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 301 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

P-009214/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Statements by the IMF chief
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 15
English version ... 16

E-009215/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Emergencies in connection with clandestine immigration into the EU
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 17
English version ... 18

E-009216/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: European Investment Bank support for small and medium-sized enterprises in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 19
English version ... 20

E-009217/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Request for additional Frontex resources to deal with the influx of migrants along the EU's south-eastern border
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 21
English version ... 22

E-009219/12 by Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo and Pablo Arias Echeverría to the Commission
Subject: Discrimination against the Spanish language by the Guipúzcoa Provincial Council (Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa)
Versión española ... 23
English version ... 25

E-011105/12 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Linguistic discrimination in public procurement procedures — Follow-up question
Versión española ... 23
English version ... 25

E-001045/13 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Linguistic discrimination in public procurement procedures
Versión española 24
English version 26

E-009220/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Combining energy and transport infrastructure in Austria
Deutsche Fassung 27
English version 28

E-009221/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Combination of energy and transport infrastructure in Germany
Deutsche Fassung 27
English version 28

E-009222/12 by Marietje Schaake to the Commission
Subject: EU assessment of security risks posed by Huawei Technologies and ZTE
Nederlandse versie 29
English version 31

E-009224/12 by David Martin to the Commission
Subject: Conflict minerals from the Democratic Republic of Congo in mobile phones
English version 33

E-009225/12 by Erminia Mazzoni, Amalia Sartori, Antonio Cancian and Nikolaos Salavrakos to the Commission
Subject: Foreign investments in Bulgaria
Ελληνική έκδοση 34
Versione italiana 35
English version 36

E-009226/12 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Expulsion of migrants from Isla de Tierra in the Alhucemas archipelago
Versión española 37
English version 38

E-009227/12 by Michel Dantin to the Commission
Subject: Equipment and services for developing combined transport in Europe
Version française 39
English version 40

E-009228/12 by Renate Sommer to the Commission
Subject: Definition of volatile ingredients as set out in Annex VIII, point 4(b) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011
Deutsche Fassung 41
English version 42

E-009229/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris and Raffaele Baldassarre to the Commission
Subject: PugliaPromozione's new headquarters
Versione italiana 43
English version 44

E-009230/12 by Mikael Gustafsson to the Council
Subject: EU surplus of emission allowances
Svensk version 45
English version 46

E-009231/12 by Mikael Gustafsson to the Commission
Subject: EU surplus of emission allowances
Svensk version 47
English version 48

E-009232/12 by Thomas Ulmer to the Commission
Subject: Selection of EU Tempus projects by the EACEA
Deutsche Fassung 49
English version 50

E-009233/12 by Anna Rosbach to the Commission
Subject: Leaching of contaminated water from former rubbish dumps
Dansk udgave ... 51
English version ... 52

E-009234/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: the case of Aimé Cabrales
Wersja polska ... 53
English version ... 54

E-009235/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: Aggression against Las Damas de Blanco on the occasion of the Feast of Our Lady of Mercy
Wersja polska ... 55
English version ... 56

E-009236/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: Alan Gross in prison for 'delivering sophisticated satellite phones to Cuban Jews on behalf of the US Government'
Wersja polska ... 57
English version ... 58

E-009237/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: The unlawful detention of dissident blogger Yoani Sanchez
Wersja polska ... 59
English version ... 60

E-009238/12 by Michał Tomasz Kamiński to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Russia expels the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
Wersja polska ... 61
English version ... 62

E-009239/12 by Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz to the Commission
Subject: EU capital market crisis
Magyar változat ... 63
English version ... 64

P-009240/12 by Maria Eleni Koppa to the Commission
Subject: Violation of fundamental rights
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 65
English version ... 66

E-009241/12 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Strategy for researching the long-term effects of GM products
Versión española ... 67
English version ... 68

E-009242/12 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Ten years on from the Prestige disaster: investigation and protocol for marine accidents
Versión española ... 69
English version ... 71

E-009243/12 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Construction of a maritime boardwalk in Cho Vito (Tenerife, Canary Islands)
Versión española ... 72
English version ... 73

E-009244/12 by Dan Jørgensen to the Commission
Subject: Animal welfare in countries outside the EU
Dansk udgave ... 74
English version ... 75

E-009245/12 by Dan Jørgensen to the Commission
Subject: Green jobs as a result of the new Energy Efficiency Directive
Dansk udgave 76
English version 77

E-009246/12 by Dan Jørgensen to the Commission
Subject: Animal welfare standards for mink farming
Dansk udgave 78
English version 79

E-009247/12 by Jens Rohde to the Commission
Subject: Norwegian protectionism as regards trade in agricultural products
Dansk udgave 80
English version 81

E-009248/12 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: The current position on the regions' right to self-determination in gene technology
Deutsche Fassung 82
English version 83

E-009250/12 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: EFSA reports on GM maize
Deutsche Fassung 84
English version 85

E-009251/12 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: Reasons why South Tyroleans do not have access to discounted travel offers
Deutsche Fassung 86
English version 88

E-009252/12 by Georgios Toussas to the Council
Subject: Solidarity with the struggle of the Colombian people
Ελληνική έκδοση 90
English version 91

E-009253/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Support for patients suffering from very rare diseases
Ελληνική έκδοση 92
English version 93

E-009254/12 by Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou to the Commission
Subject: Increase in food prices and forecasts of lower cereal yields worldwide
Ελληνική έκδοση 94
English version 95

E-009255/12 by Philip Claeys to the Commission
Subject: EU funding for Northern Cyprus in connection with 'improving relations between two communities — threatening symbols' — application
Nederlandse versie 96
English version 97

E-009256/12 by Philip Claeys to the Commission
Subject: Presence of Turkish military forces in Northern Cyprus — EU initiatives via NATO
Nederlandse versie 98
English version 99

E-009257/12 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission
Subject: Quantitative data to help the stimulus for innovation in Community Plant Variety Rights (CPVR)
Svensk version 100
English version 101

P-009258/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Review of the European Global Adjustment Fund
Versione italiana 102
English version 103

E-009259/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Problem of counterfeit goods in the EU textile sector
Versione italiana 104
English version 106

E-009260/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Doubling of human rights violations by courts in the EU in the last five years
Versione italiana 108
English version 110

E-009261/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: UN warning of rising food prices in the wake of extreme weather in 2012
Versione italiana 111
English version 112

E-009262/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Girls' rights under threat in Pakistan in light of Taliban attack on activist schoolgirl
Versione italiana 113
English version 114

E-009263/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Wine-making kits and potential risks for the health of European consumers
Versione italiana 115
English version 116

E-009264/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: New cases of bird flu in Veneto
Versione italiana 117
English version 118

E-009265/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Violation of children's rights in Europe — The case of a Padua boy
Versione italiana 119
English version 122

E-009309/12 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Case of violation of the rights of the child
Versione italiana 119
English version 122

E-009326/12 by Sonia Alfano to the Commission
Subject: Listening to the view of children in custody cases and safeguarding their overriding interests
Versione italiana 120
English version 123

E-009402/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, Lara Comi, Aldo Patriciello, Erminia Mazzoni, Potito Salatto, Crescenzio Rivellini, Matteo Salvini, Giancarlo Scottà and Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Case of mistreatment of a child by police officers
Versione italiana 120
English version 123

E-009266/12 by Arlene McCarthy to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of Regulation on trade in seal products
English version 125

E-009267/12 by Arlene McCarthy to the Commission
Subject: Recognised bodies issuing attesting documents for derogated seal products
English version 126

E-009268/12 by Arlene McCarthy to the Commission
Subject: Implementation of the 116000 telephone helpline for missing children
English version 127

E-009269/12 by Daciana Octavia Sârbu to the Commission
Subject: Ivory trade
Versiunea în limba română 128
English version 129

E-009270/12 by William to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Elaboration on mission to Yemen
English version 130

E-009271/12 by William to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Elaboration on mission in Yemen
English version 130

E-009272/12 by William to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — EU Delegation to Afghanistan
English version 131

E-009273/12 by William to the Commission
Subject: Contingency plan for Greek exit
English version 132

E-009274/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Tension between Turkey and Syria
Versão portuguesa 133
English version 134

E-009275/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: USA: new farm bill in response to the drought
Versão portuguesa 135
English version 136

E-009276/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: 2013 World Bank World Development Report
Versão portuguesa 137
English version 138

E-009277/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Angela Merkel statements II
Versão portuguesa 139
English version 140

E-009278/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Faults identified in the majority of European nuclear reactors
Versão portuguesa 141
English version 142

E-009279/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Alqueva Dark Sky Programme
Versão portuguesa 143
English version 145

E-009280/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Malala Yousafzai
Versão portuguesa 146
English version 147

E-009281/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Dengue Fever outbreak in Madeira
Versão portuguesa 148
English version 149

E-009282/12 by Nuno Melo to the Council
Subject: Problems detected in a majority of European nuclear plants
Versão portuguesa 150
English version 151

E-009283/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: IMF forecasts
Versão portuguesa ... 152
English version ... 154

E-009287/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Austerity measures and financing costs
Versão portuguesa ... 152
English version ... 154

E-009811/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: New IMF outlook on austerity
Versão portuguesa ... 153
English version ... 155

E-009284/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Swiss National Bank rejects conclusions of a report by Standard & Poor's
Versão portuguesa ... 156
English version ... 157

E-009285/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: New trading rules
Versão portuguesa ... 158
English version ... 159

E-009286/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Financial transactions tax
Versão portuguesa ... 160
English version ... 161

E-009288/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Capital flight from the EU periphery to the core
Versão portuguesa ... 162
English version ... 163

E-009289/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Germany blocks Spanish bailout request
Versão portuguesa ... 164
English version ... 165

E-009290/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Cost of debt in countries subject to interventions
Versão portuguesa ... 166
English version ... 167

E-009291/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Separatist movements in the European Union
Versão portuguesa ... 168
English version ... 169

E-009292/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: The Erasmus programme
Versão portuguesa ... 170
English version ... 171

E-009293/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: The European Small Claims Procedure
Versão portuguesa ... 172
English version ... 173

E-009294/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: Food safety
Versão portuguesa ... 174
English version ... 175

E-009295/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EU budget 2014-2020
Versão portuguesa ... 176
English version ... 177

E-009296/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Call for an investigation into Chinese solar panel dumping
Versione italiana ... 178
English version ... 179

E-009297/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: The Commission should take action to protect the artistic and cultural heritage of Mali
Versione italiana ... 180
English version ... 181

E-009298/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: High levels of dioxin in breast milk in Italy
Versione italiana ... 182
English version ... 183

E-009300/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: EU vigilance on organs harvested from Chinese citizens who have been sentenced to death
Versione italiana ... 184
English version ... 185

E-009301/12 by Mario Borghezio to the Commission
Subject: Trafficking women for sexual exploitation
Versione italiana ... 186
English version ... 187

E-009302/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Counterfeit Italian foodstuffs
Versione italiana ... 188
English version ... 189

E-009303/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Crisis in Italy's photovoltaic sector
Versione italiana ... 190
English version ... 191

E-009304/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Funds from text-message fundraising affected by excessive bureaucracy
Versione italiana ... 192
English version ... 193

E-009305/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Vineyard planting rights violations
Versione italiana ... 194
English version ... 195

E-009306/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Children who are victims of abuse
Versione italiana ... 196
English version ... 197

E-009307/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: UV filters entering the food chain
Versione italiana ... 198
English version ... 199

E-009308/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Tomatoes protect against strokes
Versione italiana ... 200
English version ... 201

P-009310/12 by Ivailo Kalfin to the Commission
Subject: Ensuring safe working conditions for divers
български версия 202
English version 204

E-009311/12 by Peter van Dalen to the Commission
Subject: Fraud entailing breaches of legislation on social insurance and safety in road haulage
Nederlandse versie 205
English version 207

E-009312/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Training in IT skills for adults
Deutsche Fassung 209
English version 210

E-009313/12 by Hans-Peter Martin to the Commission
Subject: Cloud computing: certification procedure and server operating systems
Deutsche Fassung 211
English version 212

E-009315/12 by Barbara Matera to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of Christian minority in Syria
Versione italiana 213
English version 215

E-009316/12 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Statements by Monti concerning direct support for banks from the ESM
Nederlandse versie 217
English version 218

E-009737/12 by Brice Hortefeux to the Commission
Subject: United Kingdom opt-out from police and judicial cooperation
Version française 219
English version 220

P-009317/12 by Claude Moraes to the Commission
Subject: Possible opt-out for the UK from pre-Lisbon police and justice cooperation
English version 220

E-009733/12 by William (The Earl of) Dartmouth to the Commission
Subject: The cost of opting out of criminal justice powers
English version 220

P-009318/12 by Ashley Fox to the Commission
Subject: Speed limits for vans
English version 222

E-009319/12 by Inês Cristina Zuber to the Commission
Subject: Lay-off of 208 workers at Key Plastics, SA
Versão portuguesa 223
English version 224

E-009320/12 by Ashley Fox to the Commission
Subject: EU funding of the Ahava company
English version 225

E-009321/12 by Ashley Fox to the Commission
Subject: Treatment of Palestinian child prisoners
English version 226

E-009322/12 by Jim Higgins to the Commission
Subject: Analogue tachographs
English version 227

E-009323/12 by Jim Higgins to the Commission
Subject: Tachographs on vehicles weighing 2.8 tonnes or more
English version ... 228

E-009324/12 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats
English version ... 229

E-009325/12 by Elisabetta Gardini to the Commission
Subject: Cases of West Nile virus infection
Versione italiana ... 230
English version ... 231

E-009327/12 by Sonia Alfano to the Commission
Subject: Environmental risk from the use of fracking in Maremma (Italy)
Versione italiana ... 232
English version ... 234

E-009328/12 by Alyn Smith to the Commission
Subject: Autism strategy
English version ... 236

E-009329/12 by Louis Grech to the Commission
Subject: Health and safety of lifts in Malta
Verżjoni Maltija ... 237
English version ... 238

E-009330/12 by Nicole Sinclaire to the Commission
Subject: British FSB report on the eurozone crisis and falling exports
English version ... 239

E-009331/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Revision of the system for determining the minimum wage in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 240
English version ... 241

E-009332/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Specialty of industrial medicine increasingly at risk in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 242
English version ... 243

E-009333/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: The problem of alcohol consumption among 13 to 18 year-olds
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 244
English version ... 246

E-009334/12 by Hannu Takkula to the Commission
Subject: More effective exploitation of the EU's internal consumption
Suomenkielinen versio ... 247
English version ... 248

E-009335/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Monitoring at EU level of ineffective drugs
Version française ... 249
English version ... 250

E-009336/12 by Rachida Dati to the Commission
Subject: Protecting critical infrastructure without damaging the interests of final users
Version française ... 251
English version ... 253

E-009337/12 by Rachida Dati to the Commission
Subject: How can foreign-language learning from a very early age be encouraged?
Version française ... 254
English version ... 255

E-009338/12 by Sir Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Egg products
English version ... 256

E-009339/12 by Franz Obermayr to the Commission
Subject: Conclusions to be drawn from the report on failings in European nuclear power stations
Deutsche Fassung ... 257
English version ... 259

E-009340/12 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission
Subject: Recruitment of port workers in Spain
Versión española ... 261
English version ... 262

E-009341/12 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission
Subject: Youth employment
Versión española ... 263
English version ... 264

E-009342/12 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Self-determination of the Sahrawi people
Versión española ... 265
English version ... 266

E-009343/12 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Piracy in Somali waters
Versión española ... 267
English version ... 268

E-009344/12 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Information and location of genetically modified organisms (GMOs)
Versión española ... 269
English version ... 270

P-009345/12 by Paul Murphy to the Council
Subject: Addition of the LTTE to the EU 'terrorist list'
English version ... 271

E-009346/12 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Ban on food supplements
Versión española ... 272
English version ... 273

E-009347/12 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Poverty in Catalonia
Versión española ... 274
English version ... 275

E-009348/12 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Expansion of the Cerler ski resort
Versión española ... 276
English version ... 277

E-009349/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Need for a convincing response to a report by Goldman Sachs
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 278
English version ... 279

E-009350/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Commission investigation into state aid in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 280
English version ... 281

E-009351/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: 'National Registry Office' project
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 282
English version ... 283

E-009352/12 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Racist campaign against street beer vendors in Barcelona
Versión española ... 284
English version ... 285

E-009353/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Journalist sentenced in Cambodia
Versione italiana ... 286
English version ... 287

E-009354/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Safety of nuclear power stations in France
Versione italiana ... 288
English version ... 289

P-009355/12 by Corina Crețu to the Commission
Subject: Exploitation of Romanian workers by employers in other EU countries
Versiunea în limba română ... 290
English version ... 291

E-009356/12 by Konstantinos Poupakis to the Commission
Subject: Sale of food at reduced prices after expiry date
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 292
English version ... 294

E-009358/12 by Julie Girling, Raül Romeva i Rueda, Ioannis A. Tsoukalas, Gesine Meissner and Jens Nilsson to the Commission
Subject: Legal basis of retrospective regularisation of invalid fishing licences in Liberia?
Versión española ... 296
Deutsche Fassung ... 297
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 298
Svensk version ... 299
English version ... 300

E-009359/12 by Corina Crețu to the Commission
Subject: Syria: humanitarian work
Versiunea în limba română ... 301
English version ... 302

E-009360/12 by Corina Crețu to the Commission
Subject: The Sahel crisis: human rights violations in Mali
Versiunea în limba română ... 303
English version ... 304

E-009361/12 by Corina Crețu to the Commission
Subject: Forced marriage of girls
Versiunea în limba română ... 305
English version ... 306

E-009362/12 by Laurence J.A.J. Stassen to the Commission
Subject: Iran seeking to legalise marriage for girls as young as nine years old (follow-up question)
Nederlandse versie ... 307
English version ... 308

E-009363/12 by Corina Crețu to the Commission
Subject: Humanitarian aid for Syria
Versiunea în limba română ... 309
English version ... 310

E-009364/12 by Corina Crețu to the Commission
Subject: What will the Commission do to persuade the United Kingdom to respect Romanians' right to free movement within the EU?
Versiunea în limba română 311
English version 312

E-009366/12 by Willy Meyer to the Commission
Subject: Threat to Erasmus programme funding
Versión española 313
English version 314

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-009214/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(12 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Δηλώσεις της επικεφαλής του ΔΝΤ

Σε συνέντευξή της στο Τόκιο την Τετάρτη 10.10, η Γενική Διευθύντρια του Διεθνούς Νομισματικού Ταμείου Κριστίν Λαγκάρντ είχε τονίσει πως χρειάζεται μείωση του ελληνικού χρέους προτού συνεχιστεί η χρηματοδότηση της χώρας, καθιστώντας την συγκεκριμένη θέση πρόταση του ΔΝΤ.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει λάβει επίσημα σχετική πρόταση από τον εταίρο της (ΔΝΤ) στο πλαίσιο της κοινής τους δράσης για την πιστωτική βοήθεια που παρέχεται στην Ελλάδα;

2. Ποια είναι η θέση της Επιτροπής;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Τα προγράμματα οικονομικής προσαρμογής στην ΕΕ στοχεύουν στη στήριξη των προσπαθειών των κυβερνήσεων των κρατών μελών για την αποκατάσταση της δημοσιονομικής βιωσιμότητας και την υλοποίηση διαρθρωτικών μεταρρυθμίσεων, προκειμένου να βελτιωθεί η ανταγωνιστικότητα της οικονομίας και να τεθούν τα θεμέλια για βιώσιμη οικονομική ανάπτυξη. Τεχνικοί εμπειρογνώμονες από την Επιτροπή συνεργάζονται σε εποικοδομητικό πνεύμα με ομολόγους τους από την ΕΚΤ και το ΔΝΤ για την αξιολόγηση της βιωσιμότητας του χρέους, στο πλαίσιο της επανεξέτασης του ελληνικού προγράμματος προσαρμογής.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009214/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Statements by the IMF chief

At an interview in Tokyo on Wednesday 10 October Christine Lagarde, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, stressed the need to reduce Greece's debt before continuing its funding programme, establishing this as the official position of the IMF.

In view of this:

1. Has the Commission received an official recommendation along these lines from its partner (IMF) as part of the joint policy regarding loans to assist Greece?

2. What is the Commission's position on this matter?

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

Economic adjustment programmes in the EU are aimed at supporting the Member States' governments' efforts to restore fiscal sustainability and to implement structural reforms in order to improve the competitiveness of the economy, and lay the foundations for sustainable economic growth. Technical experts from the Commission are collaborating with the ECB and IMF colleagues in a constructive spirit to the assessment of debt sustainability in the context the review of the Greek Adjustment Programme.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009215/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(12 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Επείγοντα περιστατικά στον τομέα της παράνομης μετανάστευσης στην ΕΕ

Η Επιτροπή πρόσφατα και έπειτα από αίτημα του Frontex, πρότεινε στη δημοσιονομική αρχή να αποδεσμεύσει 4,5 εκατ. ευρώ από σχετικό αποθεματικό, ώστε να υπάρχει περιθώριο ανταπόκρισης σε τυχόν επείγοντα περιστατικά στη Μεσόγειο.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Αποδεσμεύτηκε το συγκεκριμένο ποσό;

2. Έχει μέχρι σήμερα αξιοποιηθεί μέρος αυτού και αν ναι σε ποιες δράσεις;

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

1. Η μερική αποδέσμευση (4,5 εκατ. ευρώ) του αποθεματικού που συστάθηκε βάσει του προϋπολογισμού της ΕΕ για το 2012 συμφωνήθηκε από την αρμόδια για τον προϋπολογισμό αρχή στις 17/10 και στις 18/10, αντίστοιχα, από το Συμβούλιο και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

2. Οι πρόσθετοι χρηματοδοτικοί πόροι στοχεύουν στην ενίσχυση ή/και επέκταση των συνεχιζόμενων κοινών επιχειρήσεων στα θαλάσσια σύνορα της Ανατολικής και Κεντρικής Μεσογείου, καθώς και στα νοτιοανατολικά χερσαία σύνορα. Η Υπηρεσία έχει ήδη ξεκινήσει την υλοποίηση των μέτρων αυτών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009215/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Emergencies in connection with clandestine immigration into the EU

On a request from Frontex the Commission recently asked the budgetary authority to release EUR 4.5 million to provide room for manoeuvre in dealing with any emergency situations in the Mediterranean.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission indicate whether the amount was released?

2. Has any of this funding been utilised to date and, if so, for what measures?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(4 December 2012)

1. The partial release (M 4,5 EUR) of the reserve established under the EU 2012 budget had been agreed by the budgetary authority, on 17/10 and 18/10 respectively by the Council and the European Parliament.

2. The additional financial resources are aimed at reinforcing and/or extending the ongoing joint operations at the maritime borders in the Eastern and Central Mediterranean as well as at the Southern-Eastern land borders. These measures were already launched by the Agency.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009216/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(12 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Στήριξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων σε ελληνικές μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις

Ο ρόλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων αποδεικνύεται κρίσιμος και καταλυτικός για την αντιμετώπιση της οικονομικής κρίσης στην Ευρώπη και τη στήριξη της ανάπτυξης και των αναπτυξιακών πρωτοβουλιών. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή για το ύψος των δανείων που έχουν χορηγηθεί από την Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων σε ελληνικές μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις τα τελευταία δύο χρόνια;

Είναι η Επιτροπή της άποψης ότι το διαθέσιμο ποσό της ΕΤΕ προς αυτό τον σκοπό θα πρέπει να αυξηθεί σημαντικά προκειμένου να στηριχθεί η ανάπτυξη σε χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα; Έχει συγκεκριμενοποιήσει ποσοτικά της σκέψεις της αυτές;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Από το 2010, η ΕΤΕπ έχει χορηγήσει στην Ελλάδα δάνεια με ίδιο κίνδυνο, συνολικού ύψους 4 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ. Ωστόσο, τα επίπεδα δανειοδοτικής δραστηριότητας άρχισαν να μειώνονται από το δεύτερο εξάμηνο του 2011, λόγω της αρνητικής οικονομικής συγκυρίας.

Για να στηριχθούν τα δάνεια της ΕΤΕπ προς την Ελλάδα, συστάθηκε από τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία κεφάλαιο εγγυήσεων ύψους 500 εκατ. ευρώ, ώστε να καταστεί δυνατό να χορηγήσει η ΕΤΕπ στις ελληνικές τράπεζες δάνεια για τις ΜΜΕ, συνολικού ύψους μέχρι 1 δισεκατομμυρίου ευρώ έως τα τέλη του 2015. Σε αυτή τη βάση, το Διοικητικό Συμβούλιο της ΕΤΕπ ενέκρινε τον Ιούνιο την πρώτη δόση ύψους 500 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ για ενδιάμεσες τράπεζες που λειτουργούν στην Ελλάδα, με την επιφύλαξη ορισμένων όρων. Η επιλογή των ενδιάμεσων τραπεζών και ο καθορισμός των κριτηρίων για τις δικαιούχους ΜΜΕ θα πραγματοποιηθούν με την εφαρμογή των συνήθων κανόνων της ΕΤΕπ.

Επιπλέον, έχει εγκριθεί η χορήγηση τριών δανείων σε ενδιάμεσες τράπεζες συνολικού ύψους 440 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ. με εγγύηση του Ελληνικού Δημοσίου, τα οποία αναμένεται να εκταμιευθούν, υπό την προϋπόθεση της εκπλήρωσης ορισμένων προϋποθέσεων από τις ελληνικές αρχές. Συνεπώς, μετά την πλήρη εφαρμογή των δύο προγραμμάτων δανειοδότησης από την ΕΤΕπ, οι ελληνικές ΜΜΕ θα έχουν τη δυνατότητα να λάβουν δάνεια ύψους 1,4 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ, εντός περίπου 30 μηνών.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009216/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: European Investment Bank support for small and medium-sized enterprises in Greece

The European Investment Bank exercises vital leverage in efforts to offset the economic crisis in Europe and support growth and growth initiatives. In this connection, can the Commission indicate what was the amount of the loans accorded by the EIB to Greek SMEs over the last two years?

Does the Commission agree that EIB resources earmarked for this purpose must be substantially increased with a view to boosting growth in countries such as Greece? Does it have any particular amount in mind?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

Since 2010, the EIB has signed loans on its own risk for a total amount of EUR 4 billion in Greece. However, activity levels started to decline since the second half of 2011 as a result of the negative economic climate.

In order to sustain EIB lending in Greece, a guarantee fund of EUR 500 million was created with Structural Funds to allow the EIB to lend up to a total of EUR 1 billion to Greek banks for SMEs up to end 2015. On this basis, the EIB Board of June approved a first tranche of up to EUR 500 million for intermediary banks operating in Greece, subject to certain conditions. The intermediary banks will be selected, and the criteria for beneficiary SMEs established, using standard EIB rules.

In addition, three loans with intermediary banks for a total amount of EUR 440 million have been approved under a Greek sovereign guarantee, and may be expected to be disbursed, subject to the fulfilment of a number of conditions precedent by the Greek authorities. Upon full implementation of both loan programmes by the EIB, Greek SMEs could thus benefit from EUR 1.4 billion of loans within approximately 30 months.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009217/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(12 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αίτημα για περαιτέρω ενίσχυση του Frontex εξαιτίας της μεταναστευτικής πίεσης στα νοτιοανατολικά σύνορα της ΕΕ

Σε πρόσφατο αίτημα του Έλληνα Υπουργού Ναυτιλίας κ. Κ. Μουσουρούλη και του Αρχηγού του Λιμενικού Σώματος κ. Δ. Μπαντιά, ζητήθηκε από την Επίτροπο κα Σ. Μάλμστρομ να εξετάσει την περαιτέρω ενίσχυση των δυνάμεων του Frontex που δραστηριοποιείται στο Αιγαίο στο πλαίσιο των επιχειρήσεων «Ποσειδών» και «Αινείας». Το αίτημα έρχεται ως αποτέλεσμα των αυξανόμενων πιέσεων στα νοτιοανατολικά θαλάσσια σύνορα της ΕΕ και των ιδιομορφιών που χαρακτηρίζουν τις προσπάθειες περιορισμού των δια θαλάσσης παράνομων μεταναστευτικών ροών.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Προτίθεται να ανταποκριθεί θετικά στο αίτημα της Ελλάδας;

2. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει για τις ακριβείς πρωτοβουλίες που θα λάβει προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση;

Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί με μεγάλη ανησυχία την κατάσταση σε ό, τι αφορά την παράνομη μετανάστευση στα εξωτερικά σύνορα των κρατών μελών, γενικά, και στα σύνορα της Ελλάδας, ειδικότερα.

Σε συνέχεια του αιτήματος του διοικητικού συμβουλίου του Frontex, η Επιτροπή υπέβαλε στην αρμόδια για τον προϋπολογισμό αρχή πρόταση για την αποδέσμευση 4,5 εκατ. ευρώ για την ενίσχυση του επιχειρησιακού προϋπολογισμού του Οργανισμού. Το Συμβούλιο και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, αντίστοιχα, ενέκριναν την αποδέσμευση στις 17 και 19 Οκτωβρίου 2012. Στη συνέχεια, το διοικητικό συμβούλιο του Frontex ενέκρινε, στις 31 Οκτωβρίου 2012, την τροποποίηση του ετήσιου προγράμματος εργασίας και τον προϋπολογισμό του Οργανισμού για το 2012.

Από το ποσό των 4,5 εκατ. ευρώ, 3,7 εκατ. ευρώ διατίθενται για την ενίσχυση των κοινών θαλάσσιων επιχειρήσεων, και συγκεκριμένα, των επιχειρήσεων «Ποσειδών» και «Αινείας», και 0,8 εκατ. ευρώ για την ενίσχυση των κοινών επιχειρήσεων στα νοτιοανατολικά χερσαία σύνορα.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009217/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Request for additional Frontex resources to deal with the influx of migrants along the EU's south-eastern border

Mr K. Mousouroulis, Greek Minister of the Merchant Marine, and Vice-Admiral D. Bantias, chief of the Hellenic Coastguard, have recently asked Commissioner C. Malmström for additional Frontex resources for the 'Poseidon' and 'Aeneas' operations in the Aegean following the increased influx of migrants along the EU's south-eastern sea border and in view of the special needs relating to containment of illegal entry by sea.

In view of this:

1. Will the Commission accede to the request by Greece?

2. Can it say exactly what measures it will take in this connection?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

The Commission has been following with great concern the situation with regard to irregular immigration at the external borders of the Member States in general and at the borders of Greece in particular.

Following the request of the Management Board of Frontex, the Commission submitted a proposal to the Budget Authority for the release of EUR 4.5 million in order to reinforce the operational budget of the Agency. The Council and the European Parliament, respectively, approved the release on 17 and 19 October 2012. Subsequently the Management Board of Frontex adopted the amendment of the Agency's 2012 Annual Work Programme and Budget on 31 October 2012.

Out of the EUR 4.5 million, EUR 3.7 million is assigned to reinforcing maritime joint operations, notably OJ Poseidon Sea and Aeneas, and EUR 0.8 million to reinforcing joint operations at the South-Eastern land borders.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009219/12
a la Comisión
Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo (PPE) y Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE)
(12 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Discriminación a la lengua española en la Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa

El pasado lunes 1 de octubre de 2012, la Comisión de Movilidad e Infraestructuras Viarias de las Juntas Generales de Guipúzcoa, informó sobre los *nuevos pliegos de contratación de la obra de construcción de la variante GI-632 en el semienlace de Antzuola-Bergara,* mediante la cual la Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa anunció su decisión de excluir de las licitaciones públicas en lo sucesivo a todas las empresas cuyos técnicos no acrediten conocimiento avanzado del euskera.

Según esta decisión, las empresas que no puedan acreditar que sus empleados dispongan del Certificado de Suficiencia Lingüística del Euskera (EGA) no podrán concurrir a contratos públicos con la Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa, lo cual constituye una medida discriminatoria que no sólo contraviene la Constitución española y normativa española y europea de contratación (ver, por ejemplo, el considerando 2 de la Directiva 2004/18/CE, sino que constituye un flagrante atentado contra las libertades fundamentales de la UE, y una grave distorsión de la libre competencia, al negar a cualquier empresa que presente su proyecto en alguna de las lenguas oficiales de la UE la posibilidad de participar en ninguna licitación pública convocada por esta Diputación.

En vista de lo expuesto anteriormente,

1. ¿Conoce la Comisión esta decisión de la Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa?

2. ¿Considera la Comisión que esta decisión constituye una vulneración de los principios fundamentales consagrados en los Tratados?

3. ¿Qué medidas piensa tomar la Comisión contra esta decisión de la Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-011105/12
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(5 de diciembre de 2012)

Asunto: Repregunta sobre la discriminación lingüística en los contratos públicos

Acabo de recibir la respuesta de la Comisión Europea a mi pregunta E-009021/2012. En dicha pregunta trasladaba mi preocupación por la discriminación lingüística que se está originando en determinados contratos públicos, pidiéndole que abriera una investigación para defender la aplicación del Derecho comunitario europeo. Citaba un ejemplo reciente, el de un contrato de servicios para asistir la dirección de las obras de la variante GI-632 (precio de la licitación 77 021 160,80 euros). La Comisión me ha contestado que «no dispone de información suficiente sobre los hechos aludidos».

Comprendiendo la falta de medios de la Comisión, este Diputado, único representante del partido político UPyD e integrado en el grupo No inscritos del Parlamento Europeo, ha localizado a través de Internet los pliegos de cláusulas administrativas que han regido la convocatoria de ese concurso público, donde se especifican las condiciones lingüísticas en la ejecución del contrato ([1]). Como podrá leer la Comisión, se establece la doble utilización de las lenguas castellana y vascuence, justificación que se ha invocado por el poder adjudicador para excluir de la licitación pública a las empresas que no acreditaran que sus directivos tuvieran títulos acreditativos de su conocimiento del vascuence.

([1]) La información sobre el contrato puede verse en: http://www4.gipuzkoa.net/concursos/diputacion/con101.asp?volver=1&codigo=10370&idioma=c&codPagina=3&departamentos=0&area=&contratos=0#; que contiene el enlace al contenido de los pliegos de cláusulas administrativas; y la regulación de la exigencia del vascuence se establece en el artículo 16 del Decreto Foral 4/2009, de 27 de enero, que regula el uso de las lenguas oficiales en el ámbito de la Diputación Foral de Guipuzcoa para el periodo 2008-2012 (que pueden leer en el boletín oficial de esa Administración pública: https://ssl.gipuzkoa.net/castell/bog/2009/02/09/bc090209.htm).

Ante esa información de uso público que le facilito, vuelvo a preguntar:

1. ¿No considera que la Diputación foral de Guipúzcoa infringe el Derecho de la Unión Europea al discriminar a las empresas por motivos lingüísticos?

2. ¿Abrirá la Comisión una investigación? ¿Adoptará alguna medida para que se cumpla la normativa europea?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-001045/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(31 de enero de 2013)

Asunto: Discriminaciones lingüísticas en la contratación pública

La Diputación de Guipúzcoa, más de treinta ayuntamientos y algunas mancomunidades de esa provincia han acordado establecer nuevas exigencias de carácter lingüístico en los contratos que suscriban. Todas las Administraciones citadas tienen la condición de «poderes adjudicadores» en los términos establecidos en la Directiva de contratos públicos ([2]). En el acuerdo se especifica que muchos procedimientos de licitación se seguirán sólo en una de las dos lenguas cooficiales, esto es, el vascuence. También las relaciones durante la ejecución de los contratos se desenvolverán sólo en esa lengua, previéndose sanciones y la posible resolución del contrato si se advierten incumplimientos de estas nuevas condiciones. Además, la Diputación de Guipúzcoa ha declarado que se exigirá el obligado cumplimiento de este «protocolo de actuación» al resto de Administraciones locales. El protocolo figura ya en la página web de la citada Diputación, aunque sólo en vascuence ([3]).

Hace ya casi dos meses me dirigí a esa Comisión europea (pregunta núm. E-011105/12) para señalar lo que, a mi juicio, eran situaciones de discriminación lingüística contrarias al Derecho comunitario de la contratación pública. A la vista de los citados acuerdos, vuelvo a preguntar:

1. ¿No considera la Comisión que la Diputación foral de Guipúzcoa infringe el Derecho de la Unión Europea al discriminar a las empresas por motivos lingüísticos?

2. ¿Adoptará alguna medida para que se cumpla la normativa europea?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Barnier en nombre de la Comisión
(18 de febrero de 2013)

El artículo 2 de la Directiva 2004/18/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 31 de marzo de 2004, sobre coordinación de los procedimientos de adjudicación de los contratos públicos de obras, de suministro y de servicios, establece que «los poderes adjudicadores darán a los operadores económicos un tratamiento igualitario y no discriminatorio y obrarán con transparencia». Esta disposición persigue garantizar la libre circulación de bienes y servicios, y que la contratación pública esté abierta a una competencia sin falseamientos en los Estados miembros.

La Comisión Europea considera que los hechos que relata su Señoría en las preguntas escritas que formula merecen ser examinados más en detalle a la luz de los objetivos de la mencionada disposición. En consecuencia, se propone iniciar una investigación con el fin de hacer una evaluación fáctica y jurídica de la práctica administrativa a que se refiere Su Señoría. Si fuera preciso, la Comisión Europea adoptará las medidas necesarias para lograr que las prácticas administrativas de los poderes adjudicadores se adecuen a la normativa de la UE sobre contratación pública.

([2]) Directiva 2004/18/CE de 31.3.2004.
([3]) http://www.gipuzkoaberri.net/WAS/CORP/DPDOficinaPrensaDigitalWEB/nota/es/531/kontratazioetarako-hizkuntza-irizpideak-modu-bateratuan-aplikatuko-dituzte-gipuzkoako-36-udalek-eta-gipuzkoako-foru-aldundiak.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009219/12
to the Commission
Carlos José Iturgaiz Angulo (PPE) and Pablo Arias Echeverría (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Discrimination against the Spanish language by the Guipúzcoa Provincial Council (Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa)

On Monday, 1 October 2012, the Guipúzcoa Provincial Council's Committee on Mobility and Road Infrastructure reported on the new contract documents for the construction work due to take place on the GI-632 road between Antzuola and Bergara. In the report, the Guipúzcoa Provincial Council announced that in future, all companies whose engineers are unable to provide evidence that they have an excellent command of the Basque language will be prevented from tendering for contracts.

This decision means that companies that fail to demonstrate that their employees have a Basque proficiency certificate (EGA) cannot bid for public contracts offered by the Guipúzcoa Provincial Council. This is a discriminatory measure which not only violates the Spanish Constitution and Spanish and EU employment legislation (see, for instance, Recital 2 of Directive 2004/18/EC) but also amounts to a flagrant violation of EU fundamental freedoms. Furthermore, by disqualifying all companies that prepare bids in one of the official languages of the EU from tendering for contracts offered by the Guipúzcoa Provincial Council, free competition is distorted.

1. Is the Commission aware of the Guipúzcoa Provincial Council's decision?

2. Does the Commission believe that this decision constitutes a violation of the fundamental principles enshrined in the EU Treaties?

3. What measures is the Commission planning to take in response to the Guipúzcoa Provincial Council's decision?

Question for written answer E-011105/12
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(5 December 2012)

Subject: Linguistic discrimination in public procurement procedures — Follow-up question

I have just received the Commission's answer to my Question E-009021/2012, in which I expressed my concern regarding linguistic discrimination in some public procurement procedures, and asked the Commission to launch an investigation in order to ensure that EU legislation is applied. I cited a recent example of a service contract to provide project management support for the GI-632 relief road (tender price: EUR 77 021 160.80). In its answer, the Commission stated that 'it does not possess sufficient information concerning the facts presented in the written question'.

Mindful of the Commission's limited resources, I — the only representative of the Union, Progress and Democracy Party (UPyD) in the European Parliament, sitting as a non-attached Member — conducted an Internet search and found the tender specifications relating to the public procurement procedure in question, which set out the linguistic conditions for the performance of the contract ([1]). As the Commission will see, it is established that both Castilian and Basque will be used. The contracting authority has used this as grounds to exclude from the public procurement procedure companies that had not provided evidence that management staff held qualifications demonstrating their proficiency in the Basque language.

([1]) For information on the procurement procedure, see: http://www4.gipuzkoa.net/concursos/diputacion/con101.asp?volver=1&codigo=10370&idioma=c&codPagina=3&departamentos=0&area=&contratos=0#. A link to the tender specifications can be found here. The requirement concerning the Basque language is established in Article 16 of local Decree 4/2009, of 27 January, laying down rules on the use of official languages in the Diputación Foral de Guipúzcoa for the period 2008-2012 (published in the local authority's official gazette at: https://ssl.gipuzkoa.net/castell/bog/2009/02/09/bc090209.htm).

Taking this publicly available information into account:

1. Does the Commission agree that the local authority in the province of Guipúzcoa (the *Diputación foral de Guipúzcoa*) is breaching EC law by discriminating against companies on linguistic grounds?

2. Will the Commission be launching an investigation into this matter? Will it take steps to ensure that EC law is complied with?

Question for written answer E-001045/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(31 January 2013)

Subject: Linguistic discrimination in public procurement procedures

The Provincial Government of Guipúzcoa, over thirty of the province's town councils and a number of joint municipal authorities have reached an agreement on setting new linguistic requirements for public procurement contracts. All of these public administration bodies have the status of 'contracting authorities' as defined by the directive on public works contracts ([2]). The agreement states that many procurement procedures will be conducted in only one of the two official languages, Basque. This will also be the language used while the contract is being carried out, and penalties may be imposed or the contract terminated if the new conditions are judged to have been breached. Furthermore, the Provincial Government of Guipúzcoa has stated that it will make this Basque language protocol mandatory for all local authorities in the province. The text of the Basque language protocol appears on the Guipúzcoa Provincial Government website, but it is only available in Basque ([3]).

I contacted the Commission almost two months ago (Written Question E-011105/2012) to draw attention to what I perceived to be instances of linguistic discrimination that were inconsistent with EC law on public procurement. In the light of the above language agreement in Guipúzcoa, I repeat my questions:

1. Does the Commission agree that the Provincial Government of Guipúzcoa is breaching EC law by discriminating against companies on linguistic grounds?

2. Will it take steps to ensure European law is complied with?

Joint answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(18 February 2013)

Article 2 of Directive 2004/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 on the coordination of procedures for the award of public works contracts, public supply contracts and public service contracts rules that 'contracting authorities shall treat economic operators equally and non-discriminatorily and shall act in a transparent way'. This provision aims at ensuring the free movement of goods and services and the opening-up of public procurement to undistorted competition in Member States.

The European Commission considers that the facts as detailed by the Honourable Members in their written questions deserve further attention taking into consideration the objectives of the provision referred to above. Therefore the European Commission intends to launch an investigation to make a factual and legal assessment of the administrative practice brought to its attention by the Honourable Members. If necessary, the European Commission will take the steps necessary to bring the administrative practice of the contracting authorities in conformity with EU public procurement law.

([2]) Directive 2004/18/EC of 31.3.2004.
([3]) http://www.gipuzkoaberri.net/WAS/CORP/DPDOficinaPrensaDigitalWEB/nota/es/531/kontratazioetarako-hizkuntza-irizpideak-modu-bateratuan-aplikatuko-dituzte-gipuzkoako-36-udalek-eta-gipuzkoako-foru-aldundiak

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009220/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(12. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Kombination von Energie- und Verkehrsinfrastruktur in Österreich

Im Rahmen der transeuropäischen Netze (TEN) wird in Österreich die Westbahn zwischen St. Pölten und Loosdorf ausgebaut. Der Lückenschluss der Bahntrasse verläuft teilweise parallel zur S 33 und zur A 1. Kommissar Oettinger betont regelmäßig die Bedeutung des Ausbaus der Energienetze zur Umsetzung einer gemeinsamen europäischen Energieinfrastruktur.

1. Überlegt die Kommission, den Lückenschluss der Westbahn mit dem gleichzeitigen Ausbau der Energieinfrastruktur zu kombinieren?

2. Wenn ja, wie soll ein Ausbau der Energieinfrastruktur in das Verkehrsinfrastrukturprojekt integriert werden?

3. Wenn nicht, wird sich die Kommission noch mit dieser Möglichkeit befassen?

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009221/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(12. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Kombination von Energie- und Verkehrsinfrastruktur in Deutschland

Im Rahmen der transeuropäischen Netze (TEN) wird in Deutschland seit Anfang Mai 2012 die Hochgeschwindigkeits-Bahntrasse zwischen Wendlingen und Ulm neu gebaut. Zeitgleich wird auch die Bundesautobahn 8 zwischen Hohenstadt und Ulm-West sechsspurig ausgebaut. Beide Bauprojekte verlaufen in großen Teilen parallel. Energiekommissar Günther Oettinger betont regelmäßig die Bedeutung des Ausbaus der Energienetze zur Umsetzung einer gemeinsamen europäischen Energieinfrastruktur.

1. Gibt es in der Kommission Überlegungen den Bau der beiden Verkehrsinfrastruktur-Projekte in Baden-Württemberg mit dem gleichzeitigen Ausbau der Energieinfrastruktur zu kombinieren?

2. Wenn ja, wie soll ein Ausbau der Energieinfrastruktur in die beiden bestehenden Verkehrsinfrastrukturprojekte integriert werden?

3. Wenn nicht, wird sich die Kommission mit dieser Möglichkeit noch befassen?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(6. Dezember 2012)

Die Kommission möchte den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-009116/2012 verweisen, in der der Ansatz der Kommission im Hinblick auf die Nutzung potenzieller Vorteile aus der koordinierten Umsetzung von Infrastrukturprojekten in verschiedenen Sektoren erläutert wird.

Was die konkreten Projekte der Eisenbahnverbindung Wendlingen-Ulm und der Autobahn Hohenstadt-Ulm-West sowie das konkrete Eisenbahnprojekt zwischen Sankt Pölten und Loosdorf betrifft, so müssten die Projektträger die mögliche Kombination mit einer Energieinfrastruktur bewerten. Die künftige Infrastrukturfazilität „Connecting Europe“ könnte die Träger zur Nutzung von Synergien bei der sektorübergreifenden Projektentwicklung anspornen. Die Basisprojekte müssen jedoch im Lichte der einschlägigen richtungsweisenden Sektorenverordnungen, über die derzeit in den Institutionen verhandelt wird, als Vorhaben von gemeinsamem Interesse anerkannt werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009220/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Combining energy and transport infrastructure in Austria

In connection with Trans-European Networks (TEN), in Austria the Westbahn railway is being extended between Sankt Pölten and Loosdorf. Part of the link in the railway line runs parallel to the S 33 and the A 1 highways. Commissioner Oettinger often underlines the importance of extending energy networks to complete a common European energy infrastructure.

1. Is the Commission thinking of combining the closing of the gap in the Westbahn with the simultaneous development of energy infrastructure?

2. If so, how will the upgrade in energy infrastructure be integrated into the transport infrastructure project?

3. If not, will the Commission consider this opportunity?

Question for written answer E-009221/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Combination of energy and transport infrastructure in Germany

As part of trans-European networks, (TENs), work began in Germany in early May 2012 to build a high-speed rail link between Wendlingen and Ulm. At the same time, the national motorway (8) between Hohenstadt and Ulm-West was widened to 6 lanes. Both building projects are running in parallel to a great extent. Mr Günther Oettinger, the energy commissioner, regularly underlines the importance of expanding the energy network to develop a common European energy infrastructure.

1. Is the Commission thinking about combining the two transport infrastructure projects in Baden-Württemberg with a parallel expansion of the energy infrastructure?

2. If that is the case, how is an expansion of the energy infrastructure to be incorporated into the current transport infrastructure projects?

3. If not, is the Commission still going to look into this possibility?

Joint answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2012)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-009116/2012 in which the Commission's approach to exploiting potential benefits from a coordinated implementation of infrastructure projects across different sectors is presented.

Regarding the concrete projects Wendlingen-Ulm railway link and Hohenstadt-Ulm-West motorway, and the concrete railway project between Sankt Pölten and Loosdorf, the possible combination with an element of energy infrastructure would have to be assessed by the promoters of the projects. The future Connecting Europe Facility could encourage promoters to exploit synergies in cross-sector project development. The underlying projects, however, will need to be recognised as Projects of Common Interest in light of the relevant sectoral guideline regulations, currently under interinstitutional negotiation.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009222/12
aan de Commissie
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(12 oktober 2012)

Betreft: EU-beoordeling van het veiligheidsrisico van Huawei Technologies en ZTE

Op 8 oktober 2012 is de commissie Inlichtingendiensten van het Amerikaanse Huis van Afgevaardigden na een jaar onderzoek ([1]) tot de conclusie gekomen dat de Chinese bedrijven Huawei Technologies en ZTE een bedreiging voor de nationale veiligheid vormen vanwege „hun pogingen om via Amerikaanse bedrijven in het bezit van gevoelige informatie te komen” en vanwege „hun loyaliteit aan de Chinese regering” ([2]). Eerder al had de Australische regering een stokje gestoken voor de deelname van Huawei Technologies aan een plan voor de ontwikkeling van een nationaal breedbandnetwerk in Australië ([3]). Huawei Technologies en ZTE verkopen apparatuur voor de aanleg en exploitatie van draadloze netwerken.

1. Deelt de Commissie de inschatting dat indien Huawei Technologies en ZTE zou worden toegestaan in de EU zaken te doen dit de Chinese regering in de gelegenheid zou stellen communicaties te onderscheppen, met het risico van online-aanvallen op essentiële infrastructuurvoorzieningen (zoals gedefinieerd in de resolutie van het Europees Parlement van 12 juni 2012 (2011/2284(INI)), waaronder dammen, energienetwerken, de ICT-sector en de sector financiële diensten? Zo niet, waarom niet?

2. Kan de Commissie meedelen of het reeds is voorgekomen dat EU-lidstaten of EU-instellingen zakentransacties met Huawei Technologies en ZTE, en/of de deelname van deze bedrijven aan aanbestedingen voor belangrijke ICT-infrastructuurprojecten, op grond van bezorgdheid met betrekking tot de nationale veiligheid hebben tegengehouden?

3. Verandert het onderzoek van de commissie Inlichtingendiensten van het Amerikaanse Huis van Afgevaardigden op enigerlei wijze de beoordeling door de Commissie van de veiligheidsrisico’s van de bedrijfsactiviteiten van Chinese bedrijven in de EU?

4. Heeft de Commissie plannen om alleen of samen met de lidstaten een onderzoek te starten naar en een beoordeling te maken van de gevolgen van de bedrijfsactiviteiten van Chinese bedrijven, in het bijzonder bedrijven in de ICT-sector, en met name Huawei Technologies en ZTE, voor de nationale veiligheid in de EU? Zo niet, waarom niet?

5. Is de Commissie geraadpleegd en/of op enigerlei wijze betrokken geweest bij het onderzoek van de commissie Inlichtingendiensten van het Amerikaanse Huis van Afgevaardigden naar de bedrijfsactiviteiten van Huawei Technologies en ZTE?

6. Kan de commissaris belast met internationale handel aangeven of het verslag van de commissie Inlichtingendiensten van het Amerikaanse Huis van Afevaardigden enige invloed heeft op het uitgestelde anti-subsidieonderzoek ([4]) naar de Chinese telecommunicatiesector (en zo ja, welke), en of het verslag aanvullend bewijs heeft opgeleverd in de anti-subsidiezaak met betrekking tot illegale subsidies en schadelijke effecten?

7. Heeft de Commissie de bezorgdheid in verband met de veiligheid naar aanleiding van de bedrijfsactiviteiten van Chinese bedrijven in de EU naar voren gebracht tijdens de laatste dialoog tussen de EU en China? En zo ja, heeft de Commissie voldoende garanties gekregen?

Antwoord van de heer De Gucht namens de Commissie
(12 december 2012)

De Commissie heeft nota genomen van het verslag van 8 oktober 2012, dat is gepubliceerd door de permanente beperkte commissie Inlichtingendiensten van het Amerikaanse Huis van Afgevaardigden. De Commissie is op geen enkele manier betrokken geweest bij het desbetreffende onderzoek.

([1]) http://intelligence.house.gov/sites/intelligence.house.gov/files/documents/Huawei-ZTE%20Investigative%20Report%20(FINAL).pdf
([2]) http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/09/us/us-panel-calls-huawei-and-zte-national-security-threat.html?pagewanted=all all & _r=0.
([3]) http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/27/technology/australia-bars-huawei-from-broadband-project.html
([4]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/94a44f84-027b-11e2-9e53-00144feabdc0.html#axzz290XMrX71.

Op de 14e topontmoeting tussen de EU en China hebben beide partijen afgesproken een EU-China cyber taskforce op te richten om bij de aanpak van hindernissen en gevaren op cybergebied de uitwisseling en de samenwerking te intensiveren, zodat de positieve rol van veilige ICT en veilig internet tot het uiterste kan worden benut bij het bevorderen van de economische en sociale ontwikkeling en eveneens zodat denkbeelden over gedeelde risico's kunnen worden uitgewisseld. Aspecten van nationale veiligheid vormen geen onderdeel van de huidige dialogen tussen de EU en China.

De Commissie is zich bewust van het belang om de beveiliging van de ICT-bedrijfsketen te garanderen; dit wordt een aspect van de nieuwe strategie inzake cyberveiligheid. Het VS-verslag is een aanvullende bron van informatie waarmee de Commissie rekening zal houden bij haar toekomstige werkzaamheden in verband met de beveiliging van de ICT-bedrijfsketen.

Er zijn de Commissie gevallen bekend waarin EU-lidstaten transacties op het gebied van ICT-infrastructuur hebben geblokkeerd om redenen van nationale veiligheid. Dit is mogelijk in het kader van hun prerogatieven inzake nationale veiligheid. De verantwoordelijkheid voor nationale veiligheid berust bij de EU-lidstaten. De bevoegdheid van de Commissie op dit terrein is beperkt en omvat geen onderzoeksbevoegdheden.

Het VS-verslag heeft geen invloed op het besluit van de EU al dan niet een onderzoek naar de invoer van ICT-apparatuur uit China te openen. DE EU opent antisubsidie- en antidumpingonderzoeken uitsluitend op basis van het beschikbare bewijsmateriaal — namelijk indien er sprake is van subsidies en/of dumping die schadelijk zijn voor de interne bedrijfstak van de EU.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009222/12
to the Commission
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: EU assessment of security risks posed by Huawei Technologies and ZTE

On 8 October 2012, the United States House of Representatives' House Intelligence Committee said that after a year long investigation ([1]) it had come to the conclusion that the Chinese businesses Huawei Technologies and ZTE were a national security threat because of 'their attempts to extract sensitive information from US companies and their loyalty to the Chinese Government' ([2]). Earlier, the Australian Government blocked Huawei's participation in a scheme to build a national broadband network in Australia ([3]). Huawei and ZTE sell equipment for the creation and operation of wireless networks.

1. Does the Commission also consider that allowing Huawei and ZTE to do business in the EU would give the Chinese government the ability to intercept communications and introduce a risk of what would amount to online attacks on critical infrastructure — as defined in the European Parliament resolution of 12 June 2012 (2011/2284(INI) — including dams, power grids, the information and communications technology (ICT) sector and financial services? If not, why not?

2. Can the Commission confirm whether EU Member States or EU institutions have already blocked business transactions with Huawei and ZTE and/or their participation in tenders for major ICT infrastructure projects as a result of national security concerns?

3. Does the investigation by the House Intelligence Committee change the Commission's current assessment of security risks posed by Chinese businesses' operations in the EU?

4. Does the Commission intend to start its own investigation, either independently or jointly with the Member States, to reassess the impact of business operations by Chinese companies, particularly ICT companies, and specifically Huawei and ZTE, on national security in the EU? If not, why not?

5. Has the Commission been consulted and/or involved in any way in the investigation by the House Intelligence Committee into the business operations of Huawei and ZTE?

6. Can the Commissioner for International Trade say whether (and if so, how) the House Intelligence Committee report has any impact on the postponed anti-subsidy investigation ([4]) into the Chinese telecommunications sector, and whether it is able to provide additional evidence for the anti-subsidy case of illegal subsidies and harmful effects?

7. Did the Commission raise the issue of security concerns stemming from Chinese business operations in the EU with the Chinese authorities during the latest EU-China dialogue? If so, did the Commission obtain sufficient assurances?

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

The Commission has taken note of the report that was published by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the United States House of Representatives on 8 October 2012. The Commission has not been involved in the Committee's investigation in any way.

At the 14th EU-China summit, the two sides agreed to set up a EU-China Cyber Taskforce to enhance exchanges and cooperation in tackling obstacles and threats to cyber issues, in order to maximise the positive role of secure ICT and Internet in promoting economic and social development, as well as to exchanging views on shared risks. National security considerations are not part of the present EU-China dialogues.

The Commission acknowledges the importance of ensuring the security of the ICT supply chain, which will be a dimension of its upcoming strategy on cyber security. The US report is an additional source of information that the Commission will take into account in its future work on ICT supply chain security.

([1]) http://intelligence.house.gov/sites/intelligence.house.gov/files/documents/Huawei-ZTE%20Investigative%20Report%20(FINAL).pdf
([2]) http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/09/us/us-panel-calls-huawei-and-zte-national-security-threat.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.
([3]) http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/27/technology/australia-bars-huawei-from-broadband-project.html
([4]) http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/94a44f84-027b-11e2-9e53-00144feabdc0.html#axzz290XMrX71.

The Commission is aware of instances where EU Member States have blocked transactions in the area of ICT infrastructure on grounds of national security concerns. They can do so as part of their national security prerogatives. The responsibility for national security lies with EU Member States. The Commission's remit in this area is limited and does not cover investigative powers.

The US report has no bearing on the EU's decision whether or not to open an investigation into imports of ICT equipment originating in China. The EU opens anti-subsidy and anti- dumping investigations solely based on the evidence at hand — i.e. the existence of subsidisation and/or dumping causing injury to the EU's domestic industry.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009224/12
to the Commission
David Martin (S&D)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Conflict minerals from the Democratic Republic of Congo in mobile phones

The recent campaign by 'Congo Calling' has highlighted the issue of illicit or 'conflict minerals' from the Democratic Republic of Congo that may well be in mobile phones. In January this year the Commission produced a communication entitled 'Trade, growth and development: Tailoring trade and investment policy for those countries most in need' (COM(2012)0022 final) ,in which it made commitments to improve transparency throughout supply chains in order to help prevent natural resource-fuelled conflicts.

Can the Commission advise on the progress that has been made towards this commitment, and comment on the suggestion by 'Congo Calling' that a campaign of public awareness be initiated to encourage corporate and social responsibility in the demands placed on Congo's mineral sector.

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

As part of the follow up to its 2010 Communication on 'Tax and Development', the European Commission is engaged in negotiations with EU institutions on the draft Accounting and Transparency Directives to promote disclosure of extractive and forestry industry payments to governments by companies listed on EU stock exchanges and other large EU companies. The Commission hopes to reach a compromise soon. The 2012 Communication on 'Trade, growth and development' has furthered strengthened the Commission's commitment in this regard and work is being undertaken to explore the feasibility of proposing an EU due diligence initiative under the current Commission mandate.

The Commission has also highlighted the importance of promoting greater support for and use of the OECD Guidelines for multinational enterprises, and OECD due diligence guidance for responsible supply chains management. In this regard, the Commission continues to work at the OECD through multi-stakeholder processes on implementation of the Guidelines and the Guidance.

In parallel, as outlined in the EU Raw Materials Strategy, the Commission continues to cooperate with and provide support to developing country partners on sustainable mining, geological knowledge and good governance in natural resources management.

To support enduring peace and stability in the Great Lakes Region, the EEAS and the Commission are working on a comprehensive response to links between the financing of armed groups and the exploitation of natural resources. This also requires the restoration of Congolese state authority and the rule of law in eastern parts of the Democratic Republic of Congo, a wide-ranging security sector reform and broader development strategies.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009225/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE) και Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ξένες επενδύσεις στη Βουλγαρία

Το 2007, ένας όμιλος Ιταλών επενδυτών κατέληξε σε συμφωνία με τη βουλγαρική κυβέρνηση, η οποία προέβλεπε την παραχώρηση στον όμιλο οικοπέδου στο χώρο του πρώην στρατιωτικού αεροδρομίου του Μποζούριστε ως αντάλλαγμα για την κατασκευή 106 διαμερισμάτων.

Παρόλο που η συμφωνία αυτή θα προσέλκυε τεράστιες επενδύσεις και θα δημιουργούσε υποδομές και τουλάχιστον 1 000 νέες θέσεις εργασίας, το βουλγαρικό Υπουργείο Πολιτισμού εξέδωσε την απόφαση RD 9D-002, με ημερομηνία 5 Ιουλίου 2010, με την οποία ολόκληρη η περιοχή τίθεται σε καθεστώς «πολιτιστικής προστασίας». Με τον τρόπο αυτόν, η εν λόγω έκταση κατέστη μη οικοδομήσιμη.

Έχοντας υπόψη:

— τη διοικητική προσφυγή που ασκήθηκε από τον όμιλο «Industrial Park Sofia» Spa (IPS) σχετικά με τη νομιμότητα του παραπάνω διοικητικού διατάγματος·

— την απόφαση αριθ. 8581/16.06.2011 του βουλγαρικού διοικητικού πρωτοδικείου, με την οποία απορρίπτεται η προσφυγή· και

— την απόφαση αριθ. 16379/12.12.2011 του Ανωτάτου Δικαστηρίου της Δημοκρατίας της Βουλγαρίας, στο οποίο άσκησε έφεση ο όμιλος IPS, σύμφωνα με την οποία: 1) η απόφαση αριθ. 8581/16.06.2011 παραβιάζει τους διαδικαστικούς κανόνες που ορίζονται στα άρθρα 168(1), 170(1) και 171(1) και (2) του Κώδικα Διοικητικής Δικονομίας· 2) δεν παρατέθηκε το σκεπτικό όσον αφορά τις ουσιαστικές προϋποθέσεις για την έκδοση δήλωσης και των παραρτημάτων της δυνάμει των άρθρων 57 και 58 και των προσωρινών άρθρων 2, 6 και 7 του νόμου περί πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς· 3) το διοικητικό πρωτοδικείο δεν εξασφάλισε στον όμιλο IPS τα δικαιώματα υπεράσπισης και δίκαιης δίκης, περιορίζοντας με αυτόν τον τρόπο τη δυνατότητά του να υπερασπιστεί τη θέση του ενώπιον του δικαστηρίου:

Θεωρεί η Επιτροπή κατάλληλη τη συμπεριφορά του διοικητικού πρωτοδικείου; Ειδικότερα, πιστεύει η Επιτροπή ότι η εν λόγω συμπεριφορά συμμορφώνεται με τις ρυθμίσεις στο πλαίσιο του μηχανισμού συνεργασίας και ελέγχου για τη Βουλγαρία και τη Ρουμανία;

Απάντηση του κ. Barroso εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(26 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή λαμβάνει υπόψη τη νομική διαμάχη μεταξύ ομάδας ιταλών επενδυτών και της βουλγαρικής κυβέρνησης όσον αφορά ορισμένα δικαιώματα επιφανείας.

2. Η ακύρωση απόφασης πρωτοβάθμιου δικαστηρίου κατόπιν άσκησης έφεσης, όπως αναφέρεται στην εν λόγω αναφορά, αποτελεί συνήθη νομική πρακτική. Η Επιτροπή δεν έχει λόγους να σχολιάσει πτυχές της παρούσας υπόθεσης.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009225/12
alla Commissione
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE) e Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Investimenti esteri in Bulgaria

Nel 2007 un gruppo di investitori italiani ha raggiunto un accordo con il governo bulgaro, ottenendo un terreno presso il sito dell'ex aeroporto militare di Božurište in cambio della costruzione di 106 appartamenti.

Sebbene l'accordo rappresentasse un'occasione per attrarre ingenti investimenti, realizzare infrastrutture e creare almeno 1 000 nuovi posti di lavoro, il ministero bulgaro della Cultura ha emesso l'ordinanza RD 9D-002 del 5 luglio 2010, che ha posto l'intera area sotto «protezione del patrimonio culturale». Il terreno è stato pertanto reso non edificabile.

Premesso che:

— la procedura di ricorso amministrativo promossa dal gruppo «Industrial Park Sofia» Spa (IPS) in merito alla legittimità del suddetto decreto amministrativo;

— la decisione n. 8581/16.06.2011 del tribunale amministrativo bulgaro, con la quale è stato respinto il ricorso; nonché

— la decisione n. 16379/12.12.2011 della Corte suprema della Repubblica di Bulgaria, adita dal gruppo IPS, la quale stabilisce che: 1) la decisione n. 8581/16.06.2011 viola le norme procedurali di cui agli articoli 168, paragrafo 1, 170, paragrafo 1 e 171, paragrafi 1 e 2 del Codice di procedura amministrativa; 2) risultava mancante l'argomentazione circa le condizioni sostanziali necessarie per il rilascio di una dichiarazione e dei rispettivi allegati, ai sensi degli articoli 57 e 58, nonché degli articoli provvisori 2, 6 e 7 della legge sul patrimonio culturale; 3) il tribunale amministrativo ha negato al gruppo IPS il diritto di difesa e il diritto a un processo equo, ponendo ostacoli alla possibilità di difendere la propria posizione contro la sentenza,

può la Commissione dire se ritiene che il comportamento del tribunale amministrativo sia adeguato? In particolare, ritiene la Commissione che tale comportamento sia in linea con il regolamento definito nel meccanismo di cooperazione e verifica per la Bulgaria e la Romania?

Risposta di José Manuel Barroso a nome della Commissione
(26 novembre 2012)

1. La Commissione prende nota della controversia tra il gruppo di investitori italiani e il governo bulgaro in merito a determinati diritti di superficie.

2. L'annullamento in appello della decisione di primo grado, come indicato nell'interrogazione scritta, costituisce normale prassi giuridica. Pertanto la Commissione non vede motivo di presentare osservazioni riguardo a elementi del caso in questione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009225/12
to the Commission
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Amalia Sartori (PPE), Antonio Cancian (PPE) and Nikolaos Salavrakos (EFD)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Foreign investments in Bulgaria

In 2007 a group of Italian investors reached an agreement with the Bulgarian Government under which a plot on the site of the former military airport at Bozhurishte was granted to the Italians in exchange for the construction of 106 apartments.

Although this agreement would have brought huge investments and created infrastructure and at least 1 000 new jobs, the Bulgarian Ministry of Culture issued Order RD 9D-002, dated 5 July 2010, which placed the whole area under 'cultural protection'. The land therefore became unbuildable.

Bearing in mind:

— the administrative recourse procedure submitted by the group 'Industrial Park Sofia' Spa (IPS) on the legitimacy of the abovementioned administrative decree;

— Decision No 8581/16.06.2011 of the Bulgarian Administrative Court, which rejected this recourse; and

— Decision No 16379/12.12.2011 of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Bulgaria, to which IPS appealed, which states that: 1) Decision No 8581/16.06.2011 violates the procedural rules as set out in Articles 168(1), 170(1) and. 171(1) and (2) of the Code of Administrative Procedure; 2) the reasoning regarding the substantial conditions necessary for the issuing of a declaration and its annexes, according to Articles 57 and 58, and temporary Articles 2, 6 and 7 of the Cultural Heritage Law was missing; 3) the Administrative Court denied IPS the rights to defend themselves and to have a fair trial, putting obstacles in the way of the possibility of defending their position against the sentence:

Does the Commission consider that the behaviour of the Administrative Court is appropriate? In particular, does the Commission believe that such behaviour complies with the regulation stated in the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism for Bulgaria and Romania?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

1. The Commission takes note of the legal dispute between a group of Italian investors and the Bulgarian government regarding certain building rights.

2. The cancellation of a first instance ruling in appeal, as set out in this petition, is normal legal practice. The Commission does not see reasons to comment on aspects of this case.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009226/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(12 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Expulsión de inmigrantes de la isla de Tierra en el archipiélago de Alhucemas

En la madrugada del pasado 4 de septiembre de 2012 el Gobierno español desarrolló una operación conjunta con el Gobierno marroquí y desalojó a los inmigrantes llegados a la isla de Tierra, (archipiélago de Alhucemas), situada a 30 metros de territorio marroquí. Esta operación supuso el traslado forzoso de 83 inmigrantes que habían comenzado a llegar a la isla desde el pasado día 29 de agosto.

De este grupo, 10 fueron trasladados a Melilla —dos mujeres y ocho niños—, que recibieron la debida atención médica. Con las otras 73 personas que restaban en la Isla, la Guardia Civil procedió a una operación de expulsión, transportando en pequeños grupos hasta la cercana Playa de Sfiha, en territorio marroquí, donde un fuerte dispositivo policial esperaba a los inmigrantes.

Este proceso de expulsión realizado por la Guardia Civil y ordenado por el Gobierno español incumple las más básicas normas que rigen la expulsión de extranjeros a nivel nacional en concreto el artículo 64 de la Ley 8/2000; así como, el artículo 15 de la Directiva 2005/85/CE y artículo 7 de la Directiva 2008/115/CE a nivel europeo y a nivel internacional, el artículo 33 de la Convención de Ginebra sobre el Estatuto de los Refugiados que impide la devolución de individuos a un territorio donde su vida o su libertad corra peligro.

El Reino de Marruecos ha sido acusado por numerosas organizaciones de defensa de los derechos humanos de expulsiones masivas de inmigrantes, e incluso del abandono de los mismos en pleno desierto en la frontera con Argelia.

Frente a lo acaecido, la Comisión Europea se pronunció a través de Michele Cercone, portavoz de la Comisaria Malström, quien recordó «a España, como al resto de países, que se deben respetar los principios y obligaciones del derecho internacional, como el principio de no devolución».

Ante los hechos presentados y las declaraciones previas de la Comisión: ¿ha exigido la Comisión los expedientes de expulsión de los 73 inmigrantes expulsados de manera efectiva por el Gobierno español? En caso afirmativo, ¿cuál ha sido la respuesta del Gobierno español?

¿Ha adoptado alguna medida la Comisión para garantizar la seguridad de los expulsados? ¿Se plantea llevar a cabo alguna acción contra el Gobierno de España por el incumplimiento de las directivas arriba citadas?

Respuesta de la Sra. Malmströmon en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de noviembre de 2012)

La Comisión está al corriente de los hechos mencionados por Su Señoría mencionó y ha pedido formalmente a las autoridades españolas información detallada sobre las medidas adoptadas para garantizar el cumplimiento del acervo comunitario y de las obligaciones internacionales.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009226/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Expulsion of migrants from Isla de Tierra in the Alhucemas archipelago

In a joint operation carried out in the early hours of 4 September 2012, the governments of Spain and Morocco expelled a group of migrants from Isla de Tierra, an islet in the Alhucemas archipelago located just 30 metres from the Moroccan coast. During the operation, 83 migrants were forcibly removed. Migrants had been arriving on the islet since 29 August 2012.

Of the 83 migrants, 10 — two women and eight children — were transferred to Melilla to receive medical attention. In a deportation operation organised by the Spanish Civil Guard, the remaining 73 migrants were transported in small groups to the nearby Sfiha beach, part of Moroccan territory, where they were met by a large number of police officers.

The expulsion process carried out by the Civil Guard and ordered by the Spanish Government breached fundamental norms governing the deportation of foreigners, at national level (see Article 64 of Law 8/2000), EU level (Article 15 of Directive 2005/85/EC and Article 7 of Directive 2008/115/EC) and international level (Article 33 of the Geneva Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, which states that individuals cannot be sent back to a country where their lives or freedom would be threatened).

Morocco has been accused by a number of human rights associations of expelling large numbers of migrants and even abandoning them in the middle of the desert, on the border with Algeria.

Following these events, Michele Cercone, spokesperson for Commissioner Malmström, said on behalf of the Commission that 'Spain, and all other countries, must respect the principles and obligations of international law, including the principle of "non-refoulement"'.

In the light of these events and previous statements issued by the Commission, has the Commission asked to see the expulsion records of the 73 migrants effectively deported by the Spanish Government? If so, how did the Spanish Government respond?

Has the Commission taken any steps to guarantee the safety of the deported migrants? Does the Commission plan to take action against the Spanish Government over non-compliance with Directives 2005/85/EC and 2008/115/EC?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

The Commission is aware of the facts mentioned by the Honourable Member of Parliament and has formally asked the Spanish authorities to provide detailed information on the measures taken to ensure the respect of EU *acquis* and international obligations.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009227/12
à la Commission
Michel Dantin (PPE)
(12 octobre 2012)

Objet: Équipements et services pour le développement du transport combiné en Europe

Dans sa feuille de route pour un espace européen unique des transports, la Commission appelle à des solutions interopérables et interconnectées en vue du développement du transport multimodal. Si les connexions entre les réseaux ferroviaires maritimes, routiers, et aériens sont explicitement mentionnées, la Commission n'a pas traité l'enjeu des équipements de transports, qui seraient en mesure de faciliter la circulation des marchandises concernées par le transport combiné.

Dans le cadre de son travail sur le transport combiné, la Commission a-t-elle étudié la possibilité d'établir des normes européennes concernant un nouveau type d'équipements, et en particulier une solution écologique et économiquement rentable de nouveaux types de conteneurs, pouvant circuler sur plusieurs modes de transport et contenir un volume suffisamment important de marchandises, l'accent étant mis sur le secteur ferroviaire, afin d'éviter que le transport par la route ne continue d'être privilégié?

Par ailleurs, une vision logistique plus globale du transport combiné est nécessaire: quelles seront les propositions de la Commission concernant le type de wagons, leur organisation, et les services en gare nécessaires pour faire avancer plus rapidement le transport ferroviaire connecté aux autres modes de transport de marchandises en Europe, en assurant une circulation fluide des marchandises sur leur trajet, porte à porte?

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

La Commission reconnaît le rôle considérable du transport combiné et sa contribution à la réalisation des objectifs stratégiques du livre blanc sur les transports visant à favoriser l'intermodalité.

La directive 92/106/CEE relative aux transports combinés détermine, entre autres, les véhicules et unités de chargement intermodales utilisés dans le transport combiné de marchandises.

Il existe aujourd'hui un grand nombre d'unités de chargement intermodales (UCI) de différents types et dimensions, faisant l'objet de normes internationales et/ou européennes (conteneurs ISO, caisses mobiles et semi-remorques).

La prudence s'impose lorsqu'on envisage l'ajout d'un autre type ou d'une autre taille d'unité de chargement, étant donné les fortes interdépendances entre les unités de chargement, les moyens de transport, le matériel de manutention dans les terminaux, l'infrastructure et l'incidence sur les opérations terminales et ferroviaires. La Commission ne prépare actuellement aucune initiative visant à définir de nouveaux types d'UCI.

La Commission estime que les solutions innovantes relatives à l'équipement de transport intermodal améliorent la compétitivité du rail dans les chaînes de transport intermodales. Dès lors, elle concourt au financement de projets de recherche afin de rendre plus attrayants le rail et les transports intermodaux ([1]).

La conception de nouveaux wagons doit se faire dans le respect des STI ([2]) pertinentes, en particulier de la «spécification technique d'interopérabilité concernant le sous-système Matériel roulant — wagons pour le fret du système ferroviaire transeuropéen conventionnel» ([3]).

S'agissant des activités de la Commission relatives aux services en gare, le règlement (UE) n° 913/2010 relatif au réseau ferroviaire européen pour un fret compétitif, reconnaissant le rôle important des terminaux intermodaux en tant qu'interfaces entre les différents modes de transport, prévoit la mise en place d'un groupe consultatif sur les terminaux pour chacun des 9 corridors de fret internationaux.

([1]) Par exemple: le projet en cours VEL-Wagon (www.vel-wagon.eu), cofinancé par l'Union européenne, cherche à développer un wagon porte-conteneurs plus long, permettant un transport plus efficient, en particulier de conteneurs maritimes de 40 pieds (qui sont les plus nombreux sur les trajets entre port et arrière-pays).

([2]) Spécifications techniques d'interopérabilité.

([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Notice.do?val=437505:cs&lang=fr&list=643067:cs,437505:cs,&pos=2&page=1&nbl=2&pgs=10&hwords=.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009227/12
to the Commission
Michel Dantin (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Equipment and services for developing combined transport in Europe

In the Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area the Commission calls for interoperable and interconnected solutions to develop multimodal transport. Although explicit reference is made to the connections between the rail, maritime transport, road, and aviation networks, the Commission does not address the issue of transport equipment, which could be used to facilitate the movement of goods by combined transport.

In its work on combined transport, has the Commission considered the possibility of laying down European standards for new types of transport equipment, more specifically for an environmentally friendly and cost-effective new type of container, which can be used with several modes of transport, in particular rail, and hold a sufficiently large volume of goods, with a view to ending road transport's status as the preferred option?

Furthermore, a broader view of combined transport logistics is necessary: what will the Commission's proposals be on the type of wagons, their set-up, and the station facilities required in order to speed up progress on the development of links between rail transport and other modes of goods transport in Europe, whilst ensuring a seamless flow of goods from door to door?

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

The Commission recognises the significant role of combined transport and its contribution to the achievement of the policy objectives in the White Paper on Transport, aiming at fostering intermodality.

Combined Transport Directive 92/106/EEC stipulates, *inter alia*, the vehicles and intermodal loading units used for combined transport of goods.

Today, there is a large number of different types and sizes of intermodal loading units (ILU), subject to international and/or European standards (ISO-containers, swap-bodies and semitrailers).

Adding further type/dimension of loading unit would require a careful approach, considering the strong interdependencies between loading units, transport means, handling equipment in terminals, infrastructure and the impact on terminal and train operations. The Commission is currently not planning any initiative to define new types of ILU.

The Commission considers that innovative solutions for intermodal transport equipment improve the competitiveness of rail in intermodal transport chains. Therefore it is co-funding research projects to make rail and intermodal transport more attractive ([1]).

The development of new wagons has to observe the relevant TSIs ([2]) in particular the 'Technical specification of interoperability relating to the subsystem rolling stock — freight wagons of the trans-European conventional rail system' ([3]).

Regarding Commission activities for station facilities, Regulation 913/2010/EC concerning a European Rail Network for Competitive Freight foresees setting up Advisory Groups for Terminals for each of the 9 international Rail Freight Corridors, acknowledging the important role of intermodal terminals as interfaces between the different modes of transport.

([1]) For example: the ongoing EU co-funded project VEL-Wagon (www.vel-wagon.eu), aiming at the development of a longer container wagon for more efficient transport of in particular 40-feet maritime containers (which dominate in the port-hinterland traffic).
([2]) Technical Specifications for Interoperability.
([3]) (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Notice.do?val=437505:cs&lang=fr&list=643067:cs,437505:cs,&pos=2&page=1&nbl=2&pgs=10&hwords=).

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009228/12
an die Kommission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(12. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Definition flüchtiger Zutaten gemäß Anhang VIII, Nummer 4, Paragraph b der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011

Gemäß Anhang VIII, Nummer 4, Paragraph b der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 muss die Menge der flüchtigen Zutaten „nach Maßgabe ihres Gewichtanteils am Enderzeugnis" im Zutatenverzeichnis angegeben werden.

1. Welche Zutaten sind als flüchtig einzustufen?

2. Ist Wasser als flüchtige Zutat einzustufen?

3. Plant die Kommission, Leitlinien zur Berechnung der mengenmäßigen Anteile für flüchtige Zutaten zu erarbeiten, um die abweichenden Berechnungstraditionen in den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten zu harmonisieren?

Antwort von Herrn Šefčovič im Namen der Kommission
(26. November 2012)

Gemäß Anhang VIII Nummer 4 Buchstabe b der Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 (1) (die ab dem 13. Dezember 2014 gelten wird) wird die Menge der flüchtigen Zutaten nach Maßgabe ihres Gewichtsanteils am Enderzeugnis angegeben (QUID-Angabe). Diese Bestimmung ist bereits in den geltenden EU-Vorschriften über die Etikettierung von Lebensmitteln enthalten (2). In den EU-Vorschriften sind flüchtige Zutaten nicht definiert. Als flüchtig können Lebensmittelzutaten gelten, die wie Wasser und Alkohol im Lauf der Herstellung eines Lebensmittels, z. B. beim Kochen oder Erhitzen, verdampfen können. Die Kommission beabsichtigt nicht, Leitlinien zur Berechnung der Anteile flüchtiger Zutaten im Rahmen der QUID-Angaben zu erarbeiten.

(1) Verordnung (EU) Nr. 1169/2011 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 25. Oktober 2011 betreffend die Information der Verbraucher über Lebensmittel und zur Änderung der Verordnungen (EG) Nr. 1924/2006 und (EG) Nr. 1925/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates und zur Aufhebung der Richtlinie 87/250/EWG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 90/496/EWG des Rates, der Richtlinie 1999/10/EG der Kommission, der Richtlinie 2000/13/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates, der Richtlinien 2002/67/EG und 2008/5/EG der Kommission und der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 608/2004 der Kommission, ABl. L 304 vom 22.11.2011.

(2) Richtlinie 2000/13/EG des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 20. März 2000 zur Angleichung der Rechtsvorschriften der Mitgliedstaaten über die Etikettierung und Aufmachung von Lebensmitteln sowie die Werbung hierfür, ABl. L 109 vom 6.5.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009228/12
to the Commission
Renate Sommer (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Definition of volatile ingredients as set out in Annex VIII, point 4(b) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011

According to Annex VIII, point 4(b) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 the quantity of volatile ingredients shall be indicated 'on the basis of their proportion by weight in the finished product'.

1. What ingredients are to be considered as volatile?

2. Is water to be considered as a volatile ingredient?

3. Is the Commission planning to draw up guidelines for calculating the proportions of volatile ingredients, so as to harmonise the various traditions for such calculations in the individual Member States?

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

In accordance with Annex VIII, point 4(b) of Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 [1] (which shall apply from 13 December 2014), the quantitative indication (QUID declaration) for volatile ingredients must relate to the weight of the ingredient used expressed as a percentage of the weight of the finished product. This provision exists already in the currently applicable EU food labelling legislation [2]. There is no EU legal definition of volatile ingredients. Food ingredients that, like water and alcohol, can be evaporated in the course of the production process of a food, for example during a cooking or heating process, can be considered as volatile. The Commission does not intend to adopt any guidelines on the calculation of the proportions of volatile ingredients in the context of QUID declarations.

---

(1) Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1924/2006 and (EC) No 1925/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Commission Directive 87/250/EEC, Council Directive 90/496/EEC, Commission Directive 1999/10/EC, Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, Commission Directives 2002/67/EC and 2008/5/EC and Commission Regulation (EC) No 608/2004, OJ L 304, 22.11.2011.

(2) Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs, OJ L 109, 6.5.2000.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009229/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) e Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE)
(12 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Nuova sede della direzione generale di Pugliapromozione

Il trasferimento della direzione generale di Pugliapromozione — ente finanziato con i fondi Fers — nel padiglione 172 della Fiera del Levante di Bari costa ai cittadini pugliesi ben 685mila euro tra ristrutturazione (509mila), progetto esecutivo (21.700), coordinamento della sicurezza in fase di progettazione (11.700), direzione dei lavori (43mila), arredi (100mila). In più vanno aggiunti i 39mila 400 euro l'anno di affitto e i 234mila 380 euro per pagare gli stipendi a 11 persone. Lo denuncia l'opposizione nel Consiglio regionale pugliese.

La notizia ha destato meraviglia e proteste nell'opinione pubblica in considerazione del periodo di tagli, aumenti di tasse e sacrifici che Stato, regioni e comuni chiedono ai cittadini.

Alla luce dei fatti più sopra esposti, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se è a conoscenza della vicenda?

2. quali attività e quali funzioni svolge l'ente Pugliapromozione utilizzando fondi europei?

3. se può verificare e controllare la correttezza con cui vengono impiegati fondi Fers per spese di allestimenti di una sede faraonica per un ennesimo ente della Regione Puglia?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(6 dicembre 2012)

Sulla base delle informazioni fornite dall'autorità di gestione del programma regionale per la Puglia, i lavori relativi alla sede della direzione generale di PugliaPromozione non sono stati cofinanziati dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR).

PugliaPromozione implementa attività volte a promuovere e a incoraggiare il turismo nella regione; solo queste attività sono cofinanziate dal FESR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009229/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE) and Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: PugliaPromozione's new headquarters

As reported by the opposition on Puglia's Regional Council, the transfer of the headquarters of PugliaPromozione — a body financed by ERDF funding — to Pavilion 172 at Bari's Fiera del Levante is costing the citizens of Puglia as much as EUR 685 000. This includes EUR 509 000 for refurbishment, EUR 21 700 for the executive design, EUR 11 700 for safety coordination during the design phase, EUR 43 000 for supervision of works and EUR 100 000 for furnishings. On top of this, there are extra costs of EUR 39 400 a year in rent and EUR 234 380 to pay the salaries of 11 people.

The news has been met with public astonishment and protest, considering the cuts, tax increases and sacrifices that the State, regions and municipalities are asking citizens to bear.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is it aware of this matter?

2. What activities and functions are performed by PugliaPromozione using European funds?

3. Can checks be carried out to ensure that ERDF funds are not being improperly used in fitting out palatial offices for yet another body set up by the Puglia Region?

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

According to the information provided by the managing authority of the regional programme for Apulia, the works for the headquarters of PugliaPromozione were not co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF).

PugliaPromozione implements activities aimed at promoting and fostering tourism in the region; only such activities are co-financed by the ERDF.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-009230/12
till rådet
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(12 oktober 2012)

Angående: EU:s överskott av utsläppsrätter

Som en följd av otillräckliga minskningsåtaganden finns det i dagsläget ett mycket stort överskott av utsläppsrätter (s.k. AAU) inom FN:s system för handel med utsläppsrätter. EU:s överskott av utsläppsrätter beräknas landa på fyra miljarder AAU. Sveriges överskott väntas bli ungefär 85 miljoner AAU. Detta är mer än Sveriges totala rapporterade utsläpp för ett helt år. En AAU motsvarar ett ton koldioxidekvivalenter. Så det är mycket stora summor vi talar om.

Inom dagens bestämmelser för utsläppshandelssystemet får överblivna utsläppsrätter föras över till nästa åtagandeperiod. Nästa år börjar den andra åtagandeperioden. Det finns ännu inget beslut om hur det stora överskottet ska hanteras. Skulle dagens stora överskott föras över skulle det äventyra hela funktionen och integriteten i systemet.

Inom EU förs diskussioner om hur EU ska hantera sitt överskott av AAU. För att nästa period ska fungera optimalt borde Sverige verka för att EU:s position blir att EU:s överskott av utsläppsrätter inte ska föras över till nästa åtagandeperiod. Om EU inte överför sitt överskott finns goda möjligheter att påverka andra Annex 1-länder att göra likadant, dvs. annullera överskottet.

