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

(2014/C 81 E/01)

Treść **Strona**

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007015/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Reciclagem eletrónica

Considerando o seguinte:

— A inovação acelerada torna os produtos eletrónicos obsoletos em pouco tempo;

— Em 1995, a média de vida de um computador era de sete anos, agora é de dois;

— Apenas 20 % dos computadores europeus são reciclados e, de acordo com as estimativas, cada pessoa produz 25 quilos de lixo eletrónico por ano;

— Construir um novo PC requer 240 kg de energia fóssil, 1 500 litros de água e um coquetel de 22 kg de produtos químicos diferentes;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Quais as medidas escritas na agenda da Comissão relativamente a esta matéria?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(20 de agosto de 2013)

Os computadores e outros produtos eletrónicos são abrangidos pelo âmbito de aplicação da Diretiva REEE ([1]), que estabelece objetivos globais vinculativos para a recolha, a valorização e a reciclagem de resíduos de equipamentos elétricos e eletrónicos (REEE). Estes objetivos foram tornados mais rigorosos na reformulação da Diretiva ([2]). Por outro lado, foi introduzida uma nova obrigação de retoma de REEE de pequenas dimensões (por exemplo, telemóveis), o que se prevê faça aumentar significativamente a recolha. A diretiva inclui também requisitos de conceção dos produtos, nomeadamente tendo em vista facilitar a reutilização, a desmontagem e a recuperação dos REEE, seus componentes e materiais.

Os Estados-Membros devem transpor a Diretiva REEE reformulada para a sua legislação nacional até 14 de fevereiro de 2014. A Comissão acompanhará a transposição e a correta aplicação da diretiva.

Para alcançar um crescimento sustentável assente num consumo sustentável, a Comissão estudará a possibilidade de tomar medidas para que os bens de consumo sejam mais duradouros, inclusive mediante apoio a serviços de reparação e de manutenção ([3]).

.

([1]) Diretiva 2002/96/CE, relativa aos resíduos de equipamentos elétricos e eletrónicos (REEE) (JO L 37 de 13.2.2003, p. 24).
([2]) Diretiva 2012/19/CE, relativa aos resíduos de equipamentos elétricos e eletrónicos (REEE) (JO L 197 de 24.7.2012, p. 38).
([3]) Comunicação da Comissão sobre uma Agenda do Consumidor Europeu — COM(2012) 225 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007015/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Electronic recycling

— Rapid innovation means that electronic products become obsolete within a very short space of time.

— In 1995, a computer's average lifespan was seven years; now it is two.

— Only 20% of European computers are recycled and an estimated 25 kg of electronic waste is produced per person per year.

— Building a new PC requires 240 kg of fossil energy, 1500 litres of water and a 22 kg cocktail of different chemicals.

What action does the Commission plan to take on this matter?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2013)

Computers and other electronic products fall within the scope of the WEEE Directive ([1]) which contains binding overall targets for the collection, recovery and recycling of waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE). These targets have been raised in the WEEE recast Directive ([2]). Moreover, a new take-back obligation for very small WEEE (e.g. mobile phones), has been introduced and this is expected to increase collection significantly. The directive also includes product design requirements, notably in view of facilitating re-use, dismantling and recovery of WEEE, its components and materials.

Member states shall transpose the WEEE recast Directive into their national legislation by 14 February 2014. The Commission will monitor the transposition and the right implementation of the directive.

In order to achieve sustainable growth underpinned by sustainable consumption, the Commission will consider taking measures to make consumer goods more durable, including support for repair and maintenance services ([3]).

.

([1]) Directive 2002/96/EC on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) (OJ L 37, 13.2.2003).
([2]) Directive 2012/19/EU on waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) (recast) (OJ L 197, 24.07.2012).
([3]) Communication of the Commission on a Consumer Agenda COM(2012) 225 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007016/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Má nutrição infantil

Considerando o seguinte:

— Tanto a subnutrição como a obesidade e o excesso de peso são formas de malnutrição e têm causas e consequências intimamente ligadas às falhas dos sistemas de alimentação;

— De acordo com a Organização Mundial de Saúde, um sistema alimentar que não fornece uma quantidade suficiente de alimentos de qualidade pode levar tanto a um fraco crescimento como a um excesso de peso, e uma criança que cresceu pouco nos seus primeiros anos de vida pode tornar-se um adolescente pequeno mas com excesso de peso e, mais tarde, desenvolver doenças crónicas em adulto;

— De acordo com a OMS, mais de 100 milhões de crianças com menos de cinco anos têm baixo peso e 165 milhões têm baixa estatura para a idade, um indicador melhor para a subnutrição crónica;

— A organização estima que 35 % de todas as mortes de crianças com menos de cinco anos estão associadas à subnutrição, ao mesmo tempo que 43 milhões de crianças da mesma idade sofrem de excesso de peso ou obesidade;

Pergunto à Comissão:

De que forma interpreta os números da OMS?

Que medidas prevê tomar para fazer face a este grave problema?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(8 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão reconhece que a subnutrição constitui uma das mais graves e evitáveis tragédias do nosso tempo. Os dados da OMS permitem a avaliação mais fiável da possível prevalência de nanismo e baseiam-se em medidas relativamente estáveis inseridas em cuidados de saúde de rotina a todos os níveis e em todos os domínios, incluindo para os mais vulneráveis. Os estudos recentes incluídos na série Lancet de 2013 confirmam a magnitude do problema, com 165 milhões de crianças que sofrem de nanismo e 3,1 milhões de crianças que morrem de subnutrição, um número impressionante de 45 % do total de casos de mortalidade infantil em 2011.

Embora a Comissão partilhe o ponto de vista da OMS de que os sistemas alimentares que não fornecem uma quantidade suficiente de alimentos de qualidade podem levar tanto a um fraco crescimento como a um excesso de peso, a Comissão considera que estas crianças são vítimas de um círculo vicioso em que a concentração de pobreza, dieta inadequada e doenças lhes dá o pior princípio de vida possível, comprometendo o seu desenvolvimento cognitivo e as capacidades físicas, armadilhando, assim, as pessoas e as sociedades em situação de pobreza.

A UE apoia uma abordagem multissetorial, incluindo intervenções em sistemas alimentares. Este ponto de vista é parte integrante da política da UE relativa à nutrição, que visa especificamente a nutrição materna e infantil e a janela de oportunidade de 1 000 dias desde a gravidez até aos dois anos. Isto aplica-se tanto ao trabalho da Comissão em situações de emergência como à redução da pobreza e ao desenvolvimento sustentável. Estas prioridades traduziram-se na assunção de compromissos em termos de mobilização política, objetivos e financiamento, descritos na comunicação da Comissão sobre nutrição materna e infantil ([1]). A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para as respostas dadas às perguntas escritas E-007017/2013, E-006591/2013 e E-003171/2013 ([2]).

([1]) COM(2013) 141 final.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007016/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Child malnutrition

— Undernutrition, obesity and overweight are forms of malnutrition, the causes and consequences of which are closely linked to food system failings.

— According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), food systems that do not provide enough quality food can lead to both poor growth and overweight; children who grow little during their early years can become small, overweight teenagers and subsequently develop chronic illnesses as adults.

— The WHO says that more than 100 million children under the age of five are underweight and that 165 million suffer from stunting, which is the one of the best indicators of chronic undernutrition.

— The organisation estimates that 35% of all deaths amongst children under five are linked to undernutrition, while 43 million children of the same age are overweight or obese.

How does the Commission interpret the WHO's figures?

What action will it take to tackle this serious problem?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

The Commission acknowledges that undernutrition represents one of the most serious and preventable tragedies of our time. The WHO's figures provide the most accurate evaluation possible of the prevalence of stunting and are based on relatively robust measures that are embedded in routine healthcare practices at all levels and in all areas, including for the most vulnerable. Recent studies reported in the 2013 Lancet series confirm the magnitude of the problem, with 165 million children suffering stunting and 3.1 million children dying from undernutrition, a staggering 45% of total child deaths in 2011.

While the Commission shares the WHO's view that food systems that do not provide enough quality food can lead to both poor growth and overweight, the Commission estimates that these children are victims of a vicious circle in which the combination of poverty, inadequate diet and disease give them the worst possible start in life, compromising their cognitive development and physical capabilities, thus trapping individuals and societies in poverty.

The EU supports a multisectoral approach including interventions on food systems. This vision is an integral part of the EU's nutrition policy framework that specifically targets Maternal and Child Nutrition and the 1 000 day window of opportunity from pregnancy to the age of two. This applies to both the Commission's work in emergency situations and on poverty reduction and sustainable development. This has been translated into commitments in terms of policy mobilisation, targets and financing as described in the Commission Communication on Maternal and Child nutrition ([1]). The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-007017/2013, E-006591/2013 and E-003171/2013 ([2]).

([1]) COM(2013) 141 final.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007017/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Mortalidade infantil

Considerando o seguinte:

— De acordo com um estudo recentemente publicado na revista The Lancet, a má nutrição é responsável pela morte de 3,1 milhões de crianças por ano e os problemas nutricionais estão na origem de 45 % de toda a mortalidade infantil;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento desta situação? Como a avalia?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(8 de agosto de 2013)

A revista «The Lancet» faculta a avaliação mais exata disponível do nível dramático do impacto que a desnutrição crónica tem atualmente na vida das crianças. A publicação recorda que o período mais importante para combater a subnutrição são os 1 000 dias que decorrem desde o início da gravidez até aos dois anos de idade.

Esta visão constitui parte integrante do quadro estratégico da UE sobre nutrição materna e infantil ([1]), que foi adotado recentemente e visa ajudar a reduzir a desnutrição crónica e aguda. Esta Comunicação fixa o objetivo ambicioso de reduzir, até 2025, em pelo menos 7 milhões o número de crianças de menos de cinco anos que sofrem de desnutrição crónica e define claramente os princípios orientadores, os objetivos e as prioridades das ações da União Europeia. Tal aplica-se ao nosso trabalho em situações de emergência e ao que tem por objetivo reduzir a pobreza e promover o desenvolvimento sustentável.

A Comissão reforçou também o diálogo político a nível nacional e internacional. Procurou assegurar que a nutrição seja considerada uma prioridade nacional em países onde as taxas de desnutrição crónica são elevadas e tentou promover a integração de atividades no período crucial dos 1 000 dias. A Comissão mantém uma colaboração estreita com o Movimento *Scaling-up Nutrition (SUN)*, os países parceiros e os doadores para que a nutrição seja prioritária na agenda do desenvolvimento e da ajuda humanitária.

Além disso, a UE comprometeu-se, aquando do evento «Nutrição para o crescimento» organizado pelo Reino Unido em junho de 2013 durante a sua Presidência do G8, a destinar o montante de 3,5 mil milhões de EUR a intervenções específicas e sensíveis ligadas à nutrição no próximo período de programação (2014-2020).

A Comissão remete também o Senhor Deputado para as respostas dadas às perguntas escritas anteriores E-006591/2013 e E-003171/2013 ([2]).

([1]) COM(2013) 141 final.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007017/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Child mortality

— According to a study recently published in *The Lancet* journal, malnutrition is responsible for the death of 3.1 million children each year, with nutritional problems accounting for 45% of all deaths among children.

Is the Commission aware of this situation? What is its assessment of it?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

The Lancet series provide the most accurate available evaluation of the dramatic level of the current impact of stunting on children's lives. The publication recalls that the crucial window of opportunity to tackle undernutrition is the 1 000 days from pregnancy to the age of two.

This vision is an integral part of the EU's nutrition policy framework on maternal and child nutrition ([1]) that was adopted recently and aims to help reduce both stunting and wasting. It sets the ambitious target of reducing the number of stunted children under five by at least 7 million by 2025, and defines clear guiding principles, objectives and priorities for EU actions. This applies to both our work in emergency situations and our work on poverty reduction and sustainable development.

The Commission has also reinforced political dialogue at national and international level. It has tried to ensure that nutrition is considered a national priority in countries where stunting rates are high, and tried to promote the mainstreaming of activities in the 1 000 day window of opportunity. The Commission is working closely with the Scaling-Up Nutrition (SUN) movement, partner countries and donors on keeping nutrition at the top of the development and humanitarian agenda.

The EU has furthermore committed itself, during the Nutrition for Growth event organised by the United Kingdom in June 2013 during their G8 Presidency, to spending EUR 3.5 billion on nutrition sensitive and nutrition specific interventions during the forthcoming programming period (2014-2020).

The Commission also refers the Honourable Member to the answers to previous written questions E-006591/2013 and E-003171/2013 ([2]).

([1]) COM(2013) 141 final.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007019/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Obesidade infantil

Considerando que:

— De acordo com a agência da ONU para a saúde, 43 milhões de crianças da mesma idade sofrem de excesso de peso ou obesidade;

— Segundo a Organização Mundial de Saúde, mais de 75 % das crianças com excesso de peso vivem nos países em desenvolvimento, que têm políticas para reduzir a subnutrição, mas negligenciam o peso das doenças associadas à obesidade.

Pergunto à Comissão:

Tem conhecimento dos números avançados pela ONU?

Que medidas implementou ou tenciona implementar na U.E para o combate à obesidade infantil?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(31 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão tem conhecimento dos dados comunicados pela OMS e, uma vez que as taxas de obesidade continuam a aumentar, a Comissão, juntamente com os Estados-Membros e as partes interessadas da UE, está a coordenar uma série de iniciativas para combater a obesidade infantil.

A estratégia para a Europa em matéria de problemas de saúde ligados à nutrição, ao excesso de peso e à obesidade ([1]), identifica as crianças como um grupo vulnerável de ação prioritária. Um exemplo é o regime de distribuição de fruta nas escolas ([2]), um programa da UE que visa incentivar os bons hábitos alimentares entre as crianças, através da distribuição de fruta e de legumes nas escolas. Além disso, a Comissão lançou projetos-piloto destinados a promover regimes alimentares saudáveis e a aumentar o consumo de fruta e legumes frescos entre os grupos sociais vulneráveis, incluindo as crianças.

Recentemente, o Grupo de Alto Nível sobre questões de Nutrição e Atividade Física iniciou o desenvolvimento de um plano de ação comum para combater a obesidade infantil, que deverá abranger o período de 2014-2020.

Além disso, a Comissão tenciona apresentar uma iniciativa política para a promoção da saúde através da atividade física em múltiplos setores, dirigida a todos os grupos etários, incluindo as crianças, e que se destina, entre outros objetivos, a combater o excesso de peso e a obesidade e a prevenir as doenças relacionadas com estes problemas.

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_pt.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007019/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Childhood obesity

According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), 43 million children of the same age are overweight or obese.

According to the WHO, over 75% of overweight children live in developing countries, which have policies in place to reduce malnutrition but overlook the seriousness of obesity-related diseases.

Is the Commission aware of the figures reported by the WHO?

What steps has it taken or does it plan to take in the EU to combat childhood obesity?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of the figures reported by the WHO and since the obesity rates continue to increase, the Commission, together with Member States and EU Stakeholders, is coordinating a range of initiatives to combat childhood obesity.

Within the strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related Health Issues ([1]), children have been identified as a vulnerable group and have been prioritised as a group for action. One example is the School Fruit Scheme ([2]), which is an EU programme that aims to encourage good eating habits in children by providing them with fruit and vegetables at school. Additionally, the Commission has launched pilot projects aimed at promoting healthy diets and increasing consumption of fresh fruit and vegetables in vulnerable societal groups, including children.

Recently, the High Level Group on Nutrition and Physical Activity started the development of a common Action Plan to tackle childhood obesity, which should cover the period 2014-2020.

In addition, the Commission intends to table a policy initiative to promote health-enhancing physical activity across sectors targeting all age groups, including children, which *inter alia* aims at combating overweight and obesity and preventing related conditions.

([1]) COM(2007) 279.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sfs/index_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007020/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Esclerose múltipla — novo tratamento

Considerando que:

— De acordo com a Organização Mundial de Saúde, a esclerose múltipla afeta 2,5 milhões de pessoas em todo o mundo, e caracteriza-se pela destruição progressiva da bainha de mielina, que protege os nervos do cérebro e da espinal medula e desempenha um papel fundamental na condução de impulsos nervosos, e que impede os impulsos elétricos de circularem eficazmente, causando sintomas que podem chegar à paralisia ou à cegueira;

— Um estudo, publicado na revista Science Translational Medicine, anunciou uma nova terapia que permite reprogramar o sistema imunitário dos doentes para reduzir a sua reatividade à mielina;

— Segundo os investigadores, esta terapia, ao contrário das terapias atuais que desativam o sistema imunitário, tornando os doentes mais sensíveis às infeções e fazendo aumentar o risco de cancro, «deixa intacto o funcionamento do sistema imunitário».

Pergunto à Comissão:

Como avalia esta importante descoberta?

Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(29 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão está ao corrente dos recentes resultados da equipa de professor Roland Martin e dos seus colaboradores ([1]) num novo tratamento para a esclerose múltipla. Os investigadores demonstraram que o tratamento reinicializa (restabelece) o sistema imunitário do doente sem afetar a sua capacidade de defesa contra infeções.

O teste envolveu nove pacientes do hospital universitário de Zurique e do centro médico universitário de Hamburg-Eppendorf. Embora os investigadores tenham demonstrado que o tratamento é seguro e bem tolerado, o reduzido número de doentes em causa não permite tirar conclusões sobre a eficácia do novo tratamento para travar a progressão da esclerose múltipla. Assim, será necessária investigação adicional para avaliar a eficácia do novo tratamento.

Embora este estudo não tenha contado com o apoio do Sétimo Programa-Quadro da Comunidade Europeia de atividades em matéria de investigação, desenvolvimento tecnológico e demonstração (2007 a 2013) (7.° PQ), o 7.° PQ investiu, desde 2007, mais de 67 milhões de EUR em investigação sobre doenças neuroinflamatórias. Este montante inclui 20 projetos internacionais que realizam atividades de investigação no domínio da esclerose múltipla e, em especial, dos processos de autoimunidade relacionados com a esclerose múltipla (por exemplo, o projeto Sybilla ([2])), num total de mais de 20 milhões de EUR.

Horizonte 2020, o programa-quadro de investigação e inovação da UE ([3]) (2014-2020), pode proporcionar novas oportunidades de apoio à investigação em Esclerose Múltipla.

([1]) Sci Transl Med. 5 de Junho de 2013;5(188):188ra75.
([2]) Biologia de sistemas de ativação de células T em situações de saúde e de doença http://www.sybilla-t-cell.de/
([3]) COM(2011) 808 final, COM(2011) 811 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007020/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Multiple sclerosis — new treatment

— According to the World Health Organisation, multiple sclerosis affects 2.5 million people worldwide. It is characterised by the progressive destruction of the myelin sheath, which protects the nerves in the brain and spinal cord and plays a vital role in conducting nerve impulses, preventing electrical impulses from circulating effectively and causing symptoms up to and including paralysis and blindness.

— A study published in the *Science Translational Medicine* journal has announced a new therapy which resets patients' immune systems to reduce their reactivity to myelin.

— According to researchers, this therapy, unlike current treatments that deactivate the immune system, making patients more susceptible to infections and increasing the risk of cancer, 'leaves the function of the normal immune system intact'.

How does the Commission view this important discovery?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of the recent findings by the team of Professor Roland Martin and his collaborators ([1]) on a new treatment for multiple sclerosis (MS). The researchers were able to show that the treatment resets the patient's immune system without affecting its ability to defend against infections.

The trial involved nine patients from the University Hospital Zurich and the University Medical Centre Hamburg-Eppendorf. While the researchers were able to show that the treatment is safe and well tolerated, the low number of patients involved does not allow for drawing conclusions on how effective the new treatment is in stopping MS progression. Further research will thus be needed to assess the effectiveness of the new treatment.

Although this study was not supported by the Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013), FP7 has since 2007 invested over EUR 67 million in research on neuroinflammatory diseases. This includes 20 international projects performing research on MS, and in particular the autoimmunity processes related to MS (e.g. the SYBILLA project ([2])), for a total of more than EUR 20 million.

Horizon 2020, the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation ([3]) (2014-2020), may provide further opportunities to support research on MS.

([1]) Sci Transl Med. 2013 Jun 5;5(188):188ra75.
([2]) Systems biology of T-cell activation in health and disease http://www.sybilla-t-cell.de/
([3]) COM(2011) 808 final, COM(2011) 811 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007022/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Material microporoso com iões de zinco

Considerando que:

— Uma equipa internacional liderada por um investigador da Universidade do Minho criou um material microporoso com iões de zinco que suprime seletivamente certos tipos de cancro, sem efeitos negativos para as células saudáveis.

Pergunto à Comissão:

— Tem conhecimento deste estudo?

Resposta dada por Máire Geoghegan-Quinn em nome da Comissão
(26 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão tem conhecimento da publicação referida pelo Senhor Deputado, da autoria de instituições em Portugal e na Bulgária, e que descreve as propriedades de inibição do crescimento de um titanossilicato microporoso contendo zinco em culturas de células cancerígenas HeLa humanas ([1]), ([2]). É todavia necessário um maior trabalho de investigação para avaliar o seu potencial terapêutico para os doentes com cancro.

A proposta da Comissão relativa ao Horizonte 2020 — Programa-Quadro de Investigação e Inovação (2014-2020) ([3]) — irá provavelmente proporcionar oportunidades de investigação de abordagens terapêuticas do cancro no âmbito do desafio societal «Saúde, alterações demográficas e bem-estar» e do objetivo «Liderança em Tecnologias Facilitadoras e Industriais» da prioridade «Liderança Industrial».

([1]) Ferdov et al. (2013) RSC Advances 3:8843.
([2]) http://www.isaude.net/en/noticia/35188/science-and-technology/material-suppresses-cancer-cells-without-causing-side-effects
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007022/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Microporous material containing zinc ions

An international team led by a researcher from the University of Minho has developed a microporous material containing zinc ions that selectively suppresses certain types of cancer, without damaging healthy cells.

Is the Commission aware of this study?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of the publication mentioned by the Honourable Member, authored by institutions in Portugal and Bulgaria and describing the growth-inhibiting properties of a zinc-containing, microporous titanosilicate in human HeLa cancer cell cultures ([1]),([2]). Further research is required to assess its therapeutic potential for cancer patients.

Horizon 2020 — The framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) ([3]), will likely offer opportunities to address cancer therapeutic approaches through the 'Health, demographic change and well-being' societal challenge and the 'Leadership in enabling and industrial technologies' objective of the priority 'Industrial leadership'.

([1]) Ferdov et al. (2013) RSC Advances 3:8843.
([2]) http://www.isaude.net/en/noticia/35188/science-and-technology/material-suppresses-cancer-cells-without-causing-side-effects
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/horizon2020/index_en.cfm?pg=h2020-documents

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007024/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: François Hollande rejeita ordens da UE I

Considerando que:

Recentemente, o Presidente francês François Hollande, afirmou que «os procedimentos e políticas são da responsabilidade do Governo e do Estado», face à exigência de reformas feita pela União Europeia; Bruxelas pediu a França para baixar reformas e custos laborais, algo que Hollande considerou uma interferência inaceitável;

Pergunta-se:

Como avalia esta posição face às exigências de Bruxelas?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(13 de agosto de 2013)

Ao abrigo do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia e do direito derivado da UE, os Estados-Membros acordaram em coordenar as suas políticas económicas e orçamentais. A crise mostrou à saciedade que o impacto das políticas de um Estado-Membro estende-se para além das suas fronteiras nacionais.

No quadro do Semestre Europeu ([1]), o Conselho, por recomendação da Comissão, adota recomendações específicas a cada país, com base nos artigos 121.° e 148.° do TFUE. Essas recomendações têm por finalidade prestar aconselhamento político específico a cada país sobre como enfrentar os principais desafios em matéria económica, social e de emprego, após uma análise aprofundada dos programas nacionais de reforma dos Estados-Membros.

As recomendações dirigidas ao Governo francês refletem, portanto, o papel confiado ao Conselho e à Comissão ao abrigo do quadro legislativo em vigor para a coordenação da política económica.

([1]) O Semestre Europeu foi codificado pelo artigo 1.° do Regulamento (UE) n.° 1175/2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007024/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: François Hollande rejects EU orders I

French President François Hollande recently responded to EU demands for reform by saying that 'the details, procedures and way of going about this are the responsibility of the Government and the State'. Brussels had called on France to implement reforms and reduce labour costs, which Hollande regarded as unacceptable interference.

How does the Commission view this response to demands from Brussels?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(13 August 2013)

Under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and EU secondary legislation, the Member States have agreed to coordinate their economic and fiscal policies. The crisis has made it abundantly clear that the impact of a Member State's policies extends beyond its national borders.

Within the framework of the European Semester ([1]), the Council, upon a recommendation of the Commission, adopts country-specific recommendations on the basis of Articles 121 and 148 of the TFEU Treaty. Their purpose is to provide country-specific policy advice on addressing the major economic employment and social challenges after a detailed analysis of the Member States' national reform programmes.

The recommendations addressed to the French Government therefore reflect the role entrusted to the Council and the Commission under the current legislative framework for economic policy coordination.

([1]) The European Semester has been codified by Regulation 1175/2011, Art. 1.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007025/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: François Hollande rejeita ordens da UE II

Recentemente, o presidente francês, François Hollande, afirmou que «os procedimentos e políticas são da responsabilidade do Governo e do Estado», face à exigência de reformas feita pela UE.

Bruxelas pediu a França para baixar reformas e custos laborais, algo que Hollande considerou uma interferência inaceitável.

Considerando que:

— François Hollande afirmou na semana passada que a crise na zona euro está ultrapassada;

— Há países da zona euro intervencionados, que passam por enormes dificuldades devido às fortes medidas de austeridade aplicadas;

— O desemprego é uma realidade que não para de aumentar em muitos países da UE;

Pergunto à Comissão:

Considera a Comissão que a crise na zona euro está ultrapassada?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(23 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a previsão da primavera de 2013, que pode ser consultada no sítio: http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/eu/forecasts/2013_spring_forecast_pt.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007025/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: François Hollande rejects EU orders II

French President François Hollande recently responded to EU demands for reform by saying that 'the details, procedures and way of going about this are the responsibility of the Government and the State'.

Brussels had called on France to implement reforms and reduce labour costs, which Hollande regarded as unacceptable interference.

— Last week, François Hollande said that the euro area crisis is over.

— Some bailed-out euro area countries are experiencing major difficulties due to the tough austerity measures in place.

— Unemployment continues to rise in many EU countries.

Does the Commission believe that the euro area crisis is over?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to the spring 2013 forecast at:
http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/eu/forecasts/2013_spring_forecast_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007026/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Consumo de álcool e drogas entre os jovens

Considerando que:

— O consumo de álcool e drogas, incluindo as chamadas «smartdrugs» e outras substâncias psicoativas, como antidepressivos e ansiolíticos, continua a aumentar em Portugal.

— Os jovens devem ser cada vez mais alertados para os danos para a saúde, que são muitas vezes irreversíveis e, também, para os perigos das interações das misturas que muitas vezes fazem.

— No caso do álcool, a interação com medicamentos pode causar varias falhas terapêuticas — desde a ineficácia de antibióticos ao efeito cumulativo de depressão do sistema nervoso. É de particular importância a combinação com o paracetamol, que pode aumentar a toxicidade.

Pergunto à Comissão:

— No que respeita à sensibilização para os danos irreversíveis dos perigos das interações das misturas de drogas e álcool, em que sentido tem agido a Comissão?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(26 de julho de 2013)

A nova Estratégia Europeia de luta contra a droga de 2013-2020 ([1]) identifica como prioridade a necessidade de abordar a tendência crescente que se verifica no uso de múltiplas substâncias, incluindo uma combinação de álcool, medicação receitada e substâncias ilícitas, bem como o aparecimento e a propagação de novas substâncias psicoativas. Salienta também a necessidade de aumentar a sensibilização sobre os riscos associados ao consumo de drogas e à utilização combinada de substâncias, bem como de aumentar a qualidade, a cobertura e a diversificação de serviços para a redução da procura de droga.

A Comissão apoia e complementa a ação dos Estados-Membros pela promoção do desenvolvimento de abordagens inovadoras e o intercâmbio de melhores práticas, e pelo financiamento da investigação através de programas de financiamento da UE. No âmbito do Programa de Informação e Prevenção em matéria de droga ([2]) existem dois projetos orientados para a prevenção e tratamento em relação ao uso de várias drogas (álcool e drogas) ([3]).

([1]) Estratégia de luta contra a droga da UE (2013-20) 2012/C 402/01.

([2]) Decisão n.° 1150/2007/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho de 25 de setembro de 2007 que cria, para o período de 2007 a 2013, o programa específico «Informação e prevenção em matéria de droga» no âmbito do programa geral «Direitos fundamentais e Justiça» JO L 257 de 3.10.2007, p. 23-29.

([3]) TRIP — Testes em intervenções de prevenção em áreas recreativas dirigidos aos consumidores de múltiplas drogas — número do projeto — JUST/2009/DPIP/AG/0946 e Esbirtes Controlo eletrónico, breve intervenção e encaminhamento para tratamento de consumidores de (múltiplas) drogas em serviços de emergência — número do projeto — JUST/2009/DPIP/AG/0930.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007026/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Alcohol and drug use among young people

More and more people in Portugal are using alcohol and drugs, including 'smart drugs' and other psychoactive substances, such as antidepressants and anxiolytics.

Young people need to be increasingly aware of the often irreversible harm to health and the dangerous interactions that can be caused by mixing drugs and alcohol, as they often do.

When it comes to alcohol, drug interactions can cause a range of treatment failures, from negating the efficacy of antibiotics to the cumulative effect of central nervous system depression. Particularly serious is mixing alcohol with paracetamol, which can increase toxicity.

— What action has the Commission taken to raise awareness of the irreversible harm caused by dangerous interactions produced by mixing drugs and alcohol?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

The new European Drugs Strategy 2013-2020 ([1]) identifies as a priority the need to address the increase trend towards poly-substance use, including combination of alcohol and prescribed medication and illicit substances as well as the emergence and spread of new psychoactive substances. It also emphasises the need to improve awareness about the risks linked to drug use and to the combined used of substances, as well as to increase the quality, coverage and diversification of drug-demand reduction services.

The Commission supports and complements Member States' action by promoting the development of innovative approaches and the sharing of best practices, and by funding research, through EU financial programmes. Under the Drug Prevention and Information Programme ([2]) two projects targeted prevention and treatment of poly-drug (alcohol and drug) use ([3]).

([1]) EU Drugs Strategy (2013-20) 2012/C 402/01.

([2]) Decision No 1150/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 September 2007 establishing for the period 2007-2013 the Specific Programme Drug prevention and information as part of the General Programme Fundamental Rights and Justice. OJ L 257, 3.10.2007, p. 23-29.

([3]) TRIP — Testing in Recreational-settings prevention-Interventions addressed to Polydrugusers — project number- JUST/2009/DPIP/AG/0946 and ESBIRTES Electronic screening, brief intervention and referral to treatment for (poly) drug users in emergency services) , project number JUST/2009/DPIP/AG/0930.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007028/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(17 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Pesca de melva en el puerto seco de Gibraltar

El desarrollo sostenible y la conservación del medio ambiente son principios básicos de la actividad de la Unión Europea. La política pesquera común (PPC) ha sido desde hace años una prioridad para la conservación de los caladeros europeos, como puede observarse en el Reglamento (CE n° 199/2008 sobre la recopilación, gestión y uso de los datos del sector pesquero, el Reglamento (CE) n° 1005/2008 sobre la pesca ilegal, no declarada y no reglamentada y el Reglamento (CE) n° 2371/2002 sobre la conservación y la explotación sostenible de los recursos pesqueros. Asimismo, debe señalarse la línea de actuación marcada por la Comisión ([1]) para reducir las capturas accesorias y eliminar los descartes en las pesquerías europeas y el reciente acuerdo alcanzado entre el Consejo y el Parlamento en el marco de la reforma de la PCC.

Diversos medios de comunicación ([2]) han denunciado recientemente unos hechos en el puerto seco de los astilleros de Gibraltar que podrían vulnerar parte —si no la totalidad— de la normativa comunitaria anteriormente citada. Las imágenes publicadas muestran cómo al parecer se ha utilizado dicho puerto seco para capturar varias toneladas de melva, un pez que, en cumplimiento de la normativa comunitaria, no se puede capturar en esta época en la zona del Estrecho de Gibraltar. Dichos peces fueron presuntamente sacrificados, desconociéndose el destino final de los mismos e ignorándose si se ha declarado dicha captura y si se ha producido su incorporación a los sistemas de recopilación de datos oportunos o verificado el cumplimiento de las condiciones exigibles para su comercialización. Cabe señalar además que las prácticas contrarias a la normativa de conservación medioambiental no son un hecho aislado en Gibraltar, donde se practican, de forma frecuente, rellenos de tierra ganando terreno al mar en zonas de especial protección comunitaria que prohíben estrictamente estas prácticas (LIC ES6120032 «Estrecho Oriental» de la Red Natura 2000).

Teniendo presente lo anterior, cabe formular las siguientes preguntas:

1. ¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión de los hechos denunciados y de si se ha comercializado parte de dichas capturas?

2. ¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión de la práctica de Gibraltar de realizar rellenos de tierra ganando terreno al mar?

3. ¿Considera compatible la Comisión las actuaciones denunciadas con la normativa de conservación medioambiental europea?

4. ¿Tiene previsto la Comisión adoptar, tras las investigaciones pertinentes, las medidas oportunas que garanticen la eficacia directa de la que gozan los reglamentos comunitarios y la reparación de los actos que los hayan contravenido?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(25 de septiembre de 2013)

De conformidad con el Acta de Adhesión de 1972, la normativa de la UE en el ámbito de la política pesquera común no se aplica en Gibraltar. No obstante, si el pescado desembarcado en Gibraltar se vende posteriormente en el mercado de la UE, su entrada está sujeta al régimen de certificación de capturas en virtud del Reglamento INDNR (Reglamento (CE) n° 1005/2008).

Por lo que se refiere a las actividades para ganar terreno al mar que se realizan en Gibraltar, en septiembre de 2011 la Comisión solicitó información al Reino Unido en relación con las obras de construcción del proyecto *Sovereign Bay* en Gibraltar. Las autoridades del Reino Unido indicaron que se había evaluado el impacto potencial del proyecto y que se había llegado a la conclusión de que no produciría ningún impacto significativo en los lugares de la red Natura 2000 designados en sus proximidades. Sobre la base de la información facilitada, la Comisión no ha observado la existencia de ninguna infracción de la legislación medioambiental de la UE en este caso.

([1]) COM(2007)0136 final.
([2]) http://www.europapress.es/andalucia/cadiz-00351/noticia-ecologistas-denunciaran-gibraltar-ue-utilizar-astillero-pescar-melva-ilegalmente-20130601113719.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007028/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Bullet tuna fishing in the Gibraltar dry dock

Sustainable development and the preservation of the environment are fundamental principles of the work of the European Union. For years, the common fisheries policy (CFP) has been giving priority to the preservation of fishing grounds, as demonstrated by Regulation (EC) No 199/2008 on the collection, management and use of data in the fisheries sector, Regulation (EC) No 1005/2008 on illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, and Regulation (EC) No 2371/2002 on the conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources. The strategy taken by the Commission ([1]) to reduce bycatch and eliminate discards in European fisheries and the recent agreement reached between the Council and Parliament on the CFP reform also deserve to be highlighted.

Various media reports ([2]) have recently condemned incidents taking place in the dry dock of the Gibraltar shipyards which may have violated some — if not all — of the regulations mentioned above. The pictures which were published show how the dry dock was seemingly used to catch many tonnes of bullet tuna which, in accordance with Union legislation, may not be caught in the Strait of Gibraltar in the current season. According to the reports, the fish appear to have been killed deliberately, but it was not known where the fish would end up, whether the catches had been declared and the relevant information entered into the data collection system, or whether the conditions for placing on the market had been met. Such infringements of environmental protection legislation are not the only violations committed in Gibraltar, where land is regularly reclaimed from the sea in Special Protection Areas where this kind of activity is strictly prohibited (SCI ES6120032 'Estrecho Oriental', Natura 2000).

1. Is the Commission aware of the incidents mentioned above? Has part or all of the catch been placed on the market?

2. Is the Commission aware of the fact that Gibraltar is conducting land reclamation?

3. Does the Commission believe that the acts reported in the media are in compliance with European legislation in the area of environmental protection?

4. Does the Commission intend to conduct relevant investigations and take steps to ensure that Union legislation has direct effect, and that action is taken to seek redress for the breaches committed?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(25 September 2013)

According to the 1972 Act of Accession, the EU rules regarding the common fisheries policy do not apply to Gibraltar. However, if fish landed in Gibraltar is subsequently sold into the EU market, this entry is subject to the catch certification scheme under the IUU regulation (Regulation No 1005/2008).

As regards land reclamation activities in Gibraltar, the Commission requested in September 2011 information from the United Kingdom concerning the works to build the development of Sovereign Bay project in Gibraltar. The United Kingdom authorities indicated that the potential impact of the development had been assessed and that it concluded that there would be no significant impact on any of the Natura 2000 sites designated in the vicinity of the project. From the information provided, the Commission was unable to identify a breach of EU environmental law in this case.

([1]) COM(2007) 0136 final.
([2]) http://www.europapress.es/andalucia/cadiz-00351/noticia-ecologistas-denunciaran-gibraltar-ue-utilizar-astillero-pescar-melva-ilegalmente-20130601113719.html

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-007029/13
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(17 juni 2013)

Angående: Valideringstjänster som kategori A-tjänster eller kategori B-tjänster inom ramen för upphandlingsdirektiven

I det nyligen utarbetade förslaget om en nationell federation för validering av e-identifiering som används för offentliga förvaltningstjänster fastställer den svenska regeringen att den måste upprätta en tjänstekoncessionsmodell med beaktande av EU:s upphandlingslagstiftning, så att federationen kan tillämpa den särskilda standarden för e-identifiering och e-autentisering, SAML 2.0 ([1]). Konkurrensverket invände i april 2011 mot att den svenska regeringen inte hade varit tydlig när det gällde statusen för valideringstjänsterna som A- eller B-tjänster ([2]). Regeringen ansåg att den beviljade tjänsten skulle anses vara en B-tjänst enligt upphandlingslagstiftningen, jämförbar med en elektronisk signatur, även om regeringen medger att detta inte är fastställt ([3]). Men att normalisera en teknisk standard till ett specifikt ändamål inom den offentliga sektorn och låta vem som helst som uppfyller den standarden tillhandahålla valideringstjänster som är kompatibla med tjänsten utgör en datortjänst eller en teknisk tjänst, och är således en kategori A-tjänst ([4]).

Kan kommissionen tydliggöra om den anser att valideringstjänster för e-autentisering av privatpersoner för e-förvaltningstjänster är en tjänst inom kategori A eller kategori B? Är den svenska regeringens federation för sådana valideringstjänster i så fall förenlig med EU:s upphandlingsregler?

Svar från Michel Barnier på kommissionens vägnar
(5 augusti 2013)

I bilaga IIA till det nuvarande direktivet om offentlig upphandling anges 16 tjänstekategorier som omfattas av direktivets detaljerade bestämmelser. Tjänster som ingår i bilaga IIB omfattas endast av bestämmelserna om tekniska definitioner och skyldigheten att informera om ingångna avtal. Denna uppdelning är dock endast relevant om en offentlig myndighet har för avsikt att ingå ett avtal om allmännyttiga tjänster.

På grundval av de uppgifter som föreligger kan frågan huruvida valideringstjänster för e-autentisering av privatpersoner för e-förvaltningstjänster är en tjänst inom kategori A eller kategori B inte besvaras slutgiltigt. Det krävs ytterligare uppgifter om tjänsternas omfattning och art för att kunna göra den indelningen.

När en offentlig myndighet förbereder tilldelningen av en koncession avseende allmännyttiga tjänster, so mi det fall som ledamoten skildrar, är den emellertid inte bunden av direktivet om offentlig upphandling. Därför är en indelning av tjänsterna i kategori A eller B inte nödvändig. Den upphandlande myndigheten kommer under alla omständigheter att behöva respektera principerna om öppenhet och insyn, lika behandling och icke-diskriminering enligt EU-fördragen. Dessa skyldigheter gäller tilldelning av koncessioner oberoende av huruvida tjänsten omfattas av bilaga IIA eller IIB.

([1]) https://docs.eid2.se/
([2]) http://www.kkv.se/beslut/11-0122.pdf
([3]) http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/20/39/36/b8a671a0.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/docs/guidelines/services_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007029/13
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Validation services as category A or category B services under the procurement directives

In its recently established proposal for a national federation for validation of electronic identification used in public government services, the Swedish Government concludes that it has to establish a service concession model under the EU procurement framework in order for the federation to apply a specific electronic identification and authentication standard called SAML2 ([1]). The competition authority intervened in April 2011 to object that the Swedish Government had not been clear about the status of the validation services as A-services or B-services ([2]). It was the government's belief that the service conceded should be considered a B-service under the procurement framework, analogous to an electronic signature, although it acknowledges that this is not established ([3]). However, arguably normalising a technical standard for a particular task in the public sector and allowing for anyone compliant with that standard to provide validation services who is compliant with that service constitutes a computer service or a technical service and thus a category A service ([4]).

Could the Commission clarify whether it considers validation services for electronic authentication of private persons to eGovernment services to be a category A or a category B service? Is the Swedish Government federation for such validation services in this case compliant with EU procurement rules?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

Annex IIA to the current public procurement directive lists 16 categories of services which are subject to the detailed provisions of the directive. Services falling under Annex IIB are only subject to the provisions on technical definitions and on the obligation to inform about concluded contracts. This division is however relevant only when a public authority intends to award a public service contract.

On the basis of the available information it is not possible to give a definitive answer to the question whether 'validation services for electronic authentication of private persons to eGovernment services' are category A or a category B services. To do so, more information on the exact content and nature of these services would be needed.

However, when a public authority is preparing the award of a public service concession, as is the case in relation to the Honourable Member's question, it is not bound by the public procurement directive. Therefore the classification of services to category A or category B is not necessary. The contracting authority will in any case need to abide to the principles of transparency, equal treatment and non-discrimination deriving from the EU Treaties. These obligations apply to the award of the concession regardless of the service falling under the scope of Annex IIA or Annex IIB.

([1]) https://docs.eid2.se/
([2]) http://www.kkv.se/beslut/11-0122.pdf
([3]) http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/20/39/36/b8a671a0.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/publicprocurement/docs/guidelines/services_en.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007030/13
alla Commissione
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(17 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Grandi opere e procedure di smaltimento delle «terre e rocce da scavo»: definizione di rifiuti come sottoprodotto

La DG Ambiente, il 4 marzo 2013, ha archiviato la denuncia dell'Associazione Idra con riferimento alla presunta violazione della normativa europea da parte del decreto ministeriale 10 agosto 2012, n. 161 «Regolamento recante la disciplina dell'utilizzazione delle terre e rocce da scavo», ritenendolo formalmente conforme alla direttiva sui rifiuti. La DG dichiara che esiste una corrispondenza tra l'articolo 5 della direttiva 2008/98/CE e l'articolo 4 del decreto 161/2012. In realtà notevoli sono le differenze tra i due testi. La direttiva fa riferimento ai «processi di produzione» mentre il regolamento italiano fa riferimento alle «opere» (vale a dire «il risultato di un insieme di lavori di costruzione, demolizione, recupero, ristrutturazione, restauro, manutenzione»). Gli ambiti di riferimento sono estremamente diversi. A livello di utilizzo la direttiva pone la seguente condizione: «la sostanza o l'oggetto soddisfa, per l'utilizzo specifico, tutti i requisiti pertinenti riguardanti i prodotti e la protezione della salute e dell'ambiente e non porterà a impatti complessivi negativi sull'ambiente o la salute umana». Per il regolamento è sufficiente che «il materiale da scavo, per le modalità di utilizzo specifico di cui alla precedente lettera b), soddisfa i requisiti di qualità ambientale di cui all'Allegato 4». Appare estremamente grave che nell'articolato non si faccia un accenno all'esigenza fondamentale di verificare, caso per caso, in concreto, l'assenza di impatti complessivi negativi sull'ambiente e sulla salute. Ciò appare in palese violazione della normativa europea. Lo stesso legislatore italiano si limita al riferimento a meri «requisiti di qualità ambientale» (in contrapposizione con le specifiche condizioni poste dall'articolo 5 della direttiva 2008/98/CE). Dal punto di vista tecnico è evidente la differenza tra quanto previsto dalla normativa europea e quanto contenuto nel decreto, che fa riferimento esclusivamente all'ambiente e non alla salute. L'allegato 4 fa riferimento alle procedure di caratterizzazione chimico-fisiche dei materiali da qualificare come sottoprodotti. Queste non garantiscono che l'impiego di un materiale residuale di scavo in sostituzione di terra o di materiale di cava non determini impatti complessivi negativi sull'ambiente o la salute umana, e che l'utilizzo dei sottoprodotti garantisca ai prodotti da questi ottenuti i medesimi requisiti dei prodotti ottenuti a partire dalle materie prime (in relazione alla salute e all'ambiente).

Ritiene la Commissione che questi elementi forniscano spunti per una valutazione approfondita del caso? In caso di risposta negativa può fornire una spiegazione puntuale e giuridica da contrapporre a tali argomentazioni?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007031/13
alla Commissione
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(17 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Grandi opere e procedure di smaltimento delle «terre e rocce da scavo»: definizione di «normale pratica industriale»

La DG Ambiente, il 4 marzo 2013, ha archiviato la denuncia dell'Associazione Idra con riferimento alla presunta violazione della normativa europea da parte del decreto ministeriale 10 agosto 2012, n. 161 «Regolamento recante la disciplina dell'utilizzazione delle terre e rocce da scavo», ritenendolo formalmente conforme alla direttiva sui rifiuti. La DG dichiara che esiste una corrispondenza tra l'articolo 5 della direttiva 2008/98/CE e l'articolo 4 del regolamento italiano 161/2012. In realtà notevoli sono le differenze tra i due testi. Un'analisi a parte merita la questione delle «normali pratiche industriali». Secondo la direttiva 2008/98/CE la qualifica di sottoprodotto è assegnabile qualora il materiale non sia soggetto ad alcun trattamento diverso dalla normale pratica industriale. Apparentemente il regolamento riprende integralmente la stessa norma, stipulando però un elenco (allegato 3) delle operazioni che possono essere considerate «normale pratica industriale». L'elenco riporta una serie di attività che possono ritenersi ben lontane dall'ordinarietà del processo produttivo e che possono trasformare radicalmente la natura del materiale trattato. Attività quali «la riduzione della presenza nel materiale da scavo degli elementi/materiali antropici (ivi inclusi, a titolo esemplificativo, frammenti di vetroresina, cementiti, bentoniti), eseguita sia a mano che con mezzi meccanici» sono peraltro maggiormente riconducibili al trattamento dei rifiuti piuttosto che alla normale pratica industriale. Trattamenti come «la stabilizzazione a calce o a cemento» sono un intervento che altera fortemente la natura del materiale (vedi in questo caso la presenza di ph fortemente alcalini che potrebbero rendere il nuovo materiale inadatto ad utilizzi «a suolo»). Ciò è in conflitto con la ratio della norma (e non con la forma della stessa, che invece pare rispettata), secondo la quale il «sottoprodotto», per essere tale, deve essere sostanzialmente equiparabile, sotto il profilo dell'impatto ambientale e sanitario, al bene che sostituisce. In sostanza, non devono essere necessarie speciali operazioni dirette a «innocuizzare» la sostanza perché questa possa essere «normalmente» impiegata nella pratica industriale. Questo concetto è tratto in primo luogo dalla giurisprudenza della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione europea e, a seguire, dalla giurisprudenza italiana, formatasi sulla base della normativa quadro europea.

Pertanto non ritiene forse la Commissione che queste considerazioni meritino un approfondimento da parte dei servizi competenti? In ogni caso, può fornire una risposta dettagliata, specifica e argomentata sui profili evidenziati nella presente interrogazione?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007032/13
alla Commissione
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(17 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Grandi opere e procedure di smaltimento delle «terre e rocce da scavo»: sistema di controlli

La DG Ambiente, il 4 marzo 2013, ha archiviato la denuncia dell'Ass. Idra con riferimento alla presunta violazione della normativa europea da parte del regolamento recante la disciplina dell'utilizzazione delle terre e rocce da scavo, ritenendolo formalmente conforme alla direttiva sui rifiuti. Con riferimento alle osservazioni dell'Associazione sul livello inadeguato di controlli la DG Ambiente afferma che «varie disposizioni del decreto fanno riferimento a controlli e ispezioni da parte delle autorità». S'invita la Commissione a dedicare un'ulteriore valutazione sul fatto che le norme sui controlli all'interno del decreto non sembrano in grado di garantire quel livello adeguato di tutela ambientale e sanitaria imposta dalla normativa europea. In primis il decreto individua una sorta di meccanismo di «silenzio-assenso» grazie al quale l'operatore proponente, una volta presentato il piano per la gestione dei materiali e trascorsi 90 giorni, può avviare le sue attività, con il forte rischio che si agisca a danno di enormi interessi ambientali e sanitari. Dubbi importanti emergono anche rispetto alla possibilità di fare la caratterizzazione dei materiali di scavo nel luogo di destinazione piuttosto che in quello di produzione. Un pericoloso vulnus del decreto, visti gli interessi in gioco, è rappresentato dal fatto che la caratterizzazione venga fatta dal proponente, con il rischio, già manifestatosi in concreto come dimostrano recenti atti giudiziari, che questa possa essere elaborata ad hoc nell'interesse privato e non in quello sovraordinato della tutela dell'ambiente e della salute dei cittadini. Il decreto, inoltre, fa riferimento al fatto che la caratterizzazione preliminare è funzionale solo a verificare l'esistenza di «rischio per la contaminazione dell'ambiente», tralasciando completamente gli aspetti legati alla salute dei cittadini che, al contrario, sono espressamente citati tra le condizioni inserite nella direttiva sui rifiuti. Un altro aspetto determinante riguarda il fatto che la caratterizzazione delle terre di scavo è prevista in via ordinaria solo precedentemente ai lavori, attraverso forme di campionatura che possono fornire solo un'indicazione ma non la certezza della tutela degli interessi pubblici in gioco. La mancanza di un monitoraggio costante e indipendente dei materiali escavati destinati al riutilizzo rende del tutto inconsistente il sistema dei controlli posto in essere.

Pertanto, non ritiene forse la Commissione che queste considerazioni meritino un approfondimento? In ogni caso, può fornire una risposta dettagliata, specifica e argomentata che dimostri l'efficacia del sistema di controlli posti in essere dal regolamento e la loro sostanziale corrispondenza alla normativa europea?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007033/13
alla Commissione
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(17 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Grandi opere e procedure di smaltimento delle «terre e rocce da scavo»: indebito allargamento del campo di esclusione della direttiva sui rifiuti

La DG Ambiente, il 4 marzo 2013, ha archiviato la denuncia dell'Associazione Idra sulla presunta violazione della normativa europea da parte del regolamento recante la disciplina dell'utilizzazione delle terre e rocce da scavo, ritenendolo formalmente conforme alla direttiva «rifiuti». Si segnala alla Commissione la sostanziale differenza tra l'articolo 2, paragrafo 1, lettera c), della direttiva 2008/98, che esclude dall'ambito della stessa «suolo non contaminato e altro materiale allo stato naturale escavato nel corso di attività di costruzione, ove sia certo che il materiale sarà utilizzato a fini di costruzione allo stato naturale nello stesso sito in cui è stato escavato», e l'articolo 3 del d.l. 2/2012 e successivamente il D.M. 10 agosto 2012, n. 161 (sopra citato), tramite i quali il legislatore italiano ha fornito un'interpretazione autentica dell'articolo 185 del D.lgs. 152/2006 (che da attuazione alla direttiva 2008/98). Nella nozione di suolo vengono incluse le «matrici materiali di riporto» vale a dire «i materiali eterogenei non assimilabili per caratteristiche geologiche e stratigrafiche al terreno in situ, all'interno dei quali possono trovarsi materiali estranei», come disciplinati dal D.M. 161/2012 ed in particolare all'allegato 9 che definisce i riporti come «una miscela eterogenea di terreno naturale e di materiali di origine antropica, anche di derivazione edilizio-urbanistica pregressa». Con tali modifiche si estende l'esclusione dalla disciplina sui rifiuti oltre al suolo non contaminato e altro materiale naturale (così come previsto dalla normativa europea), anche ai materiali di origine antropica cioè il suolo contaminato da quei materiali non naturali («estranei») che il legislatore europeo ha chiaramente escluso dall'ambito dell'esclusione e che, nella pratica, altro non sono che rifiuti, sostanze ed oggetti non naturali (materiali estranei al suolo) di cui il detentore si è disfatto e che sono frammisti al terreno naturale. Da sottolineare che il legislatore italiano, per motivare l'esclusione dall'ambito della direttiva sui rifiuti, non cita mai la nozione di «sottoprodotto» in quanto le lettere b) e c) dell'articolo 185 del D. Lgs. 152/06 così come modificato e interpretato, fanno riferimento ad esclusioni tout court e non al rispetto di ulteriori condizioni. Appare evidente che il campo di esclusione della direttiva sui rifiuti sia indebitamente esteso nell'attuale legislazione italiana, come già avvenuto nel 2007 con condanna della Corte di giustizia europea.

Ritiene la Commissione che questi elementi forniscano spunti per una valutazione approfondita del caso? In caso di risposta negativa, può fornire una spiegazione puntuale e giuridica da contrapporre a tali argomentazioni?

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007034/13
alla Commissione
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(17 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Grandi opere e procedure di smaltimento delle «terre e rocce da scavo»: infiltrazioni della criminalità organizzata e mafiosa

Nella risposta all'interrogazione P-001908/2013 la Commissione afferma «Quanto al rischio che il decreto italiano sia impropriamente applicato, favorendo così la criminalità organizzata, i denunzianti non hanno fornito alcun elemento atto a dimostrare un caso concreto di applicazione scorretta».

Si ritiene di dover informare la Commissione dell'indagine attualmente in corso da parte della Procura di Firenze (che ha portato anche al sequestro dei cantieri) con accuse di associazione a delinquere, truffa, corruzione e smaltimento abusivo dei rifiuti. Secondo l'accusa «una ditta che si occupava di smaltire fanghi e rifiuti (terre di scavo) dai cantieri per la Tav fiorentina, sarebbe legata alla camorra e in particolare al clan dei Casalesi». L'inchiesta è partita proprio da un accertamento sullo smaltimento dei fanghi nei cantieri della Tav fiorentina. Gli investigatori hanno scoperto che le «ditte smaltitrici si dividevano in pieno accordo i quantitativi di fanghi e acque e si occupavano anche della loro raccolta, trasporto e smaltimento in discarica».

Le indagini colpiscono anche funzionari pubblici che, proprio con riferimento allo smaltimento dei rifiuti, «si mettevano a disposizione per stilare pareri compiacenti e declassificare per esempio i fanghi di perforazione in terra non inquinata». Questa inchiesta appare agli occhi della scrivente emblematica di quali siano gli interessi in gioco, di come la criminalità organizzata e i sistemi criminali riescano a infiltrarsi in questo genere di attività e avvalorano la tesi secondo la quale il regolamento del 2012 che mira a escludere le terre da scavo dall'ambito di applicazione della direttiva «rifiuti» rappresenti, in virtù delle numerose criticità riscontrate puntualmente in diverse interrogazioni e in circostanziate denunce di cittadini e associazioni, una palese violazione della normativa ambientale europea e dei diritti garantiti dai trattati stessi, oltre ad un concreto rischio per l'ambiente e la salute dei cittadini stessi, di cui la Commissione è garante.

Alla luce di questi fatti, ritiene la Commissione che si possa escludere il rischio concreto di infiltrazioni della criminalità organizzata in questo genere di attività?

Risposta congiunta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(20 agosto 2013)

Per quanto riguarda le tematiche sollevate nelle interrogazioni scritte E-007031/2013, E-007032/2013 e E-007033/2013, la Commissione invita l'onorevole deputata a consultare la lettera del 4 marzo 2013, con cui la Commissione ha fornito, a seguito della denuncia all'associazione Idra, una spiegazione dettagliata dei motivi per cui ritiene che il decreto italiano 161/2012 non sia incompatibile con la direttiva 2008/98.

Per quanto concerne gli ulteriori quesiti posti nell'interrogazione scritta E-007030/2013, la Commissione fa notare quanto segue:

— l'uso del termine «opere» di cui all'articolo 4 del decreto italiano 161/2012, al posto del termine «processi di produzione» di cui all'articolo 5 della direttiva 2008/98 ([1]) relativa ai rifiuti , non costituisce una violazione della direttiva 2008/98 in quanto le opere di costruzione e demolizione di cui al decreto italiano 161/2012 sono un tipo di processo di produzione.

— il decreto italiano 161/2012 contiene effettivamente riferimenti alla salute pubblica, all'articolo 2, paragrafo 2, e agli allegati 4 e 8.

Per quanto riguarda i temi sollevati nell'interrogazione scritta E-007034/2013, la Commissione prende atto del fatto che il procuratore di Firenze sta indagando su denunce di smaltimento illecito di rifiuti in connessione con la costruzione della linea ad alta velocità che tocca Firenze. Tuttavia, il fatto che in casi concreti i rifiuti degli scavi siano stati smaltiti illegalmente non dimostra che il decreto italiano 161/2012 sia incompatibile in quanto tale con la direttiva 2008/98.

([1]) GU L 312 del 22.11.2008.

Infine, la Commissione è a conoscenza del fatto che gruppi criminali organizzati stanno sempre più espandendo le loro attività nel settore dello smaltimento dei rifiuti. Tuttavia, spetta alle autorità nazionali indagare sui casi specifici e assicurare i responsabili alla giustizia.

La Commissione chiederà alle autorità italiane di fornire chiarimenti circa il meccanismo basato sul principio «silenzio assenso» previsto dal decreto italiano in questione.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007030/13
to the Commission
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Major works and disposal procedures for excavated earth and rocks: definition of waste as a by-product

On 4 March 2013, DG Environment filed a complaint by the Idra association concerning alleged infringement of Community law, arguing that Ministerial Decree 161 of 10 August 2012 on the use of excavated land and rocks effectively complied with Directive 2008/98/EC on Waste and that Article 4 of the decree was in line with Article 5 the directive. In practice, however, the two texts differ substantially The directive refers to 'production processes', while the Italian legislation refers to 'works' (encompassing construction, demolition, recovery, restructuring, restoration and maintenance activities). The reference frameworks are extremely different. The directive specifies that the substance or object must fulfil 'all relevant product environmental and health protection requirements for the specific use and will not lead to overall adverse environmental or human health impacts.' The Italian legislation simply specifies that the excavated material must satisfy the environmental conditions set out in Annex 4 with regard to the specific use thereof referred to in paragraph (b) above. However, no reference is made to the fundamental need to verify on a case-by-case basis the absence of any overall unfavourable effects on the environment and public health. This is a serious omission and would appear to be in direct infringement of European law. The Italian legislation merely refers to environmental quality requirements (as opposed to the specific conditions contained in Article 5 of Directive 2008/98/EC). From the technical point of view, it is clear that there are differences between the directive and the Decree, the latter simply referring to the environment and not public health. Annex 4 refers to the chemical and physical classification of materials redefined as by-products. This does not guarantee that the use of residual materials from excavations in place of quarried earth or materials will not have an overall unfavourable impact on the environment and public health and that the use of by-products from them will meet the same requirements as products obtained from raw materials (in terms of the environment and public health).

Does the Commission not consider that the matter therefore warrants closer scrutiny? If not, can it put forward a point-by-point legal refutation of the above arguments?

Question for written answer E-007031/13
to the Commission
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Major works and disposal procedures for excavated earth and rocks: definition of normal industrial practice

On 4 March 2013, DG Environment filed a complaint by the Idra association concerning alleged infringement of Community law, arguing that Ministerial Decree 161 of 10 August 2012 on the use of excavated land and rocks effectively complied with Directive 2008/98/EC waste and that Article 4 of the decree was in line with Article 5 the directive. In practice, however, the two texts differ substantially, particularly regarding the term 'normal industrial practices' which should be given separate consideration. Under Directive 2008/98/EC, the term 'by-products' applies to material that can be used directly without any further processing other than normal industrial practices. While this provision is apparently being implemented in full, a number of operations are listed (Annex 3) as normal industrial practice, including those which could be considered as far removed from standard production processes and could radically transform the nature of the material being processed. Activities such as the reduction of man-made elements/materials (for example fibreglass, cement or bentonite fragments) contained in excavated material either manually or by mechanical means relate more to waste processing than to normal industrial practice. 'Lime or cement stabilisation' greatly alter the nature of the material (the presence of highly alkaline ph possibly making the new material unsuitable for 'ground' uses). This infringes the spirit (while appearing to respect the letter) of the directive since, to be considered a 'by-product', a material must be substantially similar to that which it is replacing in terms of environmental impact and effects on public health. Basically, it should not be necessary to carry out special operations to render it harmless so that it can be used for standard industrial practices. This principle is embodied first and foremost in the case law established by the European Union Court of Justice and, by extension, in Italian case law based on European framework legislation.

Does the Commission not consider that the matter therefore warrants closer scrutiny? Can it at least put forward detailed and specific arguments in response to the points raised in this question?

Question for written answer E-007032/13
to the Commission
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Major works and disposal procedures for 'excavated earth and rocks': monitoring procedures

On 4 March 2013, DG Environment filed a complaint by the Idra association concerning alleged infringement of Community law, arguing that the regulations governing the use of excavated earth and rocks in fact complied with the corresponding provisions of the directive on waste. In reply to objections by Idra regarding inadequate monitoring, DG Environment cited references in the relevant decree to supervision and inspection by the authorities. Can the Commission re-examine these provisions, since they do not appear to guarantee adequately the level of environmental and health protection required under European law? In particular, the decree contains a sort of 'silence means assent' mechanism authorising the promoter, 90 days after presenting a resource management plan, to proceed with operations at enormous risk to the environment and public health. Classification of excavated material at the place of arrival rather than the place of production is a possibility that also gives rise to serious misgivings. Furthermore, a major weakness of the decree is the classification of the material by the promoter himself, giving rise to the risk of ad hoc evaluations with vested interests in mind, rather than evaluations carried out in the overall interest of environmental protection and public health, something which has recently been shown to have substantial legal implications. Under the terms of the decree, moreover, the preliminary evaluation serves to verify the existence of an environmental pollution risk alone, completely ignoring public health issues, which are, on the other hand, expressly referred to in the directive on waste. Anther major concern is the standard practice of sampling earth to be excavated prior to commencement of works, a procedure which cannot by itself fully guarantee protection of the public interests at stake, while the absence of any ongoing and independent monitoring of the excavated materials intended for reutilisation substantially defeats the object of the inspection procedure.

Does the Commission not consider that the matter therefore warrants closer scrutiny? Can it at least give detailed and specific evidence of the effectiveness of the statutory monitoring arrangements and their overall compliance with the Community law?

Question for written answer E-007033/13
to the Commission
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Major works and disposal procedures for excavated earth and rocks: unwarranted extension of exclusions under the directive on Waste

On 4 March 2013, DG Environment filed a complaint by the Idra association concerning alleged infringement of Community law, arguing that the regulations governing the use of excavated earth and rocks effectively complied with the corresponding provisions of the directive on Waste. There in fact is a substantial difference between Article 2(1)(c) of Directive 2008/98, which excludes from its scope 'uncontaminated soil and other naturally occurring material excavated in the course of construction activities, where it is certain that the material will be used for the purposes of construction in its natural state on the site from which it is excavated' and Article 3 of Decree Law 2/2012 and the subsequent Ministerial Decree No 161 of 10 August 2012 (referred to above), which gives an authentic interpretation of Article 185 of Legislative Decree 152/2006 (implementing Directive 2008/98). Here earth is also taken to mean aggregate filling material, i.e. heterogeneous material which cannot be assimilated in geological and stratigraphic terms with the earth in situ and may contain extraneous filling material defined in Ministerial Decree 161/2012 and, in particular, Annex 9 thereof, as a heterogeneous mixture of natural soil and manmade materials, including materials from previous building and urban development projects. This would effectively exclude from the scope of the waste provisions not only uncontaminated soil and other natural materials (as laid down under EC law) but also manmade materials, i.e. earth contaminated by non-natural (extraneous) materials or non-natural waste substances and (extraneous) objects) which have been discarded and become mixed up with natural soil. This was manifestly not the intention behind the EU legislation. Moreover, in justifying the exclusion of waste from the directive, Italian legislation never refers to 'by-products'. Articles 185(b) and (c) of Legislative Decree 152/06, as modified and interpreted, refer simply to exclusions and make no further stipulations. It is therefore clear that the exclusions from the scope of Directive on Waste have been extended to an unwarranted degree under current Italian law, as was the case in 2007, leading to a condemnation by the European Court of Justice.

Does the Commission not consider that the matter therefore warrants closer scrutiny? If not, can it put forward a point-by-point legal refutation of these arguments?

Question for written answer E-007034/13
to the Commission
Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Major works and disposal procedures for 'excavated earth and rocks': infiltration by organised crime and the Mafia

In its answer to Question P-001908/2013, the Commission stated 'As for the risk that the Italian Decree might be incorrectly applied thus favouring organised crime, the complainants have provided no evidence of such a concrete case of bad application.'

The Florence Public Prosecutor's Office (which has also seized building sites) is currently conducting an investigation into alleged criminal enterprise, fraud, corruption and unlawful waste disposal. According to the allegations, a company that disposed of mud and waste (excavated earth) from building sites for the Florence high-speed train line (TAV), had links to the Camorra and in particular to the Casalesi clan. The investigation is part of a wider investigation into the disposal of mud from TAV building sites in Florence. Investigators have discovered that the waste disposal companies agreed to divide up quantities of mud and water between themselves and collected, transported and disposed of them in landfill.

The investigations also involve public officials who, with regard to waste disposal, offered to issue favourable opinions and to reclassify drilling mud as uncontaminated earth, for example. In my view, this investigation is emblematic of the interests at stake and of how organised crime and criminals infiltrate this kind of activity, giving weight to the idea that the 2012 regulation intended to exclude excavated earth from the scope of the 'Waste' Directive is, in view of the many critical points detailed in several questions and in detailed complaints from the public and various associations, in clear breach of European environmental law and the rights enshrined in the Treaties, as well as a very real risk to the environment and public health, which the Commission is responsible for safeguarding.

Does the Commission think that it can rule out the very real risk of organised crime infiltrating this kind of activity?

Joint answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2013)

As concerns the issues raised by Questions E-007031/2013, E-007032/2013 and E-007033/2013, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to the letter of 4 March 2013 whereby the Commission provided the complainant Idra association with a detailed explanation of why it considers that the Italian Decree 161/2012 is not incompatible with Directive 2008/98/EC.

As concerns the additional issues raised by Question E-007030/2013, the Commission observes the following: — The use of the term 'works' in Article 4 of the Italian Decree 161/2012, instead of the 'production processes' referred to in Article 5 of Directive 2008/98/EC [1] on waste, does not constitute a breach of Directive 2008/98/EC, because the construction and demolition works covered by the Italian Decree 161/2012 are a kind of production process. — The Italian Decree 161/2012 does contain references to public health in its Article 2(2) and in its Annexes 4 and 8.

As concerns the issues raised by Question E-007034/2013, the Commission takes note that the Florence Public Prosecutor is investigating allegations of unlawful waste disposal in connection with the building of the Florence high-speed train line. However, the fact that in concrete cases excavation waste may have been disposed of illegally does not prove that the Italian Decree 161/2012 is as such incompatible with Directive 2008/98/EC.

Finally, the Commission is aware that Italian organised criminal groups are increasingly expanding their activities in the waste disposal sector. However, the responsibility to investigate and prosecute specific cases rests with national authorities.

The Commission will ask the Italian authorities to provide clarifications on the 'silence means assent' mechanism foreseen by the Italian Decree 161/2012.

[1] OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007035/13
do Komisji
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wstrzymanie funduszy europejskich 2014-2020 na dofiansowanie dróg lokalnych

Komisja Europejska poprzez przygotowane wytyczne wstrzymała możliwość przekazywania dotacji z funduszy unijnych po roku 2014 r. na cele związane z modernizacją i rozbudową sieci dróg lokalnych (w praktyce w Polsce dróg gminnych i powiatowych).

Taka sytuacja przeczy logice funduszy spójności, których celem jest m.in. równomierny rozwój obszarów Unii Europejskiej. Błędem jest aż tak duże zawężanie przez Komisję Europejską celów na inwestycje transportowe. To państwa członkowskie i regiony mają najlepiej rozpoznane swoje potrzeby. Odgórne ograniczanie im narzędzi do realizacji celów zapisanych w dokumentach strategicznych UE jest błędne.

W związku z powyższym proszę o odpowiedź na pytania:

1. Czym kierowała się Komisja Europejska podejmując decyzję o zlikwidowaniu dofinansowania dla dróg lokalnych?

2. Dlaczego Komisja Europejska sztucznie zawęża państwom członkowskim narzędzia do realizacji celów strategicznych Unii Europejskiej?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(5 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Zwiększenie oddziaływania polityki spójności służącej realizacji priorytetów europejskich stanowi główną zasadę w kontekście wniosków ustawodawczych Komisji na lata 2014-2020. Dlatego też w art. 9 projektu rozporządzenia w sprawie wspólnych przepisów dotyczących europejskich funduszy strukturalnych i inwestycyjnych wprowadzono wykaz celów tematycznych zgodnych ze strategią „Europa 2020". Wykaz obejmuje m.in. cel tematyczny 7 „Promowanie zrównoważonego transportu i usuwanie niedoborów przepustowości w działaniu najważniejszych infrastruktur sieciowych". W kontekście wskazanego celu Europejski Fundusz Rozwoju Regionalnego (EFRR) może wspierać inwestycje w zakresie transeuropejskiej sieci transportowej (TEN-T), a także w przypadku drugorzędnych i trzeciorzędnych węzłów połączonych z infrastrukturą TEN-T.

Inwestycje w zakresie dróg lokalnych mogą być uzasadnione jedynie wówczas, gdy stanowią część kompleksowego i zrównoważonego planu na rzecz mobilności w miastach lub też zintegrowanego planu rozwoju obszarów miejskich na rzecz rewitalizacji gospodarczej i społecznej obszaru miejskiego, lub gdy zapewniają dostęp do zasobów gospodarczych wspieranych przez EFRR (na przykład park technologiczny). We wszystkich tych przypadkach inwestycje w drogi lokalne powinny w dalszym ciągu stanowić element uzupełniający działania podstawowego.

Ponadto w ramach celu „Europejska współpraca terytorialna" EFRR może wspierać różne rodzaje infrastruktury ponad granicami.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007035/13
to the Commission
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Withholding of EU funds for the financing of local roads in the 2014-2020 period

The Commission has drafted guidelines that call for the withholding of EU funds after 2014 for objectives relating to the modernisation and development of local roads (in Poland's case, this mainly affects municipal and county roads).

This contradicts the logic of the cohesion funds, which aim to ensure the equal development of the EU's regions. The Commission was mistaken to narrow the objectives to investments in transport infrastructure to such a large extent. It is the Member States and the regions that are best able to recognise their own needs. Imposing top-down limitations on the tools at their disposal to implement the objectives set out in EU strategic documents is a mistake.

In this connection:

1. What spurred the Commission to take the decision to eliminate funding for local roads?

2. Why is the Commission artificially limiting the tools available to Member States to implement EU strategic objectives?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

Maximising the impact of cohesion policy delivering European priorities is a main principle in the Commission's legislative proposals for 2014-2020. Therefore, a list of thematic objectives in line with the Europe 2020 strategy has been established in Article 9 of the draft Common Provisions Regulation of the European Structural and Investment Funds. The list includes thematic objective 7 'promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures'. In this context the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) can support investments in the Trans-European Transport (TEN-T) network, as well as the secondary and tertiary nodes connecting to TEN-T infrastructure.

Investments in local roads can only be supported where they form part of a comprehensive and sustainable urban mobility plan, or an integrated urban development plan for economic and social regeneration of an urban area, or where they ensure accessibility to economic assets supported by the ERDF (for instance, a technological park). In all these cases, local roads should remain a complementary part of the core intervention.

Furthermore, under the European Territorial Cooperation Goal, the ERDF may support all types of infrastructure across borders.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007037/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Economia da zona euro

O BCE reconhece que a economia da zona euro vai de mal a pior em 2013. A recessão passa de 0,5 % para 0,6 %.

O BCE admitiu a possibilidade de adotar taxas negativas, cobrando aos bancos para receber os seus depósitos.

Pergunta-se:

Concorda com esta medida admitida pelo BCE?

Que outras medidas tem vindo a Comissão a estudar para combater o agravamento da recessão na zona euro?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão não se pronuncia sobre a política monetária na área do euro; o BCE funciona de forma independente, pelo que todos os pedidos de informações lhe devem ser dirigidos.

Muitos Estados-Membros registam atualmente um crescimento reduzido ou mesmo negativo. Há que implementar reformas estruturais para um retorno ao crescimento. Foram já adotadas medidas nesse sentido. No quadro do Semestre Europeu, a Comissão, conjuntamente com os Estados-Membros, está a procurar soluções para o problema do baixo crescimento. Após uma cuidadosa avaliação das situações orçamentais e dos desafios estruturais de cada país, foram dirigidas aos Estados-Membros recomendações, que fornecem orientações de política económica geral e uma orientação orçamental adequada assente na realização de profundas reformas estruturais. Cabe agora aos Estados-Membros implementar as reformas.

A Comissão está igualmente a trabalhar para restabelecer o fluxo de crédito destinado à economia real, em especial às PME. Em setembro de 2012, a Comissão apresentou uma proposta de criação de um mecanismo único de supervisão (MUR), que constitui o primeiro passo no sentido de uma União bancária na Europa. No Conselho Europeu de junho deste ano, os dirigentes europeus saudaram os acordos celebrados no âmbito do Eurogrupo sobre as principais características do quadro de recapitalização bancária direta pelo MEE e no âmbito do Conselho sobre o projeto de diretiva que estabelece um enquadramento para a recuperação dos bancos e a resolução de crises bancárias. A Comissão propôs legislação relativa a um mecanismo único de resolução (MUR) com vista à obtenção de um acordo no Conselho até ao final de 2013.

A Comissão coopera também estreitamente com o BEI para desenvolver e aplicar instrumentos que potenciem o impacto dos recursos do orçamento da UE com base nos empréstimos do BEI, como a iniciativa «obrigações para financiamento de projetos», e com o FEI para apoiar as PME ([1]). Uma melhor governação do setor bancário e o apoio ao crédito contribuirão também para melhorar as perspetivas de crescimento da Europa.

([1]) Ver «Livro Verde relativo ao financiamento a longo prazo da economia europeia», COM(2013) 150 de 25.3.13; e «Reforçar o crédito à economia: Execução do aumento de capital do BEI e iniciativas conjuntas Comissão-BEI», relatório conjunto Comissão-BEI ao Conselho Europeu de 27-28 de junho de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007037/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: The economy of the euro area

The European Central Bank (ECB) has acknowledged that the economy of the euro area is going from bad to worse in 2013. The fall in GDP has risen from 0.5% to 0.6%.

The ECB has admitted that negative rates might be introduced, which would allow it to charge banks for receiving their deposits.

Does the Commission agree with this measure suggested by the ECB?

What other steps has the Commission considered to stop the recession in the euro area from getting worse?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The Commission does not comment on monetary policy in the euro area; ECB acts independently and any inquiries should be addressed to it.

Many Member States are experiencing low or even negative growth. Structural reforms are now needed for a return to growth. Steps in this direction have already been taken. The Commission is addressing low growth together with the Member States within the European Semester. After a careful assessment of national structural challenges and budgetary situations the country-specific recommendations addressed to Member States provide comprehensive economic policy guidance and an appropriate fiscal stance with in-depth structural reforms. It is now up to the Member States to implement reforms.

The Commission is also working to restore the flow of credit to the real sector, in particular to SMEs. In September 2012 it made a proposal for a single supervisory mechanism (SSM), the first step towards a banking union in Europe. At this year's June European Council, European leaders welcomed the agreements reached in the Eurogroup on the main features of the framework for direct bank recapitalisation by the ESM and in the Council on the draft directive establishing a framework for bank recovery and resolution. The Commission has proposed legislation on a Single Resolution Mechanism (SRM) in view of reaching an agreement by the Council by the end 2013.

The Commission also cooperates closely with the EIB to develop and implement instruments which leverage resources from the EU budget with EIB lending, such as the Project Bond Initiative, and with the EIF in support of SMEs ([1]). Better governance of the banking sector and credit support will further contribute to improve growth prospects in Europe.

([1]) See 'Green paper on long-term financing of the European economy' COM(2013)150 25.03.13; and 'Increasing lending to the economy: implementing the EIB capital increase and joint Commission-EIB initiatives', Joint Commission-EIB report to the European Council 27-28 June 2013.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007038/13
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(17 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Campaniile împotriva românilor și bulgarilor în Marea Britanie

Unele formațiuni politice din Marea Britanie au declanșat campanii publice, încercând să alimenteze temerile cu privire la gradul de imigrare din România și Bulgaria după ridicarea finală a restricțiilor pe piața muncii la începutul anului viitor.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze ce acțiuni a derulat, derulează sau are în vedere pentru a combate astfel de atitudini antieuropene, jignitoare la adresa cetățenilor europeni din România și Bulgaria.

Răspuns dat de dl Andor în numele Comisiei
(31 iulie 2013)

Comisia nu poate interveni în mod direct împotriva diferitelor formațiuni politice în ceea ce privește campaniile și declarațiile acestora în legătură cu măsurile publice suplimentare demarate împotriva unui eventual aflux al lucrătorilor din România și Bulgaria.

Comisia a accentuat în mod repetat impactul pozitiv al liberei circulații a lucrătorilor. Aceasta a reamintit că măsurile tranzitorii au scopul de a ajuta statele membre să introducă treptat libera circulație și astfel, statele membre nu ar trebui să amâne aplicarea legislației UE privind libera circulație a lucrătorilor până la terminarea efectivă a perioadei de tranziție. Perioada de tranziție se va încheia în mod irevocabil la 31 decembrie 2013. Lucrătorii români și bulgari vor beneficia complet de legislația UE privind libera circulație a lucrătorilor pe teritoriul întregii Uniuni Europene în același mod ca și toți ceilalți cetățeni ai UE.

De asemenea, la 26 aprilie 2013, Comisia a adoptat o propunere de directivă a Parlamentului European și a Consiliului privind măsurile de facilitare a exercitării drepturilor conferite lucrătorilor în contextul liberei circulații a lucrătorilor ([1]). Propunerea are ca scop o mai bună informare a lucrătorilor din UE, precum și a părților interesate și a autorităților publice cu privire la drepturile oferite de legislația UE privind libera circulație, instituirea de organisme care să ofere sprijin lucrătorilor migranți din UE și asigurarea că astfel de drepturi pot intra în vigoare eficient la nivel judiciar și administrativ.

([1]) COM(2013) 236 din 26.4.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007038/13
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Efforts to stir up anti-Romanian and anti-Bulgarian sentiment in the United Kingdom

A number of political organisations in the United Kingdom have been launching a campaign seeking to fuel public fears regarding the influx of Romanian and Bulgarian immigrants following the final removal of employment market restrictions early next year.

Can the Commission say what measures it has been taking or envisaging to counter such offensive anti-European attitudes in respect of Romanian and Bulgarian citizens?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The Commission cannot intervene directly against the different political organisations in relation to their campaigns and declarations for additional public measures against the possible influx of Romanian and Bulgarian workers.

The Commission has repeatedly stressed the positive impact of free movement of workers. It has recalled that the transitional arrangements aim at helping Member States to gradually introduce free movement, and therefore Member States should not simply delay the application of full EC law on free movement of workers until the overall end of the transitional period. The overall transitional period will irrevocably end on 31 December 2013. Romanian and Bulgarian workers will benefit fully from 1 January 2014 from EC law on free movement of workers in the entire EU in the same way as all other EU citizens.

Moreover, on the 26th April 2013 the Commission adopted a proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on measures facilitating the exercise of rights conferred on workers in the context of freedom of movement for workers ([1]). The proposal aims to better inform EU workers, as well as other stakeholders and public authorities about the rights conferred by EC law on free movement; to set up bodies providing assistance to EU migrant workers; and to ensure that such rights can be effectively enforced at judicial and administrative levels.

([1]) COM(2013) 236 of 26.4.13.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-007039/13
à la Commission
Véronique De Keyser (S&D)
(17 juin 2013)

Objet: Application de l'accord ACAA

L'État d'Israël a-t-il communiqué à la Commission sa nomination d'une autorité responsable en concordance avec l'article 9, paragraphe 1, de l'ACAA? Si tel est le cas, Israël a-t-il bien confirmé que le territoire pour lequel l'autorité responsable (israélienne) est compétente n'inclut absolument pas les territoires palestiniens occupés (TPO)?

Si cette précision importante n'a pas été apportée, la Commission a-t-elle, malgré cela, accepté la nomination? Dans ce cas, la Commission, comprenant ainsi qu'Israël délimite dès lors son territoire comme incluant — en dépit du droit international — les territoires palestiniens occupés, considère-t-elle qu'un avertissement unilatéral serait suffisant pour s'assurer que l'ACAA indique clairement et explicitement sa non-application aux territoires palestiniens occupés?

En effet, au vu des déclarations du Conseil des affaires étrangères du 10 décembre 2012 affirmant que les colonies sont illégales au regard du droit international, les produits des colonies ne peuvent, de fait, être considérés comme «légalement mis sur le marché» au sens cité dans l'article 5 de l'accord ACAA.

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(9 août 2013)

La Commission rappelle que l'ACAA est un protocole à l'accord d'association UE-Israël, dont le champ d'application ne couvre pas les territoires placés sous administration israélienne depuis 1967. Au regard du droit international, l'UE ne reconnaît pas la légalité des colonies israéliennes sur ces territoires. L'ACAA n'y change rien.

Aux fins de l'article 9 de l'ACAA, se référant à l'annexe relative à l'acceptation mutuelle des produits industriels — bonnes pratiques de fabrication (BPF) des produits pharmaceutiques, Israël a désigné, le 14 janvier 2013, le ministère de la santé comme autorité responsable pour l'État d'Israël. Dans sa réponse du 4 février 2013, la Commission a reconnu cette désignation et indiqué que «la reconnaissance de l'Union européenne ne modifie pas sa position selon laquelle la juridiction légitime des autorités israéliennes ne s'étend pas aux territoires placés sous administration israélienne depuis 1967».

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007039/13
to the Commission
Véronique De Keyser (S&D)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Implementation of the ACAA with Israel

Has the State of Israel notified the Commission of its nomination of a responsible authority pursuant to Article 9(1) of the ACAA (Agreement on Conformity Assessment and Acceptance of industrial products)? If so, has Israel confirmed that the area for which the responsible (Israeli) authority is competent does not include any part of the occupied Palestinian territories (OPT)?

Did the Commission accept the nomination despite this important clarification not being provided? If so, does the Commission — on the basis that Israel defines its territory as including the OPT, a stance at odds with international law — believe that a unilateral warning would suffice to secure Israel's consent to the inclusion in the ACAA of an explicit reference to the fact that it does not apply to the OPT?

The statements made at the Foreign Affairs Council of 10 December 2012 confirming that Israeli settlements are illegal under international law make it clear that products originating in settlements may not be 'lawfully placed on the market' within the meaning of Article 5 of the ACAA.

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The Commission recalls that the ACAA is a Protocol to the EU-Israel Association Agreement, whose scope does not include the territories under Israeli administration since 1967. Under international law, the EU does not recognise the legality of the Israeli settlements in those territories. The ACAA does not alter that fact.

For the purpose of Article 9 of the ACAA, as related to the annex on Mutual Acceptance of Industrial Products — Pharrmaceutical Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP), Israel designated on 14 January 2013 the Ministry of Health as the responsible authority for the State of Israel. In its reply of 4 February 2013, the Commission has acknowledged this designation indicating that 'The European Union's acknowledgement does not alter the European Union's position that the legitimate jurisdiction of Israeli authorities does not extend to the territories brought under Israeli administration since 1967'.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007040/13
alla Commissione
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(17 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Preservare il monumento alle vittime della tragedia dell'Heysel

Il 29 maggio 1985, circa un'ora prima dell'inizio della finale di Coppa dei Campioni tra Juventus Fc e Liverpool Fc, lo stadio Heysel di Bruxelles fu teatro di una tragedia a seguito della quale perirono 39 persone, di cui 32 italiani, schiacciate, calpestate e uccise nella calca per sfuggire all'aggressione degli hooligans britannici. Oltre 600 furono i feriti, di cui molti in maniera grave, in quella che è ad oggi uno dei peggiori drammi della storia calcistica europea. Dramma causato dalla violenza dei gruppi di tifosi organizzati inglesi, unita alle carenze di una struttura di per sé considerata inadeguata ad ospitare eventi sportivi della portata di una finale europea. Nel 2005, per commemorare quel dramma, nell'Heysel rimodernato, e ribattezzato Stade Roi Baudoin, è stata scoperta una scultura opera dell'artista francese Patrick Rimoux: posta in corrispondenza del settore Z dove sono stati massacrati i *supporter* italiani e costata circa 140 mila euro, si compone di una meridiana che comprende i colori delle bandiere italiana e belga, oltre a recare incise i versi della poesia Funeral blues di W.H. Auden. Inoltre 39 luci brillano per ricordare ognuna delle vittime della follia hooligan.

Considerato che adesso, a 28 anni di distanza da quella tragedia, le autorità belghe hanno annunciato l'intenzione di abbattere lo stadio Roi Baudoin, per costruire nelle immediate vicinanze — precisamente nel sito dell'attuale parcheggio C, dall'altra parte rispetto all'ingresso principale della struttura — un nuovo complesso, per consentire alla Federcalcio belga di avanzare la propria candidatura ad ospitare i Mondiali di calcio del 2022, insieme ai Paesi Bassi. Considerato che la scultura in memoria della tragedia dell'Heysel verrebbe anch'essa distrutta, cancellando così un simbolo che dovrebbe servire da monito imperituro perché simili episodi di violenza durante avvenimenti sportivi non si verifichino mai più. Considerato infine che si ritiene necessario mantenere alta l'attenzione sul problema della violenza negli stadi, visti i recenti episodi sia in Italia — Lecce e Roma — che in altre parti d'Europa, ad esempio a Parigi un mese fa e a Londra lo scorso aprile, può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. È essa a conoscenza del progetto di abbattimento dello stadio ex-Heysel e del monumento commemorativo dei 39 tifosi morti nel maggio dell'85?

2. Può inoltre la Commissione comunicare se siano allo studio regole comuni per impedire alle frange violente delle tifoserie europee di provocare disordini e ostacolare il regolare svolgimento delle manifestazioni sportive?

3. Come valuta essa la proposta di prevedere un regolamento europeo per affidare alle società sportive l'onere di vigilare sulla sicurezza negli impianti, secondo il modello britannico, evitando così di impegnare ingenti forze di polizia, necessarie per altri compiti?

Risposta di Androulla Vassiliou a nome della Commissione
(29 luglio 2013)

1. La Commissione è al corrente del progetto di demolizione dello stadio Re Baldovino. Essa non è tuttavia competente ad intervenire sulla questione, che è di competenza esclusiva delle autorità del Regno del Belgio. L'onorevole parlamentare può quindi prendere direttamente contatto con queste ultime per esprimere la propria preoccupazione.

2. La Commissione si impegna a contribuire alla prevenzione della violenza degli spettatori. In base alla decisione 2002/348/JHA del Consiglio relativa alla sicurezza in occasione di partite di calcio internazionali è stato messo a punto, di concerto con L'UEFA, lo scambio di dati tra punti nazionali d'informazione sul calcio, rendendo in tal modo possibile lo scambio di informazioni operative sui tifosi a rischio tra servizi di polizia e/o autorità sportive. La Commissione promuove l'ampio ricorso al vademecum sulla cooperazione tra forze di polizia e sostiene la formazione a livello paneuropeo dei funzionari di polizia e degli addetti alla sicurezza per prevenire e controllare più efficacemente la violenza. Le autorità incaricate dell'applicazione della legge non possono tuttavia intervenire sulle cause alla base della violenza nello sport. Per garantire che gli eventi sportivi possano essere vissuti da tutti e per minimizzare i rischi per la sicurezza si invitano le autorità competenti a sostenere misure socioeducative volte alla prevenzione di atti violenti da parte degli spettatori. Un elemento importante in tale senso è la creazione di legami stretti con i gruppi di tifosi. La Commissione invita allo scambio di buone pratiche in questo ambito.

3. L'articolo 165 del TFUE prevede la competenza dell'Unione nel sostenere, coordinare e integrare l'azione degli Stati membri nel settore dello sport ed esclude esplicitamente qualsiasi armonizzazione delle disposizioni nazionali. La Commissione non è pertanto competente a disciplinare la materia a livello di UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007040/13
to the Commission
Fabrizio Bertot (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Preserving the monument to the victims of the Heysel tragedy

On 29 May 1985, around one hour before the start of the final Champions League match between Juventus FC and Liverpool FC, the Heysel stadium in Brussels was the scene of a tragedy, as a result of which 39 people died, including 32 Italians, who were crushed, trampled upon and killed in a stampede while attempting to escape the aggression of British hooligans. More than 600 were injured, many seriously, in what today stands out as one of the worst tragedies in the history of European football. A tragedy caused by the violence of organised groups of British supporters, combined with the shortcomings of facilities which, in themselves, were considered inadequate for hosting sporting events as important as a European final. In 2005, to commemorate that tragedy, in the revamped Heysel stadium — renamed *Stade Roi Baudoin* — a sculpture by the French artist Patrick Rimoux was unveiled. It was placed in the Z sector, where the Italian supporters had been killed, and cost around EUR 140 000. It consists of a sundial that includes the colours of the Italian and Belgian flags and bears verses of the poem Funeral Blues, by WH Auden. In addition, 39 lights twinkle in remembrance of each of the victims of the hooligan madness.

Now, 28 years after the tragedy, the Belgian authorities have announced their intention to demolish the Roi Baudoin stadium, in order to build a new complex in the immediate vicinity — more specifically on the site of the current car park C, on the far side of the main stadium entrance — to enable the Belgian Football Association, together with the Netherlands, to apply to host the World Cup in 2022. The sculpture in memory of the Heysel tragedy would thus also be destroyed, thereby erasing a symbol that should serve as an eternal warning for similar incidents of violence during sporting events never to take place again. Moreover, the focus needs to be kept on the problem of football hooliganism, given recent events in Italy (Lecce and Rome) and in other parts of Europe — for instance, in Paris a month ago and in London in April.

In view of the above, can the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the plan to demolish the former Heysel stadium together with the memorial for the 39 supporters who died there in May 1985?

2. Can the Commission say whether any common rules are being considered, with a view to preventing the violent fringes of European supporters from causing unrest and preventing sporting events from being carried out normally?

3. What is its view of the proposal to draw up an EU regulation to place the burden on sports clubs for monitoring the safety of the facilities they use, along the lines of the British model, thus avoiding the deployment of large numbers of police officers, who are needed for other tasks?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of the plans to demolish the Roi Baudoin stadium. However, the Commission has no jurisdiction to address this issue, which is a matter solely for the authorities in the Kingdom of Belgium. The Honourable Member might therefore want to contact them directly to express his concerns.

2. The Commission is committed to contributing to the prevention of spectator violence. On the basis of Council Decision 2002/348/JHA on security at international football matches, data exchange between National Football Information Points has been developed with UEFA. Exchange of operational information on risk supporters among police services and/or sports authorities has been made possible. The Commission promotes wide usage of the Handbook for Police Cooperation and supports pan-European training for police officers and safety personnel to prevent and control violence more effectively. However, law enforcement authorities cannot deal with the underlying causes of violence in sport. To ensure that sport events are enjoyable for all those concerned and to minimise safety risks, competent agencies are encouraged to support social and educational measures to prevent spectator violence. Developing close links with supporter groups should be an important element. The Commission encourages the exchange of good practices in this field.

3. Article 165 of the TFEU provides for a competence to support, coordinate and complement the action of Member States in the field of sport and expressly excludes any harmonisation of national laws. Thus, the Commission has no competence to regulate this matter at EU level.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007041/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(17 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Financiación europea de las obras del puerto de Granadilla

En una noticia aparecida el pasado 6 de junio en la prensa local de la isla de Tenerife se afirma que la Comisión Europea cofinanciará el proyecto del puerto de Granadilla con 67 millones de euros. Dicha información aparece tras unas declaraciones supuestamente realizadas por la Comisión tras una reunión mantenida en Bruselas con José Manuel Soria, Ministro de Industria, Energía y Turismo.

Este proyecto lleva años luchando contra la opinión de los habitantes de la isla que se verán fuertemente impactados por el proyecto, que destruirá el medio ambiente de la zona, y por consiguiente, los recursos de la principal actividad económica de la zona, que es el turismo. Este controvertido proyecto ha sido objeto de numerosas preguntas y peticiones, dado el rechazo popular, así como de diversos procedimientos judiciales. Como recordatorio, en 2010 el Tribunal Superior de Justicia de Canarias acordó suspender la decisión del Gobierno de Canarias de desproteger los sebadales, lo que implicó la paralización de las obras de construcción.

Lamentablemente, a día de hoy continúan las obras de un puerto que conlleva un daño irreversible para el ecosistema marino, habiéndose iniciado en mayo el vertido de materiales para la banqueta del dique exterior de las obras de abrigo.

En cuanto a una supuesta y controvertida financiación europea, desmentida en diversas ocasiones, en la respuesta que la Comisión Europea dio a mi pasada pregunta E-010807/2011, el Comisario Hahn afirmó que dicha institución no contaba con ninguna solicitud de pago para este proyecto. La información presentada en el citado medio de comunicación local parece contradecir la respuesta dada por el Comisario de Política Regional.

Ante lo expuesto, ¿está la Comisión al corriente de la noticia publicada en la prensa local tinerfeña? ¿Ha puesto la Comisión a disposición los citados 67 millones de euros para la realización del proyecto del puerto de Granadilla?

En caso afirmativo, ¿han incumplido las autoridades españolas el artículo 69 del Reglamento (CE) n° 1083/2006 del Consejo al no haber dado a conocer las solicitudes de fondos? De estar cofinanciando el proyecto, ¿podría detallar en qué momento modificó sus decisiones anteriores sobre el mismo?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007192/13
a la Comisión
Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D)
(19 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Construcción del puerto de Granadilla en Santa Cruz de Tenerife (España)

Según diversos medios de comunicación de Tenerife (España), el puerto de Granadilla ya cuenta de forma oficial y confirmada con la financiación de la UE, fijada en 67 millones de euros. Otras informaciones públicas afirman que la construcción del muelle de Granadilla no cuenta con ningún apoyo por parte de la UE.

Ante estas contradictorias informaciones se formulan las siguientes preguntas:

1. ¿Qué información tiene la Comisión sobre las obras de construcción del puerto de Granadilla en Santa Cruz de Tenerife (España)?

2. ¿Tiene previsto la Comisión algún mecanismo de apoyo para la construcción del muelle de Granadilla?

3. ¿Hay alguna partida presupuestaria prevista por la Comisión para ayudar a la construcción del muelle de Granadilla?

4. ¿Es cierta la información publicada según la cual la UE se ha comprometido a financiar con 67 millones de euros la construcción del citado muelle?

Respuesta conjunta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(12 de agosto de 2013)

La Comisión está al corriente de la información publicada en la prensa local de Tenerife y subraya que ha actuado de manera totalmente conforme con el actual marco normativo.

La Comisión recibió en abril de 2009 una solicitud de financiación del gran proyecto del puerto de Granadilla y la trató de acuerdo con las normas y procedimientos vigentes. La Comisión formuló una serie de observaciones relativas al proyecto, especialmente relacionadas con el medio ambiente, la viabilidad económica y las cuestiones relativas a las ayudas estatales; estas observaciones necesitaron de explicaciones detalladas de las autoridades españolas, lo que explica el tiempo requerido para tratar la solicitud.

La financiación que se ha solicitado a la UE para el proyecto asciende a 67 millones de euros, de los que 14 millones han sido certificados a la Comisión hasta la fecha. El gasto relacionado con un gran proyecto puede certificarse a la Comisión antes de que este haya sido aprobado por una decisión de la Comisión.

La Comisión ha llevado a cabo un examen exhaustivo de esta solicitud y ha solicitado información adicional, que se le ha facilitado, con el fin de llegar a una conclusión final sobre su aprobación. Las autoridades españolas consideran que esta infraestructura es vital para la isla de Tenerife y la han incluido como proyecto prioritario en su plan estratégico de desarrollo de los puertos marítimos en España.

Dado que el gran proyecto del puerto de Granadilla no ha sido todavía objeto de ninguna decisión de la Comisión, no se han quebrantado las normas en materia de información y publicidad.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007041/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: EU funding of the work on the Port of Grandadilla

A report published on 6 June in the local press of the island of Tenerife stated that the European Commission is set to co-finance the Granadilla port project with a contribution of EUR 67 million. This information came to light after statements allegedly made by the Commission after a meeting in Brussels with José Manuel Soria, Minister of Industry, Energy and Tourism.

This project has, for years, been up against the opposition of the inhabitants of the island, who will be severely affected by the project, which will destroy the environment in the area and, as a result, the main local economic activity — tourism. This controversial project has been the subject of numerous questions and petitions, given its rejection by the people, as well as a number of legal proceedings. It is worth remembering that in 2010 the High Court of the Canary Islands agreed to suspend the decision of the Government of the Canary Islands to remove the protected status of the seagrass meadows (*sebadales*), which meant that the building works in question had to be stopped.

Unfortunately, the work on the port, which will lead to irreversible damage to the marine ecosystem, is still continuing, as in May, the dumping of material for the construction of the external sea wall began.

As regards the alleged (and controversial) EU funding, which has been denied on several occasions, in the answer the Commission gave to my last Question E-010807/2011, Commissioner Hahn stated that the Commission had not received any payment claim for this project. The information reported in the local media as mentioned above would appear to contradict this answer given by the Commissioner for Regional Policy.

Is the Commission aware of this report published in the local press in Tenerife? Has the Commission indeed made available the said EUR 67 million for the Granadilla port project?

If so, are the Spanish authorities not in breach of Article 69 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006, for having failed to publicise their applications for funding? As regards the co-financing of the project, could the Commission give details on when exactly it changed its mind with regard to its previous decisions on the matter?

Question for written answer E-007192/13
to the Commission
Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Construction of the port of Granadilla, Santa Cruz de Tenerife (Spain)

According to various media reports from Tenerife (Spain), the port of Granadilla has already been officially allocated EU funding to the tune of EUR 67 million. Other sources claim that the construction of the Granadilla pier will not receive any EU funding whatsoever.

In the light of these conflicting reports:

1. What information does the Commission have at its disposal concerning construction work at Granadilla port, Santa Cruz de Tenerife (Spain)?

2. Has the Commission made plans for any type of support mechanism for the construction of the Granadilla pier?

3. Has any budget item been allocated by the Commission to support the construction of the Granadilla pier?

4. Is there any truth in the reports that the EU has pledged EUR 67 million to finance construction of the pier?

Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

The Commission is aware of the report published in the local press in Tenerife and underlines that it has acted in full accordance with the current regulatory framework.

The Commission received an application for financing the 'Port of Granadilla' Major Project in April 2009 and has dealt with it in line with the current rules and procedures. The Commission had a range of observations regarding the project, notably related to the environment, economic viability and state aid issues, which required detailed explanations from the Spanish authorities, which explains the time required to deal with the application.

The requested EU funding for the project is EUR 67 million, of which EUR 14 million has been certified to the Commission so far. Expenditure related to a major project can be certified to the Commission before the project has been approved by a Commission decision.

The Commission has carried out a thorough examination of this application and has requested additional information, which has been provided, in order to be in a position to reach a final conclusion on its approval. The Spanish authorities consider that this infrastructure is vital for the island of Tenerife and has been included as a priority project in their strategic plan for the development of seaports in Spain.

Since the major project 'Port of Granadilla' has not yet been the subject of a Commission decision, there is no breach of information and publicity rules.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007042/13
a la Comisión
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(17 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Reforma del sistema de pensiones

La mayoría de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea se han visto abocados a realizar una reforma de las pensiones en los últimos años debido a los cambios demográficos (aumento de la esperanza de vida y baja tasa de natalidad) y económicos (incorporación tardía de los jóvenes al mercado de trabajo y aumento del desempleo en la EU).

La Comisión Europea ha urgido al Gobierno español a poner en marcha una serie de medidas antes de finales de año para evitar así un expediente sancionador por desequilibrios excesivos. Entre esos ajustes propuestos por la Comisión se encuentra la reforma de las pensiones y, más concretamente, el diseño del factor de sostenibilidad con el objetivo de garantizar la estabilidad financiera a largo plazo del sistema de pensiones, estableciendo, entre otras cosas, que la edad de jubilación vaya aumentando en función del aumento de la esperanza de vida.

Recientemente, el Parlamento Europeo ha aprobado una Resolución relativa a una Agenda para unas pensiones adecuadas, seguras y sostenibles (P7_TA(2013)0204) en la que se deploran los severos recortes practicados en los Estados miembros afectados más duramente por la crisis, que han empujado a muchos pensionistas a la pobreza o les hacen correr el riesgo de caer en ella, y en la que se pide un consenso entre los Gobiernos, las empresas y los sindicatos a la hora de modificar el aumento de los años de cotización.

¿Qué medidas piensa tomar la Comisión para evitar que los ajustes presupuestarios instaurados por la troika no condicionen el derecho a una calidad de vida digna para todos en la vejez?

En el Libro Blanco sobre las Pensiones que publicó la Comisión en febrero de 2012 no se aborda adecuadamente la importancia de los regímenes universales de pensiones del primer pilar (pensiones públicas universales, por reparto) que como mínimo excluyen la pobreza y que son la base del Estado de bienestar. ¿Piensa la Comisión dar prioridad a esta cuestión con el objetivo de garantizar un nivel de vida digno y una independencia económica para las personas de más edad?

Respuesta del Sr. Mr Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(31 de julio de 2013)

El Libro Blanco sobre las Pensiones demuestra que en unas sociedades en proceso de envejecimiento se pueden garantizar unas pensiones adecuadas, seguras y sostenibles «creando para ello las condiciones que permitan la elevada participación de las mujeres y los hombres en el mercado de trabajo a lo largo de sus vidas y mejorando las oportunidades para constituir unos planes de ahorro complementarios de jubilación» que sean seguros. El Libro Blanco sobre las Pensiones también hace hincapié en que las pensiones públicas son y seguirán siendo la principal fuente de ingresos de los europeos de más edad y en que «los planes de ahorro complementarios de jubilación también pueden contribuir a garantizar unas tasas de reemplazo adecuadas en el futuro». Las recomendaciones específicas para cada país en materia de pensiones y jubilación tienen casi exclusivamente por objetivo ayudar a los Estados miembros a mantener la sostenibilidad y la adecuación de sus sistemas públicos de pensiones. El factor de sostenibilidad de las pensiones españolas propuesto en las correspondientes recomendaciones específicas consistente en vincular la edad de jubilación a la evolución de la esperanza de vida puede tener un impacto positivo en la adecuación y sostenibilidad de las pensiones.

En el Estudio Prospectivo Anual sobre el Crecimiento de 2013 ([1]), la Comisión recomienda «que se sea selectivo cuando se prevean recortes con el fin de preservar el potencial de crecimiento futuro y las redes esenciales de protección social» y, por consiguiente, que se combinen «las medidas de ajuste de manera que fomenten tanto el crecimiento, como la justicia social».

([1]) Estudio Prospectivo Anual sobre el Crecimiento 2013 [COM(2012) 750]: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2013_es.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007042/13
to the Commission
María Irigoyen Pérez (S&D)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Reform of the pension system

In recent years, most EU Member States have had to reform their pension systems due to demographic changes (higher life expectancy and low birth rate) and economic changes (the late age at which young people enter the labour market and the rise in unemployment in the EU).

The Commission has urged the Spanish Government to initiate a series of steps before the end of the year to avoid being sanctioned for excessive imbalances.

The changes proposed by the Commission include pension reform and, more specifically, defining the sustainability factor in order to guarantee the long-term financial stability of the pension system by ensuring, among other things, that the retirement age increases in accordance with the rise in life expectancy.

Parliament recently adopted a resolution on an agenda for adequate, safe and sustainable pensions (P7_TA(2013)0204) which deplores the severe cuts in the Member States hardest hit by the crisis that have pushed many pensioners into, or put them at risk of, poverty. It also calls for governments, employers and trade unions to reach a consensus on modifying the increase in the number of contributory years.

What steps does the Commission intend to take to prevent the budgetary adjustments established by the troika from affecting the right to a decent quality of life for all in old age?

The White Paper on Pensions, published by the Commission in February 2012, does not adequately address the importance of universal first-pillar pension schemes (universal public pay-as-you-go pensions) which at least keep people out of poverty and form the basis of the welfare state. Does the Commission intend to prioritise this issue in order to ensure that older people enjoy a decent standard of living and economic independence?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The White Paper on Pensions demonstrates that adequate, safe and sustainable pensions in ageing societies can be ensured 'by creating the conditions for a high level of labour force participation of women and men throughout their lives and enhancing the opportunities to build up safe complementary retirement savings.' It also highlights that public pensions are and will remain the main source of income of older Europeans while 'complementary retirement savings can also help secure adequate replacement rates in the future'. Country Specific Recommendations on pensions and retirement have almost exclusively been aimed at helping Member States preserve the sustainability and adequacy of their public pension systems. Linking the retirement age to changes in life expectancy — proposed in the CSR for the Spanish pension sustainability factor — could have a positive impact on both adequacy and sustainability of pensions.

In the 2013 Annual Growth Survey ([1]) the Commission recommended 'being selective where cuts are envisaged so as to preserve future growth potential and essential social safety nets' and thus use a 'composition of adjustment which supports both growth and social fairness'.

([1]) Annual Growth Survey 2013, COM(2012) 750 final: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/ags2013_en.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007044/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(17. juni 2013)

Om: Opfølgende spørgsmål på mangelfuldt svar

I dets svar til de skriftlige spørgsmål E-004765/2013 og E-004767/2013 har Kommissionen tilsyneladende glemt at svare på dele af spørgsmålene i forbindelse med spørgsmål E-004765/2013.

Derfor anmodes Kommissionen venligst om:

1. En oversigt over sprogkrav for brugsanvisninger for medicinsk udstyr til patienter — i hver af de forskellige medlemsstater? (en oversigt der angiver sprogkrav per medlemsstat).

2. En oversigt over sprogkrav for brugsanvisninger for medicinsk udstyr til sundhedspersonale — i hver af de forskellige medlemsstater? (en oversigt der angiver sprogkrav per medlemsstat).

3. En oversigt over sprogkrav for mærkning af medicinsk udstyr — i hver af de forskellige medlemsstater? (en oversigt der angiver sprogkrav per medlemsstat).

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Neven Mimica
(30. juli 2013)

Vedrørende det ærede medlems spørgsmål E-004765/2013 ([1]) om de sprogkrav, der gælder i hver medlemsstat, for medicinsk udstyr vedrørende brugsanvisninger for patienter og sundhedspersonale samt mærkning, kan Kommissionen oplyse det ærede medlem om, at der ikke er nogen forpligtelse for medlemsstaterne til at oplyse Kommissionen om sådanne krav. Kommissionen er derfor ikke i besiddelse af de oplysninger, som det ærede medlem har udbedt sig.

Det ærede medlem vil være nødt til at henvende sig til de kompetente myndigheder vedrørende medicinsk udstyr i EU-medlemsstaterne for at få sådanne oplysninger. Disse myndigheder er angivet på det nedenstående websted ([2]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/da/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Liste over kontaktpersoner i de nationale kompetente myndigheder: http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/links/contact_points_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007044/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Medical devices and translation: further question following incomplete answer

In its answers to my written questions E-004765/2013 and E-004767/2013, the Commission seems to have forgotten to answer some of the questions in E-004765/2013.

Could the Commission therefore please outline:

1. the language requirements applicable to instructions for medical devices for patients in each Member State (listing language requirements for each Member State);

2. the language requirements applicable to instructions for medical devices for healthcare practitioners in each Member State (listing language requirements for each Member State);

3. the language requirements applicable to the labelling of medical devices in each Member State (listing language requirements for each Member State)?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

Following the Question E-004765/2013 ([1]) of the Honourable Member as to the medical devices language requirements applicable in each Member State on instructions for patients, instructions for healthcare practitioners and labelling, the Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that there is no obligation for the Member States to notify such requirements to the Commission. The Commission thus does not possess the information requested by the Honourable Member.

In order to obtain such information, the Honourable Member would have to address this question to the medical devices national competent authorities within the EU Member States ([2]), which are listed on the website below.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) List of contact points within the national competent authorities: http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/links/contact_points_en.htm

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007045/13
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(17 juni 2013)

Betreft: Gerechtelijke stappen door niet-verzekerde depositohouders in Cyprus

Meer dan 3 000 niet-verzekerde depositohouders van wie de activa bevroren zijn, hebben bij het Hooggerechtshof van Cyprus beroep aangetekend tegen de zogenaamde „bail-in" (redding van de banken door inbreng van de particuliere sector). Volgens de klagers en hun advocaten is de bail-in „eigendomsdiefstal" ([1]). Hoewel het Hooggerechtshof op 7 juni 2013 oordeelde dat het niet bevoegd is om zich uit te spreken over deze beroepen, stelde het dat deze moeten worden onderzocht in het kader van particuliere processen voor de arrondissementsrechtbank. De depositohouders gaven te kennen dat ze met hun zaak ook zouden gaan naar het Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens en het Hof van Justitie van de Europese Unie ([2]). Indien een rechtbank de twee besluiten van de centrale bank van Cyprus van 29 maart 2013 ([3]) onwettig acht, dan komt het idee van een bail-in als afwikkelingsinstrument, zoals vervat in het huidige voorstel voor het herstel en de afwikkeling van kredietinstellingen en beleggingsondernemingen, politiek op losse schroeven te staan.

Gezien het bovenstaande:

1. Heeft de Commissie een behoorlijke effectbeoordeling van haar voorstel uitgevoerd?

2. Zo ja, hoe beoordeelt zij de mogelijke gevolgen voor het fundamentele recht op eigendom, dat wordt gewaarborgd door artikel 17 van het Handvest van de grondrechten van de Europese Unie en artikel 1 van het Protocol bij het Verdrag tot bescherming van de rechten van de mens en de fundamentele vrijheden?

3. Gelet op de klachten van belanghebbenden en burgers, acht de Commissie het passend om een nieuwe, juistere effectbeoordeling uit te voeren?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(27 augustus 2013)

De Commissie heeft met betrekking tot het op 6 juni 2012 gepubliceerde voorstel voor een richtlijn inzake het herstel en de afwikkeling van kredietinstellingen en beleggingsondernemingen een grondige effectbeoordeling verricht. De volledig tekst van de effectbeoordeling is geregistreerd als document SWD(2012)166 final en is op de website van de Commissie beschikbaar op het volgende adres:

http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/bank/docs/crisis-management/2012_eu_framework/impact_assessment_final_en.pdf

Bij de voorbereiding van het voorstel heeft de Commissie zorgvuldig de implicatie van het bail-ininstrument ten aanzien van de bescherming van de mensenrechten geanalyseerd. Meer bepaald wordt de beperking van de eigendomsrechten als gevolg van het bail-ininstrument op grond van de relevante mensenrechtenregels, als door het Hof van Justitie geïnterpreteerd, gerechtvaardigd door het feit dat tot afwikkeling wordt overgegaan wanneer de instelling niet langer levensvatbaar is of waarschijnlijk niet langer levensvatbaar is. In die omstandigheden zou, als niet tot afwikkeling zou worden overgegaan, de instelling insolvent worden. Voorts worden crediteuren die het voorwerp van een bail-in zijn, beschermd door het beginsel dat „geen crediteur slechter af mag zijn". Het beginsel wordt weergegeven in artikel 29, lid 1, onder f), van het voorstel dat bepaalt: „geen enkele crediteur lijdt grotere verliezen dan hij zou hebben geleden indien de in artikel 2 bedoelde entiteit volgens een normale insolventieprocedure zou zijn geliquideerd".

Bovendien wordt, in de context van de aan de gang zijnde wetgevingsonderhandelingen betreffende het voorstel, in overweging genomen in een bevoorrechte rang voor depositohouders te voorzien, ook boven de 100.000 EUR. Een en ander zou garanderen dat deposito's pas na alle ongedekte niet-bevoorrechte passiva het voorwerp van bail-in kunnen zijn.

De Commissie denkt niet dat in dit stadium een verdere effectbeoordeling nodig is.

([1]) http://cyprus-mail.com/top-court-to-rule-on-deposit-freeze/.
([2]) http://cyprus-mail.com/top-court-backs-away-from-haircut-lawsuits/.
([3]) (R. A. D. 103/2013 en 104/2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007045/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Legal action taken by uninsured depositors in Cyprus

More than 3 000 appeals against the bail-in have been lodged with the Supreme Court of Cyprus by uninsured depositors whose assets had been frozen. The applicants and their lawyers referred to the bail-in as 'theft of property' ([1]). Although on 7 June 2013 the Supreme Court ruled it had no jurisdiction over these appeals, it stated that they should be examined as part of private lawsuits filed at district courts. Depositors stated that they would also take their cases to the European Court of Human Rights and the European Court of Justice ([2]). Should a court deem the two decrees issued on March 29 2013 by the Central Bank of Cyprus ([3]) unlawful, the very idea of the bail-in as a resolution tool, put forward in the current proposal on the recovery and resolution of credit institutions and investment firms, will politically fall apart.

