains in Slovakia is not an open one. SK-nic is apparently preventing non-Slovak operators from competing, and is to this end keeping prices artificially high.

1. Do these protectionist actions on the part of SK-nic conflict with the EU's Single Market freedoms, most notably the free movement of services and the freedom of establishment?

2. Does the Commission have any plans to investigate the Slovak domain name market?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2012)

The Commission is aware that Member States have different requirements for obtaining a specific national top-level domain name (TLD). Having received complaints, the Commission is currently investigating the compatibility of national rules on the allocation of TLDs by Member States with the fundamental freedoms of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU ([1]). In this context, it will also look into the case raised by the Honourable Member. Depending on the outcome of the analysis, the Commission will assess whether it will be necessary to take further steps.

([1]) See also Section 4.3.3. of the Commission Staff Working Document 'Online services, including e-commerce, in the single market', accompanying the communication from the Commission 'A coherent framework to boost confidence in the Digital Single Market of e-commerce and other online services', SEC(2011) 1641 final of 11 January 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009081/12
to the Commission
Gay Mitchell (PPE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Standardising the days on which Mother's Day and Father's Day are celebrated in Europe

The dates for Mother's Day and Father's Day vary in different countries in Europe. Does the Commission have any plans to standardise the days on which Mother's Day and Father's Day are celebrated across Europe? Would the Commission see any benefits in doing so?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2012)

The matter in question it is not within the Commission's competence.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009441/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(17 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: L'UE chieda immediatamente le scuse ufficiali del Governo turco

Fonti di stampa denunciano che a Burhan Kuzu, presidente della commissione per gli affari Costituzionali del parlamento di Ankara, il rapporto della Commissione europea su «Strategia di allargamento e sfide principali per il periodo 2012-2013» non è piaciuto affatto, in particolare per quel che riguarda il capitolo sulla protezione dei diritti umani nel Paese, tant'è che, davanti ai cronisti accorsi in conferenza stampa, il dirigente del partito di Erdogan ha buttato nella spazzatura il foglio incriminato, definendo la relazione «pessima e poco credibile».

Il Ministro dell'Economia Zafer Caglayan, invece, ha duramente attaccato «l'ipocrita Unione europea, che ha fatto aspettare per 50 anni la Turchia davanti alla sua porta» e ha dichiarato che «[l'UE] si è macchiata di un crimine contro l'umanità' nei confronti di Ankara. Altro che Nobel per la Pace, appena assegnato a Bruxelles, l'Unione europea, ha detto, meriterebbe il premio dell'ipocrisia».

La Commissione ha il dovere di chiedere immediatamente, e di ricevere in mondo altrettanto tempestivo, le scuse ufficiali del governo turco.

La Commissione non ritiene offensivo questo comportamento da parte di un Ministro e di un altro alto esponente di un Paese candidato all'UE?

La Commissione non ritiene opportuno congelare qualsiasi tipo di negoziato in corso con la Turchia almeno fino a quando non riceverà delle scuse?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(30 novembre 2012)

La Commissione ritiene che la relazione di avanzamento costituisce uno strumento utile per orientare le riforme necessarie in Turchia conformemente agli standard e alla normativa consolidata dell'UE ad esempio negli ambiti della libertà di espressione e degli sforzi per contrastare la criminalità e combattere il terrorismo.

Occorre rilanciare negoziati di adesione, soprattutto se si vuole che gli standard dell'UE continuino a rappresentare il parametro delle riforme della Turchia. Il processo di adesione è fondato sulle disposizioni chiaramente definite dal quadro di negoziazione concordato da tutti gli Stati membri nel 2005 e dalle conclusioni del Consiglio del dicembre 2006.

La Commissione ribadisce il suo fermo impegno a cooperare con la Turchia, collaborare per far avanzare le riforme, migliorare ulteriormente il rapporto tra l'UE e la Turchia e continuare il processo di adesione.

Per quanto riguarda la presidenza del Consiglio cipriota, la Commissione ha espresso serie preoccupazioni in rapporto alle dichiarazioni e alle minacce della Turchia, e ha invitato a rispettare pienamente il ruolo della presidenza del Consiglio, che costituisce un elemento istituzionale fondamentale dell'UE previsto dal trattato.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009082/12
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(10 oktober 2012)

Betreft: Commissie: „Slecht gesteld in Turkije"

De Europese Commissie heeft haar rapport „Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013" gepubliceerd. Daarin wordt gesteld dat Turkije op politiek vlak geen vorderingen heeft gemaakt. Voorts schort het in Turkije aan fundamentele rechten, zoals de vrijheid van meningsuiting en strijdt het land niet genoeg tegen criminaliteit en terrorisme.

In het rapport wordt Turkije opgeroepen de relatie met Cyprus te „normaliseren" en de soevereiniteit van EU-lidstaten te respecteren.

1. Wat gaat de Commissie doen, nu zij bovengenoemde gebreken in Turkije heeft vastgesteld? Hebben de gebreken gevolgen voor de toetredingsonderhandelingen met en de EU-geldstromen naar Turkije? Zo ja, welke? Zo neen, hoe gaat de Commissie er dan voor zorgen dat de gebreken worden verholpen?

2. Is de Commissie ertoe bereid te erkennen dat Turkije nooit aan de vereisten voor toetreding tot de EU zal voldoen? Is de Commissie er derhalve toe bereid de toetredingsonderhandelingen met en de EU-geldstromen naar Turkije direct te beëindigen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Indien Turkije tóch tot de EU toetreedt, welke gevolgen heeft dat dan voor de vrijheid van meningsuiting en de strijd tegen criminaliteit en terrorisme in de rest van de EU?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009149/12
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(11 oktober 2012)

Betreft: Turkije: „Cyprus oorzaak van negatief Commissierapport"

Turkije is diep teleurgesteld over het voortgangsrapport dat de Commissie heeft gepresenteerd. Volgens Bagis, Turks minister van Europese Zaken, heeft het Europese voorzitterschap van Cyprus te maken met de „negatieve insteek". Hij noemde het document „generaliserend"; volgens hem staat het vol vooroordelen.

In het voortgangsrapport oordeelt de Commissie dat er in Turkije ernstige tekortkomingen zijn op het gebied van persvrijheid en de vrijheid van meningsuiting en vereniging. Ook is de Commissie kritisch over de lange duur van juridische procedures en het gebrek aan beleid om de Koerdische kwestie op democratische wijze op te lossen.

Turkije zal de dialoog met de EU hernieuwen als Ierland het voorzitterschap in januari van Cyprus overneemt.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Turkije: Cyprus de reden voor teleurstellend EU-rapport" ([1])?

2. Wat vindt de Commissie ervan dat Turkije alle door de Commissie geconstateerde gebreken in Turkije afwimpelt op het Cypriotische voorzitterschap? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat dit de werkelijke Turkse tekortkomingen geenszins kan verbloemen? Is de Commissie voornemens Turkije hierop aan te spreken? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Accepteert de Commissie het dat Turkije de dialoog met de EU (pas) zal hernieuwen als Ierland het voorzitterschap van Cyprus zal overnemen? Is de Commissie ertoe bereid geen gehoor te geven aan deze misplaatste Turkse arrogantie en de dialoog met Turkije überhaupt niet meer aan te gaan? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Heeft deze hele gang van zaken, d.w.z. de geconstateerde gebreken in Turkije en de misplaatste reactie van Turkije daarop, gevolgen voor de relatie tussen de EU en Turkije? Deelt de Commissie de mening dat Turkije nooit tot de EU moet toetreden? Zo neen, hoe kan de Commissie, in het licht van de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije, de in Turkije geconstateerde gebreken en de misplaatste Turkse reactie daarop verdedigen?

([1]) http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Europese-Unie/351644/Turkije-Cyprus-de-reden-voor-teleurstellend-EUrapport.htm

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(30 november 2012)

De Commissie gelooft dat het voortgangsverslag nuttig is als leidraad voor verdere noodzakelijke hervormingen in Turkije, overeenkomstig de EU-normen en het *acquis* — bijvoorbeeld op vlakken als de vrijheid van meningsuiting en inspanningen inzake het beteugelen van de criminaliteit en het bestrijden van terrorisme.

Er moet opnieuw de nodige vaart worden gezet achter de toetredingsonderhandelingen, niet in het minst om te garanderen dat de EU-normen de maatstaf blijven voor hervormingen in Turkije. Het toetredingsproces is gebaseerd op de bepalingen die duidelijk zijn afgebakend in het onderhandelingskader dat in 2005 door alle lidstaten is goedgekeurd, alsook op de conclusies van de Raad van december 2006.

De Commissie blijft zich ten volle inzetten voor de samenwerking met Turkije om de hervormingen in Turkije te stimuleren, de relaties tussen de EU en Turkije te verbeteren en het toetredingsproces voort te zetten.

Wat betreft het Cypriotische voorzitterschap, herhaalt de Commissie haar ernstige bezorgdheid over de uitlatingen en dreigementen van Turkije en roept zij Turkije op om de rol van het voorzitterschap van de Raad ten volle te respecteren, aangezien dit een fundamenteel institutioneel kenmerk van de EU is, dat in het Verdrag is vastgelegd.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009447/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(17 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Turquia: relatório anual da Comissão

A Turquia reagiu muito negativamente ao relatório anual da Comissão Europeia a seu respeito chegando o seu ministro dos Assuntos Europeus a declarar que «o espelho partido da União Europeia estava longe de refletir a verdade. O relatório da União reflete apenas as tentativas de atrasar a adesão da Turquia desde que a União está em crise económica e política».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que comentários lhe merecem as declarações do ministro turco?

2. Que apreciação faz da evolução turca rumo à adesão?

3. Considera realista prospetivar a efetiva adesão da Turquia à União Europeia num prazo razoável?

4. Mantém interesse e apoio a esta adesão?

5. Que benefícios mútuos reconhece nesse alargamento da União?

Resposta conjunta dada por Štefan Füle em nome da Comissão
(30 de novembro de 2012)

A Comissão considera que o relatório sobre os progressos realizados constitui uma ferramenta útil para orientar as reformas ainda necessárias na Turquia, de acordo com as normas e o acervo da UE, como por exemplo ao nível da liberdade de expressão e dos esforços para controlar a criminalidade e combater o terrorismo.

É necessário que negociações de adesão recuperem a sua dinâmica, a fim de garantir que as normas da UE continuam a constituir as referências para as reformas na Turquia. O processo de adesão assenta nas disposições claramente descritas no quadro de negociação acordado por todos os Estados-Membros em 2005, bem como nas conclusões do Conselho de dezembro de 2006.

A Comissão continua firmemente empenhada em cooperar com a Turquia, trabalhando em conjunto para promover o processo de reforma no país, melhorando assim as relações entre a EU-Turquia e prosseguindo o processo de adesão.

Relativamente à presidência cipriota do Conselho, a Comissão reiterou as suas sérias preocupações acerca das declarações e ameaças turcas e apelou ao pleno respeito pelo papel da presidência do Conselho, que constitui uma característica institucional fundamental da UE prevista no Tratado.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009082/12
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Commission statement on the unsatisfactory state of affairs in Turkey

The Commission has published its report 'Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013'. It states that, politically, Turkey has not made any progress. Moreover, fundamental rights such as freedom of speech are not adequately respected in Turkey, and the country is not doing enough to combat crime or terrorism.

The report calls upon Turkey to 'normalise' relations with Cyprus and respect the sovereignty of EU Member States.

1. What will the Commission do, now that it has identified the above shortcomings in Turkey? Will these shortcomings have an impact on the accession negotiations with, and EU financing flows for, Turkey? If so, what? If not, how will the Commission ensure that the shortcomings are remedied?

2. Will the Commission acknowledge that Turkey will never meet the requirements for accession to the EU? Will the Commission therefore immediately halt the accession negotiations with, and EU financing flows for, Turkey? If not, why not?

3. If Turkey joins the EU after all, what impact will this have on freedom of expression and efforts to control crime and combat terrorism in the rest of the EU?

Question for written answer E-009149/12
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Turkey: 'Cyprus cause of adverse Commission report'

Turkey is very disappointed with the progress report submitted by the Commission. According to Turkey's European Affairs Minister Bagis, Cyprus's Presidency of the EU has influenced this 'negative approach'. He describes the document as 'generalising'; in his view, it is full of prejudices.

In the progress report, the Commission expressed the view that serious shortcomings existed in Turkey in the fields of freedom of the press, freedom of expression and freedom of association. The Commission also criticised the protracted nature of judicial procedures and the lack of a policy to resolve the Kurdish issue in a democratic manner.

Turkey will resume the dialogue with the EU when Ireland takes over the Presidency from Cyprus in January.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report 'Turkije: Cyprus de reden voor teleurstellend EU-rapport' [Turkey: 'Cyprus cause of adverse Commission report'] ([1])?

2. What view does the Commission take of the fact that Turkey is blaming Cyprus's Presidency for all the shortcomings in Turkey noted by the Commission? Does the Commission agree that this cannot by any means cover up the true shortcomings in Turkey? Will the Commission contact Turkey about this? If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission find it acceptable that Turkey should (only) resume the dialogue with the EU once Ireland takes over the Presidency from Cyprus? Will the Commission reject this misplaced Turkish arrogance and refrain from resuming the dialogue with Turkey at all? If not, why not?

4. Will this whole sequence of events, i.e. the reported shortcomings in Turkey and the misplaced response to them by Turkey, have consequences for the relationship between the EU and Turkey? Does the Commission agree that Turkey should never be allowed to join the EU? If not, how can the Commission, in the light of the accession negotiations with Turkey, defend the shortcomings in Turkey and Turkey's misplaced response to them?

([1]) http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Europese-Unie/351644/Turkije-Cyprus-de-reden-voor-teleurstellend-EUrapport.htm

Question for written answer E-009441/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(17 October 2012)

Subject: The EU should immediately ask the Turkish government for an official apology

Press sources report that Burhan Kuzu, the head of the Turkish Parliamentary Commission for Constitutional Affairs, did not like the European Commission report on *Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013* at all, particularly the chapter on protection of human rights in the country, such that, in the presence of the journalists who had flocked to a press conference, the leader of Erdogan's party threw the offending paper into the bin, describing the report as appalling and barely credible.

The Minister for the Economy, Zafer Caglayan, on the other hand, harshly attacked the 'hypocritical European Union' which 'has had Turkey waiting on its doorstep for 50 years'. He said that the EU bears the stain of a 'crime against humanity' with respect to Ankara. Rather than the Nobel Peace Prize recently awarded to Brussels, the European Union, he said, should be given the prize for hypocrisy.

The Commission has a duty to immediately ask for, and receive, an official apology from the Turkish government.

Does the Commission not consider this behaviour on the part of a minister and another senior representative of an EU candidate country to be offensive?

Does the Commission not believe it would be appropriate to freeze any kind of negotiations under way with Turkey, at least until it receives the apology?

Question for written answer E-009447/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(17 October 2012)

Subject: Turkey: Commission annual report

Turkey has reacted very negatively to the European Commission's annual report on it. Its Minister for European Affairs went so far as to state that 'the EU's broken mirror is far from reflecting the truth. The report is a reflection of the desire of the EU, which is suffering an economic and political crisis, to delay Turkey's membership through various excuses'.

I would therefore ask the Commission:

1. What comments would it make regarding the statements made by the Turkish minister?

2. What is its assessment of Turkey's progress towards accession?

3. Does it consider it realistic to foresee Turkey's accession to the EU occurring within a reasonable timeframe?

4. Does it remain interested in and supportive of this accession?

5. What mutual benefits does it recognise in this enlargement of the Union?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(30 November 2012)

The Commission believes that the progress report is a useful tool to guide further necessary reforms in Turkey, in line with the EU standards and the *acquis* — for instance in areas such as freedom of expression and efforts to control crime and to combat terrorism.

Accession negotiations need to regain their momentum, not least to ensure that EU standards remain the benchmark for reforms in Turkey. The accession process is based on the provisions clearly set out in the Negotiating Framework agreed by all Member States in 2005 as well as the Council conclusions of December 2006.

The Commission remains fully committed to cooperating with Turkey, working together to propel reforms in Turkey, further improving EU-Turkey relations and continuing the accession process.

Regarding the Cypriot Council Presidency the Commission has reiterated its serious concerns with regard to Turkish statements and threats and called 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.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009083/12
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(10 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Apoios às micro, pequenas e médias empresas do setor da restauração

A Associação da Hotelaria, Restauração e Similares (Ahresp) divulgou ontem que, em resultado do aumento do IVA para 23 % e das sucessivas medidas impostas a Portugal pela troika FMI/BCE/CE e aprofundadas pelo Governo da República Portuguesa, se prevê o encerramento de 39 mil restaurantes e hotéis e a extinção de 99 mil postos de trabalho, sendo de realçar que no corrente ano já encerraram 11 mil empresas do setor, foram extintos 37 416 postos de trabalho e se registou uma perda de volume de negócios de 959 milhões de euros.

Face a este cenário, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Não considera que estes números sublinham, uma vez mais, o erro colossal das medidas impostas pela troika?

2. Que medidas prevê para contrariar este encerramento massivo de empresas, apoiar a sua atividade e a manutenção dos postos de trabalho?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(15 de janeiro de 2013)

A situação que se vive no setor da hotelaria e da restauração em Portugal não é necessariamente devida ao aumento do IVA. Resulta, na realidade, em grande parte, do decréscimo generalizado do consumo das famílias, por sua vez consequência do processo de transição em curso de uma expansão muito dependente do consumo interno para um crescimento centrado nas exportações. Este reequilíbrio da economia é necessário para reduzir o sobre-endividamento público e privado que, ao longo de muitos anos, se foi gerando em Portugal e redundou numa evolução insustentável da dívida externa. Por outro lado, dados recentes relativos os setor turístico não dão indicações de que o aumento do IVA tenha tido efeitos negativos no número ou nos gastos dos turistas estrangeiros.

O programa da UE, do BCE e do FMI de assistência financeira a Portugal visa apoiar o ajustamento económico-financeiro da economia portuguesa. Embora exija um acordo mútuo, a nível geral, sobre os principais objetivos e medidas a adotar, as decisões sobre as maneiras concretas de os alcançar e de as realizar são da responsabilidade exclusiva das autoridades portuguesas. Não compete, portanto, à Comissão interferir diretamente nas decisões específicas das autoridades portuguesas, desde que, em termos gerais, as decisões tomadas sejam conformes com as condicionantes do programa de assistência financeira e com o quadro jurídico da União Europeia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009083/12
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Support for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in the restaurant sector

Portugal's Association of Hotels, Restaurants and Similar Businesses (AHRESP) reported yesterday that the VAT increase to 23%, as well as successive measures imposed on Portugal by the IMF, ECB and the Commission and deepened by the Portuguese Government, are expected to cause 39 000 restaurants and hotels to close, destroying 99 000 jobs. It should be stressed that 11 000 companies in the sector have already gone out of business this year, destroying 37 416 jobs, and that turnover has decreased by EUR 959 million.

In view of the above, can the Commission state:

1. Does it agree that these figures once again underline that the measures imposed by the troika were a colossal mistake?

2. What measures is it planning to counteract the effects of these companies going out of business *en masse*, to keep them afloat and to retain these jobs?

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

The current developments in the Portuguese hotel and restaurant sector are not necessarily attributable to the increase in VAT. A large part of it is in fact explained by the general decrease in household consumption. In turn, the fall in household consumption is the counterpart of the ongoing rebalancing of the economy from a strongly domestic-demand based expansion towards export-driven growth. The rebalancing of the economy is necessary to reduce public and private over-indebtedness which had built up in Portugal over many years leading to an unsustainable trend in the external debt position. Moreover, recent data on tourism do not suggest that the VAT increase triggered negative effects on arrivals and spending of foreign tourists.

The EU/ECB/IMF financial assistance programme for Portugal aims at supporting the economic and financial adjustment of the Portuguese economy. While this requires mutual agreement at a general level about the main objectives and policy measures, it is in the exclusive responsibility of the Portuguese authorities to decide on the specific ways to implement them. The Commission is therefore not in a position to interfere directly into the detailed decisions of the Portuguese authorities, as long as they are in general compliance with the conditionality of the financial assistance programme and the EU legal framework.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009084/12
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(10 octobre 2012)

Objet: Réduire le fardeau administratif pesant sur les PME

Alors que l'Europe traverse l'une des plus graves crises économiques de son histoire, il est crucial de rappeler que les entreprises sont créatrices de richesses et d'emploi. Les petites et moyennes entreprises (PME) en particulier constituent la colonne vertébrale de l'économie européenne. On estime que près de 99 % du total des entreprises européennes sont des PME, et qu'elles sont responsables pour 85 % de l'ensemble des nouveaux emplois créés dans l'Union entre 2002 et 2010.

Pour que l'Europe retrouve le chemin de la croissance, il est donc primordial de créer un environnement législatif propice au développement de nos PME, en particulier en allégeant le fardeau administratif pesant sur celles-ci.

De nombreuses initiatives ont été prises en ce sens par la Commission, notamment pour réglementer de façon plus intelligente et plus efficace, en prenant en compte les spécificités propres aux PME. L'ouverture d'une consultation publique le 28 septembre dernier, visant à identifier les dix actes législatifs pesant le plus sur les PME, arrive ainsi fort à propos. Si cette consultation est un pas dans la bonne direction, un certain nombre d'outils qui permettraient de diminuer la charge administrative sur les plus petites entreprises sont déjà connus et doivent être utilisés.

En amont de la préparation de nouveaux actes législatifs, il faut améliorer l'application du principe de «priorité aux PME», qui met ces dernières au cœur de la réflexion sur les politiques publiques à adopter.

Dans cet esprit, il est nécessaire de soumettre de façon plus constante les nouvelles propositions législatives au «test PME», qui permet de déterminer leur impact attendu sur les petites et moyennes entreprises.

Parallèlement à la publication de la consultation publique, quelles mesures la Commission compte-t-elle prendre pour mieux mettre en œuvre le principe de «priorité aux PME» dans le processus législatif?

Réponse donnée par M. Tajani au nom de la Commission
(4 décembre 2012)

En novembre 2011, la Commission a publié un rapport intitulé «Alléger les charges imposées aux PME par la réglementation — Adapter la réglementation de l'UE aux besoins des micro-entreprises».

Comme il était annoncé dans ce rapport, la Commission, dans la préparation des futures propositions législatives, part dorénavant du principe que les micro-entreprises en particulier doivent être exclues du champ d'application de la législation proposée à moins que la proportionnalité d'une couverture de ces entreprises puisse être prouvée. Si une telle proportionnalité est démontrée, des régimes adaptés aux micro-entreprises doivent être envisagés. La proportionnalité et les régimes spécifiques sont examinés lors de la procédure d'analyse d'impact. Les résultats de cet examen sont inclus dans le rapport d'analyse d'impact et sont soumis au contrôle indépendant du Comité d'analyse d'impact. Ce renversement de la charge de la preuve permet de mieux vérifier si les propositions de l'UE répondent au principe du «Think small first» (penser d'abord aux petits). L'objectif n'est pas d'exclure les micro-entreprises de toute réglementation, mais bien d'établir des réglementations qui leur sont adaptées. Des lignes directrices spécifiant comment mettre cela en œuvre dans la pratique ont été publiées. Début 2013, la Commission présentera un premier rapport d'avancement et un tableau de bord.

La consultation publique «Quels sont les dix actes législatifs les plus contraignants pour les PME?» a été lancée dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre du rapport susmentionné. Les résultats de la consultation permettront de procéder à des révisions ciblées et taillées sur mesure de ces actes législatifs, qualifiés de contraignants. Le rapport sur le programme pour une réglementation intelligente, actuellement en cours d'élaboration, permettra d'en savoir plus sur les prochaines étapes à accomplir en la matière.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009084/12
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Reducing the administrative burden on SMEs

At a time when Europe is experiencing one of the most serious economic crises in its history, it is vitally important to remember that it is businesses which generate wealth and jobs. Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in particular are the backbone of the European economy. It is estimated that almost 99% of European businesses are SMEs and that they accounted for 85% of the new jobs created in the European Union between 2002 and 2010.

If Europe is to return to growth, it is essential, therefore, to create a legislative environment which is conducive to the development of SMEs, principally by easing the administrative burden on these businesses.

With that aim in view the Commission has launched a number of initiatives, in particular in an effort to introduce smarter and more effective regulation which takes account of the specific circumstances of SMEs. The public consultation launched on 28 September 2012, the aim of which is to identify the 10 most burdensome items of legislation for SMEs, is very timely. Whilst this consultation is a step in the right direction, a number of approaches which would reduce the administrative burden on the smallest businesses have already been identified and should be employed.

Even before new legislation is drawn up, the way in which the 'Think Small First' principle is applied must be improved; that principle places SMEs' interests at the heart of public policy-making.

Accordingly, new legislative proposals must more systematically undergo the SME test to assess their likely impact on small and medium-sized enterprises.

In addition to publishing the outcome of the public consultation, what measures does the Commission intend to take to implement the 'Think Small First' principle more effectively during the legislative process?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2012)

In November 2011, the Commission published a Report on 'Minimising regulatory burden for SMEs — Adapting EU regulation to the needs of micro-enterprises'.

As announced in that Report, preparation by the Commission of future legislative proposals is currently based on the principle that micro-entities, in particular, should be excluded from the scope of proposed legislation unless it can be proved that their inclusion is proportionate. When such proportionality is demonstrated, regimes adapted to micro-entities should be taken into consideration. The assessment of proportionality and of the specific regimes is carried out during the impact assessment process, is included in the impact assessment report and is subject to the independent scrutiny of the impact assessment Board. This reversal of the burden of proof ensures a better test of EU proposals against the 'Think small first' principles. Its aim is not to exclude micro enterprises from all regulations but rather to build regulations so that they are also fit for micro enterprises. Guidance has been published in order to specify how to implement this in practice. In early 2013, the Commission will present a first progress report and scoreboard.

The TOP 10 public consultation has been launched as one of the implementing actions of the abovementioned Report. The results of the consultation will be used to make focused and tailor-made revisions of legislative acts which have been identified as burdensome. The review of the Smart Regulation agenda, which is currently under preparation, will provide information on further steps in this area.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-009087/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(10 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: Ajutor de stat pentru combinatul Oltchim (România)

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă a primit o notificare oficială de la Guvernul român privind acordarea unui împrumut combinatului Oltchim și, dacă da, la ce dată a fost înregistrată această notificare.

Răspuns dat de dl Almunia în numele Comisiei
(6 decembrie 2012)

Până la data formulării prezentului răspuns scris, autoritățile române nu au notificat oficial niciun ajutor pentru salvare vizând Oltchim S.A.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009087/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: State aid for the Oltchim industrial complex (Romania)

Has the Commission received official notification from the Romanian Government concerning the granting of a loan to the Oltchim industrial complex and, if so, when this was registered?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2012)

As of the date of this written reply, the Romanian authorities have not formally notified rescue aid for Oltchim S.A.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009088/12
à la Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(10 octobre 2012)

Objet: Secteur ferroviaire: plateformes et flux de passagers

Suite à sa réponse du 7 août 2012, il y a lieu d'observer que la Commission européenne n'envisage pas d'accorder la même priorité aux gares d'envergure européenne qu'aux ports et aux aéroports. Cette vision erronée sera préjudiciable pour concevoir l'aménagement du territoire européen de manière optimale et, par conséquent, financer utilement les grands projets de transports. Pour preuve, au contraire des ports et des aéroports d'envergure européenne, l'implantation de chaque gare relèvera de la seule compétence de l'État membre concerné. Les plateformes ferroviaires ont pourtant une importance capitale dans la structure des réseaux.

La Commission européenne définit des cartes en annexe de sa proposition sur les orientations des réseaux transeuropéens de transport pour 2020.

1. Quelle est la valeur de ces cartes? Ont-elles une portée contraignante, contractuelle ou indicative?

2. L'Union européenne a-t-elle une quelconque influence, légale ou factuelle (orientations), sur l'implantation des plateformes de voyageurs (gare, port, aéroport)?

3. Quels sont les moyens qu'elle met à disposition des États (ESPON, Eurostat)?

Il est généralement admis que les réseaux de transport doivent être exploités de manière encore plus optimale. L'un des moyens pour y arriver pourrait être une gestion mieux coordonnée des flux de passagers (lieux de correspondance, ticket unique pour tout un trajet, etc). C'est une question d'autant plus d'actualité que les réseaux ferroviaires s'ouvrent progressivement à la concurrence.

4. La législation européenne va-t-elle dans ce sens? Dans la négative, la Commission compte-t-elle bientôt faire des propositions?

5. Quelles sont les autorités nationales compétentes pour la question des flux de passagers?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(21 novembre 2012)

Comme l'indique l'Honorable Parlementaire, les gares de voyageurs ne sont pas indiquées séparément sur les cartes incluses dans la proposition de la Commission relative à la révision des orientations relatives aux RTE-T ([1]). Cela ne correspond pas à un ordre de priorité d'un mode de transport par rapport aux autres, mais s'explique par le fait que les nombreuses gares situées sur les lignes ferroviaires et dans les nœuds urbains ne seraient pas reconnaissables sur les cartes. Toutefois, comme précisé à l'article 12, paragraphe 1, point c de la proposition, toutes les gares ferroviaires sur les lignes indiquées sur les cartes font partie du réseau RTE-T.

1. Les cartes sont incluses dans les annexes de la proposition de règlement et feraient dès lors partie d'un acte juridique contraignant une fois le règlement adopté.

2. Conformément au principe de subsidiarité, la décision relative à l'emplacement exact des gares de voyageurs, des ports ou des aéroports ne relève pas des compétences de l'UE. Dans la plupart des cas, l'emplacement des gares de voyageurs dans les zones urbaines est le résultat d'une évolution historique.

3. Dans le domaine de la politique en matière de RTE-T, la Commission a développé, conjointement avec les États membres, le système TENtec pour soutenir la politique en matière de RTE-T. Des informations complémentaires sont disponibles sur internet ([2]).

4. Les aspects importants évoqués par l'Honorable Parlementaire sont abordés dans le règlement proposé ([3]).

([1]) COM(2011) 650.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/infrastructure/TENtec/index_fr.htm
([3]) (voir notamment l'article 36, paragraphe 1, point c), l'article 37, les articles 13, paragraphe 2, et l'article 39 (d)).

5. En application des dispositions du règlement (CE) nº 1370/2007 ([4]), les autorités compétentes, tant au niveau national qu'au niveau local, peuvent organiser les transports publics de voyageurs par chemin de fer et par route en imposant des obligations de service public (OSP) ou en en confiant l'exécution à une entreprise, en octroyant une compensation aux opérateurs de service public en contrepartie des coûts supportés et/ou en leur accordant des droits exclusifs en contrepartie de l'exécution d'OSP.

([4]) Règlement (CE) nº 1370/2007 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 23 octobre 2007 relatif aux services publics de transport de voyageurs par chemin de fer et par route, et abrogeant les règlements (CEE) nº 1191/69 et (CEE) nº 1107/70 du Conseil, JO L 315 du 3.12.2007 pp. 1-13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009088/12
to the Commission
Franck Proust (PPE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Railway industry: passenger transport nodes and passenger movements

Its reply of 7 August 2012 makes it clear that the Commission does not intend to assign the same priority to stations of European significance as to ports and airports. This ill-advised approach will make it more difficult to plan land use optimally in the EU and thus to fund major transport projects properly. In support of this assertion it may be pointed out that, unlike ports and airports of European significance, the location of each railway station will be a matter purely for the Member State concerned. Yet rail nodes are an extremely important element in network structures.

In an annex to its proposal concerning guidelines for trans-European transport networks for 2020, the Commission provides maps.

1. What is the status of these maps? Is their scope binding, contractual or indicative?

2. Does the European Union have any influence — *de jure* or *de facto* (guidelines) — over the location of passenger transport nodes (stations, ports and airports)?

3. What resources does the EU make available to States (ESPON, Eurostat)?

It is generally accepted that transport networks ought to be exploited in an even more optimal manner. One way of achieving this could be by managing passenger movements in a more coordinated manner (stations where it is necessary to change trains; a single ticket for a whole journey, etc.). This issue is all the more burningly topical because rail networks are gradually being opened up to competition.

4. Does European legislation make provision for this? If not, will the Commission soon submit proposals?

5. Which national authorities are responsible for passenger movements?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(21 November 2012)

As indicated by the Honourable Member, passenger stations are not separately indicated in the maps contained in the Commission proposal for the revision of the TEN-T guidelines ([1]). This does not reflect any prioritisation of one mode over others, but is due to the fact that the numerous stations along the rail lines and within urban nodes would not be recognisable in the maps. However, as clarified in Art. 12(1)(c) of the proposal, all railway stations along the lines indicated in the maps are part of the TEN-T.

1. The maps are included in the annexes to the proposed regulation and would therefore upon adoption of the regulation be part of a binding legal act.

2. In line with the principle of subsidiarity, the decision on the exact location of passenger stations, ports or airports does not fall within the competences of the EU. In most cases, the location of passenger stations in urban areas results from a historical development.

3. In the field of TEN-T policy, the Commission has developed together with the Member States the TENtec system to support the TEN-T policy. More information is available on the Internet ([2]).

4. The important aspects identified by the Honourable Member are part of the proposed regulation ([3]).

5. Pursuant to the provisions of Regulation 1370/2007 ([4]), competent authorities at either national or local level can organise public passenger transport by road and by rail by imposing and contracting for public service obligations (PSO) while compensating public service operators for costs incurred and/or granting exclusive rights in return for the provision of public transport services under PSO.

([1]) COM(2011)650.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/infrastructure/tentec/index_en.htm
([3]) (see in particular Articles 36(c), 37, 13(2) and 39(d)).
([4]) Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on public passenger transport services by rail and by road and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) Nos 1191/69 and 1107/70, OJ L 315, 3.12.2007, p. 1-13.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009089/12
alla Commissione
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(10 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Sequestro di pescherecci italiani in acque internazionali

Il 4 ed il 7 ottobre sono stati intercettati e sequestrati, in acque internazionali, tre pescherecci del compartimento marittimo di Mazara del Vallo (Italia), da parte delle autorità egiziane e libiche.

Entrambi i sequestri sono avvenuti con modalità che vanno ben oltre le competenze decisionali e territoriali di tali nazioni. Il primo è avvenuto a 25 miglia dalla costa egiziana, dove il peschereccio italiano, dopo essere stato sottoposto ad un controllo di routine da parte delle autorità locali, è stato sequestrato e dirottato nel porto di Alessandria. L'evento più increscioso, però, è quello che è avvenuto a 40 miglia dalle coste libiche, precisamente nel canale di Sicilia, dove due pescherecci italiani sono stati intercettati da una motovedetta libica durante la loro battuta di pesca. I militari libici hanno prima sparato alcuni colpi di arma da fuoco in direzione dei pescherecci intimando loro lo stop, e successivamente hanno posto sotto sequestro gli scafi e scortato i 14 membri dell'equipaggio al porto di Bengasi.

Questi sequestri si vanno ad aggiungere ad altri incresciosi episodi accaduti nel recente passato, come ad esempio il sequestro dei cinque pescherecci nel luglio scorso da parte delle autorità egiziane, ed il sequestro di un peschereccio nel settembre del 2010 da parte delle autorità libiche sul quale già interpellai la Commissione per un chiarimento sulle delimitazioni delle frontiere marittime della Libia.

Per questo:

1. non crede la Commissione che bisogna garantire ad ogni costo l'incolumità e i diritti dei pescatori italiani e che sia inammissibile l'utilizzo di armi da fuoco in acque internazionali da parte delle autorità nordafricane?

2. Non crede la Commissione che sia necessario attivare un tavolo di confronto tra i Paesi rivieraschi e contemporaneamente avviare un piano di sviluppo per il Mediterraneo, volto al superamento del contenzioso relativo alle zone esclusive di pesca istituite da molte nazioni?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009162/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Peschereccio italiano fermato dai libici

Due giorni fa, una pattuglia di militari libici su una motovedetta ha sequestrato e scortato nel porto di Bengasi due pescherecci di Mazara del Vallo che si erano spinti nel canale di Sicilia per battute di pesca. Per fermare gli equipaggi dei due scafi italiani, composti da 14 persone, i libici hanno sparato alcuni colpi di arma da fuoco sulle fiancate dei pescherecci. Le ragioni di tali azioni risiedono nel fatto che i nordafricani considerano proprie le acque che il diritto definisce internazionali.

Alla luce di quanto precede, potrebbe la Commissione chiarire:

1. in base al Regolamento (CE) n. 1006/2008 del Consiglio, relativo alle autorizzazioni delle attività di pesca dei pescherecci comunitari al di fuori delle acque dell'UE e all'accesso delle navi di paesi terzi a tali acque, quali azioni intende intraprendere in difesa dei pescatori il cui lavoro è sempre più ostacolato da dispute di tale gravità?

2. Con quali piani intende perseguire l'obiettivo della sicurezza nel Canale di Sicilia, in particolare, e nelle acque internazionali, in generale?

Risposta congiunta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione
(15 gennaio 2013)

La Commissione appoggia pienamente una risoluzione pacifica di queste controversie in conformità del principio delle Nazioni Unite che vieta la minaccia e l'uso della forza nelle relazioni internazionali, nonché delle pertinenti disposizioni del diritto internazionale, in particolare la convenzione UNCLOS. Essa ritiene che tali controversie possano essere risolte solo tramite la cooperazione internazionale ed è pronta ad agevolare tale processo cooperativo tra i paesi mediterranei ogniqualvolta sia giustificata un'azione a livello politico.

Va osservato che il regolamento (CE) n. 1006/2008 del Consiglio costituisce uno strumento di diritto interno dell'Unione e non può dunque essere utilizzato nell'ambito di controversie internazionali sull'interpretazione e l'applicazione delle disposizioni relative all'estensione e ai limiti delle acque marine soggette alla sovranità o alla giurisdizione degli Stati costieri.

Indipendentemente dalle questioni giurisdizionali e in materia di competenza attualmente esistenti, la Commissione prende atto di una netta tendenza verso la proclamazione di zone economiche esclusive o zone di pesca esclusive da parte degli Stati costieri del Mediterraneo. Essa segue da vicino questi recenti sviluppi e, se necessario, presenterà raccomandazioni politiche in proposito, tenuto conto delle caratteristiche specifiche del Mar Mediterraneo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009089/12
to the Commission
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Seizure of Italian fishing boats in international waters

On 4 and 7 October, three fishing boats based in Mazara del Vallo (Italy) were intercepted and seized, in international waters, by the Egyptian and Libyan authorities.

Both seizures took place in ways that far exceeded the decision-making and territorial powers of these countries. The first took place 25 miles from the Egyptian coast, where the Italian fishing boat, after being subjected to a routine inspection by the local authorities, was seized and diverted to the port of Alexandria. The most unfortunate event, however, was that which took place 40 miles from the Libyan coast, specifically in the Strait of Sicily, where two Italian fishing boats were intercepted by a Libyan patrol boat during their fishing trip. The Libyan soldiers first fired a few shots in the direction of the vessels, ordering them stop, and then impounded the vessels and escorted the 14 crew members to the port of Benghazi.

These seizures can be added to the list of other regrettable incidents that have recently occurred, such as the seizure of five fishing boats by the Egyptian authorities in July and the seizure of a fishing boat by the Libyan authorities in September 2010. With regard to the latter incident, I previously asked the Commission for clarification on the delimitation of Libya's maritime borders.

1. Does the Commission therefore not agree that the safety and rights of Italian fishermen should be guaranteed at all costs and that it is unacceptable for authorities in North Africa to use firearms in international waters?

2. Does the Commission not agree that a debate should be launched among coastal Mediterranean countries, at the same time as a development plan for the Mediterranean, with the aim of resolving the disputes concerning the exclusive fishing zones that have been established by many countries?

Question for written answer E-009162/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Italian fishing vessel stopped by Libyans

Two days ago, a Libyan military patrol boat seized two fishing boats from Mazara del Vallo, which had ventured into the Strait of Sicily to fish, and escorted them into the port of Benghazi. The Libyans fired shots at the sides of the fishing vessels to stop the 14 crew members of the two Italian boats. The reason for this action is that the North Africans consider that the waters, which are legally defined as international waters, belong to them.

In view of the above, could the Commission say:

1. what action it intends to take to defend the fishermen whose work is increasingly impeded by these serious disputes, in accordance with Council Regulation (EC) No 1006/2008 regarding fishing authorisations for European fishing vessels outside EU waters and access by third-country vessels to these waters?

2. what plans the Commission intends to adopt to pursue safety in the Strait of Sicily in particular, and in international waters in general?

Joint answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(15 January 2013)

The Commission fully supports a peaceful resolution of these issues in accordance with the United Nations principle of prohibition of the threat and use of force in international relations and the relevant provisions of international law and in particular Unclos. The Commission believes that such disputes can be resolved only by way of international cooperation. The Commission stands ready to facilitate such cooperative process among the Mediterranean countries whenever action at the political level is warranted.

It should be noted that Council Regulation (EC) No 1006/2008 constitutes an instrument of domestic Union law and is thus not capable of being used in international disputes about the interpretation and application of provisions pertaining to the extent and limits of sea waters under the sovereignty or jurisdiction of coastal States.

Notwithstanding the existing jurisdictional and competence issues, the Commission takes good note of the fact that there is a momentum towards proclamations of exclusive economic zones or exclusive fisheries zones by the coastal States in the Mediterranean. The Commission is following closely these recent developments and if necessary will come up with political recommendations to that effect with due regard to the specific characteristics of the Mediterranean Sea.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009090/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(10. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Personal/Kosten EUMS INT

Derzeit verfügt EUMS INT über 41 Posten. Bei ihrer Einrichtung 2001 wurden für EUMS INT 30 Posten vorgesehen.

1. Wie viele Posten von den oben erwähnten 41 sind welcher Besoldungsgruppe zuzuordnen? Wie viele von den 30 Posten im Jahre 2001 waren welcher Besoldungsgruppe zuzuordnen?

2. Besteht das gegenwärtige Gesamtpersonal von EUMS INT lediglich aus 41 Posten? Wenn nicht, welche andere Kategorie von Mitarbeitern hat EUMS INT und wie hoch sind die gegenwärtigen Gesamtkosten?

3. Bestand das Gesamtpersonal von EUMS INT im Jahre 2001 lediglich aus 30 Posten? Wenn nicht, welche andere Kategorie von Mitarbeitern hatte EUMS INT und wie hoch waren die Gesamtkosten?

4. Aus welchen anderen Kosten bestehen die Ausgaben von EUMS INT? Wie hoch sind diese Kosten derzeit? Wie hoch waren sie jeweils in den Jahren 2011 und 2001?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(7. Dezember 2012)

Zurzeit verfügt die Direktion EUMS INT über 41 Stellen, die mit 34 Offizieren, fünf Unteroffizieren und zwei zivilen Assistenten besetzt sind. Beim Militärpersonal handelt es sich grundsätzlich um abgeordnete nationale Sachverständige. Die Ränge der Offiziere reichen von OF-3 (Major) bis hin zu OF-6 (Direktor, Brigadegeneral), während die Unteroffiziere den Rang OR-5/8 innehaben und die Assistenten in der Besoldungsgruppe AST 2 bzw. AST 3 eingestuft sind. Es gibt keine weiteren Personalkategorien.

Im Jahr 2001 verfügte EUMS INT über 30 Stellen (21 Offiziere, acht Unteroffiziere und ein ziviler Assistent). Die Ränge war dieselben, weitere Personalkategorien gab es nicht.

Die Ausgaben im Zusammenhang mit EUMS INT gehen zulasten des Verwaltungshaushalts des EUMS, der Teil des Verwaltungshaushalts des EAD ausmacht.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009090/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Staff/costs EUMS INT

At present EUMS INT has over 41 staff posts. When EUMS INT was set up in 2001, provision was made for 30 posts.

1. What are the pay grades of the abovementioned 41 posts? What were the grades of the 30 posts in 2001?

2. Does the present total staff complement of EUMS INT consist simply of those 41 posts? If not, what other categories of staff does EUMS INT have and what is their total cost?

3. Did the total staff complement of EUMS INT in 2001 consist simply of 30 posts? If not, what other categories of staff did EUMS INT have and what was their total cost?

4. What other costs make up the expenditure of EUMS INT? How much are these costs at present? How much were they in 2011 and 2001?

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

At present EUMS INT Directorate has 41 staff posts with 34 officers and five Non-Commissioned Officers (NCO) as well as two civilian assistants. The military personnel have always been Seconded National Experts. The ranks of the officers vary between OF-3 (Major) and OF-6 (Director, Brigadier General), the rank of the NCOs is OR-5/8, the civil assistants are AST 2 and AST 3. There are no other categories of staff.

In 2001, EUMS INT comprised 30 posts (21 officers, eight NCO and one civil assistant). The ranks were the same and there were no other categories of staff.

The expenditure related to EUMS INT falls under the EUMS administrative budget which is part of the EEAS administrative budget.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009091/12
an den Rat
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(10. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: SitCen/INTCEN-Haushalt/Personal

Laut der Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-8361/2010 vom Februar 2011 entsprachen die Haushaltsmittel des Gemeinsamen Lagezentrums (SitCen) im Jahr 2007 einer genehmigten Personalausstattung von 19 AD- und 50 AST-Beschäftigten.

1. Wie hoch waren die Haushaltsmittel des SitCen jeweils in den Jahren 2000 und 2001? Welcher genehmigten Personalausstattung entsprach dies genau?

2. Wie viel Personal beschäftigte das SitCen jeweils in den Jahren 2000 und 2001?

3. Im Jahr 2011 wurde das SitCen zum EU Intelligence Analysis Centre (INTCEN). Kann der Rat Auskunft über die Gesamthaushaltsmittel des INTCEN und dessen Personal jeweils in den Jahren 2011 und 2012 geben?

Antwort
(17. Dezember 2012)

Gemäß der Haushaltsordnung (Artikel 41) und ihren Durchführungsbestimmungen (Artikel 27) werden die Ausgaben der EU entsprechend ihrer Art oder ihrer Zweckbestimmung gegliedert. Der Rat führt keine EU-Maßnahmen durch, das heißt, bei seinen Ausgaben handelt es sich um Verwaltungsausgaben, und die Eingliederung der entsprechenden Mittel folgt ausschließlich diesem Zweck. In der Praxis hat dies — im Einklang mit Artikel 27 der Durchführungsbestimmungen — zur Aufstellung von zwei Titeln geführt:

— Personal des Organs — Titel 1

— Gebäude, Material und Sachausgaben — Titel 2

Der Haushalt des Rates ist nicht nach Dienststellen aufgeteilt, und dies ist auch nicht vorgesehen. Die für den Betrieb des SitCen erforderlichen Finanzmittel sind in der gemeinsamen Haushaltsstruktur enthalten.

Das SitCen gehörte 2000/2001 zur Strategieplanungs- und Frühwarneinheit. Für das SitCen allein sind keine getrennten Zahlen verfügbar. Das Gesamtpersonal der Strategieplanungs- und Frühwarneinheit setzte sich wie folgt zusammen:

	AD Beamte	Bedienstete auf Zeit	AST Beamte	INSGESAMT
2000	4	15	9	28
2001	5	16	13	34

Ab 2002 war das SitCen eine unabhängige Verwaltungsstelle, die die folgenden Bediensteten beschäftigte:

	AD Beamte	Bedienstete auf Zeit	AST Beamte	INSGESAMT
2002	2	0	3	5

Da das SitCen am 1. Januar 2011 in den EAD eingegliedert wurde, ist die Frage nach dem Haushalt und dem Personal des INTCEN in den Jahren 2011 und 2012 an die Hohe Vertreterin zu richten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009091/12
to the Council
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: SitCen/INTCEN budget/staff

According to the answer to Written Question E-8361/2010 from February 2011, the budget for the Joint Situation Centre (SitCen) corresponded to an authorised staff of 19 AD and 50 AST in 2007.

1. What was SitCen's budget in 2000 and 2001, respectively? What exact number of authorised staff did it correspond to?

2. What was the total number of SitCen staff in 2000 and 2001, respectively?

3. In 2011 SitCen became the EU Intelligence Analysis Centre (INTCEN). Could the Council provide information on the total budget for INTCEN and its staff in 2011 and 2012, respectively?

Reply
(17 December 2012)

The Financial Regulation (Article 41) and its Implementing Rules (Article 27) stipulate that EU expenditure must be classified by type or use. The Council does not run EU policies, hence its expenditure is of an administrative type, and the classification of the corresponding appropriations complies exclusively with that purpose. In practice, and in line with Article 27 of the Implementing Rules, this has led to the establishment of two titles:

— Persons working with the institutions — Title 1

— Buildings, equipment and operating expenditure — Title 2

The Council budget does not have a separate budget by service, nor is this foreseen. The financial resources necessary for the operation of SITCEN are included in the common budget structure.

In 2000/2001, the SitCen was part of the Policy Planning and Early Warning Unit. No separate figures are available for the SitCen alone. The total staff of the PPEWU consisted of:

	Administrators	Temporary Agents	Assistants	TOTAL
2000	4	15	9	28
2001	5	16	13	34

From 2002 onwards, the SitCen became an independent administrative entity, consisting of:

	Administrators	Temporary Agents	Assistants	TOTAL
2002	2	0	3	5

Given that the SitCen was transferred to the EEAS on 1 January 2011, the question about the 2011 and 2012 INTCEN budget and staff should be addressed to the High Representative/Vice-President of the Commission.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009092/12
an die Kommission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(10. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HV — SitCen/INTCEN-Haushalt/Personal

Laut der Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-8361/2010 vom Februar 2011 entsprachen die Haushaltsmittel des Gemeinsamen Lagezentrums (SitCen) im Jahr 2007 einer genehmigten Personalausstattung von 19 AD- und 50 AST-Beschäftigten.

1. Wie hoch waren die Haushaltsmittel des SitCen jeweils in den Jahren 2000 und 2001? Welcher genehmigten Personalausstattung entsprach dies genau?

2. Wie viel Personal beschäftigte das SitCen jeweils in den Jahren 2000 und 2001?

3. Im Jahr wurde das SitCen in das EU Intelligence Analysis Centre (INTCEN) umgewandelt. Kann die Kommission Auskunft über die Gesamthaushaltsmittel des INTCEN und dessen Personal jeweils in den Jahren 2011 und 2012 geben?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(13. Dezember 2012)

Zu Frage 1) Dem Herrn Abgeordneten wird mitgeteilt, dass es weder für das EU SitCen noch für das EU INTCEN jemals eine eigene Haushaltslinie oder Mittelzuweisung gab. Wie alle dem Generalsekretariat des Rates unterstellten Dienste wurde das EU SitCen aus den allgemeinen Verwaltungsmitteln des Rates finanziert. Das EU INTCEN wird aus den allgemeinen Verwaltungsmitteln des EAD finanziert. Dies bedeutet, dass sämtliche Kosten u. a. für Personal, Infrastruktur und IT aus dem Budget für den EAD beglichen werden.

Zu Frage 2) In der Antwort auf die parlamentarische Anfrage E-5998/09 wurde ein Überblick über die personelle Ausstattung des SitCen von 2001 bis 2009 gegeben. Die dort aufgeführte Tabelle wird hier noch einmal wiedergegeben:

SitCen	
2001	0
2002	10
2003	25
2004	39
2005	61
2006	57
2007	70
2008	84
2009	103

Zu Frage 3) Ein Überblick über das gesamte Personal des EU INTCEN im Jahr 2012 ist in der Antwort auf die parlamentarische Anfrage E-006017/2012 enthalten. Dort wird die Gesamtzahl der Bediensteten des EU INTCEN in den Jahren 2012 und 2013 mit knapp 70 angegeben. In der Antwort wird ebenfalls ausgeführt, dass sich die Mehrheit des Personals des EU INTCEN — wie bereits des EU SitCen — aus EU-Beamten und Zeitbediensteten zusammensetzt. Darüber hinaus sind eine Reihe nationaler Experten aus den Nachrichten- und Sicherheitsdiensten der EU-Mitgliedstaaten im EU INTCEN beschäftigt.

Was die Personalstärke des EU INTCEN im Jahre 2011 angeht, so belief sich die Gesamtzahl des EU INTCEN-Personals im Jahr 2011 nach einer Umstrukturierung der Krisenreaktionskapazitäten des EAD auf rund 70.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009092/12
to the Commission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — SitCen/INTCEN budget/staff

According to the answer given in February 2011 to our parliamentary Question E-8361/2010, SitCen's budget corresponded to 19 AD and 50 AST authorised staff in 2007.

1. What was SitCen's budget in 2000 and 2001 respectively? What exact number of authorised staff did it correspond to?

2. What was the total number of SitCen staff in 2000 and 2001 respectively?

3. In 2011 SitCen was transformed into INTCEN. Could the Commission provide us with information concerning the total budget of INTCEN and its staff in 2011 and 2012 respectively?

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

1. The Honourable Member of the European Parliament should note that neither EU SITCEN nor EU INTCEN ever had its own budget line or budget appropriation. As any of the entities in the General Secretariat of the Council, EU SITCEN was financed from the general administrative budget lines of the Council. Similarly, EU INTCEN is financed from the general administrative budget lines of the EEAS. This implies that all costs such as staff, infrastructure and IT are covered from the budget of the EEAS.

2. An overview of the SITCEN staffing numbers from 2001 to 2009 was provided in the answer to the parliamentary Question E-5998/09. The table contained in this answer is reproduced below:

SITCEN	
2001	0
2002	10
2003	25
2004	39
2005	61
2006	57
2007	70
2008	84
2009	103

3. An overview of the total number of EU INTCEN staff in 2012 is contained in the answer to the parliamentary Question E-006017/2012, where is stated that the total number of EU INTCEN staff in 2012 and 2013 will be close to 70. In the answer it is also specified that as was the case with EU SITCEN, the majority of EU INTCEN staff are EU officials and temporary agents. Furthermore a number of national experts from the security and intelligence services of the EU Member States are employed by EU INTCEN.

As regards the staff numbers of EU INTCEN in 2011, the Honourable Member of the European Parliament is informed that following a restructuring of the EEAS crisis response capabilities, the total number of staff working for EU INTCEN in 2011 was around 70.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-009093/12
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(10 oktober 2012)

Angående: Innebörden av ordet ”omfattar” i samband med uppräkningar av immateriella rättigheter

I sitt pressmeddelande av den 24 maj 2011 säger kommissionsledamot Michel Barnier att begreppet immateriella rättigheter omfattar en rad olika lagstadgade rättigheter ([1]).

Ska den uppräkning som följer ordet ”omfattar” uppfattas som uttömmande i detta uttalande?

Svar från Michel Barnier på kommissionens vägnar
(22 januari 2013)

I Europeiska kommissionens pressmeddelande av den 24 maj 2011 om en strategi för immateriella rättigheter innebär uttrycket ”omfattar” inte att uppräkningen som följer är uttömmande. I pressmeddelandet talas det bara om patent, varumärken, mönster och geografiska beteckningar samt upphovsrätt och rättigheter som är kopplade till upphovsrätt. Kommissionens strategi, och, mer allmänt, de europeiska bestämmelser som antagits på detta område, berör emellertid även andra rättigheter än de uppräknade.

Exempelvis gäller själva direktivet om skyddet för immateriella rättigheter ([2]) alla immaterialrättsintrång som omfattas av EU-lagstiftningen eller nationell lagstiftning. Direktivet innehåller ingen detaljerad förteckning över de berörda rättigheterna, men kommissionen har i ett uttalande ([3]) lagt fram en minimiförteckning över de immateriella rättigheter som omfattas av direktivets tillämpningsområde. I den förteckningen nämns bland annat bruksmönster, skydd av växtförädlingsprodukter och handelsbeteckningar, i den mån de är skyddade som exklusiva rättigheter i gällande nationell lagstiftning. Det anges uttryckligen att förteckningen är en minimiförteckning.

([1]) EUROPA – PRESS RELEASES – Press Release – Kreativitet och innovation ska främjas genom ny kommissionsplan för immateriella rättigheter.
([2]) Direktiv 2004/48/EG av den 29 april 2004 om säkerställande av skyddet för immateriella rättigheter, EUT L 157, 30.4.2004, s. 45.
([3]) Uttalande från kommissionen om artikel 2 i Europaparlamentets och rådets direktiv 2004/48/EG om säkerställande av skyddet för immateriella rättigheter (2005/295/EG), EUT L 94, 13.4.2005, s. 37.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009093/12
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: The meaning of the word 'comprises' in relation to intellectual property rights listings

In his press release of 24 May 2011, Commissioner Michel Barnier makes the claim that the concept of intellectual property rights comprises a number of different legal rights ([1]).

Is the word 'comprises' meant to be understood as being exhaustive in this statement?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Barnier au nom de la Commission
(22 janvier 2013)

Dans le contexte du communiqué de presse de la Commission européenne du 24 mai 2011 relatif à la stratégie en matière de droits de propriété intellectuelle, le terme «recouvrent» ne signifie pas que la liste des droits mentionnés est exhaustive. Le communiqué de presse ne mentionne que les brevets, marques commerciales, dessins et indications géographiques ainsi que les droits d'auteurs et les droits voisins. Toutefois, la stratégie de la Commission et plus généralement les règles européennes adoptées dans ce domaine concernent également d'autres droits que ceux énoncés.

Par exemple, la directive sur le respect des droits de propriété intellectuelle ([2]) elle-même s'applique à toute atteinte aux droits de propriété intellectuelle protégés au titre de la législation européenne ou nationale. Elle ne contient pas de liste précise des droits concernés mais la Commission a fourni dans une déclaration ([3]) une liste minimale des droits de propriété intellectuelle entrant dans le champ d'application de cette directive. Figurent par exemple également dans cette liste les droits en matière de modèles d'utilité, les protections des obtentions végétales ou les dénominations commerciales dans la mesure où elles sont protégées en tant que droits de propriété exclusifs par le droit national concerné. En tout état de cause il est bien précisé que cette liste est minimale.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/11/630&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en.
([2]) Directive 2004/48/CE du 29 avril 2004 relative au respect des droits de propriété intellectuelle, JO L 157 du 30.4.2004, p. 45.
([3]) Déclaration de la Commission concernant l'article 2 de la directive 2004/48/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil relative au respect des droits de propriété intellectuelle, JO L 94 du 13.4.2005, p. 37.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009095/12
an die Kommission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(10. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Zweite Fehmarnsundbrücke als Teil des Projekts Feste Fehmarnbeltquerung

Im September 2012 kündigte die schleswig-holsteinische Landesregierung an, den Bau einer zweiten Querung über den Fehmarnsund zur Ertüchtigung des Hinterlandes der geplanten Festen Fehmarnbeltquerung prüfen zu wollen. Laut Medienberichten würde diese zusätzliche Querung 300 bis 500 Mio. EUR kosten. Die Finanzierung dieses Projekts wurde bislang nicht in die Budgetplanungen des Projekts Feste Fehmarnbeltquerung aufgenommen.

1. Gehört eine mögliche zweite Fehmarnsundquerung zur Projektplanung der Festen Fehmarnbeltquerung, für deren Kosten das Königreich Dänemark aufzukommen hat?

2. Wird die EU für den Bau eines solchen Bauwerks — Brücke oder Tunnel — finanzielle Mittel aus dem TEN-T- oder anderen Budgets zur Verfügung stellen?

3. Inwieweit ist der Bau einer zweiten Fehmarnsundquerung mit den Schutzzielen des Natura-2000-Schutzgebiets Fehmarnbelt vereinbar?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(28. November 2012)

1. Die Kommission finanziert gegenwärtig im Rahmen des TEN-V-Programms eine Studie zur Schienenstrecke Lübeck-Puttgarden. Dieses Projekt befindet sich noch in der Phase der Voruntersuchung der verschiedenen Streckenführungsvarianten. Über die Idee einer zweiten Querung des Fehmarnsund ist die Kommission bislang nicht offiziell in Kenntnis gesetzt worden.

2. Die Schienenstrecke Kopenhagen-Hamburg über Fehmarn ist Teil des Eisenbahnkorridors Helsinki-Valetta und steht auf der Liste der vorermittelten Vorhaben im Anhang des Vorschlags für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Schaffung der Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ ([1]). Für die in diesem Anhang aufgeführten Vorhaben werden Mehrjahresprogramme beschlossen und Haushaltsmittel zugewiesen. Nur wenn ein Vorhaben im Rahmen einer Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen zum TEN-V-Programm förmlich vorgeschlagen und ausgewählt wird, kann es Finanzhilfen der Union erhalten.

3. Das fragliche Vorhaben muss einer angemessenen Prüfung seiner Auswirkungen auf die Erhaltungsziele für Natura-2000-Gebiete gemäß Artikel 6 Absatz 3 der Richtlinie 92/43/EWG zur Erhaltung der natürlichen Lebensräume sowie der wildlebenden Tiere und Pflanzen (ABl. L 206 vom 22.7.1992, S. 7) unterzogen werden und darf nur genehmigt werden, wenn das Gebiet als solches nicht beeinträchtigt wird. Ausnahmen von dieser Regel sind gemäß Artikel 6 Absatz 4 der genannten Richtlinie nur unter der Bedingung möglich, dass es keine alternativen Lösungen gibt, das Projekt aus zwingenden Gründen des überwiegenden öffentlichen Interesses erforderlich ist und alle notwendigen Ausgleichsmaßnahmen ergriffen werden, um die globale Kohärenz des Natura-2000-Netzes schützen.

([1]) KOM(2011)0665 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009095/12
to the Commission
Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Second Fehmarnsund crossing as part of the Fehmarn Belt Fixed Link

In September 2012, the Government of the Land of Schleswig-Holstein announced that it wanted to consider the construction of a second crossing over the Fehmarnsund as part of the upgrading of approaches to the planned Fehmarn Belt Fixed Link. Media reports put the cost of the additional crossing at EUR 300-500 million. No financing has yet been earmarked for this project within the projected budget for the Fehmarn Belt Fixed Link.

1. Is a possible second crossing over the Fehmarnsund part of the plans for the Fehmarn Belt Fixed Link for which Denmark is to foot the bill?

2. Will the EU make available funding from the TEN-T programme, or from another budget, for the construction of such a bridge or tunnel link?

3. Is the construction of a second Fehmarnsund crossing compatible with the objectives of the Fehmarn Belt Natura 2000 conservation site?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2012)

1. The Commission is currently financing a study project for the rail section Lübeck-Puttgarden through the TEN-T programm. The study project is still at the stage of the preliminary studies of the different alignment variants. The Commission has not received so far any official information concerning the idea of a second crossing over the Fehmarnsund.

2. The rail section Copenhagen-Hamburg via Fehmarn is part of the corridor Helsinki-Valetta and included as pre-identified section in the annex to the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Connecting Europe Facility ([1]). For projects listed in the annex multiannual programmes will be adopted and budgetary resources allocated. If a project is formally presented and selected in the framework of a TEN-T call for proposal, it can receive Union financial assistance.

3. The project referred to has to be subject of an appropriate assessment of its effects with regard to the Natura 2000 site's conservation objective pursuant to Article 6(3) of Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (OJ L 2006, 22.7.1992, p. 7) and can only be authorised if it does not adversely affect the integrity of the site. Exemptions from this rule are possible pursuant to Article 6(4) of the directive under the condition that there are no alternative solutions, that the project is necessary for imperative reasons of overriding public interest and compensatory measures to ensure the coherence of the Natura 2000 network are taken.

([1]) COM/2011/0665 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009096/12
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(10 oktober 2012)

Betreft: VP/HR — Vervolgvraag over gedwongen kinderarbeid van Dalit-meisjes in de kledingproductie van in de EU gevestigde bedrijven

In vervolg op het antwoord van de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger op de vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E 005948/2012, zou ik graag opheldering willen vragen over de rol van de Europese Unie, inclusief de EU-delegatie in Delhi, met betrekking tot gedwongen kinderarbeid. Verschillende belanghebbenden, met inbegrip van in de EU gevestigde bedrijven, zetten zich zowel individueel als collectief in voor deze zaak. De verschillende activiteiten en het effect ervan zijn vastgelegd in het document „Gedwongen (kinder-)arbeid in de Zuid-Indiase kledingindustrie — De laatste stand van zaken met betrekking tot het debat en de actie inzake het sumangali systeem", gepubliceerd door Stichting Onderzoek Multinationale Ondernemingen (SOMO) en de Nederlandse Landelijke India Werkgroep (LIW). De vraag blijft welke rol de Europese Unie kan en moet spelen als cruciale belanghebbende bij het uitroeien van gedwongen kinderarbeid in de Indiase kledingindustrie.

1. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger bereid, met het oog op de ernstige en wijdverspreide aard van dit probleem en de betrokkenheid van een aantal EU-bedrijven, een speciaal initiatief uit te werken om dit probleem samen met de Indiase overheid en de regering van Tamil Nadu op te lossen? Dit zou namelijk een cruciale vorm van steun kunnen betekenen voor de bedrijven en andere belanghebbenden die reeds bezig zijn deze diepgewortelde en structurele kwestie aan te pakken.

2. Welke actie wordt of kan worden ondernomen door de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger, in samenwerking met de delegatie, om de campagne van de IAO en de Europese sociale partners van de textiel- en kledingindustrie ter uitroeiing van gedwongen kinderarbeid in de Zuid-Indiase kledingindustrie, te steunen?

3. Hoe denkt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger transparantie te verzekeren met betrekking tot het hoofdstuk over duurzame ontwikkeling in de voorgestelde vrijhandelsovereenkomst tussen de EU en India? En hoe denkt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger, wat betreft de dialoog rond deze kwestie, ervoor te zorgen dat het maatschappelijke middenveld op adequate wijze bij deze dialoog wordt betrokken?

4. Is de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger bereid praktische steun te verlenen aan de recent aangekondigde substantiële wijzigingen in de Indiase Kinderwet, door samen met de Indiase overheid te werken aan een tijdsgebonden uitvoeringsplan voor de nieuwe wet, met bijzondere aandacht voor de uitroeiing van kinderarbeid in die sectoren die hun producten exporteren naar de Europese Unie?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(4 december 2012)

In het antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-005948/2012 werd benadrukt dat kinderarbeid in India een belangrijke kwestie is voor de EU en dat deze consequent wordt aangepakt via projectfinanciering, via besprekingen in het kader van de lokale mensenrechtendialoog tussen de EU en India en, in ruimere zin, via het werk dat de Europese Commissie samen met de belanghebbenden heeft verricht om voor een groot aantal sectoren een mensenrechtenrichtsnoer voor maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen op te stellen.

Op 28 augustus 2012 heeft de Indiase regering de wet betreffende het verbod op kinder- en adolescentenarbeid tot wijziging van de bestaande wet goedgekeurd. Dit wordt als een positieve ontwikkeling beschouwd. Na de inwerkingtreding van deze wet zal elke vorm van kinderarbeid onder de leeftijd van 14 jaar verboden zijn en zullen kinderen van 14 tot 18 jaar geen ongezonde beroepen mogen uitoefenen.

De EU is bereid de Indiase overheid te helpen om de uitdagingen van de praktische toepassing van deze wetgeving aan te pakken en zij zal de uitvoering van de wet inzake het recht op onderwijs blijven aanmoedigen.

Hoewel een speciaal initiatief voor Tamil Nadu inzake kinderarbeid, zoals beschreven in de vraag, momenteel niet wordt overwogen, zal de EU met betrekking tot deze kwestie met de autoriteiten blijven samenwerken.

Zoals uiteengezet in het antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-005948/2012, zou het hoofdstuk over duurzame ontwikkeling bij de onderhandelingen over een vrijhandelsovereenkomst een alomvattend kader moeten bieden dat op internationaal erkende normen en overeenkomsten berust, waaronder de IAO-kernnormen voor arbeid. Het zou eveneens in een toezichthoudende rol voor het maatschappelijk middenveld voorzien.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009096/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Follow-up question on bonded child labour of Dalit girls in garment production for EU-based companies

As a follow-up to the answer of the Vice-President/High Representative to Written Question E-005948/2012, I would request you to be more specific on the role of the European Union, including the EU Delegation in Delhi, in taking up the issue of bonded child labour. Various stakeholders, including EU-based companies, are actively taking up this issue both individually and collectively. The various activities and their impact have been assessed in the document entitled 'Bonded (child) labour in the South Indian Garment Industry — An Update of Debate and Action on the 'Sumangali Scheme'), published by the Centre for Research on Multinational Companies (SOMO) and the India Committee of the Netherlands. The question remains of what role the European Union can and should play as a crucial stakeholder in the efforts to eradicate bonded child labour in India's garment industry.

1. In view of the very serious and widespread nature of this problem and the involvement of a number of EU companies, is the Vice-President/High Representative willing to undertake a special initiative to work on a solution with the Indian Government and the state government of Tamil Nadu, as this could be a crucial form of support for companies and other stakeholders already working on this deep-rooted and structural issue?

2. What action is being or can be taken by the Vice-President/High Representative, alongside the Delegation, to support the campaign of the ILO and the European social partners of the textile and clothing sector aimed at the eradication of bonded child labour in the south Indian garment industry?

3. How will the Vice-President/High Representative ensure transparency with regard to the chapter on sustainable development in the proposed EU-India free trade agreement? Furthermore, regarding dialogue on these issues, how does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to ensure adequate civil society input in these dialogues?

4. Is the Vice-President/High Representative willing to give practical support to the recently announced substantial amendments to India's Child Labour Act, by offering to work with the Government of India on a time-bound implementation plan for the new Act, especially with regard to eradicating child labour in those sectors that export their products to the European Union?

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

In the written answer to Question E-005948/2012 it was stressed that child labour in India is an important issue for the EU, and one that has consistently been addressed through project financing, discussion in the EU-India local Human Rights Dialogue, and, in a broader way, through work being undertaken by the European Commission with stakeholders to develop a Corporate Social Responsibility human rights guide relevant for a wide range of sectors.

On 28th August 2012 the Government of India approved the Child and Adolescent Labour Prohibition Act amending the existing law, which is seen an a positive development. When in force, all forms of child labour under the age of 14 years will be banned, and the employment of children in the 14-18 age group in hazardous occupations will be prohibited.

The EU stands ready to assist the Indian authorities with the challenges that the implementation of this legislation may pose, and will continue to encourage the enforcement of the Right to Education Act.

While a special initiative in Tamil Nadu on child labour of the sort referred to in the question is not for the moment being considered, the EU will continue to work with the authorities on this matter.

The sustainable development chapter of the Free Trade Agreement (FTA) negotiations, as was explained in the written answer to Question E-005948/2012, would aim to provide an overall framework based on internationally recognised standards and agreements, including the ILO's core labour standards. It would also foresee a monitoring role for civil society.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-009097/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(10. oktober 2012)

Om: Roamingtakstloftet i forhold til nationale takster

Med roaming-III forordningen er der nye takstlofter over selskabernes opkrævning fra kunderne, når de roamer i et andet EU-land.

Kan det være rigtigt, at disse takstlofter ikke også finder anvendelse i forhold til forbrugernes brug af netværket i deres eget hjemland.

Som eksempel kan jeg give, at man med et belgisk mobiltelefonabonnement kan komme til at betale:

— 0,20 EUR for et minuts tale til et telefonnummer i Belgien,

— 0,15 EUR for en sms til et andet belgisk nummer og,

— 0,50 EUR for en MB data mens jeg er i Belgien.

Det er i hvert fald for så vidt angår sms-taksten et stykke over roamingtakstlofterne, hvilket i praksis betyder, at det vil være billigere at benytte et dansk telefonnummer end et belgisk, når man befinder sig i Belgien, selvom de er på samme netværk.

Kan det virkelig være rigtigt, at det er tilladt for en national udbyder at kræve takster, der er højere end roaminglofterne, eller er det blot udtryk for, at det belgiske marked for mobiltelefoni ikke er præget af nogen form for konkurrence?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Neelie Kroes
(29. november 2012)

Nationale og internationale opkald foretaget fra den opkaldende parts eget land hører under den pågældende nationale tilsynsmyndighed. EU-lovgivningen giver de nationale tilsynsmyndigheder mulighed for at skride ind over for de konkurrenceproblemer, der måtte opstå på deres nationale markeder, og træffe passende foranstaltninger.

Det belgiske mobilmarked tilbyder kunderne en række tjenester og takster, både enkeltvis og som pakkeløsninger, der gør det muligt for den enkelte forbruger at vælge de tjenester, der passer ham eller hende bedst. Belgiske forbrugere kan forelægge deres sag for den belgiske tilsynsmyndighed, IBPT ([1]). Forbrugere, der overvejer, hvilke tjenester der bedst dækker deres behov, kan anvende en takstsimulator på IBPT's websted.

Med hensyn til både nationale og internationale opkald har Kommissionen taget hånd om en anden vigtig problemstilling, som har stor indflydelse på slutbrugerpriserne, nemlig de takster, som udbyderne afkræver hinanden, når opkald termineres på deres respektive netværk. I maj 2009 vedtog Kommissionen en henstilling ([2]), som indeholder retningslinjer for de nationale tilsynsmyndigheder vedrørende fastsættelse af termineringstakster på et niveau, der svarer til de effektive omkostninger. Anvendelse af omkostningsbaserede termineringstakster vil sænke engrosomkostningerne i forbindelse med såvel nationale som internationale opkald, hvilket på et konkurrenceorienteret marked bør føre til en sænkning af detailpriserne.