Med anledning av detta vill jag fråga rådet huruvida man avser att verka för att EU inte för vidare sitt överskott av AAU till nästa åtagandeperiod inom FN:s handelssystem med utsläppsrätter?

Svar
(17 december 2012)

Rådet har upprepade gånger i sina slutsatser betonat de allmänna principer som bör ligga till grund för en lösning på frågan överskott av tilldelade utsläppsenheter, som den ärade parlamentsledamoten redogör för ([1]).

Den 25 oktober 2012 antog rådet slutsatser om förberedelserna inför den 18:e sessionen i partskonferensen (COP 18) för FN:s ramkonvention om klimatförändringar (UNFCCC) och den 8:e sessionen i partsmötet för Kyotoprotokollet (CMP 8) (Doha, Qatar, den 26 november-7 december 2012) ([2]). I dessa slutsatser *"UPPREPAR" rådet "att överskottet av tilldelade utsläppsenheter från den första åtagandeperioden kan inverka på protokollets miljöintegritet om det inte åtgärdas på lämpligt sätt; BETONAR att det brådskar att lösa denna fråga med tanke på antagandet av ändringarna i bilaga B och inledandet av den andra åtagandeperioden den 1 januari 2013, och UPPREPAR att detta måste ske utan diskriminering och med lika behandling av EU-länder och tredjeländer som gör ett kvantifierat åtagande om begränsning eller minskning av utsläpp ([3]) för den andra åtagandeperioden och att det därvid ska noteras att överföringen och användningen av en andra åtagandeperiod endast gäller för parter som gör ett kvantifierat åtagande om begränsning eller minskning av utsläpp under den andra åtagandeperioden; FÖRESLÅR att man enas om en lösning för överföring och användning av tilldelade utsläppsenheter under den andra åtagandeperioden enligt Kyotoprotokollet där en ambitiös miljöintegritetsnivå upprätthålls och incitamenten för att överträffa målen bevaras samtidigt som fastställandet av ambitiösa mål främjas ([4])."*

Dessutom bör det erinras om att den EU-lagstiftning som styr genomförandet av de nuvarande målen för utsläppsminskning för perioden 2013 – 2020 (det så kallade klimat- och energipaketet) inte tillåter att man använder ett överskott av utsläppsrätter som förts över från den första åtagandeperioden för att uppfylla dessa mål ([5]).

([1]) Bland annat i 7517/12 och 15353/11.
([2]) 15455/12.
([3]) QELRO – Quantified Emission Limitation and Reduction Objectives.
([4]) Idem, punkt 16.
([5]) 3737/08.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009230/12
to the Council
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: EU surplus of emission allowances

As a result of insufficient reduction commitments, there is currently a very large surplus of emission allowances (known as Assigned Amount Units or AAUs) within the UN emissions trading system. The EU surplus is calculated at around 4 billion AAUs. Sweden's surplus is expected to be approximately 85 million AAUs. That is more than Sweden's total reported emissions for an entire year. One AAU is equal to one tonne of carbon dioxide equivalents, so these are very large amounts we are talking about.

Under the current ETS provisions, surplus allowances may be carried over to the next commitment period. Next year sees the beginning of the second commitment period. There is as yet no decision on how to deal with the large surplus. If the current large surplus were to be carried over, this would jeopardise the entire functioning and integrity of the system.

Discussions are being held within the EU on how the EU should deal with its surplus AAUs. In order to optimise the functioning of the next commitment period, Sweden should work to ensure that the EU position is for the EU surplus of AAUs not to be carried over to the next commitment period. If the EU does not carry over its surplus, this is a good opportunity to influence other Annex A countries to do likewise, i.e. to cancel the surplus.

In view of the above, what does the Council think can be done to ensure that the EU does not carry over its surplus AAUs to the next commitment period in the UN emissions trading system?

Reply
(17 December 2012)

The Council has repeatedly stressed, in its conclusions, the general principles that should underpin a solution for the issue of the Assigned Amount Units (AAUs) surplus as outlined by the Honourable Member ([1]).

On 25 October 2012, the Council adopted conclusions concerning preparations for the 18th session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 18) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the 8th session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 8) (Doha, Qatar, 26 November — 7 December 2012) ([2]). In these conclusions, the Council 'REITERATES that the surplus of AAUs from the first commitment period could affect the environmental integrity of the Protocol if it is not addressed appropriately; EMPHASISES the urgency of resolving this issue in view of the adoption of amendments to Annex B and the start of the second commitment period on 1 January 2013, and REITERATES that this must be done in a non-discriminatory manner, treating equally EU and non-EU countries which take on a QELRO ([3]) under the second commitment period, noting that carry-over and use for a second commitment period applies only to parties which take on a QELRO under the second commitment period; PROPOSES to agree a solution on the carry-over and use of AAUs in the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol that maintains an ambitious level of environmental integrity and preserves incentives for overachievement while encouraging the setting of ambitious targets' ([4]).

Furthermore, it should be recalled that EU legislation governing the implementation of its current emission reduction objectives for the period 2013-2020 (the so-called climate and energy package) does not allow for the use of surplus AAUs carried over from the first commitment period to meet these objectives ([5]).

([1]) 7517/12, 15353/11, *inter alia*.
([2]) 15455/12.
([3]) Quantified Emission Limitation and Reduction Objectives.
([4]) Idem, paragraph 16.
([5]) 3737/08.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-009231/12
till kommissionen
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(12 oktober 2012)

Angående: : EU:s överskott av utsläppsrätter

Som en följd av otillräckliga minskningsåtaganden finns det i dagsläget ett mycket stort överskott av utsläppsrätter (s.k. AAU) inom FN:s system för handel med utsläppsrätter. EU:s överskott av utsläppsrätter beräknas landa på fyra miljarder AAU. Sveriges överskott väntas bli ungefär 85 miljoner AAU. Detta är mer än Sveriges totala rapporterade utsläpp för ett helt år. En AAU motsvarar ett ton koldioxidekvivalenter. Så det är mycket stora summor vi talar om.

Inom dagens bestämmelser för utsläppshandelssystemet får överblivna utsläppsrätter föras över till nästa åtagandeperiod. Nästa år börjar den andra åtagandeperioden. Det finns ännu inget beslut om hur det stora överskottet ska hanteras. Skulle dagens stora överskott föras över skulle det äventyra hela funktionen och integriteten i systemet.

Inom EU förs diskussioner om hur EU ska hantera sitt överskott av AAU. För att nästa period ska fungera optimalt borde Sverige verka för att EU:s position blir att EU:s överskott av utsläppsrätter inte ska föras över till nästa åtagandeperiod. Om EU inte överför sitt överskott finns det goda möjligheter att påverka andra Annex 1-länder att göra likadant, dvs. annullera överskottet.

Med anledning av detta vill jag fråga kommissionen huruvida man avser att verka för att EU inte för vidare sitt överskott av AAU till nästa åtagandeperiod inom FN:s handelssystem med utsläppsrätter?

Svar från Connie Hedegaard på kommissionens vägnar
(3 december 2012)

EU har vid upprepade tillfällen förklarat att överskottet av utsläppsenheter (AAU) från första åtagandeperioden skulle kunna påverka protokollets miljöintegritet om det inte hanteras korrekt. I förhandlingarna har kommissionen betonat att denna fråga måste lösas å det snaraste så att ändringarna i bilaga B kan antas, och med tanke på att den andra åtagandeperioden inleds den 1 januari 2013. Kommissionen har också fastställt att detta måste ske på ett icke-diskriminerande sätt, så att EU-länder och länder utanför EU som gör åtaganden om begränsning och minskning av utsläpp under andra åtagandeperioden behandlas lika. Kommissionen noterar att överföring och användning av utsläppsrätter under den andra åtagandeperioden endast är möjlig för parter som gjort åtaganden om begränsning och minskning av utsläpp för andra åtagandeperioden.

Inför den nalkande klimatkonferensen i Doha kommer EU att fortsätta att försöka finna en lösning för överföring och användning av utsläppsenheter i andra åtagandeperioden under Kyotoprotokollet, så att en ambitiös miljöintegritetsnivå och incitamenten för att gå länge än sina åtaganden kan bibehållas. Samtidigt vill man uppmuntra till ambitiösa målsättningar.

I de internationella förhandlingarna ligger nu alla fakta på bordet för en kompromiss om överföring av överskott av utsläppsenheter. När vi försöker finna en balans mellan dessa olika faktorer för att uppnå en kompromiss kommer det att vara viktigt att inte bara se på tillgången, utan också på efterfrågan efter sådana enheter. EU:s utsläpp kommer att utgöra minst 70 % av utsläppen under en andra Kyoto-åtagandeperiod. EU:s lagstiftning tillåter inte användningen av överskott av utsläppsenheter för att uppfylla våra åtaganden under klimat- och energipaketet. Denna lagstiftning ligger till grund för våra utsläppsminskningar under den andra åtagandeperiod och en överföring av utsläppsenheter skulle inte påverka EU:s ambitioner.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009231/12
to the Commission
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: EU surplus of emission allowances

As a result of insufficient reduction commitments, there is currently a very large surplus of emission allowances (known as Assigned Amount Units or AAUs) within the UN emissions trading system. The EU surplus is calculated at around 4 billion AAUs. Sweden's surplus is expected to be approximately 85 million AAUs. That is more than Sweden's total reported emissions for an entire year. One AAU is equal to one tonne of carbon dioxide equivalents, so these are very large amounts we are talking about.

Under the current ETS provisions, surplus allowances may be carried over to the next commitment period. Next year sees the beginning of the second commitment period. There is as yet no decision on how to deal with the large surplus. If the current large surplus were to be carried over, this would jeopardise the entire functioning and integrity of the system.

Discussions are being held within the EU on how the EU should deal with its surplus AAUs. In order to optimise the functioning of the next commitment period, Sweden should work to ensure that the EU position is for the EU surplus of AAUs not to be carried over to the next commitment period. If the EU does not carry over its surplus, this is a good opportunity to influence other Annex A countries to do likewise, i.e. to cancel the surplus.

In view of the above, what does the Commission think can be done to ensure that the EU does not carry over its surplus AAUs to the next commitment period in the UN emissions trading system?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2012)

The EU has on a number of occasions made it clear that the surplus of AAUs from the first commitment period could affect the environmental integrity of the Protocol if it is not addressed appropriately. In the negotiations, it has emphasised the urgency of resolving this issue in view of the adoption of amendments to Annex B and the start of the second commitment period on 1 January 2013, and stated that this must be done in a non-discriminatory manner, treating equally EU and non-EU countries which take on a QELRO under the second commitment period, noting that carry-over and use for a second commitment period applies only to parties which take on a QELRO under the second commitment period.

As we approach the Doha climate conference, the EU will continue to explore a solution on the carry-over and use of AAUs in the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol that maintains an ambitious level of environmental integrity and preserves incentives for overachievement while encouraging the setting of ambitious targets.

In the international negotiations, all the elements are on the table for a compromise on the carry-over of surplus AAUs. As we seek the right balance between these elements to find such compromise, it will be important that we look not only at the supply, but also the demand for such units. EU emissions will represent at least 70% of the emissions under a second Kyoto commitment period. EU legislation does not allow for the use surplus AAUs for compliance with our obligations under the climate and energy package. This legislation forms the basis for our reductions under a second commitment period and a carry over of such units will not affect the EU's ambition.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009232/12
an die Kommission
Thomas Ulmer (PPE)
(12. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Selektion von EU-Tempus-Projekten durch die EACEA

Im Zusammenhang mit der Vergabe von Förderungen durch EACEA Tempus haben sich einige Ungereimtheiten ergeben.

So wurde ein vom Verfasser unterstützter Antrag aufgrund einer administrativen Besonderheit im Vorfeld des Verfahrens abgelehnt. In den Verfahren zuvor war dies jedoch kein Problem.

Die Rechtsgrundlage der Medizinischen Fakultäten in Baden-Württemberg sind hinsichtlich Finanzen, Forschung und Lehre unabhängig von ihren jeweiligen Universitäten. Für die Antragstellung wird jedoch die Unterschrift des Rektors/Vizerektors einer Universität gefordert. Bisher war der besondere rechtliche Status der Medizinischen Fakultät kein Problem. Des Weiteren erscheint es so, dass es bei dem Verfahren im Allgemeinen der nötigen Transparenz fehlt.

1. Was wird getan, um bei der Vergabe der Mittel eine höhere Transparenz zu fördern?

2. Entscheiden Fachkräfte über die Vergabe, die sich mit dem Themengebiet auskennen?

3. Inwieweit kann man eine Sonderregelung für medizinische Fakultäten schaffen bzw. wie wird es diesen ermöglicht, sich an diesem Verfahren auch weiterhin zu beteiligen?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(26. November 2012)

Im Rahmen von Tempus gelten für die Antragsteller die in der jeweiligen Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen veröffentlichten Kriterien in Bezug auf Förderfähigkeit, Ausschluss, Auswahl und Vergabe. Im Leitfaden für die Antragstellung zur fünften Aufforderung zur Einreichung von Vorschlägen im Rahmen von Tempus EACEA 25/2011 wird in Abschnitt 5.3.1 Absatz 2 erläutert, dass Fakultäten/Abteilungen/Zentren, die zwar Teil von Hochschuleinrichtungen sind und doch als unabhängige juristische Personen einsetzt wurden, als nicht förderfähig gelten, sofern sie nicht eine spezifische projektbezogene, vom Rektor/Präsidenten der Hochschulreinrichtung unterzeichnete Erklärung vorlegen, wonach sie ermächtigt sind, für die gesamte Einrichtung aufzutreten. Diese Bestimmung wurde in der fünften Aufforderung untermauert, um zu gewährleisten, dass Vorschläge von der Hochschuleinrichtung insgesamt und nicht nur von einzelnen Fakultäten eingereicht werden.

Ein Evaluierungsausschuss, dem auch Vertreter der Exekutivagentur und der Europäischen Kommission angehören, überwacht das gesamte Bewertungsverfahren, um die Gleichbehandlung aller Anträge sowie eine faire und transparente Anwendung der veröffentlichten Kriterien sicherzustellen. Die Ergebnisse des Auswahlverfahrens werden auf der Website der Agentur veröffentlicht.

Die medizinischen Fakultäten in Baden-Württemberg können unter den in der Aufforderung beschriebenen Bedingungen an den Tempus-Vorhaben teilnehmen. Generell bedeutet dies, dass der Antrag von derjenigen Universität eingereicht werden muss, zu der die medizinische Fakultät gehört. Alternativ kann der Rechtsvertreter der Universität die vorstehend angeführte spezifische projektbezogene Erklärung abgeben. Der Sonderstatus der medizinischen Fakultäten in Baden-Württemberg wird nicht infrage gestellt, jedoch gelten für alle Antragsteller dieselben formalen Kriterien.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009232/12
to the Commission
Thomas Ulmer (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Selection of EU Tempus projects by the EACEA

There has been a certain amount of inconsistency in the allocation of grants by EACEA Tempus.

For example, due to an unusual administrative situation, one application was rejected at an early stage of the procedure, even though this had not been a problem before.

In terms of finances, research and teaching, medical faculties in Baden-Württemberg operate on a separate legal basis to their universities. However, grant applications by universities have to be signed by the Chancellor/Vice Chancellor. In the past, the special legal status of medical faculties was not a problem. At present there seems to be a lack of transparency in the relevant procedures.

1. What is being done to ensure greater transparency in allocating funding?

2. Are funding decisions being taken by people who know about the subject?

3. Could special arrangements be made for medical faculties, or is there some other way of ensuring that they can continue to participate?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

Tempus applicants must comply with the eligibility, exclusion, selection and award criteria published in the Call for Proposals for which they are applying. The application guidelines of the fifth Tempus Call for Proposals EACEA 25/2011, Section 5.3.1 (2), stipulate that 'Faculties/Departments/Centres which are part of higher education institutions but established as autonomous legal entities, are considered ineligible, unless they can provide a specific project-related statement signed by the Rector/President of the higher education institution, authorising them to commit the whole institution.' This provision has been reinforced in the fifth Call to ensure that higher education institutions are committed as a whole, not only at the level of individual faculties.

An Evaluation Committee, including representatives from the Executive Agency and the European Commission, supervises the overall assessment procedure in order to guarantee the equal treatment of all applications and to ensure a fair and transparent application of the published criteria. The results of the selection procedure are published on the Agency's website.

Medical faculties in Baden-Württemberg can participate in Tempus projects under the conditions specified in the call. As a rule, this means that the application has to be submitted by the university to which the medical faculty belongs. Alternatively, the legal representative of the university may issue the specific project-related statement mentioned above. The specific status of medical faculties operating in Baden-Württemberg is not put into question, but the same formal criteria apply to all applicants.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-009233/12
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(12. oktober 2012)

Om: Udsivning af forurenet vand fra gamle lossepladser

I den danske presse har der været historier om, at der fra hundredvis af gamle lossepladser siver kemikalier ud i bl.a. danske vandløb — og at der ikke gøres nok for at forhindre det.

Problemet i Danmark er, at ansvaret for forurenet jord fra gamle lossepladser falder under én myndighed, regionerne, mens vandmiljøet primært falder under kommunerne. Det fører til, at det er svært at placere ansvaret for udsivning fra forurenet jord ud i vandløbene.

1. Hvad er Kommissionens holdning til forlydenderne om Danmarks manglende handling på området?

2. Har Danmark i Kommissionens øjne implementeret vandrammedirektivet tilfredsstillende?

3. Er Kommissionen bekendt med andre lande i en lignende situation? Og i så fald hvilke?

4. Har Kommissionen planer om yderligere tiltag på området? Hvis ja, hvilke og hvornår?

5. Hvordan vurderer Kommissionen generelt at implementeringen af vandrammedirektivet forløber i Medlemslandene?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Janez Potočnik
(3. december 2012)

Kommissionen er ikke orienteret om de hændelser, der beskrives i spørgsmålet, og kan følgelig ikke tage stilling hertil. Kommissionen har for nylig foretaget en vurdering af Danmarks gennemførelse af direktiv 2000/60/EF om fastlæggelse af en ramme for Fællesskabets vandpolitiske foranstaltninger ([1]) (vandrammedirektivet), herunder styring, kontrol, evaluering og forvaltning af kemisk forurening og identifikation af foranstaltninger. Konklusionerne er offentliggjort i den tredje rapport om gennemførelse af vandrammedirektivet ([2]), som indeholder individuelle vurderinger af medlemsstaterne såvel som et samlet europæisk overblik over medlemsstaternes resultater. Rapporten er en del af den »Plan for at beskytte Europas vandressourcer«, som Kommissionen netop har offentliggjort, og som indeholder forslag til en videre indsats for at sikre, at Europas vandressourcer beskyttes bedre.

([1]) EUT L 327 af 22.12.2000.
([2]) KOM(2012) 670 endelig.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009233/12
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: Leaching of contaminated water from former rubbish dumps

According to articles in the Danish press, chemicals from hundreds of former rubbish dumps are leaching into Danish watercourses etc. — and not enough is being done to prevent it.

The problem in Denmark is that the responsibility for contaminated soil from former rubbish dumps lies with one authority, the regions, while the aquatic environment comes primarily under the municipal authorities. This makes it difficult to assign the responsibility for the migration of contaminated soil into watercourses.

1. What is the Commission's stance on the reports of Denmark's lack of action in this field?

2. In the Commission's opinion, has Denmark implemented the Water Framework Directive satisfactorily?

3. Is the Commission aware of any other countries that are in a similar situation? If so, which ones?

4. Is the Commission planning any further initiatives in this field? If so, which and when?

5. What is the Commission's general view of how implementation of the Water Framework Directive is progressing in the Member States?

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

The Commission has not been informed about the events described in the question and can therefore not take a stance on them. The Commission has recently undertaken an assessment of the Danish implementation of Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy ([1]) (Water Framework Directive), including aspects related to governance, monitoring, assessment and management of chemical pollution and identification of measures. The conclusions are published in the 3rd implementation report on the Water Framework Directive ([2]), which includes Member State specific assessments, as well as a European overview of findings covering Member States performances. This report is part of the 'Blueprint to safeguard Europe's Water Resources' recently published by the Commission which also includes proposals for further action to ensure the Europe's water resources are better protected.

([1]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([2]) COM(2012)670 final.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009234/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(12 października 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Kuba: sprawa Aimé Cabrales

Kubańska policja aresztowała Aimé Cabrales w niedzielę 23 września 2012 i zwolniła ją z aresztu dwa dni później, po tym, jak grupa kilkunastu aktywistów zebrała się przed komisariatem policji w hawańskiej dzielnicy Zanja. Aimé Cabrales jest aktywistką organizacji Cuba Independiente y Democrática (CID), której zadaniem jest zwracanie uwagi na sprawy więźniów politycznych. W przeszłości była wielokrotnie aresztowana i przesłuchiwana przez policję w odwecie za jej działalność obywatelską. Przyczyną jej ostatniego bezprawnego aresztowania była chęć powstrzymania jej od wzięcia udziału w uroczystościach z okazji święta Matki Bożej Miłosierdzia, patronki więźniów, które odbywają się 24 września.

1. Czy ESDZ wie o sprawie Aimé Cabrales?

2. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel mogłaby poruszyć tę sprawę w rozmowie z przedstawicielami kubańskiego rządu w Brukseli (tj. z ambasador Mirthą M. Hormillą Castro i Josém Oriolem Marrero Martinezem, doradcą do spraw europejskich)?

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

1. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wie o sprawie Aimé Cabrales.

2. Wzrastająca liczba aresztowań tymczasowych napawa Unię Europejską niepokojem; kwestia ta była i będzie omawiana z władzami kubańskimi, zarówno w Hawanie, jak i w Brukseli.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009234/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: the case of Aimé Cabrales

Aimé Cabrales was detained on Sunday, 23 September 2012 and released by Cuban police two days later after a dozen activists congregated outside the police station in Zanja, Havana. Aimé Cabrales is an activist from the organisation Cuba Independiente y Democrática (CID), whose role is to draw attention to political prisoners' cases. In the past, she has been subjected to numerous arrests, reprisals for her civic activities and police interrogations. One reason for her latest unlawful detention was to prevent her from attending the ceremonies of the Feast of Our Lady of Mercy, the patron of prisoners, which is held on 24 September.

1. Is the EEAS aware of the case of Aimé Cabrales?

2. Could the Vice-President/High Representative take up her case with representatives of the Cuban Government based in Brussels (ie, Ambassador Mirtha M. Hormilla Castro and José Oriol Marrero Martinez, Counsellor for European Affairs).

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

1. The HR/VP is aware of the case of Aimé Cabrales.

2. The question of the upsurge of temporary arrests is a source of concern for the EU and this matter has been, and will continue to be raised, with the Cuban authorities both in Havana and in Brussels.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009235/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(12 października 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Kuba: Agresja wobec Las Damas de Blanco przy uroczystościach z okazji święta Matki Bożej Miłosierdzia

Ostatnio ujawnione nagranie wideo ukazuje brutalną agresję wobec Las Damas de Blanco (Kobiet w Bieli). Wideo pokazuje, jak agenci departamentu bezpieczeństwa państwa blokują wyjście z siedziby Las Damas de Blanco, by członkinie tej organizacji nie mogły uczestniczyć w uroczystościach z okazji święta Matki Bożej Miłosierdzia, patronki uwięzionych, które jest obchodzone dnia 24 września.

1. Czy ESDZ wie o tym zdarzeniu?

2. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel może wydać oświadczenie skierowane do władz kubańskich na temat nieustających represji wobec Las Damas de Blanco? Byłby to zdecydowany sygnał, że Unia Europejska ściśle śledzi sytuację w zakresie praw człowieka na Kubie i uważa takie traktowanie Las Damas de Blanco za niedopuszczalne.

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

1. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wie o powtarzających się aktach prześladowania wymierzonych przeciwko organizacji Las Damas de Blanco.

2. W kontaktach na najwyższym szczeblu z władzami kubańskimi Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wyraziła swoje zaniepokojenie ograniczaniem wolności słowa i nadal będzie przedstawiać zastrzeżenia w tym zakresie, zwłaszcza w obliczu wzmożonego stosowania aresztów tymczasowych względem usposobionych pokojowo członków opozycji, w tym organizacji Las Damas de Blanco.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009235/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: Aggression against Las Damas de Blanco on the occasion of the Feast of Our Lady of Mercy

A video recording has recently been released which shows brutal aggression against Las Damas de Blanco (Ladies in White). The video shows agents of the Department of State Security blocking the exit of the Las Damas de Blanco headquarters in order to prevent them from taking part in the ceremonies associated with the Feast of Our Lady of Mercy, the patron of prisoners, which is held on 24 September.

1. Is the EEAS aware of this?

2. Could the Vice-President/High Representative issue a statement to the Cuban authorities concerning the ongoing repression of Las Damas de Blanco? This would send a strong signal that the European Union is closely monitoring the human rights situation in Cuba and finds the mistreatment of Las Damas de Blanco unacceptable.

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

1. The HR/VP is aware of repeated acts of harassment against the Damas de Blanco.

2. The HR/VP has raised, and will continue to raise with the Cuban authorities, at the highest level, its concern with restrictions of freedom of expression, notably through the upsurge of temporary arrests of peaceful opposition members, including the Damas de Blanco.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009236/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(12 października 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Kuba: Alan Gross uwięziony za „dostarczanie wyrafinowanych telefonów satelitarnych kubańskim Żydom w imieniu rządu Stanów Zjednoczonych"

Alan Gross został aresztowany w dniu 3 grudnia 2009 r. w Hawanie i skazany na 15 lat więzienia pod zarzutem naruszania „integralności" bezpieczeństwa narodowego Kuby poprzez „dostarczanie wyrafinowanych telefonów satelitarnych kubańskim Żydom w imieniu rządu Stanów Zjednoczonych". Mieszkające w Stanach Zjednoczonych jego matka i jedna z jego córek chorują na raka. Jego żona obawia się, że Alan Gross „nie przeżyje tej gehenny".

1. Czy ESDZ wie o sprawie Alana Grossa?

2. Mając na uwadze, że uwięzienie go jest rażącym naruszeniem prawa międzynarodowego, czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel mogłaby podjąć tę kwestię w rozmowie z przedstawicielami rządu Kuby?

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

1. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wie o przypadku pana A. Grossa.

2. Sprawa pana A. Grossa jest kwestią dwustronną pomiędzy Kubą i Stanami Zjednoczonymi. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca poruszyła sprawę dotyczącą pana A. Grossa w rozmowach z kubańskimi władzami w odniesieniu do kwestii humanitarnych.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009236/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: Alan Gross in prison for 'delivering sophisticated satellite phones to Cuban Jews on behalf of the US Government'

Alan Gross was arrested on 3 December 2009 in Havana and sentenced to 15 years in prison on charges of undermining the 'integrity' of Cuba's national security by 'delivering sophisticated satellite phones to Cuban Jews on behalf of the US Government'. His mother and one of his daughters are battling cancer in the United States. His wife fears that 'he is not going to survive this terrible ordeal'.

1. Is the EEAS aware of the case of Alan Gross?

2. Bearing in mind that his imprisonment is a blatant violation of international law, could the Vice-President/High Representative take up his case with representatives of the Cuban Government?

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

1. The HR/VP is aware of the case of A. Gross.

2. The case of A. Gross is a bilateral matter between Cuba and the US. The HR/VP has raised it with the Cuban authorities on humanitarian grounds.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009237/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(12 października 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Kuba: Bezprawne aresztowanie dysydentki i blogerki Yoani Sanchez

Yoani Sanchez została aresztowana 6 października 2012 w mieście Bayamo razem z mężem i kolegą, który również prowadził blog, Reinaldem Escobarem, oraz wieloma innymi anty-rządowymi opozycjonistami. Sanchez udała się do Bayamo, aby opisać na blogu proces Angela Carromero, członka hiszpańskiej konserwatywnej Partii Ludowej, który podczas wizyty na wyspie w lipcu 2012 r. w regionie Bayamo rozbił wypożyczony samochód. Kubańscy urzędnicy oskarżyli go o jazdę z nadmierną prędkością i spowodowanie śmierci dysydenta Oswalda Payi i innego kubańskiego aktywisty, którzy znajdowali się w aucie. Carromerowi grozi wyrok 10 lat pozbawienia wolności.

W piątek rano prorządowy blog podał informację, że Sanchez pojechała do Bayamo, „wszcząć prowokację i rozpocząć medialne show, aby zakłócić prawidłowy przebieg procesu". Po spędzeniu wielu godzin w areszcie Sanchez została zwolniona, ale miejsce pobytu innych aresztowanych nadal pozostaje nieznane. W niedawno sporządzonym raporcie Kubańska Komisja Praw Człowieka i Pojednania Narodowego odnotowała, że w 2010 r. odnotowano na Kubie 2074 „samowolne zatrzymania", jak miało to miejsce w przypadku Sanchez. W okresie od stycznia do września 2012 r. liczba ta wzrosła do 5105.

1. Czy ESDZ wie o ostatnich represjach wobec Yoani Sanchez?

2. Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel, mając na uwadze walkę Sanchez o wolność słowa, mogłaby poruszyć jej sprawę z przedstawicielami kubańskiego rządu?

3. Jakie jest stanowisko ESDZ w sprawie przywołanego powyżej raportu?

4. Czy ESDZ poinformowała kubański reżim o swoim zaniepokojeniu wzrostem liczby samowolnych zatrzymań?

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

1. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wie o zatrzymaniu Yoani Sanchez w dniu 4 października i zwolnieniu jej w dniu 5 października.

2. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca podnosiła w rozmowach z władzami kubańskimi w Hawanie i w Brukseli kwestię aresztu tymczasowego zastosowanego względem Yoani Sanchez.

3. Delegacja UE w Hawanie jest w kontakcie z Kubańską Komisją Praw Człowieka i Pojednania Narodowego i zapoznała się z przywołanym raportem.

4. Tak, w rozmowach z władzami kubańskimi w Hawanie i w Brukseli Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wyraziła swoje zaniepokojenie w związku ze wzmożonym stosowaniem aresztów tymczasowych.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009237/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Cuba: The unlawful detention of dissident blogger Yoani Sanchez

Yoani Sanchez was arrested along with her husband and fellow blogger, Reinaldo Escobar, and a number of other anti-government figures in the city of Bayamo on 6 October 2012. Sanchez had travelled to Bayamo to cover the trial of Angel Carromero, a member of Spain's conservative Popular Party who crashed his rental car in the Bayamo area while visiting the island in July 2012. Cuban officials had accused him of speeding and causing the deaths of dissident Oswaldo Paya and another Cuban activist, who were in the car. Carromero is facing a sentence of up to 10 years in prison.

Early Friday, a pro-government blog asserted that Sanchez had travelled to Bayamo 'to start a provocation and a media show to harm the proper conduct of the trial'. After several hours of detention, Sanchev was released but the whereabouts of the other detainees is still unknown. In a recent report, the Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation noted 2 074 'arbitrary detentions' like Sanchez's were reported in Cuba in 2010. That number rose to 5 105 between January and September of 2012.

1. Is the EEAS aware of the most recent repressions against Yoani Sanchez?

2. Bearing in mind her struggle for freedom of speech, could the Vice-President/High Representative take up her case with representatives of the Cuban Government?

3. What is the EEAS position on the report cited above?

4. Has the EEAS expressed its concerns to the regime in Cuba about the rise of arbitrary detentions?

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

1. The HR/VP is aware that Y. Sanchez was detained on 4 October and released on 5 October.

2. The HR/VP raised the question of the temporary arrest of Y. Sanchez with the Cuban authorities in Havana and in Brussels.

3. The EU Delegation in Havana is in contact with the Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation and took note of this report.

4. Yes, the HR/VP has expressed its concern to the Cuban authorities in Havana and in Brussels on the upsurge of temporary arrests.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-009238/12
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(12 października 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Rosja zmusza Agencję Stanów Zjednoczonych na rzecz Rozwoju Międzynarodowego (USAID) do zakończenia działalności na swoim terytorium

Kreml nakazał Agencji Stanów Zjednoczonych na rzecz Rozwoju Międzynarodowego (USAID) zaprzestanie działalności w Rosji. Może to poważnie zaszkodzić wielu organizacjom pozarządowym i stowarzyszeniom obrony praw człowieka, które zawdzięczały USAID znaczną część swojego finansowania. 19 września 2012 rosyjskie ministerstwo spraw zagranicznych oskarżyło USAID o próby „wywarcia wpływu na procesy polityczne, w tym na wybory powszechne różnego rodzaju oraz na instytucje społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, poprzez podział dotacji".

1. Jaka jest odpowiedź UE na taki ruch ze strony rosyjskich władz?

2. W jaki sposób wykorzystuje się środki UE na wspieranie organizacji pozarządowych i stowarzyszeń obrony praw człowieka w Rosji?

3. Czy UE może wypełnić powstałą lukę i podjąć starania w celu wsparcia działań organizacji pozarządowych po wydaniu przez Rosję bezpodstawnej decyzji nakazującej USAID zakończenie działalności?

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

Agencja USAID przez długi czas prowadziła skuteczną działalność w Rosji. Decyzja władz rosyjskich o zamknięciu biura USAID w Moskwie oznacza przerwanie kilku ważnych programów, w tym w dziedzinie społecznej oraz zdrowia, a także związanych ze społeczeństwem obywatelskim. Unia Europejska wyraziła ubolewanie z tego powodu.

Unii Europejskiej bardzo zależy na tym, aby Rosja była państwem stabilnym, dobrze prosperującym i demokratycznym. Wspieranie społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, które odgrywa rolę w modernizacji Rosji, jest kluczowe dla osiągnięcia tego celu. Dotychczas realizacja programów finansowanych przez UE w Rosji przebiegała bez zakłóceń.

Unia Europejska wspiera organizacje pozarządowe w ramach Europejskiego Instrumentu na rzecz Wspierania Demokracji i Praw Człowieka. Budżet tego instrumentu przeznaczony na te działania został podwojony i wynosi obecnie 4 mln EUR, co umożliwi udzielenie większej pomocy organizacjom działającym na rzecz społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, także w Federacji Rosyjskiej.

Zamknięcie USAID należy jednak rozpatrywać w szerszym kontekście, z uwzględnieniem pakietu ustawodawczego obejmującego ustawę nadającą tej organizacji pozarządowej status „zagranicznego agenta" oraz ustawę o zdradzie stanu. Taki rozwój sytuacji prowadzi do ograniczenia kontaktowania się organizacji pozarządowych z zagranicznymi partnerami oraz utrudnia im otrzymanie funduszy z zagranicy. Nie jest wykluczone, że może to mieć wpływ na udzielenie pomocy finansowej ze strony UE dla grup działaczy obywatelskich w Rosji. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca Catherine Ashton wyraziła obawy związane z tymi zabiegami, które, jak zauważa, ograniczają aktywne funkcjonowanie społeczeństwa obywatelskiego oraz prowadzą do wzmożonego zastraszania obywateli Rosji. Podkreśliła, że fala tego typu działań ustawodawczych napawa Unię Europejską coraz większym niepokojem.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009238/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Russia expels the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

The Kremlin has ordered the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to cease its operations in Russia. This may seriously impair many non-governmental organisations and human rights groups that have relied on USAID for a significant part of their funding. On 19 September 2012, the Russian Foreign Ministry accused USAID of seeking to 'influence political processes, including elections of various types, and institutions of civil society through the distribution of grants.'

1. What is the EU's response to this move by the Russian authorities?

2. How is EU funding used to support non-governmental organisations and human rights groups in Russia?

3. Can the EU fill the void and endeavour to foster the work of NGOs following this groundless decision to expel USAID from Russia?

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

USAID has been doing useful work in Russia over a long period of time. The Russian decision to close the USAID ofice in Moscow means that several important programmes, including in the social and health fields as well as on civil society issues, will now be discontinued. The EU has expressed regret at this development.

The EU has a strong interest in a stable, prosperous and democratic Russia. Supporting civil society — which contributes to the modernisation of Russia — is a key element in this interest. So far, no EU-funded programmes in Russia have been impeded by the government.

The EU funds non-governmental organisations via the EIDHR. The EIDHR budget for these activities has now been doubled to EUR 4 Million which will entail more outreach to civil society organisations also in the Russian Federation.

The closure of the USAID has to be seen in a broader context, however, together with the legislative package that includes the NGO 'foreign agent' law and the law on treason. These developments aim at restricting NGOs interaction with foreign partners and make it more difficult for them to receive foreign funding. It is not excluded that this could have an effect on EU's financial assistance to civil groups in Russia. HR/VP Ashton expressed concern with these developments, which, she noted, limit the space for vibrant civil society and increase intimidation in Russia. She stressed that an upsurge of these legislative moves was of growing concern to the European Union.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-009239/12
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE)
(2012. október 12.)

Tárgy: Az Európai Unió tőkepiaci válságáról

Szélsőségesen széttöredezetté vált az eurózóna finanszírozási piaca, aminek a legfontosabb oka az eurózóna perifériájáról a központi országok felé megindult tőkemenekítés. Minthogy az EKB beavatkozásai ellenére is a nagy bankok fokozatosan mérséklik tevékenységüket Közép- és Kelet-Európában – éket verve az erős központ és a bajban lévő periféria közé –, csökkentik a hitel-betét arányt és leányaik pénzügyi támogatását, ezért számos Közép-Európai államban a hitelezés stagnálására vagy apadására lehet számítani, ami roppant kilátástalan helyzetbe sodorhatja a vállalkozásokat. Amennyiben nem sikerül az eurózóna tőkepiaci válságára megfelelő megoldást találni, az európai bankok mérlegfőösszege jövő év végéig 2800 milliárd dollárral, vagyis 7%-kal fog csökkenni – figyelmeztetett globális pénzügyi stabilitási jelentésében a Nemzetközi Valutaalap, amely szerint pótlólagos intézkedésekkel ez a visszaesés 6%-ra csökkenthető.

A jelentésben felvázolt kedvezőtlenebb, nem megfelelő intézkedések által előidézett esetben pedig ez a mérlegzsugorodás elérheti a 4,5 ezer milliárd dollárt is, ami a periférián a hitelkínálat akár 18 százalékos szűkülését is eredményezheti. Ilyen az európai válságkezelő alapok felhatalmazása arra, hogy bankokat is feltőkésítsenek. Az európai periféria országaiban a csökkenés alapesetben hozzávetőleg 10% körüli lehet.

1. Nem gondolja-e a Bizottság, hogy az uniós késlekedés a mérlegfőösszeg és egyúttal a tőkeáttétel csökkenése kedvezőtlenül hathat a növekedésre, negatívan hathat a beruházásokra, és megemelheti az amúgy is rendkívül magas munkanélküliségi rátát?

2. Mi a Bizottság véleménye egy nemzeti szintű növekedésbarát pénzügyi konszolidációról, ami a külső egyensúlytalanságok csökkentését, növekedést ösztönző strukturális reformokat, valamint a bankrendszerek megtisztításának befejezését célozza, melyhez az anyagi támogatás uniós szintű – az EKB keretein belül biztosított – források jelentenék?

3. Milyen pótlólagos intézkedéseket fog javasolni a Bizottság, s ezeket milyen időtávon belül szeretné megvalósítani?

Olli Rehn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. január 15.)

Az Európai Bankhatóság (EBH) 2012. október 3-án tette közzé zárójelentését az általa koordinált bankfeltőkésítésről ([1]). Jelentésében az EBH azt állapította meg, hogy a bankok jelentős előrelépést tettek tőkehelyzetük javítása és általában véve az európai bankrendszer ellenálló képességének megerősítése terén. A feltőkésítési folyamatnak a reálgazdasági hatásaival kapcsolatban az EBH arra a következtetésre jutott, hogy a feltőkésítésnek összességében nem volt negatív hatása. A Bizottság úgy véli, hogy a bankrendszer megtisztítása, a pénzügyi szektor töredezésének megfordítása és a bankunió irányába mutató meghatározó lépések megtétele – többek között az egységes szanálási mechanizmus és betétgaranciák megteremtése révén – alapvető fontosságúak a mostani válság kezelése és a fenntartható növekedéshez és munkahelyteremtéshez való visszatérés szempontjából.

A 2012. november 28-án elfogadott, a 2013. évi éves növekedési jelentésben foglaltak szerint a válságból való kilábalás és a fenntartható növekedéshez és munkahelyteremtéshez való visszatérés szempontjából a Bizottság központi jelentőséget tulajdonít a növekedésbarát konszolidációnak és a strukturális reformok következetes végrehajtásának. Ugyanezen a napon a Bizottság elfogadta „A valódi, szoros, gazdasági és monetáris unió tervezetét”, amely a teljes körű bankunió megvalósítása irányába mutató lépéseket is tartalmazza, benne többek között az egységes felügyeleti mechanizmus gyors elfogadásával, ezt követően pedig az egységes szanálási mechanizmus felállításával.

([1]) http://www.eba.europa.eu/capitalexercise/EU-Capital-Exercise-Results.aspx.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009239/12
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE)
(12 October 2012)

Subject: EU capital market crisis

The euro area financing market has completely shattered, primarily because of capital flight from the margins of the euro area to countries in the centre. Since, in spite of ECB intervention, the large banks are gradually restricting their activities in central and eastern Europe, driving a wedge between the strong centre and the struggling outer regions. They are also reducing the loan-to-deposit ratio and financial support to their affiliates, so that we can expect a stagnation or decrease in lending in many Central European countries, which will put businesses in a completely hopeless situation. If no solution is found to the capital market crisis in the euro area, the IMF has warned in its report on global financial stability that the European banks' balance sheet total will fall by 2 800 billion dollars — or 7% — by the end of next year (which might be reduced to 6% if additional provisions are enforced).

However, in the scenario outlined in the report — resulting from inappropriate, disadvantageous measures — the figure might be as high as 4.5 thousand billion dollars, which would cause a credit squeeze of up to 18% in outlying areas. This is how the European crisis management fund is authorised to recapitalise banks. The basic reduction in countries on the outskirts of Europe would be around 10%.

1. Does the Commission not think that procrastination on the part of the EU and the reduction in the balance sheet total and in leverage will have a negative impact on growth and investments and cause an increase in the unemployment rate, which is already extremely high?

2. What would the Commission's opinion be of national-level, growth-friendly financial consolidation aimed at reducing external imbalances, the implementation of structural reforms to promote growth, and completing the clean-up of the banking system, the financial support for which would be EU-level funds guaranteed by the ECB?

3. What additional measures will the Commission propose, and what timescale will it put forward for their implementation?

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

The European Banking Authority (EBA) on 3 October 2012 published the final report of its recapitalisation exercise ([1]). It concluded that European banks have made significant progress in boosting their capital positions and in strengthening the overall resilience of the European banking system. As far as the results of this exercise on lending to the real economy, it is concluded that there has been no overall negative impact. The Commission considers cleaning up the banking system, reversing the fragmentation of the financial sector and making decisive steps towards a banking union, including a single resolution mechanism and deposit guarantees, as essential for dealing with the current crisis and returning to sustainable growth and jobs.

The Commission considers growth friendly consolidation and the ambitious implementation of structural reforms central to exit the crisis and return to sustainable growth and jobs, as laid out in the Commission's 2013 Annual Growth Survey, adopted on 28 November 2012. On the same day, the Commission also adopted the Blueprint for a Deep and Genuine Economic and Monetary Union, which includes a stepwise approach for moving towards a full banking union, i.a. by rapid adoption of the Single Supervisory Mechanism and the subsequent setting up of a Single Resolution Mechanism.

([1]) http://www.eba.europa.eu/capitalexercise/EU-Capital-Exercise-Results.aspx.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-009240/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Παραβίαση θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων

Προ ολίγων ημερών, ο υπουργός Εσωτερικών της Ελλάδας, Ευριπίδης Στυλιανίδης, ανταποκρινόμενος σε κοινοβουλευτική ερώτηση βουλευτή του ακροδεξιού κόμματος «Χρυσή Αυγή», με την οποία ζητούσε στοιχεία των αλλοδαπών παιδιών που πηγαίνουν σε βρεφονηπιακούς σταθμούς, απέστειλε αίτημα στους Δήμους να καταθέσουν στατιστικά στοιχεία επί αυτού του ζητήματος.

Με βάση τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

Κατά τη γνώμη της η ιθαγένεια αποτελεί κριτήριο επιλογής για τους βρεφονηπιακούς σταθμούς;

Η πράξη αυτή συνιστά παραβίαση των Συνθηκών;

Η ενέργεια αυτή συνιστά παραβίαση των προσωπικών δεδομένων;

Απάντηση της κας Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Όσον αφορά τους πολίτες της ΕΕ, θα πρέπει να αναφερθεί ότι, σύμφωνα με την αρχή της μη εισαγωγής διακρίσεων λόγω ιθαγένειας δυνάμει του δικαίου της ΕΕ, όλοι οι πολίτες της Ένωσης που διαμένουν σε άλλο κράτος μέλος πλην του δικού τους δικαιούνται ίσης μεταχείρισης με τους υπηκόους του εν λόγω κράτους μέλους στο πλαίσιο της Συνθήκης. Κατά συνέπεια, τα τέκνα τους έχουν το δικαίωμα να πηγαίνουν σε βρεφονηπιακούς σταθμούς υπό τις ίδιες συνθήκες με τους υπηκόους του κράτους μέλους υποδοχής.

Όσον αφορά το δικαίωμα προστασίας προσωπικών δεδομένων, όπως αναγνωρίζονται δυνάμει του άρθρου 16 της ΣΛΕΕ, τονίζουμε ιδίως τη γενική αρχή του «οριοθετημένου σκοπού» βάσει του άρθρου 6 της οδηγίας 95/46 ([1]). Βάσει της αρχής αυτής, τα κράτη μέλη προβλέπουν ότι τα δεδομένα προσωπικού χαρακτήρα πρέπει «να υφίστανται σύννομη και θεμιτή επεξεργασία», … «να συλλέγονται για καθορισμένους, σαφείς και νόμιμους σκοπούς και η μεταγενέστερη επεξεργασία τους να συμβιβάζεται με τους σκοπούς αυτούς».

Η παρακολούθηση και η επιβολή της προστασίας προσωπικών δεδομένων στα κράτη μέλη υπάγονται στην αρμοδιότητα των εθνικών αρχών, ειδικότερα των εποπτικών αρχών για την προστασία των δεδομένων και των εθνικών δικαστηρίων, που είναι αρμόδιες να ελέγχουν εάν, σε συγκεκριμένη περίπτωση, η επεξεργασία των δεδομένων τηρεί τον εθνικό νόμο περί προστασίας των δεδομένων κατ' εφαρμογή της οδηγίας 95/46/ΕΚ. Για τους λόγους αυτούς, θα πρέπει να απευθυνθείτε στην ελληνική υπηρεσία προστασίας δεδομένων.

Οι αρμοδιότητες της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής είναι περιορισμένες σε ό,τι αφορά την επιβολή των εθνικών κανονισμών περί προστασίας των δεδομένων από τις εθνικές αρχές — η Επιτροπή είναι αρμόδια να ελέγχει εάν τα κράτη μέλη εφαρμόζουν ορθά το δίκαιο της ΕΕ, εάν έχουν θεσπιστεί τα αναγκαία μέτρα σε εθνικό επίπεδο για την εφαρμογή της οδηγίας 95/46/ΕΚ για την προστασία των δεδομένων και, ενδεχομένως, κάνει χρήση των εξουσιών της ως θεματοφύλακας των Συνθηκών.

([1]) Οδηγία 95/46/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου της 24ης Οκτωβρίου 1995 για την προστασία των φυσικών προσώπων έναντι της επεξεργασίας δεδομένων προσωπικού χαρακτήρα και για την ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία των δεδομένων αυτών.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009240/12
to the Commission
Maria Eleni Koppa (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Violation of fundamental rights

A few days ago, the Greek Minister of the Interior, Evripidis Stylianidis, acting in response to a parliamentary question tabled by a Member of far right 'Golden Dawn' party who had asked for data about foreign children attending nurseries, issued a request to municipalities to submit statistics on this issue.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Does it consider that nationality is a selection criterion for nurseries?

Does this act constitute a violation of the Treaties?

Does this act constitute a violation of the rules on personal data protection?

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

As regards EU citizens, it should be noted that, in line with the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of nationality under EC law, all Union citizens residing in another Member State than their own are entitled to equal treatment with the nationals of that Member States within the scope of the Treaty. Consequently, their children have the right to attend nurseries under the same conditions as nationals of the host Member State.

Regarding the right to the protection of personal data as recognised under Art. 16 TFUE, we point out in particular the general 'purpose limitation' principle under Art. 6 of Directive 95/46 ([1]). Pursuant to this principle, Member States shall provide that personal data must be 'processed fairly and lawfully',… 'collected for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes and not further processed in a way incompatible with those purposes'.

The supervision and enforcement of data protection in the Member States falls under the competence of national authorities, in particular the data protection supervisory authorities and national courts, which are competent to verify if in a specific case, the processing activity respects national data protection law implementing Directive 95/46/EC. For these reasons, the authority that ought to be contacted is the Greek Data Protection Authority.

The competences of the European Commission are limited as regards the enforcement of national data protection rules by national authorities — it is competent to verify if EC law is properly implemented by Member States, if the necessary measures have been adopted at national level to implement the Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC and, if appropriate, use its powers as guardian of the Treaties.

([1]) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009241/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Estrategia de investigación sobre los efectos de los productos transgénicos a largo plazo

El reciente estudio elaborado por la Universidad de Caen, Séralini y otros (2012) centrado en los efectos sobre la salud de ratas alimentadas con maíz transgénico durante dos años, concretamente con el modelo NK603 desarrollado por Monsanto, muestra evidencias claras de que existe una mayor incidencia de diversos tipos de cáncer en los animales alimentados con maíz transgénico.

Esto ha impulsado el debate sobre los transgénicos en la opinión pública y ha profundizado las exigencias de numerosas asociaciones, ONG y ciudadanos para que las autoridades competentes revisen la normativa actual sobre los alimentos transgénicos para avanzar hacia su prohibición.

Más allá de las diferentes evaluaciones nacionales sobre la seguridad del producto, la Comisión Europea encargó un estudio sobre la seguridad del maíz NK603 a la Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria (EFSA). Así, el 27 de Mayo de 2009, EFSA, basando el estudio en la alimentación de ratas por un periodo de sólo 90 días, publicó su evaluación de la toxicología del producto con una opinión favorable.

El cultivo y la alimentación con este tipo de maíz ha sido autorizado en la Unión Europea a través de las Decisiones de la Comisión del 19 de Julio de 2004 y del 3 de Marzo de 2005 y, en el caso concreto de España, varias son las comunidades autónomas que han autorizado el cultivo de este, como por ejemplo, la Comunidad Autónoma de Aragón, en donde la Comisión Interdepartamental de Organismos Modificados Genéticamente del Gobierno de la Comunidad autorizó, por Resolución firmada el 11 de marzo de 2011, el cultivo de este maíz transgénico y del MON 810 a Monsanto Agricultura España S.L.

Por todo ello, y teniendo en cuenta el carácter novedoso de los productos transgénicos y el desconocimiento de sus efectos reales a largo plazo ¿considera la Comisión suficiente un periodo de exposición de sólo 90 días para analizar los efectos tóxicos a largo plazo de los productos transgénicos?

A la luz de los resultados del estudio de la Universidad de Caen, ¿no considera la Comisión que se puede estar incumpliendo el principio de precaución sosteniendo la evaluación del maíz NK603 realizada por EFSA como la única evaluación de riesgos aceptable? ¿Piensa la Comisión solicitar nuevos estudios sobre los efectos a largo plazo de los alimentos transgénicos? ¿Ha alertado la Comisión al Gobierno de Aragón de las graves consecuencias del maíz NK603 descubiertas o piensa hacerlo? ¿Está considerando la Comisión revisar toda la normativa sobre transgénicos?

Respuesta del Sr.Šefčovič en nombre de la Comisión
(27 de noviembre de 2012)

Remítase Su Señoría a la respuesta de la Comisión a la pregunta escrita P-008278/2012 ([1]), que aborda los resultados del estudio de Séralini *et al.* y las medidas de seguimiento por parte de la Comisión. Esta ha informado ampliamente a los Estados miembros y al público sobre esta cuestión. Es responsabilidad de los Estados miembros difundir la información a nivel nacional si lo consideran necesario. La Comisión reitera que el maíz NK603 está autorizado en la EU únicamente para su uso en alimentos y piensos ([2]), y no para el cultivo.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB
([2]) Puede hallarse una descripción completa de la autorización de NK603 en el registro de productos autorizados de la UE: http://ec.europa.eu/food/dyna/gm_register/gm_register_auth.cfm?pr_id=16.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009241/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Strategy for researching the long-term effects of GM products

The 2012 study conducted by the University of Caen, Séralini and other partners into the health effects on rats fed GM maize for two years (specifically NK603 maize developed by Monsanto) revealed clear evidence that animals fed GM maize are more likely to get various types of cancer.

The study sparked a public debate and strengthened calls from many associations, NGOs and members of the public for the competent authorities to amend the current legislation on GM foods and move towards a ban on such foods.

Over and above the various national safety assessments carried out into this strain of GM maize, the Commission also asked the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) to conduct a study into the safety of NK603 maize. On 27 May 2009, after conducting a feeding study in rats lasting only 90 days, EFSA published a toxicity evaluation concluding that NK603 maize was safe.

Under the Commission Decisions of 19 July 2004 and 3 March 2005, this type of maize was allowed to be grown and used in foodstuffs across the EU. In the case of Spain, several autonomous regions, including Aragon, authorised the cultivation of this type of maize. In Aragon, the Regional Government's Interdepartmental Committee on Genetically Modified Organisms signed a decree on 11 March 2011 authorising Monsanto Agriculture Spain Ltd to grow NK603 and MON810 maize.

In view of the above, and bearing in mind that GM products are relatively new and their real long-term effects remain unknown, does the Commission believe that just 90 days' exposure is sufficient in order to study the long-term toxicity of GM products?

In the light of the results obtained by the University of Caen, does the Commission agree that it might be failing to comply with the precautionary principle by endorsing the EFSA study into NK603 maize as the only acceptable risk assessment? Does the Commission plan to request additional studies into the long-term effects of GM foods? Has the Commission warned the Regional Government of Aragon about the discovery of serious effects caused by NK603 maize, and if not, is it planning to do so? Is the Commission planning to amend all the legislation on GMOs?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-008278/2012 ([1]), which addresses the results of the study by Séralini *et al* and follow up measures by the Commission. The Commission has widely communicated with the Member States and the public on this issue. It is Member States' responsibility to spread the information at national level if they consider it necessary. The Commission reiterates that the maize NK603 is authorised in the EU for food and feed use only ([2]), and not for cultivation.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB
([2]) Full description of the authorisation of NK603 can be found in the EU register of authorised products: http://ec.europa.eu/food/dyna/gm_register/gm_register_auth.cfm?pr_id=16.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009242/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Diez años del accidente del Prestige: investigación y protocolo de actuación ante accidentes marítimos

El 16 de octubre de 2012 comenzará en España el juicio para esclarecer las responsabilidades en el caso del accidente marítimo y catástrofe ambiental provocada por el petrolero *Prestige*. Así, el Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Galicia será la autoridad competente encargada de evaluar los testimonios y dictar sentencia en la mayor catástrofe ambiental sufrida e España. En noviembre de 2002, el petrolero *Prestige* se partió enfrente de las costas gallegas vertiendo al mar más de 70 000 toneladas de fuel, lo que provocó una catástrofe ambiental sin precedentes.

Diez años después de lo ocurrido es necesario analizar si a nivel europeo se han dispuesto normas y protocolos de actuación en este tipo de accidentes.

Tras la catástrofe, el Parlamento Europeo y el Consejo impulsaron el Reglamento (CE) n° 1726/2003, modificando el anterior Reglamento (CE) n° 417/2002, que fue posteriormente modificado por el Reglamento (CE) n° 2172/2004 de la Comisión, para asegurar el fin del uso de petroleros monocasco en las zonas marítimas europeas. También, a raíz del Reglamento (CE) n° 1406/2002, se creó la Agencia Europea de Seguridad Marítima (EMSA) encargada de asesorar a la Comisión y a los Estados miembros en la materia.

Actualmente se plantean numerosas cuestiones sobre los efectos negativos del accidente del *Prestige* para el medio ambiente y la salud de las personas de los que carecemos de constancia y que próximamente con el inicio de juicio saldrán a debate.

Como declara la EMSA en su misión B.2.3, ¿tiene constancia la Comisión de si este organismo ha desarrollado, en conjunto con el Gobierno Autonómico de Galicia, alguna investigación sobre los efectos a largo plazo del accidente del *Prestige*?

Teniendo en cuenta que una reciente investigación académica, publicada en el «Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health», concluye que la exposición continuada al fuel puede provocar efectos perjudiciales para la salud, y continuando con el cumplimiento de la misión B.2.3 de la EMSA ¿dispone la Comisión de información detallada sobre los efectos nocivos para la salud que pudo tener este vertido sobre los más de 300 000 voluntarios que limpiaron toneladas de chapapote? ¿Ha desarrollado la Comisión algún protocolo de actuación que pueda servir de referencia a nivel comunitario para prevenir accidentes o actuar en caso de estos de manera que se provoque el mínimo daño ambiental posible?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de diciembre de 2012)

La AESM no ha desarrollado en colaboración con el Gobierno Autonómino de Galicia ninguna investigación sobre los efectos a largo plazo del accidente del Prestige.

La Comisión no dispone de información detallada sobre los efectos nocivos que este vertido ha podido tener sobre la salud de los voluntarios que participaron en la limpieza de los vertidos de fuel.

Existe un amplio corpus de Derecho de la UE en materia de prevención de accidentes. La Comisión trabaja junto a los Estados miembros y la AESM para prevenir este tipo de accidentes y remediar cualquier daño medioambiental que estos pudieran causar.

La Directiva 2009/17/CE, por la que se modifica la Directiva 2002/59/CE, relativa al establecimiento de un sistema comunitario de seguimiento y de información sobre el tráfico marítimo obliga a los Estados miembros a elaborar planes para la acogida de buques en necesidad de asistencia. Además, el Reglamento (CE) n° 724/2004, por el que se modifica el Reglamento (CE) n° 1406/2002, por el que se crea la Agencia Europea de Seguridad Marítima, establece que la AESM debe brindar a los Estados miembros y a la Comisión asistencia técnica y científica en el ámbito de la contaminación accidental o deliberada procedente de buques, y debe apoyar, previa solicitud, con medidas adicionales y de un modo que resulte eficaz en cuanto a los costes, los mecanismos de los Estados miembros de lucha contra la contaminación. Entre ellos se incluyen:

— una Red de buques de apoyo de respuesta a los vertidos de petróleo distribuida a través de la costa europea,

— CleanSeaNet, Servicio de vigilancia por satélite para la detección de mareas negras y buques en aguas europeas,

— el Servicio de Información «MAR-ICE» sobre los vertidos de sustancias químicas en el mar,

— un Servicio de Expertos de Respuesta a la Contaminación Marina.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009242/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Ten years on from the Prestige disaster: investigation and protocol for marine accidents

The trial for determining legal responsibility for the marine accident and environmental disaster caused by the *Prestige* oil tanker will begin on 16 October 2012 in Spain. The High Court of Justice of Galicia will be the competent authority for evaluating statements and passing judgment in the case of Spain's worst ever environmental disaster. In November 2002, the *Prestige* oil tanker broke apart off the Galician coast spilling more than 70 000 tonnes of oil into the sea, which caused an unprecedented environmental disaster.

Ten years on from the disaster, there needs to be an analysis of whether standards and protocols have been established on a European level for this type of accident.

After the disaster occurred, the European Parliament and the Council approved Regulation (EC) No 1726/2003, amending Regulation (EC) No 417/2002, which was subsequently amended by Commission Regulation (EC) No 2172/2004, to ensure that single-hull oil tankers would no longer be used in European maritime areas. In addition, as a result of Regulation (EC) No 1406/2002, the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) was created to advise the Commission and Member States on this subject.

Lots of unanswered questions are currently being raised about the negative effects of the *Prestige* disaster on the environment and people's health, which will soon be debated once the trial has begun.

In reference to EMSA's mission statement B.2.3, does the Commission know if this agency has carried out an investigation, in collaboration with the Regional Government of Galicia, into the long-term consequences of the *Prestige* disaster?

Given that a recent academic investigation, published in the Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health, concluded that continued exposure to oil may have harmful effects on health, and in further reference to the fulfilment of EMSA's mission statement B.2.3, does the Commission have detailed information about the adverse effects that this oil spill could have had on the health of more than 300 000 volunteers who cleared up tonnes of oil? Has the Commission established a protocol that could be used as a reference at Community level on how to prevent accidents and what action to take in the event of an accident in order to minimise the environmental damage caused?

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

EMSA has not carried out an investigation, in collaboration with the Regional Government of Galicia into the long term consequences of the Prestige disaster.

The Commission has no detailed information on any adverse effects that the oil spill may have had on the health of volunteers involved in the clean up of oil.

There is a large body of EC law aimed at accident prevention and the Commission works with the Member States and EMSA to prevent such accidents and to remediate any environmental damage thereby caused.

Directive 2009/17/EC amending Directive 2002/59/EC establishing a Community vessel traffic monitoring information requires Member States to draw up plans for the accommodation of ships in need of assistance. Furthermore, Regulation 724/2004 amending Regulation 1406/2002 establishing EMSA provides that EMSA shall provide Member States and the Commission with technical and scientific assistance in the field of accidental or deliberate pollution by ships and support on request with additional means in a cost efficient way the pollution response mechanisms of Member States. This includes:

— A Network of Stand-by Oil Spill Response Vessels distributed along the European coastline;

— CleanSeaNet; the satellite based oil spill and vessel detection and monitoring service covering European waters;

— The MAR-ICE Information Service in case of chemical spills at sea;

— A Marine Pollution Response Experts Service.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009243/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Construcción de pasarela marítima en Cho Vito (Tenerife, Islas Canarias)

La zona conocida como Cho Vito, situada en el municipio costero de Candelaria (Tenerife), ha sido especialmente afectada por los efectos de la aplicación, en ocasiones arbitraria y caprichosa, de la Ley de costas española que supuso la demolición de varias de las edificaciones de Cho Vito, lo cual implicó la pérdida de la única vivienda de varios vecinos.

Cho Vito es un ejemplo paradigmático de la arbitraria aplicación de la Ley de Costas en los últimos años: se han producido derribos de pequeñas viviendas, primeras residencias, que son precisamente las construcciones que tienen un menor impacto ambiental, mientras proliferan grandes hoteles y urbanizaciones de segunda residencia por toda la costa española que representan un modelo económico insostenible y sobre las que no se aplicó esta ley.

En 2011 comenzaron las obras en una pasarela marítima en el mismo municipio, la cual puede infringir varias disposiciones de la legislación de la UE, como la Directiva 85/337/CEE que obliga a la realización de una evaluación de impacto ambiental para este tipo de proyectos, evaluación de la que dichas obras públicas carecen; igualmente, parecen no haberse respetado las disposiciones sobre contratación pública y responsabilidad ambiental.

Además de esta desigualdad de trato en la aplicación de la Ley de Costas que supuso el derribo de parte de las viviendas, los habitantes de Cho Vito denuncian que a los propietarios de las casas aún en pie de la zona se les ha negado el acceso a sus hogares y han sufrido cortes en el suministro de agua y electricidad mientras se desarrollaban los trabajos de esta pasarela.

Ante el posible incumplimiento de la directiva de evaluación del impacto ambiental que supondría la construcción de la pasarela marítima en Cho Vito, ¿tiene la Comisión constancia de la construcción de la misma?

¿Posee la Comisión información de que se haya realizado la pertinente evaluación de impacto ambiental antes de acometer las obras?

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

En lo que respecta a los efectos de la aplicación de la Ley de costas española, la Comisión remite a Su Señoría a las respuestas a las preguntas escritas anteriores sobre este asunto (entre otras, E-652/2010 del Sr. Caspary y el Sr. Ulmer y E-618/2012 del Sr. Romeva i Rueda ([1])), así como a sus comunicaciones a la Comisión de Peticiones del Parlamento Europeo (por ejemplo, peticiones 274/2009 y 494/2010 en lo que respecta a esta localidad concreta). El Derecho de propiedad y una indemnización adecuada de los derechos de propiedad son competencia exclusiva de los Estados miembros y la Comisión no tiene potestad para intervenir.

En cuanto a la construcción de la pasarela marítima de Cho Vito en Tenerife, la Comisión no tiene conocimiento de este proyecto y no sabe si las disposiciones de la Directiva 2011/92/UE ([2]) (llamada Directiva de evaluación del impacto ambiental o Directiva EIA) son aplicables en este caso. La Comisión ha recabado de las autoridades españolas competentes información acerca de la conformidad de este proyecto con los posibles requisitos pertinentes con arreglo al Derecho medioambiental de la UE.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) DO L 26 de 28.1.2012 (versión codificada de la Directiva 85/337/CEE relativa a la evaluación de las repercusiones de determinados proyectos públicos y privados sobre el medio ambiente, en su versión modificada).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009243/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Construction of a maritime boardwalk in Cho Vito (Tenerife, Canary Islands)

The area known as Cho Vito, in the coastal municipality of Candelaria in Tenerife, has been particularly affected by the sometimes arbitrary and wilful way in which the Spanish Coastal Law is applied. Under this law, several buildings in Cho Vito have been demolished and consequently a number of inhabitants have lost their sole residence.

Cho Vito is a typical example of the arbitrary way in which the Coastal Law has been applied in recent years. Small main homes have been pulled down, despite the fact that these are precisely the types of buildings that have the least environmental impact. Meanwhile, the large hotels and holiday-home developments that have mushroomed along the Spanish coast and which constitute an unsustainable economic model have not been subject to the Coastal Law.

In 2011, work began on a maritime boardwalk in the municipality of Candelaria. This project potentially infringes several provisions of EU legislation, such as Directive 85/337/EEC, which requires an environmental impact assessment to be carried out for such projects. No such assessment has been carried out for this project. Equally, it seems that the provisions regarding public procurement and environmental liability have not been complied with.

In addition to the unfair application of the Coastal Law, which has meant that a number of homes in Cho Vito have been demolished, residents there have complained that even homeowners on the very edge of the zone have been denied entry to their houses and had their water and electricity cut off while work on the boardwalk is under way.

Given the possibility that the construction of the Cho Vito maritime boardwalk does not comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive, is the Commission aware of the construction of this boardwalk?

Does the Commission know if the relevant environmental impact assessment was carried out before work on the boardwalk began?

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

Regarding the effects of the application of the Spanish Coastal Law, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to previous written questions on this matter (i.a. E-652/2010 by Mr Caspary and Mr Ulmer and E-618/2012 by Mr Romeva i Rueda ([1])), as well as to its communications to the Petitions Committee of the Parliament (for example, Petitions 274/2009 and 494/2010 concerning this specific location). Property law and adequate compensation of property rights fall under the exclusive competence of the Member States and the Commission has no powers to intervene.

Regarding the construction of the Cho Vito maritime boardwalk in Tenerife, the Commission is not aware of this project and does not know whether the provisions of Directive 2011/92/EU ([2]) (known as the Environmental Impact Assessment or EIA Directive) are applicable to this case. The Commission has requested information from the competent Spanish authorities concerning the compliance of this project with the possible relevant requirements under EU environmental law.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) OJ L 26, 28.01.2012 (codified version of Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, as amended).

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-009244/12
til Kommissionen
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(15. oktober 2012)

Om: Dyrevelfærd i lande uden for EU

Vil Kommissionen beskrive indsatsen for at sikre dyrevelfærd i lande uden for EU? Hvad gør Kommissionen?

Dyrevelfærdslovgivning i EU kan potentielt svække konkurrenceevnen for vores egne producenter, hvis en tilsvarende lovgivning ikke er til stede i lande, vi konkurrerer med. I hvilket omfang er det muligt at imødegå dette problem ved at stille dyrevelfærdsmæssige krav til samhandelspartnere?

Vil Kommissionen beskrive karakteren af disse krav og henvise til den juridiske hjemmel for at stille dem?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(13. december 2012)

På grundlag af data indsamlet under en ekstern evaluering i 2010 ([1]), »skyldes lavere produktionsomkostninger i tredjelande generelt i højere grad forskelle i udgifter til arbejdskraft og foder og andre omkostninger end forskellige standarder for dyrevelfærd.«

Med det i tankerne er det nyttigt at bemærke, at Kommissionen er aktiv i at fremme dyrevelfærd uden for EU. Af denne grund indgår dyrevelfærd systematisk i de bilaterale forhandlinger inden for rammerne af frihandelsaftaler med tredjelande. Flere forskellige former for sådant bilateralt samarbejde er allerede på plads ([2]).

Hvad EU kan gøre, er at sikre, at bestemmelser, der svarer til EU-standarderne om beskyttelse af dyr på slagterier er en forudsætning for import af kød fra tredjelande. Det gør EU ved at anvende tilsvarende regler som dem i EU over for virksomheder, der beskæftiger sig med kød i tredjelande. Disse producenter vurderes løbende under kontroller udført af Levnedsmiddel-og Veterinærkontoret, revisionstjenesten i Kommissionens Generaldirektoratet for Sundhed og Forbrugere.

Desuden er Kommissionen er også aktiv i Verdensorganisationen for Dyresundhed (OIE) og i FN's Fødevare- og Landbrugsorganisation (FAO), som arbejder med dyrevelfærd i en global sammenhæng. Dette medvirker til at sikre, at der gælder lige vilkår over hele verden, hvilket letter den globale konkurrenceevne for EU-operatører.

EU-strategien for dyrebeskyttelse og dyrevelfærd 2012-2015 ([3]) omfatter som en central målsætning at fortsætte og udbygge støtten til internationalt samarbejde.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/3 %20Final%20Report%20-%20EUPAW%20Evaluation.pdf
([2]) Chile, Canada, New Zealand, Sydkorea, Australien.
([3]) KOM(2012)0006 endelig/2 af 15.2.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009244/12
to the Commission
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Animal welfare in countries outside the EU

Could the Commission please describe the efforts being made to safeguard animal welfare in countries outside the EU? What action is the Commission taking?

Animal welfare legislation in the EU may potentially weaken the competitiveness of our own producers if no equivalent legislation is in place in countries with which we compete. To what extent is it possible to address this problem by imposing animal welfare requirements on trading partners?

Could the Commission please describe the nature of these requirements and indicate the legal basis for imposing them?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2012)

On the basis of data collected during an external evaluation in 2010 ([1]) , 'lower production costs in third countries generally owe more to differences in labour, feed and other costs, than to different animal welfare standards.'

With that in mind, it is useful to note that the Commission is active in promoting animal welfare outside the EU. For this reason, animal welfare is systematically included in bilateral negotiations conducted in the context of Free Trade Agreements with third countries. Several forms of such bilateral cooperation are already in place ([2]).

What the EU can do is to ensure that equivalent provisions to EU standards on the protection of animals in slaughterhouses are required for the importation of meat from third countries. It does this by applying similar rules as those in the EU to operators operating meat in third countries. These producers are regularly assessed during audits of the Commission's audit service of the Directorate-General for Health and Consumers (FVO — Food and Veterinary Office).

Furthermore, the Commission is also active in the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) and in the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) where work is undertaken on animal welfare, in a global context. This helps to ensure that a level playing field operates worldwide and facilitates the global competitiveness of EU operators.

The EU strategy for the Protection and Welfare of animals 2012-2015 ([3]) includes, as a key objective, to continue and expand the support for international cooperation.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/3%20Final%20Report%20-%20EUPAW%20Evaluation.pdf
([2]) Chile, Canada, New Zealand, South Korea, Australia.
([3]) COM(2012) 6 final/2 of 15.2.2012.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-009245/12
til Kommissionen
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(15. oktober 2012)

Om: Grønne jobs som følge af det nye energieffektivitetsdirektiv

Kan Kommissionen oplyse, hvor mange grønne jobs den forventer, at der bliver skabt direkte og indirekte af det nye energieffektivitetsdirektiv (4.10.2012)?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Günther Oettinger
(3. december 2012)

Det anslås i den analyse, som ledsagede Kommissionens oprindelige forslag til et direktiv om energieffektivitet, at de foreslåede foranstaltninger potentielt vil kunne skabe 400 000 nye job i 2020. Der er her kun tale om direkte nye job i 2020, ikke om ændringer inden for sektorerne. Kommissionens tjenestegrene vurderer, at det direktiv, som blev vedtaget i juni 2012, får mindre indvirkning på beskæftigelsen end det, der oprindeligt blev foreslået. Der er imidlertid ikke foretaget nogen modelberegninger, som kan sætte tal herpå.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009245/12
to the Commission
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Green jobs as a result of the new Energy Efficiency Directive

Can the Commission state how many green jobs it expects to be created, directly or indirectly, by the new Energy Efficiency Directive (4.10.2012)?

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

The analysis accompanying the original Commission proposal for the Energy Efficiency Directive estimated that the proposed measures had the potential to create net 400 000 new jobs in 2020. These are only direct new jobs in 2020 and do not include changes within the sectors. The Commission services estimate that the directive as agreed in June 2012 would have a lower employment impact than originally proposed. However, no modelling work was carried out to quantify this impact.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-009246/12
til Kommissionen
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(15. oktober 2012)

Om: Dyrevelfærdsmæssige standarder for minkavl

I Danmark produceres mange mink. Der har desværre i pressen ofte været eksempler fremme på, at dyrene ikke har været behandlet ordentligt og efter tilfredsstillende dyrevelfærdsmæssige standarder.

Er Kommissionen opmærksom på disse problemer med minkavl i Danmark?

Hvornår har Kommissionen sidst været på kontrolbesøg på en dansk minkfarm?

Efter min mening er der ikke bare behov for at slå ned på de avlere, der allerede nu bryder almen dyreværnslovgivning ved at misrøgte dyrene. Jeg mener også, at reglerne for minkavl generelt bør strammes. Er Kommissionen enig i det?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Maroš Šefčovič
(28. november 2012)

Kommissionen er bekendt med de påstande, der har været fremme i medierne om minkavl.

Medlemsstaterne er først og fremmest ansvarlige for at sikre, at EU's lovgivning om pelsdyrs velfærd, herunder velfærd hos mink, gennemføres. Årligt skal de forelægge Kommissionen rapporter om resultaterne af de dyrevelfærdsinspektioner, som foretages på minkfarme i henhold til Kommissionens beslutning 2006/778/EF ([1]). De danske myndigheder fastslog i 2012 i deres rapport til Kommissionen, at de igen i 2011 havde rettet opmærksomheden mod dyrevelfærd hos mink, og at de havde besøgt omkring 800 besætninger med pelsdyr (hvoraf de fleste var besætninger med mink) ud af 1 600 besætninger. 565 af de inspicerede besætninger overholdte lovgivningen om dyrevelfærd, 188 fik en indskærpelse, 75 fik et påbud, og 10 blev anmeldt til politiet. Det ser derfor ud til, at de danske myndigheder træffer de nødvendige foranstaltninger til at gennemføre EU's dyrevelfærdslovgivning for så vidt angår pelsdyr, som holdes i minkfarme.

Den seneste revision, som omfattede et besøg på en dansk minkfarm, blev gennemført af Kommissionens tjenestegrene i 2006 ([2]) og behandlede spørgsmål vedrørende aflivning.

Kommissionen mener, som det fremgår af EU-strategien for dyrebeskyttelse 2012-2015 ([3]), at efterlevelse af de gældende regler vedrørende dyrevelfærd skal prioriteres. Strategien sigter desuden mod udviklingen af en helhedsorienteret tilgang, som sikrer, at de fælles problemer, der ligger til grund for ringe velfærd i EU, løses, og som omfatter alle de berørte dyr. For øjeblikket er det Kommissionens prioritet at arbejde hen imod en forbedring af forståelsen af dyrevelfærd blandt landbrugerne ved at øge kompetencerne og yde teknisk bistand.

([1]) EUT L 314 af 15.11.2006.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_id=1521.
([3]) KOM(2012)0006 endelig http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009246/12
to the Commission
Dan Jørgensen (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Animal welfare standards for mink farming

Denmark produces a large number of mink. Unfortunately, the press has often reported on cases in which the animals are not treated properly in accordance with adequate animal welfare standards.

Is the Commission aware of these problems with mink farming in Denmark?

When did the Commission last inspect a Danish mink farm?

In my opinion it is not only necessary to act against breeders who are already breaching general animal welfare legislation by neglecting their animals. I also believe that the rules on mink farming generally need to be tightened up. Does the Commission agree?

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

The Commission is aware of the allegations made in the press regarding mink farming.

Member States are primarily responsible for ensuring that EU welfare legislation on fur animals, including mink, is implemented. They have to report annually to the Commission on the results of the welfare inspections they carried out in fur farms as required by Commission Decision 2006/778/EC ([1]). In 2012, the Danish authorities stated in their report to the Commission that in 2011 they focused again their attention on the welfare of mink and visited around 800 fur animal holdings (most of them mink holdings) out of 1 600. 565 of these inspected holdings were compliant with welfare legislation, 188 received a warning notice, 75 received an enforcement notice and 10 were reported to the police. It appears therefore that the Danish authorities are taking the necessary actions to implement EU welfare legislation on fur animals in mink farms.

The last audit which included a visit in a Danish mink farm was carried out by Commission services in 2006 ([2]) and covered the aspects of killing.

As stated in the EU strategy on the protection of animals 2012-2015 ([3]), the Commission considers that enforcement of the existing rules on animal welfare is the priority. The strategy will also aim at developing a holistic approach so that common underlying drivers for poor welfare in the EU will be addressed and reach all animals concerned. The priority for the Commission, for the time being, is to work towards improving the understanding of animal welfare among farmers through increased competence and technical assistance.

([1]) OJ L 314, 15.11.2006.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_id=1521.
([3]) COM(2012) 6 final http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/actionplan/actionplan_en.htm

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-009247/12
til Kommissionen
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(15. oktober 2012)

Om: Norsk protektionisme hvad angår handel med landbrugsprodukter

Norge har i juli måned indført en told på 72 % på import af planten Hortensia. Samtidig er der forlydender om en tidobling af tolden på ost, så den går fra 27 DKK til 270 DKK. Dette vil i praksis gøre dansk ost usælgelig på det norske marked.

Den danske gartneribranche eksporter er årligt for 250 mio. DKK til det norske marked, hvoraf planten Hortensia udgør en relativt stor andel, idet disse ikke produceres i Norge, men er eftertragtede som havebeplantning. Danske gartnerier er på forhånd stærkt pressede af krisen, og disse nye tiltag fra Norge vil bringe branchen yderligere i krise med tab af endnu flere arbejdspladser til følge.

Den danske mejeribranche eksporter er årligt for op til 150 mio. DKK til det norske marked. Denne eksport vil i praksis forsvinde, såfremt Norge gennemfører den planlagte hævelse af den eksisterende told fra 27 DKK til 270 DKK.

Den danske handelsminister har forsøgt at indgå i dialog med Norge, men Norge nægter at ændre kurs.

Norge er gennem EØS forpligtet af EU's indre markeds acquis og frihandelsområde, med undtagelse af landbruget. Under EØS-aftalen har Norge således ret til at indføre importtold på landbrugsprodukter, samtidig med at aftalen forpligter Norge til en gradvis liberalisering af handlen, også inden for landbrugsvarer.

Kan Kommissionen redegøre for, om Norges forøgelse af tolden anses som værende proportionel?

Kan Kommissionen redegøre for, hvad Norge konkret har forpligtet sig til over for EU, hvad angår lempelse af handel?

Kan Kommissionen redegøre for, hvilke skridt der påtænkes taget over for Norge, såfremt det bekræftes, at Norges tiltag strider imod landets forpligtelser?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Karel De Gucht
(12. december 2012)

Kommissionen er særdeles bekymret over Norges nylige ændringer af tolden på visse landbrugsprodukter.

Ifølge Kommissionens tjenestegrenes vurdering strider ændringerne mod samarbejdsånden inden for Det Europæiske Økonomiske Samarbejdsområde (EØS). I artikel 19 i EØS-aftalen er det fastsat, at de kontraherende parter er forpligtet til fortsat at bestræbe sig på at opnå en gradvis liberalisering af deres handel med landbrugsprodukter.

Med henblik herpå afholder EU og Norge regelmæssige forhandlinger, der fører til bilaterale aftaler. Den seneste af disse aftaler trådte i kraft den 1. januar 2012, og i henhold til bestemmelserne heri vil parterne tage skridt til at sikre, at de fordele, de indrømmer hinanden, ikke bringes i fare som følge af andre importrestriktioner.

Kommissionen har allerede givet udtryk for sine bekymringer i Det Blandede EØS-udvalg den 28. september 2012, mens en specifik reference indgår i EU's erklæring om Verdenshandelsorganisationens (WTO) eksamination af Norges handelspolitik.

Kommissionen anser dialog for at være den mest konstruktive måde at løse disse problemer på. Et møde med de norske myndigheder blev afholdt den 17. oktober 2012, hvor Norge afgav forklaring, mens kommissæren for landbrug den 7. november 2012 mødtes med Norges minister for landbrug og fødevarer og på det kraftigste modsatte sig en toldændring på og en omklassificering af visse hortensiaer. Kommissæren anmodede for begge punkter om, at Norges foranstaltninger trækkes tilbage inden udgangen af 2012, og advarede om, at Kommissionen står klar til at undersøge de tilgængelige retlige muligheder, hvis dette ikke er tilfældet. Kommissæren for handel gav udtryk for samme holdning under et møde med Norges nye udenrigsminister den 26. november 2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009247/12
to the Commission
Jens Rohde (ALDE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Norwegian protectionism as regards trade in agricultural products

In July, Norway introduced an import duty of 72% on hortensia plants. There are also reports of a tenfold increase in the duty on cheese, which would thus rise from DEK 27 to DEK 270. In practice, this will make it impossible to sell Danish cheese on the Norwegian market.

The Danish horticultural sector's exports to the Norwegian market amount to DEK 250 million a year. Hortensia plants account for a relatively large proportion of this, as they are not produced in Norway, but are in demand there as garden plants. Danish horticulturists are already under severe pressure as a result of the crisis, and this new measure by Norway will aggravate the situation in the sector and lead to the loss of even more jobs.

The Danish dairy industry's exports to the Norwegian market represent up to DEK 150 million a year. In practice, this business will come to an end if Norway implements the planned increase in the existing rate of duty from DEK 27 to DEK 270.

The Danish Minister for Trade has attempted to enter into a dialogue with Norway, but Norway refuses to change course.

Through its membership of the EEA, Norway is bound by the EU's Internal Market *acquis* and committed to the free trade area, except in agriculture. Under the EEA Agreement, Norway is therefore entitled to introduce import duties on agricultural products, but at the same time is also obliged to progressively liberalise trade, also in agricultural products.

Can the Commission say whether it considers Norway's increase in duties to be proportionate?

Can the Commission explain Norway's precise commitments to the EU in terms of easing of trade?

Can the Commission say what steps can be envisaged if it is confirmed that Norway's action is at odds with the country's obligations?

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

The Commission is particularly concerned about Norway's recent custom changes on certain agricultural products.

Following the assessment of the Commission's services, the changes run counter to the spirit of cooperation within the European Economic Area (EEA). Article 19 of the EEA Agreement foresees that the contracting parties undertake to continue their efforts with a view to achieving progressive liberalisation of agricultural trade between them.

To this end, EU and Norway hold periodic negotiations resulting in bilateral agreements. The latest of these agreements entered into force on 1 January 2012 and pursuant to its provisions, the parties will take steps to ensure that the benefits which they grant each other will not be jeopardised by other restrictive import measures.

The Commission has already raised its concerns within the EEA Joint Committee held on 28 September 2012, whereas a specific reference is included in the EU statement on Norway's World Trade Organisation (WTO) Trade Policy Review.

The Commission deems dialogue the most constructive way to address these issues. A meeting with Norwegian authorities was held on 17 October 2012, whereby Norway provided clarifications, whereas on 7 November 2012 the Commissioner for Agriculture met Norway's Minister for Agriculture and Food and strongly opposed the change of duties and the reclassification of some hortensias. The Commissioner requested on both points that measures taken by Norway are withdrawn by the end of 2012 and warned that the Commission is prepared to study the available legal options should that not be the case. The Commissioner responsible for Trade took the same line during a meeting with Norway's new Minister of Foreign Affairs on November 26 2012.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009248/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Status quo bei dem Selbstbestimmungsrecht der Regionen bzgl. der Gentechnik

Im September trat Schleswig-Holstein als 56. Teilnahmeregion dem „Netzwerk der gentechnikfreien Regionen" bei. In diesem Zusammenhang wurde erneut diskutiert, dass die Europäische Kommission bereits 2010 in Aussicht stellte, dass die europäischen Regionen selbst über die Nutzung von Gentechnik im Agrarsektor entscheiden dürften. Bislang sind keine diesbezüglichen Regelungen erfolgt.

Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Was ist der gegenwärtige Status der Beratungen?

2. Wann wird den Regionen das Selbstbestimmungsrecht bei der Nutzung von Gentechnik im Agrarbereich gewährt?

3. Was genau soll dieses Recht der Regionen umfassen?

4. Wird ein diesbezüglicher Beschluss auch die Einrichtung von gentechnikfreien Übergangszonen zwischen gentechniknutzenden Regionen und solchen, die keine Gentechnik nutzen, umfassen?

5. Aus welchem Grund gibt es hierzu bislang keine Beschlüsse? Ist auch bekannt, warum es hierzu bislang keinen Ratsbeschluss gibt?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(6. Dezember 2012)

Im Juli 2010 hat die Kommission einen Vorschlag für eine Verordnung veröffentlicht, die den Mitgliedstaaten die Möglichkeit bietet, den Anbau von GVO auf ihrem gesamten Hoheitsgebiet oder auf Teilen davon aus Gründen, die nicht mit der Bewertung der Sicherheit von GVO hinsichtlich Gesundheit oder Umwelt in Zusammenhang stehen ([1]), einzuschränken oder zu verbieten. Welche Rolle subnationale Gebietskörperschaften — z. B. die Regionen oder Bundesländer — bei der Festlegung dieser Verbote/Einschränkungen des Anbaus von GVO spielen, ist von den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten entsprechend ihren nationalen verfassungsrechtlichen Vorkehrungen zu entscheiden.

Das Parlament hat im Juli 2010 eine Stellungnahme in erster Lesung zu dem Vorschlag angenommen. Eine Sperrminorität an Mitgliedstaaten hat verhindert, dass der Rat bereits in erster Lesung eine Einigung zu diesem Vorschlag erzielen konnte. Die Kommission ist entschlossen, mit Parlament und Rat weiter an diesem wichtigen Vorschlag zu arbeiten.