In the light of this:

1. Has the Commission properly conducted an impact assessment in relation to its proposal?

2. If so, how has the Commission evaluated the potential consequences for the fundamental right to property, which is safeguarded by Article 17 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and Article 1 of the Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms?

3. In the light of the complaints raised by stakeholders and citizens, does the Commission think it will be appropriate to conduct a new and more accurate impact assessment?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(27 August 2013)

The Commission has conducted a thorough impact assessment in relation to the proposal for a directive on the recovery and resolution of credit institutions released on 6 June 2012. The full text of the impact assessment is registered as document SWD(2012)166 final and is available on the Commission website at the following address:

http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/bank/docs/crisis-management/2012_eu_framework/impact_assessment_final_en.pdf

In the preparation of the proposal, the Commission has carefully analysed the implication of the bail-in tool with regard to the protection of human rights. In particular, the limitation to property rights entailed by the bail-in tool is justified under the relevant human rights rules as interpreted by the Court of Justice by the fact that the point of entry into resolution is reached when that the institution is no longer viable or is likely to be no longer viable. In these circumstances, if no resolution action was taken, the institution would have entered into insolvency. Furthermore, bailed-in creditors are protected by the 'no creditor worse off' principle. This principle is reproduced under Article 29 (1) f of the proposal whereby 'no creditor incurs greater losses than would be incurred if the institution had been wound down under normal insolvency proceedings'.

In addition, in the context of the ongoing legislative negotiations of the proposal a privileged ranking for depositors, including above EUR 100.000 is being considered. It would ensure that deposits are bailed-in only after all unsecured non-preferred liabilities.

The Commission does not think that a further impact assessment is needed at this stage.

([1]) http://cyprus-mail.com/top-court-to-rule-on-deposit-freeze/.
([2]) http://cyprus-mail.com/top-court-backs-away-from-haircut-lawsuits/.
([3]) (R.A.D. 103/2013 and 104/2013).

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007046/13
til Kommissionen
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) og Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(17. juni 2013)

Om: Udbredelsen af MDR-TB i Europa

Næsten en fjerdedel af alle tilfælde af multiresistent tuberkuse (MDR-TB) i verden optræder i WHO's europæiske region, hvilket udgør en trussel for såvel borgernes sundhed som Europas økonomi. Mens det koster ca. 1 000 EUR at behandle et normalt TB-tilfælde, kan prisen for behandling af MDR-TB komme helt op på 50 000 EUR.

1. Hvis tuberkulose (TB) og især multiresistent TB fortsætter med at spredes, hvor mange EU-borgere vil så være blevet ramt af TB om ti år?

2. Eftersom Kommissionen hovedsagelig støtter kampen imod TB gennem bidrag til den globale fond (GFATM), og siden GFATM er ved at rykke sine aktiviteter uden for europæisk område, hvordan agter Kommissionen så at imødegå den voksende MDR-TB-epidemi i Europa?

3. Hvilke foranstaltninger ville efter Kommissionens mening være mest effektive til at bekæmpe udbredelsen af MDR-TB?

4. Hvor stor en procentdel af sundhedsudgifterne går til at behandle MDR-TB, og hvor meget går til at forebygge sygdommen i de EU-medlemstater, der er hårdest ramt af MDR-TB? Hvordan kan vi sikre, at de 5 lande, der har de største vanskeligheder i EU, bekæmper epidemien tilstrækkelig effektivt? Hvordan kan EU støtte disse 5 hårdt belastede EU-lande ved hjælp af de eksisterende finansielle instrumenter?

5. Hvor store EU-midler bruges i øjeblikket til forskning i behandling, undersøgelse og forebyggelse af MDR-TB?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(2. august 2013)

1. Tuberkulose (TB) påvirkes af migration og økonomi samt af, hvor velfungerende sundhedssystemerne er. Indvirkningen af alle faktorerne er vanskelig at forudse, da disse kan ændre sig betydeligt i de kommende 10 år.

2. De nationale regeringer har kompetencen vedrørende organiseringen af sundhedstjenesterne, herunder retningslinjerne for tiltag til bekæmpelse af TB. EU's struktur- og regionalfonde, førtiltrædelsesinstrumentet og det europæiske naboskabsinstrument kan alle bruges til at bekæmpe multiresistent TB (MDR-TB), hvis dette er prioriteret af modtagerlandene. Andre finansieringsmuligheder tilbydes af sundhedsprogrammet, det syvende rammeprogram for forskning og teknologisk udvikling (RP7), herunder mulig støtte, der er til rådighed fra Det Europæiske Center for Forebyggelse af og Kontrol med Sygdomme, fra Verdenssundhedsorganisationen og Stop-TB-partnerskabet, der lægger stor vægt på behovet for at fokusere på marginaliserede befolkningsgrupper.

3. Til at bekæmpe spredningen af TB er det afgørende at styrke sundhedssystemerne, så alle TB-patienter i EU får en ordentlig behandling, og at tage fat på de sårbare dele af samfundet, der er mest berørt.

4. Det budget, der er til rådighed til forebyggelse og behandling af TB, er et spørgsmål om prioritering på nationalt plan samt om valg af det bedst egnede finansielle instrument.

5. Forskning i TB har været et af de prioriterede områder i RP7. 49 projekter er blevet finansieret med mere end 108 mio. EUR gennem EU's bidrag. MDR og XDR TB er ligeledes blevet behandlet specifikt, herunder gennem projektet om det »Pan-European network for the study and clinical management of drug resistant tuberculosis« (paneuropæisk netværk til undersøgelse og klinisk håndtering af medicinresistent tuberkulose) (11 mio. EUR) og projektet om »Development of a two-approach plate system for the fast and simultaneous detection of MDR and XDR M. tuberculosis« (udvikling af to-tilgangs pladesystemet til hurtig og samtidig påvisning af MDR og XDR M. tuberkulose) (2,7 mio. EUR).

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007046/13
adresată Comisiei
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) și Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(17 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Răspândirea tuberculozei rezistente la medicamente (TB-RM)

Aproape un sfert din cazurile de tuberculoză rezistentă la medicamente (TB-RM) sunt înregistrate în zona europeană a OMS, amenințând sănătatea cetățenilor și a economiilor Europei. Dacă tratarea unui caz de TB normală costă în jur de 1 000 de euro, tratarea unui caz de TB-RM se poate ridica până la 50 000 de euro.

1. Câți cetățeni europeni vor fi afectați de TB în 10 ani, dacă continuă rata îmbolnăvirilor de TB, mai ales de TB-RM?

2. În condițiile în care Comisia Europeană sprijină combaterea TB mai ales prin contribuții la Fondul global de luptă împotriva HIV/SIDA, tuberculozei și malariei (FGSTM), dar FGSTM este într-un proces de transfer din Europa spre alte regiuni, cum intenționează Comisia să abordeze epidemia din ce în ce mai mare de TB-RM în Europa?

3. În opinia Comisiei, care ar fi cea mai eficientă măsură de combatere a răspândirii TB-RM?

4. În statele membre ale UE cel mai grav afectate de TB-RM, câte procente din cheltuielile de sănătate sunt alocate tratării TB-RM și câte pentru prevenire? Cum putem să ne asigurăm ce cele cinci țări din UE cel mai afectate combat epidemia în mod adecvat? Cum sprijină UE aceste țări prin intermediul instrumentelor financiare?

5. Câte fonduri UE sunt folosite în prezent pentru cercetarea modalităților de tratare, testare și prevenire a TB-RM?

Răspuns dat de dl Borg în numele Comisiei
(2 august 2013)

1. Tuberculoza (TB) este influențată de migrație, de situația economică și de funcționarea sistemelor de sănătate. Influența tuturor factorilor este greu de anticipat, deoarece aceștia s-ar putea schimba considerabil în următorii 10 ani.

2. Organizarea serviciilor de sănătate, incluzând gestionarea intervențiilor de combatere a TB, ține de competența guvernelor naționale. Atât fondurile structurale și regionale ale UE, cât și instrumentele de preaderare și instrumentele europene de vecinătate ar putea fi utilizate pentru combaterea tuberculozei multirezistente la medicamente (MDR-TB) dacă țările beneficiare acordă prioritate acestui lucru. Alte posibilități de finanțare sunt oferite de Programul în domeniul sănătății și de Al șaptelea program-cadru pentru activități de cercetare și de dezvoltare tehnologică (PC7), incluzând posibila acordare de sprijin din partea Centrului European de Prevenire și Control al Bolilor, a Organizației Mondiale a Sănătății și a Parteneriatului Stop TB, care pun un mare accent pe necesitatea de a viza populațiile marginalizate.

3. Pentru a combate răspândirea tuberculozei este esențial, pe de-o parte, să se consolideze sistemele de sănătate, astfel încât toți pacienții bolnavi de tuberculoză din UE să beneficieze de un tratament corespunzător și, pe de altă parte, să se vizeze acele sectoare vulnerabile ale societății care sunt cele mai afectate.

4. Bugetul disponibil pentru prevenirea și tratarea tuberculozei este o chestiune care depinde de stabilirea priorităților la nivel național, precum și de alegerea celui mai adecvat instrument financiar.

5. Cercetarea în domeniul tuberculozei este unul dintre domeniile prioritare ale PC7. 49 de proiecte sunt finanțate, UE contribuind cu peste 108 milioane EUR. Tube~~rculoza multire~~zistentă la medicamente (MDR-TB) și tuberculoza extensiv rezistentă la medicamente (XDR-TB) au fost, de asemenea, abordate în mod specific, inclusiv prin proiectul „Pan-European network for the study and clinical management of drug resistant tuberculosis" („Rețeaua paneuropeană pentru studiul și gestionarea clinică a tuberculozei rezistente la medicamente", proiect în valoare de 11 milioane EUR) și prin proiectul „Development of a two-approach plate system for the fast and simultaneous detection of MDR and XDR M. tuberculosis" („Dezvoltarea unui sistem pe bază de plăci, cu abordare dublă, pentru detectarea rapidă și simultană a Mycobacterium tuberculosis MDR și XDR", proiect în valoare de 2,7 milioane EUR).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007046/13
to the Commission
Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D) and Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Spread of MDR-TB in Europe

Nearly a quarter of the world's cases of multi-drug-resistant tuberculosis occur in the WHO European Region, posing a threat to both the health of the citizens and the economies of Europe. Where the cost of treating a normal case of TB is around EUR 1 000, the price of treating MDR-TB can be EUR 50 000.

1. If tuberculosis (TB), and especially multi-drug-resistant TB, continue to spread, how many EU citizens will be affected by TB in 10 years' time?

2. Since the European Commission is supporting the fight against TB mainly by contributing to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM), but the GFATM is currently transitioning out of the European region, how does the Commission plan to address the growing MDR-TB epidemic in Europe?

3. What, in the Commission's opinion, would be the most effective measures to combat the spread of MDR-TB?

4. In the EU Member States that are hardest hit by MDR-TB, how high a percentage of healthcare expenditure is going towards treating MDR-TB, and what proportion towards preventing it? How can we ensure that the five high burden countries in the EU fight the epidemic adequately ? How can the EU support the five EU high burden countries using existing financial instruments?

5. How many EU funds are currently being used for research into treating, testing and preventing MDR-TB?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

1. Tuberculosis (TB) is influenced by migration, economy, and functioning of healthcare systems. The influence of all factors is difficult to forecast since these might change considerably in the coming 10 years.

2. The health services' organisation is competence of national governments including leadership for interventions to fight TB. EU's structural and regional funds, pre-accession and European neighbourhood instruments could all be used to fight multidrug resistant TB (MDR-TB) if this is prioritised by the recipient countries. Other funding opportunities are offered by the Health Programme, the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7), including possible support available from the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, from World Health Organisation and the Stop-TB partnership, which put great emphasis on the need to focus on marginalised populations.

3. To combat the spread of TB it is crucial to reinforce the health systems so that all TB patients in the EU receive adequate treatment, and address those vulnerable sectors of society which are the most affected.

4. The budget available to prevent and treat TB is matter of setting priorities at national level as well as the choice of the most appropriate financial instrument.

5. Research on TB has been one of the priority areas of FP7. 49 projects have been funded with EU contribution for more than EUR 108 million. MDR and XDR TB have also been addressed specifically, including the 'Pan-European network for the study and clinical management of drug resistant tuberculosis' project (EUR11 million) and the 'Development of a two-approach plate system for the fast and simultaneous detection of MDR and XDR M. tuberculosis' project (EUR 2.7 million).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007047/13
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(17 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Promozione dell'imprenditorialità attraverso l'istruzione

L'imprenditorialità è alla base dell'economia e promuove il dinamismo economico, la crescita e la creazione di posti di lavoro. Per questo motivo, l'Unione europea si trova di fronte alla sfida di proseguire nella promozione dei fattori necessari alla creazione di un ambiente in cui l'iniziativa imprenditoriale e le attività commerciali possano prosperare. Poiché il modo di pensare e la comprensione sociale si formano in giovane età, l'istruzione può svolgere un ruolo importante nell'affrontare con successo la sfida imprenditoriale.

La ricerca ha dimostrato l'esistenza di una correlazione positiva tra la presenza di start-up, da un lato, e la competitività economica e la crescita, dall'altro. Tuttavia, i benefici dell'educazione all'imprenditorialità non sono solo di carattere economico. L'imprenditorialità è una competenza utile nella vita quotidiana, a livello sia personale che sociale. Rappresenta altresì una soluzione al problema della disoccupazione giovanile (al 23 % in Europa).

L'Unione europea offre molte opportunità attraverso fondi e programmi, come ad esempio l'Erasmus giovani imprenditori, tuttavia non sensibilizza in modo sufficiente all'imprenditorialità e non incoraggia abbastanza i giovani a sviluppare questa competenza. È per questo che è necessario promuovere e incoraggiare l'imprenditorialità negli istituti di istruzione, nonché fornire maggiori offerte formative ai giovani, agli insegnanti e ai docenti.

Nel 2012 la Commissione ha condotto un'indagine dal titolo «Entrepreneurship in the EU and beyond» (L'imprenditorialità nell'UE e oltre). Dai risultati è emerso che meno di un quarto (il 23 %) degli intervistati nell'Unione ha partecipato a corsi o attività relativi all'imprenditorialità. Tra i giovani europei si riscontra una mancanza di fiducia e spirito imprenditoriale.

In considerazione di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— Dati i vantaggi sociali ed economici apportati dall'imprenditorialità, vi è margine per una maggiore promozione nelle scuole e nelle università?

— Potrebbe la Commissione considerare la possibilità di elaborare un quadro specifico per una simile iniziativa?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(14 agosto 2013)

La Commissione è impegnata, in stretta collaborazione con le autorità nazionali e le altre parti interessate, nella promozione dell'educazione all'imprenditorialità. Con la comunicazione «Ripensare l'istruzione» e il «piano d'azione imprenditorialità 2020» la Commissione ha presentato un quadro politico coerente per l'educazione all'imprenditorialità, proponendo interventi a livello di UE e di Stati membri. La Commissione invita gli Stati membri a garantire a tutti i giovani la possibilità di compiere almeno un'esperienza imprenditoriale concreta nel ciclo dell'istruzione obbligatoria poiché è prioritario fare di questo tipo di insegnamento un elemento essenziale dei nostri sistemi di istruzione. In questo campo i paesi possono avere accesso a ulteriori risorse attraverso Erasmus + e i fondi strutturali e di investimento.

Recentemente le attività della Commissione si sono concentrate anche sulla formazione degli insegnanti, visto il loro ruolo essenziale ai fini dell'introduzione dell'educazione all'imprenditorialità nelle scuole. Per favorire uno scambio sui metodi più validi e promuoverne la diffusione, si sono tenuti nel 2012 due workshop europei, cui ha fatto seguito la pubblicazione nel 2013 di una guida riservata agli educatori. Sette progetti europei riguardanti temi chiave, quali la formazione degli insegnanti, una piattaforma on line per gli educatori e nuovi metodi per la valutazione delle competenze imprenditoriali, sono stati al centro di un invito a presentare proposte pubblicato nel 2012. Infine nel novembre del 2013 verranno pubblicati orientamenti politici cui seguirà la messa a punto di strumenti e quadri a sostegno di una maggiore promozione di tali competenze a beneficio dei discenti in tutta Europa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007047/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Promotion of entrepreneurship through education

Entrepreneurship is at the heart of the economy and fosters economic dynamism, growth and job creation. This is why the challenge for the European Union (EU) is to continue promoting the key factors for building a climate in which entrepreneurial initiative and business activities can thrive. As attitudes and social understanding take shape at an early age, education can play a major part in successfully addressing the entrepreneurial challenge.

Research has proved the existence of a positive correlation between business start-ups and economic competitiveness and growth. However, the benefits of entrepreneurship education are not only economic. Entrepreneurship is a skill that is useful in both personal and social aspects of everyday life. It also presents itself as a solution to youth unemployment (23% in Europe).

The EU offers many opportunities in the form of funds and programmes, such as Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs. However, it does not raise enough awareness of entrepreneurship and does not sufficiently encourage young people to develop this skill. This is why there is a need to promote and encourage entrepreneurship in educational institutions, and why more training should be offered to students as well as to teachers and professors.

In 2012 a survey called 'Entrepreneurship in the EU and beyond' was conducted by the Commission. The results showed that just under a quarter (23%) of EU respondents have ever taken part in any course or activity about entrepreneurship. There is a lack of entrepreneurial spirit and confidence among the young people of Europe.

In light of the above, could the Commission answer to the following questions:

— Given the social and economic benefits of entrepreneurship, is there scope for greater promotion in schools and universities?

— Would the Commission consider developing a specific framework for this initiative?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2013)

The Commission is working in close cooperation with national authorities and other relevant stakeholders to promote education for entrepreneurship. The Commission presented a coherent policy framework for entrepreneurship education with 'Rethinking Education' and the 'Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan' proposing actions at EU and Member State level. The Commission calls on Member States to give all young people the chance of at least one practical entrepreneurial experience during compulsory education since the priority is to make this type of learning a basic feature in our education systems. Sources such as Erasmus+ and Structural and Investment Funds offer countries a route to additional resources for this work.

The Commission's activities have also recently focused on training teachers, as they have a key role in bringing entrepreneurship education into the classroom. Two European workshops in 2012 aimed to share and disseminate successful methods, followed up with the publication of a guide for educators in 2013. A 2012 call for proposals sees seven European projects addressing key issues such as training teachers, online platform for educators and new methods to assess entrepreneurial skills. Further to this, policy guidance will be published in November 2013 followed by development of tools and frameworks to support greater promotion of these skills for learners across Europe.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007048/13
to the Commission
Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Charges for mobile phone calls

Can the Commission outline the action it will be taking to narrow the gap between Irish consumers and consumers in the rest of the EU in relation to charges for making calls on mobile phones?

At present, Ireland is the fifth most expensive country in the EU as regards charges for mobile phone calls, which cost 36% more than the EU average.

Can the Commission explain why there remains such a disparity between some Member States in relation to charges for making calls on mobile phones?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

Domestic mobile call charges fall under the supervision of the National Telecom Regulatory Authority (NRA) in each country ([1]). The EU rules provide NRAs with tools to act in relation to any competition problems that exist within their national markets and to impose remedies on operators when appropriate. The Irish mobile market offers its customers a variety of services and tariffs, both as a stand alone or in bundles that allow consumers to choose services that best corresponds to their needs. The latest available data suggest that Irish consumers pay prices that are close to the EU's average ([2]).

The Commission has addressed an important issue which contributes substantially to end-user prices, namely the rates operators charge to each other when terminating calls on their respective networks. The Commission adopted in May 2009 a recommendation ([3]) which includes guidance for NRAs to set these termination charges at the level which corresponds to the efficient costs. Application of cost-oriented termination charges will lower the wholesale costs for domestic calls, which in a competitive market should also lead to lower retail prices.

Despite the tools available under the current regulatory framework it is true that disparities between Member States exist, which should not be present in a fully functioning single market. The 2013 Spring European Council stressed the importance of the digital single market for growth and called for concrete measures be prepared in time for the October European Council. The Commission is currently working on a legislative measure which should allow operators to provide digital services across the EU and allow citizens and businesses to enjoy such services from anywhere in Europe.

([1]) www.comreg.ie.
([2]) http://digital-agenda-data.eu/charts/analyse-one-indicator-and-compare-countries#chart={'indicator-group':"mobile","indicator":"mob_arpm","breakdown-group":"total","breakdown":"TOTAL_MOB","unit-measure":"eurocent","ref-area":['BE","BG","CZ","DK","DE","EE","IE","EL","ES","FR","IT","CY","LV","LT","LU","HU","MT","NL","AT","PL","PT","RO","SI","SK","FI","SE","UK","EU-27"]}.
([3]) Commission Recommendation 2009/396/EC on the Regulatory Treatment of Fixed and Mobile Termination Rates in the EU, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:124:0067:0074:EN:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007049/13
to the Commission
Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Wave defences and coastal erosion

In Renvyle, Co. Galway, Ireland, wave defences have been severely damaged by recent bad weather. Any further damage threatens to cause the seawater to contaminate a small freshwater lake. The lake is designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), because of a rare strain of weed which is growing in it.

Could the Commission outline what support or funding, if any, are available to tackle coastal erosion where it threatens Special Areas of Conservation?

Is there funding available for the construction of wave defences?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

The regulatory framework governing 2007-2013 European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) projects includes environmental and risk protection as a potential investment area. The regional ERDF programme for the Border, Midland and Western (BMW) region (in which Galway is situated) thus contains an investment priority dealing with environment and risk protection. The corresponding funding allocation supports investments in the fields of water source protection (drinking water) and promotion of energy efficiency and renewable energy. The construction of flood and/or coastal erosion defences is not, however, an investment activity foreseen under the BMW programme.

The regulatory framework governing the 2007-2013 European Fisheries Fund operations provides no scope for the construction of flood and/or coastal erosion defences.

There may be scope under priority 3 (quality of life and diversification) of Ireland's Rural Development Programme for 2007-13 to support coastal communities in the protection and restoration of local areas of natural and/or environmental importance. Enquiries may be addressed to the following department: Rural Development II, Department of Community, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs, Teeling Street, Tubbercurry, Co. Sligo, telephone (07191) 86700.

The Commission would also refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E/5490/08.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007050/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(17. juni 2013)

Om: Forskellige definitioner af sjældne sygdomme

Prævalens i definitionen af sjældne sygdomme har konsekvent været anvendt i EU's lovgivning og politik om sjældne sygdomme. Rådets henstilling fra 2009 om et tiltag vedrørende sjældne sygdomme henviser til både EF-handlingsprogrammet vedrørende sjældne sygdomme og forordning (EF) nr. 141/2000 med hensyn til prævalens i definitionen af sjældne sygdomme som en lidelse, »der berører højst fem ud 10 000 personer i Fællesskabet«.

Til trods for dette tal har lande som f.eks. Danmark, Sverige og Det Forenede Kongerige defineret sjældne sygdomme som sygdomme med en anden prævalens. Dette er ikke kun i modstrid med EU's regelsæt, men denne udvikling kan være til skade for patienterne, idet det kan føre til en forskelsbehandling mellem de mere almindelige sjældne sygdomme og andre sjældne sygdomme, når lovgivningen og politikken for sjældne sygdomme anvendes på nationalt plan. Det kan desuden føre til problemer, hvis en EU-borger med en sjælden sygdom flytter fra en EU-medlemsstat, som anvender EU-prævalensen, til en medlemsstat, som ikke anvender den.

Kommissionen anmodes i denne forbindelse om at besvare følgende spørgsmål:

1. Mener Kommissionen, at der burde være overensstemmelse i definitionen af sjældne sygdomme i hele Europa?

2. Vil Kommissionen i sin vurderingsrapport efter gennemførelsen af de nationale planer for sjældne sygdomme se på, hvordan sjældne sygdomme defineres i de nationale planer i hele Europa?

3. Hvilke konsekvenser har medlemsstaternes forskellige definitioner af sjældne sygdomme for EU's lovgivning som f.eks. forordning (EF) nr. 141/2000 om lægemidler til sjældne sygdomme?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Tonio Borg
(25. juli 2013)

Kommissionen fremmer en konsekvent definition af sjældne sygdomme i alle sine politikker. Samtidig fremgår det af traktatens artikel 168, at Unionens indsats på folkesundhedsområdet respekterer medlemsstaternes ansvar for organisation og levering af sundhedstjenesteydelser og behandling på sundhedsområdet. Dette omfatter definitionen af sjældne sygdomme.

I Rådets henstilling ([1]) af 8. juni 2009 om et tiltag vedrørende sjældne sygdomme henstilles det ikke desto mindre til medlemsstaterne, at de med henblik på policyarbejdet på fællesskabsplan anvender en fælles definition af sjældne sygdomme, som sygdomme, der højst rammer 5 ud af 10 000 personer.

I gennemførelsesrapporten om foranstaltninger i forbindelse med Kommissionens meddelelse om sjældne sygdomme: en udfordring for Europa og om ovennævnte henstilling fra Rådet planlægger Kommissionen at aflægge beretning om, hvordan medlemsstaterne anvender definitionen af sjældne sygdomme i forbindelse med politik på EU-plan.

Terminologi på medlemsstatsplan har ingen indvirkning på, hvordan forordning (EF) nr. 141/2000 fungerer, da dens anvendelsesområde og dens anvendelse er baseret på definitionen af lægemidler til sjældne sygdomme i forordningen selv.

([1]) 2009/C151/02: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:151:0007:0010:DA:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007050/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Different definitions of rare diseases

Prevalence in the definition of rare diseases has been consistently applied in EU rare disease legislation and policy. The Council Recommendation of 2009 on an action in the field of rare diseases refers to both the Community action programme on rare diseases and Regulation (EC) No 141/2000 with regard to prevalence in the definition of rare diseases as 'affecting not more than 5 in 10 000 persons in the Community'.

Despite this figure, countries such as Denmark, Sweden and the UK have defined rare diseases as having a different prevalence. Not only is this contrary to the EU regulatory framework, but this development could be detrimental to patients, as it could result in discrimination between more common rare diseases and other rare diseases when rare disease legislation and policy are applied at national level. Furthermore, it could lead to problems if an EU citizen with a rare disease moves from an EU Member State that applies the EU prevalence to one that does not.

In connection with this, can the Commission please answer the following questions:

1. Does the Commission feel there should be consistency in the definition of rare diseases across Europe?

2. In its assessment report following the implementation of the national plans for rare diseases, will the Commission look at how rare diseases are defined in the national plans across Europe?

3. What implications do the Member States' different definitions of rare diseases have for EU legislation, such as Regulation (EC) No 141/2000 on orphan medicinal products?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

The Commission is promoting one consistent definition of rare diseases across all its policies. At the same time, according to Art. 168 of the Treaty, EU action in the field of public health shall respect the responsibilities of Member States for the organisation and delivery of health services and medical care. This includes the definition of rare diseases.

Nevertheless, in the Council Recommendation ([1]) of 8 June 2009 on an action in the field of rare diseases, Member States have committed themselves to use, for the purposes of EU-level policy work, a common definition of rare disease as a disease affecting no more than 5 per 10 000 persons.

In the Implementation Report on action under the Commission Communication on Rare Diseases: Europe's challenges and on the Council recommendation mentioned above, the Commission is planning to report upon how Member States are using the definition of rare diseases for the purposes of EU-level policy.

Terminology used at Member State level has no impact on the functioning of Regulation (EC) No 141/2000 as the scope of that instrument and its application are based on the definition of an orphan medicinal product as provided and specified in the regulation itself.

([1]) 2009/C151/02: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:151:0007:0010:EN:PDF.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007051/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(17. juni 2013)

Om: Vaccine imod tuberkulose

En af de voksende tursler mod folkesundheden i Europa er udbredelsen af tuberkulose, især de multiresistente former for tuberkulose. En del af problemet er behandling af mennesker, der er smittet med TB, en anden del består i manglen på tilstrækkelige foranstaltninger til at forhindre, at sygdommen breder sig.

Kommissionen anmodes i denne forbindelse om at besvare følgende:

— Hvornår kan vi forvente at have en ny vaccine, der virker imod tuberkulose?

— Tager Kommissionen initiativer, og yder den støtte (i givet fald hvilke initiativer og hvilken støtte) med henblik på at udvikle bedre forebyggende foranstaltninger imod tuberkulose, herunder nye vaccine(r)?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Máire Geoghegan-Quinn
(26. juli 2013)

Kommissionen er opmærksom på, at forebyggende foranstaltninger er vigtige for udryddelsen af tuberkulose (TB) som globalt sundhedsproblem. Siden 2000 har Kommissionen gennem sine rammeprogrammer for forskning, teknologisk udvikling og demonstration støttet forskningssamarbejdet vedrørende udviklingen af en tuberkulosevaccine med mere end 34 mio. EUR. FP6 ([1]) projektet TBVAC ([2]) har hjulpet fem potentielle vacciner videre til klinisk fase I-undersøgelser, mens det nuværende FP7 ([3]) projekt NEWTBVAC ([4]) fokuserer på opdagelse og præklinisk udvikling af en ny generation af potentielle TB-vacciner. Derudover har partnerskabet mellem de europæiske lande og udviklingslande vedrørende kliniske forsøg (EDCTP), som er Kommissionens og 16 europæiske landes fælles initiativ vedrørende klinisk forskning, støttet otte kliniske forsøg med TB-vacciner i det sydlige Sahara.

De mest avancerede potentielle TB-vacciner undergår p.t. klinisk fase II-undersøgelser, og det vil kræve væsentlige videnskabelige og finansielle ressourcer at udvikle dem til færdige vacciner. Det er en udfordring, men ifølge det mest optimistiske skøn vil det kunne resultere i lanceringen af en ny TB vaccine inden 2030.

Kommissionen støtter også forebyggelse mod TB i medlemsstaterne gennem sit sundhedsprogram ([5]) og målrettede initiativer, der koordineres i tæt samarbejde med Verdenssundhedsorganisationen og Det Europæiske Center for Forebyggelse af og Kontrol med Sygdomme. Den femte rapport »Tilsyn med og overvågning af tuberkulose i Europa 2013« ([6]) konsoliderer de resultater, der hidtil er nået.

([1]) Det sjette rammeprogram for forskning, teknologisk udvikling og demonstration (FP6, 2002-2006).
([2]) http://www.tbvi.eu/projects/tbvac.html
([3]) Det syvende rammeprogram for forskning, teknologisk udvikling og demonstration (FP7, 2007-2013).
([4]) http://www.tbvi.eu/projects/newtbvac.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/health/index.html
([6]) http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/185800/Tuberculosis-surveillance-and-monitoring-in-Europe-2013.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007051/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Vaccine against tuberculosis

One of the growing public health threats in Europe is the spread of tuberculosis (TB), especially in its drug-resistant forms. While one part of the problem is the treatment of people infected with TB, another part is the lack of sufficient measures to prevent the spread of the disease.

In connection with this, can the Commission please answer the following:

— When can we expect to see a new working vaccine against tuberculosis?

— What, if any, initiatives and support does the Commission have with regard to developing better prevention measures against tuberculosis, including new vaccine(s)?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of the importance of preventive measures for eliminating tuberculosis (TB) as a global health problem. Since 2000, the Commission has supported collaborative research for TB vaccine development with more than EUR 34 million through its Framework Programmes (FPs) for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities. The FP6 ([1]) project TBVAC ([2]) has helped advance five TB vaccine candidates to phase I clinical trials, while the ongoing FP7 ([3]) project NEWTBVAC ([4]) is focusing on the discovery and preclinical development of a new generation of TB vaccine candidates. In addition to this, the European Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership (EDCTP), a joint clinical research initiative between the Commission and 16 European countries, has supported eight clinical trials on TB vaccines in sub-Saharan Africa.

The most advanced TB vaccine candidates are currently in phase II clinical trials, and developing these into final products will require the mobilisation of significant scientific and financial resources. This is a challenging task but in the most optimistic scenario, it could result in the introduction of a new TB vaccine by 2030.

The Commission also supports the prevention of TB in Member States through its Health Programme ([5]) and through targeted initiatives coordinated in close contact with the World Health Organisation and with the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. The fifth report on 'Tuberculosis surveillance and monitoring in Europe 2013' ([6]) consolidates the achievements reached so far.

([1]) Sixth Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP6, 2002-2006).
([2]) http://www.tbvi.eu/projects/tbvac.html
([3]) Seventh Framework Programme for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7, 2007-2013).
([4]) http://www.tbvi.eu/projects/newtbvac.html
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/health/index.html
([6]) http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/185800/Tuberculosis-surveillance-and-monitoring-in-Europe-2013.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007052/13
til Kommissionen
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(17. juni 2013)

Om: Forskellig ordlyd af forskellige sprogversioner af et direktiv

Det er vigtigt, at meningen med EU's lovgivning altid fremgår klart, uanset hvilket af de officielle sprog, den oversættes til. Der kan imidlertid altid ske fejl, og der sker fejl. I forbindelse med direktiv 93/42/EØF om medicinske anordninger er der således tilsyneladende sket en fejl. I bilag I til dette direktiv, »Væsentlige krav«, afsnit 13, »Fabrikantens oplysninger«, underafsnit 13.6 står der:

»Brugsanvisningen skal i givet fald omfatte følgende: »udstedelsesdato eller dato for seneste revision af brugsanvisningen««

I de andre sprogversioner (såsom spansk, italiensk eller hollandsk) står der ikke »eller«; i stedet for står der, at brugsanvisningen skal indeholde:

»the date of publication of the latest version of the instructions for use« (»datoen for offentliggørelse af den seneste udgave af brugsanvisningen«) (på spansk: »fecha de publicación de la última revisión de las instrucciones de utilización«).

Kommissionen anmodes i denne forbindelse om at besvare følgende:

1. Er det virkelig tilstrækkeligt kun at anføre datoen for udstedelse i brugsanvisningen til en medicinsk anordning og ikke for »den seneste revision af brugsanvisningen«?

2. Hvad agter Kommissionen at gøre for at råde bod på denne uoverensstemmelse mellem de forskellige sprogudgaver?

3. Ved Kommissionen, om denne forskel i ordlyd har ført til, at medlemsstaterne gennemfører direktivet på forskellige måder?

4. Hvis borgere, organisationer eller virksomheder opdager en sådan uoverensstemmelse mellem de forskellige oversættelser, er der så en nem måde, hvorpå de kan indberette dette? Kan det så også sikres, at der foretages en rettelse, eller at der i det mindste offentliggøres en påmindelse, der forklarer forskellene og præciserer, hvilken fortolkning af teksten, der er den korrekte?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Neven Mimica
(6. august 2013)

Kommissionen anerkender fuldt ud betydningen af at sikre en sammenhængende oversættelse af retsakter til de forskellige officielle EU-sprog og anerkender den afvigelse, som det ærede medlem har stillet spørgsmål om, vedrørende oversættelsen af del 1 (væsentlige krav), afsnit 13.6, litra q), i bilag I til direktiv 93/42/EØF ([1]).

Det er Kommissionens opfattelse, at denne afvigelse skyldes en skrivefejl, og at sætningen »… udstedelsesdato eller dato for den seneste revision af brugsanvisningen« skal læses som »… dato for offentliggørelse af den seneste udgave af brugsanvisningen«. Kommissionen er dog ikke bekendt med afvigende gennemførelse i medlemsstaterne af direktiv 93/42/EØF som følge af forskelle i oversættelsen af den pågældende sætning.

Det er vigtigt at bemærke, at direktiv 93/42/EØF blev vedtaget af Rådet, og at den pågældende bestemmelse i dette direktiv er blevet indsat ved direktiv 2007/47/EF, der blev vedtaget af Europa-Parlamentet og Rådet. I sådanne tilfælde ligger ansvaret for at rette eventuelle fejl i originalen og/eller oversættelser hos den eller de institutioner, der har vedtaget retsakten. Det er derfor op til Europa-Parlamentet og Rådet at analysere sagen og beslutte, om en sprogudgave bør rettes.

([1]) EFT L 169 af 12.7.1993, s. 1.

Borgere, organisationer og virksomheder kan meddele fejl i retsakter gennem EUR-Lex-helpdesken (eurlex-helpdesk@publications.europa.eu). Læsernes anmodninger vil blive analyseret af Publikationskontoret og omdirigeret til de kompetente myndigheder eller institutioner, der skal behandle sådanne anmodninger og rette eventuelle fejl.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007052/13
to the Commission
Anna Rosbach (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Different wording in different language versions of a directive

It is important that the meaning of EU legislation should always be clear, regardless of which of the official languages it is translated into. However, mistakes can and do happen. One such case seems to be the Medical Devices Directive 93/42/EEC. In Annex 1 to this directive, Essential Requirements, Section 13, Information supplied by the manufacturer, subSection 13.6, it says:

'Where appropriate, the instructions for use must contain the following particulars:
(q) date of issue or the latest revision of the instructions for use'.

However, in other language versions (such as Spanish, Italian and Dutch) there is no 'or'; instead, it is stated that the instructions for use must contain:

'the date of publication of the latest version of the instructions for use' (in Spanish: 'fecha de publicación de la última revisión de las instrucciones de utilización').

In connection with this, can the Commission please answer the following:

1. Is it really sufficient to include only the date of issue in the instructions for use of a medical device, rather than the 'latest revision of the instructions for use'?

2. What does the Commission intend to do about this discrepancy in meaning between the language versions?

3. Does the Commission know if this difference in wording has led to the Member States implementing the directive in different ways?

4. If citizens, organisations or companies discover such a discrepancy among translations, is there an easy way for them to report it? And can it then be ensured that a correction is made — or at least a memo published explaining the differences and stating which is the valid interpretation of the text?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

The Commission fully recognises the importance of ensuring coherent translation of legal acts into the different official languages of the European Union and acknowledges the discrepancy raised by the Honourable Member regarding the translation of Part 1 (Essential Requirements), Section 13.6(q) of Annex I to Directive 93/42/EEC ([1]).

The Commission is of the opinion that this discrepancy is a typographical error and that the sentence '… date of issue or the latest revision of the instructions for use.' should be read as '… date of issue of the latest revision of the instructions for use.' The Commission is, however, not aware of any diverging implementation within the Member States of Directive 93/42/EEC due to discrepancies in the translations of the concerned sentence.

It is important to note that directive 93/42/EEC was adopted by the Council and that the relevant provision of this directive has been inserted by Directive 2007/47/EC which was adopted by the European Parliament and the Council. In such cases, the responsibility of correcting any errors in the original and/or in any translations lays on the institution(s) who adopted the legal act. Therefore, it is for the European Parliament and the Council to analyse the case and decide if any language version needs to be corrected.

Citizens, organisations and companies can notify errors in legal acts through Eur-Lex public helpdesk (eurlex-helpdesk@publications.europa.eu). Readers' requests will be analysed by the Publications Office and redirected to the responsible services or institutions that have to handle such requests and correct notified errors, if considered necessary.

([1]) OJ L 169, 12.7.1993, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007053/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Aid targets and corporate tax avoidance in the developing world

While the UK continues to honour its strong commitment to international aid, it is estimated that a total of some EUR 200 billion a year is lost in tax revenue to developing countries through tax avoidance by multinationals.

Does the Commission have its own estimates of the revenue that is currently lost to developing countries, and does it believe that it is appropriate for European taxpayers to effectively subsidise tax avoidance on this scale?

Does the Commission believe that there are steps that could be taken involving the World Bank to reduce this loss of revenue to the developing world, or is this a problem that can only be addressed through a UN- or G8-sponsored multilateral tax treaty?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

Various estimates of the amount of tax revenues lost in developing countries exist and show substantial losses as the Honourable MEP rightly points out. These losses are difficult to estimate in a precise manner due to their nature. However, the Commission shares the view that they are very high.

For combating tax avoidance and tax havens, the Commission refers to its initiative of 6 December 2012: an Action Plan to strengthen the fight against tax fraud and tax evasion ([1]) together with two recommendations on aggressive tax planning and regarding measures intended to encourage third countries to apply minimum standards of good governance in tax matters ([2]).

The 2010 Communication 'Tax and Development' ([3]) aims at improving synergies between tax and development policies by suggesting ways to help developing countries to build efficient, effective, fair and transparent tax systems to increase revenue mobilisation and tackle tax evasion and avoidance. The Commission worked with the UN to develop a Practical Manual on Transfer Pricing for Developing Countries and is in a Tripartite Partnership with the World Bank and the OECD to strengthen countries' capacities in auditing and monitoring transfer pricing transactions.

Furthermore, the Commission strongly supports international efforts to curb tax evasion and avoidance and welcomes the international prominence these issues are given in international fora, such as the G8, G20, UN and the OECD.

The EU also supports a large number of country-specific projects, capacity building initiatives and other activities. For example in 2011/2012 in Ghana, we trained 20 tax specialists of the 'large tax payers' unit' to enable them to audit transfer pricing transactions.

([1]) COM(2012) 722.
([2]) C(2012)8806; C(2012)8805.
([3]) COM(2010)163 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007054/13
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Profit disclosure and tax avoidance proposals at Fermanagh

Tax avoidance by large corporations is now a major concern for governments around the world, and it is an issue that will feature prominently at the G8 summit that begins today in Fermanagh, Northern Ireland.

The Treasury ministers of Britain, France and Germany recently discussed the option of forcing banks operating within the EU to disclose their international profits.

Does the Commission support this initiative and, if so, does the Commission believe that such transparency should be restricted to banks or should it apply to all transnational corporations? Finally, what proposals on tax avoidance does the Commission intend to propose at the summit?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2013)

The Commission notes that the recently agreed Capital Requirements Directive ([1]) already foresees that banks shall disclose on a country-by country basis from 2015 onwards certain information, such as tax on profit or loss.

In addition, the Commission fully supports the European Council's conclusions of 22 May 2013 as regards reporting by all large companies and groups on tax matters. To this end, the Commission will work closely together with the European Parliament and the Council to make sure that EU rules are adopted as quickly as possible in this area. In parallel, the Commission will continue to follow closely the international discussions on these issues in the G8, G20 and OECD.

The Commission's contribution concentrated on evasion rather than avoidance, notably the aim for automatic exchange of information between tax authorities to become the new global standard of cooperation in tax matters. The Commission has long advocated the use of automatic exchange of information as a tool to combat and prevent tax fraud and evasion and achieved tangible results on this within the EU. On 12 June 2013 the Commission adopted a further legislative proposal ([2]) to extend the scope of automatic exchange of information under the directive on Administrative Cooperation ([3]). New initiatives on automatic exchange of information which are ongoing at the international level could greatly benefit from EU achievements in this area.

([1]) OJ L 176/338, 27.6.2013.
([2]) COM(2013) 348 final.
([3]) OJ L 64, 11.3.2011, p. 1.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007055/13
à la Commission
Dominique Vlasto (PPE)
(17 juin 2013)

Objet: Exportations européennes de vin en Chine

Comme plusieurs études démontrent que les entreprises chinoises vendent leurs panneaux solaires sur le marché européen à un prix considérablement plus bas que les coûts de production (dumping), la Commission a décidé d'instaurer des taxes provisoires sur le solaire chinois.

Depuis le 6 juin 2013, les taxes appliquées aux panneaux solaires chinois s'élèvent à 11,8 % et passeront à 47,6 % en moyenne si la Commission européenne et Pékin ne parviennent pas à trouver un accord dans les deux mois à venir.

À la suite de cette décision, les autorités chinoises ont annoncé l'ouverture d'une enquête antidumping et antisubventions sur les vins importés de l'Union européenne.

Cette enquête, qui s'apparente à une mesure de représailles commerciales, fait porter une menace sérieuse sur les exportations de vins et spiritueux européens vers un marché en pleine croissance. La Chine représente en effet près de 12 % des exportations de vins de l'Union européenne, soit 546 000 000 d'euros pour la France, 89 000 000 d'euros pour l'Espagne et 77 000 000 d'euros pour l'Italie.

D'éventuelles mesures antidumping ne feraient qu'accroître les charges qui pèsent déjà sur les exportations de vins européens en Chine et qui sont aujourd'hui considérables (majoration du prix à l'importation estimée entre 75 % et 200 %).

1. Alors que la Commission a réagi en garantissant «qu'il n'y a pas de dumping ou de subventions sur les exportations de vins européens vers la Chine», comment entend-elle répondre à cette enquête?

2. Sur quels types de vins et sur quels pays producteurs l'enquête porte-t-elle?

3. La Commission envisage-t-elle de déposer un recours devant l'OMC?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(20 août 2013)

La Commission se permet de renvoyer l'Honorable Parlementaire à sa réponse à la question écrite n. E- 005790/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=FR

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007055/13
to the Commission
Dominique Vlasto (PPE)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: European wine exports to China

In response to several studies which show that Chinese firms are 'dumping' their solar panels on the European market, i.e. selling them at a price far below their production cost, the Commission decided to impose temporary anti-dumping duties on these products.

As of 6 June 2013, tariffs of 11.8% have been levied on Chinese solar panels; this figure will rise to an average of 47.6% if the Commission and Beijing fail to reach an agreement within the next two months.

The Chinese authorities have responded by announcing the launch of an anti-dumping and anti-subsidy probe into wine imports from the European Union.

This probe, which seems to be some kind of retaliatory measure, may seriously jeopardise EU wine and spirit exports to a fast-growing market. In 2012, almost 12% of the EU's wine exports went to China, equating to sales worth EUR 546 million for France, EUR 89 million for Spain and EUR 77 million for Italy.

Any anti-dumping measures will only serve to make EU wines exported to China, which are already marked up by between 75% and 200% by importers, even more expensive.

1. Although the Commission has already made it clear that there is no dumping or subsidising of European wine exports to China, how does it intend to respond to this anti-dumping probe?

2. Which kinds of wine and which wine-producing countries does the probe cover?

3. Does the Commission intend to lodge an appeal with the WTO?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to previous Written Question E- 005790/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007056/13
à la Commission
Frédéric Daerden (S&D)
(17 juin 2013)

Objet: Dumping social entre États membres au préjudice des travailleurs

Dans ma question écrite P-003479/2013, j'avais particulièrement insisté pour que la Commission dispose de moyens pour mettre fin au dumping social et sanctionner l'exploitation honteuse des conditions de travail et de rémunération des travailleurs détachés à l'intérieur de l'Union.

La Commission ne précise nullement de façon concrète dans sa réponse quels seront ses moyens d'intervention et de sanction en cas d'abus avérés.

D'autre part, quand la Commission affirme que «la proposition de la Commission garantit que les travailleurs détachés sont rémunérés à hauteur du travail fourni» ou «met un terme à la concurrence déloyale des salaires», elle ne précise nullement de quelle manière.

Par conséquent, la Commission peut-elle indiquer concrètement, au-delà de la proposition de directive (COM(2012)131 final) relative à l'exécution de la directive 96/71/CE, en cours d'examen, de quels moyens d'investigation elle disposera et quelles seront les sanctions imposées pour mettre fin rapidement à ces abus, autrement que par des déclarations incantatoires?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(31 juillet 2013)

Le suivi et le contrôle de l'application des conditions de travail et d'emploi ainsi que la rémunération effective des travailleurs, y compris des travailleurs détachés, relèvent de la compétence des États membres, qui disposent d'organismes spécialisés tels que les services de l'inspection du travail pour procéder aux vérifications et déterminer les mesures correctrices qui s'imposent.

Dans sa question, l'Honorable Parlementaire ne fournit pas d'éléments de preuve concrets, ni d'exemple d'une «pratique déloyale» dans le domaine du détachement de travailleurs. S'en tenant au contexte global de la question, la Commission réaffirme que, en tant que gardienne des traités, elle veille à la bonne application de la législation de l'Union européenne dans les États membres. Lorsque la Commission prend connaissance de pratiques qualifiées de déloyales ou d'abusives, elle doit tout d'abord tirer entièrement au clair les faits afin d'être en mesure d'évaluer si les allégations de pratiques de dumping social constituent une violation des règles applicables de l'Union. S'il apparaît qu'un État membre n'a pas transposé correctement la législation de l'UE, ne l'a pas transposée du tout, ou applique de façon erronée certaines règles transposées, une procédure d'infraction est engagée, pour contraindre l'État membre concerné à modifier sa législation ou la manière dont il l'applique.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007056/13
to the Commission
Frédéric Daerden (S&D)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Social dumping within the EU at the expense of workers

In my Written Question P-003479/2013, I placed particular emphasis on the need for the Commission to be equipped with the resources required to put an end to social dumping and to penalise deplorable working conditions and unfair wages for workers posted within the EU.

In its reply, the Commission gives no clear indication of what preventive or punitive measures it would take in cases involving the proven exploitation of workers.

What is more, when the Commission says its proposal 'should ensure that posted workers are paid for the work they do' and should aim to 'stop unfair wage competition', it gives no indication as to how this might be done.

Could the Commission therefore explain, in detail and without resorting to the usual tired mantras, and setting aside its proposal for a directive (COM(2012) 131 final) on the implementation of Directive 96/71/EC, which is currently under consideration, what investigative measures it will take and what penalties it will impose in order to put a swift end to these unfair practices?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The monitoring and enforcement of the working and employment conditions and the actual remuneration of workers, including posted workers, fall within the competence of the Member States, which have specialized bodies such as labour inspectorates to make such verifications and determine the appropriate corrective measures.

In his question the Honourable member does not indicate any factual evidence or describe any example of an 'unfair practice' related to the posting of workers. Keeping with the general terms of the question, the Commission restates that, as guardian of the Treaties, it monitors the correct application of EC law in the Member States. When the Commission becomes aware of alleged abusive or unfair practices, it first has to make a thorough clarification of the factual circumstances in order to be able to assess whether or not the allegations of social dumping practices constitute a breach of the applicable Union rules. If it becomes apparent that a Member State has not transposed EU legislation correctly, has failed to transpose it at all, or is applying transposed rules incorrectly, infringement proceedings are instituted to compel the Member State concerned to amend its legislation or the way in which it is applied.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007057/13
do Komisji
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR) oraz Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(17 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Realizacja inwestycji przeciwpowodziowych w Polsce

W związku z pojawiającymi się informacjami o niedopełnieniu przez polski rząd obowiązków wynikających z Ramowej Dyrektywy Wodnej w zakresie zintegrowanego podejścia do zarządzania wodami prosimy o odpowiedzi na następujące pytania:

1. Jaka dokładnie kwota może zostać Polsce odebrana? Jak realnym jest zagrożenie utraty ponad 2 mld zł na ten cel?

2. Czy możliwa jest utrata środków z nowej perspektywy budżetowej 2014-2020?

3. Do kiedy Polska musi wprowadzić jednolity plan gospodarowania wodami w dorzeczach w Polsce, aby móc skorzystać ze środków z Programu Operacyjnego Infrastruktura i Środowisko?

4. Czy Komisja widzi szansę na wdrożenie takiego planu w odpowiednim czasie? Czy polski rząd podjął odpowiednie starania w tym zakresie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(8 sierpnia 2013 r.)

1. Dyskusje pomiędzy Komisją a władzami polskimi w sprawie właściwego wdrożenia ramowej dyrektywy wodnej trwają od 2011 r. Komisja wydała kilka zaleceń mających na celu zagwarantowanie, że infrastruktura przeciwpowodziowa otrzymująca wsparcie UE nie narusza przepisów ramowej dyrektywy wodnej. Nigdy nie rozważano cofnięcia dotąd niewykorzystanych funduszy UE w tym sektorze. Wszystkie wysiłki koncentrują się obecnie na zapewnieniu, aby przydzielone środki były wydawane zgodnie z przepisami UE.

2. Ramy prawne dotyczące europejskich funduszy strukturalnych i inwestycyjnych na lata 2014-2020 są nadal przedmiotem dyskusji z Radą i Parlamentem, dlatego nie można udzielić ostatecznej odpowiedzi w tej kwestii. Wniosek Komisji zawiera jednak „uwarunkowania *ex ante*" dotyczące inwestycji wodnych, zgodnie z którymi państwa członkowskie powinny zapewnić spełnienie wymogów ramowej dyrektywy wodnej ([1]), zanim będą uprawnione do otrzymania wsparcia finansowego UE na powiązane działania. Komisja uznaje znaczenie działań przeciwpowodziowych w Polsce i oczekuje, że odpowiednie prawodawstwo UE będzie przestrzegane.

3. Polska nie musi wprowadzić jednolitego planu gospodarowania wodami w dorzeczach w Polsce w ramach programu operacyjnego „Infrastruktura i środowisko na lata 2007-2013", projekty, które korzystają z funduszy UE w ramach tego programu, muszą być zgodne z wymogami ramowej dyrektywy wodnej.

4. Według harmonogramu przedstawionego przez władze polskie, głowne plany dla Odry i Wisły będą gotowe do sierpnia 2014 r.

([1]) Dyrektywa 2000/60/WE Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady z dnia 23 października 2000 r. ustanawiająca ramy wspólnotowego działania w dziedzinie polityki wodnej.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007057/13
to the Commission
Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR) and Tomasz Piotr Poręba (ECR)
(17 June 2013)

Subject: Implementation of anti-flood investment projects in Poland

Given the emerging reports concerning the Polish Government's failure to meet its obligations under the Water Framework Directive in terms of an integrated approach to water management, we should like to put the following questions to the Commission:

1. How exactly could Poland's share of funds be clawed back? How likely is it that more than PLN 2 billion invested for anti-flood purposes will be lost?

2. Is there a risk that funding will be lost from the new Multiannual Financial Framework for 2014-2020?

3. By what date must Poland introduce a single water management plan for Poland's river basins in order to be able to benefit from Infrastructure and Environment Operational Programme funds?

4. Does the Commission foresee the possibility of implementing such a plan within a suitable time frame? Has the Polish Government made adequate efforts in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

1. Discussions between the Commission and the Polish authorities on the correct implementation of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) have been ongoing since 2011. The Commission made several recommendations aiming at ensuring that flood prevention infrastructure receiving EU support does not violate the WFD. At no point was the option to withdraw still unused EU funds in this sector discussed. All efforts are currently concentrated on making sure that all allocated money is spent in compliance with EU legislation.

2. The legal framework for the European Structural and Investment Funds for 2014-2020 is still being discussed with the Council and the Parliament, and thus no definitive answer can be provided at this time. Nevertheless, the Commission proposal includes an '*ex-ante* conditionality' for water-related investments whereby Member States should make sure that the requirements of the WFD ([1]) are respected before being entitled to receive EU financial support for related activities. The Commission acknowledges the importance of flood prevention measures for Poland, and expects that EU relevant legislation will be respected.

3. There is no requirement for Poland to introduce a single water management plan for Poland's river basins under the Infrastructure & Environment 2007-2013 programme; the projects which benefit from EU Funds under this programme must comply with the requirements of the WFD.

4. According to the timetable presented by the Polish authorities, the master plans for the Odra and Wisla Rivers will be ready by August 2014.

([1]) Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007058/13
al Consejo
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(18 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Espionaje del Reino Unido en la Cumbre del G-20

Recientemente han aparecido en *The Guardian* unas revelaciones sobre la manera en que los servicios de inteligencia británicos espiaron a las autoridades diplomáticas que participaron en la cumbre mundial del G-20 celebrada el pasado 2009, a través de escuchas y todo tipo de violaciones de la privacidad, con la autorización expresa del Gobierno del Reino Unido.

Las revelaciones proceden de los documentos enviados por el ex colaborador de la NSA Edward Snowden a dicho periódico, filtraciones por las que se encuentra actualmente escondido en Hong Kong. Las escuchas realizadas a representantes políticos y diplomáticos de los participantes en el G-20 supusieron una herramienta fundamental de negociación que fue empleada por el Reino Unido para sacar el mayor provecho posible de dicha cumbre. Las escuchas fueron autorizadas por el anterior ministro Gordon Brown y suponen numerosas violaciones de derechos, así como un varapalo a la legitimidad de la diplomacia británica y a los resultados de la citada cumbre.

El espionaje realizado empleaba la tecnología estadounidense Prisma que, según los documentos de Snowden, viene siendo utilizada por los servicios de inteligencia del país desde hace años. Con dicha tecnología los agentes británicos practicaron escuchas a numerosos representantes y fueron capaces de superar la seguridad de sus mensajes electrónicos, pudiendo acceder al correo electrónico de los representantes diplomáticos en tiempo real para informar a los negociadores del Reino Unido durante la cumbre. Esta violación masiva de la intimidad y de los intereses nacionales en una cumbre de tan elevado nivel supone un delito sin precedentes, al menos conocidos, y exige por tanto que se tomen medidas concretas con respecto al Reino Unido.

1. ¿Piensa el Consejo exigir responsabilidades penales al Reino Unido ante este escandaloso caso de espionaje?

2. ¿Ha adoptado alguna medida el Consejo para que el Reino Unido no viole sistemáticamente las libertades fundamentales y los intereses nacionales de otros países?

3. ¿Cómo piensa colaborar el Consejo en la protección de Edward Snowden para garantizar su seguridad y el acceso a la información que ha puesto a disposición de la opinión pública?

4. ¿Piensa el Consejo pedir explicaciones al Reino Unido por los citados hechos?

Respuesta
(16 de septiembre de 2013)

No incumbe al Consejo comentar artículos publicados en la prensa.

El Consejo no ha debatido ninguna de las cuestiones específicas que plantea Su Señoría.

En este sentido, el Consejo quisiera señalar que, con arreglo al artículo 4, apartado 2, del TUE, la seguridad nacional sigue siendo responsabilidad exclusiva de cada Estado miembro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007058/13
to the Council
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Revelations of UK spying at G20 summit

The Guardian newspaper recently revealed how the British intelligence services had spied on visiting diplomats at the G20 summit in 2009. They reportedly tapped private communications and breached any number of privacy rules, with the express authorisation of the UK Government.

These revelations come from documents leaked to the Guardian by Edward Snowden, a former NSA employee, who is now in hiding in Hong Kong. Intercepting the communications of the visiting G20 politicians and diplomats was instrumental in enabling the UK to secure a negotiating advantage at the summit. The surveillance was authorised by the former British Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, and constitutes multiple rights violations, dealing a blow to the legitimacy of British diplomacy and the results of the summit itself.

The operation involved the use of Prism, a US surveillance program, which, according to Snowden's documents, the UK's intelligence services have been using for years. British agents used this technology to bug numerous representatives and were able to bypass their email security systems to gain real-time access to diplomats' private messages before sending their findings to UK negotiators at the summit. As far as we know, this gross violation of national interests and privacy at such a high-level summit is an unprecedented crime which calls for concrete action to be taken against the UK.

l. Does the Council intend to hold the UK criminally responsible for this shocking act of espionage?

2. Has the Council taken any action to ensure the UK does not repeatedly violate the fundamental liberties and national interests of other countries?

3. How does the Council intend to help ensure Edward Snowden's safety and guarantee access to the information he made available to the public?

4. Does the Council intend to ask the UK to explain its actions?

Reply
(16 September 2013)

It is not for the Council to comment on articles appearing in the press.

The Council has not discussed any of the specific issues raised by the Honourable Member.

In this connection, the Council would point out that, in accordance with Article 4(2) TEU, national security remains the sole responsibility of each Member State.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007059/13
a la Comisión (Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(18 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: VP/HR — Protección de Edward Snowden

Durante el presente mes hemos asistido a un nuevo escándalo relacionado con los excesos que los servicios secretos norteamericanos cometen a lo largo y ancho del mundo sin que ningún país exija responsabilidad por la violación que estos actos de espionaje suponen.

El ciudadano norteamericano Edward Snowden, de 29 años de edad, viajó desde los Estados Unidos hasta Hong Kong el mismo día en que reveló información a los periódicos The Washington Post y The Guardian sobre el programa de escuchas internacionales de la Agencia de Seguridad Nacional (NSA). Este ciudadano, que trabajaba para una subcontrata que colaboraba en el proyecto, se ha escondido en Hong Kong puesto que el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos ha iniciado su persecución. En este sentido, el pasado 13 de junio, el FBI afirmó que este ciudadano está siendo objeto de una investigación criminal, aunque no se han especificado los cargos.

Si bien actualmente se está alentando el acuerdo transatlántico entre Europa y los Estados Unidos, este último país viola sistemáticamente las libertades fundamentales y además persigue a aquellos ciudadanos que tratan de revelar la verdad del funcionamiento del entramado institucional de la inteligencia del país. En este contexto parece que Snowden puede convertirse en el nuevo soldado Maning, una nueva víctima de la represión norteamericana por dar a conocer la verdadera actividad que lleva a cabo la inteligencia de los EE.UU.

1. ¿Qué medidas está llevando la Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante para presionar a los EE.UU. para que garanticen la seguridad y terminen con la persecución de Edward Snowden?

2. ¿La Comisaria de Justicia y Derechos Fundamentales, Viviane Reding ha exigido que los EE.UU. den explicaciones por la violación masiva de derechos de ciudadanos europeos. ¿Considera la Comisión que se deben detener las negociaciones del Acuerdo de Asociación Transatlántico hasta que se esclarezcan las responsabilidades penales de las violaciones cometidas por la NSA y hasta que se garantice la seguridad y libertad de Edward Snowden?

3. ¿Considera la Comisión que se debe detener este acuerdo de asociación hasta que se tengan garantías de que los EE.UU. respetan los derechos fundamentales y el Derecho internacional?

Respuesta de la Alta Representante y Vicepresidenta Ashton en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de septiembre de 2013)

La Comisión no hace comentarios sobre la persecución del Sr. Snowden. Sin embargo, ha expresado su preocupación y ha pedido aclaraciones a los Estados Unidos acerca de sus actividades de vigilancia reveladas por los medios de comunicación en la medida en que se refieran a personas e instalaciones de la UE. La Comisión toma nota del compromiso del Presidente Obama de facilitar esas aclaraciones y de la propuesta del fiscal general de crear un grupo de expertos de alto nivel UE-EE.UU. para estudiar estas cuestiones. La primera reunión de este grupo de trabajo se celebró en Bruselas los días 22 y 23 de julio de 2013 y otra reunión tendrá lugar en las próximas semanas.

La Comisión considera que las negociaciones comerciales con los Estados Unidos no deberían aplazarse, sino celebrarse paralelamente a las conversaciones sobre las actividades de vigilancia de ese país. La Comisión seguirá este asunto con la mayor atención.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007059/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Protecting Edward Snowden

This month, we have witnessed a fresh scandal concerning the lines the US secret services are able to cross all over the world, without any country holding them to account for the rights violations these acts of espionage represent.

The US whistleblower Edward Snowden, 29, fled from the US to Hong Kong on the same day that he revealed information to the Washington Post and the Guardian newspapers about the NSA's international wiretapping programme. Snowden, who worked for a subcontractor that was involved in the project, has taken refuge in Hong Kong after a hunt was launched by the US Government. On 13 June 2013, the FBI stated that Snowden is the subject of a criminal investigation, but the charges have not been made public.

Although an EU-US transatlantic agreement is currently on the table, the US consistently violates fundamental liberties and pursues those people who try to make public how the country's intelligence services really operate. In this sense, it seems Snowden might follow Manning, the US soldier behind the Wikileaks revelations, as the latest victim of US repression for shedding light on the real activity of the US intelligence services.

1. What action is the Vice-President/High Representative taking to pressure the US into guaranteeing Edward Snowden's safety and putting an end to his persecution?

2. The European Commissioner for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship, Viviane Reding, has demanded that the US explain this gross violation of EU citizens' rights. Does the Commission consider that the EU-US Transatlantic Partnership Agreement negotiations ought to be put on hold until the people behind the violations committed by the NSA have been held criminally responsible and Edward Snowden's safety and freedom have been guaranteed?

3. Does the Commission consider this partnership agreement ought to be put on hold until assurance is given that the US will respect fundamental rights and international law?

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

The Commission does not comment on the prosecution of Mr Snowden. However the Commission has expressed its concerns and has sought clarifications from the United States on its reported surveillance activities to the extent that they concern EU individuals and premises. The Commission notes President Obama's commitment to provide such clarifications and the Attorney General Holder's proposal to establish an EU/US high level expert group to examine these matters. The first meeting of this Working Group was held in Brussels on 22-23 July 2013 and it will meet again in the coming weeks.

The Commission considers that the trade negotiations with the United States should not be postponed, but that conversations on US surveillance activities should run in parallel to the negotiations. The Commission will follow this matter with the utmost attention.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007060/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(18 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Rehabilitación energética y el BEI

La Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo objeto del procedimiento 2011/0172 (COD) contempla diferentes medidas para poder alcanzar los compromisos de eficiencia energética que la Unión Energética se ha propuesto cumplir antes del 2020.

Esta Directiva prevé movilizar un paquete de préstamos del Banco Europeo de Inversiones de hasta 120 000 millones de euros. Existen propuestas en comunidades autónomas de España de planes económicos de fomento del sector de la construcción con el objetivo de impulsar una rehabilitación de viviendas que mejore su eficiencia energética.

Estas propuestas se ajustan al cumplimiento de la citada Directiva para mejorar la eficiencia energética, pero el desarrollo de estos planes depende de la disposición de dichos fondos del BEI. En comunidades autónomas como Andalucía existe una voluntad política de implementar planes para aplicar esta Directiva, pero resulta necesaria la colaboración del Gobierno central.

1. ¿Dispone la Comisión de información sobre si el Gobierno de España ha solicitado acceso a los fondos que el BEI pone a disposición para proyectos relativos a la implementación de la mencionada Directiva?

2. ¿Es posible que un Gobierno regional del nivel de una comunidad autónoma en España pueda solicitar acceso a dicha financiación del BEI sin necesidad de que sea el Gobierno central el que solicite los citados fondos?

Respuesta del Sr. Rehn en nombre de la Comisión
(3 de septiembre de 2013)

El BEI viene apoyando activamente numerosas inversiones en el ámbito de la eficiencia energética en toda España. Las solicitudes proceden del Gobierno central, las Comunidades Autónomas y los municipios, así como de entidades públicas y privadas. La cartera de préstamos en estudio muestra un esfuerzo creciente en dicho ámbito.

Por otro lado, el BEI ha promovido de forma complementaria las siguientes iniciativas especiales en materia de eficiencia energética en España:

ELENA — Asistencia Energética Local Europea — un mecanismo de asistencia técnica de la Comisión Europea para acelerar la preparación y aplicación de los proyectos de eficiencia energética y energías renovables desarrollados por los municipios, regiones y otras entidades locales. En España, este mecanismo ha sido utilizado ya en Madrid y Barcelona y en la Región de Murcia para proyectos relacionados con la mejora de la eficiencia energética del transporte, el alumbrado y los edificios.

Jessica — Ayuda Europea Conjunta en Apoyo de Inversiones Sostenibles en Zonas Urbanas — una forma de utilizar las dotaciones de los Fondos Estructurales para apoyar el desarrollo urbano, por ejemplo, mediante proyectos de eficiencia energética. En España existen en la actualidad dos Fondos de Cartera Jessica destinados a las inversiones en este ámbito: el FC de Andalucía (80,5 millones de euros), y el FC FIDAE (123,2 millones de euros).

Los Gobiernos regionales pueden solicitar directamente los préstamos del BEI. Los proyectos deben atenerse a los objetivos del BEI para los préstamos y a los criterios de admisibilidad en materia de eficiencia energética.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007060/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: The EIB and improving energy efficiency

The directive of the European Parliament and of the Council under procedure No 2011/0172 (COD) provides for various measures by which to fulfil the energy efficiency commitments that the Energy Union has pledged to meet by 2020.

This directive provides for a package of loans from the European Investment Bank (EIB) of up to EUR 120 000 million. Some of Spain's autonomous communities (regional governments) have put forward proposals concerning economic development plans for the construction sector, with the aim of promoting the improvement of energy efficiency in housing.

These proposals comply with the energy efficiency directive, but the development of the plans depends on the availability of the funds in question from the EIB. In regions such as Andalusia, the political will to implement plans to comply with this directive exists, but the cooperation of central government is needed.

1. Does the Commission have any information as to whether the Spanish Government has requested access to the EIB funds made available for projects relating to the implementation of this directive?

2. May a regional government, such as an autonomous community in Spain, request access to this EIB funding directly, without passing through the central government?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(3 September 2013)

The EIB has been actively supporting multiple energy efficiency (EE) investments across Spain. Requests have originated in the Spanish Government, regional governments, municipalities, and in public and private institutions. The pipeline of loans under study shows an increasing effort in this field.

Furthermore, the EIB has additionally promoted the following special energy efficiency initiatives in Spain:

ELENA — European Local Energy Assistance — a European Commission technical assistance facility for accelerating the preparation and implementation of energy efficiency and renewable energy projects developed by municipalities, regions and other local authorities. In Spain this facility has already been used in the cities of Madrid and Barcelona, and in the region of Murcia for projects related to improving EE in public transport, lighting and buildings.

JESSICA — Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas — is a way of using existing Structural Fund allocations to support urban development including energy efficiency projects. In Spain there are currently two JESSICA holding funds (HF) dedicated to investments in EE: the HF Andalucía (EUR 80.5m), and HF FIDAE (EUR 123.2m).

Regional governments can request the EIB for loans directly. The projects must be in line with general EIB lending objectives and eligibility criteria for energy efficiency.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007061/13
an die Kommission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(18. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Menschenhandel innerhalb der thailändischen Fischereiindustrie

In dem am 29. Mai veröffentlichten Bericht einer Umwelt- und Menschenrechtsorganisation werden Menschenrechtsverletzungen und Menschenhandel in der thailändischen Fischereiindustrie beklagt. Der Bericht umfasst Zeugenaussagen von burmesischen Arbeitern — einige nicht älter als 16 –, die unter Zwang mehrere Monate auf Schiffen festgehalten wurden. Sie alle unterlagen mühseligen und oft auch gewalttätigen Arbeitsbedingungen, ohne eine Entlohnung zu erhalten. Die Zeugenaussagen umfassen sowohl Berichte über Prügel, Folter und Mord auf See und an der Küste als auch Informationen über Mittäterschaft von thailändischen Beamten.

Über Umwege erreichen Fänge dieser Schiffe auch die EU. Dabei werden Fischfänge, die aus derartigen Schiffen stammen, zu Fischmehl verarbeitet und als Futter für thailändische Garnelen genutzt, die wiederum in den europäischen Markt exportiert werden.

Was gedenkt die Kommission vor dem Hintergrund dieser Entwicklungen in der thailändischen Fischerei zu tun, um die Umsetzung der im Bericht „Towards Global EU Action Against Trafficking in Human Beings“ empfohlenen Maßnahmen zu gewährleisten?

Was hält die Kommission von der Einrichtung einer internationalen Datenbank (Global Record) für Fischereifahrzeuge, um gegebenenfalls den Markteintritt von Produkten aus Fängen solcher Schiffe zu verhindern?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(5. September 2013)

Die EU teilt die Besorgnis der Frau Abgeordneten. Das Thema wurde gegenüber der thailändischen Regierung angesprochen, darunter auch vom Präsidenten der Kommission anlässlich des Besuchs der thailändischen Ministerpräsidentin Yingluck Shinawatra im März 2013.

Neben den Maßnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten und anderer Geber finanziert die EU bilaterale und regionale Projekte zur Bekämpfung des Menschenhandels in Thailand und Myanmar, vor allem durch Hilfe für die Opfer des Menschenhandels, einschließlich Schutzmechanismen für Kinder und Unterstützung für die Rückkehr in ihr Heimatland.

Nachdem die thailändische Regierung ihren Wunsch zum Ausdruck gebracht hat, mit der EU zusammenzuarbeiten, wird im Oktober 2013 ein Workshop mit der Generalstaatsanwaltsanwaltschaft und EU-Experten stattfinden, um Informationen über verbesserte Methoden der Rechtsdurchsetzung auszutauschen. Darüber hinaus hat Thailand kürzlich Mittel aus dem Programm „MIEUX“ beantragt, das darauf abzielt, die Kapazitäten der Partnerländer auszubauen, damit sie durch ein umfassendes Konzept für die Migrationssteuerung alle Aspekte der Migration besser bewältigen können.

Die EU wird weiter beobachten, ob Thailand die Arbeitsnormen der Übereinkommen der Internationalen Arbeitsorganisation (IAO) einhält, und sich in den laufenden Verhandlungen mit Thailand über ein Freihandelsabkommen darum bemühen, dass eine Klausel über die Einhaltung der Kernarbeitsnormen, einschließlich der Beseitigung von Kinderarbeit und Zwangsarbeit, aufgenommen wird.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007061/13
to the Commission
Jutta Steinruck (S&D)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Human trafficking in the Thai fishing industry

A report drawn up by an environmental and human rights organisation and published on 29 May 2013 points the finger at human rights violations and human trafficking in the Thai fishing industry. The report reproduces testimony given by Burmese workers — some as young as 16 — who were held against their will on fishing vessels for months on end. They had to cope with difficult working conditions and often violent treatment, and without being paid. The testimony includes accounts of beatings, torture and murder which took place at sea and while the vessels were moored near the coast and information pointing to the complicity of Thai officials.

Fish caught by these vessels also reach the EU by circuitous routes. The fish in question are processed to make meal which is then used as feed for Thai prawns, and those prawns are in turn exported to Europe.

In the light of this information concerning the Thai fishing industry, what steps does the Commission plan to take in order to ensure that the measures recommended in the report entitled 'Towards Global EU Action Against Trafficking in Human Beings' are in fact implemented?

What does the Commission think of the idea of setting up an international database (Global Record) in an effort to prevent products made from fish caught by these vessels from entering the EU market?

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

The EU shares the concerns raised by the Honourable Member. This issue has been raised with the Thai Government and more recently, by the President of the Commission during Thai Prime Minister Yingluck's visit in March 2013.

In addition to the activities of Member States and other donors, the EU has funded bilateral and regional projects addressing trafficking in human beings in Thailand, Myanmar, in particular providing assistance to the victims of trafficking, including child protection mechanisms, and supporting their return to the country of origin.

Following the Thai government's expressed desire to cooperate with the EU, a workshop with the Attorney's General Office and relevant EU experts will be organised in October 2013 with a view to sharing information on improved enforcement practices. Furthermore, Thailand has recently requested funds from the 'MIEUX' programme which aims at enhancing the capacities of partner countries to better address all areas of migration through a comprehensive approach to migration management.

The EU will continue to monitor the implementation by Thailand of labour standards under the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Conventions and will seek in the ongoing Free Trade Agreement (FTA) negotiations with Thailand to include a reference to the implementation of core labour standards, including the elimination of child labour and forced labour.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007062/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Σκάνδαλο Prism

Οι κολοσσοί του διαδικτύου Google και Facebook επιμένουν πως δεν γνώριζαν την ύπαρξη του προγράμματος Prism, το οποίο δίνει πρόσβαση στις αρχές των ΗΠΑ σε στοιχεία χρηστών δημοφιλών διαδικτυακών εταιρειών. Ωστόσο, στο έγγραφο στο οποίο απέκτησε πρόσβαση η εφημερίδα Guardian δηλώνεται ότι η αμερικανική κυβέρνηση έχει πρόσβαση σε τέτοια δεδομένα με τη σύμφωνη γνώμη των κολοσσών του διαδικτύου και συγκεκριμένα των AOL, Apple, Facebook, Google, Microsoft, PalTalk και Yahoo, παρέχοντας μάλιστα και ημερομηνίες για το πότε «εντάχθηκαν» στο πρόγραμμα. Επιπλέον, σύμφωνα με δηλώσεις της αμερικανικής κυβέρνησης, υπήρξε πρόσβαση «μόνο» σε προσωπικά δεδομένα χρηστών εκτός ΗΠΑ και όχι σε Αμερικανούς πολίτες.

Με δεδομένο πως η προστασία προσωπικών δεδομένων των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών πρέπει να αποτελεί ύψιστο καθήκον της ΕΕ, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Γνώριζε την ύπαρξη του προγράμματος Prism και τους πραγματικούς στόχους του;

2. Πιστεύει ότι δημιουργούνται οποιοιδήποτε κίνδυνοι για την ιδιωτική ζωή ή/και τα προσωπικά δεδομένα των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών και ποιοί;

3. Τι προτίθεται να πράξει για να διερευνήσει σε βάθος την υπόθεση, προστατεύοντας τους Ευρωπαίους πολίτες στις 27 χώρες μέλη της από μυστικές συγκεντρώσεις μέσω διαδικτύου, πληροφοριών και προσωπικών δεδομένων που τους αφορούν;

4. Υπάρχουν ευρωπαϊκές κυβερνήσεις ή υπηρεσίες της ΕΕ που εμπλέκονται, συνεργάζονται ή συνδέονται με οποιοδήποτε τρόπο με το πρόγραμμα αυτό;

5. Υπάρχει αντίστοιχο σύστημα πληροφορικής το οποίο χρησιμοποιεί η ΕΕ για την προστασία της εποπτείας πληροφοριών και των πολιτών από το ενδεχόμενο τρομοκρατίας;

6. Προτίθεται να θέσει το θέμα στην κυβέρνηση των ΗΠΑ στα πλαίσια των διμερών σχέσεων Ευρώπης-ΗΠΑ και με ποιό τρόπο;

Απάντηση της κ. Reding εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στις απαντήσεις που έδωσε στις γραπτές ερωτήσεις E-007934/13 και E-006783/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007062/13
to the Commission
Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: The Prism scandal

Internet giants Google and Facebook insist they were unaware of the existence of the Prism programme, which gives the US authorities access to the data of users of popular online companies. However, the document to which the Guardian newspaper has obtained access states that the US government enjoyed access to such data with the consent of Internet giants, namely AOL, Apple, Facebook, Google, Microsoft, PalTalk and Yahoo. It even provides dates when they 'joined' the programme. However, according to statements by the US government, access was granted 'only' to the personal data of users outside the US, and not US citizens.

Given that the personal data protection of European citizens should be a top responsibility for the EU, will the Commission say:

1. Did it know of the existence of the Prism programme and its real objectives?

2. Does it believe that this has created any risks for the privacy and/or personal data of European citizens? If so, what risks?

3. What will it do to thoroughly investigate this case, protecting European citizens in the 27 Member States from secret attempts over the Internet to gather information and personal data relating to them?

4. Are there any European governments or services that are involved, cooperate or are connected in any way with this programme?

5. Is there a corresponding IT system used by the EU as an intelligence oversight instrument to forestall acts of terrorism?

6. Does it intend to raise the issue with the US government in bilateral EU-US relations and, if so, how?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-007934/13 and E-006783/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007063/13
to the Commission
Mike Nattrass (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Corvera Airport not opening — EU funds expended

Will the Commission give a total figure for all EU funds granted and a separate figure for funds intended to be granted to Corvera Airport, also known as 'Murcia International Airport'.

Does the Commission intend to claw back any funds in view of the failure of the implementation of the project?

Please also see the inaccurate and out-dated website: http://www.corveraairporttravel.com/

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The Commission has not granted any funds to Murcia International Airport.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007064/13
to the Commission
Mike Nattrass (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: www.mepranking.eu site and abuse of the MEP questions system

Are you aware that a site exists at www.mepranking.eu which counts the number of questions asked by MEPs to the Commission and that this is regarded as a factor in judging the effectiveness of MEPs?

Does the Commission believe that this is an incentive to ask questions which leads to an abuse of the system?

Does it consider that excessive numbers of questions asked to the Commission by MEPs leads to high administration costs and that these questions should be limited with this cost factor in mind?

What is the cost of asking a question to the Commission?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

1. The Commission is aware of the website mentioned by the Honourable Member.

2. The Commission considers that this should not be an incentive to ask more questions.

3. It is not for the Commission to judge whether the number of parliamentary questions is 'excessive', but the constant increase in the number of questions posed does lead to significant administrative costs.

4. The Commission has not calculated the costs involved in answering a written question posed by a Member of Parliament.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007065/13
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(18 juin 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Utilisation d'armes chimiques contre les rebelles syriens par le régime d'Al-Assad

Les récents développements en Syrie ont permis de reconnaître que le régime largement contesté d'Al-Assad en Syrie a pu faire l'usage, contre les rebelles, de différentes armes chimiques mortelles, parmi lesquelles le gaz Sarin. Les sources concordent désormais et attestent d'une utilisation de ces gaz à plusieurs reprises.

L'usage de tels gaz est strictement prohibé par le droit international. Dès 1925, le protocole de Genève condamnait largement l'usage de telles armes, aux effets dévastateurs et inhumains. La convention de 1993 sur l'interdiction de l'usage des armes chimiques et sur leur destruction confirme ce principe de droit international. La Syrie est donc clairement en violation du droit international.

1. Face à ce non-respect des règles du droit international, que compte faire la Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité?

2. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante entend-t-elle augmenter la pression sur le régime syrien, représenté par Al-Assad?

Réponse donnée par M[me] Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(26 août 2013)

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a été informée par certains États membres de l'UE et par les États-Unis de l'utilisation d'agents chimiques contre des civils en Syrie. Le 14 juin 2013, elle a publié à ce sujet une déclaration indiquant notamment que «cette évaluation de la situation, conjuguée aux autres informations qui ont été rapportées, souligne l'urgence de donner suite à nos appels réitérés en faveur d'un accord portant sur le déploiement immédiat d'une mission de vérification des Nations unies chargée d'enquêter sur le terrain au sujet de ces allégations» ([1]).

À ce stade, en l'absence de déploiement réussi d'une mission d'enquête des Nations unies, il est difficile de confirmer l'usage d'armes chimiques. L'UE continuera à insister auprès de la Syrie pour qu'elle adhère à la convention sur les armes chimiques et ratifie d'urgence la convention sur les armes biologiques. L'UE rappelle que tout usage d'armes chimiques par quiconque et en quelque circonstance que ce soit est répréhensible et tout à fait contraire aux normes et règles de droit de la communauté internationale. Il incombe tout particulièrement aux autorités syriennes de veiller à ce que leurs armes chimiques soient stockées en sécurité en attendant leur destruction sous contrôle indépendant, et à ce qu'elles ne tombent pas entre les mains de tout autre État ou acteur non étatique.

L'UE rappelle qu'il est urgent de trouver une solution politique au conflit et salue l'appel conjoint lancé par les États-Unis et la Russie en faveur d'une conférence de paix sur la Syrie pour favoriser l'émergence d'un processus politique fondé sur les principes énoncés dans le communiqué de Genève du 30 juin 2012.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137474.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007065/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Use of chemical weapons against Syrian rebels by the al-Assad regime

Recent events in Syria have shown that Bashar al-Assad's beleaguered regime has used deadly chemical weapons, including Sarin gas, against rebel groups. Evidence from a range of sources now confirms that such gases have been used several times.

The use of such gases is strictly prohibited by international law, and the Geneva Protocol of 1925 declared the use of these destructive and inhumane weapons unacceptable. The 1993 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction reiterates this principle of international law. Syria is, therefore, in clear violation of international law.

1. How does the VP/HR intend to respond to Syria's violation of international law?

2. Does the VP/HR intend to increase the pressure on the al-Assad regime in Syria?

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

The HR/VP is aware of reports from some EU Member States and the US on the use of chemical agents against civilians in Syria. The HR/VP released a statement on that matter on 14 June 2013, which stated that 'this assessment, combined with others that have been circulated, makes even more urgent our repeated calls for an agreement to immediately deploy a UN verification mission to investigate these allegations on the ground' ([1]).

At this time, without a sucessful deployment of a UN investigation mission, it is difficult to confirm the use of chemical weapons. The EU will continue to urge Syria to accede to the Chemical Weapons Convention and to ratify the Biological Weapons Convention as a matter of urgency. The EU recalls that any use of chemical weapons by anyone under any circumstances would be reprehensible and completely contrary to the legal norms and standards of the international community. The Syrian authorities bear a particular responsibility to ensure that their chemical weapons are stored securely pending independently verified destruction and are not permitted to fall into the hands of any other State or non-state actor.

The EU reiterates the urgent need for a political solution of the conflict and welcomes the joint US-Russian call for a peace conference on Syria to promote a political process based on the principles included in the Geneva communique of 30 June 2012.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137474.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007066/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(18 juin 2013)

Objet: Croissance du salafisme en Europe

Le salafisme est un mouvement fondamentaliste qui prône un retour à l'islam originel à travers une lecture stricte et littérale du Coran et de la sunna. S'il est bien sûr certain que tous les salafistes ne sont pas amenés à entreprendre des actions violentes, le mouvement entretient des rapports difficiles avec les divers gouvernements européens: le ministère allemand de l'Intérieur a annoncé le 13 juin 2013 la dissolution de trois groupes salafistes, «DawaFFM», «Audios islamiques» et «An-Nussrah».

Le salafisme constitue un groupe à la croissance particulièrement rapide et relativement inquiétante, en ce qu'il remet en cause l'idée démocratique en elle-même. En un an, le nombre de salafistes en Allemagne est passé de 3 800 à 4 500. En France, selon le ministère de l'Intérieur, les salafistes seraient au nombre de 13 000, contre quelques dizaines dans les années 1990. Certains États membres ont pu participer, vendredi 7 juin, à une réunion à Luxembourg sur la menace constituée par les jeunes Européens partis combattre en Syrie dans les rangs de groupes radicaux. Lors de cette réunion, le statut des groupes salafistes en Europe n'a malheureusement pas été abordé, alors qu'il nécessite une plus grande coopération entre les États membres.

En se gardant de tomber dans tout amalgame, force est de constater que le salafisme est souvent un passage obligé vers une revendication islamiste plus violente. Un exemple concret est que, récemment, tous les jeunes partis d'Allemagne pour faire le Djihad en Syrie ou en Égypte entretenaient, de près ou de loin, des liens avec le mouvement salafiste.

1. Face à ce nouvel enjeu sécuritaire en Europe, quelle est la position de la Commission?

2. La Commission entend-elle œuvrer pour une plus grande coordination entre États membres afin de prévenir tous les risques possibles?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Malmström au nom de la Commission
(13 septembre 2013)

La Commission accorde la plus grande attention aux analyses et aux rapports disponibles au niveau de l'UE, notamment le rapport EU Terrorism Situation and Trend (situation et tendances en matière de terrorisme dans l'UE) élaboré par Europol ([1]) Les citoyens de l'Union européenne qui se rendent en Syrie ou dans d'autres régions touchées par des conflits sont une source d'inquiétude grave pour la sécurité interne européenne. Ce rapport fait état du nombre croissant de citoyens radicalisés de l'UE qui se sont rendus dans des régions touchées par des conflits pour y mener des activités terroristes, et de la menace qu'ils représentent au cas où ils reviendraient sur le territoire de l'Union européenne avec l'intention d'y perpétrer des actes terroristes. Le traitement des données PNR, envisagé par la Commission dans la proposition PNR au niveau de l'UE, constitue un instrument efficace permettant de détecter et de prévenir les activités liées au terrorisme en analysant les itinéraires aériens.

La Commission considère toujours que toutes les formes de radicalisation et d'extrémisme violent constituent l'une des priorités de la sécurité interne. Le Conseil (JAI) s'est penché sur cette question le 7 juin 2013, en se fondant sur un rapport élaboré par le coordinateur de la lutte contre le terrorisme de l'UE, qui présente les mesures que l'UE et les États membres pourraient prendre en termes d'intensification de la coopération et d'échange d'informations, de collaboration avec les communautés locales et de communication. Il a également été question d'une amélioration de l'utilisation des voies diplomatiques et des possibilités offertes par la législation actuelle de l'UE ([2]). La Commission a accepté de soumettre, d'ici à la fin de l'année, une analyse des risques pour déterminer les menaces que font peser sur la sécurité de l'UE les combattants étrangers qui reviennent sur le territoire de l'Union et les mesures qui pourraient être prises pour atténuer ces risques.

([1]) Derniers rapports disponibles en 2013: https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/te-sat-2013-eu-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report et en particulier le chapitre 2 consacré au terrorisme inspiré par la religion.

([2]) Par exemple, une utilisation accrue et harmonisée des systèmes d'information SIS et SIS II.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007066/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Growth of Salafism in Europe

Salafism is a fundamentalist movement which advocates returning to an original form of Islam through a strict and literal interpretation of the Quran and the Sunnah. Although not all Salafists are prepared to engage in violent acts, the movement has a troubled relationship with European governments: on 13 June 2013, the German Ministry of the Interior announced the banning of three Salafist groups — 'DawaFFM', 'Islamische Audios' and 'an-Nussrah'.

The Salafist movement is growing very rapidly, and this is worrying as it could pose a threat to the very idea of democracy. In one year, the number of Salafists has grown from 3 800 to 4 500 in Germany. According to the French Ministry of the Interior, the number of Salafists in France has risen from several dozen in the 1990s to some 13 000 now. On 7 June 2013, representatives of several Member States attended a meeting in Luxembourg at which the threat posed by young Europeans leaving to fight alongside radical groups in Syria was discussed. Regrettably, the status of Salafist groups in Europe was not addressed, even though closer cooperation among the Member States on this issue is now badly needed.

Without generalising, it must be acknowledged that Salafism is often a stage on the path towards a more violent form of Islamism. By way of illustration, all the young people who recently travelled from Germany to join the jihads in Syria or Egypt had ties of one kind or another with the Salafist movement.

1. What is the Commission's position on this new security challenge facing Europe?

2. Does the Commission intend to take steps to facilitate closer coordination between Member States with a view to tackling all possible threats?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(13 September 2013)

The Commission closely follows the analysis and reports available at EU level, *inter alia*, the EU Terrorism Situation and Trend report produced by Europol ([1]). EU citizens travelling to Syria and other conflict zones are a serious concern for European internal security. This report indicates that increasing numbers of radicalised EU citizens travelled to regions of conflict to engage in terrorist activities, and refers to the threat posed by these people should they return to the European Union with the intent to commit acts of terrorism. The processing of PNR data, as envisaged in the Commission EU PNR proposal, provides an effective instrument to detect and prevent terrorist-related activities by analysing air travel routes.

The Commission continues to addresses all forms of radicalisation and violent extremism as one of the priorities for internal security. The issue was discussed at the Council (JHA) on 7 June 2013, based on a paper prepared by the EU Counter Terrorism Coordinator, outlining possible actions by the EU and Member States in terms of closer cooperation and information exchange, work with local communities and communication. Better use of diplomatic channels and possibilities offered by existing EU legislation ([2]) was also discussed. The Commission has agreed to present, by the end of the year, an analysis identifying major security risks for the EU from returning foreign fighters and to propose possible mitigation measures.

([1]) Cf. for the latest such reports from 2013: https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/te-sat-2013-eu-terrorism-situation-and-trend-report and in particular Chapter 2 on religiously inspired terrorism.

([2]) E.g. increased and harmonised use of SIS II and the SIS alert system.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007067/13
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(18 juin 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Violences confessionnelles en Égypte

Depuis la chute du régime de M. Moubarak, les violences confessionnelles à l'encontre des coptes ont refait une brusque apparition en Égypte. Les coptes chrétiens représentent entre 6 et 10 % des 83 millions d'Égyptiens, et des affrontements surviennent régulièrement entre coptes et musulmans. Depuis la chute du régime d'Hosni Moubarak en février 2011, ces heurts ont tué une cinquantaine de chrétiens et plusieurs musulmans.

Le 6 avril 2013, au moins quatre chrétiens et un musulman ont trouvé la mort dans des affrontements confessionnels armés dans le gouvernorat de Qalyoubia, au nord du Caire. Ces affrontements ont pu être encouragés par l'arrivée au pouvoir de M. Morsi, islamiste appartenant aux frères musulmans, même si ce dernier a pu appeler au calme à plusieurs reprises.

1. Face à cette situation préoccupante, qui se traduit par une insécurité grandissante pour la minorité copte d'Égypte, qu'envisage la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante?

2. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante entend-elle renforcer son soutien à la liberté de croyance et de religion en Égypte, afin d'atteindre les objectifs de protection et de défense de la liberté de culte?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(24 septembre 2013)

L'UE est consciente et inquiète des difficultés auxquelles les différentes minorités religieuses sont confrontées en Égypte et condamne toute forme d'intolérance, de discrimination et de violence à l'encontre des personnes en raison de leur religion ou de leurs convictions, indépendamment du lieu où elles sont commises et indépendamment de la religion. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante a appelé à plusieurs reprises les autorités égyptiennes à garantir la liberté de religion ou de conviction dans le pays.

La délégation de l'UE suit de près les cas de violences sectaires et souligne l'importance d'éviter toute discrimination pour des motifs religieux dans ses contacts avec les autorités égyptiennes. Afin d'encourager l'amélioration de la liberté de religion ou de conviction en Égypte, le SEAE souhaite collaborer avec tous les acteurs concernés dans le pays et avec les organisations internationales et régionales partageant les valeurs et objectifs de l'Union européenne à cet égard.

L'UE considère que la coopération et le dialogue politique sont les voies les plus appropriées pour encourager le gouvernement du Caire et faire pression sur lui pour qu'il entreprenne des actions concrètes afin de protéger les Coptes et les autres minorités religieuses. Par conséquent, et compte tenu des développements récents survenus dans le pays, l'UE suit l'évolution de la situation sur le terrain par un contact et un dialogue étroits avec les principales parties prenantes afin de prendre les mesures nécessaires et appropriées.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007067/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Sectarian violence in Egypt

Since the fall of the Mubarak regime, sectarian violence against Copts has made a sudden reappearance in Egypt. Coptic Christians account for between 6% and 10% of the 83 million Egyptians and there are regular clashes between Copts and Muslims. Since the fall of the regime of Hosni Mubarak in February 2011, these clashes have killed around 50 Christians and a number of Muslims.

On 6 April 2013, at least four Christians and one Muslim were killed in sectarian armed clashes in the Qalyubia governorate, north of Cairo. The clashes were encouraged by the rise to power of Mr Morsi, an Islamist belonging to the Muslim Brotherhood, even though he has managed to restore calm on several occasions.

1. In view of this alarming situation, which is resulting in a growing sense of insecurity for the Coptic minority in Egypt, what does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to do?

2. Will the Vice-President/High Representative strengthen her support for freedom of faith and religion in Egypt, in order to achieve the objectives of protection and defence of the freedom of worship?

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

The EU is aware and concerned about the constraints that different religious minorities face in Egypt and condemns all forms of intolerance, discrimination and violence against persons because of their religion or belief, wherever it takes place and regardless of the religion. The HR/VP repeatedly called on the Egyptian authorities to ensure freedom of religion or belief in the country.

The EU delegation is closely following cases of sectarian violence and emphasises the importance of avoiding discrimination on religious grounds in its contacts with Egyptian authorities. In order to support the improvement of freedom of religion or belief in Egypt, the EEAS is keen to engage with all the relevant stakeholders in the country as well as with the regional and international organisations sharing EU's values and objectives in this respect.

The EU considers that cooperation and political dialogue are the most appropriate channels to encourage and put pressure on Cairo's government so that it will undertake concrete actions in order to protect Copts and other religious minorities. Therefore, and in light of the recent developments in the country, the EU is monitoring the situation on the ground in close contact and dialogue with key stake holders in order to take the necessary and appropriate measures.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007068/13
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE) et Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(18 juin 2013)

Objet: Musique dans l'accord de libre-échange Union européenne — États-Unis

Les ministres du commerce européens se sont mis d'accord, vendredi 14 juin, pour exclure le secteur audiovisuel du mandat de négociations commerciales de l'Union européenne avec les États-Unis afin de protéger l'exception culturelle. Le compromis final prévoit que l'audiovisuel pourra être ajouté à un stade ultérieur dans le mandat confié à la Commission européenne, à condition d'obtenir l'unanimité des 27 États membres.

Toutefois, les déclarations de la Commission européenne qui ont suivi vident de tout son sens l'accord obtenu et caricaturent la défense de l'exception culturelle. Le Président de la Commission européenne a ainsi tenu à qualifier l'attitude de la France dans les négociations de «réactionnaire» et le Commissaire européen au Commerce a précisé à maintes reprises que la non-inclusion de la culture n'était que «provisoire» et que la discussion serait ouverte si la partie américaine en faisait la demande.

Ceci ne peut engendrer que de la confusion, de l'inquiétude et de la défiance chez les acteurs culturels en Europe. Comment la Commission compte-t-elle permettre à l'UE de rester libre de définir sa politique de quotas et de subventions pour le cinéma, la télévision, la musique et la radio en tenant une telle position?

Les débats sur l'exception culturelle ont avant tout concerné le cinéma européen, notamment les politiques nationales et européennes de soutien et de développement de ce secteur. Toutefois, les biens audiovisuels couvrent également la musique qui, par le biais des quotas radio, dispositif qui a fait ses preuves, est un secteur qui a su préserver des productions nationales fortes. Les quotas ont permis de sauver la chanson française et ont créé un effet économique positif pour l'industrie musicale. La France est aujourd'hui le seul pays de l'Union dont le répertoire local détient une part aussi importante dans la vente de musique enregistrée. En outre, malgré la crise du disque, la valeur annuelle créée par la filière musicale en France est estimée à environ 8 milliards d'euros.

La Commission peut-elle nous confirmer que l'accord de libre-échange UE/États-Unis ne constituera pas une menace pour les quotas radio, tels que pratiqués notamment en France, dans le secteur de la musique?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(21 août 2013)

La Commission tient à informer l'Honorable Parlementaire que la dimension européenne de la diversité culturelle n'est pas matière à discussion: la défense de ce principe est un objectif fondamental de l'Union européenne, mais aussi une obligation légale, inscrite dans le traité. Par ailleurs, l'Union s'est engagée à cet égard au titre de la Convention de l'Unesco sur la protection et la promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles. La question n'est pas de savoir si la diversité culturelle doit être défendue dans les négociations sur un nouveau partenariat avec les États-Unis (partenariat transatlantique de commerce et d'investissement, «PTCI»), le problème est de déterminer la meilleure façon de le faire. La Commission et les États membres ont débattu des moyens d'introduire, dans les directives de négociation, un juste équilibre entre, d'une part, la sensibilité du secteur audiovisuel et, d'autre part, l'objectif consistant à mener des négociations larges et ambitieuses. Les services audiovisuels sont exclus du chapitre sur le commerce des services et l'établissement. Bien que la Commission soit prête à écouter les idées de ses partenaires sur cette question, elle n'est naturellement pas en position de négocier des engagements de libéralisation dans ce secteur sensible.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007068/13
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE) and Tokia Saïfi (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Music in free trade agreement between the European Union and the United States

The European Ministers for Trade agreed on Friday, 14 June, to exclude the audiovisual sector from trade negotiations between the European Union and the United States, in order to protect the culture exclusion. The final compromise states that the audiovisual sector may be added at a later date to the mandate granted to the European Commission, provided that the 27 Member States are in unanimous agreement.

However, subsequent declarations by the European Commission render the agreement obtained meaningless and make a mockery of the defence of the culture exclusion. The President of the European Commission qualified the attitude of France in the negotiations as 'reactionary' and the European Commissioner for Trade stipulated several times that the culture exclusion was merely provisional and that talks would be opened if the US so requested.

This will simply cause confusion, concern and defiance on the part of cultural players in Europe. How does the Commission intend to allow the EU to remain free to define its policy of quotas and subsidies for cinema, television, music and radio in taking such a stand?

The debate on the culture exclusion has revolved primarily around European cinema, especially national and European support and development policies for that sector. However, audiovisual goods also include music which, through the tried and tested system of radio quotas, is a sector which has managed to maintain strong national production. Quotas have allowed French song to be preserved and have generated a positive economic effect for the music industry. France is the only country in the Union today whose local repertoire accounts for an important proportion of registered music sales. Moreover, despite the CD crisis, the annual value generated by the music industry in France is estimated at approximately EUR 8 billion.

Can the Commission confirm that the EU/US free trade agreement will not constitute a risk to radio quotas in the music industry, as applied in France in particular?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

The Commission can inform the Honourable Member that there is no discussion on the European dimension of cultural diversity: the defence of this principle is a fundamental objective of the European Union, but also a legal obligation, enshrined in the Treaty. In addition, the EU has made commitments in this regard as part of the Unesco Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. The question is not whether cultural diversity must be defended in the negotiations on a new partnership for trade and investment with the United States ('TTIP'), but what is the best way to do this. The Commission and the Member States have discussed about ways to include the right balance in the negotiating directives of the TTIP between, on the one hand, the sensitivity of the audiovisual sector and on the other, the aim of extensive and ambitious negotiations. Audiovisual services are excluded from the chapter on trade in services and establishment. Although the Commission is willing to listen to the ideas of its partners on this issue, it is of course not in a position to negotiate liberalisation commitments in this sensitive area.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007069/13
alla Commissione
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Geologia ed aree a rischio in Europa

Quest'anno cade il cinquantenario del disastro del Vajont. Il 9 ottobre 1963 nel neo-bacino idroelettrico artificiale del Vajont a causa della caduta di una colossale frana dal soprastante pendio montuoso nelle acque del sottostante e omonimo bacino lacustre alpino vi fu una tracimazione dell'acqua contenuta nell'invaso con effetti devastanti su tutta la valle, che causò quasi 2000 vittime. È stato dimostrato che il disastro del Vajont poteva essere evitato anche e soprattutto attraverso un giusto impiego degli studi geologici. Da allora si è quindi capito quanto importante dovesse essere la geologia applicata all'ingegneria civile. Molte cose sono state fatte in ambito europeo in questa direzione, ma non abbastanza. Neanche un anno fa, durante l'Assemblea generale del Servizio Geologico europeo è stato ribadito come la geologia possa dare molto all'Europa ma anche come la geologia stessa abbia bisogno di un impegno diretto da parte dell'Europa. Non vi può essere sviluppo del territorio senza la conoscenza del territorio. Le scienze della terra assumono quindi un ruolo centrale tanto nello sviluppo economico quanto in quello sociale.

Come portavoce degli interessi italiani voglio rimarcare come il Consiglio Nazionale Geologi sia una parte attiva della Federazione Europea Geologi (contando più di 15000 iscritti) e che le sue numerose attività coinvolgono le diverse componenti della geologia ossia quella professionale, quella universitaria e quella della ricerca.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— Reputa la Commissione che sia necessario lo stanziamento di fondi per la ricerca e lo studio di aree a rischio geologico sul territorio dell'Unione al fine di prevenire disastri evitabili?

— Reputa la Commissione che sia necessario promuovere uno standard europeo di sicurezza e di certificazione geologica per l'installazione e gestione dei siti industriali sul territorio dell'Unione?

— Reputa la Commissione che sia auspicabile un'implementazione delle funzioni della Federazione europea dei Geologi, anche semplificando l'iter di accesso al titolo di eurogeologo?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(2 agosto 2013)

Dalla fine degli anni ottanta l'UE sostiene la ricerca interdisciplinare a livello internazionale nel settore dei rischi naturali (di natura geologica o legati al clima e alle condizioni meteorologiche), contribuendo così a migliorare la base di conoscenze necessarie per affrontare con più efficacia i pericoli, i punti deboli e i rischi in questo settore e a sviluppare solidi approcci di gestione dei rischi che promuovano strategie di prevenzione e attenuazione.

La comunicazione COM(2009)82 ([1]) e il «documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione sugli orientamenti per la valutazione e l'individuazione dei rischi per la gestione dei disastri» ([2]) favoriscono e migliorano la coerenza rispetto alle valutazioni dei rischi negli Stati membri dell'UE.

Per proteggere l'ambiente sono essenziali norme di sicurezza in materia di realizzazione e gestione dei siti industriali. La Commissione ha riconosciuto questa necessità, che trova riscontro nel sostegno dato ai progetti nel settore della gestione delle crisi nell'ambito dell'attuale programma quadro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico (7°PQ). Tuttavia, finora non sono state svolte ricerche specifiche sulla fattibilità di norme europee di certificazione geologica riguardanti i siti industriali. Occorrerebbe effettuare ricerche supplementari prima di adottare qualsiasi ulteriore misura.

([1]) SEC(2009)202, SEC(2009)203 — Un approccio comunitario alla prevenzione delle catastrofi naturali e di origine umana.
([2]) SEC(2010)1626.

Il titolo professionale di «geologo europeo» è frutto di un'iniziativa volontaria avviata dalla Federazione europea dei geologi. La direttiva aggiornata riguardante le qualifiche professionali ([3]) prevede nuovi strumenti per semplificare la mobilità dei professionisti. Introduce un nuovo sistema di riconoscimento automatico sulla base di un bagaglio comune di conoscenze, capacità e competenze. Si potrebbero elaborare «quadri comuni di formazione» per i professionisti grazie ai quali le qualifiche così ottenute potrebbero essere riconosciute negli altri Stati membri.

([3]) Oggetto di un accordo potenziale in un dialogo a tre il 12 giugno 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007069/13
to the Commission
Aldo Patriciello (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Geology and at-risk areas in Europe

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the Vajont disaster. On 9 October 1963, a huge landslide from the mountainside into the waters of the Vajont mountain lake below caused the water contained in the reservoir to overtop the Vajont artificial hydroelectric basin, devastating the whole valley and killing some 2 000 people. It has been shown that the Vajont disaster could have been avoided, particularly had geological studies been used properly. Since then, the importance of applying geology to civil engineering has been recognised. Much has been done in the EU along these lines, but not enough. Barely a year ago, at the general meeting of the European Geological Service, it was reiterated how geology can offer Europe a great deal but also how geology needs direct commitment from Europe. It is not possible to develop the land without understanding the land. Earth sciences thus play a pivotal role in both economic and social development.

As I represent Italian interests, I should like to point out how the Italian National Geologists' Council is an active member of the European Federation of Geologists (which has over 15 000 members) and that its many activities involve the various fields of geology, namely professional, university and research geology.

— Does the Commission think that funds should be allocated to the research and study of areas of the EU that are at risk in geological terms, in order to prevent avoidable disasters?

— Does the Commission think that it should promote a European safety and geological certification standard for setting up and running industrial sites within the EU?

— Does the Commission think that it would be desirable for the European Federation of Geologists to implement its tasks, also simplifying the procedure for obtaining the professional title of 'European Geologist'?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The EU has been supporting international inter-disciplinary research in the field of natural hazards (geological or climate/meteorological related) since the late 1980s thus contributing to the improved integrated knowledge-base necessary for a better assessment of hazards, vulnerabilities and risks and for the development of sound risk management approaches promoting prevention and mitigation strategies.

Communication COM(2009)82 ([1]) and the 'Staff Working Paper on Risk Assessment and Mapping Guidelines for Disaster Management' ([2]) support and improve coherence with respect to risk assessments undertaken in EU Member States.

Safety rules on setting up and running industrial sites are essential to ensure a secure environment. The Commission has recognised this necessity, which is reflected in the support of projects in the area of crisis management through the current Framework Programme for Research, Development and Demonstration Activities (FP7). However, to date, no specific research has been carried out on the feasibility of developing European geological certification standards related to industrial sites. Additional research would be needed before any further steps are taken.

The professional title of 'European Geologist' is a voluntary initiative set up by the European Federation of Geologists. The modernised Professional Qualifications Directive ([3]) provides for new tools aimed at simplifying the mobility of professionals. This directive introduces a new system of automatic recognition based on a common set of knowledge, skills and competences. 'Common training frameworks' could be developed for professions and the qualifications obtained under such a framework could be recognised in other Member States.

([1]) SEC(2009) 202, SEC(2009) 203 — A Community approach on the prevention of natural and man-made disasters.
([2]) SEC(2010) 1626.
([3]) on which a political agreement has been reached in trilogue on 12 June 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007902/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(3 luglio 2013)

Oggetto: Valutazione d'impatto dell'ingresso della Croazia nell'Unione europea

Il 1º luglio 2013, la Croazia ha fatto il suo ingresso nell'Unione europea. La domanda di adesione era stata presentata il 21 febbraio 2003, mentre il Consiglio europeo l'aveva dichiarata «paese candidato» il 18 giugno dell'anno successivo. Osservati nel loro complesso, i negoziati di adesione si sono protratti per circa 8 anni, dall'ottobre del 2005 ad oggi.

La Croazia vive una particolare situazione economica, avendo subito anch'essa il contraccolpo della crisi finanziaria iniziata nel 2008 ed avendo perso nel successivo biennio, come sottolinea uno studio del Ministero degli Affari esteri italiano, circa sette punti percentuali di prodotto interno lordo.

Nonostante l'andamento economico leggermente più favorevole degli anni 2011-2012, l'industria croata è ancora coinvolta nella recessione e il sistema bancario nazionale è tuttora controllato per i 4/5 da banche straniere.

La pubblica amministrazione croata è colpita da elevati tassi di corruzione, mentre il settore privato manca di un'industria produttiva di carattere medio-piccolo ed il debito pubblico continua a crescere, attestandosi ormai a quota 56,3 % del Pil.

Infine il tasso croato di disoccupazione è tra i più alti in tutta l'Unione, raggiungendo il 20,9 %, è inferiore solo a quello greco (26,8 %) e spagnolo (27 %).

Può la Commissione precisare se ha eseguito nuove valutazioni sull'impatto che l'adesione di questo nuovo Stato membro produrrà sull'economia UE e sulle possibili conseguenze negative sulle economie delle regioni limitrofe?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(6 settembre 2013)

La Croazia ha risentito della crisi economica fino dall'inizio, nel 2008, e deve ancora affrontare, come molti Stati membri dell'UE, notevoli sfide legate alla prolungata recessione. Ora come ora, il suo problema principale è migliorare la competitività dell'economia e avviare una crescita che sia fonte di occupazione, garantendo al tempo stesso il risanamento di bilancio. Sono state prese alcune misure importanti per quanto riguarda l'attuazione di riforme strutturali urgenti in campo economico al fine di migliorare la competitività e le prospettive di crescita. In presenza della leadership politica necessaria per attuare ulteriori riforme, la Croazia ha buone probabilità di tornare alla crescita nel 2014, come previsto dalla Commissione. Le precedenti adesioni hanno prodotto risultati tangibili in termini di crescita e occupazione in tutta l'UE e di aumento degli investimenti. La Croazia non dovrebbe fare eccezione. Inoltre, la partecipazione della Croazia al mercato interno e alla politica di coesione dell'UE offre opportunità supplementari per gli operatori economici di tutta l'UE.

Durante i preparativi per l'adesione, la Croazia ha adottato misure strutturali per migliorare l'efficienza del sistema giudiziario, rafforzare lo Stato di diritto e ottenere buoni risultati in termini di lotta alla corruzione, compresa una serie di misure preventive. Il paese si è dotato del quadro giuridico e istituzionale necessario per combattere la corruzione, ottenendo già i primi risultati in questo campo.

I progressi compiuti dalla Croazia dal 2005, quando sono iniziati i negoziati di adesione, dimostrano che il 1º luglio 2013, data di adesione all'UE, il paese era sufficientemente preparato. In quanto Stato membro dell'UE, la Croazia è ora soggetta al medesimo monitoraggio esercitato su tutti gli altri Stati membri.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007070/13
aan de Commissie
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(18 juni 2013)

Betreft: Toetreding van Kroatië tot de Europese Unie

Ondanks het ontbreken van publieke ondersteuning, ondanks de existentiële crisis van de Europese Unie en ondanks de algehele malaise in Europa, heeft men het schijnbaar toch verstandig geacht om Kroatië te laten toetreden tot de Europese Unie.

Zoals reeds lang geleden viel te voorspellen, komen de eerste onheilsberichten al tot ons ([1]). In dit kader stel ik de Commissie graag de volgende vragen:

1. Volgens een artikel van Reuters ([1]) is Kroatië amper toegetreden, of er is al sprake van begrotingstekorten, slechte ondernemersomstandigheden, een slecht functionerend rechtssysteem en dito overheid. Deelt de Commissie mijn mening dat de Europese Unie het zich niet kan permitteren een land dat zijn zaken zo slecht voor elkaar heeft toe te laten treden? Zo niet, waarom niet?

2. Deelt de Commissie mijn mening dat het toetreden van Kroatië wederom zal leiden tot een oneigenlijke en zware belasting voor de lidstaten, die nu al gebukt gaan onder het oplossen van de problemen van andere zwakke landen? Zo niet, waarom niet?

3. Volgens een artikel op EUobserver ([2]) behoort Kroatië tot de meest corrupte landen van Europa. Deelt de Commissie mijn mening dat als een land al in aanmerking zou moeten komen voor toetreding tot de Europese Unie, dergelijke alarmerende problemen eerst opgelost moeten zijn, voordat er sprake kan zijn van toetreding. Zo niet, waarom niet?

4. Deelt de Commissie de zorgen dat zodra Kroatië is toegetreden tot de Europese Unie, de bereidheid tot hervorming van het land terug zal zakken naar een laag niveau en men wederom weer niet blijkt te hebben geleerd van fouten uit het verleden, zoals de toetreding van Bulgarije. Zo niet, waarom niet?

5. Kan de Commissie minstens een week voor ingang van de toetreding van Kroatië antwoord geven op mijn vragen?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(6 september 2013)

Kroatië is slachtoffer van de economische crisis die in 2008 begon en staat, net als veel EU-lidstaten, voor grote problemen in de nasleep daarvan; zo kampt het land nog steeds met een recessie. De belangrijkste taak is nu om het concurrentievermogen van de economie te vergroten en snel werkgelegenheidsbevorderende groei op gang te brengen, terwijl ook de begroting wordt geconsolideerd. Met betrekking tot de tenuitvoerlegging van de zeer dringende structurele hervormingen van de economie zijn de eerste belangrijke stappen gezet om het concurrentievermogen en de groeiperspectieven te verbeteren. Met de nodige politieke wil om verdere hervormingen door te voeren, zou Kroatië in 2014 opnieuw groei moeten vertonen, zoals de Commissie verwacht. In het verleden zijn dankzij uitbreidingen concrete resultaten geboekt wat betreft groei en werkgelegenheid in de hele EU, alsmede meer investeringen. Er is geen reden om aan te nemen dat Kroatië in dat opzicht een uitzondering zal zijn. Daarnaast biedt de deelname van Kroatië aan de interne markt en het cohesiebeleid ondernemingen in de hele EU extra kansen.