Endelig er Kommissionen gået aktivt ind i kampen mod misbrug i den elektroniske kommunikationssektor og arbejder tæt sammen med de nationale tilsynsmyndigheder for at sikre en effektiv håndhævelse af konkurrenceretten. Kommissionen er imidlertid ikke vidende om eventuelle urimelige priser i den belgiske telekommunikationssektor.

([1]) Institut belge des services postaux et des télécommunications, http://www.ibpt.be/fr/1/Home/Accueil/Accueil.aspx.
([2]) Kommissionens henstilling 2009/396/EF om regulering af fastnet- og mobiltermineringstakster i EU, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/ exUriServ.do?uri= OJ:L:2009:124:0067:0074:DA:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009097/12
to the Commission
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Ceiling on roaming charges in relation to national charges

The Third Roaming Regulation places new ceilings on how much the providers can charge customers for roaming services in another EU country.

How can it be that these ceilings are not applicable also to consumers' use of mobile networks in their own country?

As an example, with a Belgian mobile phone subscription you may be charged:

— EUR 0.20 for a one-minute call to a telephone number in Belgium;

— EUR 0.15 for an SMS sent to another Belgian number; and

— EUR 0.50 for downloading 1 MB of data inside Belgium.

At least as far as the SMS charge is concerned, this is considerably higher than the ceiling on roaming charges. This means, in practice, that when you are in Belgium it is less expensive to use a Danish telephone number than a Belgian one, although the network is the same.

Is it really the case that a national provider is allowed to charge prices exceeding the ceilings on roaming charges, or does this merely reflect the complete lack of competition on the Belgian mobile telephony market?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2012)

Domestic or international calls made from the caller's own country fall under the supervision of the National Regulatory Authority (NRA) in each country. The EU regulatory framework provides NRAs with tools to act in relation to any competition problems that exist within their national markets and to impose remedies when appropriate.

The Belgian mobile market offers its customers a variety of services and tariffs, both as a stand alone or in bundles that allow consumers to choose services that best corresponds to their needs. Belgian consumers can address their concerns to the Belgian regulator, IBPT ([1]). A specific tool on IBPT's website allows consumers to use a tariff simulator in deciding which service suits their needs best.

Furthermore with regard to both international and domestic calls, the Commission has addressed an important issue which contributes substantially to end-user prices, namely the rates operators charge to each other when terminating calls on their respective networks. The Commission adopted in May 2009 a recommendation ([2]) which includes guidance for NRAs to set these termination charges at the level which corresponds to the efficient costs. Application of cost-oriented termination charges will lower the wholesale costs for both domestic and international calls, which in a competitive market should also lead to lower retail prices.

Finally, the Commission has been active in tackling abusive behaviour in the electronic communications sector and is working closely in cooperation with national competition authorities to ensure effective competition law enforcement. The Commission has however no indications of possible abusive prices in the Belgian mobile telecommunications sector.

([1]) http://www.ibpt.be/fr/1/Home/Accueil/Accueil.aspx.
([2]) Commission Recommendation 2009/396/EC on the Regulatory Treatment of Fixed and Mobile Termination Rates in the EU, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:124:0067:0074:EN:PDF.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-009098/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(10. oktober 2012)

Om: Portal for service og industri

Der eksisterer i dag ingen fælles EU-portal for virksomheder indenfor service og industri i EU. Der findes i dag 2 store portaler, made-in-China.com og made-from-india.com

Derfor er kontakt mellem virksomheder og mellem borger og virksomhed ikke optimal.

En etablering af en fælles portal vil fremme handel mellem virksomheder og mellem borger og virksomhed.

Vil Kommissionen tage initiativ til etablering af en fælles EU-kontrolleret internet portal for service og industri?

En portal kunne have følgende struktur:

Medlemmerne i bestyrelsen for portalen kunne sammensættes af personer i EU og industrien i EU i fællesskab.

Adgangen til portalen kunne baseres på non-profit.

EU og industrien kan sammen fastlægge et regelsæt for portalen.

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Antonio Tajani
(12. december 2012)

Kommissionen har ikke planlagt noget initiativ om oprettelse af en EU-internetportal, hvor EU's virksomheder kan fremme salget af deres produkter og tjenesteydelser. Kommissionen mener, at det er den private sektor og ikke de offentlige myndigheder, der skal reklamere for og markedsføre produkter og tjenesteydelser. Dette er også tilfældet for de nævnte portaler, made-in-china.com og made-from-india.com, som er private initiativer.

Kommissionen har dog etableret en række værktøjer, der kan være nyttige med henblik på at lette adgangen for EU's produkter og tjenesteydelser til udenlandske markeder. Et par eksempler på disse værktøjer er »Market Access Database«-portalen ([1]) og henvisningen til »Europages«-portalen ([2]).

Herudover har Kommissionen gennemført forskellige aktiviteter, der skal hjælpe små og mellemstore virksomheder til at blive mere konkurrencedygtige på det indre marked og i tredjelande. En af disse aktiviteter er »Enterprise Europe Network«, som er gennemført under rammeprogrammet for konkurrenceevne og innovation. Dette netværk trækker på ekspertisen fra 3 000 ansatte i 600 regionale partnerorganisationer, der typisk er handelskamre, innovationsbureauer, erhvervsorganisationer, universiteter eller teknologicentre. Netværket har en database for erhvervsmæssigt samarbejde og teknologioverførsel med 15 000 forslag til partnerskaber, som kan findes på det offentlige websted, i partnerorganisationernes portaler og på deres websteder på det nationale sprog og let tilgængeligt for SMV'erne ([3]).

([1]) madb.europa.eu.
([2]) www.europages.com.
([3]) Netværkets websted: http://portal.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/
Netværkets succeshistorier: http://portal.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/success-stories/list.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009098/12
to the Commission
Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Services and industry portal

Today there is no common EU web portal for EU businesses in the services and industry sectors. There are currently two large such portals, made-in-China.com and made-from-india.com.

Contact at business-to-business level and at business-to-consumer level is therefore not as good as it could be.

Establishing a common portal would boost both business-to-business and business-to-consumer trade.

Would the Commission take the initiative to establish a common, EU-monitored web portal for the services and industry sectors?

Such a portal could be set up along the following lines:

The members of its board could be EU representatives and representatives of EU industry.

Access to the portal could be on a non-profit basis.

The rules governing the portal could be drawn up jointly by the EU and industry.

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2012)

There is no initiative planned by the Commission to create an EU web portal where EU companies can promote their products and services. The Commission believes that the advertisement and promotion of products and services should be organised by the private sector rather than by the public authorities. This is also the case for the referred portals made-in-China.com and made-from-india.com which are private initiatives.

However, the Commission has set up a number of tools which might be useful for the purposes of facilitating access of EU products and services to external markets. Some examples of such tools are the Market Access Database portal ([1]) and the reference made to the Europages portal ([2]).

Additionally, the Commission has implemented different activities to help small and medium-sized enterprises become more competitive in the internal market and third countries. One of these activities is the Enterprise Europe Network, implemented in the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP). This network calls upon the expertise of 3 000 staff in 600 regional partner organisations who are typically Chambers of Commerce, innovation agencies, business organisations, universities or technology centres. The Network operates a Business Cooperation and Technology Transfer Database with 15 000 proposals for partnerships which can be consulted on the public website and on the portals and websites of the partner organisations in the national language and easily accessible by SMEs ([3]).

([1]) madb.europa.eu.
([2]) www.europages.com.
([3]) Network's website: http://portal.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/
Network's Success Stories: http://portal.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/success-stories/list.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009100/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(10 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Plan General de Ordenación Urbana PGOU — SC1-Guadalmesí, Valdevaqueros y otros — seguimiento pregunta parlamentaria E-005482/2012

En un escrito de la Comisión de Peticiones del Parlamento Europeo, Petición 1279/2007, se dice: «cabe esperar que los peticionarios utilicen el Informe Auken en favor de sus casos particulares ante las autoridades municipales o regionales o ante los órganos jurisdiccionales españoles a los que se pueda instar a que actúen en relación a los asuntos mencionados».

Se ha utilizado este escrito ante las administraciones para instar a que actúen y es ignorado sistemáticamente. Se ha utilizado ante la Fiscalía de Algeciras y es archivado el caso.

El SC1-Guadalmesí puede actuar como precedente para otros casos similares como las pretendidas construcciones en Valdevaqueros, denunciado y registrado ante la Comisión bajo CHAP (2012)01462. Mientras las autoridades y los órganos jurisdiccionales hagan oídos sordos a las desesperadas acciones de la ciudadanía y las decisiones del Parlamento europeo sean consideradas como actos que no vinculan a responsabilidad alguna, los ciudadanos se encontrarán desamparados y supeditados a actitudes dictatoriales. La situación geográfica del SC1-Guadalmesí, entre LIC's, incumple, al igual que otros planes que se pretende poner en práctica en el municipio de Tarifa, las directivas europeas. La Red Natura 2000 está representada en este municipio por 7 LIC's.

La realidad de hoy se encuentra desfasada en más de 20 años con un Plan de Ordenación Urbano que data de 1990 y fue publicado en 2002 sin el correspondiente EIA y por tanto ilegalmente. Se permiten con este Plan actuaciones especulativas que promueven la corrupción. La figura del promotor vuelve a cobrar auge dejando el Informe Auken como una mera recomendación sin efecto. Se anteponen nuevamente intereses monetarios a la legalidad urbanística y a las directivas europeas medioambientales. En el municipio de Tarifa hay escasez de agua, construcciones en ruinas y deshabitadas y falta de depuradoras. En los meses de verano su núcleo urbano triplica la población normal no existiendo tampoco depuradora. No se está aplicando ni velando por el interés publico europeo de la Red Natura 2000.

¿Que actuaciones piensa emprender la Comisión para hacer valer el artículo 6, apartado 1, del Tratado de la UE y obligar a las administraciones y los órganos jurisdiccionales españoles a que consideren el Informe Auken? ¿Cómo piensa la Comisión aplicar su propio deber de protección para con los ciudadanos europeos?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de diciembre de 2012)

La Comisión toma sistemáticamente medidas para garantizar el cumplimiento por los Estados miembros de todo el Derecho de la UE, incluida la legislación en materia de medio ambiente que protege derechos fundamentales. En lo que respecta al cumplimiento de la legislación ambiental en España, la ciudad de Tarifa forma parte de las que se considera que no aplican un tratamiento de las aguas residuales urbanas conforme a lo dispuesto en la Directiva 91/271/CEE del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 1991, sobre el tratamiento de las aguas residuales urbanas. La Comisión llevó este particular ante el Tribunal de Justicia, que condenó a España mediante su sentencia de 14.4.2011 en el asunto C-2010/343.

En cuanto a los proyectos previstos en Valdevaqueros, la Comisión ha puesto en marcha una investigación para comprobar el cumplimiento del Derecho medioambiental de la UE aplicable, así como de las disposiciones de la Directiva 92/43/CEE del Consejo, de 21 de mayo de 1992, relativa a la conservación de los hábitats naturales y de la fauna y flora silvestres. La Comisión ha recabado información de las autoridades españolas en el marco de esta investigación. Ahora se está examinando su respuesta.

En cuanto al Informe Auken, incumbe a los Estados miembros decidir si siguen sus recomendaciones y hasta qué punto lo hacen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009100/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: General Urban Development Plan (PGOU) SC1-Guadalmesí, Valdevaqueros and others — follow-up to parliamentary Question E-005482/2012

A letter from the Committee on Petitions of the European Parliament, in reference to Petition 1279/2007, contains the following: 'it is to be hoped and expected that petitioners will use the Auken report to promote their own individual cases before municipal or regional authorities or before the Spanish courts and tribunals which may be called upon to act in relation to the issues raised.'

This note has been presented before the authorities to urge them to take action, but it has been consistently ignored. It has been presented before the Algeciras Public Prosecutor's Office and the case has been shelved.

SC1-Guadalmesí may be a precedent for other similar cases, such as the planned building work in Valdevaqueros, which has been the subject of a complaint to the Commission registered under CHAP (2012) 01462. As long as the authorities and the courts ignore the desperate action taken by citizens, and the European Parliament's decisions are not considered to have any binding effect at all, citizens will be unprotected against and at the mercy of dictatorial attitudes. The geographical location of the SC1-Guadalmesí plan, which is in between sites of Community interest (SCIs), means that it breaches European directives, as do other plans that are intended to be implemented in Tarifa. There are 7 SCIs which are part of the Natura 2000 network in this district.

Today's reality is out of phase with a General Urban Development Plan dating from 1990, and which was published in 2002 without the corresponding environmental impact assessment (EIA), and therefore, in breach of the legislation. This plan gives the green light to speculative actions which promote corruption. The developer continues to work at an intense pace while regarding the Auken report as a mere recommendation with no effect. Monetary interests once again come before compliance with laws on urban development or European environmental directives. In Tarifa, there are water shortages, uninhabited buildings in ruins and a lack of water treatment plants. During the summer months, the population in the town centre, which does not have a water treatment plant either, triples. The European public interest of the Natura 2000 network is not being protected.

What steps will the Commission take to ensure that Article 6 (1) of the EU Treaty is respected, and to oblige Spanish authorities and courts to take account of the Auken Report? How will the Commission fulfil its own duty to protect European citizens?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2012)

The Commission is regularly taking steps to ensure the compliance of Member States with all EU legislation, including the environmental legislation which protects fundamental rights. As regards compliance with environmental legislation in Spain, the town of Tarifa was included among those identified as not providing adequate urban waste water treatment as required by Council Directive 91/271/EEC of 21 May 1991 concerning urban waste-water treatment ([1]). The Commission took this issue to the ECJ which, in its judgment of 14.4.2011 on Case C-2010/343, condemned Spain.

With regard to the developments planned in Valdevaqueros, the Commission has launched an investigation to check compliance with applicable EU environmental law and with the provisions of Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora ([2]). In the context of this investigation, the Commission has requested information from the Spanish authorities. Their reply is currently under assessment.

As for the Auken Report, it falls to Member States to decide whether and to what extent they chose to follow its recommendations.

([1]) OJ L 135, 30.5.1991.
([2]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009101/12
aan de Commissie
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(10 oktober 2012)

Betreft: „Natuurlijk in het wild levende vogelsoorten" in de Europese vogelrichtlijn

In Nederland bestaat discussie over de interpretatie van de in artikel 1 van de Europese vogelrichtlijn (2009/147/EG) vermelde term „natuurlijk in het wild levende vogelsoorten".

De Nederlandse regering laat de vangst en het kortwieken van knobbelzwanen (*Cygnus olor*) door zogenaamde zwanenboeren toe en motiveert dit op grond van de uitzondering die het Hof van Justitie in de zaak-Vergy (C-149/94) heeft gemaakt voor „in gevangenschap geboren en opgekweekte vogels. Volgens de Nederlandse regering moeten deze zwanen, die vrij leven in de velden en van de „boeren" voeding noch beschutting ontvangen, beschouwd worden als „in gevangenschap geboren en opgekweekte" vogels en daarom uitgesloten worden van bescherming krachtens de vogelrichtlijn.

1. Is het waar dat noch in de EU-wetgeving noch in de uitspraken van het Hof een definitie van de term „in gevangenschap geboren en opgekweekt" werd geformuleerd?

2. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat voor de interpretatie van deze term de in artikel 54 van Verordening (EG) nr. 865/2006 van de Commissie vermelde definitie van „in gevangenschap geboren en gefokt" moet gebruikt worden?

3. Is de Commissie het ermee eens dat uit de interpretatie van dit concept geconcludeerd moet worden dat knobbelzwanen niet beschouwd kunnen worden als „in gevangenschap geboren en opgekweekte" vogels en dus beschermd moeten worden krachtens de vogelrichtlijn?

4. Is de Commissie bereid de Nederlandse overheid te informeren dat deze vangst en verminking van knobbelzwanen een inbreuk vormen op de Europese vogelrichtlijn?

Antwoord van de heer Potočnik namens de Commissie
(22 november 2012)

Er bestaat geen juridische definitie van de term „in gevangenschap gefokt en opgekweekt" in de context van de uitvoering van Richtlijn 2009/147/EG van de Raad ([1]). Die richtlijn is van toepassing op alle vogelsoorten die in de EU van nature in het wild voorkomen. Het Hof van Justitie van de EU heeft bevestigd dat deze bescherming niet geldt voor in gevangenschap gefokte specimens ([2]).

Niettemin dient er een objectief controleerbaar mechanisme te zijn om vast te stellen of een specimen daadwerkelijk in gevangenschap is geboren en opgekweekt. In dit verband lijken de criteria van artikel 54 van Verordening (EG) nr. 865/2006 van de Raad ([3]) bij uitstek relevant, ook al zijn zij ontwikkeld met het oog op de uitvoering van Verordening (EG) nr. 338/97 van de Raad inzake de bescherming van in het wild levende dier- en plantensoorten door controle op het desbetreffende handelsverkeer ([4]) en zijn zij niet wettelijk bindend bij de uitvoering van de Vogelrichtlijn.

Het vangen en kortwieken van knobbelzwanen (*Cygnus olor*) in Nederland lijkt niet verenigbaar met de beschermingsvoorschriften van de Vogelrichtlijn, maar zou, mits aan alle betreffende voorwaarden is voldaan, toelaatbaar kunnen zijn in het kader van een afwijking overeenkomstig artikel 9 van de richtlijn. De Commissie zal de Nederlandse instanties om verduidelijking vragen teneinde te bepalen of deze praktijk in overeenstemming is met de Vogelrichtlijn.

([1]) PB L 20 van 26.1.2010.
([2]) Arrest van 8 februari 1996, Strafzaak tegen Didier Vergy, zaak C-149/94, Jurispr. 1996.
([3]) PB L 166 van 19.6.2006.
([4]) PB L 61 van 3.3.1997. Verordening laatstelijk gewijzigd bij Verordening (EG) nr. 1332/2005 van de Commissie, PB L 215 van 19.8.2005.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009101/12
to the Commission
Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: 'Naturally occurring birds in the wild state' in the European birds directive

In the Netherlands, a dispute exists over the interpretation of the phrase 'naturally occurring birds in the wild state' included in Article 1 of the European birds directive (2009/147/EC).

The Dutch Government allows the capturing and pinioning of mute swans (*Cygnus olor*) by so called 'swan-farmers', justifying it on the grounds of the exception made in the ECJ's decision in the Vergy case (C-149/94) for birds 'born and reared in captivity'. According to the Dutch Government, such swans, which spend their lives free in the fields and are neither fed nor sheltered by the 'farmers', should be considered as birds that are 'born and reared in captivity' and should therefore be excluded from protection under the Birds Directive.

1. Is it correct that no definition of the term 'born and reared in captivity' has been formulated in EU legislation or ECJ verdicts?

2. Does the Commission agree that for the interpretation of this terminology, the definition of 'born and bred in captivity' provided in Article 54 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 865/2006 should be applied?

3. Does the Commission agree that the interpretation of this concept should lead to the conclusion that mute swans cannot be considered birds 'born and reared in captivity' and are thus protected under the Birds Directive?

4. Is the Commission willing to inform the Dutch Government of the fact that this capturing and mutilation of mute swans constitute a breach of the European birds directive?

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

There is no legal definition of the term 'bred and reared in captivity' in the context of implementation of Council Directive (2009/147/EC) ([1]). The directive applies to all species of naturally occurring birds in the wild state in EU. The EU Court of Justice has confirmed that the protection does not extend to specimens bred in captivity ([2]) .

Notwithstanding, there must be an objectively verifiable mechanism to confirm that specimens are in fact born and reared in captivity. In this context the criteria set out in Article 54 of Council Regulation (EC) No 865/2006 ([3]), would appear to be highly relevant, although these have been developed for implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein ([4]) and are not legally binding in the context of implementation of the Birds Directive.

The capturing and pinioning of mute swans (Cygnus olor) in the Netherlands would not appear to be consistent with the protection requirements of the Birds Directive but may be permissible as a derogation under Article 9 of the directive if all the necessary conditions are met. The Commission will seek clarification with the Dutch authorities to determine whether this practice is in compliance with the Birds Directive.

([1]) OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.
([2]) Judgment of 8 February 1996, Criminal proceedings v Didier Vergy, Case C-149/94, ECR 1996.
([3]) OJ L 166, 19.6.2006.
([4]) OJ L 61, 3.3.1997, Regulation as last amended by Commission Regulation (EC) No 1332/2005, OJ L 215, 19.8.2005.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009102/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(10 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Cumplimiento del Protocolo de Kioto por parte del Reino de España

El Reino de España posiblemente cumplirá con el Protocolo de Kioto al comprar derechos de emisión de CO_2 baratos a Polonia. Según parece, el acuerdo permitirá la compra de casi 100 millones de toneladas de CO_2 por un valor de unos 40 millones de euros, a menos de 1 euro la tonelada. Mientras, el Reino de España ha tomado medidas retroactivas en contra de los intereses de los productores fotovoltaicos (RDL 14/2010 y RD 1565/2010), con la supuesta intención de la reducción del déficit de tarifa y de la situación de crisis económica del país.

El Reino de España ya ha invertido 770 millones de euros para adquirir créditos de carbono en los últimos cinco años. Y todavía está obligada a seguir comprando derechos debido al exceso de emisiones.

¿Cree la Comisión que esa es la manera más efectiva y coherente para combatir el cambio climático y para promover una Europa más sostenible?

¿Cree la Comisión que es una buena práctica de un Estado Miembro dejar de invertir en la implantación de energías renovables tomando medidas retroactivas y gastar el dinero público en la compra de CO_2 a otro país?

¿Cuál es el modelo energético sostenible que los Estados Miembros deben seguir e implantar? ¿Tiene la Comisión recomendaciones en este sentido?

Respuesta de la Sra. Hedegaard en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de noviembre de 2012)

El cumplimiento de los compromisos asumidos en virtud del Protocolo de Kioto es fundamental para avanzar hacia una economía hipocarbónica y reforzar la credibilidad de Europa en las negociaciones internacionales sobre el cambio climático. La Comisión ha publicado recientemente su informe anual sobre los avances hacia la consecución de los objetivos de Kioto sobre la base de los datos presentados por los Estados miembros. Como se indica en ese informe, España solo alcanzará su objetivo de limitación de las emisiones de 2008-2012 si recurre a los mecanismos de flexibilidad previstos en el Protocolo de Kioto. El recurso a estos mecanismos de flexibilidad es la única manera de conseguir el cumplimiento de las normas ahora que está casi finalizado el período 2008-2012.

En el marco de la Estrategia Europa 2020, la Comisión formuló recomendaciones generales y específicas por países para reducir las emisiones de gases de efecto invernadero. En el caso concreto de España, el documento de trabajo de los servicios de la Comisión «Evaluación del programa nacional de reforma de 2012 y del programa de estabilidad de España» explica lo siguiente: «La suspensión de las ayudas a las energías renovables desalienta la inversión en el sector y hará difícil que España alcance sus objetivos energéticos y climáticos en el marco de la Estrategia Europa 2020. Por otra parte, con una menor proporción de energías renovables, la dependencia de España de la energía importada aumentaría respecto de la tasa actual del 79 %».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009102/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Spain's compliance with the Kyoto Protocol

Spain may be seeking to comply with the Kyoto Protocol by buying cheap CO_2 emission allowances from Poland. Apparently, the agreement would allow Spain to buy almost 100 million tonnes of CO_2 emission allowances for around 40 million euros, which is less than one euro per tonne. Meanwhile Spain has applied retroactive measures harmful to the interests of solar energy producers (laws RDL 14/2010 and RD 1565/2010), with the declared intention of reducing the tariff deficit amid the current situation of economic crisis in the country.

Spain has already spent 770 million euros in the past five years on buying carbon credits, and the country is obliged to continue buying allowances because of its excess emissions.

Does the Commission believe that this is the most effective and logical way of tackling climate change and promoting a more sustainable Europe?

Does the Commission believe that it is good practice for a Member State to stop investing in renewable energy sources and instead to apply retroactive measures and spend public money on buying CO_2 allowances from other countries?

What sustainable energy model should the Member States copy and implement? Does the Commission have any recommendations in this regard?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

Fulfilling the commitments taken under the Kyoto Protocol is essential to move towards a low-carbon economy and strengthen Europe's credibility in the international negotiations on climate change. The Commission recently published its annual report on progress towards achieving the Kyoto objectives on the basis of data submitted by Member States. As mentioned in this report, Spain will achieve its 2008-2012 emission limitation objective only if it uses the flexibility mechanisms provided for in the Kyoto Protocol. Using these flexibility mechanisms is the only way to achieve compliance now that the 2008-2012 period is almost over.

In the context of the Europe 2020 strategy, the Commission prepared general and country-specific recommendations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In particular for Spain, the Commission Staff Working Document 'Assessment of the 2012 national reform programme and stability programme for Spain' explains that 'suspending support for renewables discourages investment in the sector and will make it hard to achieve Spain's target under the Europe 2020 energy and climate goals. Moreover, with less renewable energy in the mix, Spain's dependence on imported energy would further increase from the current 79%'.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009103/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Claudio Morganti (EFD) e Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(10 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Prelievi di organi in Cina

Nelle ultime settimane il governo della Repubblica Popolare Cinese ha espresso l'intenzione di interrompere, entro un massimo di cinque anni, la controversa pratica dei prelievi degli organi dei prigionieri giustiziati.

Secondo diverse stime, in Cina sono eseguite ogni anno tra le duemila e le ottomila condanne a morte, «utili» per fornire un discreto numero di organi necessari a soddisfare l'enorme richiesta di trapianti, sia legali che illegali.

Con la pratica attualmente in vigore, ai prigionieri condannati a morte viene infatti spesso estorta un'autorizzazione «volontaria» al trapianto; si intende ora modificare questo sistema di dubbia eticità, ed è già stata avviata una sperimentazione per incentivare donazioni realmente volontarie. I primi risultati forniti non sembrano tuttavia ancora dare risultati soddisfacenti in questo senso.

Ancora oggi, sono numerose le denunce di uccisioni volontarie di oppositori politici o di coscienza, tra cui numerosi praticanti del Falun Gong, al solo scopo di fornire organi al fiorente e spesso illegale mercato dei trapianti. Inoltre, per aggiungere orrore ad orrore, diverse testimonianze lascerebbero intendere che questa pratica di prelievo sia praticata anche su persone ancora in vita.

Quali sono le informazioni di cui dispone l'Alto Rappresentante/Vicepresidente della Commissione in merito a questa pratica in Cina?

È a conoscenza di episodi di prelievi coatti di organi da parte del Governo cinese su prigionieri politici o di coscienza? In tale caso, quali misure intende intraprendere per porre fine a questa pratica?

Può inoltre indicare se esista un «mercato dei trapianti» e un «turismo dei trapianti» tra l'Unione europea e la Cina?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(25 gennaio 2013)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza della pratica cinese di espiantare gli organi di prigionieri giustiziati e condivide con il Parlamento le inquietudini sul traffico di organi. Nell'ambito dei rapporti con la Cina, e in particolare del dialogo sui diritti umani, l'Unione pone regolarmente la questione della pena di morte, del sistema di rieducazione attraverso il lavoro e dei trattamenti inflitti ai membri del *Falun Gong*. L'Unione europea ribadisce fermamente la propria opposizione di principio alla pena di morte e invita la Cina ad adottare ogni misura atta a garantire il rispetto di garanzie internazionalmente riconosciute per le condanne alla pena capitale, come il diritto ad un equo processo. L'Unione europea nutre in particolare apprensione per la mancata pubblicazione da parte della Cina di dati statistici sulla pena di morte e sui trapianti di organi, in assenza dei quali è impossibile sapere di preciso da dove provengono gli organi trapiantati o verificare l'attendibilità delle numerose denunce di presunti espianti di organi da detenuti in rieducazione nei campi di lavoro.

È risaputo che un per lottare efficacemente contro il traffico di organi bisogna aumentare il numero di organi disponibili e l'AR/VP si compiace dell'annuncio dato di recente dal governo cinese che intende porre fine a questa pratica e incoraggiare una donazione di organi autenticamente volontaria. La normativa cinese sui trapianti di organi umani, entrata in vigore il 1° luglio 2006, richiede l'accordo scritto del donatore ma non affronta adeguatamente il problema del consenso, specie per coloro che muoiono in custodia o per esecuzione. L'Unione ha già sollevato la questione nell'ambito delle precedenti sessioni del dialogo UE-Cina sui diritti umani e intende proseguire su questa strada. L'UE continua peraltro a esortare il paese a porre fine al sistema di rieducazione attraverso il lavoro e a garantire che nessuno venga incarcerato senza essere processato.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009103/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Claudio Morganti (EFD) and Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Organ harvesting in China

In recent weeks, the Chinese Government stated that it will stop, within five years, the controversial practice of harvesting organs from executed prisoners.

According to estimates, between 2 000 and 8 000 death sentences occur in China every year, which are 'useful' for supplying the many organs required to meet the huge demand for both legal and illegal transplants.

Under current practice, death-row prisoners are often forced into 'voluntarily' consenting to donating their organs. This unethical system is to change, and an experiment has been started to encourage genuine voluntary organ donations. However, the initial results have been unsatisfactory.

There are still many reports of political opponents or prisoners of conscience, including many Falun Gong practitioners, being murdered just to supply organs for the flourishing and often illegal transplant market. Even more horrifying, there is also some evidence to suggest that organ harvesting occurs on live victims.

What information does the Vice-President/High Representative have about this practice in China?

Is she aware of forced organ harvesting by the Chinese Government on political prisoners or prisoners of conscience? If so, what will she do to end this practice?

Can she also say if 'transplant market' and 'transplant tourism' exist between the European Union and China?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(25 January 2013)

The HR/VP is indeed aware of China's practice of 'harvesting' organs from executed prisoners and shares the Parliament's concern on organ trafficking. In its contacts with China, the EU regularly raises the death penalty, the Re-Education through Labour system and treatment of practising Falun Gong members, notably in the EU-China human rights dialogue. The EU stresses its principled opposition to the death penalty and urges China to take all measures to ensure respect for internationally recognised safeguards, including due process rights, in relation to death penalty cases. The EU is particularly concerned at the secrecy which surrounds both death penalty and organ transplant statistics, which makes it impossible to gain an accurate picture of the source of transplanted organs, and at allegations that many organs are harvested from prisoners in Re-Education through Labour camps.

It is recognised that a good way of fighting organ trafficking is to increase the number of available organs. Therefore the HR/VP welcomes the recent announcement by the Chinese Government that the practice will be stopped and genuine voluntary organ donations will be encouraged. Indeed China has adopted a regulation on human organ transplants which came into effect on 1st July 2006, which requires the written agreement of the donor. However, the regulation does not adequately address the issue of donor consent, especially for those who have died in custody or have been executed. The EU has already addressed this point in the framework of past rounds of the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue and will continue to do so. The EU also continues to call on China to end the system of Re-Education through Labour and to ensure that no-one is placed in detention without a trial.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009104/12
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(10 octobre 2012)

Objet: Développement d'une filière européenne des hydroliennes

Le développement des énergies marines renouvelables est amené à contribuer à la diversification des approvisionnements énergétiques de l'Union européenne. En effet, l'énergie cinétique des courants de marée a l'avantage d'être parfaitement prévisible des années à l'avance et présente aussi l'intérêt d'être très performante, grâce à la densité élevée de l'eau.

Des progrès importants ont été enregistrés ces deux dernières années au Royaume-Uni, en France et dans le monde, qui tendent à démontrer la viabilité technico-économique nécessaire à la pré-commercialisation de la technologie hydrolienne. Cette technologie présente, en outre, un intérêt en matière de compétitivité à l'exportation comme en témoigne le succès du système hydrolien italien Enermar, développé dans le détroit de Messine et exporté en Asie avec le soutien le soutien financier de l'Organisation des Nations unies pour le développement industriel (ONUDI).

Dans sa communication de juin 2012 intitulée «Énergies renouvelables: un acteur de premier plan sur le marché européen de l'énergie» (COM(2012)271), la Commission souligne, sans citer expressément les hydroliennes, que les «autres technologies sont encore récentes et peuvent nécessiter un soutien pour que les énergies renouvelables jouent le rôle accru qui leur est assigné pour l'avenir (…). Il semblerait que les technologies marines, le stockage de l'énergie, les matériaux et la fabrication avancées pour les technologies liées aux énergies renouvelables devraient être placés plus haut dans la hiérarchie des priorités pour la recherche future».

— Comment la Commission compte-t-elle accompagner le développement de l'énergie hydrolienne dans le cadre du plan stratégique européen pour les technologies énergétiques (plan SET) et du futur programme de recherche «Horizon 2020»?

— La Commission a-t-elle réalisé une étude sur le potentiel européen des courants marins? A-t-elle établi une cartographie des zones possibles d'installations des hydroliennes? A-t-elle réalisé des études de prospective sur le développement d'une filière européenne des hydroliennes sous-marines qui soit innovante, créatrice d'emplois et compétitive à l'exportation?

— La Commission coopère-t-elle avec l'État français qui a lancé une feuille de route pour le développement de l'énergie hydrolienne en mars 2012 et confié une mission d'étude à RTE (Réseau de transport d'électricité) sur les conditions de raccordement des hydroliennes et l'articulation entre le réseau offshore et le réseau terrestre?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(28 novembre 2012)

Comme elle l'a indiqué dans sa communication de juin 2012 ([1]), la Commission estime que certaines énergies renouvelables, telles que l'énergie marine, sont encore à un stade de développement relativement précoce et nécessiteront probablement la mise en place à long terme d'un cadre favorable au soutien public.

En ce qui concerne le plan SET, l'énergie marine bénéficie de soutien dans le cadre d'un programme commun spécifique, axé sur les projets de R&D à plus long terme, de l'alliance européenne de la recherche dans le domaine de l'énergie (EERA — European Energy Research Alliance), établie conformément au plan SET. Toutefois, l'opportunité de créer une initiative industrielle européenne pour ce type d'énergie, toujours dans le cadre du plan SET, est actuellement étudiée. À l'heure actuelle, l'énergie éolienne et six autres technologies renouvelables ou secteurs connexes font l'objet de telles initiatives. En 2013, la Commission entend publier une communication sur les technologies énergétiques afin d'identifier les besoins et les défis à venir en matière de recherche et de développement, conformément aux priorités définies dans le programme de recherche «Horizon 2020». Cette communication portera sur l'énergie marine et sur toutes les autres technologies renouvelables et à faible émission de carbone.

([1]) «Énergies renouvelables: un acteur de premier plan sur le marché européen de l'énergie», COM(2012) 271 final.

Divers aspects de l'énergie marine ont déjà fait l'objet d'études, menées directement pour le compte de la Commission ou dans le cadre de projets financés par le programme «Énergie Intelligente — Europe» ou le 7e programme-cadre de recherche ([2]). En outre, la Commission a récemment énoncé, dans sa communication sur la croissance bleue ([3]), les conclusions qu'elle tire de l'une de ces études. Dans ce document, la Commission cite l'énergie marine parmi les domaines prometteurs en termes de croissance économique à long terme et d'emplois durables et elle annonce son intention de traiter les questions relatives aux énergies renouvelables marines dans une communication en 2013.

À cet égard, la Commission poursuivra également sa coopération avec les États membres intéressés par la poursuite du développement de l'énergie marine, tels que la France.

([2]) Voir, par exemple, les études présentées sur les pages suivantes: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/maritimeforum/content/2946, http://www.orecca.eu/documents, ou encore sur la page http://setis.ec.europa.eu/newsroom-items-folder/the-si-ocean-project-strategic-initiative-for-ocean-energy-development, consacrée à un projet en cours.

([3]) Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen, au Conseil, au Comité économique et social européen et au Comité des régions, «La croissance bleue: des possibilités de croissance durable dans les secteurs marin et maritime», COM(2012) 494 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009104/12
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Development of a European marine power industry

The development of renewable marine power aims to help diversify the EU's sources of energy supply. The advantage of the kinetic energy generated by tides is that it can be estimated years in advance and is also very effective, thanks to the high density of the water.

Significant progress has been made in the last two years in the United Kingdom and France and elsewhere in the world, showing that marine power technology is now sufficiently technically and economically viable to proceed to the pre-commercialisation stage. That technology has also shown itself to be competitive in export terms, as has been shown by the success of the Italian ENERMAR marine power system developed in the Straits of Messina and exported to Asia with the financial support of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO).

In its communication of June 2012 entitled 'Renewable Energy: a major player in the European energy market' (COM(2012)271), the Commission stressed, without expressly referring to marine power, that 'Other technologies are still young and may need support for renewable energy to play its expected, expanded role in the future (…). It would appear that notably ocean technologies, energy storage, advanced materials and manufacturing for renewable energy technologies need to be given higher priority in future research.'

— How does the Commission intend to support the development of marine power as part of the EU's strategic energy technology plan (the SET-Plan) and the future Horizon 2020 research programme?

— Has it conducted a survey on Europe's sea current potential? Has it mapped potential sites for marine power facilities? Has it conducted exploratory studies into the development of a European sub-surface marine power industry that is innovative, creates jobs and whose exports would be competitive?

— Is it working in cooperation with the French State, which published a roadmap for the development of marine power in March 2012 and has commissioned a study from the French energy distribution network (RTE) on the connection requirements for marine power facilities and the interface between the offshore network and land-based network?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2012)

As stated in its communication of June 2012 ([1]), the Commission is of the opinion that some renewable energy technologies such as ocean energy are still at a relatively early stage of development and are likely to need a positive framework for public support well into the future.

As regards the SET plan, ocean energy receives support as part of a dedicated Joint Programme within the SET Plan European Energy Research Alliance (EERA) focusing on longer term R R&D D projects. However, discussions are currently taking place to investigate the scope for a SET Plan European Industrial Initiative (EII). Today, wind energy and six other renewable technologies or associated sectors are included as EIIs. The Commission intends to publish a communication on energy technology in 2013 in order to identify future R R&D D needs and challenges in line with the priorities identified in Horizon 2020. This communication will cover ocean energy together with all renewable and low-carbon technologies.

A number of studies covering various aspects of ocean energy have been conducted, either directly on behalf of the Commission or as part of projects financed under the Intelligent Energy Europe or the 7th Research Framework Programme ([2]). Moreover, the Commission has recently summarised its conclusions from some of these studies in its Blue Growth Communication ([3]). While identifying ocean energy as a promising area in terms of sustainable economic growth and employment, it has also announced that it intends to address ocean renewable energy issues in a communication in 2013.

In this context the Commission will also further pursue its ongoing contact with Member States, such as France, interested in the continuing development of ocean energy.

([1]) 'Renewable Energy: a major player in the European energy market' (COM(2012)271 final).

([2]) See for example the studies under https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/maritimeforum/content/2946, http://www.orecca.eu/documents, or http://setis.ec.europa.eu/newsroom-items-folder/the-si-ocean-project-strategic-initiative-for-ocean-energy-development for an ongoing project.

([3]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Blue Growth. Opportunities for marine and maritime sustainable growth, COM(2012) 494 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009105/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Glenis Willmott (S&D)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU funding under FP7 and Israeli settlements

I have been contacted recently by a number of constituents concerned about the possibility that FP7 funding could be indirectly supporting firms operating in illegal Israeli settlements. In particular, many are concerned by reports about funding that has been provided to the Ahava company.

In its answer to Written Question E-007464/2011 by Alexandra Thein and others, the Commission states that it is 'not aware of any provision of EC law that obliges it not to fund activities under an FP7 project carried out in Israeli settlements that have been established in the occupied territories.'

Regardless of a lack of legal obligation, given that Israeli settlements in occupied territories are deemed illegal under international law, can the Commission confirm whether there is any agreed EU policy on the funding of activities carried out in these settlements, or by companies based in such settlements?

Furthermore, can the Commission confirm whether there is any basis in EC law for Member States to exclude from participation in tendering processes those companies operating in illegal Israeli settlements or using products originating from them?

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

The answers to the inquiries from the Honourable Member are provided in previous replies to written questions E-007066/2012 and E-007505/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009106/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(10 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Uso de fondos europeos en la construcción de un centro de acogida de animales en Galicia

La Diputación de Pontevedra, en Galicia, está proyectando un servicio de recogida de animales abandonados a diversos Ayuntamientos que comprendan una población total de casi un millón de habitantes. Este servicio, a través de un convenio que restringirá ciertas competencias de los municipios, se realizará en torno a unas instalaciones proyectadas con una capacidad máxima de 500 animales.

Este proyecto de perrera, financiada gracias al programa Proder, es difícil que logre mantener un índice de ocupación inferior al 100 %, cuando en el territorio de la provincia se abandonan cada año miles de animales, entre perros, gatos y cada vez más, especies exóticas. De acuerdo con el Tratado de Lisboa, los Estados miembros han adquirido un deber moral con todos los seres vivos, ya que a partir de este momento se les reconocen ciertos aspectos que antes no se tenían en cuenta. Por ello, resulta paradójico que se acabe financiando con fondos comunitarios lo que puede ser la mayor perrera del sur de Europa, un espacio donde primará el sacrificio de los propios animales abandonados, ya que no existe la previsión de impulsar ni un tejido asociativo ni acciones de sensibilización y concienciación en los municipios que se adhieran al convenio de recogida de seres vivos. Unas instalaciones financiadas con fondos comunitarios no pueden convertirse en un centro de exterminio de animales sanos. Es preciso avanzar hacia programas e iniciativas que primen el bienestar animal y la salud humana, que se dirijan a la base de la promoción de la adopción y métodos como la esterilización para atajar el problema que representa el abandono de animales.

— ¿Tiene constancia la Comisión Europea del uso de fondos comunitarios para la construcción de una perrera en la provincia de Pontevedra? En caso positivo, ¿cuál ha sido la aportación comunitaria? En caso negativo, ¿por qué la Diputación de Pontevedra anuncia tal desembolso e incluye a las instituciones comunitarias?

— ¿Considera la Comisión adecuado promover políticas de exterminio de animales domésticos sanos en lugar de promocionar medidas alternativas y respetuosas con los animales abandonados?

— Siendo el bienestar animal uno de los principios de la política de la Unión, ¿considera la Comisión necesaria la adopción de nuevas medidas para mejorar el bienestar de los animales domésticos, y sobre todo de aquellos que son abandonados?

Respuesta del Sr. Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(3 de diciembre de 2012)

Remitimos a Su Señoría a las respuestas a las preguntas escritas E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-009002/2011 y E-002062/2012 ([1]), en las que se abordan las cuestiones de los perros vagabundos y la gestión de la población de perros.

La Comisión no tiene conocimiento de que exista ninguna financiación específica de la UE para construir refugios en España, y no hay ninguna normativa de la UE sobre bienestar de los animales que regule la tenencia de perros, gatos y animales exóticos abandonados.

La Comisión no tiene ninguna función específica en relación con la forma en que las autoridades nacionales competentes gestionan los refugios para animales.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009106/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Use of EU funds to build an animal shelter in Galicia

The council of Pontevedra in Galicia is planning to set up a collection service for abandoned animals covering several municipalities that together have a combined population of almost one million inhabitants. Under an agreement that will restrict some of the competences of the municipalities, the collection service will be run in conjunction with an animal shelter that has a planned maximum capacity of 500 animals.

It is difficult for the animal shelter — which was financed by the Proder scheme — to maintain an occupation rate of below 100% given that thousands of animals — from dogs and cats to a growing number of exotic species — are abandoned every year across the province. Since the Lisbon Treaty, Member States have had a moral duty towards all living creatures, given that at that time, certain features of animals that had previously not been taken into account were recognised for the first time. For this reason, it seems paradoxical that EU funds have been used to complete what might be the largest animal shelter in southern Europe. Euthanasia of abandoned animals will prevail at this shelter given that there is no plan to promote a network of associations or run a public awareness campaign in the municipalities that decide to enter into this agreement on the collection of living creatures. Facilities built with EU funds should not be converted into extermination centres for healthy animals. Instead, schemes and initiatives that prioritise animal welfare and human health, and which are based on promoting adoption and other methods such as neutering in order to control the problem of animal abandonment, should be encouraged.

— Is the Commission aware that EU funds have been used to build an animal shelter in the province of Pontevedra? If so, how much EU funding has the shelter received? If not, why does the council of Pontevedra claim to have received such funding from the EU institutions?

— Does the Commission believe that it is appropriate to support the extermination of healthy pets instead of promoting alternative, kinder methods of dealing with abandoned animals?

— Given that animal welfare is a principle of EU policy, does the Commission believe that new measures to improve the welfare of domestic animals, especially those which have been abandoned, should be adopted?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2012)

The Honourable Member is invited to refer to the answers to written questions E-006543/2011, E-007161/2011, E-009002/2011and E-002062/2012 ([1]) which address the issues of stray dogs and of dog population management.

The Commission is not aware of specific EU funding for shelters in Spain and there is no EU welfare rule that governs the keeping of abandoned dogs, cats and exotics.

The Commission has no specific role regarding the way animal shelters are managed by the national competent authorities.

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

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009107/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(10. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Ist die Demokratie in Südeuropa in Gefahr?

Bei dem Projekt der Europäischen Union als solchem dachten die Gründerväter an Frieden und wirtschaftliche Integration.

Die jüngsten Demonstrationen in Spanien gegen die Sparmaßnahmen sowie der Generalstreik letzte Woche in Griechenland zeigten einen klaren Bruch.

1. Ist der Kommission diese Entwicklung bekannt, und wie bewertet sie sie?

2. Ist die Kommission bereit, in diesen von der Krise betroffenen Ländern Kampagnen und Initiativen einzuleiten, um das Bewusstsein der Menschen im Hinblick auf ein verstärkt proaktives Verhalten und mehr eigenständiges Handeln zu schärfen, um so einen aktiven Beitrag zu ihren Lebensbedingungen und ihrem Wohlergehen in der Europäischen Union zu leisten?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(3. Dezember 2012)

Die Kommission unterstützt aktiv alle EU-Mitgliedstaaten bei der Förderung ihres Wachstumspotenzials. Sie hat die Demonstrationen und Streiks zur Kenntnis genommen. Friedliche Demonstrationen und Streiks gelten in demokratischen Staaten als legitime Maßnahmen. Eine Reihe von Mitgliedstaaten führt derzeit ehrgeizige Strukturreformen durch, die sich an den Empfehlungen der Kommission und des Rates orientieren. Dieser Prozess ist möglicherweise schwierig, dient jedoch dem Ziel, mehr Wachstum und haushaltspolitische Stabilität für die Zukunft zu gewährleisten. Dies wird auch finanziell durch den Einsatz von EU-Programmen unterstützt.

Die Kommission befindet sich ferner mit den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern im Gespräch, hört auf ihre Erwartungen und ermutigt sie, sich EU-weit stärker politisch zu engagieren.

So wurde 2013 zum Europäischen Jahr der Bürgerinnen und Bürger ([1]) erklärt: Dieses Europäische Jahr bietet den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern Gelegenheit zum EU-weiten Engagement im demokratischen Leben. Es wurde ein Bündnis zivilgesellschaftlicher Organisationen gebildet, das die Debatte befeuern und die Aktionen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger in allen EU-Mitgliedstaaten unterstützen soll; es tritt ferner das gesamte Jahr 2013 über als strategischer Partner der Kommission auf. Darüber hinaus organisiert die Kommission eine Reihe von Bürgerdialogen, in denen Bürgerinnen und Bürger aus allen Gesellschaftsschichten mit Politikern jeder Couleur zusammentreffen, um offen über die besten Strategien für die Zukunft zu diskutieren.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-1253_de.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009107/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Is democracy in danger in southern Europe?

The project of the European Union per se was conceived by its founders as one of peace and economic integration.

The recent protests in Spain against austerity measures, as well as the general strike last week in Greece, have pointed to clear signs of fracture.

1. Is the Commission aware of these developments, and how does it evaluate them?

2. Is the Commission willing to launch campaigns and initiatives in these afflicted countries in order to raise people's awareness of possible forms of more proactive behaviour and autonomous action which could constitute active contributions to their lifestyle and wellbeing within the European Union?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2012)

The Commission actively supports all EU Member States in strengthening their growth potential. It has taken note of demonstrations and strikes. Peaceful demonstrations and strikes are legitimate actions in democratic societies. A number of Member States currently carry out ambitious structural reforms in line with the recommendations by the Commission and the Council. This process can be difficult but serves the goal of more growth and economic and budgetary stability in the future. The use of EU programmes support this also financially.

The Commission also communicates with citizens, listens to their expectations and encourages their engagement in EU political life.

For example, 2013 will be the European Year of Citizens ([1]): The European Year will provide opportunities for citizens' engagement in the EU democratic life. An alliance of civil society organisations which aims at stimulating debate and action of citizens across all EU Member States has been formed and will be a strategic partner of the Commission throughout the year. The Commission also brings citizens from all walks of life and politicians of all levels together in a series of citizen's dialogues to have open debates about the best course for the future.

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-1253_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009108/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(10. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Generalstreiks in Griechenland wirken sich auch auf den Reiseverkehr aus

Am 3.10.2012 findet in Griechenland zum zweiten Mal innerhalb von fünf Monaten ein Generalstreik statt, von welchem auch der Reiseverkehr betroffen sein wird.

1. Kann die Kommission abschätzen, welche langfristigen wirtschaftlichen Auswirkungen diese Streiks auf den Fremdenverkehr haben werden? (Bitte um ausführliche Darlegung)

2. Welche Maßnahmen empfiehlt die Kommission Griechenland, damit sich diese Streiks nicht doppelt auswirken — auf den griechischen und auf den europäischen Fremdenverkehr?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(6. Dezember 2012)

1. Eine Einschätzung der langfristigen wirtschaftlichen Gesamtfolgen von Streiks ist mit einer hohen Unsicherheit behaftet und stark davon abhängig, von welchen Annahmen man ausgeht und ob die verschiedenen möglichen indirekten Auswirkungen von Streiks berücksichtigt werden oder nicht. Generell bedeutet ein Streik Arbeitsausfall und entspricht somit einer Zeit ohne wirtschaftliche Tätigkeit und ohne Produktion. Im Bereich des Tourismus, den die Frau Abgeordnete anspricht, können Streiks, die für bestimmte Regionen und Zeiträume erwartet werden, potenzielle Reisende davon abhalten, eine Reise bzw. einen Urlaubsaufenthalt in diesen Regionen bzw. während dieser Zeiträume anzutreten.

2. Das Streikrecht ([1]) und die Bedingungen seiner Ausübung fallen in den Zuständigkeitsbereich der Mitgliedstaaten. Die Kommission äußert sich daher nicht zu dieser Frage.

Grundsätzlich ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass die Förderung des sozialen Dialogs zwischen Arbeitgebern und Arbeitnehmern sowie die Einbeziehung der Sozialpartner zur Sicherung des Arbeitsfriedens von großem Nutzen sein kann. Im Einklang mit Artikel 152 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union ist die Union der Förderung der Rolle der Sozialpartner und des sozialen Dialogs auf Ebene der Union verpflichtet. Sie berücksichtigt dabei die Unterschiedlichkeit der nationalen Systeme.

([1]) Art. 28 der Charta der Grundrechte der Europäischen Union: „Die Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer sowie die Arbeitgeberinnen und Arbeitgeber oder ihre jeweiligen Organisationen haben nach dem Unionsrecht und den einzelstaatlichen Rechtsvorschriften und Gepflogenheiten das Recht, Tarifverträge auf den geeigneten Ebenen auszuhandeln und zu schließen sowie bei Interessenkonflikten kollektive Maßnahmen zur Verteidigung ihrer Interessen, einschließlich Streiks, zu ergreifen“.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009108/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: General strikes in Greece affect travel

On 3 October 2012 a general strike is to take place in Greece for the second time in five months, and travel will be one of the sectors affected.

1. Can the Commission assess (and indicate in detail) the likely long-term economic effects of these strikes on tourism?

2. What measures does the Commission recommend that Greece take to prevent these strikes affecting both Greek and European tourism?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2012)

1. Estimating the full long-term economic effects of strikes is subject to very high uncertainty and would always be very sensitive to the assumptions used in such an exercise and to the consideration or not of the various possible indirect effects of strikes. However, in general, it can be said that strikes represent missed days of work and thereby of no activity and of no production. In the particular case of tourism that the Honourable Member of the European Parliament mentioned, expectation of strikes in certain regions and periods of time may deter potential tourists from traveling to or holidaying in those regions in those periods.

2. The right to strike ([1]) and the conditions under which it can be exercised are a matter of competence of the individual Member States. Thus, the Commission shall not comment on those matters on this occasion.

As a general guideline, the Commission is of the view that promoting social dialogue between management and labour, and enhancing the participation of social partners can go a long way to ensuring industrial peace. In line with Article 152 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the Union is, committed to promote the role of social partners and their dialogue at EU level, taking into account the diversity of national systems.

([1]) Art. 28 Charter: 'Workers and employers, or their respective organisations, have, in accordance with Union law and national laws and practices, the right to negotiate and conclude collective agreements at the appropriate levels and, in cases of conflicts of interest, to take collective action to defend their interests, including strike action.'.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009109/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(10 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Intervento dell'UE sulle malattie infettive nelle carceri europee

Uno studio dell'Istituto nazionale per la promozione della salute delle popolazioni migranti e per il contrasto delle malattie della povertà (INMP) denuncia che, a livello internazionale, il tasso di HIV fra i detenuti è del 7,9 % e quello dell'epatite C del 38 %. Sono in aumento anche l'epatite B, pari al 7 % e la tubercolosi, pari al 6,9 %. Sono registrati inoltre casi di sifilide, soprattutto tra i detenuti provenienti dai paesi dell'est Europa.

Come valuta la Commissione questi dati, anche in relazione alla presenza nelle carceri di un elevato numero di detenuti extraeuropei?

Quali misure intende intraprendere per debellare queste malattie, o perlomeno diminuirne i tassi, fra i detenuti nelle carceri europee?

Risposta di Maros Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(29 novembre 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza delle disparità sanitarie che si registrano in contesto carcerario nell'UE, in particolare per quanto concerne le percentuali di malattie infettive quali HIV, epatite B e C, tubercolosi e sifilide.

Nell'UE, le disposizioni in tema di sanità, comprese quelle che si applicano nelle prigioni, sono di competenza degli Stati membri dell'UE. La Commissione, assieme alle pertinenti agenzie esecutive, in particolare il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie e l'Osservatorio europeo delle droghe e delle tossicodipendenze, coadiuva gli Stati membri nel promuovere l'equità nell'accesso ai test, alla prevenzione, al trattamento e alle cure attraverso i suoi programmi specifici. Il monitoraggio e la sorveglianza di queste malattie rientra nel campo di attività della Rete comunitaria per le malattie trasmissibili (decisione 2119/98).

La comunicazione della Commissione sulla lotta contro l'HIV/AIDS nell'UE e nei paesi vicini 2009 — 2013 ([1]) e il piano d'azione che l'accompagna ribadiscono ulteriormente la necessità di misure efficaci per la riduzione del danno al fine di prevenire l'HIV e la tubercolosi e di offrire un trattamento per le infezioni multiple anche in ambiente carcerario e in altri ambiti particolari.

L'attuale piano d'azione dell'UE in materia di lotta contro la droga 2009-2012 ([2]) fa dell'accesso all'assistenza sanitaria per i tossicodipendenti nelle carceri un obiettivo a livello europeo. La Commissione finanzia inoltre diversi progetti legati alla sanità carceraria nell'ambito del suo programma Salute e del programma di Prevenzione e informazione in materia di droga.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_threats/com/aids/docs/com2009_en.pdf
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:326:0007:0025:it:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009109/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: EU action on infectious diseases in European prisons

According to a study by the Italian National Institute for Health, Migration and Poverty (NIHMP), the HIV rate among international prison inmates is 7.9% and the hepatitis C rate is 38%. Hepatitis B and tuberculosis, 7% and 6.9% respectively, are also on the increase. Cases of syphilis have also been recorded, particularly among inmates from eastern European countries.

What is the Commission's view of these figures, taking into account the high number of inmates from outside the EU?

What will it do to eradicate these diseases, or at least reduce them, among inmates in EU prisons?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the health inequities in prison settings in the EU, in particular as relates to the rates of infectious diseases such as HIV, Hepatitis B and C, tuberculosis as well as syphilis.

In the EU, provision of healthcare, including in prisons, falls within the competence of EU Member States. The Commission, together with the relevant executive agencies, in particular the European Centre for Disease prevention and Control and the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, supports Member States in promoting an equal level of access to testing, prevention, treatment and care via its dedicated programmes. Monitoring and surveillance of these diseases is covered by the Community Network on Communicable diseases (Decision 2119/1198).

The Commission Communication on combating HIV/AIDS in the EU and neighbouring countries 2009 — 2013 ([1]) and its accompanying action plan, further stress the need for effective harm reduction measures to prevent HIV and tuberculosis and to provide co-infection treatment including in prisons and other particular settings.

In addition, the current EU Action Plan on Drugs 2009-2012 ([2]) defines access to healthcare for drug users in prison as an objective at European level. Furthermore, the Commission is funding several projects related to prison health under its Health Programme and Drug Prevention and Information Programme.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_threats/com/aids/docs/com2009_en.pdf
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:326:0007:0025:en:PDF.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-009110/12
à la Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(10 octobre 2012)

Objet: Accord de pêche avec le Maroc

Le 14 décembre 2011, le Parlement européen, réuni en session plénière, a décidé de ne pas reconduire l'accord de pêche existant entre le Maroc et l'Union européenne en raison du différend sur la couverture, par l'accord, de la zone de pêche située au large du Sahara marocain. Depuis, les navires battant pavillon de l'UE ne peuvent plus pêcher dans les eaux marocaines. Aujourd'hui, la Commission européenne tente de reprendre les négociations.

Sur ce point, la Commission européenne pourrait-elle répondre aux questions suivantes:

1. Où en sont les discussions exploratoires et quand la Commission compte-t-elle débuter les négociations?

2. Le 19 septembre 2012, un accord pour entamer les négociations sur un nouvel accord de pêche aurait été trouvé entre les représentants du gouvernement du Maroc et ceux de la Commission européenne. Dans cet accord, il était convenu de faire mention de lasituation des droits de l'Homme au Maroc, en soulignant la bonne volonté du Royaumedu Maroc sur cette question. La Commission pourrait-elle indiquer pourquoi les négociations n'ont toujours pas débuté?

3. La Commission n'estime-t-elle pas qu'il est dangereux, pour la pêche européenne, deperdre une importante zone de pêche au profit de la Chine et la Russie?

Réponse donnée par Mme Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(26 novembre 2012)

À la suite de la visite au Maroc en avril 2012 du membre de la Commission chargé de la pêche et des affaires maritimes, la Commission a mené des pourparlers exploratoires avec les autorités marocaines en vue d'une réouverture des négociations relatives au renouvellement du protocole à l'accord de partenariat dans le secteur de la pêche entre l'UE et le Maroc.

Sur la base de principes communs adoptés au cours de ces pourparlers, les parties ont tenu un premier cycle de négociations à Rabat les 8 et 9 novembre 2012.

Dans le cadre de ce processus, la Commission recherche les meilleures conditions d'accès possibles pour la flotte de l'UE, dans les conditions et limites fixées par le Conseil dans ses directives de négociation.

Le premier cycle de pourparlers officiels s'est déroulé dans un esprit constructif. Les parties sont convenues d'aller rapidement de l'avant, une seconde réunion étant prévue en principe pour la mi-décembre 2012 à Bruxelles.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009110/12
to the Commission
Gilles Pargneaux (S&D)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Fisheries agreement with Morocco

On 14 December 2011 the European Parliament, meeting in plenary session, decided not to renew the existing fisheries agreement between Morocco and the European Union in the light of the dispute concerning the coverage or otherwise by the agreement of the fishing area off the coast of Moroccan Sahara. Since then, EU vessels have no longer been able to fish in Moroccan waters. The Commission is now seeking a resumption of the negotiations.

1. What stage has been reached in the exploratory talks and when does the Commission expect the negotiations to start?

2. On 19 September 2012 an agreement to open negotiations on a new fisheries agreement was reportedly reached between the representatives of the Moroccan Government and the Commission. It was agreed that reference would be made to the human rights situation in Morocco, emphasising the Kingdom of Morocco's commitment to protecting human rights. Could the Commission state why negotiations have still not started?

3. Does the Commission not take the view that losing an important fishing area to China and Russia would be harmful to the European fishing industry?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

Following the visit of the Member of the Commission responsible for Fisheries and Maritime Affairs to Morocco in April 2012, the Commission has conducted exploratory talks with the Moroccan authorities in view of re-opening negotiations for the renewal of the protocol to the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the EU and Morocco.

Building on common principles agreed during these talks, the parties held a first round of negotiations in Rabat on 8 and 9 November 2012.

In the process, the Commission is seeking the best possible access conditions for the EU fleet, within the conditions and limits set down by the Council in its negotiation directives.

The first round of official talks was held in a constructive spirit. Parties agreed to move on quickly, with a second meeting tentatively scheduled for mid-December 2012 in Brussels.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-009111/12
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(10 octobre 2012)

Objet: Règlementation sur le traitement des cendres issues de la combustion dans les chaudières à bois

1. La Commission pourrait-elle indiquer les règles en vigueur concernant le traitement des cendres issues de la combustion dans les chaudières à bois?

2. À quel type de déchets s'apparentent les cendres issues des fumées?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(19 novembre 2012)

Le traitement des cendres issues de la combustion dans les chaudières à bois doit être conforme aux dispositions en la matière énoncées dans la directive 2008/98/CE ([1]) (directive sur les déchets) et doit s'effectuer sans nuire à l'environnement et/ou à la santé humaine, comme le prévoit l'article 13 de ladite directive.

Selon la hiérarchie des déchets énoncée à l'article 4 de la directive sur les déchets, l'installation doit fonctionner de manière à ne produire aucun déchet ou à ce que ces déchets soient recyclés. Si cela est techniquement et économiquement impossible, les déchets sont éliminés tout en veillant à éviter ou à réduire l'incidence sur l'environnement. Dans le cas particulier des grandes installations de combustion d'une puissance thermique nominale d'au moins 50 MW, les exigences prévues dans la directive 2008/1/CE ([2]) (directive relative à la prévention et à la réduction intégrées de la pollution) s'appliquent.

La composition des cendres varie selon que ces dernières résultent de la combustion du bois seul ou de celui-ci et d'autres formes de biomasse (tourbe) ou des déchets de bois issus de la démolition. De manière générale, les cendres du bois contiennent principalement du carbonate de calcium, de la potasse et du phosphate. Si la composition est optimale, les cendres peuvent être utilisées comme matériau ou adjuvant dans le secteur de la construction et des matériaux de construction.

Les cendres peuvent être considérées comme des sous-produits si les conditions cumulées énoncées à l'article 5 de la directive sur les déchets sont réunies.

([1]) JO L 312 du 22.11.2008.
([2]) JO L 309 du 27.11.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009111/12
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Rules on the treatment of ash from wood-fired boilers

1. Could the Commission outline the rules in force on the treatment of ash from wood-fired boilers?

2. What category of waste does this ash fall into?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(19 November 2012)

The treatment of ashes resulting from the combustion of wood in dedicated plants must comply with the relevant provisions laid down in Directive 2008/98/EC (Waste Framework Directive — WFD) and must be carried out without endangering the environment and/or human health, as provided in Article 13 of the WFD.

According to the waste hierarchy set out in Article 4 of the WFD, the installation shall operate so that it does not generate waste, or that this waste is recovered. Where that is technically and economically impossible, it is disposed of while avoiding or reducing any impact on the environment. In the specific case of large combustion plants with a rated thermal input of at least 50 MW, the requirements laid down in Directive 2008/1/EC (Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive — IPPCD) apply.

The composition of the ashes depends on whether wood is combusted alone or together with other biomass (e.g. peat) or wood waste from demolition. Generally, wood ash contains mainly calcium carbonate, potash, and phosphate. Where the composition is optimal, the ashes can be used as a material or an additive in the construction and building material industry.

Ashes can qualify as by-products where the cumulative conditions set out in Article 5 of the WFD are met.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009112/12
à Comissão
Ana Gomes (S&D)
(10 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Transparência ao longo da cadeia de abastecimento de minérios provenientes de zonas de conflito

Numa Comunicação, de janeiro de 2012, sobre comércio e desenvolvimento (COM(2012)0022), a Comissão afirma que explorará «formas de melhorar a transparência ao longo de toda a cadeia de abastecimento, incluindo os aspetos de devida diligência», com base num compromisso anterior contido na sua estratégia para a Europa no domínio das matérias-primas (COM(2011)0025), em que propõe «analisar formas de aumentar a transparência ao longo da cadeia de aprovisionamento e combater, em coordenação com os principais parceiros comerciais, as situações em que as receitas provenientes das indústrias extrativas são utilizadas para financiar guerras ou conflitos internos».

A base para esta proposta da UE foi preparada pela Organização de Cooperação e de Desenvolvimento Económicos (OCDE). Em consulta com a indústria, os governos e a sociedade civil, a OCDE elaborou um guia sobre a devida diligência para cadeias de abastecimento responsável de minérios provenientes de zonas de conflito e de alto risco, o qual foi publicado em 2010. Na sua Comunicação de janeiro de 2012, a Comissão comprometeu-se a dar «maior apoio e utilização» a estas normas de devida diligência.

Pode a Comissão indicar de que forma controla e avalia o cumprimento das normas de devida diligência da OCDE:

— por parte de empresas europeias que comercializam ou utilizam nos seus processos de fabrico algumas ou a totalidade das seguintes substâncias: estanho, tântalo, tungsténio e ouro;

— por parte de empresas que importam estes minérios para a UE?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(10 de dezembro de 2012)

Na sua Comunicação sobre matérias-primas, a Comissão propôs «analisar formas de aumentar a transparência ao longo da cadeia de aprovisionamento e combater, em coordenação com os principais parceiros comerciais, as situações em que as receitas provenientes das indústrias extrativas são utilizadas para financiar as guerras ou conflitos internos».

A Comissão colabora estreitamente nos esforços desenvolvidos pela OCDE para dar resposta ao problema dos «minérios de conflito» e apoia veementemente as orientações da OCDE sobre o dever de diligência (DDG ([1])) para cadeias de abastecimento responsável de minérios provenientes de zonas de conflito e de alto risco.

A Comissão não só participa nos trabalhos do grupo de peritos da CIRGL ([2])-OCDE-ONU sobre o dever de diligência para o aprovisionamento responsável nas cadeias de abastecimento de estanho, tântalo, tungsténio e ouro como incentiva a indústria a aplicar as orientações.

No âmbito do relatório anual dos pontos de contacto nacionais, a Comissão informa anualmente a Comissão de Investimento da OCDE sobre a aplicação das DDG.

A Comissão está inclusive a ponderar a possibilidade de financiamento de apoio à aplicação das DDG da OCDE, ao abrigo da componente de preparação para situações de crise do Instrumento de Estabilidade

A *task force* internacional sobre a exploração e o comércio ilegais de recursos naturais na região dos Grandes Lagos foi reativada em 22 de maio de 2012, facultando assim uma plataforma de discussão à comunidade internacional e ao Secretariado da OCDE.

Por último, em 25 de outubro de 2011, a Comissão adotou uma nova estratégia europeia em matéria de RSE ([3]), que tomou em consideração importantes princípios e orientações neste domínio acordados a nível internacional, tais como as orientações da OCDE para as empresas multinacionais e os princípios orientadores das Nações Unidas sobre as empresas e os direitos humanos. No sítio Web da Comissão estão disponíveis mais orientações sobre o instrumento da OCDE de sensibilização para os riscos, destinado às empresas multinacionais nas zonas de má governação.

([1]) Due Diligence Guidance — orientações sobre o dever de diligência.
([2]) Conferência Internacional sobre a Região dos Grandes Lagos.
([3]) Responsabilidade social das empresas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009112/12
to the Commission
Ana Gomes (S&D)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Transparency throughout the supply chain of minerals from conflict zones

A January 2012 trade and development communication (COM(2012)0022) stated that the Commission would 'explore ways of improving transparency throughout the supply chain, including aspects of due diligence', building upon an earlier commitment contained in its raw materials strategy for Europe (COM(2011)0025) that proposed to 'examine ways to improve transparency throughout the supply chain and tackle in coordination with key trade partners situations where revenues from extractive industries are used to fund wars or internal conflicts'.

The groundwork for such an EU proposal has been laid by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). In consultation with industry, governments and civil society, the OECD has developed detailed 'Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas', published in 2010. In its January 2012 communication the Commission committed itself to 'greater support for and use of' these due diligence standards.

Could the Commission outline in what ways it is monitoring and measuring implementation of the OECD due diligence standards

— by European companies trading or using in their manufacturing processes any or all of the following: tin, tantalum, tungsten and gold;

— by companies importing these minerals into the EU?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2012)

In the communication on Raw Materials, the Commission proposed to 'examine ways to improve transparency throughout the supply chain and tackle in coordination with key trade partners situations where revenues from extractive industries are used to fund wars or internal conflicts'.

The Commission is closely involved in OECD efforts to address the issue of conflict minerals and strongly supports the OECD's DDG ([1]) on Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals of Minerals from Conflict-affected and High Risk Areas.

The Commission is involved in the work of the ICGLR ([2])-OECD-UN Group of Experts on Due Diligence for Responsible Sourcing in the 3T and Gold Supply Chains and also encourages the industry to implement the guidance.

As part of the Annual Report of National Contact Points the Commission reports annually to the OECD Investment Committee on the implementation of the OECD DDG.

It is also considering funding, under the Crisis-preparedness Component of the Instrument for Stability, in support of the implementation of the OECD DDG.

The International Taskforce on illegal exploitation and trade of natural resources in the Great Lakes Region was reactivated on 22 May 2012, which provided the international community and the OECD Secretariat with a platform for discussion.

Lastly, on 25 October 2011 the Commission approved a new European Strategy on CSR ([3]), which takes into account the importance of internationally agreed CSR guidelines and principles, such as the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Additional guidance on the OECD Risk Awareness Tool for Multinational Enterprises in Weak Governance Zones is available on the Commission website.

([1]) Due Diligence Guidance.
([2]) International Conference on Great Lakes Region.
([3]) Corporate Social Responsibility.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-009114/12
Komisijai
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(2012 m. spalio 10 d.)

Tema: Bendros žemės ūkio politikos atitiktis pirminei ES teisei

Europos Teisingumo Teismas yra priėmęs sprendimą, kuriame pažymima, kad žemės ūkio situacija naujosiose valstybėse narėse ir valstybėse senbuvėse radikaliai skiriasi, todėl laipsniškas paramos didinimas yra pateisinamas, ypač tiesioginių išmokų srityje.

Ar priėmus Europos Teisingumo Teismo sprendimą įgyvendinta bendra žemės ūkio politika atitinka Lisabonos sutarties 39 straipsnyje numatytus tikslus?

D. Cioloș atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. gruodžio 13 d.)

Sprendime T-333/09, Lenkija prieš Komisiją, į kurį gerbiama narė tikriausiai daro nuorodą ir kuriame Bendrasis Teismas aiškina, kad žemės ūkio padėtis naujosiose valstybėse narėse ir valstybėse narėse senbuvėse iš esmės skiriasi ir kad siekiant netrukdyti jau vykdomo būtino žemės ūkio sektoriaus reorganizavimo naujose valstybėse narėse, Sąjungos parama, ypač tiesioginių paramos schemų srityje, laipsniškai didinama pagrįstai.

Atsižvelgiant į tai, kad Bendrasis Teismas savo sprendime visiškai pritaria laipsniškam tiesioginių išmokų didinimui naujosiose valstybėse narėse, kaip šiuo metu nurodyta Tarybos reglamente (EB) Nr. 73/2009 ([1]), nustatančiame bendrąsias tiesioginės paramos schemų ūkininkams pagal bendrą žemės ūkio politiką taisykles, Komisija daro išvadą, kad bendroji žemės ūkio politika įgyvendinama pagal Sutarties dėl Europos Sąjungos veikimo 39 straipsnį.

([1]) OL L 30, 2009 1 31, p. 16-99.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009114/12
to the Commission
Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Compliance of the common agricultural policy with EU primary law

The European Court of Justice has adopted a ruling indicating that there are radical disparities in the situation of agriculture in the new and old Member States, and that a gradual increase in the amount of support, specifically in the area of direct payments, is therefore justifiable.

Is the common agricultural policy implemented following the ruling adopted by the Court of Justice consistent with the objectives set out in Article 39 of the Treaty of Lisbon?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2012)

The ruling to which the Honourable Member seems to refer is T-333/09, Poland v. Commission, where the General Court explains that the agricultural situation in the new Member States was radically different from the one existing in the old Member States and that, in order not to disturb the necessary reorganisation in progress of the agricultural sector in the new Member States, a gradual introduction of Union aids, in particular of those relating to direct support schemes, was justified.