Die Mitgliedstaaten können Koexistenzmaßnahmen gemäß Artikel 26a der Richtlinie 2001/18/EG ([2]) anwenden, um das unbeabsichtigte Vorhandensein von GVO in konventionellen und ökologischen Kulturen zu vermeiden. Im Juli 2010 hat die Kommission eine Empfehlung zu Leitlinien für die Entwicklung nationaler Koexistenzmaßnahmen ([3]) veröffentlicht, die unter anderem vorsieht, dass die Mitgliedstaaten eine grenzübergreifende Zusammenarbeit mit den Nachbarländern gewährleisten sollten, damit die Koexistenzmaßnahmen in den Grenzregionen wirkungsvoll durchgeführt werden können. Dieses Vorgehen könnte auch auf nationaler Ebene zur Organisation der Koexistenz zwischen Regionen angewandt werden, in denen GVO angebaut werden dürfen, und denjenigen, in denen dies nicht erlaubt ist, sofern diese Regionen befugt sind, darüber zu entscheiden. In diesem Zusammenhang könnten auch technische Lösungen wie die vom Herrn Abgeordneten genannte geprüft werden.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/docs/proposal_de.pdf
([2]) ABl. L 106 vom 17.4.2001.
([3]) ABl. C 200 vom 1.7.2010, S. 22.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009248/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: The current position on the regions' right to self-determination in gene technology

In September, Schleswig-Holstein became the 56th region to join the GMO-free regions network. This has led to renewed discussions on the issue, raised by the European Commission in 2010, of European regions being able to decide on the use of gene technology in the agricultural sector by themselves. So far, there have been no rules adopted on this matter.

This gives rise to the following questions:

1. What is the current state of discussions ?

2. When will the regions gain the right to decide themselves on the use of genetic technology in the agricultural sector?

3. What exactly will be covered by this regional right?

4. Will any decision in this area also cover the establishment of GMO-free transitional zones between those regions using gene technology and those which do not?

5. Why have there been no decisions on this matter so far? Why has there so far been no Council decision on the subject?

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

In July 2010 the Commission published a proposal for a regulation allowing the Member States to restrict or ban the cultivation of GMOs on all or part of their territory, for reasons not related to the safety assessment of GMOs as regards health or the environment ([1]). The potential role of sub-national territorial entities — for instance the regions — in setting these GMO cultivation bans/restrictions is a matter to be decided by Member States individually, depending of their national constitutional arrangements.

The Parliament adopted a first reading opinion on the proposal in July 2010. A blocking minority of Member States have not allowed the Council to reach yet a first reading agreement on this proposal. The Commission is committed to keep working with the Parliament and the Council on this important proposal.

Coexistence measures, as set in Article 26a of Directive 2001/18/EC ([2], can be implemented by Member States to avoid unintended presence of GMOs in conventional and organic crops. The Commission published in July 2010 a recommendation on guidelines for the development of national co-existence measures ([3]), which provides amongst others that Member States should ensure cross-border cooperation with neighbouring countries to guarantee the effective functioning of co-existence measures in border areas. This approach could also be used at national level to organise the co-existence between regions which cultivate GMOs and those which do not, when they have the competence to decide on this matter. Technical solutions such as the one mentioned by the Honourable Member could be examined in that context.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biotechnology/docs/proposal_en.pdf
([2]) OJ L 106, 17.4.2001.
([3]) OJ C 200/1, 22.7.2010.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009250/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: EFSA Gutachten zu Genmais

Wie der Presse zu entnehmen war, sandte die Europäische Kommission der EU-Lebensmittelbehörde European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) Gutachten zu Maisvarianten zurück. Die Gutachten sollen Genmais betreffen, der Insektengifte produziert.

Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Welche Gutachten wurden hier genau zurückgesandt? Was waren die wesentlichen Ergebnisse dieser Gutachten?

2. Aus welchen Gründen und mit welchem Zweck wurden diese Gutachten zurückgeschickt?

3. Wie wurden diese Gutachten geprüft?

4. Wie sieht die Kommission die Rolle der EFSA in dieser Angelegenheit grundsätzlich?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(6. Dezember 2012)

1, 2, 3. Die Kommission hat die Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit (EFSA) vor kurzem um weitere wissenschaftliche Unterstützung in Form von Gutachten zu den insektengeschützten genetisch veränderten Maissorten 1507, Bt11 und MON810 ersucht.

Da zu diesen GVO sehr viele Informationen zur Verfügung stehen, hat die Kommission die EFSA am 20. Juni 2012 ersucht ([1]), Gutachten vorzulegen, in denen ihre zuvor angenommenen Schlussfolgerungen zu den einzelnen Risikobereichen dieser GVO unter Berücksichtigung der jüngsten einschlägigen wissenschaftlichen Veröffentlichungen zusammengestellt sind.

Am 13. September 2012 hat die Kommission die EFSA ersucht ([2]), zusätzliche Belege und weitere Klarstellungen zur Unterstützung bestimmter Aspekte ihrer vorausgegangenen Gutachten zu diesen drei GVO hinsichtlich deren Auswirkungen auf Nichtziel-Lepidoptera vorzulegen.

Im Anschluss an diese Ersuchen wurden auf der Website der EFSA ([3]) zwei wissenschaftliche Gutachten des Gremiums für genetisch veränderte Organismen zu der Maissorte 1507 veröffentlicht. Die Gutachten zu den Maissorten Bt11 und MON810 stehen noch aus.

4. Nach Artikel 6 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 178/2002 ([4]) erstellt die EFSA wissenschaftliche Gutachten, die als wissenschaftliche Grundlage für die Ausarbeitung und den Erlass von Gemeinschaftsmaßnahmen in den Bereichen ihres Auftrags dienen. Die oben genannten Ersuchen wurden auf dieser Basis an die EFSA übermittelt.

([1]) Auftrag für Bt11: http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/?wicket:interface=:4;
Auftrag für 1507: http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/?wicket:interface=:5;
Auftrag für MON810: http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/?wicket:interface=:6

([2]) Gemeinsamer Auftrag für Bt11, 1507, MON810: http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/?wicket:interface=:7.

([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2933.htm; http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2934.htm

([4]) ABl. L 31 vom 1.2.2002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009250/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: EFSA reports on GM maize

According to the press, the European Commission has returned reviews of maize varieties to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). The reviews apparently concern GM maize that produces insecticide.

This raises the following questions:

1. Exactly which reviews were sent back? What were their main findings?

2. Why and for what purpose were these reviews returned?

3. How were the reviews assessed?

4. In principle, how does the Commission view the role of the EFSA in this matter?

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

1, 2, 3. The Commission recently asked the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) to provide further scientific support, in the form of opinions, on the insect-protected Genetically Modified (GM) maizes 1507, Bt11 and MON810.

On 20 June 2012, because of the wide range of available information on these GMOs, the Commission asked EFSA ([1]) to provide opinions gathering their previously adopted conclusions for each area of risk of these GMOs taking into account recent relevant scientific publications.

On 13 September 2012, the Commission asked EFSA ([2]) to provide additional evidence and further clarification to support elements of their previous opinions on these three GMOs as regards their impact on non-target lepidoptera.

Following these requests, two scientific opinions of the GMO Panel on maize 1507 have been published on the EFSA website ([3]). The opinions on maize Bt11 and MON810 are still expected.

4. Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 ([4]) provides that EFSA shall provide scientific opinions which will serve as the scientific basis for the drafting and adoption of Union measures in the fields falling within its mission. Above mentioned requests were sent to EFSA based on this ground.

([1]) Mandate on Bt11: http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/?wicket:interface=:4;
Mandate on 1507: http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/?wicket:interface=:5;
Mandate on MON810: http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/?wicket:interface=:6
([2]) Joint mandate Bt11, 1507, MON810: http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/?wicket:interface=:7
([3]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2933.htm; http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2934.htm
([4]) OJ L 31, 1.2.2002.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009251/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Gründe, weshalb Südtiroler im Ausland auf verbilligte Reiseangebote verzichten müssen

Medienberichten zufolge müssen Südtiroler im Ausland oft auf verbilligte Reiseangebote verzichten. Ein Fall eines Südtiroler Ehepaars, das in Österreich bei einem österreichischen Reisebüro einen Apulien-Aufenthalt gebucht hat, sorgte für Aufregung. Das Ehepaar aus Südtirol musste wegen einer vom Hotel zusätzlich eingeforderten Aufzahlung zum verbilligten österreichischen Reiseangebot von 1 000 EUR schlussendlich auf seinen Urlaub verzichten, nur weil sie Italiener und nicht Österreicher waren.

Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. Wie erklärt sich die Kommission diese eindeutige Diskriminierung für italienische Staatsbürger bei der Urlaubsbuchung im Ausland?

2. Wie beurteilt die Kommission diese unterschiedliche Behandlung von EU-Bürgern bei der Buchung von Reisen bzw. Urlauben?

3. Widerspricht diese Vorgangsweise, dass Südtiroler im Ausland auf verbilligte Reiseangebote verzichten müssen, nicht der Dienstleistungsrichtlinie?

4. Laut Medienberichten und Aussagen des Europäischen Verbraucherzentrums haben Südtiroler Reisebüros bei der EU bereits deswegen interveniert, inwiefern ist die Kommission darüber informiert worden? Wie ist der Stand der Dinge?

5. Welche Schritte gedenkt die Kommission zu unternehmen, um den freien Binnenmarkt auch bei der Buchung von Urlaubsreisen im Ausland zu gewährleisten, trotz unterschiedlicher Staatsbürgerschaft?

6. Welche Schritte gedenkt die Kommission zu unternehmen, um die Einhaltung der Dienstleistungsrichtlinie in allen EU-Ländern gleichermaßen zu gewährleisten?

7. Wie kann die Kommission gewährleisten, dass es bei „Internet-Buchungen“ nicht zu ähnlich gelagerten Problemen kommt wie im oben beschriebenen Fall?

Antwort von Herrn Barnier im Namen der Kommission
(7. Dezember 2012)

Der Kommission sind andere Fälle, die ähnlich gelagert sind wie der vom Herrn Abgeordneten genannte Fall, bekannt. Die Verbraucher erwarten, dass sie Dienstleistungen im Binnenmarkt zum selben Preis erhalten wie in anderen Mitgliedstaaten ansässige Personen.

Diese Praxis ist Gegenstand von Artikel 20 Absatz 2 der Dienstleistungsrichtlinie (2006/123/EG). Nach dieser Bestimmung stellen die Mitgliedstaaten sicher, „dass die allgemeinen Bedingungen für den Zugang zu einer Dienstleistung, die […] bekannt gemacht hat, keine auf der Staatsangehörigkeit oder dem Wohnsitz des Dienstleistungsempfängers beruhenden diskriminierenden Bestimmungen enthalten“. Unterschiedliche Zugangsbedingungen sind jedoch zulässig, wenn diese „unmittelbar durch objektive Kriterien gerechtfertigt sind“.

Die Bestimmung wurde in Italien durch Artikel 29 Absatz 1 der Gesetzesverordnung 59/2010, in Österreich durch § 23 Dienstleistungsgesetz vom 21. November 2011 umgesetzt. Es obliegt daher den zuständigen nationalen Behörden, d. h. der italienischen Kartellbehörde und der österreichischen Bezirksverwaltungsbehörde, diese Bestimmung bei den in ihrem Land niedergelassenen Dienstleistungserbringern durchzusetzen.

Im Juni 2012 hat die Kommission eine Unterlage zur Anwendung dieser Bestimmung ([1]) veröffentlicht. Darin werden die typischen Situationen, in denen Dienstleistungsempfänger eine unterschiedliche Behandlung aufgrund ihrer Staatsangehörigkeit oder ihres Wohnsitzes erfahren, und die von den Unternehmen genannten Umstände geschildert. Ferner wird erläutert, wann diese unterschiedliche Behandlung gerechtfertigt oder auch nicht gerechtfertigt sein kann, damit die nationalen Behörden besser in der Lage sind, die von ihnen geforderte Einzelfallanalyse durchzuführen. Die Kommission wird sich in Zusammenarbeit mit den zuständigen nationalen Behörden weiterhin für die Verbesserung der Lage vor Ort und für mehr Aufklärung einsetzen.

([1]) Arbeitsunterlage der Kommissionsdienststellen zur Erstellung eines Leitfadens für die Anwendung von Artikel 20 Absatz 2 der Richtlinie 2006/123/EG über Dienstleistungen im Binnenmarkt, abrufbar unter:
http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/services/services-dir/rights_of_recipients_de.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009251/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Reasons why South Tyroleans do not have access to discounted travel offers

According to media reports South Tyroleans often do not have access to discounted travel offers available in other countries. The case of a South Tyrolean couple who had booked a stay in Apulia through an Austrian travel agency, in Austria, caused a stir. The couple, faced with a demand from the hotel for payment of a supplement of EUR 1 000 over and above the cost of the Austrian discounted travel package, had to do without their holiday in the end, simply because they were Italians and not Austrians.

The following questions arise:

1. How does the Commission explain this clear discrimination against Italian citizens when making a holiday booking through another country?

2. How does the Commission assess this different treatment of EU citizens in connection with the booking of travel or holidays?

3. Does this practice, whereby South Tyroleans are deprived of access to discounted travel offers available abroad, not contravene the services directive?

4. According to media reports and statements by the European Consumer Centre, South Tyrolean travel agencies have already approached the EU on the subject. Has the Commission been informed of this? What is the state of play?

5. What steps is the Commission planning to take in order to guarantee the free market in relation to the booking of holidays through an agency situated in another country, despite different nationality?

6. What steps is the Commission planning to take to ensure uniform compliance with the services directive in all EU countries?

7. How can the Commission ensure that problems similar to the case described above do not occur in connection with Internet bookings?

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

The Commission is aware of similar cases to the one mentioned by the Honourable Member. Consumers expect that they receive services in the internal market at the same price as residents of other Member States.

This practice is dealt with by Article 20(2) of the Services Directive (2006/123/EC). According to this provision ‘Member States shall ensure that the general conditions of access to a service, which are made available to the public at large […], do not contain discriminatory provisions relating to the nationality or place of residence of the recipient’. However, differences in the conditions of access are allowed ‘where those differences are directly justified by objective criteria’.

The provision has been implemented in the Italian legal order by Article 29(1) of Legislative Decree 59/2010, in Austria by § 23 Dienstleistungsgesetz of 21 November 2011. It is therefore up to the relevant national authorities, namely the Italian Antitrust Authority and the Austrian Bezirksverwaltungsbehörde to enforce this provision upon service providers established in their respective countries.

In June 2012, the Commission published a document on the application of this provision ([1]). It seeks to explain the typical situations in which service recipients are confronted with different treatment on grounds of their nationality or place of residence, the circumstances invoked by businesses and when this may or may not be objectively justified so that national authorities are in a better position to undertake the necessary case-by-case analysis. The Commission will continue to help improve the situation on the ground and to raise awareness in cooperation with the competent national authorities.

([1]) Commission Staff Working Document with a view to establishing guidance on the application of Article 20(2) of Directive 2006/123/EC on services in the internal market, accessible at: http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/services/services-dir/rights_of_recipients_en.htm

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009252/12
προς το Συμβούλιο
Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αλληλεγγύη στην πάλη του κολομβιανού λαού

Με αμείωτη ένταση συνεχίζεται η αντιλαϊκή πολιτική της κυβέρνησης της Κολομβίας. Οι διώξεις ενάντια στο λαϊκό κίνημα, οι συλλήψεις και οι φυλακίσεις, οι δολοφονίες συνδικαλιστών και αγωνιστών, η καταπίεση συνολικά του κολομβιανού λαού. Η αναβάθμιση των σχέσεων ΕΕ-Κολομβίας με τη μονογραφή στις 23.3.2011 της συμφωνίας ελεύθερου εμπορίου, ενισχύει την αντιλαϊκή κυβέρνηση της Κολομβίας, με οδυνηρές επιπτώσεις για την εργατική τάξη και τα λαϊκά στρώματα της χώρας. Ο Χοακίν Πέρες Μπεσέρα αγωνιστής με Σουηδική υπηκοότητα και χιλιάδες άλλοι πολιτικοί κρατούμενοι παραμένουν φυλακισμένοι. Στις 14 Οκτώβρη 2012 στο Όσλο, ξεκινούν οι συνομιλίες μεταξύ των Ενόπλων Επαναστατικών Δυνάμεων της Κολομβίας-Στρατός του Λαού (FARC-EP) με την κυβέρνηση της Κολομβίας. Ωστόσο οι FARC-EP εξακολουθούν να περιλαμβάνονται στο κατάλογο των «τρομοκρατικών οργανώσεων» της ΕΕ, ενώ συνεχίζεται το «κυνήγι μαγισσών» ενάντια σε πρόσωπα που θεωρούνται ότι σχετίζονται μαζί τους.

Ερωτάται το Συμβούλιο:

Καταδικάζει τη συνεχιζόμενη επιθετικότητα της κολομβιανής κυβέρνησης, τις διώξεις, συλλήψεις, φυλακίσεις χιλιάδων πολιτικών κρατουμένων και τις δολοφονίες αγωνιστών; Προτίθεται να διαγράψει τις Ένοπλες Επαναστατικές Δυνάμεις της Κολομβίας-Στρατός του Λαού (FARC-EP) από τον κατάλογο των «τρομοκρατικών οργανώσεων» της ΕΕ; Συμφωνεί με τη λαϊκή απαίτηση για την άμεση απελευθέρωση όλων των πολιτικών κρατουμένων από τις Κολομβιανές φυλακές;

Απάντηση
(7 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Το Συμβούλιο δεν έχει πληροφορίες για την εικαζόμενη φυλάκιση κολομβιανών πολιτών για πολιτικούς λόγους· γνωρίζει την περίπτωση του κ. Pérez Becerra, ο οποίος κατηγορείται από τις κολομβιανές αρχές για παροχή υποστήριξης στις Ένοπλες Επαναστατικές Δυνάμεις της Κολομβίας (FARC). Πρόκειται πλέον για θέμα αρμοδιότητας της δικαιοσύνης της Κολομβίας.

Το Συμβούλιο έχει εκφράσει επανειλημμένα τη στήριξή του στην κυβέρνηση της Κολομβίας κατά την αναζήτηση από μέρους της λύσης κατόπιν διαπραγματεύσεων στην εσωτερική ένοπλη σύγκρουση, η δε Ύπατη Εκπρόσωπος της ΕΕ χαιρέτισε πρόσφατα την έναρξη ειρηνευτικών συνομιλιών με τη FARC. Ο κατάλογος των προσώπων, ομάδων και οντοτήτων που υπόκεινται στην κοινή θέση 2001/931/ΚΕΠΠΑ επανεξετάζεται τακτικά. Στις 25 Ιουνίου 2012, το Συμβούλιο εξέδωσε την απόφαση 2012/333/ΚΕΠΠΑ του Συμβουλίου στην οποία κατέληγε στο συμπέρασμα ότι η FARC ενέχεται σε τρομοκρατικές πράξεις, κατά την έννοια του άρθρου 1 παράγραφος 3 της κοινής θέσης 2001/931/ΚΕΠΠΑ και ότι θα πρέπει να εξακολουθήσει να υπόκειται στα εκεί προβλεπόμενα ειδικά περιοριστικά μέτρα.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009252/12
to the Council
Georgios Toussas (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Solidarity with the struggle of the Colombian people

The Colombian government is pursuing with undiminished ferocity its anti-working class policies: persecution of the people's movement, arrests and imprisonment, the killing of trade unionists and activists, in short the repression of the people of Colombia. The upgrading of EU — Colombia relations with the initialling on 23.3.2011 of a free trade agreement has strengthened Colombia's anti-working class government, but has had painful consequences for the working class and ordinary people in the country. Joaquin Perez Becerra, an activist with Swedish citizenship, and thousands of other political prisoners remain in jail. On 14 October 2012 talks started in Oslo between the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia — People's Army (FARC-EP) and the Colombian government. However, the FARC-EP is still included in the EU's list of 'terrorist organisations' while a 'witch hunt' is continuing against persons who are considered to be associated with that organisation.

In view of the above, will the Council say:

Does it condemn the continuing aggression of the Colombian government, and the persecution and the arrest and imprisonment of thousands of political prisoners and the murder of activists? Will it remove the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia — People's Army (FARC-EP) from the EU's list of 'terrorist organisations'? Will it endorse the popular demand for the immediate release of all political prisoners from Colombian prisons?

Reply
(7 January 2013)

The Council has no information on the alleged imprisonment of Colombian citizens for political reasons. The Council is aware of the case of Mr Pérez Becerra, who is accused by the Colombian authorities of providing support to the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC). This is now a matter for the Colombian judiciary.

The Council has consistently expressed its support for the Colombian Government in its search for a negotiated solution to the internal armed conflict, and the EU High Representative recently welcomed the start of peace talks with the FARC. The list of persons, groups and entities subject to Common Position 2001/931/CFSP is kept under regular review. On 25 June 2012 the Council adopted Council Decision 2012/333/CFSP in which it concluded that the FARC had been involved in terrorist acts within the meaning of Article 1(3) of Common Position 2001/931/CFSP and that it should continue to be subject to the specific restrictive measures provided for therein.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009253/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Υποστήριξη ασθενών που πάσχουν από πολύ σπάνιες παθήσεις

Στην Ευρώπη σήμερα διαβιούν χιλιάδες ασθενείς με πολύ σπάνιες ασθένειες, πολλές εκ των οποίων δεν είναι καταχωρημένες (ακριβώς εξαιτίας της σπανιότητάς τους) στα εθνικά συστήματα υγείας των κρατών μελών με αποτέλεσμα οι ασθενείς να μην έχουν πρόσβαση στη δωρεάν περίθαλψη ή στην επαρκή από τα ασφαλιστικά ταμεία και το κράτος πρόνοιας χρηματοδότηση της θεραπείας ή των επεμβάσεων που απαιτούνται. Για παράδειγμα, μία πολύ σπάνια ασθένεια με το όνομα «σύνδρομο Οκαμότο» δεν είναι καταχωρημένη στο ελληνικό σύστημα υγείας, με αποτέλεσμα η μία και μοναδική ασθενής στην Ελλάδα (οκτάχρονο κοριτσάκι), που είναι και μοναδική περίπτωση και σε ολόκληρη την ΕΕ, (συμπτώματα: προβλήματα στα νεφρά (υδρονέφρωση), στένωση πνευμονικής αρτηρίας και ανοιχτό βοτάλιο (καρδιολογικό), κορμική υποτονία, σχιστία υπερώας (λυκόστομα), μικροκεφαλία, ψυχοκινητική καθυστέρηση και άλλα), να μην μπορεί να συμπεριληφθεί στο σύστημα υγείας ή να λάβει από αυτό επαρκή στήριξη για τις εξουθενωτικές οικονομικά και ψυχολογικά δεκάδες επεμβάσεις που απαιτούνται.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Με ποιο τρόπο ελέγχονται τα κράτη μέλη ώστε πολίτες που πάσχουν από πολύ σπάνιες ασθένειες στην ΕΕ να έχουν ισότιμη πρόσβαση στα συστήματα υγείας;

2. Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή για καλές πρακτικές που εφαρμόζονται σε εθνικά συστήματα υγείας κρατών μελών που αφορούν τις πολύ σπάνιες ασθένειες και μπορούν να υιοθετηθούν από άλλα κράτη μέλη;

3. Στο πλαίσιο των πρωτοβουλιών στήριξης της υγείας των πολιτών στην ΕΕ και, δεδομένου ότι οι πολύ σπάνιες ασθένειες δεν καλύπτονται κάποιες φορές από τα εθνικά συστήματα υγείας, θεωρεί η Επιτροπή σύμφωνη με τις αρμοδιότητες που ορίζει η Συνθήκη την ανάληψη πρωτοβουλίας και την κατάρτιση σχετικού κώδικα στον προϋπολογισμό της ΕΕ ώστε πολίτες της ΕΕ που πάσχουν από αυτές τις παθήσεις να μπορούν να λαμβάνουν την απαιτούμενη στήριξη και μέσω κοινοτικής χρηματοδότησης;

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

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει την κατάσταση σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο όσον αφορά τις σπάνιες νόσους και τις δυσκολίες που αντιμετωπίζουν οι πολίτες που πάσχουν από τις νόσους αυτές. Για τον λόγο αυτό, το 2008 η Επιτροπή εξέδωσε ανακοίνωση για την ευρωπαϊκή δράση σχετικά με τις σπάνιες νόσους ([1]), ενώ το 2009 το Συμβούλιο εξέδωσε σύσταση ([2]) για τις δράσεις στον τομέα των σπάνιων νόσων. Η σύσταση καλεί τα κράτη μέλη να καταρτίσουν εθνικά σχέδια για τις σπάνιες νόσους έως το τέλος του 2013, ώστε να εξασφαλίζεται η διαθεσιμότητα πρόληψης, διάγνωσης, αγωγής και αποκατάστασης, και η ίση πρόσβαση σε αυτές, για τα άτομα που πάσχουν από σπάνιες νόσους.

Το άρθρο 12 της οδηγίας 2011/24/ΕΕ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 9ης Μαρτίου 2011, περί εφαρμογής των δικαιωμάτων των ασθενών στο πλαίσιο της διασυνοριακής υγειονομικής περίθαλψης ([3]) ορίζει ότι η Επιτροπή θα στηρίζει τα κράτη μέλη στην ανάπτυξη ευρωπαϊκών δικτύων αναφοράς μεταξύ παρόχων υγειονομικής περίθαλψης και κέντρων εμπειρογνωμοσύνης στα κράτη μέλη.

Η Επιτροπή υποστηρίζει δίκτυα όπως το EPIRARE (Ευρωπαϊκή Πλατφόρμα για τα Μητρώα Σπάνιων Νόσων) ([4]) και το EUROPLAN (Ευρωπαϊκό Σχέδιο για την Ανάπτυξη Εθνικών Σχεδίων για τις Σπάνιες Νόσους) ([5]) για την προώθηση ευρωπαϊκών ορθών πρακτικών σχετικά με τη συνεργασία μεταξύ μητρώων σπάνιων νόσων και για την παροχή τεχνικής βοήθειας σε εθνικά σχέδια για τια σπάνιες νόσους.

Η Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει αρμοδιότητες όσον αφορά τον κατάλογο νόσων στο πλαίσιο υπουργικών διαταγμάτων ή πολιτικών για την επιστροφή δαπανών. Η σύσταση ενός χρηματοδοτικού μηχανισμού σε επίπεδο ΕΕ για την κάλυψη της αγωγής νόσων που δεν καλύπτονται στα συστήματα επιστροφής δαπανών δεν θα ήταν συμβατή με το πεδίο αρμοδιοτήτων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στον τομέα της δημόσιας υγείας, όπως ορίζεται στη Συνθήκη για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

([1]) COM(2008)679 τελικό.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:151:0007:0010:EN:PDF
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:088:0045:0065:EN:PDF
([4]) http://www.epirare.eu/
([5]) http://www.europlanproject.eu/_newsite_986987/index.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009253/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Support for patients suffering from very rare diseases

In Europe today there are thousands of patients suffering from very rare diseases, many of which are not registered (precisely because they are so rare) in Member States' national health systems; this means that patients do not have access to free healthcare or adequate funding from insurance funds and the welfare state for treatment or operations where they are required. For example, a very rare disease called the 'Okamoto syndrome' is not registered in the Greek health system, which means that the one patient suffering from this disease in Greece and indeed in the EU as a whole (an eight year-old girl) [symptoms: kidney problems (hydronephrosis), pulmonary artery stenosis and cardiological problems, hypotonia, a cleft palate , microcephaly, psychomotor retardation, etc] cannot be covered by the health system and the patient is unable to receive sufficient support for the dozens of operations needed which take a crushing financial and psychological toll.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. What controls exist on Member States as to ensure that citizens suffering from very rare diseases in the EU have equal access to health systems?

2. Can it provide information about good practices in the national health systems of Member States relating to very rare diseases which could be adopted by other Member States?

3. As part of initiatives to support the health of EU citizens, and given that very rare diseases are sometimes not covered by national health systems, does it consider that it would be compatible with its competences, as set out in the Treaty, to launch an initiative and draw up a code in the EU budget to ensure that EU citizens suffering from such disorders can receive the necessary support, including through EU funding?

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

The Commission is aware of the situation with regard to rare diseases at European level, and of the difficulties faced by citizens suffering from such diseases. This is why, in 2008, the Commission adopted a communication on European action in the field of rare diseases ([1]), and the Council adopted a recommendation in 2009 ([2]) on actions in the field of rare diseases. The recommendation calls on Member States to develop national plans for rare diseases before the end of 2013 to ensure equal access and availability of prevention, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation for people with rare diseases.

Article 12 of 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 ([3]) establishes that the Commission shall support Member States in the development of European reference networks between healthcare providers and centres of expertise in the Member States.

The Commission is supporting networks, such as EPIRARE (European Platform on Rare Diseases Registries) ([4]) and EUROPLAN (European Project for Rare Diseases National Plans Development) ([5]) to promote European good practices on cooperation between rare diseases registers and to provide technical assistance to national plans on rare diseases.

The Commission has no competence as regards the list of diseases under national Ministerial Decrees or in reimbursement policies. Setting up an EU level funding instrument to cover the treatment of diseases not covered in the reimbursement systems of the national health systems would not be compatible with the scope of the powers of the European Union in the field of public health as defined in the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union.

([1]) COM(2008)679 final.
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:151:0007:0010:EN:PDF.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:088:0045:0065:EN:PDF.
([4]) http://www.epirare.eu/.
([5]) http://www.europlanproject.eu/_newsite_986987/index.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009254/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αύξηση των τιμών των τροφίμων και προβλέψεις για μείωση της συγκομιδής των σιτηρών παγκοσμίως

Τα Ηνωμένα Έθνη, στις 4 Οκτωβρίου 2012 ανέφεραν ότι οι τιμές των τροφίμων παγκοσμίως αυξήθηκαν ελαφρώς το Σεπτέμβριο έπειτα από δύο μήνες σταθερότητας και προειδοποίησαν ότι, παρά την αύξηση της παραγωγής σιτηρών σε χώρες με χαμηλά εισοδήματα, η παγκόσμια συγκομιδή του εμπορεύματος αυτού, αναμένεται να μειωθεί φέτος ([1]). Συγκεκριμένα, κατά τη διάρκεια του Σεπτεμβρίου, ο Δείκτης Τιμών Τροφίμων του Οργανισμού Τροφίμων και Γεωργίας του ΟΗΕ (FAO) αυξήθηκε κατά 1,4% σε σχέση με τον Αύγουστο κι η αύξηση αυτή, από 213 σε 216 μονάδες, αντανακλά κυρίως την αύξηση των τιμών των γαλακτοκομικών προϊόντων και του κρέατος. Ένα μήνα νωρίτερα, ο Οργανισμός Τροφίμων και Γεωργίας του ΟΗΕ (FAO), το Παγκόσμιο Πρόγραμμα για τα Τρόφιμα (WFP) και το και το Διεθνές Ταμείο για την Αγροτική Ανάπτυξη (IFAD), με κοινή ανακοίνωση, είχαν τονίσει ότι απαιτείται άμεση, συντονισμένη και διεθνής δράση ώστε να αποτραπεί επανάληψη της επισιτιστικής κρίσης των ετών 2007-2008 ([2]).

Η Επιτροπή ερωτάται:

1. Κατά πόσο έχει επηρεαστεί η ΕΕ από τις παγκόσμιες αυτές εξελίξεις; Διαθέτει πρόσφατα στοιχεία για τις τιμές τροφίμων και την συγκομιδή σιτηρών σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο; Διαπιστώνει στρεβλώσεις στην ευρωπαϊκή αγορά και σε ποιες χώρες εντοπίζονται;

2. Ποιες οι πρωτοβουλίες της σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο και σε επίπεδο G20 για την αντιμετώπιση των κινδύνων που εγκυμονούν; Ποια μέτρα έχει λάβει για την υποστήριξη των Ευρωπαίων παραγωγών και την προστασία των Ευρωπαίων καταναλωτών;

Απάντηση του κ. Cioloş εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Νοεμβρίου 2012)

Σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο, παρά τη φετινή ξηρασία σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη, η τρέχουσα πρόβλεψη για τα σιτηρά δεν δημιουργεί σοβαρά προβλήματα εφοδιασμού. Σύμφωνα με τον τελευταίο ισολογισμό σιτηρών της Επιτροπής, η συνολική παραγωγή σιτηρών για το 2012/13 θα ανέλθει σε 272 εκατομμύρια τόνους, 4% λιγότερο από τον μέσο όρο της πενταετίας.

Η Επιτροπή παρακολουθεί εκ του σύνεγγυς την κατάσταση των τιμών των γεωργικών προϊόντων και του κόστους παραγωγής. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, δημοσιεύει τον πίνακα δεδομένων για τις τιμές των βασικών προϊόντων (Commodity Price Data Dashboard) ([3]) ο οποίος παρέχει μηνιαία περίληψη των δεδομένων των τιμών των αγαθών για τα πιο αντιπροσωπευτικά γεωργικά προϊόντα και τις τιμές καταναλωτή για τα τρόφιμα, σε επίπεδο ΕΕ και σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο. Επιπλέον, η Επιτροπή δημιούργησε το ευρωπαϊκό μέσο παρακολούθησης των τιμών των τροφίμων ([4]) με σκοπό την παρακολούθηση της μηνιαίας εξέλιξης των τιμών των τροφίμων στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ. Προς το παρόν, οι τιμές παραγωγού σε διάφορους τομείς κρέατος (βοείου κρέατος, κρέατος πουλερικών και χοιρείου κρέατος) παραμένουν σε υψηλά επίπεδα, ώστε να αντισταθμίζουν — τουλάχιστον εν μέρει — την αύξηση του κόστους των ζωοτροφών και να εξασφαλίζουν αποδεκτά περιθώρια στους κτηνοτρόφους.

Σε διεθνές επίπεδο, η Επιτροπή συμμετέχει ενεργά στο σύστημα πληροφόρησης για τις γεωργικές αγορές (AMIS) του G20, το οποίο αποβλέπει στη βελτίωση της διαφάνειας στις παγκόσμιες αγορές. Επιπλέον, είναι μέλος του φόρουμ ταχείας αντίδρασης, το οποίο συστάθηκε με σκοπό να διευκολυνθεί ο συντονισμός των πολιτικών απαντήσεων μεταξύ των συμμετεχόντων σε περίπτωση επισιτιστικής κρίσης. Κατά τη συνεδρίαση των εκπροσώπων του AMIS του Οκτωβρίου, συμφωνήθηκε ότι δεν ήταν απαραίτητο να συγκληθεί το φόρουμ ταχείας αντίδρασης διότι, με βάση τα μέχρι τότε διαθέσιμα στοιχεία, οι αγορές βασικών γεωργικών προϊόντων λειτουργούσαν ικανοποιητικά. Η Επιτροπή θα παραμείνει σε επαγρύπνηση, ενώ παράλληλα θα παρακολουθεί τις τιμές των τροφίμων και θα ανταλλάσσει στοιχεία για τις γεωργικές αγορές με τους εταίρους της του G20.

([1]) http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43213&Cr=food+security&Cr1=#.UHfTtG_Mh8E.
([2]) http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/155472/icode/.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/markets/foodprices/.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/competitiveness/prices_monitoring_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009254/12
to the Commission
Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Increase in food prices and forecasts of lower cereal yields worldwide

On 4 October 2012 the United Nations reported that world food prices had risen slightly in September after two months of stability and warned that, despite the increase in cereal production in low-income countries, the worldwide harvest of this commodity was expected to fall this year ([1]). More specifically, in September the Food Price Index of the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) rose by 1.4% compared to August and this increase, from 213 to 216 units, mainly reflects the increase in prices of dairy products and meat. A month earlier, the ÚN's Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the World Food Programme (WFP) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) had issued a joint statement, stressing that urgent, coordinated international action was needed to prevent a recurrence of the food crisis of the years 2007-2008 ([2]).

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. To what extent has the EU been affected by these global developments? Does it have any recent data on food prices and the cereal harvest at European level? Has it noted distortions in the European market and in which countries have these occurred?

2. What initiatives has it taken at global level and in the G20 to address these dangers? What measures has it taken to support European producers and protect European consumers?

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

At European level, despite this year's drought in certain Member States, the current forecast for cereals does not pose serious problems of supply. The latest Commission cereals balance sheet puts total cereals production for 2012/13 at 272 million tonnes, 4% less than the five-year average.

The Commission closely monitors the situation of the agricultural prices and production costs. More specifically, it publishes the Commodity Price Data Dashboard ([3]) which provides a monthly summary of commodity price data for the most representative agricultural products and consumer food prices, at EU and world level. Moreover, the Commission established the European Food Prices Monitoring Tool ([4]) which is meant to observe the monthly developments of food prices in the EU Member States. For the time being, producer prices in the various meat sectors (beef and veal, poultry and pigmeat) remain at a high level, which — at least partially — compensates the increase in feed costs and guarantees livestock producers' acceptable margins.

At international level, the Commission actively participates in the G20 Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS), which aims at improving transparency in global markets. Moreover, it is member of the Rapid Response Forum which was set up with a view to facilitate coordination of policy responses among participants in case of food crises. At the October meeting of the G20 AMIS representatives it has been agreed that in light of the information available to that date, the agricultural commodity markets were functioning well and a meeting of the Rapid Response Forum was not necessary. The Commission will continue to remain vigilant, while monitoring food prices and sharing agricultural markets data with the G20 as appropriate.

([1]) http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=43213&Cr=food+security&Cr1=#.UHfTtG_Mh8E
([2]) http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/155472/icode/
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/markets/foodprices/
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/food/competitiveness/prices_monitoring_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009255/12
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(15 oktober 2012)

Betreft: EU-geld voor Noord-Cyprus in kader van „verbetering relaties tussen twee gemeenschappen — bedreigende symbolen — toepassing

De EU geeft geld aan Noord-Cyprus op basis van Verordening (EG) nr. 389/2006 met als doel — artikel 1 — naast de economische integratie en de voorbereiding van het acquis ook de „verbetering van de relaties tussen de gemeenschappen".

Wanneer men nabij Nicosia vanuit het noorden het zuiden binnenrijdt ziet men geen opvallende symbolen. Wanneer men vanuit het zuiden het noorden binnenrijdt ziet men meerdere symbolen: een grote slo.a. „happy to be Turk" boven de weg, een zeer recent standbeeld van Ataturk omringd door minstens 10 Turkse vlaggen, grote vlaggen van o.a. Turkije, en een reusachtige tekening op een rotswand met Turkse symbolen.

Al deze symbolen, waarvan sommige onlangs geplaatst, hebben blijkbaar enkel de bedoeling de Grieks-Cypriotische bevolking te intimideren of te provoceren.

Graag deze vragen:

1. Meent de Commissie dat het aanbrengen, handhaven en zelfs bijkomend aanbrengen van deze symbolen verenigbaar is met het streven te komen tot betere relaties tussen de twee gemeenschappen?

2. Wordt de verwijdering van deze symbolen door de Commissie gevraagd aan diegenen die het feitelijke gezag hebben in het noorden? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Worden in het kader van Verordening (EG) nr. 389/2006 projecten voorgesteld om deze symbolen te verplaatsen of, zoals in het geval van de rotstekening, te verwijderen om zo de relaties tussen de gemeenschappen te verbeteren? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(4 december 2012)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van de symbolen waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst en begrijpt dat dit gevoelig ligt bij de Grieks-Cypriotische gemeenschap. Het is niet aan de Commissie om deze kwestie aan te kaarten, de twee gemeenschappen zouden hierover in gesprek moeten gaan.

De problemen die het geachte Parlementslid noemt, benadrukken nogmaals dat een snelle allesomvattende regeling in Cyprus noodzakelijk is. De Commissie heeft in haar recente mededeling over de uitbreidingsstrategie en de belangrijkste uitdagingen 2012-2013 herhaald dat de onderhandelingen nieuw leven moeten worden ingeblazen en snel zouden moeten worden voltooid, waarbij wordt voortgebouwd op de vooruitgang tot nu toe.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009255/12
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: EU funding for Northern Cyprus in connection with 'improving relations between two communities — threatening symbols' — application

The EU gives money to Northern Cyprus pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 389/2006 with the aim — Article 1 — in addition to economic integration and preparation of the *acquis*, also of 'improving relations between the communities'.

If one drives into the South from the North near Nicosia, one does not see any conspicuous symbols. If one drives into the North from the South, one sees various symbols: a large slogan 'happy to be Turk' above the road, a very recent statue of Ataturk surrounded by at least 10 Turkish flags, large flags, inter alia of Turkey, and an enormous drawing containing Turkish symbols on the face of a cliff.

All these symbols, some of which have only recently been displayed, clearly have the sole aim of intimidating or provoking the Greek Cypriot population.

1. Does the Commission believe that displaying these symbols, keeping them on display and even displaying additional ones is compatible with efforts to achieve better relations between the two communities?

2. Does the Commission ask those who *de facto* hold power in the North to remove these symbols? If not, why not?

3. Are any projects proposed under Regulation (EC) No 389/2006 to move these symbols or, as in the case of the drawing on the cliff, to remove them, in order to improve relations between the communities? If not, why not?

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

The Commission is aware of the various symbols the Honourable Members refers to and understands the sensitivities of the Greek Cypriot community in this respect. It is not for the Commission to take up these issues but they should be subject to a bi-communal dialogue.

The issues raised by the Honourable Member once again underline the need for a rapid comprehensive settlement in Cyprus. In its recently presented Communication on the Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2012-2013, the Commission reiterated the necessity to re-launch the negotiations with the aim of reaching a swift conclusion of the talks, building on the progress achieved to date.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009256/12
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(15 oktober 2012)

Betreft: Aanwezigheid van Turkse militairen in Noord-Cyprus — Initiatieven EU via NATO

1. Hoeveel Turkse militairen bevinden zich op dit ogenblik volgens de Commissie in Noord-Cyprus? Op welke locaties?

2. Klopt de bewering dat Noord-Cyprus op die manier, in verhouding tot de burgerbevolking, één van de meest gemilitariseerde zones ter wereld is?

3. Is de Commissie van mening dat deze militaire aanwezigheid op dit ogenblik gelegitimeerd wordt door welke militaire bedreiging dan ook, nu Cyprus deel uitmaakt van de EU en Griekenland en Turkije NATO-leden zijn?

4. Is de Commissie van mening dat het aantal Turkse militairen in Cyprus verminderd zou moeten worden?

5. Op welke concrete wijze heeft de Commissie een verzoek tot vermindering van de Turkse troepensterkte in Noord-Cyprus ter bespreking voorgelegd binnen de NATO, waarvan ook Turkije deel uitmaakt?

6. Indien dit nog niet gebeurd is, is de Commissie bereid dit formeel te doen?

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

De Commissie heeft geen kennis van het aantal Turkse militairen in het noorden van Cyprus en evenmin van de plaatsen waar zij gelegerd zijn. Zij heeft geen mandaat of capaciteit om het aantal militairen te monitoren. Daarom kan zij het aantal militairen in verhouding tot de burgerbevolking niet beoordelen.

Verwacht wordt dat de terugtrekking van Turkse militairen deel zal uitmaken van een allesomvattende regeling van de kwestie Cyprus, zoals dit het geval was bij vorige voorstellen voor een regeling. De Commissie heeft herhaaldelijk benadrukt hoe belangrijk het is om zo snel mogelijk tot een allesomvattende regeling te komen. De Commissie staat ook positief tegenover een unilaterale afbouw van de Turkse militaire aanwezigheid die voorafgaand aan een overeenkomst zou kunnen plaatsvinden om vertrouwen tot stand te brengen tussen de beide gemeenschappen.

Wat betreft de vragen van het geachte Parlementslid met betrekking tot de NAVO, deelt de Commissie mee dat zij op dit punt niet bevoegd is.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009256/12
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Presence of Turkish military forces in Northern Cyprus — EU initiatives via NATO

1. As far as the Commission knows, how many Turkish troops are currently stationed in Northern Cyprus? Where are they stationed?

2. Is it true that they make Northern Cyprus one of the most heavily militarised zones in the world, in terms of the ratio of troops to the civilian population?

3. Does the Commission consider that this military presence is currently justified by any possible military threat, given that Cyprus is now a member of the EU and Greece and Turkey are members of NATO?

4. Does the Commission consider that the number of Turkish troops in Cyprus should be reduced?

5. In what specific way has the Commission sought to place a reduction in the number of Turkish troops in Northern Cyprus on the agenda for discussion within NATO, of which Turkey is also a member?

6. If the Commission has not yet done this, will it submit a formal request to this effect?

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

The Commission does not know the number or location of Turkish troops in the northern part of Cyprus and has no mandate or capacity to monitor troop levels. Therefore, the Commission is not in a position to assess the ratio of troops to the civilian population.

The withdrawal of Turkish troops is expected to be part of a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem, as was the case in previous settlement plans. The Commission has repeatedly stressed the importance to reach a comprehensive settlement as soon as possible. The Commission would also welcome any unilateral reduction of Turkey's military presence ahead of a settlement to build confidence between the two communities.

Regarding the Honourable Member's questions as regards NATO, the Commission has no competence in this matter.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-009257/12
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(15 oktober 2012)

Angående: Kvantitativa data för att underbygga innovationsincitamentet i CPVR (gemenskapens växtförädlarrätt)

I sitt svar av den 17 augusti 2012 på frågan E-005616/2012 ([1]) svarar kommissionen att den noggrant ska undersöka behovet av att producera mer detaljerade kvantitativa uppgifter om EU:s växtförädlarrättsordning och dess effekt på innovation. Mot bakgrund av att de externa konsulterna GHK Consulting i studien ”Evaluation of the Community Plant Variety Rights Acquis” menar att dessa kvantitativa data saknas (sidan 33, sista stycket), när förväntar sig kommissionen ha funnit ett svar på frågan om ett sådant behov finns?

Svar från Tonio Borg på kommissionens vägnar
(17 december 2012)

Efter den utvärdering av gemenskapens lagstiftning om växtförädlarrätt som genomfördes 2011 och med beaktande av den stora mängd uppgifter som varje år tas fram av gemenskapens växtsortsmyndighet (CPVO) anser kommissionen att kvantitativa uppgifter finns tillgängliga, särskilt hos CPVO. Uppgifterna analyserades däremot inte av konsulterna. Kommissionen anser därför att inga ytterligare uppgifter behöver inhämtas. De tillgängliga uppgifterna kommer att användas för att analysera effekter av gemenskapens växtförädlarrätt på innovationen.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=WQ&reference=E-2012-005616&language=SV.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009257/12
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Quantitative data to help the stimulus for innovation in Community Plant Variety Rights (CPVR)

In its answer of 17 August 2012 to Question E-005616/2012 ([1]), the Commission said that it would carefully examine the need to produce more detailed quantitative data on the CPVR system and the impact on innovation. In its study 'Evaluation of the Community Plant Variety Rights Acquis', the external company GHK Consulting states that quantitative data have not been provided (p.33, last paragraph). In view of this, when does the Commission expect to be able to answer the question of whether such a need exists?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(17 December 2012)

Following the evaluation of the Community Plant Variety Rights legislation carried out in 2011 and taking into account the considerable amount of data produced each year by the Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), the Commission considers that quantitative data were available, in particular at the level of the CPVO. However, the data were not analysed by the Consultant. The Commission therefore believes that no further data needs to be generated. The available data will be used to analyse the CPVR impact on innovation.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2012-005616+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-009258/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Revisione del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione

Il Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione è stato istituito nel 2006 con il regolamento (CE) n. 1927/2006, modificato successivamente dal regolamento (CE) n. 546/2009, per aiutare i lavoratori a trovare un nuovo impiego e a riqualificarsi quando perdono il lavoro a seguito di mutamenti strutturali del commercio mondiale. Con riferimento al suo funzionamento per il periodo compreso tra il 1° gennaio 2007 e il 31 ottobre 2012, si prega la Commissione di rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Quante domande ha ricevuto in totale? Quante domande ha ricevuto da ciascuno Stato membro? Quante domande per settore?

2. Qual è il numero complessivo dei lavoratori che hanno beneficiato dell'aiuto del FEG?

3. Quali sono i profili dei lavoratori maggiormente interessati dall'intervento del FEG?

4. Qual è l'importo complessivo erogato dal Fondo? Quale importo ha ricevuto complessivamente ciascuno Stato membro?

5. Qual è stata la percentuale di reintegro nel mercato del lavoro dei lavoratori aiutati dal FEG?

6. Tra i beneficiari che sono stati reintegrati con successo, quanti hanno trovato un'occupazione stabile?

7. Quanto tempo è passato, in media, tra il ricevimento della domanda e l'erogazione dei finanziamenti?

8. Quante persone, in media, hanno rifiutato volontariamente l'assistenza del FEG, ritenendola inadeguata?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(26 novembre 2012)

Da quando è diventato operativo nel 2007 il FEG ha ricevuto 101 domande. Sono stati richiesti 441,7 milioni di euro per aiutare più di 91 000 lavoratori. Le domande presentate al FEG provenivano finora da 33 settori e da venti Stati membri.

A tutt'oggi sono stati pagati 333,5 milioni di euro. Le 19 relazioni finali ricevute sinora indicano che un totale di 20 426 lavoratori licenziati ha beneficiato dell'assistenza del FEG per quanto concerne le operazioni già completate.

Anche se gli Stati membri sono invitati dalla Commissione a fornire informazioni in linea con la classifica ISCO-08, essi forniscono a volte soltanto dati estimativi che non sono sempre basati su fonti comparabili. La Commissione non è pertanto in grado di stabilire statistiche coerenti per quanto concerne i profili dei lavoratori.

La percentuale di reintegro stabilita sulla base delle operazioni già completate è pari al 42,7 %. Si tratta però soltanto di un'istantanea della situazione occupazionale dei lavoratori nel momento in cui vengono raccolti i dati. La situazione varia notevolmente in un breve arco di tempo.

Poiché il regolamento del FEG non fa obbligo agli Stati membri di fornire informazioni in merito al tipo o alla qualità del lavoro trovato, né informazioni sui lavoratori che possono aver deciso volontariamente di non chiedere l'assistenza del FEG, la Commissione non raccoglie questo tipo di dati.

L'intero iter procedurale del FEG richiede 220 giorni in media tra il momento della domanda e il pagamento. Mediamente 110 giorni servono alla Commissione europea per valutare i casi. Le due fasi successive (approvazione da parte del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio e fase di pagamento) sono più brevi e richiedono 60 e 50 giorni rispettivamente.

Particolari in merito al FEG sono disponibili nel EGF Statistical Portrait 2007-2011 (Quadro statistico del FEG 2007-2011) e nel sommario ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=326&langId=en.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009258/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Review of the European Global Adjustment Fund

The European Global Adjustment Fund was established in 2006 by Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006, subsequently amended by Regulation (EC) No 546/2009, to help workers to find new employment and to gain new qualifications when they lose their work because of structural changes in world trade. With reference to the functioning of the Fund between 1 January 2007 and 31 October 2012:

1. How many applications did the Commission receive altogether? How many applications did it receive from each Member State? How many per sector?

2. What is the total number of workers who have received assistance from the EGF?

3. What are the profiles of the workers who have most commonly received assistance from the EGF?

4. How much funding, altogether, has been granted from the Fund? How much money, altogether, has each Member State received?

5. What percentage of workers who have received assistance from the EGF have found employment again?

6. Among beneficiaries who have successfully found employment again, how many have found stable employment?

7. How much time has passed, on average, between receipt of an application for funding and the granting of that funding?

8. How many people, on average, have voluntarily refused assistance from the EGF on the grounds that they consider it inadequate?

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

There have been 101 applications to the EGF since it started operating in 2007. Some EUR 441.7 million has been requested to help more than 91 000 workers. EGF applications have been so far submitted for 33 sectors and by 20 Member States.

To date EUR 333.5 million has been paid out. The 19 Final Reports received so far show that a total of 20 426 dismissed workers have benefited from EGF assistance in already completed operations.

Even if Member States are invited by the Commission to provide information in line with the ISCO-08 classification, they are providing sometimes only estimated data which is not always based on comparable sources. The Commission is therefore not in the position to establish meaningful statistics regarding the profiles of workers.

The re-integration rate established on the basis of the completed operations is 42,7%. This however only provides a snapshot of the workers' employment situation at the moment the data are collected. It changes significantly in a short space of time.

Since the EGF Regulation does not require Member States to provide information regarding the type or quality of the work that has been found, nor information regarding workers who may have voluntarily decided not to ask for EGF assistance, the Commission does not collect this kind of data.

The EGF complete process takes 220 days on average between application and payment. On average 110 days are taken up by the European Commission assessing the cases. The subsequent two steps (approval by the European Parliament and the Council, and the payment phase) are each shorter, spanning 60 days and 50 days, respectively.

Details on the EGF are available in the EGF Statistical Portrait 2007-2011 and the summary ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=326&langId=en

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009259/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Il problema delle merci contraffate nel settore tessile dell'UE

Una recente tavola rotonda tra deputati ed esperti dell'industria in seno al Parlamento europeo ha posto l'accento sul problema persistente negli Stati membri e nell'industria tessile dell'UE relativo ai prodotti tessili contraffatti. Tale problema è stato esaminato su due livelli: la produzione di merci contraffatte in paesi terzi, segnatamente in Cina, ma anche il successo dei falsari nell'importare tali merci nell'UE.

L'industria tessile costituisce parte integrante dell'economia europea. L'Unione europea rappresenta il secondo esportatore mondiale di prodotti tessili e l'1,8 % dei lavoratori dell'UE è impiegato in detto settore. I prodotti tessili contraffatti sono motivo di grande preoccupazione in Italia. Oltre un terzo del fatturato del settore tessile europeo viene generato in Italia. Le merci contraffatte rappresentano un ostacolo alla crescita del settore. Nel 2007, circa il 60 % di tutte le merci contraffatte sequestrate alle frontiere europee proveniva dalla Cina, e nel 2008 la Commissione ha registrato una percentuale pari al 54 %.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, si chiede alla Commissione di rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È essa a conoscenza dei problemi persistenti rappresentati dalle merci contraffatte che entrano nel mercato europeo?

2. Dispone la Commissione di statistiche attuali concernenti le modalità, il luogo di entrata nell'UE e la provenienza delle merci contraffatte?

3. Quali misure intende adottare la Commissione al fine di ridurre al minimo l'importazionee la circolazione delle merci contraffatte nell'UE nonché di tutelare i diritti di proprietàintellettuale dei produttori europei?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(30 novembre 2012)

1. La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alle risposte date alle interrogazioni scritte E-6741/12 ed E-7670/12 ([1]).

2. Le statistiche sulla tutela dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale da parte delle autorità doganali nell'UE, pubblicate ogni anno dalla Commissione europea, sono basate sui dati trasmessi dagli Stati membri alla Commissione ([2]). Le statistiche in questione contengono indicazioni sui paesi di provenienza e sui mezzi di trasporto utilizzati, nonché un riepilogo dei casi accertati e delle merci intercettate per Stato membro.

3. La tutela dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale (DPI) è certamente una delle priorità della Commissione e degli Stati membri. Diverse iniziative sono state prese per ridurre al minimo l'importazione di merci contraffatte nell'UE.

In particolare, nel maggio 2011 la Commissione ha proposto ([3]) un nuovo regolamento inteso a rafforzare la tutela dei DPI da parte delle autorità doganali, nell'ambito di una comunicazione relativa a una vasta strategia dell'UE in materia di DPI. La proposta è attualmente all'esame del Parlamento europeo ([4]) e del Consiglio.

Al fine di rendere più efficiente l'intervento delle autorità doganali a tutela dei DPI, l'UE ha adottato un approccio doganale armonizzato, basato sul piano d'azione doganale in materia di lotta contro le violazioni dei DPI per il periodo 2009-2012 ([5]). Scopo del piano è contrastare quattro grandi problematiche: la distribuzione di merci contraffatte pericolose, la criminalità organizzata, la globalizzazione della contraffazione e la vendita di merci contraffatte via Internet. Il Consiglio adotterà probabilmente un nuovo piano d'azione dell'UE a fine anno.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html#sidesForm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/customs/customs_controls/counterfeit_piracy/statistics/index_en.htm
([3]) Proposta della Commissione per un regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo alla tutela dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale da parte delle autorità doganali (COM(2011) 285 definitivo), reperibile in http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0285:FIN:IT:PDF
([4]) Risoluzione legislativa del Parlamento europeo del 3 luglio 2012 sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativo alla tutela dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale da parte delle autorità doganali (COM(2011)0285 — C7-0139/2011 — 2011/0137(COD)), reperibile in http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2012-0272&language=IT&ring=A7-2012-0046.
([5]) Risoluzione del Consiglio 2009/C 71/01, del 16 marzo 2009, relativa al piano d'azione doganale dell'UE in materia di lotta contro le violazioni dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale per il periodo 2009-2012.

La Commissione e gli Stati membri attuano anche un piano d'azione sulla cooperazione doganale con la Cina in materia di DPI. Il piano, articolato in quattro iniziative prioritarie, prevede tra l'altro lo scambio di informazioni e l'attivazione di una rete di esperti delle dogane presso porti e aeroporti al fine di intercettare le spedizioni ad alto rischio.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009259/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Problem of counterfeit goods in the EU textile sector

A recent panel discussion involving MEPs and industry experts at the European Parliament highlighted the continuing problem of counterfeit textile goods for Member States and the EU textile industry. The problem was explored at two levels: the production of counterfeit goods in third countries, notably China, but also the success of counterfeiters in importing these goods into the EU.

The textile industry is an integral part of the EU economy. The EU is the world's second largest exporter of textile products, and 1.8% of EU workers are currently employed in the industry. Counterfeit textile products are of considerable concern for Italy. More than one third of the European textile industry's turnover is generated by Italy. Counterfeit goods are an obstruction to the growth of this industry. In 2007 almost 60% of all counterfeit goods seized at European borders came from China, and in 2008 the Commission's recorded figure was 54%.

In the light of the above information, can the Commission please answer the following:

1. Is the Commission aware of the continuing problems posed by counterfeit goods entering the European market?

2. Does the Commission have any current statistics on how and where counterfeit goods are entering the EU, and where they come from?

3. What steps is the Commission taking to minimise the importation and circulation of counterfeit goods in the EU, and to protect the intellectual property rights of EU producers?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(30 November 2012)

1. The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its reply to written questions E-6741/12 and E-7670/12 ([1]).

2. Statistics on EU customs enforcement of intellectual property rights published each year by the European Commission are based on the data transmitted by the EU Member States to the Commission ([2]). These statistics provide details on the countries of provenance, an overview of cases and articles intercepted per Member State as well as on the means of transport used.

3. IPR protection represents a clear priority for the Commission and Member States. A number of initiatives have been taken to minimise the importation of counterfeit goods in the EU:

In May 2011 the Commission proposed ([3]) a new regulation to strengthen the customs enforcement of IPR, as part of a communication on a comprehensive EU strategy concerning intellectual property rights. This proposal is now before the European Parliament ([4]) and the Council.

In order to make the IPR-related activities of customs more efficient, a harmonised customs approach has been agreed on the basis of an EU Customs Action Plan to combat IPR infringements for years 2009 to 2012 ([5]). This Action Plan aims to tackle four main challenges, namely, dangerous counterfeit goods, organised crime, globalisation of counterfeiting, and the sales of counterfeits over the Internet. A new EU Action Plan will probably be adopted by the Council at the end of this year.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/customs/customs_controls/counterfeit_piracy/statistics/index_en.htm
([3]) The Commission Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning customs enforcement of intellectual property rights (COM(2011) 285 final) is available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=EN&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2011&nu_doc=285
([4]) European Parliament legislative resolution of 3 July 2012 on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning customs enforcement of intellectual property rights (COM(2011)0285 — C7-0139/2011 — 2011/0137(COD)) is available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2012-0272&language=EN&ring=A7-2012-0046.
([5]) 2009/C 71/01 Council Resolution of 16 March 2009 on the EU Customs Action Plan to combat IPR infringements for the years 2009 to 2012.

The Commission and the Member States are also implementing an Action Plan with China on customs cooperation on IPR. This Action Plan is structured around four key actions, involving in particular an exchange of information and the operation of a network of customs experts at airports and seaports to target high risk consignments.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009260/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Raddoppio delle violazioni dei diritti umani da parte dei tribunali nell'Unione europea negli ultimi cinque anni

Uno studio condotto dall'organizzazione londinese Fair Trials International e dallo studio legale internazionale Clifford Chance ha messo in evidenza un fenomeno allarmante, ovvero l'aumento esponenziale delle violazioni dei diritti umani ad opera dei tribunali all'interno dell'Unione europea. Lo studio copre il quinquennio compreso tra il 2007 e l'estate del 2012. Le statistiche dipingono un quadro preoccupante: nel 2007 le violazioni del diritto a un equo processo penale negli Stati membri dell'UE ammontavano a 37, mentre nel 2011 ne sono state denunciate 75; ciò equivale a un aumento di oltre il 100 %.

In base a quanto emerso dallo studio, Grecia, Bulgaria, Polonia e Romania sarebbero gli Stati membri meno virtuosi in termini di amministrazione della giustizia attraverso i processi penali. Il motivo di critica più comune risiede nei ritardi con i quali i casi sono stati portati in giudizio. Tra le altre problematiche menzionate rientrano l'impossibilità di accedere a interpreti, avvocati difensori e documenti processuali. È stata inoltre denunciata la mancata presunzione di innocenza dell'imputato fino a prova contraria da parte dei tribunali. Dal momento che l'Unione europea si fonda sullo Stato di diritto e sul rispetto dei diritti umani di base, un'ulteriore crescita del numero di tali violazioni costituirebbe motivo di preoccupazione.

Alla luce di quanto suesposto, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza di questo studio o di studi analoghi riguardanti le violazioni dei diritti umani nei tribunali dell'Unione europea? In caso affermativo, qual è la sua posizione in merito?

2. È la Commissione a conoscenza di altre violazioni nei tribunali del'Unione europea di cui i cittadini europei dovrebbero essere messi al corrente?

3. Quali sforzi sta compiendo la Commissione, all'ora attuale, per garantire che la giustizia nell'Unione europea venga amministrata nel modo più equo possibile, nonché per promuovere i diritti umani negli Stati membri?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(27 novembre 2012)

La Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea deve essere sempre rispettata dalle istituzioni dell'UE e dagli Stati membri nell'applicazione del diritto dell'Unione. Per monitorare i progressi compiuti nel rispetto della Carta, la Commissione pubblica dal 2010 un'apposita relazione annuale, che mostra in che modo le istituzioni dell'UE e gli Stati membri l'hanno attuata ([1]). La relazione comprende anche un titolo «Giustizia» contenente informazioni sull'applicazione dei diritti processuali istituiti dall'UE. La Commissione è a conoscenza dello studio condotto da Fair Trials International.

([1]) La relazione del 2011 sull'applicazione della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea è accessibile al sito: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/charter-brochure-report_en.pdf

Per rafforzare la fiducia reciproca tra sistemi giudiziari degli Stati membri e il riconoscimento reciproco delle decisioni giudiziarie in tutta l'Unione, la Commissione è impegnata a fissare norme minime per la tutela di indagati e imputati nei procedimenti penali. A livello dell'Unione sono già stati compiuti notevoli progressi: sono state adottate due direttive relative ai procedimenti penali, l'una sul diritto all'interpretazione e alla traduzione ([2]) e l'altra sul diritto all'informazione ([3]). La Commissione ha inoltre presentato una proposta di direttiva relativa al diritto di accesso a un difensore nel procedimento penale e al diritto di comunicare al momento dell'arresto ([4]), proposta che si trova attualmente in fase di discussione al Consiglio e al Parlamento europeo. La Commissione è altresì impegnata nella redazione delle valutazioni d'impatto di potenziali iniziative in materia di patrocinio a spese dello Stato e di garanzie speciali per le persone vulnerabili. I due strumenti adottati disciplinano già vari aspetti della presunzione d'innocenza, mentre altri rientreranno nel campo di applicazione della futura direttiva sul diritto di accesso a un difensore e al diritto di comunicare al momento dell'arresto. Inoltre, la Commissione sta analizzando approfonditamente tale questione e intende presentare un'iniziativa in merito alla presunzione d'innocenza alla fine del 2013.

([2]) Direttiva 2010/64/CE del 20 ottobre 2010 (GU L 280 del 26.10.2010, pag. 1).
([3]) Direttiva 2012/13/CE del 22 maggio 2012 (GU L 142 dell'1.6.2012, pag. 1).
([4]) COM(2011)326 definitivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009260/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Doubling of human rights violations by courts in the EU in the last five years

A study conducted by the London-based organisation Fair Trials International and the international law firm Clifford Chance has exposed the alarming phenomenon of an exponential increase in human rights violations perpetrated by courts in the EU. The study covers the five-year period between 2007 and summer 2012. The statistics paint a worrying picture: there were 37 violations of the right to a fair criminal trial in EU Member States in 2007 but 75 in 2011, meaning an increase of more than 100%.

The study found Greece, Bulgaria, Poland and Romania to be the worst Member States in terms of delivering justice through criminal trials. The most common cause for criticism was delays in bringing cases to trial. Other problems cited included lack of access to interpreters, defence lawyers and court documents. The failure of courts to presume the accused innocent until proven guilty was also highlighted in the findings. Since the European Union is founded on the rule of law and respect for basic human rights, it would be cause for concern should the numbers of such violations continue to rise.

In the light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is the Commission aware of this study or of similar studies concerning violations of human rights in EU courts? If so, what is its stance on this issue?

2. Is the Commission aware of other violations in EU courts that European citizens should be made aware of?

3. What efforts is the Commission currently making to ensure that justice in the EU is as equitable as possible and to promote human rights in the Member States?

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

The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU must always be respected by EU institutions and by the Member States when they are implementing EC law. In order to track progress on the implementation of the Charter, the Commission publishes an annual report on the application of the Charter since 2010. These reports show how the EU institutions and the Member States have applied the Charter ([1]). The report includes a title on Justice which contains information on the application of EU procedural rights. The Commission is aware of the Study by Fair Trials International.

In order to enhance mutual trust among Member States' judicial systems and the mutual recognition of judicial decisions throughout the EU, the Commission is laying down minimum standards for the protection of suspects and accused persons in criminal proceedings. Significant progress has already been made at EU level. Directives on the right to interpretation and translation ([2]) and on the right to information in criminal proceedings ([3]) have been adopted. The Commission proposed a directive on the right of access to a lawyer and on the right to communicate upon arrest ([4]), which is under discussion in the Council and European Parliament. The Commission is drafting impact assessments on possible initiatives on legal aid and on special safeguards for vulnerable persons. Various aspects of the presumption of innocence are already covered by the two adopted instruments. Further aspects will be covered by the future Directive on the right of access to a lawyer and on the right to communicate upon arrest. Moreover, the Commission is currently looking in detail into this topic and intends to present an initiative on the presumption of innocence at the end of 2013.

([1]) The 2011 Report on the Application of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights is available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/charter-brochure-report_en.pdf
([2]) Directive 2010/64/EU of 20 October 2010, OJ L 280, 26.10.2010, p.1.
([3]) Directive 2012/13/EU of 22 May 2012, OJ L 142, 1.6.2012, p.1.
([4]) COM(2011) 326 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009261/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Allarme delle Nazioni Unite sul rincaro dei prezzi dei generi alimentari provocato dalle condizioni meteorologiche estreme del 2012

Questa settimana le Nazioni Unite hanno lanciato l'allarme sull'aumento dei prezzi della carne e dei prodotti lattiero-caseari a seguito di condizioni meteorologiche estreme in gran parte dell'Europa e negli Stati Uniti. Le statistiche dell'Organizzazione delle Nazioni Unite per l'alimentazione e l'agricoltura (FAO), con sede a Roma, prevedono che la produzione globale di grano registrerà un calo del 5,2 % nel 2012 e che la resa di svariate colture utilizzate quale foraggio animale potrebbe diminuire del 10 % rispetto allo scorso anno.

Le condizioni climatiche estreme che hanno provocato una scarsa resa delle colture, insieme alla crisi economica e alla disoccupazione in Europa, rappresentano un motivo di grave preoccupazione per i cittadini europei. Nel 2012 il prezzo del grano è già cresciuto del 25 %, quello del granoturco del 13 % mentre quello dei prodotti lattiero-caseari è lievitato del 7 % solo lo scorso mese. L'Unione nazionale degli agricoltori del Regno Unito ha riferito che la situazione non è mai stata così tragica dalla fine degli anni '80.

Alla luce delle considerazioni sopraesposte, si prega la Commissione di rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È essa a conoscenza di questa nuova relazione a cura della FAO?

2. Può essa fornire statistiche per indicare in quale misura gli Stati membri saranno colpiti da tali aumenti dei prezzi?

3. Quali eventuali azioni intende essa adottare al fine di garantire che i cittadinieuropei non debbano subire gli effetti degli aumenti dei prezzi dei prodotti alimentari di base?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(26 novembre 2012)

1) La Commissione è regolarmente informata dalla FAO sulle questioni relative ai prezzi dei prodotti alimentari e partecipa attivamente a tutte le iniziative in materia. Sulla base delle stime e delle analisi disponibili condivide l'opinione della FAO secondo cui attualmente non vi è alcuna crisi alimentare. La Commissione ritiene che il rincaro dei prezzi dei prodotti alimentari debba essere al centro della sua agenda politica internazionale, evitando tuttavia interventi unilaterali e sostenendo i meccanismi coordinati volti ad affrontare tale problema. L'UE continua pertanto ad essere in prima linea nel contribuire al proseguimento dei processi del G8 e del G20.

2) Nel giugno-luglio 2012, i prezzi del granturco sono aumentati da 190 EUR/t a 240-260 EUR/t e i prezzi del frumento da 210 EUR/t a 260 EUR/t sui mercati a termine dell'UE. Da allora, tuttavia, i prezzi si sono stabilizzati e si sono mossi entro un margine relativamente ridotto.

Vista la disponibilità di frumento a livello mondiale è improbabile un incremento sostenuto dei prezzi del pane e della farina. Il Consiglio internazionale dei cereali prevede che la produzione mondiale di frumento raggiungerà 657 milioni di tonnellate, mentre il consumo è previsto a 679 milioni di tonnellate. Il divario fra il consumo e la produzione dovrebbe essere agevolmente colmato dalle scorte esistenti, stimate a 175 milioni di tonnellate.

3) Eccetto per il granturco colpito dalla siccità, la situazione dell'approvvigionamento dei cereali nell'UE può ritenersi soddisfacente. Calcolando anche le importazioni tradizionali, la domanda interna dovrebbe essere soddisfatta. La Commissione continua a seguire l'evoluzione dei prezzi dei cereali ed i flussi commerciali e, se fosse necessario, non esiterà ad adottare misure intese ad affrontare il rincaro dei prezzi e a garantire l'equilibrio del mercato. Nel 2011-2012 si era deciso di sospendere i dazi doganali sul frumento tenero di bassa e media qualità e sull'orzo da foraggio ([1]). Tale misura ha contribuito ad evitare un incremento eccessivo dei prezzi dei prodotti alimentari nell'UE. La Commissione intende prolungare tale sospensione tariffaria fino al 30 giugno 2013.

([1]) Cfr. i regolamenti (UE) n. 1350/2011 e n. 633/2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009261/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: UN warning of rising food prices in the wake of extreme weather in 2012

This week the UN warned of increasing meat and dairy prices in the wake of extreme weather conditions across large parts of Europe and in the United States. Statistics from the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) in Rome show that global wheat production is expected to fall 5.2% in 2012 and yields from various other crops grown to feed animals could be 10% down on last year.

The extreme weather conditions causing poor crop yield, combined with the economic crisis and unemployment in Europe is of grave concern to European citizens. Prices for wheat have already risen 25% in 2012, maize 13% and dairy prices rose 7% just in the last month. The UK National Farmers Union reported that the situation has not been this bad since the late 1980s.

In the light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is the Commission aware of this new report from the FAO?

2. Can the Commission provide statistics to show to what extent Member States will be affected by these price increases?

3. What measures, if any, is the Commission taking to ensure that European citizens do not suffer unnecessarily from price increases on staple foods?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

1. The Commission is regularly informed by FAO on food price issues and participates actively in all related initiatives. Based on available estimates and analysis it shares FAO's views that at present there is no food crisis. The Commission considers that avoiding unilateral actions and supporting coordinated mechanisms to face rising food prices must be at the centre of its international policy agenda. Therefore, the EU continues being at the forefront to contribute to the inputs of the G8/G20 processes.

2. During June-July 2012 maize prices increased from 190 EUR/t to 240-260 EUR/t and wheat prices from 210 EUR/t to 260 EUR/t on the EU futures markets. Since then however prices have stabilised and moved in a relatively narrow range.

In view of the availability of wheat at world level a substantial rise in bread and flour prices is not likely. The International Grains Council forecasts world wheat production to reach 657 million tonnes, while consumption is put at 679 million tonnes. The gap between consumption and output should be safely covered by the existing stocks, estimated at 175 million tonnes.

3. With the exception of the drought-hit maize, the cereals supply situation in the EU can be viewed as satisfactory. Together with traditional imports the internal demand would be met. The Commission continuously follows the evolution of cereals prices and trade flows and in case necessary will not hesitate to take measures in order to tackle increasing prices and ensure market equilibrium. In 2011/12 it was decided to suspend the customs duties on common wheat of low and medium quality and feed barley ([1]). This measure contributed to avoiding excessive rise of food prices in the EU. The Commission intends to extend this tariff suspension until 30 June 2013.

([1]) See Regulations (EU) No 1350/2011 and 633/2011.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009262/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Diritti delle ragazze minacciati in Pakistan alla luce dell'attentato dei talebani nei confronti di una giovane studentessa attivista

Il 9 ottobre 2012, una giovane attivista pakistana di 14 anni, Malala Yousafzai, sostenitrice del diritto all'istruzione femminile, è stata ferita a colpi di arma da fuoco mentre tornava a casa da scuola, nella valle dello Swat. Malala Yousafzai è diventata famosa per aver reso pubbliche le atrocità commesse nella valle dello Swat dai talebani nel 2009, quando l'area fu teatro di accese lotte tra i militanti e l'esercito. Il suo blog per la BBC Urdu aveva inoltre riferito di istituti scolastici femminili dati alle fiamme.

I talebani hanno rapidamente rivendicato la responsabilità dell'attentato, dichiarando di non voler assistere alla diffusione delle idee politiche secolari della ragazza nella valle dello Swat. L'attentato nei confronti di questa coraggiosa adolescente, vincitrice di un premio per la pace, ha dato adito a dubbi in merito alle dichiarazioni delle autorità pakistane, che affermano di aver «ripulito» la valle dello Swat dai militanti e di tenere la situazione sotto controllo.

Il Pakistan è un partner commerciale dell'Unione europea e, secondo il piano di impegno quinquennale UE-Pakistan del marzo 2012, le due parti avrebbero concordato di intraprendere un dialogo strategico sulla sicurezza e i diritti umani. Alla luce delle informazioni suesposte, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. Ritiene che l'attentato a Malala Yousafzai costituisca un passo indietro nella promozione dei diritti delle ragazze e dei diritti umani in Pakistan?

2. Ritiene che il governo pakistano stia agendo in misura sufficiente per tutelare la sicurezza degli abitanti della valle dello Swat e per proteggere i diritti umani dei suoi cittadini?

3. Come valuta, all'ora attuale, la situazione generale dei diritti umani in Pakistan?

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

Malala Yousafzai, nota sostenitrice del diritto all'istruzione delle ragazze, ha espresso pubblicamente sul suo blog per la BBC Urdu, con grande coraggio, la propria opposizione al divieto imposto dai talebani all'istruzione femminile. L'attentato dei talebani nei suoi confronti ha inflitto, in quanto tale, un duro colpo ai diritti delle ragazze e ai diritti umani in Pakistan e, in una dichiarazione dell'AR/VP Catherine Ashton, è stato definito «una vile aggressione e un attacco sia contro i valori umani fondamentali sia contro tutti i difensori dei diritti umani in Pakistan».

Dalla rioccupazione della valle dello Swat nel 2009, l'esercito pakistano ha ridotto la propria presenza in loco e ha accelerato il trasferimento delle responsabilità in materia di sicurezza e di governance al governo civile. Per quanto sia improbabile che la valle dello Swat ritorni sotto il controllo dei talebani, i problemi di sicurezza paiono destinati a continuare. Occorre sviluppare le capacità necessarie per un governo civile effettivo e per l'applicazione della legge perché l'esercito possa ritirarsi e le esigenze locali in materia di sviluppo e di giustizia siano rispettate. Assieme ad altri donatori internazionali, l'UE sostiene già questo processo di sviluppo delle capacità.

Sebbene il Pakistan abbia ratificato la maggior parte delle convenzioni internazionali in materia di diritti umani, l'UE è consapevole che in molte aree la situazione dei diritti umani in Pakistan è precaria e solleva regolarmente la questione nell'ambito del dialogo con il paese. Dal 2011 il Pakistan ha introdotto nuove norme al fine di affrontare meglio i problemi legati alla discriminazione e alla violenza contro le donne. Tuttavia, si dovrà garantire che le nuove leggi in materia vengano attuate, anche perché, a seguito delle recenti modifiche costituzionali, la responsabilità a tal riguardo è condivisa tra le autorità federali e quelle provinciali.

Secondo l'UE si potrà incidere su tali sviluppi solo mediante un impegno graduale con il Pakistan su tutti i fronti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009262/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Girls' rights under threat in Pakistan in light of Taliban attack on activist schoolgirl

A young 14-year-old Pakistani activist, Malala Yousafzai, who championed education for girls, was shot and injured in Swat Valley on 9 October 2012 as she made her way home from school. Yousafzai became famous for highlighting Taliban atrocities in the Swat Valley in 2009 when it was the scene of intense fighting between the army and the Taliban. Her BBC Urdu blog also spoke of the burning of girls' schools.

The Taliban quickly claimed responsibility for the attack, stating that they did not want her secular political views spreading in the Swat valley. The attack on this courageous peace prize-winning teen has created doubts about the claims of the authorities that militants have been 'flushed out' of the Swat Valley and that the Pakistani authorities are maintaining control.

Pakistan is a trade partner of the EU and the March 2012 EU-Pakistan 5-year Engagement Plan outlines that the EU and Pakistan agree to take part in strategic dialogue on security and human rights. In light of the information above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does the Commission regard the shooting of Yousafzai as a step backwards in the advancement of girls' and human rights in Pakistan?

2. Is the Commission confident that the Pakistani government is doing enough to provide security for its citizens in the Swat valley and to protect the human rights of its citizens?

3. How does the Commission currently view the overall human rights situation in Pakistan?

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

Malala Yousafzai's objection to the Taliban's prohibition of female education was courageously and publicly expressed through her BBC Urdu blog. She has been a well-known advocate of education for girls. As such, t he attack on her was a blow by the Taliban against girls' and human rights in Pakistan. It was described as 'a vile aggression and an assault both on basic human values and against all human rights defenders in Pakistan' in a statement by HR/VP Ashton.

Since its reoccupation of the Swat valley in 2009, the Pakistani army had been reducing its presence and accelerating transfer of security and governance to civilian government. Although it is unlikely that Swat will fall once more under the control of the Taliban, problems of security are likely to continue. Capacity-building for effective civilian government and law-enforcement is essential so that the army can withdraw, and so that local needs for development and justice can be met. The EU is already supporting this capacity-building process, along with other international donors.

Although Pakistan has ratified most of the international human rights conventions, the EU is aware that in many areas the human rights situation in Pakistan is precarious, and these are regularly raised in the EU's dialogue with Pakistan. Since 2011 Pakistan has introduced new legislation in order to better tackle issues of discrimination and violence against women. But implementation of these new laws will need to be ensured, especially as responsibility is shared between national and provincial governments following the recent constitutional changes.

The EU's position is that we can only influence these developments through a progressive engagement with Pakistan across the board.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009263/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Kit per la produzione di vino e possibili rischi per la salute dei consumatori europei

Navigando in Internet si possono trovare kit prodotti principalmente in USA e Canada per produrre «vino europeo» in tempi molto brevi ed a costi molto contenuti. Questi kit contengono generalmente mosto da fermentare, solfiti, lieviti e vari additivi.

Al di là dei gravissimi problemi in termini di lesione dell'economia e dell'immagine di qualità dei prodotti europei, il vino prodotto con i kit è a tutti gli effetti una potenziale minaccia per la salute dei consumatori europei. Un altro aspetto molto preoccupante di questo commercio è, infatti, quello sanitario: non si conosce l'origine del «mosto» con cui si parte per la produzione e che potrebbe essere ottenuto da qualsiasi uva o addirittura da altra frutta né è dato sapere se sono stati aggiunti zuccheri, contaminanti chimici e/o biologici.

1. È la Commissione a conoscenza di aziende europee che si occupano della produzione di questi kit?

2. Ha intenzione di affrontare il problema sanitario legato alla loro diffusione, magari all'insaputa dei consumatori, verificandone i precisi contenuti e lanciando un'apposita campagna di sensibilizzazione ai rischi connessi all'utilizzo di sostanze sconosciute o pericolose?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(6 dicembre 2012)

La Commissione è stata informata delle pratiche commerciali cui si fa riferimento nell'interrogazione ed è a conoscenza del coinvolgimento di alcune aziende europee nella commercializzazione di tali prodotti. Nell'ultima riunione del comitato di gestione dell'OCM unica, le delegazioni degli Stati membri sono state informate del fatto che prassi quali la produzione o la commercializzazione di «vini europei» con kit di mosti e vari additivi importati da paesi terzi sono in contrasto con le norme di etichettatura per il settore vitivinicolo stabilite dalla legislazione europea.

La Commissione ha precisato che gli Stati membri devono prendere le disposizioni necessarie per impedire la commercializzazione illecita di tali prodotti nell'Unione attraverso il loro ritiro dal mercato.

In particolare, sono state contattate le autorità italiane e britanniche al fine di vietare la commercializzazione dei prodotti in questione. Per quanto riguarda i possibili rischi per la salute, la Commissione ha anche invitato gli Stati membri ad adottare le misure necessarie nel quadro delle loro indagini.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009263/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Wine-making kits and potential risks for the health of European consumers

Kits for making 'European wine' can be found online in a very short time and at very low cost. Produced for the most part in the USA and Canada, the kits generally consist of must to be fermented, sulphites, yeast and various additives.

Quite apart from the very serious harm caused to the economy and image of European products, the wine produced with these kits poses a potential threat to the health of European consumers. A very worrying aspect of this trade is the unknown origin of the 'must' used for making the wine; this could be derived from any grape, or even from another type of fruit. It is also unknown whether any sugars have been added, or any chemical and/or biological contaminants.

1. Is the Commission aware of any European companies producing these kits?

2. Does it intend to tackle the health problems associated with their distribution, which are perhaps unknown to consumers, by determining their precise ingredients and launching an appropriate campaign to raise awareness about the risks associated with the use of unknown or dangerous substances?

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

The Commission was informed of the commercial practices referred to in the question and is aware of some European companies involved in the marketing of the concerned products. The delegations of the Member States were informed during the last meeting of the management committee of the single CMO that practices like producing or marketing 'European wines' with kits of musts and various additives imported from third countries were in infringement with the rules of labelling laid down in the wine sector by the European legislation.

The Commission specified that the Member States must take the necessary measures to prevent the illicit placing on the EU market of these products by withdrawing them from the market.

Contacts were in particular established with the Italian and United Kingdom's authorities in order to prohibit the marketing of the products concerned. Concerning the possible health risks, the Commission also required the Member States to take the necessary measures within the framework of their investigations.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009264/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Nuovi casi di influenza aviaria in Veneto

Alla fine del mese di settembre, in Veneto, in un allevamento del Trevigiano a Maserada sul Piave e in uno del Veronese a Sona, sono stati registrati due casi di influenza aviaria. Il ceppo del virus sarebbe l'H5N2, una sottospecie meno aggressiva dell'H5N1, responsabile della pandemia di qualche anno fa. Ad oggi, fortunatamente, si tratta soltanto di pochi focolai isolati che destano una moderata preoccupazione e che le autorità sanitarie locali stanno monitorando con attenzione. Tuttavia è doveroso muoversi per tempo, predisponendo sin da subito tutte le dovute contromisure per scongiurare conseguenze ben più gravi: si pensi, per esempio, a quanto accaduto nel 2005, quando soltanto in Veneto furono abbattuti oltre 16 milioni di polli, provocando una psicosi generale tra i cittadini e danni ingentissimi (circa 55 milioni di euro) all'economia del nostro territorio.

1. Considerato che l'influenza aviaria costituisce da sempre una minaccia a livello mondiale e, per questo, richiede un'azione coordinata e rapida a livello europeo ed internazionale, considerato inoltre che nessuna regione può affrontare una simile emergenza da sola, è la Commissione al corrente di questi fatti?

2. Cosa intende fare per monitorare gli effetti e i possibili sviluppi del virus in Veneto e in Europa?

3. Ha intenzione di prevedere degli stanziamenti economici a sostegno del settore avicolo e degli allevatori che, dopo la comparsa del virus, hanno dovuto o dovranno abbattere i propri animali a scopo cautelativo?

4. Preso atto di quanto accaduto nel 2005, quali misure preventive ha predisposto l'UE per arginare il rischio del contagio ed evitare il tracollo economico del settore avicolo?

Risposta di Maros Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(28 novembre 2012)

La Commissione è ben consapevole dei rischi che l'influenza aviaria comporta per la salute animale e quella umana. Esiste un'estensiva legislazione dell'UE per assicurare un'azione preventiva e meccanismi di risposta rapida al fine di affrontare questi rischi.

Alla luce delle crisi di influenza aviaria registrate in Italia nel 2000 e nei paesi Bassi nel 2003 e delle più recenti conoscenze scientifiche era stata adottata la direttiva 2005/94/CE ([1]) per aggiornare le misure esistenti finalizzate al controllo efficace di tale malattia. Per integrare le misure di eradicazione nel caso di un focolaio, la direttiva ha introdotto misure obbligatorie volte a prevenire il rischio di mutazione dei virus dell'influenza da bassa a elevata patogenicità attraverso i programmi approvati e cofinanziati a livello di UE per la sorveglianza dell'influenza aviaria negli Stati membri.

Finora l'Italia ha efficacemente applicato la legislazione dell'UE per controllare i recenti focolai di influenza aviaria a bassa patogenicità nel pollame. La Commissione segue da vicino la situazione ed è pronta ad adottare ulteriori misure ove necessario.