Gedurende de voorbereidingen op de toetreding heeft Kroatië structurele maatregelen doorgevoerd om het justitiële stelsel efficiënter te maken, de rechtsstaat te versterken en resultaten te boeken met betrekking tot corruptiebestrijding, waaronder een serie preventieve maatregelen. Het wettelijke en institutionele kader om corruptie te bestrijden is opgezet en begint vruchten af te werpen.

Dankzij de vorderingen die Kroatië heeft geboekt sinds de opening van de toetredingsonderhandelingen in 2005, is het land op 1 juli 2013 goed voorbereid toegetreden tot de EU. Als EU-lidstaat gelden voor Kroatië nu dezelfde toezichtsmechanismen als voor alle andere EU-lidstaten.

([1]) http://uk.reuters.com/article/2013/06/03/uk-eu-croatia-idUKBRE9520PT20130603.
([2]) http://euobserver.com/justice/120064.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007070/13
to the Commission
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Accession of Croatia to the European Union

Despite the lack of public support, despite the existential crisis facing the European Union and despite the general malaise in Europe, it has apparently been considered wise to allow Croatia to join the European Union.

As might have been predicted long ago, the first bad news stories are already reaching us ([1]). This gives rise to the following questions to the Commission:

1. According to a Reuters article[1], Croatia has no sooner joined than there are budget deficits, conditions for business are poor, and neither the judicial system nor the machinery of government is functioning properly. Does the Commission agree that the European Union cannot afford to let a country which is performing so badly join the EU? If not, why not?

2. Does the Commission agree that the accession of Croatia will once more impose a heavy and improper burden on the Member States, which are already struggling to solve the problems of other weak countries? If not, why not?

3. According to an EUobserver article ([2]), Croatia is one of the most corrupt countries in Europe. Does the Commission agree that even if it is accepted that a country should be eligible for accession to the European Union, such alarming problems must first be solved before accession is possible. If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission share the concern that as soon as Croatia has acceded to the European Union, the readiness to reform the country will decline to a low level and it will again become clear that the lessons of the past have not been learned, for example those prompted by the accession of Bulgaria? If not, why not?

5. Can the Commission answer my questions at least a week before Croatia's accession takes effect?

Question for written answer E-007902/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(3 July 2013)

Subject: Impact assessment of Croatia's accession to the European Union

On 1 July 2013, Croatia joined the European Union. Its membership application was submitted on 21 February 2003 and the European Council declared it a 'candidate country' on 18 June of the following year. Taken as a whole, the accession negotiations lasted for around 8 years, from October 2005 to the present day.

Croatia is going through a difficult economic situation, given that it too has suffered the backlash of the financial crisis that began in 2008 and, over the following two years (as pointed out in a study conducted by the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs), lost around seven percentage points of its gross domestic product.

Despite the slightly more favourable economic trend of 2011 and 2012, Croatian industry is still mired in recession and 4/5 of the domestic banking system is still controlled by foreign banks.

The Croatian civil service has high rates of corruption, while the private sector has no small and medium-sized industries and the national debt continues to grow, having now reached 56.3% of GDP.

Lastly, the Croatian unemployment rate is among the highest in the whole of the EU and, at 20.9%, is lower only than the rate in Greece (26.8%) and Spain (27%).

Can the Commission say whether it has carried out any new assessments on the impact that the accession of this new EU Member State will have on the EU economy and on any negative consequences it might have on the economies of neighbouring regions?

([1]) http://uk.reuters.com/article/2013/06/03/uk-eu-croatia-idUKBRE9520PT20130603.
([2]) http://euobserver.com/justice/120064.

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(6 September 2013)

Croatia has suffered from the onset of the economic crisis in 2008 and, like many EU Member States, faces big challenges in its wake, as it continues to struggle with recession. Its main challenge now is to improve the competitiveness of its economy and kick-start job-rich growth, while ensuring fiscal consolidation. Some important initial steps have been taken regarding the implementation of urgently needed structural reforms in the economy, to improve competitiveness and growth prospects. With the required political leadership to implement further reforms, Croatia is well-placed to return to growth in 2014, as the Commission forecasts. Past accessions have yielded tangible results in terms of growth and jobs across the EU and higher levels of investments. Croatia should be no exception. In addition, Croatia's participation in the EU's Internal Market and Cohesion Policy, offers additional opportunities for economic operators across the EU.

During its accession preparations, Croatia took structural measures to improve the efficiency of the judiciary, strengthened rule of law, and built up a track record in fighting corruption, including setting up a series of preventive measures. The relevant legal and institutional framework to fight corruption is in place and has started to deliver results.

The progress made by Croatia since the opening of the accession negotiations in 2005 meant that Croatia has joined the EU on 1 July 2013 well prepared. As an EU Member State, Croatia is now subject to the same monitoring as all other EU Member States.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení P-007071/13
Komisi
Zuzana Roithová (PPE)
(18. června 2013)

Předmět: Podmínky garance půjček pro studenty v rámci programu „Erasmus pro všechny“

Evropská komise představila projekt garancí půjček pro studenty v rámci programu „Erasmus pro všechny“ ve výši 880 milionů EUR. Jde o potenciálně velmi pozitivní nástroj pomoci pro studenty, kteří by jinak neměli přístup k odpovídajícím finančním zdrojům pro studium v zahraničí. Do návrhu nařízení však nejsou zahrnuty jednoznačné a podrobnější informace o mechanismu garancí – tedy za jakých podmínek budou banky spravovat poskytnuté stovky milionů EUR tak, aby nemohlo dojít k jejich nehospodárnému vynakládání například na administrativní úkony banky. Poskytovat veřejné prostředky bankám nelze jen na základě obecného mandátu, ale podle naprosto transparentních pravidel. Přitom v dopadové studii jsou této otázce věnovány jen obecné a stručné informace, které neposkytují vyčerpávající přehled o nastavení systému a jeho účinné kontrole.

Jaká kritéria hodlá Evropská komise společně s Evropskou investiční bankou stanovit pro systém garancí půjček pro studenty v rámci programu „Erasmus pro všechny“?

Jakým striktním podmínkám budou podléhat banky vybrané ve veřejné soutěži, aby nedošlo k nehospodárnému užití veřejných prostředků v rámci tohoto systému garancí půjček?

Kdo bude ručit za účelné využití a splacení svěřených prostředků (půjde o stát, Evropskou investiční banku či vybrané národní banky)?

Jakým způsobem hodlá Evropská komise zaručit zapojení a efektivní kontrolu realizace systému garancí půjček ze strany Evropského parlamentu?

Jaký dopad nesplácených studentských půjček na rozpočet EU je předpokládán, respektive, jaký je předpoklad schopnosti VŠ studentů splátky splácet?

Banky tímto způsobem získají tisíce nových klientů s podporou EU; nepůjde o nedovolenou veřejnou podporu v rámci hospodářské soutěže (tj. o přílišné zvýhodnění těchto subjektů oproti jejich konkurenci)?

Odpověď komisařky Vassiliou jménem Komise
(15. července 2013)

Navrhovaná kritéria systému záruk za studentské půjčky jsou tato: nevyžaduje se ručitel či ručení rodiči, úrokové sazby nižší než tržní úrokové sazby a možnost odložit či zmrazit splácení až na dva roky. Tato kritéria budou stanovena v právním základě po dohodě mezi Parlamentem a Radou.

Finanční zprostředkovatelé (subjekty poskytující studentské půjčky, banky atd.) budou vybíráni transparentním a otevřeným postupem na základě výzvy k vyjádření zájmu – příklady výzev pro jiné záruky ES spravované EIF jsou uvedeny na jejich internetových stránkách. Žadatelé budou muset prokázat, jak splňují zveřejněná kritéria, a doložit, že převedou maximální přínos prostředků EU na studenty.

Evropský investiční fond, jednající jménem Komise, zajistí náležité využití prostředků prostřednictvím smluvního vztahu s vybranými finančními zprostředkovateli. Plnění bude sledováno průběžně a v souladu s čl. 140 odst. 8 finančního nařízení. Komise bude každoročně podávat zprávu Parlamentu a Radě. Zvláštní hodnocení v polovině období věnované zárukám za studentské půjčky bude součástí programu Erasmus+.

Systém je koncipován tak, aby splácení půjček bylo dostupné a uskutečnitelné. Zatímco o výši jednotlivých půjček rozhoduje student a finanční zprostředkovatel, sociální kritéria a omezení záruky (na 12 000 EUR na program trvající 1 rok a 18 000 EUR na program trvající 2 roky) vyvažují přístup k dostatečnému kapitálu snížením rizika nadměrného zadlužení. Zatížení rozpočtu EU je omezeno na částku stanovenou pro tento systém v programu Erasmus+.

Tento systém bude otevřený všem bankám. Vybrány budou ty banky, které studentům nabídnou nejlepší podmínky.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007071/13
to the Commission
Zuzana Roithová (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Student loan guarantee conditions for the 'Erasmus for All' programme

The Commission has proposed a student loan guarantee facility for the 'Erasmus for All' programme amounting to EUR 880 million. This could potentially have a very positive effect, helping students who would not otherwise have had access to appropriate funding to finance their studies abroad. However, the draft regulation does not contain explicit or detailed information on the guarantee mechanism, i.e. on the conditions governing how the banks will manage the hundreds of millions of euros entrusted to them without engaging in wasteful spending, for instance on administrative transactions. Entrusting public funds to banks is unacceptable under a general mandate; rather, absolutely transparent rules must be put in place. The impact study only contains brief, general references to this issue, and it fails to provide an exhaustive overview of how the system would be set up and how it would be monitored effectively.

What criteria will the Commission and the European Investment Bank prescribe for the student loan guarantee scheme for the 'Erasmus for All' programme?

What stringent conditions will the banks selected through public tender procedures be required to fulfil, with a view to preventing the wasteful spending of public funds through the loan guarantee scheme?

Who will be responsible for ensuring that the funds are used appropriately and repaid: the Member State, the European Investment Bank or the chosen national banks?

How does the Commission intend to ensure Parliament's involvement in, and effective supervision of, the implementation of the loan guarantee scheme?

What is the anticipated impact of unpaid student loans on the EU budget, or more precisely, what is the predicted capacity of university students to make repayments?

Under this scheme, the EU will help banks to gain thousands of new customers; is the scheme not, therefore, a form of forbidden public aid that undermines competition by giving the chosen banks an undue advantage over their competitors?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(15 July 2013)

The proposed criteria for the Student Loan Guarantee scheme are: no requirement for collateral or parental guarantees, lower than market interest rates, and the possibility to defer or freeze repayments for up to two years. These will be set out in the legal base following agreement between Parliament and Council.

Financial intermediaries (student loan agencies, banks etc) will be selected in a transparent and open procedure via a call for expressions of interest — examples of calls for other EC guarantees managed by the EIF can be found on their website. Applicants will have to demonstrate how they meet the published criteria and prove that they will transfer the maximum benefit of the EU resources to students.

The European Investment Fund, acting on the Commission's behalf, will ensure proper use of the funds via the contractual relationship with the selected financial intermediaries. Delivery will be monitored on an ongoing basis and in accordance with Article 140 (8) of the Financial Regulation. The Commission will report annually to the Parliament and Council. As part of the Erasmus+ programme, there will be a specific mid-term evaluation of the Student Loan Guarantee.

The scheme is designed so that repayments are affordable and achievable. While the level of individual loans is for the student and financial intermediary to decide, social criteria and a limit on the guarantee (EUR 12 000 for a 1-year programme and EUR 18 000 for 2 years) balance access to sufficient capital with limiting the risk of overindebtedness. EU budget exposure is limited to the amount laid down for the scheme in Erasmus +.

The scheme will be open to all banks. Those selected will be the ones that give the best deal to students.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007072/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(18 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Espionaje del Reino Unido en la Cumbre del G-20

Recientemente han aparecido en *The Guardian* unas revelaciones sobre la manera en que los servicios de inteligencia británicos espiaron a las autoridades diplomáticas que participaron en la cumbre mundial del G-20 celebrada el pasado 2009, a través de escuchas y todo tipo de violaciones de la privacidad, con la autorización expresa del Gobierno del Reino Unido.

Las revelaciones proceden de los documentos enviados por el ex colaborador de la NSA Edward Snowden a dicho periódico, filtraciones por las que se encuentra actualmente escondido en Hong Kong. Las escuchas realizadas a representantes políticos y diplomáticos de los participantes en el G-20 supusieron una herramienta fundamental de negociación que fue empleada por el Reino Unido para sacar el mayor provecho posible de dicha cumbre. Las escuchas fueron autorizadas por el anterior ministro Gordon Brown y suponen numerosas violaciones de derechos, así como un varapalo a la legitimidad de la diplomacia británica y a los resultados de la citada cumbre.

El espionaje realizado empleaba la tecnología estadounidense Prisma que, según los documentos de Snowden, viene siendo utilizada por los servicios de inteligencia del país desde hace años. Con dicha tecnología los agentes británicos practicaron escuchas a numerosos representantes y fueron capaces de superar la seguridad de sus mensajes electrónicos, pudiendo acceder al correo electrónico de los representantes diplomáticos en tiempo real para informar a los negociadores del Reino Unido durante la cumbre. Esta violación masiva de la intimidad y de los intereses nacionales en una cumbre de tan elevado nivel supone un delito sin precedentes, al menos conocidos, y exige por tanto que se tomen medidas concretas con respecto al Reino Unido.

1. ¿Piensa la Comisión exigir responsabilidades penales al Reino Unido ante este escandaloso caso de espionaje?

2. ¿Ha adoptado alguna medida la Comisión para que el Reino Unido no viole sistemáticamente las libertades fundamentales y los intereses nacionales de otros países?

3. ¿Cómo piensa colaborar la Comisión en la protección de Edward Snowden para garantizar su seguridad y el acceso a la información que ha puesto a disposición de la opinión pública?

4. La Comisaria de Justicia y Derechos Fundamentales, Viviane Reding, ha exigido que los Estados Unidos den explicaciones por la violación masiva de derechos de ciudadanos europeos. ¿Piensa la Comisión hacerlo con el Reino Unido?

Respuesta de la Sra. Reding en nombre de la Comisión
(5 de septiembre de 2013)

La Comisión ruega a Su Señoría se remita a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-006783/13.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007072/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Revelations of UK spying at the G20 summit

The Guardian recently published information revealing that the British intelligence services spied on diplomats attending the G20 world summit in 2009. They reportedly tapped into communications and breached any number of privacy rules, with the express authorisation of the UK Government.

These revelations come from documents leaked to the newspaper by Edward Snowden, a former NSA employee, who is now in hiding in Hong Kong. Eavesdropping on visiting politicians and diplomats from the G20 nations was instrumental in enabling the UK to secure a negotiating advantage at the summit. These eavesdropping operations were authorised by former Prime Minister Gordon Brown and constitute multiple rights violations, as well as dealing a blow to the legitimacy of British diplomacy and the results of the summit itself.

The spying operations employed US Prism technology which, according to Snowden's documents, the country's intelligence services have been using for years. British agents used this technology to bug numerous representatives and were able to bypass their email security systems to gain real-time access to diplomats' private messages before sending their findings to UK negotiators at the summit. As far as we know, this gross violation of privacy and national interests at such a high-level summit is an unprecedented crime which calls for concrete measures to be taken against the United Kingdom.

1. Does the Commission intend to hold the UK criminally responsible for this shocking act of espionage?

2. Has the Commission taken any action to ensure that the United Kingdom does not systematically violate the fundamental liberties and national interests of other countries?

3. How will the Commission help to protect Edward Snowden, in order to guarantee his safety and safeguard access to the information that he has made available to the public?

4. The Commissioner for Justice and Fundamental Rights, Viviane Reding, has demanded explanations from the United States regarding the massive violation of European citizens' rights. Will the Commission demand similar explanations from the United Kingdom?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-006783/13.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007073/13
a la Comisión
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(18 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Protocolo de pesca con Mauritania

Tras la votación en la Comisión de Pesca del pasado día 29 de mayo en la que, por 16 votos a favor, 6 en contra y 1 abstención, fue aprobado el informe Mato que proponía «el rechazo a la celebración del Protocolo por el que se fijan las posibilidades de pesca y la contrapartida financiera establecidas en el Acuerdo de Asociación en el sector pesquero entre la Unión Europea y la República Islámica de Mauritania», y antes de que se celebre la votación final en el pleno de la Cámara, teniendo en cuenta la infrautilización del Protocolo que se viene aplicando provisionalmente, cabe formular la siguiente pregunta:

¿Va a adoptar la Comisión alguna medida encaminada a modificar el actual protocolo de manera que sea utilizado por la flota europea?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007074/13
a la Comisión
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(18 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Contraprestación financiera Mauritania

¿Mantiene la Comisión que, a la vista de la escasa utilización de las licencias para faenar en aguas de Mauritania y a la vista de los nuevos datos sobre las reservas de pulpo, la contraprestación financiera de 70 millones de euros abonada por la UE es una cantidad razonable?

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007075/13
a la Comisión
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(18 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Comité Conjunto — Acuerdo de Pesca UE-Mauritania

¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión de las previsiones para la celebración de la reunión del Comité Conjunto en la que se deben validar los acuerdos del pasado 24 de mayo?

¿Tiene intención la Comisión de hacer algún nuevo planteamiento al Comité Conjunto en vista de las actuales circunstancias, a saber, nuevos informes, infrautilización y rechazo por parte de la Comisión de Pesca del PE del Protocolo de pesca UE-Mauritania que viene aplicándose de manera provisional?

Respuesta conjunta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de septiembre de 2013)

La Comisión logró mejoras significativas de las medidas técnicas, especialmente las referidas a los camarones y a las especies pelágicas, en la reunión del Comité conjunto celebrada en París en febrero de 2013 y en una reunión técnica que tuvo lugar en Bruselas en mayo de 2013. En septiembre de 2013, se celebrará otra reunión del Comité conjunto para certificar el acuerdo alcanzado en la reunión técnica. Es intención de la Comisión explorar con Mauritania la posibilidad de mejoras adicionales.

En los primeros seis meses de aplicación provisional del Protocolo, la Comisión ha estado siguiendo de cerca el porcentaje de utilización y el correspondiente valor generado por las actividades pesqueras enmarcadas en él, basándose tanto en las licencias de pesca como en las capturas. A finales de junio, el nivel general de utilización era bajo, pero en las últimas semanas ha habido un cambio significativo. En el caso de las especies pelágicas, se ha producido un incremento del número de licencias utilizadas. Según los datos más recientes comunicados por los armadores, la productividad de las actividades pesqueras es buena. Otros segmentos de la flota también están faenando con buenos resultados (merluza senegalesa, especies demersales, atún).

La Comisión continuará supervisando el porcentaje de utilización a fin de asegurarse de que el Protocolo genera un valor que compense la inversión.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007073/13
to the Commission
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Fishing Protocol with Mauritania

After a vote in the Committee on Fisheries on 29 May 2013, the Mato report was adopted by 16 votes to 6 with 1 abstention. This report calls on Parliament to reject the Protocol setting out the fishing opportunities and financial contribution provided for in the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the Islamic Republic of Mauritania. A final vote will now take place in plenary. Given the under-utilisation of the Protocol which was being implemented on a provisional basis:

Does the Commission intend to take some kind of action to change the current protocol so that it can be used by the European fleet?

Question for written answer E-007074/13
to the Commission
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Compensatory payment to Mauritania

In view of the low take-up of licences for fishing in Mauritanian waters and the new information on octopus stocks, does the Commission still consider the EUR 70 million the EU pays in financial compensation to be a reasonable figure?

Question for written answer E-007075/13
to the Commission
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Joint committee — EU-Mauritania fisheries agreement

Does the Commission know what is likely to happen at the Joint Committee meeting at which the agreements of 24 May 2013 are supposed to be ratified?

Does the Commission intend to suggest that the Joint Committee adopt a new approach in the light of the publication of new reports, the underuse of fishing opportunities and the rejection by Parliament's Fisheries Committee of the EU-Mauritania fisheries protocol which is currently being applied provisionally?

Joint answer given by Mrs Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(11 September 2013)

The Commission has achieved significant improvements of technical measures in particular for shrimp and pelagic categories during the Joint Committee held in Paris in February 2013 and a technical meeting in Brussels in May 2013. A Joint Committee will be organised in September 2013 to validate the results of the technical meeting. The Commission is committed to explore with Mauritania potential further improvements.

In the first 6 months of the provisional application of the protocol, the Commission has been closely monitoring the utilisation rate and the corresponding value generated by fishing activities under the protocol, both based on licences and catches. The overall level of utilisation was low at the end of June, however there has been a significant change in the last few weeks. For pelagics, the uptake of licences has increased. According to the most recent information from the ship-owners, the productivity of fishing activities is good. Other segments are also fishing with good results (black hake, demersal, tuna).

The Commission will continue to monitor the utilisation rate in order to ensure that the protocol delivers value for money.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007076/13
a la Comisión
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(18 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Sobreexplotación de cefalópodos

A la vista de los informes recientemente publicados en relación con la supuesta sobreexplotación de cefalópodos en Mauritania, cabe fomentar las siguientes preguntas:

¿Mantiene la Comisión que la pesquería de cefalópodos está sobreexplotada?

¿Cree la Comisión que a la vista de los últimos estudios científicos sobre la supuesta escasez de la reservas de pulpo, está justificada la exclusión de la flota cefalopodera de la UE del Protocolo de pesca con Mauritania?

¿Se propone la Comisión adoptar alguna medida en relación con esta situación?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de septiembre de 2013)

En el informe de la última reunión del comité científico conjunto (celebrada en Rennes del 2 al 5 de abril de 2013) se comunicaron al Parlamento Europeo los datos más reciente sobre las poblaciones de cefalópodos y una evaluación de las mismas. La Comisión toma nota de los resultados de las evaluaciones realizadas por ese Comité, que confirman que dichas poblaciones continúan estando sobreexplotadas.

Los cefalópodos no están excluidos del nuevo Protocolo con Mauritania sino que figuran mencionados con un cupo de cero. Mauritania ha dejado clara su intención de desarrollar su propia pesca cefalopodera artesanal. El Protocolo concede a la flota de la Unión Europea acceso prioritario a los excedentes disponibles en las zonas de pesca de ese país, lo que significa que, en cuanto exista algún excedente de la población de cefalópodos y Mauritania decida asignar una parte del mismo a flotas extranjeras, la flota de la UE tendrá prioridad de acceso sobre las de otros países.

La Comisión seguirá trabajando con Mauritania para lograr el mejor resultado posible para la flota de la UE y velar por la sostenibilidad de esa población. Así, por ejemplo, mediante un marco alternativo de gestión, basado en un enfoque espaciotemporal, se podría generar un aumento de los rendimientos futuros de esa pesquería. Para evaluar la posibilidad de ese modelo de gestión en aguas mauritanas, se organizará en los próximos meses un protocolo experimental en el comité científico conjunto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007076/13
to the Commission
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Overfishing of cephalopods

In light of the recently published reports concerning the supposed overfishing of cephalopods in Mauritania:

Does the Commission agree that cephalopod stocks are being overfished?

In light of the recent scientific studies into the supposed scarcity of octopus stocks, does the Commission see any justification for excluding the EU's cephalopod fleet from the Fishing Protocol with Mauritania?

Does the Commission intend to take action to address this issue?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(11 September 2013)

The most recent data and assessment regarding cephalopod stocks have been made available to the European Parliament in the report of the last Joint Scientific Committee (Rennes, 2-5 April 2013). The Commission takes note of the results of the assessments carried out by this Committee, confirming that these stocks remain overexploited.

Cephalopods are not excluded from the new Protocol with Mauritania, but mentioned with zero quota. Mauritania has made clear its intention to develop its own coastal cephalopod fishery. The Protocol grants European Union fleets priority access to available surpluses in Mauritanian fishing zones. This means that as soon as a surplus of the cephalopod stock is available, and if Mauritania agrees to allocate part of this surplus to foreign fleets, EU fleets will have priority access over other foreign fleets.

The Commission will continue to work with Mauritania in order to secure the best possible outcome for the EU fleet and sustainability of the stock. Hence, an alternative framework, based on a spatio-temporal approach, might generate increases of future yields of this fishery. An experimental protocol, in the framework of the Joint Scientific Committee, will be organised in the upcoming months to evaluate this management model in Mauritanian waters.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007077/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Condanna di un'attivista per i diritti delle donne in Arabia Saudita: il caso di Wajeeha al-Huwaider

Lo scorso 15 giugno è stata divulgata la notizia della condanna a dieci mesi di reclusione dell'attivista saudita Wajeeha al-Huwaider, cui si applicherà anche il divieto di lasciare il territorio nazionale per i prossimi due anni. La blogger, fondatrice di una lega femminile per promuovere il diritto delle donne a conseguire la patente di guida e a circolare liberamente, ha sfidato i divieti delle autorità religiose in più occasioni: accusando pubblicamente un imam saudita di aver ucciso la figlioletta picchiandola ripetutamente e aiutando una cittadina canadese a fuggire, con il marito arabo e i suoi figli, dal Regno.

L'accusa per la quale Al-Huwaider si trova attualmente in carcere è quella di favoreggiamento in una «tentata evasione», rispetto al quale la condannata si è però limitata a un sostegno morale, più che sostanziale.

Inoltre l'Arabia Saudita, nonostante l'estensione del diritto di voto alle donne a partire dal 2015, vede appena trenta donne in Parlamento e pretende che ciascuna sottostia al controllo di un tutore, al limite anche un figlio minorenne, purché maschio, continuando a negare loro la possibilità di guidare in città, di partecipare a riunioni pubbliche da sole, di esprimere la propria opinione e di utilizzare i nuovi strumenti di comunicazione.

Tutto ciò contrasta con i diritti riconosciuti alle donne a livello internazionale, in particolar modo con l'art. 1 della Convenzione sui diritti delle Donne ai sensi del quale «Gli Stati parti condannano la discriminazione nei confronti della donna in ogni sua forma, convengono di perseguire con ogni mezzo appropriato e senza indugio, una politica tendente ad eliminare la discriminazione nei confronti della donna (…)».

Alla luce di quanto sopra può la Commissione far sapere:

— se sia a conoscenza della condanna contro Wajeeha al-Huwaider e di sentenze simili nei confronti di altre attiviste e

— quali azioni intenda intraprendere per spingere l'Arabia Saudita ad avviare un dialogo serio e costruttivo sui diritti umani e, in particolare, sulla dignità della donna?

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

1. La Commissione è ben consapevole delle questioni sollevate dall'onorevole parlamentare e ha costantemente inserito la questione dei diritti delle donne nell'ambito delle sue relazioni con l'Arabia Saudita, a livello sia bilaterale che multilaterale, in linea con la posizione di principio dell'UE sulla parità tra i sessi.

2. Si rinvia cortesemente l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta data alla sua precedente interrogazione scritta E-006638/2013 ([1]) per ulteriori dettagli sullo stesso tema.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007077/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Conviction of a women's rights activist in Saudi Arabia: the case of Wajeeha al-Huwaider

It was revealed on 15 June that the Saudi activist, Wajeeha al-Huwaider, had been sentenced to ten months in prison and will also be banned from leaving the country for the next two years. The blogger, founder of a women's league for the promotion of women's right to obtain a driving licence and circulate freely, has defied bans imposed by the religious authorities on several occasions: by publicly accusing a Saudi imam of having killed his daughter by repeatedly beating her and by helping a Canadian citizen to flee the Kingdom with her Arab husband and children.

Al-Huwaider has now been imprisoned for having aided in an 'escape attempt', although her conviction was limited to moral, rather than concrete, support.

Furthermore, Saudi Arabia, despite having awarded women the right to vote from 2015, has barely thirty women in Parliament and claims that each of them is under the supervision of a tutor, even an underage child if necessary, provided that it is a son, and thus continues to deny them the possibility of driving in the city, taking part in public meetings alone, expressing their own opinions and using new means of communication.

This is all in conflict with women's rights recognised at international level, especially Article 1 of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which states that 'States Parties condemn discrimination against women in all its forms, agree to pursue by all appropriate means and without delay a policy of eliminating discrimination against women (…)'.

In view of the above, could the Commission state:

— whether it is aware of the conviction of Wajeeha al-Huwaider and similar sentences against other activists and

— which measure it intends to implement to press Saudi Arabia into opening a serious and constructive dialogue concerning human rights and, especially, women's dignity?

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

1. The Commission is well aware of the issues raised by the Honourable Member, and has consistently included the issue of women's rights in its relations with Saudi Arabia, both at bilateral and multilateral level, in line with the EU's principled stance on gender equality.

2. The Honourable Member is kindly refered to the reply given to his previous Written Question E-006638/2013 ([1]) for more details on the same issue.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007078/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Condizioni di cristiani nel Bangladesh e nella regione indiana del Maharastra

È notizia recente la vittoria del Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP) alle elezioni amministrative locali e l'aumento delle violenze perpetrate dagli estremisti indù contro i cristiani in Maharastra, uno degli Stati tradizionalmente più tolleranti del sub-continente indiano.

Il BNP sostiene le manifestazioni del gruppo estremista Jamaat-e-Islam, il quale attacca da tempo i verdetti di colpevolezza dei tribunali di guerra che processano i membri del partito islamico, avendo causato nel solo mese di marzo di quest'anno 35 morti e circa 800 feriti.

Al contempo, in India l'odio religioso assume dimensioni tali per le quali ai Cristiani viene impedito di costruirsi casa, di lavorare i terreni di proprietà, e di recarsi in chiesa la domenica. Gli edifici religiosi cristiani vengono distrutti o sfregiati.

Sia in Bangladesh che in India, la posizione dei cristiani è quanto mai fragile, e i loro diritti calpestati — soprattutto risultano violati l'eguaglianza richiamata dal preambolo della Dichiarazione universale dei diritti dell'uomo del 1948, il diritto al rispetto della propria vita familiare ex art. 7 CEDU, il diritto di costruire una famiglia di cui all'art. 9, la libertà di pensiero, di coscienza e di religione ex art. 10 e, infine, quello alla proprietà ex art. 17 CEDU.

Può l'Alto Rappresentante precisare quanto segue:

— è a conoscenza degli avvenimenti che hanno investito il Bangladesh e la regione indiana del Maharastra?

— quali azioni intenda intraprendere per dare impulso al dibattito sulla libertà religiosa nei due Paesi?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente è ben consapevole delle questioni menzionate dall'onorevole parlamentare nella sua interrogazione. Infatti, i problemi che le comunità cristiane si trovano ad affrontare in Maharashtra sono le stesse riscontrate in altre regioni dell'India.

L'Unione europea presta grande attenzione alla necessità di tutelare i diritti umani e le libertà fondamentali sia in India sia in Bangladesh. La non discriminazione, le questioni di genere e i diritti delle donne, la libertà di religione e di credo sono tra i principali temi che vengono regolarmente sollevati con entrambi i governi. Discussioni approfondite sulla situazione in India e in Bangladesh hanno luogo anche a livello multilaterale, in particolare presso il Consiglio per i diritti umani delle Nazioni Unite, a Ginevra.

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha espresso costernazione per l'elevato numero di morti registrato in Bangladesh durante le manifestazioni che hanno seguito le sentenze pronunciate, nel febbraio 2013, dall'International Crimes Tribunal. L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha fatto appello a tutte le forze politiche affinché lavorino insieme nell'interesse del paese, invito rinnovato anche durante il suo incontro con il ministro degli Affari esteri del Bangladesh Dipu Moni, il 1º giugno 2013.

Il dialogo sui diritti umani tra l'Unione europea e l'India rappresenta inoltre una buona opportunità per intrattenere un periodico scambio di opinioni su tali questioni.

L'UE sostiene anche progetti per la salvaguardia dei diritti umani e delle libertà fondamentali in entrambi i paesi, in particolare attraverso lo Strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani (EIDHR).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007078/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Situation of Christians in Bangladesh and in the Indian region of Maharashtra

According to recent news, the Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP) has won local elections and there has been a rise in acts of violence by Hindu extremists against Christians in Maharashtra, traditionally one of the most tolerant states of the Indian subcontinent.

The BNP supports protests by the extremist group Jamaat-e-Islami, which for some time has attacked the guilty verdicts handed down by war courts trying members of the Islamist party, leaving 35 people dead and around 800 wounded in March 2013 alone.

At the same time, religious hatred is becoming so widespread in India that Christians are prevented from building homes, from working their land and from going to church on Sundays. Christian religious buildings are destroyed or defaced.

Christians in Bangladesh and in India are in a very vulnerable position and their rights are being trampled. In particular, the equality referred to in the preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, the right to respect for family life under Article 7 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (CFREU) and the right to found a family under Article 9, the freedom of thought, conscience and religion under Article 10 and the right to property under Article 17 of the CFREU are being violated.

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the events in Bangladesh and the Indian region of Maharashtra?

— What action will she take to promote a debate on religious freedom in the two countries?

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

The High Representative/Vice-President is well aware of the issues mentioned by the Honourable Member in his question. Indeed, as regards India, the problems Christian communities face in Maharashtra are the same as the ones encountered in other regions.

The European Union pays great attention to the necessity of protecting human rights and fundamental freedoms in both India and Bangladesh. Non-discrimination, gender issues and women's rights, freedom of religion and belief are some of the most relevant topics that are regularly raised with both governments. Thorough discussions on the situation in India and Bangladesh also take place at the multilateral level, in particular at the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva.

The High Representative/Vice-President expressed her distress at the large number of dead in Bangladesh during demonstrations following the verdicts handed down in February 2013 by the International Crimes Tribunal. The High Representative/Vice-President appealed to all political forces to work together in the interests of the country, a point also made during her meeting with the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh, H.E. Dipu Moni, on 1 June 2013.

The EU-India Human Rights Dialogue also provides a good opportunity to exchange views on these matters at regular intervals.

The EU also supports projects on human rights and fundamental freedoms in both countries, especially through the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007079/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Reiterarsi dei casi di esecuzioni sommarie in Siria

Nelle città siriane di Idlib e Al-Bab, nonché in alcune zone di Aleppo, vige da un anno la Sharia, imposta dai ribelli islamisti affiliati ad Al-Qaeda. Le corti islamiche, nell'applicazione della legge, colpiscono soprattutto i cristiani e tutti coloro che, pur essendo musulmani, non appartengano alla corrente islamica wahhabita.

L'interrogante:

— considerando che durante l'attacco delle milizie di Sadeq al-Amin al villaggio sciita di Hatlah sono stati uccisi tutti coloro che si opponevano all'avanzata islamica, e che i loro corpi sono stati esposti al vilipendio pubblico anche con la registrazione di video in proposito inneggianti alla guerra santa, poi diffusi su Internet;

— osservando inoltre che il supporto economico ai ribelli, negli ultimi mesi, è stato contestuale alla repressione della milizia sciita di Hezbollah contro i sunniti e i non-musulmani;

— evidenziando infine che, delle circa trenta milizie ribelli oggi attive in Siria, solo tre fanno parte del *Free Syrian Army*, l'organismo attivo nel dialogo con i paesi occidentali, mentre le altre risultano legate ad Al-Qaeda e a cellule terroristiche affini, e divulgano la notizia di voler rafforzare l'Islam radicale in Medio Oriente,

chiede all'Alto Rappresentante Ashton:

— quale situazione si sia prodotta dopo la cessazione dell'embargo delle armi nei confronti della Siria da parte dell'UE;

— quali siano oggi i dati sulle persecuzioni religiose contro i cristiani e le altre minoranze nel paese.

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

Dal 31 maggio l'UE non applica più l'embargo sulle armi nei confronti della Siria. Le decisioni in merito a un'eventuale esportazione di armi verso questo paese sono ora di competenza dei singoli Stati membri. Gli Stati membri hanno inoltre convenuto sul fatto di vietare, in questo frangente, le esportazioni di attrezzature letali o che possano essere utilizzate per la repressione interna. Ad oggi non siamo a conoscenza di forniture di armi da parte di uno Stato membro.

La questione del rispetto e della tutela delle minoranze in Siria suscita grande preoccupazione. In molte occasioni l'UE ha sollecitato tutte le parti coinvolte nel conflitto a rispettare pienamente le disposizioni di diritto internazionale umanitario e sui diritti umani nonché a rispettare i diritti delle minoranze religiose ed etniche. Tutti coloro che si sono resi responsabili di atrocità e di violazioni e abusi dei diritti umani devono rispondere dei loro atti. L'UE ribadisce che queste violazioni non possono rimanere impunite e ricorda che il Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite può adire in qualsiasi momento la Corte penale internazionale sulla situazione in Siria. L'UE rinnova l'invito alla Siria a concedere alla commissione d'inchiesta un accesso immediato, pieno e incondizionato a tutto il paese.

L'Unione europea riafferma l'urgente necessità di una soluzione politica del conflitto e ha accolto con favore la proposta congiunta di Stati Uniti e Russia per una conferenza di pace sulla Siria volta a promuovere un processo politico fondato sui principi sanciti dal comunicato di Ginevra del 30 giugno 2012. L'UE si adopererà con il massimo impegno per contribuire a creare le condizioni affinché tale conferenza si possa realizzare con successo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007079/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Repeated instances of summary executions in Syria

Shariah law has been in force in the Syrian cities of Idlib and Al-Bab and in some areas of Aleppo for the past year, imposed by Al-Qaida-affiliated Islamist rebels. The enforcement of Shariah law by Islamic courts particularly affects Christians and all those who, despite being Muslims, do not belong to the Wahhabi movement.

In the Sadiq al-Ameen militia attack on the Shiite village of Hatla all those who opposed Shariah rule were killed and their bodies were publicly desecrated, including through the shooting of videos praising the holy war, which were then broadcast on the Internet.

The financial support provided to the rebels in recent months must be seen in the context of the acts of violence committed by the Hezbollah Shiite militia against Sunnis and non-Muslims.

Only three of the 30 or so rebel militias active in Syria today are part of the Free Syrian Army, the body engaged in dialogue with Western countries. The others are linked to Al-Qaida and similar terrorist groups which want to spread their message of radical Islam and strengthen that religion's hold in the Middle East.

Can the VP/HR say what the situation is following the EU's lifting of its arms embargo on Syria?

What information is available on religious persecution of Christians and other minorities in Syria?

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

Since 31 May the EU has no longer applied an arms embargo against Syria. The possible export of arms to Syria is now a matter of Member States' national policies. Member States also agreed that they would not allow exports of lethal equipment or internal repression items at that stage. We are not aware of any arms delivery by any Member State so far.

The issue of the respect and protection of minorities in Syria is a subject of major concern. The EU has urged in many occassions all parties in the conflict to fully respect international humanitarian and human rights law and to respect the rights of religious and ethnic minorities. All those responsbible for atrocities and human rights violations and abuses must be held accountable. The EU reaffirms that there should be no impunity for any such violations and recalls that the UN Security Council can refer the situation in Syria to the International Criminal Court at any time. The EU continues to call on Syria to allow the Commission of Inquiry immediate, full and unfettered access throughout the country.

The EU reiterates the urgent need for a political solution of the conflict and has welcomed the joint US-Russia call for a peace conference on Syria to promote a political process based on the principles included in the Geneva communiqué of 30 June 2012. The EU will spare no efforts in helping to create the appropiate conditions for the succesful convening of this conference.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007080/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Divieto di frequentare le scuole cattoliche in Indonesia

Il Consiglio dei Mullah indonesiani (MUI) ha recentemente emesso una fatwa nei confronti di quelle famiglie musulmane che, nella regione di Jawa, iscrivono i figli in scuole cattoliche. In particolare, rischiano la chiusura due scuole gestite da religiosi, gli istituti di Tegal e Pemalang, i quali si sono opposti al decreto ingiuntivo che prevede di rendere obbligatorio lo studio dell'islam in classe.

Considerando che le due scuole citate offrono da anni il loro servizio a studenti di ogni fede, realizzando in concreto il diritto allo studio di migliaia di giovani indonesiani;

Osservando inoltre gli artt. 14 e 21 CEDU, rispettivamente sul tema del diritto all'istruzione e alla non discriminazione, in particolare nella parte in cui si sottolinea la libertà dei genitori di istruire ed educare i figli secondo le proprie convinzioni religiose, filosofiche e pedagogiche, vietando ogni discriminazione fondata sulla religione, sulle convinzioni personali e su opinioni politiche;

Evidenziando infine che il MUI ha già intrapreso campagne analoghe contro la moda nel vestiario femminile, vietando pantaloni attillati e minigonne, il diritto di voto e l'alzabandiera;

Si chiede alla Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante:

— se sia a conoscenza di eventuali nuovi decreti emessi dal consiglio in questione;

— quali misure intenda intraprendere per garantire il diritto alla studio degli studenti indonesiani.

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

La delegazione dell'Unione europea non segue sistematicamente le nuove fatwa emesse dal Consiglio dei Mullah indonesiani (MUI). Sebbene le fatwa siano prese sul serio da molti indonesiani musulmani, esse non sono giuridicamente vincolanti e spesso vengono semplicemente ignorate. A quanto risulta alla delegazione, la fatwa contro le famiglie musulmane della regione di Giava che mandano i figli nelle scuole cattoliche è stata emanata dalla sezione locale del MUI di Tegal e non a livello nazionale. La delegazione, tuttavia, riceve periodicamente relazioni e aggiornamenti sulle discriminazioni e gli attacchi contro le minoranze religiose, tra cui i cristiani, che di solito riguardano i problemi incontrati per ottenere le autorizzazioni per la costruzione dei luoghi di culto.

La Costituzione del 1945 stabilisce che ogni cittadino è tenuto a seguire l'insegnamento di base e che il governo deve coprire i relativi costi. L'istruzione è la seconda priorità del piano di sviluppo nazionale a medio termine 2010-2014 e il governo si è fermamente impegnato a garantire pari opportunità a tutti i bambini indonesiani. Nell'ultimo decennio si è registrato un forte aumento delle iscrizioni a tutti i livelli e si è quasi raggiunto l'obiettivo dell'istruzione primaria universale. In collaborazione con il ministero dell'Istruzione e della cultura e con il ministero degli Affari religiosi, l'UE contribuisce all'effettiva attuazione di tali strategie attraverso il «Programma di sostegno al settore dell'istruzione», comprendente un sostegno al bilancio del settore e una struttura che agevola il lavoro di analisi per la definizione di politiche basate su dati concreti.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007080/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Pupils banned from attending Catholic schools in Indonesia

The Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI) recently issued a fatwa against Muslim families in the Java region who send their children to Catholic schools. Two schools run by the Catholic Church in Tegal and Pemalang in particular face closure as they have refused to implement the decree making the study of Islam a mandatory part of the curriculum.

The two schools have opened their doors to students from all faiths for years, enabling thousands of young Indonesians to exercise their right to education.

Articles 14 and 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, on the right to education and non-discrimination respectively, stipulate that parents are free to ensure that education and teaching is in conformity with their own religious, philosophical and pedagogical convictions and prohibit all discrimination on the grounds of religion, personal beliefs and political opinions.

The MUI has launched similar campaigns against women's fashions, in an effort to ban women from wearing close-fitting trousers and mini skirts, the right to vote and flag-raising ceremonies.

Can the Vice-President/High Representative state whether it is aware of any new decrees issued by the MUI?

What measures does it intend to take to ensure that all Indonesian pupils can exercise their right to education?

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

The Delegation of the European Union does not systematically follow new fatwas issued by the Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI). While fatwas carry some weight with many Indonesian Muslims they are not legally binding and often simply ignored. The Delegation understands that the fatwa against Muslim families in the Java region who send their children to Catholic schools was issued by the local MUI branch in Tegal, not the national MUI. The Delegation, however, does receive regular reports and updates about discrimination or attacks against religious minorities, including Christians, usually with regard to difficulties in obtaining permits for the establishment of places of worship.

The 1945 Constitution states that 'each citizen is obligated to attend basic education and the Government is obligated to fund it'. Education is the second priority in the National Medium-Term Development Plan 2010-14, and the Government of Indonesia is highly committed to the provision of equal opportunity to all Indonesian children. Enrolment has significantly increased at all levels in the last decade, with universal primary education almost achieved. In collaboration with the Ministry of Education and Culture and the Ministry of Religious Affairs, the EU supports effective implementation of these strategies through the 'Education Sector Support Programme', consisting of a sector budget support and a facility to support analytical work for evidence-based policy development.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007081/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Sfruttamento minorile in Bangladesh

Il *Bangladesh Child Right Forum* stima siano 7,4 milioni i bambini bangladesi costretti a lavorare fin da piccoli per contribuire al mantenimento delle proprie famiglie, divenendo vittime di abusi e torture nel 17 % dei casi.

Considerando che, in età compresa tra i 5 e i 10 anni, molti di questi minori già lavorano per 16 ore al giorno, svolgendo mansioni in luoghi quali fabbriche, campagne e abitazioni di privati, con evidente violazione dell'articolo 32 CEDU, il quale fa divieto di sfruttare il lavoro minorile e impone la protezione dei giovani sul luogo dove svolgono la loro attività;

Sottolineando poi che il Bangladesh si è impegnato a sradicare il fenomeno dello sfruttamento del lavoro minorile entro il 2015 e ha ricevuto fondi UE per il proprio sviluppo, in particolare per dare impulso all'economia e vincere la malnutrizione, prerequisiti fondamentali per garantire l'istruzione delle giovani generazioni;

Osservando infine i dati UNESCO dello scorso anno, secondo i quali l'abbandono scolastico in Bangladesh tocca 8 milioni di giovani e l'analfabetismo interessa 44 milioni di persone su 164 milioni di cittadini;

Si chiede alla Commissione:

— di divulgare i dati inerenti ai suoi ultimi studi sull'abbandono scolastico e sullo sfruttamento della manodopera minorile in Asia, e in particolare nello stato del Bangladesh;

— di rendere noti gli ultimi sviluppi della cooperazione allo sviluppo attuata dall'Unione europea in Stati terzi, con riguardo alle tematiche della cultura e dell'istruzione.

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(16 agosto 2013)

L'UE è impegnata a perseguire entro il 2016 l'obiettivo di eliminare le forme peggiori di lavoro minorile ([1]) e l'obiettivo di sviluppo del millennio (MDG) 2 consistente nell'ottenere l'universalizzazione dell'istruzione primaria entro il 2015. La Commissione continua instancabilmente ad operare contro tutte le forme peggiori di lavoro minorile ([2]).

La Commissione non produce dati suoi sui tassi di abbandono scolastico o sul lavoro minorile a livello mondiale ma si basa sulle cifre e sulle stime di organizzazioni internazionali come la Banca mondiale e gli organismi delle Nazioni Unite, tra cui l'OIL ([3]).

L'istruzione è uno dei principali elementi della cooperazione dell'UE con l'Asia, in cui nove documenti di strategia nazionale (DSN) sono incentrati sul settore dell'istruzione, per un importo totale di 820 milioni di euro. Tali azioni hanno contribuito ad avvicinare gli obiettivi MDG 2, con tassi particolarmente elevati nella regione, in cui l'88 % dei bambini nelle corrispondenti fasce di età frequentano le scuole elementari. Sono tuttavia necessari miglioramenti qualitativi, soprattutto nel campo del tasso di abbandono scolastico, ancora troppo elevato.

Il contributo dell'UE al settore dell'istruzione nell'ambito del DSN 2007-2013 Bangladesh è pari a 112,6 milioni di euro (il 28 % del DSN totale). Il Bangladesh ha incrementato l'accesso all'istruzione e le iscrizioni anche per le minori, ma la sua qualità e lo sviluppo delle competenze rimangono deboli. La Commissione intende incrementare il sostegno nel settore per migliorare il dialogo sull'attuazione delle politiche in materia a tutti i livelli, consolidare i risultati ottenuti e migliorare l'impatto. Gli interventi per il periodo 2014-2020 possono concentrarsi sull'istruzione primaria e secondaria, sull'alfabetizzazione dei giovani e degli adulti, sullo sviluppo delle competenze e delle competenze per la vita.

([1]) Si veda il documento di lavoro dei servizi della Commissione (2013) 173 sul commercio e le forme peggiori di lavoro minorile.
([2]) Relazioni annuali dell'UE sui diritti umani e la democrazia, disponibili su: http://eeas.europa.eu/human_rights/; riesame della cooperazione 2002-2012 con l'Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro (OIL), disponibile su: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---europe/---ro-geneva/---ilo-brussels/documents/publication/wcms_195135.pdf
([3]) http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/all-publications/lang--en/index.htm?facetcriteria=GEO=BGD&facetdynlist=WCMS_203618

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007081/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Child exploitation in Bangladesh

The Bangladesh Child Rights Forum has estimated that 7.4 million Bangladeshi children are forced to work from an early age to help support their families, becoming victims of abuse and torture in 17% of all cases.

Between the ages of five and ten, many of these children already work 16 hours a day, performing tasks in places such as factories, the countryside and private homes, in clear breach of Article 32 ECHR, which prohibits the exploitation of child labour and requires young people to be protected at their place of work.

Bangladesh has undertaken to eradicate child labour by 2015 and has received EU funding for its development, in particular to boost the economy and to overcome malnutrition, which are vital prerequisites for ensuring the education of the younger generations.

Looking at last year's data from Unesco, according to which nearly 8 million young people drop out of school early in Bangladesh and 44 million people out of a population of 164 million are illiterate, can the Commission:

— disclose the data from its latest studies on school drop-out rates and the exploitation of child labour in Asia, and particularly in the state of Bangladesh;

— provide information on the latest developments in EU development cooperation in third countries, with regard to culture and education?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(16 August 2013)

The EU is committed to the 2016 target for elimination of the worst forms of child labour ([1]) and to the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 2 relating to achieving universal primary education by 2015. The Commission continues to campaign tirelessly against all forms of child labour ([2]).

The Commission does not produce its own data on school drop-out rates or global child labour but relies on figures and estimates from international organisations such as the World Bank and UN bodies, including the ILO ([3]).

Education is a major component of the EU Cooperation with Asia, where nine Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) have education as a focal sector, for a total amount of EUR 820 million. This has supported achievement of MDG 2 targets, which are overall high in the region, with 88% of primary school aged children enrolled in schools. However, there are still challenges in quality and remaining high drop-out rates.

The EU contribution to the education sector within the Bangladesh CSP 2007-2013 amounted to EUR 112.6 million (28% of total CSP). Bangladesh has boosted access and enrolments including for girls, however quality of education and skills development remain weak. The Commission intends to enhance support in this sector to improve focused policy dialogue at all levels, consolidate achievements and improve impact. Interventions for 2014-2020 may focus on primary and secondary education, youth and adult literacy, skills and life skills development.

([1]) See further Staff Working Document (2013) 173 on Trade and Worst Forms of Child Labour.
([2]) EU annual Reports on Human Rights and Democracy, available at http://eeas.europa.eu/human_rights/; review of the cooperation 2002-2012 with the International Labour Organisation (ILO), available at http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---europe/---ro-geneva/---ilo-brussels/documents/publication/wcms_195135.pdf
([3]) http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/all-publications/lang--en/index.htm?facetcriteria=GEO=BGD&facetdynlist=WCMS_203618

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007082/13
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(18 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Taxas sobre transações financeiras

Considerando o seguinte:

O BCE teme que a taxa sobre as transações financeiras prejudique o crédito na periferia. O francês Christian Noyer, do Banco Central Europeu, receia que as empresas e os bancos saiam a perder com a taxa e questiona se o encaixe fiscal será o previsto por Bruxelas;

Pergunta-se:

Que estudos existem sobre a cobrança desta taxa?

Concorda com a posição assumida pelo BCE?

Resposta dada por Algirdas Šemeta em nome da Comissão
(31 de julho de 2013)

1. A Comissão publicou em setembro de 2011 uma avaliação de impacto exaustiva que acompanha a proposta original de 2011 (SEC (2011) 1102 final e os seus anexos) e publicou outra análise técnica sob a forma de notas explicativas no seu sítio Web em maio de 2012. Além disso, no âmbito da preparação da proposta de diretiva que aplica uma cooperação reforçada no domínio do ITF, de fevereiro de 2013, os serviços da Comissão empreenderam uma análise adicional (SWD (2013) 28) para analisar mais de perto as opções políticas em apreço no contexto da cooperação reforçada. Para além destes documentos, existe um número considerável de estudos e documentos de investigação em matéria de impostos sobre as transações financeiras disponíveis na literatura económica.

2. A Comissão não partilha a posição expressa pelo Senhor Deputado e está convicta de que as estimativas de receitas para o ITF são bastante prudentes, tendo em conta os vários estudos e os números indicados pelos participantes do setor financeiro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007082/13
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Financial transaction tax

The European Central Bank (ECB) fears that the financial transaction tax might adversely affect credit on the periphery. Christian Noyer of the ECB is concerned that the tax will cause companies and banks to lose out and doubts that it will generate the level of tax revenue predicted by Brussels.

What studies have been done on this tax?

Does the Commission agree with the ECB's position?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

1. The Commission has published in September 2011 a full impact assessment accompanying the original proposal of 2011 (SEC(2011) 1102 final and its annexes) and has subsequently published further technical analysis in the form of explanatory notes on its website in May 2012. Moreover, in preparing the proposal for a directive implementing enhanced cooperation in the area of FTT of February 2013, the Commission's services have undertaken additional analysis (SWD(2013) 28) to look closer at the policy options at hand in the context of enhanced cooperation. Besides these documents, there is a significant number of studies and research papers about financial transaction taxes available in the economic literature.

2. The Commission does not share the position quoted by the Honourable Member and believes that the revenue estimates for the FTT are rather conservative having in mind various studies and the numbers indicated by the financial industry participants.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007083/13
à la Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(18 juin 2013)

Objet: Demande concernant le statut légal de la salvia divinorum

La salvia divinorum est une plante de la famille des lamiaceae, connue pour ses effets psychotropes puissants. En effet, celle-ci contient un composant psychoactif, la salvinorine A, qui peut mener, lors de sa consommation par un usager, à une forte altération de la perception, à des hallucinations voire à des pertes de conscience.

En dépit de ses qualités psychotropes puissantes et dangereuses, la salvia divinorum est loin de faire l'objet d'une interdiction complète dans l'Union européenne. La salvia divinorum devient de plus en plus attrayante en ce qu'elle n'apparaît souvent dans aucun texte de loi. Ainsi, de nombreux usagers de drogues douces illégales comme le cannabis se dirigent désormais vers la salvia divinorum.

1. La Commission entend-elle harmoniser la position européenne quant à l'usage non prescrit de cette plante?

2. La Commission envisage-t-elle, au vu du danger que peut représenter cette plante pour l'usager, de réglementer la possession, la vente, la production et l'importation de ce psychotrope?

3. À l'heure où une grande partie des consommateurs de cette plante se fournissent directement via Internet, la Commission entend-elle mieux réglementer la vente en ligne de salvia divinorum?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(31 juillet 2013)

Salvia divinorum (ou Salvia) est une plante psychotrope qui peut provoquer des effets dissociatifs — une sensation de détachement du réel et de sortie de son propre corps — ainsi que des hallucinations. On dispose de peu d'informations sur le degré d'utilisation de *Salvia divinorum* dans l'Union européenne. Des rapports relatifs aux saisies indiquent que les graines et les feuilles séchées de *Salvia divinorum* peuvent aisément être obtenues auprès d'opérateurs sur l'internet et dans des boutiques spécialisées, dans certains États membres. La *Salvinorine* — le principal principe psychoactif de ces feuilles — ne semble pas être disponible sur le marché mais des informations concernant les procédures d'isolation sont disponibles sur l'internet.

Salvia divinorum et la *salvinorine* ne figurant dans aucune des listes des Conventions des Nations unies sur les drogues, elles ne sont pas placées sous contrôle au niveau international. Elles font néanmoins l'objet d'une surveillance dans le cadre de la législation sur les drogues et les médicaments dans certains États membres de l'UE.

La décision 2005/387/JAI ([1]) du Conseil relative à l'échange d'informations, à l'évaluation des risques et au contrôle des nouvelles substances psychoactives définit le cadre juridique permettant de prendre des mesures à l'égard de ces substances dans l'UE. Grâce à cet instrument, le Conseil peut décider d'appliquer des mesures de contrôle à une substance dans l'ensemble des pays de l'Union européenne, à partir d'une proposition de la Commission et à la suite d'une analyse des risques posés par la substance, analyse effectués par le comité scientifique de l'Observatoire européen des drogues et des toxicomanies (OEDT). De plus, un rapport préparé conjointement par l'OEDT et Europol permet de disposer de premières informations sur les risques potentiels associés à la substance en question et, de décider en conséquence si une analyse des risques s'avère nécessaire.

Les informations échangées à ce jour sur *Salvia divinorum* au moyen du mécanisme d'échange rapide d'informations n'ont pas justifié l'élaboration d'un rapport conjoint ni d'une analyse des risques associés à cette substance.

([1]) JO L 127 du 20.5.2005, pp. 32-37.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007083/13
to the Commission
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Request concerning the legal status of salvia divinorum

Salvia divinorum is a member of the mint family known for its powerful psychoactive effects. It contains a psychoactive substance, salvinorin A, which can, when consumed, have a significant mind-altering effect and cause hallucinations and even loss of consciousness.

Despite its powerful and dangerous psychoactive characteristics, salvia divinorum has for some reason not been outlawed throughout the Union. The fact that there are virtually no laws covering the substance is one reason for its increasing popularity. Many users of illegal soft drugs such as cannabis are now switching to salvia divinorum.

1. Does the Commission intend to harmonise the EU position on the non-prescribed use of salvia divinorum?

2. Given that salvia divinorum can be harmful to users, does the Commission plan to regulate the possession, sale, production and import of this psychoactive substance?

3. At a time when many salvia divinorum users are purchasing the plant directly via theInternet, does the Commission intend to ensure that online sales of this product are betterregulated?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

Salvia divinorum (or *Salvia*) is a psychoactive plant which can induce dissociative effects — feelings of detachment from the environment and from one's own body — and hallucinations. There is limited information on the extent of use of *Salvia divinorum* in the EU. Reports on seizures indicate that seeds and dried leaves of *Salvia divinorum* are easily available from Internet suppliers and specialised shops in certain Member States. *Salvinorin*, the main psychoactive ingredient of the leaves, does not appear to be offered on the market but information about procedures for its isolation is available on the Internet.

Salvia Divinorum and *Salvinorin* are not listed in any of the schedules of the United Nations Conventions on Drugs and are, therefore, not controlled at international level. However, they are controlled under drugs legislation or medicines legislation in certain EU Member States.

Council Decision 2005/387/JHA ([1]) on the information exchange, risk-assessment and control of new psychoactive substances provides the legal framework for addressing such substances in the EU. Under this instrument, the Council may decide to subject a substance to control across the EU, on the basis of a proposal from the Commission, following a risk assessment of the substance conducted by the Scientific Committee of the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA). A joint report from the EMCDDA and Europol provides initial information about the potential risks associated with the substance and whether, as a consequence, a risk assessment is necessary.

The information shared so far on *Salvia Divinorum* through the mechanism for rapid exchange of information has not justified the launch of a joint report and risk assessment on the substance.

([1]) OJ L 127, 20.5.2005, pp. 32-37.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007084/13
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante)
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(18 juin 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Liberté de la presse au Mali

La liberté de la presse est actuellement largement menacée au Mali, et ce, notamment, à la suite des événements ayant frappé le pays au courant de l'année 2012. Ainsi, le Mali a chuté de 74 places dans le classement de «Reporters sans frontières» concernant la liberté de la presse dans le monde et arrive à la 99e position sur les 179 pays analysés. Le putsch militaire à Bamako le 22 mars, puis la prise du Nord du pays par les indépendantistes touaregs et des groupes islamistes armés, ont exposé les médias du Nord à la censure et aux menaces.

Face à cette réalité désolante, il importe d'agir pour rétablir ce qui est l'un des piliers démocratiques les plus importants. Alors que le Mali était présenté comme un exemple de réussite concernant les droits d'expression et de la presse en Afrique, les événements ont mené à la création d'un climat d'insécurité pour les journalistes, qu'ils soient maliens ou étrangers. Les exactions se multiplient et de nombreux médias ont dû arrêter toutes leurs diffusions.

Face à ces nouveaux enjeux, le SEAE entend-il renforcer son soutien à la liberté de la presse dans le monde, et en particulier au Mali, afin de respecter les engagements pris?

Réponse donnée par Mme Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(2 septembre 2013)

À la suite du coup d'État du 22 mars 2012 et de l'occupation du nord du Mali par des groupes terroristes en 2012, les libertés publiques et la liberté d'expression, en particulier, ont été de plus en plus limitées et leurs défenseurs victimes de mesures d'intimidation, notamment dans le nord du Mali.

En dépit des importants progrès politiques réalisés depuis le début des opérations militaires internationales au début du mois de janvier au Mali, les restrictions officielles ou officieuses de la liberté d'expression n'ont pas toutes été levées. L'état d'urgence a effectivement été décrété jusqu'au 6 juillet et l'ancienne junte continuerait de jouer un rôle négatif insidieux sur la politique locale et la société malienne à tous les niveaux. Les médias privés du Mali ont lancé une grève en mars après l'arrestation de Boukary Daou, directeur de publication du quotidien *Le Républicain* — l'un des journaux les plus populaires à Bamako — et son incarcération pendant plus d'un mois pour avoir publié une lettre dénonçant les mauvaises conditions des soldats combattant les terroristes dans le nord.

Dans ce contexte, l'UE a entrepris des démarches à haut niveau pour demander des éclaircissements et s'assurer que les droits fondamentaux sont garantis de manière appropriée. Cet objectif s'inscrit également dans le cadre du dialogue politique entre l'Union européenne et le Mali et de la stratégie poursuivie par l'Union dans le domaine des Droits de l'homme au Mali. En outre, la Commission européenne a accru le niveau de l'aide apportée par l'UE aux médias locaux par l'intermédiaire de la Fondation Hirondelle et de l'Union des radios et télévisions libres du Mali (dans le cadre de la prévention des conflits et de la réconciliation).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007084/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Christine De Veyrac (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Freedom of the press in Mali

Freedom of the press is under enormous threat in Mali, especially following events which hit the country during the course of 2012. As a result, Mali has fallen 74 places in the reporters Without Borders press freedom index and is now 99th out of the 179 countries listed. The military coup in Bamako on 22 March, followed by the takeover of the north of the country by Tuareg secessionists and armed Islamic groups, has exposed the media in the north to censorship and threat.

In the face of this bleak situation, action needs to be taken to restore what is one of the most important democratic pillars. Where Mali was held up as an example of success in terms of freedom of expression and freedom of the press in Africa, these events have resulted in a climate of insecurity for both Malian and foreign journalists. Reprisals are increasing and numerous stations have had to stop broadcasting.

Faced with this new challenge, does the EEAS intend to step up its support for freedom of the press in the world, and in Mali in particular, in keeping with the commitments made?

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

As a consequence of the coup d'état of 22 March 2012 and the occupation of the north of Mali by terrorist groups in 2012, public liberties and the freedom of speech in particular have been increasingly restricted and their defenders intimidated, in particular in the north of Mali.

Despite the important political progress made since international military operations started in early January in Mali, official or unofficial restrictions on the freedom of speech have not all been lifted. State of emergency was indeed declared till 6 July and the former junta continues reportedly to play an insidious negative role on local politics and the Malian society across the board. Mali's private media launched a strike in March after editor Boukary Daou of Le Républicain — one of the most popular newspapers in Bamako — was arrested and detained for more than one month for publishing a letter about poor conditions of soldiers fighting terrorists in the north.

In this context, the EU has undertaken high level demarches to request clarification and ensure that fundamental rights are protected as appropriate. This objective is also part of the political dialogue between the EU and Mali and the EU Human Rights Strategy for Mali. In addition, the European Commission has enhanced the level of EU support to local medias through Fondation Hirondelle and Union des Radios et Télévisions Libres du Mali (in the field of conflict prevention and reconciliation).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007085/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Contrabbando di resti di tigri, elefanti e rinoceronti tra Nepal e Cina

È notizia recente il sequestro di svariati kili di ossa di leopardo, denti di tigre e zanne di elefante a Tinkar, sul confine occidentale tra Cina e Nepal. Si tratta di materiale considerato un bene di lusso dal mercato orientale, impiegato oltretutto nella medicina tradizionale asiatica.

Le forze dell'ordine hanno arrestato gli esecutori materiali di tale traffico, ma non i loro mandanti, che restano sotto la protezione degli uomini politici locali.

Inoltre, l'Unione europea riconosce negli animali esseri meritevoli di protezione e, sul piano internazionale, una delle fonti normative principali è la Convenzione sul commercio internazionale delle specie minacciate di estinzione, del 3 marzo 1973, che riconosce quali specie a rischio anche la panthera tigris, il leopardus pardalis e molte altre.

Infine, la scoperta dei reperti è stata effettuata dalle autorità di polizia nepalesi, mentre quelle cinesi non si sono ancora espresse al riguardo.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, può la Commissione far sapere:

1. se sia a conoscenza dell'accaduto e di altri episodi simili e

2. come intenda intervenire per sensibilizzare i paesi terzi alla tutela dell'ambiente e alla salvaguardia delle specie a rischio?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(8 agosto 2013)

La Commissione viene regolarmente informata sui sequestri di prodotti della flora e della fauna selvatiche effettuati dalle dogane delle diverse parti della CITES, inclusi i sequestri che avvengono in Cina e Nepal.

L'Unione europea non è competente a intervenire direttamente nelle questioni bilaterali a cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare, ma segue da vicino l'evoluzione del traffico illecito in fauna selvatica a livello mondiale, in particolare per quanto riguarda tigri, elefanti e rinoceronti.

L'UE è fortemente impegnata nella lotta contro il traffico illecito di specie selvatiche e nel corso della 16ª riunione della convenzione sul commercio internazionale delle specie a rischio (CITES), tenutasi nel marzo 2013, ha svolto un ruolo di primo piano per l'adozione di una serie di raccomandazioni riguardo ad azioni concrete e di largo respiro contro il traffico illecito di specie selvatiche e per la sensibilizzazione dei paesi terzi riguardo la protezione delle specie a rischio. L'attuazione delle raccomandazioni sarà riesaminata nella riunione del comitato permanente della CITES che si terrà a luglio 2014.

L'UE è anche il principale donatore (con 1,7 milioni di euro) di fondi destinati all'*International Consortium against Wildlife Crime* (Consorzio internazionale contro i crimini sulla flora e la fauna selvatiche), che riunisce l'Interpol, l'Ufficio delle Nazioni Unite contro la droga e il crimine (UNODC), l'Organizzazione mondiale delle dogane, la CITES e la Banca mondiale. Il mandato di questo organismo interistituzionale, istituito nel 2010, è di contrastare il traffico illecito di specie selvatiche anche mediante azioni di sensibilizzazione riguardo a questo tema.

Recentemente, inoltre, la Commissione e l'amministrazione forestale dello Stato cinese hanno convenuto di intensificare la cooperazione per migliorare la sostenibilità del commercio globale delle specie di fauna e flora selvatiche e per combattere il loro commercio illegale.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007085/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Trafficking of the body parts of tigers, elephants and rhinoceroses between Nepal and China

News has recently emerged of the seizure of many kilos of leopard bones, tiger teeth and elephant tusks at Tinkar, on the western border between China and Nepal. These are considered to be luxury goods on the Oriental market and are used mainly in traditional Asian medicine.

The police have arrested the actual smugglers, but not the instigators, who remain under the protection of local politicians.

The European Union recognises animals as deserving of protection and, at international level, one of the main legal standards is the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, of 3 March 1973, which recognises *Panthera tigris*, *Leopardus pardalis* and many other species as endangered.

While these body parts were discovered by the Nepalese police, the Chinese police have not yet commented.

1. Can the Commission state whether it is aware of the occurrence of similar episodes, and

2. how it intends to intervene to raise awareness in third countries of the need to protect the environment and safeguard endangered species?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

The Commission is regularly made aware of seizures of wildlife products by customs from several CITES Parties including in China and Nepal.

The European Union is not competent to intervene directly in the bilateral issues referred to by the Honourable Member but is following closely the evolution of wildlife trafficking globally, in particular illegal trade in tigers, elephants and rhinoceroses.

The EU is very committed to the fight against wildlife trafficking and played a leading role in the adoption, at the 16th meeting of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) in March 2013, of a series of recommendations calling for comprehensive and concrete actions against wildlife trafficking, including on awareness-raising in third countries on the need to protect endangered species. The implementation of those recommendations will be reviewed at the CITES Standing Committee meeting in July 2014.

The EU is also the major donor (EUR 1.7 million) to the 'International Consortium against Wildlife Crime' which brings together Interpol, the UN Office on Drugs and Crime, the World Customs Organisation, CITES and the World Bank. The mandate of this inter-agency body created in 2010 is to tackle wildlife trafficking including by raising awareness to this issue.

The Commission and the State Forestry Administration of China also agreed recently that they will intensify their cooperation to improve the sustainability of global trade in wild fauna and flora and to tackle illegal wildlife trade.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007086/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Esecuzioni senza previo processo in Siria; il caso di Aleppo

L'*Osservatorio Siriano per i diritti umani* ha denunciato che il 9 giugno scorso ad Aleppo un venditore di caffè appena quattordicenne è stato condannato a morte da due jihadisti perché, nell'atto di negare loro un caffè gratis, avrebbe detto «anche Maometto in persona avrebbe compiuto il buon gesto di pagare», rendendosi con ciò colpevole di blasfemia. L'esecuzione è stata compiuta sulla pubblica piazza, sotto lo sguardo dei genitori del ragazzo.

Considerando che questo è solo l'ultimo episodio di una lunga serie di intimidazioni e violenze, molte delle quali rivolte contro donne e bambini, «soggetti deboli», e nei confronti di persone di fede diversa da quella musulmana;

Osservando inoltre che la maggior parte delle zone siriane sotto il controllo dei ribelli pullula di tribunali islamici improvvisati, privi di qualsiasi legittimazione e spesso ancorati al fondamentalismo di matrice jihadista;

Considerando inoltre che a norma dell'articolo 47, comma 2, della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea «Ogni individuo ha diritto a che la sua causa sia esaminata equamente, pubblicamente ed entro un termine ragionevole da un giudice indipendente e imparziale, precostituito per legge. Ogni individuo ha la facoltà di farsi consigliare, difendere e rappresentare»;

Si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se sia a conoscenza di quanto avvenuto ad Aleppo e di altri episodi simili;

2. come intenda tutelare concretamente i diritti dei minori coinvolti nella guerra in Siria.

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

L'UE nutre profonda preoccupazione per le informazioni e le segnalazioni relative all'aumento degli atti di intimidazione e violenza nei confronti delle persone vulnerabili, come le donne e i bambini, per motivi di religione o di credo, e condanna fermamente tali atti.

L'UE esorta costantemente tutte le parti in conflitto a rispettare pienamente il diritto umanitario internazionale e la normativa sui diritti umani. Tutti i responsabili di atrocità e di violazioni ed abusi in materia di diritti umani devono rispondere dei loro atti. L'UE ribadisce che simili violazioni non devono restare impunite e ricorda che il Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite può adire in qualunque momento la Corte penale internazionale in merito alla situazione in Siria. Inoltre, l'UE invita nuovamente la Siria a garantire alla commissione d'inchiesta dell'ONU l'accesso pieno e illimitato in tutto il paese.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007086/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Executions without trial in Syria; the case of Aleppo

The *Syrian Observatory for Human Rights* reported that a coffee seller, aged just 14, was condemned to death by two Jihadists on 9 June in Aleppo because, in refusing to give them free coffee, he said 'Muhammad himself would have done the right thing and paid', and was thus guilty of blasphemy. The execution was carried out in the public square, in front of the boy's parents.

This is only the latest in a long series of episodes of intimidation and violence, many of which have been committed against women and children, 'vulnerable individuals', and people of a religion other than Islam.

Most areas in Syria under rebel control are teeming with ad hoc Islamic courts, devoid of any legitimacy and often anchored in Jihadi fundamentalism.

Under Article 47, paragraph 2, of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, 'Everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal previously established by law. Everyone shall have the possibility of being advised, defended and represented';

1. can the Commission state whether it is aware of what occurred in Aleppo and other similar episodes, and

2. what concrete measures it intends to implement in order to safeguard the rights of children caught up in the war in Syria?

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

The EU is deeply concerned by the news and alleged reports on increasing acts of intimidation and violence against vulnerable people, women, children and people on the grounds of religion or belief and strongly condemn them.

The EU continues to urge all parties in the conflict to fully respect intrenational humanitarian law and human rights law. All those responsible for atrocities and human rights violations and abuses must be held accountable. It also reaffirms that there should be no impunity for any such violations and recalls that the UN Security Council can refer the situation in Syria to the International Criminal Court, at any time The EU also reiterates its call on Syria to allow the UN Commission of Inquiry, full and unfettered access throughtout the country.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007087/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Inasprimento della repressione nei confronti dei mezzi di informazione iraniani

A causa delle imminenti elezioni politiche, il governo di Teheran ha disposto il blocco di tutti i mezzi di informazione alternativi alla tv di stato e l'arresto immediato dei giornalisti sospettati di violare questo provvedimento. Sono già state chiuse le redazioni dei giornali riformisti *Aseman*, *Mehrnameh* e *Tajrobeh*, mentre a fine maggio si è avuto l'arresto del direttore del periodico *Baztab Emrooz*, colpevole di aver pubblicato le prove dei brogli elettorali che portarono al potere Ahmadinejad nel 2009.

Considerando che l'intento di Teheran è di evitare il riproporsi di scontri come quelli che caratterizzarono l'*Onda Verde* nel 2009, ma che queste misure non tutelano la pubblica sicurezza, in quanto contravvengono al fondamentale diritto di espressione di cui all'articolo 11 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'Unione europea, ed in particolare al comma 2 che sancisce che «La libertà dei media e il loro pluralismo sono rispettati»;

Sottolineando poi l'importanza della sentenza della Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo *Fatullayev/Azerbaigian*, in particolare nella parte in cui si riconosce il fondamento della libertà di espressione intesa non solo come manifestazione di idee «accolte con favore (…) inoffensive od indifferenti» ma anche di quelle affermazioni «che disturbino, sconvolgano od inquietino» uno Stato o una parte della popolazione, in virtù di principi quali il pluralismo, la tolleranza e l'apertura mentale, senza i quali non può esistere una società democratica.

Si chiede all'Alto Rappresentante, Catherine Ashton:

1. quale atteggiamento intenda assumere l'Unione a fronte degli sviluppi elettorali in Iran;

2. quali azioni voglia intraprendere per dissuadere le autorità iraniane dal continuare nell'attuazione di tali politiche sui mezzi di informazione.

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha rilasciato numerose dichiarazioni sull'importanza della libertà dei mezzi di comunicazione in Iran. La dichiarazione rilasciata più recentemente risale al 31 gennaio 2013 e riguarda l'ondata di arresti di giornalisti e di redattori dei giornali. Con tale dichiarazione l'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente ha sollecitato le autorità iraniane a investigare a fondo su quei casi e a chiarire quali accuse sono state mosse contro i giornalisti.

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente continua a esortare l'Iran a rispettare il diritto della libertà di espressione, in conformità con gli obblighi internazionali in materia di diritti umani.

Il presidente eletto, Hassan Rohani, si è impegnato ad essere più ricettivo rispetto alle preoccupazioni della comunità sulla situazione dei diritti umani nel paese. Ci auguriamo che il presidente Rohani manterrà questo impegno. L'UE seguirà strettamente i relativi sviluppi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007087/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Harsher repression of the media in Iran

In view of the imminent elections, the government in Tehran has ordered the blocking of all media outlets other than state TV and the arrest of all journalists suspected of violating this measure. The newsrooms of reformist newspapers *Aseman*, *Mehrnameh* and *Tajrobeh* have already been closed, while at the end of May the editor of the periodical *Baztab Emrooz* was arrested after having published proof of the election rigging that brought Ahmadinejad to power in 2009.

Considering that Tehran's intention is to prevent the recurrence of clashes like the ones that characterised the *Green Movement* of 2009, but that these measures do not ensure public security as they violate the fundamental right of expression, as stipulated in Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, and in particular paragraph 2, which states that 'The freedom and pluralism of the media shall be respected';

Underlining the importance of the judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in the *Fatullayev/Azerbaijan* case, particularly where it recognises freedom of expression as the right to express ideas 'that are favourably received (…) or regarded as inoffensive or as a matter of indifference' but also to make statements 'that offend, shock or disturb' the State or any sector of the population, in line with the principles of pluralism, tolerance and broadmindedness, without which there can be no democratic society.

Could the Vice-President/High Representative state:

1. What attitude the Union intends to take in the face of these electoral developments in Iran.

2. What measures she intends to take to dissuade the Iranian authorities from continuing to implement such policies in respect of the media.

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

The HR/VP has issued several statements on the importance of free media in Iran. The most recent statement was issued on 31 January 2013 on the wave of arrests of journalists and news editors. She urged the Iranian authorities to thoroughly investigate these cases and clarify the charges that have been brought against the journalists.

The HR/VP continues to call on Iran to respect the right to freedom of expression, in accordance with its international human rights obligations.

President-elect, Hassan Rohani, has pledged that he will be more receptive to the concerns of the international community over the human rights situation in the country. We hope that Mr Rohani will live up to this pledge. The EU will closely follow any developments in this regard.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007088/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Incursione di estremisti alla conferenza di pace fra musulmani e cristiani a Surabaya

È notizia confermata da più fonti che, nel pomeriggio dello scorso 11 giugno, militanti del Fronte di difesa islamico (FPI) hanno effettuato un blitz nella diocesi di Surabaya, sull'isola di Jakarta, per creare scompiglio all'incontro interreligioso tra cristiani e musulmani, volto a realizzare la convivenza pacifica tra le due fedi. Nei giorni prima dell'incontro, le forze di polizia locali avrebbero cercato di dissuadere gli organizzatori dal realizzare l'evento. Poi, durante le incursioni degli estremisti, si sono astenute dall'intervenire, salvo poi trattenere alcuni partecipanti cristiani per interrogarli.

Considerando che il governo di Jakarta impone un rigoroso controllo su ogni manifestazione pubblica, al punto che si dà la necessità di ottenere sempre una previa autorizzazione all'organizzazione degli incontri religiosi;

osservando altresì come le autorizzazioni all'incontro interreligioso di Surabaya, seppur concesse a tempo debito, siano state ritirate poco prima dell'inizio del convegno — come testimonia il relatore cristiano ortodosso Noorsena;

sottolineando infine che nessun provvedimento è stato preso nei confronti di chi ha causato gli scontri, tanto che questi soggetti hanno potuto fare ritorno a casa subito dopo mentre gli organizzatori e i partecipanti all'incontro sono stati costretti a subire un fermo di polizia;

può la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante precisare quanto segue:

1. Intende fare pressione sul governo di Jakarta affinché riveda le sue posizioni restrittive nei confronti della libertà di pensiero?

2. Dispone essa di dati e studi recenti riguardanti la situazione vissuta dai cristiani sull'isola?

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

La libertà di espressione e di credo è un tema ricorrente del dialogo annuale sui diritti umani tra l'UE e l'Indonesia. La delegazione dell'Unione europea a Giacarta è a conoscenza dei fatti di Surabaya, la cui gravità ha raggiunto un livello mai associato in precedenza a un evento interconfessionale. Stando alle informazioni di cui dispone la delegazione, più che essere rivolta ai cristiani in quanto tali, in questo caso specifico la collera degli estremisti è stata scatenata dalla presenza di Ulil Abshar Abdalla, un intellettuale liberale musulmano fondatore della Rete islamica liberale.

La delegazione riceve periodicamente relazioni e aggiornamenti sulle discriminazioni e gli attacchi contro le minoranze religiose, tra cui i cristiani, che di solito riguardano le difficoltà incontrate per ottenere le autorizzazioni per la costruzione dei luoghi di culto.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007088/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR Extremist raid disrupts the peace conference between Muslims and Christians in Surabaya

Several sources have reported that, on the afternoon of 11 June, militants from the Islamic Defenders Front (FPI) launched a raid in the Diocese of Surabaya, on the island of Java, to disrupt the interfaith meeting between Christians and Muslims, the goal of which was to promote peaceful coexistence between the two faiths. In the days leading up to the meetings, the local police forces had apparently sought to dissuade the organisers from holding the event. Then, during the extremists' raid, the police took no action apart from detaining some Christian participants for questioning.

The Indonesian Government imposes strict control over all public demonstrations; to such an extent that prior authorisation must always be obtained when organising religious meetings.

Although the permits for the interfaith meeting in Surabaya had been issued beforehand, they were cancelled just before the meeting started — according to Noorsena, an orthodox Christian who spoke at the meeting;

No action was taken against the instigators of the clashes and they were able to return home immediately, whereas the organisers and participants were placed in police custody;

1. can the Vice-President/High Representative state whether it intends to put pressure on the Indonesian Government for it to reconsider its repressive stance regarding freedom of thought, and

2. does it have any recent data and studies concerning the experiences of Christians on the island?

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

Freedom of expression or belief is a regular topic at the annual EU-Indonesia Human Rights Dialogue. The Delegation of the European Union in Jakarta is aware of the incident in Surabaya which appears to be the first time an inter-faith event is targeted in this manner. The Delegation understands that, in this particular instance, the extremists' ire was directed more against the presence of Ulil Abshar Abdalla, a liberal Muslim intellectual, founder of the Liberal Islam Network rather than Christians per se.

The Delegation receives regular reports and updates about discrimination or attacks against religious minorities, including Christians, usually with regard to problems obtaining permits for the establishment of places of worship.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007089/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — «Raid antiterroristico» in Uzbekistan contro una cristiana di 76 anni con problemi di salute

Alcune settimane fa; le forze di polizia uzbeke hanno effettuato un raid antiterroristico nella casa di un'anziana signora di Guliston, di fede protestante e da tempo affetta dal morbo di Parkinson. Nell'incursione hanno trovato una decina di libri religiosi, tra cui la Bibbia, dei cd di musica sacra e alcune videocassette anch'esse di carattere religioso. Tutto è stato sequestrato e distrutto.

Alla donna è stata inflitta una multa pari a circa 800.000 soms — dieci volte il salario minimo previsto per i lavoratori — e che questo la costringerebbe a non spendere alcunché per almeno otto mesi, dal momento che la sua pensione è pari ad un ottavo di quella somma.

Inoltre l'Uzbekistan considera la detenzione di libri sacri e di altro materiale religioso cristiano un crimine penalmente perseguibile, nonostante la dichiarazione universale dei diritti dell'uomo riconosca agli articoli 17 e 18 che «Ogni individuo ha il diritto ad avere una proprietà sua personale o in comune con altri. Nessun individuo potrà essere arbitrariamente privato della sua proprietà» e che «Ogni individuo ha diritto alla libertà di pensiero, di coscienza e di religione; tale diritto include la libertà di cambiare di religione o di credo, e la libertà di manifestare, isolatamente o in comune, e sia in pubblico che in privato, la propria religione o il proprio credo».

Alla luce di quanto sopra esposto, può la Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante rendere noto se l'Unione europea intende avviare un dialogo con l'Uzbekistan per discutere questo e di altri casi analoghi?

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

L'attuazione, spesso rigorosa, della legislazione in materia di libertà di religione in Uzbekistan, e in particolare il divieto assoluto di qualsiasi forma di attività di «proselitismo», cui fa riferimento l'onorevole deputato, è stata affrontata ripetutamente durante il dialogo annuale fra l'UE e l'Uzbekistan sui diritti umani. I diritti umani, compreso quello fondamentale della libertà di religione e di credo, sono un elemento essenziale dell'azione esterna dell'Unione europea e un caposaldo della sua politica estera.

Inoltre, le delegazioni dell'UE monitorano il livello di libertà di religione e di credo e intervengono in proposito, ove possibile, su base locale, mentre in ambito internazionale l'UE ricorre a impegni multilaterali per rafforzare il consenso sulle norme in materia di libertà di religione e di credo e contro l'intolleranza e la violenza di stampo religioso.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007089/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — 'Anti-terror raid' in Uzbekistan against a 76-year-old Christian woman in poor health

A few weeks ago, Uzbek police carried out an anti-terror raid on the house of an elderly Protestant lady in Guliston, who has suffered for many years from Parkinson's disease. During the raid, they found about ten religious books, including the Bible, ten religious music CDs and some videos, which were also religious in nature. Everything was seized and destroyed.

The lady received a fine of around USZ 800 000 — ten times the minimum wage for workers — which would force her to spend nothing for at least eight months, since her pension is one-eighth of this sum.

Furthermore, Uzbekistan considers keeping religious books and other Christian material a criminal offence, despite the fact that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states in Articles 17 and 18 that 'Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property' and that 'Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief'.

In view of the above, can the Vice-President/High Representative state whether the European Union intends to open a dialogue with Uzbekistan to discuss this and other similar cases?

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

The often rigorous implementation of the Uzbek legislation on religious freedom, and in particular its very strict ban on any sort of 'proselytising' activities, to which the honourable Member or Parliament refers to, has been repeatedly raised during the annual Human Rights dialogue between the EU and Uzbekistan. Human Rights, including the fundamental right of freedom of religion and belief (FoRB), constitute the silver thread that runs through all of our external action and a gold standard of our foreign policy.

In addition, EU Delegations are monitoring the state of freedom of religion and belief and locally engage on such issues whenever possible, while in international fora the EU has recourse to multilateral engagement in order to gather consensus on FoRB standards and against religious intolerance and violence.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007090/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Sterilizzazioni coattive in India. Il caso di New Delhi

Diversi studi statistici convergono nell'affermare che, solo nel 2012, in India si sarebbero avuti circa 4 milioni e mezzo di casi di sterilizzazioni forzate sulle donne, in applicazione della legge sul controllo delle nascite. In molte circostanze, i funzionari incaricati dal Governo di attuare la politica di controllo demografico convincono le donne con l'inganno, offrendo loro pochi euro e senza specificare che, dopo l'operazione, non potranno più avere figli.

Considerando che il governo indiano prevede la costruzione, nei prossimi anni, di 12mila nuovi campi medici specializzati nella sterilizzazione delle donne e che, già oggi, sono circa 650mila le ragazze costrette a sottoporsi all'intervento nell'arco dei dodici mesi.

Osservando inoltre come l'India esegua da sola il 37 % di tutte le sterilizzazioni femminili mondiali, superando anche la Cina che si attesta a quota 34 %.

Considerando infine che queste pratiche, in quanto coattive, violano apertamente la dignità della persona umana e tutti i diritti fondamentali che ne sono corollario, in primis il diritto alla vita familiare di cui all'art. 7 CEDU.

Si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se abbia intrapreso un confronto serio e costruttivo, su questa tematica, con il governo indiano;

2. se sia a conoscenza di nuove politiche repressive nei confronti della maternità femminile, attuate da altri Paesi?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(8 agosto 2013)

1) In conformità all'attuale politica del governo dell'India, e come confermato dal ministero della Salute e del benessere familiare, in India non sono presenti né programmi di pianificazione familiare coercitivi né obiettivi di sterilizzazione. Secondo quanto rilevato dalla delegazione dell'UE in India, i metodi di pianificazione familiare, quali la posticipazione della prima gravidanza, il distanziamento delle gravidanze o la sterilizzazione, sono applicati sulla base di consulenze e di scelte informate e volontarie.

Questi aspetti sono stati discussi sistematicamente e apertamente dalla Commissione durante le missioni congiunte di verifica del programma per la Salute riproduttiva e infantile (National Reproductive and Child Health Programme, RCH) sostenuto dall'UE.

Il governo dell'India, di fatto, si oppone alla sterilizzazione forzata, ha eliminato gli obiettivi della pianificazione familiare e ha delineato orientamenti per migliorare la qualità dell'assistenza. Tuttavia è stato constatato che, in alcuni luoghi, la sterilizzazione viene effettuata senza un'adeguata consulenza o un consenso informato. Il governo indiano si sta adoperando affinché gli operatori sanitari rispondano di tali pratiche scorrette.

2) La Commissione ha seguito i dibattiti, le politiche e le pratiche in tale ambito, in particolare in Cina, in Corea del Sud e nei paesi dell'Associazione dell'Asia meridionale per la cooperazione regionale e ha cercato di trarre insegnamento dalle prassi seguite in altri paesi, senza peraltro giungere a conclusioni affrettate quanto alla loro applicabilità in India o alla loro influenza su tale paese. Attualmente, la Commissione non è a conoscenza di politiche coercitive per la pianificazione familiare, fatta eccezione per la politica cinese del figlio unico. Secondo le delegazioni UE, le politiche di pianificazione familiare nei paesi che hanno accordi di cooperazione con l'UE avvengono su base volontaria.

La Commissione rimanda inoltre l'onorevole parlamentare alle risposte date alle interrogazione scritte E-005190/2013, E-004800/2013 e E-005235/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007090/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Forced sterilisations in India — The case of New Delhi

Several statistical studies all reach the same conclusion that around 4.5 million women underwent forced sterilisation in India in 2012 alone, in implementation of a birth control law. In many cases, officials tasked by the government with implementing population control policy trick women into undergoing the procedure, offering them the equivalent of a few euros without telling them that, after the operation, they will no longer be able to have children.

The Indian Government is planning to construct 12 000 new medical centres specialising in female sterilisation in the coming years and around 650 000 girls are currently forced to undergo sterilisation every year.

India alone accounts for 37% of all female sterilisations worldwide, which is more than even China, which accounts for 34%.

Finally, as these sterilisations are compulsory, they are a clear violation of human dignity and all associated fundamental rights, primarily the right to family life enshrined in Article 7 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

1. Has the Commission held a frank and constructive discussion on this issue with the Indian Government?

2. Is it aware of any new policies implemented by other countries to stop women having children?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

1. As per the Government of India's policy today and confirmation from the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, there are neither coercive family planning schemes nor targets for sterilization in India. Family planning methods, such as delay of first birth, spacing, or sterilization are taking place on the basis of counselling and voluntary and informed decision making processes which have been observed by the EU delegation in India.

These issues have been systematically and openly discussed by the Commission during the joint review missions of the EU-supported National Reproductive and Child Health Programme.

The Government of India in fact opposes forced sterilisation, and has removed targets for family planning and developed guidelines for improving quality of care. Nonetheless, there is evidence that in some places, sterilisation does occur without proper counselling or informed consent. The Government of India is seeking to bring health providers to account for malpractice.

2. The Commission has been following debates, policies and practices particularly in China, South Korean and South Asian Association Regional Cooperation countries. The Commission has been attentive to learning from other countries yet not drawing conclusions too fast about potential applicability in or influence on India. At the moment, the Commission is not aware of any coercive family planning policies apart from China's one child policy. According to EU delegations, family planning policies are voluntary in the countries where the EU has cooperation.

The Commission also refers the Honourable Member to the answers to previous Written Questions E-005190/2013, E-004800/2013 and E-005235/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html;jsessionid=987EC3257DF4C7A682B41123ABBD3EED.node1

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007091/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Violazioni della libertà religiosa in Cina

A inizio giugno, un'altra monaca tibetana si è data fuoco nel Sichuan per protestare contro l'occupazione cinese e la mancanza di libertà religiosa. Le autorità locali, subito dopo il gesto, hanno oscurato internet ed interrotto le linee telefoniche.

Considerando che si tratta del centoventesimo caso di immolazione di un religioso buddista tibetano contro la Cina e che quest'ultima, ancora oggi, non dà segno di volersi aprire al riconoscimento e alla tutela degli abitanti della regione.

Osservando altresì come l'atteggiamento cinese violi sia il contenuto della Dichiarazione universale dei diritti dell'uomo che la Carta CEDU, in particolar modo l'art. 10 c. 1 per il quale «Ogni individuo ha diritto alla libertà di pensiero, di coscienza e di religione. Tale diritto include (…) la libertà di manifestare la propria religione o la propria convinzione individualmente o collettivamente, in pubblico o in privato, mediante il culto, l'insegnamento, le pratiche e l'osservanza dei riti».

Sottolineando infine che i controlli delle autorità cinesi si sono fatti più consistenti soprattutto con riferimento ai raduni dei fedeli, come dimostra la task force impiegata per controllare il monastero di Nyatso lo scorso 10 giugno, in occasione dell'assemblea tra i religiosi dei cinquanta monasteri circostanti.

Si chiede alla Commissione:

1. quali sforzi abbia finora compiuto l'UE per esortare la Cina a mantenere un atteggiamento in linea con le previsioni a tutela della libertà di espressione e di coscienza;

2. quali passi intenderà porre in atto qualora continui la violazione dei diritti umani del governo cinese nei confronti dei monaci e delle monache buddiste?

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

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente esprime profonda preoccupazione per la serie inquietante di autoimmolazioni in Tibet. L'UE ha invitato ripetutamente le autorità cinesi ad astenersi dal ricorso alla forza e a consentire ai tibetani di professare la loro religione, usare la loro lingua e seguire le loro tradizioni culturali, affrontando le cause all'origine di questi gesti. L'Unione europea ha sollevato l'argomento ripetutamente in seno al Consiglio dell'ONU sui diritti umani, all'Assemblea generale dell'ONU e, di recente, in occasione del dialogo UE-Cina sui diritti umani del 25 giugno 2013. L'UE continuerà a esprimere alle autorità cinesi le proprie preoccupazioni in tutte le occasioni e a tutti i livelli opportuni.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007091/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Violation of religious freedoms in China

In early June, another Tibetan nun set fire to herself in Sichuan to protest against the Chinese occupation and the lack of religious freedom. Immediately afterwards, the local authorities shut down the Internet and blocked the telephone lines.

Considering that this is the one hundred and twentieth case of self-immolation by a Tibetan Buddhist monk or nun in protest against China and that, even today, the Chinese show no signs of being willing to recognise and protect the inhabitants of the region.

Considering, furthermore, that the Chinese attitude violates the content of both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the ECHR, in particular Article 9, paragraph 1, which states that 'Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom (…), either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance'.

Finally, in view of the fact that the Chinese authorities are exercising ever-greater control, especially over religious assemblies, as demonstrated by the task force deployed to inspect the Nyatso Monastery on 10 June, during the gathering of monks from fifty surrounding monasteries.

1. Can the Commission state what efforts the EU has made so far to urge China to bring its attitude in line with the provisions safeguarding freedom of expression and conscience, and

2. What measures it intends to implement should the Chinese Government continue to violate the human rights of Buddhist monks and nuns?

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

The High Represenative/Vice-President is deeply concerned at the distressing series of self-immolations in the Tibetan areas. The EU has repeatedly urged the Chinese authorities to refrain from the use of force, to allow the Tibetan people to exercise their religious, linguistic and cultural rights and to address the root causes of the self-immolations. The EU has raised the subject repeatedly at the UN Human Rights Council and UN General Assembly and very recently at the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue on 25 June 2013. The EU will continue to express its concerns to the Chinese authorities at all appropriate opportunities and levels.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007092/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Accesso ai vaccini nei paesi in via di sviluppo

Un recente progetto finanziato dall'Unione europea, *Auditec*, su cui sta lavorando il prof. Rino Rappuoli, sta cercando di porre le basi conoscitive per generare vaccini innovativi, basti pensare a quello contro la meningite da meningicocco, che ancora colpisce numerose persone in Africa e in altri paesi in via di sviluppo. Il meningicocco B, il cui vaccino sarà presto disponibile in Italia, causa ogni anno circa 50 000 morti in Europa, mentre ancora nei paesi in via di sviluppo muoiono ogni anno 2,5 milioni di bambini a causa di diarrea infantile e di polmonite da pneumococco, poiché privi di vaccini che in Europa sono invece largamente utilizzati. Entro il 2020, sostiene il prof. Alberto Mantovani, l'immunizzazione contro virus e batteri salverà 2,5 milioni di persone, tuttavia le fasce più povere della popolazione mondiale, quelle cui i governi non riescono a garantire misure sanitarie adeguate, non avranno accesso ai vaccini.

Può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. È essa in grado di presentare i dati del lavoro di *Aditec*?

2. È essa in grado di presentare una stima dell'impatto futuro dei nuovi vaccini finanziati dall'UE?

3. Non ritiene di dover mettere in pratica delle misure di cooperazione infantile tese a garantire vaccini elementari ai bambini dei paesi in via di sviluppo?

4. Riesce a stimare l'impatto del vaccino contro il meningicocco B?

5. Quali misure di coordinamento adotta a livello internazionale per identificare e contenere le nuove malattie che si stanno diffondendo, come ad esempio il virus H7N9 comparso recentemente in Cina?

Risposta di Tonio Borg a nome della Commissione
(6 agosto 2013)

1. Il progetto è iniziato un anno e mezzo fa e tutti i dati pubblici (prevalentemente pubblicazioni) possono essere consultati sul sito web del progetto ([1]). In particolare, il ruolo dei vari coadiuvanti nel configurare la risposta immunitaria ai vaccini meningococcici di gruppo B negli adulti sani è studiato da Novartis Vaccines & Diagnostics. I risultati delle sperimentazioni sono attesi per il 2016.

2. L'impatto di un «nuovo» vaccino non può essere stimato senza disporre di dati comprovati sull'efficacia, la sicurezza e il contesto nel quale tali vaccini saranno utilizzati.

3. Migliorare la salute dei bambini è una delle priorità della cooperazione dell'UE allo sviluppo. L'UE sostiene i paesi partner nel loro sforzo di rafforzare i rispettivi sistemi sanitari nazionali mediante gli aiuti bilaterali. L'UE investe anche in iniziative globali come l'Alleanza mondiale per i vaccini e l'immunizzazione (GAVI), il cui scopo è incrementare l'accesso ai vaccini, compresi quelli contro la meningite, nei paesi poveri.

4. Nel quadro del progetto ADITEC, è prematuro interrogarsi sull'impatto di un nuovo vaccino contro il meningococco B dal momento che i primi dati sono attesi per il 2016.

5. La legislazione dell'UE sulle malattie trasmissibili, oltre al regolamento sanitario internazionale dell'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità, garantisce il coordinamento della sorveglianza e delle misure di risposta relative alle malattie trasmissibili esistenti ed emergenti, comprese quelle che possono causare pandemie.

([1]) www.aditecproject.eu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007092/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Access to vaccines in developing countries

A recent project funded by the European Union, Auditec, which Professor Rino Rappuoli is working on, is seeking to build a knowledge base for creating innovative vaccines, such as the vaccine against meningococcal meningitis, which still affects many people in Africa and in other developing countries. Meningococcus B, the vaccine for which will soon be available in Italy, is responsible for around 50 000 deaths in Europe every year, while in developing countries 2.5 million children still die each year due to infantile diarrhoea and pneumococcal pneumonia, since they do not have access to vaccines that are widely used in Europe. By 2020, according to Professor Alberto Mantovani, immunisation against viruses and bacteria will save 2.5 million lives. However, the poorest sections of the world's population, those whose governments are unable to guarantee adequate health services, will not have access to vaccines.

1. Can the Commission present any data from the Aditec project?

2. Can it estimate what impact new vaccines funded by the EU will have in the future?

3. Does it not think it should implement childhood cooperation measures to ensure basic vaccines for children in developing countries?

4. Can it estimate what impact the meningococcus B vaccine will have?

5. What international coordination measures is it taking to identify and contain new diseases that are being spread, such as the H7N9 virus, of which there was a recent outbreak in China?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

1. The project started 1.5 years ago and all public data (mainly publications) can be found on the project website ([1]). Specifically, the role of different adjuvants in shaping the immune response to group B meningococcal vaccines in healthy adults is investigated by Novartis Vaccines & Diagnostics. Results of the trial are expected in 2016.

2. The impact of 'new' vaccine cannot be estimated without any evidence-based data on efficacy, safety and context in which these vaccines will be used.

3. Improving child health is one of the priorities of EU development cooperation. The EU supports partner countries to strengthen their overall health system with bilateral aid. The EU also invests in global initiatives such as the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisations (GAVI) that aims to increase access to vaccines in poor countries, including those against meningitis.

4. In the frame of the ADITEC project, it is premature to speculate on the impact of a new meningococcus B vaccine since first data are expected in 2016.

5. The EU legislation on communicable diseases, as well as the World Health Organisation's International Health Regulations, provide surveillance and response coordination of existing and emerging communicable diseases, including those with the potential to cause pandemics.

([1]) www.aditecproject.eu.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007097/13
alla Commissione
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(18 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Trasferimento di risorse destinate al progetto del «terzo valico» Genova — Milano

Il 15 Giugno 2013 il Consiglio dei ministri del governo italiano ha approvato un decreto legge recanti misure urgenti in materia di crescita e denominato «decreto fare». Tra le altre misure il decreto prevede lo stanziamento di risorse per una serie di progetti infrastrutturali attraverso l'istituzione di un fondo di 2 030 milioni di euro per il quadriennio 2013-2017 per consentire la continuità dei cantieri in corso o per l'avvio di nuovi lavori.

Il reperimento delle risorse necessarie all'istituzione di tale fondo avviene attraverso il trasferimento, definito temporaneo, di risorse precedentemente destinate ad altre opere, tra cui il tratto del «terzo valico» Genova — Milano.

Considerando che il tratto del «terzo valico» Genova — Milano è parte determinante di uno dei corridoi previsti dal regolamento per la rete transeuropea dei trasporti e che lo spostamento, anche temporaneo, di risorse potrebbe causare un ritardo consistente nella realizzazione dell'opera.

Può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

— Simili provvedimenti predisposti dal governo italiano possono essere ritenuti in contrasto con il progetto e le tempistiche previste per la realizzazione della rete transeuropea dei trasporti?

— Se e come intende intervenire per garantire la tempestiva realizzazione di una delle scelte strategiche della mobilità in Europa?

Risposta di Siim Kallas a nome della Commissione
(2 agosto 2013)

La Commissione ha preso debitamente atto della serie di investimenti effettuati dal governo italiano. Il potenziale impatto del trasferimento di risorse citato dall'onorevole deputato dipenderà dai futuri finanziamenti che dovranno essere messi a disposizione.

Nel 2011, nella prospettiva di sostituire le norme vigenti in materia, la Commissione ha proposto un nuovo regolamento sugli orientamenti dell'Unione per lo sviluppo della rete transeuropea dei trasporti.

In base a tale proposta (proposta della Commissione relativa a un regolamento sul meccanismo per collegare l'Europa), attualmente sottoposta alla procedura legislativa ordinaria, l'intera rotta Genova-Rotterdam sarebbe inclusa nel Corridoio della rete centrale n. 6. Come per gli altri corridoi previsti, sarà necessaria una pianificazione comune dei lavori. I particolari di questo *iter* sono attualmente al vaglio del legislatore.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007097/13
to the Commission
Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Transfer of resources intended for the Genoa-Milan 'Third Crossing' project

On 15 June 2013, the Italian Council of Ministers approved a decree law containing urgent measures for growth known as the '*decreto fare*' (action decree). Among other measures, the decree provides for resources to be allocated to a series of infrastructure projects by establishing a fund of EUR 2 030 million for the four-year period 2013-2017, allowing current projects to continue and new ones to be launched.

The resources needed to establish this fund will come from an allegedly temporary transfer of resources previously earmarked for other projects, including the 'third crossing' between Genoa and Milan.

The Genoa-Milan 'third crossing' is a key part of one of the corridors envisaged by the regulation for the Trans-European Transport Network and the transfer of resources, albeit temporary, could result in a major delay in the completion of the work.

— Does the Commission believe that similar measures taken by the Italian Government can be deemed to conflict with the project and time frames set for completion of the Trans-European Transport Network, and

— does it intend to intervene in order to ensure prompt implementation of one of the strategic decisions for mobility in Europe, and if so how?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The Commission took good note of the concentration of investments undertaken by the Italian Government. The potential impact of the reallocation of commitments quoted by the Honourable Member will depend on future funding to be made available.

In 2011, the Commission has proposed a new Regulation on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network, with a view to replacing the existing rules in the area.

According to the proposal (which refers to the Commission's proposal on a regulation on the Connecting Europe Facility) currently undergoing the ordinary legislative procedure, the whole Genova-Rotterdam route would be included in the Rhine-Alpine Core Network Corridor. As for the other corridors envisaged, common planning work will need to take place in this regard. Details of this process are currently under discussion by the legislator.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007918/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 juillet 2013)

Objet: Aide financière à l'Égypte

«La Commission et le Service européen pour l'action extérieure (SEAE) ne se sont pas assurés que les autorités égyptiennes remédient aux graves faiblesses en matière de GFP [gestion des finances publiques]», a indiqué la Cour des comptes européenne (CCE) dans un communiqué.

L'audit réalisé était centré sur la GFP et la lutte contre la corruption d'une part, et sur les Droits de l'homme et la démocratie d'autre part.

«Le manque de transparence du budget, l'inefficacité de la fonction d'audit et la corruption endémique démontrent ces graves faiblesses. La Commission et le SEAE n'ont pas réagi à l'absence de progrès en prenant des mesures décisives afin de garantir l'obligation de rendre compte des importants volumes de fonds de l'UE qui ont continué d'être versés directement aux autorités égyptiennes», peut-on lire dans le communiqué.

Le rapport critique le manque de progrès des interventions de l'Union en Égypte dans le domaine des Droits de l'homme et de la démocratie.

«Le principal programme en matière de Droits de l'homme a, dans une large mesure, été un échec», indique la Cour. «Il a débuté lentement et a pâti de l'attitude négative des autorités égyptiennes. La Commission et le SEAE n'ont pas employé les moyens financiers et politiques dont ils disposaient pour briser cette résistance.»

«Certains éléments du programme ont dû être totalement abandonnés. Les fonds acheminés par l'intermédiaire des organisations de la société civile (OSC) n'étaient pas suffisants pour faire une différence perceptible», précise la Cour.

1. La Commission peut-elle s'expliquer en détails sur les conclusions du rapport?

2. L'Union européenne ne doit-elle pas conditionner son soutien à l'Égypte? Or elle n'a suspendu son aide financière ni quand Morsi s'est doté des pleins pouvoirs en novembre 2012, ni lorsque 43 employés d'ONG ont été condamnés à la prison…

3. Un «changement radical» dans la gestion de l'aide financière européenne à l'Égypte ne serait-il pas des plus opportuns?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission
(3 septembre 2013)

La Commission/La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante se félicitent de l'examen par la Cour des comptes des programmes d'aide de l'UE. Toutes les informations et explications nécessaires ont été fournies oralement et par écrit à la Cour des comptes lors de la préparation de son rapport spécial sur l'Égypte.

La Commission/La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante ont reconnu le bien-fondé des observations de la Cour ainsi que d'un grand nombre de ses recommandations, en particulier celles visant à améliorer l'efficacité du dialogue politique de l'UE sur la gouvernance et à renforcer la gestion de l'instrument d'appui budgétaire en Égypte.

La Commission/La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante tiennent à souligner que l'UE a pu, au fil des années, établir un dialogue et une coopération concrète avec l'Égypte sur les questions sensibles de la gouvernance, de la démocratie et des Droits de l'homme.

Dans le contexte particulier du «printemps arabe» de 2011, la Commission/La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante ont entrepris un réexamen de la politique européenne de voisinage, en mettant l'accent sur une approche incitative de notre dialogue politique et de notre aide.

Les priorités de l'UE sont de stimuler le développement social et économique inclusif et de mettre en place une démocratie durable et solide en Égypte. L'UE accorde une place importante au soutien de la société civile et est en contact permanent avec les représentants de cette dernière. Le respect de l'État de droit, des droits humains et des droits de la femme, ainsi que les minorités occupent une place centrale dans notre politique et notre aide en faveur de l'Égypte.

Les décaissements financiers auxquels la Commission a procédé dépendent entièrement des progrès réalisés en matière de réformes et du plein respect de certaines conditions. En outre, pour ce qui concerne l'aide supplémentaire apportée dans le cadre du programme Spring, des conditions sans équivoque ont été fixées en matière de réformes et de démocratie. Par conséquent, aucune nouvelle opération d'appui budgétaire pour l'Égypte n'a été décidée depuis le mois d'août 2011.

Plus de détails sont fournis en annexe.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007098/13
aan de Commissie
Lucas Hartong (NI) en Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(18 juni 2013)

Betreft: Vervolgvragen (2) subsidieverlening aan Egypte

Vandaag maakte de Europese Rekenkamer bekend ([1]) dat zij zware kritiek heeft op de besteding van 1 miljard euro EU-steun voor Egypte. „Het is volstrekt onduidelijk of het geld efficiënt en rechtmatig is besteed", aldus de Rekenkamer. Het is zelfs zo ernstig dat de Rekenkamer „… simpelweg niet weet hoe het geld is besteed, dus ook niet hoe fout". Het is een „zwart gat waarin het miljard is terechtgekomen". In dat kader de volgende vervolgvragen:

1. Volgens de EU was het merendeel (600 miljoen) van de subsidies bestemd voor zorg, onderwijs en transport. Kan de Commissie aangeven aan welke projecten dit geld PRECIES is besteed? Wie waren de ontvangers? Wie droeg de eindverantwoording qua toezicht op de juiste besteding van deze gedoneerde belastinggelden?

2. Het geld werd rechtstreeks aan het Egyptische ministerie van Financiën overgemaakt. Kan de Commissie aangeven op welke wijze het ministerie verantwoording heeft afgelegd over de besteding van deze gelden? Graag ontvangt de PVV Eurofractie hiervan schriftelijke bewijzen.

3. De Raad antwoordde mij op eerdere schriftelijke vragen dat „de voorzitter van de Europese Raad (de heer Van Rompuy) verwees naar de totale financiële inspanning die onder voorwaarden ter beschikking wordt gesteld via verschillende financiële mechanismen waarover de Commissie en financiële instellingen (zoals de EIB en EBRD) beschikken." Kan de Commissie aangeven op welk moment de heer Van Rompuy permissie heeft verkregen van de Commissie om specifieke financiële uitspraken namens de Commissie en haar „financiële instellingen" te doen richting Egypte?

4. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat het een dwaasheid is geweest om zoveel geld ter beschikking te stellen aan het land Egypte terwijl de rechtsstaat daar de laatste maanden zienderogen afkalft en de mensenrechten hieronder ernstig lijden?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007109/13
aan de Commissie
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(18 juni 2013)

Betreft: Europese Rekenkamer oordeelt vernietigend over EU-hulp aan Egypte

Op 18 juni 2013 publiceerde de Europese Rekenkamer een verslag over de EU-steun aan Egypte in de periode vóór en na de opstand van januari 2011. De conclusie van het verslag is vernietigend: de steun was „goed bedoeld, maar ondoeltreffend". De Rekenkamer concludeert onder andere dat

— „de voorzichtige, zachte aanpak niet werkte";

— de Commissie de enige donor is die Egypte rechtstreekse begrotingssteun verleent, maar dat „een gebrek aan begrotingstransparantie, een ondoeltreffende controlefunctie en wijdverbreide corruptie" de impact van deze steun ondermijnden;

— de Commissie „te weinig aandacht besteedt aan de rechten van vrouwen en minderheden", terwijl hun situatie nog verslechterd is ten opzichte van de periode-Moebarak. „De christenen hebben het zwaarst te lijden onder het geweld."

De Rekenkamer vermeldt dat de Commissie en de EDEO zo goed als alle aanbevelingen van de Rekenkamer hebben aanvaard.

1. Kan de Commissie aangeven welke aanbevelingen zij wel en welke aanbevelingen zij niet heeft aanvaard?

2. Kan de Commissie aangeven welke beleidsveranderingen zij concreet gaat doorvoeren naar aanleiding van het verslag van de Rekenkamer?

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/binnenland/21658141/___EU-steun_in_zwart_gat___.html

3. Kan de Commissie aangeven waarom zij als enige donor rechtstreekse begrotingshulp aan Egypte heeft verstrekt? Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat deze vorm van hulp onmiddellijk moet worden stopgezet, aangezien de geconstateerde problemen zoals het gebrek aan transparantie en controle en wijdverbreide corruptie zeker niet van de ene op de andere dag zullen verdwijnen?

4. Kan de Commissie concreet aangeven hoe zij opvolging gaat geven aan de conclusies betreffende de verslechterende situatie van vrouwen en minderheden? Hoe gaat de Commissie werken aan de verbetering van de situatie van de christenen, gegeven het feit dat haar beleid hierin tot nu toe heeft gefaald?

5. Indien de Commissie van mening is dat de hulp aan Egypte moet worden voortgezet, kan zij aangeven onder welke voorwaarden deze hulp in de toekomst zal worden verstrekt en hoe de naleving van deze voorwaarden zal worden gecontroleerd?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007124/13
aan de Commissie
Thijs Berman (S&D)
(19 juni 2013)

Betreft: Samenwerking van de EU met Egypte op het gebied van goed bestuur

Op 18 juni 2013 publiceerde de Europese Rekenkamer een speciaal verslag (nr. 4) over de samenwerking van de EU met Egypte op het gebied van goed bestuur. Dit verslag bevatte enkele zeer kritische opmerkingen van de Europese Rekenkamer over de manier waarop circa 1 miljard EUR aan hulpgelden zijn besteed.

Volgens het verslag was een in het kader van het Europees nabuurschaps- en partnerschapsinstrument (ENPI) uitgevoerd programma inzake mensenrechten en het maatschappelijk middenveld niet gebaseerd op ervaringen uit het verleden, terwijl het ten uitvoer werd gelegd door, onder meer, aan het Mubarak-regime gelieerde organisaties. De Commissie antwoordde slechts dat het te vroeg was om de benadering te veranderen door lessen uit het verleden hierin te integreren. Is de Commissie bezig de manier waarop zij haar programma's ontwerpt te verbeteren, zodat hierbij rekening kan worden gehouden met lessen uit het verleden?