Given that the General Court fully endorses in its ruling the phasing-in of direct payments in the new Member States, as currently set out in Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 ([1]) establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers under the common agricultural policy, the Commission concludes that the common agricultural policy has been implemented in accordance with Article 39 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

([1]) OJ L 30, 31.1.2009, p. 16-99.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009115/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(10. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Erneuerbare Energien und AKW-Sicherheitsnachrüstungen

Am 4. Oktober 2012 stellte Günther Oettinger, Mitglied der Kommission mit Zuständigkeit für Energie, die Ergebnisse der Stresstests an den europäischen Kernkraftwerken vor, die nach dem Atom-Unfall in Fukushima durchgeführt wurden. Von 145 Reaktoren wurden im Rahmen der Stresstests 54 Reaktoren vor Ort von Experten begutachtet. Bei nahezu allen Reaktoren wurden Sicherheitsmängel und ein Bedarf an Nachrüstung festgestellt. Für die Umsetzung der benötigten Maßnahmen zur Verbesserung der Sicherheit rechnet die Kommission mit einem Investitionsvolumen von 10 bis 25 Milliarden EUR.

1. Kann die Kommission erläutern, welche Investitionskosten sie für jedes einzelne AKW erwartet?

2. Auf welche Berechnungen hat die Kommmission ihre Investitionsannahmen angesichts der Tatsache gestützt, dass im Falle von 91 Reaktoren kein Besuch vor Ort erfolgte?

3. Könnten die Kosten für die erforderlichen Investitionen nach Einschätzung der Kommission noch anwachsen, weil der notwendige Nachrüstungsbedarf bei den nicht besuchten Kraftwerken nicht ebenso exakt eingeschätzt werden kann wie bei den besuchten Kraftwerken?

4. Hat die Kommission analysiert, welche Auswirkungen Investitionen vergleichbarer Größenordnung im Bereich des Ausbaus erneuerbarer Energien haben würden?

5. Wenn ja: Wie viele Kernkraftwerke könnten durch Investitionen von 10 bis 25 Milliarden EUR in die erneuerbaren Energien ersetzt werden?

6. Wenn nein: Warum wurde keine derartige Analyse durchgeführt, und wird die Kommission dies nachholen?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(3. Dezember 2012)

1. Die Kommission verfügt nicht über genaue Zahlen zu den erwarteten Investitionen für jedes einzelne Kraftwerk.

2.-3. Wie in der Mitteilung über die Stresstests ([1]) dargelegt, gründen sich die darin angegebenen Zahlen auf die Schätzungen, die die für nukleare Sicherheit zuständige französische Behörde veröffentlicht hat und die mehr als ein Drittel der Reaktoren in der Europäischen Union betreffen. Für die zusätzlichen sicherheitstechnischen Verbesserungen werden zwischen 30 Mio. EUR und 200 Mio. EUR pro Reaktorblock veranschlagt. Diese Schätzungen müssen allerdings noch in den nationalen Aktionsplänen bestätigt werden, die bis Ende 2012 vorzulegen sind.

Diese Kostenschätzungen haben nichts damit zu tun, ob ein Kraftwerk besichtigt wurde oder nicht.

4.-6. Nein, weil sowohl die Wahl der einzelnen Energieträger als auch die Entscheidung über die allgemeine Struktur der Energieversorgung bei den Mitgliedstaaten liegt und weil privatwirtschaftliche Investitionen in den Energiesektor — sei es nun in Kernenergie oder in erneuerbare oder sonstige Energiequellen — von den betreffenden Unternehmen und nicht von der Kommission beschlossen werden.

([1]) Mitteilung der Kommission an den Rat und das Europäische Parlament über die umfassenden Risiko- und Sicherheitsbewertungen („Stresstests") von Kernkraftwerken in der Europäischen Union und damit verbundene Tätigkeiten, KOM(2012)571 endg.; im Internet abrufbar unter: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/safety/doc/com_2012_0571_de.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009115/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Renewable energies and safety improvements to nuclear power plants

On 4 October 2012, energy commissioner Günther Oettinger presented the findings of the stress conducted on Europe's nuclear power plants following the Fukushima nuclear accident. Experts carried out on-site tests of 54 out of 145 reactors. Almost all reactors were found to have safety failings and to be in need of upgrading. The Commission estimates the investment required for these safety improvements at between EUR 10 and 25 billion.

1. Can the Commission give the expected investment for each plant?

2. On what calculations has the Commission based its investment estimate given that no visit was made to 91 of the reactors?

3. Could the investment estimated by the Commission increase because the costs of updating those plants not visited cannot be estimated as precisely as those visited?

4. Has the Commission examined what impact this level of investment would have in expanding renewable energies?

5. If so: how many nuclear plants could be replaced by renewable energies with an investment of between EUR 10 and 25 billion?

6. If not: why were no studies into this carried out and will the Commission now rectify this?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2012)

1. The Commission does not have precise figures for the expected investment at each plant.

2.-3. As stated in its final Communication on stress tests ([1]), the figures referred to therein are based on the estimates published by the French nuclear safety authority (covering more than one third of the reactors in the European Union (EU)). The cost estimates for the additional safety improvements are in the range of EUR 30 million to EUR 200 million per reactor unit and are subject to confirmation in the national actions plans to be prepared by the end of 2012.

These cost estimates are not related to whether a plant has been visited or not.

4.-6. No, because the choice between different energy resources and the general structure of energy supply is decided by the Member States, and because private investments in the energy sector, whether nuclear energy, renewable or other sources of energy, are decided by the undertakings concerned and not by the Commission.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the Council and the Parliament on the comprehensive risk and safety assessments ('stress tests') of nuclear power plants in the European Union and related activities, COM(2012) 571 final; available at: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/safety/doc/com_2012_0571_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009116/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(10. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Kombination von Energie- und Verkehrsinfrastrukturprojekten

Im Rahmen der transeuropäischen Netze (TEN) werden viele Bahnverkehrsprojekte parallel zu Straßenbauprojekten oder bestehen Straßenverkehrsachsen gebaut. So wird in Deutschland die Neubaustrecke Wendlingen-Ulm in weiten Teilen parallel zur Autobahn A 8 gebaut. In Österreich verläuft der Lückenschluss der Westbahn zwischen St. Pölten und Loosdorf teilweise parallel zur S 33 und zur A 1. Kommissar Oettinger betont regelmäßig die Bedeutung der Energienetze zur Umsetzung einer gemeinsamen europäischen Energieinfrastruktur.

1. Überlegt die Kommission, den Ausbau der europäischen Energieinfrastruktur mit dem Ausbau der Verkehrsinfrastruktur zu kombinieren? Wenn ja, geschieht dies bereits heute im Rahmen konkreter Ausbauprojekte und wo ist dies für zukünftige Projekte im Rahmen der TEN-Netze geplant?

2. Welche Kostenvorteile sieht die Kommission durch die Kombination von Energieinfrastrukturprojekten und Verkehrsinfrastrukturprojekten?

3. Wird die Kommission ein Grünbuch zur Kombination von Infrastrukturprojekten in den Bereichen Verkehr, Energie und Breitband-Telekommunikation erstellen?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(6. Dezember 2012)

1. Die Kommission ist sich bewusst, dass erhebliche Synergien ausgeschöpft werden können, wenn Infrastrukturprojekte in Sektoren wie Verkehr, Energie und/oder Breitband-Telekommunikation kombiniert werden. Im Verordnungsvorschlag zur Fazilität „Connecting Europe", die für diese drei Sektoren gemeinsam eingerichtet werden soll, werden Maßnahmen vorgeschlagen, die Projektträger ermuntern sollen, sektorenübergreifende Synergien zu suchen und auszuschöpfen. Im Falle von sektorenübergreifenden Synergien können die Kofinanzierungsquoten um bis zu 10 Prozentpunkte erhöht werden.

2. Die Kostenvorteile, die sich aus der Kombination von Energie- und Verkehrsinfrastrukturprojekten ergeben können, sind je nach Projekt sehr unterschiedlich.

3. Im März 2007 veröffentlichte die Kommission die Mitteilung „transeuropäische Netze: Entwicklung eines integrierten Konzepts" ([1]), in der unter anderem mögliche Synergien zwischen den drei transeuropäischen Netzen (Energie, Verkehr und Telekommunikation) untersucht wurden.

([1]) KOM(2007)135 endg.; SEK(2007)374.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009116/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Combining energy and transport infrastructure projects

Within the framework of the Trans-European Networks (TENs), many rail transport projects are being carried out parallel to road-building projects or to existing road-transport axes. In Germany, large parts of the new Wendlingen-Ulm line are being constructed parallel to the A 8 motorway. In Austria, parts of the Westbahn completion works between St. Pölten and Loosdorf run parallel to the S 33 and A 1 highways. Commissioner Oettinger regularly underlines the significance of energy networks for implementing a common European energy infrastructure.

1. Is the Commission considering combining the development of European energy infrastructure with that of transport infrastructure? If so, is this already taking place within the current framework of specific development projects and where, in the framework of the TEN networks, is this planned for with regard to future projects?

2. What cost advantages does the Commission see accruing from the combination of energy and transport infrastructure projects?

3. Will the Commission draw up a Green Paper on combining infrastructure projects in the transport, energy and broadband telecommunications sectors?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2012)

1. The Commission recognises that substantial synergies may be explored when combining the development of infrastructure projects in sectors such as transport, energy and/or broadband. The proposed regulation on Connecting Europe Facility, which is common for those three sectors, proposes measures to encourage project promoters to look for and explore the cross-sector synergies. In case of cross-sector synergies the co-financing rates may be increased by up to 10 percentage points.

2. The cost advantages from the combination of energy and transport infrastructure projects will vary substantially between projects.

3. In March 2007 the Commission issued a communication entitled 'Trans-European networks: Towards an integrated approach' (COM(2007) 135 final; SEC(2007) 374) ([1]) which, among other aspects, looked at the possible synergies between the three trans-European networks (energy, transport and telecommunications).

([1]) (COM(2007) 135 final; SEC(2007) 374).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009117/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(10 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Cobro por el uso de todas las carreteras de la UE

El Libro Blanco «Hoja de ruta hacia un espacio único europeo de transporte: por una política de transportes competitiva y sostenible» COM(2011)0144 final fija el «objetivo a largo plazo de cobrar por la utilización de las carreteras a todos los vehículos y en toda la red para reflejar como mínimo el coste de mantenimiento de la infraestructura, la congestión, la contaminación del aire y la contaminación acústica.»

La Comisión ha abierto una consulta pública para aplicar estas medidas basadas en el principio «usuario pagador». Sin embargo, tal principio ignora el hecho de que las infraestructuras de transporte no benefician solo los usuarios directos, sino también a quienes no las utilizan pero reciben a través de ellas productos, servicios y relaciones. Resumidamente: las infraestructuras y medios de transporte son un bien básico y, como tal, responsabilidad de todos, no solo de sus usuarios directos, lo cual hace que su financiación vía impuestos (mediante una fiscalidad diferenciada y adaptada según se trata de empresas, ciudadanos, medios individuales o colectivos, limpios o contaminantes para incentivar o desincentivar prácticas en razón de los objetivos perseguidos) resulte tan pertinente que parece absurdo cobrar solo a sus usuarios directos.

Es más: las ruinosas autopistas de peaje españolas son un claro ejemplo de que el modelo es manifiestamente inadecuado, tiene un coste grave en vidas humanas, (tal es el caso de los accidentes generados por la coexistencia de la autopista de peaje AP-2 y la carretera N-II en Aragón), y hace que cada operador, público o privado, se convierta en un monopolista del corredor de comunicación en el que opera.

¿No cree la Comisión que habría que replantearse la idoneidad del principio «usuario pagador» dada la distorsión que genera al aplicarse sobre un sector básico del que se aprovecha toda la sociedad, y no solo los usuarios directos?

¿Qué opina la Comisión sobre el caso de las deficitarias autopistas de peaje españolas?

¿No piensa la Comisión que en el actual contexto de crisis económica el cobro por el uso de la red viaria contribuye a imposibilitar la recuperación del crecimiento?

¿Qué opina la Comisión del caso de la peligrosa N-II de Aragón que el Estado español se niega a convertir en autovía aunque rehúsa también liberar el peaje de la AP-2 (concesión que, habiendo de expirar en 2014, fue prorrogada por el Estado hasta 2021) mientras acumula muertos y heridos cada año?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(30 de noviembre de 2012)

1. La Comisión coincide con Su Señoría en que importantes beneficios socioeconómicos, tales como una mayor accesibilidad de las regiones, pueden, en muchos casos, justificar la financiación pública de la *construcción* de infraestructuras de transporte. Por otro lado, la Comisión opina que los peajes deben reflejar, en términos generales, los costes generados por el *uso* directo de las infraestructuras, tales como el desgaste de las carreteras y los principales costes externos (contaminación, congestión, ruido, etc.), si bien, en algunos casos, no resulta razonable imputar la totalidad de los costes directos de una carretera que, por lo demás, se justifica por importantes beneficios socioeconómicos (tal es el caso, por ejemplo, de algunas carreteras rurales).

2. La Comisión no dispone de información suficiente que le permita evaluar el estado de conservación de las autopistas de peaje españolas.

3. La Comisión no comparte este punto de vista. La oferta logística es un factor clave determinante del atractivo de la UE como base productiva y comercial. Europa necesita una red de transporte densa y eficaz para fomentar el crecimiento económico. Con las actuales restricciones de los presupuestos nacionales, el mantenimiento periódico de las infraestructuras de transporte supone cada vez más un desafío para muchos Estados miembros. La contribución del usuario puede ayudar a paliar el déficit financiero y preservar, de este modo, la competitividad europea en el mercado mundial.

4. La Comisión opina que los peajes deben coordinarse a fin de evitar el desvío del tráfico de las carreteras de peaje a carreteras paralelas, ya que estas están menos preparadas para soportar un tráfico denso. Esta coordinación de los peajes aplicables a los vehículos pesados de transporte de mercancías ya se aplica, con resultados satisfactorios, en varios Estados miembros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009117/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Charging for the use of all roads in the EU

The White Paper Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area — Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system, COM(2011) 144 final, sets out the long-term goal 'to apply user charges to all vehicles and on the whole network to reflect at least the maintenance cost of infrastructure, congestion, air and noise pollution.'

The Commission has launched a public consultation on implementing these measures based on the 'user pays' principle. However, this principle ignores the fact that transport infrastructure benefits both direct and indirect users, for whom the infrastructure is a channel for receiving products, services and communication. In short, infrastructure and means of transport are basic facilities and, as such, everyone is responsible for them, not only the direct users. This means that funding them through taxes (using tax differentiation and adapted taxation distinguishing between companies, citizens, individual or collective means of transport and clean or polluting users, in order to encourage or discourage certain practices on the grounds of the objectives sought) is such a relevant point that it seems absurd to only charge direct users.

Moreover, the crumbling toll motorways in Spain are a clear example that the model is inadequate. This model has a serious human cost (such is the case with the accidents caused by the coexistence of the AP-2 toll motorway and the N-II non-toll road in Aragon), and makes every operator, whether they are public or private, a monopolist of the communication route in which they operate.

1. Does the Commission not think that the suitability of the 'user pays' principle should be reconsidered, given its inadequacy when applying it to a basic sector which the whole society benefits from, not only direct users?

2. What is the Commission's view concerning the poor state of repair of Spanish toll motorways?

3. Does the Commission not think that in the current economic crisis, charging for the use of the road network prevents a return to growth?

4. What does the Commission think about the dangerous N-II road in Aragon, which the Spanish Government will not make into a motorway, even though it also refuses to remove the toll from the AP-2 (this concession was extended by the government until 2021, although it was due to expire in 2014) while more deaths and injuries are caused each year?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(30 November 2012)

1. The Commission agrees with the Honourable Member that wider socioeconomic benefits — such as better accessibility of regions — can in many cases justify public funding of the *construction* of transport infrastructure. On the other hand, the Commission believes that tolls should generally reflect the costs generated by the direct *use* of the infrastructure such as wear and tear of the roads and the main external costs (pollution, congestion, noise etc.), though there will be cases where it is unreasonable to charge the full direct costs of a road which is nonetheless justified by wider socioeconomic benefits (eg some rural roads).

2. The Commission does not have sufficient information to be able to comment on the state of repair of Spanish toll motorways.

3. The Commission does not share this view. The logistics offer is a key determinant of the EU's attractiveness as a base for production and trading. Europe needs its dense and efficient transport network to foster economic growth. With constraints on national budgets, regular maintenance of transport infrastructure is increasingly becoming a challenge for many Member States. User charging can help bridge the financing gap and thus preserve Europe's competitiveness in the global marketplace.

4. The Commission believes that tolls should be coordinated in order to prevent the diversion of traffic from toll roads to parallel roads, which are less well suited for supporting heavy transit traffic. Such coordination of tolls for heavy goods vehicles is already successfully applied in several Member States.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009118/12
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Risk of Lyme disease

Since the early 1990s, the incidence of Lyme disease in much of Europe has increased and the geographical distribution of cases has also expanded. This is due to a number of factors such as improved recognition and clinical suspicion, but also the increasing popularity of outdoor leisure pursuits in tick habitat areas (exposing the healthiest people to the greatest risk of exposure), an increase in host populations for ticks and tick habitats, and changing climatic conditions due to global warming.

Ticks are known to be highly sensitive to climatic conditions. Research carried out by the World Health Organisation has shown that future climate change in Europe will facilitate a spread of Lyme disease into higher latitudes and altitudes, and contribute to an extended and more intense Lyme disease transmission season in some areas.

It has come to my attention that it is not possible to gain an accurate description of Lyme disease epidemiology in Europe as any surveillance statistics are based on non-standardised case criteria and, as such, result in inaccurate and uncoordinated systems of data collection. However, the incidence of Lyme disease throughout Europe is expected to continue to rise. In Scotland alone, the number of reported cases of Lyme disease has risen 11-fold in the past decade which is a major cause for concern. There is also strong anecdotal and statistical evidence to suggest that many cases of the disease go misdiagnosed or undiagnosed each year. Thus the true number of cases may be considerably higher than reported case numbers would suggest.

As such, could the Commission please clarify to what extent it is aware of:

1. the growing risk posed by Lyme disease in Europe and any evidence to support this;

2. any plans for studies into the scale of this problem on an EU-wide basis;

3. any examples of best practice by Member State governments in tackling Lyme disease?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the epidemiology of Lyme disease in the EU.

In Europe, at least five species of the *Borrelia burgdorferi* can cause Lyme disease. The burden of Lyme disease in the EU is difficult to estimate in a harmonised way due to the heterogeneity of case definitions applied by the Member States. While approximately 85000 cases of Lyme disease are confirmed annually across Europe, this is likely to be an underestimation. An online survey conducted in 2011 showed that 23 out of the 28 EU/ EFTA countries which responded have surveillance systems in place.

Concerning plans and examples of best practice, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control has called two expert consultations (in 2010 and 2011) to provide science-based evidence to strengthen the capacity of Member States — including laboratory capacity — for the surveillance and prevention of tick-borne diseases, including Lyme disease. In addition the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control has recently launched a comprehensive review for Lyme disease laboratory capacity at EU level, which is currently ongoing.

In the seventh call of FP7 there are funding opportunities in the HEALTH Programme ([1]) for research projects which specifically address neglected infectious diseases in central and eastern Europe, including for Lyme disease.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/cooperation?callIdentifier=FP7-HEALTH-2013-INNOVATION-1.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009119/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Διαδικασία αποκρατικοποίησης του ομίλου ΔΕΠΑ

Στην Ελλάδα διεξάγεται διεθνής διαγωνισμός για την αποκρατικοποίηση του ομίλου ΔΕΠΑ. Μεταξύ των 14 εταιριών που έχουν προκριθεί στο επόμενο διαγωνιστικό στάδιο από το ΤΑΙΠΕΔ (Ταμείο Αξιοποίησης της Ιδιωτικής Περιουσίας του Δημοσίου) είναι και η ρωσική εταιρία Gazprom.

Επίσης, στις 4.9.2012 η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή άρχισε έρευνα για παραβίαση των κανόνων περί ανταγωνισμού από την Gazprom, και συγκεκριμένα για κατάχρηση δεσπόζουσας θέσης στην αγορά φυσικού αερίου.

Ανεξάρτητα από την άποψη που έχει κανείς για την ιδιωτικοποίηση τέτοιου είδους δικτύων, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Η έρευνα που διεξάγει η Επιτροπή για την εταιρία Gazprom ενδέχεται να επηρεάσει την διαγωνιστική διαδικασία για την ιδιωτικοποίηση του ομίλου ΔΕΠΑ;

2. Η Απόφαση του Συμβούλιου (4.10.2012) για την υιοθέτηση μηχανισμού ανταλλαγής πληροφοριών μεταξύ κρατών μελών και Επιτροπής για τις διεθνείς ενεργειακές συμφωνίες με τρίτες χώρες, θα έχει εφαρμογή στην διαδικασία αποκρατικοποίησης του ομίλου ΔΕΠΑ;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

1. Η κίνηση της επίσημης διαδικασίας έρευνας ανταγωνισμού εκ μέρους της Επιτροπής σχετικά με ενδεχόμενες αντιανταγωνιστικές πρακτικές της Gazprom στα κράτη μέλη της Κεντρικής και Ανατολικής Ευρώπης δεν επηρεάζει αυτή καθεαυτή την ελληνική διαγωνιστική διαδικασία. Πάντως, οι κανόνες του ανταγωνισμού, όπως ο κανονισμός της ΕΕ για τις συγκεντρώσεις, πρέπει να τηρηθούν όσον αφορά την αγορά του ομίλου ΔΕΠΑ από άλλη επιχείρηση. Επίσης, η οδηγία 2009/73/ΕΚ σχετικά με τους κοινούς κανόνες για την εσωτερική αγορά φυσικού αερίου περιλαμβάνει διατάξεις σχετικά με τον αποτελεσματικό διαχωρισμό όσον αφορά τις δραστηριότητες δικτύου και τις δραστηριότητες προμήθειας και παραγωγής, που εφαρμόζονται τόσο για τις κοινοτικές όσο και για τις εξωκοινοτικές επιχειρήσεις. Στην περίπτωση που οι δραστηριότητες δικτύου ελέγχονται από πρόσωπο τρίτης χώρας, πρέπει επίσης να εξασφαλιστεί ότι δεν διακυβεύεται η ασφάλεια του ενεργειακού εφοδιασμού της Κοινότητας ή των κρατών μελών της.

2. Η απόφαση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου για τη θέσπιση μηχανισμού ανταλλαγής πληροφοριών όσον αφορά τις διακυβερνητικές συμφωνίες μεταξύ κρατών μελών και τρίτων χωρών στον τομέα της ενέργειας καλύπτει ιδίως όλες τις διακυβερνητικές συμφωνίες μεταξύ κρατών μελών και τρίτων χωρών που έχουν αντίκτυπο στην προμήθεια φυσικού αερίου, πετρελαίου ή ηλεκτρικής ενέργειας μέσω σταθερής υποδομής ή στην ποσότητα της ενέργειας που εισάγεται στην Ένωση. Η απόφαση δεν δημιουργεί υποχρεώσεις για τα κράτη μέλη όσον αφορά συμφωνίες μεταξύ εμπορικών φορέων. Μια διαδικασία ιδιωτικοποίησης δεν φαίνεται να εμπίπτει στα κριτήρια αυτά, εκτός αν συνοδεύεται από διακυβερνητική συμφωνία μεταξύ Ελλάδας και μιας τρίτης χώρας.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009119/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Privatisation of DEPA group

Greece has invited international bids for the DEPA group, which is to be privatised. Among the 14 companies selected by the HRADF (Hellenic Republic Assets Development Fund) for the next stage of the tendering procedure is the Russian Gazprom company.

On 4 September 2012 the Commission launched an investigation into alleged infringement of competition rules by Gazprom and, more specifically, abuse of a dominant position on the natural gas market.

Aside from the advisability of privatising such networks, can the Commission provide the following information:

1. Are Commission investigations into Gazprom expected to affect the tendering procedure for privatisation of the DEPA group?

2. Will the Council decision of 4 October 2012 establishing a mechanism for the exchange of information between Member States and the Commission on intergovernmental agreements in the field of energy apply to the DEPA privatisation procedure?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2012)

1. The opening of formal proceedings in the Commission's competition investigation concerning potential anti-competitive practices of Gazprom in central and eastern European Member States does not as such affect the Greek tendering process. However, competition rules, such as the EU Merger Regulation ([1]), need to be respected as regards the acquisition of the DEPA group by another undertaking. Further, Directive 2009/73/EC concerning common rules for the internal market in natural gas ([2]) includes provisions on the effective separation of network activities from supply and production activities, which apply to both Community and non-Community undertakings. In case network activities are controlled by a person from a third country, it must also be ensured that security of energy supply of the Community or its Member States is not put at risk.

2. The decision of the European Parliament and the Council establishing an information exchange mechanism with regard to intergovernmental agreements between Member States and third countries in the field of energy ([3]) covers in particular all intergovernmental agreements between Member States and third countries which have an impact on the supply of gas, oil or electricity through fixed infrastructure or which have an impact on the amount of energy imported into the Union. The decision does not create obligations for Member States as regards agreements between commercial entities. A privatisation procedure does not seem to fall under these criteria, unless it would be accompanied by an intergovernmental agreement between Greece and a third country.

([1]) Council Regulation No 139/2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings, OJ L 24, 29.1.2004, p.1.
([2]) OJ L 211 of 14.8.2009, p.94.
([3]) Decision No 994/2012/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 establishing an information exchange mechanism with regard to intergovernmental agreements between Member States and third countries in the field of energy, OJ L 299,27.10.2012, p.13.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009120/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Καθυστερήσεις στην υλοποίηση του Μετρό της Θεσσαλονίκης

Η κατασκευή του Μετρό της Θεσσαλονίκης, που συγχρηματοδοτείται από την ΕΕ, έχει ξεκινήσει από τον Ιούνιο του 2006 και παρουσιάζει σημαντικές καθυστερήσεις στην υλοποίησή του. Το τελευταίο διάστημα, μάλιστα, το έργο βρίσκεται σε απόλυτο τέλμα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ποιος είναι ο συνολικός προϋπολογισμός του έργου, η απορροφητικότητα και το χρηματοδοτικό σχήμα;

2. Πού οφείλονται οι καθυστερήσεις του έργου και πότε προβλέπεται τελικά η ολοκλήρωσή του; Υπάρχει αλλαγή του φυσικού αντικειμένου; Ποια είναι η πρόοδος του φυσικού αντικειμένου μέχρι σήμερα;

3. Υπάρχει χρονική συσχέτιση της πορείας εκτέλεσης του κυρίως έργου με τη δρομολογούμενη επέκταση του Μετρό, για την οποία έχει ζητηθεί ήδη η συνδρομή της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(4 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

1. Η επίσημη αίτηση σχετικά με την υλοποίηση του έργου «Μελέτη, κατασκευή και λειτουργία του μετρό της Θεσσαλονίκης» υπεβλήθη από τις ελληνικές αρχές στις 14 Ιουνίου 2007, ύστερα από συζητήσεις με τις ελληνικές αρχές. Η Επιτροπή ενέκρινε το έργο με την απόφαση της 17ης Δεκεμβρίου 2009 ([1]), αφού έλαβε πρόσθετα στοιχεία στις 10 Αυγούστου 2009 και στις 19 Οκτωβρίου 2009. Ο συνολικός δημόσιος προϋπολογισμός ανέρχεται στα 200 εκατομμύρια ευρώ και η συνεισφορά της ΕΕ κατά την περίοδο 2000-2006 ήταν 100 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Το έργο αυτό συνεχίζεται ως έργο «γέφυρα» για την περίοδο 2007-2013, αλλά δεν έχει υποβληθεί ακόμα αίτηση για συγχρηματοδότηση, έτσι η Επιτροπή δεν είναι σε θέση να κάνει κάποιο σχόλιο σχετικά με το κόστος του.

2. Το εν λόγω έργο «γέφυρα» αναμένεται να ολοκληρωθεί έως το τέλος της τρέχουσας περιόδου. Αφού η επίσημη αίτηση που αφορά το μεγάλο έργο δεν έχει υποβληθεί ακόμα, η Επιτροπή έχει ζητήσει λεπτομερή στοιχεία σχετικά με την πορεία του έργου από τις ελληνικές αρχές, οι οποίες φέρουν την ευθύνη για την εφαρμογή του.

3. Η αίτηση για το έργο της επέκτασης του μετρό της Θεσσαλονίκης δεν έχει υποβληθεί ακόμα. Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι η λειτουργικότητα του έργου για την επέκταση του μετρό της Θεσσαλονίκης είναι άμεσα συνδεδεμένη με την εφαρμογή και τη λειτουργικότητα της κύριας γραμμής και συνεπώς, τα δύο έργα θεωρούνται αλληλένδετα.

([1]) Απόφαση C(2009)10454 της Επιτροπής, της 17.12.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009120/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Delays in completing the Thessaloniki Metro

The construction of the Thessaloniki Metro, which commenced in June 2006 with EU funding is now being affected by considerable delays, works having now ground to a complete halt.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission indicate the total budget for the project, the take-up of funding and the funding schedule?

2. What are the reasons for the delays and when is it expected that the project will be completed? Have there been any changes to the fundamental stages of the project? What progress has been made in completing the fundamental stages of the project to date?

3. Is there any connection between the time being taken to complete the main project and the projected extension, for which funding has already been requested from the European Investment Bank?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2012)

1. The official project application 'Study, construction and function of Thessaloniki metro' was submitted by the Greek Authorities on 14 June 2007 after discussions with the Greek Authorities. The project was approved by Commission decision of 17 December 2009 ([1]), after receiving additional information on 10 August 2009 and 19 October 2009. The total public budget is EUR 200 million and the EU contribution during the 2000-2006 period was set at EUR 100 million. This project is set to continue as a 'bridge' project in the 2007-2013 period but it has not been submitted yet for co-financing so the Commission cannot comment on the costs of the latter.

2. This 'bridge' project is expected to be finished by the end of the current period. Since the official application of the major project application has not yet been submitted, the Commission has requested detailed information on the state of play from the Greek authorities who are responsible for the implementation of the project.

3. The project application of the Thessaloniki metro extension has not been submitted yet. The Commission considers that the functionality of the Thessaloniki metro extension project is directly related to the implementation and functionality of the main line and therefore the two projects are considered to be interlinked.

([1]) Commission Decision C(2009)10454 of 17.12.2009.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009121/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αύξηση φορολόγησης του υγραερίου κίνησης (LPG) στην Ελλάδα

Δημοσιεύματα του ελληνικού Τύπου αναφέρονται στο ενδεχόμενο αύξησης του ειδικού φόρου κατανάλωσης στο υγραέριο κίνησης (LPG) κατά 164%. Το μέτρο αποδίδεται σε φοροεισπρακτικούς λόγους, αλλά και για να καλυφθεί η διαφορά τιμής που υπάρχει με τα υπόλοιπα καύσιμα κίνησης.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Είναι ενήμερη για πρόθεση του Υπουργείου Οικονομικών της Ελλάδας να προβεί σε αύξηση της φορολογίας στο υγραέριο κίνησης; Αν ναι, τι ύψους;

2. Υπάρχει, σύμφωνα με την Κοινοτική Νομοθεσία, ανώτατο όριο φορολόγησης του υγραερίου κίνησης (LPG);

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Σύμφωνα με τις πληροφορίες που διαθέτει η Επιτροπή, ο τρέχων φορολογικός συντελεστής που ισχύει στην Ελλάδα για το υγραέριο (LPG) είναι 200 ευρώ ανά 1 000 kg όταν χρησιμοποιείται ως καύσιμο κίνησης και 60 ευρώ ανά 1 000 kg ([1]) όταν χρησιμοποιείται για θέρμανση. Η Ελλάδα διαβιβάζει ανεπίσημα στην Επιτροπή δύο φορές κατ' έτος (Ιανουάριο και Ιούλιο) λεπτομερείς πληροφορίες σχετικά με τα εθνικά επίπεδα φορολογίας που εφαρμόζονται για τα ενεργειακά προϊόντα. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει επισήμως ενημερωθεί σχετικά με τις προθέσεις της Ελλάδας να αυξήσει τον εθνικό συντελεστή φορολογίας για το υγραέριο.

Επί του παρόντος η οδηγία 2003/96/ΕΚ ([2]) καθορίζει ελάχιστα επίπεδα φορολογίας, προβλέποντας έναν ορισμένο βαθμό εναρμόνισης των ειδικών φόρων κατανάλωσης που επιβάλλονται στα ενεργειακά προϊόντα και την ηλεκτρική ενέργεια. Τα κράτη μέλη μπορούν να καθορίζουν άνω των κατώτατων αυτών ορίων επίπεδα φορολόγησης τα οποία θεωρούν κατάλληλα, συνεκτιμώντας παραμέτρους εθνικής πολιτικής. Η οδηγία 2003/96/ΕΚ δεν προβλέπει ανώτατο όριο φορολογίας.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/excise_duties/energy_products/rates/index_en.htm
([2]) ΕΕ L 283 της 31.10.2003.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009121/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Increased tax on liquid petroleum gas (LPG) in Greece

According to Greek press reports, there are plans to increase the special consumption tax on liquid petroleum gas (LPG) by 164% in order to increase tax revenues and offset the price difference between LPG and other fuels.

In view of this:

1. Is the Commission aware of the recommendation from the Greek Finance Ministry to increase the tax on liquid petroleum gas and does it know the amount of this increase?

2. Has an upper LPG tax limit been established under Community legislation?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(20 November 2012)

According to information available to the Commission the current tax rate applicable in Greece for LPG used as propellant is EUR 200 per 1000 kg and EUR 60 per 1000 kg ([1]) when used for heating. Greece informally provides the Commission with detailed information about the national tax levels applicable for energy products twice a year (in January and July). The Commission has not been formally informed about the intentions of Greece to increase the national tax rate for LPG.

Currently Directive 2003/96/EC ([2]) sets minimum levels of taxation providing for a certain degree of harmonisation of excise duty applicable to energy products and electricity. Above these minima, Member States can fix levels of taxation as they see fit, taking into account national policy considerations. Directive 2003/96/EC does not provide for a maximum tax limit.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/excise_duties/energy_products/rates/index_en.htm
([2]) OJ L 283, 31.10.2003.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009122/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κατανομή πόρων για τη νέα προγραμματική περίοδο (2014-2020)

Για χώρες, όπως η Ελλάδα, που βρίσκονται αντιμέτωπες με συνεχή και επιδεινούμενη ύφεση, τα προγράμματα του Εθνικού Στρατηγικού Πλαισίου Αναφοράς (ΕΣΠΑ) μπορούν να αποτελέσουν ευκαιρία ανάπτυξης. Πληροφορίες, που αναφέρουν ότι για τη νέα περίοδο προγραμματισμού (2014-2020) χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα θα λάβουν χρηματοδοτήσεις πολύ μικρότερου ύψους σε σχέση με την προηγούμενη περίοδο, προκαλούν ανησυχία.

Κατόπιν των ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Τι μέτρα θα ληφθούν ώστε χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα, με ραγδαία επιδείνωση των οικονομικών και κοινωνικών δεικτών (π.χ. την ανεργία από 8,9 το 2009, σε 11,8 το 2010, 15,9 το 2011 και 21,9% τον Μάρτιο 2012), όχι μόνο να μην λάβουν χαμηλότερη χρηματοδότηση, σε σχέση με το προηγούμενο Πλαίσιο Αναφοράς, αλλά αντίθετα να λάβουν αυξημένους πόρους, οι οποίοι θα πρέπει να επικεντρωθούν στην ενδυνάμωση της απασχόλησης και στην ενίσχυση της πολύ χαμηλής παραγωγικής βάσης της οικονομίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή υπέβαλε πρόταση για το πολυετές δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο 2014-2020 σχετικά με την πολιτική συνοχής βάσει εναρμονισμένων, αντικειμενικών δεικτών, για όλα τα κράτη μέλη και τις περιφέρειες. Η σύγκριση των ενδεχόμενων μελλοντικών χρηματοδοτήσεων με αυτές που έχουν ληφθεί κατά την περίοδο 2007-2013 πρέπει να γίνεται με προσοχή. Ιδιαίτερα στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδας, τα στοιχεία του περιφερειακού και εθνικού ΑΕγχΠ που ήταν διαθέσιμα τη στιγμή του καθορισμού των δημοσιονομικών προοπτικών της περιόδου 2007-2013 τροποποιήθηκαν αργότερα, λόγω βελτιώσεων στη μεθοδολογία των εθνικών και περιφερειακών λογαριασμών.

Το τελικό ύψος της χρηματοδότησης για την Ελλάδα θα καθοριστεί στο πλαίσιο των διαπραγματεύσεων μεταξύ του Συμβουλίου και του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009122/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: Distribution of resources for the new programming period (2014-2020)

For countries such as Greece facing chronic and aggravated recession, programmes under the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) could provide opportunities for growth. Great concern is now being caused by reports that for the new programming period (2014-2020) countries such as Greece will be receiving far less funding than before.

In view of this:

Can the Commission say what measures will be taken to ensure that countries such as Greece, whose economic and social indicators are rapidly deteriorating (for example, unemployment up from 8.9% in 2009 to 11.8% in 2010, 15.9% in 2011 and 21.9% in March 2012) do not have their funding reduced from the previous reference framework but, on the contrary, are given more resources, which must be centred on improving the employment situation and boosting the very weak production figures which are undermining the economy?

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

The Commission has submitted a proposal for the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework concerning cohesion policy which is based on harmonised, objective indicators, available for all Member States and regions. Comparing the potential future allocation with those received during the 2007-2013 period should be done with caution. Especially in the case of Greece, the regional and national GDP figures which were available at the time of the establishment of the financial perspectives for 2007-2013 have been revised afterwards, due to improvements in the national and regional accounts methodology.

The final level of the financial allocation for Greece will be determined in the context of the negotiations in the Council and the European Parliament.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009123/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(10. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: 25 Mrd. EUR für Atomnachrüstung und wo bleibt die Sicherheit

25 Mrd. EUR sind also nun nötig, um die Schrottmeiler Europas nachzurüsten.

1. Ist die Kommission in der Tat der Ansicht, dass damit auch die Sicherheit unserer europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger in irgendeiner Form gewährleistet sein könnte?

2. Hat die Kommission schon einmal angedacht, diesen Betrag stattdessen für andere und besonders sichere Energiequellen zu investieren?

3. Wie will die Kommission prinzipiell eine Nachrüstung rechtfertigen, wenn es nicht nur wirtschaftlicher und nachhaltiger, sondern vor allem für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger sicherer wäre, in grüne Energien zu investieren?

4. Geht die Kommission mit ihrer Haltung tatsächlich das Risiko ein, dass auch auf europäischem Boden ein Unglück der Größe Fukushimas oder Tschernobyls passieren könnte?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(3. Dezember 2012)

1. Ja. Bei den Stresstests wurden Maßnahmen ermittelt, mit denen die Sicherheit von Kernkraftwerken und damit auch die Sicherheit der Bürgerinnen und Bürger erhöht wird.

Zu den Fragen 2 und 3: Die Umsetzung der aufgrund der Stresstests abgegebenen Empfehlungen fällt in die Zuständigkeit der Mitgliedstaaten. Entscheidungen über private Investitionen im Energiebereich — sei es in die Kernenergie, in erneuerbare Energien oder andere Energiequellen — werden von den jeweiligen Unternehmen und nicht von der Kommission getroffen.

Wenngleich die Entscheidung über die Nutzung der Kernenergie bei den Mitgliedstaaten liegt, ist es Aufgabe der Europäischen Union, im Interesse aller Mitgliedstaaten einen fortschrittlichen Rechtsrahmen für die Kernenergie zu entwickeln, der die Einhaltung höchster Sicherheitsstandards gewährleistet.

4. Für die Gewährleistung der Sicherheit von Kernkraftwerken sind die Mitgliedstaaten zuständig. Die Verantwortung liegt dabei in erster Linie beim Genehmigungsinhaber, der rechtlich verpflichtet ist, die Sicherheit unter der Aufsicht der zuständigen Regulierungsbehörde regelmäßig zu bewerten, zu überprüfen und zu verbessern ([1]).

Nach Ansicht der Kommission ist es entscheidend, dass die aus dem Unglück in Fukushima gezogenen Lehren und die aufgrund der Stresstests abgegebenen Empfehlungen ordnungsgemäß und konsequent umgesetzt und in den europäischen Rechtsrahmen einbezogen werden. Weitere Informationen dazu finden sich auch in der Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-008953/12 von Frau Papadopoulou ([2]).

([1]) Richtlinie 2009/71/Euratom des Rates über einen Gemeinschaftsrahmen für die nukleare Sicherheit kerntechnischer Anlagen (ABl. L 172 vom 2.7.2009, S. 18), Artikel 5 und 6.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009123/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: EUR 25 billion needed for atomic upgrade — what about safety?

EUR 25 billion is apparently needed to upgrade Europe's ramshackle nuclear power plants.

1. Does the Commission really believe that this will somehow help to ensure the safety of Europeans?

2. Has it even occurred to the Commission that this money could instead be used for alternative, much safer energy sources?

3. How does the Commission justify an upgrade in principle, when investing in green energy would not only be more sustainable and make more economic sense, but would also be safer for Europeans?

4. With this initiative, could the Commission be running the risk of a catastrophe on the scale of Fukushima or Chernobyl happening on European soil?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2012)

1. Yes. The stress tests have identified measures to improve the safety of nuclear power plants and therefore improve the safety of citizens.

2 and 3. Implementation of the recommendations of the stress tests is a national responsibility. Private investments in the energy sector, whether in nuclear, renewable, or other sources of energy, are decided by the undertakings concerned and not by the Commission.

While it belongs to the Member States to choose whether or not to use nuclear energy, the role of the European Union (EU) is to develop in the interest of all Member States the most advanced legal framework for nuclear energy, meeting the highest standards for nuclear safety.

4. Ensuring the safety of nuclear power plants is a national responsibility. The responsibility for this rests in the first instance with the licence holder, who is required by law to regularly assess, verify and improve safety under the supervision of the competent regulatory body ([1]).

The Commission considers that it is crucial that the lessons learned from the Fukushima accident and the recommendations of the stress tests are properly and consistently implemented and reflected in the European legislative framework. The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-008953/12 by Ms Papadopoulou ([2]) for further information.

([1]) Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations (OJ L 172, p.18), Articles 5 and 6.

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

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009124/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(10. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: 25 Mrd. EUR für Nachrüstung

25 Mrd. EUR sind nun angedacht und Berichten zufolge notwendig, um die Schrottmeiler Europas nachzurüsten.

1. Wie gedenkt die Kommission angesichts der anhaltenden Krisensituation dies zu finanzieren?

2. Wie würde die Kommission eine solche Finanzierung bei der steigenden und immer lauter werdenden Anti-Nuklearstimmung in vielen europäischen Ländern überhaupt rechtfertigen wollen?

3. Wie will die Kommission heute eine Nachrüstung rechtfertigen, wenn es doch viel wirtschaftlicher wäre, nachhaltig in grüne Energien zu investieren?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(6. Dezember 2012)

Für die Wahl der Energieträger sind die Mitgliedstaaten zuständig. Privatwirtschaftliche und öffentliche Investitionen in den Energiesektor — sei es nun in die Kernenergie oder in erneuerbare oder sonstige Energiequellen — werden von den jeweiligen Unternehmen und nationalen Behörden beschlossen, nicht von der EU.

Die Umsetzung der im Rahmen der Stresstests abgegebenen Empfehlungen, einschließlich der Finanzierung, liegt in nationaler Zuständigkeit.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009124/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (ALDE)
(10 October 2012)

Subject: EUR 25 billion for upgrading

EUR 25 billion are now being mooted and, according to reports, are necessary in order to upgrade Europe's outdated nuclear power stations.

1. How does the Commission intend to fund this, in view of the ongoing crisis situation?

2. How would the Commission care to justify such funding in view of the increasingly numerous and vocal protests against nuclear energy in many European countries?

3. How will the Commission justify upgrading today, when it would be much more economical to invest sustainably in green forms of energy?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2012)

The choice between different energy resources is a competence of the Member States. Equally, private or public investments in the energy sector, whether in nuclear, renewable or other sources of energy, are decided by the undertakings and national authorities concerned, and not by the EU.

The implementation of the recommendations of the stress tests, including financing, is a national responsibility.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-009125/12
à Comissão
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(11 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Papel da UE na redução dos riscos sísmicos

É significativo o risco sísmico existente em vários Estados-Membros. Os terramotos são inevitáveis e recorrentes. A ciência pode determinar, com elevado grau de confiança, as zonas em que os futuros terramotos são suscetíveis de ocorrer. Embora a sua ocorrência tenha uma probabilidade cíclica, não é previsível o momento exato dessa ocorrência.

Os riscos para a vida humana, a destruição de infraestruturas económicas e a devastação do nosso património histórico não podem ser postos em causa. No entanto, estes riscos podem ser minimizados, já que a moderna engenharia sísmica tem a capacidade de reforçar edifícios e outras estruturas, a fim de suportar os efeitos de terramotos de grande intensidade.

No presente, vários Estados-Membros, numa situação de crise profunda, tendem a limitar os seus investimentos às necessidades imediatas, abandonando estratégias preventivas para mitigar os riscos sísmicos, uma tarefa complexa, mas indispensável, para garantir a resistência e a sustentabilidade do desenvolvimento económico, para cujo efeito é sem dúvida necessária uma abordagem pan-europeia.

A autora desta pergunta e a Associação Europeia de Engenharia Sísmica consideram que a CE deveria assumir a liderança nesta questão a dois níveis distintos: legislativo, criando um quadro com as normas mínimas de segurança contra terramotos em infraestruturas importantes, tanto edifícios públicos como outros, em áreas sísmicas identificadas; e orçamental, facultando apoio financeiro para garantir condições de segurança nas estruturas existentes.

Face a estas considerações, pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Tenciona a Comissão elaborar um enquadramento legislativo para que os Estados-Membros estabeleçam normas mínimas para os níveis de segurança contra terramotos nas infraestruturas críticas identificadas nos termos da Diretiva do Conselho 2008/114/CE, de 8 de dezembro?

2. Tenciona a Comissão prestar ajuda financeira aos Estados-Membros para que prossigam esta tarefa? Serão as medidas propostas incluídas no novo quadro legislativo relativo aos fundos estruturais pós-2014?

3. Será a sociedade civil implicada na classificação, por uma ordem de prioridades, das necessidades de reforço da resistência sísmica dos edifícios existentes? Em caso afirmativo, como?

Resposta dada por Kristalina Georgieva em nome da Comissão
(27 de novembro de 2012)

De acordo com o princípio de subsidiariedade, os Estados-Membros continuam a ser competentes para regulamentar o nível de segurança das obras de construção no seu território, o que excluí, por conseguinte, exclui a adoção de normas mínimas para os níveis de segurança para na Europa.

Porém, a UE tem vindo a financiar de forma significativa a elaboração de códigos comuns europeus ([1]) que abrangem também de modo muito global a conceção de estruturas antissísmicas, como o Eurocódigo 8.

Além disso, os Estados-Membros podem recorrer aos fundos de coesão disponíveis para a «prevenção de riscos», incluindo os programas e projetos relacionados com os riscos sísmicos. Para o próximo período de programação (2014-2020), a Comissão propôs disposições reforçadas em matéria de gestão do risco de catástrofes e uma condição prévia específica que requer a avaliação dos riscos nacionais ou regionais para orientar os investimentos em função dos riscos principais ([2]).

([1]) Para mais informações sobre os denominados Eurocódigos, consultar: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/ construction/eurocodes/ index_en.htm
([2]) COM(2012) 496 final.

No âmbito de um programa de intercâmbio de boas práticas para a prevenção de catástrofes, a Comissão recolheu mais de 420 boas práticas, das quais 73 estão especificamente relacionadas com os riscos de sismos. Com base nestas, a Comissão deu início a um debate com os Estados-Membros sobre as formas de utilizar estas boas práticas para apoiar a prevenção de riscos a nível nacional e local. Tal poderá ser feito através da elaboração de orientações sobre questões transversais, como a boa governação, o planeamento e as campanhas de sensibilização, que poderão também revelar-se benéficas em termos de prevenção de riscos sísmicos.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009125/12
to the Commission
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: EU role in the reduction of seismic risk

There is a significant seismic risk in several Member States. Earthquakes are unavoidable and recurrent. Science can determine with a high degree of confidence the zones where future earthquakes are likely to occur. Although the probability of earthquakes occurring is cyclical, what is not predictable is when exactly they will occur.

There is no doubt that earthquakes pose a risk to human life and can destroy economic infrastructure and devastate our historic heritage. However, these risks can be minimised as modern earthquake engineering has the capacity to strengthen buildings and other facilities to enable them to withstand very intense earthquakes.

At present, several Member States, hit hard by the crisis, are tending to limit their investments to immediate needs, neglecting preventive strategies to mitigate seismic risk, even though this element is a complex but indispensable factor in ensuring resilient and sustainable economic development, for which a pan-European approach is absolutely vital.

I share the view of the European Association for Earthquake Engineering that the Commission should take the lead on this issue at two different levels: legislative, creating a framework with minimum earthquake safety standards for important facilities and public and other buildings in seismic areas; and budgetary, providing financial support to ensure adequate safety conditions in existing structures.

With this in mind:

1. Does the Commission intend to put forward any legislative framework under which Member States will be called upon to ensure minimum earthquake safety standards for the critical infrastructure identified in Council Directive 2008/114/EC?

2. Does the Commission intend to provide financial support for the Member States for the pursuing of this task? Will these proposed measures be included in the new legislative framework for the post-2014 Structural Funds?

3. Will civil society be involved in prioritising the need to increase the seismic resistance of existing buildings? If so, how?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(27 November 2012)

Under the subsidiarity principle, Member States remain competent to regulate the level of safety in construction works in their territory which therefore excludes the adoption of a minimum European safety level.

The EU has however significantly financed the development of common European codes ([1]) that cover also in a very comprehensive way the earthquake resistant design of structures as Eurocode 8.

In addition Member States can draw on the available Cohesion funding for 'risk prevention', including for programmes and projects dealing with seismic risks. For the next programming period (2014-2020), the Commission has proposed strengthened provisions on disaster risk management and a specific *ex-ante* conditionality requiring national or regional risk assessments as a pre-condition to orient the investments according to the major risks ([2]).

As part of a good practice programme in disaster prevention, the Commission has collected over 420 good practices in disaster prevention, 73 of which specifically relate to earthquake risks. On this basis the Commission has started discussions with Member States on how these good practices could be used to support risk prevention at national and local level possibly through guidance on horizontal issues such as governance, planning, and awareness-raising that could also be beneficial for seismic risks.

([1]) For the so called Eurocodes, more info is available on: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/construction/eurocodes/index_en.htm
([2]) COM(2012) 496 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-009126/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(11 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Comissário Ciolos alerta para possível redução no orçamento da futura PAC

A recente intervenção do Comissário Ciolos durante o Congresso dos Agricultores Europeus organizado pelo COPA-Cogeca, em Bucareste, alerta para a possibilidade de uma negociação do quadro orçamental para 2014/2020 com fortes cortes no capítulo agrícola.

Segundo a imprensa, circulam rumores de que a França e a Alemanha poderiam ter acordado numa redução de 5 a 6 % das ajudas agrícolas.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Confirma a possibilidade de cortes no capítulo agrícola? Quais?

Tem conhecimento de algum acordo entre a França e a Alemanha para uma redução de 5 a 6 % das ajudas agrícolas?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(9 de novembro de 2012)

A Comissão não pode comentar notícias da imprensa sobre possíveis negociações dos Estados-Membros relativas a discussões em curso sobre o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual (2014-2020), e particularmente sobre as dotações da Política Agrícola Comum.

Relativamente a 2014-2020, a Comissão propôs o congelamento dos montantes da PAC ao nível de 2013 em preços correntes. A proposta da Comissão deve permitir o financiamento necessário de uma reforma ambiciosa da PAC, incluindo a distribuição mais equitativa dos pagamentos diretos e a dotação do envelope para o desenvolvimento rural, com base em critérios objetivos e no desempenho passado.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009126/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Commissioner Ciolos warns of possible future CAP budget cuts

Addressing the recent Copa-Cogeca Congress of European Farmers, in Bucharest, Commissioner Ciolos warned that the 2014-2020 budgetary framework might be renegotiated and the agriculture chapter severely scaled down.

According to press reports, France and Germany are rumoured to have reached agreement on a 5% to 6% cut in agricultural support.

Is it true that the agriculture chapter might be cut back? If so, what would this involve?

Is the Commission aware of any agreement between France and Germany on a 5% to 6% cut in agricultural support?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(9 November 2012)

The Commission cannot comment on press reports on Members States' possible negotiation positions in relation to the ongoing discussions on the Multi-annual Financial Framework 2014-2020 and in particular on the amounts that will be allocated to the common agricultural policy.

For the period 2014-2020, the Commission has proposed a freeze of the amounts for the common agricultural policy at their 2013 level in current prices. The Commission proposal should provide the necessary financing in order to allow an ambitious reform of the common agricultural policy, including a more equitable distribution of the direct payments and an allocation of the envelope for rural development based on objective criteria and past performance.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009127/12
to the Commission
Roger Helmer (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: EU guidelines for rural broadband access by 2015

The Commission will recall its proposal for a regulation on the Connecting Europe Facility (COM(2011)0665), which, if adopted as it stands, will require all homes to have access to at least 30Mb download speed by 2020.

We understand that EU funding is available for this purpose, but that it applies only to fibre-to-cabinet and fibre-to-home solutions. Fibre-to-home is expensive, while fibre-to-cabinet cannot deliver the required speed if the (usually copper) cabinet-to-home connection exceeds 1.5 km.

This could leave up to 9 million UK homes which cannot access the required download speed.

We understand that wireless/radio solutions were omitted from EU funding plans as, at the time, the technology was not sufficiently advanced. However we are advised by a UK company, UK Broadband, that recent advances make a wireless/radio solution viable. This could work for the 9 million homes that are difficult to reach with a land-based solution.

Does the Commission agree that wireless/radio is now viable? And are there any plans to extend EU funding to solutions of this type?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(20 November 2012)

Firstly, a clarification, the Connecting Europe Facility does not require all homes to have access to at least 30Mb but aims to facilitate such a result. The Digital Agenda for Europe (DAE), one of the seven flagship initiatives of the Europe 2020 strategy, has set up as one of the goals to be achieved by 2020 to ensure that all Europeans have access to much higher Internet speeds of above 30 Mbps.

To reach these ambitious targets it is necessary to develop a comprehensive policy, based on a combination of regulatory, policy and funding instruments.

The proposal for a regulation on the Connecting Europe Facility is one of funding instruments. It is based on market logic (preference to financial instruments rather than grants) and aims at supporting broadband investments primarily in areas in which projects would otherwise not have access to finance. It will work hand in hand with Structural Funds, which should intervene primarily in sparsely populated areas where these is no business case.

The CEF regulation is aligned with the DAE and includes the condition that projects funded must provide broadband speeds that contribute at least to achieve the DAE target of 30 Mbps but does not exclude any technology, whether fixed, fixed-wireless, wireless or satellite, that is able to meet this condition. This is in line with the DAE's recognition that a mix of technologies will be used to meet its different objectives.

In addition, Member States should use fully the Structural and Rural Development Funds that are already earmarked for investment in ICT infrastructures and services. In this context again no particular technologies are mandated.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-009128/12
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(11 oktober 2012)

Angående: Ändringar i EU:s tjänstelagstiftning till följd av frihandelsavtalet mellan EU och Sydkorea

Kommissionen har till parlamentet överlämnat ett utkast till kommenterad dagordning för det första sammanträdet i kommittén för handel med tjänster, etablering och elektronisk handel inom ramen för frihandelsavtalet mellan EU och Sydkorea. I förslaget till dagordning nämns det att man var tvungen att se över vissa delar av den nationella lagstiftningen i Sydkorea och EU eftersom ytterligare tillträde gavs till fler tjänstesektorer inom ramen för frihandelsavtalet.

Vilka ändringar har gjorts till EU:s och medlemsstaternas lagstiftning till följd av avtalet?

Svar från Karel De Gucht på kommissionens vägnar
(12 november 2012)

Tjänstedelen i frihandelsavtalet mellan EU och Sydkorea täcker åtaganden inom ett antal sektorer, däribland lagstiftningsfrågor. De allra flesta bestämmelserna fastställer den befintliga nivån på tillträde, dvs. hindrar parterna från att minska den nuvarande nivån på tillträde för den andra partens tjänsteleverantörer, och kräver därför inga ändringar av lagstiftningen. Vissa bestämmelser kan dock i princip föranleda ändringar av parternas nationella lagar. Detta kan exempelvis vara fallet för åtaganden som Sydkorea gjort när det gäller databehandling för finansiella tjänster. Vad gäller EU har sådana rättsliga ändringar varken gjorts på EU-nivå eller rapporterats på medlemsstatsnivå efter det att avtalet började tillämpas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009128/12
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Changes in services legislation in the EU following EU-South Korea FTA

The Commission has sent Parliament the annotated draft agenda for the first meeting of the committee on trade in services, establishment and electronic commerce of the EU-Korea FTA. The draft agenda mentions that the additional opening-up of several service sectors in the EU-Korea FTA has made necessary a review of certain parts of domestic law in South Korea and the EU.

What changes have been made to European Union or Member State legislation as a result of the agreement?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(12 November 2012)

The services part of the EU-Korea Free Trade Agreement (FTA) covers commitments in a number of sectors including regulatory issues. The vast majority of the provisions bind the existing level of openness, i.e. prevent Parties from going below the current level of openness for services providers of the other Party and hence do not require legislative changes. Some provisions may however in principle trigger changes in the Parties' domestic laws. This could e.g. be the case for commitments taken by Korea in the area of data processing for financial services. On the side of the EU, no such legislative changes have been made at the EU level nor have they been reported at Member State level following the application of the Agreement.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-009129/12
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(11. oktober 2012)

Om: Risikoen for mangel på fødevarer i de mest udsatte Eurozone-lande

EU-kommissionen har for nylig foretaget en rundspørge i alle EU-lande, der viser, at befolkningen i flere lande er bekymret for, om deres forsyning af fødevarer af vil være stabil i fremtiden. Især i Grækenland hersker der ængstelse, idet 94 % af grækerne frygter fødevareknaphed. Også 85 % af de adspurgte i Portugal udtrykker ængstelse over stabile fødevareleverancer i fremtiden.

Grækenlands binding til Euroen ser ud til at forlænge pinen. Men uanset hvordan og hvornår Grækenland forlader Euro-zonen, bør der være et europæisk, solidarisk beredskab på plads i tide, idet Grækenland ikke i dag er i stand til at producere fødevarer til sin egen befolkning. Med genindførelse af drachmen vil fødevarepriserne eksplodere og gøre fødevaremangel blandt store dele af befolkningen i til et reelt problem.

1. Hvilke moralske konsekvenser har EU-kommissionen draget af at have lokket Grækenland ind i et valutasamarbejde, som har ødelagt landets økonomi?

2. Hvilke praktiske foranstaltninger vil EU-kommissionen som følge af sit moralske ansvar over for Grækenland sætte i værk for at kunne afbøde en akut fødevaremangel blandt den græske befolkning?

Svar afgivet på vegne af Kommissionen af Olli Rehn
(14. december 2012)

Kommissionen har gennem fødevaredistributionsprogrammet for de dårligst stillede i Unionen bidraget til at reducere fødevareusikkerheden i Europa i mere end 25 år. Kommissionen ser en fremtid for Grækenland inden for eurosamarbejdet, og vil fortsætte med at bistå Grækenland med landets reformarbejde.

I oktober 2012 fremlagde Kommissionen et forslag til en forordning for Europa-Parlamentet og Rådet om Den Europæiske Fond for Bistand til de Socialt Dårligst Stillede ([1]).

Fonden vil støtte medlemsstaternes ordninger for mad til de socialt dårligst stillede samt tøj og andre basale forbrugsgoder til hjemløse og børn med materielle afsavn.

Den materielle støtte til de fattigste vil også blive kombineret med tiltag til social integration af støttemodtagerne. Som en del af forslaget til den flerårige finansielle ramme foreslog Kommissionen i juni 2011 et budget på 2,5 mia. EUR til fonden i perioden 2011-2020. Forslaget vil dog være nytteløst, hvis fonden ikke får tildelt sit eget budget. Derfor opfordrer Kommissionen medlemsstaterne og Parlamentet til at sikre, at den europæiske fond for de mest udsatte har tilstrækkelige ressourcer til at bidrage til målet om at nedbringe fattigdommen i henhold til 2020-strategien.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1704&furtherNews=yes.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009129/12
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Risk of food shortages in the most crisis-hit euro countries

The Commission has recently carried out an opinion poll in all EU Member States which shows that the public in many countries are worried about the future stability of their food supplies. Concerns are particularly pronounced in Greece, where 94% of the people fear food shortages. In Portugal, too, 85% of those polled expressed fears over the stability of food supplies in the future.

The fact that Greece is tied to the euro looks likely to prolong the agony. But however and whenever Greece leaves the euro area, a European contingency plan for solidarity should be in place in time, as Greece is not currently able to produce food for its own people. The reintroduction of the drachma would lead to an explosion in food prices and make food shortages a real problem for large sections of the population .

1. What moral lessons has the Commission learnt from locking Greece into a monetary cooperation system which has devastated the country's economy?

2. What practical measures will the Commission undertake, prompted by its moral responsibility for Greece, in order to avert an acute food shortage among the Greek population?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(14 December 2012)

For more than 25 years, the Commission contributes to reducing food insecurity in Europe through a 'Food Distribution programme for the Most Deprived Persons of the Community' (MDP). The Commission sees Greece's future inside the euro area and will continue to support Greece in its reform efforts.

In October 2012, the Commission presented a proposal for a regulation to the European Parliament and to the Council on the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived ([1]).

The Fund would support Member States schemes providing food for the most deprived people and clothing and other essential goods to homeless people and materially-deprived children.

This material assistance to the poorest would also be coupled with measures aimed at the social integration of persons assisted. The Commission foresaw a budget of euro 2.5 billion for the Fund during the period 2011-2020 as part of its June 2011 proposal for a Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF). Nevertheless, without a proper budget, this proposal will remain a dead letter. This is why the Commission invites Member States and the Parliament to ensure that the European Fund for the most needy will have sufficient resources to contribute to the objective of poverty reduction as defined in the 2020 strategy.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1704&furtherNews=yes.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009131/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Drone iraniano abbattuto in Israele

Il 6 ottobre 2012, un drone disarmato che stava sorvolando il deserto del Negev è stato intercettato dagli israeliani e successivamente abbattuto utilizzando aerei da combattimento F-16. Il velivolo era entrato nello spazio aereo israeliano attraverso Gaza e, secondo gli israeliani, probabilmente era stato lanciato dalla milizia libanese Hezbollah con l'aiuto dell'Iran, suo sostenitore. Sebbene il drone non fosse armato, si ritiene che stesse svolgendo una missione di raccolta di informazioni. Nessuno ha tuttavia rivendicato ufficialmente la responsabilità per il lancio dell'aeromobile.

Un sito di informazione iraniano legato alle Guardie della Rivoluzione del paese ha suggerito la possibilità che si sia verificato un malfunzionamento a livello del sistema antimissile israeliano «Iron Dome» (la cosiddetta «cupola di ferro»), in altre parole che il paese sia vulnerabile. Il sistema Dome è infatti progettato per l'abbattimento di missili a corto raggio lanciati dai guerriglieri e non di velivoli che procedono a bassa quota.

È la prima volta che un drone riesce a penetrare lo spazio aereo israeliano dal luglio 2006, quando il paese era impegnato in un conflitto con Hezbollah. In risposta a questo incidente, Israele ha dispiegato batterie di missili Patriot lungo il confine settentrionale del paese.

1. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante in merito al lancio di droni nel Mediterraneo orientale?

2. Il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante nutre preoccupazioni circa un eventuale inasprimento delle tensioni tra Libano e Israele?

3. Qual è la valutazione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante in ordine al coinvolgimento dell'Iran nel sostenere l'utilizzo di droni da parte di Hezbollah?

4. Qual è la posizione del Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante in merito al supporto militare e finanziario dell'Iran a Hezbollah?

Risposta dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(22 gennaio 2013)

L'Unione europea conferma il suo saldo impegno per la sicurezza di Israele, di cui la pace con i paesi vicini rappresenta la migliore garanzia, nonché nei confronti delle principali minacce nella regione. L'UE è a conoscenza della dichiarazione di Hezbollah in merito alla paternità del drone lanciato sul territorio israeliano e alla collaborazione dell'Iran nell'operazione. L'Unione europea condanna la violazione della sovranità e dell'integrità territoriale di qualsiasi paese, compresa quella dello spazio aereo, e ricorda che fornire materiale militare di qualunque tipo a qualsivoglia entità in Libano, senza la previa autorizzazione del governo libanese o dell'UNIFIL, costituisce una violazione della risoluzione 1701 del Consiglio di sicurezza dell'ONU.

L'UE ha costatato con soddisfazione la relativa calma della situazione sul confine tra Libano e Israele nei mesi precedenti il lancio del drone e ricorda regolarmente a entrambe le parti i rispettivi obblighi derivanti dalla risoluzione 1701 del Consiglio di sicurezza e la necessità di una sua piena applicazione. L'UE sottolinea l'importanza dell'UNIFIL che, assieme alle forze armate libanesi, svolge un ruolo essenziale nel mantenimento della pace nel sud del Libano.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009131/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Iranian drone shot down in Israel

On October 6 2012, Israeli officials tracked an unarmed drone which passed over the Negev desert and later shot it down using F-16 fighter jets. It entered Israeli airspace through Gaza and officials suggest that it was probably launched by the Lebanese militia Hezbollah with the support of its sponsor Iran. While it was not armed, it is believed to have been on an intelligence gathering mission. Yet no one has officially claimed responsibility for launching the drone.

An Iranian news site associated with the country's Revolutionary Guards suggested that there were failings in Israel's Iron Dome anti-missile system (i.e. the country is vulnerable). The Dome system is designed to shoot down short-range guerrilla rockets and not low-flying aircraft.

This is the first time that a drone has managed to infiltrate Israeli airspace since July 2006 when the country was engaged in a war with Hezbollah. In response to this incident, Israel has put Patriot missile batteries on its northern border.

1. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative on drones being launched in the eastern Mediterranean?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative have concerns about a flare-up of tensions between Lebanon and Israel?

3. What is the assessment of the Vice-President/High Representative on Iran's involvement in helping Hezbollah deploy drones?

4. What is the position of the Vice-President/High Representative on Iran's military and financial support for Hezbollah?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(22 January 2013)

The EU reiterates its fundamental commitment to Israel's security, including with regard to vital threats in the region, which is best guaranteed through peace between Israel and its neighbours. The EU is aware that Hezbollah has claimed responsibility for the drone aircraft which was shot down over Israeli territory and has said that it was made with Iranian assistance. The EU condemns violation of any country's sovereignty and territorial integrity, including through violation of its airspace. The EU reiterates that the supply of military material of all types to any entity in Lebanon, unless authorised by the Government of Lebanon or Unifil, is in violation of UN Security Council resolution 1701.

The EU has taken positive note of the relatively calm situation on the Lebanese-Israeli border in the recent months before the drone launch. The EU regularly reminds both sides of their obligations stemming from UNSC Resolution 1701 and the need for its full implementation. The EU stresses the role of Unifil, which jointly with the Lebanese Armed Forces plays a crucial role in maintaining peace in the South of Lebanon.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009132/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Ragazza pakistana colpita da arma da fuoco per aver denunciato le atrocità dei talebani

Il 9 ottobre 2012 diversi media hanno riferito che una ragazza pakistana di 14 anni è stata ferita con colpi di arma da fuoco da due uomini, al rientro da scuola, nella città di Mingora, nella valle dello Swat in Pakistan. La giovane, Malala Yousafzai, è autrice di un blog pubblicato nel 2009 dal servizio della BBC in lingua urdu. Lo scorso marzo è stato reso noto che la ragazza si trovava sulla lista nera dei talebani. Non vi è stato alcun arresto per il tentativo di omicidio. Un portavoce talebano ha dichiarato che la giovane è stata aggredita perché antitalebana e laica, aggiungendo che non sarà risparmiata.

Il ministro locale dell'informazione ha affermato: «Il fatto che le donne siano divenute un obiettivo è segno della debolezza dei talebani.» Stando al quotidiano The Telegraph, Malala Yousafzai aveva solo undici anni quando i talebani occuparono la valle dello Swat, ordinando la chiusura di tutte le scuole femminili. Al blog di Yousafzai è stato riconosciuto il merito di aver reso pubbliche le brutalità del regime dei talebani e le loro azioni, tra cui la decapitazione. Lo stesso blog ha inoltre denunciato il maltrattamento delle ragazze, obbligate a nascondere i libri sotto il velo per il timore di essere colpite con acido al volto. La giovane ha affermato di essersi convinta a iniziare il blog a seguito del divieto di istruzione per le donne: «Ho deciso di far sentire la mia voce contro il regime dell'arretratezza». I talebani sono stati allontanati definitivamente dalla valle dello Swat dall'esercito pakistano nel 2009.

Può la Commissione rispondere a quanto segue:

1. È il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante disposto a rilasciare una dichiarazione sul tentativo di omicidio di Malala Yousafzai?

2. Quali azioni intraprende l'UE all'ora attuale al fine di sostenere le ragazze e le donne che abitano la valle dello Swat, minacciate da attacchi mirati da parte dei talebani?

3. Secondo le valutazioni dei funzionari dell'UE in Pakistan, qual è la portata della minaccia dei talebani e dei loro sostenitori nella valle dello Swat?

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

Il 10 ottobre 2012 il portavoce dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha rilasciato una dichiarazione in risposta alla sparatoria contro Malala Yousafzai. La dichiarazione ampiamente riportata dalla stampa del Pakistan definiva l'incidente come una vile aggressione e un assalto sia ai valori umani fondamentali che ai difensori dei diritti umani di Pakistan.

L'UE opera tramite un fondo fiduciario multidonatori che ha contribuito alla ricostruzione di scuole e ad altri progetti di sviluppo nello Swat e nel settore di Malakand, zone interessate da operazioni militari nel 2009. L'UE collabora inoltre con l'UNHCR al fine di aiutare gli sfollati a tornare alle loro case.

Nell'ambito di tutto quello che sta facendo in Pakistan l'UE riserva particolare attenzione all'accesso delle ragazze all'istruzione; le questioni relative ai diritti delle donne e dei bambini rappresentano inoltre uno tra i temi principali nel nostro dialogo bilaterale. L'UE finanzia, insieme al governo centrale e quello provinciale, un vasto numero di progetti che mirano a sostenere le donne e le ragazze del Pakistan.

L'UE sostiene anche progetti destinati a migliorare l'accesso alla giustizia e la qualità dell'applicazione della legge in Pakistan, in particolare le forze di polizia e le procure, anche nella provincia del Khyber Pakhtoonkwa in cui si trova la valle dello Swat.

La grande maggioranza dei pakistani non sostiene l'estremismo violento, come hanno dimostrato le elezioni del 2008 e l'ondata di rigetto che ha generato nel paese l'aggressione a Malala Yousafzai.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009132/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Pakistani girl shot for exposing Taliban atrocities

On 9 October 2012, various news sources reported that a fourteen-year-old Pakistani girl was shot by two men on her way home from school in the town of Mingora in Pakistan's Swat Valley. The girl, Malala Yousafzai, had written a blog for the BBC's Urdu service in 2009. It was revealed in March that she was on a Taliban hit list. No arrests have been made for her attempted murder. A Taliban spokesman said that she was attacked because she was anti-Taliban and secular, adding that she would not be spared.

The local minister for information said: 'It is the sign of weakness of Taliban that they have been targeting females.' According to the newspaper The Telegraph, Malala Yousafzai was just eleven years old when the Taliban took over the Swat Valley and ordered that all girls' schools be closed. Yousafzai's blog was credited with exposing the brutal reign of the Taliban and their activities including beheadings. It also reported the treatment of girls, who were forced to conceal books under shawls for fear of having acid thrown in their faces. She says she was motivated to start the blog after girls were prevented from receiving an education: 'I decided to stand against the forces of backwardness'. The Taliban was eventually pushed out of the Swat Valley by the Pakistani military in 2009.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative prepared to make a statement about the attempted murder of Malala Yousafzai?

2. What steps is the EU currently taking to support girls and women who live in the Swat Valley and who face the threat of targeted attacks by the Taliban?

3. According to the assessment by EU officials in Pakistan, what is the extent of the threat posed by the Taliban and its supporters in the Swat Valley?

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

The spokesperson of the HR/VP issued a statement on 10 October 2012 in reaction to the shooting of Malala Yousafzai. The statement, which was widely reported in the Pakistan press, described this incident as a vile aggression and an assault both on basic human values and against all human rights defenders in Pakistan.