La decisione 2009/470/CE del Consiglio ([2]) prevede un contributo finanziario dell'Unione per sovvenire ai costi incorsi dagli Stati membri per l'indennizzo degli allevatori nel caso di focolai di influenza aviaria ad alta e bassa patogenicità fino a concorrenza del 50 % del valore dei capi di pollame e delle uova distrutti, dei costi di pulitura e disinfezione degli allevamenti e delle attrezzature e della distruzione dei mangimi contaminati.

([1]) GU L 10 del 14.1.2006.
([2]) GU L 155 del 18.6.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009264/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: New cases of bird flu in Veneto

Two cases of bird flu were recorded in Veneto at the end of September, at farms in Maserada sul Piave (Treviso) and Sona (Verona). The strain of virus involved appears to be H5N2, a less aggressive sub-species of H5N1, which was responsible for the pandemic of a few years ago. So far, fortunately, there have only been a few isolated outbreaks, which are causing moderate concern and being carefully monitored by local health authorities. However, it is right to take early action, preparing all the necessary countermeasures to prevent far more serious consequences. We must remember, for example, what happened in 2005, when more than 16 million chickens were destroyed in Veneto alone, creating general panic among the public and causing extremely serious damage (around EUR 55 million) to the Italian economy.

1. Bird flu has always been a global threat, and therefore demands coordinated and rapid action at European and international level. No region can tackle this kind of emergency alone. Is the Commission aware of these facts?

2. What does it intend to do to monitor the effects and any potential spread of the virus in Veneto and in Europe?

3. Does it intend to provide any financial support to those poultry farmers and breeders who, after the appearance of the virus, have had to, or will have to, destroy their animals as a precautionary measure?

4. Bearing in mind what happened in 2005, what preventive measures has the EU prepared for minimising the risk of contagion and avoiding the economic collapse of the poultry sector?

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

The Commission is well aware of the risks to animal and public health posed by avian influenza. Comprehensive EU legislation is in place for preventive action and rapid response mechanisms to address those risks.

In the light of the avian influenza crises in Italy in 2000 and the Netherlands in 2003 and new scientific knowledge, Directive 2005/94/EC [1] was adopted to update existing measures for the effective control of that disease. To complement the eradication measures in case of an outbreak that directive introduced mandatory measures aimed at preventing the risk of mutation of influenza viruses from low to high pathogenicity through EU-approved and co-financed programmes for avian influenza surveillance in Member States.

So far, Italy has successfully applied the EU legislation to control the recent outbreaks of low pathogenic avian influenza in poultry. The Commission follows the situation closely and is ready to adopt further measures if necessary.

Council Decision 2009/470/EC [2] provides for a Union financial contribution to Member States' costs for compensating farmers in case of highly and low pathogenic avian influenza outbreaks covering up to 50% of the value of poultry and eggs destroyed, cleaning and disinfection of holdings and equipment and the destruction of contaminated feeding stuffs.

---

[1] OJ L 10, 14.1.2006.
[2] OJ L 155, 18.6.2009.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009265/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Violazione dei diritti dei minori in Europa — Il caso del bambino di Padova

Formalmente i diritti dei minori trovano ampia difesa a livello internazionale. Si pensi alla Convenzione ONU sui diritti dell'infanzia e dell'adolescenza, approvata dall'Assemblea generale delle Nazioni Unite il 20 novembre 1989 e ratificata in Italia con legge n. 176 del 27 maggio 1991, o alla Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione che all'articolo 24, in tema di diritti del bambino, contiene un esplicito riconoscimento del loro diritto alla protezione, alle cure necessarie al loro benessere, alla libertà di espressione, al rispetto delle loro opinioni e alla considerazione del loro interesse superiore in tutti gli atti che li riguardano. Eppure tutti questi loro diritti vengono quotidianamente oltraggiati. A Cittadella, in provincia di Padova, per procedere con l'esecuzione di un provvedimento deciso dalla Corte d'appello di Venezia di sottrarre un bimbo di dieci anni alle cure materne per affidarlo al padre, le forze dell'ordine hanno realizzato un vero e proprio blitz. Dopo numerosi vani tentativi degli assistenti sociali di prelevare il bimbo presso la casa dei nonni materni, sono intervenuti gli agenti di polizia che hanno prelevato il bambino in modo coatto mentre si trovava nella sua scuola. La zia ha filmato quanto accaduto e le immagini del «blitz» sono state trasmesse sulla nostra rete televisiva nazionale scuotendo l'opinione pubblica per l'intensità e soprattutto per la grande sofferenza psicologica e anche fisica del minore la cui richiesta di soccorso medico è rimasta inascoltata.

Posto che le forze di polizia hanno legittimamente eseguito un compito affidato loro dalla magistratura italiana e preso atto che dopo l'entrata in vigore del trattato di Lisbona la Comunità europea ha rafforzato l'obiettivo di istituire uno spazio di libertà, sicurezza e giustizia in cui il rispetto dei diritti dell'infanzia costituisca una priorità assoluta, ritiene la Commissione che le modalità di esecuzione delle sentenza del tribunale non abbiano, in qualche modo, violato i diritti dell'infanzia tutelati a livello internazionale ed europeo?

Come intende proteggere i diritti di tutti quei minori che sono vittime in Europa dei conflitti legali tra i genitori?

Ha ipotizzato di istituire un Osservatorio europeo che si occupi di monitorare che nell'UE il rispetto dei diritti dei bambini sia garantito, non solo nelle legislazioni e nelle politiche elaborate dagli Stati membri, ma anche nelle loro prassi operative?

Ha pensato di istituire negli Stati membri corsi di formazione che aiutino le forze dell'ordine a operare nel rispetto dei diritti dei minori che certamente hanno esigenze e sensibilità diverse da quelle degli adulti?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009309/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Caso di violazione dei diritti del minore

I bambini sono una categoria molto vulnerabile che richiede un approccio particolare, soprattutto quando sono coinvolti, loro malgrado, in procedimenti giudiziari che riguardano i propri genitori, in particolar modo in casi di separazione, divorzio o rottura della relazione coniugale.

Il giorno 10 ottobre, in Italia, un bambino di dieci anni è stato prelevato da agenti in borghese presso la sua scuola elementare di Cittadella, in provincia di Padova, in seguito al provvedimento della Corte d'Appello — Sezione minori del Tribunale di Venezia che prevedeva l'allontanamento del minore dall'ambiente materno, affidandolo in via esclusiva al padre con collocamento in una comunità. L'intervento avvenuto presso la scuola di Cittadella è stato eseguito, secondo le autorità di polizia, in quanto i tentativi esperiti in passato presso la casa materna e dei nonni non avevano avuto l'esito sperato.

La scena, ripresa in un video, sta suscitando molto clamore: è palese la reazione negativa del bambino che ha tentato invano di resistere in tutti i modi agli agenti delle forze dell'ordine che, cercando di portarlo in auto con la forza, hanno utilizzato metodi inadeguati e piuttosto aggressivi.

Premesso che tale avvenimento è in palese contrasto con uno dei principi cardine della normativa comunitaria, ovvero l'interesse superiore del minore, e considerato che le recenti direttive comunitarie relative ai diritti dei minori mirano alla massima tutela dei bambini coinvolti nei procedimenti giudiziari, può dire la Commissione se sia stata rispettato l'articolo 24 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea che, tra le altre cose, afferma che i «bambini hanno diritto alla protezione e alle cure necessarie per il loro benessere»? Può dire, altresì, se sia stato rispettato l'articolo 4 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea che vieta qualsiasi tipo di trattamento inumano e degradante?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009326/12
alla Commissione
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Opinione del bambino nei casi di affidamento e tutela del suo interesse superiore

Giovedì 11 ottobre, le versioni online delle maggiori testate giornalistiche italiane diffondono il video [1] di un bambino letteralmente trascinato fuori da scuola da alcuni agenti della questura di Padova. Il prelevamento è finalizzato a condurre il bambino in una struttura protetta, in esecuzione a un decreto della Corte d'appello di Venezia, che conferisce la patria potestà unicamente al padre, ritenendo il bambino affetto da PAS. Allo stato attuale, la madre sembra non avere diritto di accesso alla struttura. La PAS (sindrome dell'alienazione genitoriale) è una dinamica psicologica disfunzionale che si attiverebbe nel bambino quando la separazione dei genitori conosce una brutale fase di conflittualità. Si precisa che gran parte della letteratura scientifica internazionale smonta l'esistenza della sindrome come fenomenologia medico-psichiatrica e la riduce a mero strumento di retorica forense nei casi di affidamento. A prescindere dalle cause che lo hanno determinato, si ritiene che il trattamento ricevuto dal bambino sia altamente lesivo del suo interesse superiore, specie se si considera la volontà espressa di voler rimanere con la madre.

La Convenzione relativa ai diritti del fanciullo si pone a sostegno di questa ipotesi per le seguenti ragioni: al bambino, rinchiuso in una struttura, viene negato di avere relazioni familiari (art. 8); all'atto del prelevamento gli viene negato il diritto di essere ascoltato (art. 12) e non gli viene garantito il diritto a non subire violenza alcuna (art. 19). In linea generale, l'intera situazione viola il diritto del bambino a vivere in un'atmosfera di «amore e di comprensione [nonché] di affetto e sicurezza (…) morale», nel rispetto del principio sesto della Dichiarazione dei diritti del fanciullo. La Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea protegge, dal canto suo, i diritti del minore all'articolo 24, con particolare riferimento al diritto della presa in considerazione dell'opinione personale del bambino.

Alla luce di questi fatti, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. cosa fa l'Unione europea per garantire che l'opinione del bambino abbia il giusto peso nelle cause di affidamento;

2. se il tema dell'inammissibilità del concetto di «alienazione genitoriale» è stato mai trattato dalle istituzioni europee e se esiste un progetto in tal senso?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009402/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Matteo Salvini (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD) e Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(16 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Episodio di maltrattamento di un bambino da parte di agenti di polizia

A Cittadella, in provincia di Padova, un bambino di 10 anni è stato strattonato e trascinato con la forza da alcuni agenti di polizia che lo hanno prelevato all'interno della sua classe entrando nella scuola da lui frequentata durante le ore di lezione. Tutto ciò è avvenuto in esecuzione di un provvedimento di affidamento del minore in via esclusiva al padre, disposto dalla competente autorità giudiziaria. L'episodio è stato filmato con un telefono cellulare dalla zia del minore ed è stato trasmesso da una importante trasmissione televisiva italiana. Le immagini hanno poi fatto il giro della rete, provocando indignazione e sgomento tra i cittadini italiani. Nonostante l'invocazione di aiuto da parte del bambino nei confronti della madre e il suo diniego verso l'invito a seguire i poliziotti, gli stessi procedevano brutalmente e conducevano forzatamente il minore all'interno dell'auto di servizio ignorandone le richieste di soccorso. Secondo gli psicologi il bambino dopo questo episodio potrebbe rimanere traumatizzato a vita.

[1] http://bit.ly/Q3zi3V.

Dopo l'esplosione del caso, il governo italiano e il capo della polizia hanno chiesto scusa per l'accaduto con ciò ammettendo l'errore commesso attivando quel tipo di intervento.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, si chiede dunque alla Commissione quanto segue:

1. Questo episodio rappresenta una violazione dei diritti dei minori così come espressamente sanciti dall'Unione europea nella Carta dei diritti fondamentali?

2. Quali urgenti iniziative conoscitive e sanzionatorie l'Unione europea intende assumere di fronte a un fatto così grave?

Risposta congiunta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione

(4 dicembre 2012)

Le misure prese dalla polizia italiana in questo caso costituiscono l'esecuzione di una decisione nazionale sulla responsabilità genitoriale che non è disciplinata dal diritto dell'Unione europea. Spetta, pertanto, alle autorità nazionali assicurare il rispetto dei loro obblighi in materia di diritti fondamentali. Per lo stesso motivo la Commissione non può esprimersi sul concetto di «alienazione genitoriale».

Più in generale, al fine di contribuire alla fiducia reciproca nei casi di affidamento di minori, la Commissione ha organizzato, nell'ambito del VII Forum sui diritti del bambino ([2]), un laboratorio sulle autorità per la tutela dei minori e i casi di affidamento. Vi è stato un fruttuoso scambio di idee sulle pratiche in questo settore che ha messo in luce l'importanza di fornire adeguate informazioni ai bambini e ai genitori e un'apposita formazione agli operatori del settore.

L'Agenda dell'UE per i diritti dei minori ([3]) incoraggia la formazione di professionisti del diritto sui modi per favorire una partecipazione ottimale dei minori al sistema giudiziario. La priorità fondamentale del 2013 del programma dell'UE ([4]) è una formazione sulla giustizia a misura di bambino destinata agli operatori di giustizia che interagiscono con i minori tra cui la polizia. Inoltre, la Commissione ha finanziato la traduzione delle linee guida su una giustizia «a misura di minore» ([5]) al fine di favorirne la diffusione tra gli operatori del settore. L'Agenda dell'UE pone in primo piano il diritto del bambino di essere ascoltato ed è stato promosso uno studio per offrire un quadro della legislazione e delle pratiche esistenti in materia di partecipazione dei minori al sistema giudiziario.

Per quanto riguarda un nuovo osservatorio per garantire il rispetto dei diritti dei minori nelle azioni degli Stati membri, la Commissione ricorda che tale compito spetta alle autorità nazionali e che l'Agenzia per i diritti fondamentali è l'organo competente in materia di diritti dei minori. Pertanto, la Commissione non ritiene necessario istituire un osservatorio di tale tipo.

([2]) Il 13 e 14 novembre 2012.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0060:FIN:IT:HTML
([4]) Programma della Commissione «Diritti fondamentali e cittadinanza»: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/grants/programmes/fundamental-citizenship/index_en.htm
([5]) linee guida del Comitato dei Ministri del Consiglio d'Europa su una giustizia «a misura di minore»: http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/childjustice/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009265/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Violation of children's rights in Europe — The case of a Padua boy

Officially, children's rights are well defended at international level by provisions that include the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted by the General Assembly on 20 November 1989 and ratified in Italy by Law No 176 of 27 May 1991, or the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, whose Article 24 on the rights of the child contains an explicit acknowledgment of children's right to the protection and care necessary for their well-being, to freedom of expression, to respect for their views, and to their best interests being the primary consideration in all actions that concern them. And yet, all of these rights are violated on a daily basis. Police recently carried out what can only be described as a raid to seize a ten-year old boy in Cittadella, in the province of Padua and removed him from his mother's care, acting on an order from the Venice Court of Appeal giving custody to the father. After numerous unsuccessful attempts by social workers to pick up the boy from his maternal grandparents' home, police intervened and forcibly grabbed him while he was at school. The boy's aunt filmed what happened and the images of the raid were broadcast on national television, sparking public outrage at the force used, and especially at the psychological and even physical distress suffered by the boy, whose request for medical help went unheeded.

Given that the police were legitimately carrying out a task entrusted to them by the Italian courts and that, since the Lisbon Treaty was passed, the EU has reaffirmed its goal of creating a space of liberty, security and justice in which respect for children's rights is an absolute priority, does the Commission not consider that the manner in which the court order was enforced violated children's rights that are protected at international and European level?

How does it intend to protect the rights of children in Europe who are victims of legal battles between their parents?

Has it considered setting up a European Observatory to ensure that children's rights are respected in the EU, not only in the laws and policies adopted by the Member States, but also in their actions?

Has it considered establishing training courses in the Member States to help police operate with respect for the rights of children, who undoubtedly have different needs and sensitivities to those of adults?

Question for written answer E-009309/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Case of violation of the rights of the child

Children are extremely vulnerable and require special attention, especially when, in spite of themselves, they become involved in legal proceedings concerning their parents, such as in cases of separation, divorce or marriage breakdown.

On 10 October in Italy, a ten-year old boy was removed from his primary school in Cittadella, in the province of Padua, following an order issued by the Juvenile Section of the Venice Court of Appeal for the child to be removed from his mother's care. The order awarded exclusive custody to the father and provided for the boy to be placed in a community. According to the police, the action was taken at the Cittadella school because previous attempts to remove the child from his mother's home, and that of his grandparents, had been unsuccessful.

The scene, which was captured on video, is causing an outcry. The boy's opposition is evident in the way he tries in vain and with all his might to resist the police officers, who use inappropriate and rather aggressive methods as they try to put him in a car by force.

This event is in clear violation of one of the cardinal principles of Community legislation, namely the best interests of the child. Recent EU directives relating to the rights of the child aim to provide the best possible protection for children involved in legal proceedings. Article 24 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union states, among other things, that 'children shall have the right to such protection and care as is necessary for their well-being.'

Can the Commission state whether this principle has been complied with?

Can it also state whether there has been any violation of Article 4 of the same Charter, which prohibits any type of inhuman or degrading treatment?

Question for written answer E-009326/12
to the Commission
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Listening to the view of children in custody cases and safeguarding their overriding interests

On Thursday, 11 October, the online versions of Italy's main newspapers featured the video ([1]) of a boy being literally dragged out of school by Padua police officers. The purpose of the removal was to take the child to a secure facility, enforcing an order issued by the Venice Court of Appeal awarding exclusive custody to the father, having judged the child to be suffering from PAS. As things stand, the mother appears to have no right of access to the facility. PAS (Parental Alienation Syndrome) is a psychological disorder said to be produced in a child when there is severe conflict between the estranged parents. Most of the international scientific literature is sceptical about the existence of the syndrome as a medical or psychiatric reality, and regards it merely as a tool of forensic rhetoric used in custody cases. Leaving aside the causes, the treatment received by the boy is considered to be highly damaging to his best interests, especially given his express desire to stay with his mother.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child supports this view for the following reasons: in being confined to a facility, the boy is denied the right to family relations (Article 8); in the act of removal, he is denied the right to be heard (Article 12) and the right to protection from all forms of violence (Article 19). Overall, the entire situation violates the right of the child to live in an atmosphere of 'love and understanding' and of 'affection and of moral (…) security', in accordance with Principle 6 of the Declaration of the Rights of the Child. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, for its part, protects the rights of the child in Article 24, with particular reference to the right to have its personal views taken into consideration.

Can the Commission answer the following:

1. What is the European Union doing to ensure that the child's views are given proper weight in custody cases?

2. Has the question of the inadmissibility of the concept of 'parental alienation' ever been tackled by the European institutions? Are there any plans to do so?

Question for written answer E-009402/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Lara Comi (PPE), Aldo Patriciello (PPE), Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), Potito Salatto (PPE), Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Matteo Salvini (EFD), Giancarlo Scottà (EFD) and Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(16 October 2012)

Subject: Case of mistreatment of a child by police officers

In Cittadella, province of Padua, a 10-year-old child was pulled and dragged forcefully by some police officers who had entered his school during school hours and removed him from class. All this was done to execute a custody order, issued by a court, to give the father sole custody of the child. The episode was filmed on a mobile phone by the child's aunt and was broadcast by a major Italian TV programme. The images then went viral on the Internet, causing indignation and outrage among Italians. Despite the child's call for help from his mother and his refusal to follow the police officers, the latter behaved brutally and dragged the child to the police car ignoring his pleas for help. According to psychologists, after this incident the child could remain traumatised for life.

Since the case was exposed, the Italian Government and the police chief have apologised for what happened, thereby admitting their mistake in taking such action.

Given the above facts, can the Commission say:

1. whether this is a violation of children's rights as expressly enshrined in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights;

2. what urgent action, with a view to obtaining further information and imposing penalties, does the EU intend to take with regard to such a serious matter?

([1]) http://bit.ly/Q3zi3V

Joint answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission

(4 December 2012)

The measures taken by Italian police in this case relate to the enforcement of a domestic decision on parental responsibility which is not governed by EC law. Therefore it is for national authorities to ensure that their obligations regarding fundamental rights are respected. For the same reason, the Commission cannot comment on the concept of 'parental alienation'.

At a more general level, in order to contribute to the mutual trust in child custody cases, the Commission organised during the 7th Forum on the Rights of the Child ([2]) a workshop on child welfare authorities and custody cases. A fruitful exchange of views took place on practices in this area and highlighted the importance of providing relevant information to children and parents and appropriate training to practitioners.

The EU Agenda for the Rights of the Child ([3]) encourages training of professionals regarding the participation of children in judicial systems. The funding priority in 2013 under the relevant EU programme ([4]) is training on child-friendly justice targeted at professionals dealing with children, including police. The Commission also funded the translation of the Guidelines on the Child-Friendly Justice ([5]) in order to contribute to their dissemination to practitioners. The child's right to be heard is highlighted in the EU Agenda and a study has been launched to provide an overview of legislation and practice on child participation.

As regards a new observatory to ensure that Member States' actions respect children's rights, the Commission recalls that such task belongs to national authorities and that the Fundamental Rights Agency provides its expertise on the rights of the child. Therefore, the Commission is not considering the setting up of such an observatory.

([2]) On 13 and 14 November 2012.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52011DC0060:en:NOT
([4]) Fundamental Rights and Citizenship Programme, http://ec.europa.eu/justice/grants/programmes/fundamental-citizenship/index_en.htm
([5]) Guidelines of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on child-friendly justice, http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/childjustice/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009266/12
to the Commission
Arlene McCarthy (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Implementation of Regulation on trade in seal products

On 4 April 2012, the Commission stated in its answer to Written Question E-001965/2012 that it had received reports from 18 out of 27 Member States regarding the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1007/2009 on trade in seal products.

Further to this response, could the Commission confirm which Member States have not provided implementation reports and what action the Commission is taking to ensure that these Member States submit the required information as soon as possible?

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

In accordance with Article 7(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1007/2009 ([1]) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 on trade in seal products, the Commission will report by the end of this year on the implementation of the regulation, on the basis of national reports that Member States were to submit to the Commission by 20 November 2011. After its reply to Written Question E-001965/2012 ([2]) and despite several reminders, the Commission received only one more national report. Should any further report be submitted at this late stage, there would not be sufficient time to assess and integrate it appropriately in the Commission report. As a consequence, the implementation report will clearly identify which Member States have failed to comply with their reporting obligation in a timely manner. To this date, 8 countries have yet to submit their national reports: Finland, France, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands and Portugal.

([1]) OJ L 286, 31.10.2009.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009267/12
to the Commission
Arlene McCarthy (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Recognised bodies issuing attesting documents for derogated seal products

Regulation (EC) No 1007/2009 on trade in seal products provides for the development of recognised bodies to issue attesting documents for derogated seal products, allowing certain authorised seal products to be sold on the EU market.

Could the Commission confirm how many applications to provide attesting documents have been received, and whether any of these applications have been granted?

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

In accordance with Article 6 of Commission Regulation (EU) No 737/2010 ([1]) laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1007/2009 ([2]) on trade in seal products, 12 requests for the inclusion in a list of recognised bodies have been received. The Commission is currently processing these requests internally in order to ensure that they comply with the requirements set out in this regulation.

([1]) OJ L 216, 17.8.2010.
([2]) OJ L 286, 31.10.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009268/12
to the Commission
Arlene McCarthy (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Implementation of the 116000 telephone helpline for missing children

Further to the Commission's response to Written Questions E-005198/2012 and E-005362/2012 regarding the implementation of the 116000 helpline for missing children, has the Commission received replies to the letters it sent to the 10 Member States which have not yet implemented the helpline?

What were the reasons given by these Member States for non-implementation, and what follow-up action will the Commission take?

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

On 22 May 2012, the Commission sent a letter to 10 Member States which at that time did not have a functioning hotline for missing children ([1]), reminding them of their obligations and requesting that they provide the Commission with all information on measures taken to fulfil them.

To date, responses were received from Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Latvia, Luxembourg and Sweden revealing various stages of progress. Some Member States were close to implementation. Other Member States cited difficulties, in particular lack of interest of potential operators to respond to the call for proposals to make the hotline operational or the fact that the service provider failed to make the hotline operational and the number had to be reassigned.

Since May 2012, three Member States have implemented the hotline ([2]). The hotline is still not available in seven Member States ([3]), but the Commission has been informed unofficially that final stages in the implementation are forthcoming in at least two other Member States by the end of 2012. The Commission will consider launching infringement proceedings against those Member States that do not act.

([1]) Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, Cyprus, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Sweden.
([2]) Austria, Cyprus, Luxembourg.
([3]) Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-009269/12
adresată Comisiei
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(15 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: Comerțul cu fildeș

Comerțul internațional cu fildeș a fost interzis în 1990 datorită preocupărilor privind declinul dramatic al populației de elefanți din Africa. Relaxarea ulterioară a condițiilor de aplicare a interdicției (ce a avut ca scop facilitarea încheierii unui acord între Namibia, Botswana și Zimbabwe) și acordarea unei permisiuni speciale Japoniei și Chinei pentru a achiziționa fildeș au dus la o creștere rapidă a comerțului legal, iar populația de elefanți continuă să scadă.

Rapoarte recente au scos la iveală deficiențe grave în cadrul sistemelor de control și monitorizare a comerțului cu fildeș, cu precădere în China. De asemenea, există încă dubii privind corectitudinea datelor ce au motivat relaxarea inițială a condițiilor de aplicare a interdicției internaționale.

Împărtășește Comisia opinia conform căreia controalele interne din China nu sunt suficient de stricte și că singura cale de a asigura protecția adecvată populațiilor de elefanți vulnerabile este interzicere globală a comerțului internațional cu fildeș?

În ce mod contribuie Comisia la aplicarea interdicției existente în domeniul comerțului?

Răspuns dat de dl Potočnik în numele Comisiei
(12 decembrie 2012)

Comisia o invită pe distinsa membră să consulte răspunsul la întrebarea scrisă E-008984/2012, adresată de dl Boulland ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009269/12
to the Commission
Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Ivory trade

The 1990 ban on international trade in ivory was introduced following concerns about the dramatic decline in African elephant populations. A subsequent relaxation of this ban (to facilitate the entry of Namibia, Botswana and Zimbabwe into the agreement) and the granting of special permission to Japan and China to make purchases of ivory have led to a sharp increase in legal trade, whilst elephant populations continue to fall.

Recent reporting has exposed serious failings in the systems used to control and monitor the ivory trade, especially in China. Questions also remain about the reliability of the data which justified the initial relaxation of the international ban.

Does the Commission share the view that domestic controls in China are not robust enough, and that a comprehensive international trade ban is the only way to ensure proper protection of these vulnerable elephant populations?

What contribution is the Commission making towards enforcing the current trade ban?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-008984/2012 by Mr Boulland ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009270/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Elaboration on mission to Yemen

Could the EEAS elaborate on the purpose of the delegation to Yemen? What is the role of Ambassador Michele Cervone d'Urso in achieving its goals?

Question for written answer E-009271/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Elaboration on mission in Yemen

The European External Action Service website states that the EU Delegation to Yemen concentrates on three main areas: 'support for state-building and governance,' 'social development', and increasing 'economic development and livelihoods.' Would the EEAS elaborate on how the mission has worked to achieve these goals in 2011-12?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(5 December 2012)

The EU Delegation in Yemen officially represents the EU in this country, promotes EU values and pursues EU policies and objectives.

The EU seeks to develop a closer relationship with Yemen and is playing a major role, in close cooperation with Member States and other key actors of the International Community, in support of the delicate transition that Yemen is going through. The EU aims in particular, at enhancement of the political dialogue and trade and economic cooperation while encouraging the reform and state building processes, supporting development cooperation and contributing to the international response to humanitarian needs.

The EU financial assistance follows a comprehensive approach to support Yemen's efforts to address its challenges. Central to this approach is the Country Strategy Paper 2007-2013 implemented through Multiannual Programmes. The EU response concentrates, as the Honourable Member points out, on three main areas: support for state-building and governance, social development and economic development and livelihoods.

The EU Delegation in Sana'a, with the support from Commission services and EEAS in Brussels, has had an important role in initiating and implementing ongoing projects in these areas. A comprehensive evaluation exercise is currently being prepared and its results are expected in 2013.

The Head of Delegation is responsible for the sound and efficient management of the Delegation, represents the EU in Yemen and pursues EU objectives in the country, therefore assisting the High Representative/Vice-President and the Commission in fulfilling their responsibilities in the field of external relations.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009272/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — EU Delegation to Afghanistan

Can the European External Action Service provide details on the role of the EU Delegation to Afghanistan in implementing the Multiannual Indicative Programme in that country, and on how it determined which sectors to make priority areas for aid under this programme, which amounts to an estimated EUR 220 million for this year?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(7 December 2012)

EU assistance to Afghanistan, from the EU Budget, is managed by the Commission through the EU Delegation to Afghanistan, in Kabul.

The EU's legal and strategic framework for development cooperation with Afghanistan includes a Country Strategy Paper (CSP 2007-2013) and two Multiannual Indicative Programmes (MIP 2007-2010 and MIP 2011-2013), formally agreed with the Government of Afghanistan. These are further implemented through Annual Action Programmes (AAP) and action-specific Financing Agreements signed with the Ministry of Finance.

Following the July 2010 Kabul Conference, and in line with the principles of aid effectiveness and division of labour, the government asked donors to progressively align funding with national programmes, using government systems as much as possible, improving coordination and better targeting development assistance.

The current MIP 2011-2013 (EUR 600 million), aligned with the Afghanistan National Development Strategy, foresees interventions in three focal areas: rural development, governance and the rule of law and social sectors (health and social protection); and regional cooperation as a non-focal area.

In line with the CSP and MIPs, the EU Delegation is in charge of the identification and formulation phases defining the design and implementation modalities of each action. Action fiches are submitted to peer reviews (quality support group), part of the broader Commission's quality assurance mechanism.

The AAP 2012 includes health, social protection and agriculture (EUR 190 million). It is intended to commit an additional EUR 30 million earmarked for governance and the rule of law under the 2013 EU budget. ([1])

([1]) For further information, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the State of Play on EU Afghanistan Cooperation available on: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/asia/country-cooperation/afghanistan/documents/eu_afghanistan_state-of-play_0712_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009273/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Contingency plan for Greek exit

Despite the success of the European Stability Mechanism in German courts, the upcoming Troika report will again raise the spectre of a potential Greek default. Has the Commission prepared a contingency plan for a Greek exit?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(14 December 2012)

The accession to the euro is irreversible. The Commission does not prepare any plan that would be contrary to the Treaty of which it is the guardian.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009274/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Tensão entre a Turquia e a Síria

A Turquia é membro da NATO.

Tem-se assistido a um crescimento da tensão entre as autoridades turcas e sírias, que faz antever uma escalada do conflito.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem acompanhado a evolução da tensão entre a Turquia e a Síria?

Que posição tem vindo a adotar a Comissão, perante o recrudescimento do conflito entre os dois países referidos, tendo em conta que a Turquia é um membro efetivo da NATO?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(28 de novembro de 2012)

A Comissão tem conhecimento das crescentes tensões entre a Turquia e a Síria. Está a acompanhar de perto a situação e felicita a Turquia pelos notáveis esforços humanitários que tem envidado dando abrigo a mais de 100 000 sírios que fugiram à violência no seu país.

O Conselho Negócios Estrangeiros de outubro de 2012 instou novamente as autoridades sírias a respeitarem a integridade territorial e a soberania de todos os países vizinhos; as violações da soberania de países terceiros são inaceitáveis e não podem ser toleradas.

Por outro lado, uma escalada da violência não é do interesse de nenhuma das partes envolvidas. O conflito na Síria terá de ser resolvido através de um processo político, evitando repercussões para os países vizinhos.

No que diz respeito ao facto de a Turquia ser membro da NATO, não compete à Comissão pronunciar-se sobre procedimentos de outra organização internacional.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009274/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Tension between Turkey and Syria

Turkey is a NATO member.

There has been growing tension between the Turkish and Syrian authorities which suggests that an escalation of the conflict is likely.

I ask the Commission:

Is it aware of the increasing tensions between Turkey and Syria?

In the face of further conflict between the two countries, what is the Commission's position, considering that Turkey is a full member of NATO?

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

The Commission is aware of the increasing tensions between Turkey and Syria. It is following events extremely closely and commends Turkey for its remarkable humanitarian efforts in sheltering over 100,000 Syrians who have fled the violence in their country.

The October 2012 Foreign Affairs Council urged the Syrian authorities again to fully respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all neighbouring countries; violations of third countries' sovereignty are unacceptable and cannot be tolerated.

At the same time, an escalation in violence is in no-one's interests. The conflict in Syria needs to be resolved by means of a political process while avoiding spill over effects to neighbouring countries.

As regards the membership of Turkey in NATO, it is not for the Commission to comment on procedures of another international organisation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009275/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: EUA: nova lei agrícola para responder à seca

O presidente norte-americano Barack Obama, defendeu recentemente na sua declaração semanal pela rádio e Internet, que os membros do Congresso deveriam aprovar uma lei agrícola que ajude o setor a lidar com a seca que afeta o país.

O apelo surge depois de o Departamento de Agricultura ter revisto em baixa as suas estimativas de produção de milho e soja, referindo que «a seca reduziu as previsões para os níveis mais baixos dos últimos seis anos».

Obama refere que é necessária «uma lei que, não só ajude os agricultores e proprietários agrícolas a responder a este tipo de desastres, mas também faça as reformas necessárias e lhes dê alguma certeza ao longo do ano».

As alterações climáticas verificadas em todo o planeta têm provocado secas severas, afetando por todo o mundo a atividade agrícola e a subsistência dos agricultores.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Não considera justificada medida equivalente na UE?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloș em nome da Comissão
(14 de novembro de 2012)

A atual PAC dispõe já de diversos instrumentos que poderão intervir na gestão dos riscos, incluindo medidas de apoio ao mercado e pagamentos diretos, assim como algumas medidas de desenvolvimento rural. A Comissão propôs que a PAC reformada contenha um novo dispositivo para a gestão dos riscos no âmbito do segundo pilar, com base nos instrumentos atualmente disponíveis para subsidiar seguros ou fundos mútuos e acrescentando um instrumento de estabilização do rendimento, administrado por meio de fundos mútuos. Os Estados-Membros podem combinar o dispositivo de gestão dos riscos com outras medidas de desenvolvimento rural destinadas a reduzi-los, como as ajudas à reconstituição do potencial de produção afetado por catástrofes naturais e medidas preventivas na agricultura e na silvicultura.

Acresce que a luta contra as alterações climáticas foi especialmente contemplada nas propostas da Comissão sobre a CAP pós-2013. Por um lado, fomenta-se a atenuação das alterações climáticas com a introdução de medidas ecológicas obrigatórias, da máxima importância em termos do clima, e o reforço das disposições sobre condicionalidade, bem como medidas de desenvolvimento rural específicas. Por outro, é possível abordar a adaptação às alterações climáticas através de uma vasta gama de medidas de desenvolvimento rural de apoio à gestão de riscos e de desafios específicos, como uma melhor gestão hídrica.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009275/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: USA: new farm bill in response to the drought

In his weekly radio and Internet address, the United States President Barack Obama recently reiterated that members of Congress should approve a farm bill to help the sector cope with the drought affecting the country.

The call has come after the Department of Agriculture revised its production estimates for corn and soya, and said that 'the drought had cut expected output to the lowest level in six years'.

Obama emphasises the importance of 'a farm bill that not only helps farmers and ranchers respond to natural disasters but also carries out necessary reforms and gives them some long-term certainty'.

Climatic changes have caused severe droughts globally, affecting farming and farmers' welfare throughout the world.

I ask the Commission:

Is it considering adopting similar measures in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(14 November 2012)

The current CAP already has several instruments which play a role in risk management, including market support measures and direct payments, as well as a number of Rural Development measures. The Commission has proposed that the reformed CAP will contain a new toolkit for Risk Management within Pillar II, building on the current available instruments to subsidise insurance or mutual funds and adding an income stabilisation tool, administered through mutual funds. Member States may combine the Risk Management toolkit with other Rural Development measures aimed at risk reduction such as aids for restoration of production potential damaged by natural disasters and for preventive measures in agriculture and forestry.

In addition, climate action has been given great attention in the Commission proposals for the CAP post-2013. On the one hand, climate change mitigation will be enhanced through the introduction of obligatory greening measures, which are highly climate relevant, and by strengthening cross compliance requirements, as well as by targeted rural development measures. On the other hand, climate change adaptation can be addressed through a broad range of rural development measures supporting risk management and specific challenges like improved water management.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009276/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Relatório do Banco Mundial sobre o Desenvolvimento Mundial 2013

No recente Relatório sobre o Desenvolvimento Mundial de 2013 do Banco Mundial (BM), o respetivo presidente Jim Yong Kim, alerta que no meio da atual crise económica global, cerca de 200 milhões de pessoas em todo o mundo enfrentam o desemprego, e que, 75 milhões dessas pessoas têm menos de 25 anos.

Jim Yong Kim refere ainda que «nos próximos 15 anos serão necessários 600 milhões de novos empregos para absorver a crescente população em idade laboral, sobretudo na Ásia e na África subsaariana».

Pergunto à Comissão:

Que previsão faz, relativamente às alterações dos fluxos migratórios da Ásia e da África subsariana, para a Europa, em razão daquelas previsões feitas pelo Banco Mundial?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(11 de dezembro de 2012)

A Comissão partilha as preocupações do Senhor Deputado em relação às tensões sociais associadas às elevadas taxas de desemprego em certas zonas de países em desenvolvimento e, em particular, ao desemprego jovem. Além disso, a OIT classificou a situação atual, em que quase 75 milhões de jovens estão sem trabalho, como uma «crise de emprego jovem» ([1]) Contudo, a Comissão não está em posição de confirmar cenários de desemprego a longo prazo a nível mundial, nem de avançar com previsões de fluxos de migração que dependem de uma grande variedade de fatores, incluindo futuros desenvolvimentos socioeconómicos na UE e noutras regiões, tais como a Ásia e a África Subsariana.

A taxa de desemprego média na UE era de 10,6 % em setembro de 2012 e, de acordo com as previsões económicas da Comissão Europeia mais recentes, espera-se que atinja um máximo de quase 11 % na UE em 2013, apesar de existirem grandes variações entre os Estados-Membros. O desemprego jovem também atingiu um novo pico em setembro, com uma taxa de 22,8 %.

Não existem soluções simples para aumentar o emprego (juvenil). Para melhorar o emprego dos jovens na UE, a Comissão adotou a «Iniciativa Oportunidades para a Juventude» há um ano, estimulando a ação da UE e dos Estados-Membros e a mobilização de fundos estruturais da UE ([2]). A Comissão apresentará um pacote relativo ao emprego jovem em dezembro de 2012, que incluirá uma iniciativa sobre instrumentos de garantia para a juventude.

([1]) Ver documento «Global Employment Outlook» da OIT, de setembro de 2012, e a Resolução da Conferência Geral da mesma organização, de maio de 2012, em www.ilo.org. Consultar também o sítio web Global Emplyement Trends para mais informações: http://www.ilo.org/global/research/global-reports/global-employment-trends/WCMS_171571/lang--en/index.htm

([2]) Consultar: http://ec.europa.eu/social/home.jsp?langId=pt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009276/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: 2013 World Bank World Development Report

In the 2013 World Development Report from the World Bank, its president Jim Yong Kim warned that in the current global economic crisis around 200 million people worldwide — including 75 million under the age of 25 — are unemployed.

Jim Yong Kim stated that '600 million new jobs will be needed in the next 15 years to absorb the burgeoning workforce, mainly in Asia and sub-Saharan Africa'.

In the face of changes in migratory flow from Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, what is the Commission's forecast for Europe with regard to these predictions by the World Bank?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2012)

The Commission shares the concerns of the Honourable Member about the social tensions related to the high rates of unemployment in certain parts of the developing world and in particular the challenge of youth unemployment. Also the ILO qualified the current situation with close to 75 million young people out of work as a 'youth employment crisis' ([1]). However, the Commission is neither in a position to confirm longer term unemployment scenarios at world level nor to advance forecasts of migration flows which depend on a large variety of factors, including future socioeconomic developments in the EU and other regions such as Asia and sub-Saharan Africa.

The average EU unemployment rate stood at 10.6% in September 2012 and, according to the latest European Commission Economic Forecast, it is expected to peak just below 11% in the EU in 2013, though with large variations among Member States. Youth unemployment reached a new high in September as well, at 22.8%.

There are no simple answers to boosting (youth) employment. To improve youth employment in the EU, the Commission adopted its 'Youth Opportunities initiative' one year ago, stimulating EU and Member State action and the mobilisation of EU Structural Funds ([2]). The Commission will put forward a Youth Employment Package in December 2012, including an initiative on Youth Guarantee schemes.

([1]) See ILO Global Employment Outlook, September 2012 and Resolution of the General Conference of the ILO, May 2012 on www.ilo.org. See also Global Employment Trends for more data: http://www.ilo.org/global/research/global-reports/global-employment-trends/WCMS_171571/lang--en/index.htm

([2]) See http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1006.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009277/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Declarações de Angela Merkel II

Angela Merkel afirmou recentemente que os países mais endividados da área do euro devem «resolver os seus problemas», ao passo que a Alemanha terá de continuar a apostar no aumento da produtividade para ajudar os demais parceiros comunitários.

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Como avalia estas declarações?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(3 de dezembro de 2012)

A Comissão não comenta opiniões de políticos dos Estados-Membros veiculadas na imprensa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009277/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Angela Merkel statements II

Angela Merkel recently stated that the most indebted countries in the euro area need to 'resolve their problems', but that Germany will continue to invest in increasing productivity to help its EU partners.

I ask the Commission:

— What is its assessment of these statements?

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

The Commission does not comment on opinions expressed by Member State politicians in the press.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009278/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Detetadas falhas na maioria das centrais nucleares europeias

Segundo notícia divulgada pela Agência Bloomberg, e tendo em conta um relatório preliminar da Comissão Europeia, os 134 reatores nucleares que operam na União Europeia têm de melhorar os níveis de segurança.

Os custos das referidas melhorias deverão rondar os 30 a 200 milhões de euros por reator nuclear.

As novas regras de segurança foram criadas em resposta ao desastre que ocorreu em Fukushima.

Os «testes de stress» levados a cabo no perímetro europeu incluem ameaças de desastres naturais, acidentes de avião e explosões próximas dos reatores.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Confirma o teor da notícia avançada pela Agência Bloomberg?

Dada a gravidade desta situação, a Comissão já elaborou algum plano de emergência que preveja a melhoria da segurança dos 134 reatores existentes na UE? Qual?

Resposta dada por Günther Oettinger em nome da Comissão
(12 de dezembro de 2012)

1. A Comissão transmitiu recentemente ao Conselho e ao Parlamento Europeu o seu relatório final sobre os «testes de resistência», adotado a 4 de outubro de 2012 ([1]). De um modo geral, as normas de segurança nas centrais nucleares da Europa são elevadas. Com base nos «testes de resistência», as autoridades nacionais de segurança concluíram não se justificar o encerramento de nenhuma central nuclear. Todavia, os «testes de resistência» revelaram a necessidade de melhorar a segurança nuclear na União Europeia, em especial nas zonas em que as normas e práticas internacionais mais rigorosas nem sempre são aplicadas ([2]).

A Comissão permite-se remeter o Senhor Deputado para as perguntas escritas E-008953/12, da Senhora Deputada Papadopoulou, para mais informações sobre as medidas de acompanhamento, e E-009115/12, do Senhor Deputado H-P Martin, para mais informações sobre as estimativas dos custos dos melhoramentos de segurança.

2. A preparação para emergências é da responsabilidade nacional, mas, tal como referido na comunicação, uma das próximas etapas é a elaboração de planos de ação para que os organismos de regulamentação nacionais melhorem a segurança, na sequência das recomendações da comunicação.

([1]) Comunicação da Comissão ao Conselho e ao Parlamento Europeu sobre as avaliações exaustivas de risco e segurança («testes de resistência») das centrais nucleares na União Europeia e atividades correlatas, COM(2012) 571 final; disponível em: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/safety/stress_tests_en.htm

([2]) A saber: Normas de previsão de riscos sísmicos e de inundações, instalação de instrumentação sísmica de medição e alerta, sistemas confinados de ventilação com filtro destinados a permitir a despressurização segura do reator em caso de acidente, proteção e equipamento de combate a acidentes graves e existência de uma sala de controlo de emergência.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009278/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Faults identified in the majority of European nuclear reactors

According to reports from Bloomberg based on a draft report by the European Commission, the 134 nuclear reactors in operation in the European Union must improve levels of safety.

These safety upgrades may cost between EUR 30 million and EUR 200 million per nuclear reactor.

The new safety regulations were introduced in response to the Fukushima disaster.

The 'stress tests' carried out within the European Union covered threats from natural disasters as well as plane crashes and explosions close to reactors.

I ask the Commission:

Can it confirm the Bloomberg report?

Given the seriousness of this situation, has the Commission drawn up emergency plans to ensure improved safety measures for the 134 reactors in the EU? If so, what are they?

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

1. The Commission has recently transmitted to the Council and the European Parliament its final report on stress tests, adopted on 4 October 2012 ([1]). In general, the standards of safety of nuclear power plants in Europe are high. Based on the stress tests, national safety authorities came to the conclusion that no closure of nuclear power plants was warranted. Nevertheless, the stress tests have revealed that further improvement of nuclear safety in the European Union (EU) is needed, particularly in areas where the highest international standards and best practices are not applied in all cases ([2]).

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its replies to written questions E-008953/12 by Ms Papadopoulou for further information on the follow-up measures and E-009115/12 by M. H-P Martin for further details on cost estimates of safety improvements.

2. Preparing for emergencies is a national responsibility, but as the communication says, one of the next steps is to produce a set of action plans for National Regulators to improve safety following the recommendations in the communication.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European 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/stress_tests_en.htm

([2]) These include: standards for earthquake and flooding risk calculation, on-site seismic instruments to measure and alert of possible earthquakes, containment filtered venting systems to allow safe depressurizing of the reactor containment in case of an accident, protection and availability of equipment to fight severe accidents, and existence of a backup emergency control room.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009279/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Programa Dark Sky Alqueva

Considerando que:

— O Programa Dark Sky Alqueva é o programa piloto em Portugal de implementação da Agenda para a Sustentabilidade e Competitividade do Turismo Europeu (COM(2007)0621) da Comissão Europeia;

— Este é um programa que tem efeitos visíveis diretos sobre o ambiente, dado que contribui para a diminuição da poluição luminosa e para o aumento da eficiência energética;

— A poluição luminosa não afeta somente a capacidade de observar as estrelas, mas também é prejudicial para os seres humanos e para o normal ciclo dos ecossistemas;

— Este programa tem um modelo de desenvolvimento que permite obter no destino o máximo de retorno com o mínimo de investimento;

— O Alqueva foi o primeiro destino do mundo a receber a certificação «Starlight Tourism Destination»;

— O mercado alvo direto para este tipo de produto é de 25 milhões de turistas e, segundo os mais recentes estudos, o mercado alvo pode chegar a metade da população mundial que vive em cidades e áreas circundantes onde existe um elevado nível de poluição luminosa.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento do referido programa?

Está prevista a sua divulgação e promoção, com ações direcionadas para o mercado interno, europeu e internacional?

Tendo em conta que este programa se enquadra nos objetivos da Comunicação de 2010 da Comissão Europeia, COM(2010)0352, equaciona dotá-lo de financiamento comunitário?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(21 de dezembro de 2012)

A Comissão tem conhecimento do programa Dark Sky Alqueva e regista com muito agrado o facto de esta iniciativa estar a ser implementada de acordo com os objetivos da política da UE em matéria de turismo. O impacto positivo deste programa no ambiente e no desenvolvimento do turismo pode certamente ser considerado como um exemplo de boas práticas valiosas. Tal é igualmente confirmado pela certificação «Destino Turístico Starlight» atribuída ao Alqueva.

De forma a apoiar e promover iniciativas que desenvolvam o turismo sustentável à escala da UE, a Comissão lança anualmente convites à apresentação de propostas dirigidos a projetos de cooperação (transnacionais) transfronteiras. A Comissão apenas pode aceitar as propostas de projetos que sejam apresentadas em resposta a convites à apresentação de propostas e só os projetos com uma dimensão transnacional podem ser cofinanciados através destes convites.

Tendo em conta a dimensão local/regional da iniciativa Dark Sky Alqueva, poderá eventualmente haver outros fundos mais bem adaptados às características deste projeto do que os convites à apresentação de propostas para projetos de turismo transnacionais lançados à escala da UE. Nomeadamente, no que diz respeito a ações inovadoras ou de demonstração que visem questões ambientais, poderá ter interesse o convite à apresentação de propostas a lançar no início de 2013 ao abrigo do programa LIFE+. Ver informação detalhada no sítio Web do programa LIFE da Comissão ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/life/

Podem ser obtidas mais informações sobre o eventual financiamento às partes interessadas no setor do turismo através da consulta de: *Study on the impact of EU policies and the measures undertaken in their framework on tourism* (estudo sobre o impacto das políticas da UE e medidas tomadas no seu âmbito em matéria de turismo) ([2]).

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=6227&lang=en&title=Study%2Don%2Dthe%2Dimpact%2Dof%2DEU%2Dpolicies%2Dand%2Dthe%2Dmeasures%2Dundertaken%2Din%2Dtheir%2Dframework%2Don%2Dtourism

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009279/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Alqueva Dark Sky Programme

Given that:

— The Alqueva Dark Sky Programme is the Portuguese pilot programme implemented under the Commission's 'Agenda for a sustainable and competitive European tourism' (COM(2007)0621);

— This programme has a direct and visible environmental impact, as it helps to reduce light pollution and to increase energy efficiency;

— Light pollution not only affects our ability to stargaze, but is harmful to humans and the normal cycle of ecosystems;

— This programme's development model enables maximum return with minimal investment;

— Alqueva was the first destination in the world to receive 'Starlight Tourism Destination' certification;

— The direct target market for this type of product is 25 million tourists. According to the latest studies, the target market could reach half the world's population living in cities and surrounding areas with high levels of light pollution.

I would ask the Commission:

Is it aware of this programme?

Will it promote and publicise it, with measures targeting the domestic, European and international markets?

Given that this programme meets the objectives of the 2010 Commission Communication COM(2010)0352, will it be granted EU funding?

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

The Commission is aware of the Alqueva Dark Sky Programme and highly appreciates the fact that this initiative is implemented in line with the objectives of the EU tourism policy. Its positive impacts on the environment and tourism development can certainly be considered as valuable good practice. This is also confirmed by the 'Starlight Tourism Destination' certification that the Alqueva site received.

To support and promote initiatives on sustainable tourism development at EU level, the Commission annually launches calls for proposals aimed at cross-border (transnational) cooperation projects. The Commission can only support project proposals submitted in response to open calls and only projects with a transnational dimension can be co-funded through these calls.

Taking into account the local/regional dimension of the Alqueva Dark Sky Programme initiative, other funds could possibly be a better match for the project characteristics than these EU level calls for proposals of transnational tourism projects. In particular, for innovative or demonstrative actions targeting environmental issues, the call for proposals that will be launched early in 2013 under the LIFE+ Programme could be of interest. Detailed information can be found on the Commission's LIFE website ([1]).

More information on the possible funding for stakeholders in the tourism sector can be found in the: *Study on the impact of EU policies and the measures undertaken in their framework on tourism* ([2]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/life/
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemdetail.cfm?item_id=6227&lang=en&title=Study%2Don%2Dthe%2Dimpact%2Dof%2DEU%2Dpolicies%2Dand%2Dthe%2Dmeasures%2Dundertaken%2Din%2Dtheir%2Dframework%2Don%2Dtourism

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009280/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Malala Yusufzai

Malala Yusufzai, uma jovem paquistanesa de 14 anos, foi atacada em plena luz do dia por combatentes do Movimento Talibã do Paquistão (TTP), aliado à Al-Qaeda, em frente à sua escola em Mingora.

A jovem Malala Yousafzai tornou-se mundialmente famosa quando aos onze anos ergueu a voz contra o encerramento de escolas para meninas.

Malala vive no vale de Swatt, no norte do Paquistão, uma zona onde os talibã conservadores têm imposto a lei da tradição, apesar de aparentemente o exército do país tentar manter a segurança.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Não considera que a UE deveria condicionar a abertura do respetivo mercado a produtos produzidos no Paquistão ao cumprimento de regras básicas de civilização, como a outros Estados que se pretendem de Direito?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(16 de janeiro de 2013)

A UE está ciente do problema com que o Paquistão se defronta diariamente devido ao terrorismo no Vale de Swat e noutras zonas do país, tendo condenado publicamente o ataque a Malala Yousafzai. A UE manifestou a sua preocupação com os prejuízos que um clima de violência e intimidação causa ao desenvolvimento em geral e, no contexto do diálogo que mantém regularmente com o Paquistão, instou as autoridades paquistanesas, ao mais alto nível, a garantir a segurança física e a proteção dos direitos dos seus cidadãos.

Foram muitos os que no Paquistão, inclusive ao mais alto nível, ficaram consternados com o ataque a Malala. É do mais alto interesse da UE apoiar os que se manifestam contra o extremismo e estão preparados para tomar medidas contra os autores de crimes como este. A retirada do nosso apoio às instituições e governo democráticos do país teria o efeito oposto. Existe uma correlação direta entre fatores como a pobreza, o desemprego, o analfabetismo e a disseminação de ideias extremistas, e a redução das perspetivas económicas do Paquistão não faria senão reforçar esses fatores.

A UE deveria, em vez disso, procurar utilizar os instrumentos de que dispõe para encorajar a aplicação dos direitos humanos essenciais, tal como consagrados nas convenções internacionais em que o Paquistão é parte. No âmbito do seu Regulamento SPG, a UE oferece a possibilidade de um sistema de preferências reforçadas a países em desenvolvimento («SPG+») com este objetivo em vista.

Em paralelo, a UE apoia projetos que têm por objetivo melhorar o acesso à justiça e também a qualidade da aplicação da legislação no Paquistão, em especial a nível dos serviços policiais e do ministério público.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009280/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Malala Yousafzai

Malala Yousafzai, a fourteen-year-old Pakistani girl, was attacked in broad daylight in front of her school in Mingora by militants of the Taliban Movement in Pakistan (TTP), which is allied to al-Qa'ida.

Malala Yousafzai became internationally known for speaking out against the closure of girls' schools when she was eleven.

Malala lives in the Swat valley in northern Pakistan, a region where traditional law has been imposed by the conservative Taliban despite the national army apparently attempting to maintain security.

I ask the Commission:

Does it think that the EU should only open its market to products from Pakistan providing the basic rules of civilisation are respected, as with other states wanting this right?

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

The EU is aware of the terrorist problem faced by Pakistan in the Swat Valley and other areas of the country on a daily basis, and has publicly condemned the attack on Malala Yousafzai. The EU has conveyed its concern at the damage a climate of violence and intimidation does to overall development, and in the context of regular dialogue with Pakistan has called on the Pakistani authorities, at the highest level, to ensure the physical security as well as the protection of the rights of its citizens.

Many in Pakistan, including at the highest level, were appalled by the attack on Malala. It is in the EU's deepest interests to support those who speak out against extremism and are prepared to take measures against the perpetrators of crimes such as this. To withdraw our support for the country's democratic government and institutions would have the opposite effect. There is a direct correlation between factors such as poverty, unemployment and illiteracy and the spread of extremist ideas; diminishing Pakistan's economic prospects would only enhance these factors.

The EU should instead seek to use its instruments to encourage the implementation of basic human rights, as enshrined in international conventions to which Pakistan is party. Under its GSP Regulation the EU offers the possibility of enhanced preferences to developing countries ('GSP+') with this objective in view.

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

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009281/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Surto de dengue na Madeira

Segundo notícias veiculadas pela comunicação social portuguesa, as autoridades de saúde revelaram a existência de um surto de dengue, com várias dezenas de casos já confirmados. Cumpre referir que todos estes casos são relativos a pessoas residentes na Madeira, e que não saíram da região, sendo que se trata de uma região com enorme fluxo de turistas provenientes de todo o mundo.

Tratando-se de uma região de um Estado-Membro da UE, a situação extrema descrita, que põe em causa a saúde dos residentes e dos que à Madeira se deslocam, justifica claramente, para além da ação das autoridades nacionais, também a das instituições europeias.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem a Comissão acompanhado a evolução da doença na Madeira?

Que medidas está disposta a implementar para combate ao surto de dengue que assola a região, colocando em risco os residentes e demais pessoas, nomeadamente da UE, que à Madeira se deslocam?

Que apoios extraordinários está disposta a colocar à disposição do Estado português e do governo regional?

Resposta dada por Maroš Šefčovič em nome da Comissão
(22 de novembro de 2012)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a sua resposta à pergunta escrita P-09512 ([1]) apresentada pela Senhora Deputada Marisa Matias.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009281/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Dengue Fever outbreak in Madeira

According to the Portuguese media, health officials have reported an outbreak of dengue fever, with several dozen cases now confirmed. All these cases involve Madeira residents, who had not left the region. This region is visited by a vast number of tourists from around the world.

This region is part of an EU Member State. This extreme situation, which jeopardises the health of residents and those travelling to Madeira, therefore justifies action from EU institutions as well as national authorities.

I would ask the Commission:

Has it followed this disease's development in Madeira?

What steps will it take to combat the dengue fever outbreak plaguing the region, which endangers residents and others, including EU citizens, travelling to Madeira?

What additional support will it provide to the Portuguese State and to the Regional Government of Madeira?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-09512 ([1]) by Mrs Marisa Matias.

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

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009282/12
ao Conselho
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Detetadas falhas na maioria das centrais nucleares europeias

Segundo notícia divulgada pela Agência Bloomberg, e tendo em conta um relatório preliminar da Comissão Europeia, os 134 reatores nucleares que operam na União Europeia têm de melhorar os níveis de segurança.

Os custos das referidas melhorias deverão rondar os 30 a 200 milhões de euros por reator nuclear.

As novas regras de segurança foram criadas em resposta ao desastre que ocorreu em Fukushima.

Entre os «testes de stress» levados a cabo no perímetro europeu encontram-se ameaças de desastres naturais, acidentes de avião e explosões próximas dos reatores.

Pergunta-se ao Conselho:

Tem acompanhado esta situação?

Dada a gravidade do assunto, o Conselho já elaborou algum plano de emergência que preveja a resolução do problema?

Resposta
(16 de janeiro de 2013)

O Conselho Europeu de 24-25 de março de 2011 ([1]) solicitou que fosse lançado um processo a nível da UE para fazer uma avaliação exaustiva dos riscos e da segurança («testes de resistência») em todas as centrais nucleares da Europa. O Conselho Europeu também convidou a Comissão a examinar o quadro jurídico e regulamentar vigente em matéria de segurança das instalações nucleares.

Este processo de avaliação foi devidamente conduzido por autoridades de segurança nacionais independentes segundo métodos e critérios acordados em comum. Foram elaborados relatórios nacionais de avaliação e submetidos a uma análise pelos pares, que incluiu visitas a um número selecionado de sítios. No final da avaliação pelos pares, o Grupo de Reguladores Europeus em matéria de Segurança Nuclear (Ensreg) publicou um relatório final, contendo um certo número de recomendações para aumentar as atuais margens de segurança nas centrais nucleares. Todo o processo foi realizado de uma forma totalmente transparente, tendo todos os relatórios sido colocados à disposição do público na íntegra.

O relatório do Ensreg foi apresentado ao Conselho Europeu de 28-29 de junho de 2012, que convidou os Estados-Membros a assegurarem a implementação plena e atempada das recomendações formuladas no referido relatório, na sequência da conclusão dos testes de resistência no domínio da segurança nuclear ([2]). A Comissão e o Ensreg concordaram quanto à necessidade de prosseguir os trabalhos.

Em julho, acordaram, por conseguinte, num plano de ação para dar seguimento às recomendações. Os Estados-Membros aceitaram, em especial, preparar planos nacionais para a implementação das recomendações pertinentes, cuja implementação será devidamente controlada pelas respetivas autoridades de segurança nacionais. Estes planos de ação nacionais serão publicados até ao final de 2012 e serão analisados pelos pares no primeiro semestre de 2013.

O Conselho Europeu também solicitou a rápida aplicação das recomendações do Grupo *Ad Hoc* da Segurança Nuclear composto por Estados-Membros para abordar os aspetos da segurança.O Conselho Europeu apelou à intensificação dos esforços para reforçar a cooperação da UE com todos os seus vizinhos em matéria de proteção e segurança nucleares.

Em relação ao quadro jurídico europeu e regulamentar sobre a segurança, cabe à Comissão avaliar se deve apresentar novas iniciativas, às quais o Conselho daria toda a devida atenção.

([1]) EUCO 10/1/11, VER 1, ponto 31.
([2]) EUCO 76/12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009282/12
to the Council
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Problems detected in a majority of European nuclear plants

The Bloomberg agency has reported, on the basis of a preliminary report by the European Commission that the 134 nuclear reactors operating in the European Union need to improve their safety levels.

It seems likely that the rough cost of these improvements will be between EUR 30 million and EUR 200 million per reactor.

The new safety rules have been created in response to the Fukushima disaster.

The 'stress tests' carried out in Europe includes threats of natural disasters, aircraft crashes and explosions near a reactor.

Can the Council state:

Has it been monitoring this situation?

Given the gravity of the situation, has the Council yet drafted an emergency plan that provides for the problem's resolution?

Reply
(16 January 2013)

The European Council on 24-25 March 2011 ([1]) requested an EU-wide process to be launched for a comprehensive risk and safety assessment ('stress-tests') to be carried out at all nuclear plants in Europe. The European Council also invited the Commission to review the existing legal and regulatory framework for the safety of nuclear installations.

This assessment process was duly conducted by independent national safety authorities in accordance with common agreed methods and criteria. National assessment reports were prepared and submitted to peer reviews that included visits in a selected number of sites. At the end of the peer review, the European Nuclear Safety Regulator Group (ENSREG) published a final report, containing a certain number of recommendations for further increase of the existing safety margins of the nuclear power plants. The whole process was conducted in a fully transparent manner, all reports being made available to the public in their entirety.

The ENSREG report was submitted to the European Council of 28-29 June 2012, who invited_Member States to ensure the full and timely implementation of the recommendations presented in this report further to the completion of the nuclear safety stress tests ([2]). The Commission and ENSREG agreed that further work was needed.

In July, they agreed accordingly upon an action plan for the follow up of the recommendations. Member States accepted in particular to prepare national plans for the implementation of relevant recommendations, the implementation of which to be duly controlled by their national safety authorities. These national action plans will be published by the end of 2012 and will be peer-reviewed in the first half of 2013.

The European Council also called for the rapid implementation of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Group on Nuclear Security composed of Member States to deal with security aspects.

The European Council called for further efforts to enhance the EU's cooperation with all the EU's neighbours on nuclear safety and security.

With regards to the European legal and regulatory safety framework, it is for the Commission to assess whether it should table new initiatives, to which the Council would give all due consideration.

([1]) EUCO 10/1/11 REV 1, paragraph 31.
([2]) EUCO 76/12.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009283/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Previsões FMI

Foi recentemente divulgado um relatório do FMI, de acordo com o qual as previsões de crescimento são revistas em baixa. Nesse relatório, é reconhecido que as medidas de contenção orçamental aplicadas em vários países em todo o Globo estão a ter, nos últimos anos, um impacto negativo na economia muito maior do que aquilo que os modelos que estão a ser utilizados previam. Enquanto que nos modelos de projeção usados se estimava que, por cada euro de cortes de despesa pública ou de agravamento de impostos se perdia 0.5 euros no PIB, a realidade mostrou que esse impacto (os chamados multiplicadores) é muito maior. Afinal, desde que começou a Grande Recessão em 2008, o que os dados económicos mostram é que, por cada euro de austeridade, o PIB está a perder um valor que se situa no intervalo entre 0,9 e 1,7 euros. As previsões e o crescimento agora considerados errados foram pressuposto dos programas de austeridade a que foram sujeitos os países forçados a recorrer à ajuda externa, entre os quais se conta Portugal. Como é evidente, o confessado erro de avaliação traduz-se, necessariamente, no agravamento das condições dos países intervencionados, com um impacto negativo na economia, que antes não tinha sido previsto.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

Reconhece as novas previsões de crescimento feitas pelo FMI?

Consequentemente, tendo em conta o impacto negativo das medidas de austeridade impostas aos países intervencionados, e antes não previsto, não considera que os memorandos de entendimento celebrados com a Troika (FMI, BCE e CE) deveriam ser reajustados à nova realidade, sob pena de condenarem as economias dos países em causa, ao contrário do que seria a intenção dos programas aplicados?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009287/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Planos de austeridade e custo do financiamento

É notório o aumento, nesta altura, da contestação social e política nos países periféricos da zona euro (Portugal, Espanha e Grécia), tendo o FMI, recentemente, alertado para os efeitos nocivos de um ritmo acelerado na implementação dos programas de austeridade. No «World Economic Outlook» (WEO), a instituição também diz que o custo do financiamento das economias periféricas da moeda única deve ser razoável. O FMI afirma ainda que «as economias a periferia devem continuar o seu processo de ajustamento do défice a um ritmo que possam suportar, mas é também importante que tenham acesso a financiamento a custos razoáveis». Enquanto que, nos modelos de projeção usados, se estimava que por cada euro de cortes de despesa pública ou de agravamento de impostos se perdia 0,5 euros no PIB, a realidade mostrou que esse impacto (os chamados multiplicadores) é muito maior. Afinal, desde que começou a Grande Recessão em 2008, o que os dados económicos mostram é que por cada euro de austeridade, o PIB está a perder um valor que se situa no intervalo entre 0,9 e 1,7 euros.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento destas conclusões do FMI?

Não considera que estas conclusões vêm dar razão a quem defende que o processo de ajustamento dos países intervencionados está a ser feito de forma muito violenta?

Não considera que o custo dos fundos disponibilizados pela Troika aos países intervencionados é demasiado elevado, não ajudando assim à sua recuperação?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009811/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(26 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Nova visão do FMI face à ideia de austeridade

Considerando que:

— o estudo apresentado no «*World Economic Outlook*» pelo Fundo Monetário Internacional (FMI), uma das instituições que faz parte do memorando de entendimento, assinado entre esta instituição, a Comissão Europeia e Portugal, assinala que os efeitos recessivos das políticas de austeridade estão claramente mal avaliados;

— neste mesmo estudo, «*a investigação da equipa do FMI sugere que os cortes orçamentais tiveram efeitos multiplicadores de curto prazo no produto maiores do que se esperava*», levando a uma crise sem precedentes nos países intervencionados, uma vez que, por cada euro cortado com o ajustamento orçamental, o efeito recessivo no PIB foi de 0,9 a 1,7 e não a 0,5 euros, como estava previsto;

— as medidas para encurtar o défice público dos Estados-Membros deverão ser aplicadas com vista uma estratégia de médio e longo prazo, uma vez que, para uma política de crescimento e aumento do emprego, são necessárias políticas de investimento a curto e médio prazo.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Se, tendo em conta este estudo do FMI e as diversas declarações da sua Presidente, Christine Lagarde, não tenciona, em conjunto com o FMI e os países intervencionados, rever as políticas e medidas exigidas e os prazos para o cumprimento dos memorandos, de modo a aliviar países como Portugal e a Grécia que se encontram num ambiente de recessão contínua e de aumento crescente da taxa de desemprego?

2. Na última avaliação efetuada em Portugal, verificou-se uma flexibilização do cumprimento do défice de 5 % para este ano, 4,5 % para o próximo ano e de 2,5 % para 2014. Tendo em conta que o PEC, bem como o Tratado, estabelecem o limiar de 3 % do PIB para o défice público, qual a razão para pedir a Portugal um défice público de 2,5 % em 2014? Não considera esta medida discriminatória face aos outros Estados-Membros?

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

A solidez das finanças públicas constitui uma condição prévia essencial para a estabilidade macroeconómica e o crescimento, especialmente na área do euro, onde os efeitos de políticas orçamentais insustentáveis se fazem sentir de forma mais incisiva, como claramente demonstra a atual crise. A Comissão não nega que o ajustamento orçamental tem consequências negativas sobre o crescimento a curto prazo, na medida em que a contenção orçamental reduz as despesas agregadas, nem que, durante as crises financeiras, este efeito pode ser maior do que o habitual. Alguns Estados-Membros, nomeadamente aqueles com reduzido acesso ao mercado, não têm alternativa viável à consolidação, uma vez que a sua não aplicação poderia ter consequências ainda mais gravosas. Quando a sustentabilidade orçamental está em risco, a ausência de consolidação pode resultar num aumento dos prémios de risco ou na perda total do acesso ao mercado, com consequências para o crescimento muito piores do que no caso de uma consolidação.

A Comissão preconizou uma consolidação das finanças públicas favorável ao crescimento. Isto implica que o ritmo da consolidação orçamental seja diferenciado consoante os países, de acordo com a sua margem de manobra orçamental, a fim de se encontrar o justo equilíbrio entre os potenciais efeitos negativos sobre o crescimento e os riscos que pesam sobre a sustentabilidade da dívida. No caso de grandes choques negativos para o crescimento, as regras orçamentais da UE oferecem a necessária flexibilidade para reponderar a trajetória de ajustamento. Esta possibilidade foi utilizada em várias ocasiões no passado, mais recentemente no caso de Espanha e de Portugal. Embora a consolidação incida no lado das despesas, é necessário desenvolver um conjunto de medidas favoráveis ao crescimento tanto do lado das receitas como das despesas, protegendo os principais vetores do crescimento, e assegurando ao mesmo tempo a eficiência das despesas. As melhores práticas internacionais mostram que, em muitos países, ainda há margem para poupanças de recursos públicos no que respeita a níveis inalterados de serviços.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009283/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: IMF forecasts

According to a recent report by the IMF, its growth forecasts have been revised downwards. This report acknowledges that the budgetary consolidation measures applied in various countries worldwide in recent years are having a negative impact on the economy far in excess of that forecast by the models in use. While the projection models used estimated that each EUR 1 of public-spending cuts or additional taxation resulted in a loss of EUR 0.5 in GDP, this impact — or so-called multipliers — has been shown to be far higher in reality. In fact, the economic data show that, since the major recession started in 2008, each EUR 1 of austerity has led to a loss of between EUR 0.9 and EUR 1.7 of GDP. The forecasts and growth which are now considered wrong were a presupposition of the austerity programmes to which the countries forced to seek outside help were subjected, including Portugal. Obviously, this acknowledged evaluation error necessarily translates into a previously un-forecasted exacerbation of the conditions in the bailed-out countries, with a negative impact on the economy.

Can the Commission state:

Does it acknowledge the IMF's new growth forecasts?

Consequently, given the negative impact of the austerity measures imposed on the bailed-out countries and the fact that these consequences were unexpected, does it agree that the memoranda of understanding concluded with the troika of the IMF, the ECB and the Commission should be readjusted to the new situation or — surely not the intention of these programmes — risk dooming the economies of the countries in question?

Question for written answer E-009287/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Austerity measures and financing costs

There has been marked social and political unrest in the peripheral countries of the eurozone — Portugal, Spain and Greece — and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) has recently drawn attention to the harmful effects of the accelerated implementation of austerity programmes. The IMF's 'World Economic Outlook' (WEO) states that the costs of obtaining funding for peripheral economies within the single currency should be reasonable. The IMF further states that, 'While economies in the periphery must continue to adjust their fiscal balances at a pace they can bear, it is essential to ensure their access to funding at reasonable cost'. While the projection models used estimated that each EUR 1 of cuts in public spending or additional taxation resulted in a loss of EUR 0.5 in GDP, this impact — the so-called multipliers — is far higher in reality. In fact, the economic data show that, since the Great Recession began in 2008, each EUR 1 of austerity has led to a loss of between EUR 0.9 and EUR 1.7 in GDP.

I therefore ask the Commission:

Is it aware of these IMF findings?

Does it not consider the findings to give credibility to those who maintain that the adjustment process in countries where intervention is taking place has been implemented too harshly?

Does it not consider that the costs of the Troika funding made available to countries subject to intervention are too high, thereby impeding their recovery?

Question for written answer E-009811/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(26 October 2012)

Subject: New IMF outlook on austerity

Given that:

— the study presented in the *World Economic Outlook* by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) — an institution that forms part of the memorandum of understanding, concluded between the IMF, the Commission and Portugal — indicates that the negative impacts of austerity policies are clearly poorly evaluated;

— in this same study, 'IMF staff research suggests that fiscal cutbacks had larger-than-expected negative short-term multiplier effects', leading to an unprecedented crisis in the bailed-out countries, since the negative effect on GDP was EUR 0.9 to EUR 1.7 for every euro cut through fiscal adjustment and not EUR 0.5 as planned;

— the measures to reduce the Member States' budget deficit should be applied using a medium- and long-term strategy, as a growth and job creation policy requires short- and medium-term investment policies.

I would ask the Commission:

1. Given this IMF study and various statements by the IMF President Christine Lagarde, will it — along with the IMF and the bailed-out countries — review the required policies and measures and deadlines for compliance with the memoranda, to relieve countries such as Portugal and Greece that are experiencing a continued recession and increasing unemployment rates?

2. In the last evaluation conducted in Portugal, deficit targets were relaxed to 5% this year, 4.5% next year and 2.5% for 2014. Given that the Stability and Growth Pact, as well as the Treaty, establish the budget deficit threshold at 3% of GDP, why request that Portugal reach a budget deficit of 2.5% in 2014? Does it not think that this measure is unfair compared to those imposed on other Member States?

Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(25 January 2013)

Sound public finances are an essential prerequisite for macroeconomic stability and growth, particularly in the euro area, where cross-country spillovers from unsustainable fiscal policies are stronger, as clearly demonstrated by the current crisis. The Commission does not deny that fiscal adjustment has negative effects on growth in the short term as fiscal retrenchment reduces aggregate spending, nor that during financial crises, this effect can be larger than usual. Some Member States, especially those with reduced market access, have no viable alternative to consolidation, as its absence could lead to even more negative consequences. When fiscal sustainability is at risk, lack of consolidation can result in higher risk premia or the loss of any market access, with consequences for growth that are far worse than in case of consolidation.

The Commission has called for fiscal consolidation to be growth-friendly. This implies that the speed of consolidation has to be differentiated across countries according to their fiscal space, to strike the right balance between potential negative growth effects and the risks to debt sustainability. In case of large negative shocks to growth, the EU fiscal rules provide appropriate flexibility for reconsidering the adjustment path. This possibility has been taken up on several occasions in the past, most recently for Spain and Portugal. While focusing the consolidation on the expenditure side, there is a need to devise an overall growth-friendly mix of revenue and expenditure protecting key growth drivers, while ensuring efficiency of expenditure. International best practices show that in many EU countries there is significant room for savings of public resources for unchanged levels of services.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009284/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Banco Nacional da Suíça nega conclusões de um relatório da Standard & Poor's

Foi divulgado recentemente um relatório da Standard & Poor's que relaciona compras invulgarmente avultadas de dívida dos países do centro do euro pelo Banco Nacional da Suíça.

Segundo o mesmo relatório, nos sete primeiros meses do ano, o referido banco terá comprado cerca de 80 mil milhões de euros de títulos de dívida de cinco países nucleares do euro (Alemanha, França, Holanda, Finlândia e Áustria), assegurando o equivalente a 48 % das necessidades de financiamento globais previstas para estes países em 2012.

Por seu lado, o Banco Nacional da Suíça (SNB) nega as conclusões do relatório da S&P que diz serem «incorretas» e decorrerem de um «erro fundamental» por ignorarem «o aumento substancial dos depósitos do SNB noutros bancos centrais e instituições internacionais».

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento do referido relatório da Standard & Poor's?

Que avaliação faz do mesmo?

Não considera que esta situação venha a espoletar novos pedidos de ajuda dos países periféricos?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(13 de dezembro de 2012)

Em coerência com a sua prática relativa às políticas monetárias conduzidas pelos bancos centrais da UE, a Comissão não comenta as decisões de bancos centrais de países terceiros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009284/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Swiss National Bank rejects conclusions of a report by Standard & Poor's

Standard & Poor's (S&P) recently published a report detailing unusually large debt purchases from the core euro area countries by the Swiss National Bank (SNB).

According to the same report, in the first seven months of the year, the SNB bought around EUR 80 billion of bonds from the core euro area countries — Germany, France, the Netherlands, Finland and Austria — and thus provided them with 48% of their overall funding needs for 2012.

However, the SNB rejects the conclusions of the S&P report, which it says are incorrect and based on a 'fundamental error', because they ignore 'the sizable increase of SNB deposits with other central banks and international institutions'.

Can the Commission state:

Is it aware of the aforementioned S&P report?

What is its assessment?

Does it agree that this situation will spark new bailout requests from the peripheral countries?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2012)

In keeping with the practice regarding the conduct of monetary policy by EU central banks, the Commission does not comment on decisions by central banks of third countries.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009285/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Novas regras para o «Trading»

O relatório Liikanen, solicitado pela Comissão e recentemente divulgado, define sobretudo uma grande medida: «a separação jurídica e operacional das atividades de retalho e de "trading" dos grandes bancos».

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

Concorda com a medida solicitada pelo relatório?

Se sim, quando pensa ser possível vir a implementar a mesma de forma a evitar colapsos futuros da banca comercial?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(7 de dezembro de 2012)

O relatório do grupo de peritos de alto nível sobre a reforma da estrutura do setor bancário da UE foi apresentado à Comissão Europeia em 2 de outubro de 2012.

Após a receção do relatório, os serviços da Comissão lançaram uma consulta pública aos interessados sobre o relatório e as suas recomendações, a qual decorreu até 13 de novembro de 2012.

Com base no relatório, nas respostas à consulta e noutros trabalhos de análise, a Comissão determinará o seguimento adequado a dar às recomendações do grupo. Qualquer eventual proposta legislativa será acompanhada de uma avaliação de impacto prévia exaustiva.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009285/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: New trading rules

The central recommendation set out in the Liikanen report, requested by the Commission and recently published, involves measures that would create a legal and operational separation of retail and trading activities at major banks.

Can the Commission state:

Does it agree with the measures requested in the report?

If yes, when does it think the implementation thereof will be possible, so as to prevent the collapse of commercial banks in the future?

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

The report of the High-level Expert Group on reforming the structure of the EU banking sector was presented to the European Commission on 2 October 2012.

Upon receiving the report, the Commission services launched a public stakeholder consultation on the report and its recommendations; such consultation ran until 13 November 2012.

On the basis of 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 legislative proposal would be accompanied by a thorough prior impact assessment.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009286/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Taxa sobre transações financeiras

Portugal é um dos países que aderiu à cooperação reforçada para o projeto de taxa sobre transações financeiras. Com a cooperação reforçada, a Comissão irá elaborar uma proposta sobre esta matéria. Um analista de mercados financeiros português refere que uma taxa de 0,25 % sobre as transações financeiras levaria à morte dos mercados financeiros em Portugal.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

Há estudos efetuados, para os diversos países, sobre o impacto que a taxa a cobrar terá sobre os mercados financeiros?

O que pensa fazer se os países que estão contra esta medida não a implementarem, ficando, assim, com uma vantagem competitiva sobre os demais?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(3 de dezembro de 2012)

A avaliação de impacto (SEC (2011) 1102), integrada na proposta COM(2011)594 apresenta uma análise aprofundada do impacto da taxa nos mercados financeiros. Pode aceder a mais informações na página inicial da Comissão Europeia dedicada à iniciativa ([1]).

Dado não haver qualquer perspetiva de acordo entre os 27 Estados-Membros em relação ao imposto, e a pedido de 11 Estados-Membros, a Comissão apresentou um projeto de decisão do Conselho que autoriza um reforço da cooperação.

Com base nas informações disponíveis, não é possível concluir se as instituições financeiras com domicílio fora do território onde o IOF é aplicado, incluindo qualquer Estado-Membro que possa não participar na cooperação reforçada, obterão uma «vantagem competitiva» sistemática. Em particular, os termos da proposta inicial da Comissão, que sujeitam as instituições financeiras ao IOF, implicam que as instituições não residentes no território onde se aplica o IOF terão o mesmo tratamento que as instituições residentes no território onde se aplica o IOF desde que sirvam os mercados desses Estados. De qualquer modo, a Comissão continuará a prestar particular atenção aos potenciais riscos de deslocação, nomeadamente quando preparar a proposta para o IOF em cooperação reforçada, caso a autorização seja concedida pelo Conselho (após a aprovação do Parlamento Europeu).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/other_taxes/financial_sector/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009286/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Financial transactions tax

Portugal is one of the countries that have signed up for enhanced cooperation on the proposed financial transaction tax. With enhanced cooperation, the Commission will draft a proposal in this regard. A Portuguese financial-markets analyst has stated that a 0.25% tax on financial transactions would destroy the financial markets in Portugal.

Can the Commission state:

Have studies been carried out on the impact that the tax to be levied will have on financial markets?

What does it intend to do if the countries against this measure do not implement it, thereby gaining a competitive advantage over the others?

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

The impact assessment (SEC(2011) 1102) joined to the Commission proposal COM(2011) 594 presents an in-depth analysis of the impact of the tax on financial markets. Further information can be found on the home page of the European Commission dedicated to the initiative ([1]).

In the absence of any perspective of an agreement among all 27 Member States on the tax, and at the request of 11 Member States, the Commission has presented a draft Council decision authorising an enhanced cooperation.

On the basis of the available information it cannot be concluded that financial institutions domiciled outside the territory to which the FTT applies, including in any Member States which might not participate in an enhanced cooperation, will gain a systematic 'competitive advantage'. In particular, the terms of the initial Commission proposal, governing the liability of financial institutions to FTT, imply that those institutions who are not domiciled within the territory to which the FTT applies will be treated the same way as the institutions who are domiciled within the territory to which the FTT applies as soon as they serve the markets of the latter territory. In any event, the Commission will continue to pay particular attention to potential delocalisation risks, notably when preparing the proposal for FTT under enhanced cooperation, should the authorisation be granted by the Council (following the consent of the European Parliament).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/taxation/other_taxes/financial_sector/index_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009288/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Fuga de capitais da periferia para o centro da Europa

O FMI, no seu relatório de Estabilidade Financeira Global afirmou que «a fuga de capital da periferia para o centro da zona euro agrava a instabilidade financeira na Europa e realça o precário equilíbrio da moeda europeia».

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

Conhece as conclusões deste relatório?

Considerando que a crise da dívida soberana é uma das responsáveis desta «fuga» de capitais, o que pode ainda ser feito para minimizar essa «fuga» de capitais, que é perniciosa para as economias dos países da zona periférica?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(13 de dezembro de 2012)

A Comissão tomou nota do REFM (GFSR) ([1]) e das suas conclusões. O REFM constata que em vários países abrangidos por programas de ajustamento e países vulneráveis da área do euro ocorreu uma fuga de capitais privados e que essa fuga foi, em geral, compensada por fluxos de financiamento quase oficial sob a forma de programas de assistência macrofinanceira e por alterações no sistema Target 2. Esta constatação está correta e em consonância com anteriores trabalhos de investigação publicados pela Comissão em abril de 2012 no seu relatório trimestral sobre a área do euro ([2]).

O relatório do FMI apela à adoção de medidas destinadas a restabelecer a estabilidade e a confiança do setor privado na área do euro. Alega, nomeadamente, que o processo de reforço da integração da área do euro, conducente a uma união monetária, orçamental e financeira, deve avançar para que a estabilidade seja restabelecida. A Comissão tem trabalhado nos últimos meses e nos últimos anos exatamente nesse sentido e continuará a fazê-lo, tanto através da sua atividade de supervisão e assistência específicas por país como da reformulação da arquitetura de governação económica da UEM. Como o FMI reconhece, o BCE tem também agido de forma decisiva para pôr fim às graves perturbações registadas nos mercados de títulos de dívida soberana de alguns Estados-Membros, tendo criado o instrumento TMD (OMT).

De importância fundamental para assegurar a estabilidade financeira da área do euro a médio prazo é a reforma do setor financeiro, para a qual a Comissão apresentou propostas ambiciosas nos últimos meses. O avanço para uma união bancária permitirá reduzir os ciclos de retroação perniciosa entre os bancos e as dívidas soberanas, um problema que tem sido um fator determinante da fuga de capitais privados dos Estados-Membros vulneráveis.

A posição da Comissão é apresentada na AAC (AGS) de 2013 ([3]) e no plano pormenorizado para uma União Económica e Monetária efetiva e aprofundada, ambos adotados em 28 de novembro de 2012 ([4]).

([1]) Relatório sobre a estabilidade financeira mundial.
([2]) Relatório trimestral sobre a área do euro, vol. 11, n.º 1, abril de 2012.
([3]) Análise anual do crescimento; ver igualmente o anexo macroeconómico.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2013_pt.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009288/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Capital flight from the EU periphery to the core

In its Global Financial Stability Report, the IMF states that capital flight from peripheral countries to core countries in the euro area is exacerbating financial instability in the EU and highlights the precarious state of the euro.

I therefore ask the Commission:

Is it aware of this report's conclusions?

Given that the sovereign debt crisis is one of the reasons for this capital 'flight', what can be done to minimise this 'flight', which is harming the economies of peripheral countries?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2012)

The Commission has taken note of the GFSR ([1]) and its conclusions. The GFSR finds that private capital has flowed out of a number of programme and vulnerable euro area countries, and that these outflows have generally been offset by quasi-official funding flows in the form of macrofinancial assistance programmes and through changes in TARGET 2 claims. This finding is correct and in line with earlier research published by the Commission in April 2012 in its Quarterly Report on the euro area ([2]).

The IMF Report calls for policy measures aiming at restoring stability and private sector confidence in the euro area. It notably argues that the process of further integrating the euro area as a monetary, fiscal, and financial union must be pushed ahead for stability to be restored. The Commission has been working towards precisely these aims in the past months and years and will continue to do so, both through its country-specific surveillance and assistance efforts, as well as by shaping the overhaul of EMU's economic governance architecture. As the IMF acknowledges, the ECB has also acted decisively to quell the severe disruptions in some Member States' (MS) sovereign bond markets through the creation of its OMT facility.

Of critical importance for securing euro area financial stability in the medium term is financial sector reform, on which the Commission has presented far-reaching proposals in recent months. Progressing towards a banking union will ensure that pernicious feedback loops between banks and sovereigns are reduced, a problem that has been a significant factor in motivating private capital flight from vulnerable MS.

The Commission's views are expressed in the AGS 2013 ([3]) and the Blueprint for a Deep and Genuine EMU, both adopted on 28 November 2012 ([4]).