Bij een aantal projecten van maatschappelijke organisaties is het niet gelukt de doelstellingen te verwezenlijken als gevolg van bemoeienis van of het ontbreken van overeenstemming met de Egyptische autoriteiten. Zo moest in april 2012 een in het kader van het Europees nabuurschaps- en partnerschapsinstrument opgezet programma van een maatschappelijke organisatie worden geannuleerd. Hoewel democratie en mensenrechten beleidsprioriteiten van de EU zijn, is er slechts in beperkte mate financiering beschikbaar gesteld in het kader van andere financieringsinstrumenten, zoals het Europees instrument voor democratie en mensenrechten, waarvoor geen nauwe samenwerking met en toestemming van de Egyptische autoriteiten zou zijn vereist. Waarom heeft de Commissie niet meer financieringsmiddelen beschikbaar gesteld via deze kanalen?

De Europese Rekenkamer heeft erop gewezen dat de Commissie geen inventarisatie heeft gemaakt van Egyptische ngo's. In antwoord hierop verklaarde de Commissie dat deze inventarisatie in 2013 zou plaatsvinden. Waarom gebeurt dit pas in zo'n laat stadium?

Waarom heeft de Commissie er niet toe besloten gevolg te geven aan haar scherpe kritiek ten aanzien van mensenrechtenschendingen door de hulp, al was het maar gedeeltelijk of tijdelijk, op te schorten?

De Commissie heeft de Egyptische autoriteiten niet gevraagd een plan voor het beheer van de overheidsfinanciën op te stellen, ofschoon 60 % van de EU-bijstand wordt verstrekt door middel van sectorale begrotingssteun. Waarom heeft de Commissie het bestaan van sectorale begrotingssteun, die over het algemeen veel eenvoudiger te controleren is, niet aangegrepen om het ontbreken van een plan voor het beheer van de overheidsfinanciën aan de orde te stellen?

De Europese Rekenkamer uitte eveneens kritiek op het feit dat de Commissie geen duidelijke criteria heeft vastgesteld voor de hervorming van het beheer van de overheidsfinanciën. Waarom heeft de Commissie vastgehouden aan haar „dynamische" benadering hoewel er volgens de Europese Rekenkamer duidelijke benchmarks nodig waren? En waarom bleef de Commissie begrotingssteun verstrekken terwijl de Egyptische autoriteiten niet bereid waren de hervorming van de overheidsfinanciën op te nemen in de agenda van de informele economische dialoog?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007261/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(20 juni 2013)

Betreft: Onwetendheid over besteding van EU-middelen in Egypte

De Europese Rekenkamer heeft zware kritiek op de besteding van 1 miljard euro aan steun voor Egypte, tussen 2007 en 2013. Niemand weet hoe het geld besteed is, laat staan of het efficiënt en rechtmatig besteed is.

De Rekenkamer vermeldt o.m. dat projecten voor meer democratie en mensenrechten weinig succesvol waren, mede door de onwil van de Egyptische autoriteiten.

De problemen zijn naar verluidt nog erger geworden sinds de islamisten aan de macht kwamen.

Waarom is het verlenen van steun niet gebonden aan voorwaarden, waarvan de naleving grondig en regelmatig gecontroleerd wordt? Komen er nieuwe procedures die de transparantie moeten verhogen?

Zal de Commissie alsnog opheldering vragen over de besteding van de middelen?

Overweegt de Commissie een deel van de middelen terug te vorderen indien er geen bevredigende uitleg komt over de besteding van het geld? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Het rapport van de Rekenkamer handelde specifiek over Egypte. Acht de Commissie de situatie wat betreft de onduidelijkheid over de besteding van EU-middelen beter in landen als Tunesië of Libië? In hoeverre zijn er daar verschillen met Egypte?

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-008768/13
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter / Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Bastiaan Belder (EFD)
(17 juli 2013)

Betreft: VP/HR — Verslag van de Europese Rekenkamer over de besteding van financiële steun van de EU aan Egypte

Deelt de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger de mening dat het onwenselijk is dat steun aan landen met gebrek aan verantwoording niet gekoppeld is aan voorwaarden ten aanzien van bestedingsdoeleinden, wettigheid, regelmatigheid, doeltreffendheid en doelmatigheid, zoals in het geval van Egypte?

Zo ja, op welke wijze en termijn wil de vicevoorzitter/hoge vertegenwoordiger deze onverantwoorde aanpak omzetten in een benadering met robuuste voorwaarden en verantwoordingsplicht, te beginnen met de casus Egypte?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(3 september 2013)

De Commissie en de hoge vertegenwoordiger verwelkomen het toezicht van de Rekenkamer op de bijstandsprogramma's van de EU. Toen de Rekenkamer haar speciaal verslag over Egypte opstelde, heeft zij van de Commissie en de hoge vertegenwoordiger alle mogelijke informatie en uitleg gekregen, zowel mondeling als schriftelijk.

De opmerkingen van de Rekenkamer en veel van haar aanbevelingen zijn door de Commissie en de hoge vertegenwoordiger aanvaard. Met name geldt dat voor de aanbevelingen om de effectiviteit van de beleidsdialoog van de EU op bestuursgebied te vergroten en die om het beheer van de begrotingssteun voor Egypte te versterken.

De Commissie en de hoge vertegenwoordiger benadrukken dat de EU erin is geslaagd om in de loop der jaren met Egypte een dialoog en concrete samenwerking tot stand te brengen over gevoelige onderwerpen als bestuur, democratie en mensenrechten.

De Commissie en de hoge vertegenwoordiger zijn, met name tegen de achtergrond van de „Arabische lente" van 2011, begonnen met een herziening van het Europees nabuurschapsbeleid, waarbij zij de nadruk leggen op een stimulerende aanpak van beleidsdialoog en bijstand.

De EU wil primair een inclusieve sociale en economische ontwikkeling bevorderen en in Egypte een duurzame en diepgaande democratie tot stand brengen. Steun voor het maatschappelijk middenveld staat hoog op de agenda van de EU. Zij is voortdurend in dialoog met maatschappelijke organisaties. De rechtsstaat, de mensenrechten en de rechten van vrouwen en minderheden vormen de kern van ons beleid en onze bijstand.

De Commissie eist bij haar uitbetalingen dat vooruitgang is geboekt met de hervormingen en dat de voorwaarden strikt zijn nageleefd. Voor aanvullende steun via het Spring-programma zijn bovendien duidelijke voorwaarden gesteld met betrekking tot hervorming en democratie. Er is sinds augustus 2011 dan ook geen nieuwe begrotingssteun voor Egypte meer vastgesteld.

Nadere details zijn in de bijlage vermeld.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007098/13
to the Commission
Lucas Hartong (NI) and Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Follow-up questions concerning subsidies granted to Egypt (2)

The European Court of Auditors announced today ([1]) that it has deep misgivings about the spending of EUR 1 billion in EU subsidies for Egypt. 'It is totally unclear whether the money is being spent efficiently and legally', the Court of Auditors said. The situation is so serious that the Court of Auditors 'simply does not know how the money is being spent, so it does not know if it is being spent wrongly'. It is a 'black hole into which this billion euros has fallen'. Could the Commission therefore please answer these follow-up questions:

1. According to the EU, the majority of the subsidies (EUR 600 million) was intended for care, education and transport. Can the Commission state PRECISELY which projects this money was spent on? Who were the recipients? Who bore ultimate supervisory responsibility for the correct spending of this donation of taxpayers' money?

2. The money was transferred directly to the Egyptian Finance Ministry. Can the Commission state in what way the ministry was held accountable for the spending of these sums? The Dutch Party for Freedom in the European Parliament would like to see written evidence.

3. In response to one of my earlier questions (E-001277/2013), the Council said that 'the President of the European Council (Mr Van Rompuy) was referring to the total financial effort (grants and loans) being made available, subject to conditionality, through different financial mechanisms at the disposal of the Commission and financial institutions (such as the EIB and EBRD)'. Can the Commission say when it gave Mr Van Rompuy permission to make specific financial pronouncements concerning Egypt on behalf of the Commission and the 'financial institutions'?

4. Does the Commission agree with the Dutch Party for Freedom that it was foolish to make so much money available to Egypt while the rule of law has clearly been crumbling there in recent months and human rights are suffering grievously as a result?

Question for written answer E-007109/13
to the Commission
Peter van Dalen (ECR)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: European Court of Auditors' damning assessment of EU aid to Egypt

On 18 June 2013, the European Court of Auditors published a report on the EU aid supplied to Egypt in the periods before and after the Uprising of January 2011. The conclusion reached in the report is damning: the support was 'well-intentioned but ineffective'. The Court of Auditors concludes, among other things, that

— 'the "softly softly" approach has not worked';

— the Commission is the only donor providing direct budget support to Egypt, but that 'lack of budgetary transparency, an ineffective audit function and endemic corruption' undermined the effect of this support;

— the Commission 'does not give sufficient attention to women's and minorities' rights', while their situation is even worse than during the Mubarak rule. 'The Christians are suffering the brunt of the violence.'

The Court of Auditors reports that the Commission and the EEAS have accepted virtually all the Court's recommendations.

1. Can the Commission specify which recommendations it has accepted and which it has not?

2. Can the Commission indicate what specific policy changes it will implement in response to the Court's report?

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/binnenland/21658141/___EU-steun_in_zwart_gat___.html

3. Can the Commission indicate why it is the only donor providing direct budget support to Egypt? Does the Commission agree with me that this form of aid must be stopped immediately, seeing that the problems identified, such as a lack of transparency and control and endemic corruption, are surely not going to disappear overnight?

4. Can the Commission specify what actions it is going to take following the conclusions regarding the deteriorating situation of women and minorities? What is the Commission going to do to improve the situation of the Christians, given that its policy in this respect has failed so far?

5. If the Commission believes that the aid to Egypt should be continued, can it indicate the conditions under which this aid will be provided in future and how compliance with these conditions will be verified?

Question for written answer E-007124/13
to the Commission
Thijs Berman (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: EU cooperation with Egypt in the field of governance

On 18 June 2013, the European Court of Auditors (ECA) published a special report (No 4) on 'EU cooperation with Egypt in the field of governance'. In this report, the ECA made several highly critical observations on the way in which approximately EUR 1 billion in aid had been spent.

The report stated that a European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) programme on human rights and civil society had not been based on lessons learned and that it had been implemented by, among others, organisations linked to the Mubarak regime. The Commission merely replied that it was too early to change the approach by incorporating lessons learned. Is the Commission improving the way in which it designs its programmes, such that lessons learned will be taken on board?

A number of civil society organisation (CSO) projects have not achieved their objectives due to interference by or lack of agreement with Egyptian authorities. For example, in April 2012, a CSO programme under ENPI had to be cancelled. Even though democracy and human rights are EU policy priorities, very limited funding has been made available under other financial instruments, such as the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), which would not require strong cooperation and agreement from the Egyptian authorities. Why has the Commission not made more funding available through those channels?

The ECA has highlighted the fact that the Commission has not carried out a mapping exercise of Egyptian NGOs. In its reply, the Commission said that the mapping was to take place in 2013. Why is this being done at such a late stage?

Why did the Commission not decide to follow up on its severe criticisms of human rights violations with a suspension of aid, even partially and/or temporarily?

The Commission has not asked the Egyptian authorities to establish a public finance management (PFM) plan, even though 60% of the EU's assistance is channelled through sectoral budget support (SBS). Why has the Commission not used the existence of SBS, which is, in general, much easier to control, so as to address the lack of a PFM?

The ECA also criticised the fact that the Commission did not establish clear criteria for PFM reform. Why did the Commission stick to its 'dynamic' approach even though clear benchmarks were needed according to the ECA? Furthermore, why did the Commission continue with the disbursement of budget support even though the Egyptian authorities did not want to put PFM reform on the agenda of the Informal Economic Dialogue?

Question for written answer E-007261/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Lack of information about the use made of EU funding in Egypt

The Court of Auditors has strongly criticised the use made of EUR 1 bn in aid to Egypt between 2007 and 2013. No one knows how the money was spent, let alone whether it was used efficiently and lawfully.

The Court of Auditors states, *inter alia*, that projects to promote democracy and human rights were not very successful, partly because the Egyptian authorities were not wholeheartedly in favour of them.

The problems have apparently become even worse since the Islamists came to power.

Why is the provision of aid not subject to conditions, compliance with which is monitored thoroughly and regularly? Will new procedures be instituted to increase transparency?

Will the Commission now seek information about the use made of the funding?

Will the Commission recover part of the funding unless a satisfactory account is given of the use made of it? If not, why not?

The Court of Auditors' report dealt specifically with Egypt. Does the Commission consider the situation to be any better in such countries as Tunisia or Libya as regards the lack of clarity as to how EU funds have been used? To what extent do differences exist there in comparison with Egypt?

Question for written answer E-007646/13
to the Commission
James Nicholson (ECR)
(27 June 2013)

Subject: EU aid to Egypt

A recent report from the European Court of Auditors has found that the Egyptian government has demonstrated little interest in EU programmes aimed at fostering civil society and protecting the rights of women and minorities. Given that the EU has supplied almost EUR 1 billion in aid to Egypt over the past seven years, what is the Commission doing to address this issue?

Question for written answer E-007918/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(3 July 2013)

Subject: Financial support to Egypt

In a press release, the European Court of Auditors (ECA) stated that 'the Commission and the European External Action Service (EEAS) [had] failed to ensure that the Egyptian authorities tackled major weaknesses in PFM [Public Finance Management]'.

The audit focused on PFM and the fight against corruption on the one hand, and human rights and democracy on the other hand.

'Lack of budgetary transparency, an ineffective audit function and endemic corruption were all examples of these undermining weaknesses. The Commission and the EEAS did not react to the lack of progress by taking decisive action to ensure accountability for considerable EU funds, which continued to be paid directly to the Egyptian Authorities', continued the press release.

The report is critical of the lack of progress made despite EU support in Egypt in the areas of human rights and democracy.

According to the Court of Auditors, 'the main human rights programme was largely unsuccessful. It was slow to commence and was hindered by the negative attitude of the Egyptian authorities. The Commission and the EEAS did not use the financial and political leverage at their disposal to counteract this intransigence.'

'Some elements of the programme had to be dropped completely. Funds channelled through Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) were not sufficient to make a discernible difference', specified the Court of Auditors.

1. What is the Commission's analysis of the report's conclusions in detail?

2. Should conditions be attached to Union support in Egypt? Aid was not even suspended when Morsi assumed plenary powers in November 2012 or when 43 NGO workers were put behind bars.

3. Would it not be fitting to effect a 'radical change' in the way in which European financial aid to Egypt is managed?

Question for written answer P-008768/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Bastiaan Belder (EFD)
(17 July 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Report by the Court of Auditors on the use made of EU financial assistance to Egypt

Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree that it is undesirable that — as in the case of Egypt — support to countries which do not adequately account for the use made of funding should not be subject to any conditions regarding the purposes for which it is used and the lawfulness, regularity, effectiveness and efficiency of the expenditure?

If so, how and when will the Vice-President/High Representative abandon this irresponsible approach and introduce robust conditionality and accountability, starting with Egypt?

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(3 September 2013)

The Commission/HR welcomes the scrutiny by the Court of Auditors of EU assistance programmes. During the preparation of its special report on Egypt, all possible information and explanations both in writing and orally have been provided to the Court.

The Court's observations and many of its recommendations have been accepted by the Commission/HR. In particular, those aiming at improving the effectiveness of EU policy dialogue on governance and at strengthening the management of the Budget Support (BS) instrument in Egypt.

The Commission/HR, would like to emphasise that the EU has been able to establish over the years a dialogue and concrete cooperation with Egypt on the sensitive issues of governance, democracy and human rights.

In particular against the background of the 'Arab Awakening' in spring 2011, the Commission/HR initiated a review of the European Neighbourhood Policy, putting the focus on an incentive based approach in our policy dialogue and assistance.

The EU's priority is to stimulate the inclusive social and economic development and to build a sustainable and deep democracy in Egypt. Support to Civil Society is high on the EU agenda, as the EU is engaging in a constant dialogue with Civil Society representatives. Respect of rule of law, human and women's rights and minorities are at the core of our policy and assistance.

The Commission has made financial disbursements which depend entirely on progress in reforms and the unequivocal fulfilment of conditions. Moreover, for additional support under the SPRING programme unequivocal conditionalities were established linked to reforms and democracy. Thus, no new BS operation has been decided for Egypt since August 2011.

More detail is provided in the annex.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007099/13
do Komisji
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(18 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Sytuacja producentów gipsu w UE

Przemysł budowlany jest jednym ze strategicznych sektorów gospodarki UE, od którego zależy dalszy rozwój gospodarczy wielu sektorów (np. infrastruktury). W szczególności specyficzna jest sytuacja producentów gipsu, gdyż ponad połowa światowej produkcji gipsu przypada na UE. Przemysł ten zatrudnia ponad 14 000 osób i liczy około 3 miliony lokalnych, małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw.

Przedstawiciele producentów gipsu szacują, że koszty związane z wprowadzeniem systemu ETS mogą sięgnąć nawet 25 % ich zysków. W związku z tym, może mieć miejsce ucieczka tego przemysłu poza granice UE.

Czy Komisja zamierza podjąć decyzję o uwzględnieniu przemysłu gipsowego na liście sektorów narażonych na ryzyko przeniesienia produkcji poza UE (carbon leakage list)? Jeśli tak, kiedy taka decyzja zostanie podjęta?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Connie Hedegaard w imieniu Komisji
(30 lipca 2013 r.)

Sektory „produkcja gipsu" oraz „produkcja wyrobów z gipsu dla budownictwa" (kody NACE 2653 i 2662) zostały poddane ponownej ocenie pod kątem wpisania ich do wykazu sektorów i podsektorów uważanych za narażone na znaczące ryzyko ucieczki emisji objętego decyzją 2010/2/UE. Sprawozdanie analityczne wykazało, że sektory te spełniają kryteria określone w art. 10a dyrektywy 2003/87/WE.

Decyzja Komisji w sprawie aktualizacji wykazu sektorów i podsektorów uważanych za narażone na znaczące ryzyko ucieczki emisji musi zostać przyjęta przez Parlament Europejski i Radę w drodze procedury regulacyjnej połączonej z kontrolą. Dnia 10 lipca 2013 r. Komitet ds. Zmian Klimatu pozytywnie zaopiniował wniosek Komisji o wpisanie ww. sektorów do wykazu sektorów i podsektorów uważanych za narażone na znaczące ryzyko ucieczki emisji. W przypadku zatwierdzenia projektu decyzji ww. sektory będą uprawnione do otrzymania dodatkowych bezpłatnych przydziałów w 2014 r.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007099/13
to the Commission
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Situation facing gypsum producers in the EU

The construction industry is one of the EU's strategic economic sectors, and the continued development of many other sectors (e.g. infrastructure) is dependent upon it. The situation facing gypsum producers is of particular importance, as more than half of the world's gypsum is produced in the EU. This industry employs over 14 000 people and over 3 million local SMEs are reliant upon it.

Representatives of gypsum producers estimate that the costs associated with the introduction of the Emissions Trading System could consume up to 25% of their profits. This could possibly lead to the industry moving outside the EU.

Does the Commission intend to adopt a decision on including the gypsum industry on the list of sectors exposed to the risk of carbon leakage outside the EU? If so, when will such a description be adopted?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

The sectors 'Manufacture of plaster' and 'Manufacture of plaster products for construction purposes' (NACE codes 2653 and 2662, respectively) have been reassessed with a view to adding these sectors to the list of sectors and subsectors deemed to be exposed to a significant risk of carbon leakage covered by Decision 2010/2/EU. The sectors concerned demonstrated, in an analytical report, that they satisfy the criteria set out in Article 10a of Directive 2003/87/EC.

The Commission Decision to amend the carbon leakage list is to be adopted through the regulatory procedure with scrutiny by the European Parliament and the Council. The Climate Change Committee on 10 July 2013 gave a favourable opinion to the Commission's proposal to add the concerned sectors to the carbon leakage list. If the draft Decision is accepted in the process, the sectors in question will be eligible to receive additional free allowances in 2014.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007100/13
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Caballos en la fiesta del Rocío en Andalucía

Cada año y tras la fiesta del Rocío en Andalucía, se repite la misma triste imagen: varios cadáveres de caballos son abandonados tras el fin de los festejos. Las cifras hablan por sí solas: 25 caballos muertos en 2008, 23 en 2009, 11 en 2011, 23 en 2013.

Unos mueren de agotamiento por las largas caminatas, otros de sed, otros por falta de descanso o por la falta de experiencia de los caballistas. Los caballos son considerados como un elemento más del festejo y no como un ser vivo al que hay que respetar.

La asociaciones protectoras de animales defienden que todo ello podría evitarse estableciendo un exhaustivo control durante el camino, estableciendo paradas cada ciertos kilómetros, previendo controles del estado de los animales tanto a la salida como a la entrada de la romería, así como evitando las competiciones de caballos.

Todas estas acciones vulneran la Ley 11/2003, de 24 de noviembre, de Protección de los Animales. Pero es necesaria una aplicación efectiva de la misma y, a su vez, que se elabore una normativa más estricta de la Unión Europea que ayude a evitar estas actuaciones y proteger a los animales utilizados en festejos populares.

Teniendo en cuenta lo anterior, cabe formular las siguientes preguntas.

1. ¿Prevé la Comisión elaborar algún tipo de reglamento o directiva para proteger a los animales empleados en tales festividades?

2. ¿Se podría establecer una alternativa al uso de dichos animales?

Respuesta del Sr. Mr Borg en nombre de la Comisión
(31 de julio de 2013)

La Comisión remite a Su Señoría a su respuesta a la pregunta escrita E-004702/2013 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007100/13
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Horses at the Fiesta del Rocío in Andalusia

Every year, after the Fiesta del Rocío in Andalusia, we see the same sad image of abandoned dead horses. The figures speak for themselves: 25 horses died in 2008, 23 in 2009, 11 in 2011, and 23 in 2013.

Some die of exhaustion from the long walks, others of thirst, and others due to lack of rest or the inexperience of the riders. The horses are considered to be just another part of the festival and not living beings that must be respected.

Animal rights associations argue that all of this could be avoided by carrying out thorough checks along the way, establishing stopping points every few kilometres, checking the condition of the animals when they start and finish the pilgrimage and banning competitions involving horses.

All these actions are in breach of Law 11/2003 of 24 November on the protection of animals. However, this law must be applied effectively and stricter EU regulations must be drawn up to help to prevent these actions and protect the animals used in popular festivals.

1. Does the Commission intend to draw up a regulation or directive to protect the animals used in these festivities?

2. Could an alternative to using these animals be found?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question E-004702/2013 ([1]).

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

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007101/13
an die Kommission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(18. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Expertengruppe PRISM

Kommissionsmitglied Cecilia Malmström hat während einer Rede am 14. Juni 2013 angekündigt, eine Expertengruppe einzusetzen, die sich mit dem US-Überwachungsprogramm PRISM auseinandersetzen soll.

1. Wann wird die Expertengruppe eingesetzt?

2. Wie lange wird die Expertengruppe bestehen?

3. Wer sind die Mitglieder der Expertengruppe?

4. Wer hat auf welcher Grundlage entschieden, wer die Mitglieder der Expertengruppe sind?

Antwort von Viviane Reding im Namen der Kommission
(2. September 2013)

Die erste Sitzung der Ad-hoc-Arbeitsgruppe EU-USA fand am 22. und 23. Juli 2013 in Brüssel statt, eine zweite folgt im September.

Den Vorsitz für die EU führt die Kommission gemeinsam mit der EU-Ratspräsidentschaft. Vertreten wird die EU in der Gruppe durch die Kommission, die EU-Ratspräsidentschaft, den Koordinator für die Terrorismusbekämpfung, den Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst, ein Mitglied der Arbeitsgruppe gemäß Artikel 29 und höchstens zehn Experten aus den Mitgliedstaaten. Die Kommission wird dem Europäischen Parlament und dem Rat im Oktober Bericht über die Ergebnisse der Arbeit der Gruppe erstatten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007101/13
to the Commission
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: PRISM expert group

In a speech on 14 June 2013, Commissioner Malmström announced that an expert group would be set up to examine the US surveillance programme PRISM.

1. When will the expert group be set up?

2. How long will the expert group remain in place?

3. Who are the members of the expert group?

4. Who decided who the members of the expert group would be and on what basis?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 September 2013)

The ad-hoc EU-US working group held its first meeting on 22-23 July 2013 in Brussels and will hold a second one in September.

The EU side is co-chaired by the Commission and the Presidency. The EU side is composed of the Commission, the Presidency, the Counter-terrorism Coordinator, EEAS, a member of the article 29 Working Group and up to ten Member State experts. The Commission will report about the findings of the group to the European Parliament and the Council in October.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007102/13
an die Kommission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(18. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Öffentliche Mittel fließen in Legebatterien in der Türkei, der Ukraine und China

Die Europäische Bank für Wiederaufbau und Entwicklung (EBRD), aber auch Export-Kreditagenturen von einigen EU-Staaten sowie die Weltbank finanzieren Medienberichten und einem Bericht des österreichischen Tierschutz-Bündnisses zufolge landwirtschaftliche Unternehmen außerhalb der EU, für die Tierschutz ein Fremdwort ist. Demnach fließen hunderte Millionen von öffentlichen Mitteln der EU vor allem in Legebatterien oder enge Kastenstände für Schweine in die Ukraine, die Türkei und nach China. Auch Deutschland unterstützt den Export von Käfigsystemen in Drittstaaten, obwohl Käfighaltung von Legehennen in Deutschland genauso wie in Österreich verboten ist.

1. Wie hoch sind die europäischen Gelder, die unter dem Deckmantel Entwicklungshilfe in solche Fabriken und landwirtschaftlichen Betriebe außerhalb der EU fließen?

2. Wie hoch sind die österreichischen Gelder, die in landwirtschaftliche Unternehmen außerhalb der EU fließen?

3. Gefährden die daraus resultierenden Billigimporte aus solchen Drittstaaten wie etwa Eier aus Käfigtierhaltung nicht unsere heimische Landwirtschaft und die Existenz unserer Bauern?

4. Die Österreichische Kontrollbank hat zwar keinerlei Legebatterie-Finanzierungen vergeben, aber Schweinestalleinrichtungen in der Ukraine finanziert. Entsprechen diese Ställe überhaupt den EU-Normen?

5. Wäre eine Aufnahme von Tierschutzstandards in die Kreditvergabepolitik der Weltbank nicht vernünftig? Wie beurteilt die Kommission dies?

6. EU-Tierschutzstandards sollten Mindestkriterium sein, so fordern Tierschützer. Wie beurteilt die Kommission diese Forderungen?

7. Welche Maßnahmen wird die Kommission nun auf EU-Ebene und im Hinblick auf die Weltbank im Sinne von nachhaltiger und fortschrittlicher Tierschutzpolitik treffen, auch um hier die Glaubwürdigkeit der EU sowie die heimischen Landwirtschaftsstandards zu schützen?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(29. August 2013)

Die EU-Entwicklungshilfe konzentriert sich auf Kleinbauern, die sich in der Regel in frühen Stadien der Intensivierung befinden. Ziel unserer Interventionen ist eine nachhaltige Intensivierung (gemäß der Definition der GD AGRI und DEVCO), die den Tierschutz berücksichtigt. Bei jeglichen künftigen Diskussionen über dieses Thema mit EU-Institutionen oder internationalen Einrichtungen sollte sichergestellt sein, dass eine rasche Auszahlung der Kredite nicht den EU-Tierschutzvorschriften zuwiderläuft und den EU-Landwirten nicht schadet. Hinsichtlich der Tätigkeit der Europäischen Bank für Wiederaufbau und Entwicklung (EBWE) in diesem Bereich verweist die Kommission den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-007559/2013 ([1]).

Fragen zu den österreichischen Geldern und Einzelheiten der mit diesen Geldern finanzierten Produktionssysteme sollte der Herrn Abgeordnete an die zuständigen österreichischen Behörden richten.

Zum Thema Billigimporte ist zu sagen, dass Eier aus der Ukraine und aus der Türkei eingeführt werden dürfen, allerdings nur in der Güteklasse B. Das bedeutet, dass sie nicht als Konsumeier vermarktet, sondern nur weiterverarbeitet werden dürfen. Schweinefleisch und Schweinefleischerzeugnisse für den menschlichen Verzehr dürfen derzeit aus keinem dieser Länder in die EU eingeführt werden. Die Importe von Eiern und Schweinefleisch aus Drittländern machen derzeit weniger als 1 % des gesamten EU-Verbrauchs aus. Die EU ist bei beiden Produkten Netto-Exporteur.

Hinsichtlich der Anwendung von EU-Rechtsvorschriften in Drittländern verweist die Kommission den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antworten auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-10734/2012 ([1]) und E-4842/2013 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007102/13
to the Commission
Franz Obermayr (NI)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Public funds being poured into laying batteries in Turkey, Ukraine and China

According to media reports and a report by the Austrian Animal Welfare Alliance, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) along with export credit agencies from some EU Member States and the World Bank are funding agricultural holdings outside the EU for which animal welfare is an alien concept. It is claimed that hundreds of millions in EU public funds are being poured, in particular, into laying batteries or cramped crate stalls for pigs in Ukraine, Turkey and China. Germany is also supporting the export of cage systems to third countries, although the keeping of laying hens in cages is prohibited in Germany, just as it is in Austria.

1. How much in the way of European funds is being poured into these sorts of factories and agricultural holdings outside the EU under the guise of development aid?

2. How much in the way of Austrian funds is being poured into agricultural holdings outside the EU?

3. Do the resulting cheap imports from these third countries, such as eggs from caged animals, not threaten our domestic agriculture and the livelihoods of our farmers?

4. Although the *Österreichische Kontrollbank* has not funded any laying batteries, it has funded the fitting out of pig housing in Ukraine. Does this housing actually meet EU standards?

5. Would it not make sense to include animal welfare standards in the World Bank's loan policies? What is the Commission's view on this?

6. Supporters of animal welfare are demanding that EU animal welfare standards be considered a minimum criterion. What is the Commission's opinion of these demands?

7. What steps will the Commission now take at EU level and in relation to the World Bank with a view to pursuing a sustainable and modern animal welfare policy in order also to safeguard the credibility of the EU and domestic agricultural standards?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(29 August 2013)

EU development assistance focuses on smallholders, generally at early stages of intensification. Sustainable intensification, as defined by DG AGRI and DG DEVCO, drives our interventions and includes animal welfare. Any future discussions on these issues with other EU or international institutions should ensure that a balance between quick down payments of the credit is not conflicting with EU rules on animal welfare and is not detrimental to EU farmers With regard to the activity of the EBRD in this area, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007559/2013 ([1]).

Regarding Austrian funds and the particulars of the production systems financed by such funds, the Commission would advise the Honourable Member to contact the relevant Austrian authorities.

On the issue of cheap imports, eggs are authorised for import from Ukraine and Turkey but only as 'class B' eggs. This means that they cannot be marketed as table eggs but can only be used for processing. Pork and derived meat products for human consumption are currently not authorised for import into the EU from either of these countries. For eggs as well as for pork, imports from all third countries currently count for less than 1% of the total EU consumption. For both products the EU is a net exporter.

With regard to the application of EU legislation in third countries the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-10734/2012[1] and E-4842/2013[1].

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

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007103/13
an die Kommission
Norbert Neuser (S&D) und Udo Bullmann (S&D)
(18. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Schutz der Bevölkerung gegen den unerträglichen Bahnlärm

Der Deutsche Bundesrat hat sich am 7.6.2013 auf Initiative der Bundesländer Rheinland-Pfalz und Hessen in einem einmütigen Votum dafür ausgesprochen, dass die EU-Kommission und die Bundesregierung mehr zum Schutz der Bevölkerung gegen den unerträglichen Bahnlärm — insbesondere im Mittelrheintal — unternehmen müssen.

In der Entschließung des Deutschen Bundesrates wird die EU-Kommission aufgefordert, europaweit für ältere Güterzüge ähnliche Lärmgrenzwerte einzuführen, wie sie für neue Güterwaggons gelten.

Vor diesem Hintergrund fragen wir die Kommission:

1. Plant die Kommission die Einführung ähnlicher Lärmgrenzwerte für ältere Güterwagen, wie sie bereits für die neuen Güterwagen gelten?

2. Wenn ja, bis wann will die Kommission zum Schutz der Bevölkerung diese Lärmgrenzwerte einführen?

3. Kann durch die jetzt genehmigte Zulassung der neuen LL-Bremssohlen dieser Prozess beschleunigt werden?

4. Plant die Kommission gemeinsam mit den Mitgliedsländern ein lärmabhängiges Preissystem, um Anreize zu setzen, früh auf leise Bremsen umzurüsten?

5. Ist die Kommission bereit, zur Umrüstung der Güterwagen auf leise Bremssysteme mit entsprechender finanzieller Hilfe diese Umrüstung zu unterstützen?

Antwort von Herrn Kallas im Namen der Kommission
(2. August 2013)

Die Kommissionsdienststellen haben unlängst zu der Folgenabschätzung über eine Minderung der von Güterwagen in der Europäischen Union ausgehenden Lärmemissionen eine unterstützende Studie in Auftrag gegeben. Außerdem findet derzeit eine öffentliche Konsultation statt, die noch bis zum 3. Oktober dauern wird und über folgenden Link zugänglich ist: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/media/consultations/2013-railnoise_en.htm.

In der Studie wird u. a. die Option geprüft, die für neue Wagen geltenden Lärmgrenzwerte auf sämtliche in der EU verkehrenden Wagen auszuweiten. Bis zum Abschluss der Folgenabschätzung kann die Kommission den Ergebnissen jedoch nicht vorgreifen, weder was die bevorzugte Option noch was den eventuellen Einführungstermin einer Maßnahme betrifft.

Mit der Zulassung der neuen LL-Bremssohlen im Juni dieses Jahres wurde bereits ein erster Schritt unternommen, durch den sich die Aussichten auf eine raschere Verringerung des Schienenlärms in der EU verbessern.

Die Richtlinie 2012/34/EU bietet die Möglichkeit, abgestufte Trassenentgelte in Abhängigkeit von den Lärmemissionen der Wagen zu erheben. Die Kommission erwägt, aufgrund dieser Richtlinie bis 2015 eine Durchführungsmaßnahme vorzuschlagen, mit der die Bedingungen für eine solche lärmabhängige Abstufung für diejenigen Mitgliedstaaten, die entsprechende Regelungen bereits eingeführt haben oder einführen werden, harmonisiert werden sollen.

Der Vorschlag zur Schaffung der Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ (KOM(2011)665/3 ([1])) sieht die Möglichkeit vor, dass die EU die Umrüstung der Bestandsgüterwagen mit bis zu 20 % der förderfähigen Kosten finanziell unterstützt. Ferner wird auch bei einer der Optionen, die im Rahmen der vorgenannten unterstützenden Studie zu untersuchen sind, zugrunde gelegt, dass zusätzliche öffentliche Gelder für die Umrüstung bereitgestellt werden.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/rail/interoperability/doc/com_2011_665_3_-_connecting_europe_facility.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007103/13
to the Commission
Norbert Neuser (S&D) and Udo Bullmann (S&D)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Protecting the public from intolerable rail traffic noise

On the initiative of the federal states of Rhineland-Palatinate and Hessen, the German *Bundesrat* agreed in a unanimous vote on 7 June 2013 that the European Commission and the Federal Government must to do more to protect the public against the intolerable noise from rail traffic, particularly in the central Rhine valley.

The decision of the German *Bundesrat* calls on the Commission to introduce noise limits throughout Europe for older freight trains similar to those that apply to new freight wagons.

1. Is the Commission planning to introduce noise limits for older freight wagons similar to those that already apply to new freight wagons?

2. If so, by what date does it intend to introduce these noise limits in order to protect the public?

3. Can this process be speeded up by authorising the new LL brake blocks, use of which has now been approved?

4. Is the Commission, together with the Member States, planning a noise-based pricing system in order to establish incentives to switch to quiet brakes at an early juncture?

5. Is it prepared to support this switch to quiet braking systems on freight wagons with appropriate financial assistance?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The Commission services have recently launched an impact assessment support study on the reduction of noise generated by railway freight wagons in use in the European Union. A public consultation is moreover ongoing and will last until 3 October and is available through the following link:

http://ec.europa.eu/transport/media/consultations/2013-railnoise_en.htm

Extending currently applicable noise limits from new wagons to all wagons circulating in the EU is one of the options being assessed in the study. However, until the impact assessment process is finalised, the Commission cannot anticipate its outcome neither regarding the preferred option nor the date of eventual introduction of a measure.

Authorisation of new LL brake blocks, which took place in June this year, is a positive development that increases the chances for quicker reduction of railway noise in the EU.

Directive 2012/34/EU provides for a possibility to differentiate infrastructure charges in respect of the noise levels of wagons. Under this directive, the Commission is considering proposing, by 2015, an implementing measure harmonising conditions for such noise differentiation for those Member States which introduced or will introduce relevant schemes.

The proposal for the Connecting Europe Facility (COM(2011)665/3 ([1])) provides for a possibility for the EU to co-fund retrofitting of existing freight wagons by up to 20% of eligible costs. Moreover, one of the options to be analysed within the support study referred to above assumes additional public subsidies for retrofitting.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/rail/interoperability/doc/com_2011_665_3_-_connecting_europe_facility.pdf

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007104/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(18 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Επιστροφές αιτούντων άσυλο στην Μάλτα, την περίοδο 2010 έως σήμερα

Είναι σε θέση να με ενημερώσει η Επιτροπή αναφορικά με τον αριθμό των αιτούντων άσυλο που επεστράφησαν από άλλα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ στην Μάλτα, με βάση τα οριζόμενα από τον κανονισμό Δουβλίνο ΙΙ, κατά την περίοδο 2010 έως σήμερα;

Απάντηση της κ. Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(1 Αυγούστου 2013)

Σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία της Eurostat, κατά την περίοδο 2010-2012, 442 άτομα μεταφέρθηκαν στη Μάλτα από τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ και τις χώρες που είναι συνδεδεμένες με το κεκτημένο του Δουβλίνου (Νορβηγία, Ισλανδία, Ελβετία και Λιχτενστάιν), 222 άτομα το 2010, 142 άτομα το 2011 και 78 άτομα το 2012.

Τα ανωτέρω στοιχεία συγκεντρώθηκαν με βάση πληροφορίες που διαβίβασαν κράτη μέλη και χώρες που είναι συνδεδεμένες με το κεκτημένο του Δουβλίνου. Τα ζητηθέντα δεδομένα δεν έχουν διαβιβαστεί από όλα τα εν λόγω κράτη για όλα τα έτη, και η Eurostat δεν έχει ολοκληρώσει την επεξεργασία του συνόλου των πληροφοριών που υποβλήθηκαν.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007104/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Return of asylum-seekers to Malta since 2010

Can the Commission state how many asylum-seekers have been returned from other EU Member States to Malta, on the basis of the provisions of the Dublin II Regulation, since 2010?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

According to Eurostat data, 442 persons were transferred during the period 2010-2012 to Malta from the EU Member States and the countries associated to the Dublin *acquis* (Norway, Iceland, Switzerland and Liechtenstein) 222 persons in 2010, 142 persons in 2011 and 78 persons in 2012.

The above compilation of data was made on the basis of information provided by Member States and the countries associated to the Dublin *acquis*. Not all of these States provided the required data for a certain year, and not all the information received has been fully processed by Eurostat.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007105/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(18 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Εξάλειψη διοικητικών επιβαρύνσεων για τις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Πράξη για τις Μικρές Επιχειρήσεις (Small Business Act — SBA) απέβλεπε μεταξύ άλλων, στον εκσυγχρονισμό και στην απλούστευση της νομοθεσίας της ΕΕ για τις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις, με στόχο την μείωση των διοικητικών επιβαρύνσεων που οφείλονται στη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ κατά 25% έως το 2012.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Επετεύχθη ο στόχος της μείωσης κατά 25% των διοικητικών επιβαρύνσεων στη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ για τις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις;

— Διαθέτει πρόσφατα συγκριτικά στοιχεία μεταξύ των κρατών μελών για το διοικητικό κόστος και τον χρόνο που απαιτείται για την ίδρυση μιας επιχείρησης; Ποια η περίπτωση της Ελλάδας;

Απάντηση του κ. Tajani εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(9 Αυγούστου 2013)

Το πρόγραμμα δράσης για τη μείωση κατά 25% του διοικητικού φόρτου για τις επιχειρήσεις που οφείλεται στη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ δρομολογήθηκε από την Επιτροπή και έγινε αποδεκτό από το Συμβούλιο το 2007 ([1]).

Η τελική έκθεση σχετικά με τα αποτελέσματα δημοσιεύτηκε το Δεκέμβριο του 2012 ([2]). Στο πλαίσιο αυτού του προγράμματος, εγκρίθηκαν μέτρα σε επίπεδο ΕΕ τα οποία κατέληξαν σε ετήσια εξοικονόμηση 30,8 δισεκατομμυρίων ευρώ για τις επιχειρήσεις. Το ποσό αυτό αντιστοιχεί σε μείωση κατά 25% του υφιστάμενου διοικητικού φόρτου που οφείλεται στη νομοθεσία της ΕΕ, που εκτιμήθηκε στα 123,8 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ. Μια επιπλέον μείωση κατά 5,5% του φόρτου, που θα επέφερε συνολικά το ποσοστό του 30,5%, θα μπορούσε να επιτευχθεί, αν εγκριθούν από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και το Συμβούλιο τα συμπληρωματικά μέτρα που πρότεινε η Επιτροπή.

Τα πιο πρόσφατα συγκριτικά στοιχεία για τα κράτη μέλη όσον αφορά το διοικητικό κόστος και τον χρόνο που χρειάζεται η εκκίνηση μιας νέας εταιρείας διατίθενται στον δικτυακό τόπο:

http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/business-environment/start-up-procedures/progress-2012/index_en.htm για χάρτη όλων των πληροφοριών ειδικά για κάθε χώρα.

Οι πιο πρόσφατες πληροφορίες, από το έτος 2012, δείχνουν ότι στην Ελλάδα χρειάζονται κατά μέσο όρο 5 ημέρες και κοστίζει 910 ευρώ· ο ευρωπαϊκός μέσος όρος είναι 5,4 ημέρες με κόστος 372 ευρώ, σε σύγκριση με τον στόχο που είναι τρεις ημέρες και 100 ευρώ. Αυτός ο στόχος προτάθηκε στην Ανασκόπηση του Small Business Act (SBA) ([3]) και επικυρώθηκε στα συμπεράσματα του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με την Ανασκόπηση του SBA ([4]).

([1]) COM(2007)23 «Πρόγραμμα δράσης για τη μείωση του διοικητικού φόρτου στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση».
([2]) COM(2007)23 «SWD(2012)423 τελικό — πίνακας 1, σελίδα 7.».
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/small-business-act/files/sba_review_en.pdf
([4]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/intm/122326.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007105/13
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Eliminating administrative burdens for SMEs

The European Small Business Act (SBA) was intended, *inter alia*, to modernise and simplify EU legislation for SMEs in order to reduce administrative burdens arising from EU legislation by 25% by 2012.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— Has the goal of a 25% reduction of administrative burdens in EU legislation for SMEs been achieved?

— Does it have any recent comparative data concerning Member States regarding the administrative costs and the time needed to start up a business? How does Greece fare in this respect?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The Action Programme for reducing by 25% the administrative burdens on business stemming from EU legislation was launched by the Commission and endorsed by the Council in 2007 ([1]).

A final report on the results was published in December 2012 ([2]). Under this programme, measures resulting in annual savings of EUR 30.8 billion for businesses have been adopted at EU level. This represents a 25% reduction in existing administrative burdens stemming from EU legislation, which have been estimated at EUR 123.8 billion. Another 5.5% of burden reduction, which would bring the total to 30.5%, could be achieved if the additional measures already proposed by the Commission are adopted by the European Parliament and the Council.

The latest comparative data for Member States regarding the administrative costs and the time needed to start up a company may be found on:

http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/business-environment/start-up-procedures/progress-2012/index_en.htm for chart of all country-specific info.

The latest information, as of 2012, shows that in Greece it takes on average 5 days and costs EUR 910; the European average is 5.4 days with costs of EUR 372, by comparison to the target of 3 days and EUR 100. This target was proposed in the SBA Review ([3]) and confirmed in the Council Conclusion on the Review of the SBA ([4]).

([1]) COM(2007) 23 'Action Programme for Reducing Administrative Burdens in the European Union'.
([2]) COM(2007) 23 'SWD(2012) 423 final' — Table 1, page 7.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/small-business-act/files/sba_review_en.pdf
([4]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/intm/122326.pdf

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007107/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(18 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – obozy pracy przymusowej w Chinach

Chiński system laojiao, czyli reedukacji przez pracę, został wprowadzony w latach pięćdziesiątych XX w. przez komunistyczny rząd Chin w celu utrzymania stabilności w chaotycznym okresie po rewolucji. Pół wieku po tych wydarzeniach system ten nadal istnieje. W ramach niego policja i państwowe służby bezpieczeństwa mogą przetrzymywać „przestępców" aż do czterech lat bez procesu sądowego. Zgodnie z pierwotnym założeniem, laojiao miał służyć reedukacji złodziei i prostytutek, jednak zdaniem wielu ugrupowań system ten służy również „reedukacji" działaczy politycznych. Według *Amnesty International* jest to sposób zamknięcia ust opozycjonistom i uciszenia tych, którzy obrażają rząd.

Jakie informacje na temat laojiao w Chinach może przedstawić Europejska Służba Działań Zewnętrznych (ESDZ)?

Czy ESDZ jest świadoma, że obozy pracy przymusowej podważają podstawowe prawa Chińczyków?

Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca Komisji/Wysoka Przedstawiciel poruszała tę sprawę w rozmowach z rządem Chin?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Catherine Ashton w imieniu Komisji
(20 sierpnia 2013 r.)

ESDZ wie o istnieniu w Chinach obozów pracy przymusowej i podziela obawę Szanownego Pana Posła. Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca wielokrotnie wzywała rząd chiński do zreformowania systemu reedukacji przez pracę (RTL). Temat ten poruszany jest regularnie w ramach dialogu dotyczącego praw człowieka, którego ostatnia sesja miała miejsce dnia 25 czerwca w Guiyang, prowincji Guizhou w Chinach.

W świetle oświadczeń władz Chin wydanych w bieżącym roku o planach reformy systemu Laogai i nieskazywania obywateli na odbycie kary w obozach pracy od końca 2013 r., ESDZ będzie zwracać się do chińskich partnerów o dostarczenie więcej informacji i nadal będzie monitorować zmiany w tej dziedzinie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007107/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Forced labour camps in China

The Chinese system of *laojiao*, or 're-education through labour', was introduced in the 1950s by the Communist Party Government to maintain stability after the chaotic post-revolution days. Half a century later, the system is still in place. It allows the police and other state security agents to detain 'offenders' for up to four years without trial. *Laojiao* was originally designed for thieves and prostitutes, but many rights groups believe that the system is also used for political activists. According to Amnesty International, 'it is a way to silence dissent and keep those quiet that offend the government'.

What information can the External Action Service (EEAS) provide about *laojiao* in China?

Is the EEAS aware that these forced labour camps undermine the basic rights of the Chinese people?

Has the Vice-President/High Representative raised the issue with the Chinese Government?

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

The EEAS is aware of the existence of forced labour camps in China and shares the Honorable Member's concern. The High Representative/Vice-President has repeatedly called on the Chinese Government to adopt reforms to its Re-education through Labour (RTL) system. The issue is raised regularly in the framework of the Human Rights Dialogue, the last session of which took place on 25 June in Guiyang, Guizhou Province, China.

In view of Chinese government officials' statements from earlier this year, expressing the intent to reform the Laogai system and no longer sentence citizens to imprisonment in labour camps from the end of 2013, the EEAS will continue to ask its Chinese interlocutors to provide further details and will keep monitoring developments in this field.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007108/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(18 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – niski poziom bezpieczeństwa w chińskich zakładach pracy

Niedawno w chińskim zakładzie przetwórstwa drobiu podczas zmiany pracowniczej wybuchł pożar, w wyniku którego śmierć poniosło 119 z obecnych w środku 350 osób. Na podstawie przeprowadzonego śledztwa stwierdzono, że duża liczba ofiar to wynik braku dobrych planów ewakuacyjnych. Wiele wyjść z zakładu przetwórstwa drobiu było zamkniętych, aby powstrzymać pracowników od wychodzenia na przerwy – otwarte były tylko jedne drzwi. Pracownicy tratowali się wzajemnie, usiłując ujść z życiem. Właściciel i kierownicy zakładu przebywają w areszcie policyjnym. Przedstawicielka organizacji Asia Monitor Resource Centre stwierdziła jednak, że za zapewnienie otwartych wyjść odpowiadają urzędnicy ds. bezpieczeństwa na lokalnym szczeblu rządowym. Według niej urzędnicy rzadko kontrolują zakłady pracy pod względem bezpieczeństwa.

Czy Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel poruszyła tę kwestię z Chinami?

Jakie jest stanowisko Europejskiej Służby Działań Zewnętrznych (ESDZ) w tej sprawie?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez Wysoką Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodniczącą Komisji Catherine Ashton
w imieniu Komisji
(21 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Wysoka Przedstawiciel/Wiceprzewodnicząca ma świadomość niskiego poziomu bezpieczeństwa w chińskich zakładach pracy i podziela niepokój Szanownego Pana Posła. ESDZ regularnie podnosi kwestię bezpieczeństwa w miejscu pracy w ramach kompleksowego partnerstwa strategicznego UE-Chiny, w tym w ramach dialogu między UE a Chinami dotyczącego praw człowieka. Ponadto Komisja prowadzi z Chinami zorganizowany dialog w sprawie polityki zatrudnienia i polityki społecznej, zorganizowany dialog na temat pracy, zatrudnienia i spraw społecznych, a także – z chińską administracją państwową do spraw bezpieczeństwa pracy – dialog polityczny i współpracę w dziedzinie ochrony zdrowia i bezpieczeństwa w miejscu pracy. Wszystkie te dialogi zostały w przeszłości uwzględnione w dialogach wysokiego szczebla. W 2011 r. Komisja przyjęła konkretny projekt dotyczący współpracy w dziedzinie zdrowia i bezpieczeństwa w miejscu pracy, poruszający kwestie polityki, inspekcji i szkolenia.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007108/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Poor workplace safety in China

A fire recently occurred at a Chinese poultry processing plant which started during a shift change when there were 350 workers inside, 119 of whom died. Following investigations, it was found that the huge number of casualties arose due to the absence of a good workplace safety plan. Many of the exits in the poultry plant had been closed to stop the workers from taking breaks and only one door was open. Workers trampled over each other trying to survive. The owner and managers are in police custody. However, a representative of the Asia Monitor Resource Centre stated that ensuring unlocked exits is the responsibility of the safety officials at local government level. She said they rarely bother to check the safety of workplaces.

Has the Vice-President/High Representative raised this issue with China?

What is the position of the European External Action Service (EEAS) on the matter?

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

The HR/VP is aware of poor workplace safety in China and shares the Honourable Member's concern. The EEAS regularly raises workplace safety within the extensive framework of the EU-China Strategic Partnership, including in the EU-China Human Rights Dialogue. Furthermore, the Commission maintains with China a structured Dialogue on Employment and Social Policies, a structured Dialogue on Labour, Employment and Social Affairs, and — with the Chinese State Administration for Work Safety — a Policy Dialogue and Cooperation in Health and Safety at Work, all of which have in the past fed into high level dialogues. Finally, the Commission adopted in 2011 a specific cooperation project on Occupational Health and Safety addressing policy, inspection and training aspects.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení P-007110/13
Komisi
Olga Sehnalová (S&D)
(18. června 2013)

Předmět: Předváděcí prodejní akce a používání nekalých a agresivních obchodních praktik

Na 72 % předváděcích prodejních akcí, které kontrolovala v roce 2012 Česká obchodní inspekce, národní kontrolní a dozorový orgán, bylo zjištěno porušení obecně závazných právních předpisů na ochranu spotřebitele vycházejících z evropské legislativy. Převážnou část zjištěných porušení představovalo prokázané používání některé z forem nekalých obchodních praktik k manipulaci a ovládnutí účastníků těchto akcí, a také agresivních obchodních praktik, tedy zvlášť závažného porušování spotřebitelských práv spotřebitelů, v tomto případě zejména seniorů. Výsledky dosavadních kontrol z roku 2013 tento trend dlouhodobého porušování práv spotřebitelů ze strany organizátorů těchto akcí dále potvrzují.

Evropské spotřebitelské centrum ČR, spolufinancované Evropskou komisí, nedávno informovalo, že organizátoři předváděcích akcí navíc začali vozit svoje zákazníky do zahraničí na poznávací zájezdy spojené s prodejem zboží. Neznalost prostředí i jazyka a nátlak v cizím prostředí umocňuje zranitelnost zúčastněných spotřebitelů a ti tak nejsou schopni odolat nekalým obchodním praktikám, kterým jsou vystaveni. Po zemích EU dokonce prodejci začali zájezdy směřovat mimo země Evropské unie, např. do Turecka.

1. Jakými informacemi disponuje Komise ohledně fenoménu předváděcích prodejních akcí?

2. Zaznamenává v této souvislosti Komise podněty ze strany spotřebitelů či národních dozorových orgánů jednotlivých členských států?

3. Jsou tyto předváděcí prodejní akce rozšířené a podobně problematické i v jiných státech EU?

4. Jaké kroky hodlá Komise podniknout k posílení prosazování práva, aby nedocházelo k uplatňování nekalých obchodních praktik v oblasti cestovního ruchu?

Ve sdělení, které se týká uplatňování směrnice o nekalých obchodních praktikách, Komise informuje o záměru uspořádat v roce 2013 osvětovou kampaň v EU o právech spotřebitelů, včetně směrnice o nekalých obchodních praktikách.

5. Jakým způsobem bude tato kampaň probíhat a zaměří se také na problematiku předváděcích akcí?

Odpověď Viviane Redingové jménem Komise
(2. srpna 2013)

Komise si je vědoma skutečnosti, že fenomén předváděcích prodejních akcí je v Evropě velmi rozšířen.

Směrnice 2005/29/ES ([1]), jež zakazuje obchodníkům používat klamavé a agresivní obchodní praktiky vůči spotřebitelům, už zajišťuje zvláštní ochranu těm spotřebitelům, kteří jsou obzvláště zranitelní z důvodu svého věku či důvěřivosti. A navíc, směrnice 85/577/EHS ([2]) uděluje spotřebitelům právo zrušit ve lhůtě alespoň sedmi dnů smlouvu, kterou uzavřeli v průběhu zájezdu organizovaného obchodníkem. Tato směrnice bude od června 2014 nahrazena směrnicí 2011/83/EU ([3]), která ochranu spotřebitelů v této oblasti posiluje.

Jak si jsou vážení páni jistě vědomi, sdělení týkající se uplatňování směrnice 2005/29/ES ([4]) a průvodní zpráva k němu ([5]), které byly přijaty 14. března 2013, vymezují hlavní oblasti, v nichž je třeba zintenzivnit prosazování práva, a to včetně odvětví cestovního ruchu a dopravy. Evropská spotřebitelská centra skutečně hlásí častý výskyt agresivních praktik v oblasti dočasného užívání ubytovacích zařízení (tzv. timeshare). Agresivní praktiky se používají zejména při podomním prodeji a při jiných prodejích mimo obchodní prostory.

V zájmu účinného prosazování práva byly vymezeny tyto prioritní činnosti: pořádání tematických seminářů ve spolupráci s vnitrostátními orgány prosazování práva, aktualizace pokynů k provádění směrnice 2005/29/ES a vytvoření konkrétních ukazatelů prosazování práva pro oblast nekalých obchodních praktik.

([1]) Úř. věst. L 149, 11.6.2005.
([2]) Úř. věst. L 372, 31.12.1985.
([3]) Úř. věst. L 304, 22.11.2011.
([4]) „Dosažení vysoké úrovně ochrany spotřebitele – Budování důvěry ve vnitřní trh", COM(2013) 138 final.
([5]) COM(2013) 139 final.

V současnosti se kromě toho připravuje celoevropská osvětová kampaň v úzké spolupráci se zúčastněnými stranami, včetně podniků a sdružení spotřebitelů, jejímž cílem je zvýšit celkovou informovanost o právech spotřebitelů a možnostech prosazování práva v různých oblastech.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007110/13
to the Commission
Olga Sehnalová (S&D)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Sales events and the use of unfair and aggressive trade practices

Violations of EU consumer protection laws were uncovered at 72% of the sales events inspected by the Czech Trade Inspection Authority (the national inspection and supervision body) in 2012. Most of the violations involved clear-cut cases of unfair and aggressive trade practices being used to manipulate and overwhelm event attendees. As such, they represented particularly serious violations of consumer rights — particularly those of senior citizens. This long-term trend of consumers' rights being violated by sales event organisers is further borne out by the results of inspections carried out so far in 2013.

Moreover, the Czech Republic's European Consumer Centre, which is co-financed by the Commission, recently said that sales event organisers had started to take their customers abroad on sales-related trips. The participants' lack of familiarity with the language and their surroundings in a foreign environment makes them more vulnerable, and they are unable to resist the unfair trade practices to which they are exposed. Besides EU Member States, salespeople have started to take customers to non-EU destinations — such as Turkey — for such sales trips.

1. What information does the Commission have on the phenomenon of sales events?

2. Is the Commission taking note of the concerns of consumers and of national inspectionbodies in the Member States?

3. Are such sales events as widespread and problematic in other EU Member States?

4. What steps does the Commission intend to take to strengthen enforcement of the law inorder to put an end to such dishonest trade practices in the tourism sector?

In its communication on the implementation of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive, the Commission states its intention of organising an EU-wide awareness-raising campaign on consumer rights, including the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive.

5. How will this campaign be organised, and will it tackle the issue of sales events?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The Commission is aware that the phenomenon of sales events is widespread in Europe.

Directive 2005/29/EC ([1]) which prohibits traders from engaging in misleading and aggressive commercial practices towards consumers already offers specific protection to consumers who are particularly vulnerable because of their age or credulity. Furthermore, Directive 85/577/EEC ([2]) provides consumers with the right of withdrawal, during a minimum of seven days, from contracts concluded by consumers during excursions organised by traders. This directive will be replaced as from June 2014 by Directive 2011/83/EU ([3]), which reinforces the consumer protection in this area.

As the Honourable Member is aware, the communication on the application of Directive 2005/29/EC ([4]) and its accompanying Report ([5]) adopted on 14 March 2013 identify key areas where enforcement should be stepped up, including the travel and tourism sector. Indeed, European Consumer Centres reported frequent aggressive practices in the timeshare sector. Besides, aggressive practices occur mainly in doorstep selling and other off-premises sales.

In order to make enforcement more effective, priorities for action include organising thematic workshops with national enforcers, updating the Guidance on the implementation of Directive 2005/29/EC and developing enforcement indicators specific to the area of unfair commercial practices.

([1]) OJ L 149, 11.6.2005.
([2]) OJ L 372, 31.12.1985.
([3]) OJ L 304, 22.11.2011.
([4]) 'Achieving a high level of consumer protection — Building trust in the internal market' COM(2013) 138 final.
([5]) COM(2013) 139 final.

Furthermore, the EU-wide awareness raising campaign is currently being prepared, in close cooperation with stakeholders, including businesses and consumer associations, with a view to increase the overall knowledge of both consumer rights and enforcement options on a wide range of areas.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007111/13
an die Kommission
Paul Rübig (PPE)
(18. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Weitergabe von Rahmenrezepturen

Die parlamentarische Anfrage betrifft die Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1223/2009 vom 30. November 2009 über kosmetische Mittel.

Aus Artikel 4 der gegenständlichen Verordnung ist nicht klar ersichtlich, unter welchen Umständen der Händler bzw. der Hersteller die „verantwortliche Person" darstellt.

Gemäß Artikel 13 Absatz 1 Buchstabe h der Verordnung hat die verantwortliche Person der Kommission auf elektronischem Wege die Rahmenrezeptur bekannt zu geben, um bei schwierigen Vorkommnissen eine rasche und geeignete medizinische Behandlung zu ermöglichen.

Daraus kann sich folgende Problematik ergeben: Bei derartigen Rezepturen handelt es sich häufig um Betriebsgeheimnisse. Falls der Händler als die „verantwortliche Person" gilt, ist der Hersteller gezwungen, seine geheimen Rezepturen an den Händler weiterzugeben. Obwohl es sich dabei nur um die Verpflichtung handelt, Rahmenrezepturen und somit keine exakten prozentuellen Angaben bekannt zu geben, wird der Händler zumeist in der Lage sein, anhand der Rahmenrezeptur das kosmetische Produkt selbst herzustellen. Hieraus würde sich insbesondere für kleinere Unternehmen, deren Existenz großteils von der Geheimhaltung ihrer speziellen Rezepturen abhängt, ein enormer finanzieller Nachteil ergeben.

Ich bitte um Aufklärung folgender Fragen:

1. Unter welchen Umständen ist der Händler bzw. der Hersteller die „verantwortliche Person"?

2. War es von der Kommission beabsichtigt, dass Hersteller somit oftmals gezwungen sind, ihre geheimen Rezepturen weiterzugeben?

3. Bejahendenfalls, welche Schritte gedenkt die Kommission zu unternehmen, um den Schutz der betroffenen Hersteller zu gewährleisten?

Antwort von Herrn Mimica im Namen der Kommission
(7. August 2013)

Gemäß Artikel 4 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1223/2009 über kosmetische Mittel ([1]) ist die verantwortliche Person für ein innerhalb der Gemeinschaft hergestelltes kosmetisches Mittel der Hersteller, während für ein importiertes kosmetisches Mittel der Importeur die verantwortliche Person ist. Der Händler ist nur dann die verantwortliche Person, wenn er ein kosmetisches Mittel unter seinem eigenen Namen und seiner eigenen Marke in Verkehr bringt oder ein Produkt, das sich bereits in Verkehr befindet, so ändert, dass die Einhaltung der geltenden Anforderungen berührt sein kann ([2]).

Die Kommission möchte gewährleisten, dass kosmetische Mittel, die in der EU in Verkehr gebracht werden, sicher sind. Die Rahmenrezeptur kosmetischer Mittel enthält wichtige Informationen, die es den Giftnotrufzentralen erlauben, Leben zu retten, wenn schnelle und gezielte medizinische Hilfe erforderlich ist. Daher müssen alle verantwortlichen Personen diese Informationen bereitstellen, wenn sie ihre Produkte melden. Weiterhin müssen sie gewährleisten, dass die von ihnen in Verkehr gebrachten kosmetischen Mittel sicher sind, und müssen daher im Interesse einer effektiven Marktüberwachung eine Produktinformationsdatei einschließlich der Sicherheitsbewertung für das Produkt für die zuständigen Behörden bereithalten. Wenn ein Händler die verantwortliche Person ist, muss er über all diese Informationen verfügen, um die Anforderungen der Kosmetikverordnung erfüllen zu können.

Hersteller können die sensiblen betriebsinternen Informationen, die sie den verantwortlichen Personen für ihre Produkte zur Verfügung stellen, vertraglich durch zivilrechtliche Vertraulichkeitsklauseln schützen lassen.

([1]) ABl. L 342 vom 22.12.2009, S. 59.
([2]) Die Übersetzung von Informationen im Zusammenhang mit einem kosmetischen Mittel, das bereits in Verkehr gebracht wurde, gilt nicht als Änderung dieses Produkts dahin gehend, dass die Einhaltung der geltenden Anforderungen dieser Verordnung berührt sein könnte.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007111/13
to the Commission
Paul Rübig (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Communication of frame formulations

This parliamentary question concerns Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 of 30 November 2009 on cosmetic products.

It is not clear from Article 4 of this regulation under what circumstances the distributor or the manufacturer represents the 'responsible person'.

In accordance with Article 13(1)(h) of the regulation, the responsible person must inform the Commission, by electronic means, of the frame formulation in order to allow for prompt and appropriate medical treatment in the event of difficulties.

This may give rise the following problem. These types of formulations are often trade secrets. If the distributor is classed as the 'responsible person', manufacturers will be forced to disclose their secret formulation to the distributor. Although the obligation only concerns disclosure of the frame formulation and therefore not the exact percentages, distributors will in most cases be able to manufacture the cosmetic product themselves using the frame formulation. This would result in an enormous financial disadvantage for smaller undertakings in particular, whose existence is largely dependent on their special formulations remaining secret.

I would ask for clarification of the following:

1. Under what circumstances is the distributor or manufacturer the 'responsible person'?

2. Was it the Commission's intention for manufacturers to often be forced to disclose their secret formulations?

3. If so, what steps does it intend to take to ensure the protection of the manufacturers concerned?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

According to Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 on cosmetic products ([1]), the manufacturers are the responsible persons for cosmetic products manufactured in the EU, while importers are responsible persons for cosmetic products imported in the EU. Distributors only become responsible persons if they place a cosmetic product on the market under their name or trademark or modify a product already placed on the market in such a way that compliance with the applicable requirements may be affected ([2]).

It was the Commission's intention to ensure that cosmetic products placed on the EU market are safe. The frame formulation of cosmetic products is an important piece of information that allows anti-poison centres to save lives when prompt and appropriate medical treatment is necessary. This is why all responsible persons must disclose this information when notifying their products. They must also ensure that the cosmetic products they place on the market are safe, and, to that end, they must keep a product information file, including the safety assessment of the product, readily available to competent authorities for market surveillance purposes. Distributors that have become responsible persons must have all this information in order to comply with the requirements of the Cosmetics Regulation.

Manufacturers can protect the sensitive commercial information they communicate to the responsible persons for their products through confidentiality clauses included in contracts of civil law.

([1]) OJ L 342, 22.12.2009, p. 59.
([2]) The translation of information relating to a cosmetic product already placed on the market shall not be considered as a modification of that product of such a nature that compliance with the applicable requirements of the regulation may be affected.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007112/13
an die Kommission
Evelyn Regner (S&D) und Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(18. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Datenerfassung in Duty-Free-Bereichen von Flughäfen

Bei einem Kauf von Waren im Duty-Free-Bereich einiger, aber nicht aller Flughäfen wird beim Bezahlen oft der Boarding Pass erfragt und gescannt.

1. Ist der Kommission bekannt, auf welcher Grundlage dies geschieht? Wenn ja, was ist diese Grundlage?

2. Ist der Kommission bekannt, welche Daten dabei gespeichert werden? Wenn ja, welche Daten sind dies?

3. Ist der Kommission bekannt, wie lange diese Daten gespeichert werden, wer Zugriff auf diese Daten hat und welche Zwecke sie erfüllen?

Antwort von Frau Reding im Namen der Kommission
(21. August 2013)

Das EU-Recht ([1]) sieht die Befreiung von Verbrauchsteuern auf Waren vor, die von Reisenden, die sich in ein Drittland (oder Drittgebiet) begeben, in Tax-free-Verkaufsstellen in EU-Flughäfen gekauft werden.

1. Die Tax-free-Verkaufsstellen in Flughäfen erfassen und verarbeiten Daten, einschließlich personenbezogener Daten, um zu prüfen, ob ihre Kunden Anspruch auf diese Befreiung haben. Die Reisenden müssen daher im Besitz eines Reisedokuments sein, aus dem ersichtlich ist, dass der Bestimmungsflughafen in einem Drittland oder Drittgebiet liegt.

2. Wie die Daten der Reisenden erfasst werden, ist von Mitgliedstaat zu Mitgliedstaat unterschiedlich ([2]). In einigen Mitgliedstaaten wird lediglich die Flugnummer erfasst, personenbezogene Daten dagegen nicht. Wo die nationalen Zollvorschriften dies verlangen, werden auch Daten zur Identifizierung des Reisenden gespeichert. Je nach der Regelung von zollfreien Einkäufen ist auch die Dauer der Datenspeicherung in den Mitgliedstaaten unterschiedlich. Damit die nationalen Behörden die Tax-free-Läden zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt kontrollieren können, beträgt diese in manchen Mitgliedstaaten drei Jahre, in anderen bis zu zehn Jahre.

3. Die Kommission hält die Verarbeitung der Daten für rechtmäßig, da die Mitgliedstaaten nach dem EU-Recht die erforderlichen Maßnahmen ergreifen müssen, um sicherzustellen, dass die Befreiung von der Verbrauchsteuer so angewandt wird, dass Steuerhinterziehung und -umgehung oder Missbrauch ausgeschlossen sind.

Soweit personenbezogene Daten verarbeitet werden, findet die Datenschutzrichtlinie 95/46/EG ([3]) Anwendung, wonach personenbezogene Daten nicht länger gespeichert werden dürfen, als für den angegebenen Zweck erforderlich. Die Erfassung der Daten sollte verhältnismäßig und somit auf das unbedingt erforderliche Maß begrenzt sein (Datenminimierung).

([1]) Artikel 14 der Richtlinie des Rates 2008/118/EG über das allgemeine Verbrauchsteuersystem.
([2]) Siehe Stellungnahme 8/2009 (WP 167) der Datenschutzgruppe nach Artikel 29 (unabhängiges Beratungsgremium der Europäischen Union in Datenschutzfragen).
http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/privacy/docs/wpdocs/2009/wp167_de.pdf
([3]) Richtlinie 95/46/EG zum Schutz natürlicher Personen bei der Verarbeitung personenbezogener Daten und zum freien Datenverkehr.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007112/13
to the Commission
Evelyn Regner (S&D) and Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Data collection in duty-free zones of airports

When buying goods at duty-free zones in some but not all airports, the purchaser is asked to produce his or her boarding card and then the boarding card is scanned.

1. Does the Commission know the reason for this? If so, what is that reason?

2. Does the Commission know which data are saved during this process? If so, which data?

3. Does the Commission know how long this data is retained, who has access to it and what purpose does it serve?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

EC law ([1]) allows for the exemption of excise duties for purchases made in duty-free shops at EU airports by passengers travelling to third countries (or territories).

1. Duty-free shops at airports collect and process data, including personal data, to verify whether their customers are eligible for this exemption. Travellers have to hold a transport document, stating that the final destination is an airport situated in a third territory or country.

2. The practice on collecting of passenger data varies between Member States ([2]). In some Member States only the flight number is registered without collecting any personal data. But where national customs legislation so requires, also data for identifying the passenger are kept. Depending on the methods how to deal with duty-free purchases, also the practice for the retention of the collected data in Member States varies. For enabling the national authorities to control the duty free shops at a later stage, this period is in some Member States three years, but could be also up to 10 years.

3. The Commission considers that the processing of data is legitimate as EC law requires Member States to take the measures necessary to ensure that the excise duty exemption is applied in such a way as to prevent any possible evasion, avoidance or abuse.

Where personal data are processed, the Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC ([3]) provides that personal data must not be kept for longer than is necessary for a specified purpose. The data collection should be proportionate and therefore also limited to what is strictly necessary (data minimisation).

([1]) Article 14 of Council Directive 2008/118/EC concerning the general agreements for excise duty.
([2]) See Opinion 8/2009 (WP 167) of Art. 29 Data Protection Working Party (independent European advisory body on data protection and privacy) . http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/privacy/docs/wpdocs/2009/wp167_en.pdf
([3]) Directive 95/46/EC on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007113/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(18 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Έρευνα OLAF για τον αυτοκινητόδρομο Κόρινθος-Τρίπολη-Καλαμάτα & τον κλάδο Λεύκτρο-Σπάρτη

Πρόσφατα κοινοποιήθηκε στην Επιτροπή Δημοσιονομικού Ελέγχου του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου αναφορά Κίνησης Πολιτών, στην οποία καταγγέλλεται ότι, για τον οδικό άξονα «Κόρινθος-Τρίπολη-Καλαμάτα & κλάδος Λεύκτρο-Σπάρτη», υπάρχει «σωρεία οικονομικών παραβάσεων που έχουν τελεσθεί στο έργο και οδήγησαν την OLAF στη διερεύνηση του θέματος για απάτη και διαφθορά».

Έγγραφο της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας που επισυνάπτεται στην εν λόγω καταγγελία, αναφέρει, μεταξύ άλλων, ότι «σχετικά με την καταγγελία για απάτη, το Παράρτημα Έρευνας Απάτης της ΕΤΕπ ενημέρωσε την OLAF, η οποία και ξεκίνησε έρευνα για την υπόθεση. Το Παράρτημα Έρευνας Απάτης της ΕΤΕπ συνεργάζεται με την έρευνα που διεξάγει η OLAF».

Κατόπιν έρευνάς μας, διαπιστώσαμε επίσης ότι, η εν λόγω καταγγελία αφορούσε σε πολύμηνη εσκεμμένη καθυστέρηση να εγκριθεί η τροποποίηση των περιβαλλοντικών όρων του έργου εκ μέρους των Δημόσιων Υπηρεσιών, εξ αιτίας της οποίας προκλήθηκε αναβολή της ημερομηνίας παράδοσής του αλλά και ενεργοποίηση της ρήτρας υπέρ του παραχωρησιούχου για αποζημιώσεις 68 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ από το ελληνικό κράτος.

Με δεδομένα τα ανωτέρω, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Τι γνωρίζει για τη συγκεκριμένη υπόθεση; Η αιφνίδια διακοπή των εργασιών από το Νοέμβριο του 2012 μέχρι και σήμερα, σχετίζεται με τη διερεύνηση των καταγγελιών;

Τι συνέπειες θα υπάρξουν σε περίπτωση που οι καταγγελίες αυτές αποδειχθούν βάσιμες;

Απάντηση του κ. Šemeta εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(20 Αυγούστου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή επιβεβαιώνει ότι Ευρωπαϊκή Υπηρεσία Καταπολέμησης της Απάτης (OLAF) ξεκίνησε έρευνα την 1η Φεβρουαρίου 2012 όσον αφορά τα θέματα στα οποία αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου σχετικά με το δάνειο της Ευρωπαϊκής Τράπεζας Επενδύσεων (ΕΤΕ). Η OLAF συνεργάζεται στενά με τις αρμόδιες αρχές και βρίσκεται σε επαφή με την ΕΤΕ. Δεδομένου ότι συνεχίζεται η έρευνα της OLAF, δεν μπορούν να γίνουν περισσότερα σχόλια προς το παρόν.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007113/13
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: OLAF investigation into the Corinth-Tripoli-Kalamata freeway & the Leuktro-Sparta branch expressway

The European Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control recently received a petition from a citizens' initiative alleging that, in respect of the road axis 'Corinth-Tripoli-Kalamata & the Leuktro-Sparta expressway branch', a 'large number of financial irregularities had occurred, prompting OLAF to investigate whether fraud and corruption were involved.'

A document of the European Investment Bank which was attached to this complaint states, *inter alia*, that 'in respect of the complaint about fraud, the EIB's Fraud Investigations Division has provided information to OLAF, which has launched an investigation into the case. EIB's Fraud Investigations Division is cooperating with the investigation conducted by OLAF'.

Our investigation also found that this complaint involved a plan to deliberately delay approval of the amended environmental conditions of the project by the Public Services over many months, resulting in the postponement of the date of delivery of the project. This would have activated the clause in favour of the concession holder who would have been entitled to compensation from the Greek State to the tune of EUR 68 million.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

What does it know about this case? Is the sudden suspension of work since November 2012 linked to the investigation of the complaints?

What consequences will there be if these allegations prove to be well-founded?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2013)

The Commission can confirm that the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) has opened an investigation on 1 February 2012 into the matters referred to by the Honourable Member in relation to the European Investment Bank (EIB) loan. OLAF is cooperating closely with the relevant Greek authorities and has liaised with the EIB. As the OLAF investigation is ongoing, no further comments can be made at this stage.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007114/13
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Invasive alien species

The GB Non-Native Species Secretariat, the UK body responsible for helping to coordinate the approach to invasive non-native species in Great Britain, has issued an alert for the Quagga Mussel, *Dreissena bugensis rostriformis*.

The Quagga Mussel is a highly invasive non-native species that can significantly alter whole ecosystems by filtering out large quantities of nutrients. It is also a serious biofouling risk, blocking pipes and smothering boat hulls and other structures.

Although this species has not yet been found in Great Britain, given its spread through Europe to the Netherlands and Germany it is expected to arrive soon, quite possibly in my own constituency.

Can the Commission advise whether its legislative proposals on invasive alien species will establish a similar alert system to that developed in the UK, and advise by when we can expect these proposals to be published?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

The Commission is working intensively on a legislative proposal on invasive alien species which is scheduled for adoption after the summer break. The Commission is considering proposing measures for the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species, of which the quagga mussel is an example. The Commission also considers an early warning and rapid response system for new invasions of invasive alien species of Union concern, coupled with a system for the exchange of information between Member States to ensure swift and coordinated action, as well as provisions on the management of invasive alien species already established in the EU territory.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007115/13
to the Commission
Marta Andreasen (ECR)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: TransEuropa Ferries BV

TransEuropa Ferries BV of Ostende, Belgium commenced bankruptcy proceedings in April 2013.

Among its other debts is an amount of about GBP 3.3 million due to a local authority in the UK, Thanet District Council, in respect of unpaid port fees.

The outstanding amount was allowed to accumulate over a period of approximately three years following discussions in early 2010 intended to keep the company in business.

To put this amount into context, it is greater than the council's entire operating costs for the Port of Ramsgate for the financial year 2011/12.

There may have been a similar arrangement between TransEuropa and the Port of Ostende.

Is the Commission aware of these arrangements?

Have they breached state aid rules?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

The Commission is not aware of the arrangements described between Thanet District Council and TransEuropa Ferries BV. The Commission also has no information on any similar arrangement that may have existed between TransEuropa and the Port of Ostende. Neither the British nor the Belgian authorities have notified ([1]) the European Commission of any aid to the company. Therefore it is difficult for the Commission to assess whether any such arrangements breached state aid rules.

The Commission observes that any creditor, whether in the private or public sector, may negotiate with their debtors when they consider it is in their interests to do so, and such behaviour does not necessarily involve state aid.

The Commission further observes that even if the arrangements described were to be deemed state aid incompatible with the Treaty, then bankruptcy proceedings leading to termination of the company's economic activities and its deregistration from the commercial register would make recovery of any such aid unlikely.

([1]) According to Article 108(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union: 'The Commission shall be informed, in sufficient time to enable it to submit its comments, of any plans to grant or alter aid'.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007116/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(18 juni 2013)

Betreft: Economische sancties tegen kritisch geachte ondernemers in Turkije

De Turkse premier Erdoğan schrikt er niet voor terug ondernemingen aan te vallen die door mensen geleid worden die hij te kritisch voor zijn beleid acht. Zo riep hij onlangs op tot een boycot van het bedrijf Boyner, en zei hij in het openbaar dat „onze wraak groot zal zijn" tegenover een andere onderneming, de Garantie-Bank. De aandelen van beide ondernemingen kenden als gevolg van deze publieke verklaringen een sterke daling op de beurs (Die Welt, 11 juni 2013).

Is de Commissie bekend met de feiten?

Acht de Commissie dit alles in overeenstemming met de criteria van Kopenhagen?

Welke gevolgen heeft dit voor het toetredingsproces?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(5 september 2013)

De Commissie kent de uitspraken waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst.

De Commissie onderzoekt de door Turkije geboekte vooruitgang met betrekking tot de criteria van Kopenhagen in haar jaarlijkse voortgangsverslagen. Het voortgangsverslag over 2013 zal verschijnen op 16 oktober 2013.

Daarnaast is nadere betrokkenheid bij Turkije belangrijk in het kader van het EU-toetredingsproces, onder andere met betrekking tot hoofdstuk 23 (Justitieel stelsel en grondrechten). De vooruitgang met betrekking tot dit hoofdstuk is cruciaal voor de hervormingsinspanningen van Turkije.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007116/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Economic sanctions in Turkey against entrepreneurs perceived as critical

Turkish Prime Minister Erdoğan does not shy away from attacking companies led by people whom he sees as too critical of his policies. Thus, he recently called for a boycott of the Boyner company, and he said in public that 'our revenge will be great' with regard to another company, Garanti Bank. As a result of these public statements, the two companies' shares crashed on the stock exchange (Die Welt, 11 June 2013).

Are these facts known to the Commission?

Is all this, in the Commission's opinion, compatible with the Copenhagen criteria?

What implications will this have for the accession process?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2013)

The Commission is aware of the statements referred to by the Honourable Member.

The Commission examines progress made by Turkey towards meeting the Copenhagen criteria in its annual Progress Reports. The 2013 Progress Report will be published on 16 October 2013.

In addition, further engagement with Turkey is important within the framework of the EU accession process, including on Chapter 23 — Judiciary and fundamental rights. Progress on this chapter is fundamental to Turkey's reform efforts.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007132/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Repressioni turche e candidature europee

Stando alle testimonianze di cittadini turchi, da alcuni mesi il governo sta lavorando con la massima discrezione per rimuovere scritte e sigle recanti la dicitura «Repubblica di Turchia» in vari edifici pubblici, dagli ospedali, ai tribunali e alle scuole. Ennesimo segno che la politica di Erdogan è poco in linea con quella spinta occidentale e anche modernizzatrice che fu del padre della patria Atatürk. Del resto anche le misure repressive messe in atto dal governo e dalla polizia durante le proteste di Gezi Park hanno poco a che vedere con l'occidente e dimostrano una certa mancanza di spirito democratico da parte di Erdogan, che pare poco avvezzo a ricevere critiche e utilizza sistemi di sicurezza pericolosi per i cittadini: numerose testimonianze hanno parlato di gas lacrimogeni nocivi lanciati dagli elicotteri a bassa quota o di additivi chimici nell'acqua degli idranti usati per disperdere la folla, mentre sono note le violenze ai danni dei cittadini, ma anche a rappresentanti della stampa internazionale e a chiunque in Turchia, medici e avvocati compresi, cerchi di aiutare con la propria professionalità i manifestanti.

Alla luce di quanto sopra il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante:

1. Come giudica, considerando il fatto che la Repubblica turca è candidata all'adesione all'UE, l'atteggiamento del Premier Erdogan che ha più volte dichiarato di non riconoscere l'autorità del Parlamento europeo?

2. Non ritiene doveroso, a fronte della candidatura della Turchia, di richiedere al governo turco una relazione chiara e un'indagine su quanto sta avvenendo in questi giorni a Istanbul e in altre città, con la possibilità di verifica da parte di osservatori europei?

3. È in possesso di informazioni certe su quante persone siano state ferite o siano morte in seguito agli scontri?

4. Quali iniziative diplomatiche sta prendendo relativamente a quanto accade in Turchia?

Risposta congiunta di Štefan Füle a nome della Commissione
(9 agosto 2013)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alle risposte fornite alle precedenti interrogazioni scritte E-006193/2013, E-006403/201, E-006871/2013, P-006302/2013, E-006922/2013, E-007265/2013, E-007260/2013, E-007036/2013, E-007238/2013, E-006378/2013, E-006390/2013, E-006507/2013, E-006891/2013, E-006721/2013, E-007023/2013 e E-007093/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007117/13
aan de Commissie
Laurence J. A. J. Stassen (NI)
(18 juni 2013)

Betreft: Turkse politie doet invallen bij media en onderzoekt restricties sociale media

Het Turkse AK-regime draait de Turkse vrije media de duimschroeven nog verder aan. Op dinsdag 18 juni hebben Turkse veiligheidsfunctionarissen en politieagenten invallen gedaan bij de krant Atilim en het persbureau Etkin ([1]). Dezelfde dag werd verder bekend dat de Turkse regering een onderzoek is gestart om het gebruik van sociale media in te perken ([2]).

1. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat het volstrekt onacceptabel is dat de Turkse politie dergelijke invallen pleegt bij de Turkse media? Zo neen, waarom niet?

2. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het volstrekt absurd is dat de Turkse regering nu de sociale media de schuld geven van de protesten tegen het AK-regime? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat de mediavrijheid en de vrijheid van meningsuiting in Turkije ernstig onder druk staan door het intimiderende optreden van de Turkse regering? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat het autoritaire en ondemocratische optreden van de Turkse regering volstrekt onacceptabel zijn en dat de toetredingsonderhandelingen met Turkije onmiddellijk moeten worden gestaakt? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(9 augustus 2013)

De Commissie verwijst het geachte Parlementslid naar haar antwoorden op de schriftelijke vragen E-006193/2013, E-006403/201, E-006871/2013, P-006302/2013, E-006922/2013, E-007265/2013, E-007260/2013, E-007036/2013, E-007238/2013, E-006378/2013, E-006390/2013, E-006507/2013, E-006891/2013, E-006721/2013, E-007023/2013 en E-007093/2013 ([3]).

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/buitenland/21658395/__Invallen_bij_media_Turkije__.html
([2]) http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/governement-working-on-draft-to-restrict-social-media-in-turkey.aspx?pageID=238&nID=48982&NewsCatID=338.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/nl/parliamentary-questions.html?tabType=wq#sidesForm.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007117/13
to the Commission
Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Turkish police raid media outlets and look into introducing restrictions on social media

The Turkish AK regime is tightening the screws on the Turkish free media even more. On Tuesday 18 June, Turkish security officials and police officers raided the *Atilim* newspaper and the Etkin news agency ([1]). It emerged the same day that the Turkish Government had launched an inquiry to restrict the use of social media ([2]).

1. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that such raids by the Turkish police on the Turkish media are totally unacceptable? If not, why not?

2. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that it is totally absurd that the Turkish Government is now blaming the social media for the protests against the AK regime? If not, why not?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that freedom of the media and freedom of expression in Turkey are under serious threat because of the intimidating actions of the Turkish government? If not, why not?

4. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that the Turkish government's authoritarian and undemocratic actions are totally unacceptable and that the accession negotiations with Turkey should be terminated immediately? If not, why not?

Question for written answer E-007132/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Turkish repression and EU candidacy

According to eyewitness reports from Turkish citizens, for some months the government has been working very discreetly to remove documents and other items bearing the words 'Republic of Turkey' from various public buildings including hospitals, courts and schools. This is yet another sign that Prime Minister Erdoğan's policy has little in common with the westernising and modernising policies of Atatürk, the republic's founder. Moreover, the repressive acts of the government and the police during the Gezi Park protests have little to do with the West and show a certain lack of democratic spirit on the part of Mr Erdoğan, who seems unaccustomed to taking criticism and uses security systems that are dangerous to the population: numerous eyewitnesses have spoken of harmful tear gas dropped from low-flying helicopters and of chemical additives in the water taken from hydrants to disperse crowds. It is common knowledge that violence is being done not only to Turkish citizens, but also to representatives of the international press and to anyone in Turkey — including doctors and lawyers — who tries to give professional help to the demonstrators.

1. Bearing in mind that the Republic of Turkey is a candidate for accession to the EU, how does the Vice-President/High Representative view the behaviour of Prime Minister Erdoğan, who has said on many occasions that he does not recognise the authority of the European Parliament?

2. In view of Turkey's candidacy, does she not consider it right to ask the Turkish Government for a clear report and an investigation into what has happened recently in Istanbul and other cities, with the possibility of verification by EU observers?

3. Does she have any reliable information about how many people have been injured or killed as a result of the clashes?

4. What diplomatic initiatives is she taking in relation to events in Turkey?

([1]) http://www.telegraaf.nl/buitenland/21658395/__Invallen_bij_media_Turkije__.html
([2]) http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/governement-working-on-draft-to-restrict-social-media-in-turkey.aspx?pageID=238&nID=48982&NewsCatID=338

Joint answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer to previous Written Questions E-006193/2013, E-006403/201, E-006871/2013, P-006302/2013, E-006922/2013, E-007265/2013, E-007260/2013, E-007036/2013, E-007238/2013, E-006378/2013, E-006390/2013, E-006507/2013, E-006891/2013, E-006721/2013, E-007023/2013, E-007093/2013 ([3]).

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

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-007118/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(18 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Κατάργηση της μεθόδου ψαρέματος γρι-γρι

Μια επικερδής μέθοδος ψαρέματος είναι το γρι-γρι. Η προώθηση όμως της εν λόγω μεθόδου έχει πολλαπλές αρνητικές επιπτώσεις. Αρχικά εξανεμίζει το ήδη πενιχρό εισόδημα των ψαράδων, ενώ σε πολλές περιπτώσεις τους στέλνει ακόμη και στην ανεργία. Επίσης αρνητικές συνέπειες έχει και στο περιβάλλον καθώς η μέθοδος γρι-γρι είναι μαζική και μη επιλεκτική, με αποτέλεσμα να εξαφανίζει πολύ γρήγορα μεγάλες ποσότητες ψαριών.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Δεδομένης της πολιτικής της ΕΕ για προστασία και αειφόρο ανάπτυξη των θαλάσσιων μας περιοχών καθώς και της πολιτικής προτεραιότητας για την καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας, δεν θα έπρεπε η μέθοδος γρι-γρι να απαγορευτεί;

Απάντηση της κ. Δαμανάκη εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(31 Ιουλίου 2013)

Τα γρι-γρι χρησιμοποιούνται ευρέως από σκάφη πολύ διαφορετικών μεγεθών, από βάρκες ανοικτού τύπου και κανό έως μεγάλα ποντοπόρα πλοία. Χρησιμοποιούνται για την αλίευση ποικιλίας ειδών στα οποία συμπεριλαμβάνονται μικρά πελαγικά είδη, όπως η ρέγγα, το σκουμπρί και ο γαύρος, καθώς και άκρως μεταναστευτικά είδη, όπως ο τόνος.

Σε σύγκριση με την πλειονότητα των άλλων τεχνικών αλιείας, η αλιεία με γρι-γρι δεν θεωρείται επιβλαβής για τους φυσικούς πόρους ή το περιβάλλον, εκτός από περιπτώσεις στις οποίες τα γρι-γρι χρησιμοποιούνται για την αλίευση ειδών που απλώς δεν μπορούν να αντέξουν την αλιευτική πίεση για τους πληθυσμούς τους (π.χ. τόνος). Σε αυτές τις περιπτώσεις, επιβάλλεται η λήψη αυστηρών μέτρων ελέγχου.

Ως επί το πλείστον, οι απορρίψεις είναι γενικώς χαμηλές στην αλιεία με γρι-γρι και η ελαφρά κατασκευή αυτών των αλιευτικών εργαλείων συνεπάγεται περιορισμένη ή και καμία επίπτωση στον θαλάσσιο πυθμένα. Τα σκάφη γρι-γρι ευθύνονται για πολύ λιγότερες εκπομπές CO_2 από τα σκάφη που χρησιμοποιούν συρόμενα εργαλεία, όπως οι τράτες. Δεν έχουν περιέλθει σε γνώση της Επιτροπής αποδεικτικά στοιχεία τα οποία να υποδηλώνουν ότι η αλιεία με γρι-γρι εκτοπίζει τους αλιείς που χρησιμοποιούν άλλα εργαλεία και οδηγεί σε ανεργία.

Ο κύριος αντίκτυπος των γρι-γρι που αναφέρθηκε σε πρόσφατη μελέτη που χρηματοδοτήθηκε από την ΕΕ είναι η τυχαία σύλληψη δελφινιών σε ορισμένα είδη αλιείας. Εντούτοις, αναπτύχθηκαν ειδικές τεχνικές, — τα δίχτυα τύπου Medina με μικρά μάτια και η τεχνική βύθισης που επιτρέπουν στα περικυκλωμένα δελφίνια να διαφεύγουν ζωντανά. Οι τεχνικές αυτές χρησιμοποιούνται σήμερα ευρέως και έχουν σχεδόν εξαλείψει πλήρως την παρεμπίπτουσα αλίευση δελφινιών με τον συγκεκριμένο τύπο αλιείας.

Με την προϋπόθεση ότι τα γρι-γρι χρησιμοποιούνται με υπεύθυνο τρόπο, η Επιτροπή δεν κατανοεί για ποιο λόγο πρέπει να απαγορευθεί η χρήση τους.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007118/13
to the Commission
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Banning purse-seine fishing

Purse-seine fishing is a lucrative fishing method. However, encouraging this method has many adverse effects. In particular, it erodes fishermen's already meager income and in many cases results in them becoming unemployed. It also has a negative impact on the environment, since purse-seine fishing is an indiscriminate, mass fishing method and thus eliminates large quantities of fish very rapidly.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Given the EU's policy regarding the protection and sustainable development of our marine areas and its political priority to fight unemployment, does it not agree that purse seine fishing should be banned?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

Purse seines are widely used by a large range of vessel sizes, ranging from open boats and canoes up to large ocean going vessels. They are used to target a variety of species including small pelagic species such as herring, mackerel and anchovy as well as highly migratory species such as bluefin tuna.

Compared to most other fishing techniques purse seining, is not considered harmful to natural resources or the environment except in situations when they are used to target species that simply can't take the fishing pressure on their populations (e.g. Bluefin tuna). In such circumstances there is a need to ensure stringent control measures.

For the most part, discards are generally low in purse seine fisheries and the light constructions of such gears means there is little or no impact on the seabed. Purse seine vessels also have much less CO_2 emissions than vessels deploying towed gears such as trawls. There is no evidence known to the Commission to suggest purse seine fisheries displace fishermen using other gears leading to unemployment.

The main impact of purse seines reported in a recent EU funded study, is the incidental capture of dolphins in some fisheries. However, special techniques have been developed — the Medina panel and 'back down' operation — which allow encircled dolphins to escape alive. These techniques are now widely used and have almost totally eliminated dolphin bycatch in these fisheries.

Provided purse seines are used responsibly, the Commission sees no reason why their use should be banned.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-007119/13
do Komisji
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(18 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Ocena projektu „Port Lotniczy w Gdańsku – budowa drugiego terminalu pasażerskiego wraz z infrastrukturą oraz rozbudowa i modernizacja infrastuktury lotniskowej i portowej"

Zgodnie z otrzymaną przez Zarząd Spółki PL Gdańsk w dniu 18 marca 2013 r. wiadomością od Komisji prace nad oceną projektu 2010PL161PR022 zostały wstrzymane m.in. w związku z badaniem zasadności udzielenia pomocy publicznej dla lotniska Gdynia-Kosakowo. W moim przekonaniu decyzja ta jest nieuzasadniona, ponieważ oba te lotniska są projektami o innym przeznaczeniu i powinny być rozpatrywane niezależnie. Wobec tego, decyzja o wstrzymaniu procesu oceny projektu i uzależnienie jej od działań związanych z inwestycją w Gdyni, jest dla mnie niezrozumiała.

Prace nad rozbudową drugiego terminalu pasażerskiego Rębiechowa zakończyły się ponad rok temu, natomiast kompletny wniosek o potwierdzenie wkładu finansowego został złożony przez MRR w dniu 30 sierpnia 2010 r. Oczekiwanie na ocenę tego projektu trwa już zatem 3 lata. Dodatkowo, Zarząd Spółki PL Gdańsk już od wielu miesięcy nie jest proszony o wyjaśnienia związane z projektem, gdyż wszystkie wątpliwości zostały rozwiane w przeciągu dwóch pierwszych lat ewaluacji. W obecnym czasie planowane są kolejne procesy inwestycyjne finansowane przez banki komercyjne; przedłużająca się decyzja Komisji powoduje zatem powstanie dodatkowych szkód.

W związku z powyższym, chcę zapytać:

Kiedy strona polska może spodziewać się zakończenia procesu oceny gdańskiego projektu nr 2010PL161PR022 i uzyskania decyzji Komisji?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-007885/13
do Komisji
Jan Kozłowski (PPE)
(3 lipca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Termin zakończenia oceny projektu nr 2010PL161PR022 dotyczącego budowy drugiego terminalu pasażerskiego Portu Lotniczego Gdańsk

Port Lotniczy Gdańsk znajduje się w sieci lotnisk TEN-T stanowiącej kluczową infrastrukturę lotniskową Polski oraz integralną część infrastruktury europejskiej. Projekt został rzeczowo oraz finansowo zrealizowany zgodnie z harmonogramem, a lotnisko w Gdańsku jest obecnie na etapie rozliczania wniosku o płatność końcową. Lotnisko w Gdańsku oczekuje na zakończenie oceny gdańskiego portu oraz wersją roboczą decyzji Komisji dla projektu nr 2010PL161PR022 pt. „Port Lotniczy w Gdańsku – budowa drugiego terminalu pasażerskiego wraz z infrastrukturą oraz rozbudowa i modernizacja infrastruktury lotniskowej i portowej".

W związku z powyższym uprzejmie proszę o informację, kiedy Komisja zamierza zakończyć proces oceny projektu oraz przygotować wersję roboczą decyzji.

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johannesa Hahna w imieniu Komisji
(18 lipca 2013 r.)

Ocena dużego projektu dotyczącego portu lotniczego w Gdańsku, nr CCI 2010PL161PR022, jest nadal w toku z kilku powodów. Po pierwsze, po otrzymaniu wniosku w sprawie projektu Komisja zwróciła się do strony polskiej o pełną finansową analizę planowanych inwestycji w infrastrukturę portu, wraz z wyjaśnieniami dotyczącymi przewidywanego zapotrzebowania na przewozy. Po uzyskaniu takiej analizy Komisja dowiedziała się o planach dotyczących cywilnego portu lotniczego Gdynia-Kosakowo, oddalonego o ok. 25 km.

Zgodnie z informacjami w posiadaniu Komisji oba lotniska cechować będzie bardzo podobny model biznesowy, co z dużym prawdopodobieństwem zaszkodzi ich efektywności gospodarczej i finansowej. Rozwój dwóch portów lotniczych w tak bliskiej odległości może oznaczać nieoptymalną alokację zasobów prowadzącą do nadwyżki przepustowości, nieefektywne wykorzystywanie istniejącej przepustowości oraz – z punktu widzenia współfinansowania unijnego – nienajlepsze wykorzystanie pieniędzy europejskich podatników.

Komisja zwraca się o sporządzenie uaktualnionej analizy finansowej i gospodarczej dotyczącej portu lotniczego w Gdańsku w pełni uwzględniającej funkcjonowanie portu lotniczego w Gdyni w tak bliskiej odległości. Minister Rozwoju Regionalnego poinformowała niedawno Komisję, że dodatkowe dokumenty mające wykazać większą koordynację między oboma portami będą dostępne przed dniem 1 września 2013 r. Komisja oczekuje obecnie na te dokumenty.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007119/13
to the Commission
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(18 June 2013)

Subject: Assessment of the 'Gdańsk airport — construction of a second passenger terminal and infrastructure, and development and modernisation of airport and port infrastructure' project

According to information received from the Commission on 18 March 2103 by the board of PL Gdańsk, the assessment of project 2010PL161PR022 has been suspended. This is apparently related, among other things, to an examination of the legitimacy of granting public aid to the Gdynia-Kosakowo airport. I believe this decision is unjustified since the two airports are projects which serve different purposes and should be considered separately. I find it hard, therefore, to understand the decision to suspend the project assessment procedure and its dependence on activities connected with the investment in Gdynia.

Work on the development of a second passenger terminal at Rębiechowo ended more than a year ago, and the complete request for confirmation of the financial contribution was submitted by the Ministry of Regional Development on 30 August 2010. We have now been waiting three years for an assessment of this project. Furthermore, it is many months since the board of PL Gdańsk has been asked for any clarification in connection with the project, as all doubts were cleared up within the first two years of the evaluation. The next phases of the investment process, financed by commercial banks, are now planned, and the Commission dragging its feet over a decision will therefore result in additional damage.

When can the Polish side expect completion of the assessment of project 2010PL161PR022 in Gdańsk and a decision from the Commission?

Question for written answer P-007885/13
to the Commission
Jan Kozłowski (PPE)
(3 July 2013)

Subject: Deadline for completion of the assessment of project No 2010PL161PR022 on the construction of a second passenger terminal at Gdańsk Airport

Gdańsk Airport is part of the TEN-T network of airports which comprise Poland's key airport infrastructure and an integral part of the European infrastructure. The financing and implementation of the project was carried out on schedule and Gdańsk Airport is currently at the stage of settling the final payment claim. The airport is awaiting completion of an assessment of Gdańsk port and a draft version of the Commission's decision on project No 2010PL161PR022 'Gdańsk Airport — construction of a second passenger terminal and infrastructure, and development and modernisation of airport and port infrastructure'.

When does the Commission plan to complete the project assessment process and draw up a draft decision?

Joint answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

The assessment of the major project in Gdansk airport, CCI No 2010PL161PR022 is still ongoing, due to a number of reasons. Firstly, following its submission, the Commission was interested in obtaining a full financial analysis of all planned investments in the airport's infrastructure, together with explanation related to forecasted demand. When this was provided, the Commission became aware of the plans for a civilian airport at Gdynia-Kosakowo, located approx. 25 km away.

According to the information available to the Commission, both airports will pursue very similar business models, which will most likely be detrimental to both their economic and financial viability. The development of two airports in such proximity may represent a sub-optimal allocation of resources creating a capacity surplus, inefficiencies in the use of existing capacity and — as far as the EU co-financing is concerned — poor value for money for the European taxpayers.

The Commission would like to receive updated financial and economic analysis for Gdansk airport, taking fully into account the existence of Gdynia airport in such proximity. The Minister of Regional Development recently informed the Commission that by 1 September 2013 additional documents, which are to prove greater coordination between both airports, should be available. The Commission is now awaiting those documents.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007120/13
to the Commission
Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Court of Auditors report on EU cooperation with Egypt

I was shocked to read the Court of Auditors report on EU cooperation with Egypt. Following this report, will the Commission:

1. Conduct its own investigation into the failings in EU aid to Egypt, especially in the field of democracy and human rights?

2. As per the recommendations of the report, apply stricter criteria to budget support, including ensuring that budget support is free from corruption and that a commitment to democracy and human rights is a condition of disbursement?

3. Pay more attention to women's rights when, according to the report, the Egyptian Parliament has demanded 'a reduction in the age of marriage, the decriminalising of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) and a review of the Personal Status Law and Child Law in line with Sharia principles'?

4. Assure me that, given the worrying demands mentioned above and the recent death of Suhair al Bata'a, a 13-year-old girl who perished while having an FGM operation in a village to the north of Cairo, it will suspend all aid to Egypt if FGM is legalised or there is a de facto moratorium on prosecuting those who carry out this barbaric crime?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(2 September 2013)

The Commission and the High Representative/Vice-President fully cooperated with the Court of Auditors in the preparation of its report on Egypt and take its conclusions and recommendations very seriously.

On the basis of the new EU Budget Support (BS) policy, new and more rigorous guidelines have guided all BS operations since 1 January 2013. These include a stronger link to fundamental values (human rights, democracy and the rule of law), which are assessed when programmes are identified and for each proposed disbursement. A risk management framework, combining five risk categories (political, macroeconomic, development, Public Financial Management and corruption/fraud) and a stronger focus on accountability and transparency are applied.

The Egyptian Parliament has not adopted or discussed any formal draft law on women's rights. The entire legislative framework on women's and children's rights is still in place. The EU stresses the importance of women's and children's rights at every high level event, notably at the latest Association Committee meeting on 28 February 2013. The EU is also funding projects worth EUR 12.4 million directly improving women's situation, such as via UN WOMEN ([1]).

The EU is profoundly saddened by the death of Sohair El Batea on 6 June 2013, reaffirms its strong commitment to eradicating Female Genital Mutilation and is supporting the national campaign to eradicate this practice through a joint programme with the UNDP ([2]).

([1]) Securing Rights and Improving Livelihoods of Women (EUR 4 million).
([2]) 'Abandonment of Female Genital Mutilation and Empowerment of Families' (EUR 3 million).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007121/13
a la Comisión
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D)
(19 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Modelo de contrato único

La dualidad, es decir, la coexistencia de trabajadores con contratos indefinidos con una situación de seguridad y protección laboral muy superior a otros que poseen contratos temporales, constituye una de las características más representativas de los mercados laborales en la EU. Pese a ello, existen importantes diferencias entre los Estados, siendo España el país con mayor índice de temporalidad con un 24,9 % de la población activa en 2010, lo que representa más de 10 puntos porcentuales por encima de la media europea. De acuerdo con la OCDE se puede establecer una correlación positiva elevada entre la temporalidad y el nivel de destrucción de empleo de un país, y las estadísticas así lo demuestran, ya que desde el inicio de la crisis se han destruido en España más de 3 800 000 empleos, correspondiendo más del 74 % de dicha destrucción a los jóvenes menores de 30 años que padecen el índice de temporalidad más elevado de toda la OCDE (el 61,4 % para los jóvenes menores de 24 años).

Dicha tendencia resulta especialmente preocupante si tenemos en cuanta los importantes costes que provoca esta segmentación laboral en términos de aumento de desigualdades entre trabajadores en cuanto al acceso a seguridad, protección laboral, salarios y formación, así como en cuanto a la reducción de la productividad media del país, ya que se reducen los incentivos de trabajadores y empresarios para invertir en capital humano específico para las empresas y se promueven las actividades económicas de bajo valor añadido. Ante el riesgo de condenar a toda una generación a la precariedad, el pasado 13 de mayo el Comisario de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, Laszló Andor, propuso que España contemple la implantación de un «contrato único abierto» para frenar el elevado desempleo, sobre todo juvenil, y para acabar definitivamente con la segmentación del mercado laboral.

1. ¿Podría la Comisión explicar más en profundidad dicha propuesta?

2. ¿No piensa la Comisión que el contrato único no eliminaría por completo la dualidad en el mercado laboral sino que la transformaría simplemente en otra modalidad?

3. ¿En qué modalidad de contrato único piensa la Comisión, en uno con derechos crecientes con la antigüedad o bien en un contrato único con un largo periodo de prueba?

4. ¿No piensa la Comisión que podrían observarse problemas legales para la introducción de esta figura contractual en España, pudiéndose considerar que es anticonstitucional o que viola la Convención 158 de la OIT ratificada por el país?

Respuesta del Sr. Andor en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de agosto de 2013)

En su paquete de medidas para el empleo ([1]), la Comisión subrayó que era una prioridad garantizar contratos adecuados para luchar contra la segmentación del mercado de trabajo.

El pasado mes de noviembre, la Comisión manifestó que las reformas encaminadas a simplificar la legislación laboral y reducir las diferencias en la protección del empleo entre los diferentes tipos de contrato de trabajo podrían mejorar la capacidad de adaptación de los mercados de trabajo y reducir la segmentación ([2]). Para ello, los Estados miembros podrían examinar como posible solución el recurso a contratos de duración indefinida con un período de prueba suficientemente largo y un aumento gradual de una serie de derechos de protección para todos los trabajadores ([3]). Corresponde a los Estados miembros determinar, en su caso, el tipo exacto de contrato que se ajuste mejor a sus necesidades.

([1]) Adoptado en abril de 2012.
([2]) COM(2012) 750 final de 28.11.2012.
([3]) COM(2010) 682 final de 23 de noviembre de 2010.

La Comisión resumió su evaluación global de la evolución y las reformas del mercado de trabajo español en las recomendaciones específicas para cada país de 2013 ([4]) y el documento de trabajo de los servicios de la Comisión adjunto, cuya publicación se efectuó el 29 de mayo de 2013. Para abordar el nivel de desempleo, que es inaceptablemente alto, y la segmentación del mercado de trabajo, España debería concluir, de aquí a julio de 2013, la reforma del mercado de trabajo de 2012, incluidos todos sus objetivos y medidas, y presentar modificaciones, en caso necesario, en septiembre de 2013 a más tardar. Es preciso aplicar una reforma completa de las políticas activas del mercado de trabajo ([5]) y adoptar medidas adicionales para modernizar y reforzar los servicios públicos de empleo. También debe prestarse una atención específica a los jóvenes que no trabajan, estudian ni reciben formación mediante la aplicación de la «Garantía Juvenil». Debería aumentarse la eficacia del programa de formación de reciclaje para los trabajadores de más edad y los trabajadores poco cualificados.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/csr2013_spain_es.pdf
http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/swd2013_spain_es.pdf

([5]) PAMT.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007121/13
to the Commission
Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Single contract model

One of the most characteristic features of EU labour markets is a duality, namely that workers with permanent contracts who enjoy much greater job security and protection coexist with others who possess temporary contracts. However, significant differences exist between Member States, among which Spain has the highest proportion of temporary workers, with 24.9% of its working population on temporary contracts in 2010, over 10% more than the European average. According to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, a strong positive correlation can be drawn between temporary contracts and the degree to which a country's jobs are destroyed. This view is borne out by the statistics: since the start of the crisis, over 3 800 000 jobs have been destroyed in Spain, 74% of which were held by young people under 30, the group that suffers the highest level of temporary employment across OECD member countries (61.4% for young people under 24).

This trend is particularly worrying if we consider that labour segmentation leads to increasingly unequal access to secure living conditions, job protection, salaries and training and reduces a country's average productivity level since there are fewer incentives for workers and entrepreneurs to invest in human resources for companies and economic activities of low added value are undertaken. An entire generation is at risk of being condemned to a state of precariousness. In view of this situation, Laszló Andor, the Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, proposed on 13 May that Spain should consider implementing a 'single open-ended contract' to curb this high unemployment, particularly among the young, and to end segmentation in the labour market.

1. Could the Commission explain this proposal in more depth?

2. Does the Commission not think that, rather than eliminating duality in the labour market, a single contract would simply create a different kind of duality?

3. What type of single contract is the Commission considering? One that grants rights increasing in line with length of service or a single contract with a long trial period?

4. Does the Commission not think that the introduction of this type of contract in Spain could give rise to legal problems since it might be considered anti-constitutional or in breach of ILO Convention 158, which the country has ratified?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

In its Employment Package ([1]), the Commission stressed that ensuring appropriate contractual arrangements to combat labour market segmentation was a priority.

Last November, the Commission expressed that reforms aiming at simplifying employment legislation and reducing gaps in employment protection between different types of work contracts could improve the resilience of labour markets and reduce segmentation. ([2]) To this objective, Member States could possibly consider whether the use of open-ended contractual arrangements with a sufficiently long probation period and a gradual increase of a range of protection rights for all employees could be a possible solution to explore. ([3]) It is for the Member States to elaborate, if they so wish, the exact type of contractual arrangements that would fit their needs best.

([1]) Adopted in April 2012.
([2]) COM(2012) 750 final of 28 November 2012.
([3]) COM(2010) 682final of 23 November 2010.

The Commission has summarised its overall assessment of Spanish labour market developments and reforms in the 2013 country-specific recommendations ([4]) and the accompanying Staff Working Document published on 29 May 2013. To address the unacceptably high level of unemployment and labour market segmentation, Spain should finalise the evaluation of the 2012 labour market reform covering the full range of its objectives and measures by July 2013, and present amendments, if necessary, by September 2013. A comprehensive reform of active labour market policies ([5]) needs to be implemented and additional action taken to modernise and reinforce the Public Employment Service itself. Specific attention should be also paid to young people not in employment, education or training, through the implementation of a Youth Guarantee The effectiveness of reskilling training programme for older and low skilled workers should be reinforced.

([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/csr2013_spain_es.pdf . http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/swd2013_spain_es.pdf

([5]) ALMPs.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007122/13
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(19 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Cambios retroactivos en la regulación del mercado de la energía en España

El Gobierno español ha ido adoptando desde 2010 una serie de medidas retroactivas que han cambiado las condiciones del mercado de la energía en este Estado miembro. Los emprendedores e inversores que, a la vista del marco legal establecido, decidieron invertir en energía renovable, y especialmente en la fotovoltaica, han visto cambiar drásticamente las condiciones del mercado, que han provocado la quiebra de numerosas empresas y acabado con miles de puestos de trabajo centrados en un sector que genera empleos de calidad y debería ser un sector económico de futuro. La realidad descrita está afectando a la libre competencia en el sector eléctrico español, como ya reconoció la Comisión en su evaluación del programa nacional de reforma y estabilidad para España 2012 (SWD(2012)0310). A esta primera crítica se unen los reparos expuestos por la Comisión en su Comunicación sobre el mercado interior de la energía (COM(2012)0663) en torno a los llamados «pagos por capacidad», hechos tan llamativos como los beneficios extraordinarios de los productores de energía por medios convencionales en España y las dudas que plantea a muchos operadores del sector la unificación de órganos reguladores en una sola Comisión Nacional de los Mercados y la Competencia. Además, dos comisarios europeos han expresado en público su preocupación por lo ocurrido con las renovables en España. Así, el Comisario de Energía, Günter Oettinger, mantiene, según la prensa especializada, una línea de trabajo para actuar en auxilio de los productores fotovoltaicos españoles, para lo cual maneja informes detallados sobre la sucesión de normas retroactivas que ya ha ido soportando este colectivo y los correspondientes impactos económicos. Por su parte, la Comisaria de Acción por el Clima, Connie Hedegaard, se ha declarado contraria a aprobar normas retroactivas para las renovables: «Todo lo que se haga en este área ha de tener largo recorrido y tenemos que tener mucho cuidado en no cambiar las reglas retroactivamente».

1. ¿Qué medidas recomienda la Comisión para mejorar la competencia en el mercado eléctrico español, considerando las barreras descritas, para que no afecte a la inversión en renovables?

2. ¿En qué consiste el trabajo que desarrolla el Comisario Oettinger en torno al mercado de la energía fotovoltaica en España? ¿Considera la Comisaria Hedegaard que lo ocurrido en España es un cambio retroactivo de las reglas del juego?