The EU has been working through a multi-donor trust fund which contributed to the rehabilitation of schools and other development projects in Swat and the Malakand division, areas which were affected by a military operation in 2009. The EU has also been working with UNHCR to help internally displaced persons return to their homes.

In all its work in Pakistan the EU pays particular attention to access to education for girls and issues relating to the rights of women and children are a major feature in our bilateral dialogue. The EU funds a large range of projects, aimed at supporting Pakistani women and girls, with both the central and provincial governments.

The EU is also 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, including in Khyber Pakhtoonkwa province where the Swat valley is located.

The vast majority of Pakistanis do not support violent extremism, as shown in the 2008 elections and again, now, in the upsurge of revulsion throughout the country which followed the attack on Malala Yousafzai.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009133/12
alla Commissione
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Gravidanza e antidepressivi: conseguenze negative per lo sviluppo dei bambini

Milioni di donne durante la gravidanza soffrono di depressione e ricorrono all'uso di farmaci. Una possibile causa di tale disturbo dell'umore può essere legata alla presenza di una quantità inadeguata di serotonina, neurotrasmettitore coinvolto nella regolazione dell'umore.

Gli inibitori selettivi della ricaptazione della serotonina (SSRI) sono la classe di antidepressivi più utilizzata; questi, come altri farmaci, possono passare attraverso la placenta ed essere presenti in tracce nel latte materno. Durante lo sviluppo del cervello, la serotonina sembra avere un ruolo giuda nella crescita e nella connessione delle nuove cellule deputate alla sensibilità tattile, visiva e olfattiva e alla memoria nonché collegate al pensiero. Modificarne i livelli in fase precoce potrebbe, quindi, alterare il processo di formazione di queste vie, influendo sulle capacità cognitive di un bimbo da quando è ancora in pancia.

La British Columbia University ha condotto una ricerca su tre gruppi di madri, uno senza sintomi di depressione, uno curato con farmaci inibitori della ricaptazione della serotonina, e uno con sintomi, ma senza trattamento. In ogni gruppo è stata misurata la capacità di riconoscere diversi linguaggi, rispettivamente a 6 e 10 mesi del bambino, sulla base del ritmo cardiaco e del movimento degli occhi, mentre durante la gestazione è stata fatta una misura della capacità di distinguere vocali e consonanti, sempre sulla base dei cambi di ritmo del cuore alla settimana 36. Il gruppo senza sintomi ha risposto riconoscendo diversi linguaggi a 6 mesi, ma non a 10. Quelli esposti ad antidepressivi durante la gestazione, invece, non sono riusciti a discriminare le differenze a nessuna età, mentre gli altri ci sono riusciti a 10 mesi e non a 6.

Tali studi dimostrano che l'assunzione di farmaci influisce sullo sviluppo cognitivo del bambino.

Era la Commissione a conoscenza di tali studi? Se sì, come intende affrontare tale delicata situazione al fine di tutelare la salute di madri e bambini?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(12 dicembre 2012)

I prodotti medicinali contenenti inibitori selettivi della ricaptazione della serotonina (SSRI) sono stati autorizzati dagli Stati membri. L'informazione sul prodotto è parte dell'autorizzazione alla commercializzazione e contiene dettagli specifici sulla gravidanza e l'allattamento.

Tutti i prodotti medicinali sono soggetti a una sorveglianza post-commercializzazione. Tra gli altri obblighi ([1]), il titolare dell'autorizzazione di immissione in commercio è tenuto a comunicare alle autorità competenti tutte le eventuali nuove informazioni tali da influire sulla valutazione dei benefici e dei rischi legati al prodotto medicinale. Un allarme per la sicurezza potenzialmente serio può indurre l'UE a procedere a una nuova valutazione (vale a dire, la procedura di deferimento).

Gli SSRI in quanto classe terapeutica sono stati oggetto di un deferimento UE nel 2005 ([2]) in relazione all'uso da parte di bambini e adolescenti. Il gruppo di lavoro «Farmacovigilanza» presso l'Agenzia europea per i medicinali ha raccomandato un aggiornamento dell'informazione sulla classe del prodotto nel 2010 ([3]) e nel 2012 ([4]). Le modifiche correlate dell'informazione del prodotto comprendevano il rischio di ipertensione polmonare persistente nei neonati.

La Commissione non è informata dello studio menzionato dall'onorevole deputata. Le attività della Commissione contribuiscono però a estendere le conoscenze sulla sicurezza dei medicinali durante la gravidanza, ad esempio per il tramite del progetto EUROMEDICAT ([5]), finanziato nell'ambito del programma FP7, progetto che comprende gli SSRI e i rischi di malformazioni congenite.

([1]) Direttiva 2001/83/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 6 novembre 2001 recante un codice comunitario relativo ai medicinali per uso umano, GU L 311 del 28.11.2001, e successive modifiche.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/refh_others.htm, Decisione C(2005)3256 del 19/08/2005.
([3]) http://www.hma.eu/fileadmin/dateien/Human_Medicines/CMD_h_/Product_Information/PhVWP_Recommendations/SSRIs_and_TCAs/CMDhPhVWP0202010_March10.pdf
([4]) http://www.hma.eu/fileadmin/dateien/Human_Medicines/CMD_h_/Product_Information/PhVWP_Recommendations/SSRIs_and_possible_increased_risk_of_male_infertility/CMDhPhVWP0502012.pdf
([5]) http://www.euromedicat.eu.

La legislazione farmaceutica modificata di recente ([6]) prevede un processo rafforzato per la gestione delle segnalazioni di sicurezza. Se e quando necessario si procederà a ulteriori interventi normativi su eventuali nuovi dati relativi agli inibitori selettivi della ricaptazione della serotonina.

([6]) Regolamento (UE) n. 1235/2010 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 15 dicembre 2010 e direttiva 2010/84/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 15 dicembre 2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009133/12
to the Commission
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Pregnancy and antidepressants: adverse effects on child development

Millions of women suffer from depression during pregnancy and turn to medication. One possible cause of this mood disorder may be linked to insufficient levels of serotonin, which is a neurotransmitter involved in mood regulation.

Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) are the most commonly used class of antidepressants. These drugs, like others, can pass through the placenta and traces may be present in breast milk. During brain development, serotonin appears to play a decisive role in the growth and connection of new cells involved in memory and the senses of touch, sight and smell, as well as those associated with the mind. Changing serotonin levels at an early stage could thus alter the formation of these pathways, affecting a child's cognitive capabilities while it is still in the womb.

The University of British Columbia has conducted research on three groups of mothers, one group with no symptoms of depression, one group treated with serotonin reuptake inhibitors, and another with symptoms but without treatment. In each group, the children's capacity to recognise different languages, at 6 and 10 months of age respectively, was measured on the basis of heart rate and eye movement. During pregnancy, the ability to distinguish between vowels and consonants was measured at week 36, again on the basis of changes in heart rate. The group with no symptoms recognised different languages at 6 months, but not at 10 months. Children exposed to antidepressants during pregnancy could not tell the difference at any age, while the other group could do so at 10 months but not at 6 months.

These studies show that taking medication affects a child's cognitive development.

Was the Commission aware of these studies? If so, how will it deal with this sensitive issue so as to protect the health of mothers and children?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(12 December 2012)

Medicinal products containing selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) have been authorised by the Member States. Their product information is part of the marketing authorisation and contains specific information on pregnancy and lactation.

All medicinal products are subject to a post-marketing surveillance. Among other obligations ([1]), the marketing authorisation holder has to inform the competent authorities of any new information which might influence the evaluation of the benefits and risks of the medicinal product. A potentially serious safety concern may be subject to an EU re-assessment (i.e. the referral procedure).

SSRIs as a therapeutic class have been subject to a EU referral in 2005 ([2]) in relation to use by children and adolescents. The Pharmacovigilance Working Party at the European Medicines Agency has recommended an update of class product information in 2010 ([3]) and in 2012 ([4]). Related changes of product information included the risk of Persistent Pulmonary Hypertension in Neonates.

The Commission has not been informed about the study mentioned by the Honourable Member. However, the Commission activities contribute to knowledge on safety of medicines in pregnancy, e.g. by FP7-funded project EUROMEDICAT ([5]), which includes SSRIs and the risk of congenital malformations.

Recently amended pharmaceutical legislation ([6]) provides for a strengthened process on management of safety signals. If and when appropriate, further regulatory action on new data concerning selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors shall be taken.

([1]) Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, as amended.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/refh_others.htm, Decision C(2005)3256 of 19/08/2005.
([3]) http://www.hma.eu/fileadmin/dateien/Human_Medicines/CMD_h_/Product_Information/PhVWP_Recommendations/SSRIs_and_TCAs/CMDhPhVWP0202010_March10.pdf
([4]) http://www.hma.eu/fileadmin/dateien/Human_Medicines/CMD_h_/Product_Information/PhVWP_Recommendations/SSRIs_and_possible_increased_risk_of_male_infertility/CMDhPhVWP0502012.pdf
([5]) http://www.euromedicat.eu/ .
([6]) Regulation (EU) No 1235/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 2010 and Directive 2010/84/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 2010.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009134/12
alla Commissione
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Rischi per la salute causati dagli alimenti contenenti acrilamide

Secondo una ricerca condotta dall'American Chemical Association, le patatine fritte surgelate potrebbero causare gravi danni alla salute umana. Secondo tali ricercatori, il pericolo maggiore è rappresentato dalle patatine che subiscono un processo di frittura parziale e sono successivamente congelate prima della vendita. I risultati cui sono giunti gli esperti rivelano che tali prodotti possono contenere acrilamide, una sostanza ritenuta cancerogena. Se ciò fosse accertato, il consumo di patatine surgelate comporterebbe un alto rischio per la salute di decine di milioni di consumatori abituali. I prodotti contenenti acrilamide sono diversi. Tale ammide è rilasciato, in quantitativi elevati potenzialmente nocivi alla salute, a seguito di specifici processi di cottura e conservazione. Si tratta di un composto mutageno e cancerogeno, con tossicità sistemica ma preferenziale per il sistema nervoso sia centrale che periferico e per quello riproduttivo.

Secondo la ricerca, i produttori dovrebbero intervenire urgentemente e modificare le modalità di cottura e conservazione di determinati prodotti, in primo luogo le patatine. Solo intervenendo su tali fasi sembra infatti possibile ridurre il tenore di acrilamide che altrimenti si formerebbe nel processo di conservazione.

I ricercatori hanno scoperto che per risolvere il problema si potrebbe diminuire il rapporto tra glucosio e fruttosio durante il taglio delle patate, riportando alla normalità la presenza di questa sostanza naturale.

La Commissione è a conoscenza di tale ricerca? In caso affermativo, quali misure intende suggerire al fine di accelerare la messa in atto delle azioni necessarie a ridurre il tenore di acrilamide nei prodotti che subiscono processi di conservazione rischiosi per la salute?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(26 novembre 2012)

L'acrilamide è una sostanza che si forma non soltanto nelle patatine fritte surgelate, ma in tutti gli alimenti contenenti amido che siano stati surgelati, fritti o arrostiti a temperature elevate. L'acrilamide non è costituita soltanto di zuccheri (come, ad esempio, il glucosio e il fruttosio citati nella ricerca menzionata) ma anche da altri precursori (come, ad esempio, gli aminoacidi). L'acrilamide non è aggiunta in quanto tale agli alimenti.

A partire dal 2007 gli Stati membri sorvegliano i livelli di acrilamide nei pertinenti gruppi di prodotti alimentari sulla base di raccomandazioni specifiche dell'UE in tema di monitoraggio ([1]). I risultati sono oggetto di compilazioni e relazioni e vengono pubblicati a cura dell'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA). L'ultimo aggiornamento di una simile relazione è stato pubblicato il 23 ottobre 2012 ([2]).

Gli Stati membri sono inoltre invitati a effettuare indagini in loco nei casi in cui si siano riscontrati livelli elevati di acrilamide ([3]). Le indagini servono ad accertare in che modo le misure attualmente disponibili per la riduzione dell'acrilamide negli alimenti sono attuate dagli operatori del settore alimentare. Le misure di mitigazione esistenti sono quelle stabilite nel codice di condotta del Codex per l'acrilamide ([4]), nonché quelle sviluppate dall'industria (le linee guida sull'acrilamide denominate «toolbox FDE» ([5])) in stretta cooperazione con la Commissione e gli Stati membri.

Sulla base della valutazione del monitoraggio dell'acrilamide nonché delle informazioni sui risultati delle indagini condotte dagli Stati membri la Commissione esamina ora se siano necessarie ulteriori misure.

([1]) Raccomandazione della Commissione 2007/331/CE del 3 maggio 2007 e raccomandazione della Commissione 2010/307/UE del 2 giugno 2010.

([2]) Update on acrylamide levels in food from monitoring years 2007 to 2010. EFSA Journal 2012;10(10):2938. [38 pp.] doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2938.

([3]) Commission Recommendation on investigations into the levels of acrylamide in food (Document C(2010) 9681 final of 10.1.2011).

([4]) Codex Code of Practice for the reduction of acrylamide in foods (CAC/RCP 67-2009).

([5]) Il toolbox è reperibile al seguente indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/chemicalsafety/contaminants/ciaa_acrylamide_toolbox09.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009134/12
to the Commission
Iva Zanicchi (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Health risks caused by foods containing acrylamide

According to research conducted by the American Chemical Society, frozen chips could seriously harm human health. According to the researchers, chips that are partially fried and subsequently frozen before sale pose the greatest danger. The experts' results show that these products may contain acrylamide, a carcinogen. If this were to be confirmed, the consumption of frozen chips could pose a great risk to the health of tens of millions of regular consumers. Many products contain acrylamide. This amide is released, in high quantities that are potentially harmful to health, after specific cooking and preservation processes. It is a mutagenic and carcinogenic compound with systemic toxicity, but is preferentially toxic to both the central and peripheral nervous system and to the reproductive system.

According to the research, producers should take urgent action and change the way that certain products, particularly chips, are cooked and preserved. Only by taking action at these stages of the process does it appear possible to reduce the content of acrylamide that would otherwise form during the preservation process.

The researchers discovered that, to resolve the problem, the glucose to fructose ratio could be reduced while cutting the potatoes, bringing levels of this natural substance back to normal.

Is the Commission aware of this research? If so, what measures will it suggest to accelerate the necessary steps to reduce acrylamide content in products undergoing preservation processes and, therefore, posing health risks?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

Acrylamide is a substance which is formed not only in frozen chips, but in all starchy food that have been deep-fried, roasted or baked at high temperatures. Acrylamide is not only formed from sugars (such as glucose and fructose mentioned in the cited research), but also from other precursors (such as amino acids). Acrylamide is not added to food as such.

Since 2007 the Member States are monitoring acrylamide levels in relevant food groups under specific EU monitoring recommendations ([1]). The results are compiled in reports and published by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). The latest update of this report was published on 23 October 2012 ([2]).

Furthermore, Member States are requested to carry out on-the-spot investigations in cases where high acrylamide levels have been found ([3]). The investigations serve to find out how the currently available mitigation measures for reducing acrylamide in food are implemented by food business operators. Existing mitigation measures are those laid down in the Codex Code of Practice for acrylamide ([4]), as well as those developed by industry (the FDE acrylamide 'toolbox' ([5])) in close cooperation with the Commission and the Member States.

On the basis of the evaluation of the acrylamide monitoring as well as of the information on the outcome of the Member States' investigations, the Commission is considering whether further measures are necessary.

([1]) Commission Recommendation 2007/331/EC of 3 May 2007 and Commission Recommendation 2010/307/EU of 2 June 2010.
([2]) Update on acrylamide levels in food from monitoring years 2007 to 2010. EFSA Journal 2012;10(10):2938. [38 pp.] doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2938.
([3]) Commission Recommendation on investigations into the levels of acrylamide in food (Document C(2010) 9681 final of 10.1.2011).
([4]) Codex Code of Practice for the reduction of acrylamide in foods (CAC/RCP 67-2009).
([5]) The toolbox can be found at the following link: http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/chemicalsafety/contaminants/ciaa_acrylamide_toolbox09.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009135/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(11 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Acessibilidade e transportes nas RUP

Considerando que:

O Parlamento Europeu, na sua resolução sobre o papel da Política de Coesão nas Regiões Ultraperiféricas da União Europeia no contexto da Estratégia UE 2020, de 18 de abril de 2012, defende uma integração do projeto das Autoestradas do Mar nas RUP, no âmbito dos transportes e da rede transeuropeia de transportes;

A Comissão Europeia, na sua Comunicação intitulada «As Regiões Ultraperiféricas da União Europeia: Parceria para um crescimento inteligente, sustentável e inclusivo», de 20 de junho de 2012, afirmou que, *«na sequência das sugestões feitas pelo Parlamento Europeu no domínio dos transportes, a Comissão analisará com as RUP e os seus Estados-Membros quais os fundos da política de coesão que podem ser mais úteis para cada caso»*;

Um dos eixos da Estratégia Renovada da UE para a Ultraperiferia diz respeito a melhorar a acessibilidade da UE no mercado único, o que significa melhorar a rede de transportes e diminuir os constrangimentos do afastamento geográfico e das dificuldades de ordem estrutural, como é, aliás, também referido no Relatório Solbes;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Dispõe já de conclusões quanto aos fundos da política de coesão que considera mais úteis para cada caso no domínio dos transportes? A que conclusões chegou?

2. Em caso negativo, para quando prevê tal análise?

3. Pretende, no âmbito da negociação dos fundos da política de coesão, levantar esta questão?

4. É intenção da Comissão apresentar uma proposta de regulamento sobre os transportes nas RUP, nos termos da possibilidade conferida pelo artigo 349.° TFUE?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(10 de dezembro de 2012)

Durante as negociações sobre os contratos de parceria e os programas pertinentes, a Comissão examinará, em conjunto com as regiões ultraperiféricas e os seus Estados-Membros, o modo mais adequado de utilizar os fundos da política de coesão para melhorar a acessibilidade destas regiões ao mercado único, em especial em termos de transportes.

A Comissão não tem a intenção de apresentar uma proposta de regulamento específica sobre os transportes nas regiões ultraperiféricas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009135/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Accessibility and transport in the outermost regions

Given that:

The European Parliament, in its Resolution on the role of cohesion policy in the outermost regions of the European Union in the context of EU 2020, of 18 April 2012, advocates the establishment of the Motorways of the Sea project in the outermost regions in relation to transport and the trans-European transport network;

In its communication of 20 June 2012, entitled *The outermost regions of the European Union: towards a partnership for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*, the European Commission stated that 'following suggestions made by the European Parliament in the field of transport, the Commission will examine with the OR and their Member States how the opportunities under the cohesion policy funds can best be used in each case';

One of the axes of the renewed EU strategy for the outermost regions concerns improving the accessibility of the EU within the single market, which involves improving the transport network and reducing the constraints of geographic isolation and structural problems, as the Solbes report also mentions.

Can the Commission state:

1. Has it reached any conclusions yet on how the opportunities arising from cohesion policy funds can best be used for each type of transport? What conclusions has it reached?

2. If not, when does it envisage carrying out this analysis?

3. Does it intend to raise this issue during negotiations on the cohesion policy funds?

4. Does the Commission intend to table a proposal for a regulation on transport in the outermost regions, pursuant to Article 349 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2012)

During the negotiations on the relevant partnership contracts and programmes, the Commission will examine with the outermost regions and their Member States how to best use cohesion policy funds to improve the accessibility of these regions to the single market, in particular as regards transport issues.

The Commission does not intent to table a specific proposal for a regulation on transport in the outermost regions.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009136/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(11 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Programa POSEI sobre energia, transportes e tecnologias da informação e comunicação nas RUP

Considerando que:

O Parlamento Europeu, na sua resolução sobre o papel da Política de Coesão nas Regiões Ultraperiféricas da União Europeia no contexto da Estratégia UE 2020, de 18 de abril de 2012, defende a criação de um programa específico, na área da energia, dos transportes e das tecnologias da informação e da comunicação, com base nos POSEI;

A Comissão Europeia, na sua Comunicação intitulada «As Regiões Ultraperiféricas da União Europeia: Parceria para um crescimento inteligente, sustentável e inclusivo», de 20 de junho de 2012, afirmou que, *«na sequência da sugestão do Parlamento Europeu», «analisará com as RUP e os respetivos Estados-Membros a melhor maneira de desenvolver o financiamento das energias renováveis e da eficiência energética, no âmbito dos fundos da política de coesão, para responder às necessidades específicas e às capacidades das RUP»*;

O sucesso dos programas POSEI nas áreas da Agricultura e das Pescas, nas Regiões Ultraperiféricas, justifica a sua manutenção para o próximo período plurianual de 2014 a 2020, bem como a criação de programas semelhantes noutras áreas, como a energia, os transportes e as tecnologias da informação e da comunicação, para compensar os custos da ultraperiferia em termos de acessibilidade, de conectividade e de dependência de combustíveis fósseis, tal como reiterado pelo Parlamento e pela Comissão Europeia;

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Dispõe já de algumas conclusões quanto à melhor maneira de financiar as energias renováveis e apoiar a eficiência energética? A que conclusões chegou?

2. Em caso negativo, para quando prevê tal análise?

3. Pretende, no âmbito da negociação dos fundos da política de coesão, levantar esta questão? Está recetiva a apoiar uma tal proposta de POSEI para a energia, os transportes e as tecnologias da informação e da comunicação, nas Regiões Ultraperiféricas?

4. É intenção da Comissão apresentar uma proposta de regulamento que vise o programa POSEI na área da energia, dos transportes e das tecnologias da informação e da comunicação?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(10 de dezembro de 2012)

No decorrer das negociações sobre contratos e programas de parcerias relevantes, a Comissão avaliará, em conjunto com as regiões ultraperiféricas e os seus Estados-Membros, qual será a melhor forma de utilizar os fundos da política de coesão para responder às necessidades específicas das regiões ultraperiféricas relativamente à energia, aos transportes e às tecnologias de informação e comunicação.

A Comissão não pretende apresentar uma proposta específica para um regulamento relativo às regiões ultraperiféricas em nenhum dos três domínios mencionados.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009136/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: POSEI programme for energy, transport, and information and communications technology in the outermost regions

Whereas:

The European Parliament, in its Resolution on the role of cohesion policy in the outermost regions of the European Union in the context of EU 2020, of 18 April 2012, advocates the creation of a specific programme in the field of energy, transport and information and communications technology, based on the POSEI schemes;

In its communication of 20 June 2012, entitled *The outermost regions of the European Union: towards a partnership for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*, the European Commission stated that 'following suggestions made by the European Parliament', it 'will examine with the OR and their Member States how funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency under the cohesion policy funds can best be deployed to meet the specific needs and capacities of the OR';

As Parliament and the Commission have repeatedly stated, the success of the agriculture and fisheries POSEI schemes in the outermost regions justifies retaining them for the next multiannual financial framework, 2014-2020, and also justifies creating similar programmes in other areas, such as energy, transport, and information and communications technology, to offset the costs to the outermost regions in terms of accessibility, connectivity and dependence on fossil fuels;

I ask the Commission:

1. Has it reached any conclusions yet on the best means of financing renewable energy and supporting energy efficiency? If so, what are these?

2. If not, when does it envisage carrying out this analysis?

3. Does it intend to raise this issue during negotiations on the cohesion policy funds? Is it receptive to a similar POSEI proposal for energy, transport, and information and communications technology in the outermost regions?

4. Does the Commission intend to present a proposal for a regulation based on POSEI schemes in the area of energy, transport, and information and communications technology?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2012)

During the negotiations on the relevant partnership contracts and programmes,the Commission will examine with the outermost regions and their Member States how to best use cohesion policy funds to meet the outermost regions' specific needs with regard to energy, transport and information and communication technologies.

The Commission does not intend to table a specific proposal for a regulation concerning the outermost regions on any of the three fields at stake.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009137/12
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(11 października 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Zdrowie a edukacja w krajach rozwijających się

W krajach rozwijających się edukacja i zdrowie są ściśle ze sobą powiązane. Liczne badania wskazują, że w krajach, w których dziewczynki uczęszczają do szkoły, charakteryzują się m.in. mniejszą umieralnością noworodków. Bez powszechnego dostępu do edukacji na poziomie podstawowym nie ma szans na zmniejszenie światowego poziomu ubóstwa i wyrównania szans życiowych.

W związku z tym, że od dłuższego czasu trwa debata nad ustaleniem celów przyszłej polityki rozwojowej, zwracam się z zapytaniem:

— Czy Komisja zamierza popierać edukację i zdrowie, jako jedne z głównych priorytetów polityki rozwojowej po 2015 r.?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Andrisa Piebalgsa w imieniu Komisji
(4 grudnia 2012 r.)

Wizja UE dotycząca skuteczniejszej i mającej większy wpływ polityki rozwoju została opisana w programie działań na rzecz zmian, zaproponowanym przez Komisję ([1]) i popartym przez Radę ([2]). W komunikacie tym zaproponowano zróżnicowane partnerstwa, w tym poprzez skoncentrowanie zasobów tam, gdzie są one najbardziej potrzebne i mają największy wpływ na ograniczenie ubóstwa.

Pod względem priorytetów politycznych UE skoncentruje się na kwestiach dotyczących praw człowieka, demokracji, zasad dobrych rządów oraz zrównoważonego i sprzyjającego włączeniu społecznemu wzrostu gospodarczego na rzecz rozwoju społecznego. W tym celu UE utrzyma wsparcie na rzecz włączenia i rozwoju społecznego na poziomie co najmniej 20 % pomocy UE. Obejmuje to świadczenie wysokiej jakości usług, w tym w zakresie podstawowej edukacji oraz zdrowia, przy jednoczesnym wsparciu ukierunkowanym na zapewnienie, że wszyscy, a w szczególności osoby ubogie, mają lepszy dostęp do tych usług. Zdrowie i edukacja pozostają więc również w przyszłości ważnym priorytetem unijnej polityki rozwoju.

Komisja podziela obawy Szanownego Pana Posła dotyczące równości płci. UE będzie w dalszym ciągu promować równość płci i wzmocnienie pozycji kobiet jako podmiotów działających na rzecz rozwoju poprzez plan działania na rzecz równości płci z 2010 r.

Komisja podejmuje obecnie działania mające na celu włączenie tych nowych priorytetów polityki UE do krajowego, regionalnego i tematycznego procesu programowania.

W odniesieniu do okresu po 2015 r. Komisja aktywnie uczestniczy w rozmowach na ten temat. Zdrowie, edukacja i wszystkie inne aspekty rozwoju społecznego pozostaną ważnymi elementami agendy rozwoju, zgodnie z programem działań na rzecz zmian.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0637:FIN:PL:PDF.
([2]) Wersja w jęz. angielskim: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/130243.pdf i wersja w jęz. polskim: http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/pl/12/st09/st09369.pl12.pdf.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009137/12
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Health and education in developing countries

In developing countries, education and health are closely linked. Many studies show that infant mortality rates are lower in countries in which girls attend school. Without universal access to basic education there is no hope of reducing world poverty or establishing a level playing field when it comes to life chances.

Given that discussions have been ongoing for some time with regard to defining the objectives of the future development policy:

— Is the Commission intending to support health and education as one of the main priorities for the development policy after 2015?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2012)

The EU's vision for a more effective and higher-impact development policy is set out in the Agenda for Change, as proposed by the Commission ([1]) and endorsed by the Council ([2]). This proposes differentiated partnerships including by focusing resources where they are needed most and have the highest impact in terms of poverty reduction.

In terms of policy priorities, the EU will focus on human rights, democracy, good governance and inclusive and sustainable growth for human development. To this end, the EU will continue to support social inclusion and human development through at least 20% of EU aid. This involves the provision of quality services, including basic education and health, together with support to ensure that all people and the poor in particular, have greater access to these services. Health and education will thus remain an important priority in the future EU development policy.

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's concern for gender equality; the EU will continue to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women as development actors through its 2010 Gender Action Plan.

The Commission is now translating the new EU policy priorities into the country, regional and thematic programming process.

With regard to the post-2015, the Commission is actively engaged in the discussions. Health, education and all other aspects of human development will remain important elements of the development agenda, in line with the Agenda for Change.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0637:FIN:EN:PDF.
([2]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/130243.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009138/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(11 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κατάργηση Φορέα Διαχείρισης Εθνικού Δρυμού Αίνου-Κεφαλλονιάς

Στο πλαίσιο μείωσης των Φορέων Διαχείρισης Προστατευόμενων Περιοχών Δικτύου Natura 2000 στην Ελλάδα ([1]) η κυβέρνηση προτίθεται να καταργήσει τον Φορέα Διαχείρισης Εθνικού Δρυμού Αίνου — έναν ιδιαίτερα αποδοτικό κι αποτελεσματικού φορέα επικαλούμενη δημοσιονομικούς λόγους. Το όρος Αίνος έχει ανακηρυχθεί Εθνικός Δρυμός ([2]) και αποτελεί Τόπο Κοινοτικής Σημασίας (ΤΚΣ) ([3]), Ειδική Ζώνη Διατήρησης (ΕΖΔ) και Ζώνη Ειδικής Προστασίας (ΖΕΠ) ([4]), διεθνούς αναγνωρισιμότητας. Περιλαμβάνει την κεφαλληνιακή ελάτη (Abies cephalonica) — πολύ σπάνια νησί έχει δάσος ελάτης — και πλήθος ελληνικών ειδών που φέρουν το όνομα του όρους Αίνος ή της Κεφαλλονιάς ([5]).

Φύονται σε αυτό πολλά ελληνικά ενδημικά είδη φυτών, 7 αποκλειστικά ενδημικά του Εθνικού Δρυμού και της νήσου Κεφαλλονιάς, ενώ 5 περιλαμβάνονται στο νέο «Βιβλίο Ερυθρών Δεδομένων» και προτείνεται να προστατευθούν ως «Σπάνια» και «Κινδυνεύοντα». Δεν υπάρχει συνοδευτική έκθεση που να αποδεικνύει ότι από την κατάργηση του Φορέα Διαχείρισης Αίνου προκύπτει δημοσιονομικό ή άλλο όφελος (αναβάθμιση λειτουργίας, επέκταση ορίων ευθύνης του, περιλαμβάνοντας και τις υπόλοιπες σημαντικές περιοχές του Δικτύου Natura των νήσων Κεφαλλονιάς και Ιθάκης, όπως το «Καλόν Όρος» (GR2220001)). Η λειτουργία του Φορέα χρηματοδοτείται μέχρι το 2015 από ευρωπαϊκούς πόρους (ΕΠΠΕΡΑΑ). Το ΔΣ — άμισθο — αντιτίθεται στην κατάργηση του φορέα ενώ η Επιτροπή Φύση, οι περιβαλλοντικές οργανώσεις και υπηρεσιακοί παράγοντες έχουν κατ' επανάληψη επιχειρηματολογήσει κατά της αλλαγής του καθεστώτος των Φορέων Διαχείρισης, τουλάχιστον μέχρι το 2015, οπότε λήγει η προγραμματική περίοδος εξασφαλισμένης χρηματοδότησης για αυτούς μέσω του ΕΠΠΕΡΑΑ, πολύ περισσότερο αν δεν υπάρχει αξιολόγηση και διαβούλευση για όποιες αλλαγές γίνουν.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Έχει ενημερωθεί από τις ελληνικές αρχές για την κατάργηση του Φορέα και για τα επιστημονικά, οικολογικά και οικονομικά κριτήρια στα οποία βασίστηκε η απόφαση αυτή;

— Είναι η κατάργηση του Φορέα συμβατή με τη διαχείριση των Εθνικών Δρυμών και τις επιδιώξεις της Οδηγίας για τους οικοτόπους (92/43/ΕΟΚ); Αν όχι, τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει;

— Πώς αντιμετωπίζει την τροποποίηση των τεχνικών όρων υλοποίησης (π.χ. αλλαγή δικαιούχου) των εγκεκριμένων προγραμμάτων για την περιοχή Αίνου-Κεφαλλονιάς και τις πιθανές επιπτώσεις στην υλοποίηση και στα χρονοδιαγράμματά τους;

Απάντηση του κ. Potočnik εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην απάντησή της στη γραπτή ερώτησή του E-007884/2012 ([6]) σχετικά με το συνολικό ζήτημα της συγχώνευσης των οργανισμών που είναι υπεύθυνοι για τη διαχείριση των περιοχών Natura 2000 στην Ελλάδα.

([1]) Σχέδιο Νόμου «Συγχώνευση φορέων της αρμοδιότητας του ΥΠΕΚΑ» http://www.opengov.gr/minreform/?p=577.
([2]) Β.Δ. 776/19 Νοεμβρίου 1962.
([3]) GR2220002.
([4]) GR2220006.
([5]) Π.χ. Viola cephalonica, Poa cephalonica, Silene cephallenia, Erysimum cephalonicum, Limonium cephalonicum, Ophrys cephalonica, Astragalus sempervirens subsp. cephalonicus, Campanula garganica subsp. cephallenica, Mentha pulegium subsp. cephalonica, Scutellaria rupestris subsp. cephalonica, Saponaria aenesia και Ajuga orientalis subsp. aenesia).
([6]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009138/12
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Dissolution of the management board of the Mount Ainos National Park in Kefalonia

In a bid to reduce the number of Natura 2000 protected area management boards in Greece, ([1]) the government is, for what it indicates are financial reasons, planning to dissolve the Mount Ainos National Park management body, which works very efficiently. Mount Ainos has been declared a national park ([2]) as well as being a site of Community importance (SCI) ([3]), a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and a Special Protection Area (SPA) of international renown ([4]). The park contains Greek fir (*Abies cephalonica*), which rarely grows on islands and a large number of Greek species named after Mount Ainos or Kefalonia ([5]).

Numerous indigenous Greek plant species also grow there, seven of them to be found in the national park and on the island of Kefalonia alone, and five of them included in the red list of rare and endangered species. No documentary evidence has been provided that the dissolution of the Mount Ainos management body will have any financial or other advantages (improvement in operation methods, widening of scope to include other major Natura 2000 areas on the islands of Kefalonia and Ithaki, such as the 'Kalon Oros' (GR2220001)). The organisation is entitled to European funding up to 2015 (EPPERAA). The — unpaid — board is opposed to being wound up, while the Natura 2000 Committee, environmental bodies and other stakeholders have repeatedly argued against any change to the status quo regarding management boards, at least until 2015 on expiry of the period of guaranteed EPPERAA funding, particularly if the proposed changes have not been properly assessed and discussed.

In view of this:

— Has the Commission been informed by the Greek authorities plans to wind up this management board and of the scientific, ecological and financial criteria on which this decision was based?

— Is such a move in accordance with the proper management of national parks and the objectives of Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats? If not, what measures will it take?

— What view does it take of the changes to the technical conditions for implementation of approved programmes (for example, changes regarding the bodies entitled to funding) in respect of the Mount Ainos area of Kefalonia and the possible implications regarding project implementation and adherence to timetables?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2012)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to his Written Question E-007884/2012 ([6]) on the overall issue of merging of organisations responsible for managing Natura 2000 areas in Greece.

([1]) Bill for the merger of bodies belonging to the Greek Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, http://www.opengov.gr/minreform/?p=577.
([2]) Royal Decree 776/19 December 1962.
([3]) GR2220002.
([4]) GR2220006.
([5]) e.g. *Viola cephalonica, Poa cephalonica, Silene cephallenia, Erysimum cephalonicum, Limonium cephalonicum, Ophrys cephalonica, Astragalus sempervirens subsp. cephalonicus, Campanula garganica subsp. cephallenica, Mentha pulegium subsp. cephalonica, Scutellaria rupestris subsp. cephalonica, Saponaria aenesia* and *Ajuga orientalis subsp. aenesia*).
([6]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009139/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(11 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Διασυνοριακές επιπτώσεις από πιθανή λειτουργία ορυχείου χρυσού-χαλκού στην Ilovitza της ΠΓΔΜ

Στις 24 Ιουλίου 2012 υπογράφηκε σύμβαση παραχώρησης προς την εταιρεία Euromax Resources μεταλλοφόρου κοιτάσματος χρυσού-χαλκού έκτασης 5 km^2 στην τοποθεσία Ilovitza της ΠΓΔΜ ([1]). Πρόκειται για περιοχή που βρίσκεται στη λεκάνη απορροής του ποταμού Στρυμώνα, πολύ κοντά στα σύνορα με Βουλγαρία και Ελλάδα. Η περιεκτικότητα των εδαφών σε χρυσό δεν υπερβαίνει τα 0,32 γραμμάρια/τόνο, σύμφωνα με την εταιρεία, ενώ συνολικά υπολογίζεται ότι το κοίτασμα περιλαμβάνει 3,8 εκατομμύρια ουγγιές χρυσού ([2]). Η εταιρεία δηλώνει ότι ο χρυσός και ο χαλκός θα παράγονται ως συμπύκνωμα, το ορυχείο θα κατασκευαστεί το 2015 και θα είναι έτοιμο για παραγωγή στα μέσα του 2017. Σύμφωνα με τη Διεθνή Συνθήκη του Espoo για τη Διασυνοριακή Ρύπανση (1994), η Ελλάδα και η Βουλγαρία είναι «επηρεαζόμενα μέλη», ως εκ τούτου έχουν βαρύνουσα άποψη στη διαδικασία έγκρισης και η χώρα όπου πρόκειται να γίνει το έργο οφείλει να παράσχει στους πολίτες των περιοχών που πιθανόν να επηρεαστούν πλήρη και έγκαιρη πληροφόρηση και να τους δώσει τη δυνατότητα να συμμετέχουν στη διαδικασία λήψης αποφάσεων. Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει ενημερωθεί για τα σχέδια εξόρυξης χρυσού και χαλκού στη συγκεκριμένη περιοχή και τις πιθανές διασυνοριακές περιβαλλοντικές επιπτώσεις τους; Έχει γίνει Μελέτη Περιβαλλοντικών Επιπτώσεων; Γνωρίζει αν θα χρησιμοποιηθεί τεχνολογία εκχύλισης κυανίου;

2. Γνωρίζει για τυχόν διαδικασίες διαβούλευσης με τα γειτονικά κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, Ελλάδα και Βουλγαρία; Σκοπεύει να ενημερώσει περαιτέρω τα κράτη μέλη της περιοχής για τυχόν περιβαλλοντικές επιπτώσεις που αναμένονται από τη συγκεκριμένη επένδυση;

3. Με δεδομένο ότι προωθούνται πολλά σχέδια για εξορύξεις στα Βαλκάνια ([3]), όπου οι χώρες που πλήττονται από την οικονομική κρίση αδυνατούν να αντισταθούν σε οικονομικά και περιβαλλοντικά καταστροφικούς όρους που μπορεί να επιβάλουν οι εξορυκτικές εταιρείες, τι μέτρα λαμβάνει, τουλάχιστον σε συνεργασία με κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ στην περιοχή, για να αποφευχθούν μη αντιστρεπτές επιπτώσεις στο περιβάλλον και την υγεία των πολιτών από τις εξορυκτικές δραστηριότητες;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή δεν ενημερώθηκε για τις σχεδιασθείσες δραστηριότητες εξόρυξης χρυσού-χαλκού στην τοποθεσία Ilovica της πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβικής Δημοκρατίας της Μακεδονίας (ΠΓΔΜ). Επίσης, δεν υπάρχει νομική υποχρέωση κοινοποίησης στην Επιτροπή βάσει της σύμβασης Espoo των Ηνωμένων Εθνών (ΗΕ).

Στα συμπεράσματα του Συμβουλίου του 1998, υπογραμμίστηκε η σημασία για τις υποψήφιες χώρες να ευθυγραμμιστούν με τα περιβαλλοντικά πρότυπα της ΕΕ για όλες τις νέες επενδύσεις. Σχετικά με αυτό, η Επιτροπή έχει ορισμένες διασφαλίσεις:

— στην περίπτωση συγχρηματοδότησης από την ΕΕ: υπάρχει de facto υποχρέωση για την πλήρωση των προτύπων ΕΕ ως προϋπόθεση της εκταμίευσης πόρων ΕΕ·

— στην περίπτωση συμμετοχής Διεθνών Χρηματοδοτικών Οργανισμών (ΔΧΟ), εφαρμόζεται η ίδια προϋπόθεση. Πέντε από αυτούς (Αναπτυξιακή Τράπεζα του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης, Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Ανασυγκρότησης και Ανάπτυξης, Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων, Χρηματοδοτική Συνεργασία του Βορρά για το Περιβάλλον και Σκανδιναβική Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων) υπέγραψαν τις «Ευρωπαϊκές Αρχές για το Περιβάλλον», όπου δεσμεύτηκαν να εξασφαλίσουν την τήρηση του περιβαλλοντικού κεκτημένου της ΕΕ στα επενδυτικά σχέδια των χωρών της διεύρυνσης.

— Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί με προσοχή την κατάσταση όσον αφορά τη συμμόρφωση με την οριζόντια περιβαλλοντική νομοθεσία. Όπως αναφέρεται στην πλέον πρόσφατη έκθεση προόδου για την ΠΓΔΜ ([4]), η ικανότητα εφαρμογής της οδηγίας ([5]) για την εκτίμηση των περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων (ΕΠΕ) βελτιώθηκε παρότι εξακολουθούν να υπάρχουν αδυναμίες, ιδίως σε τοπικό επίπεδο, και οι απαιτήσεις για την πρόσβαση σε πληροφορίες και δημόσιες διαβουλεύσεις σχετικά με την ΕΠΕ ακόμη δεν εφαρμόζονται ορθά. Απαιτείται η καταβολή σημαντικών προσπαθειών για την εφαρμογή της εθνικής νομοθεσίας σχετικά με τον έλεγχο της βιομηχανικής ρύπανσης και την προστασία της φύσης.

([1]) EurOmax Resources Ltd to invest $500 mln, plans to hire 500 people http://vlada.mk/node/4026?language=en-gb.
([2]) http://www.euromaxresources.com/s/Ilovitza.asp.
([3]) http://www.euromaxresources.com/i/maps/EOX_EUmap_props.jpg.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/mk_rapport_2012_en.pdf
([5]) Οδηγία 85/337/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου, της 27ης Ιουνίου 1985 για την εκτίμηση των επιπτώσεων ορισμένων σχεδίων δημοσίων και ιδιωτικών έργων στο περιβάλλον, ΕΕ L 175 της 5.7.1985.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009139/12
to the Commission
Nikos Chrysogelos (Verts/ALE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Cross-border impact of projected gold and copper mining activities at Ilovica in Fyrom

On 24 July 2012, a concession agreement was signed with the Euromax Resources company for the extraction of gold and copper deposits over an area of 5 km^2 at Ilovica in Fyrom ([1]), which is situated in the Strimon river basin very close to the Bulgarian and Greek borders. The company calculates the gold content of the deposits to be no more than 0.32 g/tonne, yielding a total of 3.8 million ounces of gold ([2]). It indicates that the gold and copper will be produced as condensates, that construction work on the mine will begin in 2015 and that it will enter into operation half-way through 2017. Under the 1994 International Espoo Convention on Transboundary Pollution, Greece and Bulgaria are parties affected and therefore have an opinion of importance in the authorisation procedure. Furthermore, the country in which the project is situated is required to provide local residents likely to be affected with full and timely information, thereby giving them the opportunity to take part in the decision-making procedure. In view of this:

1. Has the Commission been informed of the projected gold and copper extraction activities in this area and the likely cross-border environmental impact thereof? Does it know whether cyanide extraction technology will be used?

2. Does it know whether any consultations are taking place with the neighbouring EU Member States, Greece and Bulgaria? Will it inform the Member States of the anticipated environmental impact of this project?

3. In view of the numerous mining projects being launched in the Balkans ([3]), where countries in the throes of the economic crisis are in no position to comply with economically and environmentally disastrous terms which could be imposed by mining companies, what measures does it intend to take in cooperation with EU Member States in this area to avoid irreversible consequences for the environment and the health of local residents as a result of mining activities?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2012)

The Commission has not been informed of the projected gold and copper extraction activities at Ilovica in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (fYRoM). There is also no legal obligation for the Commission to be notified under the United Nations (UN) Espoo Convention.

The 1998 Council conclusions underlined the importance for the candidate countries to align with EU environmental standards for all new investments. In this respect, the Commission has several safeguards:

— if EU co-financing is involved: there is de facto an obligation to meet EU standards as a pre-condition for EU disbursement of funds;

— when International Financial Institutions (IFIs) are involved, the same pre-condition applies. Five of them (Council of Europe Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Investment Bank, Nordic Environment Finance Corporation and Nordic Investment Bank) have signed the European Principles for the Environment whereby they commit themselves to make sure that the EU environmental *acquis* is being applied in enlargement countries for investment projects.

The Commission closely monitors the situation as regards the compliance with environmental horizontal legislation. As stated in the last Progress Report on FYROM ([4]), the capacity for implementing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive ([5]) was improved, although shortcomings remain, in particular at local level and requirements for access to information and public consultations related to EIA are still not adequately applied. Significant efforts are still needed in order to implement the national legislation on industrial pollution control and nature protection.

([1]) EurOmax Resources Ltd to invest USD 500 mln, plans to hire 500 people http://vlada.mk/node/4026?language=en-gb.
([2]) http://www.euromaxresources.com/s/Ilovitza.asp.
([3]) http://www.euromaxresources.com/i/maps/EOX_EUmap_props.jpg.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2012/package/mk_rapport_2012_en.pdf
([5]) Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, OJ L 175, 5.7.1985.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009140/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Opposition in Bangladesh to ending the caretaker government system

In the past, Bangladesh had adopted, given a longstanding history of political instability, a unique system of having a non-party caretaker government for purposes of facilitating holding a free and fair election. The current government has now repealed this settled system, under the Fifteenth Amendment to the constitution.

Under that amendment, the election, due next year, will be held 90 days before the expiry of the present term of the parliament. It means that the government and the parliament will continue to function at the same time without the parliament being dissolved, which is strongly perceived by the opposition parties like the BNP (Bangladesh National Party) as unfair, and has resulted in their decision not to participate in that election unless the provisions for a non-party caretaker government are restored so as to ensure a level playing field for all the participants in the election.

Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the situation and the danger of a boycott of the parliamentary election which might delegitimise the outcome? Can the EU find a possible role as a mediator to help the opposition parties find a compromise solution that will ensure that all political parties feel able to participate in a free and fair election?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the deterioration in government — opposition relations following the scrapping of the caretaker government system. The EEAS representatives have also been informed by the BNP of its current position on the reinstatement of the caretaker government as a pre-condition for its participation in the next elections.

Past EU offers to support mediation among political parties have been ultimately turned down. The EU has consistently encouraged all political forces to find a consensus on the modalities for an inclusive electoral framework, which should be determined locally. The EU is currently supporting capacity building at the Bangladesh Election Commission (EUR 10 mill.) and remains ready to continue its long-standing support to the consolidation of democracy in Bangladesh. The EU observed the last general elections, and would certainly consider observing the next ones should it be invited to do so. Member States have expressed support for the deployment of an election observation mission — provided that the conditions for a credible and democratic process are met.

The caretaker system was specifically designed for a country where there is no relationship of trust between a democratically elected government and a 'loyal opposition'. Most countries do not have anything similar. It is open to question whether any opposition party which unilaterally decides to boycott an election is acting in the interests of the country or of democracy.

Without a caretaker government, the independence of the Bangladesh Election Commission (BEC) will be fundamental for the process. Therefore, the HR/VP considers that the way in which the BEC performs its role on the way to elections will be key to establish its credibility.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009141/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Anti-Buddhist attacks in Bangladesh

Over the weekend of 29-30 September 2012 Islamist mobs went on the rampage in Bangladesh, directing their anger against members of the country's tiny Buddhist minority. Several Buddhist temples and dozens of private homes of Buddhists were set ablaze. The violence was allegedly provoked by a photograph of a Buddhist boy next to a partially burned copy of the Koran. The interior minister of Bangladesh subsequently claimed that the violence had been planned and orchestrated. Supporters of the opposition Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP), including members of the extremist organisation Jamaat-e-Islami and its student wing, Islami Chhatra Shibir, were widely blamed for the violence. These events come some six months after a spate of violent attacks on members of the Hindu minority in Bangladesh, which was the subject of my parliamentary Question E-002958/2012.

1. To what extent is the Vice-President/High Representative concerned that fundamentalist sentiment is being mobilised by Muslim extremists in Bangladesh in order to put pressure on Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina (of the BNP's bitter rival, the Awami League) to abandon the war crimes trial of senior members of the Islamist group Jamaat-e-Islami for their alleged involvement in atrocities perpetrated during the 1971 liberation war against Pakistan?

2. What links does the Vice-President/High Representative make between the war crimes trial and the apparently systematic and planned violence against religious minorities over the past several months?

3. Given the historical enmity between Bangladesh and Pakistan, what concerns does the Vice-President/High Representative have regarding allegations that extremist elements in Pakistan may be giving practical support to counterparts in Bangladesh to attack religious minorities, which are perceived by many Islamists in Bangladesh as being supporters of the Awami League and pro-India?

4. Will the Vice-President/High Representative continue to support the war crimes trial despite it apparently being exploited by extremists to destabilise the country politically and foment violence?

5. What efforts will the Vice-President/High Representative make to encourage the BNP to promote religious tolerance and equality in Bangladesh and to denounce and disassociate itself from the serious alleged recent actions ascribed to its associates?

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

The HR/VP is aware of the attacks in the Ramu and Ukhia sub-districts (Cox's Bazar). Representatives of the EU Delegation as well as of EU Member States have held contacts with *inter alia*, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, opposition leaders and civil society organisations with a view to gathering more information about the incidents. While differing on other points, all the initial inquiries conducted so far suggest that the attacks were orchestrated rather than spontaneous.

The HR/VP welcomes the opening of an official investigation and the commitment made by the Government to rebuild the Buddhist monasteries, compensate the victims whose houses were destroyed and bring those responsible to justice. The efforts made by the opposition and by civil society organisations to undertake their own detailed inquiries demonstrate the seriousness with which the incidents are taken in Bangladesh.

The press has reported a number of cross-accusations between the government and the opposition on the responsibility for the events. As the circumstances surrounding these events are still to be clarified, it is premature to comment on such allegations. The HR/VP notes the strong condemnation issued by Jamaat-e-Islami and its call for an impartial investigation and exemplary punishment to those responsible for the attacks. Both the BNP and Jamaat-e-Islami have made declarations stressing the importance of communal harmony in Bangladesh and demanding the security of minority communities.

The EU is not providing any legal or financial support to the war crimes trials and has not been approached by the Government of Bangladesh to do so.

The EU intends to continue raising the importance of communal harmony in any official contacts with Bangladesh.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009142/12
aan de Commissie
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(11 oktober 2012)

Betreft: Milieueffecten van invoerrechten

Op 8 oktober 2012 publiceerde het sportkledingbedrijf Puma een analyse van de milieuvoordelen en -nadelen van producten, waarin de milieueffecten van hun producten worden onderzocht. In deze analyse wordt de vergelijking gemaakt tussen de klassieke suède sportschoen van Puma en een nieuw model, gemaakt van katoen en met een biologisch afbreekbare zool. De conclusie van het verslag luidt dat de milieueffecten van de nieuwe schoen 31 % lager zijn dan die van de traditionele schoen. Tegelijkertijd is de consumptieprijs van deze „groenere" schoen bijna 12 % hoger dan die van de traditionele sportschoen.

Een van de redenen die Puma voor dit prijsverschil aanvoert, is dat de invoerrechten voor biologisch afbreekbaar plastic hoger zijn dan die voor leder.

1. Is de Commissie op de hoogte van deze averechtse effecten?

2. Is de Commissie van mening dat de milieueffecten van producten voldoende in overweging worden genomen in het huidige kader van de invoerrechten, zowel binnen de WTO als de EU?

3. Is de Commissie van plan actie te ondernemen om ervoor te zorgen dat het handelsbeleid van de EU de innovatie met betrekking tot het verkleinen van de ecologische voetafdruk van producten niet belemmert?

Antwoord van de heer De Gucht namens de Commissie
(21 november 2012)

De grote meerderheid van sportschoenen op de markt in de EU wordt uit derde landen ingevoerd als afgewerkt product: daarom zijn de toepasselijke invoerrechten gelijk aan die welke geheven worden op het hele afgewerkte product. Overeenkomstig de toepasselijke regelgeving worden voor schoenen met biologisch afbreekbare plastic zolen geen hogere invoerrechten betaald dan voor schoenen met lederen zolen. Wat onderdelen van schoenen — zoals zolen — betreft, maakt het soort materiaal geen verschil voor de toepasselijke invoerrechten. De Commissie meent daarom dat invoerrechten het betrokken product niet negatief beïnvloeden in vergelijking met gelijkaardige producten met lederen zolen.

In algemener opzicht streeft de Commissie ernaar de bijdrage van het handelsbeleid van de EU aan milieudoelstellingen te vergroten door haar verschillende instrumenten, waaronder multilateraal overleg, bilaterale handelsbesprekingen en steun aan vrijwillige initiatieven (bijv. milieukeuren). De EU moedigt ondernemingen ook aan om milieuoverwegingen op te nemen in hun bedrijfsactiviteiten, overeenkomstig internationaal aanvaarde beginselen van maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen ([1]).

([1]) Mededeling COM(2011) 681 — „Een vernieuwde EU-strategie 2011-2014 ter bevordering van maatschappelijk verantwoord ondernemen".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009142/12
to the Commission
Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Environmental effects of import duties

On 8 October 2012, the Puma sportswear company published a 'Product Environmental Profit and Loss Analysis' (PEPLA), in which it examines the environmental impact of its products. In this report, a comparison is made between the classic Puma suede sneaker and a new model made from cotton and with a biodegradable sole. The report concludes that the environmental impact of the new shoe was 31% lower than that of the traditional sneaker. At the same time, however, the retail price of this 'greener' shoe is almost 12% higher than that of the traditional sneaker.

One of the reasons given for this price difference is that import duties on biodegradable plastic are higher than those on leather.

1. Is the Commission aware of these perverse effects?

2. Is the Commission of the opinion that the environmental impact of products is sufficiently taken into account in the current framework in which import duties are set, within both the WTO and the EU?

3. Does the Commission plan any actions to ensure that the EU's trade policy does not hamper innovation aimed at reducing the environmental footprint of products?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(21 November 2012)

The vast majority of sport shoes in the EU market are imported as finished product from third countries: therefore, the applicable duties are those levied on the entire finished product. According to the applicable rules, shoes with soles of biodegradable plastic do not pay higher duties than shoes with leather soles. As for shoes' parts, like soles, there is not any difference in the applicable duty depending on the material. Therefore, the Commission considers that import duties do not affect negatively the product under consideration compared to similar products with leather soles.

More in general, the Commission aims at enhancing the contribution of the EU trade policy to environmental objectives, through its different instruments, including multilateral discussions, bilateral trade negotiations, and support to voluntary intiatives (e.g. eco-labels). The EU also envcourages enterprises to include environmental concerns in their business operations, in accordance with internationally agreed principles on Corporate Social Responsibility ([1]).

([1]) Communication COM(2011) 681 — 'A renewed EU strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social Responsibility'.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009143/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(11 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εγγυήσεις εξαγωγών προς την Ελλάδα

Με την απόφαση ΕΕ 2012/C 117/01 της 21.4.2012, αποφασίσθηκε η εξαίρεση της Ελλάδας από τον κατάλογο των χωρών με εμπορεύσιμους κινδύνους με το επιχείρημα «τη δριμεία οικονομική αναταραχή της ελληνικής οικονομίας και τη στενότητα ιδιωτικής ασφαλιστικής κάλυψης για εξαγωγές προς την Ελλάδα».

Μία τέτοια απόφαση, βοηθά επιχειρήσεις κρατών μελών να εξάγουν στην Ελλάδα χωρίς κίνδυνο για τις εξαγωγές τους, αλλά και ελληνικές επιχειρήσεις να παρακάμπτουν προβλήματα ρευστότητας. Ταυτόχρονα όμως η ίδια απόφαση δημιουργεί προβλήματα σε έλληνες παραγωγούς, αφού εξαιτίας της απόφασης αυτής θα δεχθούν αθέμιτο ανταγωνισμό από τα εισαγόμενα προϊόντα, καθώς δεν μπορούν και αυτοί να καλύψουν ασφαλιστικά τον κίνδυνο που προκύπτει από ενδεχόμενη αδυναμία πληρωμής πελατών τους στην ελληνική αγορά.

Με δεδομένο ότι η ανωτέρω εξαίρεση της Ελλάδας αφορά όλα τα προϊόντα, κεφαλαιουχικά και καταναλωτικά, και με δεδομένο ότι τον κίνδυνο που προκύπτει από αφερεγγυότητα πελατών τον αντιμετωπίζουν κυρίως οι ελληνικές επιχειρήσεις, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Ποιο είναι το σύνηθες ποσοστό ασφαλιστικής κάλυψης που παρέχεται σήμερα στις εξαγωγικές πιστώσεις από κράτη μέλη προς την Ελλάδα; Τίθεται θέμα αθέμιτου ανταγωνισμού σε βάρος ελληνικών επιχειρήσεων;

— Μπορεί να διαβεβαιώσει ότι η απόφαση αυτή δεν θα πλήξει επιχειρήσεις που παράγουν αγαθά εντός της Ελλάδας;

— Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να πάρει για την προστασία των ελλήνων παραγωγών;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(7 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Λόγω της δύσκολης κατάστασης στην Ελλάδα, το 2011 παρατηρήθηκε έλλειψη ικανότητας ασφάλισης ή αντασφάλισης για την κάλυψη των εξαγωγών προς την Ελλάδα. Η έλλειψη αυτή ανάγκασε την Επιτροπή να τροποποιήσει τους κανόνες της για τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις όσον αφορά τη βραχυπρόθεσμη ασφάλιση εξαγωγικών πιστώσεων ([1]), εξαιρώντας την Ελλάδα από τον κατάλογο χωρών με εμπορεύσιμους κινδύνους. Η τροποποίηση αυτή επέτρεψε στα κράτη μέλη να παράσχουν στήριξη, υπό ορισμένες προϋποθέσεις, για την ασφάλιση εξαγωγικών πιστώσεων για εξαγωγές προς την Ελλάδα και συγχρόνως βοήθησε επιχειρήσεις σε άλλα κράτη μέλη, οι οποίες επιθυμούσαν να εξάγουν προς την Ελλάδα, αλλά δεν μπορούσαν με άλλο τρόπο να βρουν ασφάλιση εξαγωγικών πιστώσεων στην αγορά. Αυτό με τη σειρά του επιτρέπει στις επιχειρήσεις στην Ελλάδα που χρειάζονται τις εισαγωγές αυτές να τις επιτύχουν και γενικότερα, να εξασφαλιστεί ότι τα αναγκαία είδη παραμένουν διαθέσιμα για την ελληνική οικονομία. Απόκειται στα κράτη μέλη να αποφασίσουν εάν επιθυμούν να κάνουν χρήση της δυνατότητας αυτής. Εξ όσων γνωρίζει η Επιτροπή, το έκανε σημαντικός αριθμός κρατών μελών. Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι τα οφέλη για το γενικό συμφέρον και ιδίως για την ελληνική οικονομία στο σύνολό της, αντισταθμίζουν σε μεγάλο βαθμό οποιεσδήποτε στρεβλώσεις θα μπορούσαν να προκύψουν σε συγκεκριμένες περιπτώσεις.

Επειδή η τροποποίηση αυτή πρόκειται να λήξει στις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2012, η Επιτροπή θα πρέπει να καθορίσει εάν η τρέχουσα κατάσταση της αγοράς δικαιολογεί τη λήξη της εξαίρεσης της Ελλάδας από τον κατάλογο των χωρών με εμπορεύσιμους κινδύνους το 2013, ή αν απαιτείται παράτασή της. Η Επιτροπή θα προβεί σε διαβουλεύσεις και θα ζητήσει πληροφορίες από τα κράτη μέλη, τους ασφαλιστές πιστώσεων και άλλα ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη σχετικά με τη διαθεσιμότητα επαρκούς ικανότητας στον ιδιωτικό τομέα, καθώς και δραστηριότητας εκ μέρους ασφαλιστών που ασκούν δραστηριότητα εξ ονόματος του κράτους ή με κρατική εγγύηση ή του ίδιου του κράτους στην παροχή βραχυπρόθεσμων ασφαλίσεων εξαγωγικών πιστώσεων για εξαγωγές προς την Ελλάδα το 2012.

([1]) Ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής προς τα κράτη μέλη, βάσει του άρθρου 93 παράγραφος 1 της Συνθήκης, για την εφαρμογή των άρθρων 92 και 93 της Συνθήκης στη βραχυπρόθεσμη ασφάλιση εξαγωγικών πιστώσεων, ΕΕ C 281 της 17.9.1997, σ. 4.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009143/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Guarantees regarding exports to Greece

In its communication 2012/C 117/01 of 21 April 2012, the Commission announced that, having regard to the exceptional economic disturbance to the Greek economy and the scarcity of private insurance cover for exports to Greece, it had decided to exclude Greece from the list of marketable risk countries.

While this decision effectively gives Member State companies risk-free opportunities for exporting to Greece and enables Greek companies to avoid problems of liquidity, it is at the same time creating problems for Greek manufacturers, leaving them exposed to unfair competition from imports, since they are unable to obtain insurance cover in respect of non-payment by customers in Greece.

Given that the above exemption for Greece applies to all capital and consumer goods and that the danger of customer insolvency affects principally Greek companies:

— what is the level of export-credit insurance now generally applicable in respect of exports from Member States to Greece? Is this leaving Greek undertakings exposed to unfair competition?

— Can the Commission give its assurance that this decision will not harm manufacturing undertakings in Greece?

— What measures will it take to protect Greek manufacturers?

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

Due to the difficult situation in Greece, a lack of insurance or reinsurance capacity to cover exports to Greece was observed in 2011. This led the Commission to amend its state aid rules on short-term export credit insurance ([1]) by temporarily removing Greece from the list of marketable countries. This amendment allowed Member States to support, under certain conditions, export-credit insurance for exports to Greece and helped at the same time companies in other Member States wishing to export to Greece but otherwise unable to find export-credit insurance on the market. This, in turn, allows companies in Greece who need those imports to obtain them and, more in general, ensure that necessary goods remain available for the Greek economy. It is up to the Member States to decide whether they want to make use of this possibility. To the Commission's knowledge a significant number of Member States have done so. The Commission considers that the benefits for the general interest, and in particular for the Greek economy as a whole, largely outweigh any distortions that might occur in specific cases.

Since this modification is due to expire on 31 December 2012, the Commission will have to determine whether the current market situation justifies the expiry of Greece's removal from the list of marketable risk countries in 2013, or whether an extension is needed. The Commission will consult and seek information from Member States, credit insurers and other interested parties on the availability of sufficient private capacity, as well as activity by insurers acting on behalf of or with State guarantee or the State itself in provision of short-term credit insurance for exports to Greece in 2012.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the Member States pursuant to Article 93(1) of the EC Treaty applying Articles 92 and 93 of the Treaty to short-term export-credit insurance, OJ C 281, 17.9.1997, p. 4.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009144/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(11 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Reducciones presupuestarias en el sector del mantenimiento de aguas

La autoridad nacional del agua del Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente ha prescindido casi por completo de los servicios de mantenimiento, conservación y manejo de los sistemas automáticos de información hidrológica (seguimiento en tiempo real de los datos hidrométricos y de calidad) empleados en las cuencas fluviales de todo el país. El Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente reconoce ([1]) que las redes de control en tiempo real del agua superficial instaladas en las cuencas fluviales de España —SAIH (redes para controlar el nivel del agua y los datos del flujo) y *SAICA* (redes para controlar los datos de calidad)— constituyen un sistema consolidado que ofrece apoyo operativo diario a las autoridades de las cuencas fluviales, reputadas por sus precisos exámenes de gestión en condiciones normales, pero también en situaciones de fenómenos extremos.

Entre 1994 y 2012, la UE ha invertido más de 800 millones de euros ([2]) en el establecimiento y puesta en marcha de redes de control en tiempo real del agua superficial. Actualmente, las reducciones presupuestarias en el mantenimiento y manejo de estas infraestructuras conllevan el abandono y deterioro de las mismas. Desde el primer momento, las redes de control *SAIH* han demostrado ser herramientas imprescindibles para la gestión eficiente de los recursos hídricos, tanto paliando las repercusiones de las inundaciones en la población y la actividad económica en los casos de desbordamiento, como mediante la gestión de embalses como elementos reguladores en los periodos de sequía, con el fin de garantizar la disponibilidad máxima de recursos de modo que queden cubiertas las necesidades de la población y la industria.

Además, las redes de control *SAICA*, con su diseño de tecnología avanzada, han demostrado ser dispositivos excelentes para casos de alerta temprana de contaminación y se han convertido en una infraestructura que permite evitar fugas de agua no autorizadas en el medio acuático.

1. ¿Es consciente la Comisión de que abandonar el mantenimiento de esta infraestructura conlleva su deterioro y, por consiguiente, la necesidad de invertir el doble en el futuro cuando se quiera devolverla a su estado operativo?

2. ¿Tiene presente la Comisión que las redes de control SAIH resultan imprescindibles para una gestión eficaz de los recursos hídricos ya que reducen las consecuencias adversas de las inundaciones y las sequías, máxime dado el régimen hidrológico y el carácter de las precipitaciones en la región mediterránea?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de diciembre de 2012)

1. La política de cohesión de la UE ha invertido en el tipo de infraestructuras mencionado por Su Señoría. Sin embargo, dicha política no puede financiar el mantenimiento y los costes operativos de las infraestructuras, sino que corresponde al presupuesto nacional hacerse cargo de los mismos. Al implantar sistemas de este tipo, las autoridades nacionales deberían tener en cuenta lo que lleva aparejado su mantenimiento a largo plazo y su funcionamiento. Además, la Comisión desea hacer hincapié en que los fondos de la UE no pueden financiar dos veces una misma inversión.

2. La Comisión está de acuerdo en que es necesario hacer el seguimiento de los niveles y los caudales de agua con vistas a una gestión eficiente de los recursos hídricos, incluida la gestión del riesgo de inundaciones y de las sequías, y el Plan para salvaguardar los recursos hídricos de Europa ([3]), recientemente adoptado, propone, entre otras cosas, nuevas medidas (documento de orientación) para abordar la cuestión del caudal ecológico.

([1]) http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/agua/temas/evaluacion-de-los-recursos-hidricos/SAIH_WEB_MMA_V301109_tcm7-28827.pdf
([2]) COM(2000)0822. Fondo FEDER para Galicia 2000-2006; Fondo FEDER para Extremadura 2001-2006; Fondo de Cohesión-FEDER, puesta en marcha del Sistema Automático de Información Hidrológica (SAIH) en la cuenca fluvial del Guadiana, 2007-2013.
([3]) COM(2012) 673 de 14.11.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009144/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Budget cuts in water maintenance sector

The Spanish Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment's National Water Authority has almost entirely dispensed with maintenance services and the preservation and operation of automatic water information systems (real-time monitoring of hydrometric and quality data) implemented in river basins across Spain. The Environment Ministry recognises ([1]) that the real-time surface water monitoring networks installed in Spain's river basins — SAIH (networks to monitor water level and flow data) and SAICA (networks to monitor quality data) — are a consolidated system which provides daily operational support to the river basin authorities, known for their accurate management assessments in normal conditions but also in extreme situations.

In the period between 1994 and 2012, the EU invested over EUR 800 million ([2])in the establishment and implementation of real-time surface water monitoring networks. Budget cuts in the maintenance and operation of such infrastructures now mean that these networks are being neglected and are not performing well. Since their launch, SAIH monitoring networks have proven to be essential tools for the efficient management of water resources, both in minimising the impact of floods on the population and on economic activity in periods of inundation, and in the management of reservoirs as regulatory elements in periods of drought, to ensure the maximum availability of resources to meet the demands of the population and industry.

Moreover, SAICA monitoring networks, through their technologically advanced design, have proven to be excellent early warning devices for pollution, helping to prevent unauthorised discharges into the water environment.

1. Is the Commission aware that failure to maintain this infrastructure will lead to its deterioration and, therefore, to double investment in the future when a decision is taken to put it back into operation?

2. Does the Commission take into consideration the fact that, given the hydrological regime and rainfall patterns in the Mediterranean region, SAIH monitoring networks are necessary for the efficient management of water resources by reducing the adverse impacts of floods and droughts?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2012)

1. EU cohesion policy has invested in this type of infrastructure. However, this policy cannot finance the maintenance and operational costs of such infrastructure; these costs have to be covered by the national budget. National authorities should consider the long term maintenance and operation of systems when establishing them. In addition, the Commission would like to point out that the same investment cannot be financed twice by EU funds.

2. The Commission agrees that monitoring of water levels and flow is necessary for the efficient management of water resources, including for the management of flood risk and droughts, and the recently adopted Blueprint for Safeguarding Europe's Water Resources ([3]) proposes, among other things, new measures (guidance) to address ecological flows.

([1]) http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/agua/temas/evaluacion-de-los-recursos-hidricos/SAIH_WEB_MMA_V301109_tcm7-28827.pdf
([2]) COM(2000)0822. FEDER funding, for Galicia 2000-2006; FEDER funding, for Extremadura 2001-2006; FEDER-COHESION funding, Implementation of the Automatic Hydrological Information System (SAIH) In Guadiana river basin, 2007-2013.
([3]) COM(2012)673 of 14.11.2012.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009145/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(11 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Συμπεράσματα έκθεσης Liikanen και ευρωπαϊκό σύστημα εγγύησης των καταθέσεων

Σύμφωνα με την έκθεση της επιτροπής Liikanen, που συστάθηκε από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και δημοσιεύθηκε στις 2 Οκτωβρίου 2012, ένα από τα απαιτούμενα διαρθρωτικά μέτρα του ευρωπαϊκού τραπεζικού συστήματος είναι ο διαχωρισμός ανάμεσα στις αμιγώς τραπεζικές δραστηριότητες και τις πιο ριψοκίνδυνες επενδυτικές δραστηριότητες ορισμένων ευρωπαϊκών τραπεζών, στην περίπτωση που οι δραστηριότητες αυτές αποτελούν ένα μεγάλο μερίδιο των εργασιών της τράπεζας ή όταν ο όγκος των δραστηριοτήτων αυτών θεωρείται σημαντικός από άποψη χρηματοπιστωτικής σταθερότητας. Συγκεκριμένα, σύμφωνα με την πρόταση της επιτροπής, κάθε τραπεζικός όμιλος με επενδυτικό ενεργητικό 100 δισ. ευρώ, ή ένα χαρτοφυλάκιο επενδύσεων που αντιστοιχεί στο 15-25% του συνολικού ενεργητικού του, θα πρέπει να αναθέσει σε μία χωριστή νομική οντότητα τις επενδύσεις που γίνονται για λογαριασμό της ίδιας της τράπεζας καθώς κι άλλες σημαντικές επενδυτικές δραστηριότητες ([1]).

Η Επιτροπή ερωτάται:

1. Θεωρεί ότι το μέτρο αυτό θα μπορούσε να ενισχύσει την ασφάλεια και τη σταθερότητα του ευρωπαϊκού τραπεζικού συστήματος, την ανθεκτικότητα των ευρωπαϊκών τραπεζών και την εξυπηρέτηση των αναγκών της πραγματικής οικονομίας; Αναμένεται να καταθέσει σχετικές νομοθετικές προτάσεις;

2. Ποιες οι προβλεπόμενες επιπτώσεις των προτεινόμενων μέτρων της επιτροπής Liikanen στην ανταγωνιστικότητα του ευρωπαϊκού χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα;

3. Πιστεύει ότι τα μέτρα αυτά μπορούν να λειτουργήσουν συμπληρωματικά προς το ήδη διαμορφωμένο πλαίσιο προτάσεων και στόχων της τραπεζικής ένωσης; Ποια η πρόοδος στο ζήτημα του ευρωπαϊκού συστήματος εγγύησης των καταθέσεων το οποίο αποτελεί σύμφωνα με την έκθεση Van Rompuy ([2]) κύριο στοιχείο ενός ενοποιημένου χρηματοπιστωτικού πλαισίου;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(6 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Η έκθεση σχετικά με μεταρρυθμίσεις στη δομή του τραπεζικού τομέα της ΕΕ υποβλήθηκε στην Επιτροπή στις 2 Οκτωβρίου 2012. Μετά τη λήψη της έκθεσης, οι υπηρεσίες της Επιτροπής ξεκίνησαν δημόσια διαβούλευση σχετικά με την έκθεση και τις συστάσεις που περιλαμβάνονται σε αυτή. Η διαβούλευση διήρκεσε μέχρι τις 13 Νοεμβρίου 2012. Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη την εν λόγω έκθεση, τα συμπεράσματα της διαβούλευσης και τις περαιτέρω αναλύσεις, η Επιτροπή θα αποφασίσει ποιες ενέργειες ενδείκνυται να ακολουθήσουν τις συστάσεις της ομάδας εμπειρογνωμόνων. Κάθε πιθανή επακόλουθη νομοθετική πρόταση θα συνοδεύεται από μία πρότερη αξιολόγηση αντίκτυπου, αξιολογώντας επίσης τις επιπτώσεις στην ανταγωνιστικότητα του ευρωπαϊκού χρηματοπιστωτικού τομέα.