([1]) Global Financial Stability Report.
([2]) Quarterly Report on the Euro Area, Vol. 11 No.1, April 2012.
([3]) Annual Growth Survey, also see the Macroeconomic Annex.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2013_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009289/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Alemanha trava pedido de resgate de Espanha

Segundo a imprensa europeia, Madrid está a ser pressionada pelos mercados financeiros e por alguns parceiros europeus para pedir um resgate total, sendo que o Governo espanhol já terá decidido que essa será a melhor opção para Espanha. No entanto, segundo a Reuters, a chanceler alemã Angela Merkel «prefere evitar apresentar mais resgates individuais a países da zona euro ao seu cada vez mais relutante parlamento alemão».

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

Confirma a pretensão de Madrid pedir um resgate total?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(11 de dezembro de 2012)

Cabe à Espanha decidir se deve ou não pedir assistência financeira externa. Caso a Espanha decida apresentar um pedido nesse sentido, a Comissão está plenamente disposta a elaborar, juntamente com as autoridades espanholas e outros parceiros europeus e internacionais, as modalidades dessa assistência.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009289/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Germany blocks Spanish bailout request

According to the European press, the financial markets and several European partners are pressuring Madrid into requesting a full sovereign bailout, and the Spanish Government considers that this would be the best option for Spain. However, German Chancellor Angela Merkel would 'prefer to avoid putting more individual bailouts for distressed eurozone countries to her increasingly reluctant parliament'. I therefore ask the Commission:

Does it support Madrid's intention to request a full sovereign bailout?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2012)

It is up to Spain to decide on whether or not to request external financial assistance. Should Spain decide to submit a request, the Commission stands fully ready to elaborate, together with Spanish authorities and other European and international partners, the modalities of such assistance.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009290/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Custo da dívida dos países intervencionados

Segundo o relatório do FMI divulgado no Japão, Portugal é dos países que terá mais dificuldades em reduzir a dívida pública, pois os juros exigidos são muito superiores à taxa de crescimento da economia. A grande austeridade que tem sido exigida a Portugal tem originado uma recessão acentuada da economia. No entanto, essa austeridade levou a que os saldos primários de Portugal já sejam positivos, sendo o défice originado pelos custos da dívida. Acresce o erro recentemente reconhecido pelo FMI, que confessa que, nos modelos de projeção usados, se estimava que, por cada euro de cortes de despesa pública ou de agravamento de impostos se perdia 0,5 euros no PIB, embora a realidade tenha demonstrado que esse impacto (os chamados multiplicadores) é muito maior. Afinal, desde que começou a Grande Recessão em 2008, o que os dados económicos mostram é que por cada euro de austeridade, o PIB está a perder um valor que se situa no intervalo entre 0,9 e 1,7 euros.

Assim, pergunta-se à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento das conclusões deste relatório?

Sendo o custo da dívida um fator determinante no sucesso dos programas de resgate, não lhe parece oportuno, e face ao bom desempenho de Portugal, aliviar a taxa de juro cobrados nos 78 000 milhões de euros do programa de ajuda a Portugal?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(3 de dezembro de 2012)

A Comissão tem conhecimento das conclusões do FMI. Conforme declarou igualmente o chefe da missão do FMI para Portugal (cf.: http://www.imf.org/external/country/prt/rr/2012/101712.pdf), análises transnacionais como a relativa aos multiplicadores orçamentais não podem ser aplicadas mecanicamente às circunstâncias específicas de um país. Para os países sujeitos a um programa de assistência, designadamente na zona euro, há que ter em consideração outros aspetos além do impacto da consolidação no crescimento — como o restabelecimento da competitividade, a garantia da sustentabilidade da dívida, o regresso ao mercado pelo Estado soberano, etc.

Quanto à taxa de juro cobrada a título dos empréstimos no âmbito do programa, Portugal recebe verbas do lado europeu através de dois mecanismos: o FEEF e o MEEF. A taxa de juro cobrada pelo FEEF é determinada pelo custo do financiamento do Fundo no mercado, ou seja, o FEEF mobiliza verbas junto de investidores, a uma certa taxa de juro, e passa essa taxa ao país beneficiário. Adicionalmente, cobra também uma pequena remuneração para compensar os seus custos operacionais. Não cobra remunerações pelos seus empréstimos; por outras palavras, a taxa de juro a pagar pelos empréstimos do FEEF corresponde à que o Fundo paga nos mercados financeiros.

Dado que tanto o FEEF como o MEEF gozam de uma elevada notação, as taxas de juro cobradas a Portugal são bastante baixas — presentemente inferiores a 3 %. Uma redução implicaria que o FEEF e o MEEF sofressem perdas com estes empréstimos, as quais teriam então de ser suportadas pelos contribuintes de outros Estados-Membros da UE, muitos dos quais pagam, pelas respetivas dívidas soberanas, taxas de juro superiores às cobradas a Portugal.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009290/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Cost of debt in countries subject to interventions

According to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) report published in Japan, Portugal is one of the countries that will have increased difficulties in reducing public debt, as the interest rates being paid are much higher than the economy's growth rate. The great austerity that is being required of Portugal has resulted in a sharp downturn in its economy. However, this austerity has led to a positive primary balance: The deficit arises from the cost of servicing the debt. Additionally, due to the error recently admitted to by the IMF, whereby the projection models used estimated that each EUR 1 of public-spending cuts or additional taxation resulted in a loss of EUR 0.5 in GDP, this impact — the so-called multipliers — is far higher. In fact, the economic data show that, since the Great Recession began in 2008, each EUR 1 of austerity has led to a loss of between EUR 0.9 and EUR 1.7 in GDP.

I therefore ask the Commission:

Is it aware of this report's findings?

As the cost of debt is a determining factor in the success of rescue programmes, does it not seem advisable, based on Portugal's good performance, to reduce the interest rate charged on the EUR 78 000 million of Portugal's rescue package?

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

The Commission is aware of the IMF's findings. As stated also by the IMF mission chief for Portugal (see: http://www.imf.org/external/country/prt/rr/2012/101712.pdf), a cross-country analysis like the one on fiscal multipliers cannot be applied mechanically to country-specific circumstances. For programme countries, in particular in the euro area, aspects other than the growth impact of the consolidation have to be taken into consideration such as re-establishing competitiveness, ensuring debt sustainability, regaining market access by the sovereign, etc.

As for the interest rate charged for programme loans, from the European side Portugal receives money through two facilities: EFSF and EFSM. The interest rate charged by the EFSF is determined by the cost of EFSF funding in the market, i.e. the EFSF raises money from investors at a certain interest rate and passes this interest rate on to the beneficiary country. In addition, the EFSF also charges a small fee to cover its operational costs. The EFSM charges no fees on its loans, in other words the EFSM lending rate corresponds to the EFSM borrowing rate on financial markets.

As both the EFSM and the EFSF enjoy a high rating the interest rates charged to Portugal are very low, currently below 3%. A reduction would imply that the EFSF/EFSM make losses on these loans which then would have to be borne by taxpayers of other EU Member States, many of which pay interest rates on their own sovereign debt that are higher than those Portugal pays.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009291/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Movimentos separatistas na União Europeia

A crise económica está a reavivar velhas querelas históricas e económicas entre regiões ricas com um forte sentido de identidade e governos centrais. Ao mesmo tempo que da crise da zona euro poderá emergir uma união mais fiscal e um controlo mais centralizado dos orçamentos e bancos nacionais, a crise acelerou também os apelos à independência das regiões mais ricas de alguns Estados-Membros.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

De que meios dispõe a Comissão para demover suspeitas de separatismo na UE, como as recentemente verificadas nos países como a Espanha ou Bélgica?

Resposta dada pelo Presidente José Manuel Durão Barroso em nome da Comissão
(10 de dezembro de 2012)

Não compete à Comissão tomar posição sobre as questões de organização interna relacionadas com os sistemas constitucionais dos Estados-Membros.

Certos cenários, como a separação de uma parte de um Estado-Membro ou a criação de um novo Estado, não seriam neutros relativamente aos Tratados da UE. A Comissão não deixaria de exprimir a sua opinião sobre as consequências jurídicas face ao direito da UE, caso um Estado-Membro solicitasse e apresentasse um cenário preciso.

No que diz respeito à questão geral da adesão dos Estados à União Europeia, a Comissão recorda que esta se deve efetuar em plena conformidade com as regras e os procedimentos previstos nos Tratados da UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009291/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Separatist movements in the European Union

The economic crisis is reigniting old historical and economic contentions in rich regions with a strong sense of identity and central government. While the euro area crisis will lead to more fiscal union and a more centralised control of budgets and national banks, the crisis has also heightened calls for independence from some of the richest areas in some Member States.

I ask the Commission:

How is it deterring separatist movements within the EU, such as those as recently witnessed in Spain and Belgium?

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

It is not the role of the Commission to express a position on questions of internal organisation related to the constitutional arrangements in the Member States.

Concerning certain scenarios such as the separation of one part of a Member State or the creation of a new State, these would not be neutral as regards the EU Treaties. The Commission would express its opinion on the legal consequences under EC law, on request from a Member State detailing a precise scenario.

Concerning the general question of the accession of States to the European Union, the Commission recalls that this must be fully in line with the rules and procedures foreseen by the EU Treaties.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009292/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Programa Erasmus

O Programa Erasmus, com 25 anos de existência, é o mais bem-sucedido programa de intercâmbio de estudantes do mundo. Anualmente, mais de 230 mil estudantes estudam fora do seu país graças a estas parcerias europeias. Alain Lamassoure, Membro do Parlamento Europeu e Presidente da Comissão de Orçamentos, afirmou recentemente que o Fundo Social Europeu está falido e que não consegue refinanciar os Estados-Membros em muitos programas financiados pela UE. Na falta de novas contribuições, Lamassoure estima que a Comissão Europeia seja incapaz de reembolsar os valores já adiantos pelos Governos nacionais. O programa Erasmus será, assim, afetado, sendo a União Europeia incapaz de reembolsar os diferentes Estados-Membros no âmbito do referido programa.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Confirma a situação descrita?

Resposta dada por Janusz Lewandowski em nome da Comissão
(6 de dezembro de 2012)

O Senhor Deputado poderá encontrar todas as informações necessárias sobre a situação atual do programa Erasmus no seguinte endereço: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-12-785_en.htm.

Em 23 de outubro de 2012, a Comissão aprovou o projeto de orçamento retificativo n.° 6/2012 que solicita recursos adicionais para muitos programas, incluindo o programa Aprendizagem ao Longo da Vida (que inclui o Erasmus) e o Fundo Social Europeu. Este projeto de orçamento retificativo está disponível no endereço: http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2012/2012_en.cfm.

A Comissão espera que a rápida adoção do orçamento retificativo n.° 6/2012 contribua para resolver o problema atualmente enfrentado por estes dois programas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009292/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: The Erasmus programme

The Eramus programme, which has been operating for 25 years, is the most successful student exchange programme in the world. Thanks to these partnerships, over 230 000 students each year study outside their home countries. Alain Lamassoure, an MEP and Chairman of the Budget Committee, recently said that the European Social Fund is bankrupt and cannot refund the Member States for many EU-funded programmes. In the absence of new contributions, Lamassoure estimates that the Commission will be unable to repay the amounts already advanced by national governments. The Erasmus programme will therefore be affected, since the European Union is unable to repay the different Member States involved in the programme.

Can the Commission confirm this?

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

The Honourable Member 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 23 October 2012, the Commission adopted the Draft Amending Budget 6/2012 which requests additional resources for many programmes including Lifelong Learning (which includes Erasmus) and the European Social Fund. This Draft Amending Budget can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/budget/biblio/documents/2012/2012_en.cfm.

The Commission hopes that a swift adoption of the Amending Budget 6/2012 will help to solve the problem currently facing these two programmes.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009293/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Processo Europeu das Ações de Pequeno Montante

O Processo Europeu das Ações de Pequeno Montante, disponível desde 2009, destina-se a simplificar e a acelerar a resolução dos créditos transfronteiriços que envolvem um montante inferior a 2 000 euros.É, para os litigantes, uma alternativa aos processos existentes nos termos da lei dos Estados-Membros. As decisões proferidas neste tipo de processos são reconhecidas e executórias nos outros Estados-Membros sem necessidade de declaração de executoriedade e sem que seja possível contestar o seu reconhecimento. No entanto, um estudo recente da Rede de Centros Europeus do Consumidor concluiu que apenas uma parcela mínima dos conflitos transfronteiriços é conduzida através desta solução.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Não considera que tal situação torna o mecanismo do Processo Europeu das Ações de Pequeno Montante ineficaz numa altura em que há que reforçar a confiança dos consumidores europeus?

2. Que medidas tenciona a Comissão aplicar de forma a promover e incentivar esta alternativa simples de resolução deste tipo de conflitos?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(12 de dezembro de 2012)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta à pergunta parlamentar E-7960/2012 ([1]).

Nessa resposta, a Comissão confirmou que está ciente da necessidade de reforçar a eficácia do processo europeu para ações de pequeno montante e recordou o conjunto de ações adotadas e previstas para alcançar este objetivo.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009293/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: The European Small Claims Procedure

The European Small Claims Procedure, available since 2009, aims to simplify and speed up resolution of cross-border claims under EUR 2 000. It offers an alternative for claimants to the possibilities existing under Member States' national laws. Judgments delivered under this procedure are recognised and enforceable in the other Member States without needing a declaration of enforceability, and they cannot be contested. However, a recent European Consumer Centres Network report has found that not many cross-border claims are conducted in this way.

I ask the Commission:

1. Does it believe that this situation means that the European Small Claims Procedure is ineffective and that it needs to reinforce European consumer trust?

2. What measures will the Commission take to promote and encourage this simple alternative for resolving these kinds of conflicts?

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

The Commission wishes to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to parliamentary Question E-7960/2012 ([1]). In that reply the Commission confirmed its awareness of the need to increase the effectiveness of the European Small Claims Procedure and pointed out the actions taken and planned to achieve it.

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

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009294/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Segurança Alimentar

A Comissão Europeia adotou recentemente legislação em matéria de substâncias aromatizantes dos géneros alimentícios. As substâncias aromatizantes são utilizadas para alterar o sabor e/ou o cheiro dos géneros alimentícios. Um dos regulamentos aprovados (Regulamento de Execução (UE) n.° 872/2012 da Comissão, de 5 de setembro de 2012) prevê uma lista das substâncias aromatizantes que podem ser utilizadas nos alimentos, sendo aplicável a partir de 22 de abril de 2013. Todas as substâncias aromatizantes não constantes dessa lista serão proibidas após um período de eliminação progressiva de 18 meses.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

A transparência e a segurança serão reforçadas, uma vez que a lista estará disponível numa base de dados em linha que permitirá aos consumidores, às empresas do setor alimentar e às autoridades nacionais de controlo identificar facilmente quais as substâncias aromatizantes autorizadas nos géneros alimentícios, retirando do mercado todas as outras. Que avaliação faz da segurança alimentar e dos riscos para a saúde dos consumidores no que respeita à utilização de substâncias aromatizantes em géneros alimentícios até à recente legislação adotada pela Comissão Europeia?

Resposta dada por Maroš Šefčovič em nome da Comissão
(26 de novembro de 2012)

A legislação sobre aromas utilizados em géneros alimentícios na União Europeia data de 1988 quando a primeira diretiva-quadro [1] foi adotada para garantir o uso seguro de aromas em todo o mercado interno. A diretiva foi substituída por um novo regulamento-quadro [2] em 2008. À semelhança dos quadros legislativos que o precederam, o novo Regulamento apresenta requisitos gerais para o uso seguro de aromas. Apenas os aromas que, com base nas provas científicas disponíveis, não apresentem qualquer risco para a segurança do consumidor podem ser usados na nossa comida. Além disso, o seu uso não pode induzir o consumidor em erro.

A pedido do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, e para que haja uma maior harmonização do mercado interno, as medidas-quadro também estipulam que certos tipos de aromas devem ser avaliados e autorizados a nível da União. É por isso que a Comissão adotou agora a lista da União de aromas e materiais de base [3] e, mais precisamente, a lista das substâncias aromatizantes que podem ser colocadas no mercado interno.

A legislação procura garantir o funcionamento eficaz do mercado interno, ao mesmo tempo que fornece uma base para uma proteção elevada da saúde dos consumidores. Importa salientar que a segurança das substâncias aromatizantes foi avaliada pela Autoridade Europeia para a Segurança dos Alimentos.

---

[1] Diretiva 88/388/CEE do Conselho, de 22 de junho de 1988, relativa à aproximação das legislações dos Estados-Membros no domínio dos aromas destinados a serem utilizados nos géneros alimentícios e dos materiais de base para a respetiva produção, JO L 184 de 15.7.1988, p. 61.

[2] Regulamento (CE) n.° 1334/2008 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 16 de dezembro de 2008, relativo aos aromas e a determinados ingredientes alimentares com propriedades aromatizantes utilizados nos e sobre os géneros alimentícios e que altera o Regulamento (CEE) n.° 1601/91 do Conselho, os Regulamentos (CE) n.° 2232/96 e (CE) n.° 110/2008 e a Diretiva 2000/13/CE JO L 354 de 31.12.2008, p. 34.

[3] Regulamento de Execução (UE) n.° 872/2012 da Comissão, de 1 de outubro de 2012, que adota a lista das substâncias aromatizantes prevista no Regulamento (CE) n.° 2232/96 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, inclui essa lista no anexo I do Regulamento (CE) n.° 1334/2008 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho e revoga o Regulamento (CE) n.° 1565/2000 e a Decisão 1999/217/CE. JO L 267 de 2.10.2012, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009294/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Food safety

The European Commission recently adopted new legislation on food flavourings. Flavourings are used to impart odour and/or taste to food. Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 872/2012, approved on 5 September 2012, establishes a list of approved food flavourings, which will take force on 22 April 2013. Any flavourings that are not included in this list will be phased out over 18 months.

I ask the Commission:

Transparency and safety will be increased, as the list will be available on a database that will allow consumers, food production companies and national control authorities to easily identify which flavourings are permitted for use in food production, and all others will be taken off the market. What is the Commission's assessment of the food safety and health risks for consumers regarding food flavouring use up until this recent European Commission legislation?

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

Legislating on food flavourings in the European Union dates back to 1988 when the first framework Directive ([1]) was adopted to ensure the safe use of flavourings across the internal market. This directive was replaced in 2008 by a new framework Regulation ([2]). Similar to the previous framework legislation, the new Regulation lays down general requirements for the safe use of flavourings. Only flavourings that do not, on the basis of the scientific evidence available, pose a safety risk to the health of the consumer may be used in or on foods. Furthermore, their use must not mislead the consumer.

At the request of the European Parliament and the Council and for further harmonisation of the internal market the framework measures also stipulate that certain types of flavourings should be evaluated and authorised at the Union level. This is why the Commission now has adopted the Union list of flavourings and source materials ([3]), and more precisely, the list of those flavouring substances which may be placed on the internal market.

The legislation seeks to ensure effective functioning of the internal market while providing a basis for a high level of protection of consumers' health. Importantly, the safety of flavouring substances has been assessed by the European Food Safety Authority.

([1]) Directive 88/388/EEC of 22 June 1988 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to flavourings for use in foodstuffs and to source materials for their production. OJ L 184, 15.7.1988, p. 61.

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 1334/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on flavourings and certain food ingredients with flavouring properties for use in and on foods and amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 1601/91, Regulations (EC) No 2232/96 and (EC) No 110/2008 and Directive 2000/13/EC. OJ L 354, 31.12.2008, p. 34.

([3]) Regulation (EC) No 872/2012 of 1 October 2012 adopting the list of flavouring substances provided for by Regulation (EC) No 2232/96 of the European Parliament and of the Council, introducing it in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1334/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Commission Regulation (EC) No 1565/2000 and Commission Decision 1999/217/EC. OJ L 267, 2.10.2012, p.1.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009295/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: Orçamento da União Europeia 2014-2020

O primeiro-ministro britânico, David Cameron, admitiu recentemente a possibilidade de votar contra o orçamento comunitário. Defendeu ainda a criação de um orçamento comunitário separado para os Estados-Membros que não integram a moeda única.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

Que avaliação faz da criação de um orçamento diferenciado defendido pelo primeiro-ministro britânico?

Resposta dada pelo Presidente José Manuel Barroso em nome da Comissão
(26 de novembro de 2012)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-9205/2012, do Deputado Diogo Feio ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009295/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: EU budget 2014-2020

The British Prime Minister, David Cameron, recently admitted that he may vote against the Community budget. He also advocated the creation of a separate Community budget for Member States not adopting the single currency.

I ask the Commission:

What is its view on creating a separate budget, as advocated by the British Prime Minister?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(26 November 2012)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-9205/2012 by Mr Feio ([1]).

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009296/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Domanda alla Commissione di promuovere un'inchiesta sul dumping sui pannelli solari cinesi

A inizio settembre la Commissione ha lanciato un'inchiesta antidumping sui pannelli solari importati dalla Cina, che nel 2011 hanno raggiunto il valore di 21 miliardi di euro. Gli incentivi accordati ai produttori di pannelli da parte del governo cinese hanno creato una capacità di sovrapproduzione pari a 20 volte il consumo interno e pari a due volte la capacità mondiale, per cui il 90 % della produzione deve essere esportata. A causa di questa strategia aggressiva di mercato nel 2012 i 20 maggiori produttori europei sono diventati insolventi. L'associazione EU Pro Sun ha deposto il 25 settembre una denuncia formale contro le sovvenzioni accordate dal governo cinese e, secondo le regole del diritto comunitario, la Commissione europea dispone di 45 giorni di tempo per decidere se questa denuncia debba dar inizio a un procedimento giudiziale formale.

Può la Commissione far sapere quanto segue:

1. Intende procedere formalmente contro questo palese caso di dumping a danno dell'industria europea, in un settore chiave come quello dell'energia alternativa?

2. Non ritiene che si debba tutelare la capacità produttiva europea, e in particolare quella delle PMI, in un settore altamente strategico per le politiche ambientali?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(28 novembre 2012)

L'azione adottata dalla Commissione nel caso del presunto dumping rientra nel quadro delle regole dell'UE e dell'organizzazione mondiale del commercio. In questo caso la Commissione, sulla base di una denuncia presentata da un'associazione di produttori dell'UE, ha aperto un'indagine antidumping. La Commissione formulerà conclusioni sulla base delle risultanze dell'indagine. Risultanze provvisorie dovrebbero essere presentate entro il 5 giugno 2013.

L'8 novembre 2012 è stata inoltre avviata un'indagine antisussidi in seguito a una denuncia dello stesso denunciante. Le risultanze provvisorie di tale indagine sono previste entro il 7 agosto 2013.

Nel corso di quese indagini si terrà conto di tutti gli interessi pertinenti dell'Unione, compresi quelli delle piccole e medie imprese. Le indagini stabiliranno se un dumping e/o sussidi pregiudizievoli sono in corso e, su tale base, si potranno imporre misure una volta accertato che queste non vadano contro gli interessi generali dell'Unione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009296/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Call for an investigation into Chinese solar panel dumping

In early September, the Commission launched an anti-dumping investigation into solar panels imported from China, which in 2011 reached a value of EUR 21 billion. Incentives given to solar panel producers by the Chinese Government have created an overcapacity equivalent to 20 times domestic consumption and twice global capacity, which means that 90% of the manufactured products have to be exported. Because of this aggressive market strategy, in 2012 the 20 leading European solar panel manufacturers have become insolvent. On 25 September the EU association 'Pro Sun' lodged a formal complaint against the subsidies granted by the Chinese Government and, under EC law, the Commission has 45 days to decide whether this complaint should give rise to formal legal proceedings.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

1. Does it intend to take formal legal action against this blatant case of dumping, to the detriment of European industry, in a key sector such as that of alternative energy?

2. Does it not think it should protect European manufacturing capacity, and in particular that of SMEs, in such a highly strategic sector for environmental policy?

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

The action taken by the Commission in the case of alleged dumping is framed by EU and World Trade Organisation rules. In this case, the Commission has, on the basis of a complaint lodged by an association of EU producers, opened an anti-dumping investigation. The Commission will conclude on the basis of the findings established in the investigation. Provisional findings are due to be presented at the latest on 5 June 2013.

Also, an anti-subsidy investigation was initiated on 8 November 2012 following a complaint by the same complainant. For this investigation, provisional findings are due by 7 August 2013 at the latest.

In the course of these investigations, all relevant interests of the Union, including those of Small and medium enterprises which are producers in this sector, will be considered. The investigations will establish if injurius dumping and/or subsidisation are taking place and on that basis measures may be imposed should this be found not to be against the overall Union interest.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009297/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: La Commissione intervenga sul patrimonio artistico e culturale del Mali

A Timbuktu, neo capitale del nuovo Stato indipendente di Azawad, nel nord del Mali, il nuovo governo wahhabita sta effettuando un repulisti delle statue presenti in città, raffiguranti deità islamiche tradizionali. Inoltre è in atto un terribile assalto alle biblioteche della città e al centro Ahmed Baba, fondato dal precedente governo e dall'UNESCO per proteggere e tutelare diciottomila manoscritti antichi di inestimabile valore storico e culturale. Per la cultura wahhabita, i testi di matematica, astrologia e scienze sono da considerarsi impuri e quindi sono a rischio di distruzione.

1. La Commissione come intende intervenire al fine di tutelare il patrimonio storico del Mali?

2. Ha intrapreso una collaborazione con l'UNESCO per salvaguardare il centro Ahmed Baba?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha condannato con forza la distruzione dei siti storici di Tombouctou nella dichiarazione del 4 luglio 2012 e il Consiglio Affari esteri dell'UE ha fatto altrettanto nelle conclusioni del 23 luglio 2012.

Ora come ora, tuttavia, la situazione in loco (occupazione di Tombouctou da parte degli estremisti) non permette all'UE nessun intervento più concreto a breve termine, con o senza l'UNESCO, per tutelare il centro Ahmed Baba e il patrimonio storico del Mali. Tutte le azioni di sviluppo nel Mali settentrionale sono temporaneamente sospese dal gennaio 2012 per motivi di insicurezza.

Il 15 ottobre 2012 il Consiglio ha dichiarato che l'UE era fermamente decisa ad aiutare il Mali, anche per quanto riguarda il ripristino della sua sovranità sulla parte settentrionale del paese. La strategia dell'UE consiste nel cercare una soluzione, possibilmente attraverso il dialogo. Se tuttavia il dialogo dovesse fallire, il Consiglio ha chiesto che sia programmata con urgenza una missione militare nell'ambito della politica di sicurezza e di difesa comune (PSDC). Uno dei compiti della missione consisterebbe nel sostenere la ricostruzione dell'esercito maliano perché sia in grado di espellere dal nord del paese i gruppi estremisti che hanno distrutto i siti storici.

Considerata la situazione politica del Mali, l'assistenza allo sviluppo dell'UE (tranne gli aiuti umanitari, gli aiuti diretti alla popolazione e il sostegno alla transizione democratica) è stata sospesa in attesa che sia approvata una roadmap consensuale verso le elezioni che, si spera, consentirà la graduale ripresa della cooperazione allo sviluppo. Il portafoglio di aiuti dell'UE al Mali sarà riveduto in funzione degli eventi. A breve termine sarà data priorità all'assistenza alla popolazione e alle istituzioni fondamentali che potrebbe comprendere, anche in funzione delle priorità governative, un sostegno al patrimonio culturale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009297/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: The Commission should take action to protect the artistic and cultural heritage of Mali

In Timbuktu, the capital of the newly independent state of Azawad, in the north of Mali, the new Wahhabi government is getting rid of all the statues in the city that depict traditional Islamic deities. Terrible attacks are also taking place on the city's libraries and on the Ahmed Baba centre, founded by the previous government and Unesco to protect and safeguard 18 000 ancient manuscripts of priceless historical and cultural value. For the Wahhabi culture, mathematics, science and astrology texts are considered impure and are therefore at risk of destruction.

1. How will the Commission take action to protect the historical heritage of Mali?

2. Has it been cooperating with Unesco with a view to safeguarding the Ahmed Baba centre?

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

The HR/VP has strongly condemned in her statement dated 4 July 2012 the destruction of historic sites in Timbuktu and the EU Foreign Affairs Council has done the same in its conclusions on 23 July 2012.

However, the current situation on the ground (occupation of Timbuktu by extremists) does not allow the EU to do anything more concrete in the short term with or without Unesco to safeguard the Ahmed Baba Center and the historical heritage of Mali. Since January 2012 all development interventions in the North of Mali have been temporarily suspended due to insecurity.

On 15 October 2012, the Council expressed the EU's full determination to support Mali, including the restoration of its sovereignty on the north. The EU's approach is to seek a solution preferably through dialogue, but if dialogue should fail, the Council has asked that the planning of a possible Common Defence and Security Policy (CSDP) military mission be pursued urgently. One of its tasks could be supporting the reconstruction of the Malian army to make it capable to flush out extremist groups from the north, who have been destroying historical heritage sites.

Given the political situation in Mali, EU development assistance (except humanitarian and direct aid to population as well as support to the democratic transition) has been suspended pending the approval of a consensual roadmap towards elections, which will, hopefully, enable the gradual resumption of development cooperation. The EU aid portfolio to Mali will be reviewed to adapt to the new circumstances. In the short term, the priority will be assistance to the population and to the key institutions. This may — depending also on the government's priorities — include support for cultural heritage.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009298/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Alti tassi di diossina nel latte materno in Italia

In Italia, unico paese a non aver ratificato la Convenzione di Stoccolma che prevede il divieto di produzione intenzionale di alcuni inquinanti e la riduzione di quella involontaria, si sta rilevando, seppur con difficoltà di raccolta dati, come in alcune aree geografiche si verifichi nel latte materno la presenza di diossina con valori estremamente elevati. Nell'UE è attivo un biomonitoraggio che però non viene effettuato in Italia. Inoltre manca una direttiva che imponga il marchio «Dioxin Free» sugli alimenti.

1. La Commissione può spiegare perché il biomonitoraggio non viene effettuato in Italia?

2. La Commissione intende promuovere una direttiva per imporre il marchio «Dioxin Free» sugli alimenti al fine di tutelare la salute dei cittadini dell'Unione?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(26 novembre 2012)

1. In Italia viene effettuato il biomonitoraggio. La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole deputato alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta P-005483/2012 ([1]).

2. La Commissione non ha intenzione di imporre *ope legis* un'etichetta «dioxin-free» sui prodotti alimentari.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009298/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: High levels of dioxin in breast milk in Italy

In some geographical areas in Italy, it is emerging, although data are difficult to collect, that extremely high levels of dioxin are being found in breast milk. Italy is the only country that did not ratify the Stockholm Convention banning the intentional production of certain pollutants and requiring the elimination of their unintentional production, where feasible. Biomonitoring is active in the EU, but this is not carried out in Italy. There is also no directive that imposes the 'dioxin free' label on foodstuffs.

1. Can the Commission explain why there is no biomonitoring in Italy?

2. Does the Commission intend to promote a directive to impose the 'dioxin free' label on foodstuffs in order to protect the health of EU citizens?

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

1. Biomonitoring is carried out in Italy. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question P-005483/2012 ([1]).

2. The Commission has no intention to legally impose a 'dioxin-free' label on foodstuffs.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009300/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Vigilanza UE sugli organi espiantati dai condannati a morte cinesi

Il ministro cinese Huang ha annunciato che entro tre anni circa nella Repubblica popolare cinese si cesserà di espiantare gli organi per i trapianti dai condannati a morte. In Cina ogni anno vengono giustiziate quasi 4 000 persone a fronte di 300 000 persone in attesa di ricevere un trapianto, fatto che costituisce una forte pressione nella domanda difficilmente soddisfabile.

Inoltre il mandato del ministro Huang scadrà in autunno ed esiste il rischio che il suo successore non manterrà gli impegni presi.

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza di importazioni di organi cinesi per trapianti nell'Unione Europea?

2. Intende esercitare pressioni politiche affinché la Cina rispetti gli impegni presi dal ministro Huang?

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

La Commissione condivide con l'onorevole parlamentare la preoccupazione per l'espianto di organi da cittadini cinesi condannati a morte e si compiace per l'annuncio dato di recente dal governo cinese che intende porre fine a questa pratica e incoraggiare la 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 però adeguatamente il problema del consenso, specie per coloro che muoiono in custodia o per esecuzione. L'Unione europea nutre inoltre 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. L'Unione ha già sollevato la questione nell'ambito delle precedenti sessioni del dialogo UE-Cina sui diritti umani e intende proseguire su questa linea.

La Commissione non è però a conoscenza di programmi di scambi di organi dalla Cina verso Stati membri dell'Unione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009300/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: EU vigilance on organs harvested from Chinese citizens who have been sentenced to death

The Chinese Vice-Minister of Health, Huang Jiefu, has announced that the People's Republic of China will cease removing organs for transplant from people who have been executed within approximately three years. Every year, around 4 000 people are sentenced to death in China, while there are 300 000 people waiting for transplants, a fact that applies considerable pressure on a demand that is difficult to satisfy.

Minister Huang's office will expire in the autumn and there is a risk that his successor will not honour the promises made.

1. Is the Commission aware that Chinese organs for transplant are being imported into the European Union?

2. Does the Commission intend to apply political pressure on China to make sure that it honours the promises made by Minister Huang?

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

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's concern regarding organs harvested from the Chinese citizens who have been sentenced to death. Therefore the Commission 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 is also 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. 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.

However, the Commission is not aware of any EU Member State with organ exchange programmes with China.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009301/12
alla Commissione
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Tratta delle donne per sfruttamento sessuale

In Europa tre quarti delle vittime del traffico di esseri umani sono oggetto di sfruttamento sessuale: le donne rappresentano il 79 % del totale, di cui il 12 % è costituito da minorenni. La direttiva 2011/36/UE concernente la prevenzione e la repressione della tratta di esseri umani e la protezione delle vittime dovrebbe entrare in vigore nell'aprile 2013, ma data la difformità in materia fra le varie legislazioni nazionali è già in atto una consultazione fra gli Stati Membri per una necessaria integrazione.

Può la Commissione far sapere quanto segue:

1. Quale tipo di integrazione ritiene opportuno applicare?

2. L'integrazione non rischia di allungare i tempi quando sarebbero invece necessarie misure tempestive per arginare il fenomeno?

3. Quale ruolo riveste Frontex nell'arginare il fenomeno?

4. Quali azioni ha intrapreso affinché vi sia una maggiore cooperazione fra gli Stati Membri nella lotta alla tratta di esseri umani per scopi sessuali e per una condivisione delle buone pratiche?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(28 novembre 2012)

I risultati preliminari presentati nella strategia dell'UE per l'eradicazione della tratta degli esseri umani ([1]) indicano che, nella maggioranza dei casi registrati, le vittime sono sfruttate a fini sessuali (76 % nel 2010) e che nel periodo 2008-2010 il 79 % delle vittime di sfruttamento sessuale era costituito da donne (di cui il 12 % ragazze). La Commissione pubblicherà risultati più dettagliati entro la fine del 2012.

Per armonizzare le legislazioni nazionali, la direttiva 2011/36/UE ([2]) prescrive una definizione comune del reato della tratta di esseri umani e stabilisce norme comuni per sanzioni, indagini e azioni penali nei confronti dei trafficanti, nonché in materia di assistenza, sostegno e protezione delle vittime. Il termine per il recepimento della direttiva è fissato al 6 aprile 2013. La Commissione provvede inoltre a facilitare l'operato del gruppo di contatto informale sulla direttiva 2011/36/UE, che riunisce esperti degli Stati membri al fine di discutere questioni relative al processo di recepimento.

Frontex assiste gli Stati membri nell'analisi delle rotte di migrazione e nella raccolta di dati esaurienti sui flussi migratori e ha messo a punto un manuale di formazione destinato alle guardie di frontiera per l'individuazione di eventuali vittime e casi di tratta. Inoltre, le sette agenzie dell'UE del settore Giustizia e affari interni hanno sottoscritto una dichiarazione congiunta ([3]) in cui si impegnano ad affrontare la tratta di esseri umani in modo coordinato, coerente e completo, in un partenariato reciproco, nonché in collaborazione con gli Stati membri e le istituzioni dell'UE.

([1]) La strategia dell'UE per l'eradicazione della tratta degli esseri umani (2012 — 2016), COM(2012) 286 final.
([2]) Direttiva 2011/36/UE concernente la prevenzione e la repressione della tratta di esseri umani e la protezione delle vittime, e che sostituisce la decisione quadro del Consiglio 2002/629/GAI.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/download.action?nodeId=7082e411-aa8d-4ead-ae57-3b955bd301a3&fileName=Joint+statement+of+the+Heads+of+the+EU+Justice+and+Home+Affairs+Agencies.pdf&fileType=pdf.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009301/12
to the Commission
Mario Borghezio (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Trafficking women for sexual exploitation

Three-quarters of human trafficking victims in Europe are sexually exploited: women represent 79%, 12% of whom are minors. Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims will come into force in April 2013, but due to lack of concordance between the various national legislations, a consultation is already under way between Member States to achieve the necessary integration.

Can the Commission state:

1. What type of integration does the Commission consider appropriate to apply?

2. Could the timescale for integration be extended, when instead, prompt measures are required to control this practice?

3. What role does Frontex play in stopping this practice?

4. What has it done to ensure greater cooperation between Member States in the fight against human trafficking for sexual purposes and for sharing good practices?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(28 November 2012)

Preliminary data as presented in the EU Strategy for Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings ([1]) shows that most of registered victims in Member States are used for sexual exploitation (76% in 2010). It also shows that female victims accounted for 79% (12% girls) in 2008-2010. The Commission will publish more detailed results by end 2012.

In order to harmonise national legislations, the directive 2011/36/EU ([2]) prescribes a common definition of the criminal offence of trafficking in human beings and adopts common standards on penalties, investigations and prosecutions of traffickers and on assistance, support and protection of victims. Deadline for transposition is 6 April 2013. The Commission further facilitates the 'Informal Contact Group' on the directive 2011/36/EU, which brings together experts from member states to discuss issues related to the transposition process.

Frontex assists EU Member States in the analysis of migration routes and in the collection of comprehensive data on migratory flows. It has developed a training manual for border control officers to detect potential victims and cases. All seven EU Justice and Home Affairs Agencies have signed a Joint Statement ([3]) committing to address trafficking in human being in a coordinated, coherent and comprehensive manner, in partnership with each other, with Member States and EU institutions.

([1]) The EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016 COM(2012)286 final.
([2]) Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/download.action?nodeId=7082e411-aa8d-4ead-ae57-3b955bd301a3&fileName=Joint+statement+of+the+Heads+of+the+EU+Justice+and+Home+Affairs+Agencies.pdf&fileType=pdf.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009302/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Contraffazione dell'agroalimentare Italiano

Il 4 ottobre di quest'anno si è conclusa un'operazione su scala nazionale dei Nuclei Antifrode dei Carabinieri, che ha portato al sequestro di più di 3 500 kg di prodotti agroalimentari contraffatti e recanti false etichettature DOP o IGP. Le indagini delle forze dell'ordine italiane si sono estese oltre confine con un'operazione congiunta con l'Interpol volta a contrastare il falso Made in Italy prodotto all'estero, infatti dopo i recenti casi riscontrati in Gran Bretagna di vendita di vini in polvere recanti marchi molto vicini ai più noti vini italiani DOC, ora si aggiungono casi in Germania di produzione e vendita di aceto balsamico di Modena IGP contraffatto.

Da uno studio del 2011 della Federazione Italiana dell'Industria Alimentare risulta che nel 2010 il fatturato italiano dell'industria alimentare sia stato di 124 miliardi di EUR con un valore dell'export di 21 miliardi di EUR; parallelamente il giro d'affari della contraffazione del Made in Italy unitamente al fenomeno dell' *Italian Sounding nello stesso anno ammonta a un totale di 60 miliardi di EUR nel mondo, 22 dei quali nella sola Europa*.

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza dei fatti esposti?

2. Può indicare se le aziende colpevoli di tali contraffazioni hanno beneficiato di finanziamenti UE e se si, come intende agire?

3. Che misure intende mettere in atto per fermare la circolazione e la produzione di questi falsi prodotti sul mercato UE, tutelando definitivamente le eccellenze produttive italiane e i consumatori europei?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(28 novembre 2012)

1. La Commissione non è stata informata dalle autorità italiane del sequestro in questione né ha ricevuto la relazione dello studio al quale fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare.

2. Di conseguenza, la Commissione non può indicare se alcune tra le aziende accusate di contraffazione abbiano beneficiato di fondi dell'Unione.

3. Per quanto riguarda l'etichettatura dei prodotti e la protezione delle indicazioni geografiche o delle denominazioni d'origine (IGP e DOP), le misure da adottare rientrano nella competenza degli Stati membri conformemente al diritto dell'Unione. Pertanto, gli Stati membri devono adottare le misure necessarie per porre rimedio alla situazione e in particolare per far cessare qualsiasi uso illecito di una IGP o di una DOP oppure l'uso di una menzione che induca il consumatore in errore sull'effettiva provenienza di un prodotto impedendo qualsiasi commercializzazione o esportazione dei prodotti controversi. La Commissione vigila sulla corretta applicazione delle suddette disposizioni da parte degli Stati membri.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009302/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Counterfeit Italian foodstuffs

On 4 October this year, a national operation was carried out by the Carabinieri Anti-Fraud Squads, which seized more than 3 500 kg of counterfeit food products, falsely labelled as PDO or PGI. The investigations by Italian forces also extended beyond the border, in a joint operation with Interpol aimed at clamping down on counterfeit products claiming to be 'Made in Italy' that are manufactured elsewhere. In fact, after recent cases in the United Kingdom of powdered wines being sold bearing trade names that are very similar to the most well-known Italian DOC wines, cases are now emerging in Germany of the production and sale of counterfeit PGI Modena balsamic vinegar.

A study conducted in 2011 by Federalimentare, the Italian food industry association, shows that in 2010, sales by the Italian food industry reached EUR 124 billion, with an export value of EUR 21 billion; for the same year, counterfeit 'Made in Italy' businesses and the results of the 'Italian Sounding' phenomenon account for a total of EUR 60 billion around the world, EUR 22 billion of which is in Europe alone.

1. Is the Commission aware of the above facts?

2. Can the Commission indicate whether the companies guilty of this form of counterfeiting have benefitted from EU funding, and, if so, how it intends to act?

3. What measures does the Commission intend to put in place to block the circulation and production of these counterfeit products on the EU market and thereby effectively protect Italian manufacturing excellence and European consumers?

(Version française)

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

1. La Commission n'a pas été informée par les autorités italiennes de la saisie évoquée ni reçu le rapport de l'étude à laquelle fait référence l'Honorable Parlementaire.

2. En conséquence, la Commission ne peut indiquer si des compagnies accusées de contrefaçon ont bénéficié de fonds européens.

3. Concernant l'étiquetage des produits et la protection des indications géographiques et appellations d'origine (IGP et AOP), les mesures à prendre relèvent de la compétence des États membres conformément au droit européen. Ainsi, les États membres doivent prendre les mesures nécessaires pour remédier à la situation et notamment faire cesser toute utilisation illicite d'une IGP ou AOP ou l'usage de mention induisant le consommateur en erreur sur l'origine véritable d'un produit, en empêchant toute commercialisation ou exportation des produits litigieux. La Commission veille à la bonne application de ces dispositions par les États membres.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009303/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Crisi del settore fotovoltaico in Italia

La Helios Tecnology, una delle maggiori realtà industriali italiane nella produzione di celle fotovoltaiche presente sul mercato da 30 anni, dalla fine del 2010 vive una forte situazione di crisi, ormai alcuni reparti sarebbero fermi e per molti dei 200 lavoratori si è già ricorsi allo strumento della cassa integrazione.

Ad aggravare la situazione vi è l'entrata in vigore del V Conto Energia che ha apportato fortissimi tagli agli incentivi concessi per il settore fotovoltaico.

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza di queste circostanze?

2. Ritiene possibile l'attivazione del FEG a supporto dei 200 lavoratori di quest'azienda?

3. Quali strumenti intende proporre a sostegno del settore fotovoltaico in Italia e negli Stati membri al fine di tutelare le aziende e i loro dipendenti, ma soprattutto per sostenerne un ancor maggiore sviluppo su tutto il territorio nazionale, incentivando imprenditori e privati al passaggio dalle tradizionali fonti energetiche a quelle rinnovabili?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(3 dicembre 2012)

1. La Commissione è al corrente delle modifiche apportate dal V Conto Energia agli incentivi finanziari per i progetti nel campo dell'energia solare fotovoltaica.

2. I lavoratori vittime di licenziamenti collettivi possono beneficiare del sostegno del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) su domanda presentata dallo Stato membro, purché siano soddisfatti i criteri stabiliti dal regolamento FEG ([1]). Tali criteri prevedono in particolare che gli esuberi siano dovuti a cambiamenti strutturali del commercio mondiale. La Commissione invita pertanto l'onorevole parlamentare a consultare le persone di contatto FEG per l'Italia ([2]) per appurare se tale Stato membro stia valutando di presentare domanda per il finanziamento del FEG.

3. Sebbene i meccanismi di sostegno per le fonti energetiche rinnovabili rientrino tra le competenze degli Stati membri, la Commissione europea finanzia la ricerca e l'innovazione nei sistemi che utilizzano tali fonti energetiche attraverso il Settimo programma quadro, e la diffusione sul mercato attraverso il programma «Energia intelligente — Europa». La Commissione sta inoltre lavorando con gli Stati membri per stabilire orientamenti sulla riforma del regime di sostegno delle energie rinnovabili, onde contribuire a mantenere un regime di investimenti stabile e sostenibile per il settore europeo dell'energia rinnovabile.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1927/2006 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 20 dicembre 2006, che istituisce un Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (GU L 406 del 30.12.2006, pag. 1).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009303/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Crisis in Italy's photovoltaic sector

Since the end of 2010, Helios Technology, one of Italy's largest manufacturers of photovoltaic (solar) cells, after 30 years on the market has been undergoing a major crisis. Some departments have now been closed down and many of the 200 workers have already been laid off.

Compounding the situation is the entry into force of the 5th Energy Act, which has made severe cuts to subsidies for the photovoltaic industry.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Does it think it might be possible to activate the EGF to support the 200 workers from this company?

3. What instruments will it propose to support the photovoltaic sector in Italy and in the Member States in order to protect companies and their employees, but above all to promote an greater development of the industry throughout the country by encouraging entrepreneurs and private investors to move from traditional energy sources to renewables?

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

1. The Commission is aware of the changes to financial incentives for photovoltaic solar projects, under the 5th Energy Act.

2. Workers affected by mass redundancies can benefit from support from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) on the basis of an application submitted by the Member State and provided that the criteria set out by the EGF Regulation ([1]) are fulfilled. These notably require the dismissals to be linked to structural changes in world trade patterns. The Commission would therefore refer the Honourable Member to the EGF Contact Persons for Italy ([2]) to find out whether the Member State is considering an application for EGF funding.

3. While support mechanisms for renewable energy sources are a competence of Member States, the European Commission supports research and innovation in renewable energy systems through the EU 7th Framework Programme and market dissemination through the Energy Intelligent Europe Programme. It is also working with Member States on guidance on renewable energy support scheme reform to help ensure that a stable and viable investment regime is maintained for renewable energy industries in Europe.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on establishing the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund, OJ L 406, 30.12.2006, p. 1.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=it.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009304/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Eccessiva burocrazia per l'erogazione dei fondi provenienti dagli sms solidali

Uno dei meccanismi che da anni ormai si attivano per reperire fondi da donazioni di privati cittadini in casi di emergenze o calamità è quello degli «sms o chiamate di solidarietà»; i gestori telefonici si mettono a disposizione affinché i propri utenti, inviando un sms o facendo una telefonata ad un determinato numero, possano fare una donazione di pochi euro a favore della creazione di un fondo che possa andare a sostenere determinate iniziative. Questo è avvenuto anche per sostenere le popolazioni colpite dal sisma che ha investito l'Emilia Romagna, la Pianura Padana e il Veneto nel maggio scorso; attraverso questo meccanismo di raccolta fondi sono stati raccolti formalmente 15 milioni di euro che dovevano essere destinati nel più breve tempo possibile a sostegno delle popolazioni colpite. Ad oggi in Banca d'Italia è depositata poco più della metà della cifra e nulla è ancora stato erogato in favore delle terre colpite.

La spiegazione ufficiale fornita è che questo è fatto in favore della trasparenza e l'iter burocratico per assicurarla e per assicurare un equo smistamento delle risorse prevede vari passaggi: gestore telefonico, centro di fatturazione, smistamento, Banca d'Italia, dipartimento della protezione civile e contabilità del commissario straordinario e infine ai Comuni colpiti che hanno presentato i progetti.

1. La Commissione è a conoscenza di questi fatti?

2. Può essa riferire se ha notizia di iniziative simili negli altri Stati e se in essi si riscontra un iter burocratico di erogazione dei fondi raccolti, tanto lungo e articolato quanto quello italiano?

3. Ritiene necessario la Commissione articolare una normativa standard per tutta Europa in grado di assicurare che finanziamenti di solidarietà di questo tipo, la cui ratio di base dovrebbe essere la tempestività di erogazione per sostenere le popolazioni colpite da calamità, passino per canali più diretti, meno burocratizzati, in modo tale da poter sostenere i cittadini nel momento del massimo bisogno, colmando il gap temporale di attivazione dei normali sistemi di sostegno di solidarietà previsti dagli Stati?

Risposta di Kristalina Georgieva a nome della Commissione
(29 novembre 2012)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza di iniziative di questo genere negli Stati membri né ha competenze in materia per stabilire norme comuni a tutta l'Europa che garantiscano canali specifici per le donazioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009304/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Funds from text-message fundraising affected by excessive bureaucracy

A popular fundraising mechanism is to collect private donations after emergencies or disasters via text message or telephone call. Telephone service providers allow users to donate money simply by sending a text message or making a telephone call to a given number. The fund can then support certain initiatives. This happened during the earthquake that hit Emilia Romagna, the Po Valley and Veneto in May 2012. EUR 15 million was raised, which was urgently needed by the affected citizens. Currently, a little over half of this figure is with the Banca d'Italia and nothing has been distributed to the affected areas.

The official explanation is that this occurs to ensure transparency and fair organisation of the fund. Hence, before finally reaching the affected areas, various channels have to be checked: the telephone company, billing centre, sorting, Banca d'Italia, the Civil Protection Department and special commissioner's accounts.

1. Is the Commission aware of these facts?

2. Can the Commission say if it knows of similar initiatives in other Member States and whether they have similarly complicated bureaucratic procedures for fund distribution?

3. Does the Commission consider it necessary to lay down a standard throughout Europe to guarantee that donations pass through more direct, less bureaucratic channels so they can be used to support people at the time of maximum need, filling the gap before the normal state-provided support systems can take effect?

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

The Commission is not aware of such initiatives in the Member States and has no competency in this area to lay down a standard throughout Europe to guarantee that donations pass through specific channels.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009305/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Violazione dei diritti di impianto dei vigneti

A seguito delle verifiche avviate nel 2008 dalla Commissione in Italia con le regioni, il Ministero delle politiche agricole e le strutture che gestiscono il catasto viticolo, risulterebbero circa 24 mila ettari di vigneti impiantati senza rispettare il regolamento (CE) n. 479/2008 del Consiglio del 29 aprile 2008 relativo all'organizzazione comune del mercato vitivinicolo, a seguito della presenza dei quali sarebbero state applicate sanzioni complessive per un importo di 98,8 milioni/EUR.

Può la Commissione confermare quanto sopra esposto? Può fornire i dati riguardanti le verifiche effettuate nel settore vitivinicolo italiano evidenziando, in particolare, le regioni nelle quali le violazioni dei diritti di impianto si sono verificate, le superfici interessate in ognuna di esse, l'ammontare delle sanzioni comminate alle singole regioni e i termini di pagamento delle stesse? Può dire, altresì, se sono previste sanzioni accessorie a quelle pecuniarie? Può dire se tali controlli sono stati effettuati anche negli altri Stati membri e comunicarne gli esiti?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(16 novembre 2012)

La Commissione sottolinea che nel caso in specie è fuori questione l'applicazione di una qualsivoglia sanzione. Nell'ambito della gestione concorrente gli Stati membri (SM) hanno l'obbligo di assicurare che i pagamenti agricoli siano effettuati correttamente per prevenire e perseguire le irregolarità e recuperare gli importi indebitamente pagati. La Commissione sottopone a controllo gli Stati membri nell'ambito del sistema di liquidazione dei conti inteso ad escludere le spese non sostenute conformemente alle norme UE mediante i finanziamenti dell'UE.

1. La Commissione può confermare che è stato chiesto all'Italia di applicare una rettifica pari a 98,8 milioni di EUR in seguito ad un'indagine da cui è emerso che 24 720 ettari di vigneti sono stati piantati in violazione del regolamento (CE) n. 479/2008 del Consiglio ([1]).

2. Tali risultanze sono basate sui dati ricevuti in merito a *Piemonte, Lombardia, Trento, Bolzano, Veneto, Friuli, Liguria, Emilia, Toscana, Umbria, Marche, Lazio, Abruzzo, Molise, Campania, Basilicata, Puglia, Sicilia, Sardegna*. Diverse ispezioni sono state eseguite principalmente in *Puglia* e in *Sicilia*, il che rappresenta pressappoco il 74 % delle risultanze. Le autorità italiane non hanno contestato la rappresentatività delle ispezioni. Si sottolinea che la rettifica riguarda l'Italia nel suo insieme e non le singole regioni. Lo Stato membro deve dichiarare l'importo da recuperare nella propria dichiarazione finanziaria due mesi dopo la pubblicazione della decisione della Commissione.

3. Non sono d'applicazione altri recuperi relativi a tali risultanze.

4. Analoghe ispezioni sono state eseguite in Spagna e in Grecia. I risultati di queste ispezioni sono pubblicati nella decisione della Commissione n. 2012/336/UE del 22 giugno 2012 ([2]).

([1]) GU L 148 del 6.6.2008, pagine 1-61.
([2]) GU L 165 del 26.6.2012, pagine 83-93.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009305/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Vineyard planting rights violations

Following the Commission's 2008 regional inspections in Italy with the Minister for Agriculture and the viticulture agencies, it was found that approximately 24 000 hectares of vineyards were planted in breach of Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2008 of 29 April 2008 on the common organisation of the market in wine, resulting in total fines of EUR 98.8 million.

Can the Commission confirm this?

Can it provide data concerning the inspections carried out in the Italian wine sector: particularly the regions where planting rights breaches were discovered, the areas concerned in each region, the sanctions imposed on the individual regions and the payment terms for these fines?

Can it say whether other sanctions are applicable in addition to fines?

Can it say if such inspections have been carried out in other Member States and if so, provide the results?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(16 November 2012)

The Commission would like to point out that in this case there is no question of a fine or sanction. Under shared management Member States (MS) are obliged to ensure that agricultural payments are carried out and executed correctly, to prevent and deal with irregularities and to recover amounts unduly paid. The Commission audits the MS in the context of the clearance of accounts system, which is designed to exclude expenditure not paid in conformity with EU rules from EU financing.

1. The Commission can confirm that a correction amounting to EUR 98.8 million has been addressed to Italy further to an enquiry which revealed that 24.720 hectares of vineyards were planted in breach of Council Regulation No 479/2008 ([1]).

2. These findings are based on data received concerning *Piemonte, Lombardia, Trento, Bolzano, Veneto, Friuli, Liguria, Emilia, Toscana, Umbria, Marche, Lazio, Abruzzo, Molise, Campania, Basilicata, Puglia, Sicilia, Sardegna*. Inspections were carried out in *Puglia* and *Sicily* mainly, representing around 74% of the finding. The Italian authorities have not contested the representativity of the inspections. It is emphasised that the correction concerns Italy as a whole and not individual regions. The MS has to declare the amount to be recovered in its financial statement two months after the publication of the Commission decision.

3. No other recoveries concerning these findings are applicable.

4. Similar inspections have been carried out in Spain and Greece. The results of these inspections are published in the Commission decision No 2012/336/EU of 22 June 2012 ([2]).

([1]) OJ L 148, 6.6.2008, p. 1-61.
([2]) OJ L 165, 26.6.2012, p. 83-93.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009306/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Minori vittime di abusi

Cresce in Italia il numero di reati che vedono i minori nel ruolo di vittime di abusi e maltrattamenti secondo un dossier sviluppato dalla più famosa Agenzia di stampa italiana e da una Fondazione italiana in difesa dei diritti dei bambini.

I dati allarmanti sono frutto di una ricerca durata 18 mesi in cui sono stati riportati 130mila notizie di cronaca; i casi di abusi e maltrattamenti che hanno interessato bambine e ragazze sono stati 3.196, quindi circa 6 al giorno. Inoltre, si sono registrati 804 casi di pedofilia e adescamento online seguiti da fatti di violenze familiari, abbandoni, trascuratezze, bullismo.

Alla luce di quanto precede, si interroga la Commissione per sapere:

1. Considera le misure esistenti (programma Daphne III) sufficienti per la protezione dei minori. In caso negativo, con quali politiche intende integrarle?

2. Intende promuovere programmi supplementari di monitoraggio destinati alle scuole e altri luoghi frequentati dai bambini?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(4 dicembre 2012)

La Commissione è fermamente impegnata, nell'ambito delle proprie competenze, a promuovere i diritti dei minori e delle vittime e contribuisce con i programmi DAPHNE a combattere le violenze contro i minori. Inoltre, la direttiva 2011/92/UE ([1]) permetterà di intensificare la lotta contro lo sfruttamento sessuale di minori. La direttiva ravvicina la definizione di 20 reati, prevede livelli minimi di sanzioni penali, facilita le segnalazioni, le indagini e l'azione penale e assicura alle vittime minorenni un accesso più immediato ai mezzi di ricorso.

I programmi DAPHNE permettono di finanziare numerosi progetti che promuovono con successo la protezione dei minori dalle violenze. I programmi DAPHNE si limitano però a sostenere progetti transnazionali e ONG che conducono studi sulla violenza o azioni di sensibilizzazione, creazione di reti e sviluppo di programmi a sostegno delle vittime. Non rientrano invece nei programmi DAPHNE la tutela attiva dei minori negli Stati membri o programmi nazionali di monitoraggio, che esulano dalle competenze della Commissione e sono di pertinenza delle autorità nazionali.

Il programma DAPHNE III per il 2013 finanzia in via prioritaria progetti a tutela dei minori vittime di bullismo nelle scuole. Promuovere i diritti dei minori è peraltro uno dei cinque obiettivi del nuovo programma «Diritti e cittadinanza» previsto dal quadro finanziario pluriennale 2014-2020. Tra gli obiettivi specifici: contribuire alla protezione dei minori contro i danni e la violenza nell'intento di rafforzare ulteriormente la consapevolezza e la cooperazione transnazionale in questo ambito.

([1]) Direttiva 2011/92/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 13 dicembre 2011, relativa alla lotta contro l'abuso e lo sfruttamento sessuale dei minori e la pornografia minorile, e che sostituisce la decisione quadro 2004/68/GAI del Consiglio (GU L 335 del 17.12.2011, pag. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009306/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Children who are victims of abuse

In Italy, according to a dossier compiled by the best-known Italian news agency and an Italian foundation in defence of children's rights, the number of crimes in which children are victims of abuse and cruelty is on the rise.

The alarming figures are the result of an 18-month survey which looked at 130 000 news reports; these revealed that there had been 3 196 cases of abuse of and cruelty towards children and young girls, i.e. about six cases per day. In addition, there had been 804 cases of paedophilia and online grooming as well as cases of family violence, abandonment, neglect and bullying.

In the light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Does it consider the existing measures (Daphne III programme) to be sufficient for the protection of minors? If not, how does it intend to supplement them?

2. Will it promote additional monitoring programmes for schools and other places frequented by children?

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

Within its competences, the Commission is strongly committed to promoting the rights of the child and the rights of victims and has contributed to the protection of children against violence through the Daphne Programmes. In addition to this, Directive 2011/92/EU ([1]) will step up the fight against child sexual abuse. It approximates the definition of 20 offences, sets minimum levels for criminal penalties, and facilitates reporting, investigation and prosecution, and gives child victims easier access to legal remedies.

Within the Daphne programmes numerous successful projects have been funded that promote the protection of children from violence. However, the remit of the programmes is limited to supporting transnational projects and NGOs in studying violence, raising awareness, facilitating networking and developing support programmes for victims. The active protection of children in the Member States as well as any national monitoring programmes are outside the scope of Daphne and the competences of the Commission and are the responsibility of the national authorities concerned.

The funding priorities under Daphne III in 2013, include a specific focus on children as victims of bullying at school. The promotion of the rights of the child is one of the five objectives of the new Rights and Citizenship programme under the 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework. The proposal includes the specific aim of contributing to the protection of children from harm and violence, which will further enhance awareness and transnational cooperation in this particular field.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13December 2011 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA, OJ L 335, 17.12.2011, p. 1.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009307/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: I filtri solari s'insinuano nella nostra catena alimentare

Ricercatori svizzeri e italiani hanno, di recente, messo sotto inchiesta le creme solari cercando di capire quanto danneggino l'ambiente riversandosi nelle acque.

I filtri solari passano direttamente dal corpo all'ambiente e da recenti studi pare che la concentrazione nell'acqua raggiunga livelli non preoccupanti. In mare sfiorano il centinaio di ng/l. Il problema in realtà è che i residui di crema solare si accumulano negli organismi marini e una volta assorbiti dai tessuti dei pesci, potrebbero ritornare nel nostro organismo al momento del consumo.

Inoltre, i filtri chimici contenuti nelle creme non devono essere in una concentrazione superiore 10 per cento secondo il dettato della direttiva sui cosmetici dell'Unione europea.

S'interroga dunque la Commissione per sapere:

1. È a conoscenza di questi studi?

2. Il rischio che i filtri anti-ultravioletti si accumulino nella catena alimentare umana in seguito alla diffusione degli agenti chimici nelle acque potrebbe essere oggetto di ricerche più approfondite e soprattutto diffuse in tutti i paesi europei. Intende promuovere tali studi?

3. Con quali misure si accerta il rispetto delle percentuali di filtri chimici da parte delle case produttrici?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(4 gennaio 2013)

La Commissione non è al corrente degli studi cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare e apprezzerebbe molto riceverne i riferimenti. Nel più recente riesame dell'elenco di sostanze prioritarie ai sensi della direttiva 2000/60/CE che istituisce un quadro per l'azione comunitaria in materia di acque ([1]), la Commissione non ha individuato nessuna sostanza contenuta nei filtri solari suscettibile di generare rischi significativi per o tramite l'ambiente acquatico. Tuttavia, alcuni prodotti per l'igiene e la cura personali sono stati riconosciuti come «inquinanti emergenti»; la Commissione intende acquisire maggiori informazioni sulla loro tossicità e sulle concentrazioni nell'ambiente acquatico o nel biota.

Nell'invito a presentare proposte per il programma di lavoro 2013, il Settimo programma quadro di ricerca prevede un tema di ricerca sulle sostanze tossiche nell'ambiente acquatico, e dei rischi che esse comportano per la salute, con particolare attenzione agli inquinanti emergenti e alle miscele tossiche. Sulla base dei risultati di questa e altre ricerche, la Commissione prenderà in considerazione eventuali interventi. Nell'Unione europea sono autorizzati per l'uso nei prodotti cosmetici soltanto i filtri solari, la cui sicurezza per la salute dell'uomo è stata dimostrata dal comitato scientifico per la sicurezza dei consumatori. I filtri solari di cui trattasi sono elencati nel pertinente allegato della direttiva 76/768/CEE concernente il ravvicinamento delle legislazioni degli Stati membri relative ai prodotti cosmetici ([2]), in cui sono indicate le concentrazioni massime autorizzate nei prodotti cosmetici. I produttori sono responsabili della sicurezza dei loro prodotti e della conformità di quest'ultimi ai requisiti della direttiva UE sui cosmetici. A tal fine sono tenuti a predisporre un «fascicolo sulla sicurezza» — comprendente tra l'altro una valutazione della sicurezza di un prodotto — che devono tenere a disposizione per eventuali controlli casuali da parte delle autorità degli Stati membri.

([1]) GU L 327 del 22.12.2000.
([2]) GU L 262 del 27.9.1976.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009307/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: UV filters entering the food chain

Swiss and Italian researchers have recently investigated sun creams to understand the extent of environmental damage caused when they enter water.

UV filters are transferred directly from the body to the environment and, according to recent studies, the concentration in water does not reach worrying levels. In the sea, it is approximately 100 ng/l. The problem in reality is that sunscreen residues accumulate in marine organisms and, once absorbed into fish tissues, could be returned to our bodies when we eat them.

Furthermore, the chemical filter concentrations contained in sunscreen must not exceed 10 per cent according to the EU Directive on cosmetics.

Therefore, we ask:

1. Is the Commission aware of these studies?

2. The risk of UV filters accumulating in the human food chain after the chemical agents circulate in water could further researched in Europe. Will the Commission promote such studies?

3. What will the Commission do to guarantee that manufacturers comply with the chemical filter levels in these creams?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(4 January 2013)

The Commission is not aware of the studies referred to by the Honourable Member and would appreciate receiving the relevant references. In its latest review of the priority substances list under Directive 2000/60/EC ([1]) establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, the Commission did not identify any UV filter substances as posing a significant risk to/via the aquatic environment. However, some personal care products have been recognised as 'emerging pollutants'; the Commission aims to obtain more information on their toxicity and concentrations in the aquatic environment and biota.

The Seventh Framework Programme for Research in the call for proposals Work Programme 2013 foresees a research topic on toxicants in the aquatic environment, including the risks posed to human health, in which emphasis is put on emerging pollutants and toxic mixtures. In the light of the results of this work and other research, the Commission will consider what action may be required. In the EU, only UV-filters whose safety for human health was proved by the Scientific Committee for Consumer Safety (SCCS) are allowed for use in cosmetic products. Such UV-filters are listed in the relevant annex to the directive 76/768/EEC ([2]) on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products where their maximum authorised concentrations in cosmetic products are indicated. The manufacturers are responsible for the safety of their products and for their compliance with the requirements of the EU Cosmetics Directive. To this end, they must prepare a 'safety-file' which includes *inter alia* an assessment of the safety of the product, and keep it readily accessible for random controls by the Member States' competent authorities.

([1]) OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.
([2]) OJ L 262, 27.9.1976.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009308/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Il pomodoro protegge dall'ictus

Secondo uno studio dell'Istituto finlandese di salute pubblica e nutrizione, i pomodori fanno scendere di oltre la metà le probabilità di avere un ictus. E l'effetto protettivo è ancora maggiore per la forma ischemica, ben più comune di quella emorragica, per la quale la riduzione del rischio sfiora il 60 per cento.

Si pensi che in Italia l'ictus è la seconda causa di morte e la prima di disabilità.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può dire la Commissione se intende destinare una parte dei fondi del Settimo Programma all'approfondimento di questa ricerca? Dal momento che questo alimento è dotato della capacità di ridurre il rischio di ictus, determinato per esempio dall'ipertensione, dal sovrappeso o da una familiarità per questa malattia, intende promuovere, attraverso una campagna mirata diffusa all'interno degli Stati membri, la dieta mediterranea con particolare attenzione al consumo di pomodori?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(13 dicembre 2012)

Dati sempre più numerosi dimostrano che il consumo di bioattivi nell'alimentazione svolge un importante ruolo di salvaguardia della salute. I flavonoidi e i relativi fenoli sono esempi di bioattivi di origine vegetale che esercitano un'influenza positiva su una serie di importanti fattori di rischio associati alle malattie cardiovascolari (la causa principale di decessi in Europa), al cancro e alle malattie degenerative connesse all'età.

Nell'ambito del Sesto e del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (6° PQ, 2002-2006 e 7° PQ, 2007-2013), la Commissione ha finanziato, per un importo di 30 milioni di EUR, vari progetti di ricerca finalizzati a studiare i meccanismi (assorbimento e attività) alla base degli effetti biologici esplicati da vari composti bioattivi di origine vegetale, tra cui quelli contenuti nei pomodori (si vedano gli studi FLORA ([1]), FLAVO ([2]), LYCOCARD ([3]), ATHENA ([4]), FLAVIOLA ([5]) e BASEFOOD ([6])). Orizzonte 2020, il prossimo programma quadro dell'Unione europea per la ricerca e l'innovazione, dovrebbe continuare a studiare il ruolo chiave del cibo e dell'alimentazione nel salvaguardare la salute.

La Commissione accoglie con favore e sostiene attivamente le iniziative degli Stati membri per promuovere un'alimentazione equilibrata e stili di vita attivi ma non ha in programma una campagna specifica per promuovere la dieta mediterranea. La Commissione sostiene tuttavia approcci comuni quali la promozione di un maggior consumo di frutta e verdura.

([1]) http://www.athena-flora.eu/index.php
([2]) http://flavo.vtt.fi/
([3]) http://www.lycocard.com/
([4]) http://www.athena-flora.eu/index.php
([5]) http://www.flaviola.org/
([6]) http://www.basefood-fp7.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009308/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Tomatoes protect against strokes

According to a study by the Finnish Institute of Public Health and Clinical Nutrition, tomatoes more than halve the risk of having a stroke. And the protection is even greater for the ischaemic form of the disease, where the reduction in risk is close to 60%.

Stroke is thought to be the second-biggest cause of death in Italy, and the leading cause of disability.

Does the Commission intend to devote a portion of the funds from the Seventh Framework Programme to furthering this research? Since this food has the capacity to reduce the risk of stroke, the causes of which include high blood pressure, obesity and a family history of this illness, does the Commission intend to promote the Mediterranean diet through a targeted campaign across the Member States, with particular focus on the consumption of tomatoes?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2012)

There is growing evidence that bioactives in the diet play an important role in promoting health. Flavonoids and related phenolics are examples of bioactives from plants that have beneficial influences on a number of important risk factors associated with cardiovascular diseases (the leading cause of death in Europe), cancer and age-related degenerative diseases.

In the Sixth and Seventh Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development (FP6, 2002-2006 — FP7, 2007-2013), the Commission funded several research projects (EUR 30 million) aiming to understand better the mechanisms (absorption and activity) that underlie the biological effects of different plant bioactive compounds, including those from tomatoes (e.g. FLORA ([1]), FLAVO ([2]), LYCOCARD ([3]), ATHENA ([4]), FLAVIOLA ([5]), BASEFOOD ([6])). Horizon 2020, the next EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, is expected to continue to explore food and diet as a key factor for promoting health.

The Commission welcomes and supports actively Member States' initiatives promoting a balanced diet and active lifestyles but is not planning to organise a specific campaign to promote the Mediterranean diet. Nevertheless, the Commission supports common approaches such as promoting a higher consumption of fruit and vegetables.

([1]) http://www.athena-flora.eu/index.php
([2]) http://flavo.vtt.fi/
([3]) http://www.lycocard.com/
([4]) http://www.athena-flora.eu/index.php
([5]) http://www.flaviola.org/
([6]) http://www.basefood-fp7.eu/

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-009310/12
до Комисията
Ивайло Калфин (S&D)
(15 октомври 2012 г.)

Относно: Гарантиране на безопасни условия на труд за упражняване на водолазна дейност

Водолазната дейност е една от най-рисковите професии и случаите на подводни инциденти непрекъснато се увеличават. В същото време ЕС не разполага със стандарти за безопасност и е оставил на държавите членки грижата да изготвят правила за безопасни и здравословни условия на труд. Поради това в някои държави, като Германия и Франция, такива стандарти са разписани, а в други — не.

Мои избиратели ме информират, че например в България правителството наскоро и без публично огласени мотиви се е отказало от намеренията си да изготви и приеме наредба, регламентираща работата в тази рискована професия.

Във връзка с това бих искал да запитам Европейската комисия:

Смята ли, че при специфични дейности, каквато е водолазната, е необходимо чрез конкретизиране в отделни правилници и наредби да се прецизират безопасните условия на труд?

Има ли наблюдение дали условията на труд на водолазите във всички държави членки са разписани според европейските стандарти, гарантиращи тяхната безопасност и щадящи здравето на хората, упражняващи тази професия?

В контекста на свободата на движение на работната сила, възнамерява ли Комисията да подготви общи препоръки, които да очертаят минимални стандарти за упражняването на високорискови професии в ЕС?

Насърчава ли Комисията държавите членки да изготвят такива стандарти на национална основа и следи ли дали те съответстват?

Предвижда ли Европейската комисия да регламентира с общо законодателство изисквания за здравословни и безопасни условия на труд при водолазна работа в ЕС?

Отговор, даден от г-н Андор от името на Комисията
(22 ноември 2012 г.)

Комисията е запозната с проблемите във връзка с професионалната водолазна дейност в ЕС и по-специално във връзка с тежките и опасни условия на труд.

За да се гарантира подобряване на здравословните и безопасни условия на труд в „рамковата“ директива ([1]) се изисква работодателите да извършват оценка на риска и да я документират, като това изискване се отнася до всички сфери на дейност, включително и до водолазната дейност.

Комисията счита, че ако е правилно въведена от държавите членки, „рамковата“ директива на ЕС осигурява достатъчна и ефективна защита на упражняващите професионална водолазна дейност.

В момента не се предвижда въвеждането на приложими в целия ЕС специални правила или разпоредби, тъй като, ако се прилага правилно, сега действащото законодателство относно здравословните и безопасни условия на труд е достатъчно адекватно.

Работодателите трябва да предприемат необходимите стъпки, за да се съобразят с действащото национално законодателство, с което се транспонират разпоредбите на „рамковата“ директива, и по-специално с общите си задължения във връзка с оценките на риска и мерките за защита вследствие на тях, определени в член 6. Уместността на съществуването на специална уредба относно професионалната водолазна дейност би могла да бъде съпоставена например с мерките, изложени в неотдавна оповестения доклад № 411 относно водолазната дейност на Международната асоциация на производителите на нефт и газ (OGP), в който се посочва, че „много от смъртните злополуки могат да бъдат избегнати, ако бъдат възприети несложните мерки, представени в този доклад“.

([1]) Директива 89/391/ЕИО от 12 юни 1989 г.

Специфичните въпроси, свързани с водолазната екипировка, ще бъдат обсъдени на следващото заседание на работната група MACHEX на Комитета на старшите инспектори по труда (SLIC) ([2]).

([2]) Решение на Комисията от 12 юли 1995 г. за учредяване на Комитет на старшите инспектори по труда (95/319/ЕО).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009310/12
to the Commission
Ivailo Kalfin (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Ensuring safe working conditions for divers

Diving is a high-risk occupation, and underwater accidents are becoming increasingly common. At the same time, there are no EU safety standards for diving and it has been left to the Member States to draw up the rules applicable to health and safety conditions in this area. This means that in some countries such as Germany and France, standards have been adopted, while in others they have not.

A constituent has informed me that in Bulgaria, for example, the government has recently, and without explaining this publicly, reneged on its stated intention to frame and adopt a decree regulating this dangerous occupation.

Can the Commission state, in this connection:

Whether it considers that in the case of certain specific activities, such as diving, there is a need to ensure safe working conditions by means of specific rules and regulations?

Whether any observations have been made as to whether working conditions for divers across the Member States are in line with EU standards, ensuring the safety, and safeguarding the health, of persons working in that profession?

Whether it intends, with regard to the free movement of workers, to make common recommendations setting minimum standards applicable to the carrying on of high-risk occupations in the EU?

Whether it will encourage the Member States to draw up such standards at national level and monitor their compliance with these?

Whether it plans to regulate, via common statutory health and safety requirements, the working conditions of divers operating in the EU?

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

The Commission is aware of the issues related to commercial diving in the EU and in particular the difficult and dangerous working conditions.

In order to ensure the improvement of the health and safety of workers at work the 'framework' Directive ([1]) requires employers to carry out and document a risk assessment it applies to all sectors of activities, including diving.

The Commission considers that if correctly implemented by Member States, the EU 'framework' Directive provides for sufficient and effective protection of commercial divers.

There are currently no plans to introduce EU-wide specific rules or regulations because if applied correctly current legislation on the protection of the health and safety of workers is adequate.

The employer must take the necessary steps to comply with the national legislation in force transposing the provisions of the 'framework' Directive, in particular the general obligations on risk assessment and resulting protection measures defined in Article 6. The suitability of specific arrangements for commercial divers could for instance be compared against the measures as contained in the recent Oil and Gas Producers (OGP) Diving Report 411, which concludes that 'many of the fatalities could be prevented by adopting the simple measures contained in the report'.

The specific issue of diving equipment will be discussed at the next meeting of the Senior Labour Inspectors Committee (SLIC) ([2]) Working Group MACHEX.

([1]) Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989.
([2]) Commission decision of 12 July 1995 setting up a Committee of Senior Labour Inspectors (95/319/EC).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009311/12
aan de Commissie
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(15 oktober 2012)

Betreft: Fraude met Europese sociale- en veiligheidsregelgeving in het wegvervoer

De uitzending van onderzoeksprogramma Zembla (12 oktober 2012) laat zien dat in Nederland enkele wegvervoerondernemingen bij het vervoer van gevaarlijke stoffen Europese regels omzeilen. Door veelvuldige inzet van Oost-Europese chauffeurs worden vereiste normen niet of slecht nagekomen. Volgens het programma zijn de Europese eisen te ontwijken doordat sprake is van onderbezetting bij handhavende instanties en fraude met zowel de nieuwe digitale tachograaf, de opleidingseisen als de opleidingscertificaten.

1. Kent de Commissie de uitzending van onderzoeksprogramma Zembla van 12 oktober 2012?

2. Deelt de Commissie de conclusie van het programma dat Europese regelgeving in Nederland door wegvervoerondernemingen wordt omzeild? Het gaat dan onder andere om onvoldoende opleiding vervoer gevaarlijke stoffen, vervalste ADR-verklaringen, fraude met de nieuwe digitale tachograaf en onvoldoende talenkennis. Zo nee, waarom niet?

3. Heeft de Commissie aanwijzingen dat ook in andere lidstaten wegvervoerondernemingen de regels voor het vervoer van gevaarlijke stoffen omzeilen? Zo nee, waarom niet?

4. Heeft de Commissie signalen ontvangen dat handhavinginstanties in Nederland onderbezet zijn en daardoor te weinig controles uitvoeren, in strijd met artikel 2, lid 2, derde alinea, van Richtlijn 2006/22/EG? Zo nee, is zij bereid onderzoek te doen of Nederland.d. verplichtingen van Richtlijn 2006/22/EG nakomt?

5. Kan de Commissie aangeven hoe zij toeziet op de kwaliteit van de opleiding tot vrachtwagenchauffeur, met name in Midden- en Oost-Europese landen? Heeft zij indicaties dat Richtlijn 2003/59/EG slecht of niet wordt nageleefd in deze landen? Ziet de Commissie aanleiding terug te komen op eerdere aan mij gegeven antwoorden — waarbij de Commissie aangaf geen weet te hebben van misstanden — op door mij hierover reeds gestelde vragen?

6. Hoe ziet de Commissie erop toe dat chauffeurs alleen op legale wijze aan een ADR-verklaring, op basis van een daadwerkelijk gevolgde opleiding, kunnen komen?

7. Is de Commissie bereid op korte termijn te komen met nieuwe/aanvullende regelgeving, vergezeld van adequate handhavinginstrumenten, opdat de verdere liberalisering van de wegvervoermarkt hand in hand gaat met goede sociale en veiligheidsregels en effectieve controle?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(11 december 2012)

De punten die het geachte Parlementslid aanhaalt, hebben betrekking op diverse delen van de EU-regelgeving inzake wegvervoer. Het betreft niet alleen de regels inzake markttoegang, maar ook regels voor het vervoer van gevaarlijke goederen, de opleiding van chauffeurs en het gebruik van de tachograaf. Deze regels evolueren constant om de verkeersveiligheid te verbeteren en eerlijke concurrentie en veilige werkomstandigheden te garanderen.

De Commissie heeft minimumeisen vastgesteld voor controles op de naleving van de geldende EU-regels. Voor de handhaving zijn echter de lidstaten verantwoordelijk: zij dienen maatregelen te treffen om ervoor te zorgen dat vervoersbedrijven en beroepschauffeurs deze regels naleven. Als de regels worden overtreden, dient dat te worden bestraft in overeenstemming met het stelsel van straffen dat de desbetreffende lidstaat daarvoor heeft vastgesteld. Dit stelsel dient doeltreffend, evenredig, ontmoedigend en niet-discriminerend te zijn. De lidstaten dienen regelmatig verslag aan de Commissie uit te brengen over de tenuitvoerlegging van de EU-wetgeving.

De Commissie houdt toezicht op de tenuitvoerlegging van deze wetgeving op basis van de verslagen van de lidstaten, waarin de doeltreffendheid van de regels wordt beoordeeld en de standpunten van de sector worden samengebracht. Problemen met de handhaving worden in het kader van regelmatige bijeenkomsten besproken met de lidstaten en de sociale partners. Indien nodig neemt de Commissie het initiatief om nieuwe wetgeving voor te stellen.

De Commissie is voornemens om in 2013 een initiatief te nemen met betrekking tot de markt voor wegvervoer. Dit initiatief kan maatregelen omvatten voor de indeling van ernstige inbreuken in categorieën en voor een versterkte geharmoniseerde handhaving. Ook sociale normen kunnen in dit wetgevingspakket aan bod komen.

Nadere informatie hierover is beschikbaar op de websites van de Commissie ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/road/social_provisions/driving_time/doc/swd-2012-270.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/pdf/professional_drivers/report_on_periodic_training_of_professional_drivers_nl.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009311/12
to the Commission
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Fraud entailing breaches of legislation on social insurance and safety in road haulage

The broadcast of the investigative programme Zembla on 12 October 2012 showed that in the Netherlands some road haulage businesses evade European law when transporting dangerous substances. By making much use of Eastern European drivers, they are able to wholly or partially disregard the standards in force. According to the programme, the European requirements can be evaded because the enforcement authorities are understaffed and there are opportunities for fraud relating to the new digital tachograph, training requirements and training certificates.

1. Is the Commission aware of the instalment of investigative programme Zembla of 12 October 2012?

2. Does the Commission agree with the programme's conclusion that European regulations are being evaded by road haulage businesses in the Netherlands? The shortcomings include inadequate training in the transport of dangerous substances, falsified ADR certificates, fraud in the use of the new digital tachograph and inadequate knowledge of languages. If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission have any indications that road haulage businesses in other Member States are likewise failing to comply with the rules on the transport of dangerous substances? If not, why not?

4. Has the Commission received any information to suggest that law enforcement bodies in the Netherlands are understaffed and as a result are performing too few checks, thus breaching Article 2(2)(3) of Directive 2006/22/EC? If not, will it investigate whether the Netherlands is complying with the requirements of Directive 2006/22/EC?

5. Can the Commission indicate how it monitors the quality of the training of HGV drivers, particularly in central and eastern European countries? Does it have any indications that directive 2003/59/EC is being complied with insufficiently or not at all in those countries? Given that, in answer to previous questions which I have put, the Commission has stated that it was not aware of any problems, is this still the case?

6. How does the Commission ensure that drivers can only obtain ADR certificates in a legal manner, on the basis of training which they have genuinely received?

7. Will the Commission in the near future submit proposals for new/supplementary legislation, accompanied by adequate enforcement instruments, so that the further liberalisation of the road haulage market goes hand in hand with good labour standards and safety rules and effective monitoring?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2012)

The issues raised by the Honourable Member relate to various pieces of EU road transport legislation. Apart from market access these rules also include rules on transport of dangerous goods, driver training and the use of tachograph. These rules are under constant evolution to enhance road safety, fair competition, safe working conditions.

The Commission established minimum requirements for controlling compliance with the EU rules in force. However, enforcement is the responsibility of Member States, who must take the measures to ensure that transport companies and professional drivers comply with these rules. Any infringements should be sanctioned in accordance with the national system of penalties, which must be designed to be effective, proportional, dissuasive and non-discriminatory. Member States must report regularly to the Commission on the implementation of EC laws.

The Commission monitors implementation of these laws on the basis of the Member States' reports, which assess the effectiveness of the rules and gather the views of the industry. Enforcement issues are reviewed with Member States and social partners at regular meetings. If appropriate, the Commission takes the initiative to propose new legislation.

In 2013 the Commission plans an initiative on the road transport market. This initiative could include requirements for Member States to categorise certain infringements as serious, and on enhanced harmonised enforcement. Social standards could also be part of this legislative package.

Detailed information is available on the Commission's websites ([1]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/road/social_provisions/driving_time/doc/swd-2012-270.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/pdf/professional_drivers/report_on_periodic_training_of_professional_drivers_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009312/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(15. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Fortbildung der Computerfähigkeiten von Erwachsenen

Heutzutage ist der Umgang mit Computern eine essenzielle Fähigkeit in vielen Arbeitsbereichen. Insbesondere ältere EU-Bürger und Migranten haben oftmals nie formelle Einweisungen in die Computernutzung oder in spezifische Bereiche wie Internetnutzung oder Textverarbeitung erhalten. Durch diesen Mangel an Kenntnissen im Bereich neuer Informationstechnologien sind sie auf dem Arbeitsmarkt benachteiligt.

1. Für welche Personengruppen ist der Kommission ein Mangel an IT-Kenntnissen bekannt?

2. Ist die Kommission derzeit an Weiterbildungsprogrammen für Erwachsene zur Vermittlung von IT-Kenntnissen beteiligt?

3. Wenn ja, kann die Kommission einen Überblick darüber geben, welche Programme sie derzeit unterstützt?

4. Für welche Personengruppen sind diese Programme jeweils ausgelegt bzw. welche Personengruppen haben dazu jeweils Zugang?

Antwort von Frau Vassiliou im Namen der Kommission
(6. Dezember 2012)

Die Fähigkeit zur funktionellen Nutzung von Computern und Internet (IKT-Fertigkeiten) gehört zu den grundlegenden Fertigkeiten der heutigen Gesellschaft. Das Fehlen digitaler Fertigkeiten und Kompetenzen macht nicht nur Erwachsenen, sondern auch Jugendlichen zu schaffen: Rund 28 % der Schülerinnen und Schüler in der EU haben in der Schule und zu Hause kaum Zugang zu IKT, und nur etwa 30 % dieser Gruppe verfügen über „digitale Kompetenz".

Die Überwindung des „Computer-Analphabetismus" gehört seit langem zu den politischen Prioritäten auf EU-Ebene. In den letzten zehn Jahren hat die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten durch Programme wie die „E-Learning"-Initiative oder „E-Learning" dabei unterstützt, den Umgang mit IKT in die wichtigsten Maßnahmen des lebenslangen Lernens zu integrieren. Das Programm für lebenslanges Lernen([1]) umfasst die Vermittlung von IKT-Kenntnissen auf verschiedenen Ebenen der allgemeinen und beruflichen Bildung: Schul- und Hochschulbildung, berufliche Erstausbildung und Weiterbildung sowie Erwachsenenbildung. Andere IKT-Projekte, die für alle Bildungsebenen relevant sind, werden durch die Schwerpunktaktivität 1 des bereichsübergreifenden Teils des Programms gefördert. Aktivitäten wie „eTwinning" oder das „E-Learning-Portal" erreichen viele Fachleute im Bildungswesen und darüber hinaus. Das Programm MEDIA([2]) sieht ebenfalls Fördermittel zur Erweiterung der digitalen Fertigkeiten vor.