3. ¿Considera la Comisión que lo ocurrido en España es coherente con la estrategia 2020? De mantenerse la situación, ¿podrá España cumplir en el futuro los compromisos de reducción de CO_2 y gases de efecto invernadero que han asumido todos los Estados miembros de la UE?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(21 de agosto de 2013)

1) La Comisión recomienda que España cumpla, total y correctamente, el tercer paquete de medidas del mercado interior de la energía, de julio de 2009 ([1]), y las Directivas de Energías Renovables (2009/28/CE) ([2]) y de Eficiencia Energética (2012/27/UE) ([3]). También recomienda acelerar el acoplamiento de los mercados de la electricidad con Francia y seguir desarrollando las interconexiones eléctricas con los países vecinos.

2) Se remite a Su Señoría a las recomendaciones del semestre europeo a España ([4]) y a la Comunicación de la Comisión, de 2012, sobre las energías renovables, incluida la solar ([5]), en la que la Comisión expresa su inquietud acerca de los vaivenes bruscos en la financiación de las energías renovables en España y otros Estados miembros, aunque reconoce que los regímenes de apoyo a esas energías deben adaptarse por razones de rentabilidad.

3) En virtud de la Decisión de reparto del esfuerzo (406/2009/CE) ([6]), España está obligada a reducir, antes de 2020, sus emisiones no cubiertas por el RCDE UE en un 10 % en comparación con 2005. En la última década, se ha registrado una reducción gradual de las emisiones. Los datos publicados más recientemente indican que, en 2010, estas se encontraban ya un 5 % por debajo del nivel de 2005. A la vista de las tendencias actuales, es probable que España cumpla su objetivo de reducción de emisiones de GEI, siempre que aplique rápida y completamente la legislación de la UE en materia de clima y energía.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/legislation/legislation_en.htm
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=Oj:L:2009:140:0016:0062:es:PDF
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:315:0001:0056:ES:PDF
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/europe-2020-in-your-country/espana/index_es.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/communication_2012_en.htm
([6]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:140:0136:0148:ES:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007122/13
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Retroactive changes to energy market regulations in Spain

Since 2010, the Spanish Government has been adopting a series of retroactive measures that have changed the conditions of the energy market in this Member State. Entrepreneurs and investors who, in view of the established legal framework, decided to invest in renewable energy, particularly in solar energy, have seen drastic changes in market conditions that have caused many companies to go bankrupt and made thousands of people redundant in a sector that creates good jobs and should be an economic sector of the future. This situation is affecting free competition in the Spanish electricity sector, as acknowledged by the Commission's assessment of the 2012 national reform programme and stability programme for Spain (SWD(2012)0310). In addition to this criticism, there are the objections about what are called 'payments for capacity' in the Commission's communication on the internal energy market (COM(2012)0663), and stark facts such as the windfall profits made by conventional-energy producers in Spain, and the concern of many operators in the sector about the unification of regulatory bodies into a single national commission for markets and competition. Furthermore, two European commissioners have publicly expressed their concern about the situation of renewables in Spain. The specialist press has reported that the Commissioner for Energy, Günter Oettinger, is working to assist Spanish solar-energy producers with the aid of detailed reports on the retroactive legislation that this group has already had to endure and on the resulting economic consequences. For her part, the Commissioner for Climate Action, Connie Hedegaard, has said that she is against adopting retroactive legislation on renewables: 'Everything done in this area must be for the long haul. We must be very careful not to change the rules retroactively'.

1. In view of the barriers described, what steps would the Commission recommend to improve competition in the Spanish electricity market so that investment in renewables is not affected?

2. What work is Commissioner Oettinger undertaking in relation to the solar-energy market in Spain? Does Commissioner Hedegaard consider what has happened in Spain to be a retroactive change of the rules?

3. Does the Commission consider what has happened in Spain to be coherent with the 2020 strategy? If this situation continues, will Spain be able to fulfil the commitments made by all Member States to reduce CO_2 and greenhouse-gas emissions?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

1. The Commission recommends that Spain fully and correctly implements the Third Internal Energy Market package of July 2009 ([1]) and the directives on Renewable Energy (2009/28/EC) ([2]) and Energy Efficiency (2012/27/EU) ([3]). In addition it is recommended that the electricity market coupling with France is speeded up and further power interconnections with neighbouring countries are developed.

2. The Honourable Member is referred to the 2013 EU semester recommendations to Spain ([4]) and to the 2012 Commission Communication on renewable energy including solar-energy ([5]), in which the Commission expressed concerns about stop-and-go approaches to renewable energy support in Spain as in other Member States, while recognising that support schemes for renewable energy should be adapted for cost-effectiveness reasons.

3. Under the Effort Sharing Decision (No 406/2009/EC) ([6]), Spain is obliged to decrease its emissions not covered by the EU ETS by 10% by 2020 compared to 2005. Emissions have been decreasing gradually in the last decade. The most recent publicly available data show that in 2010 emissions were already 5% below the 2005 level. Based on the current trends, Spain is likely to meet its GHG emission reduction target provided that it implements swiftly and fully the EU climate and energy legislation.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/gas_electricity/legislation/legislation_en.htm
([2]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=Oj:L:2009:140:0016:0062:en:PDF
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:315:0001:0056:EN:PDF
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/europe-2020-in-your-country/espana/index_en.htm
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/communication_2012_en.htm
([6]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:140:0136:0148:EN:PDF

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007123/13
an die Kommission
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL) und David Martin (S&D)
(19. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Weiterbehandlung der schriftlichen Anfrage E-001132/2013

In ihrer Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-001132/2013 weist die Kommission auf zwei Fälle angeblicher Enteignungen von ausländischen Investoren in Kanada hin. Die Kommission benutzt diese Fälle, um die Einführung eines Mechanismus zur Beilegung von Investor-Staat-Streitigkeiten (ISDS) in das umfassende Wirtschafts- und Handelsabkommen EU-Kanada (CETA) zu rechtfertigen.

Könnte sich die Kommission zu den folgenden beiden Fällen äußern?

1. Die Rechtssache *AbitibiBowater Inc. v Canada* scheint zu zeigen, dass der Zugang zu den Gerichten nach kanadischem Recht (*Dunsmuir v New Brunswick*, [2008] 1 SCR 190) der Zugang zum Gericht nicht verweigert worden wäre, sofern man ihn beantragt hätte. Zudem scheint es, als wären die kanadischen Gerichte auf der Grundlage solcher Verfahren befugt, ungeachtet der Datenschutzklausel im Abitibi Act die Höhe der von der Provinzregierung festgelegten Entschädigung zu überprüfen Darüber hinaus hat der Oberste Gerichtshof von Kanada seine liberale Haltung in Bezug auf indirekte Enteignungen in der Rechtssache *Antrim Truck Center v Ontario* 2013 SCC 13 (2013) nochmals bestätigt.

2. In der Rechtssache *Gallo v Canada* hätte der Grundsatz des Zugangs zur Justiz und der gerichtlichen Prüfung der Entschädigungszahlungen gleichermaßen gegolten, der Investor verzichtete jedoch darauf und leitete stattdessen direkt ein Schiedsverfahren ein. In dem anschließenden Schiedsspruch wurde bestätigt, dass die zugrundeliegende Forderung unbegründet und aussichtslos ist. Der Fall scheint eher Fragen in Bezug auf die uneingeschränkte Verfügbarkeit des ISDS als in Fragen in Bezug auf rechtmäßige Verfahren bzw. die Rechtsstaatlichkeit in Kanada aufzuwerfen.

Antwort von Karel De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(20. August 2013)

Die Kommission benutzt die beiden von der Frau Abgeordneten und den Herren Abgeordneten genannten Fälle nicht als Rechtfertigung für die Einführung eines Mechanismus zur Beilegung von Investor-Staat-Streitigkeiten in das Abkommen mit Kanada. Sie werden als Beispiele dafür angeführt, dass ausländische Investoren auf Schwierigkeiten gestoßen sind, die belegen, dass bestimmte Aspekte des kanadischen Rechtssystems keine ausreichende Sicherheit bieten.

Nach der Rechtssache Dunsmuir gegen New Brunswick ist eine gerichtliche Überprüfung möglich, selbst wenn diese Überprüfung durch eine entsprechende Klausel (*privative clause*) ausgeschlossen wurde, allerdings könnten die Gerichte nur die „Angemessenheit" („*reasonableness*") prüfen. Die „Angemessenheitsprüfung" schließt indessen die Prüfung des Sachverhalts eines Verwaltungsakts aus, sie muss sich vielmehr auf die verfahrensrechtlichen Einzelheiten beschränken, d. h. auf die Frage, ob das Verfahren transparent, begründet und nachvollziehbar war. Dieses begrenzte Handlungsrecht steht im Widerspruch zu dem Schutz, der Investoren in der EU aufgrund mitgliedstaatlicher Rechtsvorschriften, aufgrund des Protokolls Nr. 1 der Europäischen Menschenrechtskonvention und der einschlägigen Rechtsprechung gewährt wird. In der EU können enteignete Investoren auf den Wesensgehalt des Verwaltungsakts abstellen; dieser muss einen öffentlichen Zweck verfolgen, diskriminierungsfrei sein und die Zahlung einer angemessenen Entschädigung beinhalten (diese Entschädigung war nach Artikel 10 des Abitibi Acts nicht zu zahlen).

Somit wäre der etwaige Standpunkt des Obersten Gerichtshofs bezüglich der indirekten Enteignung wahrscheinlich keine Hilfe für den Investor, da es ihm unmöglich sein dürfte, den Sachverhalt des Verwaltungsaktes infrage zu stellen.

Die Rechtssache Gallo gegen Kanada beruhte auf fälschlichen Behauptungen und wurde dementsprechend von der Schiedsinstanz aus rechtlichen Gründen abschlägig beschieden. Die Kommission ist bestrebt, Bestimmungen in ihre Abkommen aufzunehmen, die eine zügige Behandlung derartiger Klagen ermöglichen. Das eigentliche Problem bleibt jedoch bestehen: Herr Gallo wurde aufgrund eines Verwaltungsakts mit *Privative Clause* enteignet, was seine Möglichkeiten zur Einlegung eines wirksamen Rechtsbehelfs gravierend beschneidet (siehe oben).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007123/13
to the Commission
Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE), Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL) and David Martin (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Follow-up to Written Question E-001132/2013

In its answer to Written Question E-001132/2013, the Commission cites two cases of alleged expropriation of foreign investors in Canada. The Commission uses these two cases to justify the introduction of an investor-to-state dispute settlement (ISDS) mechanism in the EU-Canada Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA).

Could the Commission please comment further on the following two cases?

1. In the case *AbitibiBowater Inc. v Canada*, it seems that under Canadian law (*Dunsmuir v New Brunswick*, [2008] 1 SCR 190), access to court would not have been denied if it had been sought. Secondly, it appears that, on the basis of such proceedings, Canadian courts would have had the power to review the amount of compensation determined by the provincial cabinet despite the 'privacy clause' in the Abitibi Act. Moreover, the Supreme Court of Canada has recently reaffirmed its liberal position regarding indirect expropriation in *Antrim Truck Center v Ontario* 2013 SCC 13 (2013).

2. In the case *Gallo v Canada*, the same principles of access to justice and court review of compensation would have applied, but the investor chose not to pursue this avenue; instead, he directly initiated arbitration. The arbitral award rendered in the case affirms that this was a spurious and unmeritorious claim. This case seems to raise questions that are much more about the unqualified availability of ISDS than about due process or rule of law in Canada.

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2013)

The Commission does not use the two cases mentioned by the Honourable Members to justify investor state dispute settlement in the agreement with Canada. These are offered as examples of problems which have arisen affecting foreign investors, showing that certain elements of the Canadian legal system offer insufficient security.

Dunsmuir v New Brunswick provides that judicial review may be available despite a privative clause, but that such review would be limited to 'reasonableness'. 'Reasonableness' does not allow an examination of the merits of an administrative act, but only one of process: was it transparent, reasoned and intelligible. This limited right of action is in contrast with the protection afforded to investors in the EU, under Member States' law and under Protocol 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights and relevant case-law. In the EU, investors whose property has been expropriated have a cause of action on the substance of the act, which must be for a public purpose, non-discriminatory and upon the payment of adequate compensation (which under Article 10 of the Abitibi Act, was not payable).

Therefore, the potential position of the Supreme Court on indirect expropriation would likely be of no help to an investor, as he would be unlikely to be able to question the merits of the administrative act.

Gallo v Canada was indeed a spurious claim and was suitably dismissed by the arbitration tribunal on jurisdictional grounds. The Commission aims to include provisions in its agreements that would deal with such claims expeditiously. However, the underlying issue remains: Mr Gallo's property was expropriated on the basis of an administrative act with a privative clause which would severely hamper his ability to claim judicial redress, as above.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007125/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Logement social: définition, cadre et indicateurs socio-économiques

1. La Commission compte-t-elle définir un cadre d'action européen pour le logement social de façon à garantir la cohérence entre les différents instruments politiques utilisés par l'Union en la matière (aides d'État, Fonds structurels, énergie, lutte contre la pauvreté et l'exclusion sociale, santé)?

2. La Commission entend-t-elle intégrer des indicateurs socio-économiques, tels que les investissements en matière de logements sociaux, dans le cadre du Semestre européen en les incluant dans son évaluation des objectifs visant à combattre et prévenir les bulles immobilières?

3. La Commission peut-elle clarifier, sur la base d'un échange de bonnes pratiques et d'expériences entre les États membres, la définition du logement social, sachant que ce concept fait l'objet d'une acception divergente et d'une gestion différente (s'expliquant souvent par une certaine souplesse dans l'établissement des priorités) dans les États membres, les régions et les communautés locales?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007126/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Expulsions de logements

1. La Commission compte-t-elle proposer un texte en réponse au drame social que représentent l'expulsion et la perte de leur logement pour ceux qui sont les plus touchés par la crise économique et le chômage?

2. La Commission estime-t-elle que, celles-ci se produisant dans un contexte où d'importantes aides d'État sont consacrées à l'assainissement du système financier européen, des solutions alternatives aux expulsions devraient être élaborées?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007127/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Coût du logement inadéquat

La Commission, avec l'aide de l'Agence Eurofound, va-t-elle mener en 2014 une étude sur les coûts de l'inaction face au logement inadéquat dans le cadre du programme de travail 2014 de l'Agence?

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007128/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Efficacité des modèles d'investissements à impact social dans le secteur du logement social

La Commission pourrait-elle, comme le suggère le Parlement, mener une étude sur l'efficacité des modèles d'investissements à impact social dans le secteur du logement social, en tenant compte du potentiel des Fonds structurels, utilisés sous forme d'instruments financiers et éventuellement combinés à d'autres sources de financement en faveur des investissements à impact social, comme par exemple la création d'emplois locaux dans l'économie verte ou d'emplois pour les jeunes, et l'inclusion sociale par le logement en faveur des populations marginalisées?

Réponse commune donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(2 août 2013)

Les questions de l'Honorable Parlementaire font écho aux préoccupations et aux demandes exprimées par le Parlement aux paragraphes 5, 6, 8, 11, 12 et 42 de sa résolution du 11 juin 2013 sur le logement social dans l'Union européenne [P7_TA-PROV(2013)0246] basée sur un rapport de la députée Karima Delli.

La Commission est en train de finaliser sa réponse à cette résolution et la transmettra au Parlement par la voie habituelle. La préoccupation de l'Honorable Parlementaire sera prise en compte dans cette réponse.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007125/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Social housing: definition, framework and socioeconomic indicators

1. Does the Commission intend to set out a European social housing action framework in such a way as to ensure consistency between the various policy instruments the EU uses to address this issue (State aid, structural funding, energy policy, action to combat poverty and social exclusion, health policy)?

2. Does the Commission intend to bring socioeconomic indicators, such as social housing investment, within the scheme of the European Semester by including them in its evaluation of targets for combating and preventing real estate bubbles?

3. On the basis of an exchange of best practices and experience between the Member States, and taking into account the fact that social housing is conceived and managed in different ways (often due to flexibility in establishing priorities) in the Member States, regions and local communities, can the Commission clarify the definition of social housing?

Question for written answer E-007126/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Evictions

1. Does the Commission intend to propose a text in response to the social hardship caused to those most affected by the economic crisis and by unemployment and who are being evicted and deprived of their homes?

2. Does the Commission believe that since such cases are occurring against a backdrop of major public assistance initiatives designed to put the financial system back on a sound footing, alternatives to eviction should be found?

Question for written answer E-007127/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Cost of inadequate housing

Will the Commission, with the support of the Eurofound agency, carry out a study in 2014 on the costs of the lack of action on inadequate housing within the framework of the agency's 2014 work programme?

Question for written answer E-007128/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Effectiveness of social impact investment models in the social housing sector

Parliament has called on the Commission to carry out a study into the effectiveness of social impact investment models in the social housing sector, focusing on the potential benefits of the Structural Funds when used as financing instruments, and possibly when combined with other sources of funding, in order to boost social impact investments, such as through the creation of local jobs in the green economy, or jobs for young people, and social inclusion through the provision of housing for marginalised groups. Will it be possible for the Commission to carry out such a study?

Joint answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The Honourable Member's questions reflect the concerns and demands expressed by the Parliament in paragraphs 5, 6, 8, 11, 12 and 42 of its resolution on Social Housing adopted on 11 June 2013 (P7_TA-PROV(2013)0246) based on a report of MEP Karima Delli.

The Commission is finalising its response to this resolution that will reach the Parliament through the regular channel. The Honourable member's concern will be addressed in this response.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007129/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Sanctionner les écarts de salaire entre femmes et hommes

L'inégalité de salaire entre hommes et femmes est aujourd'hui encore une triste réalité.

1. La Commission va-t-elle enfin proposer de nouvelles mesures pour sanctionner ces écarts et les réduire de manière efficace, tout en veillant à l'application correcte et effective de la directive 2006/54/CE relative à la mise en œuvre du principe de l'égalité des chances et de l'égalité de traitement entre hommes et femmes en matière d'emploi et de travail?

2. Va-t-elle réviser la législation en vigueur à ce sujet, à savoir ladite directive, comme le lui demandait le Parlement dans sa résolution du 13 mars 2012?

3. Compte-t-elle développer, en coopération avec les partenaires sociaux, des politiques propres à supprimer les écarts de salaires entre hommes et femmes, qui visent à l'intégration des femmes sur le marché du travail et promeuvent l'égalité des chances en matière de mobilité?

Réponse donnée par M[me] Reding au nom de la Commission
(5 septembre 2013)

L'une des priorités de la Commission sera de veiller à la bonne application des dispositions de la directive 2006/54/CE ([1]) relatives à l'égalité des rémunérations et de soutenir les États membres et les autres parties prenantes dans la mise en œuvre de la réglementation en vigueur. La Commission prépare un rapport sur la mise en œuvre de cette directive, qui devrait être publié cette année, où elle évaluera l'application des dispositions en matière d'égalité salariale.

Ce travail fait partie de l'action menée par la Commission pour combler l'écart de rémunération entre les hommes et les femmes ([2]). La stratégie pour l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes 2010-2015 ([3]) , qui définit le programme de travail de la Commission dans ce domaine, place l'égalité salariale parmi ses priorités.

En 2012, la Commission a lancé un projet intitulé «Equality Pays Off» (l'égalité, ça paie), en vue de sensibiliser les entreprises au problème, aux causes et aux conséquences de l'inégalité salariale, et de les soutenir dans leur action pour y remédier. Plus récemment, le 21 mars 2013, un forum d'entreprises a été organisé à Bruxelles afin de favoriser les échanges d'expériences et de connaissances entre 180 entreprises et parties prenantes sur les moyens d'encourager l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes. L'accent était mis sur les actions visant à traiter les causes de l'écart de rémunération entre hommes et femmes. En outre, la Commission a organisé la troisième Journée européenne de l'égalité salariale, le 28 février 2013.

Au cours du semestre européen, la Commission a adressé des recommandations ([4]) aux États membres sur la nécessité de s'attaquer aux causes profondes de l'écart de rémunération entre hommes et femmes, comme le manque de structures d'accueil pour les enfants et les obstacles pesant sur le deuxième revenu des ménages.

La Commission continuera à financer des projets portant sur la promotion de l'égalité hommes-femmes. Ainsi, un appel à propositions sur la question de l'écart de rémunération entre hommes et femmes a récemment été publié.

([1]) Directive 2006/54/CE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 5 juillet 2006 relative à la mise en œuvre du principe de l'égalité des chances et de l'égalité de traitement entre hommes et femmes en matière d'emploi et de travail (refonte) (JO L 204 du 26.7.2006, pp. 23 à 36).
([2]) Voir http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/gender-pay-gap/eu-action/index_fr.htm
([3]) COM(2010) 491.
([4]) Voir http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_fr.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007129/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Penalising gender pay gaps

Pay inequality between men and women is still a sad reality today.

1. Will the Commission finally propose new measures to penalise these pay gaps and effectively reduce them, all the while ensuring the correct and effective application of Directive 2006/54/EC on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation?

2. Will it revise the current legislation on this subject, namely the abovementioned Directive, as Parliament called for in its resolution of 13 March 2012?

3. Does it plan to develop, in cooperation with social partners, specific policies to eliminate pay gaps between men and women, aimed at integrating women into the labour market and promoting equal opportunities in matters of mobility?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2013)

One of the Commission's priorities for gender equality will be to monitor the correct application of the equal pay provisions of Directive 2006/54/EC ([1]) and to support Member States and other stakeholders with the proper enforcement and application of the existing rules. The Commission is preparing a Report on its application, to be published this year, assessing the implementation of the equal pay provisions.

This work is a part of projects by the Commission to tackle the gender pay gap ([2]). The strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015 ([3]) set out the Commission's work programme on gender equality and identified equal pay as one of its priorities.

The Commission launched a project called 'Equality Pays Off' in 2012 to help raise awareness in companies about the gender pay gap, its causes and consequences and to support them in their efforts to tackle it. Most recently there was a business forum in Brussels on 21 March 2013 in order to facilitate an exchange of knowledge of actions to foster gender equality between up to 180 companies and stakeholders. There was a specific focus on actions to tackle the causes of the gender pay gap. The Commission also held the third European Equal Pay Day on 28 February 2013.

During the European Semester, the Commission addressed recommendations ([4]) to Member States to tackle the root causes of the gender pay gap, such as the lack of childcare facilities and the disincentives to work for second earners.

As it has done in the past, the Commission will continue financing specific projects covering the gender equality policy area. In this sense an open call for proposals focusing on the gender pay gap has recently been published.

([1]) Directive 2006/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the implementation of the principle of equal opportunities and equal treatment of men and women in matters of employment and occupation (recast), OJ L 204, 26.7.2006, p. 23-36.
([2]) See http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/gender-pay-gap/eu-action/index_en.htm
([3]) COM(2010) 491.
([4]) See http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007130/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Aide judiciaire européenne

1. Pourquoi la Commission n'aborde-t-elle pas spécifiquement les procédures européennes auxquelles s'applique aussi la directive sur l'aide judiciaire, comme, par exemple, la procédure européenne de règlement des petits litiges, alors que l'application de la directive à la procédure susmentionnée aurait très bien pu être examinée entre le 1er janvier 2009 et le 31 décembre 2010?

2. Quelles mesures la Commission compte-t-elle prendre pour faire mieux connaître le droit à une aide judiciaire dans les litiges transfrontaliers en matière civile et commerciale, de façon à renforcer la libre circulation des citoyens?

3. La Commission envisage-t-elle de lancer une campagne d'information efficace afin de toucher un grand nombre de bénéficiaires potentiels et de praticiens de la justice?

Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission
(19 août 2013)

La directive 2002/8/CE du Conseil du 27 janvier 2003 visant à améliorer l'accès à la justice dans les affaires transfrontalières par l'établissement de règles minimales communes relatives à l'aide judiciaire accordée dans le cadre de telles affaires ([1]) («directive sur l'aide judiciaire») est un instrument horizontal qui s'applique à l'ensemble des procédures et des litiges transfrontaliers. C'est pourquoi, dans son rapport consacré à l'application de cette directive ([2]), la Commission ne mentionne aucune procédure européenne spécifique. Le rapport se concentre plutôt sur les différentes procédures prévues par la directive, telles que les procédures contentieuses, les procédures extrajudiciaires, ainsi que l'exécution des décisions des tribunaux et des actes authentiques.

La Commission n'envisage pas à ce stade de lancer une campagne d'information sur la directive relative à l'aide judiciaire, mais partage le point de vue de l'Honorable Parlementaire quant à l'importance de mieux faire connaître le droit à une aide judiciaire dans les litiges transfrontaliers en matière civile et commerciale. Dans ce contexte, le portail e-Justice est actuellement mis à jour afin d'améliorer l'accès à l'information et aux formulaires types concernant l'aide judiciaire. La migration du site web du Réseau judiciaire européen vers le portail e-Justice améliorera encore la convivialité, de même que l'étendue et l'actualité des informations.

([1]) JO L 26 du 31.1.2003.
([2]) COM(2012)71 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007130/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Legal aid in Europe

1. Why does the Commission not specifically address the European procedures to which the directive on legal aid also applies, such as, for example, the European Small Claims Procedure, when the directive's application to this procedure could easily have been examined between 1 January 2009 and 31 December 2010?

2. What measures does the Commission intend to take to raise awareness of the right to legal aid in cross-border disputes in civil and commercial matters, so as to strengthen the free movement of citizens?

3. Does the Commission plan to launch an effective information campaign in order to reach out to a large number of potential beneficiaries and legal practitioners?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(19 August 2013)

Council Directive 2002/8/EC of 27 January 2003 to improve access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes ([1]) (the 'legal aid Directive') is a horizontal instrument which applies to all cross-border litigation and procedures. Therefore, the Commission, in its Report on the application of the legal aid Directive ([2]), does not make any reference to a specific European procedure. Rather the report focuses on the different proceedings relating to the directive such as litigation procedures, extrajudicial procedures and the enforcement of court decisions and authentic instruments.

At this stage, the Commission does not envisage launching an information campaign on the legal aid Directive but it shares the views of the Honourable Member on the importance of awareness rising of the right to legal aid in cross-border disputes in civil and commercial matters. In this context, the e-Justice portal is currently updated in order to improve the access to information and to the legal aid standard forms. The migration of the European Judicial Network website to the e-Justice portal will further improve user-friendliness and provide comprehensive and updated information.

([1]) OJ L 26, 31.1.2003.
([2]) COM(2012) 71 final.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007131/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Union économique et monétaire approfondie

Le projet de la Commission pour une Union économique et monétaire approfondie annonce des propositions de modification du traité pour 2014.

1. Pourquoi ces propositions n'incluent-elles pas, entre autres, une proposition spécifique visant à modifier l'article 109 du TFUE afin d'adopter les règlements prévus à cet article, conformément à la procédure législative ordinaire?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle le faire à posteriori?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(5 août 2013)

Le «projet détaillé pour une Union économique et monétaire (UEM) véritable et approfondie» adopté par la Commission le 28 novembre 2012 expose sa vision d'une architecture solide et stable de l'UEM. Tous les grands choix économiques et budgétaires des États membres devraient progressivement faire l'objet d'une coordination, d'une ratification et d'une surveillance renforcées à l'échelon européen.

La trajectoire fixée dans le projet passe par l'adoption de mesures progressives sur le court, moyen ou plus long terme, dont certaines nécessiteraient en fait une modification du TFUE.

Les articles 107 et 108 du TFUE confient à la Commission le soin d'examiner la compatibilité des aides d'État avec le marché intérieur. L'article 109 du TFUE a trait aux règlements utiles en vue de l'application de ces articles, et en particulier aux catégories d'aides qui peuvent être dispensées de l'obligation de notification et à la clause de statu quo.

S'il est possible que des liens existent entre la coordination budgétaire envisagée dans le projet et les règles régissant l'attribution d'aides d'État, le contrôle des aides d'État est d'une portée et d'une nature distinctes. Il s'exerce spécifiquement au niveau micro-économique et, contrairement aux dispositions relatives à l'UEM, s'applique à l'ensemble du territoire de l'Union. Le TFUE attribue aussi à la Commission la compétence exclusive pour le contrôle des aides d'État et la protection de la concurrence et du marché unique. Cette fonction demeure vitale dans le processus d'approfondissement de l'UEM. En conséquence, la Commission a décidé, dans son projet sur l'UEM, qu'il n'y avait aucune raison d'inclure une proposition de modification de la base juridique du contrôle des aides d'État.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007131/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Deep economic and monetary union

The Commission's blueprint for a deep economic and monetary union puts forward proposals to amend the Treaty for 2014.

1. Why do these proposals not include a specific proposal aimed at amending Article 109 of the TFEU so as to adopt the regulations provided for in this article in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure?

2. Will the Commission put forward such a proposal at a later stage?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The 'Blueprint for a deep and genuine Economic and Monetary Union' that the Commission adopted on 28 November 2012 provides a vision for a strong and stable EMU architecture. All major economic and fiscal policy choices by Member States should gradually become subject to stronger coordination, endorsement and surveillance at the European level.

The path set out a in the Blueprint involves incremental measures taken over the short, medium and longer term, some of which would indeed require Treaty change.

Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty entrust the Commission with the task of assessing the compatibility of state aid with the internal market. Article 109 of the Treaty relates to regulations for the application of these articles, in particular the categories of aid that can be exempted from the obligation to notify and the stand-still clause.

Whilst there may be some links between the fiscal coordination envisaged under the Blueprint and the rules for granting state aid, the control of state aid is of a different scope and nature. It focuses in particular on the micro-economic level, and, contrary to the provisions regarding the EMU, applies throughout the entire Union. The TFEU also assigns to the Commission the exclusive competence to control state aid in order to protect competition and the single market. This function remains vital in the process leading to a deeper EMU. Therefore the Commission decided that there was no reason to include a proposal for a change in the legal basis for state aid control in the Commission's blueprint on EMU.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007134/13
do Komisji
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(19 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Przyczyny spadku masy osobniczej u dorsza na Morzu Bałtyckim

Obecnie zauważa się znaczny spadek jakości dorsza w Morzu Bałtyckim. Sukcesywnie traci on swoją masę, co między innymi przekłada się na obniżenie jego cen na rynku. Mimo iż według opinii doradztwa naukowego stan ilościowy tego gatunku jest zrównoważony, jego stan jakościowy jest na bardzo niskim poziomie.

Z publikacji wydawanych przez Międzynarodową Radę Badań Morza wynika również, że szprot, który stanowi główne pożywienie dla dorsza, migruje na północ Morza Bałtyckiego, a dorsz z nieznanych powodów za nim nie podąża. W związku z tym następuje rozproszenie siedlisk dorsza od jego pokarmu.

— Wobec powyższego chciałbym zapytać, czy Komisja ma zamiar podjąć działania w celu ustalenia przyczyn spadku masy osobniczej u dorsza w Morzu Bałtyckim?

— Ponadto proszę o udzielenie informacji, kiedy Komisja zamierza opublikować swoją propozycję wielogatunkowego planu zarządzania zasobami Morza Bałtyckiego?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Marię Damanaki w imieniu Komisji
(13 września 2013 r.)

W przypadku kwestii biologicznych takich jak rozwój zasobów dorsza w Morzu Bałtyckim, Komisja opiera się na opiniach naukowych dostarczonych przez Międzynarodową Radę Badań Morza (ICES). Najnowsza opinia ICES ([1]) potwierdza, że masa ciała dorsza we wschodniej części Morza Bałtyckiego rzeczywiście się zmniejsza. Uważa się, że wynika to z faktu, że stada szprota i śledzia, gatunków które stanowią podstawowe pożywienie dorsza, koncentrują się w północnej części Morza Bałtyckiego i w związku z tym są mniej dostępne dla dorsza, którego stada koncentrują się na Bałtyku południowym. W świetle tej sytuacji ICES stwierdziła, że zmniejszenie śmiertelności połowowej stad pelagicznych w obszarach południowych Morza Bałtyckiego powinno przynieść poprawę w zakresie wzrostu oraz stanu populacji dorsza. Aby poznać lepiej interakcje między gatunkami drapieżników i ich ofiar w Morzu Bałtyckim i na innych obszarach, Komisja finansuje badanie naukowe mające na celu zgromadzenie danych dotyczących zawartości żołądka najważniejszych gatunków drapieżników. Jest ono obecnie w toku i ma się zakończyć w grudniu 2014 r.

Komisja przygotowuje wielogatunkowy plan zarządzania dla stad dorsza, śledzia i szprota na Bałtyku, który zostanie poddany pod dyskusję gdy tylko Parlament i Rada zgodzą się co do zasad dotyczących przyjmowania długoterminowych planów zarządzania w ramach zreformowanej wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa.

([1]) Sprawozdanie ICES WGBFAS 2013, KOMITET DORADCZY ICES CM 2013/ACOM: 10, Sprawozdanie na temat oceny połowów na Bałtyku, Grupa robocza ICES ds. oceny połowów na Bałtyku (WGBFAS), 10 – 17 kwietnia 2013 r.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007134/13
to the Commission
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Reasons for the loss in body weight of Baltic Sea cod

A significant drop has recently been observed in the quality of Baltic Sea cod. There has been a gradual reduction in body weight, one of the consequences of which is a lower market price. Although scientific experts claim that numbers of the species are at a sustainable level, the quality of the fish is extremely poor.

The International Council for the Exploration of the Sea has also published evidence that although sprat, which are a major source of food for cod, are migrating to the north of the Baltic Sea, they are not being followed by cod for reasons which are unknown. This means that cod habitats are becoming ever more distant from their foraging areas.

— In view of the above, I would like to ask whether the Commission intends to take any steps to determine the reasons behind the loss in body weight of Baltic Sea cod?

— Following on from this, when does the Commission plan to publish its proposal for a multi-species management plan for stocks in the Baltic Sea?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(13 September 2013)

For information on biological issues such as the growth of cod in the Baltic Sea, the Commission relies on scientific advice provided by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES). The most recent ICES advice ([1]) confirms that the body weights of cod in the Eastern Baltic Sea are indeed decreasing. It is believed that this is because the sprat and herring that cod usually prey on are concentrated in the northern part of the Baltic Sea and so are less available to cod which are concentrated in the southern Baltic. In the light of this situation, ICES has advised that reducing fishing mortality on pelagic stocks in the southern areas of the Baltic Sea is likely to improve growth and the condition of cod. In order to improve understanding of the interactions between predator and prey species in the Baltic Sea and other areas, the Commission is funding a scientific study which is intended to compile data on the stomach contents of key predator species. This is currently underway and is due to finish in December 2014.

The Commission is preparing a multi-species management plan for the Baltic stocks of cod, herring and sprat that can be tabled as soon as the Parliament and the Council agree on the principles to adopt for long-term management plans as part of the reformed common fisheries policy.

([1]) ICES WGBFAS REPORT 2013, ICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE ICES CM 2013/ACOM:10, Report of the Baltic Fisheries Assessment, Working Group (WGBFAS), 10 — 17 April 2013.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007135/13
do Komisji
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(19 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Testowanie wyrobów tytoniowych na zwierzętach

Kwestia testowania produktów kosmetycznych na zwierzętach oraz importowania takich produktów na tereny UE, została w dużej mierze uregulowana. Niejasna jest natomiast blisko związana z tym tematem kwestia testowania wyrobów tytoniowych na zwierzętach, szczególnie na szczurach, małpach oraz psach. O ile testowanie na zwierzętach, poprzez eksponowanie ich przez lata na dym tytoniowy w okrutnych warunkach, jest w UE zabronione, o tyle sprowadzanie na tereny Unii znanych marek wyrobów tytoniowych, które praktykują takie testowanie, nie spotkało się z podobnym ograniczeniem. Do największych importerów należą: Chiny, Brazylia, Indie, Turcja, USA.

Sprawdzanie szkodliwych skutków ubocznych nikotyny jest w obecnych czasach bezcelowym zabiegiem, ponieważ nie ma żadnych wątpliwości, co do szkodliwości przyjmowania nikotyny. Dodatkowo, badania takie są zupełnie bezpodstawne, ponieważ zwierzęta inaczej reagują na toksyny, a ponadto te z nich, które znajdują się w laboratoriach, są eksponowane na dym tytoniowy w inny sposób, niż jest to praktykowane przez ludzi.

W związku z powyższym, chcę zapytać:

1. Jak Komisja chce propagować unijne praktyki poza granicami Unii Europejskiej, tak aby wpłynąć na działania koncernów tytoniowych i producentów?

2. Czy Komisja ma zamiar blokować import wyrobów tytoniowych testowanych na zwierzętach?

3. Jak Komisja argumentuje podtrzymywanie współpracy Unii Europejskiej z firmami tytoniowymi, którym los zwierząt jest w świetle wymienionego powyżej, obcy?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Tonia Borga w imieniu Komisji
(2 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Przepisy UE nie zawierają zakazu testowania wyrobów tytoniowych na zwierzętach. Dyrektywa 2010/63/UE ([1]), która z dniem 1 stycznia 2013 r. stała się w pełni skuteczna, stanowi jednak ramy prawne pozwalające na zastępowanie, ograniczanie i udoskonalanie wykorzystywania zwierząt używanych w UE do celów naukowych.

Na obecnym etapie Komisja nie podjęła żadnych konkretnych działań przeciwko przywozowi wyrobów tytoniowych w tym zakresie ani nie jest to planowane w najbliższym czasie.

Artykuł 5 ust. 3 ramowej konwencji o ograniczeniu użycia tytoniu zobowiązuje UE i jej państwa członkowskie do ochrony ich polityki zdrowia publicznego przed wpływem wszelkich interesów handlowych i innych żywotnych interesów przemysłu tytoniowego.

([1]) Dz.U. L 276 z dnia 20 października 2010 r., s. 33. Dyrektywa 2010/63/UE w sprawie ochrony zwierząt wykorzystywanych do celów naukowych.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007135/13
to the Commission
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Testing of tobacco products on animals

The testing of cosmetic products on animals and imports of such products into the EU have been largely regulated, but the closely linked issue of testing tobacco products on animals, in particular on rats, monkeys or dogs, remains a grey area. Although tests which involve exposing animals to tobacco smoke for many years under atrocious conditions are prohibited in the EU, there are no such restrictions on tobacco products imported into the EU by the well-known manufacturers which carry out these tests. Leading importers include China, Brazil, India, Turkey and the US.

Attempts to verify the damaging side-effects of nicotine are a pointless exercise nowadays, since the harmful nature of nicotine consumption has been proven beyond all doubt. A further reason why there are no grounds whatsoever for this research is that animals react differently to toxins, and moreover animals in the laboratory are not exposed to tobacco smoke in the same way as people.

1. How does the Commission intend to promote EU practices outside its borders in such a way as to influence the actions of tobacco groups and producers?

2. Does the Commission intend to block imports of tobacco products tested on animals?

3. How can the Commission argue in favour of maintaining the European Union's cooperation with tobacco companies when the above proves them to be indifferent to the fate of animals?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The EU legislation does not include a prohibition for testing tobacco products with animals. However, Directive 2010/63/EU ([1]), that took full effect on 1 January 2013, provides a legal framework to replace, reduce and refine the use of animals used for scientific purposes in the EU.

At this stage the Commission has not taken any specific action against imported tobacco products in this respect, nor are there any immediate plans to do so.

Article 5(3) of the framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) obliges the EU and its Member States to protect their public health policies from any commercial and other vested interests of the tobacco industry.

([1]) OJ L 276/33, 20 October 2010. Directive 2010/63/EU on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007136/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2009/18/CE — investigação de acidentes no setor do transporte marítimo

A Diretiva 2009/18/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 23 de abril de 2009, estabeleceu os princípios fundamentais que regem a investigação de acidentes no setor do transporte marítimo e alterou as Diretivas 1999/35/CE do Conselho e 2002/59/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2009/18/CE?

— Considera que a mesma cumpriu o objetivo de reforçar a segurança marítima e prevenir a poluição causada por navios, bem como de reduzir o risco de acidentes marítimos no futuro?

— Dispõe de dados que lhe permitam avaliar se os princípios fundamentais que presentemente regem a investigação de acidentes no setor do transporte marítimo são suficientes? Quais é que destacaria?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(22 de agosto de 2013)

1. Já todos os Estados-Membros da UE transpuseram a diretiva.

2. A Comissão considera que a diretiva e os seus regulamentos de execução ([1]) contribuem, de forma positiva, para a segurança marítima, através dos seguintes aspetos: 1) criação de um órgão de investigação de acidentes imparcial, de caráter independente; 2) notificação de todos os acidentes e incidentes marítimos; 3) reforço das investigações; 4) criação da base de dados designada Plataforma Europeia de Informações sobre Acidentes Marítimos (EMCIP).

3. Na fase atual (a diretiva entrou em vigor a 17 de junho de 2011), a Comissão iniciou uma série de processos por pré-infração relacionados com a imparcialidade do órgão de investigação de acidentes.

4. Tendo em conta a dimensão bastante limitada do conjunto de dados disponíveis, até à data, na EMCIP, é demasiado prematuro para declarar se os valores subjacentes à investigação de acidentes são suficientes.

([1]) Regulamento de Execução (UE) n.° 651/2011 da Comissão que adota as regras de funcionamento do quadro permanente de cooperação estabelecido pelos Estados-Membros em colaboração com a Comissão, nos termos do artigo 10.° da Diretiva 2009/18/CE (JO L 177 de 6.7.2011) e Regulamento (UE) n.° 1286/2011 da Comissão que adota uma metodologia comum para a investigação de acidentes e incidentes marítimos elaborada em conformidade com o disposto no artigo 5.°, n.° 4, da Diretiva 2009/18/CE (JO L 328 de 10.12.2011).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007136/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2009/18/EC on the investigation of accidents in the maritime transport sector

Directive 2009/18/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 established the fundamental principles governing the investigation of accidents in the maritime transport sector and amended Directives 1999/35/EC and 2002/59/EC.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's view of the amendments introduced by Directive 2009/18/EC?

— Does it believe that the directive has met the aim of improving maritime safety, preventing pollution caused by ships and reducing the risk of maritime accidents?

— Are data available that would allow it to determine whether the fundamental principles currently governing the investigation of accidents in the maritime transport sector are sufficient? What are the key figures?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2013)

1. All EU Member States have transposed the directive.

2. The Commission believes that the directive and its implementing regulations ([1]) contribute positively to maritime safety through: 1) the establishment of an independent impartial accident investigative body; 2) the notification of all marine casualties and incidents; 3) strengthening investigations; 4) the creation of the European Marine Casualty Information Platform (EMCIP) database.

3. At this stage (the directive entered into force on 17 June 2011) the Commission has launched a number of pre-infringement actions regarding the impartiality of the accident investigative body.

4. Given the rather limited size of the dataset available in EMCIP to date, it is too early to say whether the figures underlying the investigation of accidents are sufficient.

([1]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 651/2011 adopting the rules of the permanent cooperation framework pursuant to Article 10 of Directive 2009/18/EC (OJ L177 of 6.7.2011) and Commission Regulation (EU) 1286/2011 adopting a common methodology for investigating marine casualties and incidents pursuant to Article 5(4) of Directive 2009/18/EC (OJ L 328 of 10.12.2011).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007137/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Método de elaboração da lista branca/cinzenta/negra dos Estados de bandeira para a inspeção de navios pelo Estado do porto

Considera que a equidade da lista branca/cinzenta/negra dos Estados de bandeira é assegurada ou reforçada no âmbito do Memorando de Acordo de Paris, que visa garantir essa mesma equidade, em especial no que respeita ao tratamento concedido aos Estados de bandeira com frotas pequenas?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

Embora a lista branca/cinzenta/negra dos Estados de bandeira seja elaborada no âmbito do Memorando de Acordo de Paris (MA de Paris), tal é realizado com base nas inspeções efetuadas por todos os Estados do MA de Paris e carregado na base de dados THETIS, como previsto pela Diretiva 2009/16/CE relativa à inspeção de navios pelo Estado do porto; assim, a Comissão não tem dúvidas quanto à exatidão dos dados apresentados.

A questão dos Estados de bandeira com frotas pequenas foi amplamente debatida aquando da preparação da Diretiva 2009/16/CE (ver considerando 15). No entanto, até à data, nem os Estados-Membros da UE, nem os do MA de Paris chegaram a um acordo sobre a forma como o desempenho dos Estados de bandeira com frotas pequenas pode ser medido com precisão e de forma comparável, exceto através do método atualmente utilizado.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007137/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: The methodology for preparing the white, grey and black list of flag states for the inspection of ships by port states

Does the Commission believe that the accuracy of the white, grey and black list of flag states is assured or strengthened by the Paris Memorandum of Understanding, which aims to ensure accuracy, especially regarding the treatment of flag states with small fleets?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

While the black, grey and white lists of flag States are drawn up by the Paris Memorandum of Understanding (PMoU), this is done on the basis of inspections carried out by all PMoU States and uploaded into the THETIS database as foreseen by Directive 2009/16 on port State control; as such the Commission has no doubts regarding the accuracy of the data being submitted.

The issue of flag States with small fleets was extensively discussed when Directive 2009/16/EC was being drafted (see Recital 15 thereof). However thus far, neither the Member States of the EU or those of the PMoU have reached agreement on how the performance of flag States with small fleets can be measured in an accurate and comparable way other than by the method which is currently being used.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007138/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Acidentes de navegação e poluição dos mares e das costas

Os acidentes de navegação e a poluição dos mares e das costas dos Estados-Membros constituem uma séria preocupação na União Europeia.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão se considera que a legislação que presentemente rege estas questões é adequada e se está apta a fazer face aos problemas concretos que com elas se prendem.

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

Graças à adoção do terceiro pacote de segurança marítima ([1]), em 2009, a União Europeia tem, provavelmente, as normas de segurança marítima mais estritas a nível mundial. Prosseguem, contudo, as ações destinadas a assegurar a aplicação eficaz da legislação existente. A prevenção dos acidentes e a gestão das suas consequências para os mares e as zonas costeiras dos Estados-Membros, em caso de ocorrências graves, constitui uma importante tarefa da Agência Europeia da Segurança Marítima. Esta fornece assistência operacional para combate à poluição marinha causada por navios e instalações *offshore* de petróleo e gás, mediante pedido dos Estados afetados. A Agência pode também prestar assistência aos países terceiros que partilham bacias marítimas com a UE (mar Mediterrâneo, mar Negro e mar Báltico). Para essa assistência operacional, a Agência mantém uma rede especializada de «navios de reserva», que coloca à disposição dos Estados afetados, para a contenção e recuperação de poluentes. A Agência desenvolveu também um sistema de imagiologia por satélite (CleanSeaNet), destinado a detetar a poluição em tempo útil, que apoia os esforços dos Estados-Membros para prevenir descargas ilegais e derrames acidentais de hidrocarbonetos. Esta capacidade da Agência foi avaliada em termos positivos ([2]). A Comissão propôs uma nova dotação plurianual para o financiamento destas atividades no período 2014-2020 ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/safety/index_en.htm
([2]) Relatório sobre a execução do Regulamento (CE) n.° 2038/2006 relativo ao financiamento plurianual das actividades da Agência Europeia da Segurança Marítima no domínio do combate à poluição causada por navios, no período 2007-2009 (COM(2011) 286 de 23.5.2011) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0286:FIN:PT:PDF
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0174:FIN:PT:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007138/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Shipping accidents and pollution of the seas and coasts

Shipping accidents and pollution of Member States' seas and coasts are a serious concern in the European Union.

Does the Commission believe that the current legislation on these issues is sufficient to deal with the problems it addresses?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

Through the adoption of the third Maritime Safety package ([1]) in 2009, the European Union has probably the highest maritime safety standards worldwide. However the work of ensuring the effective implementation of existing legislation continues. The prevention of accidents and the management of their consequences for Member States' seas and coasts if the worse were to happen is an important task of the European Maritime Safety Agency who provides, upon request of an affected state, operational assistance to respond to marine pollution from ships and off-shore oil and gas installations. The Agency may also provide assistance to third countries sharing a regional sea basin with the Union (Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea and Baltic Sea). For such operational assistance, the Agency maintains a network of specialised 'reserve vessels' which the Agency places at the disposal of affected States for containing and recovering pollutants from the sea. The Agency has also developed a system of satellite imaging (CleanSeaNet) to detect pollution in good time and which underpins efforts by the Member States to prevent illegal discharges and accidental spillages of oil. This capacity by the Agency has been evaluated positively ([2]). The Commission has proposed a new multiannual envelope to fund these activities over 2014-2020 ([3]).

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/maritime/safety/index_en.htm
([2]) Report on the implementation of Regulation 2038/2006 on multiannual funding for the action of the European Maritime Safety Agency in the field of response to pollution caused by ships for the period 2007-2009 (COM(2011) 286 23/5/2011) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0286:FIN:EN:PDF
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0174:FIN:EN:PDF

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007139/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Alargamento da obrigatoriedade de utilização do AIS (Automatic Identification System)

Os equipamentos de identificação automática de navios (AIS — *Automatic Identification System*) foram integrados no dispositivo da Diretiva 2002/59/CE. Face ao número importante de abalroamentos com navios de pesca que não foram manifestamente avistados pelos navios mercantes ou que não avistaram os navios mercantes em seu redor, considerou-se que seria de toda a conveniência proceder a um alargamento dessa medida aos navios de pesca de comprimento superior a 15 metros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que avaliação faz deste alargamento?

2. Considera que esta medida apresenta já resultados positivos?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(2 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão é de opinião que, para aumentar a segurança marítima, é imperativo exigir que não só os navios de pesca de comprimento igual ou superior a 45 metros estejam equipados com o sistema de identificação automática (AIS) (Diretiva 2002/59/CE), mas também os navios de pesca entre 15 e 45 m. As alterações introduzidas através da Diretiva 2009/17/CE, por conseguinte, preveem a obrigação de os navios de pesca novos de comprimento superior a 15 metros estarem equipados com o AIS. Para reforçar a segurança, a Diretiva 2011/15/CE estabeleceu as mesmas exigências para os navios de pesca existentes, de acordo com o calendário nela incluído. Este quadro normativo foi criado em resposta à ameaça tanto à navegação comercial como à atividade da pesca, decorrente de os navios de pesca não estarem obrigados a instalar o AIS para melhorar a segurança marítima; além disso, apoia também o acompanhamento do tráfego, bem como das atividades de controlo da pesca.

Os navios equipados com AIS devem mantê-lo permanentemente ligado. Em circunstâncias excecionais, o AIS pode ser desligado se o capitão o considerar necessário para a segurança do navio.

Enquanto não terminar o período transitório previsto na Diretiva 2011/15/CE (maio de 2014), é demasiado cedo para se fazer uma avaliação global do efeito das medidas. No entanto, a Comissão está a acompanhar atentamente a aplicação das disposições, procedendo atualmente a um controlo, com a assistência técnica da Agência Europeia da Segurança Marítima no contexto das suas visitas aos Estados-Membros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007139/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Extending the obligatory use of AIS (Automatic Identification Systems)

Directive 2002/59/EC included provisions on on-board automatic identification equipment (AIS — automatic identification systems). Given the significant number of collisions involving fishing vessels that were not seen by merchant ships or which did not see merchant ships in their vicinity, it was deemed necessary to broaden the scope of this measure to include fishing vessels of longer than 15 metres.

1. What is the Commission's view of this change?

2. Does it believe that this measure is having positive results?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The Commission is of the view that in order to enhance maritime safety, it is imperative to require not only fishing vessels with a length of 45 metres and above to be equipped with an Automatic Identification System (AIS) (Directive 2002/59/EC), but also fishing vessels between 15 and 45 metres. The amendments introduced with the amending Directive 2009/17/EC therefore provide for the obligation for new fishing vessels with a length of more than 15 metres to be equipped with the AIS. In order to enhance safety, Directive 2011/15/EC required the same for the existing fishing vessels, according to the phasing in timetable included in that directive. This framework has been created as a response to the threat both to commercial shipping and fishing activities where fishing vessels have not been required to have AIS in improving maritime safety, it also supports traffic monitoring as well as Fisheries control.

Fishing vessels equipped with AIS shall maintain it in operation at all times. In exceptional circumstances, AIS may be switched off when the master considers this necessary in the interest of the safety or security of the vessel.

Until the transitory period set in Directive 2011/15/EC has come to an end (May 2014), it is too early to make any comprehensive assessment on the effect of the measures. However, the Commission is carefully monitoring the implementation and are currently perfoming an implementation check with the technical assistance of the European Maritime Safety Agency in the context of their on the ground visits to Member States.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007140/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Condições de vida e de trabalho a bordo dos navios

As condições de vida e de trabalho a bordo dos navios constituem uma séria preocupação na União Europeia.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

Considera que a legislação que presentemente rege estas questões é adequada e apta a fazer face aos problemas concretos que com elas se prendem?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(31 de julho de 2013)

Existe atualmente um importante corpo de legislação da UE nesta matéria, que foi elaborada para lidar com os problemas mais prementes, reconhecendo ao mesmo tempo a natureza altamente globalizada das atividades marítimas. A Convenção do Trabalho Marítimo (MLC) da OIT prevê regras mínimas em matéria de condições de vida e de trabalho para os marítimos de todo o mundo ([1]). Partes substanciais da MLC foram aplicadas pela Diretiva 2009/13/CE ([2]). As diretivas europeias relativas ao Estado de bandeira ([3]) e à inspeção pelo Estado do porto ([4]), irão obrigar os Estados-Membros a assegurar a aplicação da MLC, tal como consagrado na Diretiva 2009/13/CE.

Além disso, são aplicáveis as Diretivas 92/29/CEE (assistência médica a bordo dos navios) e 93/103/CE (navios de pesca). O relatório da Comissão sobre a aplicação prática destas diretivas propõe um número reduzido de sugestões a nível nacional e/ou da UE neste setor de alto risco, incluindo a elaboração de um guia para os navios de menos de 15 metros de comprimento.

Além disso, a Comissão lançou um reexame exaustivo das 24 diretivas da UE sobre saúde e segurança, incluindo as que dizem respeito ao setor marítimo. A revisão incidirá sobre a pertinência, a investigação e os novos conhecimentos científicos nos diferentes domínios em questão. A Comissão informará as outras instituições e os outros organismos da UE dos resultados (disponíveis no final de 2015, o mais tardar) e de eventuais sugestões para melhorar o funcionamento do quadro normativo.

Atualmente, a Comissão está igualmente a avaliar a justificação para a exclusão dos marítimos do âmbito de aplicação de diversas diretivas da UE no domínio da informação e consulta dos trabalhadores.

([1]) Tais como idade mínima, tempo de trabalho, segurança social, saúde, segurança e bem-estar.

([2]) Diretiva 2009/13/CE do Conselho, de 16 de fevereiro de 2009, que aplica o Acordo celebrado pela Associação de Armadores da Comunidade Europeia e pela Federação Europeia dos Trabalhadores dos Transportes relativo à Convenção sobre Trabalho Marítimo, 2006, e que altera a Diretiva 1999/63/CE, JO L 124 de 20 de maio de 2009, p. 30.

([3]) Proposta de diretiva do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa às responsabilidades do Estado de bandeira no que diz respeito à aplicação da Diretiva 2009/13/CE do Conselho.

([4]) Proposta de diretiva do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho que altera a Diretiva 2009/16/CE do Conselho relativa à inspeção de navios pelo Estado do porto [COM(2012) 0129].

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007140/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Shipboard living and working conditions

Shipboard living and working conditions are a serious concern in the European Union.

Does the Commission believe that the current legislation on these issues is sufficient to deal with the problems it addresses?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

There is currently an important body of EU legislation in these matters. It has been developed to deal with the most pressing problems while recognising the highly globalised nature of maritime activities. The ILO Maritime Labour Convention (MLC) provides for minimum rules on living and working conditions for seafarers worldwide ([1]). Substantial parts of the MLC have been implemented by Directive 2009/13/EC ([2]). The EU Flag State ([3]) and Port State Control Directives ([4]) will require Member States to enforce the implementation of the MLC such as embodied in Directive 2009/13/EC.

In addition, Directives 92/29/EEC (medical treatment on board vessels) and 93/103/EC (fishing vessels) apply. The Commission report on the practical implementation of these Directives proposes a limited number of suggestions at national and/or EU level in this high-risk sector, including the drawing up of a guide for vessels under 15m in length.

Furthermore, the Commission has launched a comprehensive review of the 24 EU health and safety Directives, including those that concern the maritime sector. The review will address relevance, research and new scientific knowledge in the various fields in question. The Commission will inform the other EU institutions and bodies of the results (available by the end of 2015 at the latest) and of any suggestions on how to improve the operation of the regulatory framework.

The Commission is currently also assessing the justification for the exclusion of seafarers from the scope of the application of several EU Directives in the area of information and consultation of workers.

([1]) Such as minimum age, working time, social security, health and safety, and welfare.

([2]) Council Directive 2009/13/EC of 16 February 2009 implementing the Agreement concluded by the European Community Shipowners' Associations and the European Transport Workers' Federation on the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006 and amending Directive 1999/63/EC, OJ L 124 of 20 May 2009.

([3]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning flag State responsibilities for the enforcement of Council Directive 2009/13/EC.

([4]) Proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2009/16/EC on port State control (COM(2012) 0130).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007141/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Comité para a Segurança Marítima e a Prevenção da Poluição por Navios (COSS)

O Regulamento (CE) n.° 2099/2002 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 5 de novembro de 2002, estabeleceu um Comité para a Segurança Marítima e a Prevenção da Poluição por Navios (COSS) que centralizou as tarefas dos comités criados no âmbito da legislação comunitária pertinente em matéria de segurança marítima, de prevenção da poluição por navios e de proteção das condições de vida e de trabalho a bordo.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão que avaliação faz desta centralização e, mais genericamente, do trabalho realizado pelo COSS.

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(2 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão considera que a sua relação de trabalho com o Comité para a Segurança Marítima e a Prevenção da Poluição por Navios (COSS) funciona bem.

Em média, o COSS reúne-se quatro vezes por ano. Em 2012, a Comissão adotou sete atos em conformidade com o parecer do COSS. A Comissão adotou quatro decisões de execução sobre o reconhecimento de sistemas de países terceiros de formação e certificação de marítimos, uma decisão de execução relacionada com a segurança dos navios de passageiros, uma alteração à diretiva relativa aos equipamentos marítimos e um regulamento de execução para a inspeção de navios pelo Estado do porto.

Informações suplementares sobre as tarefas e atividades do Comité podem ser consultadas no seguinte endereço do sítio Web Europa:
http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regcomitology/index.cfm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007141/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: The Committee on Safe Seas and the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (COSS)

Regulation (EC) no 2099/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 November 2002 established a Committee on Safe Seas and the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (COSS) that centralised the tasks of the committees set up under EU legislation on maritime safety, the prevention of pollution from ships and the protection of shipboard living and working conditions.

What is the Commission's assessment of this centralisation and of the work carried out by the COSS in general?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The Commission considers that its working relationship with the Committee on Safe seas and the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (COSS) works well.

On average, the COSS meets four times a year. In 2012, seven acts were adopted by the Commission in accordance with the opinion of the COSS. The Commission adopted four implementing Decisions on the recognition of third countries' systems of training and certification of seafarers, one implementing Decision related to passenger ships safety, one amending Directive on marine equipment and one implementing Regulation on port State control.

Additional information on the Committee's tasks and activities can be found on the Europa Website at the following address: http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regcomitology/index.cfm.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007142/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Sistemas de recolha e difusão de dados relativos à segurança marítima

Atualmente, o desenvolvimento e o funcionamento de sistemas de recolha e difusão de dados relativos à segurança marítima são essenciais.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que avaliação faz do sistema Equasis?

2. De que modo tem vindo a promover uma cultura de segurança marítima, nomeadamente junto dos operadores do setor dos transportes marítimos?

3. De que forma tem vindo a difundir, nomeadamente através do referido sistema, informações relativas à segurança marítima?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão chama a atenção do Senhor Deputado para o Sistema Mundial de Socorro e Segurança Marítima (GMDSS), cujo objetivo consiste em assegurar um alerta rápido e automatizado das autoridades competentes em terra, bem como dos navios nas imediações, numa situação de emergência. O sistema fornece informações de segurança marítima, além de dados meteorológicos e de navegação, à escala mundial. Existem outros sistemas transnacionais e transetoriais de partilha e intercâmbio de informações de segurança marítima, ligados ao sistema de acompanhamento do tráfego marítimo e ao regime de inspeção de navios pelo Estado do porto.

1. O sistema Equasis, de base voluntária, assenta num memorando de entendimento com as principais partes interessadas na segurança marítima, públicas e privadas, tendo por finalidade a divulgação gratuita, ao público, de informações sobre a segurança dos navios mercantes, a nível mundial.

2. O sistema Equasis é um instrumento do setor dos transportes marítimos que funciona há quase 15 anos e demonstra o seu valor acrescentado promovendo a transparência das informações de segurança marítima, que são revistas *inter pares*.

3. O sistema Equasis é alojado e gerido pela AESM desde 2009. A AESM contribui também para a produção das estatísticas anuais do Equasis, que constam da publicação *The world merchant fleet, que pode ser consultada no endereço* www.equasis.org ou na página de entrada da AESM. Em média, são visitadas, por mês, 1 806 000 páginas dinâmicas por 34 248 utilizadores distintos. Os cinco principais grupos de utilizadores do sistema Equasis são:

1. Afretadores, empresas petrolíferas, carregadores

2. Administrações públicas, autoridades portuárias, inspetores do Estado do porto

3. Seguradoras, advogados especializados em direito marítimo, clubes de proteção e indemnização (*P&I*)

4. Gestores de navios e armadores

5. Marítimos, sindicatos

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007142/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Systems for collecting and disseminating maritime safety information

There is currently urgent need to develop and operate systems for collecting and disseminating maritime safety information.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of the Equasis system?

2. How has it promoted a culture of maritime safety, particularly with operators in the maritime transport sector?

3. How has the Equasis system been used to disseminate maritime safety information?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The Commission wish to draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS) which is an international system to ensure rapid and automated alerting of relevant authorities based on shore and of ships in the immediate vicinity, in the event of a marine distress. The system provides maritime safety information, both meteorological and navigational information at sea, on a global basis. There are also other cross border and cross sector systems for maritime safety information sharing and exchange purposes in relation to vessel traffic monitoring and Port State Control.

1. EQUASIS is a voluntarily set up system, which is based on a memorandum of understanding with key public and private stakeholders involved in maritime safety for the purpose of disclosing ship-safety related information on the world merchant fleet, for free, to the public.

2. EQUASIS is an established tool in the maritime industry operating for almost 15 years, demonstrating its added value by fostering transparent and peer reviewed safety information.

3. EQUASIS is hosted and managed by EMSA, since 2009. EMSA also contributes to the production of the annual Equasis statistical publication 'The world merchant fleet', which can be found on the home page (www.equasis.org) or at EMSAs homepage. There are on average 1,806,000 dynamic pages visited and 34,248 distinct users, per month. The top five user groups of the EQUASIS system are:

1: Charterer, Oil company, Shipper

2: Government administration, Port authority, Port State Control

3: Insurer, Marine lawyer, P&I club

4: Ship manager, Ship owner

5: Seafarer, Trade union

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007143/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2010/68/UE — equipamentos marítimos

A Diretiva 2010/68/UE da Comissão, de 22 de outubro de 2010, alterou a Diretiva 96/98/CE do Conselho relativa aos equipamentos marítimos.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão?

1. Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

2. Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2010/68/EU, nomeadamente quanto à sua clareza e aos efeitos práticos desejados?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(2 de agosto de 2013)

1. Todos os Estados-Membros da UE procederam à transposição da Diretiva 2010/68/UE.

2. Esta diretiva ([1]) constituiu a sexta alteração da Diretiva 96/98/CE ([2]) do Conselho relativa aos equipamentos marítimos. Foi substituída pela sétima alteração, a Diretiva 2011/75/UE ([3]), a oitava alteração foi feita através da Diretiva 2012/32/UE ([4]) e a Comissão está atualmente a preparar a nona alteração.

Cada uma destas alterações é uma atualização do anexo técnico, a fim de acompanhar os desenvolvimentos a nível da Organização Marítima Internacional e as normas de ensaio elaboradas por organismos de ensaio, como a Organização Internacional de Normalização, etc.

Embora a Diretiva 2010/68/UE tenha atingido os objetivos em termos de eficácia e clareza, a necessidade de alterar regularmente a Diretiva 96/98/CE para ter em conta a evolução das normas internacionais demonstra claramente que o processo deve ser alterado. Por conseguinte, e independentemente do nono texto de alteração acima mencionado, a Comissão propôs uma diretiva completamente nova relativa aos equipamentos marítimos (COM(2012) 0772) que prevê um processo simplificado para atualizar estas normas internacionais.

([1]) JO L 305 de 20.11.2010.
([2]) JO L 46 de 17.2.1997.
([3]) JO L 239 de 15.9.2011.
([4]) JO L 312 de 10.11.2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007143/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2010/68/EU — marine equipment

Commission Directive 2010/68/EU of 22 October 2010 amended Council Directive 96/98/EC on marine equipment.

1. Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

2. What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Directive 2010/68/EU, particularly regarding their clarity and whether the practical effects are as intended?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

1. All EU Member States have transposed Directive 2010/68/EU.

2. Directive 2010/68/EU ([1]) was the sixth amendment of Council Directive 96/98/EC ([2]) on marine equipment. It was superseded by the seventh amendment, Directive 2011/75/EU ([3]), the eighth amendment was by means of Directive 2012/32/EU ([4]) and the Commission is currently working to prepare the ninth amendment.

Each of these amendments is an update of the technical annex to keep pace with the developments in the International Maritime Organisation and testing standards developed by testing bodies such as the International Standards Organisation etc.

While Directive 2010/68/EU achieved its goals in terms of effectiveness and clarity, the need for frequent regular amendments of Directive 96/98/EC to take account of changes in international standards clearly demonstrates that the process needs to be changed. Therefore, and independently of the ninth amendment text mentioned above, the Commission has proposed a completely new Marine Equipment Directive (COM(2012) 0772) with a streamlined process for updating these international standards.

([1]) OJ L 305 of 20.11.2010.
([2]) OJ L 46 of 17.2.1997.
([3]) OL L 239 of 15.9.2011.
([4]) OJ L 312 of 10.11.2012.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007144/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2009/17/CE — sistema comunitário de acompanhamento e de informação do tráfego de navios

A Diretiva 2009/17/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 23 de abril de 2009, alterou a Diretiva 2002/59/CE relativa à instituição de um sistema comunitário de acompanhamento e de informação do tráfego de navios.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão

1. Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

2. Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2009/17/CE?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(29 de julho de 2013)

1. Todos os Estados-Membros notificaram a transposição da Diretiva 2009/17/CE para o direito nacional até 30 de novembro de 2010. Houve, todavia, alguns atrasos, tendo a Comissão aberto um certo número de processos por infração, com base nas notificações recebidas. Estes processos foram já todos encerrados, o último em 2013.

2. A aplicação da diretiva melhorou o acompanhamento do tráfego de navios nas águas europeias, bem como o intercâmbio de dados e a cooperação entre as administrações marítimas. As alterações introduzidas incorporam as prescrições internacionais relativas à utilização de sistemas de localização e identificação de longo alcance (LRIT), prescrevem a utilização de sistemas de identificação automática (AIS) em navios de pesca e atendem à evolução técnica do sistema comunitário de intercâmbio de informações marítimas (SafeSeaNet). As alterações principais consistem nas disposições relativas aos locais de refúgio, que estabelecem um quadro normativo para o acolhimento de navios a necessitar de assistência. Essas alterações estabelecem, para os Estados-Membros, a obrigação de designarem autoridades competentes para decidir do acolhimento em locais de refúgio e de elaborarem planos para o acolhimento de navios que precisem de assistência. Com o objetivo de melhorar a aplicação das disposições da diretiva nesta matéria e promover a cooperação e o intercâmbio de experiências entre os Estados-Membros, criou-se em 2012 um grupo de cooperação para os locais de refúgio.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007144/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2009/17/EC — EU vessel traffic monitoring and information system

Directive 2009/17/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 amended Directive 2002/59/EC establishing a Community vessel traffic monitoring and information system.

1. Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

2. What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Directive 2009/17/EC?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

1. All Member States notified the transposition of the directive into national legislation by 30 November 2010. However, some delay did occur in some cases and, on the basis of the notifications the Commission launched a few nonconformity infringement procedures. All these procedures have now been closed, the last one in 2013.

2. The implementation of the directive 2009/17/EC has further improved the monitoring of vessel traffic in European waters,data exchange and cooperation between maritime authorities. The amendments incorporate international requirements on the use of long range identification and tracking of ships (LRIT), introduce the use of Automatic Identification System on the fishing vessels and deal with technical developments of the Community maritime information exchange system, the SafeSeaNet. The key elements of the amendments are the provisions related to the Place of Refuge which have established a framework concerning the accommodation of ships in need of assistance. Those changes have introduced the obligation for each Member State to designate a competent authority to decide on a Place of Refuge as well as to develop a plan including the relevant decision making process to accommodate ships in need of assistance. A cooperation Group on Place of Refuge has been established in 2012 with the aim to improve implementation of related aspects in the directive and foster cooperation and exchange of experience between Member States.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007145/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2009/16/CE — inspeção de navios pelo Estado do porto

A Diretiva 2009/16/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 23 de abril de 2009, relativa à inspeção de navios pelo Estado do porto reformulou a Diretiva 95/21/CE.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

2. Que avaliação faz da referida reformulação?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(2 de agosto de 2013)

1. Todos os Estados costeiros da UE transpuseram a Diretiva 2009/16/CE. Os Estados-Membros sem costa não estavam obrigados a transpô-la. Destes últimos, apenas a Eslováquia a transpôs. Os outros quatro Estados-Membros sem costa (Hungria, Luxemburgo, Áustria e República Checa) declararam formalmente que não a iriam transpor.

2. A Diretiva 2009/16/CE entrou em vigor em 17 de junho de 2009; os Estados-Membros deviam transpor as suas disposições para a legislação nacional até 1 de janeiro de 2011. Apesar de ter decorrido apenas um pouco mais de dois anos desde a transposição, a impressão geral da Comissão é que a diretiva está a atingir os objetivos pretendidos. As lacunas eventualmente identificadas nos aspetos jurídicos, técnicos e operacionais serão tratadas oportunamente pela Comissão.

Para uma avaliação mais detalhada da aplicação da diretiva, o Senhor Deputado poderá consultar o relatório da Comissão (COM(2012) 660 final) ao Parlamento Europeu e ao Conselho, de 16 de novembro de 2012, elaborado em conformidade com o artigo 35.° da referida diretiva.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007145/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2009/16/EC on port state control

Directive 2009/16/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on port state control recast Directive 95/21/EC.

1. Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

2. What is the Commission's assessment of this recasting?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

1. All coastal EU States have transposed Directive 2009/16/EC. Non-coastal Member States were not obliged to transpose the directive. Of the latter, only Slovakia implemented the directive. The other four non-coastal Member States (Hungary, Luxembourg, Austria and Czech Republic) formally declared that they would not transpose it.

2. Directive 2009/16/EC entered into force on 17 June 2009; Member States had to transpose the directive into their national legislation by 1 January 2011. Although there have been only just over two years of implementation the general impression of the Commission is that the directive is achieving what was intended. Any legal, technical or operational shortcomings identified will be addressed by the Commission in due course.

For a more detailed evaluation of the implementation the Honourable Member may wish to consult the Commission's report (COM(2012) 660 final) of 16 November 2012 to the European Parliament and to the Council prepared in accordance with Article 35 of the directive.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007146/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Acolhimento de navios necessitados de assistência

A necessidade de assegurar uma aplicação harmonizada e eficaz dos planos para o acolhimento de navios que precisam de assistência, bem como de clarificar o âmbito das obrigações que incumbem aos Estados-Membros a este respeito, tem sido defendida.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Considera que, presentemente, na União Europeia, essa harmonização já existe?

— Em caso negativo, o que obsta a que assim seja?

— Como avalia o regime vigente de acolhimento de navios necessitados de assistência?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada à sua pergunta E-007144/2013 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007146/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Accommodating ships in need of assistance

It has been argued that it is necessary to ensure that plans for accommodating ships in need of assistance are harmonised and applied effectively and that the obligations of Member States in this regard should be clarified.

— Does the Commission believe that this harmonisation has been achieved in the EU?

— If not, what is required to achieve it?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the current system for accommodating ships in need of assistance?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The Honourable member is referred to the Commission's reply given to his Question E-007144/2013 ([1]).

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

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007147/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Redução de navios que não obedecem às normas internacionais

A segurança, a prevenção da poluição e as condições de vida e trabalho a bordo dos navios podem ser significativamente melhoradas através da redução drástica da presença, nas águas da União Europeia, de navios que não obedecem às normas, mediante a aplicação rigorosa das convenções, códigos e resoluções internacionais vigentes.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Dispõe de dados acerca da redução, nas águas da União Europeia, de navios que não obedecem às normas internacionais vigentes?

— Classificaria de rigorosa a aplicação, por parte dos Estados-Membros, das convenções, códigos e resoluções internacionais vigentes?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(14 de agosto de 2013)

Um dos elementos mais importantes da política de segurança marítima é o regime de inspeção de navios pelo Estado do porto (PSC — sigla inglesa para *Port State Control*), o qual consiste na inspeção de navios estrangeiros pelos Estados em que se localizam os portos de escala, para verificar se a competência do comandante e dos oficiais a bordo e o estado do navio e dos seus equipamentos satisfazem as prescrições das convenções internacionais e se a lotação e a exploração do navio respeitam o direito internacional aplicável. Ao longo dos últimos 10 anos, com a aplicação das Diretivas 95/21/CE ([1]) e 2009/16/CE ([2]) sobre o PSC, a Comissão observou que as taxas médias de imobilização de navios inspecionados (número de navios cuja inspeção conduziu à imobilização) diminuiu de quase 8 % em 2002 para 3,65 % em 2012. Tal significa que, durante esse período, se verificou uma diminuição do número de navios a operar nas águas da UE que não cumprem as normas.

A Diretiva 2009/21/CE ([3]) relativa ao cumprimento das obrigações do Estado de bandeira e, em especial, o seu artigo 7.°, estabelece que os Estados-Membros devem tomar as medidas necessárias para que se realize uma auditoria da sua administração, de acordo com as normas da Organização Marítima Internacional (OMI), pelo menos todos os sete anos, sob reserva apenas da resposta em tempo útil da IMO ao pedido do Estado-Membro em causa. Todos os Estados-Membros costeiros, exceto Portugal, foram objeto dessa auditoria. Além disso, o artigo 8.°, n.° 1, exige que os Estados-Membros desenvolvam, apliquem e mantenham um sistema de gestão da qualidade para os aspetos operacionais das atividades da sua administração relacionadas com o Estado de bandeira e que certifiquem esse sistema de acordo com as normas de qualidade aplicáveis a nível internacional. Mais uma vez, todos os Estados-Membros costeiros, com exceção de Portugal e da Irlanda, adotaram um sistema deste tipo.

([1]) JO L 157 de 7.7.1995.
([2]) JO L 131 de 28.5.2009.
([3]) JO L 131 de 28.5.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007147/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Reducing the number of ships that do not comply with international standards

Maritime safety, pollution prevention and shipboard living and working conditions could be considerably improved by drastically reducing the number of ships in EU waters that do not comply with international standards by rigorously applying the international conventions, codes and resolutions in force.

— Does the Commission have data available on the reduction in the number of ships in EU waters that do not comply with the international standards in force?

— Are Member States rigorously applying the international conventions, codes and resolutions in force?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2013)

One of the most important elements of maritime safety is Port State Control (PSC) which is the inspection of foreign ships in other national ports by PSC officers for the purpose of verifying that the competency of the master and officers on board, the condition of a ship and its equipment comply with the requirements of international conventions and that the vessel is manned and operated in compliance with applicable international law. Over the last 10 years through the implementation of Directive 95/21/EC ([1]) and 2009/16/EC ([2]) on PSC, the Commission has observed that the average detention rates for ships subject to PSC (the number of ships being inspected where the inspection results in the vessel being detained) has diminished from almost 8% in 2002 to 3.65% in 2012. This means that over this time there has been a decline in the number of substandard ships operating in EU waters.

Directive 2009/21/EC ([3]) on compliance with flag State requirements and in particular Article 7 thereof sets out that EU Member States shall take the necessary measures for an audit of their administration, according to the standards of the the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), be conducted at least once every seven years, subject only to a positive reply of the IMO to a timely request of the Member State concerned. All EU coastal Member States, except Portugal, have undergone such audit.. In addition, Article 8(1) requires Member States to develop, implement and maintain a quality management system for the operational part of the flag State-related activities of its administration, and to have it certified in accordance with the applicable international quality standards. Again, all EU coastal Member States, apart from Portugal and Ireland, have put such system in place.

([1]) OJ L 157, 7.7.1995.
([2]) OJ L 131, 28.5.2009.
([3]) OJ L 131, 28.5.2009.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007148/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2010/36/UE — regras e normas de segurança para os navios de passageiros

A Diretiva 2010/36/UE da Comissão, de 1 de junho de 2010, alterou a Diretiva 2009/45/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa às regras e normas de segurança para os navios de passageiros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão?

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2010/36/UE?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(31 de julho de 2013)

A transposição da Diretiva 2010/36/UE está concluída. Todos os 28 Estados-Membros notificaram à Comissão as medidas de transposição para o direito nacional.

As alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2010/36/UE relativa às regras e normas de segurança para os navios de passageiros constituem um alinhamento técnico do atual quadro legislativo (Diretiva 2009/45/CE) pelas regras estabelecidas pela Organização Marítima Internacional (IMO) para as viagens domésticas. Estas regras, que já tinham sido acordadas pelos Estados-Membros a nível da IMO, têm a ver principalmente com a Convenção SOLAS (Salvaguarda da Vida Humana no Mar) e o Código das embarcações de alta velocidade. A avaliação das alterações foi efetuada, antes da adoção da diretiva, pela Comissão juntamente com um grupo de peritos dos Estados-Membros criado em 2007. A uma escala mais geral, efetuou-se um estudo de avaliação *ex post* sobre a legislação em vigor relativa à segurança dos navios de passageiros (Diretivas 2009/45/CE, 1998/41/CE, 1999/35/CE e 2003/25/CE), cujos resultados estão disponíveis no sítio Web da Comissão (Mobilidade e Transportes).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007148/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2010/36/EU — safety rules and standards for passenger ships

Commission Directive 2010/36EU of 1 June 2010 amended Directive 2009/45/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on safety rules and standards for passenger ships.

— Which Member States have not yet transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Directive 2010/36/EU?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The transposition of Directive 2010/36/EU is now complete. All 28 Member States have notified to the Commission the adopted measures transposing the directive in national law.

The amendments introduced by Directive 2010/36/EU on safety rules and standards for passenger ships are a technical alignment of the existing legislative framework (Directive 2009/45/EC) to the rules laid down through the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) applying to domestic voyages. These rules had already been agreed to Member States at IMO level. They mainly concern SOLAS (Safety Of Life At Sea) and the High Speed Craft Code. An assessment of these amendments, was carried out by the Commission prior to the directive's adoption together with a group of Member States' experts already established in 2007. More generally, an *ex-post* evaluation support study on the overall existing passenger ship safety legislation (Directives 2009/45/EC, 1998/41/EC, 1999/35/EC, and 2003/25/EC) has been carried out and the outcome of such a study is available on the Commission's (Mobility and Transport) website.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007149/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Responsabilidades do Estado de bandeira e do porto

O Estado de bandeira deveria garantir plenamente a exaustividade e a eficácia das inspeções e vistorias efetuadas nos navios. Não obstante, o controlo da conformidade com as normas internacionais em matéria de segurança, prevenção da poluição e condições de vida e de trabalho a bordo dos navios deverá ser igualmente assegurado pelo Estado do porto.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Considera que se encontram adequadamente delimitadas as competências e responsabilidades dos Estados de bandeira e do porto quanto ao controlo da conformidade com as normas internacionais em matéria de segurança, prevenção da poluição e condições de vida e de trabalho a bordo dos navios?

— Como avalia o número de Estados de bandeira que descuram gravemente a aplicação e o cumprimento das normas internacionais e quais são os tipos de negligência mais frequentes?

— Crê que, presentemente, é garantido que todos os navios que façam escala num porto ou ancoradouro da União sejam inspecionados regular e adequadamente?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(6 de agosto de 2013)

As competências e responsabilidades dos Estados de bandeira estão definidas nas convenções internacionais aplicáveis nas quais são Partes. A Diretiva 2009/21/CE ([1]) relativa ao cumprimento das obrigações do Estado de bandeira garante que os Estados-Membros cumpram de forma efetiva e coerente as suas obrigações enquanto Estados de bandeira, designadamente tornando obrigatório, à luz do direito da UE, o sistema de auditorias da Organização Marítima Internacional aos Estados de bandeira e impondo a certificação dos sistemas de gestão operacional das administrações marítimas nacionais. O controlo dos navios pelo Estado do porto envolve a inspeção e a verificação de que os navios elegíveis cumprem as normas internacionais de segurança e ambientais aplicáveis. Todos os Estados-Membros costeiros são signatários do Memorando de Entendimento de Paris para a inspeção de navios pelo Estado do porto (MOU de Paris) e respeitam as suas cláusulas.

O relatório anual ([2]) do MOU de Paris fornece informações sobre o modo como o controlo dos navios pelo Estado do porto é efetuado na Europa, bem como sobre os Estados de bandeira com mais fraco desempenho e as razões por que não cumprem as suas obrigações.

Com base na Diretiva 2009/16/CE ([3]), começou a funcionar, em 2011, um novo regime de inspeções pelo Estado do porto; significa isto que os navios elegíveis que cheguem aos portos da UE são inspecionados tendo em conta o seu perfil de risco e a data da última inspeção. A diferenciação do nível de inspeção toma em consideração o facto de os navios em causa arvorarem bandeira de um Estado identificado como tendo uma frota com um risco mais elevado de incumprimento. Isto não só permite um melhor direcionamento dos recursos das inspeções, mas também premeia os bons operadores e garante que, com o tempo, todos os navios serão inspecionados.

([1]) JO L 131 de 28.5.2009.
([2]) http://www.parismou.org/Organization/Whats_new/2013.07.01/2012_Annual_Report_Paris_MoU_on_PSC.htm
([3]) JO L 131 de 28.5.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007149/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Responsibilities of flag and port states

Flag states are responsible for carrying out full and effective inspections and searches of ships. However, the port state is equally responsible for ensuring compliance with international standards for maritime safety, pollution prevention and shipboard living and working conditions.

— Does the Commission believe that the competences and responsibilities of the flag and port states for ensuring compliance with international standards for maritime safety, pollution prevention and shipboard living and working conditions are adequately demarcated?

— How does it assess the number of flag states that are seriously failing to apply and ensure compliance with the international standards? In what ways are they most often negligent?

— Does the Commission believe that the current system guarantees that all ships stopping in a port or anchorage in the EU will be correctly and adequately inspected?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

Flag State competences and responsibilities are set out in the applicable international conventions to which they have become a party. Directive 2009/21/EC ([1]) on compliance with flag State requirements ensures that EU Member States effectively and consistently discharge their obligations as flag States, notably by making the International Maritime Organisation's flag State audit scheme mandatory under EC law and introducing certification of the national maritime authorities' operational management systems. Port State control involves inspecting and verifying that eligible ships comply with the applicable international safety and environmental standards. In relation to Port State Control, all coastal EU Member States are signatories to the Paris Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control (PMOU) and abide by its requirements.

The annual report ([2]) of the PMOU provides information on the way in which port State control in Europe is implemented as well as on the poorest performing flag States and why they are failing in their duties

A new inspection regime for Port State control began operations in 2011 stemming from Directive 2009/16/EC ([3]); this means that eligible ships arriving at EU ports are inspected having regard to their risk profile and when they were last inspected. The differentiation in the degree of inspections takes account of whether the ships concerned come from a flag State identified as having a fleet with a higher risk of non-conformities. This not only allows a better targeting of inspection resources, it rewards good operators and ensures that over time all ships are inspected.

([1]) OJ L 131, 28.5.2009.
([2]) http://www.parismou.org/Organisation/Whats_new/2013.07.01/2012_Annual_Report_Paris_MoU_on_PSC.htm
([3]) OJ L 131, 28.5.09.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007150/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Sistema comunitário de intercâmbio de informações marítimas SafeSeaNet

O sistema comunitário de intercâmbio de informações marítimas *SafeSeaNet*, desenvolvido pela Comissão em colaboração com os Estados-Membros, compreende, por um lado, uma rede de intercâmbio de dados e, por outro, uma normalização das principais informações disponíveis sobre os navios e suas cargas (pré-avisos e notificações).

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que avaliação faz do sistema comunitário de intercâmbio de informações marítimas *SafeSeaNet*?

— Este já se encontra plenamente operacional?

— Quais são, no seu entender, os aspetos que poderão carecer de aperfeiçoamento?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(29 de julho de 2013)

1. O Senhor Deputado refere-se à Comunicação ao Parlamento Europeu e ao Conselho (COM(2011) 232 final) sobre o relatório de avaliação da execução e do impacto das medidas tomadas por força da Diretiva 2002/59/CE relativa à instituição de um sistema comunitário de acompanhamento e de informação do tráfego de navios.

2. Sim, tornou-se plenamente operacional em 2009. É composto por uma rede de sistemas nacionais SafeSeaNet nos Estados-Membros e por um sistema central SafeSeaNet que funciona como ponto nodal. São seguidos cerca de 17 000 navios por dia, recebidos mais de 160 000 relatórios por mês e determinadas mais de 100 milhões de posições por mês no quadro do sistema de identificação automática.

Estão registadas mais de 3 000 autoridades ou pessoas como utilizadores do sistema SafeSeaNet.

3. O desempenho do SafeSeaNet está a ser discutido pela sua estrutura de governação (grupo diretor de alto nível do SafeSeaNet). A possibilidade de utilização do SafeSeaNet para trocar dados dentro do sistema ou entre sistemas, como meio de cooperação transnacional e/ou transectorial de partilha/intercâmbio de dados, continuará a ser um importante desenvolvimento, para evitar o estabelecimento de sistemas paralelos, a custos suplementares. Além disso, as possibilidades futuras de o SafeSeaNet combinar, processar e integrar dados marítimos poderá permitir ao SafeSeaNet a implementação de um ambiente comum de partilha de informações para o transporte marítimo na União.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007150/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: SafeSeaNet, the European platform for maritime data exchange

The European platform for maritime data exchange, SafeSeaNet, was developed by the Commission in conjunction with Member States. It provides a data exchange network and standardised access to the main information available on ships and their cargoes (early warnings and notifications).

— What is the Commission's assessment of SafeSeaNet?

— Is it fully operational?

— Which aspects of it could be improved?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

1. The Honourable Member is referred to COM(2011) 232 final, the communication to the European Parliament and the Council reporting the assessment on the implementation and the impact of the measures taken according to Directive 2002/59/EC establishing a Community vessel traffic monitoring and information system.

2. Yes, it became fully operational in 2009. It is composed by a network of national SafeSeaNet systems in Member States and a SafeSeaNet central system acting as nodal point. Around 17.000 ships per day are tracked, over 160.000 reports received per month and over 100 million Automatic Identification System positions per month.

More than 3.000 authorities or persons are registered as SafeSeaNet users.

3. The performance of SafeSeaNet is under discussion by its governance structure (High Level Steering Group of SafeSeaNet). The possibility for the use of SafeSeaNet to exchange data within or between systems, as one means of cross-border and/or cross-sectorial data sharing/exchange, will continue to be an important development in order to avoid that parallel systems, at extra cost, would have to be established. Furthermore, future possibilities for SafeSeaNet to combine, process and integrate maritime data could allow SafeSeaNet to implement a common information sharing environment for maritime transport in the Union.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007151/13
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(19 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Proyecto de instalación de una planta de tratamiento e incineración de residuos en Forallac (Girona)

Las plantas de tratamiento, valorización e incineración de residuos en Cataluña y Mallorca no están funcionando al máximo de su capacidad y, por lo tanto, no están siendo rentables. En Cataluña, la empresa Grecat (Gestió de Residus Especials de Catalunya, S.A.) es una empresa concesionaria de servicio público de incineración de residuos peligrosos que utiliza el único horno rotatorio. Dispone de acuerdos con la mayoría de plantas incineradoras de Europa para poder garantizar el servicio. La planta incineradora de Son Reus, de Mallorca, tiene unas dimensiones muy superiores a las necesarias para la isla y se están importando residuos desde otros lugares (Barcelona, Sabadell, etc.) para tratarlos en esa planta.

La Directiva 2008/98/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 19 de noviembre de 2008, sobre los residuos recoge el objetivo de las instituciones europeas de reducir la incineración como principal proceso de gestión de residuos. En su artículo 4, se establece una jerarquía de residuos que prioriza la prevención, la preparación para la reutilización o el reciclado a las técnicas de valorización y/o eliminación de residuos, como puede ser la incineración.

Una empresa pretende abrir una planta de tratamiento, valorización e incineración en el municipio de Forallac, en la provincia de Girona. La oposición social ha sido importante en la comarca del Baix Empordà. La planta estaría ubicada cerca del yacimiento arqueológico de Els Clots de Sant Julià, declarada por el gobierno de Cataluña como bien cultural de interés nacional.

1. ¿Cómo garantizará la Comisión su compromiso de limitar la incineración de los residuos no reciclables para el año 2020, habiendo en el Estado español incineradoras infrautilizadas mientras se permite la construcción de nuevas plantas?

2. ¿Considera la Comisión que la ubicación de plantas de incineración en las proximidades de zonas de interés natural y cultural está de acuerdo con lo establecido en la legislación europea?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(1 de agosto de 2013)

Corresponde a los Estados miembros decidir acerca de las opciones de gestión de residuos que proporcionen el mejor resultado medioambiental global de acuerdo con la jerarquía de residuos establecida en el artículo 4 de la Directiva 2008/98/CE sobre los residuos ([1]) y en consonancia con los objetivos establecidos en la Hoja de ruta hacia una Europa eficiente en el uso de los recursos ([2]).

Las últimas estadísticas disponibles ([3]) sobre el tratamiento de los residuos municipales para 2011, muestran que la tasa de incineración se situó en el 9 %, mientras que el 58 % de los residuos urbanos fue depositado en vertederos. Esto no indica un exceso de capacidad de incineración.

En relación con la posible ubicación de instalaciones de reciclaje con valorización energética (*Waste to Energy* — WtE), hay que señalar que, según la legislación pertinente de la UE en materia de medio ambiente, los planes de gestión de residuos que contengan instalaciones específicas de eliminación y valorización de residuos, como las instalaciones de WtE, están sujetos a una evaluación ambiental estratégica (EAE) ([4]). Por su parte, cada uno de los proyectos de WtE están sujetos a una evaluación de impacto ambiental (EIA) ([5]).

La Comisión no está en condiciones de hacer declaraciones sobre la ubicación de esta incineradora en particular, pero en virtud de la legislación de la UE, tanto la evaluación estratégica medioambiental como la evaluación de impacto ambiental exigen que los efectos sobre el patrimonio cultural y el paisaje tengan que ser estudiados cuidadosamente.

([1]) DO L 312 de 22.11.2008.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/resource_efficiency/pdf/com2011_571.pdf
([3]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/8-04032013-BP/EN/8-04032013-BP-EN.PDF
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:197:0030:0037:ES:PDF
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:026:0001:0021:ES:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007151/13
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Plan to install a waste treatment and incineration plant in Forallac (Girona)

Waste treatment, recovery and incineration plants in Catalonia and Majorca are not working to their full capacity and are therefore not profitable. In Catalonia, the GRECAT (Gestió de Residus Especials de Catalunya, S.A.) company holds the public-service concession for hazardous-waste incineration and uses the only rotary furnace. It has agreements with the majority of European incineration plants to guarantee its level of service. The capacity of the Son Reus incinerator in Majorca exceeds the island's requirements and waste is imported from other places, including Barcelona and Sabadell, to be treated at this plant.

Directive 2008/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste states that the aim of European institutions is to reduce the use of incineration as the main means by which waste is treated. Article 4 of the directive establishes a waste hierarchy that prioritises prevention, preparation for re-use, and recycling over techniques for recovering and/or eliminating waste, such as incineration.

A company is aiming to open a treatment, recovery and incineration plant in Forallac in the province of Girona. Public opposition to the plant in the district of Baix Empordà has been strong. The plant would be located near the archaeological site of Els Clots de Sant Julià, which the Catalonian Government has declared to be a cultural asset of national interest.

1. How will the Commission guarantee its commitment to limiting the incineration of non-recyclable waste for the year 2020 given that there are underused incinerators in Spain and at the same time new plants are being allowed to be built?

2. Does the Commission believe that locating incinerators near areas of natural and cultural interest complies with European legislation?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

It is for Member States to decide on the waste management options that deliver the best overall environmental outcome in compliance with the waste hierarchy as laid down in Article 4 of Directive 2008/98/EC ([1]) on waste and in line with the objectives set under the Roadmap for a Resource Efficient Europe ([2]).

The latest statistics available ([3]) on municipal waste treatment in 2011 indicate that the incineration rate was 9%, while 58% of municipal waste was landfilled. This does not suggest an incineration overcapacity.

In relation to the possible location of Waste to Energy (WtE) installations, it should be noted that following the relevant EU environmental law, waste management plans containing the designated waste disposal and recovery installations such as WtE plants are subject to a strategic environmental assessment (SEA) ([4]). Individual WtE projects are subject to an environmental impact assessment (EIA) ([5]).

The Commission is not in a position to comment on the location of this particular incinerator, but under EU legislation both SEA and EIA require impacts on cultural heritage and landscape to be carefully considered.

([1]) OJ L 312 of 22.11.2008.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/resource_efficiency/pdf/com2011_571.pdf
([3]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_PUBLIC/8-04032013-BP/EN/8-04032013-BP-EN.PDF
([4]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:197:0030:0037:EN:PDF
([5]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:026:0001:0021:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007152/13
to the Commission
Syed Kamall (ECR)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Differences in rail ticket prices for the same journey

A constituent has written to me explaining that for a rail fare from Perpignan to London, the cheapest quote to be found on the RailEurope website was GBP 117. On the French SNCF site, and for exactly the same trains and journey, the cheapest price quoted was EUR 82 (about GBP 71).

Can the Commission:

1. look into how these large differences in price arise and investigate whether SNCF is in breach of EC law by offering cheaper fares to passengers from its domestic market than to those from elsewhere in the EU?

2. indicate whether there are any regulations governing the amount of commission that can be charged by RailEurope over and above the SNCF fare?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(27 August 2013)

1.EU railway legislation does not regulate railway fares or prices. Under Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair commercial practices ([1]), as long as consumers are fully informed in advance about the total cost of their trips, traders legitimately put in place different pricing policies depending on the Member State(s) in which they operate. However, the charging of different prices to customers based on the residence or nationality of such customers within the EU could breach the article 18 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) that forbids discrimination on the grounds of nationality and may constitute an abuse of a dominant position within the meaning of Article102 of the TFEU. However, it is not possible to assess whether all the conditions of Article 18 and 102 TFEU would be met based on the available information (for instance, the fares quoted may differ as a result of the applicable conditions, such as conditions for cancellation or modification).

2. EU railway legislation does not regulate the amount of commission that can be charged by a railway undertaking on what appears to be its fully-owned subsidiary.

([1]) OJ L. 149, 11.06.2005, p. 22.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007153/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Formation au secteur financier

1. La Commission compte-t-elle présenter, comme l'y invite le Parlement européen, une proposition sur l'amélioration de la connaissance du secteur financier par les citoyens afin que la population dispose des informations voulues avant de décider de contracter un prêt?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle aider à la formation de la jeune génération et à la formation de la société aux crédits à court terme?

3. La Commission partage-t-elle l'idée que la formation des consommateurs réduit les risques courus face aux produits dangereux ou contrefaits, aux produits financiers spéculatifs et à la publicité mensongère? Estime-t-elle que l'éducation (y compris l'éducation financière) et la responsabilisation des consommateurs devraient être permanentes et commencer dès l'école?

Réponse donnée par M. Mimica au nom de la Commission
(31 juillet 2013)

La Commission mène actuellement une série d'initiatives relatives à l'éducation financière pour compléter les actions des États membres dans ce domaine. L'éducation financière, associée à une législation efficace et à des conseils financiers adéquats, peut aider les consommateurs à faire des choix en connaissance de cause.

En mars dernier, la Commission a ouvert la «Consumer Classroom» ([1]). Ce site web européen destiné aux enseignants contient une bibliothèque de ressources pédagogiques sur l'éducation à la consommation provenant de toute l'Union européenne, ainsi que des outils interactifs et collaboratifs pour préparer et partager des leçons avec des élèves et d'autres professeurs. Il comprend, entre autres, des sections sur l'éducation financière. Il s'adresse aux professeurs enseignant à des élèves de 12 à 18 ans dans l'ensemble de l'Union européenne et est disponible dans les langues officielles de l'Union.

De plus, la Commission conduit depuis 2011 un projet concernant la formation des organisations à but non lucratif qui fournissent des conseils financiers aux consommateurs ([2]). Le but est de renforcer les compétences de ces entités en améliorant leur connaissance des services financiers et leur capacité à donner aux consommateurs des conseils financiers généraux efficaces. À ce jour, les formations ont eu lieu dans vingt-trois États membres, dans la ou les langues officielles de ceux-ci.

Enfin, la Commission a lancé en mai 2013 une campagne d'information sur les crédits à la consommation ([3]) qui vise à informer les consommateurs âgés de 18 à 35 ans contractant un tel crédit des droits que leur confère la directive sur le crédit à la consommation. La campagne est menée à titre de projet pilote dans trois États membres (l'Irlande, Malte et l'Espagne) et pourra être étendue à d'autres États membres à l'issue d'une évaluation de son impact.

([1]) http://www.consumerclassroom.eu/fr/node.
([2]) Décision 2010/462/UE de la Commission portant adoption d'une décision de financement relative à un projet pilote en faveur de l'autonomisation des consommateurs, de l'efficacité et de la stabilité des marchés financiers européens par la formation des associations de consommateurs et des organisations analogues. Voir aussi http://www.confinad.eu/.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/citizen/my_rights/consumer-credit/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007153/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Education in the financial sector

1. Does the Commission intend to act on Parliament's calls for a proposal on how to improve citizens' knowledge of the financial sector, so that people have the necessary information before deciding to obtain a loan?

2. Does the Commission intend to play any role in educating the younger generation and educating society about short-term loans?

3. Does the Commission agree that educating consumers reduces their risks vis-à-vis dangerous or counterfeit products, speculative financial products and misleading advertising? Does it believe that education (including financial education) and empowerment of consumers need to be life-long, and should begin at school?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The Commission is currently undertaking a number of initiatives in the area of financial education to complement the activities of Member States in this area. Financial education, seen together with effective legislation and suitable financial advice, can assist consumers to make informed choices.

In March this year, the Commission published the 'Consumer Classroom' ([1]). This community website for teachers brings together a library of consumer education resources from across the EU, along with interactive and collaborative tools to help prepare and share lessons with students and other teachers. It includes, amongst others, sections on financial education. It is aimed at teachers of 12-18 year old students throughout the EU and operates in the official EU languages.

Furthermore, the Commission is running since 2011 a project on the training of non-profit organisations that provide financial advice to consumers ([2]). The aim is to build the capacity of these entities by further developing their knowledge of financial services and their ability to provide effective general financial advice to consumers. So far courses have taken place in 23 Member States in their official language(s).

Finally, the Commission launched in May 2013 an information campaign on consumer credits ([3]). The aim is to inform consumers aged between 18 to 35 years about the rights when they take out credit, as granted to them by the Consumer Credit Directive. The campaign runs as a pilot project in three Member States (Ireland, Malta and Spain) and, following an evaluation of its impact, might be extended to more Member States.

([1]) http://www.consumerclassroom.eu/.
([2]) Commission Decision 2010/462/ EU 'concerning the adoption of a financing decision on a pilot project to promote consumer empowerment, efficiency and stability of European financial markets through training of consumer associations and similar organisations' See also http://www.confinad.eu/.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/citizen/my_rights/consumer-credit/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007154/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Différence de qualité d'un même produit dans différents pays

1. La Commission accrédite-t-elle la thèse de plusieurs associations, relayée par le Parlement, selon laquelle les consommateurs d'États membres différents n'ont pas accès à la même qualité lorsqu'ils achètent des produits d'une même marque et d'un même emballage au sein du marché unique?

2. La Commission trouve-t-elle cette discrimination entre consommateurs inacceptable?

3. La Commission compte-t-elle diligenter une enquête significative sur ce problème afin de déterminer s'il convient d'adapter la législation de l'Union en vigueur?

Réponse donnée par M. Mimica au nom de la Commission
(5 août 2013)

En ce qui concerne les différences de qualité entre des produits vendus sous la même marque dans différents États membres, la Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire aux réponses qu'elle a données aux questions écrites E-001209/2013, E-4962/2009, E-004388/2011, E-005055/2011, E-005563/2011, E-005756/2011, E-001581/2012 et E-005217/2012 ([1]).

Comme indiqué dans ces réponses, la législation de l'Union sur la sécurité des produits est conçue pour assurer un niveau élevé de protection de la santé humaine, tout en garantissant le fonctionnement efficace du marché intérieur. Les États membres jouent un rôle clé dans sa mise en œuvre. La législation complémentaire de l'Union impose des exigences de qualité applicables à un certain nombre de produits spécifiques, par exemple le jus de fruits ou la confiture.

La législation de l'Union a également pour objectif de fournir aux consommateurs des informations fiables et correctes. Ainsi, la législation sur l'étiquetage des denrées alimentaires prévoit que les consommateurs doivent être pleinement informés de la nature et des caractéristiques de la denrée alimentaire (par exemple liste des ingrédients et dénomination).

Tant que les produits sont conformes à ces exigences, des différences de composition ou de qualité peuvent exister, en raison de préférences des consommateurs, de spécifications techniques des lignes de production ou de disponibilité et d'accès aux matières premières. Les exploitants décident du positionnement de leurs produits sur les marchés nationaux.

Dans deux communications, la première, datant de 2009, consacrée à l'amélioration du fonctionnement de la chaîne d'approvisionnement alimentaire en Europe ([2]) et la seconde, de 2012, portant sur le commerce électronique ([3]), la Commission a défini des mesures ayant pour objet d'accroître la transparence du marché pour les consommateurs. Hormis cela, elle n'envisage pas d'étude comparative sur la qualité de produits vendus dans des pays différents.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Communication de la Commission «Une chaîne d'approvisionnement alimentaire plus performante en Europe» (octobre 2009).
([3]) Communication de la Commission «Un cadre cohérent pour renforcer la confiance dans le marché unique numérique du commerce électronique et des services en ligne» (janvier 2012).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007154/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Difference in the quality of the same product in different countries

1. Does the Commission give credence to the theory held by several associations, and relayed by Parliament, that consumers in different Member States do not have access to the same quality when buying products of the same make and with the same packaging within the single market?

2. Does it find this discrimination between consumers unacceptable?

3. Does it intend to carry out a meaningful investigation into this issue in order to determine whether the current EU legislation should be adapted?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

With regard to differences in the quality of products sold under the same brand name in different Member States, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to written questions E-001209/2013, E-4962/2009, E-004388/2011, E-005055/2011, E-005563/2011, E-005756/2011, E-001581/2012 and E-005217/2012 ([1]).

As indicated in these replies, the Union's product safety legislation is designed to ensure a high level of protection for human health whilst ensuring the effective functioning of the internal market. Member States play a key role in their implementation. Additional Union legislation imposes quality requirements on a number of specific products, e.g. fruit juice or jam.

The Union legislation also aims to provide consumers with reliable and correct information. For example, the legislation on food labelling ensures that consumers are fully informed as to the nature and characteristics of the food (e.g., the ingredients list and the name).

As long as products comply with these requirements, differences in composition or quality may occur due to consumer preferences, technical specifications of production lines as well as availability and access to raw materials. Businesses operators decide how to position their products on national markets.

In two communications on a better functioning food supply chain from 2009 ([2]) and on E-commerce from 2012 ([3]), the Commission has set out actions aimed at increasing market transparency for consumers. Beyond this, it is not planning a comparative study on the quality of products sold in different countries.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Commission communication on a better functioning food supply chain in Europe (October 2009).
([3]) Commission communication on a coherent framework for building trust in the Digital Single Market for e-commerce and online services (January 2012).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007155/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Environnement numérique

1. Que fait la Commission dans le cadre de l'achat de contenu numérique dansl'environnement numérique?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle se pencher plus avant sur les modalités de promotion de lavente de biens et de services dans l'environnement numérique et sur la façon derenforcer la confiance des consommateurs afin que ceux-ci sachent comment défendreleurs droits et engager une procédure de règlement des litiges lorsqu'ils ont acquis unservice ou un produit de mauvaise qualité?

Réponse donnée par M[me] Reding au nom de la Commission
(20 août 2013)

Les législations nationales transposant la directive relative aux droits des consommateurs seront applicables à partir du 13 juin 2014. Les informations relatives au contenu numérique devront alors être plus claires, notamment en ce qui concerne la compatibilité du contenu avec les matériels et logiciels informatiques et l'application des mesures techniques de protection telles que la limitation du droit pour les consommateurs de dupliquer ce contenu. Les consommateurs pourront également se rétracter avant le téléchargement effectif du contenu numérique.

Afin de garantir l'efficacité de ces nouvelles dispositions dans l'ensemble de l'UE, la Commission va préparer des orientations pour les mettre en œuvre, en collaboration avec les autorités nationales compétentes. Elle va également élaborer un modèle pour afficher en ligne les principales informations obligatoires, de manière à rendre les informations relatives aux produits numériques plus claires et plus faciles à comparer.

En ce qui concerne les problèmes liés aux produits achetés en ligne, la Commission entend renforcer la coordination des mesures d'application de la législation relative aux pratiques commerciales déloyales et moderniser, en 2014, les lignes directrices sur la mise en œuvre de la directive consacrée à ces pratiques.

En outre, comme cela a été annoncé dans l'«agenda du consommateur européen» ([1]) et le «rapport sur la citoyenneté de l'Union» ([2]), la Commission lancera, au printemps 2014, une campagne de sensibilisation européenne sur les droits des consommateurs.

Enfin, la directive relative au règlement extrajudiciaire des litiges et le règlement relatif au règlement en ligne des litiges, mentionnés dans l'Acte pour le marché unique ([3]) et dans la stratégie numérique pour l'Europe ([4]), devraient permettre de renforcer la confiance des consommateurs dans le marché unique numérique en leur garantissant l'accès à des formes de règlement des litiges autres que les systèmes judiciaires des États membres.

([1]) COM(2012)225.
([2]) COM(2013)269.
([3]) COM(2011)206 .
([4]) COM(2010)245.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007155/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Digital environment

1. What action is the Commission taking in relation to the purchase of digital content in the digital environment?

2. Does the Commission intend to look further into how to promote the sale of goods and services in the digital environment and boost consumer confidence, so that consumers know how to defend their rights and can undertake dispute resolution should they have purchased a low-quality service or product?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2013)

The national laws transposing the Consumer Rights Directive will become applicable by 13 June 2014. Information on digital content will then have to be clearer, including about its compatibility with hardware and software and the application of any technical protection measures, for example limiting the right for the consumers to make copies of the content. Consumers will also have a right to withdraw from purchases of digital content, up until the moment the actual downloading process begins.

In order to ensure the EU-wide effectiveness of these new provisions, the Commission intends to develop jointly with national enforcement authorities' guidance for their implementation. It also intends to develop a model for the online display of key requirements to make the information on digital products clearer and easy to compare.

Paying particular attention to problems with online products, the Commission intends to step up coordination of enforcement action on unfair commercial practices and update the guidance document on the application of the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive in 2014.

In addition, as announced in the Consumer Agenda ([1]) and the Citizenship Report ([2]), the Commission will, by spring 2014, launch a dedicated EU-wide awareness raising campaign on consumer rights.

Finally, the Alternative Dispute Resolution Directive and the Online Dispute Resolution Regulation, which were mentioned in the Single Market Act ([3]) and the Digital Agenda ([4]), are expected to boost consumer confidence in the digital single market by ensuring that consumers have access to other forms of dispute resolution than the judicial systems in the Member States.

([1]) COM(2012)225.
([2]) COM(2013)269.
([3]) COM(2011)206 .
([4]) COM(2010)245.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007157/13
alla Commissione
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Attività marittime e portuali — Attacco contro Tirrenia

A seguito del vertice tenutosi il 18 giugno 2013 tra il presidente della Regione Sardegna, Ugo Cappellacci, e il Commissario europeo per la concorrenza, Joaquin Almunia, sulle attività della Saremar e in particolare lo scontro con la Tirrenia, si desidera sottolineare che la vivibilità della Tirrenia, azienda che oggi dà da vivere a 1 500 lavoratori del mare, tutti meridionali, non può essere messa in discussione.

La Tirrenia occupa 1 500 lavoratori, oltre l'indotto, di cui 300 amministrativi, ubicati a Rione Sirignano a Napoli e i restanti 1 200 del meridione d'Italia, e di questi circa il 70 % appartenente al territorio campano.

La Regione Sardegna non può chiedere il blocco immediato degli aumenti delle tariffe e la revisione della Convenzione con lo Stato italiano, che fino al 2020 riconosce alla Tirrenia 72,6 milioni di euro all'anno per garantire la continuità territoriale con servizi di trasporto marittimo che altrimenti non sarebbero economicamente sostenibili. Così facendo, la Regione Sardegna prenderebbe in ostaggio i 1 500 lavoratori della Tirrenia e il territorio campano da dove provengono questi lavoratori.

Già nel 2011, la Regione Sardegna ha messo in discussione il lavoro della Tirrenia, contravvenendo alle azioni adottate dallo Stato italiano e sovrapponendo alle rotte coperte, per convenzione con la Tirrenia, due navi della «Flotta Sarda», che nel giro di una sola estate hanno avuto un deficit di circa dieci milioni di euro — deficit passato in sordina, rispetto alle restrittive leggi in materia di bilancio, approfittando dell'autonomia statutaria della Regione sarda — soldi che comunque escono dalle tasche di tutti gli italiani.

Inoltre, si sottolinea che le politiche tariffarie della Tirrenia praticate per i collegamenti da e per la Sardegna sono pienamente conformi al regime convenzionale in essere, costantemente vigilato dalle competenti autorità.

Alla luce di quanto sopra, intende la Commissione impegnarsi a garantire i livelli occupazionali della Tirrenia?

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(9 agosto 2013)

La nuova convenzione firmata da CIN, l'acquirente del ramo d'azienda di Tirrenia, con lo Stato italiano è attualmente oggetto di valutazione da parte della Commissione ai sensi delle norme sugli aiuti di Stato. Analogamente, la Commissione sta esaminando, alla luce delle pertinenti norme, la sovvenzione di 10 milioni di euro concessa dalla regione Sardegna a favore di Saremar per compensare le perdite subite da questa società nell'esercizio delle due rotte che collegano la Sardegna all'Italia continentale.

La Commissione riconosce la legittimità dell'obiettivo di continuità territoriale perseguito da vari Stati membri ed è del tutto consapevole dell'importanza di garantire collegamenti affidabili ed economicamente accessibili, da e verso le regioni insulari. In questo senso, gli Stati membri dispongono di un ampio margine di discrezionalità nella definizione dei servizi d'interesse economico generale. Tuttavia, in base alle norme in materia di aiuti di Stato, la Commissione ha il compito di verificare che gli Stati membri si avvalgono di questo potere discrezionale senza errore manifesto.

Sempre in base alle suddette norme, la Commissione non ha la competenza per intervenire per salvaguardare i livelli occupazionali delle imprese che operano negli Stati membri. Tuttavia, se gli Stati membri le notificano specifiche misure di sostegno all'occupazione, la Commissione le approverà, a condizione che siano conformi con le norme in materia di aiuti di Stato.

La Commissione presta la massima attenzione alle questioni inerenti alle società dell'ex Gruppo Tirrenia. Tutte le misure sottoposte all'attenzione della Commissione sono attualmente oggetto di una valutazione approfondita nell'ambito dell'indagine formale avviata nell'ottobre 2011 ([1]) e prorogata nel dicembre 2012 ([2]).

([1]) GU C 28 dell'1.2.2012.
([2]) GU C 84 del 22.3.2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007157/13
to the Commission
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Maritime and port activities — Attack on Tirrenia

Following the summit meeting held on 18 June 2013 between the President of the Sardinia Region, Ugo Cappellacci, and the EU Commissioner for Competition, Joaquín Almunia, on the activities of Saremar and particularly the dispute with Tirrenia, it must be emphasised that the survival of Tirrenia — a company that today provides employment for 1 500 sea workers, all from the south of Italy — cannot be put in doubt.

Tirrenia employs 1 500 people (in addition to the ancillary employment), of whom 300 are office workers at Rione Sirignano, Naples, while the remaining 1 200 are in southern Italy, with around 70% in the Campania area.

The Sardinia Region cannot ask for the immediate blockage of the tariff increases and the review of the Convention with the Italian State, which until 2020 is paying Tirrenia EUR 72.6 million per year to ensure territorial continuity with maritime transport services that would otherwise not be economically sustainable. Were it to do so, the Sardinia Region would take Tirrenia's 1 500 workers hostage, as well as the Campania area from which they come.

The Sardinia Region had already threatened Tirrenia's business in 2011, by contravening the measures taken by the Italian State and superimposing on the covered routes — in agreement with Tirrenia — two ships of the 'Flotta Sarda' (Sardinian Fleet), which in the space of a single summer made a loss of around EUR 10 million. This loss went unremarked with respect to the tight budget laws, and benefited from the statutory autonomy of the Sardinia Region, but the money comes out of the pockets of all Italians.

It should also be pointed out that the pricing policies applied by Tirrenia for connections to and from Sardinia are entirely in compliance with the agreed rules in force, which are constantly monitored by the competent authorities.