Οι συστάσεις της ομάδας εμπειρογνωμόνων μπορούν να συμπληρώνουν ισχύουσες και μελλοντικές νομοθετικές προτάσεις οι οποίες, συνδυαζόμενες, είναι δυνατόν να δημιουργήσουν μία «τραπεζική ένωση». Ο περιορισμός της πολυπλοκότητας ιδίως, θα μπορούσε να καταστήσει πιο εύκολη την εποπτεία και την εξυγίανση των τραπεζών.

Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι η πρόοδος προς ένα ενοποιημένο χρηματοπιστωτικό πλαίσιο πρέπει να είναι σταδιακή ([3]), δηλαδή, πριν την καθιέρωσή του, πρέπει να προηγείται η ολοκλήρωση των εν εξελίξει μεταρρυθμίσεων σχετικά με την ανάκαμψη και την εξυγίανση των τραπεζών και τα συστήματα εγγύησης των καταθέσεων και η σύσταση ενιαίου εποπτικού μηχανισμού. Βάσει αυτών η Επιτροπή κάλεσε το Κοινοβούλιο και το Συμβούλιο να καταλήξουν σε συμφωνία, έως το τέλος του 2012, για την εκκρεμούσα πρόταση περί συστημάτων εγγύησης των καταθέσεων. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο επιβεβαίωσε την ανάγκη κατεπείγουσας δράσης, ζητώντας «ταχεία έγκριση των διατάξεων που αφορούν την εναρμόνιση των εθνικών πλαισίων εξυγίανσης και εγγύησης των καταθέσεων» ([4]). Συνεπώς, η Επιτροπή είναι πεπεισμένη ότι το Κοινοβούλιο και το Συμβούλιο θα συνεργαστούν ώστε να εγκριθεί γρήγορα η πρόταση περί συστημάτων εγγύησης των καταθέσεων, ως προϋπόθεση για την ανάπτυξη ενός ορθά ενοποιημένου πλαισίου, το οποίο θα μπορούσε να περιλαμβάνει, μεταξύ άλλων, έναν ενιαίο μηχανισμό εξυγίανσης.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/bank/docs/high-level_expert_group/report_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/focuson/crisis/documents/131201_en.pdf
([3]) Όπως αναφέρεται στην ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής «Χάρτης πορείας προς την τραπεζική ένωση», της 12ης Σεπτεμβρίου 2012, η οποία είναι διαθέσιμη στη διεύθυνση http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finances/docs/committees/reform/20120912-com-2012-510_el.pdf.
([4]) Στη σύνοδο στις 18-19 Οκτωβρίου 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009145/12
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Findings of the Liikanen report and the European deposit guarantee scheme

The report of the expert group set up by the Commission and chaired by Erkki Liikanen of 2 October 2012 concerning European banking reforms calls for a distinction to be made between purely banking activities and riskier investment activities of certain European banks where these make up a large part of a bank's activities and where the volume of transactions is considered significant from the point of view of financial stability. More specifically, the Commissioner recommends that all banking consortia with investment assets of EUR 100 billion or an investment portfolio corresponding to between 15 and 25% of its total assets should entrust investments on behalf of the banks and other major investment activities to a separate legal entity ([1]).

In view of this:

1. Does the Commission consider that such a measure could underpin the security and stability of the European banking system and the sustainability of European banks and meet the needs of the real economy more effectively? Are any legislative proposals along these lines expected?

2. What are the anticipated implications of the measures recommended by the expert group in terms of the competitiveness of the European financial sector?

3. Does the Commission believe that these measures can further develop the existing framework of recommendations and objectives in respect of banking union? What progress has been made towards a European deposit guarantee system which, according to the Van Rompuy report, ([2]) is the cornerstone of an integrated financial framework?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2012)

The report on reforming the structure of the EU banking sector was presented to the Commission on 2 October 2012. Upon receiving the report, the Commission services launched a public consultation on the report and its recommendations; such consultation ran until 13 November 2012. Taking into account the report, the consultation replies and further analytical work, the Commission will determine the appropriate follow-up to be given to the Group's recommendations. Any possible follow-up legislative proposal would be accompanied by a thorough prior impact assessment, also assessing the effect on competitiveness of the European financial sector.

The Group's recommendations could complement present and future legislative proposals which together would create a 'banking union'. Notably, the reduction in complexity could make it easier to supervise and resolve banks.

The Commission considers that progress towards the integrated financial framework should be gradual: ([3]) its establishment should be preceded by completing the current reforms on bank recovery and resolution (BRR) and deposit guarantee schemes (DGS) and setting-up the single supervisory mechanism. In this context, the Commission called on the Parliament and the Council to reach agreement on the pending DGS proposal by the end of 2012. The European Council confirmed this sense of urgency, calling for 'the rapid adoption of the provisions relating to the harmonisation of national resolution and deposit guarantee frameworks'. ([4]) Therefore, the Commission is confident that the Parliament and Council will work towards a swift adoption of the DGS proposal, as a prerequisite for developing a properly integrated framework, which could *inter alia* entail a single resolution mechanism.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/bank/docs/high-level_expert_group/report_en.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/focuson/crisis/documents/131201_en.pdf
([3]) As stated in the Commission Communication 'A Roadmap towards a Banking Union' of 12 September 2012, available at http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/finances/docs/committees/reform/20120912-com-2012-510_en.pdf
([4]) At their meeting on 18-19 October 2012.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-009146/12
lill-Kummissjoni
Joseph Cuschieri (S&D)
(11 ta' Ottubru 2012)

Suġġett: Ir-Roaming fuq in-netwerks pubbliċi ta' komunikazzjoni mobbli fl-Unjoni

Ir-Regolament (UE) Nru 531/2012 tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tat-13 ta' Ġunju 2012 dwar ir-Roaming fuq netwerks pubbliċi ta' komunikazzjoni mobbli fi ħdan l-Unjoni jindika li l-operaturi tan-netwerks mobbli iridu jissodisfaw it-talbiet kollha raġonevoli għall-aċċess għal roaming bl-ingrossa mill-1 ta' Jannar 2013.

Ir-Regolament jgħid ukoll li "l-aċċess għal roaming bl-ingrossa għandu jkopri aċċess għall-elementi kollha tan-netwerk u l-faċilitajiet assoċjati miegħu, is-servizzi rilevanti, is-sistemi tas-softwer u tal-informazzjoni, meħtieġa għall-provvediment ta' servizzi roaming regolati lill-konsumaturi".

Ladarba l-Kummissjoni se tissorvelja l-implimentazzjoni tar-regoli msemmija hawn fuq, kif biħsiebha l-Kummissjoni timmoniterja l-implimentazzjoni tar-Regolament fl-Istati Membri u liema strumenti se jintużaw biex jivverifikaw l-applikazzjoni ta' dawn ir-regoli madwar l-Unjoni Ewropea?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sinjura Kroes f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(20 ta' Novembru 2012)

Ir-Regolament dwar ir-Roaming japplika direttament u l-awtoritajiet regolatorji nazzjonali fl-Istati Membri huma inkarigati bil-kompitu tas-superviżjoni u tal-infurzar tal-konformità mar-regolament fil-ġurisdizzjonijiet tagħhom. Fl-istess ħin, il-Kummissjoni tkompli ssegwi l-funzjonament tar-regolament dwar ir-roaming, fosthom l-implimentazzjoni tal-obbligu tal-aċċess għar-roaming għall-operaturi fl-Istati Membri kollha. Minbarra l-kuntatti diretti mal-partijiet rilevanti, il-Kummissjoni se tkompli taħdem flimkien mal-Korp ta' Regolaturi Ewropej tal-Komunikazzjonijiet Elettroniċi (BEREC), li jħejji rapporti regolari ta' konformità biex jiżgura l-applikazzjoni konsistenti tad-dispożizzjonijiet dwar l-obbligu għall-aċċess mill-operaturi. Barra minn hekk, kif meħtieġ mill-Artikolu 3(8) tar-Regolament dwar ir-Roaming, il-BEREC adottat dan l-aħħar linji gwida dwar l-applikazzjoni tal-Artikolu 3 tar-Regolament dwar ir-Roaming li għandhom rwol importnati fl-iżgurar tal-applikazzjoni konsistenti tad-dispożizzjonijiet tal-aċċess mill-operaturi ([1]).

([1]) http://berec.europa.eu/eng/document_register/subject_matter/berec/regulatory_best_practices/guidelines/1015-berec-guidelines-on-the-application-of-article-3-of-the-roaming-regulation-wholesale-roaming-access.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009146/12
to the Commission
Joseph Cuschieri (S&D)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Roaming on public mobile communications networks within the Union

Regulation (EU) No 531/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2012 on roaming on public mobile communications networks within the Union stipulates that 'mobile network operators shall meet all reasonable requests for wholesale roaming access' as of 1 January 2013.

The regulation goes on to establish that '[w]holesale roaming access shall cover access to all network elements and associated facilities, relevant services, software and information systems, necessary for the provision of regulated roaming services to customers'.

Given that the Commission will supervise the implementation of the above rules, how does the Commission intend to monitor the implementation of the regulation in the Member States and which instruments will be used to verify the application of these rules across the European Union?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(20 November 2012)

The Roaming Regulation applies directly and national regulatory authorities in Member States are entrusted with the the task to supervise and enforce compliance with the regulation within their jurisdictions. In parallel, the Commission continues to monitor the functioning of the roaming regulation, including the implementation of the wholesale roaming access obligation in all Member States. In addition to direct contacts with relevant stakeholders, the Commission will continue to work together with the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC), which prepares regular compliance reports, to ensure consistent application of provisions on the wholesale access obligation. Furthermore, as required by Article 3(8) of the Roaming Regulation, BEREC adopted recently guidelines on the application of Article 3 of the Roaming Regulation which play an important role in ensuring consistent application of provisions on wholesale access ([1]).

([1]) http://berec.europa.eu/eng/document_register/subject_matter/berec/regulatory_best_practices/guidelines/1015-berec-guidelines-on-the-application-of-article-3-of-the-roaming-regulation-wholesale-roaming-access.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009147/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Violazione di diritti umani in Iran: il caso di Mohammad Ali Dadkhah

Secondo quanto pubblicato da Human Rights Without Frontiers, l'Iran avrebbe condannato un avvocato musulmano, Mohammad Ali Dadkhah, a 9 anni di carcere e 10 anni di sospensione della licenza per l'esercizio della professione legale, in quanto colpevole di «difesa di clienti impopolari». Dadkhah, infatti, aveva difeso in giudizio un pastore cristiano, accusato di avere rifiutato la conversione all'Islam e per il quale era stata chiesta la pena di morte. Grazie alle pressioni internazionali, Dadkhah era riuscito a raggiungere un accordo con le autorità iraniane per evitare la pena detentiva comminatagli e continuare a rappresentare il pastore in giudizio, ma tale accordo è stato rinnegato dalle stesse autorità a seguito della vittoria della causa da parte di Dadkhah e del conseguente rilascio del pastore, reso noto poche settimane fa.

Considerando che tali fenomeni di violazione dei diritti umani e del diritto ad un giusto processo, secondo quanto riportato anche dal New York Times, sono molto diffusi in Iran e colpiscono non solo le minoranze religiose, ma qualsiasi forma di dissidenza, in quanto anche i musulmani moderati che agiscano come difensori dei diritti umani o come avvocati di persone dichiarate colpevoli di reati religiosi subiscono incarcerazioni e condanne a morte, come è avvenuto nel caso di Dadkhah;

considerato che Mohammad Ali Dadkhah è attualmente detenuto in cella con altre 22 persone nel braccio dedicato ai prigionieri politici del più noto carcere iraniano, Evin;

considerando che l'Iran ha sottoscritto il Patto per i diritti civili e politici dell'ONU;

considerati i rapporti che l'UE intrattiene con l'Iran, in particolare nei campi dell'istruzione, della cooperazione allo sviluppo e degli aiuti umanitari;

si chiede alla Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante:

se siano stati intrattenuti colloqui con la controparte iraniana al fine di fare luce sull'episodio?

come valuti la sentenza in oggetto e come intenda intervenire concretamente, nel caso specifico ma anche in senso generale, per contenere il fenomeno delle violazioni del diritto al giusto processo e alla tutela dei diritti umani poste in essere dal regime islamico di Ahmadinejad?

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

L'AR/VP è estremamente preoccupata per il caso di Mohammad Ali Dadkhah, che segue con la massima attenzione, e ha rilasciato una dichiarazione in cui esorta le autorità iraniane a riesaminare la sua condanna alla reclusione. L'UE ha recentemente sollevato il caso di Dadkhah e di altri cinque avvocati e attivisti nel campo dei diritti umani con l'ambasciatore iraniano presso l'Unione a Bruxelles. A ciò si aggiunge l'iniziativa intrapresa il 6 novembre dalla rappresentanza dell'UE a Teheran.

L'AR/VP è estremamente preoccupata per le condizioni sempre più difficili in cui operano gli avvocati che si occupano di diritti umani e ha ripetutamente invitato le autorità iraniane a cessare le persecuzioni nei confronti dei difensori di tali diritti, che violano il patto internazionale relativo ai diritti civili e politici di cui l'Iran è firmatario.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009147/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Human rights violations in Iran: the case of Mohammad Ali Dadkhah

According to information published by Human Rights Without Frontiers, Iran has sentenced a Muslim lawyer, Mohammad Ali Dadkhah, to nine years' imprisonment and banned him from practising law for 10 years because he was found guilty of defending clients who were 'enemies of the people'. Dadkhah had defended a Christian pastor accused of refusing conversion to Islam (there had been calls for the pastor to be sentenced to death). As a result of international pressure, he had managed to reach agreement with the Iranian authorities and was thus able to escape the prison sentence passed on him and continue representing the pastor in court. The authorities, however, went back on the agreement after Dadkhah had won the case and the pastor had accordingly been released (the news of the release was published a few weeks ago).

Human rights violations and denial of the right to due process are, as *New York Times* reports have confirmed, very common occurrences in Iran, extending as they do not just to religious minorities, but to dissidence of every kind, as even moderate Muslims who act as human rights defenders or lawyers for people convicted of religious offences are imprisoned and sentenced to death, as has happened to Dadkhah.

Mohammad Ali Dadkhah is currently being held with 22 others in a cell in the political prisoners' wing of Iran's most notorious prison, Evin.

Iran has signed the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The EU has relations with Iran, especially in the spheres of education, development cooperation, and humanitarian aid.

In the light of the foregoing:

Can the Vice-President/High Representative say whether talks have been held with the Iranians with a view to shedding light on this matter?

What does she think about the sentence imposed and what practical steps will she take, not just in this specific case, but also in a general connection, in order to curb Ahmadinejad's Islamic regime in its course of violating the right to due process and denying protection of human rights?

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

The HR/VP is very concerned about the case of Mohammad Ali Dadkhah, and follows it very closely. She has made a statement on his imprisonment, urging the Iranian authorities to review the sentencing. The EU recently raised Dadkha's case and that of five other human rights activists and lawyers by summoning the Iranian Ambassador to the EU in Brussels. In addition to this, a demarche regarding the matter was carried out in Tehran on 6 November by the local EU representation.

The HR/VP is seriously concerned by the increasingly difficult conditions for human rights lawyers in Iran. She has continued to call on the Iranian authorities to stop persecuting human rights defenders, which contravenes the International Covenant of Civil and Political rights that Iran itself signed up to.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009148/12
à la Commission
François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE)
(11 octobre 2012)

Objet: Fiabilité des procédures d'alerte météorologique

La prévision météorologique est devenue un facteur essentiel d'anticipation des catastrophes naturelles et de leurs conséquences économiques et sociales.

De nombreux acteurs, publics et privés, dépendent de prévisions. Or, l'intervention de plus en plus conséquente d'organismes différents génère des situations confuses, avec des messages d'alerte parfois contradictoires. Cette confusion entraîne des situations potentiellement dangereuses pour les populations européennes, ainsi qu'un coût économique élevé engendré pour des alertes inutiles.

Face à ces dysfonctionnements qui sont récurrents, un caractère institutionnel devrait être instauré, avec unicité de source, pour la carte de vigilance météorologique, tout en attribuant le lancement des procédures de vigilance à l'organisme le plus performant, afin d'éviter toute situation contradictoire et par conséquent dangereuse. Elle serait gratuitement mise à disposition des concurrents, mais cela éviterait les situations de confusion qui menacent l'efficacité même du système. Une proposition dont l'Union européenne, compétente pour les questions de sécurité du citoyen, pourrait se saisir afin de mettre un terme à des situations potentiellement dangereuses pour les populations européennes.

La Commission envisage-t-elle d'élaborer une directive à cet égard?

Réponse donnée par Mme Georgieva au nom de la Commission
(28 novembre 2012)

La Commission n'a pas l'intention d'élaborer une directive sur les prévisions météorologiques et les procédures de vigilance.

Toutefois, pour promouvoir la coopération entre les services météorologiques européens, la Commission a soutenu, dans le cadre du mécanisme de protection civile de l'Union européenne, la mise en place de la plateforme Internet MeteoAlarm (www.meteoalarm.eu), qui a été élaborée au sein du projet européen multiservices d'alerte météorologique (EMMA) du réseau des services météorologiques européens (Eumetnet).

Elle produit des avertissements, y compris des mises en garde 5 jours à l'avance, de niveaux différents en fonction d'un code à quatre couleurs (vert, jaune, orange et rouge) pour une série de paramètres météorologiques et couvre 30 pays européens.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009148/12
to the Commission
François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Reliability of weather warning procedures

Weather forecasting has become a vital factor in preparing for natural disasters and their economic and social consequences.

Both public sector organisations and companies rely on weather forecasts. However, the increasing involvement of a range of different bodies in this field is causing confusion as a result of sometimes contradictory weather warnings. Members of the public are being placed at risk and considerable costs are being generated by unnecessary weather alerts.

In view of these recurring problems, official single-source weather warning maps should be introduced and the most effective forecasting body given the task of issuing weather warning alerts. This would prevent dangerous misunderstandings. Although these official maps would have to be made available free of charge to rival meteorological organisations, the confusion which currently undermines the very efficiency of the system would be avoided. If the EU, which is responsible for questions of public safety, were to back this proposal, situations that might potentially endanger EU citizens could be ruled out.

Does the Commission have any plans to draw up a directive setting out provisions of this kind?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2012)

The Commission has no plans to draw up a directive on weather forecasts and warnings alerts.

However, in order to foster cooperation between meteorological services in Europe, the Commission, within the framework of the European Union Civil Protection Mechanism, supported the establishment of the MeteoAlarm Internet platform (www.meteoalarm.eu), which was developed within the European Multiservice Meteorological Awareness Project (EMMA) of the Network of European Meteorological Services (EUMETNET).

It produces warnings, including 5-day warnings, of different levels according to a four-colour-code (green, yellow, orange and red) for a variety of weather parameters, covering 30 European countries.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009150/12
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(11 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Plano de ação para melhorar o acesso das PME ao financiamento

A Comissão apresentou, em dezembro do ano passado, um «Plano de ação para melhorar o acesso das PME ao financiamento» que visa delinear uma estratégia destinada a promover um melhor acesso das PME ao financiamento, com um plano de ação da UE que inclui o aumento do apoio financeiro do orçamento da União e do Banco Europeu de Investimento e uma proposta de regulamento que estabelece regras uniformes em matéria de comercialização dos fundos de capitais de risco.

O plano estabelece um rol de medidas e propostas de forma a proporcionar um maior crescimento e desenvolvimento das pequenas e médias empresas.

No entanto, as medidas previstas no plano parecem não ter em conta a realidade dos países que se confrontam com maiores dificuldades económicas, como é o caso de Portugal.

Assim, solicito à Comissão que me informe do seguinte:

1. Como é que a banca portuguesa, ainda em fase de reestruturação com vista ao cumprimento das exigências que lhe estão a ser feitas relativamente ao rácio de solvabilidade e ao rácio de desalavancagem, irá conseguir dar resposta às medidas do plano?

2. O plano refere «orientações em matéria de auxílios estatais». Na difícil situação económica em que Portugal se encontra e com as medidas impostas pela troika, como é que esses auxílios estatais poderão ocorrer?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(30 de novembro de 2012)

O plano de ação propôs medidas para melhorar os fluxos de financiamento às PME, as quais em Portugal dependem em grande medida de empréstimos bancários, tal como sucede noutros Estados-Membros e, portanto, são particularmente afetadas pelas condições de crédito rigorosas. Os empréstimos às empresas portugueses encontram-se ainda em cerca de 75 % da média da última década ([1]). Porém, os empréstimos a empresas exportadoras estão a aumentar ([2]), o que confirma que a desalavancagem do setor bancário está a acompanhar o reequilíbrio da economia.

As medidas propostas no plano de ação dizem respeito à disponibilidade do crédito. Em 2012, o BEI ([3]) manterá a sua atividade de empréstimos às PME a um ritmo sustentado, próximo do nível de 2011 ([4]). Entre 2010 e 2012, o BEI disponibilizou 910 milhões de euros às PME portuguesas ([5]). O BEI também acabou de receber um aumento de capital no valor de 10 mil milhões de euros por parte dos seus acionistas ([6]).

Decorrem também conversações avançadas entre o FEI ([7]) e um intermediário português para aceder ao instrumento europeu de garantia fornecido pelo programa PCI ([8]). É provável que um acordo final seja alcançado antes do final de 2012. Foram ainda mobilizados mais de 500 milhões de euros para reforçar os instrumentos políticos no contexto da recente reprogramação dos fundos estruturais. Além disso, no início de 2012, o Governo português criou uma nova linha de garantia ([9]) dotada de 1,5 mil milhões de euros para fornecer crédito às PME ([10]).

([1]) Os empréstimos à maioria dos setores estão a diminuir: em alguns deles em mais de 11 % (manufatura e venda a retalho).
([2]) À volta de 8 % em comparação com o ano anterior.
([3]) Banco Europeu de Investimento.
([4]) Que foi de cerca de 10 mil milhões de euros. Esta quantia está sujeita às condições de mercado e é compatível com a capacidade de financiamento do BEI.
([5]) O acordo mais recente, no valor de 50 milhões de euros, foi assinado com o Banco Popular em julho de 2012.
([6]) Ver Conclusões do Conselho Europeu de 18 e 19 de Outubro de 2012. O objetivo é reforçar a sua base de capital e aumentar a sua capacidade de empréstimo em 60 mil milhões de euros.
([7]) Fundo Europeu de Investimento.
([8]) Programa-Quadro para a Competitividade e a Inovação.
([9]) A linha chama-se «PME Crescimento». Mais de 10 000 empresas já utilizaram os mecanismos desta linha num total que ascende a 1,2 mil milhões de euros.
([10]) Neste momento estão a ser exploradas novas opções no contexto do Programa de Ajustamento Económico para Portugal, tal como está previsto nas medidas 2.17 e 7.15 do Memorando de Entendimento.

As «orientações relativas aos auxílios estatais» mencionadas no plano de ação referem-se às partes do quadro da UE relativo aos auxílios estatais que têm uma relevância particular para o financiamento das PME. ([11]) Estas regras foram aplicadas em todos os Estados-Membros antes da crise e continuam a ser válidas, independentemente da situação económica. Porém, a Comissão encontra-se atualmente a modernizar as suas regras em matéria de controlo dos auxílios estatais, no contexto do programa de modernização da política da UE no domínio dos auxílios estatais, sendo que o processo estará finalizado até ao final de 2013 ([12]).

([11]) Estas opções incluem o Regulamento geral de isenção por categoria e as Orientações relativas ao capital de risco.

([12]) No contexto da modernização da política da UE no domínio dos auxílios estatais, os Estados-Membros são informados e consultados regularmente sobre todos os aspetos da revisão. Podem encontrar-se informações complementares sobre a Modernização da política da UE no domínio dos auxílios estatais no seguinte sítio Web: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/modernisation/index_en.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009150/12
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Action plan to improve access to finance for SMEs

In December 2011, the Commission presented an Action Plan to improve access to finance for SMEs. It sets out a strategy to make access to finance easier for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), with an EU action plan that includes increased financial support from the EU budget and the European Investment Bank, as well as a regulatory proposal setting uniform rules for marketing venture capital funds.

The plan sets out a list of measures and proposals to increase SMEs' growth and development.

However, the measures provided for in the plan do not seem to address the countries facing the greatest economic difficulties, such as Portugal.

Can the Commission state:

1. How will Portuguese banks, which are still undergoing restructuring in order to meet the solvency ratio and deleveraging ratio requirements imposed on them, manage to respond to the plan's measures?

2. The plan mentions 'State aid guidelines'. In Portugal's difficult situation, and with the measures imposed by the Troika, how will this state aid be possible?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(30 November 2012)

The action plan proposed measures to improve the flow of financing to SMEs, which in Portugal are highly dependent on bank lending, as in other Member States, and therefore are particularly affected by the tight credit conditions. Loans to Portuguese companies are still at around 75% of the average for the past decade ([1]). However, loans to exporting firms are increasing ([2]), confirming that the deleveraging in the banking sector is moving in parallel with the rebalancing of the economy.

Measures proposed in the action plan address the availability of credit. In 2012, the EIB ([3]) will maintain its SME loan activity at a sustained pace, close to the 2011 level ([4]). From 2010 to 2012, the EIB has made EUR 910 million available to Portuguese SMEs ([5]). It has also just been given a EUR 10 billion capital increase by its shareholders ([6]).

There are also advanced discussions between the EIF ([7]) and a Portuguese intermediary to access the EU guarantee instrument provided by the CIP programme ([8]). An agreement is likely to be concluded before the end of 2012. In addition, more than EUR 500 million have been mobilised to reinforce the policy tools in the context of the recent reprogramming of the Structural Funds. Moreover, early 2012 the Portuguese Government created a new guarantee line ([9]) endowed with EUR 1.5 billion to provide credit to SMEs ([10]).

The 'State aid guidelines' mentioned in the action plan refer to those parts of the existing EU State aid framework that are of particular relevance to SME financing (). These rules were applied in all Member States before the crisis and continue to apply irrespective of the economic situation. However, the Commission is currently modernising its state aid rules in the context of the State Aid Modernisation, which will be finalised by the end of 2013 ([11]).

([1]) Loans to most sectors are decreasing: in some sectors as high as over 11% (manufacturing and retail).
([2]) By around 8%, compared to the previous year.
([3]) European Investment Bank.
([4]) Which was around EUR 10 billion. This amount is subject to market conditions and in line with EIB's funding capacity.
([5]) The latest deal, worth EUR 50 million, was signed with Banco Popular in July 2012.
([6]) See European Council Conclusions, 18/19 October 2012. The aim is to strengthen its capital basis and increase its lending capacity by EUR 60 billion.
([7]) European Investment Fund.
([8]) Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme.
([9]) The line is called 'PME Crescimento'. More than 10 000 companies have already used this line facilities up to an amount of EUR 1.2 billion.
([10]) New options are now being explored in the context of the Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal, as envisaged in measures 2.17 and 7.15 of the memorandum of understanding.
([11]) In the context of SAM, Member States are regularly informed and consulted on all aspects of the review. More information on SAM can be found on the following website: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/modernisation/index_en.html

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009151/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(11. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Personal in EU-Repräsentationen

Kann die Kommission tabellarisch aufstellen, wie viel (1) ständiges und (2) temporäres Personal derzeit in den ca. 130 in Drittländern basierten EU-Repräsentationen tätig ist?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(4. Dezember 2012)

Es gibt 141 EU-Delegation weltweit. Die Verteilung des in diesen Delegationen beschäftigten Personals des Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienstes (EAD) ist in untenstehender Tabelle aufgeführt. Von den 538 AD- und AST-Beamten und Bediensteten auf Zeit stammen 138 Bedienstete auf Zeit auf AD-Ebene aus den diplomatischen Diensten der Mitgliedstaaten.

DELEGATIONEN	EAD
AD- und AST-Beamte und Bedienstete auf Zeit	538
Vertragsbedienstete	191
Abgeordnete nationale Sachverständige	37
Ortskräfte	1 117
Junger Sachverständiger in Delegationen	32
GESAMT	1 915

Es gibt auch eine Reihe von Kommissionsbediensteten in den Delegationen, die dem Delegationsleiter unterstellt sind. Die Verteilung der in den Delegationen beschäftigten Kommissionsbediensteten ist in untenstehender Tabelle aufgeführt. Von den 590 AD- und AST-Beamten und Bediensteten auf Zeit sind zwei Bedienstete auf Zeit.

DELEGATIONEN	KOM
AD- und AST-Beamte und Bedienstete auf Zeit	590
Vertragsbedienstete	858
Abgeordnete nationale Sachverständige	21
Ortskräfte	2 015
Junger Sachverständiger in Delegationen	40
GESAMT	3 524

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009151/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Staff in EU Representations

Can the Commission set out in a table how many (1) permanent and (2) temporary staff are currently working in the 130 or so EU representations in third countries?

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

There are 141 EU Delegations around the world. The distribution of the European External Action Service (EEAS) staff employed in these Delegations is set out in the table below. Of the 538 AD and AST Officials and Temporary Agents, there are 138 Temporary Agents at AD level from the diplomatic services of the Member States.

DELEGATIONS	EEAS
AD and AST Officials and Temporary Agents	538
Contractual Agents	191
Seconded National Experts	37
Local Agents	1117
Young Experts in Delegations	32
TOTAL	1915

There are also a number of Commission staff in the Delegations, who work under the authority of the Head of Delegation. The distribution of the Commission staff employed in the Delegations is set out in the table below. Of the 590 AD and AST Officials and Temporary Agents, there are 2 Temporary Agents.

DELEGATIONS	COM
AD and AST Officials and Temporary Agents	590
Contractual Agents.	858
Seconded National Experts	21
Local Agents	2015
Young Experts in Delegations	40
TOTAL	3524

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-009152/12
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Monopolio dei traghetti all'isola d'Elba

L'isola d'Elba è la principale isola dell'arcipelago Toscano, nonché la terza in Italia per estensione dopo la Sicilia e la Sardegna.

È situata a circa dieci chilometri dalla costa, alla quale è collegata attraverso un servizio di navigazione gestito al momento solamente da due compagnie, *Toremar* e *Moby*, in quanto una terza, la *Blu Navy*, ha sospeso dallo scorso primo ottobre le proprie attività.

Toremar (Toscana Regionale Marittima) svolge dal 1976 le attività di collegamento con le isole dell'arcipelago Toscano, e nel 2011, la stessa *Moby* si è aggiudicata la gara pubblica bandita dalla regione Toscana per l'acquisizione del 100 % di questa compagnia.

Ci troviamo quindi ad avere tutti i servizi di collegamento gestiti dalla stessa compagnia, *Moby*, che opera sia direttamente che attraverso la controllata esclusiva *Toremar*.

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza di questa vicenda?

2. Non ritiene che questa situazione di monopolio sia lesiva per il libero mercato, la concorrenza e i diritti dei passeggeri e degli abitanti dell'isola?

(L'Autorità Italiana Garante della Concorrenza e del Mercato (AGCM) si era già espressa sulla vicenda dell'accordo *Moby-Toremar* nel luglio 2011 (C11072 — Provvedimento n. 22622), ponendo alcune condizioni per l'approvazione che ad oggi non paiono essere tuttavia rispettate.)

3. Può inoltre la Commissione europea verificare se il contratto stabilito per il servizio pubblico nei collegamenti marittimi tra l'arcipelago Toscano e l'Italia peninsulare, affidato dalla regione Toscana alla *Toremar*, sia conforme al regolamento (CEE) n. 3577/92 del Consiglio?

4. Quali misure intende infine attuare la Commissione per garantire la piena accessibilità e la continuità territoriale per aree insulari come l'isola d'Elba?

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(13 novembre 2012)

La Commissione prende atto delle preoccupazioni espresse dall'onorevole parlamentare in merito ai collegamenti via traghetto con l'isola d'Elba e altre isole dell'arcipelago toscano.

1. Pur convenendo che la creazione di monopoli o quasi monopoli può produrre effetti anticoncorrenziali dannosi per l'economia e la società nell'Unione europea, la Commissione è competente a esaminare le concentrazioni proposte a norma del regolamento UE n. 139/2004 ([1]) solo quando presentino una dimensione UE, oltre a soddisfare altre condizioni. Le concentrazioni proposte a carattere locale vengono generalmente valutate dalle autorità nazionali garanti della concorrenza secondo le norme nazionali pertinenti.

2. L'acquisizione di Moby da parte di Toremar non è stata notificata alla Commissione a norma del regolamento UE sulle concentrazioni. Visto il carattere locale dell'operazione, spettava all'autorità italiana garante della concorrenza valutarne gli effetti anticoncorrenziali. La Commissione non può quindi intervenire in questo caso specifico, che viene gestito dalle autorità nazionali.

3. Il nuovo contratto fra le autorità regionali e l'acquirente di Toremar è stato sottoposto alla Commissione. A questo stadio, la Commissione non ha particolari osservazioni circa la conformità del contratto con il regolamento 3577/92 del Consiglio ([2]).

4. Rendere più accessibili le regioni insulari garantendo servizi di trasporto marittimo più affidabili e meno costosi è una prerogativa esclusiva delle autorità nazionali. Il ruolo della Commissione si limita a valutare la conformità di queste misure con le norme UE sul cabotaggio marittimo e sugli aiuti di Stato.

([1]) GU L 24 del 29.1.2004, pag. 1.
([2]) GU L 364 del 12.12.1992, pag. 7.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009152/12
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Monopoly in ferry services to the island of Elba

Elba is the main island in the Tuscan archipelago and the third largest in Italy, after Sicily and Sardinia.

It is located roughly 10 kilometres from the coast and is served by ferries which are currently operated by only two companies, *Toremar* and *Moby*; a third company, *Blu Navy*, suspended its activities on 1 October 2012.

Toremar (Toscana Regionale Marittima) has been running ferry services to the islands in the Tuscan archipelago since 1976, and in 2011 *Moby* was successful in the invitation-to-tender procedure organised by the Tuscany region and won the right to purchase *Toremar* outright.

The result is that all ferry services to the Tuscan archipelago are now operated by the same company, *Moby*, either directly or through its wholly-owned subsidiary *Toremar*.

1. Is the Commission aware of this matter?

2. Does it not take the view that this monopoly is prejudicial to the free market, competition and the rights of passengers and the inhabitants of Elba?

(The Italian Monopolies and Mergers Commission (L'Autorità Italiana Garante della Concorrenza e del Mercato — AGCM) delivered an opinion on the *Moby-Toremar* agreement in July 2011 (C11072 — Document No 22622) which laid down a number of conditions governing approval of the deal, not all of which would yet appear to have been met.)

3. Can the Commission also verify whether the contract for the provision of public ferry services between the Tuscan archipelago and the Italian mainland, which was awarded by the Tuscany region to *Toremar*, is consistent with Council Regulation (EEC) No 3577/92?

4. What steps does the Commission intend to take to guarantee full accessibility and the continued provision of reliable links to the mainland for islands such as Elba?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(13 November 2012)

The Commission takes note of the concerns expressed by the Honourable Member regarding ferry services from the Italian mainland to Elba and other islands in the Tuscan archipelago.

1. The Commission agrees that the creation of monopolies or quasi-monopolies can produce anti-competitive effects which are detrimental to the EU economy and society. However, the Commission has jurisdiction to review proposed concentrations under the EU Merger Regulation 139/2004 ([1]) where these, among other conditions, have a Union dimension. Where the proposed concentration is local in character it will normally be examined by the National Competition Authorities under national competition rules.

2. The acquisition by Moby of Toremar has not been notified to the Commission under the EU Merger regulation. Rather due to the local character of the transaction it fell to the Italian Competition authority to make the assessment of its anti-competitive effects. Under these circumstances the Commission would not be in a position to intervene in this particular case which is being dealt with by the national authorities.

3. The new contract between the regional authorities and the buyer of Toremar has been submitted to the Commission. At this stage the Commission does not have any particular comments regarding the compliance of this contract with Council Regulation 3577/92 ([2]).

4. Easing the accessibility of island regions by improving the reliability and affordability of maritime transport services is the exclusive prerogative of the national authorities. The Commission's role is merely to assess the observance by such measures of the EU rules concerning both maritime cabotage and state aid.

([1]) OJ L 24, 29.01.2004, p. 1.
([2]) OJ L 364, 12.12.1992, p. 7.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-009153/12
a Bizottság számára
Tabajdi Csaba Sándor (S&D)
(2012. október 11.)

Tárgy: A géntechnológiával módosított szervezetek termesztése

Az Európai Bíróság 2012. szeptember 6-án hozott C-36/11-es számú ítéletében kimondta, hogy

— az olyan géntechnológiával módosított szervezetek (GMO-k) termesztése, mint a MON 810 kukoricafajták, nem tartozhat nemzeti engedélyezési eljárás alá, ha e fajták felhasználását és forgalmazását az 1829/2003/EK rendelet 20. cikke alapján engedélyezték, és e fajtákat felvették a 2002/53/EK irányelvben előírt a közös jegyzékbe;

— a 18/2001/EK irányelv 26a. cikke nem teszi lehetővé valamely tagállamnak, hogy általános jelleggel megtiltsa ilyen GMO-k területén történő termesztését az együttes jelenlétre vonatkozó olyan intézkedések elfogadásáig, amelyek a GMO-k más növényi kultúrákban való nem szándékos jelenlétét kívánják megakadályozni.

A Bizottság álláspontja szerint, figyelemmel az Európai Bizottság C-36/11-es számú ítéletére továbbra is érvényes-e a 18/2001/EK irányelv 23. cikkében Magyarország számára biztosított, a GMO-k termesztésének általános tilalmát engedélyező védzáradék?

Maroš Šefčovič válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. november 16.)

A 2012. szeptember 6-án, a C-36/11 Pioneer Hi Bred Italia ügyben hozott ítélet a géntechnológiával módosított vetőmagok termesztésének olaszországi engedélyezési rendszerére vonatkozott.

A magyarországi termesztési tilalmat egy másik ítéletre, mégpedig a 2011. szeptember 8-i, C-58/10-C68/10 Monsanto és társai egyesített ügyekre tekintettel kell megvizsgálni. Ezen ítélet szerint a 2011/18/EK irányelv ([1]) 23. cikke értelmében tagállamok nem függeszthetik fel vagy tilthatják meg azoknak a GMO-knak, mint például a MON 810 kukoricának a használatát, amelyeket a 90/220/EGK irányelv ([2]) szerint többek között termesztésre szánt vetőmagként engedélyeztek, és amelyeket az 1829/2003/EK rendelet ([3]) 20. cikkének megfelelően létező termékként jelentettek be, valamint ezt követően engedélyezésük megújítási kérelme folyamatban volt. A 1829/2003/EK rendelet 34. cikke értelmében azonban sürgősségi intézkedéseket fogadhatnak el.

A Bizottság az 1829/2003/EK rendelet és a C-58/10-C68/10 Monsanto és társai egyesített ügyekben hozott ítélet betartása érdekében jelenleg vizsgálja a MON 810 vonatkozásában a 2001/18/EK irányelv értelmében hozott nemzeti intézkedéseket. Szükség esetén megfelelő kivizsgálást és eljárást kezdeményez.

([1]) HL L 106, 2001.4.17.
([2]) HL L 117, 1990.5.8.
([3]) HL L 268, 2003.10.18.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009153/12
to the Commission
Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Cultivation of genetically-modified organisms (GMOs)

In judgment C-36/11 of 6 September 2012, the Court of Justice of the European Union stated that:

— the cultivation of genetically modified organisms such as the MON 810 maize varieties cannot be made subject to a national authorisation procedure when the use and marketing of those varieties are authorised pursuant to Article 20 of Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 and those varieties have been accepted for inclusion in the common catalogue provided for in Council Directive 2002/53/EC;

— Article 26a of Directive 2001/18/EC does not entitle a Member State to prohibit in a general manner the cultivation on its territory of such genetically modified organisms pending the adoption of coexistence measures to avoid the unintended presence of genetically modified organisms in other crops.

In the Commission's view, taking into account judgment C-36/11 of the Court of Justice of the European Union, is the safeguard clause in Article 23 of Directive 2001/18/EC enabling Hungary to enforce a general prohibition on the cultivation of GMOs still valid?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(16 November 2012)

The judgment of 6 September 2012 in the Case C-36/11 Pioneer Hi Bred Italia concerned an Italian authorisation scheme for growing genetically modified seeds.

The Hungarian cultivation ban should be examined in the view of another judgment, namely the judgment of 8 September 2011 in joined Cases C-58/10 to C-68/10 Monsanto and Others. According to that judgment, GMOs such as MON 810 maize, which were authorised as, among others, seeds for the purpose of cultivation under Directive 90/220/EEC ([1]) and which were notified as existing products in accordance with Article 20 of Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 ([2]), and were subsequently the subject of a pending application for renewal of authorisation, may not have their use or sale provisionally suspended or prohibited, by a Member State, under Article 23 of Directive 2001/18/EC ([3]). Emergency measures may, however, be adopted pursuant to Article 34 of Regulation No 1829/2003.

The Commission is currently examining national measures on MON 810 adopted under Directive 2001/18/EC in order to ensure compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 and the judgment in joined Cases C-58/10 to C-68/10 Monsanto and Others. Appropriate investigations and proceedings will be initiated if necessary.

([1]) OJ L 117, 8.5.1990.
([2]) OJ L 268, 18.10.2003.
([3]) OJ L 106, 17.4.2001.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-009154/12
Komisijai
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(2012 m. spalio 11 d.)

Tema: Komisijos rengiamos ataskaitos

Teisingumo ir vidaus reikalų taryba yra įpareigojusi Komisiją pateikti Pamatinio sprendimo 2008/913/TVR įgyvendinimo ataskaitą ir įvertinimą, kuriame būtų nurodoma, ar esama sąlygų, kurios reikalingos papildomam teisės aktui priimti. Ši ataskaita turėtų būti pateikta iki 2014 m.

Kuo konkrečiai Komisija remsis vertindama, ar esama sąlygų priimti papildomą ES teisės aktą, kuriame būtų nagrinėjami nusikaltimai, susiję su viešu pritarimu genocido nusikaltimams, nusikaltimams žmoniškumui ir karo nusikaltimams, nukreiptiems prieš asmenų grupę, apibūdinamą pagal kitus kriterijus nei rasė, odos spalva, religija, kilmė ar tautinė arba etninė kilmė, pavyzdžiui, pagal jų socialinę padėtį ar politinius įsitikinimus, taip pat susiję su atsisakymu šiuos nusikaltimus pripažinti ar dideliu jų menkinimu?

V. Reding atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. lapkričio 27 d.)

Komisijos supratimu, gerbiama Parlamento narė kalba apie Pamatinio sprendimo 2008/913/TVR 10 straipsnio 2 dalyje nurodytą įgyvendinimo ataskaitą. Šios ataskaitos tikslas – įvertinti, ar nacionalinės teisės aktai tinkamai ir visiškai atitinka pamatinio sprendimo nuostatas. Ataskaita bus parengta remiantis valstybių narių pranešimų apie perkėlimo į nacionalinę teisę priemones analize, taip pat visa Komisijos turima atitinkama informacija.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009154/12
to the Commission
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Commission Reports

The Justice and Home Affairs Council has called on the Commission to submit a report on the implementation of Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA together with its assessment indicating whether the conditions needed for an additional legal instrument exist. The report should be submitted by 2014.

What specifically will the Commission base its assessment on, in order to determine the prevalence of conditions for the adoption of an additional EU legal instrument for analysing crimes related to public approval of crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes committed against a group of people defined by reference to criteria other than race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin, such as social status or political convictions, as well as those related to the denial of these crimes or their gross trivialisation?

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

The Commission understands that the Honourable Member refers to the implementation report referred to in Article 10(2) of Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA. The aim of the report will be to assess the correctness and fullness of the compliance of national laws with the provisions of the framework Decision. The report will be written on the basis of the analyses of the notifications received by the Member States as regards their national transposing measures as well as all relevant information at the disposal of the Commission.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-009155/12
Komisijai
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(2012 m. spalio 11 d.)

Tema: Tyrimų istorinės atminties srityje stygius

„Eurobarometro“ apklausų ir Europos pagrindinių teisių agentūros (PTA) vykdomų tyrimų tikslas – pagerinti politinių sprendimų priėmėjų informuotumą. Šiuo metu Europos Parlamente svarstomas pasiūlymas dėl programos „Europa piliečiams“, kuri tiesiogiai susijusi su istorinės atminties apie Europą, suskaldžiusius totalitarinius režimus, sklaida. Komisija taip pat įpareigota kitais metais pateikti Pamatinio sprendimo 2008/913/TVR įgyvendinimo ataskaitą ir įvertinimą, kuriame būtų nurodoma, ar esama sąlygų, kurios reikalingos papildomam teisės aktui priimti. Laukdami šių sprendimų, norėtume atkreipti dėmesį į tai, kad istorinės atminties tema nėra atlikta jokių tyrimų, kurie apimtų visas ES valstybes nares, atskleistų padėtį ir visuomenės požiūrį.

Kokius darbus Komisija yra iki šiol atlikusi, įgyvendindama Teisingumo ir vidaus reikalų (TVR) tarybos 2011 m. birželio mėn. išvadose dėl totalitarinių režimų nusikaltimų Europoje atminties išdėstytą raginimą Komisijai toliau ieškoti galimybių vykdyti mokslinių tyrimų projektus, įskaitant ir „Eurobarometro“ apklausas apie tai, ką Europos piliečiai žino apie totalitarinius režimus?

Atsižvelgdami į tai, kad kai kurių totalitarinių režimų aspektas į PTA veiklą švietimo srityje jau yra įtrauktas (PTA vykdo projektą, skirtą mokymams holokausto ir žmogaus teisių tema, kartu su Komisija ir Danija rengia konferencijas „Atsiminti ateičiai“), norėtume paklausti, ar Komisija ketina kreiptis į PTA, kad agentūros veikloje totalitarinių režimų Europoje tema būtų nagrinėjama išsamiai, kaip išdėstyta 2011 m. birželio mėn. TVR tarybos išvadose dėl totalitarinių režimų nusikaltimų Europoje atminties?

V. Reding atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. lapkričio 29 d.)

Totalitarinių režimų nusikaltimų atminimo ataskaitoje ([1]) Komisija pabrėžė, kad įsipareigoja remti totalitarinių režimų padarytų nusikaltimų atminimą, visų pirma imdamasi programoje „Europa piliečiams“ numatyto 4 veiksmo – „Gyva Europos atmintis“. Šiuo veiksmu siekiama paminėti nacizmo ir stalinizmo aukas, taip įveikiant praeitį ir perduodant atmintį jaunoms europiečių kartoms. Veiksmo tikslai yra dvejopi: paskatinti diskutuoti apie Europos pilietybę, demokratiją, bendras vertybes, bendrą istoriją ir kultūrą, taip pat priartinti Europą prie jos piliečių, puoselėjant Europos vertybes bei laimėjimus ir kartu išsaugant praeities atminimą. 2011 ir 2012 m. pagal šią programą finansuoti 92 totalitarinių nusikaltimų atminimo projektai.

Prie Europos totalitarinių nusikaltimų praeities tyrimų prisideda Mokslinių tyrimų ir technologinės plėtros septintoji bendroji programa. Pagal šios programos aštuntąją teminę sritį (socialinių ekonominių ir humanitarinių mokslų programa) finansuojami Europos istorinio palikimo ir jo poveikio dabarčiai tyrimo projektai. 2010 m. paskelbus kvietimą teikti paraiškas tema „Demokratija ir totalitarizmo bei populizmo šešėliai. Europos patirtis“, atrinktas projektas, kuriame nagrinėjama, kokią įtaką totalitarizmo ir populizmo (praeities, dabarties ir ateities) šešėliai daro socialiniam jaunimo aktyvumui ([2]).

Pagrindinių teisių agentūra neturi įgaliojimo atlikti išsamaus Europos totalitarinių režimų tyrimo, tačiau šiuo metu svarsto, kaip galėtų prisidėti prie totalitarinių režimų padarytų nusikaltimų atminimo pagal savo kompetenciją.

([1]) „Totalitarinių režimų nusikaltimų Europoje atminimas“, COM(2010) 783 galutinis.
([2]) MYPLACE (Visas pavadinimas – Memory, youth, political legacy and civic engagement („Atmintis, jaunimas, politinis palikimas ir pilietinė veikla“), dotacijos susitarimas Nr. 266831) projektas pradėtas 2011 m. birželio 1 d. Projekto dalyvių skaičius – 16, trukmė – 48 mėnesių, ES įnašas – 7 994 449 eurai.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009155/12
to the Commission
Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Lack of surveys on remembrance

The purpose of opinion polls by Eurobarometer and surveys by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) is to increase awareness among political decision-makers. The European Parliament is currently debating a proposal for a 'Europe for Citizens' programme that relates directly to promoting remembrance of the totalitarian regimes that tore Europe apart. The Commission has also been called on to submit, next year, an implementation report and implementation assessment on Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA, which would indicate whether the conditions for an additional legal instrument exist. Pending the decisions, we would like to draw attention to the fact that no surveys on remembrance covering all EU Member States and revealing the situation and the attitude of society have been conducted.

What has the Commission achieved so far in response to calls for it to further examine and promote possibilities for research projects, including Eurobarometer polls on what EU citizens know about European totalitarian regimes, as set out in the 'Conclusions on the memory of the crimes committed by totalitarian regimes in Europe' adopted by the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) Council in June 2011?

Considering the aspect of some totalitarian regimes already included among the FRA's activities in education (it leads a project on the Holocaust and human rights education and, together with the Commission, holds conferences on 'Remembering for the future'), we would like to know whether the Commission intends to ask the FRA to examine the topic of totalitarian regimes in Europe in detail, as set out in the 'Conclusions on the memory of the crimes committed by totalitarian regimes in Europe' adopted by the JHA Council in June 2011.

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(29 November 2012)

In its report on memory of totalitarian crimes ([1]), the Commission underlined its commitment to support the memory of the crimes committed by totalitarian regimes in particular through the Action 4 'Active European Remembrance' of the Europe for Citizens Programme. This Action is intended to commemorate the victims of Nazism and Stalinism, as a means of moving beyond the past and pass the memory on to young generations of Europeans. The aims of this Action are twofold: fostering debate on European citizenship and democracy, shared values, common history and culture, as well bringing Europe closer to its citizens by promoting Europe's values and achievements, while preserving the memory of its past. In 2011 and 2012 this programme has funded 92 projects relating to the memory of totalitarian crimes.

The 7th Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7) contributes to research activities related to the totalitarian past of Europe. Theme 8 of FP7 (Socio-Economic Sciences and Humanities programme) finances projects on Europe's historical legacies and their repercussions for the present. In 2010, the call for proposal 'Democracy and the shadows of totalitarianism and populism: the European experience' resulted in the selection of a project which explores how young people's social participation is shaped by the shadows (past, present and future) of totalitarianism and populism ([2]).

The Fundamental Rights Agency does not have a mandate to carry out detailed research on the totalitarian regimes in Europe but is currently exploring how it could contribute to the memory of the crimes committed by totalitarian regimes within the scope of its mandate.

([1]) 'The memory of the crimes committed by totalitarian regimes in Europe', COM(2010) 783 final.
([2]) MYPLACE (Full title: 'Memory, youth, political legacy and civic engagement', grant agreement nr. 266831): the project started on 1 June 2011. It involves 16 beneficiaries and runs for 48 months, with an EU contribution of EUR 7 994 449.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009156/12
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE) e Gianni Pittella (S&D)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Problemi della siderurgia europea: il caso di Piombino

Negli ultimi mesi si è parlato molto di problematiche relative all'attività siderurgica in Europa. In Italia i casi più conosciuti sono forse quelli che riguardano Taranto e Terni, ma vi è un altro polo siderurgico, Piombino, che si trova in estrema difficoltà, e che rischia di scomparire con pesantissime conseguenze.

Nel comprensorio toscano della Val di Cornia hanno stabilimenti alcune tra le più importanti multinazionali del settore: la Lucchini, l'Arcelor Mittal-Magona e la Tenaris Dalmine, che contribuiscono a rendere Piombino uno dei principali luoghi di produzione e trasformazione dell'acciaio in Italia e in Europa.

La crisi dell'intero comparto siderurgico europeo ha fortemente colpito anche questa realtà, di cui pare aver fatto maggiormente le spese lo stabilimento più grande, ovvero la Lucchini, che attualmente occupa direttamente oltre 2 000 dipendenti, arrivando a dare lavoro a oltre 5 000 persone, se si considera anche l'indotto.

Negli ultimi mesi, questa azienda sta subendo perdite ingenti, nell'ordine dei 15 milioni di euro al mese, e tra le soluzioni paventate vi sarebbe anche quella della dismissione dell'area a caldo, che darebbe origine a una forte perdita di posti di lavoro.

Anche alla Magona la situazione appare critica, con, al momento, il 50 % di esuberi e la già prevista temporanea chiusura di interi reparti produttivi.

L'acciaio europeo si trova fortemente penalizzato rispetto alla concorrenza esterna, soprattutto asiatica, facilitata da costi di produzione ben più bassi, con regole sociali e standard ambientali totalmente differenti rispetto ai nostri.

1. È a conoscenza la Commissione delle problematiche relative al polo siderurgico di Piombino?

L'acciaio si può dire sia stato uno dei motivi per cui esiste la stessa Unione europea, essendo iniziata con l'istituzione della Comunità Europea del Carbone e dell'Acciaio (CECA) nel 1951. Dalla scadenza di questo Trattato sono passati oramai dieci anni, e il patrimonio di questo accordo, che ha gettato le basi per la rinascita e la prosperità dell'Europa, non può e non deve andare perduto.

2. Quali misure intende intraprendere la Commissione per la salvaguardia e lo sviluppo del settore siderurgico europeo?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(7 dicembre 2012)

La Commissione segue da vicino la situazione dell'industria siderurgica a livello di UE ed è consapevole dei problemi del centro siderurgico di Piombino menzionati dagli onorevoli deputati.

La produzione d'acciaio ha un posto di rilievo nella catena di valore industriale. L'importanza di concentrare la politica industriale dell'UE sull'intera catena di valore, che comprende la produzione dei metalli di base, è stata ribadita nella comunicazione del 2010 «Una politica industriale per l'era della globalizzazione».

Nel luglio 2012 la Commissione ha organizzato una tavola rotonda ad alto livello sul futuro del settore siderurgico europeo. La tavola rotonda è una piattaforma di dialogo tra i servizi della Commissione, i rappresentanti dell'industria e i sindacati. L'obiettivo è identificare i fattori che si ripercuotono sulla competitività dell'industria siderurgica e formulare raccomandazioni politiche concrete atte a consentire all'industria di superare l'attuale recessione economica nonché ad accrescere la propria competitività. I membri della tavola rotonda saranno invitati a identificare gli strumenti politici nonché le strategie imprenditoriali che potrebbero aiutare il settore siderurgico a far fronte alle sfide del momento. È il caso di notare che l'industria siderurgica italiana è rappresentata nella tavola rotonda.

A seguito di questo dialogo la Commissione preparerà una comunicazione — Un piano d'azione per l'industria siderurgica europea — entro il giugno 2013. Durante l'elaborazione del piano d'azione la Commissione intende identificare i pertinenti strumenti politici, tra cui quelli atti a mitigare l'impatto delle chiusure di capacità sui lavoratori.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009156/12
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD), Roberta Angelilli (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE) and Gianni Pittella (S&D)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: European steel industry problems: the Piombino case

In recent months, the steel industry has been much discussed in Europe. In Italy, the best-known cases are perhaps Taranto and Terni; however, there is another steel hub, Piombino, which is in extreme difficulty and faces closure, which would have dire consequences.

Many significant multinationals have plants in Val di Corno, Tuscany: Lucchini, Arcelor Mittal-Magona and Tenaris Dalmine. This makes Piombino a prime location for steel production and processing in Italy, and Europe.

The crisis affecting the entire European steel sector has also heavily affected this area. The leading establishment, Lucchini, which currently employs over 2 000 workers, and guarantees work to over 5 000, including its direct suppliers, appears to have borne the brunt.

During the past few months, this company has incurred losses of EUR 15 million per month, and its closure is feared, which would lead to significant job losses.

The situation is also critical in Magona with 50% of the workforce laid off, and plans for the temporary closure of entire production departments.

The European steel industry is disadvantaged compared to external competition, especially from Asia, which has lower production costs, and where social conduct and environmental standards are completely different.

1. Is the Commission aware of the problems relating to the Piombino steel centre?

It could be said that the European Union exists because of the steel industry, given its roots in the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951. It is 10 years since this Treaty ceased; nonetheless, its heritage, which was the basis for a renewed and flourishing Europe, cannot and must not be lost.

2. What will the Commission do to safeguard and develop the European steel sector?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(7 December 2012)

The Commission is monitoring closely the situation in the steel industry at the EU level and is aware of the problems of the steel centre in Piombino referred to by the Honourable Member.

Production of steel has an important place in the manufacturing value chain. The importance of focusing the EU's industrial policy on the whole value chain, which includes production of basic metals, was stressed in the 2010 Communication 'An Integrated Industrial Policy for the Globalisation Era'.

In July 2012 the Commission organised a High Level Roundtable on the Future of the European steel sector. The Roundtable is a platform of dialogue between the Commission's services, industry and trade unions. The objective is to identify the factors affecting the competitiveness of the steel industry and to issue concrete policy recommendations that will allow the industry to overcome the present economic downturn and to increase its competiveness. The members of the Roundtable will be invited to identify policy instruments as well as strategies for companies which could help the steel sector confront the current challenges. It is worth noting that the Italian steel industry is represented in the Roundtable.

Following this dialogue, the Commission will prepare a communication — an Action Plan for the European steel industry — by June 2013. In the preparation of the action plan, it is the intention of the Commission to identify relevant policy instruments including those which will help to soften the impacts of capacities' closures on employees.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009157/12
to the Council
David Martin (S&D)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Indication of country of origin

In 2005 the Commission proposed a draft regulation on the indication of the country of origin of certain products imported from third countries (COM(2005)0661). In October 2010 a first-reading report drafted by Cristiana Muscardini (EPP, IT) was adopted. As far as I am aware, the next step was that the draft law needed to be approved by the Council, where apparently some Member States were still opposed to the idea of a European 'made in' law.

Can the Council please state what has happened to this draft legislation and why its progress appears to have been stalled?

Reply
(7 January 2013)

The Commission submitted its proposal for a Council Regulation on the indication of the country of origin of certain products imported from third countries on December 2005.This was discussed on several occasions in the Council's preparatory bodies in 2006-2007, but failed to secure sufficient support from Member States. In October, the Commission considered that recent developments in the legal interpretation of WTO rules by the organisation's Appellate Body had rendered this proposal outdated. It therefore decided to withdraw its proposal.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009158/12
aan de Commissie
Luca. Hartong (NI) en Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(11 oktober 2012)

Betreft: Vervolgvragen MFB-leningen Egypte en Armenië

De beantwoording van mijn eerdere vraag (E-007714/2012) geven aanleiding tot de volgende vervolgvragen:

1. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat het onacceptabel is dat zij pas NA toekenning van de MFB-lening ad 500 miljoen euro aan Egypte een wetgevingsvoorstel gaat opstellen betreffende een MFB-programma ten behoeve van dit land? Is zij met de PVV van mening dat dit „het paard achter de wagen spannen" is?

2. De Commissie geeft aan dat „zonder toestemming van Armenië de Commissie geen informatie mag verstrekken over de precieze financiële voorwaarden die aan de lening verbonden zijn". Is zij met de PVV van mening dat het volstrekt onacceptabel is dat op deze manier op geen enkele wijze controle door het Parlement uitgeoefend kan worden op de leningverstrekking? Is de Commissie voornemens om op zo kort mogelijke termijn wel duidelijkheid te verschaffen omtrent deze voorwaarden, gezien mijn specifieke functie als (plaatsvervangend) lid van de Commissie begrotingscontrole van het Europees Parlement?

Antwoord van de heer Rehn namens de Commissie
(26 november 2012)

1. De Commissie wenst duidelijk te maken dat de wetgeving van de EU niet toelaat dat eerst een in het kader van een macrofinancieel bijstandsprogramma (MFB) verstrekte lening wordt toegestaan en vervolgens pas het desbetreffende wetsvoorstel wordt opgesteld. In haar antwoord op een eerdere vraag van parlementslid Lucas Hartong, E-007714/2012, deelde de Commissie mee dat het mogelijk was dat in de toekomst een wetsvoorstel met betrekking tot een MFB-programma voor Egypte werd voorbereid. Het wetsvoorstel is slechts de eerste stap bij het toekennen van een MFB-lening. Het besluit zelf wordt vastgesteld na de gebruikelijke wetgevingsprocedure die de volledige transparantie van het proces waarborgt en de rechten van de beide medewetgevers veiligstelt. Slechts indien deze wetgevingsprocedure met succes wordt doorlopen — en pas na afloop van deze procedure — verleent de Commissie een land een MFB-lening.

2. De Commissie bevestigt dat ze zonder de instemming van de begunstigden geen informatie over de exacte financiële voorwaarden van haar leningen aan derde landen vrijgeeft. Na de vraag van de geachte parlementsleden kreeg de Commissie van de Armeense autoriteiten de toestemming om deze informatie aan het Europees Parlement mee te delen. Het leninggedeelte van de bijstand ten bedrage van 65 miljoen euro werd in twee schijven uitbetaald: a) 29 miljoen euro in juli 2011 met een looptijd van 15 jaar en een jaarlijkse rente van 3,691 % en b) 35 miljoen euro in februari 2012 met een looptijd van 14,8 jaar en een jaarlijkse rente van 3,137 %. De lening wordt toegestaan onder dezelfde voorwaarden als waaronder de EU de desbetreffende middelen op de financiële markten leent. Om de best mogelijke voorwaarden te kunnen genieten, worden de gelden geleend na een aanbesteding onder de banken.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009158/12
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI) and Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Follow-up questions concerning MFA loans to Egypt and Armenia

The following questions arise from the answer given to a previous question tabled by Lucas Hartong (E-007714/2012):

1. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that it is unacceptable that it intends to draft a legislative proposal on the MFA programme for Egypt only AFTER granting the MFA loan of EUR 500 m to that country? Does it agree with the PVV that this is a matter of closing the stable door after the horse has bolted?

2. The Commission states that 'The Commission cannot disclose the information on precise financial terms of the loans without the agreement of Armenia.' Does it agree with the PVV that it is completely unacceptable that, as a result, Parliament has absolutely no way of scrutinising the granting of the loan? Will the Commission as soon as possible provide clear information about these terms, in view of my specific responsibilities as a (substitute) member of the European Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

1. The Commission would like to clarify that it is not possible under EC law to first grant a MFA loan and only then to prepare a corresponding legislative proposal. The Commission indicated in its reply to earlier Question E-007714/2012 of MEP Lucas Hartong that a legislative proposal on a macro-financial assistance programme for Egypt could be prepared in the future. The legislative proposal is only the first stage in granting MFA. The decision itself is adopted following the ordinary legislative procedure, which ensures the full transparency of the process and guarantees the rights of the two co-legislators. Only once, and if, this procedure is successfully completed will the Commission grant MFA to a country.

2. The Commission confirms that it does not disclose the information on precise financial terms of its loans to third countries without the agreement of the beneficiaries. Following the question of the Honourable Members, the Commission has obtained from the Armenian authorities the authorisation to transmit this information to the European Parliament. The EUR 65 million loan part of the assistance was disbursed in full in two instalments: a) EUR 29 million in July 2011 with a maturity of 15 years and an interest of 3.691% p.a. and b) EUR 35 million in February 2012 with a maturity of 14.8 years and an interest of 3.137% p.a. The loan is granted under the same conditions under which the EU borrows the corresponding funds in the financial markets. In order to obtain the best possible conditions, the funds are borrowed following a call for tender among the banks.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009159/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Missili Corea del Nord

La Corea del Nord ha annunciato che possiede dei missili strategici in grado di colpire il territorio degli Stati Uniti. Così Pyongyang ha risposto al nuovo accordo concluso domenica tra Washington e Seoul per aumentare la gittata dei missili sudcoreani.

In un comunicato diffuso dall'agenzia di stampa ufficiale nordcoreana Kcna, il portavoce della Commissione della difesa nazionale ha dichiarato che i loro missili strategici possono colpire «le forze americane non solo nella penisola coreana, ma anche in Giappone, a Guam e nello stesso territorio degli Stati Uniti».

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può dunque il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante comunicare quanto segue:

1. È a conoscenza della vicenda?

2. Quali provvedimenti e azioni intende intraprendere per mantenere la sicurezza in Asia e per evitare ulteriori minacce da parte della Corea nei confronti di altri paesi?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha preso atto della dichiarazione della commissione nazionale della difesa della RPDC del 9 ottobre 2012, in cui si menziona che l'esercito della Corea del Nord è in grado di colpire le forze americane e sudcoreane non solo nella penisola coreana, ma anche in Giappone, a Guam e nello stesso territorio degli Stati Uniti.

La dichiarazione va considerata parte della consueta retorica di Pyongyang. Essa è stata rilasciata in risposta all'annuncio sudcoreano del 7 ottobre, relativo alle nuove norme d'impiego riguardanti i missili. L'adozione di dette norme è stata giustificata tra l'altro come tale da permettere al Sud di affrontare meglio le aumentate potenzialità missilistiche e nucleari del Nord. Nell'ambito di tali disposizioni il raggio dei missili della Corea del Sud è stato esteso da 300 a 800 km per un carico utile di 500 kg. La dichiarazione non ha fornito nuove informazioni riguardanti i nuovi programmi missilistici del Corea del Nord, e non giustifica pertanto alcun nuovo intervento.

In tale contesto va rammentato che nell'ambito delle risoluzioni 1695, 1718 e 1874 del Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite tutte le attività relative al programma di missili balistici della RPDC sono diventate illegali e tutti gli Stati membri delle Nazioni Unite si sono impegnati a prevenire ogni possibile sostegno a tale programma.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009159/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — North Korean missiles

North Korea has announced that it has strategic missiles capable of striking the United States. This was Pyongyang's response to the new agreement concluded on Sunday between Washington and Seoul to increase the range of South Korean missiles.

In a statement issued by the official North Korean news agency, KCNA, the spokesperson for the National Defence Commission announced that their strategic missiles can strike US forces not only on the Korean peninsula, but also in Japan, Guam and the US mainland.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this situation?

2. What measures and action will she take to uphold security in Asia and to avoid further threats by North Korea to other countries?

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

The HR/VP has well taken note of the declaration of 9 October 2012 given by the DPRK National Defence Commission, in which it was mentioned that the North Korean army held within its scope of strike not only the US and South Korean forces on the Korean peninsula, but also Japan, Guam and the US mainland.

The declaration has to be seen as part of the usual Pyongyang rhetoric. It was given in reaction to the 7 October South Korean announcement of its new missile guidelines. Adoption of these new guidelines was *inter alia* justified with the argument to allow the south to better cope with the north's growing missile and nuclear capabilities. Under them the range of South Korean missiles was extended from 300 to 800 km with a 500kg payload. The declaration didn't provide any new information on the North Korean missile programmes. Therefore it doesn't create a justification for any new action.

In this context it may be reminded that under the UNSC Resolutions 1695, 1718 and 1874 all activities related to the DPRK's ballistic missile programme have become illegal and all UN Member States have committed themselves to preventing any possible assistance to such a programme.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009160/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Ricette mediche digitali

In Italia entro il 2015 finirà l'era della ricetta medica di carta: con la nuova normativa per ritirare un medicinale in farmacia o sottoporsi a un qualsiasi esame diagnostico in ambulatorio basterà presentare la tessera sanitaria con un codice inserito dal medico, corrispondente alla prestazione desiderata.

Inoltre, sarà creato un «Fascicolo sanitario online», una specie di dossier sulla storia clinica del cittadino che in cui saranno contenute anche le prescrizioni utilizzate nel corso della vita.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può la Commissione comunicare quanto segue:

1. Esistono studi che confermino un incremento dei servizi e un relativo miglioramento dell'accessibilità da parte dei cittadini in seguito all'utilizzo della tecnologia digitale?

2. L'introduzione della tecnologia digitale nell'ambito dei servizi ai cittadini è prevista anche in altri paesi membri, e, in caso di risposta affermativa, quali sono stati i risvolti della relativa applicazione?

3. In che modo la Commissione ritiene che possa essere garantita l'affidabilità, la sicurezza e la riservatezza dei dati relativi alla storia clinica dei cittadini?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(15 gennaio 2013)

Nel 2010 tutti gli Stati membri disponevano di piani in tema di sviluppo e messa in atto dell'assistenza sanitaria on line ([1]) al fine di assicurare la salute e la sicurezza del pubblico e di realizzare guadagni in termini di efficienza. Da studi effettuati emerge che nel 2012 disponevano di sistemi operativi di ricette elettroniche o di dispensa otto Stati membri, altri cinque avevano tali sistemi parzialmente operativi e quattro prevedono di attuarli nel prossimo futuro.

Ad esempio, la Grecia ha uno dei sistemi più avanzati in Europa di prescrizione elettronica di medicinali, che ha già consentito risparmi per un importo di circa 30 milioni di euro al mese a partire dall'inizio del 2012.

Il progetto pilota su vasta scala epSOS mira a pilotare e valutare due casi che sono pertinenti per la presente interrogazione: lo scambio transfrontaliero di un insieme limitato di dati del paziente e le ricette elettroniche.

Due studi fanno il quadro dei diversi livelli di maturità dei piani nazionali: lo studio di impatto eHR ([2]) e lo studio «European countries on their journey towards national eHealth infrastructures — evidence on progress and recommendations for cooperative actions» (I paesi europei sulla via di infrastrutture nazionali di sanità elettronica — progressi realizzati e con raccomandazioni per cooperazioni future) ([3]). Due studi addizionali di benchmarking in termini di presenza di servizi di sanità elettronica negli ospedali e negli ambulatori medici verranno pubblicati nel 2013 ([4]).

L'estensione dell'uso dei servizi di sanità elettronica dipende dalla fiducia e dall'accettazione degli utenti. Diverse iniziative legislative dell'UE svolgeranno un ruolo importante per assicurare la sicurezza e la riservatezza dei servizi di sanità elettronica, come ad esempio la proposta in tema di identificazione elettronica ([5]) e il progetto di regolamento sulla protezione dei dati ([6]). La direttiva 95/46/CE sulla protezione dei dati ([7]) stabilisce già che gli Stati membri devono tutelare il diritto dei cittadini alla privacy per quanto concerne il trattamento dei dati personali. Essa stabilisce inoltre regole specifiche in relazione a certe categorie di dati, come ad esempio i dati sanitari, e assicura che vengano attuati adeguati sistemi di salvaguardia.

([1]) http://www.ehealth-strategies.eu/.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/health/docs/publications/201002ehrimpact_study-final.pdf
([3]) http://www.ehealth-strategies.eu/.
([4]) http://is.jrc.ec.europa.eu/pages/TFS/EHS.html for the hospital survey.
([5]) Proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio in materia di identificazione elettronica e servizi fiduciari per le transazioni elettroniche nel mercato interno COM(2012)238.
([6]) Bruxelles, 25.1.2012 COM(2012)11 def. 2012/0011 (COD). Proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio concernente la tutela delle persone fisiche con riguardo al trattamento dei dati personali e la libera circolazione di tali dati (regolamento generale sulla protezione dei dati).
([7]) Direttiva 95/46/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 24 ottobre 1995 relativa alla tutela delle persone fisiche con riguardo al trattamento dei dati personali, nonché alla libera circolazione di tali dati.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009160/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Electronic medical prescriptions

In Italy, the age of the paper medical prescription will come to an end in 2015. New legislation means that the only requirement to collect a medicinal product from the pharmacy or to undergo an outpatient diagnostic examination will be to present a health insurance card with a code added by the doctor, corresponding to the desired service.

Moreover, an 'online medical file' will be created: a kind of personal medical history file which will also contain the prescriptions used over a person's lifetime.

1. Can the Commission state whether any studies confirm an increase in services and a related improvement in accessibility for citizens as a result of using digital technology?

2. Is the introduction of digital technology also planned for public services in other Member States and, if so, what have been the consequences of its implementation?

3. How can the Commission guarantee the reliability, security and confidentiality of the public's medical history data?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(15 January 2013)

In 2010 all Member States had plans for eHealth development and deployment ([1]) aiming at achieving public health and safety and efficiency gains. Studies indicate that in 2012, 8 Member States have operational ePrescription or dispensation systems, 5 others have such systems partially operational and 4 are planning to implement them in the near future.

For instance, Greece has one of the most advanced systems in Europe of electronic prescription of medicines, which already permitted savings of about EUR 30 million a month since beginning of 2012.