Im Zusammenhang mit der Erwachsenenbildung wurden über die Grundtvig-Aktion im Rahmen des Programms für lebenslanges Lernen nahezu 12 Mio. EUR für IKT-bezogene Maßnahmen bereitgestellt. Diese Mittel schließen die Förderung von „Lernpartnerschaften", die individuelle Fortbildung von Lehrkräften und Bildungsangebote für Erwachsene ein. Der für IKT-bezogene Projekte aufgewandte Betrag ist in den letzten Jahren gestiegen.

([1]) Weitere Informationen finden Sie unter: http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/doc78_de.htm
([2]) Weitere Informationen finden Sie unter: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/media/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009312/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Training in IT skills for adults

The ability to work with computers is now an essential skill in many sectors. Older EU citizens and immigrants, in particular, have in many cases never had any formal instruction in using computers or in specific areas such as using the Internet or word processing. This lack of knowledge with regard to new information technologies puts them at a disadvantage on the labour market.

1. Which groups of people does the Commission know to be lacking in IT skills?

2. Is the Commission currently involved in any adult education programmes to improve IT skills?

3. If so, could the Commission provide an indication of which programmes it is currently supporting?

4. Which groups of people is each of these programmes designed for, or which groups of people have access to them?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2012)

Being able to use computers and Internet (ICT skills) in a functional way is one of the basic skills in today's society. The lack of digital skills and competences is a problem for adults but also for youngsters: around 28% of students in the EU have nearly no access to ICT neither at school nor at home and only 30% of students in the EU can be considered as digitally competent.

Overcoming digital illiteracy has been a constant policy priority at EU level. Over the last decade the Commission has supported EU Member States in the integration of ICT into core lifelong learning policies through programmes like eLearning Initiative or eLearning. The Lifelong Learning Programme ([1]) addresses ICT skills at the different levels of education and training: schools, higher education, vocational education and training, and adult education. Other ICT projects, relevant to all levels of education, are funded through Key Activity 1 of the 'transversal' part of the programme. Activities such as 'eTwinning' or the 'eLearning portal' are reaching many practitioners in the educational field and beyond. The MEDIA ([2]) Programme also provides funding opportunities to raise digital skills.

As regards adult education, nearly EUR 12 million were allocated to ICT-related activities through the Grundtvig action within the Lifelong Learning Programme in 2010. This amount includes Learning Partnerships, individual teacher training and adult learner training. The amount spent on ICT-related projects has been increasing over recent years.

([1]) For more details see: http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/index_en.htm
([2]) For more details see: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/media/index_en.htm

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009313/12
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(15. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Cloud-Computing: Zertifizierungsverfahren und Server-Betriebssysteme

In ihrem Memo 12/713 „Freisetzung des Cloud-Computing-Potenzials in Europa — Was ist das und was bedeutet das für mich?" vom 27. September 2012 stellt die Kommission fest: „Cloud-Anbieter können unterschiedliche, miteinander nicht interoperable Betriebssysteme oder Anwendungsschnittstellen einsetzen, so dass Software, die für einen Cloud-Anbieter entwickelt wurde, nicht so einfach bei einem anderen Cloud-Anbieter funktioniert. Dies kann zu einer Abhängigkeit von einem bestimmten Diensteanbieter führen, weil der Kunde nicht einfach seine Daten von einem zum anderen Cloud-Anbieter verschieben kann".

1. Wird im Zertifizierungsverfahren, das die Kommission im gleichen Memo erläutert, in irgendeiner Weise auf die verwendete Software Bezug genommen?

2. Wird die Kommission zur Vermeidung der Diskriminierung von kommerziellen oder Free and Open Source Software-(FOSS)-Produkten von Mitbewerbern Sorge dafür tragen, dass in den Zertifizierungskriterien nicht auf spezifische Softwarepakete Bezug genommen wird?

3. Wird die Kommission dafür Sorge tragen, dass es in den Zertifizierungskriterien zu keiner sonstigen Diskriminierung von FOSS-Server-Betriebssystemen kommt?

Antwort von Frau Kroes im Namen der Kommission
(21. November 2012)

Die Europäische Kommission wird sich mit Unterstützung der ENISA, der europäischen Normenorganisationen und anderer einschlägiger Gremien dafür einsetzen, dass EU-weite freiwillige Zertifizierungsprogramme auf dem Gebiet des Cloud-Computing (auch in Bezug auf die zu verwendende Software) entwickelt werden und dass bis 2014 eine Liste solcher Programme aufgestellt wird.

Mit dem übergeordneten Problem der Interoperabilität von Software befasst sich die Kommission aktiv insofern, als sie — wo immer möglich — die Verwendung offener Standards anmahnt und unterstützt, weil offene Standards gewährleisten können, dass Hardware- und Software-Lösungen unterschiedlicher Anbieter miteinander interoperabel sind, auch jene, die unter das Open-Source-Geschäftsmodell fallen. Die Kommission beobachtet sehr genau die diesbezüglichen Entwicklungen, vor allem auch im Hinblick auf den Verbraucherschutz und die Software-Interoperabilität.

Die Anbieter von Cloud-Diensten sollten ein freiwilliges Zertifizierungsprogramm einrichten und sich diesem Programm dann auch anschließen. Für den Ausgang eines solchen freiwilligen Prozesses kann die Europäische Kommission allerdings keine Gewähr leisten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009313/12
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Cloud computing: certification procedure and server operating systems

In its memo 12/713 'Unleashing the Potential of Cloud Computing in Europe — What is it and what does it mean for me?', published on 27 September 2012, the Commission states: 'Cloud providers might use different operating systems or application interfaces which are not interoperable, meaning that software developed to work with one cloud provider cannot easily be made to work with another. This could lead to dependency from one service provider, since it is not necessarily easy to move data from one cloud to another ("lock-in")'.

1. Will the certification procedure that the Commission describes in the same memo in any way refer to the software used?

2. In order to avoid discrimination against any competing commercial or free and open-source (FOSS) products, will the Commission ensure that the certification criteria do not make any reference to specific software packages?

3. Will the Commission ensure that the certification criteria do not introduce any other form of discrimination against FOSS server operating systems?

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

The European Commission will work with the support of ENISA, the European Standardisation Organisations and other relevant bodies to assist the development of EU-wide voluntary certification schemes in the area of cloud computing (including as regards to used software) and establish a list of such schemes by 2014.

The Commission actively addresses the larger problem of software interoperability by encouraging and supporting the use of open standards whenever possible, because open standards can guarantee interoperability of hardware and software solutions from different vendors, including those using an open source business model. In that respect the Commission is carefully monitoring these developments, especially from the point of view of consumer protection and software interoperability.

The providers of cloud services should create a voluntary certification scheme and decide about joining it. The European Commission cannot guarantee the outcome of a voluntary process.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009315/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Persecuzione della minoranza cristiana in Siria

La crisi in Siria dura ormai da oltre 18 mesi, scatenando numerosi dibattiti in materia di diritti umani. Di recente la questione dei cristiani in Siria, minoranza di quasi il 10 % della popolazione del paese, è alla ribalta delle discussioni. Nonostante i cristiani vivano pacificamente come membri della società siriana da centinaia di anni — uno dei centri più antichi della civiltà cristiana si trova nella capitale siriana di Damasco — con l'intensificarsi delle violenze crescono le paure all'interno della comunità cristiana. Per analogia con altre situazioni di conflitto in Iraq e in Egitto, i cristiani siriani sono preoccupati per il futuro che potrebbe comprendere perdita di diritti, persecuzioni e violente rivolte.

La situazione per i cristiani in Siria è peculiare a seguito della generale battaglia religiosa fra musulmani alauiti, la minoranza che è associata al governo di Assad, e la maggioranza di musulmani sunniti. I cristiani hanno conosciuto pace e libertà religiosa sotto il governo di Assad, per cui tanti sono a favore dell'attuale regime, tuttavia ci sono alcuni gruppi che hanno scelto di schierarsi con l'opposizione o rimanere mediatori. Persistono timori, qualora il regime dovesse essere rovesciato, che i cristiani siano perseguitati dalle forze di opposizione eventualmente connesse con gruppi estremisti come i Fratelli musulmani.

Numerosi cristiani sono fuggiti nel vicino Libano. Ad esempio l'arcivescovo e vari sacerdoti della Chiesa greco-cattolica Melchita di Aleppo, fuggiti dopo che gli edifici della chiesa sono stati attaccati l'estate scorsa. Oltre 40 famiglie cristiane sono fuggite in una città in Libano dal 1° ottobre 2011 a seguito della violenza in Siria. Atti contro i cristiani sono stati segnalati in Siria ma è difficile confermare l'accuratezza delle notizie a seguito delle restrizioni sull'attività giornalistica nel paese. Mentre i ribelli hanno dichiarato esplicitamente che non hanno alcun rancore verso i cristiani, e in effetti vi sono cristiani fra gli alti funzionari del partito di opposizione, non è possibile ignorare le segnalazioni di attacchi.

Pertanto chiedo al Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante:

1. quali azioni ha il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante svolto per garantire la protezione di tutti i gruppi religiosi, tra cui i cristiani, in Siria?

2. ha cercato la delegazione dell'UE di contattare i gruppi cristiani locali per valutare la situazione? Ha potuto ottenere tutte le informazioni riguardanti la situazione dei cristiani vista la difficoltà di avere informazioni precise?

3. intende l'Unione europea accogliere le richieste di asilo di cristiani perseguitati in Siria?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente condivide con l'onorevole parlamentare la preoccupazione per la drammatica situazione umanitaria in cui versa la popolazione siriana e per le violazioni dei diritti umani commesse dal regime nei confronti del suo stesso popolo, compresa la minoranza cristiana.

Per quanto concerne l'assistenza umanitaria, l'Unione europea si è posta in prima linea nell'impegno mondiale in Siria ed è il principale donatore di aiuti: il suo contributo collettivo ha raggiunto il 16 gennaio la somma di 358 milioni di euro, di cui 150 milioni a carico del bilancio dell'UE e 208 milioni di euro forniti a livello bilaterale dagli Stati membri.

Nei messaggi destinati sia al regime che ai gruppi dell'opposizione, l'UE ha sempre ribadito il suo invito a far rispettare i principi della libertà di religione e di credo e ad evitare le contrapposizioni tra fazioni ed etnie. Nel Consiglio Affari esteri del 10 dicembre 2012, l'Unione ha accettato la coalizione nazionale siriana delle forze dell'opposizione e della rivoluzione come legittima rappresentante della popolazione della Siria e l'ha incoraggiata a diventare più inclusiva ed a continuare a impegnarsi a favore del rispetto dei principi dei diritti umani, dell'inclusività e della democrazia.

L'UE ricorre a tutti i suoi strumenti diplomatici e di cooperazione per promuovere la libertà di religione e di credo. La situazione relativa a tale libertà in Medio Oriente è controllata con la massima attenzione dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente tramite le delegazioni dell'UE.

La decisione di concedere o meno protezione internazionale a una persona che presenta domanda di asilo è assunta dalle autorità degli Stati membri in funzione di ogni singolo caso e in conformità delle norme e dell'*acquis* internazionali in materia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009315/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Barbara Matera (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Persecution of Christian minority in Syria

The crisis in Syria has now been developing for over 18 months, sparking a number of debates in the realm of human rights. Recently, the issue of Christians in Syria, who comprise nearly 10% of the country's population, has risen to the forefront of discussion. While Christians have peacefully existed as members of Syrian society for hundreds of years — one of the oldest centres of Christian civilisation is located in the Syrian capital of Damascus — fears are growing within the Christian community as the violence worsens. Drawing analogy with similar militant situations in Iraq and Egypt, Syrian Christians have become apprehensive about a future that could include a loss of rights, persecution, and violent uprisings.

The situation for Christians in Syria is particularly unique due to the overarching religious battle between Alawite Muslims, the minority group that is associated with the al-Assad government, and the majority Sunni Muslims. Christians have experienced peace and religious freedom under the al-Assad government, so many are in favour of the current regime, but there are some groups that have chosen to side with the opposition or remain as mediators. Fears persist that, should the regime be overthrown, Christians will be persecuted by the opposition forces, which could be related to extremist groups such as the Muslim Brotherhood.

A number of Christians have fled the country into neighbouring Lebanon. For example, the archbishop and several priests from the Melchite Greek Catholic Church fled Aleppo after the church offices were attacked this summer. More than 40 Christian families have fled to a single town in Lebanon as of 1 October 2012 because of the violence in Syria. Anti-Christian acts have been reported in Syria, but it is difficult to confirm the accuracy of reports due to the limitation on journalist activity in the country. While rebel forces have made explicit statements that they have no animosity towards Christians, and in fact have Christians as high ranking officials in the opposition party, it is impossible to ignore the reports of attacks.

I therefore ask the Vice-President/High Representative:

1. What action has the Vice-President/High Representative taken to ensure the protection of all religious groups, including Christians, in Syria?

2. Has the EU Delegation to Syria made any attempts to contact local Christian groups in order to assess the situation? Have they been able to obtain any information regarding the situation of Christians due to the difficulty of accurate reporting?

3. Does the EU intend to accept asylum requests from Christians who are being persecuted in Syria?

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

The HR/VP shares the Honourable Member's concern over the humanitarian plight of the Syrian population, and the human rights violations committed by the regime against its people, including the Christian minority.

In terms of humanitarian assistance, the EU has been at the forefront of the global efforts in Syria and is the main humanitarian donor with a total collective contribution reaching EUR 358 million as of 16 January (EUR 150 million from the EU budget and EUR 208 million from Member States bi-laterally).

In its messages to both the regime and the opposition groups, the EU has continuously reiterated its call to uphold the principles of freedom of religion and belief and to refrain from sectarian and ethnic division. In the Foreign Affairs Council of 10 December 2012, the EU accepted the National Coalition for Syrian Revolutionary and Opposition Forces as legitimate representatives of the Syrian people and encouraged them to become more inclusive and to remain committed to the respect of the principles of human rights, inclusivity and decomcracy.

The EU uses the full range of its diplomatic and cooperation instruments to promote Freedom of Religion or Belief. Accordingly, the HR/VP monitors the situation as regards Freedom of Religion or Belief in the Middle East with the closest attention through the EU Delegations.

The decision whether or not a person claiming asylum should be granted international protection is taken by the authorities of the Member States on the merits of every individual case and in accordance with the relevant international rules and the *acquis*.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009316/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(15 oktober 2012)

Betreft: Uitspraken Monti inzake rechtstreekse steun aan banken vanuit het ESM

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de berichten dat de regeringsleider van Italië, de heer M. Monti, heeft gezegd dat het ESM gebruikt moet worden om rechtstreeks banken te financieren ([1])? Zo ja, wat vindt hij van die uitspraken?

2. Het is nooit de bedoeling geweest dat individuele banken rechtstreeks zouden worden gefinancierd uit het ESM, maar juist dat eurozonelanden die in financieel-economische moeilijkheden zijn geraakt geholpen zouden worden. Wat vindt de Commissie, in dit perspectief, van de uitspraken van de heer Monti?

3. Tijdens de Eurotop van eind juni 2012 hebben de regeringsleiders expliciet gezegd dat de crisis slechts kon worden opgelost door de banden tussen overheid en banken te verbreken ([2]). Is de Commissie met ons van mening dat de gewraakte uitspraken van de heer Monti haaks staan op wat er toen is afgesproken? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Rehn namens de Commissie
(13 december 2012)

De mogelijkheid om banken rechtstreeks uit het ESM te herkapitaliseren, zal een krachtig instrument zijn om in de eurozone de vicieuze cirkel tussen zwakke banken en hun overheden uiteindelijk te doorbreken. Tot dusver is elke noodlijdende bank steeds door een lidstaat geherkapitaliseerd. Dergelijke herkapitalisaties resulteren echter in een verslechtering van de overheidsfinanciën van de betrokken lidstaat doordat zij de overheidsschuld doen toenemen. Tijdens de top van de eurozone van juni 2012 is daarom geconcludeerd dat het ESM die band dient te kunnen doorbreken en de mogelijkheid moet hebben financiële instellingen rechtstreeks te herkapitaliseren zodra een doelmatig gemeenschappelijk toezichtmechanisme is ingevoerd. Dit is in oktober herbevestigd door de Europese Raad. Conform deze mandaten/conclusies is dan ook een aanvang gemaakt met de werkzaamheden met het oog op de uitwerking van de technische bijzonderheden van een dergelijk instrument voor de rechtstreekse herkapitalisatie van Europese banken.

([1]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/11/eu-monti-banks-idUSL6E8LBS4F20121011.
([2]) http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-10-05/hollande-monti-push-leaders-for-january-bank-union-start.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009316/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Statements by Monti concerning direct support for banks from the ESM

1. Is the Commission aware of the reports that the head of Italy's Government, Mr M. Monti, has said that the ESM must be used to finance banks directly ([1])? If so, what view does it take of those statements?

2. It has never been the intention that individual banks should be directly financed by the ESM: on the contrary, Eurozone countries which have got into financial and economic difficulties are supposed to receive help from it. What view does the Commission therefore take of Mr Monti's statements?

3. At the European summit at the end of June 2012, the heads of government explicitly said that the crisis could only be resolved by breaking the ties between governments and banks ([2]). Does the Commission agree that the statements by Mr Monti to which I am objecting completely contradict what was agreed at that time? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2012)

The possibility of using the ESM to recapitalise banks directly will be a powerful tool for ultimately breaking the vicious circle between weak banks and their sovereigns in the euro area. So far, any recapitalisations of distressed banks have been conducted by a Member State. However, such recapitalisations lead to a deterioration of the concerned Member State's public finances, increasing its public debt. The euro area Summit of June 2012 has therefore concluded that the ESM should have the possibility to break this link by directly recapitalizing financial institutions once an effective single supervisory mechanism is established. This was reconfirmed by the European Council in October. In accordance with these mandates/conclusions, work has therefore begun on developing the technical details of such an instrument for direct recapitalisation of European banks.

([1]) http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/10/11/eu-monti-banks-idUSL6E8LBS4F20121011.
([2]) http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-10-05/hollande-monti-push-leaders-for-january-bank-union-start.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009737/12
à la Commission
Brice Hortefeux (PPE)
(24 octobre 2012)

Objet: Désengagement du Royaume-Uni dans les domaines de la coopération policière et judiciaire

Le 15 octobre 2012, le ministre de l'intérieur britannique, Theresa May, annonçait l'intention du gouvernement de David Cameron de désengager le Royaume-Uni d'un certain nombre de dispositions dans les domaines de la coopération policière et judiciaire de l'Union européenne.

Le Royaume-Uni est légalement autorisé à exercer son droit de retrait par rapport à quelques-unes des cent trente mesures du domaine de la justice et des affaires intérieures au titre de la clause de sortie *(opt-out)* qu'il a négociée dans le cadre du Traité de Lisbonne.

Ce retrait concernerait également le mandat d'arrêt européen.

La Commission a indiqué que le Royaume-Uni avait jusqu'au 1er juin 2014 pour signifier sa décision de se retirer «entièrement» des mesures prises par l'Union européenne depuis 1992.

La Commission peut-elle dire, dans l'hypothèse où le Royaume-Uni viendrait à se désengager de manière définitive des mesures prises dans les domaines de la coopération policière et judiciaire, quelles seraient les conséquences en termes opérationnels, juridiques et financiers d'une telle décision pour l'Union européenne?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Barroso au nom de la Commission
(3 décembre 2012)

L'article 10, paragraphe 4, du protocole 36 du traité de Lisbonne permet au Royaume-Uni de signifier son retrait de tous les actes de l'Union dans le domaine de la coopération policière et judiciaire en matière pénale qui ont été adoptés avant l'entrée en vigueur du traité de Lisbonne et qui n'ont pas été modifiés avant le 1er décembre 2014. À ce jour, le Royaume-Uni n'a adressé aucune signification.

Dans l'hypothèse d'une telle signification, la Commission évaluerait les conséquences financières directes qui en découleraient en tenant compte des dispositions de l'article 10, paragraphe 5, du protocole 36.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009317/12
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Possible opt-out for the UK from pre-Lisbon police and justice cooperation

Under Protocol 36 to the Treaty of Lisbon the UK Government can decide, as of 1 June 2014, to opt out of all EU policing and criminal law measures adopted before the Treaty of Lisbon.

Article 10(4) of the protocol states: 'The Council, acting by a qualified majority on a proposal from the Commission, may also adopt a decision determining that the United Kingdom shall bear the direct financial consequences, if any, necessarily and unavoidably incurred as a result of the cessation of its participation in those acts'.

Any possible 'financial consequences' for the UK in choosing to opt out are extremely important to the decision-making process and, in the interests of full transparency, should be immediately disclosed to the citizens of the UK.

Given the importance and urgency of this issue — the UK Government has indicated it will be making a final decision at the very latest before Christmas — could the Commission comment on the possibility of the UK bearing the financial consequences of an opt-out, and provide information on how those costs will be calculated and an estimate of how much they could total?

Question for written answer E-009733/12
to the Commission
William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)
(24 October 2012)

Subject: The cost of opting out of criminal justice powers

It has been suggested that, if the UK chooses to opt out of the 130 criminal justice powers, it could be forced to pay administrative fees (*Daily Telegraph,* 15 October 2012: 'MPs will get to vote on EU powers opt-out'). Could the Commission describe the nature and amount of these fees?

Question for written answer E-009737/12
to the Commission
Brice Hortefeux (PPE)
(24 October 2012)

Subject: United Kingdom opt-out from police and judicial cooperation

On 15 October 2012 the British Home Secretary, Theresa May, announced that David Cameron's government intended to withdraw the UK from a number of measures in the field of police and judicial cooperation in the EU.

The United Kingdom is legally entitled to exercise its right to withdraw from some of the 130 measures in the field of justice and home affairs under the opt-out clause which it negotiated under the Treaty of Lisbon.

The measures affected by this opt-out would include the European Arrest Warrant.

The Commission said that the UK had until 1 June 2014 to announce its decision to opt out 'entirely' from the measures taken by the European Union since 1992.

Can the Commission state, if the UK were to finally opt out of the measures taken in the fields of police and judicial cooperation, what the operational, legal and financial consequences of such a decision would be for the European Union?

Joint answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2012)

Article 10(4) of Protocol 36 to the Treaty of Lisbon enables the United Kingdom to notify that it opts out of all acts of the Union in the field of police cooperation and judicial cooperation in criminal matters which have been adopted before the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon and have not been amended before 1 December 2014. The United Kingdom has not at this point made such a notification.

In the eventuality of such a notification, the Commission would assess any direct financial consequences that might be incurred taking into account the provisions of Article 10(5) of Protocol 36.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009318/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Speed limits for vans

In the United Kingdom, the speed limit on motorways for goods vehicles below 7.5 tonnes maximum laden weight is 70 mph. For goods vehicles above 7.5 tonnes maximum laden weight the speed limit is 60 mph.

However, EU Directive 2002/85/EC requires that all goods vehicles above 3.5 tonnes registered from 2001 must be fitted with a speed limiter device which limits their speed to 56 mph.

This means that in practice a 3.5 tonne van has the same maximum speed as a 20 tonne articulated lorry. So when a 3.5 tonne van tries to overtake a big lorry on the motorway it takes quite some time causing the wind to push the van into the side of the lorry due to the small size and lower weight of the van. A constituent of mine has experienced five near misses as a result.

1. Is the Commission aware of the safety implications of small vans being limited to the same speed as large lorries when overtaking, as outlined above?

2. Has the reduction in the speed limit of vans to that of lorries improved the safety of roads in Europe?

3. Would the Commission consider limiting the scope of Directive 2002/85/EC to unladen vehicles above 3.5 tonnes rather than including transit vans which only weigh 3.5 tonnes when laden?

4. Would the Commission consider amending Directive 2002/85/EC so that the speed limit for vans is slightly higher than that of large lorries (e.g., 65 mph) so that overtaking is safer for van drivers?

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

There are strong indications that the decision of the European Parliament and the Council to apply speed limitation devices with a uniform maximum speed to all heavy goods vehicles above 3,5 tons of maximum permissible mass had positive effects on road safety. Involvement in fatal road accidents of heavy vans and trucks declined by approximately 50% in the last decade while this is not the case for vans below 3.5 tonnes without speed limitation devices where the involvement in fatal road accidents declined by approximately 30%. The Commission intends to launch an *ex-post* evaluation study on the application of Directive 92/6/EEC to commercial vehicles that would, *inter alia*, assess the impacts on road safety. Following the results of the study, the Commission would consider the feasibility of further inititiatives.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-009319/12
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(15 de outubro de 2012)

Assunto: «Lay-off» de 208 trabalhadores na Key Plastics, SA

O presidente do conselho de administração da Key Plastics, SA, que possui fábricas nos concelhos de Leiria e Vendas Novas, informou recentemente, através da comunicação social, que a empresa vai avançar para o «lay-off» de 208 trabalhadores. Esta medida surge no seguimento do despedimento de 90 trabalhadores com contrato temporário, efetivado em setembro deste ano.

O conselho de administração desta fabricante de componentes para a indústria automóvel justifica-se com a quebra de vendas no último trimestre, no valor de 3,2 milhões de euros, para a tomada desta decisão.

Assim, solicito à Comissão que me informe do seguinte:

1. A referida empresa recebeu quaisquer apoios comunitários? Qual foi o montante desses apoios? Com que fins foram concedidos e que compromissos assumiu aquando da concessão dos apoios?

2. Que medidas pensa tomar, tendo em conta os graves problemas sociais e económicos existentes em Portugal, onde o desemprego não cessa de aumentar?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(4 de dezembro de 2012)

De acordo com as informações recebidas das autoridades portuguesas, a Key Plastics, SA recebeu um apoio financeiro no valor total de 270 135,31 euros do Fundo Social Europeu (FSE) no anterior e no atual período de programação e 955 719 euros do FEDER no período anterior (2000-2006). O financiamento destinava-se a atividades de formação, que tinham como objetivo aumentar o potencial dos trabalhadores, e também a incentivar o investimento em recursos humanos e encorajar a modernização de empresas. As operações selecionadas para financiamento cumpriram as regras da UE e nacionais durante o período de implementação.

Em conformidade com o princípio da subsidiariedade, a política de emprego, incluindo as medidas destinadas a lutar contra o desemprego, é principalmente da competência dos Estados-Membros.

Porém, os fundos da Política de Coesão, bem como o Feader e o FEAMP, são fontes importantes de investimento, que visam estimular o crescimento sustentável e o emprego. O FSE e o FEDER podem ser utilizados para apoiar políticas ativas do mercado de trabalho e para financiar mecanismos de apoio às PME com vista à manutenção e à criação de empregos.

A Comissão também salienta que os trabalhadores afetados pela reestruturação podem candidatar-se ao apoio do FSE e, se reunirem as condições necessárias para tal, do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009319/12
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Lay-off of 208 workers at Key Plastics, SA

The chairman of the board of Key Plastics, SA, which owns factories in the municipalities of Leiria and Vendas Novas, recently announced the company's decision to lay off 208 workers through the media. This measure follows the laying off of 90 workers on temporary contracts in September this year.

The board of this manufacturer of plastic components for the automobile industry justified the decision by citing a EUR 3.2 million decline in sales in the last quarter.

In view of this, can the Commission state:

1. Has this company received any kind of EU support? What was the value of this support? For what purpose was this support allocated and what undertakings were made when it was received?

2. Given the serious social and economic problems in Portugal, where unemployment continues to rise, what measures does the Commission intend to take?

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

According to information received from the Portuguese authorities, Key Plastics, SA has received a total financial support amounting to EUR 270 135.31 from the European Social Fund (ESF) in the previous and the current programming period and EUR 955 719 from ERDF in the previous period (2000-2006). The funding concerned training activities which aim to enhance the employees' potential as well as incentives for investment in human resources and encouragement to the modernization of enterprises. The operations selected for funding complied with EU and national rules throughout the implementation period.

In accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, employment policy, including measures to combat unemployment, is primarily a Member State competence.

However, funds of Cohesion Policy as well as EAFRD and EMFF are important sources of investment stimulating sustainable growth and employment. ESF and ERDF can be used to support active labour market policy and to fund SME support mechanisms aiming at maintaining and creating jobs.

The Commission would also point out that workers affected by restructuring may qualify for support from the ESF and, provided that the necessary conditions are met, from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009320/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: EU funding of the Ahava company

A constituent has recently brought to my attention the involvement of Ahava in the EU's Seventh Framework Programme for Research (FP7). Ahava is an Israeli cosmetics company with the majority of its operations based in the Occupied Territories.

1. Can the Commissioner confirm whether EU research funds have been provided to Ahava and in what capacity?

2. Does the funding of companies based in the Occupied Territories contravene the terms of the EU-Israel Association Agreement whereby goods from the Occupied Territories are not entitled to receive preferential market access?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(6 December 2012)

Regarding the funding of AHAVA laboratories, the Commission would the Honourable Member refer to its answer to previous Written Question E-007505/2012 ([1]).

AHAVA laboratories are established in Israel under Israeli law and not in the Occupied Palestinian Territories even though it is known to carry out work in the Israeli settlements in those territories. Goods produced in areas beyond Israel's pre-1967 borders are not entitled to preferential treatment upon their import into the EU under the Association Agreement.

The EU-Israel Association Agreement does not regulate the funding of research by Israeli entities. Instead the funding of such entities is subject to the Agreement on scientific and technical cooperation between the European Community and the State of Israel. The funding of research in this particular case does not contravene the latter agreement.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009321/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Treatment of Palestinian child prisoners

A constituent has recently brought to my attention the plight of Palestinian children being arrested by the Israeli authorities. I am informed that 700 Palestinian children are arrested in Israel every year, of whom 170 are currently imprisoned and one is being held under administrative detention.

These children are allegedly not permitted to see their families and are subjected to interrogation unaccompanied by an adult.

1. Is the Commissioner aware of this situation concerning the detention of Palestinian children?

2. What action has the Commission taken, or will it take, to ensure that Israel adheres to its human right commitments with regard to Palestinian children?

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

The EU continues to voice its concerns about the treatment of Palestinian children in the Israeli judicial and detention system. As reported in the 2012 European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) Country Progress Report on Israel, by the end of 2011 there were 4 281 Palestinian prisoners in Israeli jails, of which 135 were children. There was also one minor in administrative detention at the end of 2011.

Although the raising of the majority age from 16 to 18 in the military law applicable to the occupied Palestinian territory in September 2011 was a welcome development, the EU remains concerned about insufficient protection of children during arrest and detention, in particular the failure to permit children to be accompanied by a lawyer and parent during questioning. Cases of solitary confinement of children continue, in contravention of Article 16 of the Convention against Torture. Around 90% of children are still denied bail in violation of the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of the Child and most Palestinian children are still detained inside Israel in violation of Article 76 of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

The EU has repeatedly conveyed its concerns about these practices to the Israeli authorities in the framework of its regular political and human rights dialogue. The EU has stated, most recently on the occasion of the July 2012 EU-Israel Association Council, that that any future upgrade in relations must be based on the shared values of both parties, and particularly on democracy and respect for human rights, the rule of law and fundamental freedoms, good governance and international humanitarian law.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009322/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Analogue tachographs

Does the Commission have any data on the number of old-style analogue tachographs still in use across the EU?

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

According to data made available by Member States for the years 2009 and 2010 in order for the Commission to produce its biennial report on the implementation of Regulation 561/2006 [1], 44% of vehicles were fitted with analogue tachographs and 56% with digital tachographs.

(1) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/road/social_provisions/driving_time/doc/swd-2012-270.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009323/12
to the Commission
Jim Higgins (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Tachographs on vehicles weighing 2.8 tonnes or more

Can the Commission provide details as to how many trucks in Europe would be affected were the Parliament's proposals to impose tachographs on vehicles of 2.8 tonnes or more to come into effect?

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

The Commission has no detailed information on the number of vehicles with weight between 2.8 and 3.5 tonnes that would be in the scope of the tachograph regulation, if the amendment proposed by the European Parliament, enlarging the scope of the regulation to such vehicles, were to be adopted.

However, the Eurostat data ([1]) on the number of vehicles according to their loading capacity can provide broad indications, even if the data is incomplete and covers only 18 out of 27 Member States. According to the latest figures available, at least seven million vehicles could be affected by the amendment. Depending on the assumptions made, the figure could reach 20 million vehicles.

([1]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php?title=File:Road_transport_by_load_capacity,_2010_(million--tkm).PNG&filetimestamp=20120130135321.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009324/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats

The Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (also known as the Bern Convention) was adopted in 1979. In accordance with Council Decision 82/72/EEC of 3 December 1981, the European Union is a contracting party to that convention. The principal aims of the convention are to ensure conservation and protection of wild plant and animal species and their natural habitats (listed in Appendices I and II of the Convention), as well as to regulate the exploitation of those species listed in Appendix III. The European badger (Meles meles) is listed in Appendix III.

Articles 7 and 8 provide protection for species listed in Appendix III, with Article 9 setting out exceptions to these provisions.

1. Is the Commission aware of the UK Government's possible badger cull, and is the Commission satisfied that both the cull and the decision-making process are in line with Union legislation?

2. Is the Commission aware of any debate within the Bern Convention's secretariat on the UK Government's decision concerning a possible badger cull?

3. Has the Commission voiced any opinion on this issue with the UK, other Member States or the Convention's secretariat?

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

The Commission is aware of a debate in the UK on the culling of badgers. It is also aware that the Bern Convention secretariat has received a complaint on the culling of badgers in the UK in early 2012 and that the complaint was dismissed in the Bureau meeting of 17 September 2012 ([1]).The badger is not protected by Union legislation as it does not fall under the Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (Habitats Directive) ([2]). The Commission has not voiced any opinion on this matter.

([1]) Convention on the conservation of European wildlife and natural habitats — 32nd meeting of the Standing Committee to the Bern Convention-Strasbourg, 37 — 30 November 2012 — Report of the 2nd meeting of the Bureau (Strasbourg, 17 September 2012) — T-PVS(2012) 15 (www.coe.int/bernconvention).

([2]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009325/12
alla Commissione
Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Casi di infezione da West Nile Virus

Uno studio dell'Università di Padova, coordinato dal Professor Giorgio Palù e pubblicato sulla rivista Eurosurveillance, ha evidenziato come i casi di infezione da West Nile Virus, malattia trasmessa dalle zanzare, siano in aumento in Italia, soprattutto nella regione Veneto.

L'articolo riporta tredici casi di infezione, cinque dei quali con interessamento del sistema nervoso e tre con febbre, tutti diagnosticati tra luglio e agosto di quest'anno. Il West Nile Virus è una malattia tropicale che, a causa dei cambiamenti climatici, si sta sviluppando anche in alcune regioni europee.

Secondo gli esperti, a favorire l'insorgere della malattia è stata l'estate torrida che ha aumentato il numero di zanzare Culex, vettori principali del virus. Si tratta di casi autoctoni, tutti pazienti che presentano un virus dello stesso ceppo virale. I sintomi accusati dai pazienti sono astenia, cefalea, febbre alta, dolori articolari e muscolari, disturbi gastrointestinali, fino a meningite ed encefalite. In alcuni rari casi il virus è risultato letale.

Negli Stati Uniti il West Nile Virus ha colpito più di mille persone, soprattutto in Texas, costringendo le autorità a campagne straordinarie di disinfestazione.

Considerata la pericolosità di questa malattia e le possibilità di contagio per la popolazione europea, può la Commissione precisare:

1. se è a conoscenza dei casi di West Nile Virus registrati in Europa;

2. come intende affrontare il problema legato a un'eventuale diffusione del West Nile Virus?

Risposta di Maroš Šefčovič a nome della Commissione
(27 novembre 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza della situazione per quanto concerne i casi di infezione da virus della febbre del Nilo occidentale. In conformità della decisione n. 2119/98/CE ([1]), la Commissione controlla e coordina le misure di concerto con gli Stati membri per proteggere la salute pubblica in relazione ai casi di malattia trasmissibile con una possibile dimensione europea, come le infezioni da virus del Nilo occidentale. La decisione di esecuzione 2012/506/UE della Commissione ([2]) stabilisce una definizione del caso ai fini della dichiarazione di tali infezioni alla rete comunitaria.

Un gruppo di lavoro dell'UE istituito dalle autorità competenti e dal comitato di regolamentazione per il sangue umano e i suoi componenti ha elaborato linee guida sul tema: «Il virus della febbre del Nilo occidentale e la sicurezza del sangue: introduzione di un piano di predisposizione operativa in Europa» ([3]) al fine di riunire le esperienze degli Stati membri nella valutazione e nella gestione dei rischi per la sicurezza del sangue posti dalle infezioni da virus del Nilo occidentale e assistere le autorità competenti nel decidere le modalità di valutazione e di gestione di tali rischi.

Dal giugno 2011 il Centro europeo per la prevenzione e il controllo delle malattie (ECDC) effettua la mappatura dell'attuale distribuzione geografica delle persone dichiarate infette da virus della febbre del Nilo occidentale. Durante la stagione della trasmissione della malattia (da giugno a novembre) sono pubblicati a scadenza settimanale aggiornamenti di tali mappe ([4]) per informare le autorità responsabili dell'emosicurezza sulle aree colpite al fine di assisterle nell'attuazione della normativa europea sulla sicurezza del sangue.

([1]) Decisione n. 2119/98/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio del 24 settembre 1998 che istituisce una rete di sorveglianza epidemiologica e di controllo delle malattie trasmissibili nella Comunità.
([2]) Decisione di esecuzione 2012/506/UE della Commissione dell'8 agosto 2012 recante modifica della decisione 2002/253/CE che stabilisce la definizione dei casi ai fini della dichiarazione delle malattie trasmissibili alla rete di sorveglianza comunitaria istituita ai sensi della decisione n. 2119/98/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organs/docs/wnv_preparedness_plan_2012.pdf
([4]) http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/healthtopics/west_nile_fever/Pages/index.aspx.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009325/12
to the Commission
Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Cases of West Nile virus infection

A study conducted by the University of Padua, which was coordinated by Professor Giorgio Palù and has been published in the scientific journal *Eurosurveillance*, shows there to be a growing number of cases of infection with the mosquito-borne West Nile virus in Italy, in particular in the Veneto region.

The article states that 13 cases of infection — five of them involving neurological problems and three, fever — were diagnosed in July and August 2012. West Nile virus is a tropical disease which is spreading to some parts of Europe as a result of climate change.

According to experts, the extremely hot weather during the summer, which resulted in an increase in the *Culex* mosquito population — the main carrier of the virus — was a contributory factor in the outbreak of the disease. All of those infected are local people, and all contracted the same strain of the virus. The symptoms include weakness, headaches, high fevers, joint and muscle pains, gastrointestinal complaints and, in some cases, meningitis and encephalitis. In a small number of cases, the virus has proved fatal.

In the United States, more than 1000 cases — the majority of them in Texas — have been reported this year, causing the authorities to take extraordinary pest control measures.

In view of the dangerous nature of this disease and the possibility of its spreading within Europe, can the Commission say:

1. whether it is aware of the cases of West Nile virus infection recorded in Europe;

2. what steps it will take to prevent any spread of the virus?

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

The Commission is aware of the current situation regarding West Nile virus infections in Europe. In accordance with Decision No 2119/98/EC ([1]), the Commission is monitoring and coordinating measures with the Member States to protect public health in relation to events caused by communicable diseases with a potential EU dimension, such as West Nile virus infections. Commission Implementing Decision 2012/506/EU ([2]) lays down a case definition for reporting such infections to the Community network.

An EU working group set up by the Competent Authorities and the Regulatory Committee on Blood and Blood Components has developed guidance on 'West Nile virus and blood safety: Introduction to a preparedness plan in Europe' ([3]) to bring together Member States' experiences in assessing and managing risks for blood safety posed by West Nile virus infections and help guide competent authorities in decision making on how to assess and manage this risk.

Since June 2011, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) produces maps showing the present geographical distribution of the reported persons infected with West Nile virus. Weekly updates of these maps are published during the transmission season (June — November) ([4]), to inform the competent authorities responsible for blood safety of affected areas in order to support their implementation of blood safety legislation.

([1]) Decision No 2119/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 September 1998 setting up a network for the epidemiological surveillance and control of communicable diseases in the Community.
([2]) Commission Implementing Decision 2012/506/EU of 8 August 2012 amending Decision 2002/253/EC laying down case definitions for reporting communicable diseases to the Community network under Decision No 2119/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/blood_tissues_organs/docs/wnv_preparedness_plan_2012.pdf
([4]) http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/healthtopics/west_nile_fever/Pages/index.aspx.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009327/12
alla Commissione
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: Rischio ambientale per l'utilizzo del fracking in Maremma (Italia)

Nel marzo 2011 il Ministero dello sviluppo economico ha assegnato l'autorizzazione per la perforazione e la ricerca di gas metano in zona Casoni, in prossimità di Grosseto. Meno di tre anni prima era stata conferita analoga autorizzazione in una zona contigua (Fiume Bruna). Per la fase di ricerca è stata utilizzata la tecnica della fratturazione idraulica che, in base agli studi condotti sull'esperienza estrattiva del Nord America, mette a serio repentaglio l'ambiente e la salute dei cittadini, come dimostrato dal fatto che essa è stata vietata in Francia e in Bulgaria e che alcuni paesi che avevano fortemente investito sulla stessa stiano adesso facendo marcia indietro. Un recentissimo studio, commissionato dalla DG Ambiente della Commissione e svolto dall'AEA, ha sottolineato i rischi connessi a tale tecnica e evidenziato la necessità di un rafforzamento della legislazione europea in materia.

La stessa Commissione, in risposta a interrogazioni precedenti sullo stesso argomento, si è impegnata a fare entro la fine del 2013 una valutazione sulla possibilità di intervenire a livello legislativo su questa problematica. Un'analisi più attenta della situazione e della pericolosità di tale tecnica potrebbe dunque portare all'abbandono o alla forte limitazione della stessa. In attesa di tali valutazioni della Commissione vi è però il rischio, ad esempio in Maremma, che le falde acquifere e i suoli vengano contaminati con incommensurabili danni per la viticoltura locale e la salute dei cittadini. Sono inoltre noti i fenomeni di sismicità indotta che vengono causati dalla presenza di tali attività e sono emersi dubbi rispetto alla possibile correlazione tra le attività di estrazione e il terremoto che ha sconvolto l'Emilia Romagna.

Può pertanto la Commissione:

1. verificare il rispetto delle direttive 2000/60/CE, 2006/118/CE, 2011/92/UE e 2006/21/CE;

2. chiedere informazioni alle autorità competenti in merito agli studi effettuati con riferimento alla richiesta di autorizzazione da parte della Independent Energy Solutions (IES) in Maremma, con precipuo riferimento all'esistenza di studi sul rischio di sismicità indotta e di inquinamento delle falde acquifere;

3. invitare le autorità di controllo designate — in questo caso Comuni e Provincia — a fornire un quadro chiaro e trasparente ai cittadini, organizzando momenti pubblici di incontro e di dibattito anche con l'IES;

4. proporre una moratoria a livello europeo per l'utilizzo di tale tecnica sino alla valutazione di fine 2013?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(3 dicembre 2012)

Nell'ambito dell'attuale contesto normativo, spetta agli Stati membri assicurare — mediante opportune valutazioni, regimi di concessione e attività di monitoraggio — che le attività di esplorazione e sfruttamento di fonti energetiche, incluse quelle che si avvalgono della fratturazione idraulica, siano conformi al disposto del quadro giuridico vigente nell'UE, ivi comprese le disposizioni relative alla protezione delle acque superficiali e sotterranee ([1]) e alla gestione dei rifiuti ([2]). È inclusa anche la pertinente legislazione sulla valutazione d'impatto ambientale ([3]) che prevede taluni requisiti per l'informazione e la consultazione del pubblico da parte delle autorità competenti.

Per quanto riguarda l'ottemperanza alla vigente normativa UE dei progetti in Maremma, al momento la Commissione non ritiene vi sia alcun motivo per avviare una procedura ufficiale di richiesta di informazioni e di consultazione del pubblico alle competenti autorità.

([1]) Direttiva 2000/60/CE, che istituisce un quadro per l'azione comunitaria in materia di acque, GU L 327 del 22.12.2000, e direttiva 2006/118/CE sulla protezione delle acque sotterranee dall'inquinamento e dal deterioramento, GU L 372 del 27.12.2006.

([2]) Direttiva 2006/21/CE, relativa alla gestione dei rifiuti delle industrie estrattive e che modifica la direttiva 2004/35/CE, GU L 102 dell'11.4.2006.

([3]) Direttiva 2011/92/EU, concernente la valutazione dell'impatto ambientale di determinati progetti pubblici e privati, GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.

Come osserva l'onorevole parlamentare, la Commissione sta svolgendo una valutazione d'impatto sulla necessità di un quadro di valutazione sotto il profilo ambientale, climatico ed energetico che consenta l'estrazione sicura degli idrocarburi non convenzionali (ad esempio il gas di scisto) in Europa. Saranno passate al vaglio tutte le opzioni strategiche del caso e l'iniziativa si concluderà entro il 2013. In base alle informazioni di cui dispone attualmente la Commissione, pochi sono i casi di fratturazione idraulica registrati finora in Europa e non si prevede alcun incremento del ricorso a questa pratica nei prossimi due anni. Questa tempistica viene giudicata adeguata ad affrontare i rischi associati al possibile incremento del ricorso alla fratturazione idraulica in Europa e, ora come ora, non viene presa in considerazione alcuna moratoria.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009327/12
to the Commission
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Environmental risk from the use of fracking in Maremma (Italy)

In March 2011, the Ministry of Economic Development awarded a licence for methane gas drilling and exploration in the Casoni area, near Grosseto. Less than three years earlier, a similar licence had been granted in an adjacent area (River Bruna). The hydraulic fracturing method was used for the exploration phase. According to studies carried out on the effects of extraction operations in the USA, this technique poses serious dangers to the environment and the health of local populations. This is reflected in the fact that it has been banned in France and Bulgaria, and that some countries which had invested heavily in it are now backtracking. A very recent study, commissioned by the Commission's Directorate General for the Environment and conducted by the AEA, has underlined the risks associated with the technique and highlighted the need for stronger European legislation in this regard.

In reply to previous questions on this topic, the Commission undertook to assess, by the end of 2013, the possibility of legislative action on this issue. A closer analysis of the situation and the dangers of this technique might therefore lead to its use being abandoned or severely restricted. Pending these assessments by the Commission, however, there is the risk — for example in Maremma — that aquifers and soils will be contaminated, causing incalculable damage to the local wine-growing industry and the health of the local people. There have also been reports of seismic events caused by these activities, with growing suspicions about the possible correlation between extraction operations and the earthquake that rocked Emilia Romagna.

Will the Commission therefore:

1. Verify compliance with Directives 2000/60/EC, 2006/118/EC, 2011/92/EU and 2006/21/EC?

2. Request information from the competent authorities on the studies carried out with reference to the licence application from Independent Energy Solutions (IES) in Maremma, with particular regard to the existence of any studies of induced seismic risk and pollution of aquifers?

3. Urge the responsible supervisory authorities — in this case the Municipalities and the Province — to provide citizens with a clear and transparent picture, organising public meetings and discussions, including with IES?

4. Propose a European moratorium on the use of this technique until the assessment is delivered at the end of 2013?

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

Under the current legal framework, it is up to Member States to ensure — via appropriate assessments, permitting regimes and monitoring activities — that any exploration or exploitation of energy sources, including those using hydraulic fracturing, complies with the requirements of the existing legal framework in the EU. This includes, *inter alia*, the protection of surface and groundwater ([1]) and provisions on waste management ([2]). It also includes the relevant legislation on environmental impact assessments ([3]) which contains certain requirements for the information and consultation of the public by the authorities in charge.

As regards the compliance of projects in Maremma (Italy) with the applicable EU legislation, the Commission presently sees no justification to initiate an official procedure to request information from the competent authorities.

([1]) Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000, and Directive 2006/118/EC on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration, OJ L 372, 27.12.2006.
([2]) Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from extractive industries and amending Directive 2004/35/EC, OJ L 102, 11.4.2006.
([3]) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on environment, OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.

As the Honourable Member points out, the Commission is conducting an Impact Assessment on the need for an environmental, climate and energy assessment framework to enable safe and secure unconventional hydrocarbons (e.g. shale gas) extraction in Europe. This exercise will look at all relevant policy options and should be finalised by end 2013. According to the information currently available to the Commission, little hydraulic fracturing has taken place in Europe so far and the practice is not expected to intensify within the next two years. This timeline is deemed suitable to tackle risks associated with a possible increased use of hydraulic fracturing in Europe and no moratorium is currently considered.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009328/12
to the Commission
Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Autism strategy

The Commission will be aware of the very real difficulties faced by many Europeans who suffer from autism. There are currently 3.3 million people in the European Union who have autism, yet the range of strategic autism action across the EU is extremely varied.

In some Baltic states, there is no word for autism. On the other hand, the Celtic nations have been working together for many years now to deliver a set of national standards. The Celtic Nations Autism Partnership (http://celticnationsautism.eu) advocates for strategic national approaches to autism that recognise the bigger picture and acknowledge the evidence as to what works, and what does not. The Partnership, comprised of Scottish Autism, Autism Cymru, the Irish Society for Autism and Autism Northern Ireland, has achieved considerable success in supporting the design, development, implementation and evaluation of national strategies for autism, and is collaborating with Autism Europe in advocating best practice.

Could the Commission please clarify to what extent it is aware of the best practice available within the Celtic nations and also outline any plans it has to disseminate best practice in strategies for autism to other Member States?

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

The Commission is aware of the importance and social impact of the different Autism Spectrum Disorders and has been undertaking actions for better identification, early detection and information to public and professionals about this group of disorders. As part of this effort, the Commission supports civil society organisations representing people with Autism Spectrum Disorders and their families. Under the EU's employment and social solidarity programme PROGRESS, the Commission has a partnership agreement (2011-2013) with Autism Europe under which this organisation benefits from an annual operational grant.

Moreover, at the request of the Parliament, the Commission manages four pilot projects on employment of persons with Autism Spectrum Disorders which aim to help develop policies for their employment and social integration. These projects will present their results before the end of 2012.

The EU Health Programme has also supported two projects related to Autism: the European Autism Information System ([1]) to provide systematic, consistent and reliable data on prevalence and economic burden Autism Spectrum Disorders and harmonised early-detection tools; and the European network of surveillance on risk factors for autism and cerebral palsy ([2]) to facilitate the early detection of Autism in children, improving the prognosis and quality of life for children and families.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/major_chronic_diseases/diseases/autistic/index_en.htm#fragment3.
([2]) http://www.ensacp.eu/.

(Verżjoni Maltija)

Mistoqsija għal tweġiba bil-miktub E-009329/12
lill-Kummissjoni
Louis Grech (S&D)
(15 ta' Ottubru 2012)

Suġġett: Il-lifts u s-saħħa u s-sikurezza f'Malta

Ġie rrappurtat li għadd ta' lifts f'Malta potenzjalment jirrappreżentaw periklu għas-saħħa u s-sikurezza tal-utenti tagħhom, minħabba li mhumiex irreġistrati u ċċertifikati. L-ispezzjoni tal-lifts ħalli jiġi żgurat li jkunu skont l-istandards ta' sikurezza tal-UE, spiss issir irregolarment u kif ġie ġie. L-istallaturi tal-lifts għandhom l-obbligu legali li jirrispettaw l-istandards u r-regolamenti tal-UE, iżda wħud minnhom jagħżlu li joperaw barra mis-sistema regolatorja, u dan naturalment iqegħed lill-utenti tal-lifts fir-riskju.

1. Din il-kwistjoni hija koperta bil-kamp ta' applikazzjoni tad-Direttiva dwar il-Makkinarju 2006/42/KE?

2. Jekk iva, il-Kummissjoni għandha implimentati l-mekkaniżmi meħtieġa biex tiggarantixxi li l-Istati membri jagħtu rendikonti regolari, bil-għan li jkun żgurat li dawn il-lifts ikunu konformi mad-Direttiva msemmija?

Tweġiba mogħtija mis-Sur Tajani f'isem il-Kummissjoni
(28 ta' Novembru 2012)

1. Il-biċċa l-kbira tal-lifts għal persuni jew għal oġġetti u persuni jinsabu fl-ambitu tad-Direttiva dwar il-Lifts 95/16/KE (għalkemm lifts għall-merkanzija biss u lifts b'veloċità tal-ivvjaġġar ta' inqas minn 0,25 m/s jinsabu fl-ambitu tad-Direttiva dwar il-Makkinarju 2006/42/KE). Id-Direttiva dwar il-Lifts tistabbilixxi rekwiżiti essenzjali tas-saħħa u s-sikurezza u proċeduri ta' evalwazzjoni ta' konformità għall-installazzjonijiet ġodda tal-lifts. Ir-rekwiżiti essenzjali tad-Direttiva huma appoġġjati minn standards armonizzati Ewropej.

Is-sikurezza tal-Lifts installati qabel ma daħlet fis-seħħ id-Direttiva dwar il-Lifts u ż-żamma u l-ispezzjoni tas-servizz ta' lifts mhumiex suġġetti għal-leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE u għalhekk jistgħu jkunu suġġetti għad-disposizzjonijiet nazzjonali taħt ir-responsabbiltà unika tal-Istati Membri.

2. L-infurzar tad-dispożizzjonijiet tad-Direttiva dwar il-Lifts (sorveljanza tas-suq) hija r-responsabbiltà tal-awtoritajiet nazzjonali fil-qafas tar-Regolament (KE) Nru 765/2008 ([1]). Ilmenti dwar lifts mhux konformi f'Malta għandhom għalhekk jiġu indirizzati lid-Direttorat tas-Sorveljanza tas-Suq tal-Awtorità Maltija tal-Istandards ([2]). Jekk l-awtoritajiet nazzjonali jonqsu milli jissodisfaw ir-responsabbiltà tagħhom biex jiżguraw l-applikazzjoni korretta tal-leġiżlazzjoni tal-UE, l-ilmenti jistgħu jiġu indirizzati lill-Kummissjoni. Sal-lum, il-Kummissjoni ma rċeviet l-ebda lment dwar l-applikazzjoni tad-Direttiva dwar il-Lifts f'Malta.

([1]) Ir-Regolament (KE) Nru 765/2008 tal-Parlament Ewropew u tal-Kunsill tad-9 ta' Lulju 2008 li jistabbilixxi r-rekwiżiti għall-akkreditament u għas-sorveljanza tas-suq relatati mal-kummerċjalizzazzjoni ta' prodotti, u li jħassar ir-Regolament tal-Kunsill (KEE) Nru 339/93.

([2]) Malta Standards Authority, id-Direttorat tas-Sorveljanza tas-Suq, it-tieni sular, Evans Building, Merchants Street MT-Valletta. Tel: +356 21 242420.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009329/12
to the Commission
Louis Grech (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Health and safety of lifts in Malta

It has been reported that a number of lifts in Malta are potentially dangerous and a safety hazard to their users, due to being unregistered and uncertified. The inspection of lifts to ensure that they are in line with EU safety standards is often irregular and haphazard. Lift installers are legally bound to abide by EU standards and regulations, but some choose to operate outside the regulatory system and this naturally puts lift users at risk.

1. Does this issue fall within the remit of the Machinery Directive 2006/42/EC?

2. If so, does the Commission have the necessary mechanisms in place to guarantee the regular rendering of accounts by Member States, in order to ensure that these lifts comply with the above Directive?

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

1. Most lifts for persons or for goods and persons are in the scope of the Lifts Directive 95/16/EC (although lifts for goods only and lifts with a travel speed of less than 0.25 m/s are in the scope of the Machinery Directive 2006/42/EC). The Lifts Directive sets essential health and safety requirements and conformity assessment procedures for new lift installations. The essential requirements of the directive are supported by European harmonised standards.

The safety of lifts installed before the Lifts Directive came into application and the maintenance and in-service inspection of lifts are not subject to EU legislation and thus may be subject to national provisions under the sole responsibility of the Member States.

2. The enforcement of the provisions of the Lifts Directive (market surveillance) is the responsibility of the national authorities in the framework of Regulation (EC) No765/2008 ([1]). Complaints about non-compliant lifts in Malta should therefore be addressed to the Market Surveillance Directorate of the Malta Standards Authority ([2]). If the national authorities fail to fulfil their responsibility to ensure correct application of the EU legislation, complaints may be addressed to the Commission. To date, the Commission has received no complaints about the application of the Lifts Directive in Malta.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 765/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 July 2008 setting out the requirements for accreditation and market surveillance relating to the marketing of products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 339/93.

([2]) Malta Standards Authority, Market Surveillance Directorate, 2nd Floor, Evans Building, Merchants' Str. MT-Valletta, Tel: +356 21 242420.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009330/12
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: British FSB report on the eurozone crisis and falling exports

The British Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) has reported that between the first and third quarters of 2012, the number of British businesses recording an increase in export sales has fallen from 11.3% to 1%.

The eurozone crisis is cited as a major factor in this disturbing statistic.

Does the Commission acknowledge that the eurozone is not only causing problems for those Members States that share the single currency but also for Member States that do not but that are now being drastically affected by the crisis?

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

As regards the export performance of UK SMEs, the analysis presented by FSB ([1]) in their latest report ([2]), points to developments which are arguably positive given the negative growth weakness over the first half of 2012 in the EU. In the words of the FSB, 'the share of businesses with exports comprising between 40% and 80% of revenue has increased', which 'could mean that business has expanded more abroad than at home, or that it has shrunk less than the domestic market.' Additionally, the marked fall in the net balance of firms reporting an increase in foreign sales 'still points to a small expansion on average, as only 27.9% saw falling sales while 43.3% were largely unaffected' while 'the outlook for the coming three months is fairly similar, though more optimistic'.

Besides external demand, an unfavourable external conjuncture, the export performance of the UK has been affected by domestic constraints. The external competitiveness of the UK deteriorated in recent years when UK export market shares fell sharply ([3]). This was partly due to rising unit labour costs as well as to the structural challenges confronting the UK, notably in the areas of transport infrastructure, access to finance (particularly for SMEs), and skills and education. For a review of the recent and prospective external performance of the UK, and the challenges that confront it, the Commission refers to its Occasional Paper on Macroeconomic Imbalances in the UK ([4]) and the Commission Autumn Forecast 2012 ([5]).

([1]) British Federation of Small Businesses.
([2]) Voice of Small Business.
([3]) As reported in the Commission's in-depth review of the UK economy under the Macroeconomic Imbalances Procedure.
([4]) Published June 2012 and available from http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/occasional_paper/2012/pdf/ocp110_en.pdf
([5]) Published on the 7th of November, 2012 and available from http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/european_economy/2012/pdf/ee-2012-1_en.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009331/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Αναθεώρηση του συστήματος καθορισμού του κατώτατου μισθού στην Ελλάδα.

Η θέσπιση του κατώτατου μισθού έχει ως βασικό στόχο, αφενός, τη διαφύλαξη της εργασιακής ειρήνης και δικαιοσύνης μέσα από την προαγωγή της βέλτιστης απόδοσης μεταξύ αμοιβής και παραγωγικότητας, και αφετέρου, τη διασφάλιση της κοινωνικής συνοχής με την προάσπιση των εργαζομένων από τον κίνδυνο της φτώχειας. Στην Ελλάδα υπάρχει ένα συγκεκριμένο σύστημα καθορισμού του κατώτατου μισθού μέσα από την επικύρωση της Εθνικής Γενικής Συλλογικής Σύμβασης Εργασίας, η οποία συνάπτεται με συμφωνία των κοινωνικών εταίρων κατόπιν ελεύθερων συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων. Σε συνέχεια σχετικής διάταξης των Μνημονίων Συνεργασίας για τη διαμόρφωση ενός νέου μηχανισμού καθορισμού κατώτατου μισθού σε εθνικό επίπεδο, προωθείται η αναθεώρηση του συγκεκριμένου συστήματος στην κατεύθυνση του περιορισμού των κοινωνικών εταίρων σε συμβουλευτικό-γνωμοδοτικό ρόλο, με το κράτος να αναλαμβάνει τον καθορισμό του ελάχιστου μισθού και την κυβέρνηση να νομοθετεί τα κατώτατα μισθολογικά όρια. Αξίζει σε αυτό το σημείο να σημειωθεί ότι στη χώρα μας δεν υφίσταται σύστημα ελάχιστου εγγυημένου εισοδήματος, ενώ το μεγαλύτερο μέρος των κοινωνικών επιδομάτων (π.χ. επίδομα ανεργίας κ.λπ.) βρίσκεται σε άμεση σχέση με τον κατώτατο μισθό.

Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Δεδομένου ότι το σύστημα καθορισμού του βασικού μισθού στην Ελλάδα είναι απόλυτα συμβατό με τις ευρωπαϊκές αρχές της συλλογικής αυτονομίας και το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο, κρίνει σκόπιμη την αναθεώρησή του;

2. Πώς αξιολογεί το γεγονός ότι δρομολογείται, με βάση τα Μνημόνια, η λήψη ενός μέτρου μόνιμου χαρακτήρα, όταν έχει τονιστεί μέχρι σήμερα ότι τα μέτρα που αφορούν στο Σύστημα Συλλογικών Διαπραγματεύσεων θα είναι στο σύνολό τους προσωρινού χαρακτήρα;

3. Κατά την άποψή της Επιτροπής και σύμφωνα με σχετικές έρευνες, ποιοι είναι οι ενδεδειγμένοι δείκτες που πρέπει να λαμβάνονται υπόψη κατά τον καθορισμό του ελάχιστου μισθού; Με ποιο τρόπο θα διασφαλιστεί θεσμικά η ουσιαστική συμμετοχή των κοινωνικών εταίρων στη νέα διαδικασία, δεδομένου ότι ο κοινωνικός διάλογος αποτελεί προτεραιότητα για την ΕΕ, αλλά και αρχή του προάγεται και προστατεύεται από το κοινωνικό κεκτημένο;

4. Στο πλαίσιο της ανταλλαγής βέλτιστων πρακτικών, ποιοι δείκτες συνυπολογίζονται για τον προσδιορισμό του ύψους του βασικού μισθού από τα κράτη-μέλη που έχουν αντίστοιχη αρμοδιότητα;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(14 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Στα περισσότερα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ, ο κατώτατος μισθός είναι νομικά κατοχυρωμένος, ήτοι καθορίζεται από την κυβέρνηση και δεν είναι διαπραγματεύσιμος. Στην Ελλάδα, η μετάβαση σε ένα τέτοιο σύστημα δικαιολογείται ώστε να εξασφαλιστεί η έγκαιρη προσαρμογή του κατώτατου μισθού στις μεταβολές των ευρύτερων συνθηκών της αγοράς εργασίας. Δεδομένων των πολύ υψηλών ποσοστών ανεργίας και της ανάγκης να μειωθεί το κόστος παραγωγής στην Ελλάδα, οι ελληνικές αρχές, το Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο, η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα και η Επιτροπή θεώρησαν σκόπιμη την επανεξέταση ορισμένων κανόνων καθορισμού των μισθών, έτσι ώστε να προωθηθεί στενότερη ανταπόκρισή τους στην επιδεινούμενη οικονομική δραστηριότητα, με στόχο να προληφθεί περαιτέρω κατακόρυφη αύξηση της ανεργίας. Το ύψος του κατώτατου μισθού πρέπει να επιτρέπει την προστασία των εργαζομένων με μικρότερη διαπραγματευτική ισχύ και, ως εκ τούτου, να καθορίζει ένα κατώτατο όριο εισοδήματος από την εργασία, συνεκτιμώντας την ανάγκη να μην τεθούν σε κίνδυνο οι δυνατότητες απασχόλησης και, συνεπώς, να μην καθοριστούν οι κατώτατοι μισθοί σε πολύ υψηλά επίπεδα.

Η ακριβής διαδικασία καθορισμού του επιπέδου του κατώτατου μισθού ποικίλει μεταξύ των κρατών μελών. Στο προβλεπόμενο πλαίσιο, το οποίο συμφωνήθηκε βάσει των όρων που προβλέπονται στο δεύτερο Πρόγραμμα Οικονομικής Προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα στις αρχές του 2012, απαιτείται η συμμετοχή των κοινωνικών εταίρων στη διαδικασία λήψης αποφάσεων σχετικά με το ύψος του κατώτατου μισθού. Οι όροι της ειδικής συμμετοχής των κοινωνικών εταίρων επαφίενται στην κρίση του έλληνα νομοθέτη και λαμβάνοντας υπόψη την αυτονομία των θεσμικών φορέων διεξαγωγής συλλογικών διαπραγματεύσεων και του κοινωνικού διαλόγου σε εθνικό και υποεθνικό επίπεδο. Οι προς εξέταση πληροφορίες μπορούν να περιλαμβάνουν: την τρέχουσα και την πιθανολογούμενη εξέλιξη του κόστους ζωής, το μισθολογικό καθεστώς και την ανεργία, καθώς και τη στήριξη του εισοδήματος από την εργασία, προκειμένου να επιτευχθεί ισορροπία μεταξύ της παροχής ενός ελάχιστου εισοδήματος στους εργαζόμενους και της αποφυγής της μείωσης των δυνατοτήτων απασχόλησης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009331/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Revision of the system for determining the minimum wage in Greece

The adoption of a minimum wage has as its main objectives, firstly, the preservation of industrial peace and justice through the promotion of an optimal balance between pay and productivity and, secondly, safeguarding social cohesion by protecting workers from the risk of poverty. In Greece, there is a specific system for determining the minimum wage through the ratification of the National General Collective Labour Agreement, which is concluded by agreement between the social partners following free collective bargaining. As a result of the relevant provisions of the Memoranda of Understanding for the creation of a new mechanism for setting the minimum wage at national level, the revision of the system is being promoted with a view to ensuring that henceforth the social partners will only play a consultative or advisory role, with the State assuming the task of setting the minimum wage and the government legislating on the minimum wage. It is worth noting at this point that in Greece there is no system of guaranteed minimum income, while the bulk of social benefits (e.g. unemployment benefits) are directly related to the minimum wage.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

1. Given that the system for determining basic pay in Greece is fully compatible with European principles of collective autonomy and the European *acquis*, does it consider that it ought to be revised?

2. How does it view the fact that a permanent measure is now being introduced under the terms of the Memoranda, even though it has been emphasised until now that measures relating to the collective bargaining system will all be temporary in nature?

3. In its view and in accordance with relevant research, what are the appropriate indicators to be considered in setting the minimum wage? What institutional measures can be taken to ensure the substantive involvement of the social partners in the new process, given that the social dialogue is a priority for the EU, and also a principle which is promoted and protected by the social *acquis*?

4. As regards the pooling of good practices, what indicators are taken into account in determining the level of minimum pay by Member States which have competences in this area?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(14 December 2012)

In most EU Member States, the minimum wage is statutory, i.e., set by the government and not bargained. Moving to such a system in Greece is justified to ensure timely adaptation of minimum wage to changes in the broad labour market conditions. Against the very high unemployment and the need to lower the costs of producing in Greece, it was found appropriate by the Greek authorities, together with International Monetary Fund, the European Central Bank and the Commission to revise some rules on wage setting with a view to promoting a stronger responsiveness of wages to falling economic activity in order to prevent further sharp increases in joblessness. The level for minimum wage has to balance the protection of those workers with less bargaining power, and thereby to set a floor for labour income, against the need of not jeopardising job opportunities and hence not setting too high minimum wages.

The precise process of setting minimum wage levels varies among Member States. A role for social partners in the decision process on the minimum wage level has been called for in the envisaged framework agreed under the terms of the second economic adjustment programme for Greece set in early 2012. The modalities of the specific involvement of social partners are left to the Greek legislator, including in view of the autonomy of collective bargaining and social dialogue institutions at national and sub-national levels. Information considered can include: prevailing and prospective evolution of cost of living, wage and unemployment conditions, as well as out of work income support in order to strike a balance between providing minimum income to workers and avoiding reducing job opportunities.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009332/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Σημαντικά και διαχρονικά αποδυναμωμένη η ειδικότητα του γιατρού εργασίας στην Ελλάδα

Η διασφάλιση συνθηκών υγείας και ασφάλειας στην εργασία αποτελεί μείζονος σημασίας ζήτημα που υπαγορεύεται από πληθώρα ανθρωπιστικών αλλά και οικονομικών λόγων, καθώς, αφενός, αναβαθμίζει το πλέγμα προστασίας και την ποιότητα ζωής των εργαζομένων, ενώ, αφετέρου, συμβάλλει ουσιαστικά στην αύξηση της παραγωγικότητας και ανταγωνιστικότητας των επιχειρήσεων. Ο όγκος του εργατικού (και του εν δυνάμει) δυναμικού αλλά και οι ώρες εργασίας σε καθημερινή βάση καθιστούν την υγεία και ασφάλεια στην εργασία αναπόσπαστο κομμάτι της δημόσιας υγείας. Σύμφωνα με διεθνείς μελέτες, η συντριπτική πλειοψηφία των εργατικών ατυχημάτων και των επαγγελματικών ασθενειών μπορούν να προληφθούν. Κατ' αυτόν τον τρόπο, η «ιατρική της εργασίας» είναι μια ειδικότητα με πολύ συγκεκριμένα χαρακτηριστικά, που διαδραματίζει έναν εξαιρετικά καθοριστικό και νευραλγικό ρόλο στην πρόληψη των επαγγελματικών κινδύνων μέσα από την έγκαιρη πρόληψη, τη διάγνωση των δυσμενών επιπτώσεων της εργασίας στην υγεία, τη θεραπευτική αντιμετώπιση και αποκατάσταση των πασχόντων και την εν γένει επιστημονική συμβολή και τήρηση του εκτεταμένου θεσμικού πλαισίου που έχει καθιερωθεί από πλήθος οδηγιών της ΕΕ. Στην Ελλάδα, παρόλο που η εν λόγω ειδικότητα έχει θεσμοθετηθεί νομικά από το 1986, καταγράφεται ένας ιδιαίτερα περιορισμένος αριθμός ειδικών ιατρών εργασίας, με συνέπεια το μεγαλύτερο μέρος της συγκεκριμένης δραστηριότητας να καλύπτεται άτυπα και εκτός νόμου από γιατρούς άλλων ειδικοτήτων, γεγονός που δημιουργεί, μεταξύ άλλων, σημαντικές (ακόμα και εγκληματικές) ελλείψεις τόσο στη διαφύλαξη και προαγωγή της επαγγελματικής υγείας, όσο και στην ουσιαστική εφαρμογή της σχετικής νομοθεσίας. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο και με δεδομένο ότι η προαγωγή της υγείας και ασφάλειας στην εργασία υπήρξε ανέκαθεν μια από τις βασικές αρχές της ευρωπαϊκής ολοκλήρωσης, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει στοιχεία για τον αριθμό των ιατρών εργασίας και των σχετικών υποδομών στα κράτη-μέλη; Αν ναι, ποια είναι η αναλογία εργαζομένων προς ιατρό εργασία ανά κράτος-μέλος; Ποια θεωρεί, σύμφωνα και με αντίστοιχες μελέτες, ενδεδειγμένη αναλογία;

2. Σκοπεύει να προβεί σε σχετικές συστάσεις προς τις χώρες που εμφανίζουν ελλείψεις στη συγκεκριμένη ειδικότητα;

3. Προτίθεται να προωθήσει την ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών, ώστε να αναδειχθούν οι πλέον ενδεδειγμένοι τρόποι για την ανάπτυξη της ειδικότητας του ιατρού εργασίας;

Απάντηση του κ. Andor εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(13 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

1. Η Επιτροπή (Eurostat) συλλέγει στοιχεία που σχετίζονται με τον αριθμό των ιατρών που ειδικεύονται στην ιατρική της εργασίας. Τα εν λόγω στοιχεία περιλαμβάνονται στον πίνακα του παραρτήματος μαζί με τα στοιχεία για τον ενεργό πληθυσμό και την αναλογία εργαζομένων προς ιατρό εργασίας στην ιατρική της εργασίας.

2 και 3. Η Επιτροπή, δεν σκοπεύει, επί του παρόντος, να προβεί σε σχετικές συστάσεις ή να προωθήσει την ανταλλαγή βέλτιστων πρακτικών, αλλά θα θα εξετάσει το θέμα της συγκέντρωσης πληροφοριών σχετικά με το ζήτημα αυτό. Το εν λόγω ζήτημα έχει υπάρξει αντικείμενο συζήτησης και στο παρελθόν και μερικά από τα συμπεράσματα παρατίθενται σε έκθεση του ΠΟΥ ([1]), στην οποία αναλύεται ειδικότερα η ενσωμάτωση της ιατρικής της εργασίας στην Ευρώπη.

([1]) Η ιατρική της εργασίας στην Ευρώπη: Πεδίο εφαρμογής και αρμοδιότητες των ιατρών εργασίας, Ευρωπαϊκό κέντρο του ΠΟΥ για το περιβάλλον και την υγεία, Bilthoven, στο σύνδεσμο http://www.who.int/occupational_health/regions/en/oeheuroccmedicine.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009332/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Specialty of industrial medicine increasingly at risk in Greece

Ensuring proper health and safety conditions at work is an issue of major importance that is vital for many humanitarian and economic reasons: on the one hand, it reinforces the protection and improves the quality of life of workers, while, on the other, it contributes substantially to increasing productivity and competitiveness. The size of workforce (and the potential workforce) and the daily working hours make health and safety at work an integral part of public health. According to international studies, the overwhelming majority of industrial accidents and occupational diseases are preventable. Thus 'industrial medicine' is a specialty with very specific characteristics, which plays an extremely crucial and pivotal role in preventing occupational risks through the timely prevention and diagnosis of the adverse impacts of work on health, through treatment and the rehabilitation of patients and, more generally, through the scientific contribution it makes and compliance with the comprehensive institutional framework established by a host of EU directives. In Greece, although this speciality has existed legally since 1986, there are only a very small number of specialists in industrial medicine; this means that most of the work in this area is performed unofficially and outside a legal framework by doctors who are specialists in other areas; this leads, inter alia, to significant (even criminal) shortcomings both in the preservation and promotion of industrial health and in the effective implementation of legislation in this area. In this context, and given that the promotion of health and safety at work has always been one of the basic principles of European integration, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have any information on the number of specialists in industrial medicine and the relevant infrastructure in Member States? If so, what is the ratio of workers to specialists in industrial medicine in each Member State? In the light of studies carried out in this area, what does it consider to be an appropriate ratio?

2. Does it intend to make recommendations in this connection to the countries where this speciality is under-represented?

3. Will it promote exchanges of best practices in order to identify the most appropriate ways of developing the specialty of industrial medicine?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2012)

1. The Commission (Eurostat) collect data related to the number of physicians specialising in occupational medicine. They are provided in the annexed table together with the active population and the ratio workers to specialists in occupational medicine.

2 and 3. The Commission has no plans currently to make such recommendations or promote the exchange of best practice, but it will consider gathering information on the issue. The issue has been debated before, and some conclusions are set out in a WHO report ([1]), which in particular discusses the integration of occupational medicine in Europe.

([1]) Occupational Medicine in Europe: Scope and Competencies, WHO European Centre for Environment and Health, Bilthoven, at http://www.who.int/occupational_health/regions/en/oeheuroccmedicine.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009333/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Το πρόβλημα της κατανάλωσης αλκοόλ στις ηλικίες 13-18 ετών

Σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία της έρευνας ESPAD 2011, που διεξήχθη από το Ερευνητικό Πανεπιστημιακό Ινστιτούτο Ψυχικής Υγείας και τα κέντρα πρόληψης σε συνεργασία με τον ΟΚΑΝΑ, αναφορικά με την κατανάλωση οινοπνευματωδών ποτών από μαθητές στην Ελλάδα μεταξύ των ηλικιών 13-19 ετών φάνηκε ότι:

— το 60,4% των μαθητών δήλωσαν ότι ήπιαν κάποιο οινοπνευματώδες ποτό τον τελευταίο μήνα πριν από την έρευνα

— ενώ το 11,3% ήπιε τουλάχιστον 10 φορές τον τελευταίο μήνα.

Η κατανάλωση αλκοόλ κατά τη διάρκεια των μαθητικών ετών έχει συνδεθεί κυρίως με οικογενειακά και κοινωνικά —εν γένει — προβλήματα. Η σοβαρότητα και επικινδυνότητα της εν λόγω κατάστασης καταδεικνύεται από το γεγονός ότι στην Ευρώπη έχει αποδειχθεί ότι ένας στους τέσσερις θανάτους στις ηλικίες μεταξύ 15-29 ετών συνδέεται άμεσα ή έμμεσα με το οινόπνευμα. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Διαθέτει στοιχεία σχετικά με την κατανάλωση οινοπνευματωδών ποτών από μαθητές ηλικίας 13-18 ετών σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο αλλά και ανά κράτος μέλος;

2. Ποια θεωρείται η βασική αιτία κατανάλωσης αλκοόλ σε αυτές τις ηλικίες; Μπορεί να στοιχειοθετηθεί σχέση ανάμεσα στις ακραίες κοινωνικές συνθήκες που διαμορφώθηκαν έπειτα από την εμφάνιση της οικονομική κρίσης και των κρουσμάτων κατανάλωσης αλκοόλ στην παιδική ή εφηβική ηλικία;

3. Υπάρχουν ποσοστά όσον αφορά στους θανάτους που συνδέονται με την κατανάλωση αλκοόλ στις ηλικίες 13-18 ετών;

4. Ποιες ενέργειες έχουν δρομολογηθεί σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο για την αντιμετώπιση του συγκεκριμένου ζητήματος;

Απάντηση του κ. Borg εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Οι βασικές πηγές συγκρίσιμων στοιχείων σχετικά με τη χρήση ουσιών, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της κατανάλωσης αλκοόλ, από τους νέους στην Ευρώπη είναι: το ευρωπαϊκό πρόγραμμα ερευνών στον μαθητικό πληθυσμό σχετικά με την κατανάλωση αλκοόλ και τα άλλα ναρκωτικά (ESPAD) ([1]), η έρευνα για τη συμπεριφορά των παιδιών σχολικής ηλικίας απέναντι σε θέματα υγείας (HBSC) ([2]) και οι έρευνες του Ευρωβαρομέτρου ([3]).

Οι διαθέσιμες έρευνες σχετικά με τη διασύνδεση των κοινωνικών συνθηκών και της κατανάλωσης αλκοόλ από παιδιά και νέους είναι ελάχιστες. Σε γενικές γραμμές, οι νέοι που ζουν σε λιγότερο εύπορα νοικοκυριά είναι περισσότερο ευάλωτοι και είναι πιο πιθανό να εμφανίσουν συμπτώματα κακής κατάστασης της υγείας. Ωστόσο, η εικόνα που διαθέτουμε είναι περίπλοκη για να την συνδέσουμε με επικίνδυνες συμπεριφορές ([4]).

Όσον αφορά τους θανάτους που σχετίζονται με το αλκοόλ, η Eurostat διαθέτει τους αριθμούς των θανάτων που οφείλονται σε ψυχικές και συμπεριφορικές διαταραχές, οι οποίες έχουν σχέση με την κατάχρηση αλκοόλ από νέους ηλικίας κάτω των 15 ετών (10 έως 14), καθώς και από 15 έως 19 ετών ([5]).

([1]) http://www.espad.org/en/Reports--Documents/ESPAD-Reports/.
([2]) http://www.euro.who.int/en/what-we-do/health-topics/Life-stages/child-and-adolescent-health/adolescent-health/health-behaviour-in-school-aged-children-hbsc2.-who-collaborative-cross-national-study-of-children-aged-1115.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/alcohol/eurobarometers/index_en.htm
([4]) Έκθεση 2012 για τους κοινωνικούς παράγοντες που επηρεάζουν την υγεία και την ευημερία μεταξύ των νέων (ΠΟΥ).
([5]) http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_cd_anr&lang=en.

Το 2006 η Επιτροπή ενέκρινε τη στρατηγική της ΕΕ για την υποστήριξη των κρατών μελών στην προσπάθεια τους να μειώσουν τις βλάβες που προκαλούνται από το οινόπνευμα ([6]). Μία από τις πέντε προτεραιότητές της είναι η προστασία των παιδιών και των νέων. Η ΕΕ εφαρμόζει τη στρατηγική σε συνεργασία με τα κράτη μέλη και τους ενδιαφερόμενους φορείς και, προς τον σκοπό αυτό, ίδρυσε το ευρωπαϊκό φόρουμ για το οινόπνευμα και την υγεία και την επιτροπή εθνικής πολιτικής και δράσης για το οινόπνευμα.

([6]) Ανακοίνωση της 24ης Οκτωβρίου 2006, μια στρατηγική της ΕΕ για τη στήριξη των κρατών μελών στην προσπάθεια τους να μειώσουν τις βλάβες που προκαλούνται από το οινόπνευμα (COM(2006)625 τελικό). http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0625en01.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009333/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: The problem of alcohol consumption among 13 to 18 year-olds

The ESPAD 2011 study which was conducted by the University Mental Health Research Institute and prevention centres in collaboration with OKANA into the consumption of alcoholic beverages by students in Greece between the 13 to 19 years of age found that:

— 60.4% of students said they had drunk an alcoholic beverage in the month preceding the survey;

— 11.3% had drunk an alcoholic beverage on at least 10 occasions during the same time span.

Alcohol consumption during student years has been associated mainly with family and social problems in general. The gravity of this situation and the danger it represents are illustrated by the fact that in Europe it has been established that one in four deaths between the ages of 15 to 29 is directly or indirectly related to alcohol. In this context, will the Commission say:

1. Does it have any data on the consumption of alcoholic beverages by students aged between 13 and 18 at European level and in individual Member States?

2. What is the root cause of alcohol consumption at this age? Can a link be made between the extreme social conditions that have developed since the onset of the economic crisis and the incidence of alcohol consumption in childhood or adolescence?

3. Are any figures available for alcohol-related deaths for pupils between 13 and 18 years of age?

4. What action has been taken at European level to tackle this issue?

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

The main sources of comparable information across Europe on substance use among young people including alcohol consumption are: the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and other Drugs (ESPAD) ([1]), the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children study (HBSC) ([2]) and the Eurobarometer surveys ([3]).

Research available on the link between social conditions and use of alcohol in children and young people is scarce. Overall, young people living in low-affluence households are more likely to report fair or poor health. The picture is, however, complex for risk taking behaviours ([4]).

Regarding alcohol-related deaths, Eurostat provides numbers of deaths due to mental and behavioural disorders related to alcohol abuse for young people under 15 years(10 to 14) and aged 15 to 19 years ([5]).

In 2006 the Commission adopted the EU Strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol related harm ([6]). One of its five priorities is to protect children and young people. The EU is implementing the strategy in cooperation with Member States and stakeholders and established the European Alcohol and Health Forum and the Committee on National Alcohol Policy and Action to that effect.

([1]) http://www.espad.org/en/Reports--Documents/ESPAD-Reports/.
([2]) http://www.euro.who.int/en/what-we-do/health-topics/Life-stages/child-and-adolescent-health/adolescent-health/health-behaviour-in-school-aged-children-hbsc2.-who-collaborative-cross-national-study-of-children-aged-1115.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/alcohol/eurobarometers/index_en.htm
([4]) 2012 report on social determinants of health and wellbeing among young people (WHO).
([5]) http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=hlth_cd_anr&lang=en.
([6]) Communication of 24 October 2006, An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol related harm (COM(2006) 625 final): http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0625en01.pdf

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-009334/12
komissiolle
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(15. lokakuuta 2012)

Aihe: EU:n sisäisen kulutuksen tehokkaampi hyödyntäminen

Euroopan unionin 27 jäsenvaltion ja yli 500 miljoonan kansalaisen kulutukseen liittyy valtava taloudellinen potentiaali. Tämän potentiaalin tehokkaampi hyödyntäminen unionin sisällä voisi nyt talouskriisin keskellä tukea merkittävällä tavalla talouskasvua ja työllisyyttä.

Harkitseeko komissio sekä markkinoinnin että kulutuksen ohjaamista EU:n sisällä niin, että hankintapäätökset ja kulutus kohdistuisivat nykyistä keskitetymmin unionin sisällä valmistettuihin tuotteisiin?

Michel Barnier'n komission puolesta antama vastaus
(18. joulukuuta 2012)

Komission mielestä sen ei ole asianmukaista ohjata markkinointia ja kulutusta EU:n sisällä siten, että hankintamenettelyt ja kulutus keskittyisivät nykyistä enemmän unionin sisällä valmistettuihin tuotteisiin.

EU:n on noudatettava tekemiään kansainvälisiä sopimuksia, joissa määrätään julkisten hankintojen kautta tapahtuvasta markkinoille pääsystä. Tällaisia sopimuksia ovat esim. julkisia hankintoja koskeva WTO:n monenvälinen sopimus (GPA) ja kahdenväliset vapaakauppasopimukset. Näissä sopimuksissa EU velvoitetaan kohtelemaan muiden sopimuspuolten ja EU:n tuotteita, palveluja, tavaroiden luovuttajia ja palvelujen suorittajia samalla tavalla.

Tällaisten kansainvälisten sopimusten soveltamisalan ulkopuolelle jäävistä kolmansien maiden tavaroista on laadittu asetusehdotus, jota käsitellään parhaillaan Euroopan parlamentissa ja neuvostossa. Ehdotuksen tarkoituksena ei kuitenkaan ole ohjata EU:n julkisia hankintoja siten, että EU:n tuotantoa suosittaisiin, vaan kyseessä on pikemminkin vastavuoroisuutta edistävä väline, jolla pyritään varmistamaan eurooppalaisten tavaroiden ja palvelujen helpompi pääsy ulkomaisille hankintamarkkinoille. Siinä annettaisiin komissiolle ehdollinen mahdollisuus toteuttaa korjaavia toimenpiteitä (mukaan lukien markkinoille pääsyn rajoittaminen) tarjouksille, jotka koskevat sellaisten maiden alkuperätavaroita tai -palveluja, jotka eivät päästä EU:n yrityksiä vastavuoroisesti hankintamarkkinoilleen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009334/12
to the Commission
Hannu Takkula (ALDE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: More effective exploitation of the EU's internal consumption

The consumption of the 27 Member States of the European Union and of their more than 500 million citizens is a source of enormous economic potential. If this potential were put to more effective use within the Union, this could now, in the midst of the economic crisis, do a good deal to support economic growth and employment.