In the light of the above, can the Commission undertake to protect Tirrenia's employment levels?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The new Convention signed by CIN, the buyer of the Tirrenia business branch, with the Italian State is currently under assessment by the Commission under state aid rules. Likewise, the EUR 10 million subsidy granted by the Sardinian Region to Saremar to compensate losses incurred by the company in the operation of two routes linking Sardinia to mainland Italy is also being assessed by the Commission under the relevant rules.

The Commission acknowledges the legitimacy of the territorial continuity objective pursued by several Member States and fully understands the importance of ensuring reliable and affordable connections to and from island regions. In this sense, Member States have a wide margin of discretion regarding the definition of services of general economic interest. It is however the Commission's task under state aid rules to verify that Member States exercise this discretion without manifest error.

It is not within the Commission's competences under state aid rules to take action to protect the employment levels of companies operating in the Member States. However, if Member States notify to it specific workforce support measures, the Commission will approve them provided that they are in line with state aid rules.

All relevant issues concerning the companies of the former Tirrenia Group receive full attention from the Commission services. All measures brought to the attention of the Commission are currently subject to in-depth assessment in the framework of the formal investigation opened in October 2011 ([1]) and extended in December 2012 ([2]).

([1]) OJ C 28, 1.2.2012.
([2]) OJ C 84, 22.3.2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007158/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Rischi sanitari legati alla pericolosa prassi dell'occultamento in mare del tonno rosso (Thunnus thynnus) pescato illegalmente

Il tonno rosso (Thunnus thynnus) è notoriamente una specie a rischio di estinzione, tra le più preziose al mondo a livello commerciale. Proprio per questo è vittima di atti di pesca illecita, frequenti soprattutto nelle zone di riproduzione in tutta l'area del mar Mediterraneo ([1]). Solo nella regione della Sicilia, infatti, sono state recentemente sequestrate quasi 28 tonnellate di tonno rosso pescato illegalmente ([2]).

Al fine di tentare di sfuggire ai controlli delle autorità preposte, tra pescatori abusivi si è diffusa la pericolosissima prassi di occultare il pesce pescato illegalmente lasciando lo stesso immerso in mare (per esempio attaccato a improprie boe) per alcuni giorni in attesa di procedere alla vendita, con evidenti gravissimi rischi sanitari per chi successivamente consumi il pesce fatto oggetto di un simile trattamento.

La prolungata permanenza nell'acqua di mare dopo il decesso, infatti, provoca la produzione nella carne del pesce dell'istamina, sostanza velenosa che può causare anche choc anafilattico in chi la assuma. L'istamina è inclusa, infatti, tra i parametri microbiologici di sicurezza alimentare dettati dalla normativa dell'Unione ([3]): alti livelli di questa sostanza denotano la presenza di batteri tipici degli alimenti.

A Palermo si sono recentemente verificati un centinaio di casi di intossicazione alimentare (una decina particolarmente gravi) tra chi aveva consumato del tonno rosso. Questi fatti hanno portato alla creazione di una speciale Unità di Crisi per fronteggiare l'emergenza e velocizzare la risposta diagnostica, decisa dall'Istituto zooprofilattico sperimentale della Sicilia, su richiesta dei NAS (Nuclei antisofisticazioni e Sanità) dell'Arma dei Carabinieri e del servizio veterinario dell'ASP (azienda sanitaria provinciale) n. 6 di Palermo. Secondo quanto dichiarato alla stampa dal direttore di quest'ultimo, il dottor Paolo Giambruno ([4]), un fenomeno di queste proporzioni non si è mai verificato in passato e i livelli di tossine analizzati nel tonno rosso consumato dai pazienti intossicati risultano essere perfettamente compatibili con la pratica dell'occultamento in mare.

In chiusura, si ricorda che nella zona è inoltre frequente la pesca abusiva di novellame di pesce spada (Xiphias gladius), altra specie a rischio di estinzione. Tutto ciò premesso, la Commissione:

1. È al corrente della suddetta prassi dell'occultamento in mare, che comporta gravi rischi sanitari?

2. Quali iniziative intende intraprendere al fine di tutelare la sicurezza alimentare dei cittadini europei e salvaguardare la presenza del tonno rosso e del pesce spada nel mar Mediterraneo?

Risposta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione
(17 settembre 2013)

La Commissione non è al corrente della pratica dell'occultamento in mare del pesce pescato. Tale pratica costituisce una violazione della normativa armonizzata dell'UE in materia di igiene e sicurezza alimentare ([5]). I prodotti freschi della pesca devono essere refrigerati il prima possibile, oppure surgelati alle temperature specificate nella legislazione.

Il rispetto delle norme in materia di sicurezza alimentare è garantito dagli Stati membri, i quali sono tenuti ad istituire un sistema generale di controlli ufficiali per verificare la conformità con la legislazione alimentare. Nel caso riferito dall'onorevole deputato, pare che i controlli ufficiali abbiano effettivamente permesso alle autorità competenti di adottare provvedimenti per contrastare le violazioni individuate.

([1]) La campagna di pesca del tonno rosso per l'anno 2013 è disciplinata dalle disposizioni della raccomandazione ICCAT (Commissione internazionale per la conservazione dei tonnidi dell'Atlantico) n. 12-03 e dalle disposizioni del regolamento (UE) n. 500/2012 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio recante modifica del regolamento (CE) n. 302/2009 concernente un piano pluriennale di ricostituzione del tonno rosso nell'Atlantico orientale e nel Mediterraneo.
([2]) Cfr. l'articolo dell'agenzia di stampa Geapress: http://goo.gl/eBs7z.
([3]) Cfr. il regolamento (CE) n. 853/2004 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che stabilisce norme specifiche in materia di igiene per gli alimenti di origine animale.
([4]) Cfr. l'articolo dell'agenzia di stampa Geapress: http://goo.gl/lFskt.
([5]) Sezione VIII, capitolo I, parte II, punto 4, sezione VIII, capitolo III, parte A, punto 1, e capitolo VII dell'Allegato III del regolamento (CE) n. 853/2004, GU L 139 del 30.4.2004).

L'Unione europea ha assunto l'impegno di garantire la corretta applicazione delle norme stabilite dalla commissione internazionale per la conservazione dei tonnidi dell'Atlantico (ICCAT) nell'ambito sia del pesce spada sia del tonno rosso, mediante una politica di stretto controllo, attuazione coercitiva del diritto e promozione di un approccio intransigente verso la pur minima trasgressione tanto all'interno quanto all'esterno dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007158/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Health risks associated with the dangerous practice of underwater concealment of illegally fished bluefin tuna (Thunnus thynnus)

The bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*) is known to be a species in danger of extinction, and is one of the world's most valuable animals in terms of trade. For this very reason, it is frequently fished illegally, particularly in the breeding grounds throughout the Mediterranean Sea ([1]) Almost 28 tonnes of illegally fished bluefin tuna was recently seized in the Sicily region alone ([2]).

In an effort to avoid the controls carried out by the responsible authorities, the fishermen in question engage in the extremely dangerous and widespread practice of concealing the illegally caught fish by leaving them submerged in the sea (for example, attached to improper buoys) for several days until the sale is made, with obvious grave risks for the health of those who subsequently consume the fish that have been subjected to this treatment.

Prolonged immersion in sea water after death causes the production, in the fishes' flesh, of histamine — a poisonous substance that can even cause anaphylactic shock if ingested. Indeed, histamine is included among the microbiological food safety parameters established by EU legislation ([3]): high levels of this substance indicate the presence of typical food bacteria.

In Palermo, some 100 cases of food poisoning (including 10 particularly serious cases) were recently identified among people who had eaten bluefin tuna. These events led to the creation of a special Crisis Unit to deal with the emergency and speed up the diagnostic response, on the initiative of the Sicily Institute of Experimental Zooprophylaxis, at the request of the NAS (Anti-adulteration and Health Units) of the Carabinieri and the veterinary service of Palermo ASP (Local Health Authority) No 6. The director of the latter service, Dr Paolo Giambruno, recently told the press ([4]) that nothing on this scale has ever been seen before, and that the toxin levels found in the bluefin tuna consumed by the poisoned patients were entirely consistent with the practice of concealment at sea.

Finally, it is noted that this area also suffers from frequent illegal fishing of juvenile swordfish (*Xiphias gladius*), another species at risk of extinction.

1. Is the Commission aware of this practice of underwater concealment, which entails serious health risks?

2. What measures does it intend to take to protect food safety for EU citizens and safeguard the presence of bluefin tuna and swordfish in the Mediterranean Sea?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(17 September 2013)

The Commission is not aware of the practice 'underwater concealment' of fish after the catch.

Such practice is a violation of the harmonised EU rules for hygiene and food safety ([5]). Fresh fishery products must undergo chilling as soon as possible, unless frozen to temperatures specified in the legislation.

Responsibility for enforcing food safety rules lies with the Member States, which are required to establish a comprehensive system of official controls to verify compliance with food law. In the case referred to by the Honourable Member, official controls seem to have indeed allowed the competent authorities to take action to counter identified violations.

([1]) The 2013 bluefin tuna fishing campaign is governed by the provisions of ICCAT (International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas) Recommendation No 12-03 and the provisions of Regulation (EU) No 500/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 302/2009 concerning a multiannual recovery plan for bluefin tuna in the eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.
([2]) See the article by the press agency GeaPress: http://goo.gl/eBs7z
([3]) See Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin.
([4]) See the article by the press agency GeaPress: http://goo.gl/lFskt
([5]) Point 4 of Part II of Chapter I, Point 1 of Part A of Chapter III, and Chapter VII of Annex III to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 (Official Journal L 139, 30.4.2004).

The EU is committed to ensure the effective implementation of rules laid down by the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) in the framework of both of the swordfish and bluefin tuna fishery through a strict control and enforcement policy and the promotion of a zero tolerance approach both inside and outside of the EU.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-007159/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(19 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Διαγωνισμός για τον τεχνολογικό πάροχο του ΟΠΑΠ

Ο τρόπος με τον οποίο διεξήχθη ο διαγωνισμός για τον τεχνολογικό πάροχο του ΟΠΑΠ δημιούργησε, σύμφωνα με δημοσιεύματα στον ελληνικό Τύπο, σοβαρά προβλήματα και διαμαρτυρίες από τον ιδιώτη που αγόρασε το μερίδιο του δημοσίου στον ΟΠΑΠ.

Με δεδομένη τη σημασία της αποκρατικοποίησης του ΟΠΑΠ για την ελληνική δημοσιονομική εξυγίανση, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

α) Διέπεται τελικά ο διαγωνισμός για τον τεχνολογικό πάροχο του ΟΠΑΠ από την κοινοτική νομοθεσία;

β) Διέπονταν οι διαδικασίες οι οποίες κατέληξαν στις προηγούμενες συμβάσεις μεταξύ ΟΠΑΠ και τεχνολογικού παρόχου του (2007, 2010 κ.λπ.), οι οποίες επίσης απασχόλησαν και απασχολούν τη διαδικασία αποκρατικοποίησης αλλά και την ελληνική δικαιοσύνη, η οποία έχει ασκήσει σχετικές διώξεις, από την κοινοτική νομοθεσία;

Απάντηση του κ. Barnier εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(22 Ιουλίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να ενημερώσει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος ότι, με βάση τα διαθέσιμα στοιχεία, ο ΟΠΑΠ δεν φαίνεται να πληροί τα κριτήρια ώστε να χαρακτηριστεί «αναθέτουσα αρχή» κατά την έννοια του άρθρου 1 παράγραφος 9 της οδηγίας 2004/18 περί συντονισμού των διαδικασιών σύναψης δημόσιων συμβάσεων έργων, προμηθειών και υπηρεσιών. Στην περίπτωση αυτή, οι συμβάσεις που υπογράφηκαν μεταξύ της εν λόγω εταιρείας και των τεχνολογικών παρόχων δεν θα καλύπτονται από τους κανόνες της ΕΕ περί δημοσίων συμβάσεων.

Όσον αφορά την ιδιωτικοποίηση των μετοχών που κατέχει το κράτος στον ΟΠΑΠ, η Επιτροπή θα ήθελε να υπογραμμίσει ότι η απόφαση ιδιωτικοποίησης και η οργάνωση της διαδικασίας ιδιωτικοποίησης παραμένουν στην αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007159/13
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Call for tenders for OPAP's technology provider

According to reports in the Greek press, the way in which the call for tenders was organised for OPAP's technology provider has created serious problems, resulting in protests from the individual who bought the public share in OPAP.

Given the importance of the privatisation of OPAP for Greek fiscal consolidation, will the Commission say:

(a) Is the call for tenders for OPAP's technology provider ultimately governed by Community legislation?

(b) Are the procedures that resulted in the previous contracts between OPAP and a technology provider (in 2007, 2010, etc.) governed by Community law? These procedures were, and continue to be, a matter of concern from the point of view of the privatisation process; they are also the subject of a prosecution launched by the Greek judicial authorities.

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(22 July 2013)

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that on the basis of the available information, OPAP does not seem to fulfill criteria to be qualified as a 'contracting authority' in the sense of Article 1(9) of Directive 2004/18 on the coordination of procedures for the award of public works contracts, public supply contracts and public service contracts. In such situation, contracts signed between this company and technology providers would not be covered by EU public procurement rules.

Regarding the privatisation of the stake held by the State in OPAP, the Commission would like to underline that a decision to privatise and the organisation of the process of privatisation remain the responsibility of Member States.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-007160/13
a Bizottság számára
Surján László (PPE)
(2013. június 19.)

Tárgy: Viviane Reding alelnök tervei a 2014-es magyarországi országgyűlési választások befolyásolására

A *Magyar Nemzet* című napilap 2013. június 18-i számában felháborító vádakat tett közzé. Az Európai Bizottság egyik, névtelenséget kérő tisztviselője szerint Reding alelnök asszony a Bilderberg-konferencián kifejtette, hogy mindent meg fog tenni annak érdekében, hogy gyengítse a jövő évi magyarországi választások legitimitását. Reding alelnök említést tett továbbá a magyarországi szervezetekkel ápolt különleges kapcsolatairól, s e szervezetek biztosították őt arról, hogy olyan jelentéseket fognak kiadni a választások előtt, amelyek bizonyítékokkal szolgálnak az emberek megfélemlítésére a szavazóhelyiségekben.

Súlyosan antidemokratikus volna, ha bárki – és különösen, ha a Bizottság egyik vezető tisztviselője – beavatkozna egy szuverén állam választási kampányába és manipulálni kívánná azt. A névtelen bejelentés alapján Reding alelnök asszony kijelentései a választási csalás vádját is felvetik. Egy évvel az uniós választások előtt egy ilyen botrány csökkentheti a választási részvételt és árthat a Bizottság hitelességének. Az alelnöknek haladéktalanul tisztáznia kell álláspontját. Hivatala sajnálatosan már két alkalmat is elmulasztott ennek megtételére.

Egyetért a Bizottság elnöke azzal, hogy Reding alelnök asszony nem méltó a tisztségére, amennyiben nem tudja tisztázni magát?

Egyetért a Bizottság azzal, hogy az ügy belső bizottsági kivizsgálása során tiszteletben kell tartani az ártatlanság vélelmét annak megelőzése érdekében, hogy ártatlanul ítéljenek el egy tisztviselőt, amire a közelmúltban, a Bizottságban is volt példa?

Egyetért a Bizottság azzal, hogy amennyiben a Reding alelnök asszony elleni vádak alaptalannak bizonyulnak, amint az bizonyára így is van, hiszen ő maga már kétszer is ezt nyilatkozta, fel kell tárni az információ forrását és a mögötte rejlő szándékot?

Maroš Šefčovič válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. augusztus 12.)

Ezek a feltételezések teljességgel alaptalanok. A Bizottság nem tartja szükségesnek az ügy további véleményezését.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007160/13
to the Commission
László Surján (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Vice-President Reding's plans to influence the 2014 parliamentary elections in Hungary

Outrageous accusations were published in the Hungarian daily *Magyar Nemzet* on 18 June 2013. According to information provided anonymously by an official at the Commission, Vice-President Reding stated at the Bilderberg conference that she would make every effort to weaken the legitimacy of next year's Hungarian elections. Vice-President Reding also made reference to her special contacts with Hungarian organisations which assured her that reports would be published ahead of the elections showing evidence of intimidation of people at polling stations.

It would be seriously anti-democratic if anybody, moreover a leader of the Commission, were to intervene in the election campaign of a sovereign state with the aim of manipulating it. Based on the anonymous information, Vice-President Reding's statements also raise the issue of accusations of election-tampering. Just one year before the EU elections, such a scandal can decrease turnout and detract from the credibility of the Commission. The Vice-President should, without any delay, clarify her position. Regretfully, her office has already missed two opportunities to this end.

Does the President of the Commission agree that in the case where Vice-President Reding is unable to clarify herself she is unworthy of her position?

Does the Commission agree that throughout internal Commission investigations, the presumption of innocence must be respected in order to prevent the premature conviction of an innocent official, as has happened recently in the Commission?

Does the Commission agree that in the case where the accusation against Vice-President Reding is proven to be false — as is certainly the case, given that she has declared it twice — the source and intent behind the misleading information should be revealed?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

These allegations are completely unfounded. The Commission does not consider it necessary to comment further on this matter.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007161/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Situazione delle maestranze della Elcograf S.p.A.

In seguito alla cessione, da parte della Arnoldo Mondadori Editore S.p.A. (di seguito, AME), del pacchetto azionario di maggioranza della Mondadori Printing S.p.A. (dal 1º gennaio 2013 Elcograf S.p.A.), azienda operante nel settore delle attività di stampa e pubblicazioni periodiche, con sede a Verona (regione del Veneto, Italia), si è verificato un tentativo di rinegoziazione dell'accordo commerciale in essere tra la vecchia e la nuova proprietà, che non permetterebbe ad Elcograf di proseguire la propria attività nel segno della continuità commerciale.

Il predetto tentativo di rinegoziazione dell'accordo sarebbe finalizzato, da parte di AME, ad ottenere un corposo abbattimento dei costi di fornitura; tuttavia, l'entità dello sconto richiesto in fase di revisione dell'accordo quadro, sarebbe tale da pregiudicare la possibilità delle maestranze di mantenere il posto di lavoro in Elcograf.

Alla luce di quanto precede, considerando che allo stabilimento di Verona fanno capo 600 lavoratori, cui si aggiungono i 150 della sede di Cles (Trento), i 140 di Melzo (Milano), i 40 di Pomezia e i 90 tra Pozzo D'Adda e Madone (Milano e Bergamo), può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— È al corrente della situazione aziendale sopra esposta?

— Ritiene possibile il ricorso all'attivazione del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione, a beneficio dei lavoratori di Elcograf S.p.A.?

Risposta di László Andor a nome della Commissione
(11 luglio 2013)

[1] La Commissione non era al corrente della situazione descritta dall'onorevole parlamentare.

[2] Nel contesto dell'attuale regolamento FEG sono ammissibili al sostegno previsto da quest'ultimo solo i licenziamenti provocati dalla globalizzazione del commercio che, nella fattispecie, non sembra esserne la causa. Nel caso tuttavia in cui si verifichino dei licenziamenti e l'Italia riesca a stabilire un collegamento tra di essi e la globalizzazione del commercio, l'Italia può decidere di presentare richiesta di sostegno del FEG di modo che i lavoratori licenziati possano essere assistiti nel trovare quanto prima un nuovo impiego.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007161/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Situation of workers at Elcograf SpA

Following the sale by the publishing house Arnoldo Mondadori Editore SpA (hereinafter abbreviated as AME) of a majority stake of Mondadori Printing SpA (known, from 1 January 2013, as Elcograf SpA), a printing and publishing company based in Verona (Veneto region, Italy), there has been an attempt to renegotiate the existing business agreement between the old and new ownership of the company, which apparently will not enable Elcograf to continue its business activities as before.

This attempt to renegotiate the agreement is apparently due to AME's desire to secure a substantial reduction of its supply costs; however, the large discount being demanded during the negotiations to revise the agreement is sufficient to put Elcograf workers' jobs at risk.

Given the above, and considering that the Verona factory employs 600 workers, in addition to 150 at the Cles branch (Trento), 140 in Melzo (Milan), 40 in Pomezia and 90 split between Pozzo D'Adda and Madone (Milan and Bergamo), can the Commission answer the following questions:

— Is it aware of this company's situation as explained above?

— Does it think it might be possible to activate the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund to assist the workers of Elcograf SpA?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(11 July 2013)

1. The Commission was not aware of the situation referred to by the Honourable Member.

2. Under the current EGF Regulation only redundancies caused by trade related globalisation are eligible for EGF support and it would seem that globalisation is not the cause of these redundancies. However, if redundancies occur, and if Italy can establish a link between these redundancies and trade-related globalisation, Italy may decide to apply for support from the EGF, so that the redundant workers can be helped to find new jobs as quickly as possible.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007162/13
alla Commissione
Franco Bonanini (NI)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Coerenza del progetto integrato territoriale «Centro città» di La Spezia con gli obiettivi del POR regionale 2007-2013 — Asse 3

Il Progetto integrato territoriale «Centro città» — riguardante un pacchetto di interventi da realizzare nel centro città del Comune di La Spezia (Regione Liguria) — è cofinanziato con fondi europei all'interno del Programma operativo regionale predisposto dalla Regione Liguria POR — Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale 2007-2013 — Asse 3 «Azione Sviluppo urbano sostenibile».

Si tenga presente l'invio al Comune di La Spezia da parte del Ministero per i beni e le attività culturali — Direzione Regionale — della comunicazione DR0004448 del 17.6.2013 intesa a sospendere l'avvio dei lavori al fine di una verifica da parte dei competenti uffici del Ministero stesso e delle recenti dichiarazioni rilasciate dallo stesso Ministro Bray al riguardo.

Si consideri inoltre la protesta diffusa da parte di molti cittadini spezzini — soprattutto in relazione agli interventi previsti in Piazza Verdi — ampiamente ripresa dalla stampa nonché l'esposto presentato alle autorità competenti (ed anche alla Commissione) nel quale si lamentano presunte difformità dell'intervento previsto rispetto alle finalità del bando.

Alla luce di quanto precede, nel pur doveroso rispetto delle scelte dell'amministrazione comunale della Spezia e/o dei servizi regionali della Liguria competenti del settore, può la Commissione far sapere se non ritiene opportuna una verifica sulla coerenza del progetto integrato territoriale «Centro città» con gli obiettivi e le finalità previste dal bando in premessa?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(10 luglio 2013)

La Commissione sta attualmente esaminando una denuncia relativa al programma «Centro città» cofinanziato nell'ambito del Programma operativo regionale predisposto dalla Regione Liguria per il 2007-2013 e ha chiesto all'autorità di gestione di trasmettere le informazioni pertinenti, al fine di verificare eventuali violazioni della politica di coesione o di qualsiasi altra normativa europea applicabile.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007162/13
to the Commission
Franco Bonanini (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Consistency of the integrated territorial project for La Spezia — 'City Centre' — with the Regional Operational Programme objectives for 2007-2013, priority axis 3

The integrated territorial project 'City Centre', concerning a package of measures to be implemented in the city centre of La Spezia (Liguria), is being co-financed with European funds under the Regional Operational Programme drawn up by the Liguria Region — ROP — European Regional Development Fund 2007-2013 — Priority Axis 3 'Sustainable Urban Development'.

On 17 June 2013 the Regional Department of the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities sent a note (Ref. DR0004448) to the City of La Spezia for the purpose of suspending the start of work until an inspection could be carried out by the relevant departments of the Ministry. Minister Bray himself has also recently issued some statements regarding this matter.

There have been widespread protests on the part of citizens in La Spezia — especially regarding the work planned for Piazza Verdi — which have been widely reported by the press. A complaint has also been submitted to the authorities responsible (and to the Commission), alleging that there are discrepancies between the planned work and the purpose of the call for proposals.

In the light of the above and whilst, naturally, respecting the decisions of the municipal administration of La Spezia and/or the regional services in Liguria which are responsible for such matters, does the Commission not think it might be advisable to check whether the integrated territorial project 'City Centre' is actually consistent with the aims and objectives set out in the relevant call for proposals?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(10 July 2013)

The Commission is currently examining a complaint relating to the 'City Centre' project co-financed within the framework of the 2007-2013 Liguria programme and has asked for relevant information from the managing authority in order to examine if there has been any infringement of cohesion policy, or any other applicable EU rules.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-007163/13
do Komisji
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(19 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Grupowe zwolnienia w CMC Poland w Zawierciu

Prezydent Zawiercia Pan Ryszard Mach poinformował mnie o ciężkiej sytuacji ekonomicznej w zakładzie CMC Poland w Zawierciu. Przedsiębiorstwo jest jednym z największych i strategicznie najważniejszych zakładów działających na terenie miasta. Z informacji wynika, że huta planuje zwolnić około 230 osób. Szczególnie niepokojący wydaje się fakt przeprowadzania zwolnień grupowych w najważniejszych sektorach produkcyjnych w zakładzie, co wyraźnie zmniejszy możliwości produkcyjne oraz może prowadzić do znacznego ograniczenia produkcji. W swoim liście prezydent informuje, że głównym problemem huty jest słaba koniunktura w przemyśle stalowym oraz wykorzystywanie przez firmy sektora tzw. schematu karuzelowego do wyłudzania podatku VAT. Próby wprowadzenia rozwiązań prawnych uniemożliwiających takie działania są blokowane przez ustawodawstwo unijne, szczególnie dyrektywę 2006/112/WE Rady z listopada 2006 r.

1. Czy Komisja Europejska zna sytuację CMC Poland w Zawierciu oraz wie o planowanych zwolnieniach grupowych?

2. Czy Komisja posiada programy wsparcia dla zwalnianych pracowników? Czy w tym wypadku jest możliwość objęcia zwalnianych osób środkami z Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji?

3. Według informacji przekazanych przez prezydenta Zawiercia zwolnienia w CMC Poland spowodują znaczny wzrost bezrobocia. Czy Komisja Europejska planuje uruchomienie specjalnych programów pomocowych dla regionów i miast szczególnie dotkniętych bezrobociem strukturalnym, takich jak Zawiercie?

4. Jakie średnio i długoterminowe inicjatywy strategiczne planuje rozpocząć Komisja Europejska w celu wsparcia i utrzymania przemysłu hutniczego oraz jego sektorów zależnych na dalszych etapach łańcucha produkcyjnego, zgodnie z rezolucją Parlamentu Europejskiego (2012/2833(RSP))? Rezolucja ta wzywała również Komisję do ścisłego monitorowania stanu hut i przemysłu stalowego na Śląsku. Jakie działania podjęła w tej sprawie Komisja? Czy zbadano również sytuację w Zawierciu?

5. Czy Komisja ma świadomość problemów wynikłych z procedury karuzelowego wyłudzania podatku VAT oraz złej dyrektywy 2006/112/WE Rady z listopada 2006 r.? Ratunkiem dla zakładu w Zawierciu byłoby wprowadzenie tzw. mechanizmu odwrotnego obciążenia na pręty stalowe. Dyrektywa w niewystarczającym stopniu dostrzega ten problem, a winna zawierać wyraźne wsparcie dla takiego rozwiązania. Jakie kroki w tej sprawie podejmie Komisja, czy planowana jest zmiana dyrektywy?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(12 lipca 2013 r.)

Komisja dobrze zna opisywaną przez Szanownego Pana Posła sytuację. Polska może ubiegać się o wsparcie z EFG ([1]) jeśli zwolnienia pracowników są wynikiem globalizacji handlu. U osoby kontaktowej do spraw EFG w Polsce Szanowny Pan Poseł może zasięgnąć informacji na temat, czy planowane jest złożenie wniosku w sprawie wsparcia dla pracowników CMC ([2]).

Polska jest jednym z głównych beneficjentów wsparcia finansowego z EFS ([3]), którego celem jest zwiększenie zatrudnienia poprzez inwestycje w umiejętności i poprawę perspektyw zatrudnienia. Obecny Program Operacyjny „Kapitał Ludzki" jest już źródłem wsparcia dla osób w szczególnie trudnej sytuacji na rynku pracy, takich jak bezrobotni, młodzież i osoby starsze, kobiety, osoby niepełnosprawne, osoby zagrożone wykluczeniem społecznym itp. Instytucja zarządzająca regionu śląskiego może udzielić więcej informacji na temat wdrożonych i planowanych środków ([4]).

([1]) Europejski Fundusz Dostosowania do Globalizacji (EFG).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=pl
([3]) Europejski Fundusz Społeczny (EFS).
([4]) http://efs.slaskie.pl/index.php?grupa=1&art=4&kat=0_06&katrodzic=0&id_m=474

Dnia 11 czerwca, w następstwie publikacji zielonej księgi dotyczącej restrukturyzacji i przewidywania zmian ze stycznia 2012 r., Komisja przyjęła plan działań dla przemysłu stalowego UE. Komisja przedstawi komunikat dotyczący ram jakości w zakresie restrukturyzacji, w którym opisane zostaną najlepsze praktyki w tej dziedzinie. Ponadto, w przypadku znaczącego ograniczania działalności lub zamykania zakładów, Komisja ułatwi dostęp do środków UE, wykorzystując specjalne grupy zadaniowe, powoływane na wniosek państw członkowskich lub związków zawodowych.

Komisja ma świadomość problemów wynikłych z procedury karuzelowego wyłudzania podatku VAT i poinformowała już polskie organy podatkowe i przedstawicieli polskiego hutnictwa żelaza i stali na piśmie, że art. 199 ust. 1 lit. d) dyrektywy 2006/112/WE zezwala już na wprowadzenie mechanizmu odwrotnego obciążenia na pręty stalowe.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007163/13
to the Commission
Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Mass redundancies at CMC Poland in Zawiercie

The mayor of Zawiercie, Ryszard Mach, has notified me of the difficult economic situation facing the CMC Poland plant in Zawiercie. The enterprise is one of the largest and most strategically important plants in the city. According to reports, the CMC steelworks plans to lay off some 230 employees. One of the most worrying facts is that the mass redundancies at this plant are being carried out in the most important production sectors. This will clearly reduce production capacity and could result in a significant fall in output. In his letter, the mayor states that the main problem facing the steelworks is the weak economic situation of the steel industry and the exploitation of carousel schemes by steel companies to fraudulently evade VAT. Attempts to introduce legal measures to put a stop to such activities are being blocked by EU legislation, in particular, by Council Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006.

1. Is the Commission aware of the situation of CMC Poland in Zawiercie and of the planned mass redundancies?

2. Are there any Commission programmes to support the laid-off workers? In this instance, could the laid-off workers receive assistance from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund?

3. According to the mayor of Zawiercie, the redundancies at CMC Poland will lead to a significant growth in unemployment. Does the Commission plan to set up specific support programmes for those regions and cities hardest hit by structural unemployment, such as Zawiercie?

4. What medium- and long-term strategic initiatives is the Commission planning to launch in order to support and maintain the steel industry and dependent industries further along the production chain, in accordance with Resolution 2012/2833(RSP) of the Parliament? This resolution called on the Commission to monitor closely future developments in the steel industry in Silesia. What specific action has the Commission taken in this matter? Has it been monitoring developments in Zawiercie?

5. Is the Commission aware of the problems caused by carousel VAT fraud and by the flawed Directive 2006/112/EC of 28 November 2006? One possible way of saving the Zawiercie plant would be to introduce the reverse charge mechanism for steel rods. The directive does not sufficiently address this problem. It should include provisions explicitly supporting such a solution. What steps will the Commission take in this matter? Are there plans afoot to revise the directive?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(12 July 2013)

The Commission is well aware of the situation. Provided that the workers' redundancies can be linked to trade related globalisation, Poland has the possibility to apply for support from the EGF ([1]). The Honourable Member may communicate with the EGF Contact Person in Poland to know whether any application is being planned in support of the CMC workers ([2]).

Poland is one of the major beneficiaries of the ESF ([3]), which provides funding to increase employment through investment in skills and improved job prospects. Its current Human Capital Operational Programme already provides assistance for individuals in a particularly difficult situation on the labour market, such as unemployed, young and older persons, women, people with disabilities, people at risk of social exclusion etc. The managing Authority in the *slaskie* region could provide more information on implemented and planned measures ([4]).

([1]) European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF).
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=pl.
([3]) European Social Fund (ESF).
([4]) http://efs.slaskie.pl/index.php?grupa=1&art=4&kat=0_06&katrodzic=0&id_m=474

The Commission adopted an Action Plan for the EU steel industry on 11 June following the January 2012 Green Paper on restructuring and anticipation of change. The Commission will propose a communication on a Quality Framework on Restructuring presenting best practices in this field. Moreover, in the case of significant downsizing or closures, the Commission will streamline access to EU funds, by using dedicated task forces, to be established at the request of Member States or trades unions.

The Commission is aware of the problems caused by VAT carousel fraud, and has already advised the Polish tax authorities and representatives of the Polish steel industry in writing that Article 199(1)(d) of Directive 2006/112/EC already allows for the introduction of a reverse charge mechanism for steel rods.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007164/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(19 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Διαγωνισμοί ΤΑΙΠΕΔ

Ερωτάται η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή:

Διέπονται οι διαγωνισμοί τους οποίους προκηρύσσει το Ταμείο Αξιοποίησης Ιδιωτικής Περιουσίας του Δημοσίου (ΤΑΙΠΕΔ), από την κοινοτική νομοθεσία;

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(12 Αυγούστου 2013)

Η πώληση περιουσιακών στοιχείων από το Δημόσιο διέπεται από τους κανόνες περί ιδιωτικοποιήσεων. Σχετικά με αυτό το θέμα, τα κράτη μέλη πρέπει να τηρούν την ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία κεφαλαίων, το δικαίωμα εγκατάστασης και τους κανόνες περί κρατικών ενισχύσεων, που προβλέπονται στα άρθρα 63, 49 και 107, αντίστοιχα, της ΣΛΕΕ. Οι εθνικές αρχές είναι υπεύθυνες για τη διοργάνωση της διαδικασίας ιδιωτικοποίησης, λαμβάνοντας υπόψη την ενωσιακή νομοθεσία, το δημόσιο συμφέρον, την περιφερειακή και διεθνή πείρα καθώς και τις βέλτιστες πρακτικές. Μετά την ολοκλήρωση της διαδικασίας, τα αποτελέσματά της μπορούν να αποτελέσουν αντικείμενο ενωσιακού και εθνικού ελέγχου για την τήρηση των κανόνων, για παράδειγμα, σχετικά με πιθανές προνομιούχες μετοχές. Εξάλλου, σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις, η συναλλαγή μπορεί να υπάγεται στους κανόνες της ΕΕ για τον έλεγχο των συγκεντρώσεων.

Εντούτοις, ορισμένες δημόσιες επιχειρήσεις παρέχουν δημόσιες υπηρεσίες που τους έχουν ανατεθεί από τις δημόσιες αρχές οι οποίες τις ελέγχουν. Οι υπηρεσίες αυτές ανατίθενται συχνά χωρίς διαδικασία διαγωνισμού, βάσει της εξαίρεσης «in-house». Μόλις το κεφάλαιο μιας εταιρίας ανοίξει στη συμμετοχή τρίτων μερών, η εταιρία η οποία αποτελεί αντικείμενο ιδιωτικοποίησης δεν μπορεί πλέον να θεωρείται ότι έχει καθεστώς «in-house» και όλες οι δημόσιες συμβάσεις που εκτελεί ή οι παραχωρήσεις στις οποίες προβαίνει πρέπει να τερματιστούν. Πράγματι, η ιδιωτικοποίηση μιας τέτοιας εταιρίας θα οδηγούσε σε άμεση ανάθεση μιας δημόσιας σύμβασης ή παραχώρησης προς την εξαγοράζουσα οντότητα, πράγμα το οποίο αντιβαίνει κατ' αρχήν στους ενωσιακούς κανόνες περί δημοσίων συμβάσεων. Έτσι, στις περιπτώσεις κατά τις οποίες η δημόσια αρχή προτίθεται να ιδιωτικοποιήσει μια εταιρία μαζί με τις δημόσιες συμβάσεις ή τις παραχωρήσεις στις οποίες προβαίνει η εταιρία, η εξαγοράζουσα πρέπει να επιλεγεί σύμφωνα με τους ενωσιακούς κανόνες περί δημοσίων συμβάσεων που εφαρμόζονται στην ανάθεση της σχετικής δημόσιας σύμβασης ή παραχώρησης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007164/13
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: TAIPED calls for tenders

Will the Commission say:

Are the calls for tenders announced by the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund (TAIPED) governed by Community legislation?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

The sale of assets by the State is governed by rules on privatisation. In this regard, Member States have to respect the Treaty freedom of capital movements, the right of establishment and the rules on state aid, Articles 63, 49 and 107 TFEU respectively. The national authorities are responsible for the organisation of the privatisation process by taking into account EC law, the public interest, regional and international experiences and best practices. After the process is finalised, its outcome can be subject to EU and national regulatory scrutiny, for example on possible 'golden shares'. Moreover, in certain cases the transaction may be subject to EU rules on merger control.

However, certain State-owned companies perform public tasks, conferred on them by the public authorities which control them. Such tasks have been often entrusted without any competitive procedure, on the basis of the 'in-house' exemption. Once the capital of a company has been opened to the third-parties' participation, the company that is subject to privatisation can no longer be regarded as having an 'in-house' status and any public contracts or concessions it performs must be terminated. Indeed, privatisation of such a company would result in a direct award of a public contract or a concession to the acquiring entity, which is in principle contrary to EU public procurement rules. Thus, in cases where the public authority intends to privatise a company together with the public contracts or the concessions the company performs, the acquirer must be selected in accordance with the EU Public Procurement rules applicable to the award of the public contract or the concession concerned.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007165/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(19 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και ΤΑΙΠΕΔ

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή ως μέρος της τρόικα, ποιες συμβουλές έχει δώσει και σε ποιες προτροπές ή παρεμβάσεις, έγγραφες ή προφορικές, έχει προβεί στους ακόλουθους διαγωνισμούς του ΤΑΙΠΕΔ: ΔΕΠΑ, ΔΕΣΦΑ, ΟΠΑΠ και Κρατικά Λαχεία;

Σε ποια νομική βάση στηρίχθηκαν, αν έγιναν, οι παραπάνω συμβουλές, προτροπές ή παρεμβάσεις;

Υπάρχουν σχετικά έγγραφα και, αν ναι, ζητώ να μου γνωστοποιηθεί η λίστα των σχετικών εγγράφων.

Απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(21 Αυγούστου 2013)

Υπεύθυνα να διοργανώνουν τις διαδικασίες ιδιωτικοποίησης είναι τα κράτη μέλη, τηρώντας απολύτως το δίκαιο της ΕΕ και λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις διεθνείς εμπειρίες και βέλτιστες πρακτικές. Η απόφαση όσον αφορά ποια περιουσιακά στοιχεία του δημοσίου ή ποιες δημόσιες επιχειρήσεις πρέπει να ιδιωτικοποιηθούν, σε ποιον βαθμό και με ποια σειρά λαμβάνεται αποκλειστικά και μόνον από τα κράτη μέλη, με βάση τις ανάγκες που αντιμετωπίζουν και τους στόχους που τα ίδια έχουν θέσει.

Λόγω της σημασίας των χρηματοδοτικών πτυχών των ιδιωτικοποιήσεων για τις χώρες που έχουν ενταχθεί σε πρόγραμμα, για την περίπτωση της Ελλάδας ορίστηκαν από τα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωζώνης και την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή δύο παρατηρητές, οι οποίοι συμμετέχουν στις συνεδριάσεις του Διοικητικού Συμβουλίου του Ταμείου Ιδιωτικοποιήσεων. Οι συνεδριάσεις αυτές είναι απόρρητες.

Οι απόψεις των υπηρεσιών της Επιτροπής σχετικά με τη διαδικασία ιδιωτικοποιήσεων στην Ελλάδα είναι διαθέσιμες στις σχετικές ενότητες των εκθέσεων συμμόρφωσης που δημοσιεύονται μετά από κάθε αξιολόγηση. Η τελευταία σχετική έκθεση βρίσκεται στη διεύθυνση:

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007165/13
to the Commission
Theodoros Skylakakis (ALDE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: The Commission and TAIPED (Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund)

What advice has the Commission given, as part of the troika, and what suggestions or interventions, written or oral, has it made in respect of the following calls for tenders: TAIPED: DEPA, DESFA, OPAP and the State Lottery?

On what legal basis were any such advice, suggestions or interventions based?

Does any relevant documentation exist and, if so, will it provide me with of a list of relevant documents?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

The responsibility to organise privatisation processes belongs to Member States, acting in full compliance with EC law, and taking into account international experiences and best practices. The choice of what, how far and in which sequence public assets or companies should be privatised remains entirely with the Member States, taking into account the various constraints they face and objectives they set for themselves.

Given the importance of the financing aspects of privatisations for programme countries, in the case of Greece two observers nominated by the Member States of the Eurozone and by the European Commission attend the meetings of the Privatisation Fund's Board of Directors. The proceedings of such meetings are confidential.

The views of the Commission services on the privatisation process in Greece are available in dedicated sections of the compliance reports published after each review. The latest version of such reports is available in the following Internet link:

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/assistance_eu_ms/greek_loan_facility/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007166/13
to the Commission
Mairead McGuinness (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Construction of wind farms in Member States

Could the Commission clarify its position in relation to wind energy?

Could the Commission outline the legislation affecting the construction of wind farms in Member States?

Could the Commission clarify whether there are any EU regulations governing the planning and location of wind farms in Member States?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(23 August 2013)

The EU has set ambitious and binding targets for renewable energy consumption in each Member State by 2020 ([1]). Wind energy, which falls within the definition of renewable energy, will have to make an important contribution towards meeting these objectives in most Member States. According to the Commission's recent progress report ([2]) despite the recent strong growth **of wind power capacity**, total wind generation may fall short of expectations due to reduced national efforts and infrastructure difficulties.

Apart from the Renewable Energy Directive there is no specific EU legislation for the construction of wind farms. However, some environmental legislation, such as the Birds ([3]) and Habitats ([4]) Directives as well as the directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment ([5]) may also affect the planning, location and construction of wind farms in Member States.

([1]) Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC).
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:140:0016:0062:EN:PDF
([2]) COM(2013) 175 Renewable energy progress report.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0175:FIN:EN:HTML
([3]) The Birds Directive (2009/147/EC).
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:020:0007:0025:EN:PDF
([4]) Directive on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (92/43/EEC).
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1992:206:0007:0050:EN:PDF
([5]) Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (2001/42/EC).
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:197:0030:0037:EN:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007167/13
to the Commission
Nicole Sinclaire (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: The Public, Sandwell: ERDF funding

'The Public' is a community arts centre in Sandwell, UK, which received funding from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF).

It is to be closed, and handed over to an educational establishment.

In a case such as this, where the use ceases to be that for which funding was initially obtained, would the local authority concerned be required to return funds received to the ERDF?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

'The Public' project was co-financed using GBP 8 million of European Regional Development Funding (ERDF) funding between 2003 and 2008.

According to cohesion policy rules, a Member State would be required to inform the Commission if a project was substantially modified within five years of the decision by the managing authority to contribute ERDF funding.

In this case, in accordance with the regulations, the managing authority would not have a legal basis to request a repayment of ERDF funding as too much time has passed since the decision to award funding was taken.

The managing authority has been and remains in contact with the local authority representatives and, given the available information, agrees that the current proposals for the project fit with the scope and criteria of the original. The managing authority has asked the local authority to provide further information and will consider the case again based on any information they receive.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007168/13
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(19 juni 2013)

Betreft: De grootste klap die ooit is toegebracht aan privacy en gegevensbescherming

Op 13 juni 2013 heeft de Commissie twee voorstellen aangenomen met betrekking tot het 112 eCall-systeem waarmee automatisch één enkel alarmnummer wordt gebeld in geval van een ernstig verkeersongeval ergens in de EU en waarmee de GPS-gegevens aan lokale hulpdiensten worden doorgegeven. De voorstellen beogen te waarborgen dat, na inwerkingtreding ervan, alle nieuwe modellen van personenauto's en lichte bedrijfsvoertuigen die op de EU-markt worden verkocht, worden uitgerust met een in voertuigen ingebouwd eCall-systeem. De Commissie heeft fabrikanten opgeroepen ervoor te zorgen dat voertuigen die met een dergelijk systeem zijn uitgerust niet traceerbaar zijn noch op enige wijze worden gevolgd „in hun normale operationele status".

Kan de Commissie in het licht van bovenstaande antwoord geven op de volgende vragen:

1. Is de Commissie van mening dat de instelling van een algemene verplichting om voertuigen met een dergelijk systeem uit te rusten verenigbaar is met de keuzevrijheid waarover consumenten op een vrije markt beschikken?

2. Deelt de Commissie in dit opzicht de mening dat bij de instelling van een algemene verplichting niet voldoende rekening wordt gehouden met de gevoeligheid van privacy en de gevolgen voor gegevensbescherming? In dit verband heeft de Groep gegevensbescherming artikel 29 in haar „Werkdocument met betrekking tot de gevolgen van het eCall-initiatief voor gegevensbescherming en privacy" ([1]) aanbevolen een vrijwillige benadering in plaats van een verplichte benadering te hanteren.

3. Hoe kan de Commissie waarborgen dat het systeem alleen functioneert in geval van een ernstig ongeval? Met betrekking tot dit punt verklaarde de Groep gegevensbescherming artikel 29 dat, wanneer dit niet wordt gewaarborgd, het systeem zonder enige twijfel illegaal is.

4. Kan de Commissie een definitie geven van een „ernstig ongeval"? Wie of wat zal bepalen of een ongeval ernstig is of niet?

5. Kan de Commissie een definitie geven van de „normale operationele status"? Betekent dit „altijd behalve in geval van een ernstig ongeval"?

Met betrekking tot de gegevens die door het in voertuigen ingebouwde eCall-systeem worden doorgegeven, heeft de Commissie bevestigd dat deze „slechts de informatie omvatten die minimaal is vereist voor de behandeling van noodoproepen".

Kan de Commissie in het licht hiervan antwoord geven op de volgende vragen:

6. Kan de Commissie toelichten wat „de minimaal vereiste informatie" behelst?

7. Is de Commissie zich bewust van het feit dat diverse soorten gegevens door het eCall-systeem kunnen worden verzameld, met inbegrip van de tijd van vertrek en aankomst, de plaats van vertrek, rijpatronen, veelgebruikte routes, frequent bezochte websites, en geluiden in de auto, inclusief de stemmen van de inzittenden ([2])?

8. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat het eCall-systeem in plaats van auto's, veeleer personen zal volgen, en dat het systeem daarom de grootste klap zal betekenen die ooit aan privacy en gegevensbescherming is toegebracht?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(1 augustus 2013)

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/civil/docs/com_2006_747_en.pdf
([2]) http://ecall.wikispaces.com/Privacy.

In het werkdocument ([3]) heeft de Groep gegevensbescherming artikel 29 een voorkeur uitgesproken voor de invoering van eCall op basis van vrijwilligheid. Er werd aanbevolen om aan een eventuele verplichting de nodige garanties inzake gegevensbescherming te koppelen en gesteld dat, wanneer de uitrol van eCall niet volgens het overeengekomen stappenplan zou vorderen, de EC extra maatregelen zou kunnen overwegen, waaronder regelgeving. De EC heeft vervolgens nieuwe maatregelen ([4]) voorgesteld om de invoering van een eCall-boordsysteem in de Unie te bespoedigen.

De voorschriften inzake bescherming van de privacy en gegevensbescherming zijn vastgesteld in artikel 6 van het voorstel voor een verordening van de Commissie ([5]). Met de minimuminformatie wordt de „minimumreeks van gegevens" („minimum set of data" — MSD) bedoeld die door het eCall-boordsysteem wordt doorgezonden aan de publieke alarmcentrale (PSAP) overeenkomstig de desbetreffende norm ([6]). De verplichte MSD-velden betreffen de activeringswijze (automatisch of manueel), de voertuigidentificatie, het voertuigtype en de wijze van aandrijving, de tijdaanduiding, de rijrichting van het voertuig, de huidige en twee vorige posities en het aantal inzittenden. Het eCall-boordsysteem verzamelt of zendt geen andere gegevens door; het systeem treedt enkel in werking bij een ongeval of wanneer het manueel wordt ingeschakeld, zodat er geen trackingprivacyprobleem is. Informatie over de automatische activering (cf. de airbagmodule) is te vinden in de desbetreffende norm ([7]).

Voertuigen moeten aan een aantal veiligheidskenmerken voldoen en de verplichte aanwezigheid ervan wordt niet als een inbreuk op de keuzevrijheid van de consument beschouwd. Wel is het zo dat het eCall-boordsysteem kosteloos en op niet-discriminerende wijze toegankelijk moet zijn voor alle onafhankelijke marktdeelnemers en gebaseerd moet zijn op een interoperabel platform met open toegang voor potentiële toekomstige boordvoorzieningen en -diensten.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/privacy/docs/wpdocs/2006/wp125_nl.pdf
([4]) COM(2009) 434 final „eCall: tijd voor implementatie".
([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/automotive/files/safety/com-2013-316_nl.pdf
([6]) EN 15722 „Road transport and traffic telematics — ESafety — eCall minimum set of data".
([7]) EN 16072 „Intelligent transport system-ESafety-PanEuropean eCall-Operating requirements".

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007168/13
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: The biggest blow ever dealt to privacy and data protection

On 13 June 2013, the Commission adopted two proposals on the 112 eCall system that will automatically dial a single emergency number in the event of a serious road accident anywhere in the EU and communicate GPS coordinates to local emergency services. The proposals are aimed at ensuring, after their entry into force, that all new models of passenger cars and light duty vehicles sold in the EU market are equipped with an eCall in-vehicle system. The Commission has called on manufacturers to ensure that vehicles equipped with such a system are neither traceable nor subject to any tracking 'in their normal operational status'.

In the light of this:

1. Does the Commission think that the establishment of a general obligation to equip vehicles with such a system is compatible with the freedom of choice that consumers enjoy in a free market?

2. In this respect, does the Commission agree that the establishment of a general obligation does not adequately take into account the sensitivity of privacy and the implications for data protection? In this regard, the article 29 Working Party, in its 'Working document on data protection and privacy implications in eCall initiative' ([1]), recommended a voluntary approach rather than a mandatory one.

3. How can the Commission ensure that the system will only work in the event of a serious accident? On this point, the article 29 Working Group stated that if this were not the case, then the system would undoubtedly be illegal.

4. Could the Commission provide a definition of 'serious accident'? Who or what will establish whether an accident is serious or not?

5. Could the Commission provide a definition of 'normal operational status'? Does this mean 'any time except for when there is a serious accident'?

With regard to the data sent by the eCall in-vehicle system, the Commission has affirmed that it will 'include only the minimum information required for the handling of emergency calls'.

In the light of this:

6. Could the Commission clarify what 'the minimum information' refers to?

7. Is the Commission aware of the fact that several kinds of data could be collected through the eCall system, including times of departure and arrival, the place of departure, driving patterns, routes that are taken regularly, frequently visited websites and sounds within the car, including the voices of persons in the car ([2])?

8. Does the Commission agree that the eCall system, rather than monitoring cars, will in fact monitor individuals and therefore constitute the biggest blow ever dealt to privacy and data protection?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

The article 29 working group document ([3]), favoured the voluntary approach for the introduction of eCall. It was recommended that any mandatory approach be accompanied by proper data protection safeguards. It was also stated that in case the eCall roll-out fails to progress according to the agreed roadmap, the EC may consider further measures, including regulatory actions. The EC subsequently proposed new measures ([4]) to accelerate the deployment of an in-vehicle eCall service in the Union.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/privacy/docs/wpdocs/2006/wp125_en.pdf
([2]) http://ecall.wikispaces.com/Privacy.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/privacy/docs/wpdocs/2006/wp125_en.pdf
([4]) COM(2009) 434 final 'eCall: Time for Deployment'.

Article 6 of the EC proposal for a regulation ([5]) sets the rules on privacy and data protection. Minimum information refers to the 'minimum set of data' (MSD) i.e. the information which is sent to the eCall Public Safety Access Point (PSAP) as defined in the relevant standard ([6]). The mandatory fields of the MSD include the triggering mode (automatic or manual), vehicle identification, vehicle type and propulsion, timestamp, vehicle direction, current and two previous positions, and number of passengers. No other data is collected or transmitted by the eCall in-vehicle system (IVS); the IVS is only activated when an accident occurs or if it is manually triggered, thus there is no privacy issue related to tracking. Information on the automatic triggering strategies (e.g. the airbag control module) is contained in the relevant standard ([7]).

There are a number of safety features that are obligatory in vehicles, eg. seatbelts, and their obligatory fitting is not considered to be a breach of consumers' freedom of choice. But, the eCall IVS should be accessible free of charge and without discrimination to all independent operators, and based on an interoperable and open-access platform for future in-vehicle applications or services.

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/automotive/files/safety/com-2013-316_en.pdf
([6]) EN 15722 'Road transport and traffic telematics — ESafety — eCall minimum set of data'.
([7]) EN 16072 'Intelligent transport system-ESafety-PanEuropean eCall-Operating requirements'.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007169/13
to the Commission
Roger Helmer (EFD)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Funding for Northern Ireland — 'Peace Funding'

A number of concerns have been raised regarding EU funding to Republican groups in Northern Ireland, and the building of a 'Peace Centre' on the site of the Maze prison, an iconic site for the Republican/Sinn Fein movement, where many Republican prisoners went on hunger strike. There are also concerns that mainly Unionist-inclined groups representing victims of the conflict are not receiving proportionate EU funding.

1. What measures are there to ensure that EU money will not be used to build a Republican shrine on the Maze site? ([1])

We have been approached by individuals from Northern Ireland concerned that EU funding and support for peace in Northern Ireland has been weighted in favour of Republicans and Republican charities, such as COISTE ([2]), which is reported to have received EU funding despite errors in its accounting ([3]). This has led to a feeling that Unionists are being sidelined, which could damage community relations.

2. What consideration has been given to the fair and proportionate allocation of funds between the two sides?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

1. EU funding for the Peace Building and Conflict Resolution Centre (PbCRC) was approved by the managing authority of the PEACE III programme in December 2011 ([4]). Based on the information provided by this authority, the Commission has no reason to doubt that the project is in conformity with the objectives of the programme. The Commission is informed that the PbCRC will be a neutral venue and provide a central location for key organisations working within the field of reconciliation and peace-building. The Centre aims to be an internationally renowned facility so that Northern Ireland's unique experience in peace-building can be shared globally. It will be located on the Maze/Long Kesh site, which in itself will contribute to attracting global interest, but the former prison buildings will not form part of the Centre.

2. A series of studies have analysed the community take-up within the area covered by the PEACE programme. For instance, the 2011 Community Uptake Analysis by the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA), estimated that 46% of PEACE III funding was associated with the Protestant community. In line with the programme's procedures, funding has been awarded according to transparent criteria and there is no evidence of bias in favour of any group or community.The managing authority is pro-actively engaging with both sides and in particular with the Protestant community including in relation to capacity-building and has met directly with local community leaders and voluntary sector groups. The managing authority also engages with elected representatives (Councillors, MLAs, MPs) from the Protestant Community to increase understanding and access to the opportunities under the programme.

([1]) http://www.irishcentral.com/news/Northern-Irelands-Maze-Prison-once-home-to-IRA-prisoners-to-become-peace-center-203816831.html
([2]) http://www.charitycommissionni.org.uk/Our_regulatory_activity/List_of_deemed_charities.aspx.
([3]) http://www.exaronews.com/articles/4337/eu-gives-13m-to-ex-ira-prisoners-group-despite-legal-breach.
([4]) Under the principle of subsidiarity and shared management of the EU's Structural Funds, the Member States have primary responsibility for awarding funding to projects and for ensuring compliance with the applicable EU regulations. The selection of the projects (except for major projects), comes under the exclusive competence of the national managing authorities, provided that their choices are in line with the principles laid down in the programming documents and comply with current legislation.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007170/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Distorsion de concurrence

La Commission compte-t-elle entreprendre un examen approfondi des distorsions de concurrence et de leurs conséquences économiques?

La Commission va-t-elle mettre à jour les déséquilibres éventuels entre les États membres dans ce domaine, ainsi que leurs causes?

Réponse donnée par M. Almunia au nom de la Commission
(5 août 2013)

Dans le cadre des efforts qu'elle déploie pour faire respecter le droit de la concurrence, la Commission contrôle régulièrement la concurrence sur les marchés de produits et de services de l'UE, notamment en examinant avec attention les notifications ayant trait à des concentrations, en étudiant les plaintes reçues, en menant des enquêtes sectorielles et en statuant sur des affaires de concurrence. À cet effet, elle procède à une analyse approfondie de la concurrence sur les marchés concernés, ainsi que du contexte économique dans lequel s'inscrit la pratique anticoncurrentielle alléguée.

La Commission est soucieuse de garantir le bon fonctionnement des marchés de l'UE et le jeu de la concurrence sur ceux-ci. Elle se tient prête à intervenir dès que ses services constatent des agissements anticoncurrentiels ou ont connaissance d'éléments attestant de tels comportements. Les autorités de concurrence des États membres veillent également au bon fonctionnement, en toute transparence, des marchés relevant de leurs compétences.

En tant qu'institution chargée de faire respecter le droit de la concurrence dans l'Union européenne, la Commission intervient régulièrement dans de nombreux États membres, dans le cadre d'affaires ayant trait à des concentrations, à des aides d'État, à des ententes ou à des abus de position dominante. L'équilibre géographique de son action en la matière varie chaque année et dépend de plusieurs éléments, tels que les notifications de concentrations, les plaintes ou les demandes de clémence qui lui sont adressées.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007170/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Distortion of competition

Does the Commission intend to carry out an in-depth review of distortions of competition and their economic implications?

Will the Commission provide updates on any imbalances between the Member States in this area and the reasons behind them?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

In its competition enforcement efforts, the Commission regularly monitors competition on the European product and service markets, in particular by scrutinising merger notifications, examining complaints, launching sector inquiries and acting in competition cases. The cases investigated by the Commission include an extensive analysis of competition in a particular market as well as of the economic setting of the alleged anticompetitive behaviour.

The Commission is keen on ensuring a well- functioning and competitive market in the EU and is prepared to act when its services identify or obtain evidence of anticompetitive behaviour. The national competition authorities of the Member States are also active in ensuring proper and transparent functioning of markets within their jurisdictions.

As the institution responsible for competition law enforcement across the European Union, the Commission is regularly active in many Member States, either in mergers, state aid or antitrust cases. The geographic balance of this activity varies each year and depends on several factors, such as merger notifications, complaints or leniency requests received.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007172/13
alla Commissione
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR) e Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: L'impatto delle ecomafie nel contesto europeo

La più grande associazione di tutela dell'ambiente in Italia ha appena stilato un rapporto sulle ecomafie, con dati sbalorditivi: nella penisola le organizzazioni criminali che lavorano in quest'ambito hanno fruttato un fatturato di 16,7 miliardi, con 34 120 reati accertati, 28 132 persone denunciate, 161 arresti, 8 286 sequestri. Il 45,7 % degli illeciti, stando all'indagine, si concentra nelle regioni con più alta densità mafiosa del paese, Campania, Sicilia, Calabria e Puglia, con la preoccupante *new entry* del Lazio. Sono aumentati nell'ultimo anno gli illeciti contro animali (+6,4 %), l'edilizia illegale e i casi di abusi e corruzione nella stipulazione di appalti pubblici.

Può pertanto la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

— È in grado di confermare i dati presentati nell'indagine?

— Ha essa avviato progetti per contrastare il fenomeno, che riveste sempre più spesso dimensioni transnazionali, in particolare per quello che riguarda il traffico illegale di rifiuti dannosi per la salute dei cittadini europei?

— Quali meccanismi utilizza per valutare la trasparenza nell'utilizzo dei fondi europei per l'ambiente e dei fondi territoriali?

— È in grado di disegnare un quadro generale della situazione delle ecomafie all'interno dell'Unione europea?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(28 agosto 2013)

Sebbene spetti principalmente agli Stati membri combattere la criminalità organizzata, l'UE ha concordato una serie di strumenti in questo campo, tra cui le indagini finanziarie volte a smantellare le reti criminali, la confisca dei beni o l'adeguamento di Europol all'evoluzione della criminalità organizzata, in particolare attraverso la negoziazione della proposta di regolamento Europol. Per quanto riguarda l'ecomafia, l'Europol ha emesso nel giugno 2011 un avviso di minaccia OC-SCAN sullo smaltimento illecito di rifiuti. In base ai risultati della valutazione della minaccia rappresentata dalla criminalità organizzata e dalle forme gravi di criminalità, la criminalità ambientale è stata identificata e riconosciuta come una minaccia emergente nel 2013. Nel 2011 Europol ha creato una piattaforma di esperti (EnviCrimeNet), che organizza riunioni annuali (la terza è prevista a novembre 2013) per personale specializzato delle autorità di contrasto che si occupano di reati ambientali. Europol ha istituito recentemente un punto di contatto per la criminalità organizzata in Italia.

La direttiva 2008/99/CE ([1]) impone agli Stati membri di predisporre sanzioni penali dissuasive per i reati ambientali più gravi.

Inoltre, la Commissione interviene quando dispone di elementi di prova che indicano una violazione di disposizioni giuridiche specifiche dell'UE, cui le autorità nazionali non hanno dato una risposta adeguata.

Per quanto riguarda le spedizioni di riufiuti, l'11/7/2013 la Commissione ha adottato una proposta ([2]) per rafforzare le ispezioni mediante una modifica al regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 ([3]).

Per quanto riguarda infine la trasparenza nell'utilizzo dei fondi europei, il regolamento (CE) n. 1083/2006 ([4]) contiene un Titolo sulla gestione finanziaria. Gli Stati membri devono anche garantire che le operazioni siano sottoposte a una corretta revisione contabile. Parimenti, il regolamento (CE) 614/2007 ([5]) contiene un articolo sulla tutela degli interessi finanziari. Inoltre, l'Ufficio europeo per la lotta antifrode (OLAF) può svolgere indagini amministrative per combattere le attività illecite che ledono gli interessi finanziari dell'UE.

([1]) Direttiva 2008/99/CE sulla tutela penale dell'ambiente (GU L 328 del 6.12.2008, pag. 28).
([2]) COM(2013) 516 http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/shipments/pdf/COM_2013_516_en.pdf
([3]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1013/2006 relativo alle spedizioni di rifiuti (GU L 190 del 12.7.2006, pag. 1).
([4]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1083/2006 recante disposizioni generali sul Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale, sul Fondo sociale europeo e sul Fondo di coesione (GU L 210 del 31.7.2006, pag. 25).
([5]) Regolamento (CE) n. 614/2007 riguardante lo strumento finanziario per l'ambiente (LIFE+) (GU L 149 del 9.6.2007, pag. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007172/13
to the Commission
Cristiana Muscardini (ECR) and Sonia Alfano (ALDE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Impact of ecomafias in the EU

Italy's biggest environmental protection association has just published a report on ecomafias, with some astonishing figures: nationwide, the criminal organisations working in this field have made an income of EUR 16.7 billion, with 34 120 identified crimes, 28 132 people reported, 161 arrests and 8 286 seizures. According to the report, 45.7% of the offences are concentrated in the country's regions that have the highest density of mafia activities: Campania, Sicily, Calabria and Apulia, with the worrying new entry of Lazio. Last year saw a rise in offences against animals (+6.4%), illegal construction, and cases of abuse and corruption in the awarding of public procurement contracts.

— Can the Commission confirm the data presented in the report?

— Has it started any projects to combat this problem, which is becoming increasingly transnational in scope, particularly with regard to illegal trafficking in waste that is hazardous to the health of EU citizens?

— What mechanisms does it use to assess transparency in the use of EU environmental and territorial funds?

— Can it give a general outline of the situation with regard to ecomafias within the EU?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(28 August 2013)

While the main responsibility for fighting organised crime is with Member States (MS), the EU has agreed on a number of instruments in this field, such as financial investigations to dismantle networks, confiscation of assets or the adaptation of Europol to the evolution of organised crime notably through the negotiation of the Europol Regulation proposal. As concerns ecomafia, Europol has in particular issued a OC-Scan on illegal waste disposal in June 2011. On the basis of the Serious and Organised Threat Assessment, environmental crime has been qualified as an emerging threat in 2013. In 2011 Europol created a platform for experts (EnviCrimeNet) holding annual meetings (third one scheduled in November 2013) for specialists from law enforcement agencies dealing with environmental crime. Europol recently established a Focal Point on Italian organised crime.

Directive 2008/99/EC ([1]) requires MS to provide for dissuasive criminal sanctions for the most serious environmental offences.

In addition, the Commission intervenes when it has evidence of breaches of specific EU legal provisions that are not adequately tackled by national authorities.

Concerning shipments of waste, on 11/7/2013 the Commission adopted a proposal ([2]) to strengthen inspections through an amendment of Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 ([3]).

Concerning transparency in the use of EU funds, Regulation (EC) 1083/2006 ([4]) contains a Title on financial management. MS must also ensure that operations are correctly audited. Likewise, Regulation (EC) 614/2007 ([5]) contains an article on protection of financial interests. Furthermore, the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) may conduct administrative investigations to fight illegal activities affecting the financial interests of the EU.

([1]) Directive 2008/99/EC on the protection of the environment through criminal law (OJ L 328, 6.12.2008, p. 28).
([2]) COM(2013) 516, http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/shipments/pdf/COM_2013_516_en.pdf
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 on shipments of waste (OJ L 190, 12.7.2006, p. 1).
([4]) Regulation (EC) 1083/2006 on the general provisions for Structural and Cohesion Funds (OJ L 210, 31.7.2006, p. 25). .
([5]) Regulation (EC) 614/2007 on the LIFE programme (OJ L 149, 9.6.2007, p. 1). .

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007173/13
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Produzione, importazione ed esportazione di pelli grezze — Dati UE

In riferimento alla mia interrogazione P-005071/2013 e alla relativa risposta, può la Commissione fornire i dati già richiesti nella stessa interrogazione e non comunicati, ovvero volume e valore di produzione europea, importazioni ed esportazioni di pelli grezze per le principali categorie animali (bovini grandi e piccoli, ovini e caprini) a partire, in questo caso, dall'anno 2007?

Dai dati in suo possesso la Commissione europea ha stabilito che non sembra vi siano indizi di grave penuria di materie prime per l'industria della pelle. Diversi operatori del settore dichiarano però che, se si considerano i dati a partire dal 2007, il calo dell'approvvigionamento del grezzo diventa evidente; sarebbe pertanto opportuno visionare queste statistiche.

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(26 agosto 2013)

La Commissione ha esaminato i dati disponibili dal 2007, riportati in allegato, che sono stati inviati direttamente all'onorevole deputato e al segretariato del Parlamento.

Nel 2008 e nel 2009 si sono registrate due importanti riduzioni della disponibilità di pelli grezze (rispettivamente del 12 % e del 28 %) a causa di un notevole aumento delle esportazioni. Nel 2010 la disponibilità ha registrato un'impennata (12 %) per poi calare di nuovo leggermente nel 2011 e nel 2012.

Secondo l'analisi della Commissione, la situazione del mercato unionale pare dovuta agli effetti combinati di una forte domanda di altri paesi (essenzialmente in Asia) e di un rallentamento della domanda interna a seguito della crisi economica, mentre non vi sono indicazioni di una carenza critica di prodotti essenziali tali da giustificare l'adozione di misure in forza del regolamento (CE) n. 1061/2009 del Consiglio ([1]). La Commissione continuerà a seguire la situazione per quanto concerne la disponibilità di queste materie prime sul mercato unionale ora che sembrano registrare una lenta inversione le tendenze generali dell'economia, che hanno avuto maggiori ripercussioni sul settore nel 2008 e nel 2009. Fatto più importante, la Commissione continuerà a indicare come priorità negli accordi di libero scambio e nei negoziati di adesione all'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio la piena eliminazione dei dazi all'esportazione di pelli grezze originarie di paesi terzi.

([1]) Regolamento (CE) n. 1061/2009 del Consiglio, del 19 ottobre 2009, relativo all'instaurazione di un regime comune applicabile alle esportazioni, GU L 291 del 7.11.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007173/13
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Production, import and export of raw hides — EU data

With reference to my Question P-005071/2013 and the related reply, can the Commission provide the data requested in that question and not given, namely the volume and value of European production, imports and exports of raw hides for the main animal categories (large and small cattle, sheep and goats) from 2007 onwards?

From the data in its possession, the Commission has established that there do not appear to be any signs of a serious shortage of raw materials for the leather industry. However, numerous operators in the sector say that the decline in the supply of raw materials becomes evident if we consider the data from 2007 onwards. It would therefore be useful to examine these statistics.

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(26 August 2013)

The Commission has examined the data available since 2007, which is provided in Annex, sent directly to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

Two significant drops in availability of raw hides and skins occurred in 2008 and 2009 (12% and 28% respectively) due to a considerable increase in exports. In 2010 the availability increased sharply (12%) to then slightly decreased again in 2011 and 2012.

The Commission's analysis is that the situation on the EU market is a consequence of the combined effects of a strong demand in other countries (mainly in Asia) and a slowing down of internal demand due to the economic downturn, there is no indication of a critical shortage of essential products which would justify the adoption of measures under Council Regulation (EC) No 1061/2009 ([1]). The Commission will continue to monitor the situation of the availability of these raw materials on the EU market as the overall economic trends that have most impacted the sector in 2008 and 2009 seem to be slowly reversing. More importantly, the Commission will continue to set as a priority in Free Trade Agreements and World Trade Organisation accession negotiations, the full elimination of export duties on raw hides and skins originating from third countries.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1061/2009 of 19 October 2009 establishing common rules for exports, OJ L 291, 7.11.2009.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007174/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) e Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Despedimentos de funcionários públicos financiado pela UE

O governo português, tendo em conta medidas acordadas com a UE e o FMI, quer concretizar um gigantesco despedimento de funcionários públicos, que (de acordo com notícias dos últimos dias) poderá atingir dezenas de milhares de trabalhadores, aumentando assim os níveis históricos de desemprego no país e a profunda debilitação das funções sociais do Estado, que vêm arrastando Portugal para uma profunda regressão civilizacional.

Notícias recentes na imprensa portuguesa dão conta da intenção do governo de usar fundos da União Europeia para financiar esses despedimentos. A confirmarem-se estes dados, a UE estaria não apenas programaticamente associada ao caminho de destruição imposto a Portugal e aos portugueses, mas assumir-se-ia, de uma forma ainda mais clara, como uma financiadora direta — com recurso a fundos públicos — desse programa de destruição.

Solicitamos à Comissão que nos informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Recebeu, até à data, algum pedido ou alguma manifestação de intenção, por parte do governo português, para usar fundos da UE para financiar o despedimento de trabalhadores do setor público?

2. É possível, neste caso, que direta ou indiretamente o orçamento da UE sirva para financiar estes despedimentos? Em caso afirmativo, de que programas e medidas resultariam as verbas em questão?

3. Qual a posição da Comissão relativamente a este assunto?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(29 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão tem conhecimento de que o Governo português tenciona reduzir o número de trabalhadores do setor público. Também está ciente do projeto de lei relativo ao sistema de requalificação e que, neste contexto, as autoridades pretendem utilizar o Fundo Social Europeu para financiar a reorientação, a reciclagem e a requalificação profissionais dos trabalhadores.

A Comissão ainda não recebeu qualquer informação pormenorizada sobre a aplicação desta medida por parte das autoridades do FSE em Portugal, não sendo claro, nesta fase, de que forma a medida será implementada em pormenor.

Em qualquer caso, o êxito do financiamento do FSE tem de ser comparado com as taxas de emprego das pessoas que tiverem participado nos cursos de requalificação, e não em relação ao número de pessoas que abandonam o serviço público.

A Comissão tem fortes preocupações sobre o potencial impacto negativo que a recessão económica e o aumento do desemprego podem ter sobre o risco de pobreza e de exclusão social em Portugal, e espera que estas ações de formação possam, em qualquer caso, facilitar a reinserção dos desempregados no mercado de trabalho.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007174/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL) and Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Public-sector worker dismissals funded by the EU

In response to the measures agreed with the EU and IMF, the Portuguese Government is planning to dismiss a vast number of public-sector workers, and according to recent reports this could affect as many as tens of thousands of employees. This will increase the already historic levels of unemployment in the country and further undermine the State's social functions, something that is already causing Portuguese civilisation to regress.

Recent reports in the Portuguese press suggest the Government intends to use EU funds to finance these dismissals. If this information is correct, the EU will not only be strategically associated with the path of destruction imposed on Portugal and the Portuguese, but it will also clearly be directly responsible for this programme of destruction using public funds.

1. Has the Commission to date received any request or statement of intent from the Portuguese Government regarding the use of EU funds to finance the dismissal of public-sector workers?

2. In this case, is it able to use the EU budget directly or indirectly to finance these dismissals? If so, from which programmes and measures are these funds drawn?

3. What is the Commission's position in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

The Commission is aware of the Portuguese government's plans to reduce the number of public sector employees. It is also aware of the planned law for the requalification system and that, in this context, the authorities want to use the European Social Fund to finance the professional reorientation, retraining and requalification of people.

The Commission has not yet received any detailed information about the application of this measure from the ESF authorities in Portugal and it is unclear, at this stage, how they will implement it in detail.

In any case, the success of the ESF funding would have to be measured against the rates of employment of the people having participated in the re-qualification courses and not in relation to the numbers of people leaving the public service.

The Commission has strong concerns about the potential negative impact that the economic downturn and rising unemployment can have on the risk of poverty and social exclusion in Portugal and expects that these training actions could in any event facilitate the reinsertion of unemployed in the labour market.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007175/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Medidas propostas pela Comissão no âmbito do pacote SES 2+ (Céu Único Europeu)

As medidas propostas pela Comissão no âmbito do pacote SES 2+ (Single European Sky — Céu Único Europeu) têm sido alvo de um amplo movimento de rejeição por parte dos trabalhadores da área ATM (Air Traffic Management) de vários países. Os trabalhadores consideram que estas medidas representam uma ameaça à sobrevivência dos ANSP (Air Navigation Service Providers), de que é exemplo, em Portugal, a NAV. Com efeito, a opção de liberalização, desregulação e redução de custos, plasmada neste pacote — uma opção, não por acaso, defendida e patrocinada pelo lóbi das companhias aéreas, em especial as multinacionais do setor — é elevada a um inaudito patamar com o SES 2+. A proposta de que os chamados serviços de suporte — todas as atividades relacionadas com a área da Informação Aeronáutica (AIM), com a área de desenvolvimento e manutenção de sistemas e infraestruturas técnicas (CNS) e com a área de formação dos profissionais do setor — sejam separados daquilo que a Comissão apelida de atividade «core» dos ANSP (Air Navigation Service Providers), ou seja, o serviço ATC. Fica, assim, aberto o caminho para a redução da atividade e estrutura dos prestadores a este último serviço, criando-se as condições para a externalização e mercantilização de todos os outros. Tudo isto desvalorizando a importância da presença de todos os intervenientes na cadeia de segurança numa estrutura única e integrada.

Assim, estamos perante um cenário de desmantelamento, a prazo, dos ANSP ou, pelo menos, de alguns deles, o que vem motivando as ações de luta já concretizadas por parte dos trabalhadores do setor e outras que se encontram em preparação.

Em face desta ampla rejeição das propostas em apreço, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Está disponível para rever ou mesmo retirar as propostas apresentadas no âmbito do SES 2+?

2. Que medidas pensa tomar em face da contestação generalizada dos trabalhadores do setor?

3. Está disponível para assegurar o envolvimento pleno das organizações representativas dos trabalhadores dos diferentes países na discussão deste assunto (o que, segundo algumas delas, não tem acontecido)?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(29 de julho de 2013)

1. A Comissão considera que a proposta é uma iniciativa equilibrada, que dá tempo suficiente para que o setor se adapte e melhore o desempenho dos serviços de navegação aérea de um modo que evite a imposição de soluções únicas para a obtenção dessas melhorias. Por conseguinte, não considera necessário alterar a proposta nesta fase. O sistema da UE é cerca de 70 % menos eficiente do que os sistemas estrangeiros comparáveis, devido principalmente a questões organizacionais, e é nossa responsabilidade garantir que as companhias aéreas europeias beneficiem de uma infraestrutura de gestão do tráfego aéreo competitiva. As estruturas integradas nacionais constituem um obstáculo a uma prestação mais coesa e eficiente de serviços de navegação aérea a nível europeu. Dificultam a evolução tecnológica e conduzem à fragmentação e à falta de interoperabilidade do sistema europeu.

2. A Comissão irá continuar a explicar os detalhes concretos da sua proposta a fim de dissipar quaisquer equívocos e preocupações infundadas que a mesma possa suscitar.

3. As organizações que representam os trabalhadores já foram convidadas para duas conferências de alto nível, três consultas públicas e diversas reuniões bilaterais. A Comissão assegurará que as associações representativas do pessoal participem no debate sobre o SES 2+, no contexto do atual quadro de diálogo social.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007175/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Measures proposed by the Commission in the SES 2+ (Single European Sky) package

Measures proposed by the Commission in the SES 2+ package have been widely rejected by Air Traffic Management (ATM) workers in several countries. The workers believe these measures represent a threat to the survival of Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSP), an example of which is Portugal's NAV. The SES 2+ package raises liberalisation, deregulation and cost-cutting to an unprecedented level, and it is no coincidence that it is defended and supported by the aviation industry lobby, in particular the multinationals in the sector. The proposal is to separate the so-called support services — meaning all activities relating to Aeronautical Information Management (AIM), the development and maintenance of Communications, Navigation and Surveillance (CNS) systems and infrastructure, and the training of professionals in the sector — from what the Commission calls the Air Navigation Service Providers' (ANSP) 'core' activities, which are the Air Traffic Control (ATC) service. This opens the way to reducing ANSP activities and structure to include ATC services only, and creates the conditions for all other services to be contracted out and commercialised. This approach devalues the importance of the presence of everyone in the single, integrated structure of the security chain.

We are threatened with the gradual dismantling of at least some of the ANSP, and it is this that is provoking opposition from some of the workers in the sector.

Given the widespread rejection of these proposals, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is it willing to review or to withdraw the proposals presented in SES 2+?

2. What measures will it take in response to the widespread opposition from the workers in the sector?

3. Is it willing to ensure that the organisations representing workers in different countries are fully involved in discussions on the subject (which, according to some , has not happened so far)?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

1. The Commission believes the proposal is a balanced initiative, leaving adequate time to the sector to adapt and improve the performance of air navigation services in a manner that avoids imposing 'one fits all' solutions about how those improvements are reached. Hence it sees no need to amend the proposal at this stage. The EU system is roughly 70% less efficient than comparable foreign systems, due mainly to organisational issues and it is our responsibility to ensure our airlines have the benefit of a competitive air traffic management infrastructure. National integrated structures are a barrier to a more cohesive and efficient provision of air navigation services at European level. They hinder technological developments and result in fragmentation and lack of interoperability of the European system.

2. The Commission will continue to explain the actual details of its proposal to dispel misunderstandings and unfounded concerns surrounding the proposal.

3. The organisations representing workers have already been invited at two high level conferences, three public consultations and various bilateral meetings. The Commission will ensure that staff representative associations are fully involved in the discussion on SES 2+, in the context of the ongoing social dialogue framework.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007176/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Pacote SES 2+ (Céu Único Europeu)

No âmbito do pacote SES 2+ (Single European Sky — Céu Único Europeu), encontra-se em fase de consulta pública o documento produzido pelo «Performance Review Body» (PRB) relativo aos objetivos de desempenho para o segundo período de referência (RP2 2015-2019). O documento evidencia a opção desreguladora em curso, apontando para novas reduções substanciais de custos, depois daquelas que foram já implementadas no RP1 (2012-2014).

Ora, o contínuo esmagamento dos custos terá inevitavelmente consequências negativas na segurança e na estabilidade do sistema. Como o passado se encarrega de demonstrar, a perturbação lançada em sistemas tão sensíveis como o sistema ATM acaba por ter resultados desastrosos e contraditórios relativamente aos pressupostos iniciais.

Em face do exposto, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Qual o montante das reduções de custos alcançadas no RP1 (2012-2014)?

2. De que estudos dispõe, até á data, sobre os efeitos das reduções de custos na segurança e na estabilidade do sistema?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(14 de agosto de 2013)

1. Um dos objetivos do sistema de desempenho do céu único europeu é melhorar a relação custo-eficácia. Para o primeiro período de referência (2012-2014), o objetivo de custo-eficácia fixado à escala da União Europeia consiste numa redução de 3,2 % por ano dos custos unitários médios nos serviços de navegação aérea em rota. Só estão atualmente disponíveis os resultados para 2012, ano em que os prestadores de serviços de navegação aérea reduziram os custos em cerca de 200 milhões de EUR em relação a custos previstos de cerca de 6,3 mil milhões de EUR.

2. O Regulamento de Execução (UE) n.° 390/2013, que estabelece um sistema de desempenho para os serviços de navegação aérea e as funções da rede (o «Regulamento Desempenho») estipula que, na aplicação do sistema, devem ser considerados os objetivos fundamentais de segurança. A intenção é garantir que os possíveis ganhos de eficiência não sejam alcançados em detrimento da segurança. O sistema define igualmente objetivos de melhoria da segurança. Além disso, o artigo 11.°, n.° 3, alínea e), estipula que, ao elaborarem os planos de desempenho, as autoridades supervisoras nacionais devem ter em conta as interdependências entre domínios essenciais de desempenho, incluindo uma avaliação do plano no que respeita ao seu impacto na segurança. Estas medidas asseguram a ausência de compromissos em matéria de segurança.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007176/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Single European Sky SES 2+ package

In the context of the Single European Sky SES 2+ package, public consultation is underway on the document produced by the 'Performance Review Body' (PRB) relating to the performance objective for the second reference period (RP2 2015-2019). The document presents the deregulatory option that is currently underway, and suggests further substantial cost reductions, which follow on from those implemented in RP1 (2012-2014).

However, the continuing reduction of funds will inevitably have negative consequences on the system security and stability. As past experience shows, changes to such sensitive systems as Aeronautical Traffic Management (ATM) can have disastrous consequences, which may be at odds with initial expectations.

1. What cost reductions have been achieved in RP1 (2012-2014)?

2. What studies does it have to date on the effects of cost reductions on system security and stability?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2013)

1. One of the objectives of the single European sky performance scheme is to improve cost-efficiency. For the first reference period 2012-2014, the EU-wide cost-efficiency target is set as a reduction of minus 3.2% per annum in the average unit costs in respect to en route air navigation services. Only the results for 2012 are currently available, during which year air navigation service providers reduced costs by around EUR 200 million compared to forecasted costs of around EUR 6.3 billion.

2. Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 390/2013 laying down a performance scheme for air navigation services and network functions (the 'performance Regulation') requires that for the implementation of the scheme due regard is given to the over-riding safety objectives. This is to ensure that possible efficiency gains are not made to the detriment of safety. The scheme also defines targets for improving safety. Furthermore, Article 11(3)(e) requires that national supervisory authorities in drawing up the performance plans consider interdependencies between key performance areas, which shall include an evaluation of the plan in respect to its impact on safety. These measures ensure that no compromise is made on safety.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007177/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Pacote SES 2+ (Céu Único Europeu)

De acordo com organizações representativas do setor, nas últimas semanas, o Eurocontrol — enquanto órgão de suporte e aconselhamento técnico da Comissão — criou, desenvolveu e aparentemente pretende implementar em tempo recorde um novo conceito: Serviços Centralizados. Na prática, estará já criado um catálogo de dez serviços diferentes — mais uma vez, serviços em áreas de suporte dos «Air Navigation Service Providers» ANSP (AIM e CNS, principalmente) — que o Eurocontrol pretende retirar da alçada dos prestadores nacionais e centralizar algures na Europa. Importa referir que o Eurocontrol, tendo sido a entidade que desenvolveu e apresentou o conceito, logo em seguida se autopropôs para ser o organismo responsável por tais serviços centralizados.

Os ANSP reagiram de imediato, mas a velocidade a que o processo está a correr justifica as chamadas de atenção e as preocupações das organizações representativas dos trabalhadores do setor. Estas organizações consideram que, no limite, a execução plena deste conceito irá acabar por conduzir à eventual perda de postos de trabalho em países periféricos.

Em face do exposto, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Qual o ponto de situação deste processo? Confirma as informações supramencionadas?

2. Qual o grau de envolvimento das organizações representativas dos trabalhadores no processo? Em que medida foram tidos em consideração os contributos e comentários por estas preparados?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(21 de agosto de 2013)

1. As informações contidas na pergunta do Senhor Deputado estão, em larga medida, corretas. O Eurocontrol é uma organização intergovernamental pan-europeia, baseada numa convenção internacional, que age em apoio da Comissão, ao abrigo de um acordo celebrado com a UE. No que se refere à aplicação do conceito de serviços centralizados, o Eurocontrol encontra-se em fase de consulta das partes interessadas do setor e de avaliação das repercussões neste, inclusive nos efetivos.

A Comissão pondera igualmente a possibilidade de integrar o conceito de serviços centralizados na legislação sobre o Céu Único Europeu (SES — *Single European Sky*), o que implicaria uma alteração da proposta de regulamento de co-decisão relativo à implementação do Céu Único Europeu (COM(2013) 410 final) e a subsequente alteração do Regulamento (UE) n.° 677/2011 da Comissão ([1]) (Regulamento de Execução respeitante à Gestão da Rede).

2. As organizações representativas dos trabalhadores foram incluídas no processo de desenvolvimento do SES2+ através de dois seminários de alto nível, uma consulta pública com uma duração de 3 meses e inúmeras reuniões bilaterais. No que respeita ao processo de desenvolvimento dos serviços centralizados pelo Eurocontrol, foram organizados diversos seminários para os quais foram convidados os parceiros sociais, que neles participaram ativamente.

([1]) JO L 185 de 15.7.2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007177/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Single European Sky SES 2+ package

According to recent statements from organisations in the sector, Eurocontrol, the Commission's support and technical advisory body, has created and developed a new concept of 'centralised services' and apparently intends to implement it in record time. In practical terms, this will lead to a set of ten different services — Air Navigation Service Provider (ANSP) support services, principally Aeronautical Information Management (AIM) and Communication, Navigation and Surveillance (CNS) services — that Eurocontrol intends to remove from the context of national providers and centralise in the EU. It is important to highlight that Eurocontrol, the body that developed and presented the concept, goes on to put itself forward as the body to be given responsibility for these centralised services.

The ANSP reacted immediately, yet the speed with which the process is proceeding justifies the warnings and concerns of the organisations representing workers in the sector. These organisations believe that full implementation of the concept will lead to job losses in peripheral countries.

1. What is the state of play with this process? Is the aforementioned information correct?

2. To what extent have the organisations representing workers been involved in the process? How have their contributions and comments been taken into consideration?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

1. The information reported in the question of the Honourable Member is largely correct. Eurocontrol is an inter-governmental pan-European organisation based on an international Convention that acts in support of the Commission under an agreement with the EU. With regard to the implementation of the concept of centralised services, Eurocontrol is now in the process of consulting industry stakeholders and assessing the impact on industry, including on staff levels.

The Commission is also considering the possibility of integrating the concept of centralised services into the legislation governing the Single European Sky (SES), which would imply a modification of the proposal for a regulation of co-decision on the implementation of the Single European Sky (COM(2013)410 final), and subsequent amendment to Commission Regulation (EU) 677/2011 ([1]) (the Network Management Implementing Regulation).

2. The organisations representing workers have been included in the process to develop SES2+ through two high-level workshops, a public consultation lasting 3 months and numerous bilateral meetings. As regards the Eurocontrol process for development of the centralised services, a series of workshops has been organised, to which the social partners have been invited and participated actively.

([1]) OJ L 185, 15.7.2011.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007178/13
ao Conselho
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Baixo preço do vinho ao produtor

Em Portugal, diversas adegas cooperativas e produtores de vinho têm vindo a alertar, com insistência, para o problema do baixo preço do vinho ao produtor. Em muitas regiões e para muitos produtores, a continuidade da produção exige um aumento do preço médio do vinho ao produtor.

A existência de produto importado, de fraca qualidade e a preços muito baixos, muitas vezes prestando falsas informações ou informações enganosas ao consumidor, é um dos fatores apontados que concorre para este problema. Esta concorrência desleal, evidentemente, vê agravados os seus efeitos num contexto de perda generalizada de poder de compra por parte da população portuguesa como o que atualmente se vive.

Em face do exposto, pergunto ao Conselho:

1. Discutiu já esta questão? Em caso afirmativo, quais as conclusões da discussão?

2. Que abordagem foi feita ao setor do vinho no contexto das negociações em curso sobre a futura OCM?

Resposta
(7 de outubro de 2013)

O Regulamento (CE) n.° 479/2008 do Conselho que estabelece a organização comum do mercado vitivinícola ([1]) tem como principal objetivo aumentar a competitividade dos produtores de vinho da UE. Para esse fim, foram acordadas diferentes medidas, nomeadamente: um regime de arranque, o estabelecimento de programas de apoio nacionais, uma nova política de qualidade relativa à denominação de origem protegida, às indicações geográficas e às menções tradicionais protegidas, e novas regras relativas à rotulagem e apresentação e às práticas enológicas.

Em 14 de janeiro de 2013, o Conselho tomou nota do relatório da Comissão sobre a implementação reforma do setor vitivinícola ([2]) que assinala um aumento dos preços entre 2008 e 2012. O Conselho registou também a intenção da Comissão de analisar eventuais melhorias legislativas no que diz respeito às medidas do setor vitivinícola ([3]).

Além disso, estão a realizar-se negociações entre o Parlamento Europeu e o Conselho no âmbito das negociações relativas à reforma da PAC e, em particular, ao Regulamento OCM Única, com o objetivo de chegar a um acordo que reforce os programas de apoio nacionais e introduza um novo regime de autorização para a plantação de vinhas no período 2016-2030.

([1]) Regulamento (CE) n.° 479/2008 do Conselho, de 29 de abril de 2008, que estabelece a organização comum do mercado vitivinícola, que altera os Regulamentos (CE) n.° 1493/1999, (CE) n.° 1782/2003, (CE) n.° 1290/2005 e (CE) n.° 3/2008 e que revoga os Regulamentos (CEE) n.° 2392/86 e (CE) n.° 1493/1999 (JO L 148 de 6.6.08, p. 1).
([2]) Ver o relatório sumário da 1448.ª reunião do CEA que teve lugar em 14 de janeiro de 2013 (5529/13, p. 4).
([3]) Ver o relatório da Comissão sobre a experiência adquirida com a implementação da reforma do setor vitivinícola, de 2008 (17630/12).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007178/13
to the Council
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Low prices paid to wine producers

Several Portuguese cooperative wineries and wine producers have repeatedly warned about low prices being paid to wine producers. The average price paid to producers for wine will have to increase in many regions and for many producers if production is to continue.

One of the factors blamed for this problem is the existence of very cheap poor quality imported products, which often give deceptive or misleading customer information. This unfair competition clearly has an even greater impact in the context of the reduced purchasing power of part of the Portuguese population.

1. Has the Council already discussed this issue? If so, what conclusions have been drawn from the discussion?

2. In what way has the wine sector been included in current negotiations on the future common organisation of agricultural markets (Single CMO Regulation)?

Reply
(7 October 2013)

Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2008 on the common organisation of the market in wine ([1]) primarily aimed to increase the competitiveness of the EU wine producers. To achieve this aim, different measures were agreed on including a grubbing-up scheme, the establishment of national support programmes, a new quality policy concerning protected designation of origin, protected geographical indications and protected traditional terms, new rules on labelling and presentation and for oenological practices.

On 14 January 2013, the Council took note of the Commission's report on the implementation of the wine reform ([2]) which showed that prices had improved between 2008 and 2012. The Council also noted the Commission's intention to examine further possible legislative improvements to the wine sector measures ([3]).

Moreover, negotiations between the European Parliament and the Council are taking place within the framework of those relating to the CAP Reform and specifically to the Single CMO Regulation, with the aim of reaching an agreement which would further strengthen the national support programmes and introduce a new authorisation scheme for vine plantings for the period from 2016 to 2030.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 479/2008 of 29 April 2008 on the common organisation of the market in wine, amending Regulations (EC) No 1493/1999, (EC) No 1782/2003, (EC) No 1290/2005, (EC) No 3/2008 and repealing Regulations (EEC) No 2392/86 and (EC) No 1493/1999 (OJ L 148, 6.6.2008, p. 1).
([2]) See Summary Record of the 1448th meeting of the SCA held on 14 January 2013 (5529/13, p. 4).
([3]) See Commission report on the experience gained with the implementation of the wine reform of 2008 (17630/12).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007179/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Baixo preço do vinho ao produtor

Em Portugal, diversas adegas cooperativas e produtores de vinho têm vindo a alertar, com insistência, para o problema do baixo preço do vinho ao produtor. Em muitas regiões e para muitos produtores, a continuidade da produção exige um aumento do preço médio do vinho ao produtor.

A existência de produto importado, de fraca qualidade e a preços muito baixos, muitas vezes prestando falsas informações ou informações enganosas ao consumidor, é um dos fatores apontados que concorre para este problema. Esta concorrência desleal, evidentemente, vê agravados os seus efeitos num contexto de perda generalizada de poder de compra por parte da população portuguesa como o que atualmente se vive.

Em face do exposto, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que acompanhamento está a ser feito desta situação?

2. Que medidas pensa tomar para a reverter a breve prazo?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(7 de agosto de 2013)

As importações de vinho em Portugal atingiram 1,3 milhões de hectolitros em 2012, o que corresponde a 27 % do total do consumo humano. Em comparação com anos anteriores, os volumes importados estão a baixar em todas as categorias de vinho e os preços unitários revelam uma efetiva tendência para o aumento. O vinho importado provém principalmente de Espanha, verificando-se uma diminuição dos volumes mas níveis de preços superiores em relação aos anos anteriores. Vale a pena referir que os vinhos portugueses são cada vez mais exportados e que as exportações atingiram um nível recorde de 3,4 milhões de hectolitros em 2012.

No período de 2009 a 2013, o setor vitivinícola em Portugal beneficia de um programa de apoio da UE de 274 milhões de euros. O novo período de programação 2014-2018 prevê um aumento do nível de apoio ao setor vitivinícola português (326 milhões de euros). A capacidade de exportação de vinho português melhorou e a competitividade dos exportadores portugueses deverá continuar a aumentar nos próximos anos.

Estes resultados podem ser explicados por uma aplicação bem sucedida do programa no setor vitivinícola.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007179/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Low prices paid to wine producers

Several Portuguese cooperative wineries and wine producers have repeatedly warned about low prices being paid to wine producers. The average price paid to producers for wine will have to increase in many regions and for many producers if production is to continue.

One of the factors blamed for this problem is the existence of very cheap poor quality imported products, which often give deceptive or misleading customer information. This unfair competition clearly has an even greater impact in the context of the reduced purchasing power of part of the Portuguese population.

1. What does the Commission think can be done in this situation?

2. What measures does it intend to take to reverse it as quickly as possible?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

Imports of wine into Portugal reached 1.3 million hectolitres in 2012 which correspond to 27% of the total human consumption. Compared to previous years, imported volumes are decreasing for all categories of wine and unit prices do show an increasing trend. Main imports originate from Spain with decreasing volumes but increasing price levels compared to the previous years. It is worthwhile to mention that Portuguese wines are exported increasingly and exports reached a record level of 3.4 million hectolitres in 2012.

Between 2009 and 2013 the wine sector in Portugal is benefiting from an EU support programme of EUR 274 million. The new 2014-2018 programming period foresees an increased level of support to the Portuguese wine sector (EUR 326 million). The capacity of Portuguese wine exports has improved and the competitiveness of Portuguese exporters should continue to improve during the following years.

These results may be explained by a successful implementation of the programme in the wine sector.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007180/13
ao Conselho
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Reatribuição de uma quota de produção de beterraba a Portugal

Tendo em conta as negociações da futura OCM única atualmente em curso e sabendo que:

— Portugal renunciou à sua quota em 2007 e 2008, com efeitos até final do regime de quotas (decidido em 2006 pelo Conselho para vigorar até 2014/15);

— O quadro anteriormente estabelecido pressupunha que, após 2014/15, Portugal poderia voltar a produzir açúcar de beterraba;

— Face às posições maioritárias verificadas no Parlamento e no Conselho em favor da extensão do regime de quotas para lá de 2015, o quadro anteriormente estabelecido pode ser alterado, caso o regime de quotas seja prolongado para lá de 2014/15;

— A reatribuição de uma quota de produção de beterraba a Portugal faz parte do conjunto de emendas à proposta da Comissão, aprovado pelo Parlamento Europeu, e constante do seu mandato para a negociação em curso;

— A concretização desta reatribuição de quota daria um inequívoco contributo para o aproveitamento das novas áreas de regadio em Portugal e, ainda, para melhorar o valor acrescentado da agricultura portuguesa;

— Os profissionais da fileira do açúcar de beterraba em Portugal têm legítimas expectativas quanto à reatribuição de quota ao país;

— Uma eventual não atribuição de quota, nas atuais circunstâncias, seria altamente discriminatória para Portugal.

Solicito ao Conselho que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Qual o ponto de situação da discussão sobre a possível reatribuição de uma quota de produção de beterraba a Portugal (não inferior a 100 000 toneladas)?

2. Que países se opõem e que países defendem esta possibilidade?

3. Quando é expectável uma decisão do Conselho sobre este assunto?

Resposta
(16 de setembro de 2013)

Em 26 de junho de 2013, foi alcançado um acordo político entre o Parlamento Europeu e o Conselho sobre o projeto de Regulamento OCM Única, incluindo o acordo para adiar o fim do regime de quotas do açúcar por um ano, para o final da campanha de comercialização do açúcar de 2016/2017, e não prever a possibilidade de reatribuição de quotas.

O Parlamento Europeu e o Conselho estão agora a trabalhar na ultimação do acordo, a fim de aprovar o pacote de reforma da PAC na primeira oportunidade.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007180/13
to the Council
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Reallocating a beet production quota to Portugal

Given that negotiations for the future single common market organisation (CMO) are currently underway and knowing that:

— Portugal surrendered its beet quota in 2007 and 2008, with effects lasting until the end of the quota regime (which the Council decided in 2006 would be in force until 2014/15);

— The previously established framework presupposes that Portugal could return to produce beet sugar after 2014/15;

— The majority positions in Parliament and the Council in favour of extending the quota regime beyond 2015 mean that the previously established framework can be amended if the quota regime is extended beyond 2014/15;

— Reallocating a beet production quota to Portugal forms part of the amendments proposed by the Commission, approved by the Parliament, and included in its mandate for the negotiations currently taking place;

— Reallocating this quota would undeniably contribute to the productive use of new irrigated areas in Portugal and improve the added value of Portuguese agriculture;

— The professionals involved in the Portuguese beet-sugar chain have legitimate expectations regarding quotas being reallocated to the country;

— Failing to allocate the quota to Portugal in the current circumstances would be highly discriminatory.

1. What is the current state of play in discussions about the possible reallocation of a beet production quota to Portugal (of no less than 100 000 tonnes)?

2. Which countries oppose and which countries support this?

3. When can a decision from the Council be expected on this matter?

Reply
(16 September 2013)

On 26 June 2013, a political agreement was reached between the European Parliament and the Council on the draft Single CMO Regulation, including agreement to postpone the end of the sugar quota regime by one year to the end of the 2016/2017 marketing year for sugar and not to provide for the possibility of quota reallocation.

The European Parliament and the Council are now working to finalise the agreement in order to adopt the CAP reform package at the earliest opportunity.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007181/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Reatribuição de uma quota de produção de beterraba a Portugal

Tendo em conta as negociações da futura OCM única atualmente em curso e sabendo que:

— Portugal renunciou à sua quota em 2007 e 2008, com efeitos até final do regime de quotas (decidido em 2006 pelo Conselho para vigorar até 2014/15);

— O quadro anteriormente estabelecido pressupunha que, após 2014/15, Portugal poderia voltar a produzir açúcar de beterraba;

— Face às posições maioritárias verificadas no Parlamento e no Conselho em favor da extensão do regime de quotas para lá de 2015, o quadro anteriormente estabelecido pode ser alterado, caso o regime de quotas seja prolongado para lá de 2014/15;

— A reatribuição de uma quota de produção de beterraba a Portugal faz parte do conjunto de emendas à proposta da Comissão, aprovado pelo Parlamento Europeu, e constante do seu mandato para a negociação em curso;

— A concretização desta reatribuição de quota daria um inequívoco contributo para o aproveitamento das novas áreas de regadio em Portugal e, ainda, para melhorar o valor acrescentado da agricultura portuguesa;

— Os profissionais da fileira do açúcar de beterraba em Portugal têm legítimas expectativas quanto à reatribuição de quota ao país;

— Uma eventual não atribuição de quota, nas atuais circunstâncias, seria altamente discriminatória para Portugal.

Solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

— Está disponível para apoiar a proposta de reatribuição de uma quota de produção de beterraba a Portugal (não inferior a 100 000 toneladas)?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(18 de julho de 2013)

Em 26 de junho, representantes do Conselho, do Parlamento Europeu e da Comissão chegaram a um acordo político sobre a nova política agrícola comum até 2020.

Um dos aspetos debatidos no quadro das conversações sobre o acordo foi, precisamente, o futuro da política açucareira. Tendo em conta o interesse de todas as partes interessadas, e ao contrário do que previra a proposta da Comissão, foi decidido prorrogar a quota até 30 de setembro de 2017.

Com efeito, após a respetiva apreciação, uma emenda introduzida pelo Parlamento Europeu no sentido de reatribuir uma quota de produção de beterraba a Portugal não foi aceite no acordo final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007181/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Reallocating a beet production quota to Portugal

Given that negotiations for the future single common market organisation (CMO) are currently underway and knowing that:

— Portugal surrendered its beet quota in 2007 and 2008, with effects lasting until the end of the quota regime (which the Council decided in 2006 would be in force until 2014/15);

— The previously established framework presupposes that Portugal could return to produce beet sugar after 2014/15;

— The majority positions in Parliament and the Council in favour of extending the quota regime beyond 2015 mean that the previously established framework can be amended if the quota regime is extended beyond 2014/15;

— Reallocating a beet production quota to Portugal forms part of the amendments proposed by the Commission, approved by the Parliament, and included in its mandate for the negotiations currently taking place;

— Reallocating this quota would undeniably contribute to the productive use of new irrigated areas in Portugal and improve the added value of Portuguese agriculture;

— The professionals involved in the Portuguese beet-sugar chain have legitimate expectations regarding quotas being reallocated to the country;

— Failing to allocate the quota to Portugal in the current circumstances would be highly discriminatory.

— Is the Commission willing to support the proposed reallocation of a beet production quota to Portugal (of no less than 100 000 tonnes)?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

On 26 June representatives of the Council, the European Parliament and the Commission reached a political agreement on a new Common Agricultural Policy until 2020.

One element in the discussions was the future sugar policy. Taking the interest of all stakeholders into account it was agreed to prolong the quota until 30 September 2017 which was not foreseen in the Commission's proposal.

After due consideration an amendment introduced by the European Parliament to re-allocate quotas to Portugal was not retained in the final agreement.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007182/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Ausência de verbas para modernização e capacitação de empresas no sector agrícola

Em Portugal, as candidaturas apresentadas por algumas adegas cooperativas e cooperativas agrícolas à ação «modernização e capacitação de empresas» do Proder (programa de desenvolvimento rural português) têm recebido como resposta por parte das autoridades, nalguns casos por mais do que uma vez, que «não há verba disponível».

Assim, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Tem conhecimento desta situação?

2. Discutiu esta questão no âmbito da reprogramação das verbas dos fundos comunitários destinados ao setor agrícola feita com o governo português?

3. Para quando é expectável que estas entidades possam beneficiar do apoio à referida ação?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(25 de julho de 2013)

1. A Comissão informa que, no âmbito das medidas queo Senhor Deputado refere, ou seja, da medida 111 — Formação profissional, e da medida 121 — Modernização das explorações agrícolas, a situação atual no que respeita ao programa de desenvolvimento rural em Portugal continental é a seguinte:

M. 111 — Contribuição do Feader: 22 468 250 EUR. Execução do Feader: 7 310 641 EUR (32,54 %);

M. 121 — Contribuição do Feader: 387 634 494 EUR. Execução do Feader: 220 649 575 EUR (56,92 %).

Isso não invalida que a taxa de afetação de algumas medidas possa exceder os montantes disponíveis do Feader, criando situações de sobrerreserva *(overbooking)*; no entanto, esta informação deverá ser confirmada pela autoridade de gestão.

2.-3. No âmbito da gestão partilhada dos programas de desenvolvimento rural, os Estados-Membros são responsáveis pela seleção, adjudicação e pagamento dos projetos, bem como pela sua reprogramação. Até à data, não foi apresentada à Comissão qualquer reprogramação relacionada com as medidas acima referidas. No que se refere à última questão, toda a informação relativa à seleção dos projetos deverá ser solicitada à autoridade de gestão do Proder, no seguinte endereço:

Maria Gabriela Ventura, Gestora do Proder
Rua Padre António Vieira, 1 — 8° andar
1099-073 Lisboa
Linha verde: 800 500 064
Telefone: 00 351 21 381 9318/19/20
Email : st.proder@gpp.pt
Sítio Internet: http://www.proder.pt

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007182/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Lack of funds for modernising and training companies in the agricultural sector

Several cooperative wineries and farming cooperatives in Portugal have applied for 'company modernisation and training' from the Portuguese Rural Development Programme (Proder) but have received the response, sometimes more than once, that there are 'no funds available'.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Has it discussed this issue with the Portuguese Government in the context of reprogramming community funds directed towards agriculture?

3. When is it anticipated that these companies may receive support for these activities?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

1. The Commission informs that according to the measures mentioned, 111 — Vocational training and 121 — Modernisation of farm holdings, the current situation in the Mainland rural development program is as follows:

M. 111 — EARDF contribution: EUR 22.468.250 EARDF execution: EUR 7.310.641 (32.54%);

M. 121 — EARDF contribution: EUR 387.634.494 EARDF execution: EUR 220.649575 (56.92%).

This does not invalidate that the compromise rate for some measures may exceed the available EARDF amounts, creating overbooking situations; however this information is to be confirmed by the Managing Authority.

2 and 3. In the framework of the shared management of rural development programmes, Member States are responsible for the selection, contracting and payments of projects, as well as for reprogramming. So far, no reprogramming related the above measures have been submitted to the Commission. As for the last question, any further information related to the selection of projects, should be requested to the Proder Managing Authority at the following address:

Maria Gabriela Ventura, Gestora do Proder
Rua Padre António Vieira, 1 — 8° andar
1099-073 LISBOA
Green line: 800 500 064
Tel.: 00 351 21 381 9318/19/20
Email : st.proder@gpp.pt
Website: http://www.proder.pt

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007183/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Comparação de preços praticados pelas grandes cadeias europeias de distribuição nos diferentes países da UE

O nível de preços ao consumidor em Portugal situa-se num patamar inusitadamente elevado.

Os portugueses não apenas têm dos salários mais baixos da UE e dos impostos mais elevados — para o que muito vem contribuindo o programa de intervenção UE-FMI — como são ainda obrigados pelas práticas da grande distribuição a pagar as suas compras a preços totalmente abusivos.

Num estudo recente realizado por um cidadão português, foi efetuada uma comparação entre os preços praticados por uma cadeia multinacional de distribuição alemã, em Portugal e na Bélgica. O estudo, para um cabaz de produtos iguais disponíveis nos dois países, revelou que os preços em Portugal eram, em média, 55,5 % mais caros.

Tendo em conta que os custos variáveis da distribuição são constituídos essencialmente pela mão-de-obra e pelos custos imobiliários, dois tipos de despesa claramente menos onerosos em Portugal, este tipo de prática abusiva só poderá ser explicado pelo poder dos interesses monopolistas instalados.

Em face do exposto, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Efetua alguma comparação sistemática entre os preços praticados pelas grandes cadeias europeias de distribuição nos diferentes países da UE? Em caso afirmativo, que conclusões retira da mesma? Em caso negativo, por que não o faz?

2. Que apreciação faz deste caso, em termos de concorrência?

Resposta dada por Joaquín Almunia em nome da Comissão
(9 de agosto de 2013)

As diferenças de preços entre os Estados-Membros, por si só, não indicam a ausência de concorrência entre os Estados-Membros ou no interior de um Estado-Membro. Se as empresas vendem produtos semelhantes a preços diferentes em diferentes Estados-Membros e, em simultâneo, prejudicam as exportações entre países, podem, nesse caso, estar a infringir as regras da concorrência. A Comissão investigará essas práticas, se forem apresentadas com outros elementos de prova além das meras diferenças de preços.

No que respeita aos produtos alimentares, a Comissão está consciente de que algumas empresas vendem produtos semelhantes a preços diferentes em diferentes Estados-Membros. As diferenças de preço dos alimentos vendidos no mesmo país e em países diferentes são causadas por vários fatores, como as preferências dos consumidores, o rendimento, a legislação laboral e comercial, e os custos de transporte, entre outros. Entre os vários estudos que quantificam a importância relativa destes fatores, o mais recente é do Banco Central Europeu ([1]). O BCE está ainda a investigar a presença e a magnitude das diferenças de preços na área do euro, bem como os denominados efeitos de fronteira. Além desse, está a decorrer um outro estudo da Comissão sobre os efeitos da concorrência no setor retalhista alimentar da UE ([2]).

A Comissão está a examinar igualmente a dispersão dos preços de bens e serviços de consumo em toda a UE, no âmbito do painel de avaliação dos mercados de consumo ([3]). A análise incide sobre preços relativos a uma vasta gama de mercados, incluindo a rápida evolução de bens a retalho e bens semiduradouros, e compara o nível de dispersão dos preços em toda a UE com a correlação entre os níveis de preços e um indicador de rendimento *per capita* (ambos por país) ([4]).

([1]) «Structural features of distributive trades and their impact on prices in the Euro area», European Central Bank. Occasional Paper Series. No 128 / September 2011.
http://www.ecb.int/pub/pdf/scpops/ecbocp128.pdf

([2]) Cf. COMP/2012/015 estudo sobre «The economic impact of modern retail on choice and innovation in the EU food sector», JO/S S244 de 19/12/2012.

([3]) Última edição publicada em dezembro de 2012, em
http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/consumer_research/editions/cms8_en.htm

([4]) A justificação subjacente é a hipótese de que, em mercados onde existe uma dispersão superior à média da dispersão dos preços em toda a União Europeia associada a uma correlação negativa ou nula entre os preços e o rendimento per capita, os consumidores dos países menos ricos são suscetíveis de pagar mais pelos mesmos produtos do que os dos países mais ricos. No entanto, de acordo com os dados disponíveis, estas situações problemáticas não são observadas numa vasta escala, uma vez que na maior parte dos mercados analisados as diferenças de preços entre países tendem a ser influenciadas pelas diferenças entre os rendimentos relativos (consumo) per capita.

Duas comunicações da Comissão, sobre um melhor funcionamento da cadeia de abastecimento alimentar ([5]) e sobre o comércio eletrónico ([6]), propõem medidas destinadas a aumentar a transparência do mercado para os consumidores, incluindo a ferramenta europeia de monitorização dos preços dos alimentos ([7]).

([5]) Comunicação da Comissão — «Melhor funcionamento da cadeia de abastecimento alimentar na Europa», de outubro de 2009.

([6]) Comunicação da Comissão — «Um enquadramento coerente para reforçar a confiança no mercado único digital do comércio eletrónico e dos serviços em linha», de janeiro de 2012.

([7]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/hicp/methodology/prices_data_for_market_monitoring

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007183/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Comparison of prices charged by major European retail chains in different EU countries

Consumer prices in Portugal have never been so high.

The Portuguese not only receive the lowest wages in the EU and pay the highest taxes — much of which go towards contributing to the EU-IMF intervention programme — they are also forced by the practices of major retailers to pay absurd prices for their purchases.

A recent study by a Portuguese national compared prices charged by a German multinational retail chain in Portugal and Belgium. The study, which looked at a basket of goods, identical in both countries, revealed that prices in Portugal were on average 55.5% more expensive.

Considering that variable distribution costs are essentially made up of labour and rent, both of which are clearly cheaper in Portugal, this type of abusive practice can only be explained by the power of the monopoly interests involved.

1. Has the Commission carried out any systematic comparison of prices charged by the major European retail chains in different EU countries? If so, what conclusions can be drawn from this? If not, why has it not done so?

2. What is its assessment of this situation from the perspective of competition?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

Price differences between Member States do not in themselves indicate lack of competition between Member States or within a Member State. If companies are selling similar products at different prices across Member States and are at the same time hindering exports between countries, this may infringe competition rules. The Commission would investigate such practices if presented with evidence going beyond mere price differences.

Regarding food items, the Commission is aware that certain companies are selling similar products at different prices across Member States. Price differences in food between and within countries are caused by a number of factors such as consumer preferences, income, labour and product market regulation, transport costs, etc. There are several studies quantifying the relative importance of such factors, the most recent by the European Central Bank ([1]). The ECB is also investigating the presence and magnitude of price differences in the euro area and so-called border effects. In addition, the Commission is doing a study on the working of competition in the EU food retail sector ([2]).

The Commission is also looking at price dispersion of consumer goods and services across the EU in the framework of the Consumer Markets Scoreboard ([3]). The analysis focuses on prices related to a wide range of markets, including fast moving retail goods and semi-durable goods, and compares the level of price dispersion across the EU with the correlation between price levels and a proxy of income per capita (both by country) ([4]).