The epSOS large scale pilot project aims to pilot and evaluate two cases which are relevant to the question: cross border exchange of a limited patient data set and ePrescription.

Two studies relate to the different levels of maturity of the national plans: the eHR impact study ([2]); and the study European countries on their journey towards national eHealth infrastructures — evidence on progress and recommendations for cooperative actions ([3]). Two additional benchmarking studies on eHealth services deployments in hospitals and doctors' premises will publish their report in 2013 ([4]).

The wider use of eHealth services depends on the trust and acceptance of users. Several EU legislative initiatives will play a role in ensuring security and privacy of eHealth services, such as the proposal for eIdentification ([5]) and the draft data protection Regulation ([6]). Directive 95/46/CE on data protection ([7]) already provides that Member States shall protect citizens' right to privacy with respect to the processing of personal data. It further lays down specific rules regarding special categories of data, such as health related data, and ensures that appropriate security safeguards are implemented.

([1]) http://www.ehealth-strategies.eu/.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/health/docs/publications/201002ehrimpact_study-final.pdf
([3]) http://www.ehealth-strategies.eu/.
([4]) http://is.jrc.ec.europa.eu/pages/TFS/EHS.html for the hospital survey.
([5]) Proposal for a regulation on mutual recognition on eID and eSignature COM(2012) 238/2.
([6]) Brussels, 25.1.2012 COM(2012) 11 final 2012/0011 (COD)Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (General Data Protection Regulation).
([7]) Directive95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October1995on the protection of the individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009161/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Violazione delle libertà fondamentali a Cuba

Alcuni giorni fa è stata arrestata a L'Avana una blogger cubana insieme al marito, anche lui giornalista, e ad altri attivisti.

È stata arrestata dalle autorità locali nell'esercizio delle sue funzioni di corrispondente di un quotidiano spagnolo, il cui orientamento è stato definito illegale e filoamericano.

È stata arrestata nelle strade della capitale mentre si recava ad una manifestazione contro la violenza, insieme ad altri blogger amici subendo abusi verbali e pesanti percosse.

Si chiede dunque al Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante:

1. È a conoscenza dell'accaduto?

2. Intende innalzare il suo livello di attenzione e valutare l'adozione di ulteriori iniziative nel quadro dell'azione condotta in tema di rispetto della libertà di espressione e dei diritti umani a Cuba?

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

1. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è informata del fermo di Yoani Sanchez il 4 ottobre e della sua liberazione il 5 ottobre. Stando alle informazioni disponibili, la signora Sanchez non partecipava a una manifestazione ma si recava a Bayamo per seguire il processo contro A. Carromero, cittadino spagnolo. L'HR/VP è inoltre al corrente che Yoani Sanchez è stata di nuovo arrestata l'8 novembre e liberata poche ore dopo. Ci risulta che Yoani Sanchez sia stata fermata davanti al ministero dell'Interno perché chiedeva informazioni su Yaremis Flores, avvocata e giornalista, arrestata quello stesso giorno.

2. L'Unione pone i diritti umani e le libertà fondamentali al centro delle relazioni con tutti i paesi, Cuba compresa. Queste questioni sono apertamente evocate nei colloqui con le autorità cubane all'Havana e a Bruxelles e il SEAE ha ripetutamente espresso le preoccupazioni dell'Unione per la recrudescenza dei fermi temporanei nel paese.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009161/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Violation of fundamental freedoms in Cuba

Several days ago in Havana, a Cuban blogger was arrested along with her husband, who is also a journalist, and other activists.

She was arrested by local authorities as she performed her duties as a correspondent for a Spanish newspaper, whose stance has been declared illegal and pro-American.

She was arrested on the streets of the capital while going to a demonstration against violence, along with other fellow bloggers who suffered verbal abuse and heavy beatings.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of what happened?

2. Will she pay more attention to the issue and consider adopting further initiatives as part of the action undertaken with regard to the respect of freedom of expression and of human rights in Cuba?

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

1. The HR/VP is aware of the fact that Y. Sanchez was detained on 4 October and released on 5 October. According to the information available, Y. Sanchez was not demonstrating, she was on her way to Bayamo to attend the trial of spanish citizen A. Carromero.The HR/VP is further aware of the fact that Yoani Sanchez was arrested on 8 November and released again a few hours later. According to the information available, Yoani Sanchez was arrested in front of the Ministry of the Interior as she demanded to be informed about the whereabouts of lawyer and journalist Yaremis Flores who had been arrested earlier that day.

2. Human rights and fundamental freedoms are at the heart of relations with all countries, including Cuba. These questions are discussed openly with the Cuban authorities in Havana and in Brussels. Within this context, the EEAS has expressed on different occasions to the Cuban authorities the EU's concern on the upsurge of temporary detentions.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009163/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — 81 immigrati al porto di Bari

Il 5 ottobre scorso nel porto di Bari la polizia di frontiera ha bloccato su un traghetto greco giunto da Igoumenitsa 81 cittadini asiatici di varia nazionalità (fra cui 8 minorenni) che, stipati su due autoarticolati, avevano intenzione di entrare illegalmente in Italia.

È stato il personale di bordo della motonave sulla quale si trovavano ad accorgersi dei clandestini i quali, per respirare, avevano tagliato parte della copertura degli automezzi sui quali viaggiavano dall'Iran. All'attracco del traghetto sono stati arrestati i quattro autisti degli autoarticolati, tre iraniani e un tunisino, due dei quali hanno inutilmente tentato la fuga.

Alla luce dei fatti più sopra esposti, può il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenze della vicenda?

2. quali provvedimenti e azioni intende intraprendere per evitare e limitare l'afflusso di immigrati clandestini nei porti del Mediterraneo?

3. se ha l'intenzione di fornire nuovi strumenti di revisione più adeguati per gestire al meglio le politiche di asilo, integrandole più strettamente con le politiche d'immigrazione?

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

1. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza della vicenda.

2. La prevenzione e la lotta alla migrazione irregolare e alla tratta di esseri umani rimangono temi della massima importanza per l'UE, fanno parte delle quattro priorità operative dell'approccio globale in materia di migrazione e mobilità ([1]) e costituiscono l'obiettivo del documento «EU Action on Migratory Pressures — a Strategic Response» (Azione dell'UE sulle pressioni migratorie — Una risposta strategica) ([2]), approvato dal Consiglio Giustizia e affari interni (GAI) nell'aprile 2011 e riesaminato durante le successive presidenze del Consiglio. Il sostegno e la solidarietà nei confronti degli Stati membri oggetto di pressioni migratorie irregolari fanno parte integrante di questa strategia.

3. I negoziati sulla seconda fase del Sistema europeo comune di asilo sono prossimi alla conclusione e dal 2013 in poi la Commissione si adopererà con il massimo impegno per garantire l'attuazione coerente delle disposizioni negoziate negli Stati membri. Inoltre, in quanto quarto pilastro dell'approccio globale in materia di migrazione e mobilità, la dimensione esterna delle politiche di asilo, in particolare il sostegno ai paesi terzi che accolgono rifugiati, è già pienamente integrata nella strategia globale della Commissione in materia di migrazione.

([1]) COM(2011)743 definitivo.
([2]) Documento del Consiglio 14481/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009163/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — 81 immigrants in the port of Bari

On 5 October in the port of Bari, border police stopped 81 Asian citizens of various nationalities (including 8 children) on a Greek ferry arriving from Igoumenitsa. The Asian citizens were packed into two articulated lorries and had intended to enter Italy illegally.

The ship's crew noticed the stowaways after they cut part of the covering of the lorries, in which they had travelled from Iran, in order to breathe. When the ferry docked, the four drivers of the articulated lorries, three Iranians and a Tunisian, two of whom tried to escape unsuccessfully, were arrested.

In view of the above events, can the Vice-President/High Representative state:

1. Whether she is aware of the matter?

2. What measures and action she intends to take to prevent and limit the influx of illegal immigrants to Mediterranean ports?

3. Whether she intends to provide new, more suitable review mechanisms to manage asylum policies in the best way possible, integrating them more closely with immigration policies?

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

1. The HR/VP is aware of the matter.

2. Preventing and combating irregular migration and eradicating trafficking in human beings remains a high priority for the EU and is one of the four operational priorities of the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility (GAMM) ([1]). It is also the purpose of the 'EU Action on Migratory Pressures — a Strategic Response' ([2]) approved by the Justice and Home Affairs (JHA) Council in April 2011 and reviewed under subsequent Council Presidencies. Support and solidarity with those Member States facing irregular migratory pressures is part and parcel of this strategy.

3. The negotiations on the second phase of the Common European Asylum System are approaching their conclusion, and from 2013 the main focus of the Commission will be on ensuring that the negotiated provisions are coherently implemented in the Member States. Furthermore, the external dimension of asylum policies, including in particular the provision of support for third countries to help them to cope with the burden of hosting refugees, is already fully integrated into the overarching migration strategy of the Commission, as it represents the fourth pillar of the GAMM.

([1]) COM(2011) 743 final.
([2]) Council Doc 14481/12.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009164/12
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(11 octobre 2012)

Objet: Intervention des entreprises européennes dans un autre État membre

Le marché unique européen va fêter prochainement ses 20 ans. Le marché unique est probablement l'une des plus belles réalisations de l'Union européenne tant pour les citoyens que pour les entreprises qui ont bénéficié du potentiel de croissance de toute la réglementation.

Cependant, l'Europe s'est considérablement élargie en 20 ans, passant de 12 à 27 États membres, et elle a subi de nombreuses crises économiques dont les effets sont encore présents. C'est pour cela que les règles qui régissent le marché doivent évoluer en parallèle de ces bouleversements.

À ce titre, je félicite l'initiative du commissaire au marché intérieur, Michel Barnier, qui a mis en place (avec ses collègues) l'Acte pour le marché unique.

Il reste néanmoins des situations de distorsion de concurrence au sein du marché intérieur lorsque les règles ne sont pas respectées. Une entreprise de prestation de service peut intervenir dans un autre État membre sous certaines conditions de détachement et se prévaloir ainsi de son droit national. Il existe certaines dérives que l'on peut constater et pour lesquelles la Commission européenne se doit d'agir:

— lorsqu'une société peut détacher ses salariés vers un autre État membre, alors qu'elle n'est en fait qu'une boîte aux lettres dans son État d'origine, cette pratique lui permettant de se prévaloir du droit le plus avantageux;

— en cas de remplacement de salariés en fin de période de détachement par d'autres salariés venant poursuivre la même activité (ce qui est contraire aux règles du détachement et à l'idée du marché intérieur);

— en cas de non-respect des déclarations et différentes formalités obligatoires pour les entreprises communautaires effectuant une mission dans un autre État membre.

Ces dérives existent et donnent une perception négative du marché commun aux yeux des citoyens.

Que compte faire la Commission pour lutter contre ces dérives:

— en termes de communication auprès des entreprises européennes, pour leur expliquer leurs droits et leurs devoirs;

— en termes d'accompagnement des entreprises souhaitant établir une activité en dehors de leur État membre, pour les informer de leurs obligations;

— en termes de contrôle, enfin, pour aider les États membres à lutter contre le tourisme entrepreneurial et croiser les fichiers des États membres?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(6 décembre 2012)

La proposition de directive de la Commission ([1]) relative à l'exécution de la directive 96/71/CE concernant le détachement de travailleurs effectué dans le cadre d'une prestation de services contient un certain nombre de dispositions qui visent à prévenir de manière plus efficace l'utilisation abusive, le contournement ou le non-respect de la directive en question, comme dans le cas des sociétés «boîtes aux lettres» ou des faux indépendants.

La proposition consiste en un ensemble équilibré de mesures détaillées et dûment proportionnées destinées à améliorer les différents aspects du contrôle de l'application des règles. Elle prévoit des dispositions spécifiques quant à la nécessité de communiquer de façon plus transparente les informations requises sur les droits et obligations et de les rendre plus facilement accessibles. Par ailleurs, elle clarifie les éléments constitutifs inhérents à la notion de détachement pour lutter contre l'utilisation abusive et le contournement des règles applicables, et elle précise les mesures de contrôle nationales conformes au droit de l'Union européenne.

([1]) COM(2012) 131 final du 21 mars 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009164/12
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: European businesses operating in another Member State

The European single market will shortly be celebrating the 20th anniversary of its establishment. It is probably one of the European Union's greatest achievements, both for its citizens and for the businesses which have exploited the potential for growth offered by the internal market rules.

However, Europe has grown considerably over the last 20 years, from 12 to 27 Member States, and it has endured many economic crises, the effects of which are still being felt. This is why the market rules must evolve to take account of these upheavals.

I therefore applaud the initiative of the Commissioner for the internal market and Services, Michel Barnier, who, together with his colleagues, has introduced the single market Act.

Some distortion of competition does, however, still arise on the internal market when the rules are not observed. A business which provides services can operate in another Member State under certain rules on the posting of workers and take advantage of that country's laxer laws. Abuses are occurring and the Commission must take action to deal with them:

— a company can post its employees to another Member State, even though it in fact consists of nothing more than a letter box in its country of origin; this practice enables companies to invoke the law that is most advantageous to them;

— employees can be replaced at the end of the posting period by other people arriving to carry out the same role (this is a breach of the rules on the posting of workers and at odds with the concept of the internal market);

— Community businesses are failing to complete all the declarations and formalities which are mandatory for firms operating in another Member State.

These abuses portray the single market in a negative light.

What action does the Commission intend to take to deal with these abuses:

— in the form of communication with European businesses, in order to explain their rights and obligations to them;

— in the form of support for businesses that wish to set up in another Member State, in order to inform them of their obligations;

— in the form of checks designed to help Member States to counter 'business tourism' and share information?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2012)

The Commission proposal ([1]) for a directive on the enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services contains a number of provisions that seek to prevent more effectively the abuse or circumvention of Directive 96/71/EC or non-compliance with it, as in the case of letterbox companies or fake self-employed.

The proposal is a balanced set of comprehensive, proportionate measures for improving various aspects of enforcement. It includes specific provisions concerning the obligation to provide the necessary information concerning rights and obligations in a more transparent and accessible way. It also clarifies the constituent elements inherent in the concept of posting with a view to combating circumvention and abuse of the applicable rules and provides clarity regarding which national control measures are in compliance with EC law.

([1]) COM(2012) 131 final of 21 March 2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009165/12
alla Commissione
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Aviazione commerciale nel quadro dell'assegnazione di bande orarie (rifusione)

L'aviazione commerciale è un settore dinamico in rapida evoluzione che nel 2011 ha registrato 704.000 voli in Europa, vale a dire il 7,1 % di tutti i movimenti IFR (operati secondo le regole del volo strumentale), stando alle cifre di Eurocontrol.

Un recente studio della Oxford Economics dal titolo «Benefici economici dell'aviazione commerciale», pubblicato nel settembre 2012, sottolinea che il settore ha generato in totale 164.000 posti di lavoro contribuendo per circa 20 miliardi di euro all'economia su scala UE. Delle 89.000 coppie di città europee collegate dall'aviazione commerciale nel 2011, il 98 % non è altrimenti collegato da un volo di linea giornaliero. Questa rete svolge attualmente un ruolo particolarmente importante nel miglioramento dell'integrazione delle regioni più remote d'Europa — aspetto fondamentale della politica di coesione dell'Unione europea.

Tuttavia, a causa della natura specifica dell'aviazione commerciale e di altre operazioni ad hoc, l'attuale proposta della Commissione concernente la revisione del regolamento 95/93 non affronta in modo adeguato il fabbisogno di slot del settore, dato che diventerà praticamente impossibile per gli operatori non di linea ottenere e/o mantenere gli slot negli aeroporti coordinati.

1. La Commissione è consapevole del fatto che l'aviazione commerciale è attualmente costretta a lasciare un crescente numero di aeroporti coordinati e che ciò potrebbe comportare la perdita di collegamento tra le regioni d'Europa? Qual è la posizione della Commissione al riguardo?

2. È consapevole del fatto che la mancata concessione di diritti storici agli operatori non di linea è in primo luogo discriminatoria e, in secondo luogo, comporterà l'emarginazione di un settore fondamentale per le imprese europee in un momento in cui la ripresa economica viene indicata da tutti come priorità assoluta? Qual è la sua posizione al riguardo?

3. È consapevole del fatto che l'espressione «servizio aereo non di linea programmato», quale definito dall'articolo 2 della sua proposta, copre solo una frazione esigua delle attività non di linea?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(30 novembre 2012)

La Commissione concorda con l'obiettivo del Parlamento europeo di garantire i collegamenti ai cittadini dell'Unione europea e alle regioni d'Europa. Nell'ambito del mercato interno dell'aviazione, fin dal 1992 è stata istituita un'estesa rete di rotte allo scopo di migliorare i collegamenti interni in Europa. Le rotte intra-UE sono oggi 4 119 e vi è stato pertanto un aumento del 237 % rispetto alle 1 732 esistenti nel 1992.

La congestione e le restrizioni operative nei principali aeroporti dell'Unione europea, soprattutto in aree urbane densamente popolate, possono creare strozzature che ostacolano la mobilità dei cittadini e impediscono lo sviluppo di nuove rotte (nazionali, intra-UE o extra-UE).

La proposta della Commissione per l'assegnazione di bande orarie è frutto di un'attenta ponderazione tra l'esigenza di assicurare un libero ed equo accesso alle bande orarie negli aeroporti con il più alto tasso di prenotazioni e la necessità di tener conto delle caratteristiche specifiche degli operatori dell'aviazione d'affari. Poiché il regolamento sulle bande orarie ha l'obiettivo di pianificare in anticipo la capacità degli aeroporti e l'aviazione d'affari opera spesso su base ad hoc, la Commissione propone di estendere la definizione di «servizio aereo non di linea programmato» al segmento operante con una certa regolarità. Qualsiasi altra misura avente la finalità di accordare privilegi specifici agli operatori dell'aviazione d'affari altererebbe il carattere non discriminatorio del sistema di attribuzione delle bande orarie.

Indirettamente altre misure, come la norma 85-15, l'aumento della lunghezza della serie di bande orarie o il sistema di bande orarie riservate, sono intese a impedire il mancato utilizzo di capacità, poiché incoraggiano le compagnie aeree a restituire al pool le bande orarie inutilizzate e queste sono accordate alle compagnie aeree interessate, soddisfacendo anche richieste puntuali degli operatori dell'aviazione d'affari.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009165/12
to the Commission
Carlo Fidanza (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Business aviation within the framework of the slot allocation recast

Business aviation is a rapidly evolving and dynamic sector, which in 2011 comprised 704 000 business aviation flights in Europe, i.e. 7.1% of all IFR (Instrument Flight Rules) movements, according to Eurocontrol data.

A recent Oxford Economics study entitled 'The Economic Benefits of Business Aviation', published in September 2012, underlines that the sector generated a total of 164 000 jobs and contributed around EUR 20 billion to the economy EU-wide. Of the 89 000 European city-pairs that business aviation connected in 2011, 98% are not otherwise covered by a daily scheduled connection. This network actually plays a particularly crucial role in improving the integration of Europe's most remote regions — a key aspect of the EU's social cohesion policy.

However, owing to the specific nature of business aviation and other ad hoc operations, the current proposal from the Commission on the revision of Regulation 95/93 does not adequately address the sector's requirements for slots, as it will become practically impossible for non-scheduled operators to obtain and/or maintain slots at coordinated airports.

1. Is the Commission aware that business aviation is being forced out of a growing number of coordinated airports and that this may result in a loss of connectivity between the regions of Europe? What is the Commission's position in this regard?

2. Is the Commission aware that not granting historical rights to non-scheduled operators, a) is discriminatory and b) will lead to the marginalisation of a key sector for Europe PLC at a time when economic recovery is being highlighted everywhere as the number one priority? What is the Commission's position in this regard?

3. Is the Commission aware that the term 'programmed non-scheduled,' as defined in Article 2 of its proposal, covers only a tiny fraction of non-scheduled activities?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(30 November 2012)

The Commission shares the European Parliament's goal to ensure connectivity for EU citizens and Europe's regions. The Internal aviation market has been delivering, ever since 1992,a great network of routes to enhance Europe's internal connectivity. There are today 4 119 intra-EU routes compared to 1 732 in 1992, ie a 237% increase.

Congestion and operational restrictions at key airports of the European Union, notably in densely populated urban areas, can create bottlenecks hampering citizens' mobility and impeding the development of new routes (domestic, intra-EU or extra-EU).

In its proposal on the allocation of slots, the Commission carefully balanced the need for open and equal access to slots at over-subscribed airports with the need to cater the specific character of business aviation operators. Taking into account that the objective of the Slot Regulation is the planning in advance of the airport capacity and that business aviation operates often on a ad hoc basis, the Commission proposes to extend the definition of programmed non-scheduled to cover the part of the sector that operates with a certain regularity. Any other measure meant to offer specific priviliges to business aviation operators would affect the non-discriminatory character of the slot allocation system.

Indirectly, other measures as 85-15 rule, the increased length of the series of slots or slot reservation system are meant to impede wasting capacity by encouraging airlines to return unused slot to the pool in order to be allocated to interested airlines, including ad hoc requests from business aviation operators.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009166/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Arrest of the former President of the Maldives

On Monday 8 October 2012, the former President of the Maldives, Mohamed Nasheed, was arrested on Fares-Maathodaa island and conveyed by boat to Malé. The police appear to have deployed excessive and disproportionate force while conducting the arrest. Sources say that riot gear, pepper spray and physical violence were used.

Mr Nasheed's supporters allege that his arrest was politically motivated, the aim being to prevent him from campaigning for the MDP in the forthcoming elections. Notwithstanding the charges that he has been called on to answer, the manner of his apprehension certainly seems designed to cause him maximum discomfort and humiliation.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of Mr Nasheed's arrest? If so, does she intend to release a statement on behalf of the EU?

2. Is she satisfied that the basis and manner of his arrest comply with international legal conventions and due process under the law of the Maldives?

3. Does she believe the climate of human rights and democracy is satisfactory in the Maldives, following the change of president under the new government?

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

1. On 9 October 2012 the Spokesperson of High Representative/Vice-President released a statement on the arrest of former President Nasheed.

2. The HR/VP has reiterated her call to the Maldivian authorities to ensure former President Nasheed's personal safety and his right to a fair trial. She has also indicated that he must be free to participate in the elections which are expected to take place next year.

3. HR/VP has taken note of the UN Human Rights Committee's Concluding Observations in its initial report on the implementation by the Maldives of the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. She is also aware of the findings of the Commission of National Inquiry mandated to prepare a report regarding the resignation of ex-President Nasheed. In line with the reports she has expressed concern about the number of incidents and fundamental human rights violations reported. She believes that the political and security climate must improve for the elections are to be inclusive and transparent and the credibility of state institutions put beyond all doubt.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009167/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Cancelación del proyecto de obras de mota de defensa contra inundaciones en Albalat de la Ribera: situación de la financiación FEDER prevista

El pasado 2 de agosto, la nueva presidencia de la Confederación Hidrográfica del Júcar aprobó una resolución por la que renunciaba a la realización de la ejecución del proyecto de obras de mota de defensa contra inundaciones en Albalat de la Ribera (Valencia), integración paisajística y adecuación ambiental del margen izquierdo del río Júcar.

Estas obras estaban planificadas para, por un lado, proteger la localidad de Albalat de la Ribera en su conjunto, y especialmente a las manzanas de viviendas que en la actualidad se encuentran desprotegidas, contra posibles inundaciones a través de la modificación en planta del trazado de la actual mota de defensa.

Asimismo, el proyecto aprobado buscaba procurar una restauración ambiental de la ribera del río Júcar a su paso por la población de Albalat de la Ribera, mejorando el hábitat fluvial y potenciando su buen funcionamiento ecológico y paisajístico, actualmente deteriorado y sin las condiciones idóneas para cumplir la Directiva Marco sobre el agua 2000/60/CE.

Tal y como se comprobó dramáticamente a finales de septiembre, las inundaciones en España constituyen un riesgo natural que, en caso de no existir medidas de prevención y gestión de catástrofes, conllevan la pérdida de vidas humanas y numerosos daños materiales.

Ante esta realidad, es inaceptable y muy preocupante que las autoridades competentes hayan paralizado esta obra de la mota de defensa contra inundaciones argumentando motivos presupuestarios, dejando así desprotegidos a los ciudadanos y ciudadanas de la localidad de una posible inundación.

Teniendo en cuenta que la mayor parte de la financiación aprobada para este proyecto proviene del Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER).

1. ¿Está la Comisión informada sobre la renuncia a la ejecución de estas obras y dispone de más información sobre otros casos similares en España?

2. ¿Podría informar la Comisión en qué situación se encuentra la financiación proveniente de los fondos FEDER aprobada para este proyecto en concreto?

3. Ante la necesidad del proyecto por la desprotección de los vecinos ante posibles inundaciones, ¿piensa la Comisión tomar cartas en el asunto para que finalmente las obras sean ejecutadas?

4. ¿Ha trasladado el Gobierno español a la Comisión algún estudio con la estimación de los riesgos asumidos al no ejecutar las obras de prevención ante inundaciones?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de diciembre de 2012)

La determinación de las medidas que deben adoptarse para reducir el riesgo de inundaciones es responsabilidad de los Estados miembros, y la Comisión está al corriente de que las autoridades españolas favorecen, en algunos casos, la retención natural del agua en vez de otras infraestructuras de protección contra las inundaciones por razones de coste-eficacia. La Comisión apoya este enfoque, aunque reconoce que la decisión sobre las medidas óptimas depende de cada sitio concreto.

1. La cofinanciación del proyecto «Mota de defensa contra inundaciones en Albalat de la Ribera, integración paisajística y adecuación ambiental de la margen izquierda del río Júcar (Valencia)» estaba prevista en el marco del programa de la Comunidad Valenciana. Sin embargo, las autoridades españolas han informado a la Comisión de la retirada de este proyecto. En efecto, en el BOE de 6 de agosto de 2012 se publicaba una resolución en la que la Confederación Hidrográfica del Júcar ([1]) renunciaba al contrato debido a la falta de recursos como consecuencia de la crisis económica. La Comisión no dispone de información sobre la retirada de otros proyectos similares.

([1]) Organismo intermedio encargado de la gestión del proyecto.

2. Los fondos del FEDER asignados de manera provisional a este proyecto se destinarán a financiar otros proyectos de conformidad con el marco financiero del programa.

3. En virtud del principio de gestión compartida, la gestión del programa se realiza de manera descentralizada por las autoridades centrales y regionales. Corresponde, por tanto, a las autoridades españolas seleccionar, en el marco del programa, los proyectos que consideren oportunos, de conformidad con los reglamentos en vigor.

4. La Comisión no ha recibido del Estado miembro ninguna estimación de los posibles riesgos debidos a la no ejecución de obras de prevención de inundaciones.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009167/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Cancellation of the flood defence works project in Albalat de la Ribera: situation regarding planned ERDF funding

On 2 August 2012, the new presidency of the Júcar Hydrographic Confederation (*Confederación Hidrográfica del Júcar*) passed a resolution not to carry out the flood defence works project in Albalat de la Ribera (Valencia), including the landscaping and environmental adaptation of the left bank of the River Júcar.

These works were planned to protect the town of Albalat de la Ribera as a whole, and especially blocks of housing not currently protected against possible flooding, by changing the layout of the current flood defence works.

The approved project also sought to restore the environment of the banks of the River Júcar as it passes through the town of Albalat de la Ribera, by improving the river habitat and enhancing its ecological and landscape functions which are currently degraded and do not meet the conditions required to comply with the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC).

As was demonstrated in dramatic fashion at the end of September, floods in Spain are a natural risk which can lead to the loss of human lives and substantial damage to property if disaster prevention and management measures are not in place.

Given these facts, it is unacceptable and very disturbing that the competent authorities have frozen these flood defence works on budgetary grounds, thus leaving the citizens of this town unprotected against possible flooding.

Bearing in mind that most of the funding approved for this project comes from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF),

1. Is the Commission aware of the decision not to carry out these works and does it have further information on other similar cases in Spain?

2. Could the Commission provide information on the situation as regards the ERDF funding approved for this specific project?

3. Given that the project is needed to protect residents against possible flooding, does the Commission intend to take action so that the works can finally be carried out?

4. Has the Spanish Government forwarded to the Commission any studies estimating the risks involved in not carrying out the flood prevention works?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission
(13 décembre 2012)

Le choix des mesures propres à réduire le risque d'inondation appartient aux États membres et la Commission n'est pas sans savoir que les autorités espagnoles préfèrent, dans certains cas, des mesures de rétention naturelle des eaux, jugées plus rentables, à des infrastructures de protection contre les inondations. La Commission est favorable à cette approche, mais estime toutefois que le choix de la mesure optimale doit s'opérer en fonction du site.

1. Le cofinancement du projet «Mota de defensa contra inundaciones en Albalat de la Ribera, integración paisajística y adecuación ambiental de la margen izquierda del río Júcar (Valencia)» était prévu dans le cadre du programme de la Comunidad Valenciana. Or, les autorités espagnoles ont informé la Commission que ce projet a été retiré. En effet, le journal officiel de l'État a publié le 6 août 2012 une résolution par laquelle la *Confederación Hidrográfica del Júcar* ([1]) renonçait au contrat en raison de manque de ressources dû à la crise économique. La Commission ne dispose pas d'informations concernant des projets similaires éventuellement retirés.

([1]) Organisme intermédiaire chargé de la gestion du projet.

2. Les fonds FEDER attribués de manière prévisionnelle à ce projet seront destinés au financement d'autres projets, conformément au cadre financier du programme.

3. Le programme est géré, en vertu du principe de gestion partagée, de manière décentralisée par les autorités nationales et régionales. Il appartient donc aux autorités espagnoles, de sélectionner, dans le cadre de ce programme, les projets qu'elles considèrent opportuns, conformément aux règlements en vigueur.

4. La Commission n'a pas reçu de l'État membre, des estimations de risques éventuels dus à l'absence de travaux de prévention des inondations.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-009168/12
do Komisji
Janusz Władysław Zemke (S&D)
(11 października 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Budowa drogi ekspresowej S-5 w Polsce

Budowa drogi S5 jest – obok budowy sieci autostrad w Polsce, jedynym z najważniejszych przedsięwzięć infrastrukturalnych. Droga ta ma także znaczenie międzynarodowe, jako istotny element sieci ogólnoeuropejskiej. Niepokoją mnie zatem narastające zaniechania przy kontynuowaniu tej inwestycji, gdyż do tej pory oddano tylko jeden odcinek długości 35 km – do Gniezna. Proszę w związku z tym o informacje:

1. Czy Komisja nadzoruje realizację budowy drogi ekspresowej S-5.

2. Kiedy zostanie wykonana dokumentacja projektowa odcinka Bydgoszcz – Nowe Marzy.

3. Kiedy zostanie rozpoczęta budowa tej drogi między Gnieznem – Bydgoszczą a węzłem Nowe Marzy.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(21 listopada 2012 r.)

1. Komisja nadzoruje realizację wszystkich projektów współfinansowanych w ramach programów polityki spójności.

2. Z powodu ograniczonych środków finansowych polskie władze podjęły decyzję o wycofaniu budowy odcinka drogi S5 Bydgoszcz-Nowe Marzy z listy projektów zaplanowanych do zrealizowania w ramach obecnej perspektywy finansowej.

3. W ramach projektu „Budowa drogi ekspresowej S5 Żnin-Gniezno, odcinek Mielno-Gniezno" w obecnym okresie współfinansowana będzie jedynie budowa niewielkiej części odcinka drogi S5 Gniezno-Bydgoszcz (tj. Gniezno-Mielno). Według informacji otrzymanych przez nas od polskich władz prace na tym odcinku powinny rozpocząć się w 2013 r., w zależności od dostępnych środków finansowych.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009168/12
to the Commission
Janusz Władysław Zemke (S&D)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Construction of the S-5 express road in Poland

Along with the motorway construction project in Poland, the building of the S-5 road is one of the country's most important infrastructure projects. It also has international significance as a vital part of the Europe-wide network. I am concerned therefore that the continuation of this project has stalled, with only a single section — the 35 km to Gniezno — so far having been opened. In this connection:

1. Is the Commission monitoring implementation of the construction of the S-5 express way?

2. When will the project documentation be drawn up for the Bydgoszcz-Nowe Marzy section?

3. When will construction start to extend the road from Gniezno to Bydgoszcz and on to the Nowe Marzy junction?

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

1. The Commission monitors the implementation of all projects co-financed under cohesion policy programmes.

2. Construction of the Bydgoszcz-Nowe Marzy section of the S5 road was withdrawn by the Polish authorities from the list of projects planned to be implemented within the current perspective due to limited financial resources.

3. Only a small part of the Gniezno-Bydgoszcz section of the S5 road, (Gniezno — Mielno) will be co-financed during the current period in the framework of the project 'Construction of the S5 expressway Żnin-Gniezno, section Mielno-Gniezno'. According to the information received from the Polish authorities, the works on this section should start in 2013, depending on the availability of financial resources.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009169/12
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: EU-Moldova visa facilitation and readmission agreement

The EU-Moldova visa facilitation and readmission agreement was ratified by the Moldovan Parliament in 2007. This small country, with an estimated population of around five million, is facing very rigid Schengen area visa procedures for those of its citizens aiming to travel to EU Member States as bona fide tourists, out of concerns about overstaying and illegal migration into the EU.

Given that most of the emigration from Moldova, estimated at around 600 000 people, having already occurred in the mid-1990s due to economic collapse in the country and that an estimated 1/3 of the population hold Bulgarian or Romanian passports, and in view of Moldova's relatively small population, which therefore does not pose a significant migration risk to the EU, will the Commission consider accelerating a change and relaxation in the visa facilitation and readmission procedures for Moldovan citizens?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2012)

The EU-Republic of Moldova Visa Facilitation and Readmission Agreements entered into force in January 2008. An amended Visa Facilitation Agreement was signed in June 2012, under which: more categories of applicants will benefit from multiple-entry visas and visa fee waivers; provisions on the issuance of multiple-entry visas to certain categories of bona fide travellers will be clarified so as to ensure that visas with a long period of validity are issued where the conditions are met; cooperation of Member States with external service providers will be subject to a clear legal framework; and holders of biometric service passports will be exempted from the visa obligation. The new agreement now requires the consent of the European Parliament. No change is planned to the Readmission Agreement, which is satisfactorily implemented.

The EU regularly discusses issues including visas and irregular migration with the Republic of Moldova in the context of the Visa Liberalisation Dialogue, the Mobility Partnership, the Joint Visa Facilitation Committee and the Joint Readmission Committee.

A Visa Liberalisation Action Plan was presented to the Moldovan authorities in January 2011. The Commission's Third Report concludes that the benchmarks of the first phase (legislative and policy framework) are met ([1]). The Commission adopted in August 2012 a report on possible migratory and security impacts on the EU of future visa liberalisation for the Republic of Moldova ([2]). Regarding the proportion of citizens of the Republic of Moldova (population 2011: 4 075 000 ([3])) having Bulgarian or Romanian citizenship, information provided by the Member States concerned indicates that this is significantly lower than the one suggested by the Honourable Member.

([1]) See COM(2012) 348 final. For migration and readmission see Block 2 topic 2 pages 6-8.
([2]) See COM(2012) 443 final. For visa issues see pages 4-5, for readmission issues see pages 5-6 and for possible migratory impacts see pages 6-15.
([3]) See COM(2012) 443 final, page 22.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009171/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Assistenza sanitaria transfrontaliera e sistemi di e-Health: ostacoli giuridici e organizzativi

I cittadini UE che contraggono una malattia o subiscono un infortunio durante un viaggio di lavoro o per turismo o per motivi di studio in un altro Stato membro, hanno il diritto di ricevere la stessa assistenza sanitaria dei cittadini di tale Stato membro. Le prerogative a garanzia dell'accesso ai servizi di assistenza sanitaria transfrontaliera sono diverse: dalla tessera sanitaria europea — distribuita a 188 milioni di cittadini europei — alle norme europee sul coordinamento della sicurezza sociale, che assicurano l'autorizzazione preventiva per un trattamento sanitario programmato all'estero. Inoltre, è possibile attivare un sistema di rimborso per trattamenti sanitari programmati all'estero direttamente in virtù della libera prestazione di servizi.

Tuttavia, l'assistenza sanitaria transfrontaliera nell'UE sembra presentare almeno due limiti evidenti: essa rappresenta solo l'1 % della spesa pubblica per la sanità, ivi compresi i servizi di pronto soccorso; la scarsità d'informazioni chiare e trasparenti su aspetti essenziali delle prestazioni sanitarie, compresi i diritti al rimborso per le spese sostenute in altri Stati membri. La situazione d'incertezza e sfiducia, peraltro, induce i pazienti a circoscrivere l'uso delle tecnologie e-Health entro i confini nazionali, creando un gap di continuità delle cure mediche in altri Stati membri dell'UE. L'e-Health, di fatto, potrebbe ridurre le disparità nell'accesso alle cure, migliorare la qualità dell'assistenza, rendere più agevole e sicuro l'accesso ai dati sanitari personali, ridurre al minimo il rischio di errori medici e contribuire alla diagnosi precoce di problemi di salute. Ad esempio, il tele-monitoraggio, lo scambio elettronico dei dati tra i laboratori, o le ricette elettroniche sono tutte misure che dovrebbero stimolare l'utilizzo delle tecnologie ICT in ambito sanitario ed accelerare l'adozione di adeguate strategie a livello nazionale. Alla luce delle iniziative della Commissione in materia di assistenza sanitaria transfrontaliera: il Piano Strategico Europa 2020; gli ambiti d'intervento dell'Agenda Europea per il Digitale, fra cui le azioni chiave nn. 13-14; considerato che la direttiva 2011/24/UE sull'applicazione dei diritti dei pazienti relativi all'assistenza sanitaria transfrontaliera prevede, all'articolo 14 «Assistenza sanitaria on line», l'istituzione di un network tra le autorità nazionali responsabili dell'assistenza sanitaria on line designate dagli Stati membri;

può la Commissione far sapere quali ulteriori misure intende adottare al fine di eliminare gli ostacoli giuridici e organizzativi (frammentazione delle norme sulla protezione dei dati personali nell'UE; meccanismi di rimborso e scarsa interoperabilità europea); garantire il carattere transfrontaliero dell'accesso all'assistenza sanitaria, soprattutto in materia di rimborsi e garanzie procedurali, fornendo informazioni trasparenti in tutti i paesi dell'UE; garantire un accesso on line sicuro ai propri dati sanitari e diffondere l'impiego di servizi di telemedicina?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(27 novembre 2012)

La direttiva 2011/24/UE ([1]) impone agli Stati membri di istituire sul loro territorio almeno un punto di contatto nazionale per informare i pazienti riguardo ai loro diritti all'assistenza sanitaria transfrontaliera. Tali punti di contatto nazionali devono inoltre fornire ai pazienti di altri paesi informazioni sulle norme di qualità e sicurezza vigenti nello Stato membro in cui si trova il punto di contatto, oltre ad altre informazioni pertinenti relative, tra l'altro, alle procedure di reclamo e di ricorso.

Inoltre, la direttiva 2011/24/UE istituisce una rete di assistenza sanitaria online ([2]) per promuovere una maggiore interoperabilità tra i sistemi sanitari online. Essa prevede orientamenti in materia di anamnesi del paziente e prescrizioni elettroniche per migliorare la sicurezza e la continuità delle cure transfrontaliere. La rete è incentrata attualmente sull'identificazione elettronica, sull'interoperabilità semantica e giuridica, sui dati che devono figurare nelle cartelle cliniche e sulle ricette elettroniche, con il sostegno di progetti ([3]) e studi ([4]). La Commissione sta valutando la possibilità di lanciare uno studio per esaminare l'effetto delle leggi nazionali in materia di cartelle cliniche elettroniche sull'accesso transfrontaliero ai servizi sanitari elettronici e sullo scambio di dati.

([1]) Direttiva 2011/24/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 9 marzo 2011; concernente l'applicazione dei diritti dei pazienti relativi all'assistenza sanitaria transfrontaliera.
([2]) Decisione di esecuzione della Commissione, del 22 dicembre 2011, che stabilisce le norme per l'istituzione, la gestione e il funzionamento della rete di autorità nazionali responsabili dell'assistenza sanitaria on line (2011/890/UE).
([3]) EPSOS Large scale project European Patients — Smart open Services, http://www.epsos.eu.
([4]) Ad esempio: Study on the set-up of guidelines for ePrescriptions interoperability, Executive Agency for Health & Consumers (EAHC) service contract number 2011-63-01; Study on the set-up of guidelines for ePrescriptions interoperability, Executive Agency for Health & Consumers (EAHC) service contract number 2011-63-01.

Altre iniziative contribuiranno a garantire un'assistenza sanitaria on line e servizi di telemedicina sicuri e senza soluzione di continuità. La proposta di regolamento in materia di identificazione elettronica ([5]) affronta questioni inerenti alla sicurezza e alla fiducia del paziente. La proposta di un regolamento generale sulla protezione dei dati ([6]) riguarda il trattamento dei dati personali, compresi i dati relativi alla salute.

La Commissione sta inoltre sviluppando insieme agli Stati membri una vasta rete informatizzata per l'applicazione della legislazione dell'UE in materia di coordinamento della sicurezza sociale ([7]) (sistema EESSI), che consentirà alle istituzioni degli Stati membri di scambiarsi informazioni e dati relativi al rimborso delle cure sanitarie per via elettronica.

([5]) Proposta di regolamento sul riconoscimento reciproco in materia di identificazione elettronica e firma elettronica — COM(2012)238/2.
([6]) Proposta di regolamento generale sulla protezione dei dati — COM(2012)11 definitivo.
([7]) Regolamento (CE) N. 883/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 29 aprile 2004 relativo al coordinamento dei sistemi di sicurezza sociale (Testo rilevante ai fini del SEE e per la Svizzera).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009171/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Cross-border healthcare and e-Health systems; legal and organisational obstacles

A Member State citizen who becomes ill or suffers an accident while travelling to another Member State for work, leisure or study, has the right to receive the same healthcare afforded by that State to its own citizens. There are various prerogatives which ensure access to cross-border healthcare: from the European Health Insurance Card — issued to 188 million EU citizens — to the European regulations on the coordination of social security, which ensure prior authorisation for medical treatment planned abroad. Furthermore, a reimbursement system may be activated for healthcare services planned abroad specifically under the terms of the freedom to provide services.

Still, cross-border healthcare within the EU seems to present at least two clear drawbacks: it accounts for only 1% of public spending for healthcare, including accident and emergency services; there is a lack of straightforward and transparent information on essential aspects of healthcare services, including the rights to reimbursement for expenses incurred in other Member States. Moreover, a combination of uncertainty and distrust leads patients to avoid using e-Health technology within their own countries, thereby creating a continuity gap when they receive care in other Member States. In fact, e-Health could reduce the inequalities in access to treatment, improve healthcare quality, ensure easier and more secure access to personal health records, minimise the risk of medical errors and contribute to the early diagnosis of illnesses. For example, telemonitoring, the online exchange of data between laboratories or e-prescriptions are all measures intended to encourage the use of ICT technology for healthcare purposes and accelerate the adoption of the appropriate strategies on national level. In view of the Commission's initiatives with regard to cross-border healthcare services: the EU Strategic Plan 2020; the scope of initiatives under the Digital Agenda for Europe, including key actions Nos 13-14; given that directive 2011/24/EU on the application of patient rights in cross-border healthcare makes provision in Article 14 'eHealth' for the establishment of a network among the national authorities responsible for online healthcare designated by the Member States.

Can the Commission state which further measures it intends to adopt in order to eliminate legal and organisational obstacles (fragmentation of the regulations on the protection of personal data in the EU; reimbursement mechanisms and lack of interoperability within Europe); to ensure the cross-border nature of access to healthcare, especially with regard to reimbursement and procedural safeguards, providing transparent information in every EU country; and to guarantee secure online access to its own healthcare data and increase the use of telemedicine services?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(27 November 2012)

Directive 2011/24/EU ([1]) requires Member States to set up at least one national contact point on their territory to inform patients about their rights in cross-border healthcare. These national contact points will also provide information to patients from other countries about quality and safety standards used in the Member State where the focal point is located along with other relevant information including complaints and redress procedures.

In addition, Directive 2011/24/EU sets up an eHealth Network ([2]) to work towards improving interoperability between eHealth systems. It foresees guidelines on data to be place in patient's summaries and ePrescriptions to enhance safety and continuity of cross-border treatment. This Network is currently focusing on eIdentification, semantic and legal interoperability, set of data in patients' summary, and ePrescriptions, supported by projects ([3]) and studies ([4]). The Commission is considering to launch a study to explore how national laws on electronic health records interact with cross-border access to eHealth services and exchange of data.

Other initiatives will play a role in ensuring secure and seamless eHealth and telemedicine services. The proposal for a regulation on electronic identification ([5]) touches upon the issues of security and trust. The proposal on a General Regulation on data protection ([6]) deals with processing of personal data, including health data.

([1]) Directive 2011/24/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 March 2011 on the application of patients' rights in cross-border healthcare.
([2]) Commission Implementing Decision of 22 December 2011 providing the rules for the establishment, the management and the functioning of the network of national responsible authorities on eHealth (2011/890/EU).
([3]) For example: EPSOS Large scale project European Patients Smart open Services, http://www.epsos.eu/.
([4]) For example: Study on the set-up of guidelines for ePrescriptions interoperability, Executive Agency for Health & Consumers (EAHC) service contract number 2011-63-01.
([5]) Proposal for a regulation on mutual recognition on eID and eSignature — COM(2012) 238/2.
([6]) Proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation — COM(2012) 11 final.

The Commission is also developing together with Member States a large scale computerised network for application of EC law on social security coordination (7) (the EESSI system), which will enable institutions in Member States to exchange information and data regarding reimbursement of healthcare electronically.

(7) Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the coordination of social security systems (Text with relevance for the EEA and for Switzerland).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009172/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Donare e riciclare pacemaker: un aiuto per l'assistenza sanitaria nei PVS

Riciclo di materiali, riciclo giocattoli per i bambini dei PVS, riciclo di dispositivi sanitari per aiutare chi non può permettersi l'acquisto di attrezzature mediche costose. Donazione di sangue, donazione di midollo e donazione di organi sono pratiche, spesso salvavita, applicate quotidianamente in tutto il mondo. Donare e riciclare sono le due parole cardine del progetto «My Heart Your Hearth» promosso dal Centro Cardiologico dell'Università del Michigan, che intende riciclare i pacemaker di pazienti deceduti. Il pacemaker stimola elettricamente la contrazione del cuore quando questa non viene assicurata in maniera normale dal tessuto di conduzione cardiaca. Nel mondo, a causa di disfunzioni cardiache normalmente risolvibili con l'impianto di un dispositivo elettronico, si stima che muoiano quasi 2 milioni di persone che economicamente non possono permettersi di sostenere i costi di queste apparecchiature. Solo negli USA, invece, al momento del decesso del paziente quasi il 45 % dei pacemaker vengono espiantati per motivi diversi e più dell'80 % vengono gettati via o smaltiti come rifiuti. Un pacemaker dura dai 6 ai 10 anni e per poter essere riutilizzato deve avere almeno il 70 % di autonomia nella batteria (può durare ancora 3 anni), nonché essere controllato e sterilizzato in base a un protocollo rigoroso.

Lo scopo del progetto si incentra sul fatto che i pacemaker possono essere donati a ospedali e centri medici dei PVS che siano in grado di effettuare l'intervento e fornire assistenza ai pazienti negli anni successivi. Da uno studio pubblicato sull'American Journal of Cardiology questa pratica chirurgica risulta sicura ed efficace per i pazienti e dai sondaggi oltre il 70 % dei «proprietari» sarebbe disposto a donare l'apparecchio in caso di decesso.

Posto che l'assistenza sanitaria delle persone è un lusso per pochi e non un diritto di tutti nei PVS, che il trapianto di organi permette di salvare migliaia di vite; che la possibilità di riutilizzo del pacemaker può consentire a diverse persone disagiate di condurre una vita senza disfunzioni cardiache, può la Commissione far sapere quali iniziative europee sono state attivate per incentivare progetti che consentano la redistribuzione nei PVS di apparecchiature mediche specifiche, quali i pacemaker?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(15 novembre 2012)

La Commissione è al corrente delle diverse iniziative private di riciclaggio di dispositivi medici nonché delle opportunità e limitazioni ad esse associate.

Vista la portata e l'incidenza potenziale estremamente limitate di queste iniziative e i notevoli problemi tecnici (manutenzione, standardizzazioni tecniche, molteplicità dei modelli e delle specifiche) e normativi (concessione di autorizzazioni subordinata alla legislazione dei singoli paesi beneficiari) che comportano, la promozione di questo tipo di progetti esula dal ruolo, dal mandato e dalla capacità della Commissione.

La Commissione monitorerà tuttavia la situazione per il caso in cui dovesse presentarsi la necessità di interventi specifici.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009172/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Donating and recycling pacemakers: a source of help for healthcare in developing countries

Recycling materials, recycling toys for children in developing countries, recycling healthcare equipment to help those who cannot afford to purchase costly medical apparatus. Donations of blood, marrow and organs are often lifesaving practices which occur around the world on a daily basis. 'Donating' and 'recycling' are the two key words in the 'My Heart Your Heart' project launched by the University of Michigan Cardiovascular Center, which is seeking to recycle pacemakers from deceased patients. A pacemaker stimulates the contraction of the heart electrically when the cardiac conduction tissue is unable to do this normally. It is estimated that almost 2 million people around the world, who cannot afford to meet the costs of electronic devices, die because of heart problems which could usually be resolved by fitting one of these devices. On the other hand, almost 45% of pacemakers are removed in the USA alone for various reasons when a patient dies and over 80% are thrown away or disposed of as waste. A pacemaker lasts for between 6 and 10 years and in order for it to be reused, it must have at least 70% battery autonomy (the battery can last for 3 more years), as well as being checked and sterilised in accordance with a strict protocol.

The goal of the project focuses on the fact that pacemakers can be donated to hospitals and medical centres in developing countries which are able to carry out the operation and provide assistance to the patients over the following years. A study published in the American Journal of Cardiology showed that this surgical practice is safe and effective for the patients. Over 70% of the 'owners' have stated in surveys that they would be willing to donate the equipment in the event of their death.

Considering that healthcare is a luxury for the few rather than a universal right in developing countries, that organ transplants allow thousands of lives to be saved, that the possibility of reusing pacemakers can enable many needy people to lead a normal life without heart problems, can the Commission state which European initiatives have been launched in order to encourage projects enabling the redistribution in developing countries of specific medical equipment, such as pacemakers?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(15 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the existence of various private medical recycling initiatives, and the opportunities and limitations these recycling initiatives have.

Because of the very limited scope and potential impact, and the considerable technical problems (maintenance, technical standardisations, multiplicity of models and specifications) and regulatory problems (authorisations in recipient countries depending on every country's legislation) raised by these initiatives, it is beyond the Commission's role, mandate and capacity to promote specifically such projects concepts.

The Commission will however monitor the situation in case a need for specific interventions arises.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009173/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Prevenzione del cancro: nuove frontiere con la senescenza cellulare

Nuove frontiere vengono esplorate nel campo della ricerca contro il cancro. Questa neoplasia, come noto, è spesso letale perché le cellule oncogeniche attaccano le cellule sane circostanti e, di fronte a una difesa impossibile, l'accelerazione cellulare è molto spesso inesorabile.

All'Università di Harvard un ricercatore italiano sta sperimentando il processo di «senescenza cellulare», scoperto già negli anni '60, per mezzo del quale, normalmente, la pelle di persone esposte a situazioni ambientali ostili risponde difendendosi da fattori altrimenti assai pericolosi per la salute umana. Il ricercatore sostiene che si possa bloccare la moltiplicazione cellulare oncogenica dell'organo maschile della prostata attraverso la somministrazione di sostanze inibitrici del complesso enzimatico SCF che, con la sua azione, inibisce alcune proteine neoplasiche, non consentendone la moltiplicazione e quindi l'invecchiamento, fino a determinare un blocco definitivo del tumore.

Questa sostanza è già stata testata sull'uomo e le risposte sono state quelle attese, mentre è in fase di sperimentazione l'azione di un farmaco inibitore delle proteine PARP che potrebbe essere impiegato per tumori alla mammella in fase precoce o, perfino, a scopo preventivo. È dimostrato che sulle cavie la sostanza non ha effetti tossici ed è ben tollerata. Queste scoperte potrebbero dare origine a una nuova generazione di farmaci che, non essendo nocivi, potrebbero essere somministrati come chemiopreventivi così come durante la fase avanzata della malattia.

Posto che il tumore alla prostata e al seno risultano le neoplasie maggiormente diffuse tra la popolazione mondiale e che la ricerca, la prevenzione e la cura del cancro sono priorità del programma europeo sulla salute e considerato che l'UE è attiva in tal senso su vari fronti, può la Commissione far sapere se intende predisporre uno studio che evidenzi gli effetti benefici della senescenza cellulare non solo per la prevenzione di neoplasie che colpiscono la prostata e la mammella, ma anche per organi diversi da quelli analizzati?

Può, inoltre, precisare se ritiene opportuno sviluppare programmi di supporto psicologico per pazienti e familiari al fine di fornire adeguato sostegno nel comprendere le potenzialità della senescenza cellulare?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(7 dicembre 2012)

La ricerca sul ruolo della senescenza cellulare nello sviluppo di malattie, tra cui il cancro, è stata sostenuta all'interno del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico ([1]) (7° PQ, 2007-2013) con circa 12,8 milioni di EUR finora stanziati. I settori interessati comprendono lo sviluppo e la convalida di nuovi biomarcatori della senescenza cellulare (TELOMARKER ([2])), nonché lo studio della modulazione di percorsi di senescenza per terapie antitumorali (PICS THERAPY ([3]), SENESCENCE CLEARANCE ([4]), CANCER&AGEING ([5])).

La Commissione ritiene che il benessere e il supporto psicosociali costituiscano un aspetto importante del trattamento globale dei tumori e debbano quindi essere incoraggiati. L'azione comune relativa al partenariato europeo per la lotta contro il cancro ([6]), finanziato nell'ambito del programma dell'UE in materia di salute ([7]), comprende attività collegate al supporto psicosociale. Tuttavia, in questa fase la Commissione non intende sostenere lo sviluppo di uno specifico programma di supporto psicologico finalizzato a una maggiore comprensione del potenziale della senescenza cellulare.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_it.html
([2]) http://www.brunel.ac.uk/shssc/research/bicgp/research-projects/telomarker.
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/98533_it.html
([4]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/94893_it.html
([5]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/90232_it.html
([6]) http://www.epaac.eu/.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/policy/2008-2013/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009173/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Cancer prevention: new frontiers in cellular senescence

New frontiers are being explored in cancer research. Neoplasia is often fatal because cancer cells attack nearby healthy cells and, faced with mounting an impossible defence, cellular acceleration is very often unrelenting.

An Italian researcher at Harvard University is experimenting with the process of 'cellular senescence', discovered in the 1960s, by which, normally, the skin of people exposed to hostile environments responds by defending itself against factors that are otherwise very dangerous to human health. The researcher argues that the multiplication of prostate cancer cells in men can be blocked by administering inhibitory substances from the SCF enzyme complex which, by its action, inhibits certain neoplastic proteins, preventing their multiplication and therefore their ageing, thus leading to a definitive block of the tumour.

The substance has already been tested in human subjects, the results of which met with expectations, whilst tests are underway on an inhibitory drug made from the PARP proteins that could be used on early-stage breast cancer tumours or even for preventative purposes. It has been proven on guinea pigs that the substance has no toxic effects and is well-tolerated. These discoveries may lead to a new generation of drugs which, given their innocuous nature, could be administered as preventative treatment for cancer as well as in the advanced stages of the disease.

Given that prostate and breast cancer are the most common neoplasias worldwide and that cancer research, prevention and treatment are priorities of the European Health Programme, and considering that the EU is active in this regard on various fronts, can the Commission state whether it intends to arrange for a study to highlight the benefits of cellular senescence, not to prevent neoplasias of the prostate and breast, but also of organs other than those analysed?

Can it moreover specify whether it considers it appropriate to develop psychological support programs for patients and families in order to provide adequate support in understanding the potential of cellular senescence?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(7 December 2012)

Research on the role of cellular senescence in diseases' development including cancer has been supported across the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development ([1]) (FP7, 2007-2013) with some EUR 12.8 million currently devoted so far. Areas addressed include the development and validation of novel biomarkers of cellular senescence (TELOMARKER ([2])) as well as the study of the modulation of senescence pathways for cancer therapy (PICS THERAPY ([3]), SENESCENCE CLEARANCE ([4]), CANCER&AGEING ([5])).

The Commission considers that the psychosocial wellbeing and support is an important part of comprehensive cancer care and should be encouraged. In the framework of the joint action on the European Partnership for Action Against Cancer ([6]), supported under the EU Health Programme ([7]), activities in relation to psychosocial support have been included. However, the Commission at this stage does not consider supporting the development of a specific psychological support programme in order to provide support in understanding the potential of cellular senescence.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html
([2]) http://www.brunel.ac.uk/shssc/research/bicgp/research-projects/telomarker.
([3]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/98533_en.html
([4]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/94893_en.html
([5]) http://cordis.europa.eu/projects/rcn/90232_en.html
([6]) http://www.epaac.eu/.
([7]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/programme/policy/2008-2013/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009174/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Psoriasi: nuovi programmi educazionali e nuove forme di terapia psicologica

La psoriasi è un'infiammazione cronica della pelle, una dermatite eritemato squamosa ad andamento cronico che colpisce entrambi i sessi con uguale frequenza e in qualsiasi età, ma più frequentemente tra i 20 e i 30 anni. Nel mondo sono 125 milioni le persone affette da psoriasi e 2,5 di queste vivono in Italia dove il tasso di incidenza di nuovi casi è di 6 ogni 10 mila abitanti. È una patologia multifattoriale in cui si incrociano fattori genetici, ambientali, psicologici, somatici, nutrizionali, che insieme determinano anche l'espressività clinica. Infatti ci sono diverse forme con varia gravità, da forme subcliniche a forme più gravi fino a casi invalidanti e di difficile controllo clinico.

Infatti, un'indagine riporta che per l'84 % dei pazienti le manifestazioni della malattia rendono la vita quotidiana molto difficile, oltre il 55 % è poco o per nulla soddisfatto delle terapie e il 50 % si cura in modo incostante anche a causa di terapie cosiddette scomode. La mancata attenzione per la cura di tale patologia è il fattore determinante che aggrava la condizione fisica, sociale e psichica delle persone: esse provano un costante senso d'imbarazzo e vergogna con cui di frequente devono combattere e che, non di rado, può compromettere anche la quotidianità in ambito familiare nonché lavorativo. Diversi e non trascurabili sono i risvolti psichici: la visibilità dei segni sul corpo può provocare insicurezza, ansia e vergogna, fino a danneggiare la sfera dei rapporti affettivi e sessuali e creare un profondo senso d'isolamento.

Posto che esistono cure per alleviare i sintomi manifesti di tale patologia senza tuttavia che sia possibile riscontrare un metodo di cura universale e definitivo; è imprescindibile sviluppare programmi educazionali complementari alla terapia farmacologica, che valorizzino il paziente affetto da psoriasi come «produttore di salute» per la propria persona; è doveroso informare e far conoscere tale patologia al fine di incentivare una maggiore compliance con i servizi sanitari, evitando sprechi in termini di risorse personali e pubbliche;

può la Commissione riferire se intende promuovere programmi di informazione su tale patologia per i singoli pazienti e i loro familiari e finanziare progetti di terapia psichica condotti in forma di gruppo, alla luce del dimostrato impatto sulla sfera emotiva dei soggetti coinvolti?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(3 dicembre 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della patofisiologia e della natura multifattoriale della psoriasi e di altre malattie croniche della pelle.

La Commissione non intende promuovere programmi d'informazione su tale malattia all'indirizzo dei singoli pazienti e delle loro famiglie e non è in grado di finanziare progetti per una terapia psicologica di gruppo poiché l'organizzazione e l'erogazione dell'assistenza sanitaria e dei servizi medici rientrano nella responsabilità degli Stati membri.

La Commissione, assieme agli Stati membri e agli stakeholder, ha tuttavia intrapreso un processo di riflessione sulle malattie croniche. Tale processo — anche se non indirizzato specificamente a determinate patologie — ci aiuterà a identificare gli ambiti in cui si registrano carenze e in cui vi sono possibilità di ottenere un valore aggiunto da un'ulteriore azione a livello di UE e dalla cooperazione tra gli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009174/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Psoriasis: new educational programmes, and new forms of mental therapy

Psoriasis is a chronic inflammation of the skin, an erythematous squamous dermopathy that follows a chronic course and affects both sexes equally at all ages, but, most frequently, between 20 and 30 years of age. Of the 125 million people around the world suffering from psoriasis, 2.5 million live in Italy, where the incidence rate is 6 per 10 000 citizens. This is a multi-factor pathology in which genetic, environmental, psychological, somatic, and nutritional factors converge to determine its clinical manifestation. In fact, different forms with various degrees of severity range from subclinical forms to more serious cases to incapacitating cases that are very difficult to manage clinically.

In fact, surveys have reported that, for 84% of patients, the onset of the disease makes daily life very difficult, that more than 55% of patients are not very satisfied or not satisfied at all with their treatment, whilst 50% experience inconsistent recovery due to 'uncomfortable' treatment. The lack of attention in treating such disease is a significant factor which causes deterioration in the physical, social, and psychological situation of individuals: They have a constant feeling of embarrassment and shame which they must frequently struggle with and which, not infrequently, can jeopardise family life and careers. The psychological implications are distinct and considerable: the visibility of marks on the body can lead to insecurity, anxiety, and shame, and may even damage friendships and sexual relationships, and create a profound feeling of isolation.

Considering that treatments exist that can alleviate symptoms exhibited by this disease, though it has not however been possible to discover a universal and definitive cure, it is essential to develop educational programmes, to complement drug therapies, focusing on the patient suffering from psoriasis as a 'maker of health' for himself; it is necessary to provide information and raise awareness regarding this disease in order to encourage better cooperation with health services, avoiding waste of individual and public resources.

Can the Commission state whether it intends to promote information programmes on this disease for individual patients and their family members, and to finance group psychological therapy projects, in view of the established impact on the emotional sphere of the individuals involved?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2012)

The Commission is aware of the pathophysiology and the multifactorial nature of psoriasis and other chronic skin diseases.

The Commission does not intend to promote information programmes on this disease for individual patients and their family members, and is not able to finance group psychological therapy projects, because the organisation and delivery of healthcare and medical services are a matter falling under the responsibility of Member States.

However, the Commission, together with Member States and stakeholders, has undertaken a reflection process on chronic diseases. This process — while not disease specific — will help us to identify those areas where gaps and added value for further action at EU level and in cooperation between Member States is needed.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009175/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Raffinerie pure: distorsioni del mercato della concorrenza

Nelle campagne 2010/11 e 2011/12, la Commissione ha evidenziato una carenza di zucchero sul mercato europeo ed ha deciso di introdurre misure eccezionali per farvi fronte, consentendo da un lato ai produttori da bietola una conversione di parte della loro produzione fuori quota in quota a dazio ridotto o nullo e, dall'altro, indicendo delle gare a dazio crescente, aperte a tutti gli operatori del mercato saccarifero (produttori da bietola, raffinatori puri, commercianti) per l'importazione di determinati quantitativi di zucchero nell'UE.

Nelle suddette campagne risulta che le quote UE di zucchero da bietola ed isoglucosio sono sempre state prodotte ed il livello dei consumi e delle esportazioni è rimasto sostanzialmente stabile. Pertanto, la carenza di zucchero riscontrata dalla Commissione può essere imputata unicamente ad una diminuzione del livello delle importazioni di zucchero che, essendo per la maggior parte grezzo di canna, è destinato all'approvvigionamento delle raffinerie pure. Ciò è dimostrato in maniera evidente dalla carenza di materia prima per i raffinatori puri, costretti a lavorare, nelle ultime campagne, un quantitativo inferiore a quello garantito loro dalla regolamentazione UE fino alla campagna 2008/09, pari a circa 2,5 milioni di tonnellate. Non vi è dubbio che tale scenario comporti un aumento consistente delle importazioni preferenziali, provocando pratiche collusive e distorsioni sul mercato dello zucchero con effetti diretti sulla concorrenza.

Per quale motivo la Commissione UE non ha aperto contingenti di importazione di zucchero greggio di canna riservati alle raffinerie pure, ed ha invece scelto di adottare misure che hanno favorito soprattutto i produttori da bietola, grazie alla possibilità di convertire la produzione fuori quota in quota?

Tali misure hanno inoltre danneggiato anche la Raffineria di Brindisi, realizzata nel 2010 in seguito all'assegnazione all'Italia, nel quadro della riforma OCM del 2006, di una quota di raffinazione, a parziale compensazione della prevista — e puntualmente realizzata — drastica riduzione della produzione da bietole. È per giunta del tutto incomprensibile che una delle principali realtà imprenditoriali italiane attive nel settore dello zucchero, come la Raffineria di Brindisi, debba essere a rischio di sopravvivenza a causa di una carenza di approvvigionamento di materia prima a condizioni eque.

Alla luce dell'interpretazione ormai consolidata data dai giudici comunitari dell'art. 101 TFUE, può la Commissione far sapere se è al corrente dei suddetti effetti distorsivi e quali misure intendere intraprendere al fine di porvi rimedio?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(5 dicembre 2012)

La capacità di raffinazione dello zucchero di canna in Europa dal 2006 è raddoppiata passando da 1,89 milioni di tonnellate pre-riforma a circa 4,2 milioni di tonnellate. Molte raffinerie sono riuscite a garantire le materia prima per questa nuova capacità di raffinazione. Durante lo stesso periodo, l'UE ha quindi aumentato le importazioni di zucchero greggio per la raffinazione, raggiungendo, già nel 2011, il livello mai raggiunto prima di oltre 4 milioni di tonnellate, ovvero 1 milione di tonnellate in più rispetto al 2006. Le importazioni preferenziali di zucchero dai paesi aderenti all'APE-EBA nel 2011/2012 sono state pari a 1,9 milioni di tonnellate — il livello più elevato in assoluto — rispetto alla cifra di 1,57 milioni di tonnellate nel periodo 2004/2005.

Uno degli obiettivi della politica UE in materia di zucchero consiste nel garantire un rifornimento sufficiente del mercato. La Commissione non ritiene opportuno privilegiare le importazioni di zucchero greggio rispetto a quelle di zucchero bianco, né in termini di priorità sotto il profilo dello sviluppo a favore dei paesi più poveri del mondo, né per i consumatori dell'UE. Tuttavia, le raffinerie a tempo pieno hanno mantenuto il privilegio di chiedere titoli d'importazione per lo zucchero greggio durante i primi tre mesi della campagna di commercializzazione. La Commissione è convinta che le misure di gestione del mercato dello zucchero adottate finora siano conformi alle disposizioni applicabili del trattato.

Per quanto riguarda la raffineria di Brindisi, nel mese di giugno 2012 la Commissione ha autorizzato l'acquisizione del controllo da parte di Südzucker su ED&F MAN, soggetta alla dismissione della raffineria di Brindisi e all'impegno delle parti a trasferire all'acquirente i contratti a lungo termine relativi al rifornimento di quantitativi sufficienti di zucchero di canna greggio a prezzi competitivi. Tali impegni garantiscono che la raffineria resterà un valido concorrente indipendente in Italia.

Infine, per quanto riguarda l'articolo 101 del TFUE, la Commissione è pronta ad esaminare tutte le prove relative ad eventuali distorsioni di mercato.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009175/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Pure refineries: distortion of the competition market

In the 2010/11 and 2011/12 campaigns, the Commission highlighted a lack of sugar on the European market and decided to introduce exceptional measures to address the issue, on the one hand allowing Swiss chard producers to convert part of their production in excess of the quota into a reduced or zero duty quota, and on the other hand, issuing calls for tender at an increasing rate of duty, open to all operators from the sugar industry (Swiss chard producers, pure refineries and traders) for the importation of specific quantities of sugar into the EU.

During these campaigns it became clear that the EU quotas for Swiss chard and isoglucose sugar have always been fully produced and that the level of consumption and exports has remained essentially stable. Therefore, the lack of sugar observed by the Commission can be attributed exclusively to a reduction in the level of sugar imports which, being comprised mainly of raw cane sugar, are used to supply pure refineries. This has been clearly demonstrated by the lack of raw materials for pure refineries, which, during the latest campaigns, have been forced to process a quantity lower than that guaranteed to them under EU regulations until the 2008/09 campaign: a shortfall of some 2.5 million tonnes. There is no doubt that this scenario leads to a sustained increase in preferential imports, encouraging collusive practices and distortions of the sugar market with direct impacts on competition.

Why has the European Commission not relaxed import quotas for raw cane sugar reserved for pure refineries, instead choosing to adopt measures which have favoured Swiss chard producers in particular, thanks to the possibility to convert their extra-quota production into within-quota production?

These measures have also harmed the refinery at Brindisi, built in 2010 following the allocation of a refining quota to Italy under the 2006 CMO reform in order to offset the planned — and rapidly implemented — drastic reduction in Swiss chard production. It is also totally incomprehensible that one of the main established Italian firms operating in the sugar sector, such as the Brindisi refinery, should risk its survival due to a lack of supply of raw materials on fair terms.

In view of the now well-established interpretation provided by Community courts to Article 101 TFEU, can the Commission state whether it is aware of the aforementioned distortive effects and which measures it intends to carry out in order to remedy them?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2012)

Since 2006 cane refining capacity in Europe doubled from 1.89 million tons pre-reform to around 4.2 million tons. Many refiners have been successful in securing the raw material for this new refining capacity. During the same period, the EU has also increased sugar imports especially of raw sugar for refining, reaching, already in calendar year 2011, the unprecedented level of more than 4 million tons, up by more than 1 million tons compared with 2006. Preferential sugar imports from EPA-EBA countries in 2011/2012 were 1.9 million tons, the highest level ever, compared with 1.57 million tons in 2004/2005.

One objective of the EU sugar policy is to guarantee a sufficient supply of the market. The Commission considers that privileging raw over white sugar imports would not be desirable, neither in terms of developmental priorities in favour of the poorest countries in the world, nor for EU consumers. However, full time refiners have kept the privilege to apply for import licences for raw sugar during the first three months of the marketing year. The Commission is convinced that the sugar market management measures taken so far are in line with the applicable Treaty provisions.

As for the Brindisi refinery, in June 2012 the Commission cleared the acquisition of control by Südzucker over ED&F MAN, subject to the divestiture of the Brindisi refinery and the parties' commitment to transfer to the purchaser the long-term contracts for the supply of sufficient raw cane sugar input at competitive prices. These commitments ensure that the refinery will remain a viable independent competitive force in Italy.

Finally on Article 101 of the TFEU, the Commission stands ready to look into any evidence regarding market distortions.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009176/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Belucistan, regione di confine in Iran: violazioni dei diritti umani e riconoscimento delle minoranze etniche

La regione del Belucistan si estende su parti del territorio dell'Iran, dell'Afghanistan e del Pakistan. La regione venne suddivisa dopo la fine dell'occupazione britannica e l'indipendenza del Pakistan. Il 20 % della popolazione dei beluci vive nell'Iran sudorientale. I beluci d'Iran sono 4 milioni, ma non esiste alcun sistema di censimento indipendente. Sebbene questi gruppi etnici possano essere definiti minoranze sul piano dei diritti linguistici e politici all'interno dell'Iran, occorre sottolineare che essi non costituiscono una minoranza nelle zone da loro abitate all'interno del territorio iraniano. Nonostante sia noto per la sua ricchezza di minerali nonché di gas, petrolio, oro e risorse marine, il Belucistan iraniano resta una delle province più povere e meno sviluppate dell'Iran. Secondo il Common Country Assessment (valutazione comune per paese) delle Nazioni Unite per l'Iran, il Belucistan presenta i peggiori indicatori tra le province iraniane per quanto riguarda l'aspettativa di vita, la scolarizzazione, l'alfabetizzazione tra gli adulti, la mortalità infantile nonché l'accesso all'acqua potabile e ai servizi igienico-sanitari. I beluci vivono in un clima di timore e abusi caratterizzato da sparizioni forzate, esecuzioni extragiudiziali e detenzioni arbitrarie.

Questa situazione evidenzia l'incapacità del governo iraniano di garantire pari diritti economici, politici, culturali e linguistici a tutti i gruppi etnici presenti nel paese. Le persone appartenenti a tali gruppi sono al contrario costrette a subire detenzioni e arresti arbitrari, torture ed esecuzioni extragiudiziali. A testimonianza dell'incerto quadro giuridico per quanto riguarda le minoranze in Iran, si osservi che:

— la Costituzione contiene una serie di articoli concernenti i diritti dei gruppi non persiani che sono contraddittori tra di loro e incompatibili con gli standard internazionali in materia di diritti umani e con le convenzioni di cui l'Iran è firmatario;

— nonostante le disposizioni in materia contenute nella Costituzione iraniana e l'adesione dell'Iran al Patto internazionale sui diritti economici, sociali e culturali (ICESCR), alla Convenzione sui diritti dell'infanzia (CRC) e alla Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sull'eliminazione di ogni forma di discriminazione razziale (ICERD), le autorità iraniane non ottemperano a tali obblighi internazionali.