Is the Commission considering guiding marketing and consumption within the EU in such a way that procurement projects and consumption focus more than at present on products produced within the Union?

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

The Commission does not believe that it would be appropriate for it to guide marketing and consumption within the EU in such a way that procurement projects and consumption focus more than at present on products produced within the Union.

The EU is bound by international agreements to which it is a Party and which cover market access on public procurement, either plurilaterally such as the WTO Government Procurement Agreement (GPA) or bilaterally such as Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). The GPA as well as FTAs with a procurement chapter oblige the EU to provide to the products, services and suppliers of its counterparts a treatment no less favourable than the one accorded to its domestic products, services and suppliers.

With respect to the third country goods or services not covered by these international agreements, a proposed Regulation is in discussion in Parliament and Council. This proposal is not meant to guide public procurement in the EU in a way that would favour EU production. Rather, it is an instrument to promote reciprocity, so as to ensure that better access for European goods and services to foreign procurement markets. It would conditionally allow the Commission to take corrective measures (including restricting access) for bids comprising goods or services originating in countries which do not reciprocally allow EU companies access to their procurement markets.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009335/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 octobre 2012)

Objet: Surveillance du marché des médicaments inutiles au niveau européen

Deux éminents professeurs de médecine viennent de publier en France les résultats d'une étude portant sur 4 000 médicaments («Guide des médicaments»). Les conclusions de cette étude font ressortir que «la moitié des médicaments sont inutiles, 20 % présentent des risques et 5 % sont potentiellement très dangereux».

Étant donné la qualité des auteurs, l'étendue de l'échantillon utilisé et l'implication du corps médical, la Commission peut-elle répondre aux questions suivantes?

1. A-t-elle pris connaissance de telles études ou d'autres études similaires menées à l'intérieur de l'Union européenne?

2. Ne juge-t-elle pas urgent de charger l'Agence européenne des médicaments de procéder à une évaluation approfondie des conclusions de tels travaux?

3. Ne considère-t-elle pas que le rôle des laboratoires pharmaceutiques, en raison des implications directes en jeu sur la santé et donc la vie des citoyens, ne peut pas se limiter à maximiser les profits?

4. En raison des implications profondes des prescriptions sur les budgets de la sécurité sociale, la vigilance des autorités publiques ne devrait-elle pas être encore renforcée?

5. Les relations étroites entre laboratoires pharmaceutiques et corps médical ne devraient-elles pas être mieux encadrées afin de réduire l'influence et même la pression de l'industrie sur la bonne foi du corps médical?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(18 décembre 2012)

1. La Commission ne sait pas si des études semblables à celle mentionnée par l'auteur de la question ont été menées dans l'Union européenne.

2. La législation pharmaceutique de l'Union ([1]), ([2]) a été récemment modifiée afin de renforcer encore le contrôle des médicaments sur le marché ([3]). Elle prévoit désormais une amélioration de la détection, de l'évaluation et du suivi des effets indésirables. Elle habilite également les autorités compétentes à imposer la réalisation d'études d'innocuité et d'efficacité supplémentaires au moment de l'octroi de l'autorisation de mise sur le marché ou ultérieurement. En vertu de ces règles, l'Agence européenne des médicaments s'est vu confier de nouvelles responsabilités, dont la surveillance des données d'innocuité. Elle sera donc chargée d'évaluer l'innocuité des médicaments, le cas échéant.

3. Une entreprise pharmaceutique qui demande une autorisation de mise sur le marché ou qui est titulaire d'une telle autorisation doit se conformer à toutes les obligations fixées par la législation de l'Union applicable en la matière. Par ailleurs, la Commission a entamé une réflexion sur la responsabilité des entreprises dans le domaine pharmaceutique ([4]).

4. et 5. La législation pharmaceutique de l'Union contient des dispositions sur la publicité pour les médicaments faite auprès des personnes habilitées à les prescrire. Toutefois, il est de la compétence des États membres de contrôler la publicité et l'activité des professionnels de la santé et, en particulier, la manière dont ceux-ci prescrivent les médicaments.

([1]) Directive 2001/83/CE instituant un code communautaire relatif aux médicaments à usage humain (JO L 311 du 28.11.2001, p. 67), telle que modifiée.

([2]) Règlement (CE) n° 726/2004 établissant des procédures communautaires pour l'autorisation et la surveillance en ce qui concerne les médicaments à usage humain et à usage vétérinaire, et instituant une Agence européenne des médicaments (JO L 136 du 30.4.2004, p. 1), tel que modifié.

([3]) Règlement (UE) n° 1235/2010 modifiant, en ce qui concerne la pharmacovigilance des médicaments à usage humain, le règlement (CE) n° 726/2004 (JO L 348 du 31.12.2010, p. 1) et directive 2010/84/UE modifiant, en ce qui concerne la pharmacovigilance, la directive 2001/83/CE (JO L 348 du 31.12.2010, p. 74).

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/healthcare/competitiveness/process_on_corporate_responsibility/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009335/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Monitoring at EU level of ineffective drugs

Two eminent professors of medicine have just published in France the results of a study of 4 000 drugs. The conclusions state that half the drugs concerned are ineffective, and thus prescribed unnecessarily, 20% pose a risk to health and 5% are potentially very dangerous.

Given the reputations of the authors, the size of the sample studied and the involvement of members of the medical profession, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Does it know if other similar studies have been conducted in the EU?

2. Is it not time to ask the European Medicines Agency to carry out a detailed analysis of the conclusions of studies of this kind?

3. Does it not take the view that the role of pharmaceutical laboratories should not be confined simply to maximising drug company profits, given the direct link between their work and public health?

4. Given that the cost of prescriptions accounts for a substantial proportion of social security budgets, should the public authorities not step up even further their supervision of the way drugs are prescribed?

5. Should the close links between pharmaceutical laboratories and the medical profession not be regulated more closely with a view to reducing the influence, which in some cases actually amounts to pressure, which the pharmaceuticals industry exerts on doctors?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(18 December 2012)

1. The Commission is not informed if other studies, similar to the one referred to by the Honourable Member, have been conducted in the EU.

2. The EU's pharmaceutical legislation ([1]), ([2]) has been amended recently to further strengthen the control of medicines on the market ([3]). It now foresees better detection, assessment and follow-up of adverse reactions. It also empowers competent authorities to impose additional safety and efficacy studies as part of the marketing authorisation or as a post-authorisation obligation. Under these rules, the European Medicines Agency has been assigned new responsibilities, including the monitoring of safety data. The agency will therefore be tasked to assess the safety of medicines, where appropriate.

3. A pharmaceutical company, as an applicant or as a marketing authorisation holder, has to comply with all obligations set out by the EU pharmaceutical legislation. In addition, the Commission is pursuing a process on corporate responsibility in the pharmaceutical industry ([4]).

4. and 5. The EU's pharmaceutical legislation includes provisions on advertising and promotion of medicinal products to persons qualified to prescribe them. However, the control of advertisement and supervision of health professionals in particular with regard to how they prescribe pharmaceuticals falls under the competence of the Member States.

([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]) Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency (OJ L 136, 30.4.2004) as amended.
([3]) Regulation (EU) No 1235/2010 amending Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 as regards pharmacovigilance of medicinal products for human use (OJ L 348, 31.12.2010, p. 10) and Directive 2010/84/EU amending and Directive 2001/83/EC as regards pharmacovigilance of medicinal products for human use (OJ L 348, 31.12.2010, p. 74).
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/healthcare/competitiveness/process_on_corporate_responsibility/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009336/12
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(15 octobre 2012)

Objet: Protéger les infrastructures critiques sans léser les utilisateurs finals

Suivant les orientations posées par le programme européen de protection des infrastructures critiques de 2006, l'Europe s'est dotée d'un cadre visant à améliorer la protection de ses infrastructures critiques. L'interconnexion toujours plus poussée du marché intérieur, et les conséquences que toute perturbation de ces installations pourrait avoir à l'échelle de l'Union, rendent une action commune dans ce domaine nécessaire.

Mais l'encadrement législatif est resté en deçà de l'évolution rapide du nombre et de la dangerosité des menaces qui touchent aujourd'hui ces infrastructures, parmi lesquelles notamment les cyberattaques ou encore les évènements naturels, dont l'ampleur comme la périodicité pourraient être renforcées sous les effets du changement climatique.

Il est louable que ce cadre réglementaire fasse actuellement l'objet d'une réflexion globale visant à l'adapter à ces nouveaux besoins.

Cependant, avec l'accroissement des menaces, ce sont aussi les coûts pour les exploitants et les opérateurs de ces infrastructures qui vont augmenter. Toute révision du cadre réglementaire devra répondre au dilemme suivant: comment accroître la protection des infrastructures sans accroître ni la charge administrative, ni la charge financière sur les opérateurs, et sans surtout que les utilisateurs finals n'en pâtissent?

Compte tenu de l'importance de garantir l'accès de tous les citoyens à une énergie sûre et abordable, je souhaite exprimer ma vive inquiétude quant aux répercussions que ces coûts pourraient avoir sur le secteur gazier, et sur les tarifs pratiqués sur les consommateurs finals.

Une proposition de révision de la directive EPCIP est attendue pour la fin de l'année 2012. La Commission est-elle en mesure de nous indiquer, dès aujourd'hui, si et comment elle envisage de prendre en compte cette question de la répercussion des coûts en vue d'assurer un prix équitable pour les opérateurs et qui protège les utilisateurs?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(12 décembre 2012)

Le programme européen de protection des infrastructures critiques (PEPIC) ([1]) et la directive 2008/114/CE du Conseil du 8 décembre 2008 concernant le recensement et la désignation des infrastructures critiques européennes ainsi que l'évaluation de la nécessité d'améliorer leur protection ([2]), ont constitué la première étape de l'établissement d'un cadre juridique en la matière.

La directive oblige les exploitants des infrastructures critiques européennes à établir un plan de sûreté pour les exploitants (PSE), qui devrait être fondé sur l'analyse de risques, un processus comprenant la détermination des menaces. Afin de bien comprendre ces menaces (d'ordre physique ou informatique), la contribution des organismes nationaux de sécurité est essentielle.

La Commission est consciente de l'augmentation des risques liés aux menaces informatiques, et les gestionnaires des systèmes de transport de gaz et d'électricité ([3]) œuvrent actuellement à répondre à ce défi croissant.

En outre, la Commission élabore actuellement des initiatives en matière de cybercriminalité ([4]), notamment une proposition de directive sur la sécurité des réseaux et de l'information.

Les coûts liés à la protection ne peuvent être pleinement mesurés qu'une fois que l'évaluation des risques susmentionnée sera menée à bien par les opérateurs et intégrée dans le coût global des activités de l'entreprise. Une meilleure compréhension de ces facteurs par toutes les parties prenantes ne peut qu'avoir un effet positif en établissant le meilleur rapport qualité/prix pour les «frais» nécessaires en matière de sécurité.

([1]) http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/fight_against_terrorism/l33260_fr.htm
([2]) JO L (345) du 23.12.2008.
([3]) www.entsoe.eu; www.entsog.eu; www.gie.eu.com.
([4]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/telecoms-internet/cyber-security.

La Commission procède actuellement à l’évaluation de la directive 2008/114/CE ainsi que du cadre général du PEPIC et présentera ses conclusions au début de l’année 2013 dans une communication de la Commission. Le programme actualisé contiendra vraisemblablement une proposition relative à une approche plus pratique de la protection des infrastructures critiques, notamment dans le domaine de l’énergie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009336/12
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Protecting critical infrastructure without damaging the interests of final users

On the basis of the guidelines laid down as part of the 2006 European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP), Europe has drawn up a set of rules designed to improve the protection of its critical infrastructure. The ever greater degree of integration of the internal market and the impact which any disruption of critical infrastructure could have at Union level make joint action in this area essential.

However, legislative provisions have not kept pace with the rapid increase in the number and seriousness of the threats to critical infrastructure, which today include cyber attacks and even exceptional weather events, which are likely to become more devastating and more frequent as a result of climate change.

The current review of the rules, with the aim of taking account of these new imperatives, is a welcome step.

However, the increase in the level of threat is generating additional costs for the operators of items of critical infrastructure. Any revision of the rules will have to solve the following dilemma: how can infrastructure protection be improved without increasing the administrative burden on and costs incurred by operators and, in particular, without damaging the interests final users?

Given the importance of guaranteeing universal access to safe and affordable energy, I have grave concerns about the impact which any increase in costs could have on the gas sector and on the prices charged to final consumers.

A proposal to revise the EPCIP Directive is due to be put forward before the end of 2012. Can the Commission state now whether and how it plans to take account of this issue of increased costs and the way they are passed on with a view to guaranteeing fair prices for operators and safeguarding the interests of final users?

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

The European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection (EPCIP) ([1]) and Directive 2008/114/EC of 8 December 2008 ([2]), on the identification and designation of European critical infrastructures and the assessment of the need to improve their protection, represented the first step in establishing a legal framework on the subject.

The directive mandates the operators of European Critical Infrastructures to establish an Operator Security Plan (OSP) which should be based on the analysis of risk, a process involving the identification of threats. In order to rightly understand these threats (physical or cyber), input from National security bodies is crucial.

The Commission is aware of the increasing risks related to cyber-threats, and the Electricity and Gas Transmission System Operators ([3]) are currently working on this rising challenge.

Moreover, the Commission is working on initiatives on cyber-security ([4]), including a proposal for a directive on Network and Information Security.

The costs associated with protection can only fully be measured once the abovementioned assessment of risk is completed by the operators and integrated in the overall cost of operations of the company. Better understanding of these factors by all stakeholders can only have a positive effect in establishing the best value for money in the necessary security ‘costs’.

The Commission is currently assessing Directive 2008/114/EC as well as the overall EPCIP framework, the outcome of which is due to be presented in a Commission Communication early in 2013. The updated Programme is likely to contain a proposal on a more practical approach to critical infrastructure protection, including in the field of energy.

([1]) http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/fight_against_terrorism/l33260_en.htm
([2]) OJ 2008 L (345), 23.12.2008.
([3]) www.entsoe.eu; www.entsog.eu; www.gie.eu.com
([4]) https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/telecoms-Internet/cyber-security

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-009337/12
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(15 octobre 2012)

Objet: Comment encourager l'apprentissage des langues étrangères dès le plus jeune âge?

L'apprentissage des langues étrangères est l'une des meilleures armes de la jeunesse européenne face à la crise actuelle. La diversité linguistique constitue une richesse pour notre continent, à la fois économique et culturelle. La maîtrise des langues étrangères est essentielle pour la mobilité des citoyens européens, le bon fonctionnement du marché unique et la compétitivité des entreprises de l'Union.

Débuter l'apprentissage d'une langue à un très jeune âge permet aux enfants de maîtriser cette langue plus rapidement, d'apprendre d'autres langues plus facilement, et de mieux maîtriser leur propre langue maternelle.

Le Parlement Européen a lui-même souligné la nécessité que chacun acquière d'excellentes capacités linguistiques dès le plus jeune âge, dans sa résolution «Éducation, formation et Europe 2020» du 11 septembre dernier.

On peut donc se féliciter de la tendance décrite dans le récent rapport «Chiffres-clés de l'enseignement des langues à l'école en Europe — 2012», qui éclaire le fait que la plupart des enfants européens commencent aujourd'hui l'apprentissage d'une langue étrangère en moyenne entre six et neuf ans.

Pourtant, l'Europe peut encore mieux faire, comme le démontre l'exemple de la Belgique, où les enfants de la communauté germanophone commencent à apprendre une langue étrangère dès l'âge de trois ans.

Développer de telles pratiques, voire même encourager l'acquisition de connaissances linguistiques avant l'école, est nécessaire pour s'assurer que le marché unique, la mobilité professionnelle et la compétitivité ne soient pas des coquilles vides, mais deviennent une réalité concrète pour nos concitoyens.

Dans cet esprit, quelles mesures la Commission envisage-t-elle de prendre pour encourager les États membres à développer un apprentissage des langues étrangères dès le plus jeune âge?

Réponse donnée par Mme Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(3 décembre 2012)

En 2011, la Commission a publié le «guide stratégique pour un apprentissage efficace et durable des langues au niveau préscolaire» ([1]). Ce guide est le résultat des travaux de recherche et des débats menés par un groupe thématique d'experts nationaux réunis dans le cadre de la méthode ouverte de coordination en matière d'éducation et de formation. Ce document examine les bienfaits de l'étude d'une langue étrangère dès le plus jeune âge, ainsi que les conditions à remplir pour un apprentissage réussi, et présente divers exemples de bonnes pratiques transposables dans les autres États membres.

Par ailleurs, plusieurs initiatives liées à l'étude des langues dès le plus jeune âge se sont vu attribuer le label européen des langues, créé par la Commission pour mettre en valeur les initiatives en faveur d'activités d'apprentissage des langues créatives et innovantes — plus d'informations à l'adresse
(http://ec.europa.eu/education/language/label/index.cfm).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/languages/pdf/ellpwp_fr.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009337/12
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: How can foreign-language learning from a very early age be encouraged?

Learning foreign languages is one of the best avenues open to young people in Europe to escape the current crisis. Linguistic diversity is both an economic and a cultural asset for Europe. Having a good command of foreign languages is essential to the mobility of EU citizens, the proper functioning of the single market and the competitiveness of EU businesses.

Learning a foreign language from a very early age enables children to become proficient in that language more quickly, to learn other languages more easily and to develop a better command of their own mother tongue.

The European Parliament underlined the need for children to acquire excellent language skills from a very early age in its resolution of 11 September 2012 entitled 'Education, training and Europe 2020'.

We should welcome, therefore, the trend described in the recent report 'Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe — 2012', which highlighted the fact that most children in Europe now start learning a foreign language between the ages of six and nine.

However, Europe can still do better, as illustrated by the case of Belgium, where children from the German-speaking community start learning a foreign language when they are just three years old.

Developing similar practices, and perhaps even encouraging some language learning for pre-primary children, is essential if the single market, labour mobility and competitiveness are not to remain empty concepts and instead become a reality for EU citizens.

With this in mind, what measures is the Commission planning to take to encourage Member States to develop foreign-language learning for very young children?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(3 December 2012)

In 2011 the Commission published the Policy Handbook 'Language learning at pre-primary school level: making it efficient and sustainable' ([1]). This handbook is the result of the research and the discussions taking place in a thematic working group of national experts in the framework of the open method of coordination on education and training. It examines the benefits of an early start in foreign language acquisition, as well as the necessary conditions for ensuring its success, and proposes various examples of good practice that could be replicated in other Member States.

Several projects related to early language learning were also awarded the European Language Label, a scheme established by the Commission to highlight initiatives that successfully promote creative and innovative language-learning activities (for more information see: http://ec.europa.eu/education/language/label/index.cfm).

([1]) See http://ec.europa.eu/languages/pdf/ellpwp_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009338/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Egg products

The European Union has brought in legislation to ensure minimum laying standards for hens (Directive 1999/74/EC). However, the EU still allows the import of eggs and egg products from third countries, some of which do not have such high animal welfare standards.

EU labelling rules ensure that consumers are informed as to the conditions in which hens are kept: 0 for organic eggs; 1 for free range eggs; 2 for barn eggs; 3 for caged eggs. These rules do not cover egg products.

In light of these higher welfare standards, has the Commission considered improving the requirements relating to the labelling of egg products, in order to identify (1) their place of origin (be it within or outside the EU) and (2) the conditions in which laying hens are kept?

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

The Commission is not considering an amendment of the Egg Marketing Regulation ([1]) so as to introduce similar animal welfare labelling systems for egg products as exists today for eggs ([2]).

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 589/2008 of 23 June 2008 laying down detailed rules for implementing Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards marketing standards for eggs, OJ L 163, 24.06.2008, p 6.
([2]) Article 12(2) and Article 30.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009339/12
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Konsequenzen nach Bericht über Mängel in europäischen Atomkraftwerken

Der Abschlussbericht der Europäischen Kommission zu den nach der Atomkatastrophe von Fukushima vereinbarten Stresstests und dementsprechende Überprüfungen der 134 europäischen Atomkraftwerke haben ergeben, dass in es in praktisch jedem europäischen Kraftwerk grobe Sicherheitsmängel gibt. Umweltschutzgruppen sehen aber weitere Sicherheitsprobleme und kritisieren, dass der Stresstest Lücken aufweist und einige wichtige Punkte ausgelassen wurden. Wie zum Beispiel Evakuierungspläne. Es gibt Kraftwerke, die sind zehn Kilometer von einer Stadt entfernt, z. B. Antwerpen. Außerdem hätten die Prüfer die Verkettung von Naturkatastrophen, die in Fukushima eindeutig das Problem war, ausgelassen. Daraus ergeben sich folgende Fragen:

1. EU-Kommissar Günter Oettinger reagierte auf einen Bericht der Tageszeitung „Die Welt“ erstmals nur schriftlich: Die Situation in Europa sei zufriedenstellend, sagte er. Aber es gäbe keinen Raum für Selbstzufriedenheit. Was genau bedeutet das? Wie ist diese Äußerung gemeint?

2. Welche angekündigten Empfehlungen wird die Kommission auf den veröffentlichten Bericht geben?

3. In welchem Zeitraum müssen die Mitgliedstaaten diese Empfehlungen umsetzen?

4. Welche Konsequenzen zieht die Kommission aus dem aktuellen Bericht?

5. Wie kann man wichtige Punkte wie Evakuierungspläne in einem Prüfbericht auslassen, wie sieht die Kommission dies?

6. Wie will man eine Verkettung von Naturkatastrophen, wie z. B. Erdbeben, bei ohnehin schon defekten Atommeilern ausschließen? Wo bleiben EU-einheitliche Sicherheitsstandards?

7. Wie denkt die Kommission über strenge Auflagen für Hochrisikotechnologien?

8. Wie will die Kommission dem grenzüberschreitenden Gefährdungspotential dieser Atomkraft-Risikotechnologie Rechnung tragen?

Antwort von Herrn Oettinger im Namen der Kommission
(22. November 2012)

1.-4. Wie im Abschlussbericht der Kommission [1] dargelegt, haben die Stresstests bestätigt, dass die Kernkraftwerke in Europa generell hohe Sicherheitsstandards aufweisen [2]. Dennoch wurden bei den Stresstests auch einige Punkte ermittelt, die noch verbessert werden müssen, um ein optimales Sicherheitsniveau zu erreichen. Es ist entscheidend, dass die sich aus den Stresstests ergebenden Empfehlungen ordnungsgemäß umgesetzt werden. Die Kommission beabsichtigt, dieses Verfahren genau zu beobachten, und plant für 2013 eine Überarbeitung der vorhandenen Richtlinie zur nuklearen Sicherheit [3].

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auch auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-008953/12 von Herrn Papadopoulou [4].

5. Das Notfallmanagement außerhalb des Standorts fällt nicht in die Zuständigkeit der für die nukleare Sicherheit zuständigen Aufsichtsbehörden und wurde daher nicht in die Spezifikationen der Stresstests einbezogen.

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten dazu auch auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-009278/12 von Herrn Melo [4].

[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.; abrufbar unter: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/safety/stress_tests_de.htm
[2] Auf der Grundlage der Stresstests gelangten die nationalen Sicherheitsbehörden zu der Schlussfolgerung, dass keine Kernkraftwerke abgeschaltet werden müssen.
[3] Richtlinie 2009/71/Euratom des Rates vom 25. Juni 2009 über einen Gemeinschaftsrahmen für die nukleare Sicherheit kerntechnischer Anlagen, ABl. L 172 vom 2.7.2009.
[4] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

6. Bei den Stresstests wurden auch Verkettungen externer Ereignisse, wie z. B. Überschwemmungen infolge von Erdbeben, berücksichtigt.

7. Die Sicherheit von Hochrisikotechnologien ist ein ständiger Schwerpunkt der Arbeit der Kommission. Neben Maßnahmen zur Gewährleistung der kerntechnischen Sicherheit schlug die Kommission im vergangenen Jahr auch Maßnahmen zur Gewährleistung der Sicherheit von Offshore-Öl- und -Gas-Anlagen vor.

8. Die Kommission hat Nachbarländer der EU in das Stresstestverfahren einbezogen und leitet derzeit weitere Maßnahmen ein, um die Vorkehrungen für Notfälle und die Notfallmaßnahmen sowohl innerhalb der EU als auch in Zusammenarbeit mit EU-Nachbarländern zu verbessern.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009339/12
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Conclusions to be drawn from the report on failings in European nuclear power stations

The European Commission's final report on the stress tests agreed on following the Fukushima nuclear disaster and the corresponding inspections of the 134 nuclear power stations in Europe have shown that there are considerable safety risks in virtually every European nuclear power station. Environmental groups point to other safety concerns and maintain that the stress test is not watertight and that a number of important points were omitted. One of these was evacuation plans. Some nuclear power stations such as Antwerp are 10 km from a town or city. In addition the testers are alleged to have omitted the possibility of a number of linked natural disasters, which was clearly the problem with Fukushima.

1. Commissioner Günter Oettinger initially responded only in writing to an article in the daily 'Die Welt', saying that the situation in Europe was satisfactory, but that there was no room for self-satisfaction. What exactly does this mean? What was he trying to say?

2. What proposals will the Commission put forward concerning the report?

3. What will the time-scale for their implementation by the Member States be?

4. What conclusions does the Commission draw from the report?

5. How can such important points as evacuation plans be omitted from an audit report? What is the Commission's view on this?

6. How can the possibility of a number of linked natural disasters such as earthquakes be excluded in the case of atomic piles which are already faulty? What has happened to uniform EU safety standards?

7. What is the Commission's view of strict conditions for high-risk technologies?

8. How does the Commission intend to take into account the potential cross-border threat posed by this high-risk nuclear technology?

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

1-4. As stated in the final report of the Commission ([1]), the stress tests have confirmed that the standards of safety of nuclear power plants in Europe are generally high ([2]). Nevertheless, stress tests also identified a number of issues that must be improved in order to reach optimum safety levels. It is crucial that the recommendations of the stress tests are properly implemented. The Commission intends to follow this process closely and will undertake to revise the existing directive on nuclear safety ([3]) in 2013.

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-008953/12 by Mr Papadopoulou ([4]).

5. Off-site emergency management is not the responsibility of nuclear safety regulators and was therefore not included in the stress tests' specifications.

The Commission would also like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-009278/12 by Mr Melo ([4]).

6. Combinations of external events, e.g. earthquake-induced flooding, were assessed during the stress tests.

([1]) Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European 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/stress_tests_en.htm
([2]) Based on the stress tests, national safety authorities came to the conclusion that no closure of nuclear power plants was warranted.
([3]) Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations, OJ L 172, 2.7.2009.
([4]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

7. Safety in high-risk technologies is a continuous focus for the Commission. Besides nuclear safety, the Commission last year also proposed measures to ensure the safety of off-shore oil and gas activities.

8. The Commission has involved EU neighbouring countries in the stress test process and is initiating further work to improve emergency preparedness and response arrangements among EU Member States and between EU Member States and neighbouring countries.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009340/12
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Contratación de trabajadores portuarios en España

Con fecha de 27 de septiembre se ha sabido que la Comisión Europea ha enviado a España un dictamen motivado por incumplir el régimen de contrataciones de personal portuario que establece el Tratado de la Unión Europea.

Esta es la segunda etapa del procedimiento de infracción que la Comisión ha abierto a España por obligar a las compañías estibadoras a participar financieramente en el capital de las empresas privadas que gestionan la contratación del personal portuario. Dicha situación se da en los puertos de Barcelona, Algeciras, Valencia y Bilbao.

A través de esta normativa se creó la Sociedad Anónima de Gestión de Estibadores Portuarios, que agrupa a las empresas privadas que quieran prestar servicios y les obliga a participar en su capital sin que se pueda contratar trabajadores portuarios en el mercado.

Esto va en contra totalmente del principio de libertad de establecimiento contemplado en los Tratados.

En este sentido,

1. ¿Cuál va a ser la determinación de la Comisión una vez transcurrido el plazo de dos meses dado a España?

2. ¿Seguirá la Comisión alargando dicho plazo *sine die* o acudirá directamente al Tribunal de Justicia de la UE para que se pueda solventar este conflicto?

3. ¿Cuáles son las razones que España da a la Comisión para no aplicar el régimen de contratación establecido en el Tratado de la UE?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de diciembre de 2012)

La Comisión está en la actualidad a la espera de recibir la respuesta de las autoridades españolas al dictamen motivado. Una vez recibida, la analizará minuciosamente y decidirá el seguimiento que conviene darle.

El dictamen motivado se remitió a las autoridades españolas el 1 de octubre de 2012 y, por consiguiente, dichas autoridades disponen de un plazo que finaliza el 1 de diciembre de 2012 para adoptar las medidas necesarias a fin de ajustarse a él o dar a conocer su posición al respecto. Hasta el momento, las autoridades españolas no han solicitado la prórroga del plazo en cuestión. Si la Comisión recibe una petición al respecto, valorará la correspondiente justificación y decidirá si la acepta o la rechaza.

Las autoridades españolas han enviado una respuesta a la Comisión, que incluye la contestación al escrito de requerimiento, pero todavía no han respondido al dictamen motivado. No obstante, la Comisión no puede facilitar información alguna al tratarse de un procedimiento de infracción en curso.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009340/12
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Recruitment of port workers in Spain

On 27 September it emerged that the European Commission had sent Spain a reasoned opinion for non-compliance, of the regime for the recruitment of port workers with the provisions of the Treaty on European Union.

This is the second stage in the infringement proceedings that the Commission has opened against Spain for obliging cargo handling companies to participate financially in the capital of the private companies that manage the recruitment of dockers. This applies to the ports of Barcelona, Algeciras, Valencia and Bilbao.

Under legislation in question, a joint-stock company (Sociedad Anónima de Gestión de Estibadores Portuarios) was created, grouping those private firms that wished to provide cargo handling services and obliging them to participate in the company's capital, without being able to recruit dockers on the market.

This is completely contrary to the principle of freedom of establishment contained in the Treaties.

In this context,

1. What decision will the Commission take once the two-month deadline given to Spain has passed?

2. Will the Commission continue to extend this deadline indefinitely or will it refer the case directly to the European Court of Justice in order to resolve the conflict?

3. What reasons has Spain given to the Commission for not applying the recruitment regime provided for in the EU Treaty?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(11 December 2012)

The Commission is currently waiting for the reply from the Spanish authorities to the reasoned opinion. Once it will receive this reply, it will thoroughly assess it and decide on the follow-up accordingly.

The reasoned opinion was sent to the Spanish authorities on 1 October 2012 and therefore the Spanish authorities have until 1 December 2012 to take the necessary measures to comply with it and/or submit their position. The Spanish authorities have so far not requested any extension of this deadline. If the Commission receives such a request, it will assess the respective justification and will accordingly decide whether to accept or reject it.

The Spanish authorities have replied to the Commission, including a reply to the letter of formal notice, but not yet a reply to the reasoned opinion. However, the Commission cannot give any details in an ongoing infringement procedure.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009341/12
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Empleo juvenil

La Comisión en su respuesta E-005841/2012 a mi pregunta sobre juventud cita que los equipos de acción, creados por la Comisión Europea para trabajar con los ocho Estados miembros afectados por los niveles más altos de desempleo juvenil, han explorado las posibilidades de reorientar los Fondos Estructurales hacia el fomento del empleo juvenil en la medida de lo posible.

Citan que se han seleccionado 7 300 millones de euros para su reasignación o asignación acelerada de los cuales 1 100 millones serán reasignados en España.

En este sentido,

1. ¿Podría la Comisión señalar cuáles son los proyectos a los que irá o ha ido dirigido este dinero? En el caso de España, ¿se ha cumplido con lo reasignado?

2. ¿Tiene la Comisión el resultado de los proyectos? ¿Cuál es la evaluación que hace la Comisión de esta asignación/reasignación?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(28 de noviembre de 2012)

La ejecución de las acciones previstas en el marco de la Iniciativa de Oportunidades para la Juventud ([1]) en España está muy avanzada.

Entre julio y septiembre de 2012 fueron reformados varios programas operativos españoles del Fondo Social Europeo ([2]), atendiendo en particular a las conclusiones del equipo de acción de la Iniciativa de Oportunidades para la Juventud y en respuesta al agravamiento de la situación del desempleo juvenil. La reasignación de fondos del FSE se centró en apoyar a los servicios públicos de empleo en el desarrollo de políticas activas del mercado de trabajo dirigidas particularmente a los jóvenes, y reorientó un total de 135 millones de euros al amparo del programa operativo de adaptabilidad y empleo. Algunos programas operativos regionales también aumentaron su apoyo a las acciones en favor de los jóvenes en un total de 33,8 millones de euros (Madrid, Navarra, Asturias, Melilla, Baleares y País Vasco), y el programa operativo temático nacional de lucha contra la discriminación reforzó los proyectos de integración en el mercado laboral e innovación social dirigidos a la juventud (50 millones de euros). Otros programas operativos regionales del FSE intensificaron sus ayudas a los alumnos que abandonan prematuramente los estudios y a la formación profesional (6,8 millones de euros en Murcia y 7,9 millones de euros en Baleares).

El FSE está atento a reforzar su apoyo a la juventud, y ya está intensificando o reasignando los recursos financieros disponibles para medidas políticas y proyectos. En el marco de la actual programación del Fondo, todos los programas operativos españoles incluyen una serie de acciones generales y específicas en beneficio de los jóvenes. Según datos nacionales, en el período comprendido entre el 1 de enero y el 30 de junio de 2012 se destinó un total de 233 millones de euros ([3]) a medidas de empleo juvenil, y esta cifra podría aumentar hasta los 2 500 millones de euros en el período de 2012 a 2015. Además, el Gobierno adoptó el 8 de noviembre de 2012 un Real Decreto ([4]) por el que se desarrolla el contrato para la formación y el aprendizaje y se establecen las bases de la formación profesional dual.

([1]) YOI (siglas inglesas de Youth Opportunities Initiative).
([2]) FSE.
([3]) Importe estimado de veintidós programas operativos.
([4]) 1529/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009341/12
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Youth employment

In its answer E-005841/2012 to my question on youth employment, the Commission states that the Action Teams, which were formed by the European Commission to work with the eight Member States experiencing the highest levels of youth unemployment, have explored the possibilities to refocus Structural Funds towards promoting youth employment where possible.

It states that EUR 7.3 billion have been earmarked for reallocation or accelerated mobilisation, of which EUR 1.1 billion will be reallocated in Spain.

In this context,

1. Could the Commission identify the projects to which this money will be or has been given? In the case of Spain, has the money been reallocated as planned?

2. Does the Commission know the outcome of the projects? What is the Commission's assessment of this (re)allocation?

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

The implementation of the actions planned under the YOI ([1]) in Spain is well advanced.

Between July and September 2012, several ESF ([2]) Spanish Operational Programmes (OP) were modified, particularly driven by the conclusions of the YOI action team and in the context of the aggravating youth unemployment situation. ESF reallocation focused on support to the Public Employment Services to develop active labour market policies, including for young people, redirecting overall EUR 135 million under the national OP *Adaptabilidad y Empleo*. Some regional OPs increased also support to actions for young people for a total of EUR 33.8 million (Madrid, Navarra, Asturias, Melilla, Baleares, Pais Vasco) and the national thematic OP *Lucha contra la Discriminación* has reinforced labour market integration and social innovation projects targeting youth (EUR 50 million). Other regional ESF OPs increased attention to early school leavers and vocational training (Murcia, EUR 6.8 million, Baleares, EUR 7.9 million).

ESF is mobilised to increase support to youth and reinforced / reallocated financial resources for policy measures and projects are now being disbursed. In the current programming framework, all ESF Spanish operational programmes include a series of both general and specific actions that benefited young people. According to national data, in the period 1 January to 30 June 2012 a total of EUR 233 million ([3]) was spent on youth employment measures, and this figure could rise to EUR 2,5 billion in the period between 2012 and 2015. Additionally, a Royal Decree ([4]) developing the training and apprenticeship contract and establishing the basis for dual vocational training has been approved by the Government on 8 November 2012.

([1]) Youth Opportunities Initiative.
([2]) European Social Fund.
([3]) estimated sum over 22 OP.
([4]) 1529/2012.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009342/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Autodeterminación del pueblo saharaui

El pasado 29 de septiembre el ministro de Asuntos Exteriores de Argelia, Mourad Medelci, exhortó en Nueva York a Marruecos y al Frente Polisario a que permitieran al pueblo saharaui ejercer su derecho de autodeterminación.

En su comparecencia ante la Asamblea General de la ONU, Medelci ha expresado el deseo del Gobierno argelino de que «el pueblo del Sáhara Occidental pueda ejercer su derecho de autodeterminación». Además también ha urgido a Marruecos y al Frente Polisario a que «actúen con buena fe» e impulsen unas negociaciones para alcanzar una «solución justa» al conflicto.

En este sentido,

1. ¿Podría la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante Ashton indicar cuál es su postura ante estas afirmaciones?

2. ¿Cuáles son los últimos pasos dados por la Unión Europea en este sentido?

3. ¿Ha podido la Sra. Ashton reunirse con los diferentes ministros de exteriores en Nueva York para tratar este asunto?

4. Tras el nombramiento de Romano Prodi como enviado especial de la ONU para la zona del Sahel y los comunicados de bienvenida en este sentido, ¿tiene conocimiento la Alta Representante de si la labor del Sr. Prodi se extenderá también a este conflicto?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de enero de 2013)

La AR/VP sigue preocupada por la larga duración del conflicto del Sáhara Occidental y sus implicaciones para la seguridad y la cooperación en la región.

La AR/VP reafirma su total apoyo a los esfuerzos del Secretario General para lograr una solución política justa, duradera y mutuamente aceptable, que contemple la autodeterminación de la población del Sahara Occidental.

La AR/VP sigue animando a las partes a trabajar por una solución de este tipo, en el marco de las Naciones Unidas. Elogia el trabajo del embajador Christopher Ross en su calidad de enviado personal del Secretario General y apoya sus esfuerzos en las consultas con las partes y los Estados vecinos. La Sra. Ashton anima a las partes y los Estados vecinos a que sigan colaborando con el embajador Ross para hacer avanzar el proceso político.

Si estuviera al alcance de la mano una solución política al conflicto, la UE consideraría aplicar medidas de apoyo para facilitar su ejecución.

El expresidente de la Comisión y exprimer ministro italiano Romano Prodi ha sido designado por el Secretario General de las Naciones Unidas, Ban Ki-moon, enviado especial para el Sahel. El área geográfica en la que el Sr. Prodi ha de desempeñar su trabajo abarca partes de Senegal, Mauritania, Argelia, Malí, Níger, Chad, Sudán, Sudán del Sur y Eritrea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009342/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Self-determination of the Sahrawi people

On 29 September 2012 in New York, the Algerian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mourad Medelci, urged Morocco and the Polisario Front to allow the Sahrawi people to exercise their right to self determination.

Addressing the UN General Assembly, Medelci expressed the Algerian Government's hope that the people of Western Sahara would be able to exercise their right to self-determination. He also urged Morocco and the Polisario Front to act in good faith and open negotiations in order to reach a just solution to the conflict.

In this context:

1. What is High Representative/Vice-President Ashton's position on these statements?

2. What recent steps has the EU taken on this issue?

3. Was Mrs Ashton able to meet with the various ministers for foreign affairs in New York in order to discuss this question?

4. Following the appointment of Romano Prodi as UN Special Envoy for the Sahel and the statements welcoming this decision, does High Representative Ashton know whether the scope of Mr Prodi's work will also extend to this conflict?

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

The HR/VP remains concerned about the long duration of the Western Sahara conflict and the implications for security and cooperation in the region.

The HR/VP reaffirms her full support for the Secretary-General's efforts to achieve a just, lasting and mutually acceptable political solution, which will provide for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara.

The HR/VP continues to encourage the parties to work towards such a solution, within the framework of the United Nations. She commends the work of Ambassador Christopher Ross as the Personal Envoy of the Secretary-General and supports his efforts in the consultations with the parties and neighbouring states. She encourages the parties and neighbouring states to continue to work with him to move the political process forward.

Should a political solution to the conflict be within reach, the EU would consider supporting measures in order to facilitate the implementation of such a solution.

Former Commission President and Italian Premier, Romano Prodi has been named by UN Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon as Envoy for the Sahel. The scope of Prodi's work includes parts of Senegal, Mauritania, Mali, Algeria, Niger, Chad, Sudan, South Sudan and Eritrea.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009343/12
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: VP/HR — Piratería en aguas somalíes

En su respuesta E-005175/2012 responde a ciertos puntos claves en la lucha contra la piratería en la costa de Somalia con la labor que la UE está ejerciendo en estrategias de respuesta y en la necesidad de un enfoque coordinado y multidisciplinar para fomentar las investigaciones y las acciones judiciales, para mejorar las investigaciones de los líderes de las redes, en el incremento de la coordinación internacional, en facilitar la cooperación en materia de aplicación de la jurisdicción militar, en la mejora de las capacidades de las entidades somalíes, ofreciendo incentivos para investigar y emprendiendo acciones judiciales así como en garantizar la recopilación sistémica de pruebas.

Respecto al proceso político, comentaba que había que esperar a que se cumpliera el plazo del 20 de agosto, debiendo aplicarse los principios de Garowe, el acuerdo de Galkayo y el comunicado de Addis del 23 de mayo acordado por los líderes somalíes.

Pasada ya esa fecha,

1. ¿Podría la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante explicar cuál es la situación política actual del Gobierno Federal de Transición?

2. ¿Sabe si se han ido cumpliendo los principios y el acuerdo anteriormente citados?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante/Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(7 de diciembre de 2012)

El mandato del Gobierno Federal de Transición (GFT) finalizó el 20 de agosto de 2012, de acuerdo con la hoja de ruta de Kampala de septiembre de 2011, los principios de Garowe, el Acuerdo de Galkayo y el comunicado de Addis. Un nuevo Presidente, Hassan Sheikh Mohamoud, y un nuevo Primer Ministro, Abdi Farah Shirdon, están trabajando y han nombrado el Gobierno Federal de Somalia que fue aprobado por el Parlamento Federal el 13 de noviembre.

La transición política acabó pacíficamente con el traspaso de poderes. Todas las instancias interesadas de Somalia han respetado los compromisos recogidos en los diferentes acuerdos en el marco de la hoja de ruta. Sin embargo, algunas tareas inscritas en esta última aún no se han llevado a cabo. Los nuevos dirigentes somalíes se han comprometido a realizar estas y otras tareas, en particular, en lo que respecta a la lucha contra la piratería, y la UE sigue apoyando y animando a las autoridades somalíes para que las lleven a cabo plenamente. La UE es uno de los principales apoyos financieros del Gobierno somalí y está dispuesta a colaborar con las nuevas autoridades.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009343/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Piracy in Somali waters

In answer E 005175/2012, Catherine Ashton addressed a number of key issues in the fight against piracy off the coast of Somalia by stating the EU was working on response strategies and the need for a multi disciplinary coordinated approach to encourage investigations and prosecutions, enhance investigations into network leaders, increase international coordination, facilitate military law enforcement cooperation, improve the capacities of Somali entities and provide incentives to investigate and prosecute, and ensure systematic collection of evidence.

On the political process, she said that the 20 August deadline had to be met and that the Garowe Principles, Galkayo agreement and 23 May Addis Communiqué agreed by the Somali Principals had to be implemented.

Now that this date has passed,

1. Could the High Representative/Vice-President explain the current political situation of the Transitional Federal Government?

2. Does she know whether the above principles and agreement have been complied with?

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

The mandate of the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) ended on 20 August 2012, in line with the September 2011 Kampala Roadmap, the Garowe Principles, Galkayo agreement and Addis Communiqué. A new President, Hassan Sheikh Mohamoud, and new Prime Minister, Abdi Farah Shirdon, are now in office and have nominated a Federal Government of Somalia which was confirmed by the Federal Parliament the 13th of November.

The political transition ended peacefully with a handover of power. All Somali stakeholders respected their commitments agreed in the different agreements within the framework of the Roadmap. Nevertheless a number of Roadmap tasks remain to be implemented. The new Somali leadership has committed to implementing these and other tasks, including in relation to the fight against piracy and the EU continues both to urge and support the Somali authorities to fully implement them. The EU is one of the main financial supports of the Somali Government and is ready to work with the new authorities.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009344/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Información y mapeado de transgénicos

En los últimos años, como consecuencia de la legislación vigente sobre OGM desarrollada en la Directiva 2001/18/CE, se ha producido la extensión y el desarrollo de nuevos cultivos de variedades transgénicas en numerosas regiones de la Unión Europea. Este tipo de cultivos goza de una escasa popularidad entre la población y existen numerosas publicaciones científicas que alertan sobre los riesgos de propagación no controlada a través de la polinización de variedades convencionales.

Estos riesgos de contaminación, que provocan incertidumbre sobre la extensión efectiva de las variedades transgénicas, provocan un fuerte impacto sobre la opinión pública. Los consumidores, tanto europeos como de otras partes del mundo, tienen un sesgo muy negativo a la hora de valorar la calidad de los cultivos transgénicos y tienden a evitar su consumo. La extensión de estos cultivos puede tener un importante impacto sobre la comercialización de la agricultura europea. La agricultura europea, que pretende competir a nivel internacional gracias a sus altos estándares, ha logrado desarrollar una importante imagen comercial relacionada con su calidad. Por ello es muy importante cumplir con las exigencias de información.

La normativa europea sobre el tema obliga, a través del artículo 31, apartado 3, letra b), de la Directiva 2001/18/CE, a los Estados miembros a crear registros con la localización de este tipo de cultivos. En el caso español, el «Registro Público de Organismos Modificados Genéticamente» publica las resoluciones que autorizan dichos cultivos en las diferentes comunidades autónomas. Pero en el caso de la superficie cultivada y localización solo ofrece información estimada para el maíz MO810.

En respuesta a mi pregunta parlamentaria E-000511/2012 *la Comisión Europea especificó que «Dichas localizaciones se deberán notificar a la autoridad competente y se deberán poner en conocimiento del público»:*

A raíz de esta respuesta:

1. *¿Considera la Comisión suficiente la publicación de datos de cultivo y localización relativos al MO810 y no al resto de variedades autorizadas en España?*

2. *¿Considera la Comisión que con la publicación de los datos de localización sólo a nivel provincial se cumple lo recogido sobre «poner en conocimiento del público» en la Directiva 2001/18/CE?*

3. ¿Qué seguimiento realiza la *Comisión del cumplimiento de la Directiva 2001/18/CE en materia de publicación de la información por parte de los Estados Miembros?*

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

1. En la UE solo está autorizado el cultivo de tres OMG: el maíz MON810 ([1]), el maíz T25 ([2]) y la patata Amflora ([3]). El T25 nunca se ha cultivado en la EU, como la Amflora nunca se ha cultivado en España. Por lo tanto, es correcto que el registro español de OMG solo presente datos de MON810.

2. La Directiva 2001/18/CE ([4]) no define el término «localización» y establece que los Estados miembros puedan aplicar de forma adecuada y flexible las disposiciones del artículo 31, letra a), de conformidad con sus disposiciones nacionales.

3. La Oficina Alimentaria y Veterinaria de la Comisión organiza regularmente auditorías en los Estados miembros para evaluar los controles oficiales de los OMG y garantizar el cumplimiento de la legislación sobre los OMG, incluida la obligación jurídica de hacer pública la información.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/dyna/gm_register/gm_register_auth.cfm?pr_id=11.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/dyna/gm_register/gm_register_auth.cfm?pr_id=20.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/dyna/gm_register/gm_register_auth.cfm?pr_id=39.
([4]) DO L 106 de 18.4.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009344/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Information and location of genetically modified organisms (GMOs)

In recent years, as a result of the existing legislation on GMOs set out in Directive 2001/18/EC, new GMOs have spread and developed in many regions in the European Union. GM crops are extremely unpopular with people, and many scientific publications warn about the risks of their non-controlled spreading through pollination of conventional crop varieties.

These risks of contamination, which cause uncertainty about the spread of GM crop varieties, have a serious impact on public opinion. Consumers, both in Europe and in other parts of the world, have a very strong bias against GM crops and their quality, and they tend to avoid consuming them. The spread of these crops may have a significant impact on the marketing of European agriculture. European agriculture, which aims to compete on an international level because of its high standards, has managed to carve out a solid commercial image related to its quality. For this reason, it is very important to comply with the requirements for providing information.

The relevant European legislation, in Article 31(3)(b) of Directive 2001/18/EC, obliges Member States to establish public registers which record the location of these types of GMOs. In Spain, the Public Register of Genetically Modified Organisms publishes the resolutions authorising the use of these organisms in the different autonomous communities. However, it only provides estimated information about the cultivated area and location for the MO810 maize variety.

In reply to parliamentary Question E-000511/2012, the Commission stated that 'The said locations must be notified to the competent authorities and made known to the public.'

Following on from this answer:

1. Does the Commission think that it is sufficient to publish data on cultivation and location for the MO810 variety and not for the other varieties authorised in Spain?

2. Does the Commission think that publishing information about the location of GMOs only on a provincial level complies with the requirement to 'make [locations] known to the public' in Directive 2001/18/EC?

3. How is the Commission monitoring compliance with Directive 2001/18/EC, more specifically with regard to the obligation for Member States to make information public?

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

1. Only three GMOs are authorised for cultivation in the EU: maize MON810 ([1]), maize T25 ([2]) and Amflora potato ([3]). T25 has never been cultivated in the EU, and Amflora has never been cultivated in Spain. Therefore it is accurate that the Spanish Register of GMOs only mentions data related to MON810.

2. Directive 2001/18/EC ([4]) does not define the term 'location' and foresees flexibility for the Member States on the appropriate manner to apply the provisions set in Article 31.3(a), in accordance with their national provisions.

3. The Food and Veterinary Office of the Commission organises regular audits in Member States in order to evaluate the official controls of GMOs and ensure the compliance with the GMO legislation, including the legal obligations to make information public.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/dyna/gm_register/gm_register_auth.cfm?pr_id=11.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/dyna/gm_register/gm_register_auth.cfm?pr_id=20.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/food/dyna/gm_register/gm_register_auth.cfm?pr_id=39.
([4]) OJ L 106, 18.4.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009345/12
to the Council
Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Addition of the LTTE to the EU 'terrorist list'

While addressing the Sri Lankan Parliament recently, the Sri Lankan MP Mangala Samaraweera, who was Minister of Foreign Affairs at the time of the addition of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) to the EU 'terrorist list' in May 2006, made the following statement:

'Also, we should not forget the support given by the US when I was the foreign affairs minister for the proscription of the LTTE in Europe. Then, seven countries in the 25-member EU did not agree with the LTTE ban, and it became a difficulty to adopt the ban as a unanimous decision. Therefore, I met [US] Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice several times and through the offices of Deputy Secretary of State Nicholas Burns, got the consent of those seven nations to proscribe the LTTE on 29 May 2006. Even the LTTE admitted it as one of its biggest defeats and in his Heroes Day speech, [the LTTE leader] [Velupillai] Prabhakaran rebuked the international community for having been deceived by the Sri Lankan Government' ('Colombo Telegraph', 4 April 2012).

The Swedish Major-General Ulf Henricsson, who was head of the Monitoring Mission of the Sri Lankan Ceasefire Agreement, also made a similar statement, saying that at a critical time the decision was made 'in the cafés of Brussels' and there was massive pressure from the UK and US governments.

1. Can the Council explain the decision of 29 May 2006 to add the LTTE to the 'terrorist list'?

2. Were representations made to this effect by the US or by any other countries?

3. Can the Council explain which Member States proposed this addition?

4. Can the Council explain which Member States supported this addition and whether any Member States (and if so, which ones) were opposed?

5. Are there documents available which explain this decision and the process behind it?

Reply
(7 January 2013)

In its declaration of 29 September 2005 the EU stated that it was 'actively considering the formal listing of the LTTE as a terrorist organisation' and called upon all parties to show commitment towards the peace process and to refrain from actions that could endanger a peaceful resolution and political settlement of the conflict in Sri Lanka. In its declaration of 31 May 2006 at the time of listing the LTTE as a terrorist organisation, the EU stated that the decision to list the LTTE was 'based on the actions of that organisation' which are covered by the provisions of Article 1(3) of Common Position 2001/931/CFSP ([1]). Common Position 2001/931/CFSP lays down the criteria for listing persons, groups or entities involved in terrorist acts and identifies the actions that constitute terrorist acts.

Third States may express their views regarding persons or groups who might be subject to measures under Common Position 2001/931/CFSP, but the decision to list an individual or a group has to be taken by the Council acting unanimously. The proposal to list the LTTE was adopted unanimously by the Council. It is not general Council policy to comment on positions of individual Member States.

A decision to list a person or group under Common Position 2001/931/CFSP is taken by the Council on the basis of relevant information; certain documents pertaining to the listing are available in the Council register of public documents.

([1]) OJ L 344, 28.12.2001, pp. 93-96.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009346/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Prohibición de complementos alimenticios

La Directiva de suplementos alimentarios 2002/46/CE y el Reglamento (CE) N° 1924/2006 y sus modificaciones, ha tenido como efecto colateral la prohibición de la venta de muchos complementos alimenticios que actualmente hay en el mercado. El texto prohíbe el 95 % de las declaraciones de propiedades saludables que figuren en los complementos alimenticios. Esto beneficia a los grandes grupos de la industria farmacéutica y agroalimentaria, ya que sólo la EFSA (European Food Safety Agency) estará habilitada para autorizar cuáles son los productos a la venta. Se trata de un paso más hacia la desaparición de todo tratamiento alternativo para las personas interesadas en cuidar su salud de forma natural. De los 4 637 expedientes de declaraciones presentados, la EFSA ha autorizado sólo 222.

De los tres procedimientos que la normativa ponía en manos de la EFSA para autorizar expedientes, esta Agencia ha decidido unilateralmente aplicar el más complejo, el más exigente y el más costoso y, por lo tanto, el más restrictivo.

1. ¿Considera que los efectos del Reglamento (CE) No 1924/2006 son positivos?

2. ¿Piensa proponer una reforma de las competencias de la EFSA en el proceso de decisión europeo, incluyendo sanciones si esta Agencia se sobrepasa en sus competencias?

3. ¿Cómo piensa garantizar el derecho de los ciudadanos a seguir tratamientos alternativos, dentro del derecho europeo a la salud?

4. ¿Qué medidas tomará para revisar la prohibición de todos los complementos alimenticios nombrados y facilitar el acceso a una medicina natural?

Respuesta del Sr. Šefčovič en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de noviembre de 2012)

El Reglamento (CE) n° 1924/2006 («el Reglamento») ([1]) tiene por objeto principal proteger a los consumidores de las declaraciones nutricionales y de propiedades saludables engañosas. El Reglamento no prohíbe la venta de alimentos, incluidos los complementos alimenticios, sino solo las declaraciones engañosas, que deberán desaparecer del etiquetado, la presentación o la publicidad de los productos.

En cuanto a las cifras, cabe señalar que las 222 declaraciones autorizadas hasta la fecha representan aproximadamente 500 entradas individuales en la lista consolidada de las 4 637 presentadas a la Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria (EFSA) para su evaluación, mientras que aún se están estudiando 2 233 entradas. A este respecto, la Comisión considera que, hasta la fecha, el Reglamento ha tenido efectos positivos para los consumidores.

La EFSA solo es responsable de la evaluación del fundamento científico, conforme a lo dispuesto en dicho Reglamento. Las decisiones de autorización son adoptadas por la Comisión. No está previsto revisar ni modificar el proceso de autorización de las declaraciones.

El Reglamento tiene por objeto garantizar que los consumidores dispongan de una información veraz para poder elegir. Cabe señalar que el Reglamento se aplica a las declaraciones relativas a alimentos, no a medicamentos, y que los alimentos no deberán mencionar «propiedades de prevención, tratamiento y curación de una enfermedad humana».

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1924/2006, relativo a las declaraciones nutricionales y de propiedades saludables en los alimentos (DO L 404 de 30.12.2006, p. 9).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009346/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Ban on food supplements

A side-effect of the Food Supplements Directive 2002/46/EC and Regulation (EC) No 924/2006 and its amendments has been to prohibit the sale of many food supplements currently on the market. The text prohibits 95% of the health claims made on food supplements. This benefits the large groups in the pharmaceutical and agri-food industries, as only the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has the power to decide which products are authorised for sale. This is another step towards the total disappearance of alternative treatment for people interested in looking after their health by natural means. Of the 4 637 claims submitted for approval, EFSA has authorised just 222.

Of the three procedures available to it under the legislation for the authorisation of claims, EFSA has unilaterally decided to apply the most complex, most exacting and most costly, i.e. the most restrictive.

1. Does the Commission consider the impact of Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 to be positive?

2. Does it intend to propose a reform of EFSA's competences in the European decision-making process, including sanctions if the EFSA oversteps the limits of its powers?

3. How does it intend to protect the right of citizens to pursue alternative treatments as part of the European right to health?

4. What steps will it take to review the ban on all food supplements and facilitate access to natural medicine?

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

Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 ([1]) ('the regulation') aims to primarily protect consumers from misleading nutrition and health claims. The regulation does not prohibit the sale of foods, including food supplements; only misleading claims will have to disappear from the labelling, presentation or advertising of products.

Regarding numbers, it should be noted that the 222 claims authorised so far represent around 500 individual entries in the consolidated list of the 4 637 submitted to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) for evaluation while 2 233 entries are still under consideration. In this respect, the Commission considers that so far, the regulation has had positive effects for consumers.

EFSA is only responsible for the assessment of the scientific substantiation according to the rules of that regulation. Authorisation decisions are taken by the Commission. There is no intention to review or modify the process of claims' authorisation.

The regulation aims at ensuring that consumers have truthful information on which they can base their choices. It should be noted that the regulation applies to claims made on foods, not medicines, and that foods shall not refer to 'preventing, treating or curing a human disease, or refer to such properties'.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods (OJ L 404, 30.12.2006, p. 9).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009347/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Pobreza en Catalunya

La Encuesta de Condiciones de Vida y Hábitos de la Población 2011 de la Diputación de Barcelona ([1]) muestra que el 57 % de las y los catalanes tienen dificultades para llegar a fin de mes, el 39 % de las familias no pueden permitirse ni una semana de vacaciones al año y el 12,7 % no tiene ni para pagar la calefacción. El 29,5 % de la población vive bajo el umbral de pobreza, llegando a un número total de 2 200 000 pobres.

Cataluña está peor que la media española, donde la tasa de pobreza es del 26,7 %, y mucho peor que la media europea, que se sitúa en el 21,6 %. Cabe recordar que en Catalunya el desempleo se sitúa en el 22 %. Es alarmante la pobreza infantil, donde Cataluña y Europa, se juegan el futuro, la tasa de riesgo de exclusión en los niños y niñas se dispara hasta el 28 %.

1. ¿Conoce la Comisión estos datos?

2. ¿Estos datos cambiarán la situación de Catalunya a la hora de recibir ayudas de Fondos Sociales y otros fondos europeos?

3. ¿Tiene en cuenta la distribución territorial de la pobreza a la hora de hacer las recomendaciones específicas del semestre europeo?

4. ¿Cómo influirán estos datos en la valoración que hace la Comisión del accionar de las diferentes administraciones públicas en el Estado español?

5. ¿Cree que a pesar de estos datos, España sigue haciendo todo lo posible para devolver la estabilidad económica y social al país?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de diciembre de 2012)

La Comisión es muy consciente de la alarmante evolución social, económica y del mercado de trabajo en España. Con el fin de aprovechar al máximo la financiación de la UE disponible, el programa operativo del FSE en Cataluña ha sido modificado recientemente para aumentar el apoyo al empleo de los jóvenes.

La intensidad de la ayuda de los fondos de la UE en el período 2014-2020 y los criterios que deben tenerse en cuenta formarán parte de un acuerdo general sobre el próximo marco financiero plurianual. En el presupuesto dedicado a la política de cohesión, las prioridades de financiación y los importes correspondientes deben responder a los principales retos detectados. Por lo que se refiere a España y Cataluña, mejorar el funcionamiento del mercado de trabajo y reforzar la cohesión social son dos de las cuestiones más urgentes.

Teniendo en cuenta la evolución de la pobreza y de la exclusión social en España, la Comisión ha propuesto una Recomendación específica (adoptada por el Consejo el 6 de julio de 2012) sobre la necesidad de mejorar la empleabilidad de los grupos vulnerables, junto con servicios eficaces de apoyo a los niños y a las familias, con el fin de mejorar la situación de las personas en riesgo de pobreza o exclusión social, o ambas, y de incrementar por consiguiente el bienestar de los niños. Respecto al FSE, tanto el capítulo nacional como el relativo a Cataluña del Programa Operativo de Lucha Contra la Discriminación dan apoyo a los grupos vulnerables. Ambos programas operativos son complementarios e incluyen acciones para mejorar el acceso al empleo y la inclusión de los desfavorecidos, para mantener a las personas en el empleo, prestar servicios a las personas dependientes y promover la igualdad y la diversidad en el trabajo.

En términos generales, la Comisión está convencida de que las reformas que se están llevando a cabo generarán necesariamente mejoras sostenibles; a este respecto, la Comisión acoge con satisfacción el ambicioso programa de reforma en que España se ha embarcado.

([1]) http://www.diba.es/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009347/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Poverty in Catalonia

The 2011 Survey on Living Conditions and Habits of the Population by the provincial council of Barcelona ([1]) reveals that 57% of Catalans have difficulty making ends meet, 39% of families cannot afford even a week's holiday a year, and 12.7% do not have the money to pay for heating. 29.5% of the population live below the poverty line, bringing the total number of poor to 2 200 000.

The figure for Catalonia is worse than the average for Spain as a whole, which has a poverty rate of 26.7%, and much worse than the European average of 21.6%.It is worth noting that unemployment in Catalonia stands at 22%. The level of child poverty is alarming, given that the future of Catalonia and Europe is at stake, with the risk of exclusion amongst children reaching 28%.

1. Is the Commission aware of these figures?

2. Will these figures affect Catalonia's position with regard to receiving assistance from the Social Fund and other European funds?

3. Is the territorial distribution of poverty taken into account when making the specific recommendations for the European Semester?

4. How will these figures influence the Commission's assessment of the actions of the various public administrations in Spain?

5. Does the Commission believe that, despite these figures, Spain is still doing everything possible to restore economic and social stability to the country?

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

The Commission is well aware of the alarming economic, labour market and social evolution in Spain. In order to get most of the available EU funding, the ESF Operational Programme in Catalonia has been modified recently to increase support to youth employment.

The intensity of assistance from EU funds in the period 2014-2020 and the criteria to be taken into account will form part of a general agreement on the next multiannual financial framework. Within the budget dedicated to cohesion policy, the priorities for funding and the corresponding amounts should reflect the key challenges identified. For Spain and Catalonia, improving the functioning of the labour market and strengthening social cohesion are two of the most pressing issues.

Taking into account the evolution of poverty and social exclusion in Spain, the Commission indeed proposed a specific recommendation (adopted by the Council on 6 July 2012) on the need to improve the employability of vulnerable groups, combined with effective child and family support services in order to improve the situation of people at risk of poverty and/or social exclusion, and consequently to achieve the well-being of children. As for the ESF, both the Catalonia and the national OP 'Fight against Discrimination' provide support to vulnerable groups. Both OPs complement each other, including actions to improve access to employment and inclusion of the less advantaged, keep people in jobs, support services for dependents, promote equality and diversity at work.

More generally, the Commission acknowledges that sustainable improvements will necessarily come as a result of an overall set of reforms, and to this respect, the Commission welcomes the ambitious reform agenda on which Spain has embarked.

([1]) http://www.diba.es/.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009348/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Ampliación estación de esquí de Cerler

El Gobierno de Aragón (España), ha retomado el proyecto de ampliación de la pista de esquí de Cerler por el Valle de Castanesa, sito en la Comarca de la Ribagorza en la comunidad aragonesa.

Sobre este proyecto, al que ya ha sido dirigida mi anterior pregunta parlamentaria E-000691/2011, la Comisión ha expresado su preocupación por el aparente incumplimiento de numerosas normativas en el ámbito medioambiental así como del irregular proceso de evaluación de impacto ambiental por la evaluación «por fases» del impacto del mismo.

En los tres últimos meses se han producido novedades. Por un lado la declaración como proyecto de «Interés General» por parte de la Comunidad Autónoma de Aragón (que forma parte de la empresa promotora Aramon en un 50 %) lo que garantiza un procedimiento especial bajo la legislación urbanística aragonesa y el segundo hecho, es que se ha realizado una resolución del Gobierno de Aragón, por el cual se cambia el plazo inicial para poder comenzar las obras, cambiando de los dos años desde la aprobación de la Declaración de Impacto Ambiental a los dos años desde la reciente Declaración del Interés General, lo que permite eludir así el cumplimiento del artículo 32.3 de la Ley 6/2007 de Protección Ambiental, que obliga a la realización de un nuevo estudio ambiental pasados dos años de la aprobación del mismo. Igualmente consideramos que esta declaración de «Interés General» no corresponde a una certera evaluación económica del proyecto tal y como indican los grandes problemas económicos que en la actualidad están teniendo las empresas de la nieve, sean privadas o semipúblicas como Aramon. Para finalizar, señalar que a nuestro juicio este proyecto solo conseguirá dilapidar el incalculable valor del capital natural que posee la Comarca, reconocido en a través de su inclusión en la Red Natura 2000.

Ante esta situación del proyecto y el consiguiente impulso por parte del Gobierno Autonómico de Aragón:

1. ¿Exigirá la Comisión en cumplimiento de la normativa vigente el desarrollo de un nuevo Estudio de Impacto Ambiental para el proyecto de ampliación de la pista de esquí de Cerler por Castanesa?

2. ¿De qué mecanismos dispondrá la Comisión para poder garantizar la integridad ecológica y paisajística de los espacios incluidos dentro de la Red Natura 2000, que pueden ser afectados por el proyecto?

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

En relación con el incumplimiento de la Directiva 92/43/CEE [1] (Directiva de hábitats) y de la Directiva 2011/92/UE [2] (llamada Directiva de evaluación del impacto ambiental o Directiva EIA), la Comisión inició una investigación para recabar información de las autoridades españolas sobre la ampliación de la estación de esquí de Cerler en el valle de Castanesa (Aragón), según lo indicado en su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-691/2011 [3].

La Directiva EIA no establece ninguna disposición sobre la validez de la declaración de impacto ambiental (DIA) o de cualquier otro documento relacionado con el procedimiento de la EIA. Por lo tanto, a menos que se produzca algún cambio de tipo físico en este proyecto, la prórroga de la validez de la DIA no vulnera la Directiva EIA.

En lo que se refiere a la Directiva sobre hábitats, la Comisión ha comprobado la información facilitada por las autoridades españolas sobre el alcance de las repercusiones previstas en el lugar de importancia comunitaria ES2410049 «Río Isábena». La Comisión coincide con las autoridades españolas en que las medidas de mitigación específicas previstas se ajustan a la Directiva de hábitats. Por lo tanto, la investigación se archivó por no haberse detectado ninguna infracción.

Además, la posible ampliación de la duración de la DIA no infringe la Directiva 92/43/CEE, ni altera la decisión de la Comisión de archivar el expediente mencionado.

---

[1] DO L 206 de 22.7.1992.
[2] DO L 26 de 28.1.2012.
[3] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009348/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Expansion of the Cerler ski resort

The Government of Aragón (Spain) has resumed the project to expand the Cerler ski resort into the Castanesa valley in the Aragonese district of Ribagorza.

The Commission has expressed its concern over this project, which was the subject of my previous parliamentary Question E-000691/2011, because of the apparent failure to comply with many environmental requirements, as well as the irregular way in which the environmental impact assessment for the project is being carried out in stages.

New developments have emerged over the last three months. Firstly, the Autonomous Community of Aragón (which holds 50% of the development firm ARAMON) has declared the project to be of 'general interest', which ensures it is subject to a special procedure under Aragonese land development legislation. Secondly, the Government of Aragón has passed a resolution changing the initial deadline for starting work from two years following the approval of the Environmental Impact Statement to two years following the recent Declaration of General Interest, thus making it possible to circumvent Article 32(3) of Law 6/007 on Environmental Protection, which requires an environmental study to be renewed two years after approval. We also consider that the declaration of 'general interest' does not reflect an accurate economic assessment of the project, as can be seen from the severe economic problems currently facing the snow industry and affecting both private companies and semi-public companies such as ARAMON. In conclusion, we believe that this project will only erode the incalculable value of the area's natural capital, which has been recognised by its inclusion in the Natura 2000 network.

In view of the circumstances of this project and the subsequent action by the Autonomous Government of Aragón:

1. Will the Commission demand that a new Environmental Impact Study be carried out for the project to expand the Cerler ski resort into Castanesa, in accordance with applicable legislation?

2. What mechanisms will the Commission be able to use in order to protect the ecological and environmental integrity of the Natura 2000 network areas that could be affected by this project?

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

Regarding the asserted breach of Directive 92/43/EEC ([1]) (known as the Habitats Directive) and Directive 2011/92/EU ([2]) (known as the Environmental Impact Assessment or EIA Directive), the Commission launched an investigation to request information from the Spanish authorities about the expansion of the Cerler Ski resort into the Castanesa Valley in the region of Aragón, as indicated in its reply to Written Question E-691/2011 ([3]).

The EIA Directive has no provision with respect to the validity of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or any other documentation related to the EIA process. Therefore, unless there is any physical change to this project, the extension of the validity of the (EIS) does not infringe the EIA Directive.

As regards the Habitats Directive, the Commission has verified information provided by the Spanish authorities on the scale of the expected impacts on the site of Community importance ES2410049 'Río Isábena'. The Commission concurs with the Spanish authorities that the specific mitigation measures foreseen are in line with the Habitats Directive. Hence, the investigation was closed, as no breach was identified.

Furthermore, a potential extension of the duration of the EIS does not undermine Directive 92/43/EEC nor changes the conclusion of the Commission to close the above investigation.

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([2]) OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009349/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ανάγκη πειστικών απαντήσεων σε έκθεση της Goldman Sachs

Σε έκθεση της η Goldman Sachs υποστηρίζει ότι η ΕΕ, υπό το φόβο των εξελίξεων σε Ισπανία και Ιταλία, θα προχωρήσει στην εκταμίευση της δόσης για την Ελλάδα, αλλά «με αυτήν τη λογική, η έγκριση της δόσης τώρα, δεν συνιστά εγγύηση για συνέχιση των πληρωμών προς την Ελλάδα: εάν η υπόλοιπη Ευρωζώνη αναπτύξει επαρκή ανθεκτικότητα, η προθυμία για παροχή βοήθειας προς την Ελλάδα θα εξαλειφθεί».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Πως μπορεί να απαντήσει πειστικά σε τέτοιου είδους προειδοποιήσεις; Πως απαντά στις ανησυχίες Ελλήνων αλλά και άλλων ότι, αν η υπόλοιπη Ευρώπη αναπτύξει επαρκή ανθεκτικότητα, η προθυμία παροχής βοήθειας προς την Ελλάδα θα εξαλειφθεί;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Στις 27 Νοεμβρίου 2012 το Eurogroup εξέφρασε απερίφραστα τη δέσμευσή του να παρέχει επαρκή στήριξη στην Ελλάδα κατά τη διάρκεια του τρέχοντος προγράμματος αλλά και μετά, έως ότου η χώρα αποκτήσει πρόσβαση στην αγορά, με την προϋπόθεση την πλήρη συμμόρφωση της Ελλάδας με τις απαιτήσεις και τους στόχους του προγράμματος προσαρμογής ([1]).

Το Eurogroup ενέκρινε επίσημα τη δεύτερη εκταμίευση, βάσει του δεύτερου προγράμματος οικονομικής προσαρμογής για την Ελλάδα, στις 13 Δεκεμβρίου 2012 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ecofin/133857.pdf
([2]) http://eurozone.europa.eu/media/864723/eg_statement_greece_13_12_12.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009349/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Need for a convincing response to a report by Goldman Sachs

In a report it has published, Goldman Sachs argues that the EU, fearing developments in Spain and Italy, will proceed with the disbursement of the tranche for Greece, but adds that, according to this way of thinking, the fact that the present tranche will be approved is no guarantee that payments to Greece will continue: if the rest of the Eurozone becomes sufficiently resilient, willingness to provide aid to Greece will disappear.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

How can it respond convincingly to such warnings? How can it ally the fears of Greeks and others that if the rest of Europe becomes sufficiently resilient, willingness to provide aid to Greece will disappear?

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

On 27 November 2012, the Eurogroup explicitly expressed its commitment to providing adequate support to Greece during the life of the current programme and beyond until it has gained market access, provided that Greece fully complies with the requirements and objectives of the adjustment programme ([1]).

The Eurogroup formally approved the second disbursement under the second economic adjustment programme for Greece on 13 December 2012 ([2]).

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/ecofin/133857.pdf
([2]) http://eurozone.europa.eu/media/864723/eg_statement_greece_13_12_12.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009350/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Έρευνα της Επιτροπής για κρατική ενίσχυση στην Ελλάδα

Σε ερώτημά μας, το Νοέμβριο του 2009 (E-5771/2009), είχαμε καλέσει την Επιτροπή να τοποθετηθεί σχετικά με τις φορολογικές χαριστικές ρυθμίσεις —τις οποίες και παραθέταμε μία προς μία— που αποκτούσε η εταιρία COSCO, από τη σύναψη σύμβασης πώλησης με τον Οργανισμό Λιμένος Πειραιώς κατά την παραχώρηση του Σταθμού Εμπορευματοκιβωτίων (ΣΕΜΠΟ) του λιμένα και οι οποίες, προφανώς, συνιστούσαν εξόφθαλμη κρατική ενίσχυση.

Σήμερα, τρία χρόνια αργότερα, η Επιτροπή στο «Κρατική ενίσχυση αριθ. S.A.28876» που δημοσιεύτηκε την 5.10.2012 στην Επίσημη Εφημερίδα, διαπιστώνει ότι πράγματι υπήρξαν φορολογικά πλεονεκτήματα υπέρ της εταιρίας COSCO, τα οποία συνιστούσαν κρατική ενίσχυση.

Δεδομένου ότι, η ίδια η Επιτροπή αφήνει να εξελίσσονται πολλές παράνομες και αδιαφανείς διαδικασίες, κατά την ιδιωτικοποίηση και άλλων δημόσιων επιχειρήσεων στην Ελλάδα, όπως π.χ., η πώληση του ΟΤΕ στην Deutsche Telekom, το όψιμο ενδιαφέρον της για την τήρηση της νομοθεσίας στην περίπτωση της COSCO προκαλεί εύλογα ερωτηματικά.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Γιατί ανέχθηκε η διαδικασία διερεύνησης της υπόθεσης για τις προφανείς παραβιάσεις της κοινοτικής νομοθεσίας να διαρκέσει τρία χρόνια;

Πώς προτίθεται να αποδείξει στον ελληνικό λαό ότι η ξαφνική της ενεργοποίηση, με τρία χρόνια καθυστέρηση, στοχεύει αποκλειστικά και μόνο στην προάσπιση της κοινοτικής νομοθεσίας και όχι στη διάθεσή της να παρέμβει στον ανταγωνισμό συμφερόντων μεταξύ ευρωπαϊκών και κινεζικών, στην περίπτωση αυτή, επιχειρήσεων;

Απάντηση του κ. Almunia εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Δεκεμβρίου 2012)

Τον Ιούλιο του 2012, η Επιτροπή κίνησε την επίσημη διαδικασία έρευνας σχετικά με ορισμένα φορολογικά πλεονεκτήματα που παραχωρήθηκαν στην Cosco. Η κίνηση της διαδικασίας παρέχει στα ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη τη δυνατότητα να υποβάλουν τις παρατηρήσεις τους όσον αφορά τα υπό εξέταση μέτρα για τα οποία η Επιτροπή εξέφρασε αμφιβολίες, αλλά δεν προδικάζει την έκβαση της παρούσας διαδικασίας έρευνας.

Η διάρκεια της έρευνας της Επιτροπής είναι δικαιολογημένη, αφενός, λόγω των σύνθετων νομικών και οικονομικών θεμάτων που αξιολογούνται από την Επιτροπή και, αφετέρου, λόγω της ανταλλαγής διάφορων επιστολών με τις ελληνικές αρχές.

Όσον αφορά το ότι ο δικαιούχος των μέτρων κρατικής ενίσχυσης είναι κινεζική εταιρεία, η Επιτροπή θα επιθυμούσε να διαβεβαιώσει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου ότι εφαρμόζει τους κανόνες για τις κρατικές ενισχύσεις που διατυπώνονται στη Συνθήκη σε όλες τις επιχειρήσεις χωρίς καμία διάκριση που να βασίζεται στην εθνικότητα ή άλλη διάκριση.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009350/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Commission investigation into state aid in Greece

In a question tabled in November 2009 (E-5771/2009), we had urged the Commission to comment on the tax concessions — which we had listed in detail — granted to the company COSCO by the sales contract with Piraeus Port Authority involving the port's Container Terminal (SEMPO), which clearly amounted to blatant state aid.

Now, three years later, the Commission in 'State aid No S.A. 28876' published on 05.10.2012 in the Official Journal has found that COSCO did in fact enjoy tax advantages constituting state aid.

Since the Commission itself has allowed many illegal and opaque procedures to go ahead during the privatisation of other public enterprises in Greece, such as, for example, the sale of OTE to Deutsche Telekom, the belated interest it has taken in ensuring compliance with the law in the case of COSCO has, justifiably, raised a number of questions.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Why did it allow the investigation of the case involving obvious breaches of EC law to drag on for three years?

How will it show the Greek people that this sudden burst of activity, after three years' delay, is motivated solely by a desire to uphold Community law rather than a desire to intervene in a clash of interests between European and Chinese undertakings?

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

In July 2012, the Commission initiated the formal investigation procedure concerning several tax advantages that have been granted to Cosco. The opening of the procedure allows interested parties to submit their comments on the measures under assessment for which the Commission raised doubts but does not prejudge the outcome of this investigation procedure.

The duration of the investigation by the Commission is justified, on the one hand, by the rather complex legal and economic issues subject to the Commission's assessment and, on the other hand, by the several exchanges of correspondence with the Greek authorities.

As far as the question about the beneficiary of the state aid measures being a Chinese company is concerned, the Commission would like to ensure the Honourable Member that it applies the state aid rules enshrined in the Treaty to all companies without any discrimination based on nationality or other distinction.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009351/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Πρόγραμμα «Εθνικό Ληξιαρχείο»

Η ελληνική κυβέρνηση ανακοίνωσε πρόσφατα το σχέδιο «Αριάδνη» ότι δηλαδή κάθε ληξιαρχική πράξη (θάνατος, γέννηση, γάμος και διαζύγιο) εκτός της δήλωσής της από να δηλώνεται στις αρμόδιες αρχές, θα πρέπει να δηλώνεται σε συμβολαιογράφο, ο οποίος θα ενημερώνει τα ασφαλιστικά ταμεία γι αυτή την μεταβολή. Η απόφαση αυτή σε καμία περίπτωση δεν συνάδει με τον πολυσυζητημένο «εξορθολογισμό» του κράτους, καθώς, αντί να αυτοματοποιεί τις διαδικασίες (π.χ. τα ληξιαρχεία των δήμων να ενημερώνουν απευθείας τα ασφαλιστικά ταμεία για τις μεταβολές), τις περιπλέκει ακόμα περισσότερο με επιπλέον ταλαιπωρία και κόστος για τους πολίτες.

Ο ανορθολογισμός και η σπατάλη καταδεικνύονται ακόμα περισσότερο αν λάβει κανείς υπόψη ότι στα πλαίσια του «Επιχειρησιακού Προγράμματος» για την Ψηφιακή Σύγκλιση 2007-2013» υλοποιείται, πρόγραμμα με τίτλο «Εθνικό Ληξιαρχείο» με συνολικό κόστος 44 εκατομμύρια ευρώ περίπου και όπου «θα καταγράφονται, θα μεταβάλλονται και θα παρακολουθούνται με σύγχρονο και συστηματικό τρόπο όλες οι νέες ληξιαρχικές πράξεις που δηλώνονται/δημιουργούνται στα τοπικά Ληξιαρχεία καθώς και η πλειοψηφία των υφιστάμενων ληξιαρχικών πράξεων των ληξιαρχείων της χώρας.»

Με δεδομένα τα παραπάνω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Έχει ολοκληρωθεί το πρόγραμμα «Εθνικό Ληξιαρχείο» και τα υποέργα του; Αν όχι, γιατί; Πότε προβλέπεται να ολοκληρωθεί και να τεθεί σε λειτουργία; Τι ποσοστό των κονδυλίων για το έργο έχει απορροφηθεί;

2. Υπάρχει συσχέτιση μεταξύ του «προγράμματος “Αριάδνη” και του προγράμματος του “Εθνικού Ληξιαρχείου”»; τα δύο προγράμματα θα καλύπτουν διαφορετικές ανάγκες; Αν όχι, γιατί χρειάζονται δύο πλατφόρμες;

3. Θα έχει επίπτωση στην υλοποίηση του συγχρηματοδοτούμενου προγράμματος «Εθνικό Ληξιαρχείο» η πρόσφατη απόφαση της κυβέρνησης; θα υπάρξει επανασχεδιασμός και καθυστέρηση στην υλοποίηση του; Θα χρειαστούν επιπλέον κονδύλια για τις όποιες αλλαγές χρειαστούν;

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

Κατ' εφαρμογή της αρχής της επιμερισμένης διαχείρισης, η ευθύνη για την εφαρμογή της πολιτικής συνοχής ανήκει στα κράτη μέλη. Επομένως, η αξιολόγηση, η επιλογή, η εφαρμογή και η καθημερινή διαχείριση των προγραμμάτων εμπίπτουν στην αρμοδιότητα των εθνικών αρχών.

Σύμφωνα με τις ελληνικές αρχές, το πρόγραμμα «Εθνικό Ληξιαρχείο» εγκρίθηκε από τη διαχειριστική αρχή του προγράμματος «Ψηφιακή Σύγκλιση» στις 30 Απριλίου 2009 με προϋπολογισμό 44 εκατομμύρια ευρώ. Το εν λόγω πρόγραμμα αφορά τη ψηφιοποίηση του μητρώου των πολιτών τόσο σε επίπεδο δήμων όσο και σε εθνικό επίπεδο. Το πρόγραμμα σχεδιάστηκε και εγκρίθηκε εκ νέου στις 26 Οκτωβρίου 2011 και βρίσκεται, επί του παρόντος, στο στάδιο της υποβολής προτάσεων, ενώ αναμένεται να έχει ολοκληρωθεί έως το τέλος του 2015. Η Κοινωνία της Πληροφορίας ΑΕ συνιστά τον φορέα υλοποίησης του προγράμματος. Το πρόγραμμα αυτό περιλαμβάνεται στον κατάλογο των προγραμμάτων προτεραιότητας που έχει καταρτιθεί από κοινού μεταξύ των ελληνικών αρχών και της Επιτροπής τον Νοέμβριο 2011.

Σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία που ελήφθησαν από τις ελληνικές αρχές, το σχέδιο «Αριάδνη» συνιστά μια πρωτοβουλία του Υπουργείου Εργασίας με σκοπό να εξακριβώνονται τα δικαιώματα των πολιτών όσον αφορά τις συντάξεις και τα παροχές, υποβάλλοντας πιο έγκαιρα τα στοιχεία γέννησης, θανάτου και άλλων πραγματικών γεγονότων. Το εν λόγω πρόγραμμα δεν συγχρηματοδοτείται δυνάμει της πολιτικής για τη συνοχή.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009351/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: 'National Registry Office' project

The Greek Government recently unveiled the Ariadne project concerning the compulsory registration of certificates for deaths, births, marriages and divorces with not only the authorities responsible to date but also a notary's office, which would be required to inform the relevant insurance funds accordingly. This decision is in no way related to the much-debated government 'rationalisation' measures, since, instead of the procedures being completed automatically (for example, ensuring that municipal registry offices inform insurance companies directly of any developments), it will, on the contrary, further complicate them, causing additional inconvenience and expense to members of the public.

The inefficiency and wastage involved emerges even more clearly in the light of the 'National Registry Office' project costing around EUR 44 million in total, forming part of the 2007-2013 Operational Programme for Digital Convergence and intended to ensure that all new certificates entered with or issued by local registry offices, as well as the majority of existing registry office certificates issued in Greece are recorded, amended and monitored systematically as the events occur.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission indicate whether the 'National Registry Office' project and related sub-projects have been completed? If not, why not? When is it expected that the project will be completed and will enter into operation? What percentage of the funding earmarked for this purpose has been utilised?

2. Is there any connection between the Ariadne and 'National Registry Office' projects? Will they cover different needs? If not, why are they both necessary?

3. Will this recent government decision have any impact on implementation of the co-funded 'National Registry Office' project? Will there be any rescheduling or delay in the implementation thereof? Will additional funding be necessary for any changes involved?

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

In application of the shared management principle, the implementation of cohesion policy is the responsibility of Member States. As such, the evaluation, selection, implementation and day to day management of projects fall under the competence of the national authorities.

According to the Greek authorities, the National Registry project was approved by the managing authority of the programme Digital Convergence on 30 April 2009 for a budget of EUR 44 million. It concerns the digitalisation of the citizens' registry at municipal and national level. The project was redesigned and re-approved on 26 October 2011 and is currently in the tendering phase and scheduled for completion by the end of 2015. The Information Society S.A is the implementing body of the project.This project is included in the priority project list jointly established in November 2011 between the Greek authorities and the Commission.

According to information received from the Greek authorities, Ariadne is an initiative of the Ministry of Labour to verify pensions and benefits rights for citizens by providing more timely birth, death and other real life event information. It is not a project being co-financed under cohesion policy.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009352/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Campaña racista contra los lateros en Barcelona

En toda Europa la crisis económica está dando espacio a organizaciones xenófobas y a políticas públicas que hacen de los inmigrantes el chivo expiatorio del descontento popular. Organizaciones que no dudan en hacer uso de la violencia indiscriminada y que actúan con impunidad. Tenemos al partido neonazi «Amanecer Dorado» en Grecia; o «Plataforma por Cataluña». La última campaña del Ayuntamiento de Barcelona contribuye a difundir las tesis sesgadas y reduccionistas. La campaña contra la venta ambulante de cerveza del Ayuntamiento podría considerarse racista, por deshumanizar a los «lateros» representándolos como brazos que surgen de cloacas malolientes y de contenedores. Así asocia a los «lateros» con la insalubridad y la posibilidad de caer enfermo, e indirectamente los señala como los culpables del cierre de los locales de ocio tradicionales.