Two Commission communications, on a better functioning food supply chain ([5]) and on E-commerce ([6]), set out actions aimed at increasing market transparency for consumers, including the European Food Prices Monitoring Tool ([7]).

([1]) 'Structural features of distributive trades and their impact on prices in the Euro area', European Central Bank. Occasional Paper Series. No 128 / September 2011. http://www.ecb.int/pub/pdf/scpops/ecbocp128.pdf
([2]) Cf. COMP/2012/015 study on 'The economic impact of modern retail on choice and innovation in the EU food sector', OJ/S S244 of 19/12/2012.
([3]) Latest edition published in December 2012, available at http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/consumer_research/editions/cms8_en.htm
([4]) The rationale behind is the hypothesis that in markets for which a higher than average dispersion of prices across the EU is coupled with a negative or null correlation between prices and income per capita, consumers of less affluent countries are likely to pay more for the same products than those of more affluent ones. However, according to the available evidence, these problematic situations are not widely observed, as for most of the markets analysed price differences across countries tend to be influenced by differences in relative income (consumption) per capita.
([5]) Commission communication on a better functioning food supply chain in Europe (October 2009).
([6]) Commission communication on a coherent framework for building trust in the Digital Single Market for e-commerce and online services (January 2012).
([7]) http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/hicp/methodology/prices_data_for_market_monitoring.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007184/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Grupos de aconselhamento da Comissão no setor da água

Num documentário exibido numa televisão alemã, o comissário para o Mercado Interno, quando confrontado com a dominante presença de quadros de grupos multinacionais com ligação ao negócio da água nos grupos de peritos que aconselham a Comissão na área das políticas da água, admitiu o desequilíbrio na composição desses grupos.

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que grupos apoiam a Comissão na elaboração de propostas legislativas com impacto no setor da água, em especial no abastecimento? Qual a sua composição?

2. Como justifica o «desequilíbrio» na composição desses grupos referido pelo Comissário?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(1 de agosto de 2013)

Para a aplicação da diretiva-quadro da água, a Comissão é apoiada por um grupo de peritos no domínio das inundações e da coordenação estratégica (EGSC). Este grupo participa na estratégia comum de aplicação da Diretiva-Quadro da Água ([1]). Participam na estrutura da estratégia comum de aplicação representantes dos Estados-Membros, da Agência Europeia do Ambiente e dos grupos de partes interessadas. As partes interessadas são geralmente organizações centrais europeias que representam os pontos de vista de diferentes setores com interesses na política da água. Existem também instituições de investigação, bem como organizações internacionais, tais como comissões fluviais internacionais. No seguinte endereço pode ser consultada uma panorâmica das partes interessadas:
http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetail&groupID=371

O documentário referia-se à composição do Grupo Diretor da Parceria Europeia de Inovação (PEI) no domínio da água. Este Grupo Diretor não assessora a Comissão Europeia no domínio da política da água, mas tal como outras PEI está especificamente encarregado de identificar estrangulamentos na inovação e procurar resolvê-los através de ações e instrumentos existentes, por exemplo através de ações-piloto e de ações de demonstração. Em conformidade com estes objetivos, o Grupo Diretor tem uma composição equilibrada de todos os grupos de partes interessadas pertinentes, representando uma variedade de perspetivas do setor público, do setor privado, das ONG e das autoridades nacionais, regionais e locais. A lista do Grupo Diretor no domínio da PEI água pode ser consultada no seguinte endereço:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/innovationpartnership/pdf/steering_group.pdf

([1]) Diretiva 2000/60/CE, JO L 327 de 22.12.2000.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007184/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Water sector advisory groups to the Commission

In a documentary shown on German television, the Commissioner for the internal market and Services admitted that there is an imbalance in the composition of the expert groups that advise the Commission on water policy since they are dominated by members of multinational groups with ties to the water industry.

1. Which groups help the Commission to draw up legislative proposals that affect the water sector and particularly water supply? Who are the members of these groups?

2. How does the Commission justify the 'imbalance' in these groups?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

In implementing the water framework directive, the Commission is supported by an expert group on floods and strategic coordination (EGSC). This group participates in the Common Implementation Strategy of the Water Framework Directive ([1]). Member States' representatives, the European Environment Agency and stakeholder groups participate in the CIS structure. Stakeholders are generally European umbrella organisations representing the views of different sectors which have an interest in water policy. There are also research institutions as well as international organisations such as International River Commissions. An overview of involved stakeholders can be found here:
http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regexpert/index.cfm?do=groupDetail.groupDetail&groupID=371

The documentary referred to the composition of the Steering Group of the European Innovation Partnership (EIP) on Water. This Steering Group is not advising the European Commission on water policy, but as with other EIPs is specifically tasked with identifying innovation bottlenecks and building on existing actions and instruments to address them for example through demonstration and pilot actions. In line with these objectives the Steering Group has a balanced composition of all relevant stakeholder groups, representing a variety of perspectives from the public sector, private sector, NGO's and national, regional and local governments. The list of the Steering Group of the EIP Water can be found here:
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/innovationpartnership/pdf/steering_group.pdf

([1]) Directive 2000/60/EC, OJ L 327, 22.12.2000.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007185/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Atual situação das negociações do Acordo de Pescas UE-Marrocos

Solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre a atual situação das negociações entre a União Europeia e Marrocos, tendo em vista a celebração de um Acordo de Pescas.

Como têm evoluído as negociações? Foi alcançado algum acordo?

Quando é expectável que tal venha a suceder?

Qual o conteúdo geral deste acordo?

Tendo em conta que o anterior acordo, à luz do direito internacional, estava ferido de ilegalidade, ao incluir as águas do Sara Ocidental — o que aliás foi uma das razões que motivou a sua rejeição por parte do Parlamento Europeu, — perspetiva-se nas negociações em curso a exclusão das águas do Sara Ocidental de um eventual futuro acordo de pescas entre a UE e Marrocos?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão
(17 de setembro de 2013)

Após seis rondas de negociações, o novo protocolo de pesca com Marrocos foi rubricado em 24 de julho de 2013.

O protocolo, que vai vigorar durante quatro anos, é coerente com a reforma da vertente externa da política comum das pescas da UE, na medida em que dá grande destaque aos pareceres científicos, à rentabilidade económica, à boa governação e ao respeito do direito internacional. A sustentabilidade é assegurada restringindo a atividade aos recursos excedentários em todas as pescarias.

O custo total do novo protocolo para a UE será de 30 milhões de EUR por ano, dos quais 16 milhões de EUR servem para compensar Marrocos pelo acesso aos recursos e os restantes 14 milhões de EUR são afetados ao apoio ao setor das pescas no país. A contribuição dos armadores é estimada em 10 milhões de EUR.

As águas do Sara Ocidental estão incluídas no novo protocolo, que contém disposições que asseguram que o direito internacional é plenamente respeitado e defendidos os interesses de todas as populações em causa. Em especial, Marrocos deve apresentar relatórios periódicos sobre o impacto económico e social do apoio setorial previsto pelo protocolo, nomeadamente sobre a sua distribuição geográfica.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007185/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Current state of negotiations on the EU-Morocco Fisheries Agreement

What is the current state of negotiations on the EU-Morocco Fisheries Agreement?

How have negotiations developed? Has any agreement been reached?

When is an agreement likely to be reached?

What is the overall content of this agreement?

Given that the earlier agreement breached international law by including the waters of the Western Sahara, which was one of the reasons why it was rejected by Parliament, are these waters likely to be excluded from any future fisheries agreement between the EU and Morocco?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(17 September 2013)

After six rounds of negotiations, the new fisheries protocol with Morocco has been initialled on 24 July 2013.

The 4-year Protocol is consistent with the reform of the external dimension of the EU Common Fisheries Policy in that it places a strong emphasis on scientific advice, economic profitability, good governance and respect of international law. Sustainability is ensured by restricting activity to the surplus resources in all fisheries.

The total cost of the new Protocol to the EU will be EUR 30 million a year, of which EUR 16 million compensates Morocco for access to the resource, the remaining EUR 14 million being assigned to the support of the fisheries sector in the country. The ship owners' contribution is estimated at EUR 10 million.

The Western Sahara waters are included in the new Protocol, which contains provisions ensuring that it fully complies with international law and serves the interests of all the populations concerned. In particular, Morocco should regularly report on the economic and social impact of the sectoral support provided for by the Protocol, including its geographical distribution.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007186/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Abandono e concentração da produção agrícola e défice agroalimentar

Relativamente ao estudo dos efeitos da Política Agrícola Comum nos diferentes países, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Dispõe de informação sobre os fenómenos do abandono e da concentração da produção agrícola, ao longo dos anos, nos diferentes países e regiões?

2. Dispõe de estudos que associem estes fenómenos à evolução do défice agroalimentar de alguns países e ao aumento da sua dívida e da sua dependência externas?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(29 de julho de 2013)

O estudo do Parlamento Europeu «Possible effects on EU land markets of new CAP direct payments» (efeitos possíveis dos novos pagamentos diretos da PAC nos mercados fundiários da UE) conclui que, com uma variação entre regiões e explorações, há uma capitalização significativa dos pagamentos diretos (regime de pagamento único por superfície e regime de pagamento único) na UE que deverá servir de incentivo para a continuação da atividade agrícola. As estatísticas disponíveis mostram que a superfície agrícola utilizada se manteve mais ou menos constante na Europa, embora o número de agricultores e explorações esteja em diminuição. A superfície agrícola utilizada diminuiu apenas -0,08 % por ano entre 1975 e 2010 para a UE-9 ([1]) e o seu mercado diminuiu em média -0,10 % por ano a nível da UE-27 (2003-2010). Pode observar-se um aumento do número de explorações cujos proprietários são entidades jurídicas (que representam, porém, menos de 2,5 % do número total de explorações) em contraste com o número de explorações que são propriedade de produtores singulares, que continua a apresentar uma tendência decrescente. Existe também um estudo externo sobre as razões para o abandono das terras ([2]).

A Comissão não tem conhecimento de qualquer estudo que ligue o abandono e a concentração das terras ao aumento do défice agroalimentar, da dívida externa e da dependência.

([1]) A UE-9 inclui a Bélgica, a Dinamarca, a Alemanha, a Irlanda, a França, a Itália, o Luxemburgo, os Países Baixos e o Reino Unido, para os quais existem séries de dados completas desde 1975.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/external-studies/2013/farmland-abandonment/fulltext_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007186/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Abandonment and concentration of agricultural production and the agri-food deficit

1. In light of the study to assess the effects of the common agricultural policy in different countries, does the Commission have any information on the abandonment and concentration of agricultural production in these countries and regions over the years?

2. Does it have access to any studies that link these phenomena to the increase in the agri-food deficit in some countries and to the rise in their external debt and dependence?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

The European Parliament Study 'Possible effects of EU land markets of new CAP direct payments' concludes that, with variation among regions and farms, there is significant capitalization of direct payments (both single area payment scheme and single payment scheme) in the EU, which should act as an incentive to continue farming land. Available statistics show that utilized agricultural area has remained more or less constant in Europe, in comparison to a decreasing number of farmers and holdings. Utilized agricultural area has decreased by only -0.08% per year between 1975 and 2010 for the EU-9 ([1]) and is marked by an average decrease of -0.10% per year at EU-27 level (2003-2010). An increase in the number of holdings owned by a legal entity can be observed (still representing less than 2.5% of total number of farms) in contrast to the number of holdings owned by sole holders, which continues its decreasing trend. An external study on the drivers of land abandonment is also available ([2]).

The Commission is not aware of any study that links potential land abandonment and concentration to the increase in agri-food deficit, external debt and dependence.

([1]) EU-9 includes Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the UK for which complete data series since 1975 are available.

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/external-studies/2013/farmland-abandonment/fulltext_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007187/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Aumento do preço dos alimentos, fome e soberania alimentar

A Agência das Nações Unidas para a Alimentação e a Agricultura (FAO) estima que os preços dos alimentos possam vir a aumentar entre 10 % e 40 % durante a próxima década. A pressionar a inflação está o aumento da procura nos países emergentes — fruto da melhoria do poder de compra das camadas populares — sem um acompanhamento concomitante da oferta.

Ao mesmo tempo, o Programa da ONU para o Meio Ambiente advertiu, no final da semana passada, que cerca de um terço dos bens alimentares produzidos no mundo são desperdiçados, facto que «complica a tarefa de reduzir a fome e a desnutrição e satisfazer uma população em rápido crescimento».

A FAO estima que, em todo o planeta, cerca de dois mil milhões de seres humanos sofrem de pelo menos um tipo de carência nutricional e que o custo deste flagelo é de 3,5 biliões de dólares. 26 % dos menores de cinco anos sofre de atraso no crescimento devido a deficiências alimentares.

Em face dos dados apresentados, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que avaliação faz deste diagnóstico e que medidas pretende tomar para contrariar este panorama?

2. Que medidas pode adotar para apoiar sistemas de produção agrícola baseados na soberania alimentar, dando prioridade à produção e ao consumo locais?

3. Que medidas podem ser implementadas para promover o equilíbrio da balança alimentar dos diferentes países? Admite a possibilidade de estabelecer limites às importações?

4. Que medidas específicas de apoio aos pequenos e médios agricultores e à agricultura familiar pensa adotar?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(9 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão controla os dados e análises, especialmente os que incluem os países vulneráveis que dependem da importação de alimentos, e dá prioridade ao apoio aos países mais afetados pela fome e a subnutrição, sendo o maior doador para a segurança alimentar, tendo atribuído 1,6 mil milhões de euros em 2012. A «Facilidade Alimentar», por exemplo, contribuiu para melhorar a produtividade agrícola e o abastecimento alimentar em 49 países, atingindo, com êxito, 59 milhões de beneficiários. As recentes políticas em matéria de resiliência ([1]) e nutrição ([2]) confirmam o compromisso da UE de fixar novas prioridades na programação futura. A Comissão lançou igualmente uma consulta sobre alimentação sustentável, que se centra nas formas de prevenir e reduzir o desperdício de alimentos ([3]). Além disso, a UE é um dos maiores doadores de ajuda alimentar humanitária. Em 2012, foram afetados 515 milhões de euros do orçamento humanitário da UE a atividades de alimentação e nutrição.

A UE apoia os países a definir as suas próprias políticas, a dar prioridade às pequenas explorações agrícolas locais e considera que o equilíbrio adequado entre o apoio à produção local e o comércio pode levar a uma maior segurança alimentar. A promoção da produção interna exige o desenvolvimento de uma série de instrumentos políticos, incluindo o recurso à política comercial em vigor para desenvolver uma cadeia agroalimentar sustentável e eficiente. A disponibilidade de alimentos pode também ser reforçada através da integração regional dos mercados, o que facilita os fluxos comerciais das zonas excedentárias para as deficitárias.

O apoio da UE centra-se nos pequenos agricultores, reconhecendo que a grande maioria das pessoas pobres e famintas continuam a viver em zonas rurais, onde a agricultura constitui a principal atividade económica e as pequenas explorações agrícolas são muito dominantes. Isto não exclui o apoio a explorações agrícolas médias e familiares.

([1]) COM(2012) 586 final.
([2]) COM(2013) 144 final.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/consultations/food_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007187/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Rising food prices, hunger and food sovereignty

The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) estimates that food prices may rise by between 10% and 40% over the next decade. The inflation is being driven by the fact that demand in emerging countries has risen due to the increase in purchasing power of low-income groups, and there has been no corresponding rise in supply.

At the same time, the United Nations Environment Programme warned last week that around a third of the food produced in the world is wasted, a fact that 'complicates the task of reducing hunger and malnutrition and of meeting the needs of a rapidly growing population'.

The FAO estimates that around 2 billion people around the world suffer from at least one type of nutritional deficiency and that the cost of this problem is USD 3.5 billion. 26% of children under the age of five suffer from delayed growth due to malnutrition.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of this situation and what steps does it plan to take to address it?

2. What measures can it adopt to support agricultural production systems based on food sovereignty that prioritise local production and consumption?

3. What measures can be implemented to improve food balance in different countries? Would it consider placing limits on imports?

4. What specific steps does it intend to take to support small, medium-sized and family farms?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The Commission monitors data and analysis, especially involving vulnerable countries that are dependent on food imports. It prioritises support for countries most affected by hunger and under-nutrition and is the largest donor for food security, providing EUR 1.6 billion in 2012. For example, the Food Facility improved agricultural productivity and food supply in 49 countries, successfully reaching 59 million beneficiaries. Recent policies on resilience ([1]) and nutrition ([2]) prove the EU's commitment to address new priorities in future programming. The Commission also launched a consultation on sustainable food, which includes a focus on ways to prevent and reduce food waste ([3]). Moreover, the EU is one of the largest donors of humanitarian food assistance. In 2012, EUR 515 million was allocated to food and nutrition activities from the EU's humanitarian budget.

The EU supports countries in defining their own policies, to prioritise local small-scale farming, and considers that an appropriate balance between support to national production and trade can lead to greater food security. The promotion of domestic production requires the development of a variety of policy instruments including using existing trade policy space as necessary to develop a sustainable and efficient agri-food chain. Food availability can also be enhanced by regional integration of markets, facilitating trade flows from surplus to deficit areas.

EU support focuses on small-scale farmers, recognising that the vast majority of the poor and hungry still live in rural areas where agriculture forms the main economic activity and where small-scale farming is very dominant. This does not exclude support to medium-sized and family farms.

([1]) COM(2012) 586 final.
([2]) COM(2013) 141final.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/consultations/food_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007188/13
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Efeitos na agricultura e no mundo rural da aplicação do programa UE-FMI

Tendo em conta o aprofundamento da crise em Portugal, em virtude da aplicação do programa UE-FMI, e os seus efeitos na agricultura e no mundo rural, como sejam a ruína de muitos pequenos e médios agricultores e da agricultura familiar, pergunto à Comissão Europeia:

— Que avaliação faz dos efeitos da implementação do programa UE-FMI em Portugal, na agricultura e no mundo rural, em especial nos setores supramencionados? Que medidas pensa tomar para contrariar a situação profundamente negativa que se vive?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(6 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão não tem conhecimento de quaisquer estatísticas que revelem que o programa de ajustamento económico tenha provocado a falência de muitas explorações agrícolas pequenas, médias e de tipo familiar.

É de notar que o declínio a longo prazo do emprego no setor agrícola é uma característica comum a todos os Estados-Membros da UE e não especifica de Portugal. Efetivamente, em 2012, o declínio do emprego na agricultura, silvicultura e pesca foi muito inferior aos valores registados em 2010 e 2011 (0,6 % contra 4,5 % e 3,1 % respetivamente) e claramente inferior à média dos últimos 10 anos (1,7 %).

Convém igualmente recordar que o programa de ajustamento económico para Portugal não contém quaisquer medidas respeitantes ao setor agrícola.

Além disso, é de referir que um dos três objetivos da política de desenvolvimento rural no âmbito da política agrícola comum para o próximo período é «alcançar um desenvolvimento territorial equilibrado das economias e comunidades rurais, incluindo a criação e manutenção de emprego». Prevê-se que muitos programas de desenvolvimento rural dos Estados-Membros visem especificamente o emprego dos jovens.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007188/13
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: The effects of the EU-IMF programme on agriculture and rural areas

Given that the crisis in Portugal is worsening under to the EU-IMF programme and that its effects on the country's agriculture and rural areas have led to the collapse of many small, medium-sized and family farms, what is the Commission's view of these effects and what steps will it take to address this dire situation?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

The Commission is not aware of any statistics showing that the Economic Adjustment Programme has led to the collapse of many small, medium-sized and family farms.

It should be noted that the long-term decline in employment in the agricultural sector is a common feature of all EU Member States and not specific to Portugal. As a matter of fact, in 2012 the decline in employment in agriculture, forestry and fishery was much below the values for 2010 and 2011 (0.6% versus 4.5% and 3.1%) and clearly below the 10-year average (1.7%).

It is also recalled that the Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal does not contain any measures related to the agricultural sector.

Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that one of the three objectives of the rural development policy within the common agricultural policy for the next period is 'achieving a balanced territorial development of rural economies and communities including creating and maintaining of employment'. It is expected that many Rural Development Programmes from Member States will target specifically youth employment.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007189/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(19 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Real Colegio de España

El Real Colegio de España, situado en Bolonia, es el único colegio universitario medieval que subsiste en la Europa continental. Fue fundado en 1364 por Don Gil de Albornoz, Arzobispo de Toledo y Cardenal Primado de España.

El colegio, que realiza una extraordinaria labor universitaria desde hace mucho tiempo, ofrece una beca para acoger cada año a los mejores estudiantes españoles en régimen de gratuidad para cursar el doctorado en cualquiera de las facultades de la Universidad de Bolonia. Al final de este periodo colegial, y tras la defensa de su tesis doctoral, los estudiantes obtienen el título de doctor europeo en su disciplina.

Además, el pasado 20 de marzo de 2012, la Comisaria Europea de Educación, Cultura, Multilingüismo y Juventud, Androulla Vassiliou, galardonó a esta ilustre institución con el Premio Unión Europea del Patrimonio Cultural/Premios Europa Nostra en la categoría de conservación.

Para obtener las becas instituidas por el Cardenal Albornoz, es necesario cumplir y acreditar los requisitos derivados de aquella voluntad fundacional: ser varón, español (portugueses incluidos), católico, de conducta irreprensible, menor de treinta años, licenciado en España con muy buenas calificaciones, no padecer enfermedad ni defecto físico incompatible con el ejercicio de las funciones correspondientes y no ser funcionario público.

¿Cree la Comisión que algunos de los criterios para acceder a la citada institución pueden ser contrarios a la Directiva 2000/78/CE?

Respuesta de la Sra. Vassiliou en nombre de la Comisión
(8 de agosto de 2013)

La Comisión observa que los requisitos de elegibilidad fijados por el Real Colegio de España de Bolonia, al permitir solamente las solicitudes presentadas por personas de determinadas convicciones y edad y que no tengan ninguna discapacidad física, imponen una diferencia de trato entre los solicitantes que responde directamente a varios de los motivos contemplados en el artículo 1 de la Directiva 2000/78/CE.

No obstante, debe determinarse en primer lugar si la Directiva es aplicable o no a la situación actual. En caso afirmativo, debe examinarse a continuación si los requisitos de elegibilidad en cuestión entran dentro del ámbito de alguna de las excepciones previstas en la Directiva.

A este respecto, la Comisión considera que, en la medida en que dichos requisitos derivan de los estatutos del Real Colegio de España de Bolonia, y no de disposiciones jurídicas o reglamentarias nacionales, los tribunales nacionales competentes están mejor situados para llevar a cabo un examen de ese tipo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007189/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: The Royal College of Spain

The Royal College of Spain in Bologna is the only surviving medieval university college in continental Europe. It was founded in 1364 by Don Gil de Albornoz, Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain.

The college, which has been doing remarkable academic work for a long time, offers a grant each year to allow the best Spanish students to prepare a doctorate, free of charge, at any faculty of the University of Bologna. At the end of this period, after defending their doctoral theses, the students are awarded the title of European Doctor in their discipline.

Furthermore, on 20 March 2012, Androulla Vassiliou, the Commissioner for Education, Culture, Multilingualism, Sport, Media and Youth awarded this institution the European Union Prize for Cultural Heritage/Europa Nostra Awards in the conservation section.

In order to win the grants set up by Cardinal Albornoz, candidates must fulfil the requirements of the founding mission. In other words, they must be male, Spanish (or Portuguese), Catholic, of irreproachable conduct, under thirty years of age, the holder of a very good degree from Spain, free from any illness or physical defect incompatible with the proper discharge of the relevant duties, and not a civil servant.

Does the Commission not believe that some of the entry criteria for this institution could be in breach of Directive 2000/78/EC?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

The Commission notes that the eligibility requirements set by the Royal College of Spain in Bologna, to the extent that they only allow applications from persons of a certain belief and age and free from any physical disability, impose a difference in treatment between applicants that is directly based on several of the grounds referred to in Article 1 of Directive 2000/78/EC.

However, it must first be determined whether or not the directive is applicable to the present situation. In the affirmative, it must further be examined whether the eligibility requirements in dispute fall within the scope of any of the exceptions or derogations laid down in the directive.

In this respect, the Commission takes the view that, insofar as the said requirements stem from the Statutes of the Royal College of Spain in Bologna, and not from national statutory or regulatory provisions, competent national courts are better placed to undertake such an examination.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007190/13
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(19 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Contaminación en la bahía de Algeciras — nueva pregunta

Son numerosas las ocasiones en que he preguntado a esa Comisión sobre el reiterado incumplimiento de la normativa comunitaria en la costa de Algeciras. Hace nueve meses advertí de la publicación de fotografías que muestran cómo se vierten residuos generados por el aeropuerto que contienen líquidos de limpieza de las pistas y de las basuras recogidas (E-007803/2012). La respuesta de la Comisión fue que se pondría en contacto con el Reino Unido para comprobar las circunstancias denunciadas.

Tras nueve meses, me permito preguntar:

1. ¿En qué estado se encuentran las comunicaciones con el Reino Unido?

2. ¿Tiene previsto la Comisión tomar medidas apropiadas ante las autoridades de Gibraltar y del Reino Unido?

3. ¿Qué medidas inmediatas y eficaces se piensa tomar para solucionar este grave atentado ecológico?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(6 de agosto de 2013)

La Comisión desea informar a Su Señoría de que, a raíz de los contactos preliminares con las autoridades del Reino Unido en relación con la contaminación de la bahía de Algeciras, la Comisión procederá en las próximas semanas a solicitar oficialmente a las autoridades del Reino Unido que expongan las causas relacionadas y las actuaciones correctoras previstas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007190/13
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Pollution in the Bay of Algeciras — new question

On a number of occasions I have asked the Commission about a repeated breach of EU legislation off the coast of Algeciras. Nine months ago, I drew attention to published photographs that showed waste from the airport, including runway cleaning fluids and rubbish, being dumped (E-007803/2012). The Commission replied that it would contact the United Kingdom in order to ascertain the allegations.

1. What is the state of play of the Commission's communications with the United Kingdom?

2. Does the Commission intend to take appropriate measures against the authorities of Gibraltar and the United Kingdom?

3. What immediate, effective action does it intend to take to stop this serious environmental damage?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that following preliminary contacts with the United Kingdom authorities on the matter concerning the pollution in the Bay of Algeciras the Commission will in the coming weeks proceed to formally asking the United Kingdom authorities to explain the related causes and the foreseen remedial actions.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007191/13
alla Commissione
Guido Milana (S&D)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Deroghe al regolamento (CE) n. 1967/2006 del Consiglio

Dall'entrata in vigore del regolamento (CE) n. 1967/2006 del Consiglio, può la Commissione dire ad oggi quante deroghe al regolamento (CE) n. 1967/2006 sono state chieste e da quali paesi?

Risposta di Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione
(24 luglio 2013)

Dall'entrata in vigore del regolamento sulla pesca nel Mediterraneo ([1]), l'UE ha concesso una deroga per quanto concerne la distanza minima dalla costa e la profondità minima per le sciabiche da natante utilizzate per la pesca del rossetto (*Alphia minuta*) in Liguria e in Toscana, acque territoriali dell'Italia ([2]).

A maggio 2013, altre due richieste di deroga riguardanti la distanza minima dalla costa e la profondità minima presentate dalla Spagna sono state esaminate dal comitato per il settore della pesca e dell'acquacoltura, che ha espresso parere favorevole. La prima riguarda le sciabiche da natante utilizzate per la pesca del rossetto nella regione di Murcia, in relazione alle quali dovrebbe essere pubblicato tra breve un regolamento di esecuzione della Commissione. La seconda riguarda le sciabiche da natante utilizzate sia per la pesca del rossetto e del ghiozzo di Ferrer (*Alphia minuta* e *Pseudaphia ferreri)* che per la pesca dello zerro (*Spicara Smaris*) nella regione delle isole Baleari. La Commissione intende adottare una posizione in merito nel corso dell'autunno.

La Slovenia ha presentato altre due richieste di deroga, attualmente all'esame della Commissione.

([1]) Regolamento (UE) n. 1967/2006 del Consiglio.
([2]) Regolamento di esecuzione (UE) n. 988/2011 della Commissione.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007191/13
to the Commission
Guido Milana (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Derogations from Council Regulation (EC) No 1967/2006

Since the entry into force of Council Regulation (EC) No 1967/2006, can the Commission say how many derogations from that regulation have been requested to date, and by which countries?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(24 July 2013)

Since the entry into force of the Mediterranean Regulation ([1]), the EU has granted one derogation as regards the minimum distance from coast and the minimum sea depth for boat seines fishing for transparent goby (*Alphia minuta*) in Liguria and Tuscany, territorial waters of Italy ([2]).

In May 2013, two further requests for derogations from the minimum distance from the coast and the minimum sea depth submitted by Spain were examined by the Committee for Fisheries and Aquaculture which delivered a positive opinion. The first concerns boat seines fishing for transparent goby in the region of Murcia, for which a Commission implementing regulation is likely to be published shortly. The second request concerns boat seines fishing for transparent and Ferrer's gobies (*Alphia minuta and Pseudaphia ferreri*) and Lowbody picarel (Spiraca Smaris) in the region of the Balearic Islands. The Commission intends to adopt a position on this case in the course of autumn.

Two more requests for derogations have been submitted by Slovenia and are under examination by the Commission.

([1]) Council Regulation (EU) No 1967/2006.
([2]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 988/2011.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007193/13
a la Comisión
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(19 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Auditoría de los fondos Miner

Los diferentes Planes del Carbón (1990-1994, 1995-1997, 1998-2005 y 2006-2012) reconocen, como principio general, el carácter integral del plan como un nuevo modelo de desarrollo integral y sostenible en las comarcas mineras. Sin embargo, este principio no se ha cumplido.

El Plan Nacional de Reserva Estratégica del Carbón 2006-2012 recoge específicamente entre estos objetivos la necesidad de estabilizar la actividad del sector en niveles compatibles con su condición de recurso estratégico en el abastecimiento energético y promover la reactivación de las comarcas mineras, todo ello de modo coherente con la normativa europea. Asimismo, el Plan contempla entre sus prioridades el respeto al medio ambiente, el fomento de la I+D+i, la mejora de la calidad de vida en las comarcas mineras y la creación de empleo juvenil en las mismas.

Nada de esto se ha realizado, dejando a las diferentes comarcas, cuyo único medio de vida es la minería, en una situación económica muy delicada. Esto contrasta con las ingentes cantidades de dinero público que supuestamente se han destinado a este fin. Especialmente el Grupo Alonso, con sus matrices Uminsa y Coto Minero Cantábrico, recibieron ingentes subvenciones públicas mientras mantienen condiciones laborales de clara explotación y plantean el despido de numerosos trabajadores, lo que provocará numerosos problemas sociales en las poblaciones dedicadas a la minería.

Ante lo expuesto, se formula las siguientes preguntas:

1. ¿Tiene conocimiento la Comisión del destino final que han tenido los fondos Miner, supuestamente destinados a cumplir los objetivos de los diferentes Planes del Carbón?

2. Ante la falta de información y de evidencia sobre el destino de los citados fondos, ¿no considera la Comisión necesario realizar una auditoría que permita esclarecer si los fondos Miner se han destinado a cumplir los objetivos de los diferentes Planes del Carbón?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(20 de agosto de 2013)

El Plan Nacional de Reserva Estratégica del Carbón 2006-2012 fue evaluado por la Comisión en el marco de dos asuntos (NN 81/2006 y NN 20/2009). De conformidad con las notificaciones, España decidió conceder ayuda para las siguientes actividades en virtud del Reglamento (CE) n° 1407/2002 del Consejo, de 23 de julio de 2002, sobre las ayudas estatales a la industria del carbón: una ayuda a la reducción de la actividad de producción (artículo 4) y una ayuda al acceso a reservas de carbón (artículo 5). La Comisión concluyó que el Plan Nacional era compatible con el mercado interior en virtud del artículo 107 del TFUE. De conformidad con el artículo 9, apartado 11, de dicho Reglamento, España debe notificar a la Comisión el cálculo de la ayuda efectivamente abonada durante el ejercicio carbonero. La Comisión solo verifica en los informes anuales de actividad si los gastos realmente efectuados se utilizaron para reducir la actividad de producción y para el acceso a las reservas (ayudas a la producción), es decir, las dos actividades subvencionadas aprobadas por ambas decisiones.

El capítulo VII del Reglamento (CE) n° 659/1999 del Consejo, de 22 de marzo de 1999, por el que se establecen disposiciones de aplicación del artículo 93 del Tratado CE (el Reglamento de procedimiento), establece los instrumentos de seguimiento de los que dispone la Comisión. La Comisión no tiene competencias para llevar a cabo auditorías complementarias para averiguar si los fondos se utilizaron a efectos de cumplir los objetivos nacionales establecidos en el Plan Nacional, siempre que no surjan dudas fundamentadas sobre la compatibilidad de dicho Plan con la Decisión de la Comisión.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007193/13
to the Commission
Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Mining funds audit

All of Spain's National Plans for Strategic Coal Reserves (1990-1994, 1995-1997, 1998-2005 and 2006-2012) recognise the general concept that each plan can be seen as a comprehensive new model for integrated, sustainable development in mining areas. This concept has not, however, been applied.

The objectives of the National Plan for Strategic Coal Reserves 2006-2012 specifically underline both the need to stabilise activity in the sector at levels which are compatible with its status as a strategic resource in terms of energy supply and the need to support the regeneration of mining areas, while complying with the relevant European legislation. Similarly, the plan's priorities include protecting the environment, promoting R&D&I, improving the quality of life and creating jobs for young people in mining areas.

None of these objectives has been met, leaving these areas, which are fully dependent on mining, to face a very precarious economic situation. This is in stark contrast with the huge sums of public money which were supposedly allocated to improve the situation. The Alonso Group in particular, with its Uminsa and Coto Minero Cantábrico operations, received massive state subsidies while continuing to clearly exploit its workforce and planning large-scale redundancies, thus creating a great number of social problems for mining communities.

1. Does the Commission know what happened to the money granted under the mining funds, which was supposed to be used to meet the objectives of the various national coal plans?

2. In the light of the lack of information and evidence regarding where the money has ended up, does the Commission not believe that it would be wise to conduct an audit in order to find out if the funds were indeed used to meet the objectives of the various national coal plans?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2013)

The National Plan for Strategic Coal Reserves 2006-2012 (the National Plan) was assessed by the Commission in two cases (NN 81/2006 and NN 20/2009). Pursuant to the notifications, Spain decided to grant aid for the following activities under Council Regulation (EC) No 1407/2002 of 23 July 2002 on state aid to the coal industry (the Coal Regulation): aid for the reduction of production activity (Article 4) and aid for accessing coal reserves (Article 5). The Commission found the National Plan compatible with the internal market within the meaning of Article 107 of the TFEU. Pursuant to Article 9(11) of the Coal Regulation, Spain must inform the Commission on the calculation of the aid actually paid during a coal year. The Commission verifies from the annual reports only whether the amount actually spent was used for reduction of production activity and to access coal reserve (aid for production), i.e. the two subsidised activities approved by the two decisions.

Chapter VII of Council Regulation (EC) No 659/1999 of 22 March 1999 laying down detailed rules for the application of Article 93 of the EC Treaty (the Procedural Regulation) sets out the Commission's monitoring tools. The Commission has no power to conduct any further audit to find out whether the funds in question were used to meet the national objectives in the National Plan as long as no serious doubts arise about the compatibility of the National Plan with the Commission decision.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007194/13
a la Comisión
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(19 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Aplicación provisional del Protocolo de pesca UE-Mauritania

Habiendo transcurrido más de 6 meses desde la entrada en vigor de la aplicación provisional del Protocolo de pesca entre la UE y Mauritania, cabe formular las siguientes preguntas a la Comisión:

En opinión de la Comisión, ¿cuál es el balance de este primer semestre de aplicación del protocolo?

¿Ha cumplido las expectativas que se había marcado la Comisión a la hora de suscribir el acuerdo?

¿Cuáles son, a juicio de la Comisión, las razones de la escasa utilización por parte del sector de las licencias puestas a disposición de la UE?

¿Cuál es el número total de barcos que están faenando en virtud de la aplicación provisional del protocolo, con expresión detallada de buques, países y categorías de pesca?

¿En qué fecha se abonó y cuál fue la cantidad exacta abonada por la UE como contrapartida financiera prevista en el protocolo?

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de septiembre de 2013)

Desde la entrada en vigor de la aplicación provisional del Protocolo, la Comisión ha estado siguiendo de cerca el porcentaje de utilización y el correspondiente valor generado por las actividades pesqueras enmarcadas en él, basándose tanto en las licencias de pesca como en las capturas. A finales de junio, el nivel general de utilización era bajo, lo que puede atribuirse a la estrategia de la flota, que estaba esperando a la votación final del Parlamento Europeo sobre el Protocolo.

Sin embargo, en las últimas semanas ha habido un cambio significativo. En el caso de las especies pelágicas, se ha producido un incremento del número de licencias utilizadas. Según los datos más recientes comunicados por los armadores, la productividad de las actividades pesqueras es buena. Otros segmentos importantes de la flota también están faenando con buenos resultados (merluza senegalesa, especies demersales, atún).

Actualmente, el Protocolo está siendo utilizado del siguiente modo: categoría 2 (arrastreros de merluza senegalesa): ES 2 licencias; categoría 3 (buques demersales): ES 4 licencias; categoría 5 (atuneros cerqueros): ES 13 licencias, FR 8 licencias; categoría 6 (atuneros cañeros y palangreros de superficie): ES 7 licencias, FR 9 licencias; categoría 7 (buques de pesca pelágica): PL 1 licencia, LT 3 licencias, LV 4 licencias, NL 1 licencia; categoría 8 (pesca pelágica en fresco): PT 2 licencias.

La Comisión continuará supervisando el porcentaje de utilización a fin de asegurarse de que el Protocolo genera para la Unión Europea un valor que compense la inversión.

La contrapartida financiera que paga la Unión Europea por el acceso de sus buques pesqueros a las aguas de Mauritania asciende a 67 millones de euros al año. Se ha efectuado a Mauritania el primer pago por el primer año de aplicación del Protocolo. El segundo pago se hará en la fecha de aniversario del Protocolo, es decir, el 16 de diciembre de 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007194/13
to the Commission
Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Provisional application of the EU-Mauritania Fisheries Protocol

It is now more than six months since the provisional application of the Fisheries Protocol between the EU and Mauritania came into force.

How would the Commission assess these first six months of application of this protocol?

Has it met the expectations the Commission had when the agreement was signed?

Why does the Commission believe the sector has made limited use of the licences available to the EU?

What is the total number of boats fishing as a result of the provisional application of the protocol, and how does this total number break down by vessel, country and fishing category?

What was the exact amount of the financial contribution paid by the EU under the terms of the protocol and when was it paid?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(11 September 2013)

The Commission has been closely monitoring the utilisation rate and the corresponding value generated by fishing activities under the Protocol, both based on licences and catches since the entry into force of the provisional application of the Protocol. At the end of June, the overall uptake in terms of licences was considered low. It could be attributed to the strategies of the fleet which was waiting for the final vote of the European Parliament over the protocol.

There has been a significant change in the last few weeks. For pelagics, the uptake of licences has increased. According to the most recent information from the ship-owners, the productivity of fishing activities is good. Other important segments are also fishing with good results (black hake, demersal, tuna).

Currently, the Protocol is used as follows: Category C (black hake trawlers): ES 2 licences; Category C (demersal vessels): ES 4 licences; Category C (tuna seiners): ES 13 licences, FR 8 licences; Category C (pole and line tuna vessels and surface longliners): ES 7 licences, FR 9 licences; Category C (pelagics): PL 1 licence, LT 3 licences, LV 4 licences, NL 1 licence; Category C (fresh pelagics): PT 2 licences.

The Commission will keep on attentively monitoring the utilisation rate in order to ensure that it will match with the European Union's expectations in terms of value for money.

In terms of financial contribution, the European Union financial contribution for access of European Union vessels is of EUR 67 million per year. The first instalment has been paid to Mauritania for the first year of execution of the protocol. The second instalment is due at the anniversary date, i.e. 16 December 2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007195/13
an den Rat
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Beitritt Islands zur Europäischen Union

Am 28. April 2013 wurde bei der Parlamentswahl in Island die bis dato regierende Mitte-links-Koalition von einer EU-kritischen Regierung abgelöst, welche ein Referendum über den Beitritt Islands zur EU angekündigt hat.

Welche Konsequenzen hat diese Entwicklung aus Sicht des Rates für die Beitrittsperspektiven Islands?

Antwort
(16. September 2013)

Dem Rat ist bekannt, dass die isländische Regierung beschlossen hat, die Beitrittsverhandlungen auszusetzen, bis der Stand dieser Verhandlungen und die Entwicklungen in der Europäischen Union bewertet worden sind und möglicherweise ein Referendum stattgefunden hat.

Allerdings hat er von der isländischen Regierung diesbezüglich keine offizielle Stellungnahme erhalten. Der Rat ist bereit, die Pläne Islands gegebenenfalls zu erörtern und die Lage entsprechend zu überdenken.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007195/13
to the Council
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Accession of Iceland to the European Union

In the parliamentary election in Iceland on 28 April 2013, the centre left coalition that was in power up to that point was defeated by a eurosceptic government, which has announced a referendum on Iceland's accession to the EU.

In the Council's opinion, what are the consequences of this development for Iceland's accession prospects?

Reply
(16 September 2013)

The Council is aware of the Icelandic Government's decision to put accession negotiations on hold until an assessment has been made of the status of the accession negotiations and developments within the European Union, and possibly until a referendum has taken place.

However, the Council has not received any official position of the Icelandic Government in this regard. The Council is ready to discuss Iceland's plans as appropriate and to review the situation accordingly.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007196/13
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Überwachung von Internet- und Telefonverkehr durch Kanada

Nach Bekanntwerden des US-Spionageprogramms PRISM gab am 11.6.2013 auch die kanadische Regierung zu, dass der Nachrichtendienst CSE „seit Jahren" ausländischen Internet- und Telefonverkehr abfängt.

1. Hat die Hohe Vertreterin die kanadische Regierung aufgefordert klarzustellen, ob der kanadische Geheimdienst auf europäischen Internetverkehr zugegriffen hat?

2. Hat die Hohe Vertreterin Kanada aufgefordert, die Spionageaktivitäten in der EU zu unterlassen?

3. Welche Maßnahmen wird die EU ergreifen, sollten kanadische Behörden oder Geheimdienste weiterhin ohne Gerichtsbeschluss auf europäischen Internet- und Telefonverkehr zugreifen?

Antwort von Viviane Reding im Namen der Kommission
(2. September 2013)

Die Kommission ist besorgt angesichts der jüngsten Medienberichte über Überwachungsprogramme in mehreren Ländern.

Der Kommission sind in diesem Zusammenhang auch die jüngsten Presseberichte über Überwachungsaktivitäten des Communications Security Establishment Canada (CSE) bekannt.

Die Kommission hat indessen keine Kenntnis von Belegen dafür, dass die Überwachungsmaßnahmen des CSE den Zugang zu und die Verarbeitung von personenbezogenen Daten von Europäern in großem Stil ermöglicht haben.

Die Kommission wird weiterhin größte Wachsamkeit üben in Bezug auf alle Berichte über Überwachungsaktivitäten ausländischer Regierungen und ihre Folgen für die Grundrechte der Europäer, insbesondere das Recht auf Schutz ihrer personenbezogenen Daten.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007196/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Monitoring of Internet and telephone communications by Canada

Following revelation of the US surveillance programme PRISM, the Canadian Government also admitted on 11 June 2013 that the national eavesdropping agency CSE has been monitoring foreign Internet and telephone communications 'for years'.

1. Has the High Representative called on the Canadian Government to state clearly whether the Canadian secret service has monitored European Internet communications?

2. Has she called on Canada to refrain from espionage activities in the EU?

3. What measures will the EU take if the Canadian authorities or secret services continue to monitor European Internet and telephone communications without a court order?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 September 2013)

The Commission is concerned about the recent media reports of surveillance programmes in several countries.

In this context, the Commission is aware of the recent press reports regarding the surveillance activities of the communications Security Establishment Canada (CSE).

However, the Commission is not aware of evidence suggesting that such monitoring activities performed by CSE have enabled access and processing, on a large scale, of the personal data of Europeans.

The Commission will continue to exercise the utmost vigilance with regard to any reports of monitoring activities by foreign governments and their impact on the fundamental rights of Europeans, in particular the right to the protection of their personal data.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007197/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Spionagetätigkeiten Kanadas und Auswirkungen auf das Freihandelsabkommen EU-Kanada

Nach Bekanntwerden des US-Spionageprogramms PRISM gab am 11. Juni 2013 auch die kanadische Regierung zu, dass der nationale Nachrichtendienst CSE „seit Jahren" ausländischen Internet- und Telefonverkehr abfängt.

1. War der Kommission das Abfangen von europäischen Daten durch den kanadischen Nachrichtendienst vor Juni 2013 bekannt?

2. War den europäischen Geheimdiensten oder Europol das Abfangen von europäischen Daten durch den kanadischen Nachrichtendienst vor Juni 2013 bekannt?

3. Verfügt die Kommission über Informationen, wie weit diese Spionagetätigkeiten reichten?

4. Verfügt die Kommission über Informationen darüber, in welchen EU-Mitgliedsländern der Internetverkehr tatsächlich durch den kanadischen Geheimdienst abgefangen wurde?

5. Wird die Kommission die Spionagetätigkeiten Kanadas im Rahmen der aktuellen Verhandlungen über ein Freihandelsabkommen („Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement", CETA) EU-Kanada ansprechen? Wenn ja, wird die Kommission ein Unterlassen der Spionagetätigkeiten als Bedingung für ein solches Freihandelsabkommen festsetzen?

Antwort von Viviane Reding im Namen der Kommission
(2. September 2013)

Die Kommission verweist den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-007196/2013.

Was Frage 5 betrifft, so weist die Kommission darauf hin, dass Angelegenheiten dieser Art nicht Gegenstand der aktuellen Verhandlungen über ein Freihandelsabkommen („Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement", CETA) sind und somit nicht im Rahmen der Gespräche erörtert werden dürften.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007197/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Espionage activities by Canada and effects on the free trade agreement between the EU and Canada

Following revelation of the US surveillance programme PRISM, the Canadian Government also admitted on 11 June 2013 that the national eavesdropping agency CSE has been monitoring foreign Internet and telephone communications 'for years'.

1. Was the Commission aware of monitoring of European data by the Canadian eavesdropping agency prior to June 2013?

2. Were the European secret services or Europol aware of the monitoring of European data by the Canadian eavesdropping agency prior to June 2013?

3. Does the Commission have any information about the extent of these espionage activities?

4. Does it have any information about which EU Member States' Internet communications the Canadian secret service has actually monitored?

5. Will it address Canada's espionage activities within the framework of the current negotiations on a free trade agreement between the EU and Canada ('Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement', CETA)? If so, will it make this free trade agreement conditional upon Canada ceasing these espionage activities?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 September 2013)

The Commision would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007196/2013.

For question 4, the Commission underlines that this kind of issue is not part of the ongoing negotiations for a Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA), and therefore is not demeed to be discussed within the framework of those talks.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007198/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Steuervermeidungen von Unternehmen

Laut Medienberichten, die sich auf eine Studie des Deutschen Instituts für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW) stützen, konnten deutsche Unternehmen zwischen 2001 und 2008 durch unterschiedliche Maßnahmen geschätzte 92 Mrd. EUR an Steuern einsparen. Gleichzeitig entgingen diese Einnahmen dem Staat.

1. Liegen der Kommission Daten über die Höhe solcher Steuervermeidungen durch Unternehmen in den 27 EU-Staaten vor?

2. Medienberichten zufolge haben die Mitgliedstaaten gegenüber der Kommission zugesagt, keine neuen Schlupflöcher zur Steuervermeidung zu schaffen. Mit welchen Maßnahmen versucht die Kommission dieses Versprechen zu überwachen und nötigenfalls durchzusetzen?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(1. August 2013)

Die Kommission verfügt über keine Daten oder Schätzungen zur Höhe der Steuern, deren Zahlung von den Unternehmen der 28 Mitgliedstaaten vermieden wurde. Aggressive Steuerplanung ist eine Praxis, mit der einige Unternehmen ihre Gesamtsteuerschuld verringern, indem sie ihre steuerlichen Angelegenheiten in einer Weise behandeln, die zwar rechtmäßig ist, jedoch dem Geist des Rechts widerspricht. Dabei nutzen sie Schlupflöcher in den einzelstaatlichen Steuersystemen, profitieren von Unzulänglichkeiten der internationalen Standards und von Diskrepanzen zwischen den nationalen Steuersystemen. Daher sind die finanziellen Auswirkungen dieser Praxis naturgemäß schwer zu beziffern.

Die Kommission hat sich mit diesen Fragen in ihrem Aktionsplan zur Bekämpfung von Steuerbetrug und Steuerhinterziehung vom 6. Dezember 2012 ([1]) und detaillierter in den beiden beigefügten Empfehlungen ([2]) auseinandergesetzt. Außerdem drängt die Kommission ständig auf rasche Lösungen für grenzübergreifende Diskrepanzen im Rahmen des Verhaltenskodex für die Unternehmensbesteuerung, trägt im Rahmen der OECD zur Entwicklung globaler Lösungen für diese Fragen bei und hat erst kürzlich eine Plattform zum verantwortungsvollen Handeln im Steuerwesen errichtet. In den Schlussfolgerungen des Rates (Ecofin) vom 14. Mai 2013 haben die Mitgliedstaaten den Aktionsplan und die Empfehlungen begrüßt, anerkannt, dass gegen aggressive Steuerplanung vorzugehen ist, und sich verpflichtet, ihre Standpunkte hinsichtlich der OECD-Entwicklungen abzustimmen. Die Kommission wird die Mitgliedstaaten auch weiterhin darin bestärken, gemeinsame Lösungen zu vereinbaren und umzusetzen.

([1]) KOM(2012)722 endg.
([2]) C(2012)8805 endg. und C(2012)8806 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007198/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Tax avoidance by companies

According to reports in the media based on a study by the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW), German companies were able to save an estimated EUR 92 billion in tax by various methods between 2001 and 2008. At the same time, the state has lost this revenue.

1. Does the Commission have details of the extent of such tax avoidance by companies in the 27 EU Member States?

2. According to media reports, the Member States have assured the Commission that they will not create any new loopholes for tax avoidance. What steps is the Commission taking to attempt to oversee this guarantee and, if necessary, enforce it?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

The Commission does not have data or estimates concerning the amount of tax avoided by companies in the 28 Member States. Aggressive tax planning by companies is a practice whereby some companies reduce their global tax bill by arranging their tax affairs in a manner which although legal contradicts the spirit of the law. They do this by using loopholes in domestic tax systems, taking advantage of deficiencies in international tax standards, and exploiting mismatches in the interaction of national tax systems. Therefore, by its very nature its financial effects are difficult to quantify.

The Commission raised these issues in its Action Plan against tax fraud and tax evasion of 6 December 2012 ([1]) and more specifically in the two accompanying Recommendations ([2]). In addition, the Commission consistently pushes for rapid solutions to cross-border mismatches in the context of the Code of Conduct on business taxation, contributes to finding global solutions for these issues within the OECD framework and recently launched a Platform on tax good governance. Through the Ecofin Conclusions of 14 May 2013, Member States have welcomed the action plan and Recommendations, recognised the need to address aggressive tax planning and committed to coordinating their positions as regards OECD developments. The Commission will continue its efforts to push Member States to agreeing and implementing common solutions.

([1]) COM(2012) 722 final.
([2]) C(2012) 8805 final, and C(2012) 8806 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007199/13
an die Kommission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Schwarze Liste für Steueroasen

Eine Mehrheit der EU-Abgeordneten hat im Vorfeld des Gipfels der EU-Staats- und Regierungschefs am 23. Mai 2013 gefordert, eine schwarze Liste für Steueroasen und Schwarzgeldparadiese einzuführen.

1. Wie bewertet die Kommission das Potenzial dieser Initiative vor dem Hintergrund der Bekämpfung von Steuerflucht?

2. Welche Maßnahmen plant die Kommission, um Steuerflucht in der EU weiter einzudämmen?

Antwort von Herrn Šemeta im Namen der Kommission
(5. August 2013)

In Bezug auf die Maßnahmen der Kommission hinsichtlich der Einführung einer schwarzen Liste für Steueroasen möchte ich den Herrn Abgeordneten auf meine Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-005767/2013 von Herrn Marc Tarabella verweisen.

Nach Auffassung der Kommission wurden die besten Maßnahmen gegen Steuerhinterziehung in ihrem Aktionsplan vom 6. Dezember 2012 zur Bekämpfung von Steuerbetrug und Steuerhinterziehung ([1]) festgelegt. Einige der in diesem Aktionsplan genannten Initiativen wurden bereits umgesetzt, z. B. die Einrichtung der Plattform für verantwortungsvolles Handeln im Steuerwesen und der jüngste Legislativvorschlag zur Ausweitung des Anwendungsbereichs des automatischen Informationsaustauschs gemäß Richtlinie 2011/16/EU des Rates über die Zusammenarbeit der Verwaltungsbehörden im Bereich der Besteuerung. Andere Initiativen werden im Einklang mit der im Aktionsplan genannten zeitlichen Staffelung weiterverfolgt.

([1]) KOM(2012)722 endg.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007199/13
to the Commission
Hans-Peter Martin (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Blacklist of tax havens

Ahead of the summit of the EU Heads of State and Government on 23 May 2013, a majority of Members of the European Parliament called for the introduction of a blacklist of tax havens and black economy paradises.

1. How does the Commission assess the prospects of this initiative in the context of the fight against tax evasion?

2. What measures is it planning to take to further stem tax evasion in the EU?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

Concerning the Commission's policy regarding the introduction of a black list of tax havens, the Honourable Member is kindly referred to the answer given to written question E-005767/2013 by Mr Marc Tarabella.

The Commission's view on the best way to tackle tax evasion has been laid down in its Action Plan of 6 December 2012 against tax fraud and tax evasion ([1]). Some of the initiatives mentioned in that Action Plan have already been implemented, e.g. the establishment of the Platform for tax good governance and the recent legislative proposal to extend the scope of automatic exchange of information under Council Directive 2011/16/EU on administrative cooperation in the field of taxation. Other initiatives will be followed up in line with the timelines set in the action plan.

([1]) COM(2012) 722 final.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007200/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(19. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Tierschutz bei Finanzierungen durch die EBRD

Die Europäische Bank für Wiederaufbau und Entwicklung (EBRD) soll zwischen 2002 und 2011 Investitionsmittel von 218 Mio. EUR für Projekte in der intensiven Tierhaltung zur Verfügung gestellt haben. Auf diese Art und Weise sollen EU-Länder jene Haltungsformen mitfinanzieren bzw. Betriebe aufrüsten, die bei uns verboten wurden. Tierschutzorganisationen kritisieren, dass bei uns verbotene Legebatterien bzw. Käfigtierhaltung mit diesen Subventionen in fernen Ländern gefördert werden. Die EBRD hält dagegen, dass mit den Investitionen die Standards erhöht, also näher an die EU-Standards gebracht werden sollen.

Problematisch ist in diesem Zusammenhang, dass die Auflagen in Drittländern laxer sind als in der EU und damit die dortigen Firmen günstiger produzieren können. Mit den Förderungen werden also auch Billigkonkurrenten herangezüchtet, welche sich nicht an hiesige Standards halten müssen.

1. In welchem Ausmaß konnte im Rahmen der durch die EBRD zur Verfügung gestellten Mittel in Drittländern tatsächlich eine Anpassung an EU-Standards erzielt werden?

2. Wie steht die Kommission zu der Problematik, dass mit den Förderungen Billigkonkurrenten zu den heimischen Bauern herangezüchtet werden, welche aufgrund laxerer Auflagen in den Drittländern sowieso günstiger produzieren können?

Antwort von Herrn Rehn im Namen der Kommission
(7. August 2013)

1. Obwohl die Europäische Bank für Wiederaufbau und Entwicklung (EBRD) kein EU-Organ ist, sind die Vorschriften und Grundsätze der EU im Allgemeinen maßgebend für die Interventionen der EBRD, und viele Strategien der Bank nehmen unmittelbar Bezug auf den politischen Rahmen der EU und den EU-Besitzstand. Die EBRD setzt sich dafür ein, dass Projekte in Drittländern den Anforderungen der EU genügen oder sich diesen annähern. Dies gelingt in den Ländern, in denen die EBRD tätig ist, jedoch nicht immer von Anfang an, was in erster Linie auf Finanzierungsengpässe zurückzuführen ist. Dies war bei jüngsten EBRD-Maßnahmen der Fall, mit denen Eierproduktionsbetriebe in der Ukraine und der Türkei finanziert wurden. Dabei stellte die Bank sicher, dass für einen größeren Teil der Produktion Schritte hin zur Einhaltung von EU-Standards unternommen wurden, die ohne eine EBRD-Finanzierung nicht erfolgt wären.

2. Die EBRD unterstützt hauptsächlich Unternehmen des privaten Sektors durch Darlehen, Beteiligungsinvestitionen oder Bürgschaften. Dies geschieht normalerweise zu den marktüblichen Sätzen, damit die Bank dem „Zusätzlichkeitsprinzip“ entspricht und keine Verdrängung privater Investoren bewirkt. Obwohl für technische Zusammenarbeit und andere Aktivitäten Finanzhilfen zur Verfügung stehen, stellt die EBRD keine Zuschüsse bereit. Der Kommission ist bekannt, dass Tierschutzorganisationen im Mai 2013 einen Bericht über internationale Finanzinstitute, Exportkreditanstalten und den Schutz von Nutztieren ([1]) veröffentlicht haben. In diesem Zusammenhang wird die Kommission im Rahmen ihrer rechtlichen Zuständigkeit untersuchen, inwieweit die Erörterung der entsprechenden Fragen mit anderen EU- und internationalen Stellen, auch der EBRD, ausgeweitet werden kann.

([1]) http://www.hsi.org/assets/pdfs/ifi_report_agribusiness.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007200/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Animal welfare in EBRD investment areas

The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) is said to have made funds of EUR 218 million available between 2002 and 2011 for investment in intensive livestock farming projects. In this way, EU Member States are seemingly helping to finance farming methods and support business practices that have been prohibited within the EU.

Animal welfare organisations criticise the supporting of battery and caged livestock farming (which are banned in the EU) with these subsidies in far off countries. The EBRD maintains however that the investments are intended to make improve standards and therefore bring them closer to EU standards.

One problem in this regard is that the regulations in third countries are not as strict as they are in the EU, and so the companies based there are able to operate more profitably. The subsidies therefore attract low cost competitors that do not have to conform to our standards.

1. To what extent has it actually been possible to achieve conformity to EU standards in third countries within the framework of the funding made available by the EBRD?

2. What is the Commission's view of the problem that, because of the subsidies, EU farmers are faced with low cost competitors who are of course able to operate more profitably due to the less stringent regulations in the third countries?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

1. Although the EBRD is not an EU body, EU rules and principles generally set the standard for EBRD interventions, and many of the Bank's policies make direct reference to the EU policy framework and *acquis*. In non-EU countries, the EBRD endeavours to get their projects to meet or approximate to EU requirements, but not all of the Bank's countries of operations are able to do so from the outset, mainly owing to affordability constraints. This has been the case in recent EBRD operations that have financed egg production facilities in Ukraine and in Turkey, where the Bank ensured that a greater proportion of production achieved steps towards compliance with EU standards than would have been the case without EBRD financing.

2. The EBRD supports mainly private sector companies via loans, equity investments or the provision of guarantees. These are normally priced at market rates in order for the Bank to meet its 'Additionality' principle of not crowding out private investors. Although grant funding is available for Technical Cooperation and other activities, the EBRD does not provide subsidies. The Commission is aware that in May 2013, animal welfare organisations published a report on international finance institutions, export credit agencies and farm animal welfare ([1]). In this context, the Commission will, within the limits of its legal competences explore the possibility of extending discussion of these issues with other EU and international institutions, including with the EBRD.

([1]) http://www.hsi.org/assets/pdfs/ifi_report_agribusiness.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007202/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(19. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Sicherheitsbestimmungen für außereuropäische Wirkstoffe

Innerhalb der EU unterliegt die Herstellung eines Medikaments den Qualitätsvorschriften der europäischen Herstellungsrichtlinien (GMP). Im Rahmen der 2011 verabschiedeten Sicherheitsmaßnahmen für den Import von Wirkstoffen in die EU müssen ab Juli 2013 außereuropäische Wirkstoffhersteller eine schriftliche Bestätigung ihrer Aufsichtsbehörde vorlegen, dass nach europäischen GMP-Bestimmungen produziert wurde. Zusätzlich müssen regelmäßige und unangekündigte Inspektionen erfolgen. 2012 stellte die Schweiz den Antrag, von der EU als GMP-gleichwertig anerkannt zu werden.

Europa ist bei der Versorgung mit Wirkstoffen für Medikamente faktisch von Nicht-EU-Ländern abhängig. Denn 70-80 % der in Europa verarbeiteten Wirkstoffe kommen mittlerweile von Sublieferanten, vor allem aus China und Indien.

1. Welche Länder haben noch den Antrag gestellt, als GMP-gleichwertig anerkannt zu werden, und wie wurde diesbezüglich entschieden?

2. Welche Kosten fallen in diesem Zusammenhang für die EU-Staaten an, die ja anscheinend personelle Kapazitäten für die Inspektionen zur Verfügung stellen?

3. Wie ist der bisherige Stand der notwendigen GMP-Inspektionen und ist zu erwarten, dass diese fristgerecht bis Juli 2013 abgeschlossen werden können?

4. Ist ggf. eine Fristverlängerung bzw. Verschiebung der neuen Vorschriften geplant?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(23. Juli 2013)

1. Eine komplette Liste der Länder, die gemäß Artikel 111b der Richtlinie 2001/83/EG die Aufnahme in die Liste beantragt haben, sowie der Status ihres Antrags können auf der Website der Kommission abgerufen werden ([1]).

2. Den Mitgliedstaaten entstehen keine zusätzlichen Kosten durch die neuen Vorschriften. Inspektionen zur Überprüfung der Einhaltung der guten Herstellungspraxis werden bei Bedarf mit den vorhandenen Ressourcen und im Rahmen der regulären Inspektionsprogramme der zuständigen nationalen Behörden durchgeführt. Die Reise- und Aufenthaltskosten der Inspektoren der Mitgliedstaaten, die an Audits in Drittländern teilnehmen, die die Aufnahme in die genannte Liste beantragt haben, werden aus dem EU-Haushalt bestritten.

3. Die Europäische Arzneimittelagentur (EMA) hat gemeinsam mit den Mitgliedstaaten die Standorte der Wirkstoffe herstellenden Betriebe in Drittländern erfasst, die mit einem Risiko behaftet sein könnten (z. B. weil sie nicht der Aufsicht der zuständigen Behörden vor Ort unterstehen und in letzter Zeit keiner Kontrolle durch einen EU-Mitgliedstaat unterzogen worden sind). Die infolgedessen durchzuführenden Inspektionen sollen bis Ende 2013 abgeschlossen werden.

4. Mit der Richtlinie 2011/62/EU ([2]) wurde ein Zeitraum von 2 Jahren zur Vorbereitung auf die neuen Vorschriften eingeräumt, der am 1. Juli 2013 abgelaufen ist. Darüber hinaus enthalten die Rechtsvorschriften keine weiteren Übergangsbestimmungen. Die Kommission verfolgt jedoch gemeinsam mit der EMA, der Wirtschaft und den Mitgliedstaaten aufmerksam, wie sich die Lage entwickelt.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/human-use/quality/index_en.htm#ias
([2]) ABl. L 174 vom 1.7.2011, S. 74.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007202/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Safety standards for active substances imported from outside the EU

Within the EU, the manufacture of medicines is subject to compliance with the quality standards found in the European directives concerning good manufacturing practices (GMP). In the context of the safety measures adopted in 2011 on the importation of active substances into the EU, manufacturers from third countries will, from July 2013 onwards, be required to present written confirmation from their competent authority that European GMP standards have been complied with. Regular, unannounced inspections must also take place. In 2012, Switzerland submitted a request to be recognised by the EU as a country which applies GMP standards which are equivalent to those required in the EU.

In practice, Europe is dependent on third countries for active substances which are used to produce medicines. 70-80% of active substances used for production in Europe now come from subcontractors based predominantly in India and China.

1. Which other countries have submitted requests to be considered GMP equivalent and what decisions were taken on their requests?

2. What costs are incurred by the Member States, given that they appear to provide staff for the inspections?

3. What is the state of play with regard to the required GMP inspections and can they be expected to be concluded by the deadline of July 2013?

4. Are there any plans to change or extend the deadline for compliance with the new provisions, if necessary?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

1. A complete list of countries having applied for listing under Article 111b of Directive 2001/83/EC, as well as the current status of their application, is available on the Commission website. ([1])

2. The new rules will not trigger additional costs for Member States. GMP inspections, when needed, will be carried out though available resources and scheduled as part of routine inspection programmes of the national competent authorities. The travel and subsistence costs of Member State inspectors involved in the audits of third countries which applied for listing are covered by the EU budget.

3. The European Medicines Agency (EMA), in collaboration with Member States, has mapped active substance manufacturing sites potentially at risk (e.g. because not under the supervision of local competent authorities and not recently inspected by an EU Member State) in third countries. The inspections deemed necessary as result of this exercise are planned before the end of 2013.

4. Directive 2011/62/EU ([2]) provided for a two year period to prepare for the new rules, which ended on 1 July 2013. An additional transitional arrangement is not provided for by the legislation. The Commission in consultation with EMA, the industry and the Member States is closely monitoring the situation.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/human-use/quality/index_en.htm#ias.
([2]) OJ L 174/74, 1.7.2011.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007203/13
an die Kommission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(19. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Kindgerechte Medikamente

Aus Mangel an entsprechenden Studien müssen Ärzte vielfach bei der Behandlung von Kindern zu Erwachsenen-Präparaten greifen. Denn für Kinder stehen viel zu wenige ordnungsgemäß zugelassene Medikamente zur Verfügung. Angeblich machen Off-Label-Anwendungen bei Kindern im niedergelassenen Bereich 40 % aus, in der Kinderonkologie sollen es sogar 80 % sein. Dabei ändert sich aufgrund des im Vergleich zu Erwachsenen völlig unterschiedlichen Stoffwechsels die nötige Wirkstoffdosierung, insbesondere bei sehr jungen Kindern und Säuglingen. Fragen, etwa nach den Nebenwirkungen, bleiben bei einer simplen entsprechend dem Gewicht des Patienten reduzierten Dosierung offen. Die EU hat sich dieses Themas ja angenommen, damit die täglichen Experimente mit unserem Nachwuchs ein Ende nehmen.

1. Gibt es schon einen Zwischenstand der 2008 in Kraft getretenen Kinderarzneimittel-Verordnung?

2. Wie ist der Stand des EU-Kinderforschungsnetzwerks EnprEMA?

3. Gibt es nach Ansicht der Kommission hinsichtlich gemeinsamer Qualitätsstandards und ethnischer Richtlinien in diesem Zusammenhang noch etwas zu tun?

Antwort von Herrn Borg im Namen der Kommission
(26. Juli 2013)

Am 24. Juni 2013 hat die Kommission einen Fortschrittsbericht ([1]) zu Kinderarzneimitteln veröffentlicht, in dem eine Bilanz der ersten fünf Jahre seit dem Inkrafttreten der Kinderarzneimittel-Verordnung ([2]) gezogen wird. In diesem Bericht, der dem Europäischen Parlament und dem Rat übermittelt wurde, werden die vom Herrn Abgeordneten aufgeworfenen Fragen thematisiert. Dem Dokument zufolge konnten im Bereich der Kinderarzneimittel insgesamt Verbesserungen erzielt werden.

Das Europäische Netzwerk für die pädiatrische Forschung der EMA (Enpr-EMA) wurde 2009 eingerichtet. So gab es zwar bereits vor Inkrafttreten der Verordnung in Krankheitsbereichen wie der pädiatrischen Onkologie ein engmaschiges Netz von Sachverständigen, doch bietet das Enpr-EMA den Mehrwert eines ganzheitlichen Ansatzes, indem es nationale und europäische Netze, Prüfer und Prüfzentren mit spezifischer Sachkenntnis in der Konzeption und Durchführung hochwertiger Studien an Kindern zusammenbringt.

Zu den vorrangigen Aufgaben des Enpr-EMA gehört die Förderung der Erforschung der Qualität, Sicherheit und Wirksamkeit von für Kinder bestimmten Arzneimitteln auf einem hohen Niveau sowie unter Berücksichtigung ethischer Grundsätze. Hierzu hat das Netz in den letzten Jahren mehrere Workshops organisiert.

Vor diesem Hintergrund sieht die Kommission keine Veranlassung, weitere Maßnahmen zu ergreifen oder zusätzliche Strukturen einzurichten. Sie möchte stattdessen betonen, dass die bestehenden Instrumente und Netzwerke wirksam eingesetzt werden müssen, damit das gemeinsame Ziel besserer Kinderarzneimittel erreicht werden kann.

([1]) Bessere Arzneimittel für Kinder — Vom Konzept zur Wirklichkeit — Allgemeiner Bericht über die bei der Anwendung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1901/2006 über Kinderarzneimittel gewonnenen Erfahrungen, KOM(2013)443 endg.: http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/paediatrics/2013_com443/paediatric_report-com(2013)443_de.pdf

([2]) Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1901/2006 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates vom 12. Dezember 2006 über Kinderarzneimittel (ABl. L 378 vom 27.12.2006, S. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007203/13
to the Commission
Andreas Mölzer (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Appropriate medicines for children

Doctors are often forced to use medicines designed for adults when treating children as too little research has been conducted into medicines for children. There are far too few medicines which have been duly approved for use by children. Off-label use reportedly accounts for 40% of prescriptions for children by registered doctors, while in child cancer care that figure could be up to 80%. Given the fact that children's metabolism works in very different ways to that of adults, the dosages of active substances required vary, especially for very young children and infants. The potential side effects for a patient whose dosage was simply calculated according to his/her weight, for example, are unknown. The EU decided to study this issue in order to put an end to the experiments which are conducted on our children on a daily basis.

1. Can any preliminary conclusions be drawn regarding the regulation on medicinal products for paediatric use which entered into force in 2008?

2. What is the current status of the European Network of Paediatric Research at theEuropean Medicines Agency (EnprEMA)?

3. Does the Commission believe that more work could be done in this area in order to develop common quality standards and ethical guidelines?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

On 24 June 2013, the Commission published a progress report ([1]) on medicines for children covering the first five years since the Paediatric Regulation ([2]) first came into force. The report has been sent to the European Parliament and the Council. It discusses the questions the Honourable Member raises. Generally speaking, the report points to improvements in the paediatric medicines landscape.

The European Network for Paediatric Research at the European Medicines Agency (Enpr-EMA) was established in 2009. While a closely-knit network of experts existed prior to the introduction of the regulation in disease areas such as paediatric oncology, Enpr-EMA provides the added value of a holistic approach by bringing together national and European networks, investigators and centres with specific expertise in designing and conducting high-quality studies in children.

One of the main tasks of Enpr-EMA is to foster high-quality ethical research on quality, safety and efficacy of medicines to be used in children. In this regard, it has, for example, organised in recent years several workshops.

Against this background, the Commission does not see a need for additional initiatives or structures. Instead, it is important that the existing tools and networks are efficiently used in order to contribute to the common goal of better medicines for children.

([1]) 'Better Medicines for Children — From Concept to Reality' — General Report on experience acquired as a result of the application of Regulation (EC) No 1901/2006 on medicinal products for human use, COM(2013) 443 final, http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/paediatrics/2013_com443/paediatric_report-com(2013)443_en.pdf

([2]) Regulation (EC) No 1901/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 on medicinal products for paediatric use, OJ L 378, 27.12.2006, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007204/13
to the Commission
Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Bilderberg conference

At the recent Bilderberg meeting in Watford, London, to which Mr Barroso was invited:

1. What expenses, including travel and accommodation, did Mr Barroso incur which were paid for by the EU?

2. The *Financial Times* of 5 June 2013 stated that the topic of 'nationalism' was to be discussed.

— In what regard was nationalism discussed?

— Was ethnic nationalism discussed?

— Was nationalism of an EU secessionist nature discussed?

— Was the purpose to discuss combating nationalism and, if so, what suggestions were made in this respect?

— Which political parties were named and/or discussed at the conference?

3. Which meetings did Mr Barroso attend?

4. What contributions did he make?

5. Which other members of the Commission attended the conference?

6. What discussions did Mr Barroso hold with George Osborne MP and Ed Balls MP?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

1. The participation of the President of the European Commission in the 2013 Bilderberg conference on 7 June 2013 in the United Kingdom did not involve costs for the European Commission.

3. The President attended discussions on international and European politics.

5. The Vice-President responsible for Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship also participated in the 2013 Bilderberg conference in a session on 'How big data is changing almost everything.'

2, 4, 6. The President attended this meeting in his personal capacity and there are no reports on the discussions held during these meetings.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007205/13
aan de Commissie
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(19 juni 2013)

Betreft: Verhaalmogelijkheden bij blokkering of verslechtering van onlinediensten

In haar toespraak op 4 juni 2013 merkte commissaris Kroes op dat veel burgers in de EU te maken hebben met blokkering of verslechtering van hun onlinediensten. Zij verwees naar de studie van BEREC (Orgaan van Europese regelgevende instanties voor elektronische communicatie) uit 2011 waaruit naar voren komt dat een op de vijf gebruikers van een vaste lijn en een op de drie mobiele gebruikers ervaring heeft met de blokkering of verslechtering van onlinediensten. De blokkering of verslechtering van bepaalde onlinediensten vormt een inbreuk op de netneutraliteit.

1. Kan de Commissie uiteenzetten of er in de EU verhaalmogelijkheden bestaan bij blokkering of verslechtering van onlinediensten?

2. Zo ja, tot wie kunnen consumenten of bedrijven zich wenden wanneer zij de gevolgen ondervinden van het feit dat hun onlinediensten zijn geblokkeerd of de kwaliteit ervan achteruitgaat?

3. Indien de verhaalmogelijkheden onvoldoende soelaas bieden of in het geheel niet voorhanden zijn, hoe wil de Commissie er dan voor zorgen dat zulke mogelijkheden er komen? Als de Commissie geen plannen heeft voor de invoering van zulke mogelijkheden, kan zij dan uiteenzetten waarom dat zo is?

4. Is de Commissie het met mij eens dat de potentiële gevolgen van het onrechtmatig blokkeren van onlinediensten schadelijk zijn voor de rechten van de consument, de mededinging, het open internet alsmede de innovatie? Zo niet, waarom niet?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(23 juli 2013)

De Commissie is vastbesloten ervoor te zorgen dat alle eindgebruikers toegang hebben tot inhoud, informatie kunnen uitwisselen of applicaties en diensten naar keuze kunnen gebruiken, en is het met het geachte Parlementslid eens dat onredelijke blokkering van internetdiensten of onredelijke verlaging van de internetsnelheid negatieve gevolgen heeft voor de rechten van de consument, innovatie, mededinging en voor het open internet.

Teneinde verslechtering van de dienstverlening en belemmering of vertraging van netwerkverkeer te voorkomen, kunnen de nationale regelgevende instanties uit hoofde van artikel 22, lid 3, van Richtlijn 2002/22/EG minimale kwaliteitseisen voor de dienstverlening opleggen aan bedrijven die openbare communicatienetwerken verzorgen.

Bovendien werkt de Commissie momenteel aan voorstellen voor een goed functionerende eengemaakte telecommarkt. Aangezien consumentenbescherming cruciaal is voor die eengemaakte markt, is de Commissie eveneens voornemens voorstellen met betrekking tot netneutraliteit te formuleren. Deze maatregelen moeten onder meer leiden tot een verantwoord gebruik van instrumenten voor het beheer van internetverkeer. Discriminerende blokkeringen of verlagingen van de internetsnelheid zijn niet toegestaan. Bedrijven mogen hun aanbod echter wel differentiëren en mogen concurreren op de kwaliteit van de dienstverlening, zolang dit overeenkomstig duidelijke transparantieregels gebeurt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007205/13
to the Commission
Marietje Schaake (ALDE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Redress mechanisms aimed at the blocking or degradation of online services

In her speech of 4 June 2013, Commissioner Kroes noted that many EU citizens experience blocking or degradation of their online services. She made reference to the 2011 study by the Body of European Regulators for Electronic Communications (BEREC) which highlights that one in five fixed line users and more than one in three mobile users experience blocking or degrading of online services. The blocking and degrading of certain online services constitutes a breach of net neutrality.

1. Could the Commission explain whether redress mechanisms aimed at the blocking and degradation of online services exist within the EU?

2. If so, to whom can consumers or companies turn when faced with the consequences of having their online services blocked or degraded?

3. If redress mechanisms do not function sufficiently, or if they do not exist at all, how does the Commission plan to establish such mechanisms? If the Commission does not plan to establish such mechanisms, could it explain why not?

4. Does the Commission agree that the potential consequences of the illegitimate blocking of online services is damaging to consumer rights, competition, the open Internet, and innovation alike? If not, why not?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

The Commission is committed to ensuring the ability of all end users to access content and distribute information or run applications and services of their choice, and agrees with the Honourable Member that unreasonable blocking or throttling of online services has a negative impact on consumer rights, innovation, competition and the open Internet.

In order to prevent the degradation of service and the hindering or slowing down of traffic over networks, Article 22.3 of Directive 2002/22/EC enables NRAs to impose minimum quality of service requirements on an undertaking or undertakings providing public communications networks.

Furthermore, the Commission is currently preparing proposals with the aim of creating a properly functioning Telecoms Single Market. Consumer protection is a vital part of that Single Market, so the Commmission intends to include proposals as regards net neutrality. The measures would ensure, amongst other things, the responsible use of traffic management tools. No discriminatory blocking and throttling would be allowed. Companies would however be allowed to differentiate their offers and compete on enhanced quality of service, provided that this is done in full compliance with clear transparency rules.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007206/13
to the Commission
Claude Moraes (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: EU funding in the area of human trafficking and child sexual exploitation

The Commission's funding programmes are important tools for developing partnerships and policies in the Member States, especially in the areas of human trafficking and child sexual exploitation.

1. Could the Commission indicate what funding programmes are currently in operation in these areas?

2. What criteria have to be met in order to be established as a beneficiary?

3. Is the funding allocated by a call for expression of interest or is it possible for organisations to make a spontaneous application?

4. What conditions are attached to the funding?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

Reflecting the importance the European Commission attaches to addressing trafficking in human beings and child sexual exploitation, support to projects in these areas is provided under a number of EU financial instruments, including: Prevention of and fight against crime (ISEC), Daphne, the Thematic Programme on Immigration and Asylum. The EU Anti trafficking website contains a global picture of all these financial instruments and a description of all the relevant funded projects ([1]).

ISECin particular provides financial support in the area of THB and child sexual exploitation. In 2013, targeted calls for proposals on 'Trafficking in Human Beings' and — in part regarding child sexual exploitation — on 'Illegal use of Internet' have been launched. A General call for proposals will be published in autumn 2013 and will also include these two areas. The calls for proposals, which are published on the ISECprogramme webpage ([2]), describe all criteria (exclusion, eligibility, selection and award) that applications have to meet to be awarded a grant. After a grant is awarded, a grant agreement is signed between the Commission and the beneficiaries detailing the work programme and the rules to be followed during the project implementation. No spontaneous applications are accepted under ISEC, only submission of applications following a call for proposals. As of 2014, the ISECprogramme will be replaced by the Internal Security Fund, currently under discussion.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/anti-trafficking/section.action?sectionPath=EU+Projects.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/financing/fundings/security-and-safeguarding-liberties/prevention-of-and-fight-against-crime/index_en.htm

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007209/13
à la Commission (Vice-Présidente / Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Politique de la terre brûlée au Soudan

De nouvelles images satellite et déclarations de témoins oculaires de secteurs se trouvant sous le contrôle des rebelles dans l'État du Nil bleu, au Soudan, montrent que les forces armées soudanaises mènent une campagne brutale de la terre brûlée afin de pousser la population civile à fuir ces zones.

Ce document, intitulé «We had no time to bury them: War crimes in Sudan's Blue Nile State», explique comment les bombardements et attaques au sol menés par les forces armées soudanaises ont détruit des villages entiers, fait de nombreux morts et blessés, et entraîné la fuite de dizaines de milliers de personnes — dont beaucoup risquent désormais de connaître la famine, la maladie et l'épuisement. Des éléments recueillis par Amnesty International indiquent que des villages situés dans les collines Ingessana, une zone qui fut un temps aux mains de l'Armée populaire de libération du Soudan-Nord (APLS-N), ont subi plusieurs offensives féroces en 2012. Des témoins ont également fait état de bombardements, remontant pour les plus récents à avril 2013, qui ont causé la mort d'enfants et d'autres civils.

L'imagerie satellite des collines Ingessana donne à voir la destruction de plusieurs villages.

Le fait que les civils soient systématiquement et délibérément pris pour cible rappelle la politique choquante appliquée par le gouvernement soudanais au Darfour qui a eu des effets dévastateurs.

1. S'en prendre délibérément à des civils n'est-il pas un crime de guerre? Compte tenu de l'ampleur des attaques, ainsi que de leur nature manifestement généralisée, il est possible qu'elles constituent en outre des crimes contre l'humanité.

Le rapport explique par ailleurs que certaines personnes ont dû choisir entre mettre leurs enfants en lieu sûr ou aider leurs parents âgés. Confrontés aux attaques, aux bombardements aériens et à la perspective de la famine, ceux qui en ont les capacités physiques n'ont d'autre choix que la fuite — souvent après avoir dû prendre de douloureuses décisions afin de déterminer lesquels de leurs proches les plus faibles ils ne pourront emmener avec eux.

2. La possibilité que cette impasse soit de longue durée est extrêmement inquiétante. La Vice-Présidente/Haute Représentante compte-t-elle accorder à cette crise des droits humains l'attention qu'elle mérite?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(17 septembre 2013)

La haute représentante et vice-présidente est vivement préoccupée par les combats qui opposent, au Soudan, le gouvernement du pays et le Mouvement populaire de Libération du Soudan — Nord dans les États du Nil bleu et du Kordofan méridional; le conflit a infligé d'énormes souffrances à la population civile, touchant près d'un million de personnes et provoquant l'exode de 200 000 réfugiés vers les pays voisins. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante condamne, en particulier, toutes les attaques visant des civils, qui constituent une violation flagrante du droit humanitaire international et des Droits de l'homme. Elle rappelle que les responsables de violences, de crimes de guerre et d'autres crimes au regard du droit international devront rendre compte de leurs actes, et souligne qu'il incombe au gouvernement soudanais de protéger tous les civils et d'en finir avec la culture de l'impunité qui règne dans le pays.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante invite les deux parties à poursuivre les pourparlers entamés sous les auspices de l'Union africaine en mai, afin de convenir d'un cessez-le-feu immédiat, d'un accès humanitaire sûr et sans entrave, et d'une solution politique globale au conflit dans les deux zones concernées. La recherche de la paix au Soudan demeure une priorité pour l'Union européenne, qui mobilise à cette fin tous les instruments applicables à la situation, y compris un soutien à la médiation de l'UA, les travaux de la représentante spéciale de l'UE pour le Soudan et le Soudan du Sud, l'aide humanitaire et la coopération au développement.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007209/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Scorched earth tactics in Sudan

New satellite imagery and eyewitness accounts from rebel-held areas in Sudan's Blue Nile State show that Sudanese military forces have resorted to brutal scorched earth tactics to drive out the civilian population.

A document entitled 'We had no time to bury them: War crimes in Sudan's Blue Nile State' describes how bombings and ground attacks by Sudanese military forces have destroyed entire villages, left many dead and injured, and forced tens of thousands to flee — with many now facing starvation, disease and exhaustion. Evidence gathered by Amnesty International indicates that villages in the Ingessana Hills, an area held for a time by the Sudan People's Liberation Army — North (SPLA-N) — endured multiple scorched earth offensives in 2012. Witnesses also described bombing attacks as recent as April 2013 that killed children and other civilians.

Satellite imagery of the Ingessana hills shows the destruction of several villages.

This systematic and deliberate targeting of civilians follows a disturbing pattern that was used by the Sudanese Government to devastating effect in Darfur.

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative not believe that deliberately attacking civilians is a war crime? Given the scale, as well as the apparently systematic nature of these attacks, they may also constitute crimes against humanity.

The report also describes how some people had to choose between taking their children to a place of safety or helping their elderly parents. Faced with attack, aerial bombardment and the prospect of starvation, those who are physically able have little choice but to flee — often after making painful decisions about who among the weakest should be left behind.

2. The possibility of a long-term stalemate is extremely worrying. Will the Vice-President/High Representative give this human rights crisis the attention it deserves?

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

The HR/VP is gravely concerned about the ongoing fighting between the Government of Sudan and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement-North in Blue Nile and Southern Kordofan states in Sudan which has caused enormous suffering for the civilian population, affecting almost a million people and causing the exodus of 200 000 refugees to neighbouring countries. The HR/VP condemns in particular all attacks targeting civilians which are in blatant violation of international humanitarian and human rights law. She recalls that those responsible for violence, war crimes and other crimes under international law must be held accountable. She recalls the Government of Sudan's responsibility to protect all its civilians and to end the culture of impunity.

The HR/VP calls on both parties to continue direct talks that have started under the auspices of the African Union in May, in order to agree on an immediate ceasefire, safe and unhindered humanitarian access, and on a comprehensive political solution to the conflict in the Two Areas. The quest for peace in Sudan remains a priority for the EU, and the EU engages with all instruments applicable to the situation, including support to AU mediation, the work of the EU Special Representative for Sudan and South Sudan, humanitarian assistance and development cooperation.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007211/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Droits de l'homme en Ukraine: suivi 1

Suite à ma question écrite E-004371/2013 sur la multiplication des violations des Droits de l'homme en Ukraine, la Commission m'a répondu, entre autres, ceci: «Parmi les mesures que l'Ukraine est fortement invitée à prendre, figure aussi l'octroi des ressources nécessaires pour mettre en œuvre efficacement le mécanisme national de prévention de la torture, conformément au "protocole facultatif à la Convention des Nations unies contre la torture et autres peines ou traitements cruels, inhumains ou dégradants"».

1. S'agit-il d'une déclaration d'intention, d'un engagement ou d'une condition au maintien des accords UE-Ukraine?

2. Sur quelle base la Commission va-t-elle évaluer les résultats obtenus par l'Ukraine?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(8 août 2013)

Dans ses conclusions du 10 décembre 2012 sur l'Ukraine, qui énoncent les critères de référence devant être remplis pour rendre possible la signature de l'accord d'association/l'accord de libre-échange approfondi et complet, le Conseil «Affaires étrangères» a insisté, entre autres, sur l'importance de la mise en œuvre effective du mécanisme national de prévention de la torture. Ce critère couvre sans ambiguïté tous les aspects pertinents, y compris l'allocation de ressources adéquates.

La mise en œuvre du mécanisme de prévention de la torture est régulièrement examinée avec les autorités ukrainiennes dans le cadre des mécanismes créés pour assurer le suivi des conclusions du Conseil «Affaires étrangères» du 10 décembre 2012, ainsi que dans le cadre du dialogue régulier sur les Droits de l'homme. Par ce biais, les autorités ukrainiennes ont communiqué des informations sur les activités de la direction chargée de la mise en œuvre du mécanisme de prévention de la torture, établie au sein du secrétariat du médiateur, sur la création du conseil d'experts composé de représentants d'organisations non gouvernementales (ONG) et sur les missions menées par des organisations internationales en Ukraine. À ce jour, le conseil d'experts s'est réuni trois fois et a approuvé, entre autres: i) un programme d'actions communes pour 2013; ii) des règles pour la participation de militants de la société civile aux visites de suivi. Depuis le début de 2013, une cinquantaine de visites auraient été effectuées dans des centres de détention et auraient été suivies d'une centaine de recommandations aux institutions pénitentiaires.

La délégation de l'UE à Kiev reste par ailleurs en contact étroit avec les représentants des ONG assurant le suivi des avancées dans ce domaine.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007211/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Human rights in Ukraine — first follow-up question

Following my Written Question E-004371/2013 about the increasing human rights violations in Ukraine, the Commission replied as follows: 'Among the measures Ukraine is vigorously asked to take is also the allocation of the necessary resources to implement effectively the National Preventive Mechanism against Torture in accordance with the "Optional Protocol to the UN Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment"' '.

1. Is this a declaration of intent, a commitment or a condition for maintaining EU-Ukraine agreements?

2. On what basis will the Commission assess the results achieved by Ukraine?

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

The 10 December 2012 Foreign Affairs Council's (FAC) conclusions on Ukraine, setting out the benchmarks for the possible signing of the Association Agreement/Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA), *inter alia* emphasised the importance of the effective implementation of the National Preventive Mechanism against torture. This benchmark clearly covers all relevant aspects, including the allocation of adequate resources.

The implementation of the Preventive Mechanism is discussed regularly with the Ukrainian authorities within the mechanisms set up for the monitoring of the implementation of the 10 December 2012 FAC conclusions as well as through the regular dialogue on human rights. In these formats, Ukraine's authorities informed about the activities of the Directorate on the implementation of the Preventive Mechanism established in the Secretariat of the Ombudsman as well as about the establishment of the Expert Council of representatives of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and of the missions of international organisations in Ukraine. To date, the Expert Council met three times, approving, among other things: (i) a plan of joint actions for 2013; (ii) rules for involvement of the civil society activists into the monitoring visits. Since the beginning of 2013 there have been reportedly more than 50 monitoring visits to the detention places, followed by more than 100 recommendations to the penitentiary institutions.

The EU Delegation in Kyiv also keeps close contact with the representatives of the NGOs monitoring results in this area.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007212/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Droits de l'homme en Ukraine: suivi 2

Suite à ma question écrite E-004371/2013 sur la multiplication des violations des Droits de l'homme en Ukraine, la Commission m'a répondu, entre autres, ceci: «La mise en place rapide d'un bureau national d'enquête, qui jouerait le rôle de police judiciaire chargée d'enquêter sur les crimes commis par les fonctionnaires (y compris la police et le parquet), constitue une autre priorité lors des discussions entre l'UE et les autorités ukrainiennes».

1. S'agit-il d'une déclaration d'intention, d'un engagement ou d'une condition au maintien des accords UE-Ukraine?

2. À quelle date est prévue la mise en place de ce bureau national?

Réponse donnée par la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante Ashton au nom de la Commission
(8 août 2013)

La mise en place d'un bureau national d'enquête est une exigence du droit national découlant du nouveau code de procédure pénale de l'Ukraine. Celui-ci prévoit, à compter de la date de son entrée en vigueur, le 17 novembre 2012, une période transitoire maximale de cinq ans pour la mise en place du bureau.

Les conclusions sur l'Ukraine adoptées le 10 décembre 2012 par le Conseil «Affaires étrangères» (CAE) soulignaient entre autres l'importance que le code de procédure pénale soit effectivement mis en œuvre. Il est clair que cet objectif de référence concerne tous les aspects pertinents de cette mise en œuvre, y compris l'instauration d'un bureau national d'enquête.

Dans le cadre des mécanismes de suivi de la mise en œuvre des conclusions du CAE du 10 décembre 2012, l'avancement des préparatifs de la mise en place du bureau fait régulièrement l'objet d'échanges avec les autorités ukrainiennes, lesquels ont montré que ces dernières semblent déterminées à prendre toutes les mesures nécessaires pour mettre en place le bureau national d'enquête dans les cinq années de la période de transition. L'Union européenne attache une grande importance à la mise en œuvre aussi rapide que possible de cette disposition.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007212/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Human rights in Ukraine — second follow-up question

Following my Written Question E-004371/2013 about the increasing human rights violations in Ukraine, the Commission replied as follows: 'The early establishment of a National Bureau of Investigation, which should act as a judicial police investigating crimes committed by civil servants (including police and prosecution) represents another priority in discussions between the EU and the Ukrainian authorities.'

1. Is this a declaration of intent, a commitment or a condition for maintaining EU-Ukraine agreements?

2. What is the target date for this national bureau to be set up?

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

The establishment of a National Bureau of Investigation is a domestic legal requirement stemming from Ukraine's new Criminal Procedure Code. The Code provides for a transitory period of up to five years for the establishment of the Bureau from the date of its entry into force — 17 November 2012.

The 10 December 2012 Foreign Affairs Council's (FAC) conclusions on Ukraine *inter alia* emphasised the importance of the effective implementation of the Criminal Procedure Code. This benchmark clearly covers all relevant aspects, including the establishment of a National Bureau of Investigation.

The state of preparation for the establishment of the Bureau is discussed regularly with the Ukrainian authorities within the mechanisms set up for the monitoring of the implementation of the 10 December 2012 FAC conclusions. The discussions have showed that the Ukrainian authorities appear committed to take all the necessary steps to establish the National Bureau of Investigation within the five years transitory period. The European Union attaches great importance to the earliest possible implementation of this provision.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007213/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Agents de joueurs: suivi

À la suite de ma question E-004273/2013 sur le statut des agents de joueurs, la Commission répond entre autre que:

«La conférence européenne sur les agents sportifs organisée par la Commission en novembre 2011 a confirmé ces conclusions. Les participants à cette conférence en ont retiré qu'une autorégulation du mouvement sportif constituait la meilleure démarche pour aller de l'avant, tout en n'excluant pas la possibilité d'une intervention de l'UE si cette approche se révélait inefficace».

1. Quels sont les critères qui permettront de dire si une autorégulation du mouvement sportifest la bonne optique?

2. Quand la Commission compte-t-elle refaire un point en vue d'une éventuelleintervention?

Réponse donnée par M^{me} Vassiliou au nom de la Commission
(26 juillet 2013)

La Commission estime que l'autorégulation du mouvement sportif devrait faciliter la recherche de solutions aux questions et aux problèmes identifiés par l'étude sur les agents sportifs dans l'UE (2010) et discutés lors de la conférence européenne sur les agents sportifs (2011). Ces questions portent notamment sur la transparence des transactions financières, sur la protection des plus jeunes joueurs, en particulier des mineurs, et sur l'éventuelle situation de conflit d'intérêt des agents de joueurs et de clubs.

Depuis 2010, la Commission est activement impliquée dans ces questions et elle suit de près les progrès accomplis dans le cadre du processus initié par la FIFA en vue de réformer la réglementation actuelle sur les agents de joueurs de football. Si l'approche d'autorégulation ne donne pas les résultats escomptés, la Commission examinera toutes les options à sa disposition afin de traiter les problèmes non résolus. La Commission réétudiera sa position en fonction des recommandations proposées par le groupe d'experts sur la bonne gouvernance d'ici la fin de l'année 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007213/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Sports agents — follow-up

In its answer to my Written Question E-004273/2013 on the status of sports agents, the Commission stated the following:

'These findings were confirmed at the EU Conference on Sports Agents organised by the Commission in November 2011. The participants in the conference concluded that a self-regulatory approach by the sports movement was the most appropriate way forward, albeit while maintaining the option of EU action if self-regulation fails to deliver the expected results.'

1. What criteria will be used to determine whether a self-regulatory approach by the sports movement is the right way forward?

2. When does the Commission intend to reconsider whether it should perhaps get involved?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

The Commission considers that self-regulation by the sport movement should facilitate finding solutions to the problems and issues identified by the Study on Sports Agents (2010) in the EU and discussed at the EU Conference on Sports Agents (2011). These issues include notably the transparency of financial transactions; the protection of the youngest players, in particular minor players; and the possible conflict of interest for agents in the representation of players and clubs.

The Commission has been actively involved in these issues since 2010 and is closely following the progress achieved in the framework of the process launched by FIFA with a view to overhauling the current Regulations on Players' Agents in football. If a self-regulatory approach does not deliver the expected results, the Commission will consider all options at its disposal in order to address the problems that remain unsolved. The Commission will examine its position in light of the recommendations to be put forward by the Expert Group on Good Governance by the end of 2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007214/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Sécurité d'approvisionnement d'énergie

Aujourd'hui, chaque État membre gère sa sécurité d'approvisionnement au niveau national.

1. La Commission n'estime-t-elle pas qu'une plus grande communication entre les États en matière énergétique serait profitable? En effet, lorsque l'Allemagne a décidé de cesser l'exploitation nucléaire, nombre de ses homologues ne l'ont appris que par voie de presse.

2. Chaque État membre pense à son propre système en vue de garantir la suffisance des moyens de production, ce qui est bien légitime, mais la thématique est bien plus large. La Commission ne trouve-t-elle pas que l'Europe aurait tout à gagner en parlant d'une seule voix au niveau énergétique?

Réponse donnée par M. Oettinger au nom de la Commission
(12 août 2013)

L'amélioration de la communication entre les États membres en matière énergétique est un objectif partagé par la Commission. Dans le domaine de l'énergie, il existe de multiples exemples d'une telle coopération.

En ce qui concerne l'électricité, la Commission a décidé en 2012 de mettre en place le groupe de coordination pour l'électricité, afin de renforcer et d'intensifier la coopération et la coordination entre les États membres et la Commission dans le domaine des échanges transfrontaliers et de la sécurité d'approvisionnement. L'utilisation de méthodologies divergentes, au niveau des États membres, pour évaluer l'adéquation des capacités de production montre que l'interdépendance des États membres en matière de sécurité d'approvisionnement n'est pas encore totalement prise en compte.

En collaboration avec les participants au groupe de coordination pour l'électricité, la Commission examine actuellement la manière dont il pourrait être remédié, par une coopération plus étroite, aux lacunes dans la méthodologie utilisée pour évaluer l'adéquation des capacités de production, au niveau européen et national. Elle veille également à ce que le rapport établi à l'échelle de l'Union par le Réseau européen des gestionnaires de réseaux de transport d'électricité puisse répondre aux besoins des décideurs politiques.

Pour ce qui est du gaz, le règlement (UE) n° 994/2010 concernant la sécurité d'approvisionnement est le fondement de la coopération en matière de sécurité de l'approvisionnement. Le règlement prévoit l'obligation pour les États membres de réaliser des évaluations de la sécurité de l'approvisionnement, y compris des approvisionnements en provenance d'autres États membres. Il renforce en outre les mécanismes de prévention et de réaction aux crises.

Les États membres coopèrent également dans le domaine des relations avec les pays tiers. La décision n° 994/2012/UE du 25 octobre 2012 établit un mécanisme d'échange d'informations en ce qui concerne les accords intergouvernementaux conclus entre des États membres et des pays tiers dans le domaine de l'énergie. La finalité est d'accroître la transparence et de garantir que les règles du marché intérieur et les objectifs de la politique en matière de sécurité énergétique de l'Union soient respectés dans ces accords.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007214/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Security of energy supplies

Today, each Member State manages the security of its own energy supplies at national level.

1. Does the Commission not believe that more communication between States regarding energy would be beneficial? In fact, when Germany decided to stop using nuclear energy, some countries only learned of this in the media.

2. Each Member State considers its own system with a view to ensuring sufficient means of production, which is quite legitimate, but the topic is much broader than that. Does the Commission not think that Europe would greatly benefit from speaking with one voice on energy?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

Improving the communication between Member States on energy is an objective shared by the Commission. In the area of energy there are multiple examples of such cooperation.

As regards electricity, the Commission decided in 2012 to establish the Electricity Coordination Group (ECG) to strengthen and intensify the cooperation and coordination between Member States and the Commission in the field of cross-border trade and security of supply. Differing methodologies at Member State level for assessing generation adequacy mean that the mutual interdependence of Member States for security of supply is not yet fully taken into account.

The Commission, working with ECG participants, is currently examining how deficiencies in the methodology for generation adequacy assessments at European and national level can be remedied through closer cooperation and ensure that the EU-wide report produced by ENTSO-E can meet the needs of policy-makers.

As regards gas, the Security of Supply Regulation 994/2010 is the basis for the cooperation regarding security of supply. The regulation foresees the obligation for Member States to prepare security of supply assessments including supplies from other Member States. It also strengthens the prevention and crisis response mechanisms.

Member States cooperate also in respect to the relations with non-EU countries. Decision No 994/2012/EU of 25 October 2012 establishes an information exchange mechanism for intergovernmental agreements between Member States and third countries in the field of energy. The objective is to increase transparency and to ensure that EU internal market rules and energy security policy goals are respected in such agreements.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007215/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Revelações da Apple sobre pedidos das autoridades americanas sobre utilizadores

A empresa norte-americana Apple revelou que recebeu entre 4 000 e 5 000 pedidos das autoridades do seu país, num período de seis meses, como parte do programa secreto de vigilância das comunicações internacionais pela internet, dias depois de o Facebook e a Microsoft terem feito revelações similares.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que avaliação faz destas revelações?

— Sabe se foi posto em causa o direito à segurança e privacidade das comunicações dos cidadãos europeus?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(26 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão está preocupada com os programas de vigilância dos EUA denunciados na comunicação social e o potencial impacto nos direitos fundamentais dos europeus. A Vice-Presidente Reding falou desta questão diretamente com o Procurador-Geral dos EUA, Eric Holder, na reunião ministerial da Justiça e Assuntos Internos UE-EUA em Dublin, a 14 de junho. Na sequência desta reunião, foram pedidos esclarecimentos adicionais por escrito às autoridades americanas, incluindo o volume dos dados recolhidos, o âmbito de aplicação dos programas e o controlo judicial disponível para os europeus. Além disso, a Comissão instituiu, juntamente com a Presidência lituana do Conselho da UE, um grupo de trabalho ad hoc UE-EUA para examinar estas questões mais a fundo. Com base nas informações obtidas, a Comissão apresentará um relatório ao Parlamento Europeu e ao Conselho em outubro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007215/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Revelations by Apple regarding requests for user information made by the US authorities

Just days after Facebook and Microsoft made similar revelations, the US company Apple has revealed that it received between 4 000 and 5 000 requests from the US authorities over a period of six months, as part of the secret programme to monitor international communications over the Internet.

— What does the Commission think of these revelations?

— Does it know if the right of EU citizens to secure and private communications was compromised?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(26 August 2013)

The Commission is concerned about the US surveillance programmes reported in the media and the potential impact on the fundamental rights of Europeans. Vice-President Reding raised this issue directly with the US Attorney-General Eric Holder at the EU-US Justice and Home Affairs Ministerial in Dublin on 14 June. Following this meeting, further clarification has been requested by writing to the US authorities, including on the volume of the data collected, the scope of the programmes and the judicial oversight available to Europeans. In addition, the Commission has set up, together with the Lithuanian Presidency of the Council of the EU, an ad-hoc EU-US working group to examine these issues further. Based on the information gathered, the Commission will report back to the European Parliament and the Council of the EU in October.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007216/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Exceção cultural — polémica em torno das declarações do Presidente da Comissão

O Presidente da Comissão Europeia criticou abertamente alguns setores adeptos da exclusão do setor audiovisual do mandato de negociação comercial da União Europeia com os Estados Unidos. Estas declarações foram interpretadas pela comunicação social e alguns decisores políticos, a nosso ver abusivamente, como tendo sido proferidas «contra a França» ou «o povo francês».

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Poderia clarificar o âmbito e os destinatários das declarações do seu Presidente?

— Considera razoáveis ou justificadas as críticas de que o seu Presidente foi objeto?

— Por que formas poderá a União Europeia contribuir para a proteção da diversidade cultural sem impor um protecionismo excessivo em torno da Europa?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(14 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão está em condições de informar o Senhor Deputado de que não está em causa a dimensão europeia da diversidade cultural: a defesa deste princípio constitui não só um objetivo fundamental da União Europeia como também uma obrigação jurídica consagrada no Tratado. Além disso, a UE assumiu compromissos nessa matéria no âmbito da Convenção da Unesco sobre a Proteção e a Promoção da Diversidade das Expressões Culturais. A questão não reside em saber se a diversidade cultural deve ser defendida no contexto das negociações relativas a uma nova parceria em matéria de comércio e de investimento com os Estados Unidos (TTIP) e sim qual a melhor forma para o fazer. A Comissão e os Estados-Membros têm vindo a discutir formas de incluir no âmbito das diretrizes de negociação da Parceria Transatlântica em matéria de Comércio e Investimento (TTIP), o justo equilíbrio entre, por um lado, a sensibilidade do setor audiovisual, e, por outro, o objetivo de levar a cabo negociações abrangentes e ambiciosas. Os serviços audiovisuais são excluídos do capítulo dedicado ao comércio de serviços e direito de estabelecimento. Embora a Comissão esteja disposta a ouvir as opiniões dos seus parceiros nesta matéria, não está em posição de negociar compromissos de liberalização neste domínio sensível.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007216/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: 'Cultural exemption' — controversy surrounding utterances by the Commission President

A number of outspoken criticisms by the Commission President regarding those seeking to exclude the audiovisual sector from the EU's mandate to negotiate a trade deal with the US have been interpreted by the media and certain political circles, unfairly in our opinion, as being 'anti-French'.

In view of this:

— Could the Commission clarify the significance of the President's observations? To whom was he referring?

— Does it regard the accusations levelled at him as reasonable or justified?

— What action could be taken in future by the EU to help conserve cultural diversity without surrounding Europe with excessively protectionist barriers?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2013)

The Commission can inform the Honourable Member that there is no discussion on the European dimension of cultural diversity: the defence of this principle is a fundamental objective of the European Union, but also a legal obligation, enshrined in the Treaty. In addition, the EU has made commitments in this regard as part of the Unesco Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. The question is not whether cultural diversity must be defended in the negotiations on a new partnership for trade and investment with the United States (TTIP), but what is the best way to do this. The Commission and the Member States have discussed about ways to include the right balance in the negotiating directives of the TTIP between, on the one hand, the sensitivity of the audiovisual sector and on the other, the aim of extensive and ambitious negotiations. Audiovisual services are excluded from the chapter on trade in services and establishment. Although the Commission is willing to listen to the ideas of its partners on this issue, it is not in a position to negotiate liberalisation commitments in this sensitive area.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007217/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Irão — eleição do Presidente Hassan Rohani

O Presidente eleito Hassan Rohani expressou, na sua primeira conferência de imprensa, a esperança de que o Irão possa alcançar com a comunidade internacional um novo acordo sobre o seu programa nuclear, afirmando que este acordo pode ser obtido com mais transparência e confiança mútua.

Assim, pergunto à Vice-presidente/Alta Representante:

— Que comentários lhe merecem as declarações do Presidente eleito?

— Já o contactou?

— Considera possível que seja alcançado um novo acordo sobre o programa nuclear iraniano?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(19 de agosto de 2013)

A AR/VP emitiu uma declaração em 15 de junho sobre as eleições iranianas, na qual desejava que o novo Presidente Rohani fosse bem-sucedido na formação de um novo governo e no desempenho das suas responsabilidades. Manifestou também o seu compromisso em trabalhar com a nova liderança iraniana para encontrar uma solução rápida para a questão nuclear.

A AR/VP ainda não contactou o Presidente Rohani, que assumirá as suas funções a 3 de agosto. A UE mantém-se empenhada numa solução diplomática baseada numa abordagem em duas vertentes, no quadro do E3/UE+3. Serão envidados esforços diplomáticos adicionais após a investidura do novo Presidente.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007217/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Election of Hassan Rohani as Iranian President

In his first press conference, President-elect Hassan Rohani said he hoped that Iran could come to a new agreement with the international community on the Iranian nuclear programme, stating that such an agreement could be achieved with more transparency and mutual trust.

— What does the Vice-President/High Representative have to say about the President-elect's comments?

— Has she already been in contact with him?

— Does she think that a new agreement can be reached on the Iranian nuclear programme?

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

The HR/VP issued a statement on 15 June on the Iranian elections, in which she wished Mr Rohani well in forming a new government and in taking up his reponsibility. She also expressed her commitment to work with the new Iranian leadership towards a swift solution of the nuclear issue.

The HR/VP has not been in contact with President Rohani who will only take up duties on 3 August. The EU remains committed to a diplomatic solution based on double-track approach, within E3/EU+3 framework. Further diplomatic efforts will take place after the inauguration of the new president.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007218/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Programa americano de vigilância da internet

Face às críticas acerca do seu programa de vigilância da internet, as autoridades norte-americanas informaram que o mesmo apenas tem como alvo estrangeiros suspeitos de atividades terroristas e esclareceu que já permitiu neutralizar ataques terroristas.

Assim, pergunto à Vice-presidente/Alta Representante:

— Que comentário lhe merecem as informações entretanto prestadas pelas autoridades americanas?

— Contactou-as a este respeito?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(2 de setembro de 2013)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-007934/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007218/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — US Internet monitoring programme

In response to criticism over its Internet monitoring programme, the US authorities have stated that the programme only targets foreigners suspected of terrorist activities and explained that it had already helped prevent terrorist attacks.

— What does the Vice-President/High Representative have to say about the statements made by the US authorities?

— Has she contacted them in this regard?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 September 2013)

The Commision would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007934/2013.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007219/13
do Komisji
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(19 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Testowanie substancji chemicznych na zwierzętach

Testowanie na zwierzętach produktów kosmetycznych jest zabronione w UE już od 2004 r. a od 2009 r. zakaz ten dotyczy także samych składników kosmetyku. W przypadku najbardziej złożonych skutków dla zdrowia początek obowiązywania zakazu wprowadzania do obrotu został przesunięty na 11 marca 2013 r. W obecnej chwili zostało to rzeczywiście całkowicie zniesione w stosunku do branży kosmetycznej, jednak wciąż nie odkryto alternatywnych metod, które w pełni zastąpiłyby testowanie substancji chemicznych. Ustalenia te nie dotyczą np. leków czy suplementów diety.

13 września 2011 r. Komisja opublikowała raport dotyczący testowania kosmetyków na zwierzętach. Uwzględniła w nim, że w marcu 2013 r. alternatywne metody testowania nie zastąpią w całości metod testowania na zwierzętach. W raporcie tym nie pojawiła się intencja wprowadzenia całkowitego zakazu, jak i informacja dotycząca konkretnej daty takiej zmiany.

W związku z ustaleniami chciałbym zapytać:

1. W jaki sposób Komisja chce promować unijny model przemysłu kosmetycznego na arenie międzynarodowej w krajach nieobjętych tym rozporządzeniem? Jakie kroki chce podjąć Komisja, żeby poszerzać i propagować te ustalenia?

2. Na jakim etapie znajdują się prace nad znalezieniem alternatywnych metod testowania produktów chemicznych, tak aby w całości zastąpić nimi testy nad zwierzętami?

3. W jaki sposób Komisja przewiduje zapewnienie opieki tym zwierzętom, na których zostały dopuszczone badania laboratoryjne?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Nevena Mimicę w imieniu Komisji
(29 lipca 2013 r.)

Dnia 11 marca 2013 r. Komisja przyjęła komunikat do Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w sprawie zakazu przeprowadzania testów na zwierzętach i zakazu wprowadzania do obrotu oraz w sprawie aktualnej sytuacji w zakresie metod alternatywnych w branży produktów kosmetycznych (COM(2013) 135 final z 11.3.2013 r.) ([1]). W komunikacie tym Komisja pokreśliła wagę międzynarodowej współpracy w zakresie zastąpienia badań na zwierzętach w branży kosmetycznej metodami alternatywnymi oraz opracowania takich metod, a także opisała najważniejsze narzędzia stosowane w tym celu. Chodzi tu zwłaszcza o: współpracę na szczeblu OECD w zakresie wytycznych dotyczących przeprowadzania testów, międzynarodową współpracę w dziedzinie regulacji dotyczących kosmetyków (International Collaboration on Cosmetics Regulation, ICCR) oraz kontakty dwustronne.

We wspomnianym komunikacie Komisja przedstawiła także aktualne informacje dotyczące metod alternatywnych wobec badań na zwierzętach. W skrócie, pomimo znacznych postępów, na razie nie jest możliwe pełne zastąpienie badań na zwierzętach metodami alternatywnymi. Szczegółowe informacje znaleźć można w sprawozdaniu z postępu prac laboratorium referencyjnego Unii Europejskiej ds. metod alternatywnych wobec testów na zwierzętach (EURL ECVAM) w sprawie opracowywania, walidacji i zatwierdzania przez organy regulacyjne metod alternatywnych wobec badań na zwierzętach w dziedzinie kosmetyków (2010-2013) ([2]).

Opieka nad zwierzętami będącymi przedmiotem badań laboratoryjnych została zapewniona przepisami dyrektywy 2010/63/UE w sprawie ochrony zwierząt wykorzystywanych do celów naukowych ([3]). Państwa członkowskie mają obowiązek przestrzegania przepisów wspomnianej dyrektywy od dnia 1 stycznia 2013 r.

([1]) Zob.: http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/com_at_2013_en.pdf
([2]) Zob.: http://ihcp.jrc.ec.europa.eu/our_labs/eurl-ecvam/eurl-ecvam-releases-2013-progress-report-development-validation-regulatory-acceptance-alternative-methods
([3]) Dz.U. L 276 z 20.10.2010, s. 33.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007219/13
to the Commission
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Testing of chemical substances on animals

Testing of cosmetic products on animals has been banned in the EU since 2004, and since 2009 this ban has also applied to the ingredients in cosmetics. In the case of the most complex health effects, the start of the marketing ban was postponed until 11 March 2013. At the moment it has in fact been completely lifted in respect of the cosmetics industry, but no alternative methods have yet been found to fully replace chemicals testing. These arrangements do not apply, for example, to medicines or food supplements.