1. Come valuta il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante la situazione del Belucistan nell'ambito delle relazioni UE-Iran, con riferimento ai trattati, alla Convenzione europea dei diritti dell'uomo, alla giurisprudenza della CEDU e al diritto internazionale nonché al Patto internazionale sui diritti civili e politici e alla quarta Convenzione di Ginevra?

2. Quali azioni possono essere intraprese per far sì che le autorità iraniane applichino pienamente i suddetti obblighi internazionali nel quadro della legislazione nazionale e adottino misure complementari volte a garantire l'osservanza degli standard UE in materia di riconoscimento delle minoranze etniche?

3. Ha tentato il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante di intavolare un dibattito sulla protezione delle minoranze etniche in Iran, in seguito all'adozione della risoluzione del Parlamento in materia (P7_TA(2012)0265)?

4. Quale quadro giuridico può proporre l'Unione europea come base negoziale per individuare un'adeguata via di uscita da questa situazione apparentemente irrisolvibile?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza della situazione difficile in cui si trovano le minoranze religiose ed etniche, tra cui anche i baluci, nella Repubblica islamica dell'Iran. Nonostante il carattere multietnico della popolazione iraniana gli individui appartenenti a minoranze sono soggetti a un gran numero di leggi e pratiche discriminatorie. La violazione dei diritti umani è un evento comune e comprende reclusioni per convinzioni, processi ingiusti per i prigionieri politici, punizioni corporali e uso della pena di morte nonché sistematiche restrizioni alla circolazione e negazione dei diritti civili. Alla luce di questa situazione la HR/VP ha espresso in numerose occasioni le sue preoccupazioni per quanto riguarda la posizione delle varie minoranze del paese.

L'UE ricorre a tutti i mezzi disponibili per sensibilizzare l'opinione pubblica al riguardo. Ha rilasciato una serie di dichiarazioni sollecitando l'Iran a porre termine alla repressione degli individui appartenenti alle minoranze religiose ed etniche e a tal fine ha inoltre preso iniziative in relazione a singoli casi. In quanto al quadro giuridico l'UE ha ripetutamente sollecitato l'Iran ad attenersi agli obblighi che l'Iran stesso ha sottoscritto nell'ambito del Patto internazionale relativo ai diritti civili e politici. L'UE ha anche invitato l'Iran a rispettare la sua propria Costituzione e le garanzie di uguaglianza tra tutti i suoi cittadini che essa sancisce.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009176/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — The Baluchistan borderland in Iran — human rights violations and recognition of ethnic minorities

The region of Baluchistan stretches out over parts of Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan. After the British occupation and the independence of Pakistan, the land was partitioned. 20% of the Baluch population live in south-eastern Iran. The Baluch population of Iran is 4 million, but there is no independent census system. Although these ethnic groups may be described as minorities in terms of language rights and political rights within Iran, it must be emphasised that they do not form a minority in their regions within Iran. Although Iranian Baluchistan is known to be rich in minerals, as well as gas, oil, gold, and marine resources, it is one of the poorest and least developed provinces in Iran. According to the UN Common Country Assessment for Iran, Baluchistan has the worst indicators among Iranian provinces for life expectancy, school enrolment, adult literacy, infant mortality and access to drinking water and sanitation. Baluch people live in a climate of fear and abuse characterised by enforced disappearances, extrajudicial killings and arbitrary detention.

This situation illustrates the failure of the Iranian Government to supply equal economic, political, cultural and linguistic rights to all of Iran's ethnic groups. It is subjecting members of these groups to arbitrary arrest and detention, torture and extrajudicial executions. As evidence of the unsettled legal framework for minorities in Iran:

— the Constitution contains a number of contradictory articles concerning the rights of non-Persian groups which are not consistent with international human rights standards and conventions to which Iran is a signatory;

— despite the relevant provisions included in the Iranian Constitution and Iran's signature of the ICESCR, the CRC and the ICERD, Iranian authorities are failing to comply with these international obligations.

1. How does the Vice-President/High Representative assess the situation in Baluchistan under EU-Iran relations, in the framework of the Treaties, the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), ECHR case-law and international law, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Fourth Geneva Convention?

2. What steps can be taken to ensure that the Iranian authorities fully implement all these international obligations in their own legislation and adopt complementary measure to guarantee compliance with EU standards on recognition of ethnic minorities?

3. Has the Vice-President/High Representative sought to discuss the protection of ethnic minority groups in Iran, following the adoption of Parliament's resolution on the subject (P7_TA(2012)0265)?

4. What legal framework can the EU put forward as a basis for negotiating a suitable way out of this seemingly intractable situation?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President is aware of the difficult situation for religious and ethnic minorities, including the Baluchi, in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Despite the multi-ethnic character of Iran's population, individuals belonging to minorities are subject to an array of discriminatory laws and practices. Human rights violations are common, and include imprisonment for conscience, unfair trial of political prisoners, corporal punishment and use of the death penalty, as well as systematic restrictions on movement and denial of certain civil rights. In light of this, the HR/VP has, on numerous occasions, expressed her concern about the position of various minorities in the country.

The EU is using all available tools to raise awareness on these issues. It has made several statements urging Iran to cease its repression of individuals belonging to ethnic and religious minorities, and also carried out demarches on individual cases to this end. As regards the legal framework, the EU has repeatedly urged Iran to abide by the obligations it freely signed up for under the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. It has also called on Iran to respect its own constitution, and to abide by guarantees therein of equality between all of its citizens.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009179/12
do Komisji
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(11 października 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Dyrektywa w sprawie zaostrzenia przepisów dotyczących spalin ze statków na Bałtyku

Od 1 stycznia 2015 r. zacznie obowiązywać unijna dyrektywa ograniczająca zawartość siarki w paliwie żeglugowym spalanym na Morzu Bałtyckim oraz Morzu Północnym. W dyrektywie nie przewiduje się zaostrzenia norm dla Morza Śródziemnego. Nowa regulacja w ocenie ekspertów znacznie podwyższy koszty funkcjonowania żeglugi na akwenach północnych, co między innymi zaburzy konkurencję z armatorami rosyjskimi.

W związku z powyższym:

— Czy Komisja nie widzi problemu w regulacji, która w sposób oczywisty zakłóca konkurencję wewnątrz Unii Europejskiej pomiędzy armatorami z północnej i południowej Europy?

— Jak Komisja zamierza chronić armatorów z Morza Bałtyckiego i Północnego przed nierówną konkurencją armatorów rosyjskich, które kosztowne regulacje nie dotyczą?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Janeza Potočnika w imieniu Komisji
(22 listopada 2012 r.)

Wniosek Komisji dotyczący zmiany dyrektywy 1999/32/WE w odniesieniu do zawartości siarki w paliwach żeglugowych ([1]) jest wynikiem zobowiązania, jakie większość państw członkowskich UE podjęła w 2008 r. poprzez wyrażenie zgody na załącznik VI do konwencji MARPOL Międzynarodowej Organizacji Morskiej (IMO).

Bardziej rygorystyczne limity zawartości siarki w paliwach żeglugowych mają zastosowanie do wszystkich statków pływających na europejskich obszarach kontroli emisji tlenku siarki (SECA), takich jak Morze Bałtyckie. Transpozycja przepisów załącznika VI do konwencji MARPOL do prawodawstwa UE zagwarantuje rygorystyczne i jednakowe egzekwowanie przepisów, prowadząc do powstania równych warunków dla statków pływających na obszarach SECA i na pozostałych obszarach morskich UE. Komisja nie sądzi, że różne standardy paliwowe spowodują zakłócenie konkurencji między statkami pływającymi na obszarach SECA (np. prom między Polską a Szwecją) a tymi pływającymi poza obszarami SECA (np. prom między Włochami a Grecją).

Federacja Rosyjska ratyfikowała załącznik VI do konwencji MARPOL. Dokument ratyfikacyjny został złożony dnia 8 kwietnia 2011 r. w IMO i wszedł w życie dnia 8 lipca 2011 r. W wyniku tego zobowiązania międzynarodowego przepisy załącznika VI do konwencji MARPOL będą stosowane i egzekwowane przez wszystkie państwa nadbrzeżne Morza Bałtyckiego.

([1]) COM(2011)439 final, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0439:FIN:PL:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009179/12
to the Commission
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Directive tightening the rules on exhaust emissions from shipping in the Baltic

On 1 January 2015 an EU directive will enter into force setting stricter sulphur limits for marine fuel in the Baltic and the North Sea. The directive does not tighten the rules applying to the Mediterranean. Experts think that the new rules will significantly increase operating costs for shipping in northern waters, one of the effects of which will be to distort competition with Russian shipowners.

In the light of the above:

— Does the Commission agree that this legislation clearly distorts intra-EU competition between shipowners in the north and south of Europe?

— How is the Commission intending to protect Baltic and North Sea shipowners against unfair competition from Russian shipowners to whom these costly rules do not apply?

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

The Commission's proposal to amend Directive 1999/32/EC as regards sulphur content in marine fuels ([1]) is a consequence of the commitment most EU Member States have made in 2008 by agreeing to MARPOL Annex VI of the International Maritime Organisation (IMO).

Stricter sulphur limits for marine fuels apply to all ships operating in the European Sulphur Emission Control Areas (SECAs) such as the Baltic Sea. The transposition of the MARPOL Annex VI provisions into EU legislation will ensure a strict and even enforcement resulting in a level playing field for ships operating within SECAs and those operating in the remaining EU sea areas. The Commission is not of the view that differing fuel standards would result in a distortion of competition between ships operating in SECAs (for example, a ferry service between Poland and Sweden) and those operating outside SECAs (for example a ferry service between Italy and Greece).

The Russian Federation has ratified MARPOL Annex VI. The instrument of ratification was deposited on 8 April 2011 at the IMO and came into effect on 8 July 2011. As a result of this international commitment, the provisions of MARPOL Annex VI will be applied and enforced by all riparian states of the Baltic Sea.

([1]) COM(2011)439 final, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/air/transport/pdf/ships/com_2011_190_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009180/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Conditions for voting abroad

With regard to the answer to my Question E-006738/12, in which the Commission referred to voting restrictions applicable in 2010, could the Commission specifically state what the present conditions for voting abroad are in Ireland, Hungary, Cyprus, Denmark, Malta, Austria and the United Kingdom? In other words, could the Commission put on record what the restrictions referred to in the answer are in Ireland, Hungary, Cyprus, Denmark, Malta, Austria and the United Kingdom? Access to this information is very poor.

— When exactly did the Commission call on these Member States to act? What exactly did it ask Member States to do to address the issue?

— Is it the case that the day a national of Ireland, Hungary, Cyprus, Denmark, Malta, Austria or the United Kingdom leaves that country to live in another Member State, that person gives up the right to vote for a government?

— If there is a time delay before the denial of voting rights comes into effect, could the Commission state, for Ireland, Hungary, Cyprus, Denmark, Malta, Austria and the United Kingdom, what that period is?

— What is the Commission's view of the fact that many of its own civil servants who are responsible for proposing European legislation have no vote at all in any national election, because of the above voting restrictions?

— How many people working in the EU institutions have no right to vote for a government anywhere in the world?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(22 November 2012)

The Commission announced in its 2010 EU Citizenship report that it would launch a discussion to identify options so as to prevent that nationals of certain EU Member States lose the right to take part in national elections as a consequence of exercising their right to free movement ([1]). The Commission wrote in June 2011 to the Member States concerned indicating that disenfranchisement may constitute an obstacle to the effective exercise of this fundamental EU right. The Commission invited these Member States to share their ideas on how to find a reasonable solution to this issue.

Moreover, the Commission recently launched a wide reaching public consultation on EU citizenship, 'Your Rights, Your Future', in which it also asked the opinion of respondents on disenfranchisement. Taking into account the results of this public consultation and the outcome of the dialogue with Member States, the Commission will decide on further steps to be taken in this matter.

With regard to the arrangements in the national legislations under which the nationals of the individual Member States are disenfranchised, the Commission notes that these rules vary broadly across the EU ([2]).

The Commission does not dispose of data on the number of persons employed by the EU institutions who may have been deprived of the right to vote in the national elections of their Member State of origin as such information concerns the individual situation of staff members.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/reding/factsheets/pdf/citizenship_report_en.pdf

([2]) According to the information at the disposal of the Commission, nationals of Denmark residing abroad are disenfranchised unless they express their wish to return in the country within two years; the rule is similar in Ireland but with a time-limit fixed at 18 months; UK nationals are disenfranchised if they have not been registered as residents in the country for the past 15 years; Cypriot nationals are disenfranchised if they have not resided in the country during the six months preceding the elections (unless they are temporarily residing abroad as students, workers or permanently residing abroad for health reasons.); nationals of Malta are disenfranchised unless they have resided there for at least six months, within the eighteen months period preceding their registration to vote; Austrian nationals residing abroad are disenfranchised unless they lodge an application to maintain their voting rights and re-apply every 10 years; due to recent legislative changes, Hungarian nationals residing abroad are no longer disenfranchised.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009181/12
an die Kommission
Herbert Reul (PPE)
(11. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Informationszugang zu Dokumenten der EFTA Surveillance Authority

Die EFTA Surveillance Authority (ESA), Aufsichtsbehörde der EFTA, hat am 5. September 2012 ihre Vorschriften zum Informationszugang durch die Öffentlichkeit rückwirkend geändert. Die Zugänglichkeit von Informationen wird hierdurch für Marktteilnehmer aus der Europäischen Union deutlich eingeschränkt. Diese Rechtsänderung erfolgte während eines laufenden Rechtsstreits vor dem EFTA-Gerichtshof, der den Informationszugang in einem Einzelfall betrifft. Sie wurde nach Vollzug lediglich auf der ESA-Webseite publiziert.

1. Wurde die Kommission vor der Änderung von der ESA konsultiert und wenn ja, wann und in welcher Form?

2. Hält es die Kommission für akzeptabel, dass die Zugangsrechte der Öffentlichkeit zu Informationen der EFTA-Aufsichtsbehörde unterhalb des Standards liegen, der für die EU-Institutionen gilt?

3. Was unternimmt die Kommission, um sicherzustellen, dass Unionsbürger Zugangsrechte zu ESA-Dokumenten erhalten, die mit denen in der Europäischen Union vergleichbar sind?

Antwort von Herrn Barroso im Namen der Kommission
(10. Dezember 2012)

Die Kommission wurde nicht zu den von der Aufsichtsbehörde der EFTA am 5. September 2012 geänderten Vorschriften über den Zugang der Öffentlichkeit zu Dokumenten konsultiert.

Die Aufsichtsbehörde der EFTA ist kein Organ der Europäischen Union. Artikel 15 Absatz 3 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union, der die Rechtsgrundlage für Transparenz und Dokumentenzugang im Hinblick auf die Organe, Einrichtungen und sonstigen Stellen der EU bildet, gilt nicht für die EFTA.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009181/12
to the Commission
Herbert Reul (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Information access to EFTA Surveillance Authority documents

On 5 September 2012 the EFTA Surveillance Authority (ESA) changed its rules on public information access retrospectively. Access to information for European Union market participants is thereby significantly restricted. This change occurred during an ongoing legal dispute before the EFTA Court concerning information access in an individual case. Following implementation the decision was merely published on the ESA website.

1. Was the Commission consulted on this change, and if so, when and how?

2. Does the Commission consider it acceptable that public access rights to EFTA Surveillance Authority information are below the standard applying to EU institutions?

3. What is the Commission doing to ensure that Union citizens receive access rights to ESA documents which are similar to those applying in the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(10 December 2012)

The Commission was not consulted on the revised rules on public access to documents adopted by the EFTA Surveillance Authority on 5 September 2012.

The EFTA Surveillance Authority is not an institution of the European Union. Article 15(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, which constitutes the legal basis for transparency and access to documents as regards institutions, offices and bodies of the EU, does not apply to EFTA.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009182/12
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(11 oktober 2012)

Betreft: Toezicht door EU op bescherming en restauratie van cultureel erfgoed in Noord-Cyprus

Gans Cyprus is deel van de EU, inclusief het door Turkije bezette noorden. In dit deel bevindt zich cultuurhistorisch erfgoed bestaande uit kerken en kloosters dat verwaarloosd, vernield en beroofd wordt. Blijkbaar wordt elke poging tot restauratie of onderhoud verhinderd.

1. Bevestigt de Commissie dat in noord-Cyprus het cultuurhistorisch erfgoed, bestaande uit kerken en kloosters, dient beschermd, onderhouden en gerestaureerd te worden door wie er het feitelijke gezag uitoefent?

2. Op welke concrete manier ziet de Commissie daarop toe? Heeft de Commissie bv. een lijst van gebouwen in het noorden die jaarlijks geïnspecteerd worden? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Welke stappen onderneemt de Commissie om te eisen dat dit cultureel-historisch erfgoed beschermd wordt en dat het huidige verval een einde neemt?

4. Maakt het bewaren, onderhouden en restaureren van dit cultureel historisch erfgoed deel uit van de projecten op basis van Verordening 389/2006 voor financiële steun aan de Turks Cypriotische gemeenschap? Zo neen, waarom niet?

5. Heeft de Commissie reeds geld gegeven voor het onderhoud, de restauratie of het herstel van gevels of delen van een (ex-)moskee?

6. Wat denkt de Commissie van de toestand van de compleet vernielde kerk van de Heilige Nicolaas in Trachoni? Hoe zullen de resten bewaard en beschermd worden?

7. Wat denkt de Commissie van de toestand van de kerk van de Heilige Maagd in Trachoni, die in verregaande staat van verval verkeert? Hoe zal deze kerk hersteld en beschermd worden?

8. Wat denkt de Commissie van de toestand van de kerk van de heilige Andronikos in Kythrea, waarin fresco's aan weer en wind blootgesteld zijn en christelijke symbolen als het gelaat van heiligen vernield zijn? Hoe zullen deze kerk en deze fresco's hersteld en beschermd worden?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(28 november 2012)

De Commissie is zich bewust van de kritieke staat van veel van de historische kerken in het noordelijke deel van Cyprus, al heeft zij geen specifieke informatie over de staat van de kerken die door het geachte Parlementslid worden genoemd.

De Commissie hecht veel belang aan het behoud van het culturele erfgoed op Cyprus. Het bijstandsprogramma voor de Turks-Cypriotische gemeenschap heeft in 2011 2 miljoen EUR verstrekt ter ondersteuning van de activiteiten van de door de twee gemeenschappen opgezette technische commissie voor cultureel erfgoed, die onder auspiciën van de VN werkt. In het kader van het hulpprogramma 2012 zal de Commissie met een bijdrage van nog eens 2 miljoen EUR het werk van deze commissie van de twee gemeenschappen verder ondersteunen. Tot op heden zijn noch in het kader van Cultuur 2000, noch in het kader van het huidige cultuurprogramma aan Cypriotische culturele organisaties subsidies toegekend voor de restauratie of het onderhoud van moskeeën of voormalige moskeeën.

Zoals het geachte Parlementslid mogelijk bekend is, heeft de commissie van de twee gemeenschappen al een lijst opgesteld van 11 prioritaire religieuze en niet-religieuze monumenten in beide gemeenschappen (waaronder 4 moskeeën) waarvoor steun zal worden uitgetrokken en die deel uitmaken van een omvangrijkere lijst van 40 monumenten die door de beide leiders is vastgesteld. Deze zijn als prioritair aangemerkt gezien de staat waarin zij verkeren en de noodzaak dringend in te grijpen om verder verval te voorkomen. De door de EU verstrekte middelen zullen worden besteed aan projecten die door de commissie van de twee gemeenschappen zijn gekozen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009182/12
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: EU monitoring of protection and restoration of the cultural heritage in Northern Cyprus

The whole of Cyprus forms part of the EU, including the Turkish-occupied North. That part of the island is home to cultural heritage sites consisting of churches and monasteries which are neglected, deliberately damaged and looted. Evidently any attempt to restore or maintain them is prevented.

1. Can the Commission confirm that in Northern Cyprus cultural heritage sites consisting of churches and monasteries ought to be protected, maintained and restored by whoever *de facto* is in a position of authority there?

2. In what specific way does the Commission ensure that this is done? Does the Commission, for example, have a list of buildings in the North which are inspected annually? If not, why not?

3. What steps does the Commission take to insist that this cultural heritage be protected and that its current decay should cease?

4. Does it make preserving, maintaining and restoring this cultural heritage part of the projects based on Regulation No 389/2006 to provide financial assistance to the Turkish Cypriot community? If not, why not?

5. Has the Commission ever provided funding for the maintenance or restoration of facades or other parts of a mosque or former mosque?

6. What view does the Commission take of the state of the completely vandalised church of St Nicholas in Trachoni? How will the ruins be preserved and protected?

7. What view does the Commission take of the state of the church of the Virgin Mary in Trachoni, which is largely dilapidated? How will this church be restored and protected?

8. What view does the Commission take of the state of the church of St Andronicus in Kythrea, in which frescos are exposed to wind and weather and Christian symbols such as saints' faces have been vandalised? How will this church and these frescos be restored and protected?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the critical state of many of the historic churches in the northern part of Cyprus, even if it does not have particular information on the state of the churches the Honourable Member refers to.

The Commission attributes great importance to the preservation of cultural heritage in Cyprus. The Aid Programme for the Turkish Cypriot community provided EUR 2 million in 2011 to the support of activities of the bi-communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage operating under UN auspices. Under the 2012 Aid Programme, the Commission is committed to continue supporting the work of this bi-communal committee with a further contribution of EUR 2 million. To date, no grants have been awarded, neither under the Culture 2000 nor the current Culture Programme, to Cypriot cultural organisations for restoration or maintenance of mosques or former mosques.

As the Honourable Member might be aware, the bi-communal Committee has already identified a list of 11 priority religious and non-religious monuments (incl. 4 mosques) for support in both communities, part of the wider list of 40 monuments agreed by both leaders. They have been prioritised based on their state of conservation and the need for urgent intervention to avoid further deterioration. EU funding will be devoted to support projects chosen by the bi-communal Committee.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009299/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Notizie di potenziali tagli al finanziamento di Erasmus

In settimana sono circolate numerose notizie sul fatto che studenti che partecipano ad una borsa Erasmus nel secondo semestre del 2012-2013 potrebbero non ricevere sufficienti finanziamenti dalle rispettive agenzie nazionali Erasmus. Queste notizie hanno fatto seguito alle indiscrezioni secondo cui il Fondo sociale europeo è alla bancarotta e che sette Stati membri — Austria, Gran Bretagna, Francia, Germania, Finlandia, Paesi Bassi e Svezia — hanno rifiutato di aumentare del 6,8 % la dotazione nel bilancio 2013, come richiesto dalla Commissione.

1. Può la commissione approfondire le notizie riassunte sopra?

2. Può la Commissione anticipare tagli ai finanziamenti per studenti che si trovano all'estero nel corso del secondo semestre 2012-2013? In caso affermativo, di quanto?

3. Che cosa sta facendo la Commissione per garantire che il programma di scambio Erasmus rimanga in vigore per gli anni a venire?

Risposta congiunta di Janusz Lewandowski a nome della Commissione
(7 dicembre 2012)

L'onorevole parlamentare troverà tutte le informazioni necessarie che riguardano la situazione attuale del programma di scambio Erasmus sul seguente sito web: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-785_en.htm

Il 23 ottobre 2012 la Commissione ha adottato un progetto di bilancio rettificativo 6/2012, il quale richiede risorse supplementari per molti programmi tra cui il Programma per l'istruzione e la formazione durante l'intero arco della vita (di cui fa parte il programma di scambio Erasmus). Detto progetto di bilancio rettificativo può essere consultato sul seguente sito web: http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2012/2012_en.cfm

La Commissione spera che le autorità di bilancio approveranno rapidamente questo progetto di bilancio rettificativo nella forma proposta dalla Commissione europea.

Nella nuova proposta riguardante il progetto di bilancio del 2013 la Commissione inserirà per il programma Erasmus stanziamenti di pagamento sufficienti a garantire il flusso finanziario per gli scambi Erasmus negli anni accademici 2012/2013 e 2013/2014.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009183/12
do Komisji
Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE)
(11 października 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Finansowanie programu ERASMUS

Program Erasmus jest jednym z największych sukcesów Unii Europejskiej w dziedzinie edukacji. Daje on tysiącom studentów możliwość podjęcia studiów w różnych krajach europejskich. Pozwala na zapoznanie się z innym systemem edukacji, poszerzeniem znajomości języka obcego, ale także, i co najważniejsze, jest polem wymiany międzykulturowej ludzi z całej Europy. W latach 2010-2011 na wymianę wyjechało ponad 230 tysięcy studentów, co stanowi rekordową liczbę w dziejach programu. Budżet programu na rok 2012 wyniósł 480,22 mln euro, na 2013 rok przeznaczono 489,22 mln euro.

W zeszłym tygodniu przewodniczący komisji budżetowej Parlamentu Europejskiego Alain Lamassoure poinformował, że Erasmusowi grozi bankructwo. Komisja w swoim oficjalnym komunikacie zapewniła, że ma pieniądze na finansowanie programu.

W związku z powyższym chciałabym zapytać, czy Komisja może zagwarantować płynność finansowania zaplanowanych wymian w roku 2013 łącznie z wymianami na semestr letni?

Czy kwota przeznaczona na rok 2013 zostanie utrzymana na poziomie przewidzianym w budżecie?

Jakie mechanizmy należy zastosować, aby środki finansowe w ramach programu Erasmus były wydawane proporcjonalnie w skali roku?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Janusza Lewandowskiego w imieniu Komisji
(7 grudnia 2012 r.)

Szanowna Pani Poseł może znaleźć wszelkie niezbędne informacje na temat stanu rzeczy w odniesieniu do programu Erasmus na stronie: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-785_pl.htm.

W dniu 23 października 2012 r. Komisja przyjęła projekt budżetu korygującego nr 6/2012, w ramach którego wnioskuje się o dodatkowe zasoby dla wielu programów, w tym dla programu „Uczenie się przez całe życie" (obejmującego także program Erasmus). Wspomniany projekt budżetu korygującego jest dostępny na stronie: http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2012/2012_en.cfm.

Komisja liczy na szybkie zatwierdzenie tego projektu budżetu korygującego przez władzę budżetową zgodnie z propozycją Komisji Europejskiej.

W swoim nowym wniosku dotyczącym projektu budżetu na 2013 r. Komisja zaproponuje wystarczające środki na płatności dla programu Erasmus w celu zapewnienia płynności finansowania wymian w ramach programu Erasmus w roku akademickim 2012/2013 oraz 2013/2014.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009183/12
to the Commission
Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Financing the Erasmus programme

The Erasmus programme is one of the EU's biggest successes in the field of education. It provides thousands of students with the opportunity to study in different European countries. It gives them a chance to get to know another education system and to improve their foreign language abilities. And most importantly, it is a forum for intercultural exchange between people from all over Europe. In 2010-2011 over 230 000 students, a record number, took part in the programme. The Erasmus budget for 2012 was EUR 480.22 million, while some EUR 489.22 m has been allocated for 2013.

Last week the chair of the European Parliament's Committee on Budgets, Alain Lamassoure, announced that the Erasmus programme was about to run out of money. In its official communication, the Commission gave an assurance that it does have the money to fund the programme.

I would like therefore to ask whether the Commission can ensure the flow of funding for the exchanges planned in 2013 and for the summer semester?

Will the amount allocated for 2013 be maintained at the level provided for in the budget?

What mechanisms should be applied to ensure that Erasmus funding is allocated on a proportionate basis over the year?

Question for written answer E-009299/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Reports on potential cuts to Erasmus funding

This week numerous reports have surfaced that students going on an Erasmus exchange in the second semester of 2012-2013 might not receive enough funding from their national Erasmus agencies. These reports have surfaced in the light of comments that the European Social Fund is bankrupt and that seven Member States — Austria, Britain, France, Germany, Finland, the Netherlands and Sweden — have refused to increase expenditure in the 2013 budget by 6.8% as requested by the Commission.

1. Can the Commission please expand on the reports summarised above?

2. Does the Commission anticipate funding cuts for students who are abroad during the second semester 2012-2013? If so, by how much?

3. What is the Commission doing to ensure that the Erasmus exchange programme remains in place in the years to come?

Joint answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(7 December 2012)

The honourable Member of the Parliament will find all the necessary information on the state of play with Erasmus at http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-785_en.htm.

On October 23, 2012, the Commission adopted the Draft Amending Budget 6/2012 which requests additional resources for many programmes including Lifelong Learning (which includes Erasmus). This Draft Amending Budget can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2012/2012_en.cfm.

The Commission hopes that the budget authority will approve rapidly this Draft Amending Budget as proposed by the European Commission.

In its new proposal for a draft budget 2013, the Commission will propose enough payment appropriations for Erasmus in order to ensure the flow of funding for the Erasmus exchanges during the academic years 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009185/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(11 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Capacidades de defesa em desenvolvimento pela Agência Europeia de Defesa

Segundo a decisão da criação da Agência Europeia de Defesa (AED), a sua função é «*apoiar os Estados-Membros e o Conselho no seu esforço para melhorar as capacidades de defesa europeias em matéria de gestão de crises e para sustentar a Política Europeia de Segurança e Defesa como ele existe e como se desenvolverá no futuro*».

Segundo a informação do seu sítio na internet, a AED «*age como um catalisador, promove colaborações, lança novas iniciativas e apresenta soluções para melhorar as capacidades de defesa*».

Que capacidades de defesa estão neste momento a ser desenvolvidas pela AED e quem são os seus parceiros públicos e privados?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

A AED apoia e facilita o desenvolvimento das capacidades de defesa, dando especial importância à mutualização e à partilha; o Plano de Desenvolvimento da Capacidade Europeia de Defesa da AED estabelece o enquadramento para abordar as prioridades e orientar a definição dos requisitos em matéria de capacidades que possam ser alcançados através da colaboração. Assim, a AED proporciona assistência aos Estados-Membros, nomeadamente nos seguintes domínios: reabastecimento em voo; luta contra os engenhos explosivos improvisados; formação de pilotos de helicóptero; hospitais de campanha; comunicações por satélite; vigilância marítima; e ciberdefesa.

A fim de preparar requisitos a mais longo prazo, a AED promove a investigação e a tecnologia no setor da defesa em matéria de cooperação. Os programas de investigação e tecnologia incluem: proteção contra as ameaças QBRN; ciberdefesa; combustíveis e energia; informações, reconhecimento e vigilância (ISR); apoio médico; garantia de mobilidade; sistemas de vigilância marítima não tripulados; e sistemas de aeronaves não tripuladas. A AED e a Comissão prosseguem o diálogo e a cooperação em matéria investigação com uma dupla utilização, a fim de identificar as sinergias entre as atividades de investigação tanto no domínio da segurança como da defesa, nomeadamente através do Quadro Europeu de Cooperação entre a Comissão, a Agência Espacial Europeia (AEE) e a AED. A AED e a Comissão estão igualmente a coordenar as suas futuras agendas de investigação no contexto da iniciativa Horizonte 2020.

A AED está também a reforçar as suas relações com terceiros. O acordo administrativo com a Agência Espacial Europeia, assinado em junho de 2011, contribuiu para melhorar as sinergias em matéria de tecnologia espacial. Foram assinados acordos administrativos com a Suíça em março de 2012, e com OCCAR, em julho de 2012. A cooperação com a Noruega, estabelecida através de um acordo administrativo próprio, continua a ser benéfica para ambas as partes. Com a NATO a AED pretende assegurar a complementaridade e reforçar mutuamente o desenvolvimento de capacidades.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009185/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Defence capabilities developed by the European Defence Agency

According to the decision establishing the European Defence Agency (EDA), its role is 'to support the Member States and the Council in their effort to improve European defence capabilities in the field of crisis management and to sustain the European Security and Defence Policy as it stands now and develops in the future'.

According to the information on its website, the EDA 'acts as a catalyst, promotes collaborations, launches new initiatives and introduces solutions to improve defence capabilities'.

What defence capabilities is the EDA currently developing and who are its public and private partners?

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

EDA supports and facilitates the development of defence capabilities, with a focus on Pooling & Sharing. EDA's Capability Development Plan provides the framework for addressing priorities and guiding the definition of capability requirements that could be met through collaboration. EDA is assisting Member States *inter alia* in the following areas: Air-to-Air Refuelling; Counter-IED; Helicopter Pilot Training; Medical Field Hospitals; Satellite Communications; Maritime Surveillance; and Cyber Defence.

In order to prepare longer-term requirements, EDA promotes Defence Research & Technology (R&T) cooperation. R&T programmes include: protection against CBRN threats; Cyber Defence; Fuel and Energy; Intelligence Surveillance & Reconnaissance (ISR); Medical Support; Mobility Assurance; Unmanned Maritime Systems; and Unmanned Aircraft Systems. Dialogue and cooperation between EDA and the Commission is pursued on dual-use research to identify synergies between defence and security research activities *inter alia* through the European Framework Cooperation (EFC) between the Commission, European Space Agency (ESA) and EDA. EDA and the Commission are also coordinating their future research agendas in the context of Horizon 2020.

EDA is reinforcing its relations with third parties. The Administrative Arrangement with the European Space Agency, which was signed in June 2011, has helped improve synergies regarding space-related technologies. Administrative Arrangements were signed with Switzerland in March 2012 and with OCCAR in July 2012. Cooperation with Norway, through its own Administrative Arrangement, continues to be mutually beneficial. The Agency pursues complementary and mutually-reinforcing capability development with NATO.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009186/12
à la Commission
Carlos Coelho (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE) et Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(11 octobre 2012)

Objet: Règlements en matière de sécurité sociale — personnel navigant

Un règlement contenant de nouvelles règles visant à définir les règlements de sécurité sociale applicables aux personnels navigants (pilotes et personnel de cabine) est entré en vigueur en juin dernier.

L'ancienne législation en vigueur prévoyait que les pilotes devaient payer la sécurité sociale dans leur pays de résidence (s'ils y exerçaient une activité substantielle) ou dans le pays où se trouve le siège social de l'entreprise. Cela a permis à certaines entreprises d'engager des pilotes issus de différents États membres et de payer les cotisations de sécurité sociale dans un seul et même pays, au lieu d'effectuer les versements dans les différents pays où les pilotes ont leur base d'affectation.

L'objectif du nouveau règlement est d'établir une règle claire déterminant le lieu où les personnels navigants sont tenus de payer les cotisations de sécurité sociale. Selon la nouvelle législation, les entreprises devront les payer dans le pays où se trouve la base d'affectation du pilote. Cette législation a été conçue dans le but de protéger les pilotes et le personnel de cabine, pour garantir que ces citoyens se déplaçant d'un État membre à un autre ne perdent pas leurs droits, notamment en ce qui concerne les droits à pension.

L'entreprise Netjets Management Limited, dont le siège social se trouve au Royaume-Uni, a jusqu'à présent payé toutes les cotisations de sécurité sociale de son personnel au système de sécurité sociale du Royaume-Uni, alors que le personnel résidait en réalité dans différents pays. En raison de la crise économique, l'entreprise, afin de réduire ses coûts, a décidé de mettre fin à un certain nombre de contrats de travail (environ 128 commandants de bord), estimant que, compte tenu des équipages actuels et des montants des cotisations sociales en vigueur, les changements à effectuer conformément au nouveau règlement entraîneront une augmentation importante des cotisations patronales. L'entreprise a décidé de mettre un terme aux contrats de travail des pilotes ayant leur base d'affectation en France et en Belgique, où la part des cotisations sociales de l'employeur est la plus élevée.

Le nouveau règlement a été adopté dans le but de protéger les droits de ces citoyens. Peut-il être utilisé comme argument pour mettre un terme aux contrats de travail des pilotes résidant en France et en Belgique? La Commission estime-t-elle que la société Netjets a interprété la notion de base d'affectation telle que la définit le règlement n° 465/2012? Cela pourrait-il être considéré comme une violation du principe de non-discrimination?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(26 novembre 2012)

Le règlement (UE) n° 465/2012 ([1]) a modifié le règlement (CE) n° 883/2004 et lié la législation applicable en matière de sécurité sociale aux équipages de conduite et de cabine à la base d'affectation de l'intéressé. La notion de «base d'affectation» du personnel navigant est utilisée à l'échelle de toute l'Union européenne pour le secteur de l'aviation civile ([2]), et se définit comme le lieu (aéroport) où le membre d'équipage commence et termine normalement son service.

Ce règlement n'a, par conséquent, pas d'incidence sur les relations de travail, qui font l'objet d'un contrat de travail et sont régies par le droit du travail interne. Il détermine uniquement la législation applicable en matière de sécurité sociale aux personnes qui travaillent normalement dans deux ou plusieurs États membres (comme le personnel navigant).

Le règlement (UE) n° 465/2012 n'entraîne pas de modifications immédiates en ce qui concerne l'État membre compétent pour la sécurité sociale des membres d'équipage. La législation prévoit une période transitoire de dix ans ([3]) pendant laquelle le personnel actuellement en place peut rester assuré dans le pays jusqu'ici compétent pour sa sécurité sociale, à moins qu'il ne demande expressément à être assuré dans l'État où se trouve sa base d'affectation. Les nouvelles règles pour la détermination de la législation applicable aux équipages de conduite et de cabine ne s'appliquent donc qu'au personnel recruté après le 28 juin 2012.

Eu égard à ce qui précède, le règlement (UE) n° 465/2012 ne doit donc pas servir d'excuse aux compagnies pour licencier du personnel navigant.

([1]) Règlement (UE) n° 465/2012 (JO L 149 du 8.6.2012, p. 4).
([2]) Règlement (CEE) n° 3922/91 relatif à l'harmonisation de règles techniques et de procédures administratives dans le domaine de l'aviation civile.
([3]) Article 87 bis du règlement (CE) n° 883/2004.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-009186/12
a Bizottság számára
Carlos Coelho (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Őry Csaba (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE) és Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(2012. október 11.)

Tárgy: Szociális biztonságra vonatkozó szabályok – légi személyzet

2012 júniusában hatályba lépett a légi személyzet szociális biztonságára vonatkozó szabályok meghatározásához szükséges új szabályokat tartalmazó rendelet.

A korábban hatályos szabályozás előírta, hogy a pilóták a lakóhelyük szerinti országban (amennyiben ott érdemi tevékenységet folytatnak), vagy pedig abban az országban fizessenek társadalombiztosítási járulékot, ahol az őket alkalmazó vállalat bejegyzett hivatalos székhelye található. Ez lehetővé tette, hogy egyes vállalatok különböző tagállamokból származó pilótákat alkalmazzanak, ám társadalombiztosítási járulékot ne a pilóták lakóhelye szerinti különböző országokban, hanem csak egyetlen országban fizessenek.

Az új rendelet célja világos szabályok megfogalmazása azon ország meghatározása céljából, amelyben a légi személyzetnek társadalombiztosítási járulékot kell fizetnie. Az új jogszabály alapján a vállalatoknak ott kell társadalombiztosítási járulékot fizetniük, ahol a pilóták bázishelye található. A szociális biztonságról szóló uniós jogszabály célja a pilóták és a fedélzeti személyzet védelme, biztosítva, hogy az egyik tagállamból a másikba mozgó polgárok társadalombiztosítási jogai – különösen a nyugdíjhoz való jogok – ne sérüljenek.

Az Egyesült Királyságban települt Netjets Management Limited társaság mindeddig az alkalmazottai után fizetendő valamennyi társadalombiztosítási járulékot az Egyesült Királyság társadalombiztosítási rendszerébe utalta, annak ellenére, hogy a személyzet tagjai különböző országokban rendelkeznek lakóhellyel. A gazdasági válság a költségek csökkentésére kényszerítette a társaságot, amely úgy döntött, hogy számos munkavállalói szerződést felmond (mintegy 128 repülőgép-vezető kapitányról van szó). A társaság becslése szerint az új rendelet folytán szükségessé váló változtatások – a jelenlegi létszámhoz és társadalombiztosítási járulékokhoz viszonyítva – a foglalkoztató által fizetendő járulékok jelentős emelkedését vonják maguk után. A társaság úgy döntött, hogy megszünteti munkavállalói szerződését azoknak a pilótáknak, akiknek lakóhelye Franciaországban vagy Belgiumban található, mivel a munkaadó által fizetendő társadalombiztosítási járulékok szintje itt a legmagasabb.

Az új rendeletet e polgárok jogainak védelme céljából fogadták el. Fel lehet-e használni ezt a rendeletet ürügyként a Franciaországban vagy Belgiumban lakóhellyel rendelkező pilóták munkavállalói szerződésének megszüntetésére? Úgy véli-e a Bizottság, hogy a Netjets a bázishely fogalmát munkavállalói esetében a 465/2012 rendelet szellemében alkalmazta? Tekinthető-e ez a megkülönböztetésmentesség elve megsértésének?

Andor László válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. november 26.)

A 465/2012/EU[1] rendelet módosította a 883/2004/EK rendeletet, és a hajózószemélyzet és a légiutas-kísérő személyzet esetében alkalmazandó szociális biztonsági jogszabályokat az érintett személy bázishelyéhez kötötte. A hajózószemélyzet bázishelye a polgári légi közlekedési ágazatban EU-szerte elterjedt meghatározás[2], és azt a helyet (repülőtér) jelenti, ahol a hajózószemélyzet tagja rendszerint megkezdi és befejezi szolgálati idejét.

Ezért ez a rendelet nincs hatással az olyan munkaviszonyokra, amelyeket munkaszerződés és nemzeti munkajog szabályoz. Egyedül a szokásosan két vagy több tagállamban dolgozó személyek (mint például a hajózószemélyzet) esetében egységesen alkalmazandó szociális biztonsági jogszabályt határozza meg.

A 465/2012/EU rendelet nem változtatja meg azonnal a hajózószemélyzet szociális biztonságának tagállami illetékességét. A jelenlegi személyzet tagjai számára 10 éves átmeneti időszak áll rendelkezésre[3], amely lehetővé teszi számukra, hogy a szociális biztonságukért jelenleg felelős országban maradjanak biztosítva, hacsak nem kérik kifejezetten, hogy abban az államban legyenek biztosítva, ahol bázishelyük található. Ezért a hajózószemélyzetre és a légiutas-kísérő személyzetre alkalmazandó jogszabály meghatározására vonatkozó új szabályt csak a 2012. június 28. után újonnan felvett személyzet esetében kell alkalmazni.

A fentiek alapján a vállalatok a hajózószemélyzet elbocsátását nem indokolhatják a 465/2012/EU rendelettel.

([1]) 465/2012/EU rendelet (HL L 149., 2012.6.8., 4. o.).
([2]) A polgári légi közlekedés területén a műszaki előírások és a közigazgatási eljárások összehangolásáról szóló 3922/91/EGK rendelet.
([3]) A 883/2004/EK rendelet 87a. cikke.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009186/12
aan de Commissie
Carlos Coelho (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE) en Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(11 oktober 2012)

Betreft: Socialezekerheidsverordening — luchtvaartpersoneel

In juni 2012 werd een verordening van kracht met nieuwe regels voor de vaststelling van de socialezekerheidsregeling die van toepassing is op luchtvaartpersoneel (piloten en cabinepersoneel).

De vorige wetgeving bepaalde dat piloten de socialezekerheidsbijdrage betaalden in het land van verblijf (indien zij hier substantiële werkzaamheden verrichtten) of in het land waar het bedrijf waarvoor zij werkten zijn statutaire zetel had. Dit stelde een aantal bedrijven in staat piloten in verschillende lidstaten in dienst te nemen en slechts in één land socialezekerheidsbijdragen te betalen in plaats van deze te betalen in de verschillende landen waar de piloten waren gevestigd.

Het doel van de nieuwe verordening is om duidelijke regels op te stellen voor de vaststelling van het land waarin luchtvaartpersoneel de socialezekerheidsbijdragen dient te betalen. Volgens de nieuwe wet moeten bedrijven de socialezekerheidsbijdrage betalen in het land waar de piloot is gevestigd. Deze EU-wetgeving inzake sociale zekerheid werd opgesteld om de piloten en het cabinepersoneel te beschermen en te waarborgen dat de rechten van burgers die van de ene lidstaat naar de andere verhuizen, in het bijzonder hun pensioenrechten, niet worden geschonden.

De onderneming Netjets Management Limited, dat in het VK is gevestigd, heeft tot op heden alle socialezekerheidsbijdragen van haar personeel betaald in het socialezekerheidsstelsel van het VK, ondanks het feit dat het personeel momenteel in verschillende landen is gevestigd. De economische crisis heeft de onderneming ertoe gebracht te bezuinigen en een aantal arbeidscontracten te beëindigen (ongeveer 128 gezagvoerders). De onderneming schat dat, op grond van het huidige personeelsaantal en de socialezekerheidstarieven, de veranderingen die zullen moeten worden doorgevoerd in lijn met de nieuwe verordening, de werkgeversbijdragen fors zullen doen stijgen. Het bedrijf heeft beslist de arbeidscontracten te beëindigen van de piloten die zijn gevestigd in Frankrijk en België, waar de werkgeversbijdragen het hoogst zijn.

De nieuwe verordening werd goedgekeurd met het doel de rechten van deze burgers te beschermen. Mag de verordening gebruikt worden als argument voor het beëindigen van de arbeidscontracten van piloten die in Frankrijk en België zijn gevestigd? Is de Commissie van mening dat Netjets het concept van de thuisbasis van haar personeel heeft geïnterpreteerd zoals wordt bedoeld in Verordening 465/2012? Kan dit worden beschouwd als een schending van het non-discriminatiebeginsel?

Antwoord van de heer Andor namens de Commissie
(26 november 2012)

Bij Verordening (EU) nr. 465/2012 ([1]) werd Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004 gewijzigd en de socialezekerheidswetgeving voor cockpit- en cabinepersoneel aan de thuisbasis van de betrokkene gekoppeld. De thuisbasis voor vliegtuigbemanningen is een in de gehele EU bekend concept in de burgerluchtvaart ([2]) en wordt gedefinieerd als de locatie (luchthaven) waar een bemanningslid in de regel zijn dienst aanvangt en beëindigt.

Deze verordening heeft daarom geen effect op de arbeidsverhoudingen die onderworpen zijn aan een arbeidsovereenkomst en het nationale arbeidsrecht. Zij bepaalt enkel welke socialezekerheidswetgeving van toepassing is op personen die normaal gezien in twee of meer lidstaten werkzaam zijn (zoals bijvoorbeeld vliegtuigbemanningsleden).

Verordening (EU) nr. 465/2012 verandert de bevoegde lidstaat voor sociale zekerheid van vliegtuigbemanningsleden niet onmiddellijk. Er is een overgangsperiode van tien jaar voor de huidige personeelsleden ([3]), waardoor zij verzekerd kunnen blijven in het land dat momenteel verantwoordelijk is voor hun sociale zekerheid als zij met opzet geen aanvraag indienen om verzekerd te worden in de staat waarin hun thuisbasis zich bevindt. De nieuwe regelgeving over de bepaling van de toepasselijke wetgeving voor cockpit- en cabinepersoneel is daarom alleen van toepassing op nieuw personeel dat na 28 juni 2012 is aangenomen.

Gezien het voorgaande, mag Verordening (EU) nr. 465/2012 door bedrijven niet als excuus worden gebruikt om vliegtuigpersoneel te ontslaan.

([1]) Verordening (EU) nr. 465/2012 (PB L 149 van 8.6.2012, blz. 4).
([2]) Verordening (EEG) nr. 3922/91 inzake de harmonisatie van technische voorschriften en administratieve procedures op het gebied van de burgerluchtvaart.
([3]) Artikel 87 bis van Verordening (EG) nr. 883/2004.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009186/12
à Comissão
Carlos Coelho (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE) e Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(11 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Regulamentos em matéria de segurança social — tripulações aéreas

Entrou em vigor em junho de 2012 um regulamento que estabelece novas regras sobre a determinação dos regulamentos em matéria de segurança social que são aplicáveis a tripulações aéreas (pilotos e pessoal de cabine).

Nos termos da legislação vigente anteriormente, os pilotos descontam para a segurança social no seu país de residência (se têm aí atividade substancial) ou no país em que a sua companhia tem a sede social. Isto permitia a algumas companhias empregarem pilotos em diferentes Estados-Membros e pagar contribuições sociais num só país em vez de nos diferentes países onde os pilotos têm a sua base.

O objetivo do novo regulamento consiste em estabelecer regras claras sobre a determinação do país em que as tripulações aéreas devem pagar contribuições sociais. Segundo a nova lei, as companhias são obrigadas a pagar contribuições sociais no país onde o piloto tem a sua base. Esta legislação da UE em matéria de segurança social é pensada tendo em vista proteger os pilotos e o pessoal de cabine, assegurando a proteção dos direitos dos cidadãos que se deslocam de um Estado-Membro para outro, especialmente os seus direitos à pensão.

Até agora, a companhia Netjets Management Limited, com sede no Reino Unido, não obstante o facto de o seu pessoal ser residente em diferentes países, procedeu ao pagamento de todas as contribuições sociais dos seus tripulantes no sistema de segurança social do Reino Unido. A crise económica levou esta companhia a reduzir os custos, decidindo rescindir um certo número de contratos de trabalho (cerca de 128 comandantes). Com base nos níveis atuais de tripulantes e taxas sociais, a companhia calcula que as mudanças que é obrigada a introduzir nos termos do novo regulamento aumentarão significativamente as contribuições do empregador. A companhia decidiu rescindir os contratos de trabalho dos seus pilotos que têm a sua base em França e na Bélgica, onde as contribuições das empresas para a segurança social são mais altas.

O novo regulamento foi adotado com o objetivo de proteger os direitos destes cidadãos. Ele pode ser usado como um argumento para rescindir os contratos de trabalho de pilotos com residência em França e na Bélgica? A Comissão considera que a Netjets interpretou o conceito de «base» do seu pessoal conforme a intenção do Regulamento (UE) n.o 465/2012? Este caso pode ser considerado uma violação do princípio de não discriminação?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(26 de novembro de 2012)

O Regulamento (UE) n.° 465/2012 ([1]) alterou o Regulamento (CE) n.° 883/2004 e associou a legislação de segurança social aplicável aos membros da tripulação de voo e de cabina ao local onde a pessoa em questão tem a sua base. Este conceito de «base» é aplicável às tripulações aéreas da aviação civil em toda a UE ([2]) e define-se como o local (aeroporto) onde o tripulante normalmente inicia e termina o período de serviço.

Por conseguinte, este Regulamento não tem impacto nas relações de emprego que estão sujeitas a um contrato de trabalho e à lei laboral nacional. O Regulamento limita-se a determinar qual a legislação única da segurança social aplicável a pessoas que normalmente trabalham em dois ou mais Estados-Membros (como é o caso, por exemplo, da tripulação de voo).

O Regulamento (UE) n.° 465/2012 não muda de forma imediata o Estado-Membro onde devem ser pagas as contribuições sociais da tripulação de voo. Está previsto um período de transição de 10 anos ([3]), desde que o interessado possa continuar a beneficiar do regime de segurança social do país por que se encontra abrangido e não apresentar um pedido para passar a beneficiar da segurança social do Estado onde tem a sua base. Deste modo, a nova regra que determina a legislação aplicável à tripulação de voo e de cabina aplica-se apenas a pessoal contratado após 28 de junho de 2012.

Com base no que precede, o Regulamento (UE) n.° 465/2012 não deve ser usado como argumento pelas companhias para despedir tripulantes.

([1]) Regulamento (UE) n.° 465/2012 (JO L 149, 8.6.2012, p. 4).
([2]) Regulamento (CEE) n.° 3922/91 relativo à harmonização das normas técnicas e dos procedimentos administrativos no setor da aviação civil.
([3]) Artigo 87.°-A do Regulamento (CE) n.° 883/2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009186/12
to the Commission
Carlos Coelho (PPE), Regina Bastos (PPE), Ivo Belet (PPE), Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE), Csaba Őry (PPE), Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE) and Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Social security regulations — air crews

A regulation containing new rules for the determination of the social security regulations applicable to air crews (pilots and cabin crew) entered into force in June 2012.

The legislation previously in force stipulated that pilots pay social security in their country of residence (if they have substantial activity there) or in the country where their company has its registered office. This allowed some companies to employ pilots in different Member States and pay social security in only one country instead of paying it in the different countries where the pilots were based.

The objective of the new regulation is to set clear rules for the determination of the country in which air crews should pay social security. According to the new law, companies will have to pay social security where the pilot has his home base. This EC law on social security was designed to protect pilots and cabin crew, ensuring that the rights of citizens moving from one Member State to another would be protected, especially their pension rights.

The UK-based company Netjets Management Limited has, until now, paid all social security contributions of the employed crew into the social security system in the UK, despite the fact that the personnel actually resided in different countries. The economic crisis has prompted the company to cut costs, and it has decided to terminate a number of employment contracts (around 128 pilots-in-command). The company estimates that, on the basis of current crew levels and social security rates, the changes which will have to be made in line with the new regulation will significantly increase the employer contributions. The company decided to terminate the employment contracts of its pilots having their home base in France and Belgium, where the employer social security contribution is highest.

The new regulation has been adopted with the objective of protecting these citizens' rights. Can it be used as an argument for ending the employment contracts of pilots having residence in France and Belgium? Does the Commission consider that Netjets has interpreted the concept of home base for its personnel as it is intended by Regulation 465/2012? Could this be considered a violation of the principle of non-discrimination?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

The regulation (EU) No 465/2012 ([1]) amended Regulation (EC) No 883/2004 and linked the applicable social security legislation for flight and cabin crew to the home-base of the person concerned. The home-base for flight crew is an EU wide concept for the civil aviation industry ([2]) and is defined as the place (airport) from where the crew member normally starts and ends duty period.

Therefore this regulation does not impact on the employment relationships which are subject to an employment contract and the national labour law. It merely determines the single applicable social security legislation for persons normally working in two or more Member States (like for example flight crew).

The regulation (EU) No 465/2012 does not change immediately the competent Member State for social security of flight crew. There is 10 years long transitional period for the current staff ([3]), providing that they can stay insured in the country currently responsible for their social security if they expressly do not request to be insured in the State where their home-base is located. The new rule on the determination of the applicable legislation for flight and cabin crew therefore applies only for newly recruited staff after 28 June 2012.

Based on the above, Regulation (EU) No 465/2012 should not be used as an excuse by companies to dismiss aircrew staff.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 465/2012 (OJ L 149, 8.6.2012, p. 4).
([2]) Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 on the harmonisation of technical requirements and administrative procedures in the field of civil aviation.
([3]) Article 87a of Regulation (EC) No 883/2004.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009187/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(11 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εκσυγχρονισμός των συστημάτων ελέγχου εναέριας κυκλοφορίας στην Ελλάδα

Η αναβάθμιση του πεπαλαιωμένου συστήματος ελέγχου εναέριας κυκλοφορίας που χρησιμοποιείται στην Ελλάδα έχει καθυστερήσει ιδιαίτερα, συνιστώντας βαρίδι για την ανάπτυξη των αερομεταφορών και του τουρισμού.

Ήδη τον Απρίλιο του 2012, ο απερχόμενος Υπουργός Μεταφορών χαρακτήρισε την αναβάθμιση του συστήματος ραντάρ PALLAS «σημαντική προτεραιότητα», ενώ στην Ανακοίνωση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής για την Ανάπτυξη στην Ελλάδα — COM(2012)183 — που παρουσίασε τον ίδιο μήνα ο Πρόεδρος Μπαρόσο, γίνεται λόγος για τη δυνατότητα «παροχής τεχνικής βοήθειας» και ενδεχομένως «χρηματοδότησης για σύγχρονο εξοπλισμό».

Παρόλα αυτά, 6 μήνες αργότερα η αναβάθμιση των εν λόγω συστημάτων παραμένει εκκρεμής. Μάλιστα στις 29 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012, μία διακοπή ρεύματος στις τεχνικές εγκαταστάσεις της Υπηρεσίας Πολιτικής Αεροπορίας οδήγησε σε σοβαρά προβλήματα του συστήματος PALLAS, «εξαφανίζοντας» τα αεροσκάφη από την οθόνη για περίπου 1,5 ώρα. Το περιστατικό εγείρει πλέον νέα ερωτηματικά σχετικά με την καταλληλότητα του εξοπλισμού.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει ζητηθεί η παροχή τεχνικής βοήθειας ή χρηματοδότησης νέου εξοπλισμού από την πλευρά των ελληνικών αρχών;

2. Έχει στη διάθεσή της εκτιμήσεις σχετικά με το συνολικό κόστος του εκσυγχρονισμού του εξοπλισμού;

3. Ποια βήματα πρέπει να γίνουν για την άμεση αναβάθμιση των εν λόγω συστημάτων;

4. Ισχύουν για τα κράτη μέλη κοινοτικές υποχρεώσεις, π.χ. βάσει των κανονισμών για τη δημιουργία του Ενιαίου Ευρωπαϊκού Ουρανού, σχετικά με τον εξοπλισμό εναέριας κυκλοφορίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Kallas εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(30 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

1. Έως τη στιγμή της σύνταξης της παρούσας απάντησης, η Ελλάδα δεν έχει ακόμη ζητήσει τεχνική συνδρομή για να αντιμετωπίσει τις τρέχουσες δυσχέρειες στην ικανότητα ελέγχου και τη διαχείριση της ροής της εναέριας κυκλοφορίας, καθώς και στις υφιστάμενες δυνατότητες χρηματοδότησης για αναβάθμιση του οικείου συστήματος ελέγχου εναέριας κυκλοφορίας (ATC ([1])). Η Επιτροπή και ο Eurocontrol βρίσκονται σε προκαταρκτικές συζητήσεις για να προσδιορίσουν δυνητικά πεδία παροχής τεχνικής συνδρομής

2. Η Ελλάδα υπέβαλε το σχετικό Εθνικό Σχέδιο Απόδοσης για την πρώτη περίοδο αναφοράς (1η Ιανουαρίου έως 14 Δεκεμβρίου), μέρος του ενωσιακού συστήματος, κατά τη διάρκεια του καλοκαιριού του 2011· στο σχέδιο αυτό περιέχονται λεπτομέρειες των απαιτούμενων επενδύσεων για την επικαιροποίηση του συστήματος ελέγχου εναέριας κυκλοφορίας.

Το σύστημα είναι η κύρια συνιστώσα του ATC που πρέπει να εκσυγχρονιστεί. Εξασφαλίζει βασικές λειτουργίες, όπως επεξεργασία και εισαγωγή δεδομένων ραντάρ και πτήσης, καθώς και λειτουργίες απεικόνισης.

Το κόστος αναβάθμισης του συστήματος Pallas ανέρχεται σε 5,25 εκατ. ευρώ. Το συνολικό κόστος όλων των αναβαθμίσεων που προβλέπονται στο σχέδιο για ολόκληρο το σύστημα ATC ανέρχονται σε 26,35 εκατ. ευρώ.

3. Οι απαραίτητες αναβαθμίσεις του συστήματος και το κόστος τους προσδιορίζονται στο ελληνικό σχέδιο απόδοσης και την ελληνική έκθεση εφαρμογής για τον ενιαίο ουρανό, τα οποία υποβλήθηκαν από τις εθνικές αρχές. Αναμένεται ότι η Ελλάδα θα λάβει αποφάσεις όσον αφορά την παροχή εθνικών πόρων, ή την αίτηση παροχής πόρων από διαρθρωτικά ταμεία ή/και από κονδύλια ΔΕΔ-Μ, προκειμένου να προχωρήσει.

([1]) Έλεγχος εναέριας κυκλοφορίας.

4 Τα κράτη μέλη υπόκεινται στις νομικές και τεχνικές απαιτήσεις της δέσμης κανονιστικών ρυθμίσεων του ΕΕΟ ([2]). Σύμφυτη με την υποχρέωση παροχής υπηρεσίας ασφαλούς αεροναυτιλίας είναι η ανάγκη για παροχή και πιστοποίηση — ως ασφαλούς και ικανού — ενός συστήματος ελέγχου εναέριας κυκλοφορίας σύμφωνα με τις απαιτήσεις του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) 552/2004 ([3]). Τα συστήματα ATC υπόκεινται αφεαυτά σε σειρά κανόνων εφαρμογής που απορρέουν από τον παραπάνω κανονισμό.

([2]) Ενιαίος ευρωπαϊκός ουρανός.
([3]) ΕΕ L 96 της 31.3.2004.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009187/12
to the Commission
Spyros Danellis (S&D)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: Modernisation of air traffic control systems in Greece

Outdated air traffic control systems in Greece are slowing down the development of air transport and tourism and improvements are hence very much overdue.

In April 2012, the outgoing Minister for Transport indicated that it was a matter of utmost priority to improve the PALLAS radar system, while the communication from the Commission on growth for Greece (COM(2012)183) presented the same month by President Barroso refers to the possibility of providing technical aid and funding for modern equipment.

Despite this, six months later, measures to improve the system have still not been taken. Furthermore, on 29 September 2012 civil aviation installations were affected by a power cut, seriously disrupting the PALLAS system and causing aircraft to vanish from the screen for around one-and-a-half hours. This gives rise to further questions concerning the suitability of equipment.

In view of this:

1. Have the Greek authorities sought technical aid or funding for new equipment?

2. Does the Commission have any estimates concerning the total cost of updating the material?

3. What steps must be taken to make immediate improvements to the systems?

4. Do joint commitments by Member States, e.g. provisions for the creation of a Single European Sky, apply to air traffic control systems?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(30 November 2012)

1. At the time of writing, Greece has not yet sought technical aid to help it through its current difficulties in Air Traffic Control Capacity and Flow Management, and in the potential that exists for funding uplifts to upgrade its ATC ([1]) system. The Commission and Eurocontrol have engaged in preliminary discussions to identify areas where assistance could be provided.

2. Greece submitted its National Performance Plan for the first reference period (1 January to 14 December) of the EU-wide scheme during the summer of 2011; that plan gives detail of investments required to update the ATC system.

Pallas is the main ATC component requiring modernisation. It provides core functions, such as radar and flight data processing and operator input and displays function.

The cost for the upgrade of the Pallas system amounts to EUR 5.25 million. The total costs of all the updates foreseen in that plan for the overall ATC system amount to EUR 26.35 million.

3. The necessary upgrades to the system and their cost are identified in the Greek Performance Plan and the Greek Single Sky Implementation Report submitted by the national authorities. Decisions should be made by Greece in regard to the provision of national funds, or the request for Structural and/or TEN-T funds in order to proceed.

4. Member states are subject to the legal and technical requirements of the SES ([2]) regulatory package. Inherent in the obligation to provide a service for safe air navigation is the need to provide, and certify as safe and able, an ATC system in accordance with the requirements of Regulation (EC) 552/2004 ([3]). ATC systems themselves are subject to a number of Implementing Rules stemming from the abovementioned Regulation.

([1]) Air traffic control.
([2]) Single European Sky.
([3]) OJ L 96, 31.3.2004.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009188/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Violenta represión militar de manifestaciones en Totonicapán: violación de los derechos humanos y el Convenio 169 de la OIT por parte del Gobierno de Guatemala

El pasado día 4 de octubre de 2012, el Ejército y la policía civil guatemalteca, mandatados por el Gobierno, reprimieron violentamente una manifestación pacífica convocada por la comunidad indígena de Totonicapán que exigían su derecho a ser consultados y expresaban su rechazo ante las reformas constitucionales, los cambios en la carrera magisterial y el alto coste de la energía eléctrica.

Según las autoridades indígenas de los 48 Cantones de Totonicapán, la violenta y brutal represión ejercida por los militares y la policía contra las personas que ejercían su derecho a manifestarse de manera pacífica conllevó el asesinato de seis manifestantes y más de una treintena de personas resultaron heridas.

Tal y como denuncian numerosas ONG, organizaciones civiles y asociaciones en defensa de los derechos humanos, este es un ejemplo más de que, mientras se continúa avanzando en la ratificación del Acuerdo de Asociación de la Unión Europea con Centroamérica, existe una sistemática violación de los derechos humanos por parte del actual Gobierno de Guatemala, presidido por el antiguo General del Ejército, Otto Pérez Molina.

Asimismo, las reformas emprendidas sin consultas y el clima actual de criminalización contra las protestas de las poblaciones indígenas suponen una clara violación del Convenio 169 de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo (OIT), ratificado por Guatemala en el año 1996.

Teniendo en cuenta que la Unión Europea se encuentra a las puertas de ratificar un Acuerdo de Asociación con la región centroamericana, incluida Guatemala, que ensalza y exige el respeto y el cumplimiento de los derechos humanos como una condición sine que non para su efectiva implementación, y que la UE supuestamente defiende la validez y el cumplimiento del derecho internacional:

— ¿Piensa trasladar la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante su preocupación por los hechos acontecidos el pasado día 4 al Gobierno guatemalteco y exigir que se depuren responsabilidades por la represión y el asesinato de los civiles?

— ¿Considera la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante que las autoridades guatemaltecas están incumpliendo el citado Convenio 169 de la OIT?

— ¿Qué medidas está implementando la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante para monitorizar que el Gobierno de Guatemala garantice y respete los Derechos Humanos?

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

La UE se ha comprometido a trabajar con el Gobierno, la sociedad civil y otros actores pertinentes para reducir los elevados niveles de conflicto social que existen en el país. El proceso de desarrollo del país deberá ir acompañado de mecanismos de participación y de un diálogo efectivos. Este es un mensaje que la UE sigue transmitiendo a todos nuestros interlocutores de Guatemala.

La UE siguió de cerca los trágicos acontecimientos que expone Su Señoría y ha mantenido frecuentes contactos con las autoridades guatemaltecas, tanto en Bruselas como en Guatemala, durante los cuales expresamos nuestra preocupación.

Tras los acontecimientos, el Presidente Pérez Molina dio instrucciones que permitieron al Fiscal realizar una investigación adecuada. Ello indica que el Gobierno está dispuesto a aceptar la independencia del Fiscal que pudo así reconstruir la cadena de trágicos acontecimientos. Como consecuencia de ello, los militares implicados han sido detenidos, ya que los resultados preliminares de la investigación parecen indicar que el oficial responsable desobedeció las órdenes de no desplegar el ejército.

Además, la UE también se congratula de la decisión que el Presidente adoptó de reforzar la policía nacional y al mismo tiempo de abstenerse de utilizar el ejército en situaciones de seguridad ciudadana como protestas y manifestaciones pacíficas.

En relación con el Convenio 169 de la OIT, cabe mencionar que el Gobierno de Guatemala ha manifestado, con ocasión del último examen periódico universal, que durante los dos próximos años se aplicarán varias medidas para mejorar la aplicación de dicho Convenio.

Por último, la Unión Europea está convencida de que el Acuerdo de Asociación va a ofrecer un marco sólido para continuar nuestro diálogo sobre cuestiones fundamentales como los derechos humanos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009188/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Violent military repression of demonstrations in Totonicapán: violation of human rights and ILO Convention 169 by the Guatemalan government

On 4 October 2012, the Guatemalan army and civilian police, under orders from the government, violently repressed a peaceful demonstration organised by the indigenous community of Totonicapán, who were demonstrating for their right to be consulted and expressing their objection to constitutional reforms, changes to the teaching degree and the high cost of electricity.

According to the authorities of Totonicapán's 48 cantons, the soldiers' and police's violent and brutal repression of people who were exercising their right to demonstrate peacefully resulted in the killing of six demonstrators, and more than thirty people were injured.

As many NGOs, civil society organisations and associations have complained, although progress is continuing to be made in ratifying the EU-Central America association agreement, this is another example that human rights are being consistently violated by the current Guatemalan government, the president of which is the former army general, Otto Pérez Molina.

In addition, the reforms undertaken without consultation and the current climate of criminalising protests by indigenous communities are a clear violation of International Labour Organisation Convention 169, which was ratified by Guatemala in 1996.

Bearing in mind that the European Union is on the verge of ratifying an association agreement with Central America, including Guatemala, which enshrines and demands respect for human rights as a prerequisite for implementing it, and also that the EU supposedly defends the validity of and respect for international law:

— Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to express her concern to theGuatemalan government about the events of 4 October and demand that they identifythose responsible for the repression and killing of civilians?

— Does the Vice-President/High Representative think that the Guatemalan authorities arebreaching International Labour Organisation Convention 169?

— What measures is the Vice-President/High Representative implementing to ensure thatthe Guatemalan government guarantees and respects human rights?

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

The EU is committed to engage with the government, civil society and other relevant actors to reduce the high levels of social conflict that exist in the country. The development process of the country will have to be accompanied by effective dialogue and participatory mechanisms. This is a message that the EU continues to pass on to all our Guatemalan interlocutors.

The EU followed closely the tragic events mentioned by the Honourable Member and has maintained frequent contacts with the Guatemalan authorities, both in Brussels and in Guatemala during which we expressed our concern.

After the events, president Pérez Molina gave instructions which allowed the public prosecutor to conduct a proper investigation. This indicates that the government is ready to accept the independent nature of the prosecutor who was then able to trace back the chain of the tragic events. As a result, the military involved have been put under arrest, as preliminary results of the investigation seem to indicate that the officer in charge disobeyed orders not to deploy the army.

Furthermore, the EU also welcomes the decision taken by the president to reinforce the national police and at the same time refrain from using the army in citizen security situations like protests and pacific demonstrations.

Regarding ILO Convention 169, it is noteworthy to mention that the government of Guatemala has expressed during the most recent Universal Periodic Review that it will implement several measures over the next two years aimed to increase the application of the Convention.

Finally, the EU is convinced that the Association Agreement will offer a solid framework to continue our dialogue on fundamental issues such as human rights.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009189/12
à la Commission
Véronique De Keyser (S&D)
(11 octobre 2012)

Objet: Réseau d'experts indépendants de l'Union européenne en matière de droits fondamentaux

J'aimerais connaître la composition actuelle du groupe d'experts indépendants de l'Union européenne en matière de droits fondamentaux auprès de la Commission.

— Sur quelles bases les membres dudit groupe ont-ils été recrutés et désignés?

— Quelle autorité les a nommés?

— Quand et pour un mandat de quelle durée?

— Un jury avait-il été chargé de les sélectionner et de les proposer pour nomination?

— Y a-t-il eu un appel public pour recruter les candidats et quelles qualités étaient requises?

— Si un membre démissionne, comment est-il remplacé?

Réponse donnée par Mme Viviane Reding au nom de la Commission
(27 novembre 2012)

Le réseau d'experts indépendants de l'Union européenne en matière de droits fondamentaux, tel que fondé par la Commission, n'est plus en activité. Ce réseau a été mis sur pied, au moyen d'un appel d'offres, par la Commission européenne en septembre 2002, suite à une recommandation du Parlement européen exprimée dans le «rapport sur la situation des droits fondamentaux dans l'Union européenne (2000)» de juin 2001. Il était financé dans le cadre d'une action préparatoire au titre de l'article 49 du règlement financier arrivée à échéance en septembre 2006. Les actions préparatoires sont limitées à trois ans et ne peuvent être renouvelées.

L'agence européenne des droits fondamentaux a été fondée en 2007 afin de fournir aux États membres et aux institutions de l'Union européenne une assistance et une expertise dans le domaine des droits fondamentaux pour la mise en œuvre de la législation européenne.

Les rapports du réseau sont disponibles à l'adresse suivante:

http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/document/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009189/12
to the Commission
Véronique De Keyser (S&D)
(11 October 2012)

Subject: EU Network of Independent Experts on Fundamental Rights

I would like to know more about the current composition of the EU Network of Independent Experts on Fundamental Rights set up by the Commission.

— On what basis were the experts chosen and appointed?

— What authority appointed them?

— When were they appointed and how long is their term of office?

— Were the experts chosen and nominated by a panel?

— Was there a public call for applications? What abilities were candidates required to demonstrate?

— If experts resign, how are they replaced?

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

The EU Network of independent experts on fundamental rights, as it was established by the Commission, is no longer active. The Network was created by the European Commission in September 2002 through a call for tenders in response to a recommendation by the European Parliament in the 'Report on the Situation as Regards Fundamental Rights in the European Union (2000)' of June 2001. The Network was financed under a 'preparatory action' in line with Article 49 of the Financial Regulation and expired in September 2006. A 'preparatory action' is limited to three years and cannot be renewed.

The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights has been established in 2007 to provide EU institutions and Member States when implementing EC law with assistance and expertise relating to fundamental rights.

The reports of the Network can be found on the following website: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/document/index_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009190/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Estudo sobre a protecção civil nas Caraíbas: ponto da situação

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-6635/2009, o senhor comissário Johannes Hahn, em nome da Comissão, declarou que a «Comissão lançou um estudo independente (atualmente em curso) sobre a proteção civil nas Caraíbas, com vista ao estabelecimento de um projeto-piloto neste domínio e à criação de uma plataforma de cooperação regional nesta área, a fim de promover a cooperação regional PTU/RU/ACP.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Quando prevê apresentar os resultados deste estudo?