La Decisión marco 2008/913/JAI del Consejo establece que «el racismo y la xenofobia son violaciones directas de los principios de libertad, democracia, respeto de los derechos humanos y de las libertades fundamentales, así como del Estado de Derecho, principios en los que se fundamenta la Unión Europea y que son comunes a los Estados miembros».

1. ¿Considera la Comisión que con esta campaña el Ayuntamiento de Barcelona promueve el racismo y la xenofobia en Barcelona y en Europa? ¿Le pedirá al Ayuntamiento que retire su campaña?

2. ¿Pedirá la Comisión que el Observatorio Europeo del Racismo y la Xenofobia haga un estudio de los efectos en Cataluña y España de la institucionalización del racismo que llevan a cabo los diferentes gobiernos locales, autonómicos y el gobierno del Estado?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de noviembre de 2012)

Según la información que obra en poder de la Comisión Europea, la campaña a la que se refiere Su Señoría tiene como objetivo combatir la venta ilegal de bebidas en las calles.

La Comisión condena firmemente todas las formas y manifestaciones de racismo y xenofobia y recuerda que los poderes públicos deben evitar toda declaración que pueda estigmatizar a grupos de personas o a individuos por motivos, por ejemplo, de origen étnico o nacional.

La Decisión Marco 2008/913/JAI prohíbe explícitamente la incitación pública e intencionada a la violencia o al odio contra un grupo de personas o un miembro de dicho grupo, definido en relación con su raza, color, religión, ascendencia u origen nacional o étnico ([1]). Sin embargo, corresponde a las autoridades nacionales, como la policía y los tribunales, investigar cada caso concreto y determinar si puede considerarse una incitación pública e intencionada a la violencia o al odio por los motivos antes mencionados. La Comisión está supervisando la aplicación de la Decisión Marco.

La Agencia de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea, creada en el año 2007 para reemplazar al Observatorio Europeo del Racismo y la Xenofobia (EUMC), es una agencia independiente que recopila, analiza y difunde datos objetivos y comparables sobre cuestiones relativas a los derechos fundamentales en toda la UE. Dentro de su ámbito de competencias, la Agencia ya ha llevado a cabo estudios sobre el racismo en los Estados miembros de la UE, por ejemplo, sobre las experiencias de discriminación y victimización delictiva de ciertas minorías étnicas y grupo de inmigrantes ([2]).

([1]) Para obtener más información, véase http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/framework-decision/index_en.htm
([2]) Las publicaciones realizadas a partir de los resultados de la Encuesta de la Unión Europea sobre minorías y discriminación (EU-MIDIS) se encuentran disponibles en http://fra.europa.eu/en/survey/2012/eu-midis-european-union-minorities-and-discrimination-survey.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009352/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Racist campaign against street beer vendors in Barcelona

Throughout Europe the economic crisis is giving rise to xenophobic organisations and public policies that are making immigrants the scapegoats for popular discontent. Organisations such as the neo Nazi party 'Golden Dawn' in Greece, or 'Platform for Catalonia', do not hesitate to use indiscriminate violence and act with impunity. The most recent campaign by Barcelona City Council is helping to spread biased and reductionist ideas. The campaign against street sales of beer could be considered racist because it dehumanises the vendors, depicting them as arms rising up from foul smelling sewers and bins. It therefore associates the vendors with insalubrity and the possibility of falling ill, and indirectly blames them for the closure of traditional leisure venues.

Council Decision 2008/913/JHA states that 'Racism and xenophobia are direct violations of the principles of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and the rule of law, principles upon which the European Union is founded and which are common to the Member States.'

1. Does the Commission consider that Barcelona City Council is promoting racism and xenophobia in Europe with this campaign? Will it ask the city council to withdraw its campaign?

2. Will the Commission ask the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia to assess the impact in Catalonia and Spain of the institutionalisation of racism by the various local and autonomous governments, and by the Spanish central government?

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

According to the information available to the European Commission, the campaign referred to by the Honourable Member is targeted against illegal sale of drinks on the streets.

The Commission strongly condemns all forms and manifestations of racism and xenophobia and recalls that public authorities should avoid any statements which could stigmatise groups of people or individuals for instance on the basis of their ethnic or national origin.

Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA specifically bans the intentional public incitement to violence or hatred targeted against a group of people or a member of such group, defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin ([1]). However, it is for national authorities, such as the police and courts, to investigate any concrete cases and to determine whether they can be considered as intentional public incitement to violence or hatred on the mentioned grounds. The Commission is monitoring the implementation of the framework Decision closely.

The EU Agency for Fundamental Rights, which was set up in 2007 to replace the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC), is an independent agency which collects, analyses and disseminates objective and comparable data on fundamental rights issues across the EU. Within the remit of its mandate, the Agency has already carried out studies on racism in the EU Member States, for instance on the experiences of discrimination and criminal victimisation by certain ethnic minority and immigrant groups ([2]).

([1]) For further information, please see http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/racism-xenophobia/framework-decision/index_en.htm
([2]) Publications derived from the results of this European Union Minorities and Discrimination survey (EU-MIDIS) are available at http://fra.europa.eu/en/survey/2012/eu-midis-european-union-minorities-and-discrimination-survey.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009353/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Giornalista condannato in Cambogia

In Cambogia un giornalista di 71 anni, giornalista, direttore di una radio, una delle poche voci indipendenti e libere del paese è stato condannato a venti anni di reclusione per un inesistente reato di «insurrezione», un verdetto ispirato direttamente dal primo ministro.

Il giornalista fa anche parte dell'Associazione dei democratici, un'organizzazione non governativa che promuove i diritti umani e la democrazia (nella foto membri dell'associazione manifestano in suo favore a luglio 2012).

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, si chiede dunque al Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante quanto segue:

1. È a conoscenze della condanna inflitta al giornalista?

2. Quali provvedimenti e azioni intende intraprendere per difendere la libertà di opinione in Cambogia?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è a conoscenza della condanna inflitta al giornalista Mom Sonando. In seguito a tale sentenza il portavoce dell'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha rilasciato il 1° ottobre una dichiarazione in cui si denuncia la mancanza d'indipendenza del sistema giudiziario.

L'UE, tramite la sua delegazione di Phnom Penh, segue da vicino la questione e proseguirà nel dialogo con il governo in modo da garantire che si faccia ricorso a tutti i canali per ottenere rispetto dei diritti fondamentali di questo difensore dei diritti umani.

Nell'ambito delle elezioni parlamentari in luglio 2013 l'UE presterà particolare attenzione alla libertà di espressione e al diritto di ogni cittadino di esprimere senza timore la sua opinione. A questo riguardo l'UE intende inviare in Cambogia una missione di esperti elettorali per procedere ad una valutazione della preparazione delle elezioni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009353/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Journalist sentenced in Cambodia

In Cambodia, a 71-year-old journalist and radio station director, one of the few free and independent voices in the country, was sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment for a non-existent crime of 'insurrection', a verdict prompted directly by the Prime Minister.

The journalist is also part of Associazione dei democratici [Association of Democrats], a non-governmental organisation that promotes human rights and democracy (the photograph shows members of the association demonstrating in support of him in July 2012).

In view of the above situation, the Vice-President/High Representative is asked the following:

1. Is she aware of the sentence imposed on the journalist?

2. What measures and action does she intend to take to defend the freedom of expression in Cambodia?

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

HR/VP is well aware of the sentence imposed on the journalist, Mom Sonando. Following this sentence, HR/VP spokesperson issued a statement on 1st October denouncing the lack of independence of the judicial system.

The EU, through its Delegation in Phnom Penh, is following the matter very closely and will continue its dialogue with the Government to make sure all channels are used to ensure the fundamental rights of this Human Rights Defender are respected.

In the context of the parliamentary elections in July 2013, the EU will pay particular attention to the freedom of expression and the right of each citizen to express his/her opinion without fear. In this respect, the EU is considering sending an Experts' Election Mission to Cambodia to assess the preparation of these elections.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-009354/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 ottobre 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Sicurezza centrali nucleari in Francia

Diciannove centrali nucleari francesi non sarebbero completamente adeguate ai criteri di sicurezza richiesti dall'Europa secondo un documento preparato dalla Commissione di Bruxelles e rivelato da un quotidiano francese.

Il documento riguarda un'indagine condotta sulle 134 centrali esistenti nei 14 paesi europei e avviata dopo l'incidente di Fukushima in Giappone. Allora, oltre a una ricognizione, vennero effettuati anche degli stress test per verificare la tenuta degli impianti soprattutto per le varie condutture. Le 19 centrali segnalate, quattro delle quali vicine ai confini italiani, manifesterebbero delle «carenze» ma «in generale la situazione è soddisfacente» e non si chiede alcuna chiusura. Si fa però notare che mancano degli strumenti di misurazione sismica e gli equipaggiamenti di soccorso in caso di incidente non sono adeguati.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, si chiede dunque al Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante quanto segue:

1. Può fornire ulteriori dettagli sul documento?

2. Può fornire un quadro completo sulla sicurezza nelle centrali nucleari nei paesi membri?

3. Può fornire informazioni sulla eventuale mancanza degli strumenti di misurazione sismica e degli equipaggiamenti?

Risposta di Günther Oettinger a nome della Commissione
(21 dicembre 2012)

1.-2. Il 4 ottobre la Commissione ha licenziato la comunicazione della Commissione al Consiglio e al Parlamento europeo sulle valutazioni complessive dei rischi e della sicurezza («prove di stress») delle centrali nucleari nell'Unione europea e attività collegate ([1]), corredata di un documento di lavoro ([2]). La Commissione tiene inoltre a rinviare l'onorevole parlamentare alle risposte alle interrogazioni scritte E-008953/2012, presentata da Antigoni Papadopoulou, E-009278/2012, presentata da Nuno Melo e E-009713/2012, presentata da Willy Meyer ([3]).

3. Come illustrato nel documento di lavoro della Commissione, non tutte le centrali nucleari degli Stati membri dispongono attualmente di strumentazione sismica in sito in esercizio. La relazione finale del Gruppo dei regolatori europei in materia di sicurezza nucleare sulla relazione del controllo di pari livello relativa alle prove di stress ([4]) dell'UE raccomanda che i regolatori nazionali valutino l'eventualità di installare sistemi di monitoraggio sismico e di sviluppare procedure associate e formazioni per le centrali nucleari che non dispongono di tali sistemi.

([1]) Comunicazione della Commissione al Consiglio e al Parlamento europeo sulle valutazioni complessive dei rischi e della sicurezza («prove di stress») delle centrali nucleari nell'Unione europea e attività collegate, COM(2012)571 final; cfr.: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/safety/doc/com_2012_0571_en.pdf
([2]) Cfr.: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/safety/doc/swd_2012_0287_en.pdf
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html
([4]) Cfr.: http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20Test%20Peer%20Review%20Final%20Report_0.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009354/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Safety of nuclear power stations in France

According to a document prepared by the Brussels Commission and reported by a French newspaper, nineteen French nuclear power stations do not fully satisfy the safety criteria required by the Europe Union.

The document reports on an investigation carried out at 134 existing power stations in 14 European countries, which was organised following the Fukushima incident in Japan. In addition to a general survey, stress tests were also carried out to check the resistance of the power plants and of the various pipelines in particular. The 19 power stations identified — four of which are close to Italian borders — revealed 'shortcomings', but 'generally speaking, the situation is satisfactory' and no shutdown was required. However, it was pointed out that they lack seismic measuring instruments and that the emergency equipment to be used in the event of an incident is inadequate.

In view of the above, can the Vice-President/High Representative answer the following:

1. Can further information on the document be provided?

2. Can she give a full picture of the safety of nuclear power stations in Member States?

3. Can she provide information on any shortages in seismic measuring instruments or equipment?

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

1-2. On 4 October the Commission issued the 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 (EU) and related activities ([1]), which was accompanied by a Staff Working Document ([2]). The Commission would also like to refer the Honourable Member to its replies to written questions E-008953/2012 by Mrs Antigoni Papadopoulou, E-009278/2012 by Mr Nuno Melo and E-009713/2012 by Mr Willy Meyer ([3]).

3. As described in the Commission's Staff Working Document, not all nuclear power plants in the Member States currently have on-site seismic instrumentation in operation. The European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group final report on the peer review of EU stress tests ([4]) recommends that national regulators consider the installation of seismic monitoring systems and development of associated procedures and training for those nuclear power plants that do not have such systems.

([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; see at: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/safety/doc/com_2012_0571_en.pdf
([2]) See at: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/nuclear/safety/doc/swd_2012_0287_en.pdf
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([4]) See at: http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20Test%20Peer%20Review%20Final%20Report_0.pdf

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-009355/12
adresată Comisiei
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: Exploatarea lucrătorilor români de către angajatori din alte state ale UE

Numeroși cetățeni români se confruntă cu abuzuri din partea unor angajatori din alte țări membre, care îi obligă să accepte să lucreze fără contract de muncă și fără respectarea unor drepturi, precum plata orelor suplimentare.

Presa europeană dezvăluie, tot mai des, abuzurile revoltătoare la care sunt supuși în unele state membre cetățeni provenind din estul Europei. Săptămâna trecută, a atras atenția situația precară a zeci de români, care lucrează în Bruxelles, în industria cărnii, majoritatea fără contract de muncă și fără plata orelor suplimentare. Este, de asemenea, cazul românilor ținuți în condiții de sclavie, pentru a presta servicii de curățenie în Danemarca. Peste 20 de persoane au fost obligate, în regiunea Zeeland, să muncească program prelungit fără a le fi plătite salariile. În Marea Britanie, BBC a dezvăluit, recent, relele tratamente la care sunt supuși românii care lucrează în sectorul hotelier. Imigranții angajați ca persoane fizice autorizate sunt plătiți de trei ori mai puțin față de venitul minim din Marea Britanie, nefiind respectate condițiile de muncă și salarizare promise inițial.

Are în vedere Comisiei inițierea unui cadru legislativ constrângător, în condițiile în care actuala legislație a UE privind libera circulație a lucrătorilor este încălcată sistematic? Consideră Comisia că menținerea restricțiilor pentru accesul românilor pe piața muncii din nouă state membre determină un statut vulnerabil care favorizează tratamentul discriminatoriu și abuzurile?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(19 noiembrie 2012)

Legislația UE privind libera circulație a lucrătorilor prevede un tratament egal al lucrătorilor migranți din UE cu cel al cetățenilor țării gazdă în ceea ce privește angajarea, remunerarea și alte condiții de muncă. Pentru a facilita exercitarea efectivă a acestui drept, în prezent, Comisia pregătește o inițiativă legislativă.

Lucrătorii români și bulgari care au fost admiși pe piața forței de muncă a unuia dintre cele opt state membre ([1]) care încă restricționează accesul la propria sa piață a forței de muncă în conformitate cu dispozițiile tranzitorii beneficiază, de asemenea, pe deplin de acest drept. Cu toate acestea, aspectele descrise de distinsul membru (orele de lucru prelungite în mod forțat fără plata salariilor, neplata orelor suplimentare sau neacordarea salariului minim, nerespectarea salariilor promise și a condițiilor de muncă) nu sugerează o diferență de tratament față de cetățenii țărilor gazdă din motive legate de naționalitatea română a lucrătorilor.

Mai degrabă, în ceea ce privește aceste aspecte legate de dreptul muncii, Comisia reamintește că toate societățile stabilite în statele membre trebuie să respecte standardele stabilite de legislația UE și de legislația națională. Aplicarea lor corespunzătoare este responsabilitatea autorităților naționale competente. Nivelul salariilor și al remunerațiilor pentru ore suplimentare reprezintă o chestiune care ține de legislația națională. În plus, Comisia face trimitere la propunerea sa privind o directivă de punere în aplicare ([2]) care vizează, în special, îmbunătățirea protecției drepturilor lucrătorilor detașați, care este în prezent în curs de examinare de către colegislatori.

([1]) Belgia, Germania, Franța, Luxemburg, Malta, Țările de Jos, Austria și Regatul Unit; în plus, până la 31 decembrie 2012, lucrătorii români se confruntă cu restricții privind accesul la piața forței de muncă în Spania.

([2]) COM(2012) 131 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-009355/12
to the Commission
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Exploitation of Romanian workers by employers in other EU countries

A large number of Romanian citizens are suffering abusive treatment by some employers in other Member States, who are forcing them to work without employment contracts and refusing to respect certain rights such as the right to pay for working overtime.

The European press is uncovering more and more frequent cases of intolerable abuses suffered by citizens from Eastern Europe in some Member States. Last week, the focus was on the precarious situation of dozens of Romanians working in the meat industry in Brussels, most of them without any employment contract and without receiving overtime pay. There are similar cases of Romanians being kept in conditions akin to slavery to provide cleaning services in Denmark. Around 20 people were forced to work long hours without wages in the Zealand region. In the United Kingdom, the BBC recently uncovered the mistreatment suffered by Romanian workers in the hotel sector. Immigrants employed as registered physical persons are being paid a third of the UK minimum wage, and the working conditions and wages initially promised are not being complied with.

Will the Commission propose a binding legal framework, given the systematic infringements of current EU legislation on the free movement of workers? Does the Commission believe that maintaining restrictions on Romanians' access to the labour market in nine Member States makes their status vulnerable and favours discriminatory and abusive treatment?

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

EC law on free movement of workers provides for equal treatment of EU migrant workers with the nationals of the host country as regards employment, remuneration and other conditions of work. To facilitate the effective exercise of this right, the Commission is currently preparing a legislative initiative.

Romanian and Bulgarian workers who have been admitted to the labour market of one of the eight Member States ([1]) that still restricts access to its labour market under the transitional arrangements also benefit fully from this right. However, what the Honourable Member describes (forcing long working hours without wages, no overtime pay or minimum wage, not keeping promised wages and working conditions) does not suggest a difference in treatment to nationals on the grounds of the Romanian nationality of the workers.

Rather, as concerns such issues of labour law, the Commission recalls that all companies established in Member States have to comply with the standards set by the EU and national law. Their proper enforcement is the responsibility of the competent national authorities. Wages and overtime pay rates are a matter of national law. Furthermore, the Commission refers to its proposal for an Enforcement directive ([2]) aiming in particular at improving the protection of the rights of posted workers, which is currently being examined by co-legislators.

([1]) Belgium, Germany, France, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Austria and the United Kingdom; in addition, until 31 December 2012 Romanian workers face restrictions on labour market access in Spain.
([2]) COM(2012) 131 fnal.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009356/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Πώληση τροφίμων με περασμένη ημερομηνία λήξης σε φθηνότερη τιμή

Σύμφωνα με τους νέους κανόνες διακίνησης και εμπορίας προϊόντων στην Ελλάδα, ενεργοποιήθηκε μια ανενεργή επί εικοσαετίας αγορανομική διάταξη, που επιτρέπει τη νόμιμη πλέον διάθεση-πώληση σε φθηνότερη τιμή τροφίμων με περασμένη ημερομηνία λήξης, σε καταστήματα λιανικής (σουπερ μάρκετ, εμπορικά καταστήματα κτλ). Βάσει αυτής, τα τρόφιμα θα βρίσκονται σε ξεχωριστό σημείο μέσα στα καταστήματα λιανικής σε ξεχωριστά ράφια από τα άλλα είδη και με εμφανή σήμανση που θα αναγράφει «τρόφιμα περασμένης διατηρησιμότητας».

Στα εν λόγω «τρόφιμα περασμένης διατηρησιμότητας» ο χρόνος διάθεσής τους δεν θα μπορεί να υπερβαίνει:

— τη μία εβδομάδα, αν η ελάχιστη διατηρησιμότητα δηλώνεται με την αναγραφή ημέρας και μήνα,

— τον ένα μήνα, αν η ελάχιστη διατηρησιμότητα δηλώνεται με την αναγραφή μήνα και έτους,

— τους τρεις μήνες, αν η ελάχιστη διατηρησιμότητα δηλώνεται με την αναγραφή μόνο του έτους.

Ουσιαστικά η διάταξη αυτή αφορά μη ευαλλοίωτα προϊόντα, όπως όσπρια, ζυμαρικά, μπισκότα, φρυγανιές, καφέδες, κονσέρβες, ενώ όσον αφορά τα ευαλλοίωτα προϊόντα, όπως είναι τα γαλακτοκομικά, δηλαδή τυριά, γιαούρτια και γάλα, απαγορεύεται η πώλησή τους μετά την ημερομηνία λήξης.

Σύμφωνα με τα παραπάνω ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Ισχύουν παρόμοιες πρακτικές σε άλλα κράτη μέλη; Αν ναι, ποίο είναι το αντίστοιχο πλαίσιο που τις διέπει;

2. Πώς διασφαλίζεται η υγεία και ασφάλεια των καταναλωτών από την πώληση τροφίμων με περασμένη ημερομηνία λήξης; Ποιος εγγυάται την ποιότητα των εν λόγω προϊόντων;

3. Πώς μπορούν να διασφαλιστούν τα νόμιμα δικαιώματα των καταναλωτών σε περίπτωση αγοράς αλλοιωμένου προϊόντος, δεδομένου ότι πρόκειται μεν για είδη με περασμένη ημερομηνία λήξης, αλλά πωλούνται νόμιμα και η εκάστοτε παραγωγός εταιρεία δεν φέρει καμία ευθύνη;

4. Υπάρχει κίνδυνος να τεθεί θέμα κατηγοριοποίησης του καταναλωτικού κοινού;

5. Πώς διασφαλίζεται η προστασία των καταναλωτών από τη χρήση της συγκεκριμένης κατηγορίας προϊόντων από καταστήματα παροχής υπηρεσιών εστίασης (εστιατόρια, ταβέρνες κ.λπ.);

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

Η Επιτροπή δεν γνωρίζει την ύπαρξη παρόμοιου νομοθετικού πλαισίου σε άλλα κράτη μέλη αλλά είναι πρόθυμη να συγκεντρώσει αυτά τα στοιχεία.

Τα προσυσκευασμένα τρόφιμα, με ελάχιστες εξαιρέσεις, πρέπει να φέρουν μια ημερομηνία ελάχιστης διατηρησιμότητας (ένδειξη «ανάλωσης κατά προτίμηση πριν από») ή τελική ημερομηνία ανάλωσης. Η νομοθεσία της ΕΕ ([1]) ορίζει ότι η ένδειξη «ανάλωση κατά προτίμηση πριν από» πρέπει να αντικαθίσταται από ένδειξη τελικής ημερομηνίας ανάλωσης όταν, από μικροβιολογική άποψη, ένα τρόφιμο είναι σε μεγάλο βαθμό αλλοιώσιμο και, επομένως, είναι πιθανό ύστερα από μια σύντομη περίοδο να θέσει την ανθρώπινη υγεία σε κίνδυνο. Ο υπεύθυνος της επιχείρησης τροφίμων φέρει την ευθύνη να καθορίσει πότε πρέπει να αναγράφεται η ημερομηνία «τελικής ανάλωσης» σε ένα τρόφιμο. Ο νέος κανονισμός σχετικά με την παροχή πληροφοριών για τα τρόφιμα στους καταναλωτές ([2]), ο οποίος θα εφαρμοστεί από τις 13 Δεκεμβρίου 2014, διατηρεί τις υπάρχουσες διατάξεις. Επιπλέον, το άρθρο 24 ορίζει ότι μετά την τελική ημερομηνία ανάλωσης το τρόφιμο δεν πρέπει να θεωρείται ασφαλές, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 14 παράγραφος 2 έως 5 του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αρ. 178/2002 ([3]).

Αντίθετα, η ημερομηνία «ανάλωσης κατά προτίμηση πριν από» αφορά την ημερομηνία έως την οποία το τρόφιμο διατηρεί τις ιδιαίτερες ιδιότητές του σε κατάλληλες συνθήκες συντήρησης. Συνεπώς, ακόμα και μετά τη λήξη αυτής της ημερομηνίας, ένα τρόφιμο μπορεί ακόμα να καταναλωθεί και να πουληθεί, εάν ο υπεύθυνος της επιχείρησης τροφίμων μπορεί να εξασφαλίσει ότι το τρόφιμο αυτό εξακολουθεί να πληροί τις απαιτήσεις όλων των νομοθετικών διατάξεων για τα τρόφιμα.

Η εκάστοτε παραγωγός εταιρεία δεν μπορεί να απαλλαγεί από καμία ευθύνη. Επομένως, οι γενικές διατάξεις στον συγκεκριμένο τομέα εφαρμόζονται, επίσης, με βάση το εν λόγω εθνικό νομοθετικό πλαίσιο.

Τα κράτη μέλη φέρουν την ευθύνη για την εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ για τα τρόφιμα και ελέγχουν, μέσα από την οργάνωση επίσημων ελέγχων, εάν οι εν λόγω απαιτήσεις τηρούνται από τους υπευθύνους των επιχειρήσεων και σε καταστήματα παροχής υπηρεσιών εστίασης. Οι επίσημοι έλεγχοι πρέπει να διεξάγονται τακτικά, καθώς επίσης, κατάλληλα μέτρα πρέπει να λαμβάνονται για να μειωθεί ο κίνδυνος και να διασφαλιστεί η εφαρμογή της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ για τα τρόφιμα.

([1]) Οδηγία 2000/13/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 20ής Μαρτίου 2000, για προσέγγιση των νομοθεσιών των κρατών μελών σχετικά με την επισήμανση, την παρουσίαση και τη διαφήμιση των τροφίμων (ΕΕ L 109 της 6.5.2000, σ. 29).

([2]) Κανονισμός (ΕΕ) αριθ. 1169/2011 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 25ης Οκτωβρίου 2011, σχετικά με την παροχή πληροφοριών για τα τρόφιμα στους καταναλωτές, την τροποποίηση των κανονισμών του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1924/2006 και (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1925/2006 και την κατάργηση της οδηγίας 87/250/ΕΟΚ της Επιτροπής, της οδηγίας 90/496/ΕΟΚ του Συμβουλίου, της οδηγίας 1999/10/ ΕΚ της Επιτροπής, της οδηγίας 2000/13/ΕΚ του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, των οδηγιών της Επιτροπής 2002/67/ΕΚ και 2008/5/ΕΚ και του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 608/2004 της Επιτροπής, ΕΕ L 304 της 22.11.2011, σ. 18.

([3]) Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 178/2002 του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου, της 28ης Ιανουαρίου 2002, για τον καθορισμό των γενικών αρχών και απαιτήσεων της νομοθεσίας για τα τρόφιμα, για την ίδρυση της Ευρωπαϊκής Αρχής για την Ασφάλεια των Τροφίμων και τον καθορισμό των διατάξεων σε θέματα ασφάλειας τροφίμων, ΕΕ L 31 της 1.2.2002.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009356/12
to the Commission
Konstantinos Poupakis (PPE)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Sale of food at reduced prices after expiry date

Under new provisions for the transport and sale of products in Greece, a market decree which has not been in force for 20 years has now been revived making it legal to offer food products for sale at reduced prices in retail outlets (supermarkets, shops, etc.) after their expiry date, provided that they are clearly labelled as such and stacked separately from other products.

Such products may not be offered for sale for longer than:

— one week, if their expiry date is indicated by day and month;

— one month, if their expiry date is indicated by month and year;

— three months, if their expiry date is indicated by year only.

This provision refers to non-perishable products such as pulses, pasta, biscuits, rusks, coffee, canned foods, etc. while perishable foods such as dairy products including cheese, yoghurts and milk may not be sold after their expiry date.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission say whether similar practices are being followed in other Member States? If so, what framework provisions apply?

2. What measures are taken to protect the safety and health of consumers regarding the sale of foods after expiry date? Who is responsible for guaranteeing the quality of the product concerned?

3. What measures can be taken to guarantee the legal rights of consumers regarding goods unfit for consumption, given that, while the products concerned are being sold after their expiry date, this is being done legally, thereby exonerating manufacturers from any responsibility?

4. Is there a danger of consumer categorisation on this basis?

5. What measures can be taken to protect consumers from the use of such product categories by catering establishments (restaurants, bars, etc.)?

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

The Commission is not aware of the existence of similar framework rules in other Member States but is willing to complete this information.

Pre-packed foods, with few exceptions, must bear a date of minimum durability (best before date) or a use by date. EC law ([1]) specifies that the 'best before' date should be replaced by a 'use by' date when, from a microbiological point of view, a food is highly perishable and is therefore likely after a short period to constitute an immediate danger to human health. It is the responsibility of the food business operator to determine when a product should be labelled with a use by date. The new Regulation on the provision of food information to consumers ([2]), which will apply from 13 December 2014, maintains the existing rules. Moreover, Article 24 states that after the 'use by' date a food shall be deemed to be unsafe in accordance with Article 14(2) to (5) of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 ([3]).

([1]) Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs (OJ L 109, 6.5.2000, p.29).

([2]) Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1924/2006 and (EC) No 1925/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Commission Directive 87/250/EEC, Council Directive 90/496/EEC, Commission Directive 1999/10/EC, Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, Commission Directives 2002/67/EC and 2008/5/EC and Commission Regulation (EC) No 608/2004, OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p.18.

([3]) Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety, OJ L 31 of 1.2.2002.

On the contrary, the 'best before' date relates to the date until which the food retains its specific properties when properly stored. Hence, even after this date, a food may still be consumed and sold, if the food business operator can assure that the food still meets all food law requirements.

Manufacturers cannot be exempted from any responsibility. Therefore, general rules in this field apply also under such national framework legislation.

Member States are responsible for the enforcement of EU food law and verify, through the organisation of official controls, that the relevant requirements thereof are fulfilled by business operators, also in catering establishments. Official controls must be carried out regularly, and appropriate measures must be taken to eliminate risk and ensure enforcement of EU food law.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009358/12
a la Comisión
Julie Girling (ECR), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Gesine Meissner (ALDE) y Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Fundamento jurídico de la regularización retroactiva de las licencias de pesca inválidas en Liberia

El artículo 3 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1005/2008 (Reglamento INDNR de la UE) dispone que «1. Se supondrá que un buque pesquero está involucrado en pesca INDNR cuando se demuestre que, infringiendo las medidas de conservación y ordenación aplicables en la zona donde haya llevado a cabo esas actividades: a) ha pescado sin contar con una licencia, autorización o permiso válido expedido por el Estado de abanderamiento o el Estado ribereño pertinente».

A lo largo de los años 2011 y 2012, algunos atuneros que enarbolaban el pabellón de Estados miembros y algunos otros que, siendo propiedad de Estados europeos, enarbolaban el pabellón de países que no formaban parte de la Unión, faenaron de manera ilegal en Liberia con licencias supuestamente expedidas por funcionarios que no representaban al Ministerio de Agricultura de Liberia, que es la autoridad competente que se encarga de la expedición de licencias de pesca para la zona económica exclusiva de Liberia.

En un principio, la Comisión exigió que los Estados miembros evitaran la importación de productos de la pesca obtenidos mediante estas licencias e investigaran el modo en que los buques pesqueros bajo pabellón comunitario se procuraban dichas licencias. Sin embargo, la Comisión cambió de posición mediante la interpretación de forma retroactiva de un acuerdo firmado en 2012 entre el Gobierno de Liberia y las empresas armadoras involucradas con objeto de regular las licencias inválidas y, por consiguiente, permitir la importación en la EU de las capturas efectuadas.

¿Puede aclarar/confirmar la Comisión sobre qué fundamento jurídico tomó la decisión de permitir la importación de estas capturas efectuadas ilegalmente?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de enero de 2013)

El Reglamento para prevenir, desalentar y eliminar la pesca ilegal, no declarada y no reglamentada (INDNR) ([1]) constituye la base para combatir las actividades de pesca ilegal en aguas de la UE y de fuera de la UE.

En el marco del Reglamento INDNR, la Comisión es responsable de prevenir a los Estados miembros acerca de situaciones potenciales de riesgo (pesca INDNR o infracciones graves), transmitiéndoles lo antes posible la información pertinente disponible o peticiones de investigación.

En cumplimiento de sus obligaciones, la Comisión informó a los Estados miembros de la situación que se daba en aguas liberianas y les instó a investigar la posible utilización por parte de operadores de la UE de licencias de pesca de Liberia carentes de validez. En este contexto, las autoridades liberianas informaron a la Comisión de que se habían impuesto sanciones a atuneros con pabellones europeos. Esta información fue comunicada a los Estados miembros, requiriéndoles al mismo tiempo que garantizasen que los productos de la pesca afectados no fueran importados en la EU. Posteriormente, las autoridades liberianas precisaron que se había llegado a un acuerdo por el cual los operadores habían aceptado abonar una indemnización a Liberia. Esta información también fue oportunamente comunicada a los Estados miembros.

En los próximos meses va a seguirse trabajando en esta cuestión.

Dado que el Estado ribereño afectado ha confirmado la legalidad de las actividades pesqueras, ha dejado de ser procedente aplicar las disposiciones del artículo 3 del Reglamento INDNR (es decir, actividades pesqueras realizadas sin licencia válida).

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1005/2008 del Consejo, de 29 de septiembre de 2008, por el que se establece un sistema comunitario para prevenir, desalentar y eliminar la pesca ilegal, no declarada y no reglamentada (Reglamento INDNR), DO L 286 de 29.10.2008, p. 1.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-009358/12
an die Kommission
Julie Girling (ECR), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Gesine Meissner (ALDE) und Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(15. Oktober 2012)

Betrifft: Rechtsgrundlage für eine rückwirkende Regularisierung ungültiger Fanglizenzen in Liberia

In Artikel 3 Absatz 1 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1005/2008 des Rates (EU-IUU-Verordnung) heißt es: „Von einer Beteiligung eines Fischereifahrzeugs an IUU-Fischerei wird ausgegangen, wenn nachgewiesen wird, dass es im Widerspruch zu den Erhaltungs- und Bewirtschaftungsmaßnahmen, die in dem betreffendem Gebiet gelten, (a) ohne eine vom Flaggenstaat oder dem betreffenden Küstenstaat erteilte gültige Lizenz, Genehmigung oder Erlaubnis gefischt hat".

Im Zeitraum 2011/2012 waren eine Reihe unter europäischer Flagge fahrender Thunfischfänger sowie unter der Flagge eines Drittstaates fahrende europäische Thunfischfänger mit gefälschten Lizenzen in Liberia tätig: diese Lizenzen wurden wiederholt von Personen ausgestellt, die nicht das liberianische Landwirtschaftsministerium vertraten, das für die Ausstellung von Fanglizenzen für die Ausschließliche Wirtschaftszone Liberias zuständig ist.

Ursprünglich forderte die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten auf, die Einfuhr von im Rahmen dieser Lizenzen gefangenem Fisch zu verhindern und zu prüfen, wie Fischereifahrzeuge, die unter ihrer Flagge tätig sind, in den Besitz derartiger Lizenzen gekommen sind. Die Kommission hat jedoch anschließend ihre Position geändert, als sie eine Vereinbarung über den Streitfall zwischen der liberianischen Regierung und den betroffenen Unternehmen aus dem Jahr 2012 dahin gehend auslegte, dass die ungültigen Lizenzen rückwirkend „regularisiert" werden sollten, so dass der gefangene Fisch in die EU importiert werden darf.

Kann die Kommission klarstellen/bestätigen, anhand welcher Rechtgrundlage sie ihren Beschluss getroffen hat, die Einfuhr dieser illegalen Fischfänge effektiv zu genehmigen?

Antwort von Frau Damanaki im Namen der Kommission
(11. Januar 2013)

Die EU-Verordnung zur Verhinderung, Bekämpfung und Unterbindung der illegalen, nicht gemeldeten und unregulierten Fischerei (IUU-Verordnung) ([1]) bildet die Grundlage für die Bekämpfung illegaler Fangtätigkeiten innerhalb und außerhalb der EU-Gewässer.

Die Kommission ist im Rahmen der IUU-Verordnung dafür verantwortlich, die Mitgliedstaaten hinsichtlich potenzieller Gefahrensituationen (IUU-Fischerei oder schwere Verstöße) zu warnen, indem sie verfügbare relevante Informationen umgehend übermittelt oder eine Überprüfung fordert.

Im Rahmen dieser Verpflichtung informierte die Kommission die Mitgliedstaaten über die Situation in den liberianischen Gewässern und forderte sie auf, Nachforschungen bezüglich der Nutzung ungültiger liberianischer Fanglizenzen durch Wirtschaftsbeteiligte der EU anzustellen. Daraufhin informierten die liberianischen Behörden die Kommission, dass unter europäischer Flagge fahrende Thunfischfänger mit Sanktionen belegt wurden. Dies wurde den Mitgliedstaaten mitgeteilt und sie wurden aufgefordert, sicherzustellen, dass die betroffenen Fischereierzeugnisse nicht in die EU eingeführt werden. Die liberianischen Behörden erklärten später, dass eine Einigung erzielt wurde, in deren Rahmen die Beteiligten der Zahlung eines finanziellen Ausgleichs an Liberia zustimmten. Dies wurde den Mitgliedstaaten ebenfalls rechtzeitig mitgeteilt.

Weitere Arbeiten in dieser Sache werden innerhalb der nächsten Monate durchgeführt.

Da der betroffene Küstenstaat bestätigt hat, dass es sich um legale Fangtätigkeiten handelt, scheint Artikel 3 der IUU-Verordnung (d.h. Fischfang ohne gültige Fanglizenz) nicht länger anwendbar zu sein.

([1]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1005/2008 des Rates zur Verhinderung, Bekämpfung und Unterbindung der illegalen, nicht gemeldeten und unregulierten Fischerei (IUU-Verordnung), ABl. L 286, S. 1.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-009358/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Julie Girling (ECR), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Gesine Meissner (ALDE) και Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Νομική βάση για την αναδρομική τακτοποίηση των ακύρων αδειών αλιείας στη Λιβερία

Το άρθρο 3(1) του κανονισμού του Συμβουλίου 1005/2008/ΕΚ (κανονισμός για την παράνομη, λαθραία και άναρχη αλιεία) αναφέρει ότι «αλιευτικό σκάφος θεωρείται ότι έχει αναπτύξει δραστηριότητες ΠΛΑ αλιείας εάν έχει αποδειχτεί ότι, κατά παράβαση των μέτρων διατήρησης και διαχείρισης που ισχύουν στην περιοχή που ανέπτυξε τις εν λόγω δραστηριότητες: (α) αλίευσε χωρίς ισχύουσα άδεια ή έγκριση εκδοθείσα από το κράτος σημαίας ή από το οικείο παράκτιο κράτος».

Στο χρονικό διάστημα 2011-12 ορισμένα θυνναλιευτικά που έφεραν ευρωπαϊκή σημαία καθώς και ευρωπαϊκής ιδιοκτησίας θυνναλιευτικά με σημαίες μη ευρωπαϊκών κρατών δραστηριοποιήθηκαν στη Λιβερία με πλαστές άδειες τις οποίες εικάζεται ότι εξέδωσαν παράγοντες που δεν εκπροσωπούσαν το Υπουργείο Γεωργίας της Λιβερίας, δηλαδή την αρμόδια αρχή για τη χορήγηση αδειών αλιείας στην Αποκλειστική Οικονομική Ζώνη της Λιβερίας.

Η Επιτροπή ζήτησε αρχικά από τα κράτη μέλη να εμποδίσουν τις εισαγωγές αλιευμάτων που αλιεύθηκαν βάσει των αδειών αυτών και να διερευνήσουν τον τρόπο με τον οποίο περιήλθε στην κατοχή κάποιων αλιευτικών που φέρουν τις σημαίες τους τέτοιου είδους άδειες. Η Επιτροπή ωστόσο, αντέστρεψε στη συνέχεια τη στάση της, ερμηνεύοντας μια συμφωνία ρύθμισης του 2012 μεταξύ της κυβέρνησης της Λιβερίας και των εμπλεκομένων εταιρειών εις τρόπον ώστε να «τακτοποιούνται» αναδρομικά οι άκυρες άδειες, επιτρέποντας έτσι την εισαγωγή του σχετικού αλιεύματος στην ΕΕ.

Μπορεί η Επιτροπή να διευκρινίσει ή να επιβεβαιώσει τη νομική βάση της απόφασής της να επιτρέπονται ουσιαστικά οι εισαγωγές των παρανόμων αυτών αλιευμάτων;

Απάντηση της κ. Δαμανάκη εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(11 Ιανουαρίου 2013)

Ο κανονισμός για την πρόληψη, την αποτροπή και την εξάλειψη της παράνομης, λαθραίας και άναρχης αλιείας (ΠΛΑ) [1] παρέχει τη βάση για την καταπολέμηση δραστηριοτήτων παράνομης αλιείας στα κοινοτικά ύδατα και σε ύδατα εκτός της ΕΕ.

Δυνάμει του κανονισμού ΠΛΑ η Επιτροπή έχει την ευθύνη να προειδοποιεί τα κράτη μέλη για το ενδεχόμενο καταστάσεων κινδύνου (ΠΛΑ αλιείας ή σοβαρών παραβάσεων) διαβιβάζοντας σχετικές πληροφορίες τις οποίες διαθέτει ή ζητώντας τη διεξαγωγή ερευνών.

Σύμφωνα με τις εν λόγω υποχρεώσεις της, η Επιτροπή ενημέρωσε τα κράτη μέλη για την κατάσταση στα ύδατα της Λιβερίας και τους ζήτησε να διερευνήσουν το ενδεχόμενο να έχουν χρησιμοποιηθεί άκυρες άδειες αλιείας Λιβερίας από διαχειριστές σκαφών της ΕΕ. Σε αυτό το πλαίσιο οι λιβεριανές αρχές ενημέρωσαν την Επιτροπή ότι επιβλήθηκαν κυρώσεις σε θυνναλιευτικά με ευρωπαϊκή σημαία. Οι ανωτέρω πληροφορίες διαβιβάστηκαν στα κράτη μέλη με το αίτημα να εξασφαλιστεί ότι τα εν λόγω αλιεύματα δεν εισάγονταν στην ΕΕ. Οι λιβεριανές αρχές διευκρίνισαν αργότερα ότι κατέληξαν σε συμφωνία διακανονισμού βάσει της οποίας οι διαχειριστές των σκαφών δέχτηκαν να καταβάλουν χρηματική αποζημίωση στη Λιβερία. Και αυτές οι πληροφορίες διαβιβάστηκαν εγκαίρως στα κράτη μέλη

Το εν λόγω ζήτημα θα εξεταστεί περαιτέρω τους επόμενους μήνες.

Δεδομένου ότι επιβεβαιώθηκε η νομιμότητα των αλιευτικών δραστηριοτήτων από το ενδιαφερόμενο παράκτιο κράτος, οι διατάξεις του άρθρου 3 του κανονισμού ΠΛΑ (ήτοι αλιευτικές δραστηριότητες χωρίς έγκυρη άδεια) φαίνεται πως δεν είναι πλέον εφαρμόσιμες.

---

[1] Κανονισμός (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1005/2008 του Συμβουλίου για την πρόληψη, την αποτροπή και την εξάλειψη της παράνομης, λαθραίας και άναρχης αλιείας (κανονισμός ΠΛΑ), ΕΕ L 286/1.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-009358/12
till kommissionen
Julie Girling (ECR), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Gesine Meissner (ALDE) och Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(15 oktober 2012)

Angående: Huruvida det finns en rättslig grund för en retroaktiv reglering av ogiltiga fiskelicenser i Liberia

Enligt artikel 3.1 i rådets förordning nr 1005/2008 (EU:s IUU-förordning) ”[ska ett] fiskefartyg […] antas bedriva IUU-fiske om det kan visas att fartyget, i strid med bevarande- och förvaltningsåtgärderna i det område där det bedrivit verksamheten, a) har fiskat utan giltig licens, godkännande eller tillstånd utfärdat av flaggstaten eller kuststaten i fråga”.

Under 2011-2012 verkade ett antal EU-flaggade tonfiskfartyg och icke EU-flaggade tonfiskfartyg i europeisk ägo i Liberia med falska licenser som enligt uppgift hade utfärdats av ombud som inte representerade Liberias ministerium för jordbruk, vilket är den behöriga myndigheten för utfärdande av fiskelicenser för Liberias exklusiva ekonomiska zon.

Kommissionen uppmanade först medlemsstater att förhindra importen av fisk som fångats av fartyg med en sådan licens och utreda hur de fartyg som verkade under medlemsstaternas flagg kommit över licensen. Kommissionen ändrade dock senare inställning genom att gå emot sina tidigare riktlinjer och tolka en uppgörelse under 2012 mellan Liberias regering och inblandade företag som att de ogiltiga licenserna ”reglerats” retroaktivt och att den fisk som fångats därmed får importeras till EU.

Kan kommissionen klargöra/bekräfta på vilken rättslig grund som kommission fattade sitt beslut om att i praktiken tillåta importen av dessa illegala fiskfångster?

Svar från Maria Damanaki på kommissionens vägnar
(11 januari 2013)

Den förordning som ska förebygga, motverka och undanröja olagligt, orapporterat och oreglerat fiske ([1]) utgör plattformen för att bekämpa olaglig fiskeverksamhet i EU:s vatten och i vatten utanför EU.

Enligt den förordningen har kommissionen ansvaret för att göra medlemsstaterna uppmärksamma på eventuella risksituationer (IUU-fiske eller allvarliga överträdelser) genom att så snabbt som möjligt vidarebefordra relevant information som blir tillgänglig eller framställningar om utredningar.

I linje med denna skyldighet har kommissionen informerat medlemsstaterna om situationen i Liberias vatten och uppmanat dem att undersöka huruvida aktörer från EU möjligtvis använder ogiltiga liberianska fiskelicenser. I detta sammanhang har de liberianska myndigheterna underrättat kommissionen om att tonfiskfartyg under EU-flagg har omfattats av sanktioner. Dessa uppgifter överlämnades till medlemsstaterna med begäran att säkerställa att berörda fiskeriprodukter inte importerats till EU. De liberianska myndigheterna förklarade senare att de nått en uppgörelse genom vilket aktörerna gått med på att betala ekonomisk ersättning till Liberia. Även denna information har lämnats till medlemsstaterna i god tid.

Ytterligare insatser på detta område kommer att göras under de kommande månaderna.

Eftersom det har bekräftats av den berörda kuststaten att fiskeverksamheten var laglig förefaller bestämmelserna i artikel 3 i IUU-förordningen (dvs. fiske utan giltig licens) längre vara tillämpliga.

([1]) Rådets förordning (EG) nr 1005/2008 om upprättande av ett gemenskapssystem för att förebygga, motverka och undanröja olagligt, orapporterat och oreglerat fiske (IUU-förordningen) (EUT L 286, 29.10.2008, s. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009358/12
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR), Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (PPE), Gesine Meissner (ALDE) and Jens Nilsson (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Legal basis of retrospective regularisation of invalid fishing licences in Liberia?

Article 3(1) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1005/2008 (the EU IUU Regulation) states that 'a fishing vessel shall be presumed to be engaged in IUU fishing if it is shown that, contrary to the conservation and management measures applicable in the fishing area concerned, it has: (a) fished without a valid licence, authorisation or permit issued by the flag State or the relevant coastal State'.

During 2011-12 a number of European-flagged tuna vessels, and European-owned tuna vessels with non-European flags, operated in Liberia under fraudulent licences, reportedly issued by agents that did not represent the Liberian Ministry of Agriculture, the competent authority for the issuance of fishing licences for Liberia's Exclusive Economic Zone.

The Commission initially requested that Member States prevent the import of fish caught under these licences and investigate how any vessels operating under their flag came to possess such licences. However, the Commission then altered its position by reversing its previous guidance, interpreting a 2012 settlement agreement between the Liberian Government and the companies involved in such a way as to retrospectively 'regularise' the invalid licences, thereby allowing the fish caught to be imported into the EU.

Can the Commission clarify/confirm on what legal basis it made its decision to effectively allow the import of these illegal fish catches?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(11 January 2013)

The regulation to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing ([1]) provides the platform to combat illegal fishing activities in EU waters and in waters outside the EU.

Under the IUU Regulation, the Commission has the responsibility to alert Member States on potential situations at risk (IUU fishing or serious infringements) by transmitting as soon as possible relevant information available or request for investigations.

In line with its obligation, the Commission informed Member States on the situation in Liberian waters and requested them to investigate possible use of invalid Liberian fishing licenses by EU operators. In this context, the Liberian authorities informed the Commission that European-flagged tuna vessels were sanctioned. This information was communicated to Member States with the request to ensure that fishery products concerned were not imported to the EU. The Liberian authorities later clarified that they reached a settlement agreement by which operators accepted to pay financial compensation to Liberia. This information was also communicated to Member States in due time.

Further work on this issue will be carried out in the next months.

As the legality of the fishing activities was confirmed by the coastal State concerned, the provisions of Article 3 of the IUU Regulation (i.e. fishing activities without a valid licence) appeared not to be applicable any more.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1005/2008 to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing (the IUU Regulation) OJ L 286/1.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-009359/12
adresată Comisiei
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: Siria: activități umanitare

Situația umanitară din Siria s-a înrăutățit în mod alarmant. Pe măsură ce luptele iau amploare, numărul victimelor continuă să crească, iar venirea iernii va pune în pericol viețile civililor care și-au pierdut locuințele în timpul acestui conflict sângeros.

Conform cifrelor oficiale, numărul civililor strămutați în Siria depășește un milion, mulți dintre ei fiind copii și femei. Până la ora actuală, aceștia au fost adăpostiți în școli și în săli de sport. Cu toate acestea, guvernul sirian a aprobat începerea noului an școlar, în pofida continuării violențelor. Civilii strămutați sunt astfel obligați să se mute din școli și să caute alte locuri pentru a se adăposti.

Timp de mai bine de un an, guvernul sirian a avut rețineri în a accepta ajutorul propus de comunitatea internațională. Cu toate acestea, Fondul Organizației Națiunilor Unite pentru Copii a ajuns recent la un acord cu guvernul sirian pentru a extinde activitățile umanitare în întreaga țară. Acest acord ar putea deschide calea multor alte forme de cooperare între Siria și actorii internaționali.

În ce mod va ajuta Comisia UNICEF în această situație? Se vor aloca fonduri suplimentare pentru a asigura locuințe pentru civlii strămutați?

Răspuns dat de dna Georgieva în numele Comisiei
(20 decembrie 2012)

Uniunea Europeană s-a situat în avangarda eforturilor umanitare din Siria și este în prezent principalul donator de ajutor umanitar pentru această criză, atât în interiorul, cât și în afara Siriei.

UNICEF este unul dintre partenerii de punere în aplicare ai Comisiei în contextul crizei din Siria. La 5 noiembrie 2012, organizația a primit o sumă totală de 11 milioane EUR de la bugetul UE:

— 10 milioane EUR în cadrul Instrumentului european de vecinătate și parteneriat (IEVP) pentru activități de educație și psihosociale pentru comunitățile gazdă și refugiații în Iordania;

— 1 milion EUR în cadrul liniei bugetare umanitare pentru asistență legată de apă, salubrizare și igienă (WASH) în tabăra de refugiați Zaatari din Iordania. Aceste fonduri ajută organizația să ajungă la peste 120 000 de sirieni strămutați vulnerabili (aproximativ 50 % fiind copii în vârstă de sub 18 ani) și persoane din comunitățile gazdă.

De asemenea, Comisia a luat în considerare cu mare atenție nevoile persoanelor strămutate intern în Siria în materie de adăposturi și de pregătire pentru iarnă. Cea mai mare parte din ajutorul umanitar în valoare de 24,65 milioane EUR furnizat de UE în Siria a fost cheltuită pentru a ajuta persoanele strămutate în interiorul țării (PSI). O finanțare suplimentară este alocată în prezent organizațiilor umanitare internaționale care vor oferi adăpost, lenjerie de pat, pături, sobe, combustibil pentru încălzire și îmbrăcăminte de iarnă populației aflate în dificultate.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009359/12
to the Commission
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Syria: humanitarian work

The humanitarian situation in Syria has deteriorated alarmingly. As the fighting spreads and the number of casualties continues to grow, the approaching winter will threaten the lives of civilians who have lost their houses during this bloody conflict.

According to official figures, there are over a million displaced civilians in Syria, many of them children and women. So far, they have been moved into schools and sports halls. However, the Syrian Government has given the go-ahead to start the new school year, despite the ongoing violence. This forces these displaced civilians to move out of schools and to look for other available buildings where they could find shelter.

For over a year the Syrian Government has been reluctant to accept the international community's aid proposals. Nevertheless, the United Nations Children's Fund has recently agreed with the Syrian Government to expand humanitarian work across the country. This agreement could pave the way for numerous other forms of cooperation between Syria and international actors.

How will the Commission help Unicef in this situation? Will additional funds be allocated in order to provide housing for these displaced civilians?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(20 December 2012)

The European Union has been at the forefront of humanitarian efforts in Syria and is at the moment the main humanitarian donor for this crisis, inside and outside Syria.

Unicef is one of the Commission's implementing partners in the Syria crisis. As of 5 November 2012, the organisation has received a total amount of EUR 11 million from the EU budget:

— EUR 10 million under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) for psychosocial and education activities for host communities and refugees in Jordan;

— EUR 1 million under the humanitarian budget line for water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) assistance in Zaatari refugee camp in Jordan. This helps the organisation to reach more than 120 000 vulnerable displaced Syrians (approximately 50% being children under the age of 18) and people from host communities.

The Commission has also carefully taken into account the needs of the Internally Displaced people in Syria in terms of shelter and winterization. Most of the EUR 24.65 million in EU humanitarian aid in Syria have been spent to assist Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). Additional funding is currently being allocated to international humanitarian organisations that will deliver shelter, sheeting, blankets, stoves, heating fuel and winter clothes to the population in need.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-009360/12
adresată Comisiei
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: Criza din Sahel: încălcările drepturilor omului în Mali

Din luna ianuarie 2012 statul Mali se confruntă cu un val de violențe care a creat cea mai acută criză de la obținerea independenței în 1960.

Mișcarea Națională pentru Eliberarea Azawadului (MNLA), o organizație politică și militară tuaregă, în colaborare cu gruparea islamică armată Ansar Dine, au lansat un blitzkrieg împotriva armatei naționale și au preluat controlul asupra mai multor orașe din nordul țării.

În timpul revoltei armate, aceste grupuri teroriste au ucis persoane nevinovate, au comis acte de viol în masă, au utilizat civili drept scuturi umane, au recrutat copii pe post de soldați, au distrus bunuri culturale care se numără printre siturile patrimoniului mondial UNESCO și au provocat strămutarea unui număr mare de persoane în țările vecine.

Proiectele finanțate de UE și „Programul special pentru pace, securitate și dezvoltare în nordului statului Mali" al autorităților maliene nu au avut niciun efect până în prezent într-o regiune care acum a devenit zonă de tranzit pentru diferite tipuri de trafic și un refugiu pentru grupările teroriste.

Ce măsuri va lua Comisia pentru a pune capăt acestei situații și pentru a restabili pacea? Cum facilitează Comisia accesul ajutorului umanitar în regiunea afectată?

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

UE este în continuare extrem de preocupată de situația din nordul statului Mali. La 15 octombrie și 19 noiembrie 2012, Consiliul Afaceri Externe al UE a exprimat hotărârea deplină a Uniunii de a sprijini Mali în restabilirea statului de drept și reinstaurarea unui guvern pe deplin suveran și democratic, cu autoritate pe întregul teritoriu malian.

Răspunsul cuprinzător al UE la această criză constă în sprijinirea statului Mali în ceea ce privește instituirea unui proces politic credibil, a unor negocieri credibile și a unei amenințări cu forța credibile pentru recuperarea regiunii de nord. O posibilă misiune de formare a UE (PSAC) este planificată în cel mai scurt timp pentru a contribui la sprijinirea reorganizării și a instruirii forțelor de apărare maliene. Consiliul va reveni asupra acestui aspect în cadrul următoarei sale reuniuni din 19 noiembrie pentru o actualizare privind progresele înregistrate.

De asemenea, UE ia în considerare sprijinirea implicării Comunității Economice a Statelor din Africa de Vest în vederea realizării acestui obiectiv.

În ceea ce privește ajutorul umanitar, Comisia finanțează intervențiile prin intermediul partenerilor internaționali care au negociat accesul în zona respectivă cu grupurile armate. Mulți dintre acești parteneri (Action Against Hunger, Comitetul Internațional al Crucii Roșii etc.) au desfășurat activități în această zonă încă înainte de declanșarea războiului civil și beneficiază de sprijinul populației locale. Partenerii internaționali finanțați prin intermediul ajutorului umanitar pe care îl acordăm în nordul statului Mali s-au angajat să respecte un cod de conduită prin care se asigură adeziunea la principiile umanitare de bază în cadrul monitorizării ajutorului acordat.

Obiectivul principal al acestor două proiecte este de a contribui la o asigurare mai eficientă a respectării drepturilor omului în locurile de detenție.

Suma alocată în 2012 pentru Mali în cadrul IEDDO este de 300 000 EUR. Printre obiectivele specifice luate în considerare de către delegația UE din Bamako se numără protecția drepturilor omului și răspunsul la conflictul din nordul țării.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009360/12
to the Commission
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: The Sahel crisis: human rights violations in Mali

Since January 2012, Mali has been facing a wave of violence that has produced the deepest crisis since the country gained its independence in 1960.

The National Movement for the Liberation of Azawad (MNLA), a Tuareg political and military organisation, in alliance with the Islamic armed group Ansar Dine, launched a blitzkrieg against the national army and seized control of several cities in the north of the country.

In the course of their armed rebellion, these terrorist groups have murdered innocents, committed mass rapes, used civilians as human shields, hired children to be soldiers, destroyed cultural goods classified as Unesco World Heritage Sites, and caused massive displacements of population to the neighbouring countries.

EU-funded projects and the Malian authorities' 'Special Programme for Peace, Security and Development in North Mali' have so far failed to make any impact in a region that has now become a transit zone for all kinds of trafficking and a safe haven for terrorist groups.

What action will the Commission take to put an end to this situation and restore a climate of peace? How is the Commission facilitating access to humanitarian aid in the affected region?

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

The EU remains extremely concerned by the situation in the north of Mali. On 15 October and 19 November 2012, the EU Foreign Affairs Council expressed the EU's full determination to support Mali in restoring the rule of law and re-establishing a fully sovereign democratic government with authority throughout Malian territory.

The EU comprehensive response to the crisis is based on helping Mali to establish a credible political process, credible negotiations and a credible threat of force to recover north. A possible EU training (CSDP) mission is being planned urgently to help support the reorganisation and retraining of the Malian defence forces. The Council will revert at its next meeting on 19 November for an update on progress.

The EU is also considering support to engagement by Ecowas with the same objective.

Concerning humanitarian aid, the Commission is funding interventions through international partners who have negotiated access with armed groups. Many of these partners (ACF, ICRC…) have been working in this area before the civil war and have support from the local population. International Partners funded by our humanitarian aid in north Mali have all endorsed a Code of Conduct which ensures the adhesion to basic humanitarian principles in the oversight of the aid provided.

The main objective of these two projects is to contribute to a better guarantee of human rights in places of detention.

The EIDHR 2012 allocation for Mali is 300.000 euros. One of the specific objectives that the EU delegation in Bamako is considering is the protection of human rights and the conflict response in the northern side of the country.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-009361/12
adresată Comisiei
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: Căsătoria forțată a tinerelor fete

Căsătoria forțată la orice vârstă și în orice circumstanțe reprezintă o încălcare gravă a drepturilor omului, dar negarea dreptului unei fetițe la copilărie, întreruperea educației și împiedicarea dezvoltării ei profesionale prin restrângerea șanselor și transformarea ei într-o ființă vulnerabilă la violența domestică este îngrozitoare și inumană.

Potrivit statisticilor, în fiecare an se căsătoresc zece milioane de fete cu vârsta sub 18 ani. Aceasta înseamnă că una din trei fete din țările în curs de dezvoltare este deja căsătorită la vârsta de 18 ani. În Nigeria, Ciad, Bangladesh, Guineea și Republica Centrafricană, 60% sau mai mult din totalul căsătoriilor reprezintă căsătorii forțate la vârste fragede. În Asia de Sud și în Africa Subsahariană, valorile sunt de 46%, respectiv 38%.

În Europa, țările în care rata căsătoriilor la vârste fragede și forțate este cea mai mare potrivit statisticilor oficiale, sunt Georgia (17%), Turcia (14%) și Ucraina (10%), dar situația nu este mai puțin gravă în Regatul Unit, Franța sau România.

Această situație deplorabilă ne împiedică să atingem șase din cele opt Obiective de dezvoltare ale mileniului. Ce măsuri concrete a luat Comisia pentru a preveni evoluția dezastruoasă a acestei practici atât de revoltătoare?

Răspuns dat de dna Ashton, Înalt Reprezentant/Vicepreședinte în numele Comisiei
(4 ianuarie 2013)

UE are un angajament de lungă durată pentru promovarea egalității de șanse între femei și bărbați și combaterea violenței împotriva femeilor în interiorul și în afara granițelor sale. Căsătoriile precoce și forțate încalcă drepturile fundamentale ale tinerelor fete. Liniile directoare ale UE privind violența împotriva femeilor, din anul 2008, reprezintă pilonul central al acțiunii externe a UE și au fost urmate de elaborarea unor rapoarte și a unor puncte de acțiune specifice privind un număr de peste 130 de țări. Grupul de lucru pentru drepturile omului al Consiliului (COHOM) a adoptat o serie de priorități la nivel mondial și regional pentru liniile directoare, incluzând o campanie privind căsătoriile precoce și forțate care va conferi un sprijin politic vizibil acestei probleme și va promova prevenirea fenomenului. Campania este prevăzută pentru anul 2013.

În iunie 2012, Consiliul Afaceri Externe a adoptat Cadrul strategic și Planul de acțiune al UE privind drepturile omului și democrația, în care acțiunile concrete privind promovarea și protecția copiilor și drepturile femeii au căpătat o prioritate mai mare. UE s-a angajat să promoveze prevenirea căsătoriile precoce și forțate care afectează copiii.

Este clar că pentru abandonarea practicilor tradiționale dăunătoare, cum este mariajul precoce, este necesară o acțiune comună. Din acest motiv, UE promovează adoptarea unui cadru legislativ adecvat la nivel național și implică nu numai șefi de guvern și parlamentari, ci și lideri religioși, în dialogul privind practicile tradiționale, în vederea promovării schimbărilor sociale.

UE tocmai a finalizat, împreună cu UNICEF, un proiect pe trei ani care a inclus acțiuni pentru a înțelege factorii determinanți ai căsătoriilor în care sunt implicați copiii în trei state din India și pentru a genera și a aplica informații și cunoștințe referitoare la motivele pentru care persistă anumite norme sociale negative și la modul în care acestea pot fi modificate pentru a îmbunătăți bunăstarea copiilor, acest din urmă obiectiv fiind pus în practică împreună cu partenerii săi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009361/12
to the Commission
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Forced marriage of girls

Forced marriage is at any age and in any circumstance a serious violation of human rights, but denying a child's right to her childhood, disrupting her education and preventing her professional development by limiting her opportunities and making her vulnerable to domestic violence is horrifying and inhuman.

According to the statistics, ten million girls under the age of 18 get married each year. That means that one in every three girls in the developing world is married by the age of 18. In Niger, Chad, Mali, Bangladesh, Guinea and the Central African Republic, 60% or more of marriages are early and forced marriages. This figure stands at 46% in South Asia and at 38% in Sub-Saharan Africa.

In Europe, Georgia (17%), Turkey (14%) and Ukraine (10%) are the countries where the rate of early and forced marriage is highest according to official statistics, but the situation is no less serious in Great Britain, France or Romania.

This appalling situation prevents us from reaching six of the eight Millennium Development Goals. What concrete measures has the Commission taken to prevent the disastrous development of such an outrageous practice?

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

The EU has a long-standing commitment to promote gender equality and combat violence against women within and outside its borders. Early and forced marriage violates girls' full enjoyment of human rights. The 2008 Guidelines on violence and discrimination against women and girls form the backbone of EU external action and have been followed by the development of specific reports and action points for more than 130 countries. The Council Working Party on Human Rights (COHOM) adopted a series of global and regional priorities for the Guidelines. This includes early and forced marriages campaign that will lend visible, political support to the issue and will promote the prevention. The campaign is envisaged for 2013.

In June 2012 Foreign Affairs Council adopted the EU Strategic Policy Framework and Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy where concrete actions on promotion and protection of children's and women's rights were prioritised. The EU committed to promote the prevention of early and forced marriages affecting children.

It is clear that in order to abandon harmful traditional practices, like early marriage, a collective action is necessary. For this reason the EU promotes the adoption of appropriate legislative framework at country level and engages not only government leaders and parliamentarians but also religious leaders, in dialogue on traditional practices, as to promote positive social change.

The EU just completed with Unicef a three-year project including action to understand the determinants of child marriage in selected states in India; and together with partners, to generate and apply knowledge and understanding of why negative social norms persist and how they can be changed to improve the well-being of children.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-009362/12
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(15 oktober 2012)

Betreft: Iran wil uithuwelijking van meisjes vanaf 9-jarige leeftijd legaliseren (vervolgvraag)

Op 12 oktober 2012 heeft de hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter mevrouw Ashton namens de Commissie antwoord gegeven op schriftelijke vraag E-007727/2012. Daarin schrijft zij onder andere: „De EU roept Iran met regelmaat op om zijn internationale verplichtingen inzake mensenrechten na te leven. Daarnaast blijft de EU gerichte beperkende maatregelen toepassen tegen een aantal Iraanse personen die verantwoordelijk zijn voor grootschalige schendingen van de mensenrechten."

1. Welke concrete oproepen heeft de EU reeds aan Iran gedaan? Welke concrete beperkende maatregelen heeft de EU reeds tegen welke Iraanse personen toegepast? Hoe is daarop gereageerd? Zijn de reacties bevredigend? Zo neen, welke vervolgstappen zullen worden ondernomen?

Voorts schrijft mevrouw Ashton: „Wat financiële samenwerking betreft, verleent de Commissie geen rechtstreekse financiële bijstand aan Iran, behalve in het kader van Erasmus Mundus, een programma dat ten goede komt aan studenten en academici en tot doel heeft interpersoonlijke contacten en betrekkingen aan te moedigen, wat onzes inziens in deze context zeker nuttig is."

2. Welke resultaten heeft de financiële bijstand van de Commissie in het kader van Erasmus Mundus reeds opgeleverd? Zijn de resultaten bevredigend? Zo neen, welke gevolgen heeft dit voor de verstrekking van de financiële bijstand?

3. Hoe garandeert de Commissie dat de door haar in het kader van Erasmus Mundus verstrekte financiële middelen niet in verkeerde handen terechtkomen?

Verder schrijft mevrouw Ashton: „De EU werkt thans samen met Unicef wat kinderhuwelijken betreft."

4. Behelst de samenwerking tussen de EU en Unicef ook financiële bijstand van de EU aan Unicef? Zo ja, hoeveel bedraagt de financiële bijstand? Welke resultaten heeft de samenwerking reeds opgeleverd? Zijn de resultaten bevredigend? Zo neen, welke gevolgen heeft dit voor de samenwerking?

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

Naar aanleiding van de sterke toename van het aantal terechtstellingen en de systematische onderdrukking van burgers in Iran heeft de EU beperkende maatregelen ingesteld, waaronder de bevriezing van tegoeden en een reisverbod, voor in totaal 78 met name genoemde personen die verantwoordelijk zijn voor ernstige mensenrechtenschendingen in Iran (Verordening nr. 359/2011 van de Raad). De maatregelen worden regelmatig geëvalueerd in het licht van de situatie in Iran.

Erasmus Mundus is een van de succesrijkste en populairste EU-programma's. Tussen 2010 en 2012 werden 30 Iraanse promovendi geselecteerd voor gemeenschappelijke programma's; hetzelfde gold tussen 2004 en 2012 voor 212 Iraanse masterstudenten. Zeven Iraanse universiteiten hebben samen met Iraakse en Jemenitische instellingen deelgenomen aan zes partnerschappen met EU-universiteiten, die aan 240 studenten en 27 personeelsleden uit Iran beurzen hebben toegekend. Twee Iraanse universiteiten hebben deelgenomen aan Action 3-projecten om de aantrekkingskracht van het Europese hoger onderwijs te bevorderen.

De samenwerking met Iran wordt door internationale sancties beperkt. In Resolutie 1737 van de VN-Veiligheidsraad worden alle landen opgeroepen om Iraniërs niet te onderwijzen of op te leiden in proliferatiegevoelige nucleaire disciplines. Het is de verantwoordelijkheid van de lidstaten om aan deze bepaling te voldoen.

Tussen de EU en Unicef heeft overleg plaatsgevonden over Irak, maar de EU geeft Unicef momenteel geen financiële steun voor zijn activiteiten in Iran.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009362/12
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Iran seeking to legalise marriage for girls as young as nine years old (follow-up question)

On 12 October 2012, the High Representative/Vice-President Lady Ashton answered Written Question E-007727/2012 on behalf of the Commission. In her answer she wrote, *inter alia*: 'The EU regularly calls on Iran to live up to the international obligation in the area of human rights obligations. In addition, the EU continues to apply targeted restrictive measures on a number of Iranian individuals responsible for massive human rights violations.'

1. What, specifically, has the EU called upon Iran to do so far? What specific restrictive measures has the EU already taken against which Iranian individuals? What was the response? Was the response satisfactory? If not, what further steps will be taken?

Lady Ashton also wrote: 'With regard to financial cooperation, the Commission does not have any direct funding with Iran except for within the framework of Erasmus Mundus, a programme which benefits students and academics with the objective to encourage people-to-people contacts and relations which, we think, would certainly be beneficial in the present context.'

2. What results has the Commission's financial assistance under Erasmus Mundus produced to date? Are the results satisfactory? If not, what consequences does this have for the provision of the financial assistance?

3. How does the Commission ensure that the funding it provides under Erasmus Mundus does not fall into the wrong hands?

Lady Ashton also wrote: 'The EU is at present cooperating with Unicef on the question of child marriage.'

4. Does the cooperation between the EU and Unicef also include financial assistance from the EU to Unicef? If so, how much financial assistance is being provided? What results has the cooperation produced to date? Are the results satisfactory? If not, what consequences does this have for the cooperation?

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

In relation to the dramatic increase in executions and the systematic repression of citizens in Iran, the EU has adopted restrictive measures, including as asset freeze and a travel ban, on altogether 78 named individuals, who are responsible for grave human rights violations in Iran (Council Regulation 359/2011). Measures are reviewed on a regular basis in view of the situation in Iran.

Erasmus Mundus is one of the most successful and popular programmes of the EU. 30 Iranian doctorate students were selected for Joint programmes between 2010-2012, in addition to 212 Iranian master students between 2004-2012. Seven Iranian universities have jointly with Iraqi and Yemeni institutions taken part in six partnerships with EU universities, which have awarded scholarships for 240 students and 27 staff from Iran. Two Iranian universities have participated in Action 3 projects to promote the attractiveness of European higher education.

International sanctions restrict cooperation with Iran. UNSC Resolution 1737 calls upon all States to prevent teaching or training of Iranians in certain nuclear proliferation sensitive disciplines. It is the responsibility of the member states to comply with this provision.

Consultations between the EU and Unicef regarding Iran have taken place, however the EU is not providing any financial assistance to Unicef for its activities involving Iran at this moment.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-009363/12
adresată Comisiei
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: Ajutorul umanitar pentru Siria

Peste 30 000 de sirieni, din care două treimi sunt civili, au murit în cele 18 luni ale conflictului civil. Bilanțul zilnic al confruntărilor crește îngrijorător, ajungându-se la recordul tragic de peste 300 de morți în confruntări violente, în cursul unei singure zile. Efectele amplificării înfruntărilor riscă să fie agravate de venirea iernii. Vremea nefavorabilă va îngreuna și mai mult misiunea atât de riscantă a organizațiilor umanitare. Accesul acestora la populația civilă care are nevoie urgentă de ajutor medical și de hrană este extrem de dificil din cauza luptelor de gherilă urbană.

Susțin apelul adresat de Comisarul Georgieva către părțile în conflict de a respecta legislația internațională în materie de război și de a permite accesul personalului umanitar la civilii în suferință.

Are în vedere Comisia inițierea unor demersuri internaționale coercitive, menite să determine părțile în conflict să pună capăt uciderii în masă a civililor sirieni?

În ce fel înțelege Comisia să-și adapteze strategia de acțiune umanitară în teatre de război urban precum cel sirian, astfel încât intervențiile pentru ajutorul de urgență să fie cât mai eficiente?

Răspuns dat de dna Georgieva în numele Comisiei
(14 decembrie 2012)

Consiliul de Securitate al ONU nu a reușit până în prezent să ajungă la un acord cu privire la criza din Siria. Uniunea Europeană a impus o serie de sancțiuni care vizează regimul sirian. În plus, UE a solicitat în repetate rânduri tuturor părților să respecte dreptul umanitar internațional în ceea ce privește, în special, dar nu numai, siguranța civililor și a lucrătorilor umanitari. Comisia a finanțat partenerii care au difuzat informații privind dreptul umanitar internațional, astfel încât combatanții să aibă cunoștință de prevederile în acest domeniu.

Acordarea ajutorului umanitar în situații de război urban este deosebit de periculoasă și dificilă. Prin partenerii săi internaționali, strategia Comisiei de ajutor în Siria a fost orientată, în măsura posibilului, către organizațiile create la nivelul comunității locale, organizațiile neguvernamentale și Semiluna Roșie Arabă Siriană (*Syrian Arab Red Crescent* —SARC) pentru a se asigura că ajutorul este acordat în mod eficient la nivel local. În zonele urbane, UE sprijină, prin intermediul partenerilor săi, comunitățile gazdă și populațiile strămutate, concentrându-se în special pe crearea de adăposturi, pregătirea pentru iarnă, îngrijirea medicală de urgență, aprovizionarea cu apă, salubrizare și activități de igienizare. Deși se înregistrează succese în multe zone ale țării, natura urbană a conflictului produce în continuare victime în rândul persoanelor care lucrează în domeniul ajutorului umanitar. Din 3 decembrie 2012 până în prezent au fost omorâți, în timp ce își desfășurau activitățile umanitare, șapte voluntari ai SARC și opt membri din rândurile personalului ONU. Acesta este unul dintre motivele pentru care Comisia — și UE — solicită ca siguranța lucrătorilor umanitari să fie respectată de către toate părțile.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009363/12
to the Commission
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: Humanitarian aid for Syria

The last 18 months have seen over 30 000 Syrian lives claimed by civil conflict, two-thirds of those killed being non-combatants. The toll is growing alarmingly, achieving a tragic record of over 300 violent deaths in a single day. The repercussions of the conflict are likely to be amplified by the onset of winter, unfavourable weather conditions adding to the already considerable risks faced by humanitarian organisations, while civilians in urgent need of medical aid and food are being seriously hampered by urban guerrilla warfare in their desperate attempts to reach them.

I therefore endorse the appeal by Commissioner Georgieva calling on the conflicting parties to comply with international rules of engagement and allow humanitarian aid workers access to hard-pressed civilians.

Is the Commission envisaging international measures to compel the warring parties to end the mass killing of Syrian civilians?

How does the Commission intend to adapt its humanitarian aid strategy to urban warfare situations, for example in Syria, so as to ensure that emergency aid can be provided as effectively as possible?

Answer given by Ms Georgieva on behalf of the Commission
(14 December 2012)

The UN Security Council has so far failed to reach agreement on the Syrian crisis. The European Union has imposed a series of sanctions targeting the Syrian regime. In addition, the EU has repeatedly called on all parties to respect international humanitarian law concerning in particular, but not only, the safety of civilians and humanitarian workers. In the field, the Commission has financed partners who have been disseminating information on international humanitarian law in order to ensure that combatants are aware of its stipulations.

Delivering humanitarian aid in situations of urban warfare is particularly dangerous and difficult. Through its international partners, the Commission's aid strategy in Syria has targeted, to the extent possible, local community based organisations, non-governmental organisations and the Syrian Arab Red Crescent (SARC) in order to ensure that aid is delivered effectively at local level. In urban contexts, through its partners, the EU supports host communities and displaced populations focusing in particular on shelter, winterization, emergency healthcare and water, sanitation and hygiene activities. While successful in many areas of the country, the urban nature of this conflict continues to create victims among humanitarian workers. As of 3 December 2012, seven SARC volunteers and 8 UN staff members have been killed doing their humanitarian work. This is one reason why the Commission — and the EU — calls for respect by all parties for the safety of humanitarian workers.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-009364/12
adresată Comisiei
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 octombrie 2012)

Subiect: Ce intenționează să întreprindă Comisia pentru a determina Marea Britanie să respecte dreptul românilor la libera circulație în UE?

Recentele declarații ale premierului David Cameron și ale ministrului britanic de interne referitoare la posibilitatea introducerii controlului la granițe pentru a bloca afluxul de imigranți din unele state membre ale Uniunii Europene sunt o confirmare a temerilor în legătură cu menținerea restricțiilor pentru cetățenii români și după expirarea termenului-limită pentru blocarea accesului liber pe piața muncii.

Libertatea de mișcare pentru cetățenii români a fost îngrădită, începând din 2007, în majoritatea statelor din Europa de Vest, prin intermediul barierelor impuse accesului pe piața muncii. Amânările repetate tind acum să se permanentizeze, prin excluderea posibilității ca românii și bulgarii să acceadă în rândul europenilor cu drepturi depline. Este incorectă și lipsită de orice argumente invocarea riscului amplificării imigrației economice. Experiența post-aderare în cazul României și Bulgariei și concluziile Comisiei Europene în acest sens contrazic asemenea false temeri.

Orice discuție despre reintroducerea vizelor pentru cetățenii unor state membre înseamnă întoarcerea spatelui nu doar principiilor fundamentale ale Uniunii Europene, ci și realității din Marea Britanie și din alte state occidentale, în care exponenții curentului eurosceptic acuză pe nedrept cele mai noi membre ale Uniunii, pentru a ascunde eșecul evident al integrării imigranților din afara UE.

Ce demers are în vedere Comisia, ca responsabilă pentru respectarea tratatelor europene, pentru a determina autoritățile britanice să se abțină de la măsuri abuzive și discriminatorii împotriva cetățenilor români?

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(4 decembrie 2012)

Conform informațiilor care au ajuns la cunoștința Comisiei Europene, ministrul britanic de interne a confirmat că cetățenii bulgari și români vor obține dreptul neîngrădit de a trăi și de a lucra în Regatul Unit începând din decembrie 2013 ([1]).

Comisia nu are cunoștință de vreo intenție a guvernului Regatului Unit de a lua măsuri formale pentru impunerea obligativității vizei în cazul cetățenilor altor state membre.

Cu privire la întrebarea dumneavoastră specifică, Comisia nu consideră că ar fi util să ofere un răspuns în legătură cu o situație care este pur ipotetică.

([1]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-20287061.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009364/12
to the Commission
Corina Crețu (S&D)
(15 October 2012)

Subject: What will the Commission do to persuade the United Kingdom to respect Romanians' right to free movement within the EU?

Recent statements by Prime Minister David Cameron and the British Home Secretary on the possibility of introducing border controls to block the influx of migrants from some EU Member States confirm fears that restrictions for Romanian citizens will be upheld once the expiry date for blocking free access to the labour market has passed.

Since 2007, free movement for Romanian citizens has been restricted in most western European countries by barriers imposed on access to the labour market. Repeated extensions mean that these barriers are now tending to become permanent, preventing Romanians and Bulgarians from joining the ranks of Europeans enjoying full rights. It is incorrect and completely unfounded to invoke the risk of a rise in economic migration. Post-accession experience in the case of Romania and Bulgaria and the Commission's own conclusions show that there is no basis for such fears.

Any discussion on the reintroduction of visas for citizens of some Member States would mean not only departing from the fundamental principles of the European Union but also disregarding the real situation in the United Kingdom and other western countries, where Eurosceptics wrongly lay the blame on the most recent members of the EU to hide their evident failure with regard to integrating migrants from outside the EU.

As guardian of the Treaties, what steps will the Commission take to persuade the British authorities to abstain from abusive and discriminatory measures against Romanian citizens?

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

The European Commission is aware of reports that the Home Secretary confirmed that Bulgarians and Romanians will gain the unrestricted right to live and work in the UK from December 2013 ([1]).

The Commission is not aware of any intentions of the United Kingdom Government to take formal measures to impose a visa obligation to citizens of other Member States.

With regard to the specific question raised, the Commission does not consider it useful to provide an answer in what is a purely hypothetical situation.

([1]) http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-20287061.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-009366/12
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(16 de octubre de 2012)

Asunto: Riesgo para la financiación del programa Erasmus

El portavoz del presupuesto de la Comisión Europea, Patrizio Fiorilli, alertó el pasado 3 de octubre sobre el riesgo de la financiación del programa Erasmus. Esto ha provocado la alarma entre la comunidad educativa y estudiantil de muchos Estados miembros que están ya sufriendo fuertes recortes en sus presupuestos educativos.

El programa Erasmus ha sido uno de los programas que más ha beneficiado a la comunidad universitaria de los Estados miembros desde la creación de la Unión Europea. Miles de estudiantes han tenido la posibilidad de afrontar sus estudios en otros países, mejorando su formación académica, su conocimiento de idiomas y estableciendo redes más allá de las fronteras de los Estados miembros.

Los recortes en la educación pública aplicados por España, llevados a cabo a través de los presupuestos generales, han afectado a la comunidad estudiantil española de manera dramática. La subida de las tasas académicas, el incremento de las restricciones para obtener becas, así como el endeudamiento creciente de gran cantidad de estudiantes para sufragar sus estudios, son algunos de los ejemplos de la aplicación de los recortes del Gobierno español, que suponen así un ataque sin precedentes al derecho universal a la educación.

La puesta en riesgo de la financiación del programa Erasmus es un incremento en el brutal recorte que está sufriendo la comunidad estudiantil española. Considerando los recortes del Gobierno español y de la mayoría de las Comunidades Autónomas, esta reducción del presupuesto europeo supondría, aparte de la agudización de la regresión educativa que España está sufriendo, la imposibilidad de reembolso de numerosos adelantos realizados por diferentes administraciones educativas para dicho programa.

Teniendo en cuenta que España es el primer país en recepción y envío de estudiantes a través de este programa y el brutal impacto del recorte del Gobierno en los presupuestos de educación, ¿considera la Comisión que España está en condiciones de cumplir los objetivos del programa Erasmus para los próximos años?

¿Piensa la Comisión implementar medidas para garantizar el acceso al programa Erasmus, así como el pago de los compromisos adquiridos con administraciones y estudiantes?

Respuesta de la Sra. Vassiliou en nombre de la Comisión
(13 de diciembre de 2012)

El 23 de octubre de 2012, la Comisión solicitó a la Autoridad Presupuestaria que aportara 9 000 millones de euros en créditos de pago con objeto de adecuarse al mayor nivel de compromisos ya aprobados por la Autoridad Presupuestaria para 2012. En este contexto, la Comisión ha solicitado 180 millones de euros para el Programa de Aprendizaje Permanente, a fin de satisfacer las necesidades de pagos hasta final de año. La parte de este importe que corresponde a Erasmus es de 90 millones de euros.

Sobre la base de las previsiones de solicitudes de los estudiantes españoles, España debería estar en condiciones de cumplir los objetivos del programa Erasmus para el próximo año, a condición de que se apruebe el presupuesto de la UE modificado y se mantengan las fuentes específicas de cofinanciación españolas. En cualquier caso, no se prevé que los estudiantes Erasmus que se desplacen al extranjero en el primer semestre del curso académico 2012-2013 tengan problemas, ya que el 99 % de los créditos de pago disponibles en 2012 ya han sido abonados a las agencias nacionales de los Estados miembros que implementan el programa. En cambio, si la Autoridad Presupuestaria no aprueba el presupuesto modificado, es probable que se produzcan graves problemas a finales de 2013 y se reduzca de forma sustancial el número de plazas ofrecidas a los estudiantes o el nivel de las becas. Esto último afectaría sobre todo a los estudiantes procedentes de entornos desfavorecidos.

El 23 de octubre de 2012 se publicó una explicación detallada de la situación.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-009366/12
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(16 October 2012)

Subject: Threat to Erasmus programme funding

The Commission's budget spokesperson, Patrizio Fiorilli, warned on 3 October 2012 that funding for the Erasmus programme was under threat. This has caused alarm among students and members of the educational community in many Member States, who are already feeling the effects of major education budget cuts.

The Erasmus programme is one of the initiatives to have brought greatest benefit to the university communities of the Member States since the founding of the European Union. Thousands of students have had the opportunity to study in other countries, thereby improving their academic training and knowledge of foreign languages whilst also enabling them to form networks that extend beyond Member State borders.

Cuts to Spain's state education spending, the result of the national budget, have had a dramatic impact on Spanish students. The Spanish Government's spending cuts have resulted in tuition fee rises, tougher restrictions on obtaining grants and many students getting increasingly into debt to finance their studies, to name just a few examples. These cuts therefore represent an unprecedented attack on the universal right to education.

The threat to funding for the Erasmus programme further increases the burden of the severe budget cuts that Spanish students are already suffering from. In the light of the budget cuts made by the Spanish Government and most of the Autonomous Communities, slashing the EU budget would not only heighten the reverse progress on education currently being witnessed in Spain but would also mean that many advance payments made by various education authorities for the Erasmus programme could not be reimbursed.

Bearing in mind the severe impact of the Spanish Government's education budget cuts and the fact that Spain is the country that hosts and sends the most Erasmus students, does the Commission believe Spain is in a position to fulfil the Erasmus programme's objectives for the next few years?

Does the Commission plan to implement measures guaranteeing access to the Erasmus programme and payment of grants pledged to education authorities and students?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(13 December 2012)

On 23 October 2012 the Commission requested the Budgetary Authority to provide an additional EUR 9 billion in payment credits to match the higher level of commitments already voted for by the Budgetary Authority for 2012. In this context, the Commission has requested EUR 180 million for the Lifelong Learning Programme to meet payment needs until the end of the year. The share of Erasmus in this amount is EUR 90 Million.

Based on the projected demand from Spanish students, Spain should be in a position to fulfil the Erasmus programme's objectives for next year provided that the amended EU budget is approved and that specific sources of co-financing in Spain are maintained. In any event Erasmus students going abroad in the first semester of the academic year 2012-2013 should not have any problems as 99% of the payment credits available in 2012 have already been paid to the National Agencies in the Member States, which implement the programme. However, if the amended budget is not voted for by the Budgetary Authority, severe problems are likely to occur later in 2013, in terms of a substantial reduction in the number of places offered to students or in the level of grants. The latter would hit students from disadvantaged backgrounds the hardest.

A detailed explanation of the situation was published on 23 October 2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-1137_en.htm