2. A estarem disponíveis, quais as suas principais conclusões?

3. Em que fase se encontra o projeto de estabelecer o referido projeto-piloto?

4. Pondera criar outras plataformas de cooperação regional nestas matérias?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(13 de dezembro de 2012)

Pela presente, a Comissão pretende informar o Senhor Deputado acerca da situação da cooperação com a região das Caraíbas no domínio da proteção civil. A Comissão confirma que, na sequência de uma decisão tomada em Barbados em maio de 2009, por todas as partes interessadas nesta região ([1]), foi realizado um estudo independente ([2]) que ficou concluído em maio de 2010. O relatório final deste estudo é transmitido em anexo ao Senhor Deputado. Adicionalmente, em junho de 2009, a Comissão propôs um projeto de declaração e um memorando de entendimento, no seminário regional UE-Cariforum em Antígua ([3]). A Comissão está preparada para retomar as discussões com as partes interessadas.

Em julho de 2012, a Comissão também apresentou ao Conselho da UE uma proposta de decisão relativa à associação dos países e territórios ultramarinos (PTU) à União Europeia ([4]), na qual propõe várias atividades de cooperação com os PTU no domínio da redução dos riscos de catástrofe.

Além disso, a Estratégia Conjunta para a Parceria UE-Caraíbas ([5]) aprovada pelo Conselho em 19 de novembro de 2012 ([6]), tem em devida consideração os PTU e propõe especificamente o reforço das capacidades regionais de resposta às catástrofes e às situações de emergência, incluindo mecanismos de proteção civil.

Por último, para o período posterior a 2013, a Comissão propôs que fosse reforçada a cooperação territorial envolvendo as regiões ultraperiféricas financiada pelo FEDER. A proteção civil continuará certamente a ser uma prioridade no próximo programa de cooperação territorial com as Caraíbas, como acontece com o programa atual 2007-2013.

([1]) A República Francesa, o Reino dos Países Baixos, o Reino Unido, os Estados de África, das Caraíbas e do Pacífico (ACP), os países e territórios ultramarinos (PTU) e as regiões ultraperiféricas.

([2]) Contrato-quadro Comissão 2007 — Lote n.° 4 — contrato n.° 2009/223098 «Assistência técnica para um estudo sobre as atuais medidas e iniciativas no domínio da proteção civil nas Caraíbas, a fim de promover, melhorar e reforçar os mecanismos de cooperação regional», relatório final, 14 de maio de 2010.

([3]) Estes documentos não foram assinados pelas partes interessadas, apesar de terem manifestado o seu interesse no projeto.

([4]) «Decisão de Associação Ultramarina», 2012/0195 (DAU).

([5]) A estratégia reconhece que a UE tem uma relação especial com as regiões ultraperiféricas e os países e territórios ultramarinos associados na região das Caraíbas. Em particular, a estratégia conjunta prevê o reforço das capacidades regionais de resposta às catástrofes e a situações de emergência, incluindo mecanismos de proteção civil, com especial ênfase na adaptação, na redução dos riscos de catástrofes e na interoperabilidade, bem como no reforço do acompanhamento, na perceção da situação e nos sistemas de alerta rápido. Neste contexto, também se irá trabalhar para melhorar a ligação entre ações a curto prazo e ações a longo prazo. A estratégia será apoiada financeiramente pelos instrumentos existentes.

([6]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/133566.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009190/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Study on civil protection in the Caribbean: state of play

In answer to my Question E-6635/2009, Commissioner Johannes Hahn, on behalf of the Commission, stated that 'The Commission has launched an independent study (currently underway) on civil protection in the Caribbean, with a view to the establishment of a pilot project in this field and the creation of a regional cooperation platform in this area, in order to promote regional OCT/OR/ACP cooperation.'

I therefore ask the Commission:

1. When will it present the results of this study?

2. If they are available, what are their main conclusions?

3. How far along is the establishing process for this pilot project?

4. Will it create other regional cooperation platforms in this area?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2012)

The Commission hereby wishes to inform the Honourable Member about the state of play of cooperation in the civil protection area with the Caribbean region. The Commission confirms that following a decision taken in Barbados on May 2009 by all relevant stakeholders in the Caribbean region ([1]), an independent study ([2]) was completed in May 2010. The final report of the study is transmitted to the Honourable Member in annex of this reply. In addition, in June 2009 the Commission proposed a draft declaration and a memorandum of understanding, at the EU-CARIFORUM regional seminar in Antigua ([3]). The Commission stands ready to resume discussions with the relevant stakeholders.

In July 2012 the Commission also submitted to the Council of the EU a proposal for a Council Decision on the association of the overseas countries and territories (OCT) with the European Union ([4]) in which it proposes various possible activities for cooperation with OCTs in the field of disaster risk reduction.

Furthermore, the Joint Caribbean EU Partnership Strategy ([5]) endorsed by the Council on 19 November 2012 ([6]), gives due consideration to the OCTs, and specifically proposes the strengthening of regional disaster and emergency response capacity, including civil protection mechanisms.

Finally, for the post-2013 period the Commission has proposed that territorial cooperation financed under the ERDF involving the Outermost Regions should be reinforced. Civil protection will certainly remain an important priority for the next Caribbean territorial cooperation programme, as it is in the current 2007-2013 programme.

([1]) French Republic, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the African-Caribbean—Pacific (ACP) States, the Overseas Countries and Territories and the Outermost Regions.

([2]) Framework Contract Commission 2007 Lot No 4 — Contract No 2009/223098 'Technical Assistance to a Study on the current actions and initiatives in the field of civil protection in the Caribbean in order to promote, enhance and reinforce the regional cooperation mechanisms', Final report, 14 May 2010.

([3]) These documents were not signed by the stakeholders although they had expressed strong interest in the project.

([4]) 'Overseas Association Decision', 2012/0195 (CNS).

([5]) The strategy recognises the EU's special links with the Outermost Regions and the associated Overseas Countries and Territories in the Caribbean. In particular, the Joint Strategy envisages strengthening regional disaster and emergency response capacity, including civil protection mechanisms, with particular emphasis on adaptation, disaster risk reduction and interoperability, as well as monitoring, situation awareness and early warning systems. In this context, work will also be done to link short- and long-term actions. The strategy will be financially supported as appropriate by existing instruments.

([6]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/133566.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009191/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Atividades de cooperação UE-Macau

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-005061/2012 a senhora Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «As atividades de cooperação [UE-Macau] existentes incluem o programa de cooperação jurídica, um programa de formação em curso para intérpretes de Macau, várias atividades no âmbito do programa de informação económica da União Europeia para Hong Kong e Macau (EUBIP), bem como cooperação em questões fiscais.»

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

1. Considera a cooperação com Macau suficiente?

2. Está disponível para alargar o âmbito das atividades de cooperação entre a União Europeia e Macau?

3. Em caso afirmativo, em que matérias se lhe afigura mais exequível semelhante alargamento?

4. A Região Administrativa Especial de Macau manifestou-lhe interesse nesse alargamento? Para que matérias?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

As relações existentes entre a UE e Macau são excelentes e a cooperação bilateral entre ambos tem vindo a expandir-se a um ritmo constante nos últimos 13 anos. O reforço da cooperação entre a UE e Macau é um objetivo fundamental e estará no centro dos debates da reunião anual do Comité Misto UE-Macau, que se realizou em 4 de dezembro de 2012, em Bruxelas.

Ambas as partes estão a explorar novos domínios de cooperação, como a proteção do ambiente, os intercâmbios académicos e culturais, bem como as questões comerciais e económicas, por exemplo, na área das indústrias criativas. Acaba de ser lançado um programa académico da UE em Macau. Juntamente com Macau, a UE pretende reforçar a cooperação e obter progressos nos domínios da aviação civil e da tributação da poupança. A UE está pronta a apoiar Macau nos seus esforços para diversificar a sua economia e diminuir a sua dependência do setor dos jogos de fortuna ou azar.

Em 2012, por ocasião da realização da Capital Europeia da Cultura em Guimarães e do Ano do Diálogo Intercultural UE-China, o Instituto Cultural de Macau e o Centro Científico e Cultural de Macau organizaram uma série de eventos culturais em Portugal.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009191/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU-Macao cooperation

In response to my Question E-005061/2012 Vice-President/High Representative Ashton, on behalf of the Commission, stated that 'Existing cooperation activities [EU-Macao] include the Legal Cooperation Programme, an ongoing training programme for Macao interpreters, various activities under the EU Business Information Programme for Hong Kong and Macao(EUBIP) as well as cooperation in tax matters'.

Therefore, I ask the Vice-President/High Representative:

1. Is the cooperation with Macao sufficient?

2. Would she be willing to increase the level of cooperation between the European Union and Macao?

3. If so, in which fields would this increased cooperation be more feasible?

4. Has the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China expressed its interest in increasing cooperation? In which fields?

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

The EU and Macao enjoy excellent relations. Bilateral cooperation between the EU and Macao has been constantly expanding over the last 13 years. Enhancing cooperation between the EU and Macao is a key goal, and will be the focal point of discussions at the annual EU-Macao Joint Committee Meeting held on 4 December 2012 in Brussels.

Both sides are exploring new areas of cooperation, such as environmental protection, academic and cultural exchanges, as well as trade and economic issues, for example, in the area of creative industries. An EU Academic Programme in Macao has just been launched. Together with Macao, the EU would like to step up cooperation and see progress in the areas of civil aviation and taxation of savings. The EU stands ready to support Macao in its efforts to diversify its economy and to decrease dependency on the gambling sector.

On the occasion of Guimarães 2012, European Capital of Culture and of the 2012 EU-China Year of Intercultural Dialogue a number of cultural events have been organised in Portugal by the Cultural Institute of Macao and by the Macao Scientific and Cultural Center.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009192/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Envelhecimento ativo

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-010518/2010, o senhor comissário László Andor declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «O envelhecimento da população da Europa está a ter efeitos de longo alcance nos regimes de pensões, o que só acresce à urgência das reformas. A chave para assegurar pensões adequadas e sustentáveis no futuro está no "envelhecimento ativo", que implica a criação de condições que permitam aos trabalhadores mais velhos permaneceram no mercado de trabalho por mais tempo. Como ação de acompanhamento do Livro Verde sobre Pensões, publicado em julho de 2010, a Comissão apresentará um Livro Branco em 2011, definindo as áreas onde é necessário agir para assegurar a sustentabilidade e a adequação dos sistemas de pensões na UE. Apoiará igualmente iniciativas a favor de um envelhecimento ativo, em articulação com o Ano Europeu do Envelhecimento Ativo previsto para 2012.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Que iniciativas apoia em favor de um envelhecimento ativo ou, nas suas próprias palavras, de que modo promove a criação de condições que permitam aos trabalhadores mais velhos permaneceram no mercado de trabalho por mais tempo?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(30 de novembro de 2012)

O programa da UE Progress apoia, entre outras medidas, ações da Comissão a favor dos trabalhadores mais velhos. Como tal, não impõe qualquer obrigação aos Estados-Membros.

A Análise Anual do Crescimento referente a 2012 ([1]) apontou a necessidade de favorecer o prolongamento das vidas profissionais, um melhor acesso a ações de aprendizagem ao longo da vida, a adaptação dos locais de trabalho e o desenvolvimento de oportunidades de emprego para os trabalhadores mais velhos. A tónica nas perspetivas de emprego dos trabalhadores mais velhos ao longo do segundo Semestre Europeu ([2]) traduziu-se em 20 recomendações específicas por país dirigidas a 18 Estados-Membros.

Em fevereiro de 2012, a Comissão adotou um livro branco sobre pensões ([3]), que apresenta uma reflexão sobre o modo como a UE e os Estados-Membros podem responder aos grandes desafios que se colocam em matéria de regimes de pensões. Avança ainda com um conjunto de iniciativas destinadas a criar as condições adequadas para que as pessoas capazes possam continuar a trabalhar, conduzindo a uma repartição mais equilibrada entre tempo no trabalho e tempo na reforma.

Em 2008, a Comissão adotou uma recomendação sobre a inclusão activa das pessoas excluídas do mercado de trabalho ([4]) Esta recomendação apela aos Estados-Membros que garantam políticas de inclusão ativa para promover a igualdade de oportunidades e atender devidamente às necessidades dos grupos vulneráveis.

Está atualmente a decorrer, por iniciativa da Comissão, o Ano Europeu do Envelhecimento Ativo e da Solidariedade entre as Gerações 2012 ([5]), que visa, designadamente, melhorar as oportunidades e as condições para os trabalhadores mais velhos.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/annual_growth_survey_en.pdf
([2]) Foram adotadas pelo Conselho recomendações especificas por país neste domínio http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ecofin/131662.pdf.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1194&furtherNews=yes.
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32008H0867:EN:NOT.
([5]) http://europa.eu/ey2012/ey2012.jsp?langId=en.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009192/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Active ageing

In answer to my Question E-010518/2010, Commissioner Andor stated on behalf of the Commission, that 'The ageing of Europe's population is having a far-reaching impact on pension schemes and makes reform more urgent than ever. Key to adequate and sustainable pensions in the future is "active ageing", which involves creating conditions that allow workers to remain longer on the labour market. As a follow-up to the Green Paper on Pensions published in July 2010, the Commission will present a White Paper in 2011 setting out areas for action to ensure the sustainability and adequacy of pension systems in the EU. It will also support initiatives for active ageing in connection with the planned European Year for Active Ageing in 2012.'

Therefore, I ask the Commission:

What actions does it support in favour of active ageing or, to use its own words, how does it promote the creation of conditions enabling allowing older workers to remain longer on the labour market?

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

The EU PROGRESS programme ([1]) supports among other things Commission's actions for older workers. As such, it doesn't impose any obligation on Member States.

The 2012 Annual Growth Survey ([2]) pointed to the need of supporting longer working lives, better access to life-long learning, adapting work places, and developing employment opportunities for older workers. The focus on employment prospects of senior workers during the second European Semester ([3]) translated into 20 country specific recommendations addressed to 18 Member States.

In February 2012, the Commission adopted a white paper on pensions ([4]). It sets out how the EU and the Member States can tackle the major challenges that confront our pension systems. It also puts forward a range of initiatives to help create the right conditions so that those who are able can continue working — leading to a better balance between time in work and time in retirement.

In 2008, the Commission adopted a recommendation on active inclusion of people excluded from the labour market. ([5]) The recommendation calls on Member States to ensure active inclusion policies to promote equal opportunities and take careful consideration of needs of the vulnerable groups.

The Commission is currently implementing the European Year for Active Ageing and Solidarity between Generations 2012 ([6]) which aims, among other things, to improve the opportunities and conditions for senior workers.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=987.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/annual_growth_survey_en.pdf
([3]) Country specific recommendations have been adopted by the Council in this regard http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ecofin/131662.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=89&newsId=1194&furtherNews=yes.
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32008H0867:EN:NOT.
([6]) http://europa.eu/ey2012/ey2012.jsp?langId=en.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009194/12
ao Conselho
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Orçamento comunitário 2014-2020 — Declarações do Presidente da Comissão

O Presidente da Comissão Europeia apelou recentemente a que «the friends of cohesion of cohesion and the friends of better spending join what I could call the Friends of Growth. I am a friend of growth.»

Assim, pergunto ao Conselho:

De que modo considera que se podem conciliar as duas posições de partida dos Estados-Membros numa proposta final adequada e equilibrada de apoio ao crescimento?

Resposta
(17 de dezembro de 2012)

O Conselho não comenta as declarações feitas por outras Instituições nem as posições tomadas por tal ou tal Estado-Membro ou grupo de Estados-Membros. O projeto de regulamento do Conselho que estabelece o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual para o período 2014-2020, atualmente em análise, será adotado em conformidade com o artigo 312.° do TFUE. O Conselho deliberará por unanimidade, após aprovação do Parlamento Europeu.

Na reunião do Conselho Europeu de junho de 2012, os Chefes de Estado ou de Governo tomaram uma decisão sobre um «Pacto para o Crescimento e o Emprego», que proporciona um quadro de ação coerente a nível nacional, da UE e da área do euro, recorrendo a todos os instrumentos, alavancas e políticas possíveis. Nesse Pacto, os Chefes de Estado ou de Governo acordaram em que o Orçamento da União Europeia deve atuar como catalisador do crescimento e do emprego em toda a Europa, servindo nomeadamente como alavanca para os investimentos produtivos e os investimentos em capital humano, e ainda em que no âmbito do futuro Quadro Financeiro Plurianual, a despesa deverá ser mobilizada a favor do crescimento, do emprego, da competitividade e da convergência, em consonância com a Estratégia «Europa 2020».

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009194/12
to the Council
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: EU budget from 2014 to 2020 — Statements by the Commission President

The Commission President recently called on 'the friends of cohesion and the friends of better spending [to] join what I could call the Friends of Growth. I am a friend of growth'.

How does the Council think that the two starting positions of the Member States could be reconciled so as to produce the necessary balanced final proposal to bolster growth?

Reply
(17 December 2012)

The Council does not comment on statements by other institutions or on the positions of individual Member States or groups of Member States. The draft Regulation of the Council laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2014-2020 currently under discussion will be adopted in accordance with Article 312 TFEU. The Council will act unanimously after obtaining the consent of the European Parliament.

At the June 2012 European Council meeting, the Heads of State or Government decided on a 'Compact for Growth and Jobs', providing a coherent framework for action at national, EU and euro area levels, using all possible levers, instruments and policies. In the 'Compact' Heads of State or Government agreed that the European Union's budget must be a catalyst for growth and jobs across Europe, notably by leveraging productive and human capital investments, and that within the future Multiannual Financial Framework, spending should be mobilised to support growth, employment, competitiveness and convergence, in line with the Europe 2020 strategy.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009195/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Orçamento comunitário 2014-2020 — Declarações do Presidente da Comissão

O Presidente da Comissão Europeia apelou recentemente a que «the friends of cohesion and the friends of better spending join what I could call the Friends of Growth. I am a friend of growth.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

De que modo considera que se podem conciliar as duas posições de partida dos Estados-Membros numa proposta final adequada e equilibrada de apoio ao crescimento?

Resposta dada pelo Presidente José Manuel Barroso em nome da Comissão
(7 de novembro de 2012)

As propostas da Comissão para o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2014-2020 representam uma abordagem ambiciosa e equilibrada que visa garantir que a União é capaz de executar a estratégia Europa 2020, financiar as suas políticas comuns e desempenhar o papel que lhe compete no contexto internacional. O nível do quadro financeiro proposto é necessário para dar resposta aos desafios que se colocam a nível europeu.

A Comissão está perfeitamente ciente das dificuldades que a indispensável consolidação orçamental está a criar aos nossos cidadãos em vários Estados-Membros. É por esta razão que é necessário garantir que o orçamento da UE se centra nas atividades que demonstram o valor acrescentado da UE, e que não podem ser suportados pelos orçamentos nacionais.

A Comissão não concorda com a posição defendida por alguns no sentido de que é necessário fazer uma escolha entre a consolidação orçamental ou o crescimento, ao nível do orçamento da UE. O orçamento da UE é um orçamento inovador, que fomenta o crescimento em toda a União, não podendo ser comparado com os orçamentos nacionais dos Estados-Membros, quer quanto ao seu âmbito de aplicação quer quanto ao seu funcionamento. A Comissão tem igualmente consciência de que os aspetos de modernização e simplificação dos elementos contidos nas suas propostas, concebidas para melhorar a qualidade da despesa, devem ser uma característica essencial do próximo quadro financeiro, a fim de garantir que os recursos disponíveis são utilizados de forma eficiente e eficaz.

A Comissão acredita que será possível chegar a um acordo sobre o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual até ao final de 2012, o que constitui um objetivo comum das instituições europeias.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009195/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: EU budget from 2014 to 2020 — Statements by the Commission President

The Commission President recently called on 'the friends of cohesion and the friends of better spending [to] join what I could call the Friends of Growth. I am a friend of growth'.

How does the Commission think that the two starting positions of the Member States could be reconciled so as to produce the necessary balanced final proposal to bolster growth?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(7 November 2012)

The Commission's proposals for the 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework represent a balanced and ambitious approach to ensure that the Union is able to deliver the Europe 2020 strategy, fund its common policies and play its role on the international stage. The level of the financial framework that it proposed is necessary in order to address the challenges that must be addressed at European level.

The Commission is well aware of the hardship which indispensable budgetary consolidation in several Member States is creating for our citizens. This is why it is necessary to ensure that the focus of the EU budget is on those activities that demonstrate EU added value and which national budgets cannot support themselves.

The Commission does not accept the approach put forward by some that there must be a choice between fiscal consolidation and growth at the level of the EU budget. The EU budget is an innovative, pro-growth budget for investment across the Union, and cannot be compared to the national budgets of the Member States in either its scope or its functioning. The Commission is equally clear that the modernisation and simplification elements of its proposals, which are designed to improve the quality of spending, must be a strong feature of the next financial framework in order to ensure that the available resources are used efficiently and effectively.

The Commission believes that it is possible to reach an agreement on the Financial Framework by the end of 2012, which is the common objective of the institutions.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009196/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: UE-Rússia — espaço comum em matéria de cultura

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-005056/2012, a senhora comissária Androulla Vassiliou declarou, em nome da Comissão que «em 2005, a UE e a Rússia concordaram com a criação de um espaço comum em matéria de cultura. Desde então, as duas partes têm trabalhado para melhorar o conhecimento e o entendimento mútuos, concedendo especial atenção ao reforço da identidade europeia e às possibilidades de sinergia.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. De que modo se tem materializado o espaço comum UE-Rússia em matéria de cultura?

2. Que iniciativas desenvolveu ou apoiou neste tocante?

3. Em que medida considera que têm sido aproveitadas as sinergias euro-russas em matéria cultural?

Resposta dada por Androulla Vassiliou em nome da Comissão
(13 de dezembro de 2012)

No seguimento da decisão de estabelecer um espaço comum em matéria de cultura entre a UE e a Rússia, foi criado um grupo de trabalho conjunto para a cultura em fevereiro de 2007 com o objetivo de definir um plano de ação cultural. O grupo de trabalho conjunto reuniu-se pela última vez em 2010. Desde aí, não houve progresso em relação aos dois pontos fulcrais do interesse da UE: a ratificação por parte da Rússia da Convenção da Unesco sobre a proteção e a promoção da diversidade das expressões culturais de 2005; e da Convenção sobre a Televisão Transfronteira do Conselho da Europa.

Entretanto, desde 2007, a delegação da União Europeia para a Rússia tem lançado convites anuais para apresentação de candidaturas centradas especificamente na cultura. O objetivo é apoiar a cooperação cultural entre a UE e a Rússia, implementada através de parcerias entre organizações não-governamentais, autoridades locais e regionais, universidades de artes, museus e outras instituições culturais. Entre 2007 e 2010, 25 projetos culturais conjuntos foram apoiados com um total de 6 milhões de euros em que estiveram envolvidas aproximadamente 100 instituições culturais da Rússia e dos Estados-Membros da UE.

Além disso, a UE dá apoios para projetos de cooperação no contexto da Parceria da Dimensão Setentrional em matéria de Cultura, que foi criada em 2010 com a participação da Rússia (300 000 euros em 2011).

Estas iniciativas facilitaram a cooperação no terreno entre a UE e os operadores culturais russos, permitindo assim que emergissem sinergias e parcerias.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009196/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: EU-Russia — a common space on culture

In answer to my Written Question E-005056/2012, Commissioner Androulla Vassiliou stated, on behalf of the Commission, that 'the EU and Russia agreed in 2005 to create a common space on culture. Since then, the two sides have been working to improve mutual knowledge and understanding, with a special focus on strengthening the European identity and opportunities for synergy'.

I therefore ask the Commission:

1. How has this EU-Russia common space on culture materialised?

2. What initiatives has it developed or supported in this regard?

3. How does it believe that EU-Russia cultural synergy has been utilised?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2012)

Following the decision to establish a common space on culture between the EU and Russia, a Joint Working Group on Culture was set up in February 2007 with the aim of drafting a Culture Action Plan. The Joint Working Group met last in 2010. Since then no progress has been made in relation to two key points of EU interest: Russia's ratification of the 2005 Unesco Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions; and of the Council of Europe Convention on Trans-frontier television.

In the meantime, since 2007, the Delegation of the European Union to Russia has launched annual thematic calls for proposals specifically focused on culture. The purpose is to support EU-Russia cultural cooperation implemented through partnerships between non-governmental organisations, local and regional authorities, artistic universities, museums and other cultural institutions. In 2007-2010, 25 joint cultural projects were supported for a total amount of EUR 6 million involving approximately 100 cultural institutions from Russia and EU Member States.

In addition, EU support is given for cooperation projects in the context of the Northern Dimension Partnership on Culture, which was established in 2010 with Russia's participation (EUR 300 000 in 2011).

These initiatives have facilitated cooperation at grass-roots level between EU and Russian cultural operators thereby allowing synergies and partnerships to emerge.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009198/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Desperdício de alimentos e refeições preparadas na União Europeia

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-009705/2011, o senhor comissário John Dalli declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «No contexto do 7.° Programa-Quadro de Investigação e Desenvolvimento, a Comissão solicitou recentemente a apresentação de propostas para a otimização da utilização dos alimentos, nomeadamente com vista a obter dados fiáveis sobre o desperdício de alimentos, de modo a avançar com possíveis soluções para uma melhor utilização dos alimentos e a poder apresentar recomendações aos responsáveis políticos.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Já obteve os dados fiáveis sobre o desperdício de alimentos que pretendia?

2. Em caso afirmativo, estão disponíveis para consulta?

3. Quais são as principais conclusões que deles retira?

4. Em caso negativo, quando conta obtê-los?

5. Está já em condições de avançar com possíveis soluções para uma melhor utilização dos alimentos?

6. Pode apresentar recomendações nesse sentido aos responsáveis políticos?

7. Em caso negativo, quando prevê fazê-lo?

Resposta dada por Maroš Šefčovič em nome da Comissão
(26 de novembro de 2012)

A Comissão está a financiar, no contexto do Sétimo Programa-Quadro de atividades em matéria de investigação e desenvolvimento, o estudo Fusions ([1]) que teve início a 1 de agosto de 2012. É um projeto de quatro anos sobre o desperdício de alimentos que envolve universidades, institutos de conhecimento, organizações de consumidores e empresas. Durante estes quatro anos, o projeto irá desenvolver uma definição uniforme do desperdício de alimentos, metodologias uniformes para calcular o desperdício de alimentos, criar uma plataforma de diversas partes interessadas da UE e desenvolver orientações gerais para as políticas dos governos nacionais e da UE.

([1]) Food Use for Social Innovation by Optimising waste prevention Strategies — pode ser seguido no Facebook (EU Fusions) e no Twitter (@EU_Fusions).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009198/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Wasted food and ready meals in the EU

In answer to my Question E-009705/2011, Commissioner John Dalli, on behalf of the Commission, stated that 'in the context of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Development, the Commission recently called for proposals on optimising of food use, notably to obtain reliable data of food wastage so as to give possible solutions for improved food use and to make recommendations to policy-makers'.

I therefore ask the Commission:

1. Has it already obtained this reliable food waste data?

2. If so, may anyone consult this data?

3. What are the main conclusions drawn from this data?

4. If not, when will it obtain this data?

5. Is it now able to propose possible solutions for better food utilisation?

6. Can it recommend policy-makers accordingly?

7. If not, when does it plan to do so?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

The Commission is funding, in the context of the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Development, the study FUSIONS ([1]) that started on 1 August 2012. It is a four-year project on food waste involving universities, knowledge institutes, consumer organisations and businesses. During these four years the project will develop a standardised definition of food waste, standardised methodologies to calculate food waste, set up an EU multi-stakeholder platform, and develop policy guidelines for national and EU governments.

([1]) Food Use for Social Innovation by Optimising waste prevention Strategies — to be followed on Facebook (EU FUSIONS) and Twitter (@EU_FUSIONS).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009201/12
ao Conselho
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Papel dos parlamentos nacionais na construção europeia

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-003843/2011, o Presidente da Comissão afirmou: «A Comissão congratula-se vivamente com a participação ativa dos parlamentos nacionais no diálogo político com a Comissão, lançado em 2006. O número de pareceres enviados pelos parlamentos nacionais tem vindo a crescer constantemente e assistiu-se a um aumento de quase 60 % em 2010, na sequência da entrada em vigor do Tratado de Lisboa. Paralelamente, os contactos e a comunicação entre a Comissão e os parlamentos nacionais também se intensificaram consideravelmente nos últimos anos, com intercâmbios regulares tanto a nível político, como a nível dos serviços. O reforço das relações entre os parlamentos nacionais e a Comissão, mas também com o Parlamento Europeu e o Conselho, tem contribuído claramente para um maior envolvimento dos parlamentos nacionais nas questões europeias. A Comissão aprecia grandemente este novo papel dos parlamentos nacionais na arquitetura europeia e está empenhada em continuar a reforçar a sua cooperação com os mesmos.»

Assim, pergunto ao Conselho:

1. Dispõe de dados quanto ao número de pareceres enviados no ano de 2011?

2. Confirma a tendência verificada de intensificação de contactos e de comunicação da Comissão, do Parlamento e do Conselho com os parlamentos nacionais?

3. Quais são as principais conclusões que dela retira?

4. Considera que os parlamentos nacionais estão efetivamente mais envolvidos nas questões europeias?

5. Por que formas pretende contribuir para reforçar a cooperação com os parlamentos nacionais?

Resposta
(25 de fevereiro de 2013)

Desde a entrada em vigor do Tratado de Lisboa, a cooperação do Conselho com os parlamentos nacionais foi reforçada, em cumprimento do artigo 12.° do TUE e dos Protocolos (n.° 1) e (n.° 2), em anexo aos Tratados. O Conselho está ativamente empenhado em garantir a plena aplicação dessas novas disposições por forma a que os parlamentos nacionais possam contribuir ativamente para o bom funcionamento da União, conforme previsto pelo artigo 12.° do TUE.

1. O Conselho envia aos parlamentos nacionais os projetos de atos legislativos emanados de um grupo de Estados-Membros, do Tribunal de Justiça, do Banco Central Europeu ou do Banco Europeu de Investimento.

Em 2011, o Conselho recebeu 452 pareceres dos parlamentos nacionais. A grande maioria desses pareceres refere-se a projetos de atos legislativos da Comissão. No entanto, dois pareceres do Senado italiano ([1]) e do Parlamento checo ([2]) referiam-se a projetos de atos legislativos enviados aos parlamentos nacionais pelo Conselho e emanados, respetivamente, de um grupo de Estados-Membros e do Tribunal de Justiça. Em 2012, o Conselho recebeu 600 pareceres dos parlamentos nacionais. Nenhum deles se referia a projetos de atos legislativos enviados pelo Conselho.

Os pareceres dos parlamentos nacionais enviados ao Conselho são sistematicamente transmitidos aos Estados-Membros, os quais, por conseguinte, têm um panorama completo do trabalho realizado por todos os parlamentos nacionais sobre os projetos de atos legislativos.

2. 3. e 4. A intensificação da comunicação entre os parlamentos nacionais e o Conselho é demonstrada pelo aumento significativo do número de pareceres apresentados ao Conselho. No entanto, deve sublinhar-se que o Conselho também coopera com os parlamentos nacionais através de diversas outras formas.

([1]) ST 8055/11.
([2]) ST 17291/11.

Assim, o Conselho transmite diretamente aos parlamentos nacionais as ordens do dia e os resultados das reuniões do Conselho e as posições adotadas pelo Conselho em relação a todos os projetos de atos legislativos. O Conselho transmite também as propostas de alteração dos Tratados emanadas dos parlamentos nacionais. O Conselho informa ainda os parlamentos nacionais dos trabalhos do Comité Permanente instituído pelo artigo 71.° do TFUE (COSI) e notifica-os dos pedidos de adesão à União Europeia.

A cooperação do Conselho com os parlamentos nacionais não se limita, aliás, à troca de informações. A Presidência do Conselho participa, assim, nas reuniões da Conferência dos Órgãos Especializados em Assuntos da União dos Parlamentos da União Europeia (COSAC), que pode apresentar à atenção do Conselho qualquer contributo que considere adequado. O Secretariado-Geral do Conselho participa também nas reuniões da COSAC e nas reuniões preparatórias. Além disso, o Conselho é representado, a nível de grupos de trabalho, no Conselho do IPEX (Intercâmbio Interparlamentar de Informação sobre a União Europeia) pelo seu Secretariado-Geral.

5. O Conselho continuará a cumprir as suas obrigações, nos termos dos Tratados, em relação aos parlamentos nacionais e analisará qualquer pedido no sentido do reforço da cooperação que os parlamentos nacionais lhe venham a apresentar.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009201/12
to the Council
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Role of the national parliaments in European integration

In reply to my Question E-003843/2011 the Commission President stated that: 'The Commission very much welcomes national parliaments' active participation in the political dialogue with the Commission, launched in 2006. The number of opinions received from national parliaments has been constantly growing and saw an increase of almost 60% in 2010, following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. In parallel, contacts and communication between the Commission and national parliaments have also considerably intensified over recent years, with regular exchanges taking place both at political and service level. The strengthening of the relations between national parliaments and the Commission, but also the European Parliament and the Council, has clearly contributed to a greater involvement of national parliaments in European affairs. The Commission greatly appreciates this new role of national parliaments in the European architecture and is committed to further enhancing its cooperation with them'.

1. Does the Council have information about the number of opinions received in 2011?

2. Is it true that the Commission, Parliament, and the Council have been tending to intensify their contacts and communication with the national parliaments?

3. If so, what are the main conclusions which the Council draws from that fact?

4. Does it consider that the national parliaments are indeed involved to a greater extent in European affairs?

5. In what ways will it help to enhance cooperation with the national parliaments?

Reply
(25 February 2013)

Since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the Council's cooperation with national parliaments has been strengthened, in compliance with Article 12 TEU and Protocols (No 1) and (No 2) annexed to the Treaties. The Council is actively engaged in ensuring full implementation of these new provisions so that the national parliaments can contribute actively to the good functioning of the Union, as provided for by Article 12 TEU.

1. The Council forwards to national parliaments draft legislative acts originating from a group of Member States, the Court of Justice, the European Central Bank or the European Investment Bank.

In 2011, the Council received 452 opinions from national parliaments. The vast majority of those opinions dealt with Commission draft legislative acts. However, two opinions from the Italian Senate ([1]) and the Czech Parliament ([2]) concerned draft legislative acts forwarded to national parliaments by the Council and originating respectively from a group of Member States and from the Court of Justice. In 2012, the Council received 600 opinions from national parliaments. None of these dealt with draft legislative acts forwarded by the Council.

National parliaments' opinions sent to the Council are systematically forwarded to the Member States, which therefore have a complete picture of the work carried out by all national parliaments on draft legislative acts.

2, 3 and 4. The intensification of communication between the national parliaments and the Council is demonstrated by the significant increase in the number of opinions submitted to the Council. However, it should be stressed that the Council also cooperates with national parliaments in a number of other ways.

The Council thus directly forwards to national parliaments the agendas for and the outcome of meetings of the Council and the positions adopted by the Council on all draft legislative acts. The Council also sends national parliaments proposals for the amendment of the Treaties. The Council furthermore informs national parliaments of the proceedings of the standing committee set up under Article 71 TFEU (COSI) and notifies them of applications for accession to the European Union.

([1]) 8055/11.
([2]) 17291/11.

The Council's cooperation with national parliaments is moreover not limited to the exchange of information. The Presidency of the Council thus participates in the meetings of the conference of Parliamentary Committees for Union Affairs (COSAC), which may submit any contribution it deems appropriate for the attention of the Council. The Council General Secretariat also attends COSAC meetings and preparatory meetings. In addition, the Council is represented at work level by its General Secretariat in the Board of IPEX (Interparliamentary EU information exchange).

5. The Council will continue vis-à-vis the national parliaments to fulfil its obligations under the Treaties and will examine any request for increased cooperation which national parliaments may submit.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009202/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Papel dos parlamentos nacionais na construção europeia

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-003843/2011, o Presidente da Comissão afirmou: «A Comissão congratula-se vivamente com a participação ativa dos parlamentos nacionais no diálogo político com a Comissão, lançado em 2006. O número de pareceres enviados pelos parlamentos nacionais tem vindo a crescer constantemente e assistiu-se a um aumento de quase 60 % em 2010, na sequência da entrada em vigor do Tratado de Lisboa. Paralelamente, os contactos e a comunicação entre a Comissão e os parlamentos nacionais também se intensificaram consideravelmente nos últimos anos, com intercâmbios regulares tanto a nível político, como a nível dos serviços. O reforço das relações entre os parlamentos nacionais e a Comissão, mas também com o Parlamento Europeu e o Conselho, tem contribuído claramente para um maior envolvimento dos parlamentos nacionais nas questões europeias. A Comissão aprecia grandemente este novo papel dos parlamentos nacionais na arquitetura europeia e está empenhada em continuar a reforçar a sua cooperação com os mesmos.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Dispõe de dados quanto ao número de pareceres enviados no ano de 2011?

2. Confirma a tendência verificada de intensificação de contactos e de comunicação da Comissão, do Parlamento e do Conselho com os parlamentos nacionais?

3. Quais são as principais conclusões que dela retira?

4. Considera que os parlamentos nacionais estão efetivamente mais envolvidos nas questões europeias?

5. Por que formas pretende contribuir para reforçar a cooperação com os parlamentos nacionais?

Resposta dada por Maroš Šefčovič em nome da Comissão
(25 de fevereiro de 2013)

Em 2011, a Comissão recebeu 622 pareceres de parlamentos nacionais. Todas as estatísticas relacionadas com os pareceres dos parlamentos nacionais estão disponíveis nos relatórios anuais da Comissão publicados no seguinte sítio Web:

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/relations/relations_other/npo/index_en.htm

Com efeito, ao longo dos últimos anos, a Comissão tem intensificado consideravelmente as suas relações com os parlamentos nacionais. Tal facto reflete-se principalmente num número crescente de reuniões e contactos bilaterais e multilaterais, tanto a nível dos serviços, com a nível político, e num aumento constante do número de pareceres dos parlamentos nacionais a que a Comissão responde por escrito.

O papel dos parlamentos nacionais na cena interinstitucional está em franco crescimento e nos últimos anos verificou-se que os parlamentos nacionais estão bem preparados e prontos para assumir as suas novas funções e competências. A Comissão sempre apoiou e facilitou a execução harmoniosa das novas responsabilidades dos parlamentos nacionais e continuará a fazê-lo. A Comissão considera particularmente positivo que os parlamentos nacionais se envolvem agora muito mais cedo no processo de decisão da UE.

A Comissão reforçará ainda mais a sua cooperação com os parlamentos nacionais, nomeadamente durante o semestre europeu. Neste contexto, propôs aos parlamentos nacionais um diálogo mais intenso em dois momentos distintos durante o semestre. Em primeiro lugar, após a publicação da Análise Anual do Crescimento, quando a Comissão tiver identificado as prioridades para o semestre; em segundo lugar, mais tarde na primavera ou no início do verão, quando a Comissão tiver apresentado, e o Conselho Europeu aprovado, as recomendações específicas por país.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009202/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Role of the national parliaments in European integration

In reply to my Question E-003843/2011 the Commission President stated that: 'The Commission very much welcomes national parliaments' active participation in the political dialogue with the Commission, launched in 2006. The number of opinions received from national parliaments has been constantly growing and saw an increase of almost 60% in 2010, following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty. In parallel, contacts and communication between the Commission and national parliaments have also considerably intensified over recent years, with regular exchanges taking place both at political and service level. The strengthening of the relations between national parliaments and the Commission, but also the European Parliament and the Council, has clearly contributed to a greater involvement of national parliaments in European affairs. The Commission greatly appreciates this new role of national parliaments in the European architecture and is committed to further enhancing its cooperation with them'.

1. Does the Commission have information about the number of opinions received in 2011?

2. Is it true that the Commission, Parliament, and the Council have been tending to intensify their contacts and communication with the national parliaments?

3. If so, what are the main conclusions which the Commission draws from that fact?

4. Does it consider that the national parliaments are indeed involved to a greater extent in European affairs?

5. In what ways will it help to enhance cooperation with the national parliaments?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(25 February 2013)

In 2011, the Commission received 622 opinions from national Parliaments. All statistics related to the opinions of national Parliaments can be found in the Commission's annual reports published on the following website:

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/relations/relations_other/npo/index_en.htm

Over the past few years, the Commission has indeed considerably intensified its relations with national Parliaments. This is mainly reflected by an increased number of bilateral and multilateral meetings and contacts, both at services level and at political level, and by the constant increase in the number of opinions from national Parliaments, to which the Commission replies in writing.

The role of national Parliaments on the interinstitutional scene is clearly growing and the last years have shown that national Parliaments are well prepared and ready to assume their new role and powers. The Commission has always supported and facilitated the smooth implementation of national Parliaments' new responsibilities and will continue to do so. The Commission particularly welcomes that national Parliaments are now much earlier involved in the EU decision-making process.

The Commission will further enhance its cooperation with national Parliaments, namely during the European Semester. In this context, it has offered national Parliaments an intensified dialogue at two separate moments during the Semester. First, following the publication of the Annual Growth Survey, when the Commission identifies the priorities for the semester; and second, later in the spring or early summer when the Commission has presented and the European Council has endorsed country-specific recommendations.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009204/12
ao Conselho
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Orçamento europeu: declarações de David Cameron

Falando das negociações para o orçamento europeu de 2014 a 2020, durante o «Andrew Marr show», o primeiro-ministro britânico admitiu a possibilidade de vetar aquele instrumento orçamental e defendeu a ideia de que a União Europeia deveria, a longo prazo, passar a ter dois orçamentos diferentes : um para os países da zona euro e outra para os que estão fora da moeda única.

Assim, pergunto ao Conselho:

1. Que apreciação faz destas declarações? Concorda com elas?

2. Admite considerar a hipótese de passarem a existir não um, mas dois orçamentos, tal como foi advogado por David Cameron?

Resposta
(10 de dezembro de 2012)

O Conselho não se pronuncia sobre as posições expressas por representantes dos Estados-Membros através dos meios de comunicação social.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009204/12
to the Council
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: European budget: statements by David Cameron

Speaking on the *Andrew Marr Show* about the 2014-2020 European budget, the British Prime Minister raised the possibility of using his veto and maintained that the EU should, in the long term, have two budgets, one for the euro area countries and one for countries outside the single currency.

1. How does the Council view these assertions? Does it agree with them?

2. Is it willing to consider the idea that, instead of a single budget, the EU should have two budgets along the lines advocated by David Cameron?

Reply
(10 December 2012)

The Council does not comment on positions expressed by representatives of individual Member States in the media.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009205/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Orçamento europeu: declarações de David Cameron

Falando das negociações para o orçamento europeu de 2014 a 2020, durante o «Andrew Marr show», o primeiro-ministro britânico admitiu a possibilidade de vetar aquele instrumento orçamental e defendeu a ideia de que a União Europeia deveria, a longo prazo, passar a ter dois orçamentos diferentes : um para os países da zona euro e outra para os que estão fora da moeda única.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que apreciação faz destas declarações? Concorda com elas?

2. Admite considerar a hipótese de passarem a existir não um, mas dois orçamentos, tal como foi advogado por David Cameron?

Resposta dada pelo Presidente José Manuel Barroso em nome da Comissão
(26 de novembro de 2012)

A Comissão considera que as negociações sobre o quadro financeiro plurianual para 2014-2020 da União Europeia e o debate sobre uma eventual capacidade orçamental para a área do euro constituem dois assuntos completamente distintos e que não devem ser confundidos. As conclusões do Conselho Europeu de 18 e 19 de outubro de 2012 confirmaram que não haverá qualquer relação entre a análise da eventual adoção de um quadro orçamental integrado para a área do euro e a elaboração do próximo quadro financeiro plurianual.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009205/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: European budget: statements by David Cameron

Speaking on the *Andrew Marr Show* about the 2014-2020 European budget, the British Prime Minister raised the possibility of using his veto and maintained that the EU should, in the long term, have two budgets, one for the euro area countries and one for countries outside the single currency.

1. How does the Commission view these assertions? Does it agree with them?

2. Is it willing to consider the idea that, instead of a single budget, the EU should have two budgets along the lines advocated by David Cameron?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

It is the view of the Commission that the negotiation of the European Union's 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework and the discussion of a possible fiscal capacity for the euro area are completely separate subjects that should not be confused. The conclusions of the European Council of 18 and 19 October 2012 confirmed that the process of exploring an integrated budgetary framework for the euro area will be unrelated to the preparation of the next multiannual financial framework.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009206/12
ao Conselho
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Papel dos trílogos na negociação interinstitucional

Raya Kardasheva, professora de política europeia no King's College de Londres, declarou recentemente ao sítio da Internet Euractiv que «não obstante agilizarem o processo legislativo, os trílogos permitem ao Conselho negociar diretamente com os líderes dos partidos maioritários no Parlamento Europeu em detrimento das comissões parlamentares e dos partidos minoritários.»

Assim, pergunto ao Conselho:

— Que apreciação faz destas declarações?

Resposta
(19 de novembro de 2012)

Não cabe ao Conselho pronunciar-se sobre declarações feitas num sítio Internet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009206/12
to the Council
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Role of trialogues in interinstitutional negotiations

Raya Kardahseva, lecturer in European politics at King's College London, has been quoted on the EurActiv Internet site as saying that trialogues, 'Despite speeding up the legislative process, … allow the Council to negotiate directly with majority party leaders in the European Parliament at the expense of committees and minority parties'.

What does the Council think about these comments?

Reply
(19 November 2012)

It is not for the Council to comment on statements appearing on a website.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009207/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Papel dos trílogos na negociação interinstitucional

Raya Kardasheva, professora de política europeia no King's College de Londres, declarou recentemente ao sítio da internet Euractiv que «não obstante agilizarem o processo legislativo, os trílogos permitem ao Conselho negociar diretamente com os líderes dos partidos maioritários no Parlamento Europeu em detrimento das comissões parlamentares e dos partidos minoritários.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que apreciação faz destas declarações?

Resposta dada por Maroš Šefčovič em nome da Comissão
(12 de novembro de 2012)

Não compete à Comissão pronunciar-se sobre a forma como o Parlamento decida ser representado em trílogos interinstitucionais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009207/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Role of trialogues in interinstitutional negotiations

Raya Kardasheva, lecturer in European politics at King's College London, has been quoted on the EurActiv Internet site as saying that trialogues, 'Despite speeding up the legislative process, … allow the Council to negotiate directly with majority party leaders in the European Parliament at the expense of committees and minority parties'.

What does the Commission think about these comments?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(12 November 2012)

It is not for the Commission to comment on how the Parliament decides to be represented in interinstitutional trialogues.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009208/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Relações UE-Cuba

Em 8 de outubro de 2009, em resposta à minha pergunta E-4378/2009, o senhor Comissário Karel De Gucht, em nome da Comissão, declarou que «A curto prazo, o relançamento do diálogo permitiu à UE debater com as autoridades cubanas — pela primeira vez desde 2003 — a questão dos presos políticos. À semelhança do que acontece com os diálogos políticos com outros países do mundo, o diálogo com Cuba deve ser encarado como um processo de diálogo.»

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

Considera ter havido progressos substanciais neste diálogo? Pode elencar quais?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(13 de dezembro de 2012)

A Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente considera que o diálogo político é um elemento indispensável para as relações com países terceiros, designadamente com Cuba. Desde que o diálogo político entre a UE e Cuba foi restabelecido em outubro de 2008, várias questões importantes, tais como as relativas aos presos políticos e aos direitos humanos fundamentais, foram abertamente discutidas com as autoridades cubanas. Entretanto, todos os presos políticos do grupo de 2003 foram libertados e anunciaram-se uma série de reformas significativas, sendo as mais recente a revisão da legislação em matéria de migração. Consequentemente, a Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente considera que o diálogo político entre a UE e Cuba produziu bons resultados e que se registaram progressos significativos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009208/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU-Cuba relations

On 8 October 2009, in answer to my Question E-4378/2009, Commissioner Karel De Gucht stated on behalf of the Commission that 'In the short term, the resumption of the dialogue has enabled the EU to discuss with the Cuban authorities — for the first time since 2003 — the question of political prisoners. As in the case of political dialogues with other countries in the world, the dialogue with Cuba should be seen as a process.'

I ask the Vice-President/High Representative:

Does she think there has been substantial progress in this dialogue? If so, can she provide details?

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

The HR/VP believes that political dialogue is an indispensable element of overall relations with Third countries, including Cuba. Since the resumption of the EU-Cuba political dialogue in October 2008, important questions such as those pertaining to political prisoners and fundamental human rights have been openly discussed with the Cuban authorities. Meanwhile, all political prisoners from the 2003 group have been released and a number of significant reforms have been announced, of which the latest is the revision of the migration law. In consequence, the HR/VP believes that the EU-Cuba political dialogue has brought results and that there has been substantial progress in this dialogue.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009209/12
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: VP/HR — Direitos humanos no Vietname: ponto da situação

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-9297/2010, a senhora Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante declarou, em nome da Comissão Europeia que: «O novo Acordo de Parceria e Cooperação UE-Vietname (APC), rubricado em 4 de outubro de 2010, incluirá cláusulas políticas significativas, nomeadamente sobre os direitos humanos, o Estado de direito e o Tribunal Penal Internacional. Estas cláusulas irão reforçar a influência que a UE tem nestas questões e permitir-lhe-ão intensificar o diálogo e a cooperação com o Vietname tendo em vista promover os direitos humanos. A UE considera que a combinação de pressão política e empenhamento construtivo constitui a melhor forma de influenciar o Vietname para que estabeleça uma sociedade mais aberta baseada no Estado de direito.»

Assim, pergunto à Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante:

1. Considera que a influência da União Europeia junto daquele país asiático foi efetivamente reforçada com o APC UE-Vietname, nomeadamente quanto aos direitos humanos?

2. De que modo foi intensificado o diálogo e a cooperação com o Vietname visando a sua promoção?

3. Que pressão política vem exercendo nesse sentido?

4. Como define aquilo que designa por «empenhamento construtivo»?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(16 de janeiro de 2013)

1. O Acordo de Parceria e Cooperação entre a UE e o Vietname (APC), assinado em junho de 2012, reafirma o compromisso de ambas as partes em matéria de direitos humanos. No âmbito do APC as partes concordaram em cooperar na promoção e proteção dos direitos humanos, incluindo no que diz respeito à aplicação dos instrumentos internacionais de defesa dos direitos humanos em que elas próprias já estão envolvidas.

2. Sobre esta base, em janeiro de 2012, a UE e o Vietname concordaram em transformar o diálogo sobre os direitos humanos atualmente com um caráter local e anual, e liderado pelos chefes das missões da UE em Hanói, num diálogo regular entre as capitais a realizar-se alternadamente em Bruxelas e em Hanói, presidido por altos funcionários. Em janeiro e outubro de 2012 realizaram-se as duas primeiras sessões desta nova forma de diálogo reforçado, o que permitiu uma troca substancial e aprofundada de pontos de vista assim como de informações sobre questões com as quais a UE está especialmente preocupada.

3. A nova ênfase dada pelo Vietname à «integração política» e a sua respeitabilidade internacionais criaram condições para as declarações e diligências da UE, bem como para que os altos dirigentes da UE possam expressar as suas preocupações junto dos dirigentes vietnamitas, podendo assim influenciar positivamente as agendas de boa governação e dos direitos humanos.

4. Com o termo «empenhamento construtivo» designa-se o diálogo aberto acerca das preocupações em matéria de direitos humanos e de cooperação, bem como a partilha de experiências, com o objetivo de promover uma maior conformidade com as normas internacionais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009209/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Human rights in Vietnam: current situation

In answer to my Question E-9297/2010, the Vice-President/High Representative stated on behalf of the European Commission that: 'The new EU-Vietnam Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA), which was initialled on 4 October 2010, will include significant political clauses, including on human rights, the rule of law and the International Criminal Court. Such clauses will enhance EU leverage on these issues and will allow the EU to intensify dialogue and cooperation aimed at promoting human rights with Vietnam. The EU takes the view that a combination of political pressure and constructive engagement bears the greatest chance of influencing Vietnam towards a more open society based upon the rule of law.'

I ask the Vice-President/High Representative:

1. Does she believe that European Union leverage on this Asian country, particularly with regard to human rights, has been increased by the EU-Vietnam PCA?

2. In what way has the dialogue and cooperation with Vietnam aimed at promoting human rights been enhanced?

3. What political pressure has been exerted in this regard?

4. Can she define what she means by 'constructive engagement'?

Answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(16 January 2013)

1. The EU-Vietnam Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) signed in June 2012 reaffirms the commitment of both sides to human rights. Under the PCA, both sides agree to cooperate in the promotion and protection of human rights, including with regard to the implementation of international human rights instruments to which they are parties.

2. On that basis, the EU and Vietnam agreed in January 2012 to upgrade a yearly local dialogue on human rights formerly led by EU Heads of Missions in Hanoi to a regular capitals-based Dialogue held alternately in Brussels and Hanoi and chaired by senior officials. The two rounds of this new enhanced Dialogue, which took place in January and October 2012, allowed for a substantial and in-depth exchange of views and information on issues of particular concern to the EU.

3. Vietnam's new emphasis on 'international political integration' and international respectability has created some space for EU statements and démarches, as well as expressions of concern at the highest level between EU and Vietnamese leaders, to play a role in influencing positively the human rights and governance agenda.

4. 'Constructive engagement' means dialogue aimed at speaking candidly on human rights concerns and cooperation and sharing of experience aimed at promoting greater compliance with international standards.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009210/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Fronteiras externas: mecanismo de resposta a circunstâncias excecionais

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-004236/2011, a Comissária Cecilia Malmström declarou, em nome da Comissão, que «para defender esta conquista e reforçar as disposições de Schengen, a Comissão está a estudar atualmente a viabilidade de criar um mecanismo que permita à União dar uma resposta adequada e comum às situações em que um Estado-Membro não consiga controlar as suas fronteiras externas ou quando uma parte da fronteira externa da União seja sujeita a uma pressão forte e inesperada. A Comissão poderá apresentar uma proposta para esse efeito.»

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Em que fase está o estudo do mecanismo anunciado?

2. Quais são as suas principais características?

3. De que modo poderá dar a tão desejada resposta adequada e comum a situações excecionais?

4. Concluiu pela apresentação de uma proposta concreta para esse efeito? Será que esta já foi apresentada? Que elementos destaca?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(26 de novembro de 2012)

Em resposta às conclusões do Conselho Europeu de junho de 2011, e à resolução do Parlamento Europeu, de julho do mesmo ano, a Comissão apresentou, em setembro de 2011, uma comunicação e duas propostas legislativas ([1]) sobre o reforço da governação no espaço Schengen.

O mecanismo de avaliação intergovernamental de Schengen atualmente em vigor não é muito eficaz para identificar e colmatar deficiências. Assim, a Comissão defende a criação de um mecanismo ao nível da UE, que permita melhorar o acompanhamento das lacunas identificadas. Ainda assim, podem existir situações em que as recomendações para a adoção de medidas corretivas não são suficientes para garantir que os Estados-Membros corrigem de forma adequada ou suficientemente rápida as deficiências persistentes e graves do controlo das respetivas fronteiras externas. As propostas da Comissão, permitem portanto a reintrodução temporária dos controlos nas fronteiras internas enquanto medida excecional, como último recurso, e apenas numa situação verdadeiramente crítica. Tal seria utilizado para garantir que os problemas podem ser resolvidos, procurando simultaneamente minimizar o seu impacto sobre a livre circulação. Estas propostas legislativas estão atualmente em discussão no Parlamento Europeu e no Conselho, estando a Comissão disposta a desempenhar um papel construtivo.

Além disso, a Comissão comprometeu-se a apresentar balanços semestrais sobre o funcionamento do espaço Schengen, sendo estes objeto de debates regulares no Parlamento Europeu e no Conselho.

([1]) COM(2011) 559, COM(2011) 560 e COM(2011) 561.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009210/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: External borders: response mechanisms for exceptional circumstances

In answering my Question E-004236/2011, Commissioner Cecilia Malmström stated on behalf of the Commission that 'to preserve this achievement and to strengthen the Schengen rules, the Commission is currently exploring the feasibility of introducing a mechanism which would allow the Union to bring an adequate and Community-based response to situations where a Member State fails to control its external borders or where a portion of the external border is submitted to unexpected and heavy pressure from outside the Union. The Commission may present a proposal to this effect.'

I ask the Commission:

1. What is the current phase of the feasibility study of the mechanism referred to above?

2. What are its main characteristics?

3. How can it provide the adequate and Community-based response to exceptional circumstances that is so needed?

4. Has a concrete proposal yet emerged to complete this process? Has this perhaps already been presented? If so, what are its key elements?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

In response to the European Council's conclusions of June 2011 and the European Parliament's resolution in July the same year, the Commission in September 2011 presented a communication and two legislative proposals ([1]) on strengthening the governance of the Schengen area.

The inter-governmental Schengen evaluation mechanism currently in place is not very effective in identifying and remedying deficiencies. The Commission therefore advocates an EU-based mechanism, which would improve the follow-up of identified shortcomings. Still, there might be situations where the recommendations for remedial action are not sufficient to ensure that persistent serious deficiencies in a Member State's control of its external borders are adequately, or sufficiently swiftly, remedied. The Commission proposals therefore allow for the temporary reintroduction of controls at internal borders as an exceptional measure of last resort in a truly critical situation. This would be used to ensure that the problems can be resolved, while minimising the impact on free movement. These legislative proposals are currently under discussion in the European Parliament and in the Council, whereby the Commission stands ready to play a constructive role.

In addition, the Commission has undertaken to present biannual overviews on the functioning of the Schengen area, providing the basis for regular debates in the European Parliament and in the Council.

([1]) COM(2011) 559, COM(2011) 560 and COM(2011) 561.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009211/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Isenção das PME do âmbito de aplicação das 4.ª e 7.ª diretivas de direito das sociedades

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-4814/2009 quanto à revisão das 4.ª e 7.ª diretivas, o Comissário Charlie McCreevy declarou que «tiveram lugar, do quarto trimestre de 2008 a meados de 2009, debates temáticos entre peritos e uma ampla consulta pública. Este período de consulta foi encerrado por um evento que reuniu as partes interessadas em junho de 2009. Um dos comentários mais recorrentes dos interessados era a insuficiência do calendário inicial deste projeto (nove meses de trabalho preparatório) para uma revisão cabal do quadro contabilístico que se aplicará a milhões de empresas em toda a UE.

Entretanto, em julho de 2009, o *International Accounting Standards Board* publicou as suas Normas Internacionais de Relato Financeiro (IFRS) para as PME. Considerou-se necessário iniciar uma série de consultas com as partes interessadas para conhecer os seus pontos de vista sobre esta nova norma, e bem assim continuar a consulta sobre outras questões de relevo para o quadro contabilístico das PME na União Europeia.

Decidiu-se, pois, prolongar as consultas por 2010. A Comissão avaliará cuidadosamente as respostas à consulta, bem como quaisquer outras informações ao seu dispor, antes de decidir o seguimento adequado. A Comissão reconhece a urgência de as PME serem aliviadas de todos os encargos administrativos desnecessários. No entanto, à luz do atual calendário, qualquer decisão sobre o andamento adequado competirá à próxima Comissão».

Assim, reitero a minha pergunta à Comissão:

Quando prevê apresentar uma proposta legislativa sobre este assunto, que considero urgente?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(7 de dezembro de 2012)

A Comissão chama a atenção do Senhor Deputado para a adoção de uma Diretiva ([1]) em março de 2012 que simplificará consideravelmente a preparação das contas anuais de mais de 5 milhões das empresas de menor dimensão da Europa — denominadas «microentidades». Estas reduções na carga burocrática permitirão libertar recursos das microentidades para que estas os possam investir no desenvolvimento das suas empresas e no crescimento de que a Europa necessita para sair da crise. Esta decisão demonstra que a UE está empenhada em reduzir a carga regulamentar. As simplificações introduzidas resultarão em potenciais poupanças anuais para as microentidades de até 3,5 mil milhões de euros.

Além disso, a Comissão propôs em outubro de 2011, na sequência do trabalho mencionado pelo Senhor Deputado, uma revisão completa da Quarta e Sétima Diretivas Direito das Sociedades em matéria de contabilidade ([2]). A Comissão propõe a simplificação das regras contabilísticas aplicáveis às PME, permitindo-lhes assim poupar potencialmente até 1,7 mil milhões de euros por ano. O processo legislativo que precede a adoção final está ainda em curso ao abrigo do processo ordinário ([3]).

([1]) Diretiva 2012/6/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 14 de março de 2012 , que altera a Diretiva 78/660/CEE do Conselho relativa às contas anuais de certas formas de sociedades, no que diz respeito às microentidades — JO L 81 de 21.3.2012.

([2]) Proposta de Diretiva do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa às demonstrações financeiras individuais, demonstrações financeiras consolidadas e relatórios conexos de certas formas de empresas — COM(2011) 684 final.

([3]) Referência interinstitucional: 2011/0308 (COD).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009211/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: SME exemption from the scope of the 4th and 7th company law directives

In answer to my Question E-4814/2009 on the revision of the 4th and 7th company law directives, Commissioner McCreevy stated that 'targeted expert discussions and a broad public consultation took place from the fourth quarter of 2008 till mid-2009. A stakeholder event in June 2009 closed this consultation period. One of the main recurring comments from stakeholders was that the initial timeframe for this project (nine months of preparatory work) was insufficient for a thorough review of the accounting framework that will apply to millions of companies throughout the EU.

Meanwhile, in July 2009, the International Accounting Standards Board published its International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) for SMEs. It was considered necessary to start a series of consultations with stakeholders to hear their views on this new Standard as well as to continue the consultation on other issues of relevance to the EU SME accounting framework.

A decision was therefore taken to continue with the consultations into 2010. The Commission will carefully assess the responses to the consultation and any other information at its disposal before deciding on the appropriate follow up. The Commission recognises the urgency of relieving SMEs of all unnecessary administrative burdens. Nevertheless, in the light of the current timing, any decision on the appropriate follow up will be for the next Commission'.

I repeat my question to the Commission:

When will it put forward a legislative proposal on this urgent subject?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(7 December 2012)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the adoption of a directive ([1]) in March 2012 that will significantly simplify the preparation of annual accounts for more than 5 million of Europe's smallest companies — so-called 'micro-entities'. These reductions in 'red tape' will free up micro-entities' resources so they can be invested in growing their businesses and deliver the growth that Europe needs to exit the crisis. This agreement shows the EU is committed to reducing regulatory burdens. The simplifications will result in potential savings of up to 3.5 billion Euro annually for micro-entities.

In addition, the Commission proposed in October 2011, following the work mentioned by the Honourable Member, a complete revision of the 4th and 7th Company Law Directives on accounting ([2]). The Commission is proposing to simplify accounting rules for SMEs, potentially saving them up to 1.7 billion Euro per year. The legislative process before final adoption is still ongoing under the ordinary procedure ([3]).

([1]) Directive 2012/6/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March 2012 amending Council Directive 78/660/EEC on the annual accounts of certain types of companies as regards micro-entities — OJ L81, 21/03/2012.
([2]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the annual financial statements, consolidated financial statements and related reports of certain types of undertakings — COM(2011) 684 final.
([3]) Interinstitutional reference: 2011/0308 (COD).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009212/12
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Regiões ultraperiféricas: estudo e resposta a casos de crise

Em resposta à minha pergunta E-6635/2009, o Comissário Johannes Hahn, em nome da Comissão, declarou que, «em 2010, a Comissão apresentará uma avaliação completa da política de proteção civil, que servirá de base à discussão suplementar sobre a forma como a Comissão poderá reforçar os instrumentos da UE e evoluir para uma capacidade de resposta rápida genuína da UE. Neste contexto, a Comissão tomará em devida consideração não só a experiência acumulada nas regiões ultraperiféricas, mas também as suas vulnerabilidades particulares».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— De que modos concretos considerou a experiência acumulada nas regiões ultraperiféricas e também as suas vulnerabilidades particulares na avaliação completa da política de proteção civil por si produzida?

Resposta dada por Kristalina Georgieva em nome da Comissão
(4 de dezembro de 2012)

O mecanismo de proteção civil visa facilitar uma cooperação reforçada entre a UE e os Estados participantes em intervenções de socorro da proteção civil em caso de emergências graves ou ameaças iminentes, tendo igualmente em conta as necessidades particulares das regiões isoladas e ultraperiféricas e de outras regiões ou ilhas da UE. Na avaliação da política de proteção civil da UE de 2010, a Comissão avaliou todos os seus instrumentos de proteção civil para um período de três anos, de 2007 a 2009. Realizaram-se um estudo documental, um estudo por um consultor externo e uma extensa consulta às partes interessadas. Em cada um destes estudos incluíram-se considerações sobre as regiões ultraperiféricas. Nos termos de referência para o estudo externo foram especificamente mencionadas as regiões ultraperiféricas. No questionário realizado às partes interessadas, dirigido às autoridades dos Estados-Membros e ainda a outras partes interessadas, incluíram-se oito questões específicas sobre as regiões ultraperiféricas. Estas questões diziam respeito à pertinência dos objetivos das atividades do mecanismo de proteção civil da UE, à sua coerência, coordenação e complementaridade, eficácia, eficiência, sustentabilidade e utilidade. Para cada uma destas áreas, foram pedidas observações específicas sobre as regiões ultraperiféricas da UE.

A avaliação não identificou quaisquer questões relevantes que carecessem de solução. Do mesmo modo, durante o período examinado (2007-2009) não se registaram pedidos de assistência provenientes das regiões ultraperiféricas. Os Estados-Membros não enviaram funcionários das regiões ultraperiféricas aos numerosos exercícios ou atividades de formação organizados pelo mecanismo de proteção civil da UE.

Nesta avaliação obtiveram-se conclusões específicas sobre as necessidades das regiões ultraperiféricas. No entanto, uma vez que estas regiões foram incluídas na metodologia de avaliação, todas as conclusões da avaliação são consideradas válidas, inclusivamente para as regiões ultraperiféricas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009212/12
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Outermost regions: study and crisis response

In his response to my Question E-6635/2009, Commissioner Johannes Hahn stated on behalf of the Commission that, 'in 2010, the Commission will present a full evaluation of civil protection policy, which will provide the basis for further discussion on how the Commission can strengthen the EU instruments and move towards a genuine EU rapid response capacity. In this context the Commission will give due consideration both to experience accumulated in the outermost regions and their particular vulnerabilities.'

I ask the Commission:

— In its final evaluation of the civil protection policy it produced, how exactly did the Commission consider the experience accumulated in the outermost regions and their particular vulnerabilities?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2012)

The Civil Protection ('CP') Mechanism seeks to facilitate reinforced cooperation between the EU and the Participating States in civil protection assistance intervention in the event of major emergencies, or the imminent threat thereof, also taking into account the special needs of the isolated, outermost and other regions or islands of the EU. In its 2010 Evaluation of EU CP Policy the Commission assessed all its civil protection instruments for the three year period 2007-2009. It carried out a desk study, a study by an external consultant and an extensive stakeholder consultation. Considerations on outermost regions were included in each of them. The terms of reference for the external study specifically mentioned outermost regions. In the stakeholder questionnaire addressed to Member State authorities and other relevant stakeholders there were eight specific questions about outermost regions as regards the relevance of the objectives of EU CP activities, their coherence, coordination and complementarity, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and the utility. For each of these areas it was asked to make specific remarks on outermost regions of the EU.

The Evaluation has not identified relevant issues requiring addressing. Also, during the period assessed (2007-2009) there were no requests for assistance emanating from the outermost regions. No personnel from outermost regions were sent by Member States to the numerous training and exercise activities organised by EU CP Policy.

The EU CP Policy Evaluation did make specific conclusions on the needs of outermost regions. However, as they were included in the evaluation methodology, all conclusions of the Evaluation are considered valid also for outermost regions.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-009213/12
adresată Comisiei
Adrian Severin (NI)
(12 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: Cerere de clarificare a răspunsului Comisiei privind blocarea exercitării unora din atribuțiile președintelui interimar al României

În data de 10 octombrie 2012 am primit din partea Comisiei Europene o scrisoare referitoare la întrebarea scrisă depusă de mine pe 22 septembrie 2012.

Textul documentului, trimis în numele Președintelui Comisiei, Jose Manuel Barroso, evită răspunsul la întrebarea pusă, oferind un rezumat general și neargumentat al situației, cu totul în afara subiectului. Întrebările mele urmăreau să clarifice motivele politice concrete (nu preocupările generale ale Comisiei pentru consolidarea statului de drept și a independenței justiției în România) și baza juridică (articolele exacte din tratatele europene) care au legitimat cererile formale ale Comisiei ca președintele (interimar) al României să nu își exercite atribuțiile constituționale.

Pseudo-răspunsul primit reprezintă o încălcare a obligațiilor Comisiei de a reacționa cu bună credință la întrebările membrilor PE. De asemenea, el încearcă să ascundă faptul că argumentele politice (inclusiv cele din documentele la care textul primit în loc de răspuns face referire) sunt inventate și nu se susțin, precum și că demersul CE a fost ilegal. Nu există nicio legătură între raportul privind progresele României în cadrul MCV sau corespondența Comisiei cu prim-ministrul și interdicția formulată de Comisie ca președintele României să își exercite atribuțiile.

În consecință, reiterăm, așadar, cererea anterioară și rugăm Comisia să ne ofere răspunsuri exacte, sincere și concrete la întrebările de mai jos:

1. Care au fost rațiunile politice care au justificat cererea imperativă ca președintele interimar al României să nu își exercite toate atribuțiile constituționale (exemplu: numirea șefilor Procuraturii cărora le-a expirat mandatul, exercitarea dreptului de grațiere, înlocuirea șefilor instituțiilor de forță ale statului etc.)?

2. Care este temeiul legal pentru formularea cererii ca președintele interimar al României să nu își exercite toate atribuțiile constituționale (articolele tratatelor europene care permit Comisiei Europene să limiteze atribuțiile constituționale ale șefilor statelor membre)?

Răspuns dat de dl Barroso în numele Comisiei
(26 noiembrie 2012)

1. Comisia își menține poziția potrivit căreia acțiunile sale în legătură cu evenimentele care au avut loc în România în luna iulie a acestui an au fost exclusiv motivate de necesitatea respectării statului de drept, a rolului Curții Constituționale și a independenței sistemului judiciar din România.

2. Aceste aspecte stau la baza tratatelor UE și sunt relevante pentru mecanismul de cooperare și de verificare (MCV).

3. Comisia monitorizează îndeaproape situația din România și va adopta un raport în cadrul MCV în următoarele săptămâni pentru a evalua dacă preocupările în ceea ce privește statul de drept și independența judiciară au fost abordate și dacă a fost restabilit echilibrul democratic.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009213/12
to the Commission
Adrian Severin (NI)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Request for clarification of Commission answer with regard to withholding certain prerogatives from the interim President of Romania

On 10 October 2012, I received from the Commission a letter referring to my question for written answer of 22 September 2012.

The answer forwarded on behalf of the Commission President, Jose Manuel Barroso, in fact avoids the question and instead gives a general and unsubstantiated outline of the situation which is totally beside the point. I was seeking to establish the specific political reasons (not the Commission's general concerns regarding consolidation of the rule of law and judicial independence in Romania) and the legal basis (the precise articles of the EU Treaties) for the Commission's formal request that the interim President of Romania refrain from exercising all his constitutional prerogatives.

This non-answer is effectively an infringement of the Commission's obligation to respond in good faith to questions from MEPs. It also seeks to disguise the fact that the political arguments (including those referred to in the documents forwarded sent in lieu of a proper answer) are spurious and unfounded and that the Commission's request was illegal. There is no link at all between the report on Romania's progress under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM) and letters from the Prime Minister to the Commission, on the one hand, and the attempt by the Commission to prevent the President of Romania from exercising his prerogatives, on the other.

In view of this, I shall repeat my previous questions and ask that the Commission provide precise, honest and specific answers thereto:

1. What were the political justifications for the peremptory request that the interim President of Romania refrain from exercising all his constitutional prerogatives (e.g. appointment of Chief Public Prosecutors, exercising the right of pardon, replacement of the heads of the state's military institutions, etc)?

2. What is the legal basis for the request that the interim President of Romania should not exercise all his constitutional prerogatives (i.e. under which articles of the EU Treaties is the Commission empowered to limit the constitutional powers of the Heads of Member States)?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

1. The Commission maintains its position that its actions in relation to events in Romania in July this year where exclusively motivated by the need to preserve the respect for the rule of law, the role of the Constitutional Court and for judicial independence in Romania.

2. These issues lie at the heart of the EU treaties and are relevant for the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM).

3. The Commission is monitoring the situation in Romania closely and will adopt a report under the CVM in the coming weeks to assess whether these concerns regarding the rule of law and judicial independence have been addressed and whether democratic checks and balances have been restored.