On 13 September 2011, the Commission published a report on the testing of cosmetics on animals. It took into account the fact that in March 2013 alternative testing methods had not completely replaced animal testing methods. The report did not indicate the intention to introduce a total ban or give any date as to when that change would occur.

In this connection, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. How does it wish to promote the EU model of the cosmetics industry in the international arena in countries not covered by this regulation? What measures does the Commission intend to take to promote these arrangements?

2. What stage has been reached in the work to find alternative methods of testing chemical products so that they can fully replace animal testing?

3. How does the Commission plan to ensure the care of animals which have subjected to laboratory testing?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

The Commission adopted its communication to the European Parliament and the Council on the animal testing and marketing ban, and on the state of play in relation to alternative methods in the field of cosmetics (COM(2013) 135 final) ([1]), on 11 March 2013. In this communication, the Commission underlined the importance of international cooperation on the replacement of animal testing in the field of cosmetics and the development of alternative methods and described the main tools in place. These are notably: cooperation at the OECD level on test guidelines, cooperation in the International Collaboration on Cosmetics Regulation (ICCR) and bilateral contacts.

In this communication, the Commission also provided an update on the availability of alternative methods to animal testing. In a nutshell, while substantial progress has been made, the full replacement of animal testing is not yet possible. Further details can be found in EURL ECVAM progress report on the development, validation and regulatory acceptance of alternative methods (2010-2013) ([2]).

The care for animals subject to laboratory testing is ensured through Directive 2010/63/EU on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes ([3]). The provisions of this directive must be applied by the EU Member States since 1 January 2013.

([1]) See: http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/sectors/cosmetics/files/pdf/animal_testing/com_at_2013_en.pdf.
([2]) See: http://ihcp.jrc.ec.europa.eu/our_labs/eurl-ecvam/eurl-ecvam-releases-2013-progress-report-development-validation-regulatory-acceptance-alternative-methods.
([3]) OJ L 276, 20.10.2010, p. 33 ff.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007220/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2012/5/UE — vacinação contra a febre catarral ovina

A Diretiva 2012/5/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 14 de março de 2012, alterou a Diretiva 2000/75/CE do Conselho no que respeita à vacinação contra a febre catarral ovina.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2012/5/UE?

— Dispõe de dados que permitam aferir de que modo a vacinação com vacinas inativadas melhorou os níveis de controlo da febre catarral ovina e de prevenção da doença clínica na União, em comparação com as anteriores vacinas vivas modificadas?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(23 de julho de 2013)

Os Estados-Membros deviam transpor a Diretiva 2012/5/UE ([1]) até 23 de setembro de 2012. Atualmente, apenas a Áustria não notificou as medidas nacionais de transposição. Em 28 de novembro de 2012, foi iniciado um processo por infração contra a Áustria por não ter notificado as suas medidas nacionais de transposição.

Como previsto, a Diretiva 2012/5/UE permitiu às autoridades e às partes interessadas dos Estados-Membros recorrerem à vacinação, em condições mais flexíveis que permitem a execução da vacinação em função das diferentes necessidades.

Em 2012, ocorreram 388 surtos de febre catarral ovina, o que indica que a tendência para uma situação mais favorável e comum da doença continuou. A doença apenas foi diagnosticada em territórios de mais elevado risco e em que a vacinação não foi efetuada de forma eficaz.

Por conseguinte, os dados disponíveis sugerem claramente que, no âmbito do novo quadro jurídico, a utilização de vacinas inativadas conduziu a uma melhoria significativa na situação da febre catarral ovina. No entanto, não foram realizados estudos específicos para quantificar os benefícios da vacinação com vacinas inativadas, em comparação com as antigas vacinas vivas modificadas.

([1]) Diretiva 2012/5/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 14 de março de 2012, que altera a Diretiva 2000/75/CE do Conselho no que respeita à vacinação contra a febre catarral ovina — JO L 81 de 21.3.2012. p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007220/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2012/5/EU — vaccination against bluetongue

Directive 2012/5/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March 2012 amended Council Directive 2000/75/EC as regards vaccination against bluetongue.

— Which Member States have still not transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Directive 2012/5/EU?

— Does it have any figures to gauge how vaccination with inactivated vaccines has improved the control of bluetongue and the prevention of clinical disease in the EU, compared with the old modified live vaccines?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

Member States were required to transpose Directive 2012/5/EU ([1]) by 23 September 2012. Currently, only Austria has not notified the national transposition measures. An infringement procedure for failure to notify its national implementing measures was launched on 28 November 2012 against Austria.

As envisaged, Directive 2012/5/EU has allowed Member States' authorities and stakeholders to make use of vaccination under more flexible conditions allowing for the implementation of vaccination suiting the different needs.

In 2012, 388 outbreaks of bluetongue occurred indicating that the trend towards a more favourable and ordinary disease situation has continued. The disease has only been diagnosed in territories which are at higher risk and where vaccination was poorly implemented.

The data available therefore clearly suggests that, under the new legal framework, the use of inactivated vaccines has led to a major improvement in the bluetongue situation. However, no specific studies have been carried out to quantify the benefits of vaccination with inactivated vaccines compared with the old modified live vaccines.

([1]) Directive 2012/5/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March 2012 amending Council Directive 2000/75/EC as regards vaccination against bluetongue — OJ L 81, 21.3.2012, p. 1.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007221/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva de Execução 2012/8/UE

A Diretiva de Execução 2012/8/UE da Comissão, de 2 de março de 2012, alterou a Diretiva 2003/90/CE que estabelece regras de execução do artigo 7.° da Diretiva 2002/53/CE do Conselho no que diz respeito aos carateres que, no mínimo, devem ser apreciados pelo exame e às condições mínimas para o exame de determinadas variedades de espécies de plantas agrícolas.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2012/8/UE?

— As variedades vegetais que os Estados-Membros atualmente incluem nos respetivos catálogos nacionais cumprem os princípios diretores estabelecidos pelo Instituto Comunitário das Variedades Vegetais (ICVV)?

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007222/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva de Execução 2011/68/UE

A Diretiva de Execução 2011/68/UE da Comissão, de 1 de julho de 2011, alterou as Diretivas 2003/90/CE e 2003/91/CE que estabelecem regras de execução do artigo 7.° das Diretivas 2002/53/CE e 2002/55/CE do Conselho, respetivamente, no que diz respeito aos carateres que, no mínimo, devem ser apreciados pelo exame e às condições mínimas para o exame de determinadas variedades de espécies de plantas agrícolas e de espécies hortícolas.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva de Execução 2011/68/UE?

Resposta conjunta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(29 de julho de 2013)

As Diretivas de Execução da Comissão 2012/8/CE e 2011/68/CE estabelecem regras de execução do artigo 7.° das Diretivas 2002/53/CE e 2002/55/CE do Conselho, respetivamente, no que diz respeito aos carateres que, no mínimo, devem ser apreciados pelo exame e às condições mínimas para o exame de determinadas variedades de espécies de plantas agrícolas e de espécies hortícolas. Os 27 Estados-Membros notificaram a transposição. No caso da Croácia, esta notificou a transposição e a Comissão está a proceder à sua avaliação. A avaliação é um controlo jurídico de medidas publicadas nos Estados-Membros.

Os protocolos são preparados pelos peritos do Instituto Comunitário das Variedades Vegetais (ICVV), pelos Estados-Membros e pela União Internacional para a Proteção das Variedades Vegetais (UPOV), a fim de ter em conta os novos conhecimentos técnicos e harmonizar os protocolos técnicos. Com base nos documentos adotados pelo Conselho de Administração do ICVV e pelo Conselho da UPOV, a Comissão introduziu diversas alterações aos exames técnicos para o registo de variedades vegetais.

A partir da data correspondente ao prazo de transposição, as variedades vegetais analisadas e em seguida registadas pelos Estados-Membros nos seus catálogos nacionais têm de ser conformes com os protocolos técnicos específicos estabelecidos pelo ICVV ou, na sua ausência, com as orientações estabelecidas pela UPOV ou, na sua ausência, com as regras nacionais.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007221/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Implementing Directive 2012/8/EU

Commission Implementing Directive 2012/8/EU of 2 March 2012 amended Directive 2003/90/EC setting out implementing measures for the purposes of Article 7 of Council Directive 2002/53/EC as regards the characteristics to be covered as a minimum by the examination and the minimum conditions for examining certain varieties of agricultural plant species.

— Which Member States have still not transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Directive 2012/8/EU?

— Do the plant varieties that the Member States currently include in their national catalogues comply with the guidelines established by the Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO)?

Question for written answer E-007222/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Implementing Directive 2011/68/EU

Commission Implementing Directive 2011/68/EU of 1 July 2011 amended Directives 2003/90/EC and 2003/91/EC setting out implementing measures for the purposes of Article 7 of Council Directives 2002/53/EC and 2002/55/EC respectively, as regards the characteristics to be covered as a minimum by the examination and the minimum conditions for examining certain varieties of agricultural plant species and vegetable species.

— Which Member States have still not transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Implementing Directive 2011/68/EU?

Joint answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

The Commission Implementing Directives 2012/8/EU and 2011/68/EU set out implementing measures for the purposes of Article 7 of Council Directives 2002/53/EC and 2002/55/EC, as regards the characteristics to be covered as a minimum by the examination and the minimum conditions for examining certain varieties of agricultural plant species and vegetable species. The 27 Member States notified transposition. As for Croatia, it notified transposition and the Commission is assessing it. The assessment is a legal check of measures published in the Member States.

The protocols are prepared by the experts from the Community Plant Variety Office (CPVO), Member States and the Union pour la Protection des Obtentions Végétales (UPOV) in order to take into account new technical knowledge and to harmonise technical protocols. Based on the documents adopted by the Administrative Council of CPVO and the Council of UPOV, the Commission had introduced the different modifications for the technical examinations for plant variety registration.

From the date corresponding to the deadline for transposition, the plant varieties examined and then registered by the Member States in their national catalogues shall comply with the specific technical protocols established by CPVO, or in their absence with the guidelines established by UPOV, or in their absence with national rules.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007223/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/15/UE — sistema comunitário de acompanhamento e de informação do tráfego de navios

A Diretiva 2011/15/UE da Comissão, de 23 de fevereiro de 2011, alterou a Diretiva 2002/59/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa à instituição de um sistema comunitário de acompanhamento e de informação do tráfego de navios.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/15/UE?

— Considera que os poderes de intervenção dos Estados-Membros em caso de incidente no mar se encontram definidos com o detalhe adequado?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

Já todos os Estados-Membros transpuseram a diretiva. A Comissão está a proceder à análise da transposição, tanto em termos de conformidade jurídica como de execução.

O objetivo das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/15/CE foi principalmente atualizar os requisitos dos sistemas de identificação automática (AIS) e dos aparelhos de registo dos dados de viagem (VDR), em consonância com as alterações à Convenção Internacional para a salvaguarda da vida humana no mar (SOLAS) e com o desenvolvimento de VDR simplificados, aprovados pela Organização Marítima Internacional.

As alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/15/CE tornaram mais explícitos os poderes de intervenção dos Estados-Membros em caso de incidente no mar, para prevenir uma ameaça grave e iminente para a costa, a segurança de outros navios e das suas tripulações e passageiros ou de pessoas em terra ou para proteger o meio marinho.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007223/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/15/EC — Community vessel traffic monitoring and information system

Commission Directive 2011/15/EU of 23 February 2011 amended Directive 2002/59/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Community vessel traffic monitoring and information system.

— Which Member States have still not transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Directive 2011/15/EU?

— Does it think the Member States' powers of intervention following an incident at sea are defined in enough detail?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

All Member States have transposed the directive. The Commission is in the process of analysing the transposition both in terms of legal conformity and implementation.

The aim of the amendments introduced by Directive 2011/15/EC was mainly to update the requirements concerning the automatic identification Systems (AIS) and voyage data recorders (VDR) in line with the modifications to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) and the development of simplified VDRs, as approved by the International Maritime Organisation.

The amendments introduced by Directive 2011/15/EC made more explicit the powers of intervention of Member States following an incident at sea in order to prevent a serious and imminent threat to the coastline, to the safety of other ships and their crews and passengers or of persons on shore or to protect the marine environment.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007224/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2010/60/UE — derrogações à comercialização de misturas de sementes de plantas forrageiras

A Diretiva 2010/60/UE da Comissão, de 30 de agosto de 2010, prevê determinadas derrogações à comercialização de misturas de sementes de plantas forrageiras destinadas a serem utilizadas na preservação do meio natural.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz da sua vigência?

— Considera suficiente o grau de utilização de misturas de sementes de plantas forrageiras destinadas a utilização na preservação do meio natural, no contexto da conservação dos recursos genéticos?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(26 de julho de 2013)

1. Todos os Estados-Membros transpuseram a Diretiva 2010/60/UE da Comissão ([1]), que prevê determinadas derrogações à comercialização de misturas de sementes de plantas forrageiras destinadas a serem utilizadas na preservação do meio natural («preservação de misturas de sementes»).

2. Com base nos pedidos dos Estados-Membros, a Comissão elaborou as regras derrogatórias, a fim de permitir a comercialização de misturas em que os componentes dessas misturas não cumprem os requisitos gerais de comercialização previstos na Diretiva 66/401/CEE ([2]) relativa às sementes de plantas forrageiras.

3. Tendo em conta o pedido dos Estados-Membros, a Comissão assume que são utilizadas misturas de preservação.

([1]) JO L 228 de 31.8.2010, p. 10.
([2]) JO L 125 de 11.7.1966, p. 2298.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007224/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2010/60/EU — derogations for marketing of fodder plant seed mixtures

Commission Directive 2010/60/EU of 30 August 2010 provides for certain derogations for marketing of fodder plant seed mixtures intended for use in the preservation of the natural environment.

— Which Member States have still not transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of its validity?

— Does it think there is sufficient use of fodder plant seed mixtures intended for use in the preservation of the natural environment, in the context of the conservation of genetic resources?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

1. All the Member States have transposed Commission Directive 2010/60/EU ([1]) providing for certain derogations for the marketing of fodder plant seed mixtures intended for use in the preservation of the natural environment ('preservation seed mixtures').

2. On the basis of Member States' requests, the Commission prepared the derogatory rules to allow the marketing of mixtures where the components of those mixtures do not comply with the general requirements for marketing provided for in Directive 66/401/EEC ([2]) on fodder plant seed.

3. Taking into account the request of the Member States, the Commission assumes that preservation mixtures are used.

([1]) OJ L 228, 31.8.2010, p. 10.
([2]) OJ 125, 11.7.1966, p. 2298.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007225/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2011/100/UE — dispositivos médicos de diagnóstico in vitro

A Diretiva 2011/100/UE da Comissão, de 20 de dezembro de 2011, alterou a Diretiva 98/79/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa aos dispositivos médicos de diagnóstico *in vitro*.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz das alterações introduzidas pela Diretiva 2011/100/UE?

Resposta dada por Neven Mimica em nome da Comissão
(29 de julho de 2013)

Todos os Estados-Membros transpuseram a Diretiva 2011/100/UE ([1]) da Comissão e comunicaram à Comissão as principais disposições de direito interno que adotaram no domínio abrangido pela presente diretiva. Embora o objetivo da presente diretiva seja garantir o mais elevado nível de proteção da saúde, assegurando que a conformidade dos ensaios para deteção da vDCJ ([2]) com os requisitos essenciais definidos no anexo I da Diretiva 98/79/CE ([3]) é verificada pelos organismos notificados, é prematuro efetuar uma avaliação das alterações introduzidas, uma vez que esses ensaios ainda estão em desenvolvimento.

([1]) JO L 341 de 22.12.2011, p. 50.
([2]) Variante da doença de Creutzfeldt-Jakob.
([3]) JO L 331 de 7.12.1998, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007225/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2011/100/EU — *in-vitro* diagnostic medical devices

Commission Directive 2011/100/EU of 20 December 2011 amended Directive 98/79/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on *in-vitro* diagnostic medical devices.

— Which Member States have still not transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of the amendments introduced by Directive 2011/100/EU?

Answer given by Mr Mimica on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

All Member States have transposed Commission Directive 2011/100/EU ([1]) and have communicated to the Commission the main provisions of national law which they adopted in the field covered by this directive. While the aim of this directive is to ensure the highest level of health protection by making sure that the conformity of vCJD ([2]) assays with the essential requirements set out in Annex I to Directive 98/79/EC ([3]) is verified by notified bodies, it is too early to make any assessment of the amendments introduced since those assays are still under development.

([1]) OJ L 341, 22.12.2011, p. 50.
([2]) Variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease.
([3]) OJ L 331, 7.12.1998, p. 1.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007226/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Diretiva 2010/65/UE — formalidades de declaração exigidas aos navios à chegada e/ou à partida dos portos

A Diretiva 2010/65/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 20 de outubro de 2010, relativa às formalidades de declaração exigidas aos navios à chegada e/ou à partida dos portos dos Estados-Membros revogou a Diretiva 2002/6/CE.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que Estados-Membros ainda não transpuseram esta diretiva?

— Que avaliação faz da sua vigência?

— Nomeadamente, crê que as formalidades de declaração atualmente exigidas aos navios à chegada e/ou à partida dos portos dos Estados-Membros são adequadas e suficientes e são dotadas da simplicidade e harmonização possíveis?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(31 de julho de 2013)

1. Todos os Estados-Membros notificaram as suas medidas nacionais de transposição. A Comissão está neste momento a avaliar a conformidade das medidas notificadas com as disposições da diretiva.

2. Em aplicação da Diretiva 2010/65/UE, os Estados-Membros são obrigados a estabelecer, até 1 de junho de 2015, plataformas eletrónicas únicas para cumprimento das formalidades de declaração exigidas aos navios que chegam aos seus portos.

3. Os Estados-Membros devem disponibilizar parte das informações recolhidas às respetivas autoridades competentes e aos outros Estados-Membros. As informações serão apresentadas apenas uma vez por escala e a apresentação em papel deixa de ser aceite.

4. Em conformidade com as prescrições da diretiva, a coordenação destinada a harmonizar a sua aplicação é feita no quadro de um grupo de peritos nacionais com o apoio da Agência Europeia da Segurança Marítima, a qual adotará especificações técnicas e funcionais comuns no que respeita aos utilizadores, aos processos e às propriedades dos dados comunicados às plataformas únicas.

5. Outro passo importante foi a apresentação pela Comissão Europeia, em 8 de julho de 2013, da iniciativa «Cintura Azul», que visa simplificar os procedimentos aduaneiros para o transporte marítimo. A diretiva reduzirá significativamente a carga administrativa imposta aos comandantes dos navios e às companhias de navegação e harmoniza os procedimentos administrativos aplicáveis.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007226/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Directive 2010/65/EU — reporting formalities for ships arriving in and/or departing from ports of the Member States

Directive 2010/65/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 2010 on reporting formalities for ships arriving in and/or departing from ports of the Member States repealed Directive 2002/6/EC.

— Which Member States have still not transposed this directive?

— What is the Commission's assessment of its validity?

— In particular, does it believe that the current reporting formalities for ships arriving in and/or departing from ports of the Member States are suitable and sufficient and are as simple and harmonised as possible?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

1. All Member States have notified their national transposition measures. The Commission is currently assessing the conformity of the communications received with the provisions of the directive.

2. In application of Directive 2010/65/EU, Member States are required to establish by 1 June 2015 electronic Single Windows to collect reporting formalities for ships arriving in ports.

3. Member States shall make part of the collected notification available for relevant authorities within and between Member States. Notifications will be submitted only once per port call and paper submissions will be no longer accepted.

4. In line with the directive requirements, the coordination for the harmonised implementation of the directive is done within a group of national experts supported by the European Maritime Safety Agency, which will adopt common functional and technical specifications describing users, processes and the properties of data submitted to Single Windows.

5. Another important step is the presentation by the European Commission on 8 July 2013 of the Blue Belt initative which aims to simplify customs procedures for martime transport. The directive will significantly reduce administrative burden on masters and shipping companies and harmonises the applicable administrative procedures.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007227/13
an die Kommission
Hermann Winkler (PPE)
(19. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Bewertung der Ergebnisse der PEW-Studie „The New Sick Man of Europe: the European Union" (Der neue kranke Mann von Europa: die Europäische Union) durch die Europäische Kommission

Im Mai 2013 veröffentlichte das Washingtoner Pew Research Center eine Studie zur Einstellung der Europäer gegenüber der europäischen Integration im Allgemeinen sowie gegenüber der Europäischen Union und ihren Institutionen im Speziellen. Wie bereits der Titel der repräsentativen Umfrage „Der neue kranke Mann von Europa: die Europäische Union" vermuten lässt, kommt die Studie zu dem Befund, dass sich die EU in einer veritablen Reputations-, Legitimations- und Vertrauenskrise befindet. In vielen Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union glauben die Menschen mehrheitlich nicht mehr daran, dass sie von einer voranschreitenden Integration Europas profitieren. Ebenso sind die Zustimmungswerte für die EU vor allem bei jungen Menschen auf einen historischen Tiefstand gefallen.

1. Hat die Kommission von dieser Studie und ihren überaus besorgniserregenden Befunden Kenntnis genommen?

2. Wie bewertet die Kommission diese Befunde und den darin zu Tage tretenden Vertrauensverlust in die Europäische Union?

3. Welche Akteure und Faktoren sind aus Sicht der Kommission für die zunehmend negative Grundstimmung gegenüber der europäischen Integration verantwortlich?

4. Welche Schlussfolgerungen zieht die Kommission aus den Befunden der Studie, vor allem mit Blick auf ihre eigene Tätigkeit?

5. Welche konkreten Maßnahmen beabsichtigt die Kommission zur Rückgewinnung des verlorenen Vertrauens zu ergreifen, und bis wann soll dies geschehen?

Antwort von Viviane Reding im Namen der Kommission
(2. August 2013)

Der Kommission ist die vom Herrn Abgeordneten erwähnte Studie bekannt, und sie möchte diesbezüglich auf ihre Antwort auf die schriftliche Anfrage E-005480/2013 ([1]) verweisen.

Zur Analyse des Meinungsbilds in der Europäischen Union stützt sich die Kommission vornehmlich auf die Standard-Eurobarometer-Umfragen, die zweimal jährlich in allen Mitgliedstaaten durchgeführt werden. Im diesem Zusammenhang verweist die Kommission den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre Antworten auf die schriftlichen Anfragen E-001416/2013 ([2]) und E-002672/2013 ([3]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-005480 %2b0 %2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0 %2f%2fEN&language=EN

([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-001416 %2b0 %2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0 %2f%2fEN&language=EN

([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-002672 %2b0 %2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0 %2f%2fEN&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007227/13
to the Commission
Hermann Winkler (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: The European Commission's assessment of the results of the Pew study 'The New Sick Man of Europe: the European Union'

In May 2013, the Washington Pew Research Centre published a study of the attitude of the Europeans to European integration in general and the European Union and its institutions in particular. As one would expect from the title of the representative survey 'The New Sick Man of Europe: the European Union', the study comes to the conclusion that the EU is in a veritable crisis of reputation, legitimacy and confidence. In many EU Member States most people no longer believe there is any advantage for them in progressive European integration. Similarly, approval ratings for the EU, particularly among young people, have sunk to an all-time low.

1. Is the Commission aware of this study and its extremely worrying findings?

2. How does it view these findings and the loss of confidence in the European Union that they reveal?

3. In the Commission's view, what agencies and factors are responsible for the increasingly negative attitude to European integration?

4. What conclusions does it draw from the findings of the study, particularly with reference to its own activity?

5. What concrete measures does it intend to take to win back the lost confidence, and when will these be put in place?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 August 2013)

The Commission is well aware of the study mentioned by the Honourable Member and would refer to its answer to Written Question E-005480/2013 ([1]).

Regarding the analysis of the state of public opinion in the European Union, the Commission's main tools are the Standard Eurobarometer surveys carried out twice a year in each Member States. In this respect, the Commission would refer to its answers to written questions E-001416/2013 ([2]) and E-002672/2013 ([3]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-005480%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-001416%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN.
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bWQ%2bE-2013-002672%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007228/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(19 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Μη τήρηση από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση της δικαστικής απόφασης για την άμεση επαναλειτουργία της ΕΡΤ

Το Συμβούλιο της Επικρατείας με απόφαση που εξέδωσε τη Δευτέρα 17 Ιουνίου, εξετάζοντας προσφυγή εναντίον της κοινής υπουργικής απόφασης για το κλείσιμο της ελληνικής δημόσιας ραδιοφωνίας και τηλεόρασης, ανέστειλε την εφαρμογή της κρινόμενης υπουργικής απόφασης και διέταξε την άμεση επαναλειτουργία της ΕΡΤ ορίζοντας ότι η ελληνική κυβέρνηση θα πρέπει να λάβει άμεσα όλα τα απαραίτητα οργανωτικά μέτρα.

Ωστόσο, παρά την εξέλιξη αυτή, η ελληνική κυβέρνηση δεν εφαρμόζει τη δικαστική απόφαση και δεν έχει λάβει κανένα μέτρο για την επαναλειτουργία της ΕΡΤ.

Με βάση τα ανωτέρω και δεδομένου ότι ο σεβασμός των δικαστικών αποφάσεων είναι από τα βασικότερα στοιχεία της δημοκρατικής λειτουργίας των κρατών μελών, ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Δεδομένου ότι η μη εκτέλεση από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση της δικαστικής απόφασης που προβλέπει την άμεση επαναλειτουργία της ΕΡΤ δεν είναι σύμφωνη με τις κοινές συνταγματικές παραδόσεις και τις γενικές αρχές του ευρωπαϊκού δικαίου, σκοπεύει η Επιτροπή να αναλάβει κάποια πρωτοβουλία;

Απάντηση της κ. Kroes εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(19 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Αναφορικά με το γενικό ζήτημα της παύσης λειτουργίας της Ελληνικής Ραδιοφωνίας και Τηλεόρασης (ΕΡΤ), η Επιτροπή παραπέμπει το Αξιότιμο Μέλος στην απάντηση που έδωσε στην προφορική ερώτηση O-069/2013 ([1]).

Όσον αφορά το συγκεκριμένο ζήτημα της εκτέλεσης απόφασης του ΣτΕ που συνδέεται με το κλείσιμο της ΕΡΤ, η Επιτροπή επισημαίνει ότι, σύμφωνα με τις Συνθήκες στις οποίες βασίζεται η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ([2]), η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή δεν διαθέτει γενικές εξουσίες παρέμβασης έναντι των αρχών των κρατών μελών. Η Επιτροπή μπορεί να παρέμβει μόνον εφόσον ανακύψει ζήτημα που άπτεται του δικαίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Η απόφαση του Δικαστηρίου στην οποία αναφέρεται το Αξιότιμο Μέλος του Κοινοβουλίου, δεν φαίνεται να σχετίζεται με την εφαρμογή του δικαίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bOQ%2bO-2013-000069%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

([2]) Συνθήκη για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και Συνθήκη για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007228/13
to the Commission
Kriton Arsenis (S&D)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Failure of Greek Government to comply with court judgment on immediate resumption of broadcasting by ERT

In a judgment pronounced on Monday, 17 June on an appeal against the joint ministerial decision to close the Greek state-owned radio and television station (ERT), the Council of State suspended the application of the ministerial decision in question and ordered that ERT should resume broadcasting and that the Greek Government should immediately take all the necessary organisational measures.

However, despite this development, the Greek Government has not applied the court judgment and has not taken any measures to ensure that ERT resumes broadcasting.

In view of the above and given that compliance with court judgments is one of the basic elements in the democratic functioning of the Member States, will the Commission say:

Given that failure by the Greek Government to enforce the court judgment ordering the immediate resumption of broadcasting by ERT is not in keeping with the common constitutional traditions and the general principles of Union law, does the Commission intend to take any action?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(19 September 2013)

As regards the general issue of the closure of the Hellenic Broadcasting Corporation (ERT) the Commission refers the Honourable Member to the answer given to the Oral Question O-069/2013 ([1]).

As regards the specific issue of the enforcement of a Council of State decision related to the closure of ERT, the Commission highlights that under the Treaties on which the European Union is based ([2]), the Commission has no general powers to intervene with the Member States. It can only do so if an issue of European Union law is involved. The Court decision to which the Honourable Member refers to does not appear to be related to the implementation of European Union law.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-%2f%2fEP%2f%2fTEXT%2bOQ%2bO-2013-000069%2b0%2bDOC%2bXML%2bV0%2f%2fEN&language=EN

([2]) Treaty on European Union and Treaty on the functioning of the European Union.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007229/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Ritiro delle forze di pace dell'ONU austriache dalle alture del Golan

Il 12 giugno 2013 le forze di pace dell'ONU austriache attive nel disimpegno degli osservatori dell'ONU si sono ritirate dalle alture del Golan per motivi di sicurezza legati all'aggravamento del conflitto tra ribelli siriani e governo. Secondo quanto più volte riportato dai mezzi di comunicazione, quella austriaca è una delle principali unità della missione di osservazione dell'ONU costituita nel 1974. Va tuttavia rilevato che le truppe dispongono di un armamento leggero che, alla luce della continua espansione del conflitto dall'interno della Siria, garantisce una scarsa protezione della loro posizione. Nell'ambito delle forze di pace gli austriaci sono 377, e il loro paese intende ritirare le truppe in più fasi.

Una volta partite le truppe austriache, a comporre le forze di pace rimarranno solo 341 filippini e 193 indiani. Recentemente si sono verificati incidenti nell'ambito dei quali i ribelli siriani hanno preso di mira le forze di disimpegno degli osservatori dell'ONU (UNDOF) facendo prigioniere le relative truppe. Molti soldati chiedono di modificare il mandato delle Nazioni Unite per la regione. Quella delle truppe austriache è una grave perdita, in quanto si tratta di forze che hanno pattugliato la frontiera per quasi quarant'anni; il governo austriaco ha tuttavia dichiarato che la minaccia per i soldati del paese ha «raggiunto un livello inaccettabile». Il governo israeliano, dal canto suo, ha fatto sapere che l'Austria dovrà provvedere autonomamente alla sicurezza. Si tratta di una situazione preoccupante alla luce dell'episodio, recentemente verificatosi lungo la frontiera israeliana, in cui i ribelli siriani hanno occupato una base ONU, poi riconquistata dall'esercito siriano, nei pressi della città abbandonata di Quneitra.

1. È il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante disposto a sostenere gli appelli di un gruppo di esponenti delle forze di pace dell'ONU a modificare il mandato delle truppe UNDOF impegnate nelle alture del Golan?

2. Come valutano il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante e i funzionari dell'UE con sede di servizio nella regione l'impatto della partenza delle truppe austriache dalle alture del Golan?

3. È il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante disposto a invitare le Nazioni Unite a chiedere la messa a disposizione di maggiori risorse militari per le forze di pace, alla luce delle lamentele relative all'insufficienza del relativo equipaggiamento per l'assolvimento della missione loro assegnata in condizioni di sicurezza?

4. Qual è il ruolo che l'UE può eventualmente svolgere nell'ambito dell'impegno in questione?

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

L'UE segue costantemente la situazione nella zona di separazione e limitazione ed è inoltre in contatto con i servizi preposti dell'ONU per quanto riguarda lo scambio di informazioni, sia sugli sviluppi e sulle relative valutazioni che su proprie proposte di piani.

Non è consuetudine dell'UE valutare le esigenze di missioni dell'ONU e il suo mandato. Tale compito spetta all'ONU stessa. Eventuali iniziative di sostegno diretto alle missioni dell'ONU devono essere richieste dall'ONU.

Per quanto riguarda l'impatto della partenza delle truppe austriache, l'UE ritiene che l'ONU riuscirà a sostituire il contingente austriaco e a mantenere le capacità dell'UNDOF. Finora, Fiji, Irlanda e Nepal si sono dichiarati disposti a inviare truppe per sostituire il contingente austriaco.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007229/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Austrian UN peacekeepers pull out from Golan Heights

On 12 June 2013, Austrian UN peacekeepers working as part of the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) pulled out from the Golan Heights because of safety fears as the conflict between Syrian rebels and the government worsened. According to various media reports, Austria is one of the key units forming the UN Observer mission, which was set up in 1974. However, the lightly armed troops have little protection to secure their position, as the conflict from inside Syria continues to spill over. Austria has 377 peacekeepers and it plans to remove its troops in stages.

Once Austrian troops have left, there will only be 341 Philippine and 193 Indian peacekeepers remaining. There have been recent incidents in which Syrian rebels have targeted UNDOF troops and detained them. Many soldiers are calling for the UN's mandate in the region to change. The loss of Austrian troops is serious as they have patrolled the border for almost forty years; however, the Austrian government has said the threat to its soldiers has 'reached an unacceptable level'. The response of the Israeli government is that Austria will have to rely on itself for security. This is a concern in light of a recent event along Israel's border when Syrian rebels captured a UN position near the abandoned town of Quneitra, before the Syrian military retook it.

1. Is the High Representative/Vice-President prepared to support calls by some UN peacekeepers for the UN to change its mandate for UNDOF troops serving in the Golan Heights?

2. What is the assessment of the HR/VP and EU officials posted in the region regarding the impact of the departure of Austrian troops from the Golan Heights?

3. Is the HR/VP prepared to call on the UN to ask for greater military resources to be made available to peacekeepers in light of complaints that they are not adequately kitted out to perform their mission safely?

4. What role, if any, can the EU play in this endeavour?

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

The EU services are constantly monitoring the situation in the area of separation and limitation. The EU is also liaising with relevant UN services with regard to information sharing, both on developments and assessments of future developments and own proposed plans.

It is not EU's practice to evaluate UN mission needs and its mandate. The UN is the organisation responsible for this task. Any possible initiative of direct support to UN missions would have to be initiated upon a request from the UN.

As to the impact of the departure of the Austrian troops, the EU assess that the UN will be successful in replacing the Austrian contingent ad maintain the capabilities of UNDOF. So far, Fiji, Ireland and Nepal declared they would send troops to replace the Austrian contingent.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007230/13
al Consiglio
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Presunta attività di Hezbollah in Germania

Il 6 giugno 2013 il quotidiano israeliano *Yedioth Ahronoth* ha riferito di una controversa relazione, recentemente pubblicata dall'agenzia nazionale di intelligence tedesca (*Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz*), riguardante il gruppo militante libanese sciita Hezbollah e le sue attività in Germania.

Secondo le stime vi sarebbero circa 250 esponenti di Hezbollah che vivono nella capitale Berlino e 950 nell'intero paese. La relazione ha rivelato che i sostenitori di Hezbollah in Germania non tengono, nella maggior parte dei casi, comportamenti degni di nota. Un ruolo di spicco è svolto dall'associazione, con sede a Gottinga, che gestisce il progetto per gli orfani del Libano (Waisenkinderprojekt Libanon e.V.) e sostiene i sopravvissuti della lotta contro Israele. L'associazione caritativa raccoglie fondi sfruttando gli incentivi fiscali concessi dalla Germania e promuove attivamente materiale antisraeliano.

Alexander Ritzmann, un analista politico della Fondazione europea per la democrazia di Bruxelles, ha esposto nel 2009 uno studio sul progetto per gli orfani presentandolo come la «succursale tedesca» di un'organizzazione affiliata a Hezbollah che promuove attentati suicidi e mira a distruggere Israele. Diverse denunce rivelano la portata delle attività di Hezbollah in Europa, in particolare a seguito dell'attacco terroristico mortale contro cittadini israeliani avvenuto in Bulgaria nel luglio 2012.

1. Quali misure ha intrapreso il Consiglio per contrastare le presunte attività terroristiche di Hezbollah all'interno dell'Unione europea?

2. Quali azioni intende intraprendere per precludere a Hezbollah la possibilità di raccogliere fondi nell'UE e per proteggere tutti i cittadini dalle sue attività?

Risposta
(16 settembre 2013)

Il 22 luglio il Consiglio ha convenuto di adottare misure restrittive nei confronti dell'Ala militare di Hezbollah, includendola nell'elenco delle persone, dei gruppi e delle entità a cui si applicano gli articoli 2, 3 e 4 della posizione comune 2001/931/PESC. Le misure adottate nel quadro della posizione comune 2001/931/PESC fanno parte delle strategie dell'UE per combattere il terrorismo e, in particolare, della lotta contro il finanziamento del terrorismo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007230/13
to the Council
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Alleged Hezbollah activity in Germany

On 6 June 2013, the Israeli newspaper Yediot Aharonot discussed a controversial report that was recently published by Germany's domestic intelligence agency, the Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz, on the Shia Lebanese militant group Hezbollah and its activities in Germany.

There are estimated to be approximately 250 Hezbollah members living in the capital Berlin and 950 in the country as a whole. The report revealed that: 'The supporters of Hezbollah in Germany behave in a largely inconspicuous way. One distinguishable role is played by the Orphans Project Lebanon [Waisenkinderprojekt Libanon e.V] in Göttingen and supports the survivors of fighters against Israel'. This charity raises funds using German tax exemption privileges and actively promotes anti-Israel material.

Alexander Ritzmann, a political analyst for the European Foundation for Democracy in Brussels, showed in a 2009 study on the Orphans Project that it is 'the German branch of a Hezbollah suborganisation' which 'promotes suicide bombings' and aims to destroy Israel. There are many reports that reveal the extent of Hezbollah's activities in Europe, especially following the deadly terror attack against Israelis in Bulgaria in July 2012.

1. What measures has the Council taken in order to thwart Hezbollah's alleged terrorist activities in the EU?

2. What action is the Council planning to take to prevent the Hezbollah from being able to raise funds in the EU and to ensure security for all citizens against its activities?

Reply
(16 September 2013)

On 22 July the Council agreed to adopt restrictive measures in respect of the Hizballah Military Wing, including it in the list of persons, groups and entities to which Artcles 2, 3 and 4 of Common Position 2001/931/CFSP apply. The measures taken within the framework of Common Position 2001/931/CFSP are part of the EU's strategies to combat terrorism and, in particular, the fight against the financing of terrorism.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007232/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Autobomba nella capitale libica Tripoli

In data 11 giugno 2013, la BBC News ha riferito in merito alla scoperta di un'autobomba posizionata sotto un'automobile appartenente all'ambasciata italiana nella capitale libica Tripoli. Due diplomatici avevano utilizzato l'automobile e l'avevano parcheggiata per andare a fare shopping nella zona centrale di Zawiyat Dahmani. Il conducente della vettura ha notato l'ordigno. La polizia è riuscita a delimitare una zona intorno al veicolo e ha fatto esplodere la bomba in tutta sicurezza. Si è ritenuto che si trattasse di un ordigno esplosivo improvvisato chiamato «bomba gelatina», un IED comune utilizzato in Libia.

Non è la prima volta che uno Stato membro dell'UE viene preso di mira. Nel mese di aprile, un'autobomba è esplosa davanti all'ambasciata francese, ferendo due guardie francesi e alcuni residenti. Secondo il sito giornalistico Maghrebia, lo scorso anno un convoglio che trasportava l'Ambasciatore britannico in Libia è stato colpito da granate. L'ambasciatore britannico è sopravvissuto, ma i responsabili della sua protezione sono stati feriti. Anche Guido de Sanctis, Console generale italiano, è sopravvissuto ad un tentato omicidio a Bengasi, quando uomini armati hanno sparato contro la sua auto blindata all'esterno del Tibesti Hotel.

1. Può dire il Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante quali misure si stanno adottando in Libia per garantire la sicurezza dei funzionari delle delegazioni dell'UE e del loro personale?

2. Allo stato attuale, quali solo le misure che l'Unione europea o i suoi Stati membri stanno adottando con le autorità libiche per distruggere i depositi di armi e di altri ordigni esplosivi che stanno alimentando la guerriglia all'interno di città libiche come Bengasi e Tripoli?

3. Quali strategie ha suggerito l'UE alle autorità libiche per frenare le insurrezioni in tutto il paese?

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

L'UE è molto preoccupata per la crescente insicurezza in Libia e per gli attentati nei confronti di stranieri e diplomatici. L'UE prende molto sul serio la sicurezza del nostro personale e segue a vicino la situazione in collegamento con le autorità locali, gli Stati membri e le altre organizzazioni. L'UE gestisce i rischi per la sicurezza con determinazione ma, come gli onorevoli deputati potranno ben comprendere, non può fornire dettagli precisi sulle misure adottate.

L'attuale pacchetto di aiuti forniti dall'UE alla Libia ammonta a 95 milioni di euro. Nell'ambito di tale dotazione, l'UE è impegnata ad attuare un progetto da 5 milioni di euro per la rimozione di ordigni inesplosi e un progetto da 5 milioni di euro per la sicurezza fisica e la gestione delle scorte di armi e munizioni convenzionali.

Il primo ministro libico Ali Zeidan ha discusso della situazione della sicurezza in Libia con i presidenti della Commissione e del Consiglio europeo durante la sua visita a maggio del 2013. In tale occasione Ali Zeidan ha ringraziato l'UE per aver dato seguito al suo impegno a inviare una missione civile, nel quadro della politica di sicurezza e di difesa comune (PSDC), in materia di gestione delle frontiere nel paese (missione UE di assistenza alle frontiere). L'UE fornisce anche altre forme di sostegno, come ad esempio corsi di formazione professionale per giovani libici (compresi i miliziani), in collegamento con altre iniziative promosse dagli Stati membri, dall'ONU e da altri partner internazionali.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007232/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Car bomb in the Libyan capital Tripoli

On 11 June 2013, BBC news reported that a car bomb had been discovered under a car belonging to the Italian Embassy in the Libyan capital Tripoli. Two diplomats had been travelling in the car, when they parked it to go and do some shopping in the central Zawiyat al-Dahmani area. It was the driver of the car who noticed the device underneath it. The police managed to cordon off an area around the vehicle and safely detonate the bomb. The bomb was believed to be an improvised explosive device called a 'gelatina bomb'. This is a common improvised explosive device (IED) used in Libya.

This is not the first time that an EU Member State has been targeted. In April, a car bomb exploded outside the French Embassy injuring two French guards and a number of residents. According to the news site Maghrebia, last year a convoy carrying the British Ambassador to Libya was struck by rocket-propelled grenades. The British Ambassador survived, but his protection officers were injured. Also, Italy's Consul-General, Guido de Sanctis, survived an assassination attempt in Benghazi when gunmen shot at his armoured car outside the Tibesti Hotel.

1. According to the Vice-President/High Representative, what efforts are being adopted in Libya to ensure the safety of EU delegation officials and their staff?

2. At present, what steps are the EU or its Member States taking with the Libyan authorities to destroy arms caches and other explosive devices, which are fuelling insurgency inside Libyan cities such as Benghazi and Tripoli?

3. What strategies has the EU suggested to the Libyan authorities to curb insurgency throughout the country?

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

The EU is deeply concerned about the growing insecurity in Libya including the attacks against foreigners and diplomats. The EU takes the security of our staff extremely seriously and we closely monitor the situation, liaising with the host authorities, with Member States and with other organisations. The EU manages security risks robustly although, the Honourable Members will understand, it cannot provide details of exactly what measures it takes.

The current package of assistance allocated by the EU to Libya amounts EUR 95 million. As part of that envelope the EU is implementing a EUR 5 million project on clearance of unexploded ordnances together with another EUR 5 million project on physical security and stockpile management of conventional weapons and ammunition.

The Libyan Prime Minister Ali Zeidan discussed the security situation in Libya with the Presidents of the Commission and of the European Council during his visit in May 2013. On this occasion Mr Zeidan thanked the EU for the follow-up on its commitment to deploy a civilian Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) mission on border management in the country (EU Border Assistance Mission (EU BAM)). Other forms of support, such as vocational training to Libyan youth, including militia members, are being implemented in conjunction with initiatives from Member States, the UN and other international partners.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007233/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Discriminazioni basate sulla casta nell'Asia meridionale

Il 7 giugno 2013, Human Rights Watch ha riferito in merito alla questione delle discriminazioni basata sulla casta e ai danni delle donne Dalit in Asia meridionale. Il termine Dalit è usato per le persone tradizionalmente considerate «intoccabili». Si stima vi siano 100 milioni di donne Dalit in India, ma ve ne sono anche in Nepal, Pakistan, Bangladesh e Sri Lanka.

Le donne Dalit sono particolarmente vulnerabili alle discriminazioni e alla violenza, che può anche includere lo stupro, la prostituzione forzata e moderne forme di schiavitù. Secondo la Relatrice speciale delle Nazioni Unite sulla violenza contro le donne, Rashida Manjoo, «molte donne Dalit subiscono l'esperienza di alcune delle peggiori forme di discriminazione».

Il 4 giugno, numerose organizzazioni non governative si sono riunite in occasione del Consiglio Diritti Umani dell'ONU a Ginevra per chiedere alle Nazioni Unite di sostenere gli sforzi per eliminare la discriminazione di genere e la discriminazione basata sulle caste. L'evento è stato il primo ad essere concentrato esclusivamente sulle donne Dalit. La Alto Commissario delle Nazioni Unite, Navi Pillay ha ribadito il proprio «massimo impegno nel contribuire all'eliminazione delle discriminazioni basate sulla casta e sull'intoccabilità» e le correlate e profondamente radicate esclusione, sfruttamento e emarginazione delle donne Dalit e di altri gruppi.

In paesi come l'India, sono vigenti da lungo tempo leggi federali per proteggere i dalit. Tuttavia, il problema risiede nel fatto che queste leggi spesso non sono applicate correttamente a livello locale. La polizia spesso nega alle donne Dalit l'accesso all'assistenza legale. Le donne Dalit spesso subiscono umiliazioni negli spazi pubblici e nelle strade, ma la polizia locale non sempre si attiva per proteggerle.

1. Quali passi intende effettuare l'Unione europea per lavorare con il Consiglio dei diritti umani dell'ONU onde persuadere i governi dell'Asia meridionale a dotarsi di disposizioni più efficaci per attuare la legislazione che garantisce che i diritti delle donne Dalit siano pienamente rispettati?

2. Quali passi sta effettuando l'UE attualmente per contribuire ad incrementare la sensibilizzazione sulla discriminazione basata sulla casta in tutta l'Asia e in particolare in India?

3. Quali eventuali programmi e iniziative appoggia l'UE, per veicolare, il sostegno a favore dei dalit e degli altri membri di caste che si trovano ad affrontare la discriminazione?

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

L'UE è attiva nell'ambito delle Nazioni Unite e ha contribuito ai lavori dell'ex sottocommissione ONU sulla promozione e la protezione dei diritti umani, compresa la relazione finale sulla discriminazione basata sul lavoro e la nascita. L'UE ha inoltre contribuito al dibattito sulla discriminazione basata sulle caste nel quadro della revisione periodica universale dell'ONU riguardo a India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nepal e Bangladesh.

L'Unione europea segue con grande attenzione le questioni riguardanti la non-discriminazione, le questioni di genere, i diritti delle donne e la libertà di religione e di credo, temi che vengono puntualmente sollevati con i paesi della regione. Nel caso dell'India, questi temi vengono anche affrontati nel quadro del dialogo locale UE-India sui diritti umani.

In India e Nepal l'UE ha fornito un sostegno finanziario per far fronte alla discriminazione basata sulle caste e alle sue conseguenze. Le risorse sono state erogate attraverso gli strumenti geografici (strategie nazionali o regionali) e quelli tematici (in particolare lo strumento europeo per la democrazia e i diritti umani (EIDHR)). I documenti della strategia EIDHR per il 2011-2013 contengono un riferimento esplicito alla discriminazione basata sulle caste. In Sri Lanka, l'assistenza fornita mediante questi strumenti ha promosso iniziative per difendere i diritti sociali e politici e migliorare le condizioni di vita dei Tamil di origine indiana che lavorano nelle piantagioni.

In India, le caste, tribù e minoranze svantaggiate sono i principali beneficiari della politica settoriale di sostegno dell'UE mediante il «programma per l'universalizzazione dell'istruzione elementare» (SSA, per i giovani dai 6 ai 14 anni) e il «programma per l'universalizzazione dell'istruzione secondaria» (RMSA, per i giovani dai 15 ai 18 anni). Il contributo dell'UE al SSA per il periodo 2007-2011 ammontava a 667 milioni di euro. Il contributo congiunto per il SSA e il RMSA per il periodo 2012-2017 è di 80 milioni di euro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007233/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Caste-based discrimination in South Asia

On 7 June 2013, Human Rights Watch reported on the issue of caste-based discrimination and Dalit women in South Asia. The term Dalit is used for people traditionally regarded as 'untouchable'. There are estimated to be 100 million Dalit women in India, but there are also Dalits in Nepal, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka.

Dalit women are particularly vulnerable to discrimination and violence, which can even include rape, forced prostitution and modern forms of slavery. According to the UN Special Rapporteur on violence against women, Rashida Manjoo, 'many [Dalit women] experience some of the worst forms of discrimination'.

On 4 June, a number of NGOs came together at the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva to call on the UN to support efforts to eliminate gender- and caste-based discrimination. The event was the first to focus exclusively on Dalit women. UN High Commissioner Navi Pillay reiterated her 'fullest commitment in contributing to the eradication of caste discrimination and "untouchability" and the correlated deeply rooted exclusion, exploitation and marginalization of Dalit women and other affected groups'.

In countries such as India, there are longstanding federal laws in place to protect Dalits. However, the problem lies in the fact that these laws are often not properly implemented at local level. Police often deny Dalit women access to legal assistance. Dalit women frequently suffer humiliation in public spaces and in the streets, but local police do not always act to protect them.

1. What steps is the EU prepared to take to work with the UN Human Rights Council to persuade governments in South Asia to adopt improved measures to implement legislation that ensures the rights of Dalit women are fully respected?

2. What steps is the EU taking at present to help raise awareness of caste-based discrimination across Asia and, in particular, in India?

3. What programmes and initiatives does the EU back, if any, that channel support for Dalits and other caste members who face discrimination?

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

The EU is active in the UN context and has contributed to the work of the former UN Sub-Commission for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, including the final report on Discrimination based on Work and Descent. The EU has also contributed to the debate on caste-based discrimination in the UN Universal Periodic Review process regarding India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Bangladesh.

The European Union pays great attention to non-discrimination, gender issues and women's rights, freedom of religion and belief, topics that are regularly raised with the countries of the region. In the case of India, these topics are also discussed in the context of the local EU-India Human Rights Dialogue.

In India and Nepal, caste discrimination and its effects have also been targeted by EU financial support, both through geographic instruments (Country or Regional Strategies) and thematic instruments (in particular the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rigths (EIDHR)). The EIDHR strategy documents for 2011-2013 contain an explicit reference to caste-based discrimination. In Sri Lanka, assistance through these instruments has been supporting initiatives to uplift the social and political human rights and living conditions of Indian-origin plantation Tamils.

In India, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Minorities are the main target of the EU Sector Policy Support 'Programme for Universalization of Elementary Education' (SSA, for children in the age group six to 14) and the 'Programme for Universalization of Secondary Education' (RMSA, for children aged 15 to 18 years). The EU contribution to SSA for the period 2007-2011 was EUR 66.7 million and for SSA and RMSA jointly for the period 2012-2017 is EUR 80 million.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007234/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Tragico caso di una ragazza egiziana morta durante l'intervento di escissione del clitoride

Il 10 giugno 2013, Al-Arabiya ha riferito che una tredicenne egiziana era morta nel corso dell'intervento chirurgico di circoncisione in un villaggio nel governatorato Daqahliya nordest del Cairo. La ragazza è stata lasciata con un medico e un infermiere che hanno eseguito la circoncisione in una sala operatoria con altre tre giovinette. Dopo l'operazione, la tredicenne non si è svegliata dall'anestesia e, secondo il rapporto di un ispettore sanitario, la causa del decesso è stata un «brusco calo della pressione sanguigna dovuto a shock traumatico».

In risposta alla morte della tredicenne, il Consiglio nazionale egiziano per le donne ha condannato la pratica della circoncisione femminile (escissione del clitoride) come atto criminale che riflette la «barbarie estrema» e ha chiesto al governo di indagare sulla questione. Inoltre, l'UNICEF ha condannato l'accaduto ribadendo che non ci sono giustificazioni né religiose né mediche per la circoncisione femminile. Le mutilazioni genitali femminili (MGF) sono state dichiarate reati penali nel 1996 in Egitto, e nel 2009 le autorità hanno arrestato un uomo per la prima volta da quando è stato introdotto il divieto delle MGF.

In un sondaggio nazionale del 2008, il 90 % delle intervistate delle donne egiziane sotto i 50, era stato circonciso. Alcuni egiziani si riferiscono alla pratica come una purificazione, e suggeriscono che è destinato a tenere le donne sotto controllo e impedire loro di cercare relazioni fuori dal matrimonio. Normalmente sono sottoposte a tale procedura le bambine tra i 9 e i 12 anni. Anche se ci sono alcuni che citano motivi religiosi per la pratica, il Gran Mufti d'Egitto, Ali Gomaa Sheikh, ha detto: «la circoncisione genitale femminile è un costume deplorevole, ereditato per abitudine. Non ha alcun fondamento nel Corano, per quanto riguarda l'autentica hadith del Profeta».

1. Allo stato attuale, sia l'Unione europea che l'UNICEF stanno lavorando per ridurre la pratica delle MGF in paesi come l'Egitto. Quali passi sta attualmente effettuando il Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna (SEAE), per incoraggiare il governo egiziano del presidente Mohammed Morsi per pubblicizzare i pericoli, e la mancanza di una base religiosa o medica per questa pratica e per organizzare una campagna contro la circoncisione femminile?

2. Quali passi stanno effettuando i funzionari dell'UE in Egitto per dar seguito al tragico caso della tredicenne morta a seguito di mutilazioni genitali femminili, e qual è la loro valutazione quanto agli sforzi delle autorità per indagare la questione e perseguire i responsabili?

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

L'UE è al corrente della pratica delle mutilazioni genitali femminili in Egitto, che considera un problema estremamente serio. Occorre adoperarsi con particolare impegno per porre fine a questo fenomeno, che viola i diritti umani fondamentali e le convenzioni internazionali.

Nel documento di strategia nazionale UE-Egitto per il 2007-2013, l'UE sostiene il governo egiziano mediante attività specifiche volte a combattere la discriminazione e la violenza basata sul genere e a porre fine alle mutilazioni genitali femminili, tra cui una legislazione adeguata e la sensibilizzazione della popolazione.

Dal novembre 2011, inoltre, l'UE è un partner chiave nell'ambito del «Programma comune per l'abbandono delle mutilazioni genitali femminili e l'empowerment delle famiglie» ([1]). Il programma mira a introdurre cambiamenti politici, giuridici e sociali duraturi che consentano a famiglie e comunità di abbandonare la pratica delle mutilazioni genitali femminili e le altre forme di violenza familiare/domestica.

In tale contesto, attraverso la sua delegazione al Cairo l'Unione europea segue con la massima attenzione il tragico caso della tredicenne morta a seguito della mutilazione genitale. I genitori della ragazza hanno segnalato il caso e il vice ministro della Salute ha mobilitato ufficialmente due avvocati per conto del Consiglio nazionale egiziano della popolazione e del suddetto programma comune. Sulla base dei futuri sviluppi saranno adottati gli opportuni provvedimenti.

([1]) Firmato nel settembre 2009 dal ministero egiziano della Famiglia e della popolazione e dal programma delle Nazioni Unite per lo sviluppo (PNUS).

Infine, nonostante la situazione e il precipitare degli avvenimenti nel paese, l'UE continuerà a seguire da vicino questo importante problema attraverso la sua delegazione al Cairo. L'Unione europea continuerà a esprimere preoccupazione in merito ai diritti delle donne in Egitto, ivi compresa la pratica della mutilazione genitale femminile, al più alto livello possibile.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007234/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Tragic case of an Egyptian girl who died while being circumcised

On 10 June 2013, Al-Arabiya reported that a 13-year-old Egyptian girl had died while being circumcised in a village in the Daqahliya governorate north-east of Cairo. The girl was left with a doctor and a nurse who performed the circumcision in an operating room with three other girls. After the operation, the girl did not wake up from the anaesthetic and, according to the report of a health inspector, the cause of death was a 'sharp drop in blood pressure resulting from shock trauma'.

In response to the girl's death, Egypt's National Council for Women condemned the practice of female circumcision as a criminal act that reflects 'extreme savagery' and called on the government to investigate the issue. In addition, Unicef condemned what happened and said that there are no religious or medical justifications for female circumcision. Female genital mutilation (FGM) was criminalised in 1996 in Egypt, and in 2009 the authorities arrested a man for the first time since the FGM ban was introduced.

In a 2008 national survey of Egyptian women under 50, 90% of respondents had been circumcised. Some Egyptians refer to the practice as purification, and suggest it is intended to keep women in check and prevent them from seeking relations outside marriage. Normally, girls of around 9 to 12 are subjected to the procedure. Although there are some who cite religious reasons for the practice, Egypt's Grand Mufti, Sheikh Ali Gomaa, has said: 'Genital circumcision of women is a deplorable, inherited custom … It has no basis in the Qur'an, with regard to the authentic hadith from the Prophet'.

1. At present, both the European Union and Unicef are working to reduce the practice of FGM in countries such as Egypt. What steps is the European External Action Service (EEAS) currently taking, therefore, to encourage the Egyptian Government of President Mohammed Morsi to publicise the dangers of, and the lack of a religious or medical basis for, the practice and to campaign against female circumcision?

2. What steps are EU officials taking in Egypt to follow up the tragic case of the 13-year-old who died as a result of FGM, and what is their assessment regarding the efforts of the authorities to investigate the issue and prosecute those responsible?

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

The EU is aware and concerned about female genital mutilation practice in Egypt. The eradication of the practice of FGM deserves particular attention being contrary to fundamental human rights and international conventions.

In the EU-Egypt Country Strategy Paper 2007-2013, the EU supports the Egyptian government with establishing specific activities planned to fight discrimination and gender-based violence and contribute to eradicating the practice of female genital mutilation, including appropriate legislation and public awareness-raising.

Furthermore, the EU, since November 2011, has become a key partner in the framework of the 'Joint Programme (JP) on the Abandonment of FGM and the Empowerment of Families' ([1]). This joint programme aims to create sustainable political, legal and social change that will empower families and communities to abandon FGM practices along with other forms of family/domestic violence.

In this context, the EU, through its Delegation in Cairo, is following very closely the tragic case of the 13-year-old girl that died as a result of FGM. The girl's parents reported the case and the Assistant Minister of Health officially mobilised two lawyers on behalf of the Egyptian National Population Council and the abovementioned Joint Programme. Based on further developments the necessary actions will be taken.

Lastly, despite the situation and the latest circumstances in the country, the EU will continue to follow closely this important issue through its Delegation in Cairo. The EU will continue to raise its concerns on women's rights in the country, including on the FGM practice, at the highest possible level.

([1]) signed in September 2009 by the Egyptian Ministry of Family and Population (MoP) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007235/13
al Consiglio
Fiorello Provera (EFD) e Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Radicalizzazione di giovani jihadisti in Europa

Il 13 marzo 2013, il Ministro olandese della sicurezza e della giustizia ha inviato una lettera agli Stati Generali dei Paesi Bassi, che conteneva la 32a edizione della Valutazione della minaccia terroristica per i Paesi Bassi (DTN32) e che elevava l'indice di allarme per minaccia al livello «sostanziale».

Secondo la «valutazione», jihadisti provenienti dall'Europa si stanno dirigendo verso il Medio Oriente e il Nord Africa per unirsi ad altri combattenti islamici. La Siria è attualmente la destinazione privilegiata. Ciò costituisce una preoccupazione principale per la sicurezza nazionale olandese. Come indicato nella relazione: «allorché detti jihadisti ritornano in Europa sono in grado di usare il loro zelo ideologico e l'esperienza di combattimento per ispirare altri a radicalizzarsi e intraprendere la jihad all'estero.»

Nell'aprile 2013 il Ministro degli esteri del Regno Unito, William Hague, ha risposto a una lettera della commissione per gli affari esteri della Camera dei Comuni, in cui esprimeva preoccupazioni circa il numero di cittadini britannici che si recavano in Siria per ricevere «una formazione» da gruppi di militanti islamici, con la possibile intenzione di tentare di compiere attentati, una volta di ritorno in Europa.

Anche i governi di Francia, Germania e Belgio hanno ammesso di nutrire preoccupazioni per il fatto che alcuni dei loro giovani cittadini si recano in paesi come Siria, Libia, Egitto, Tunisia, Afghanistan e Pakistan.

1. Quali meccanismi è disposto a mettere in atto il Consiglio per contribuire a limitare il crescere della radicalizzazione islamista in Europa e prevenire attività terroristiche come quelle recentemente perpetrate nel Regno Unito e in Francia?

2. Quali passi ha effettuato o intende effettuare il Consiglio per monitorare i cittadini dell'UE che si recano nella regione MENA (Medio Oriente e Nord Africa) per unirsi alle forze islamiste?

3. Intende il Consiglio attuare politiche e meccanismi UE per bloccare i jihadisti al loro ritorno nell'UE dal momento che alcuni Stati membri propongono di considerare tali attività come reato penale?

Risposta
(16 settembre 2013)

La strategia antiterrorismo dell'UE, adottata nel 2005, comporta l'impegno strategico di prevenire le affiliazioni al terrorismo affrontando i fattori che possono portare alla radicalizzazione e al reclutamento nelle fila del terrorismo, in Europa e a livello internazionale. Mentre la responsabilità di combattere la radicalizzazione e il reclutamento nelle fila del terrorismo ricade principalmente sugli Stati membri, tramite iniziative in materia messe in atto a livello di UE è possibile creare un quadro importante per lo scambio di buone prassi.

Dall'adozione della strategia le tendenze, i mezzi e le modalità in materia di radicalizzazione si sono evoluti e ampliati. Di conseguenza, il Consiglio nella sessione del 6-7 giugno ha adottato conclusioni per un aggiornamento della strategia al fine di tenere in considerazione una serie di sviluppi.

Il Consiglio ha specificatamente invitato la Commissione a presentare una comunicazione che esponga misure concrete sulle modalità atte a contrastare la radicalizzazione e l'estremismo violento.

Tale comunicazione dovrebbe fornire assistenza al Consiglio per l'ulteriore sviluppo della strategia volta ad affrontare la radicalizzazione in tutte le sue forme. Può anche fornire elementi di strategia atti a sostenere gli sforzi compiuti dagli Stati membri a favore della prevenzione della radicalizzazione e del reclutamento che portano all'estremismo violento e al terrorismo, promuovendo lo scambio di buone prassi e il finanziamento di opportuni progetti presentati dagli Stati membri.

Il Consiglio ha altresì invitato la Commissione a proporre, nella sua comunicazione, argomenti e misure che si inquadrino nello spettro generale degli sforzi di contrasto della radicalizzazione, tra cui potrebbero figurare, in via prioritaria, i combattenti stranieri, gli attori solitari e Internet e i social media.

Il Consiglio ha stabilito di aggiornare, in stretta consultazione con il coordinatore antiterrorismo, la Commissione europea e l'Alto Rappresentante, la strategia dell'UE volta a combattere la radicalizzazione e il reclutamento nelle fila del terrorismo allo scopo di far fronte alle tendenze attuali, emergenti o future nel quadro della prevenzione dell'affiliazione al terrorismo.

Il Consiglio è pienamente consapevole della minaccia generale posta dai combattenti stranieri che si recano non soltanto in Medio Oriente e in Nord Africa, ma anche in altre regioni come l'Afghanistan/il Pakistan e il Corno d'Africa.

Il 7 e 8 marzo il Consiglio ha discusso la situazione dal punto di vista della sicurezza nel Sahel/Maghreb e le sue implicazioni per la sicurezza interna dell'UE. I combattenti stranieri sono stati una delle questioni principali affrontate nel dibattito. La questione dei combattenti stranieri viene altresì trattata nel quadro dell'attuazione della strategia antiterrorismo dell'Unione europea ed è parte delle attività della rete per la sensibilizzazione in materia di radicalizzazione (RAN), un'iniziativa intrapresa dalla Commissione nel 2011.

Il Consiglio ha inoltre discusso la questione generale dei combattenti stranieri e rimpatriati sotto il profilo dell'antiterrorismo, in particolare per quanto riguarda la Siria, nella sessione del 6 e 7 giugno. Il coordinatore antiterrorismo dell'UE è stato invitato a presentare al Consiglio una relazione sull'attuazione delle misure per affrontare il problema dei combattenti stranieri nel dicembre 2013.

Il Consiglio ha considerato l'importanza di concentrarsi sulla segnalazione degli spostamenti e delle misure nel contesto del ritorno dei combattenti stranieri in Europa, a cui l'Onorevole parlamentare fa riferimento. I lavori sono attualmente in corso e si prevede che il Consiglio farà il punto sui progressi compiuti nel dicembre 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007235/13
to the Council
Fiorello Provera (EFD) and Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Radicalisation of young jihadists in Europe

On 13 March 2013, the Dutch Minister for Security and Justice sent a letter to the States-General of the Netherlands, which contained the 32nd edition of Terrorist Threat Assessment for the Netherlands (DTN32) and which raised the threat alert to 'substantial'.

According to the assessment, jihadists from Europe are heading to the Middle East and North Africa to join other Islamist combatants. Syria is currently the prime destination. This is a chief concern for Dutch national security. As stated in the report: 'when they [jihadists] return home they could use their ideological zeal and combat experience to inspire others to become radicalised and wage jihad abroad'.

In April 2013, the UK Foreign Secretary, William Hague, responded to a letter from the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, in which he expressed concerns about the number of UK citizens travelling to Syria to receive 'extensive training' from militant Islamist groups, with the possible intention that they may attempt to carry out attacks once back in Europe.

The governments of France, Germany and Belgium have also admitted their concerns about some of their young nationals travelling to countries such as Syria, Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, Afghanistan and Pakistan.

1. What mechanisms is the Council prepared to put in place to help curtail the growth of Islamist radicalisation in Europe and prevent terrorist activities, such as those recently committed in the UK and France?

2. What steps has the Council taken or does it plan to take to monitor EU citizens who travel to the MENA (Middle East and North Africa) region to join Islamist forces?

3. Is the Council going to implement any EU-wide policies and mechanisms to apprehend jihadists on their return to the EU, given that some Member States are proposing to criminalise such activity?

Reply
(16 September 2013)

The EU Counter Terrorism Strategy, adopted in 2005, contains a strategic commitment to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism by tackling the factors which can lead to radicalisation and recruitment to terrorism, in Europe and internationally. While the responsibility for combating radicalisation and terrorist recruitment lies primarily with the Member States, EU efforts in this field can provide an important framework for sharing good practices.

Since the strategy was adopted, the trends, means and patterns of radicalisation have evolved and broadened. As a result, the Council, at its meeting on 6-7 June, adopted Conclusions calling for an update of the strategy to take into account a number of developments.

The Council specifically invited the Commission to present a communication outlining concrete measures on ways to counter radicalisation and violent extremism.

This communication should assist the Council to further develop the strategy in order to address radicalisation in all of its forms. It may also provide policy elements to support Member States in their efforts to address the issue of preventing radicalisation and recruitment leading to violent extremism and terrorism by fostering the exchange of good practices and the funding of relevant projects proposed by the Member States.

The Council also invited the Commission to propose, in its communication, themes and measures within the broad spectrum of counter-radicalisation efforts, suggested priorities being *inter alia* foreign fighters, lone actors and Internet/social media.

The Council concluded that it would, in close consultation with the Counter Terrorism Coordinator, the EU Commission and the High Representative, update the EU Strategy for Combating Radicalisation and Recruitment to Terrorism in order to meet current, emerging or future trends in the context of preventing people from being drawn into terrorism.

The Council is well aware of the general threat posed by foreign fighters travelling not only to the Middle East and North Africa, but also to other regions such as Afghanistan / Pakistan and the Horn of Africa.

On 7 and 8 March, the Council discussed the security situation in the Sahel/Maghreb and its implications for EU internal security. Foreign fighters was one of the main issues covered in the debate. The issue of foreign fighters is also being addressed within the framework of the implementation of the EU Counter-Terrorism Strategy and is part of the activities of the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN), an initiative undertaken by the Commission in 2011.

The Council also discussed the general issue of foreign fighters and returnees from a counter-terrorism perspective, in particular with regard to Syria, at its meeting on 6 and 7 June. The EU Counter Terrorism Coordinator (CTC) was invited to present a report on the implementation of measures to address the problem of foreign fighters to the Council in December 2013.

The Council considered the importance of focusing on the detection of travel movements and of measures in the context of the return of foreign fighters to Europe, to which the Honourable Member refers. Work is currently ongoing and it is planned that the Council will take stock of progress in December 2013.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007236/13
an die Kommission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE) und Alajos Mészáros (PPE)
(19. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Hochwasser in Deutschland, der Tschechischen Republik, Österreich, der Slowakei und Ungarn

Große Teile Mitteleuropas kämpften tagelang mit den heftigsten Überschwemmungen seit Jahrzehnten, die in einigen Gebieten Todesopfer forderten. Viele Menschen wurden obdachlos, und ganze Dörfer mussten evakuiert werden. Es war sehr begrüßenswert, dass der EP-Präsident im Namen des gesamten Parlaments den Menschen, die gegen das Hochwasser kämpften, für ihren selbstlosen und engagierten Einsatz dankte. Anerkennende Worte alleine können den entstandenen Schaden jedoch nicht rückgängig machen. Genauso wenig tragen sie zum Wiederaufbau und zur Vorbeugung von Naturkatastrophen dieser Art bei.

1. Verfügt der Solidaritätsfonds der Europäischen Union über ausreichende Mittel, um die Probleme der vom Hochwasser betroffenen mitteleuropäischen Länder anzugehen?

2. Besteht nach Ansicht der Kommission die Möglichkeit, zur Behebung des Schadens und zur Entschädigung der Hochwasseropfer unverzüglich Mittel, die für andere Bereiche vorgesehen waren, umzuverteilen bzw. freie Mittel zu verwenden.

3. Würde die Kommission die Umschichtung von EU-Mitteln unter diesen Umständen genehmigen?

4. Welchen Teil des Haushalts plant die Kommission in den kommenden Jahren als Beitrag zum Wiederaufbau zerstörter bzw. beschädigter Hochwasserschutzanlagen zur Verfügung zu stellen.

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(12. August 2013)

1. Der EU-Solidaritätsfonds ist derzeit pro Jahr mit 1 Milliarde EUR ausgestattet. Für 2013 ist noch beinahe der gesamte Betrag verfügbar. Ob er ausreichen wird, kann erst gesagt werden, wenn die betreffenden Länder ihre Hilfsanträge eingereicht haben und die Schäden beziffert sind.

2./3. Es existiert keine Rechtsgrundlage, die es der Kommission ermöglichen würde, für andere Bereiche vorgesehene Mittel umzuverteilen, um unverzüglich die Hochwasseropfer zu entschädigen und die Schäden zu beheben. Die Mitgliedstaaten können beschließen, für ihre Kohäsionsprogramme und Programme für die ländliche Entwicklung bereitgestellte Mittel dafür zu verwenden, und beantragen, zu diesem Zweck ihre Programme zu ändern.

Im Zeitraum 2007-2013 kann im Rahmen der Programme des Europäischen Fonds für regionale Entwicklung und des Europäischen Landwirtschaftsfonds für die Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums ([1]) in Präventionsmaßnahmen zum Schutz gegen Naturkatastrophen investiert werden.

Deutschland hat diese Möglichkeit nicht genutzt und hat nicht die Absicht, seine EFRE-Programme zu diesem Zweck zu ändern. In der Tschechischen Republik wurden 477 Mio. EUR für Risikopräventionsprojekte vorgesehen. In der Slowakei wurden 280 Mio. EUR für Risikopräventionsmaßnahmen bereitgestellt. Die slowakischen Behörden haben die Umwidmung von 54 Mio. EUR an Programmmitteln für neue Hochwasserschutzmaßnahmen beantragt. In Ungarn wurden über das Programm Umwelt und Energie beträchtliche Mittel für Hochwasserschutzmaßnahmen bereitgestellt. Die Projekte werden gegenwärtig entlang der Donau und der Theiß umgesetzt.

4. Die Beträge für die Reparatur von Hochwasserschutzanlagen und anderen Schutzmaßnahmen werden im Wesentlichen von den Mitgliedstaaten bei der Konzeption ihrer Kohäsionsprogramme 2014-20 vorgeschlagen. Außerdem haben die Mitgliedstaaten stets die Möglichkeit, eine Anpassung ihrer von der EU kofinanzierten Programme zu beantragen.

([1]) Über den ELER kann auch der Wiederaufbau der Agrarproduktion und des forstwirtschaftlichen Potenzials nach Naturkatastrophen gefördert werden.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-007236/13
a Bizottság számára
Gáll-Pelcz Ildikó (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE) és Mészáros Alajos (PPE)
(2013. június 19.)

Tárgy: Németországban, a Cseh Köztársaságban, Ausztriában, Szlovákiában és Magyarországon bekövetkezett árvizek

Közép-Európa jelentős része napok óta küzd az elmúlt évtizedek egyik legpusztítóbb árvizével, amely egyes területeken olyannyira súlyos, hogy emberéleteket követelt. Számos ember maradt otthon nélkül, és egyes falvakban az egész lakosságot ki kellett telepíteni. Rendkívül üdvözlendő az, hogy az Európai Parlament elnöke mindannyiunk nevében köszönetét fejezte ki az árvíz elleni küzdelem résztvevőinek önzetlen és odaadó erőfeszítésükért. Bár ez a köszönetnyilvánítás rendkívül fontos, nem teszi semmissé az árvizek okozta pusztítást, nem jelent segítséget az újjáépítésre irányuló erőfeszítésekben vagy az ilyen jellegű természeti katasztrófák megismétlődésének megelőzésében.

1. Elegendő forrás áll-e rendelkezésre jelenleg az EU Szolidaritási Alapjában az árvizek sújtotta közép-európai országok problémáinak kezeléséhez?

2. A Bizottság lát-e lehetőséget arra, hogy a károk helyrehozatalát és az árvízkárosultak kártalanítását a források más területekről történő azonnali átcsoportosítása vagy a fennmaradó pénzeszközök finanszírozási forrásként történő felhasználása révén valósítsák meg?

3. Engedélyezné-e a Bizottság az uniós alapok átcsoportosítását ilyen körülmények között?

4. A Bizottság a következő néhány év költségvetésének mely részét tervezi a megsemmisült vagy megrongálódott árvízvédelmi rendszerek helyreállításában való segítségnyújtásra fordítani?

Johannes Hahn válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2013. augusztus 12.)

1. Az EU Szolidaritási Alapjából évente folyósítható juttatások teljes összege jelenleg 1 milliárd EUR. 2013-ra vonatkozóan ez az összeg szinte még hiánytalanul rendelkezésre áll. Az, hogy ez elegendő-e, csak azután állapítható meg, ha az összes érintett ország benyújtotta támogatás iránti kérelmét, és rendelkezésre állnak az adatok az okozott kárról.

2. és 3. Nincs olyan jogalap, amely lehetővé tenné a Bizottság számára a források más területekről történő azonnali átcsoportosítását a károk helyrehozatala és az árvízkárosultak kártalanítása érdekében. A tagállamok dönthetnek arról, hogy igénybe kívánják-e venni ehhez a kohéziós politikai és vidékfejlesztési programjaik keretében rendelkezésre álló forrásokat. E célból kérelmezhetik programjaik módosítását.

A 2007–2013-as időszakra vonatkozóan az Európai Regionális Fejlesztési Alap és az Európai Mezőgazdasági Vidékfejlesztési Alap ([1]) programjai lehetővé teszik a természeti katasztrófákkal kapcsolatos megelőző intézkedésekre irányuló beruházásokat.

Németország eddig nem élt ezzel a lehetőséggel, és nem kívánja ERFA-programjait e cél érdekében módosítani. A Cseh Köztársaságban 477 millió eurót juttattak kockázatmegelőzési projekteknek. Szlovákiában 280 millió eurót különítettek el kockázatmegelőzési intézkedésekre. A szlovák hatóságok kérelmezték, hogy a programon belül 54 millió eurót csoportosíthassanak át új árvízvédelmi intézkedésekre. Magyarországon a Környezet és Energia Operatív Program jelentős összegeket különített el árvízvédelmi intézkedésekre. A projektek végrehajtása jelenleg zajlik a Duna és a Tisza mentén.

4. Az árvízvédelmi rendszerek helyreállítására és egyéb megelőző intézkedésekre fordítandó összegeket lényegében a tagállamok javasolják a 2014–2020-as időszakra vonatkozó kohéziós politikai programjaik kialakítása során. Ezenfelül a tagállamoknak bármikor lehetőségük van az Unió által társfinanszírozott programjaik kiigazítását kérni.

([1]) Az EMVA forrásaiból a természeti katasztrófák következtében károsult mezőgazdasági termelési és az erdészeti potenciál helyreállítása is támogatható.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007236/13
to the Commission
Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE), Angelika Niebler (PPE) and Alajos Mészáros (PPE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Floods in Germany, the Czech Republic, Austria, Slovakia and Hungary

Large parts of Central Europe have been battling for days with some of the worst flooding in decades, in some areas so bad that it resulted in the loss of human life. Many people were left homeless and whole villages had to be evacuated. It was extremely welcome that the President of Parliament expressed his gratitude on behalf of everyone here to those dealing with the floods for their selfless and dedicated efforts. Though this acknowledgement is very important, it will not undo the devastation that has been caused, help in the reconstruction efforts or prevent the recurrence of natural disasters of this kind.

1. Are there sufficient resources currently available in the EU's Solidarity Fund to deal with the problems faced by the Central European countries affected by the floods?

2. Does the Commission see any possibility of redressing the damage and compensating victims of flooding by immediately redistributing resources from other areas or by using residual cash as a source of funding?

3. Would the Commission permit the redeployment of EU funds in these circumstances?

4. Which part of the budget over the next few years does the Commission envisage using to help repair destroyed or damaged flooding defences?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

1. The total annual allocation of the EU Solidarity Fund currently is EUR 1 billion. In 2013, almost all of this amount is still available. Whether this amount is sufficient can only be said once the countries concerned have presented their applications for aid and damage figures are known.

2, 3. There is no legal base allowing the Commission to redistribute resources from other areas in order to redress damage and compensate victims immediately. Member States may decide whether they want to use funding available in their cohesion policy and rural development programmes. For this purpose, they may ask to modify their programmes.

In the 2007-2013 period, European Regional Development Fund and European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development ([1]) programmes allow for investments in preventive measures against natural disasters.

Germany has not made use of this possibility and does not intend to modify their ERDF programmes for this purpose. In the Czech Republic, EUR 477 million was allocated to risk prevention projects. In Slovakia, EUR 280 million was earmarked for risk prevention measures. The Slovak authorities have requested a transfer of EUR 54 million from within the programme to new measures for flood protection. In Hungary, the Environment and Energy programme has allocated substantial amounts to flood safety actions. Projects are currently being implemented along the Danube and Tisza rivers.

4. The amounts devoted to repairing flood defences and other preventive action will essentially be proposed by the Member States during the design of their cohesion policy programmes for the 2014-20 period. Moreover, Member States always have the possibility to request to adjust their EU co-financed programmes.

([1]) EAFRD may also support restoration of agricultural production and forestry potential damaged by natural disasters.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007237/13
to the Commission
Robert Sturdy (ECR)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Craiova dog shelter in Romania

It has been brought to my attention that on 2 June 2013, NGO volunteers were denied access to a dog shelter in the Romanian city of Craiova to monitor what was happening inside. The volunteers had concerns about the welfare and treatment of the animals inside, as a vet known for his previous mistreatment of animals was practising at the shelter. Furthermore, the NGO volunteers also had evidence that the dogs were being prematurely euthanised.

1. Could the Commission confirm that no EU funds were used to fund the unnecessary and premature euthanasia of dogs in this shelter?

2. Is the Commission undertaking educational programmes aimed at improving animal welfare in the city of Craiova?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

The Commission would like to refer to its reply to Written Question E-005276/2013 ([1]).

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

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007239/13
à la Commission
Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Négociation d'un accord plurilatéral sur les services et modification de la liste des engagements et des exemptions de l'Union européenne à l'OMC

Le 18 mars dernier, le Conseil de l'Union européenne a donné mandat à la Commission pour négocier un accord plurilatéral sur le commerce des services ([1]).

Cette initiative, émanant de vingt et un membres de l'OMC ([2]) parties au groupe ad-hoc des «*really good friends of services*», a l'objectif d'être plus ambitieux que le GATS (*General Agreement on Trade in Services*) de l'OMC.

D'après la Commission européenne, cet accord a vocation à être complet et à n'exclure aucun secteur ou mode de prestation de service. Il doit aussi offrir un meilleur accès aux marchés des États parties.

D'autre part, tous les secteurs des services devraient être couverts dans le cadre des négociations. La Commission indique cependant que chaque État partie doit avoir la possibilité de déterminer, au préalable, quel secteur sera ouvert à des prestataires étrangers et quel sera le degré d'ouverture de chaque secteur.

L'accord devrait également comporter de nouvelles règles concernant les procédures d'autorisation et de licences et les marchés publics de services.

1. La Commission peut-elle indiquer un calendrier prévisionnel des négociations de cet accord?

2. La ratification d'un tel accord conduira-t-elle à modifier la liste des engagements et exemptions de l'Union européenne aux termes du GATS de l'OMC et, si tel est le cas, dans quelle mesure?

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(25 juillet 2013)

L'actuel groupe de 23 membres de l'OMC, rejoint récemment par le Liechtenstein et le Paraguay, qui participe aux négociations ouvertes en vue d'un accord sur le commerce des services (ACS), a l'intention de conclure l'accord le plus rapidement possible, mais a choisi de ne pas se fixer de délai approximatif. Le prochain cycle de négociations aura lieu du 16 au 20 septembre et un autre est prévu du 4 au 8 novembre 2013.

Le résultat de ces négociations, y compris les nouveaux engagements, les nouvelles disciplines et les disciplines renforcées, s'appliquera aux participants à l'ACS jusqu'à ce que l'accord soit multilatéralisé et intégré dans l'accord général de l'OMC sur le commerce des services (GATS). À ce stade des négociations, il est trop tôt pour dire quelle sera l'exacte étendue des engagements pris par chaque membre participant de l'OMC.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/fr/agricult/136414.pdf
([2]) L'Australie, le Canada, le Chili, le Taipei chinois, la Colombie, le Costa Rica, Hong Kong, l'Islande, Israël, le Japon, la République de Corée, le Mexique, la Nouvelle-Zélande, la Norvège, le Panama, le Pakistan, le Pérou, la Suisse, la Turquie, l'Union européenne et les États-Unis.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007239/13
to the Commission
Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Negotiation of a plurilateral agreement on services and possible changes to the list of EU commitments and exemptions under WTO rules

On 18 March 2013, the Council of the European Union approved a mandate for the Commission to negotiate a plurilateral agreement on trade in services ([1]).

This initiative, spearheaded by the 'Really Good Friends of Services', an ad hoc group of 21 WTO members ([2]), is intended to be more ambitious than the WTO's General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS).

According to the Commission, the agreement is designed to be comprehensive and to cover every sector and service delivery method. It should also make for better access to the markets of the participating states.

The negotiations should cover every service sector. However, the Commission is recommending that each state should be given the opportunity to specify, in advance, which of its sectors will be open to foreign service providers and to what extent.

The agreement should also include new rules governing authorisation and licensing procedures and public procurement of services.

1. Can the Commission issue a provisional timetable for the negotiations on this agreement?

2. Will the ratification of such an agreement result in changes to the list of EU commitments and exemptions under the WTO's GATS and, if so, to what extent?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

The group of currently 23 WTO-members, joined recently by Liechtenstein and Paraguay, participating in the Trade in Services Agreement (TiSA) negotiations are aiming at concluding the agreement as soon as possible, but opted for not setting themselves a tentative deadline. The next round of negotiations will take place from 16-20 September, and a further one is planned from 4-8 November 2013.

The result of these negotiations, including the new commitments and new and enhanced disciplines, will be applicable amongst TiSA participants until the agreement is multilateralised and integrated into the WTO General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). At this early stage of the negotiations, it cannot be said what exactly will be the extent of commitments taking by each participating WTO member.

([1]) http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st07/st07358.en13.pdf
([2]) Australia, Canada, Chile, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, Costa Rica, European Union, Hong Kong, Iceland, Israel, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Pakistan, Peru, Switzerland, Turkey and the USA.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007240/13
à la Commission
Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)
(19 juin 2013)

Objet: Harmonisation de la fiscalité concernant les carburants automobiles dans l'Union européenne

Dans plusieurs États membres de l'Union européenne, comme en France, le diesel bénéficie d'une fiscalité avantageuse par rapport à l'essence. L'écart de taxation entre les deux carburants est en moyenne de 12 centimes par litre pour l'ensemble des Vingt-sept et de 21 centimes par litre en France, avec un taux de taxation de 0,65 euro par litre pour le diesel contre 0,86 euro par litre pour l'essence. Cette différence incite les consommateurs et les constructeurs à se tourner majoritairement vers des véhicules fonctionnant au diesel.

Si les moteurs diesel rejettent moins de dioxyde de carbone (CO_2) dans l'atmosphère que les moteurs à essence, ils émettent des particules fines, comme les oxydes d'azote (NOx) et les benzopyrènes, tout aussi néfastes pour l'environnement que le CO_2, et très nocives pour la santé. D'après un rapport du Centre international de recherche sur le cancer de l'Organisation mondiale de la santé, paru le 13 juin 2012, le diesel présente des risques avérés de cancérogénicité et serait à l'origine de près de 42 000 décès prématurés par an en France.

L'Organisation mondiale de la santé a, par ailleurs, établi que plus de 80 % des Européens étaient exposés à des niveaux de matières particulaires supérieurs à ceux figurant dans ses lignes directrices relatives à la qualité de l'air, raccourcissant en moyenne de 8,6 mois la durée de vie de chaque citoyen européen.

Au vu des risques que présente le diesel pour la santé ainsi que de son impact négatif sur l'environnement, quand et comment la Commission entend-elle inciter les États membres à revoir leurs taux de taxation énergétique afin de réduire l'écart de taxation entre les carburants automobiles, favorable au diesel par rapport à l'essence?

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(5 août 2013)

La proposition de révision de la directive sur la taxation de l'énergie ([1]) [COM,(2011) 169], si elle était adoptée, remplacerait les taux minima de taxation en fonction du volume qui sont actuellement en vigueur par un système de taxation des carburants sur la base de leur contenu énergétique et des émissions de CO_2. La taxation génèrerait ainsi moins de distorsions, et le système tiendrait mieux compte des effets externes sur le climat de l'utilisation des carburants. Le système proposé permettrait de modifier automatiquement la situation actuelle de taxation inférieure du gazole et de récompenser ceux qui optent pour des solutions plus économes en énergie, et ainsi de mettre un terme aux subventions dont le gazole fait actuellement l'objet. La proposition est en cours de discussion au sein du Conseil de l'Union européenne, où l'unanimité est nécessaire pour que l'accord soit adopté.

([1]) Directive 2003/96/CE du Conseil du 27 octobre 2003 restructurant le cadre communautaire de taxation des produits énergétiques et de l'électricité (JO L 283 du 31.10.2003, p. 51).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007240/13
to the Commission
Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)
(19 June 2013)

Subject: Harmonisation of motor fuel taxation in the European Union

In a number of EU Member States, including France, diesel attracts a lower rate of tax than petrol. On average, the difference between the amount of tax paid on these fuels is 12 cents/litre in the EU-27 and 21 cents/litre in France, where 65 cents/litre is levied on the price of diesel and 86 cents/litre on that of petrol. This is encouraging consumers and manufacturers to turn to diesel-engined vehicles.

Although diesel engines release less carbon dioxide (CO_2) into the atmosphere than petrol engines, they also emit fine particles, such as nitrogen oxides (NOx) and benzopyrenes, which are just as damaging to the environment as CO_2 and extremely harmful to human health. A report published on 13 June 2012 by the International Agency for Research on Cancer, part of the World Health Organisation, found that diesel exhaust fumes are a major cancer risk and are potentially responsible for some 42 000 premature deaths each year in France.

The World Health Organisation also found that more than 80% of Europeans are exposed to particulate matter levels exceeding those set in the 2005 WHO Air Quality Guidelines. This air pollution reduces average life expectancy in Europe by 8.6 months.

In light of the health risks posed by diesel emissions, as well as their damaging impact on the environment, when and how does the Commission intend to encourage the Member States to overhaul their energy taxation policies, which currently favour diesel over petrol, so as to reduce the difference in the amount of tax paid on these fuels?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The proposal for revision of the Energy Taxation Directive ([1]) (COM(2011) 169) would, if adopted, replace the current volume-based minimum tax rates by a system for taxation of fuels based on energy content and CO_2 emissions. This would make taxation less distortive and more reflective of the climate-related externalities of fuel use. The proposed system would automatically amend the current situation of lower taxation for diesel and reward those who choose more energy efficient options ensuring that the current subsidy for diesel would disappear. The proposal is under discussion in the Council of the EU where the agreement requires unanimity.

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007242/13
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Pubblicazione dell'invito a presentare proposte progettuali per il programma europeo Daphne III

La necessità di un'azione concertata su scala mondiale per salvaguardare i diritti umani e porre fine alla violenza è riconosciuta ai diversi livelli locale, nazionale e internazionale.

In particolare, a livello europeo, con la decisione 779/2007/CE, l'Unione europea ha istituito, per il periodo 2007-2013, il programma Daphne III.

Questo programma comunitario è volto a prevenire e combattere la violenza contro i bambini, i giovani e le donne ed a proteggere le vittime e i gruppi a rischio con l'obiettivo di raggiungere un livello elevato di tutela della salute, benessere e coesione sociale. Esso apporta un importante aiuto complementare ai programmi già esistenti a livello nazionale.

Premessa l'importanza strategica di questo strumento in un momento storico che presenta numerosi episodi di violenza, considerato che il programma di cui sopra ha una dotazione finanziaria quinquennale e che quest'anno non è stato ancora pubblicato nessun invito a presentare proposte progettuali, si interroga la Commissione per sapere qual è la data possibile di pubblicazione dell'ultimo bando 2013 e a quanto ammonta il suo budget.

Può inoltre la Commissione rendere noto quanti progetti sono stati finanziati nell'anno 2012 e il rispettivo finanziamento comunitario ottenuto da ciascun progetto?

Risposta di Viviane Reding a nome della Commissione
(19 agosto 2013)

La Commissione è impegnata a dare una forte risposta politica contro qualsiasi forma di violenza contro le donne, i minori e i gruppi a rischio. Il programma Daphne III fornisce sostegno finanziario in questo settore attraverso inviti a presentare proposte per il periodo 2007-2013.

Lo scorso anno è stato pubblicato un invito a presentare proposte basato sui programmi di lavoro annuali di Daphne III per il 2011 e il 2012, nell'intento di combinare le priorità e le risorse disponibili per entrambi gli anni. La decisione finale di aggiudicazione è stata adottata il 19 ottobre 2012 e ha portato alla selezione di 60 progetti per un finanziamento complessivo pari a 28,3 milioni di EUR, ovvero 14,1 milioni di EUR nel 2011 e 14,2 milioni di EUR nel 2012.

L'elenco dei progetti selezionati e le informazioni sui rispettivi finanziamenti sono disponibili al seguente sito Internet:

http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/files/daphne_acte_ag_2011_2012_en.pdf. La maggior parte dei progetti sono iniziati nel primo trimestre del 2013 e saranno realizzati nell'arco di 24 mesi.

Durante l'estate del 2013 sarà pubblicato un nuovo invito a presentare proposte con una dotazione prevista pari a 11 404 000 EUR.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007242/13
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Publication of the call for proposals under the Daphne III programme

The need for concerted action on a global scale to safeguard human rights and put an end to violence is recognised at local, national and international level.

At European level, by means of Decision No 779/2007/EC the EU established the Daphne III programme for the period 2007-2013.

This Community programme is designed to prevent and combat violence against children, young people and women and to protect victims and at-risk groups, with the aim of achieving a high level of health protection, well-being and social cohesion. It complements the programmes already being implemented at national level.

In the light of the strategic importance of this instrument in a day and age when episodes of violence are common, and given that the abovementioned programme has been allocated funding for a five-year period and that this year, the final year of the programme, no call for proposals has yet been issued, can the Commission state when the 2013 call might be published and what the budget might be?

Can the Commission also reveal how many projects were financed in 2012 and say how much Community funding each received?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(19 August 2013)

The Commission is committed to a strong policy response to combat all forms of violence against women, children and at-risks groups. The Daphne III Programme has provided financial support in this field through calls for proposals for the period 2007-2013.

A call for proposals based on the Daphne III annual work programmes for 2011 and 2012 combining the priorities as well as the resources available for both years was launched last year. The final award decision was adopted on 19 October 2012, resulting in the selection of 60 projects and a total amount of funding of EUR 28.3 million, i.e EUR 14.1 million in 2011 and EUR 14.2 million in 2012.

The list of projects selected and information on their funding can be found on the following website: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/newsroom/files/daphne_acte_ag_2011_2012_en.pdf The majority of the projects have started during the first quarter of 2013 and will be implemented over 24 months.

A new call for proposals will be launched during the summer 2013. The budget foreseen is EUR 11 404 000.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-007243/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Encerramento da fábrica Tsuzuki, Mindelo, Vila do Conde, Portugal

A administração da Tsuzuki, fábrica de fiação fundada em 1991, por japoneses, e posteriormente comprada por alguns dos seus quadros (portugueses e japoneses), apresentou um plano de reestruturação e decidiu encerrar a fábrica, colocando no desemprego 140 trabalhadores.

A Região do Norte de Portugal onde está sedeada esta empresa tem uma das taxas de desemprego mais elevadas de Portugal, pelo que qualquer processo de despedimento significa atirar os trabalhadores para o desemprego sem que existam outras alternativas para estes homens e mulheres e suas famílias.

Assim, solicito à Comissão que me informe do seguinte:

1. A referida empresa recebeu quaisquer apoios comunitários?

2. Em caso afirmativo, para que fins foram concedidos e que compromissos assumiu aquando da concessão dos apoios? Considera que, a existirem compromissos, estes estão a ser postos em causa pela administração da empresa?

3. Que medidas pensa tomar, tendo em conta o dramático agravamento dos problemas sociais e económicos existentes em Portugal onde o desemprego não cessa de aumentar?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(18 de julho de 2013)

1. De acordo com as informações recebidas das autoridades portuguesas, a empresa Tsuzuki recebeu um apoio financeiro no valor total de 101 658,8 euros do Fundo Social Europeu (FSE) no período de programação de 2000-2006 e de 2007-2013. A Tsuzuki procederá a um reembolso de 1 980,69 euros a favor das autoridades portuguesas devido a correções financeiras. Além disso, a empresa recebeu um incentivo financeiro de 31 180 euros no âmbito do programa Economia no período de programação 2000-2006, relativo a um projeto complementar de formação profissional.

2. As operações selecionadas para financiamento destinaram-se a reforçar o potencial dos trabalhadores e cumpriram as regras nacionais e da UE ao longo de todo o período de execução. A Comissão gostaria de salientar que o objetivo do FSE não será prejudicado pelo encerramento da Tsuzuki, uma vez que o financiamento se referiu a ações de formação para os trabalhadores com vista a melhorar as suas capacidades profissionais.

3. A Comissão não tem competência para intervir em decisões específicas das empresas. Insta-as, porém, a adotar boas práticas em matéria de antecipação das necessidades de formação e competências, assim como de uma gestão da reestruturação socialmente responsável. Na sequência do seu Livro Verde ([1]) de janeiro de 2012 e da aprovação pelo Parlamento Europeu do Relatório Cercas ([2]), em 15 de janeiro de 2013, a Comissão proporá uma comunicação relativa a um quadro de qualidade que irá enquadrar a legislação da UE e iniciativas relevantes para a reestruturação e apresentará as melhores práticas a serem implementadas por todas as partes interessadas.

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.

([1]) Ver as respostas e um resumo em: http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=8908&langId=en
([2]) Resolução do Parlamento Europeu, de 15 de janeiro de 2013, em matéria de informação e consulta dos trabalhadores, antecipação e a gestão da reestruturação http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2013-0005+0+DOC+XML+V0//PT

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007243/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Closure of the Tsuzuki factory in Mindelo, Vila do Conde, Portugal

The management of Tsuzuki, a spinning mill set up in 1991 by Japanese founders and later taken over by a number of its executives (Portuguese and Japanese), has submitted a restructuring plan and decided to close the mill down, with the result that 140 workers will lose their jobs.

The North region, where the mill is located, has one of the highest unemployment rates in Portugal: any case of redundancy, therefore, means that the unemployed men and women concerned — and their families — will be left with no alternatives to fall back on.

1. Has Tsuzuki received any form of EU support?

2. If so, for what purposes was it granted, and what commitments were entered into at that time? Does the Commission consider that the commitments in question, if any, are being placed in jeopardy by the company management?

3. What steps will the Commission take, bearing in mind that social and economic problems are assuming the proportions of severe hardship in Portugal, where unemployment is rising unremittingly?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

1. According to information received from the Portuguese authorities, Tsuzuki has received a total financial support amounting to EUR 101.658,8 from the European Social Fund (ESF) in the programming period 2000-2006 and 2007-2013. A reimbursement of EUR 1.980,69 in favour of the Portuguese authorities will be done by Tsuzuki due to financial corrections. Furthermore the company has received an incentive financial support of EUR 31 180 within the Economy Programme of the programming period 2000-2006 to a supplementary project for professional training.

2. The operations selected for funding aimed to enhance the employees' potential and complied with EU and national rules throughout the implementation period. The Commission would like to point out that the aim of the ESF will not be jeopardised by Tsuzuki's closure since the funding referred to training activities for employees aiming at improving their professional skills.

3. The Commission has no powers to interfere in specific companies' decisions. It urges them, however, to follow good practices of anticipation of training and skills needs and socially responsible management of restructuring. Following its January 2012 Green Paper ([1]) and the adoption by the European Parliament on 15 January 2013 of the Cercas report ([2]), the Commission will propose a communication establishing a Quality Framework that will frame the EU legislation and initiatives relevant to restructuring and will present the best practices to be implemented by all stakeholders.

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.

([1]) See the replies and a summary under http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=8908&langId=en.
([2]) EP Resolution of 15 January 2013 on Information and consultation of workers, anticipation and management of restructuring, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2013-0005+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007244/13
a la Comisión
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(20 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Importaciones de cefalópodos a la UE

Quisiera conocer de la Comisión los datos correspondientes a las importaciones hechas por la UE, durante los últimos cinco años, de cefalópodos originarios de terceros Estados especificando los países de origen de las importaciones y de los Estados miembros destinatarios de las mismas.

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de septiembre de 2013)

Esta es la información que puede proporcionarle la Comisión ([1]):

En 2012, la UE importó 377 240 toneladas de cefalópodos, lo que supone una disminución en comparación con los años anteriores (392 000 toneladas en 2011; 430 000 en 2010; 413 000 en 2009 y 438 325 en 2008).

Por especies, el mayor volumen es el de calamares (246 000 toneladas en 2012), seguido del de pulpos (78 000 toneladas) y del de sepias (53 000 toneladas).

En los últimos años, las importaciones de pulpo y sepia han disminuido alrededor de un 20 %.

España e Italia son, con diferencia, los principales importadores y juntas representan el 80 % o más de todas las importaciones de la UE.

La Comisión enviará directamente a Su Señoría y a la Secretaría del Parlamento unos cuadros con el detalle de la información solicitada.

([1]) Información basada en los datos disponibles en el Observatorio Europeo del Mercado de los Productos de la Pesca y la Acuicultura (Eumofa) (http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/market-observatory/).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007244/13
to the Commission
Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Imports of cephalopods into the EU

Can the Commission put a figure on the volume of imports of cephalopods into the EU over the past five years? Which countries were they exported from and which Member States were they imported into?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(11 September 2013)

The Commission can provide the following information ([1]):

EU imports of cephalopods reached 377 240 tonnes in 2012 which represents a decrease relative to previous years (392 000 t in 2011; 430 000t in 2010; 413 000 t in 2009; 438 325 t in 2008).

At species level, squid represents the largest volume (246 000 t in 2012), before octopus (78 000 t) and cuttlefish (53 000 t).

Imports of octopus and cuttlefish registered a decrease of around 20% in the last years.

Spain and Italy are by far the main importers representing 80% or more of total EU imports.

The Commission is sending direct to the Honourable Member and the Parliament Secretariat tables containing the details of the information requested.

([1]) Based on the data available in the EU market Observatory for fisheries and aquaculture products (EUMOFA). http://ec.europa.eu/fisheries/market-observatory/

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007245/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20. juni 2013)

Om: Opfølgende spørgsmål om Apples misbrug af monopolstilling i forbindelse med en app

Nedenstående spørgsmål stilles i forlængelse af spørgsmålene »Firmaet Apples misbrug af sin dominerende stilling på markedet« af 5. november 2012 (E-009981/2012) og »Firmaet Apples misbrug af monopolstilling i forbindelse med en såkaldt app« af 16. november 2012 (E-010480/2012), da sagen har udviklet sig yderligere.

Det danske kulturministerium oplyser, at der er udarbejdet en rapport af en »high-level« gruppe, nedsat af Kommissionen, hvori der fremsættes anbefalinger med relevans for denne problemstilling ([1]). Grundlæggende handler rapporten om ytringsfrihed og pluralisme. Ministeriet oplyser videre, at kommissær Neelie Kroes planlægger en konference om sagen.

Den danske kulturminister er ligeledes gået ind i sagen nu, da hun betragter Apples opførsel som utilstedelig og et klart forsøg på censur. Hun har således oplyst, at hun ønsker at drøfte denne sag med EU-parlamentarikere på den før nævnte konference.

Spørgeren ønsker derfor besvaret, om disse oplysninger giver Kommissionen anledning til at genoverveje sagen?

Derudover ønskes det oplyst, hvorvidt disse drøftelser har fundet sted, og hvad der i givet fald er kommet ud af dem?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Joaquín Almunia
(21. august 2013)

Hvad angår EU-konkurrenceretten, har Kommissionen ikke ændret holdning ud fra den udvikling, der henvises til i den skriftlige forespørgsel.

Ifølge EU's konkurrenceregler kan virksomhederne i princippet frit indgå aftaler og fastlægge vilkår og betingelser for de aftaler, de indgår. Hvis en virksomhed nægter at indgå en aftale, kan det dog i særlige tilfælde give anledning til betænkeligheder for konkurrencen i henhold til artikel 102 i TEUF.

Hvordan artikel 102 i TEUF anvendes, afhænger af en række faktuelle, juridiske og økonomiske spørgsmål, bl.a. om Apple kan siges at have en dominerende stilling på detailmarkedet for e-bøger gennem sin iBookstore og/eller AppStore. Imidlertid har Kommissionen p.t. ikke beviser for, at Apple har en sådan dominerende stilling.

Hvad angår grundlæggende rettigheder, arbejder Kommissionen fortsat — inden for sin kompetence — for, at skabe respekt for frihed og pluralisme for medierne, som er afgørende for demokratiske samfund, og som er knæsat i artikel 11 i Den Europæiske Unions charter om grundlæggende rettigheder.

Efter ekspertgruppen om mediefrihed og -pluralisme aflagde beretning, har Kommissionen lanceret to offentlige undersøgelser, én om gruppens henstillinger og én, der specifikt handler om de nationale audiovisuelle reguleringsmyndigheders uafhængighed. Ved eventuel opfølgning inden for rammerne af EU's kompetence tages der højde for disse høringer, som nu er til evaluering.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/media_taskforce/doc/pluralism/forum/report.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007245/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Follow-up question on Apple's abuse of a monopoly position in connection with an app

This question follows up my earlier questions of 5 November 2012 on Apple's abuse of its dominant market position (E-009981/2012), and of 16 November 2012 on abuse by Apple of its monopoly position in connection with an app (E-010480/2012), since there have now been further developments.

The Danish Culture Ministry says that a report has been drawn up by a high-level group, appointed by the Commission, which makes recommendations that are relevant to this issue ([1]). The report mainly concerns freedom of expression and pluralism. The Ministry also states that Commissioner Neelie Kroes is planning a conference on this topic.

The Danish Culture Minister has now also taken a position on this issue, since she regards Apple's behaviour as inappropriate and a clear attempt at censorship. Accordingly she has said she wishes to discuss this matter with MEPs at the abovementioned conference.

In the light of this information, does the Commission intend to reconsider the matter?

Can the Commission state whether these discussions have taken place, and if so what the outcome was?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

From an EU competition law perspective, the position of the Commission has not changed in the light of the developments referred to in the written question.

Under EU competition law, companies in principle are generally free to contract and to define the terms and conditions for the contracts they conclude. However, a refusal to conclude a contract may, in certain exceptional circumstances, raise competition concerns under Article 102 TFEU.

The application of Article 102 TFEU depends on a range of factual, legal and economic elements including, *inter alia*, that Apple would be found to hold a dominant position in relation to the sale of e-books to consumers through its iBookstore and/or the AppStore. However, the Commission currently does not have any evidence that Apple holds such a dominant position.

As regards fundamental rights, the Commission, within its powers, continues to seek respect for media freedom and pluralism which are fundamental pillars of democratic societies and which are enshrined in Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

Following the presentation of the independent report of the High Level Group on Media Freedom and Pluralism, the Commission has launched two public consultations, one on the recommendations of the group and one specifically on the independence of National Audiovisual Regulatory Authorities. The decision on any possible follow-up actions within the limits of the powers of the European Union will take account of the responses to those consultations, which are currently being evaluated.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/media_taskforce/doc/pluralism/forum/report.pdf

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007246/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20. juni 2013)

Om: Lækket e-mail om særlige foranstaltninger ved kommissionsansattes besøg i Athen

En lækket e-mail fra Kommissionen skulle angiveligt advare og ruste ansatte sikkerhedsmæssigt i forbindelse med et besøg i Grækenlands hovedstad Athen ([1]).

Den lækkede e-mail skulle blandt andet opfordre medarbejdere til at opfinde falske livshistorier samt advare dem om ikke at befinde sig i nærheden af vinduer under demonstrationer. E-mailen blev offentliggjort på den græske avis To Vimas hjemmeside, men det blev ikke oplyst, hvordan den var kommet i avisens besiddelse. En talsmand fra Kommissionen bekræftede e-mailens ægthed, men fremhævede, at den del, der omhandlede advarsler om optøjer, ikke stammede fra Kommissionen.

Af samme grund ville man overveje at undersøge lækagens oprindelse.

Efterfølgende har talsmanden dog bekræftet, at Kommissionen normalt udsteder sådanne sikkerheds-anbefalinger. Endvidere skulle disse råd kun ses som sund fornuft. Intet mere, intet mindre.

Kan Kommissionen bekræfte, at den har iværksat en undersøgelse af e-mailens oprindelse?

Kan Kommissionen ligeledes bekræfte, at det er normal procedure at advare medarbejdere mod medlemsstaters vrede befolkninger?

Mener Kommissionen endvidere, at iagttagelse af sund fornuft indebærer at ændre på sin livshistorie?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Maroš Šefčovič
(30. juli 2013)

1. Kommissionen bekræfter, at der blev iværksat en intern administrativ undersøgelse af den uautoriserede udsendelse af sikkerhedsanbefalinger til pressen på det pågældende tidspunkt. Kommissionen undlader dog som en hovedregel at udtale sig yderligere i sager, der vedrører dens interne sikkerhed.

2. Kommissionen har ansvar for sine ansatte. Kommissionen informerer derfor sine ansatte om forhold, der kan påvirke deres personlige sikkerhed og tryghed, uanset hvor i verden Kommissionens personale udfører opgaver.

3. De sikkerhedsanbefalinger, der nævnes i den blog, som det ærede medlem henviser til, blev fremsat af Kommissionens kompetente tjenestegrene udelukkende til ansatte på en specifik tjenesterejse til Athen i februar 2013. Kommissionen opfordrer ikke sine ansatte til at opfinde falske livshistorier. Den giver blot anbefalinger baseret på sund fornuft til de pågældende for at skabe optimal sikkerhed og tryghed.

([1]) http://blogs.wsj.com/brussels/2013/03/04/athens-travel-tips-spark-anger/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007246/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Leaked e-mail on special measures for Commission employees visiting Athens

A leaked e-mail from the Commission allegedly seeks to forewarn its employees about security when visiting the Greek capital, Athens ([1]).

The leaked email, among other things, encourages staff to invent a fake life story, and warns them not to stand near windows during a demonstration. The e-mail was published on the website of the Greek newspaper To Vima, though no indication was given of how it was acquired. A spokesman for the Commission confirmed that the e-mail was genuine, but stressed that the part warning about demonstrations was not from the Commission.

For that reason, he said, the Commission is considering investigating the source of the leak.

However, the spokesman did confirm that the Commission normally issues such security warnings, and said the document was no more or less than common-sense travel advice.

Can the Commission confirm that it has launched an investigation into the source of the e-mail?

Can the Commission also confirm that it is normal procedure to warn staff against the anger of the public in Member States?

Furthermore, does the Commission consider that 'common sense' includes inventing a fake life story?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(30 July 2013)

1. The Commission confirms that an internal administrative investigation was launched into the unauthorised transmission of security advice to the press at the time. However, as a general rule, the Commission does not comment further on issues related to its internal security.

2. The Commission has a duty of care towards its employees. Consequently, in this context, the Commission informs its staff on issues that could potentially affect their personal safety and security, wherever in the world Commission staff is required to carry out their duties.

3. The security advice mentioned in the blog referred to in the Honourable Member's question was provided by the competent Commission services only to specific employees on a specific mission to Athens in February 2013. It does not incite staff to invent a fake life story, but merely provides staff concerned with common sense advice on how to behave in a way which ensures optimal safety and security.

([1]) http://blogs.wsj.com/brussels/2013/03/04/athens-travel-tips-spark-anger/.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007248/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20. juni 2013)

Om: Firmaet Microsofts misbrug af sin dominerende stilling på markedet

Langt de fleste computere i EU anvender Microsofts operativsystem Windows. Linux havde dog en markedsandel på 20-30 % for netbooks, indtil Microsoft satte prisen markant ned på sit operativsystem, Home Edition, fra 500-800 DKK til blot 100 DKK.

Microsofts EULA (end-user license agreement), vanskeliggør således andre aktørers mulighed for at komme ind på markedet. Aftalen indeholder provision til distributøren, når operativsystem og computer bliver solgt sammen. Endvidere indeholder EULA for Windows 7 en bestemmelse som foreskriver, at der i tilfælde af klager skal ske en samlet returnering af både det pågældende operativsystem og computeren. Forbrugerdirektivet fastslår ellers, at det kun er pligtigt at returnere beskadigede genstande partielt.

Ligeledes har Microsofts EULA sat standarder for den mængde RAM, en computer må indeholde samt skærmstørrelser. Dette har også bevirket, at det er vanskeligt for konkurrenter at komme ind på et restriktivt marked for hardware.

Vil Kommissionen på baggrund heraf redegøre for, om der kan være tale om misbrug af en dominerende stilling på markedet, samt oplyse, hvad man agter at gøre for at sikre, at aktører på EU's indre marked agerer proportionalt og fair overfor markedets andre aktører?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Joaquín Almunia
(1. august 2013)

Kommissionen er bekendt med vilkårene i Microsofts slutbrugerlicensaftale (EULA) for Windows-operativsystemet til pc'er og overvåger nøje udviklingen på dette område.

At distributørerne modtager provision, når de sælger operativsystem og computer sammen, udgør ikke i sig selv konkurrencebegrænsende adfærd. Så vidt Kommissionen ved, indebærer den pågældende aftale ikke nogen forpligtelse om at give Windows-operativsystemet eneret, og den forhindrer ikke distributører i at sælge eller forudinstallere andre operativsystemer til pc'er. Ligeledes synes forpligtelsen til at returnere både operativsystem og computer i tilfælde af klager at være en logisk følge af, at de to produkter sælges sammen, og udgør derfor ikke i sig selv konkurrencebegrænsende adfærd.

Endelig forekommer Microsofts fastsættelse af normer for antallet af RAM og for størrelsen af skærmene på de pc'er, der sælges med Windows-operativsystemet, at være tekniske krav, og det synes ikke i sig selv at udgøre konkurrencehæmmende adfærd.

På baggrund af ovenstående har Kommissionen på nuværende tidspunkt ikke til hensigt at træffe særlige håndhævelsesforanstaltninger i forbindelse med disse spørgsmål.

Kommissionen er fortsat fast besluttet på at sikre, at EU's konkurrenceregler inden for it-sektoren gennemføres fuldt ud.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007248/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Abuse by Microsoft of its dominant market position

The vast majority of computers in the EU use Microsoft's Windows operating system. Linux had a market share of 20-30% with its Netbooks until Microsoft substantially reduced the price of its Home Edition operating system from DKK 500-800 to only DKK 100.

The Microsoft end-user licence agreement (EULA) makes it hard for other operators to enter the market. Under the agreement, the distributor receives a commission when the operating system and the computer are sold together. Furthermore, the EULA for Windows 7 provides that, in the event of complaints, both the operating system and the computer must be returned to the dealer. (The Consumer Rights Directive lays down that only the faulty part of the goods has to be returned).

The Microsoft EULA has also set standards for the quantity of RAM a computer must have, as well as screen sizes. This has again made it hard for competitors to enter a restrictive hardware market.

In the light of the above, does the Commission consider there has been abuse of a dominant market position, and what does it propose to do to ensure that operators on the EU's internal market act proportionately and fairly towards other market operators?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

The Commission is aware of the terms of the Microsoft end-user licence agreement (EULA) for the Windows PC operating system and monitors developments in this field closely.

The fact that distributors receive a commission when an operating system and a computer are sold together does not in itself constitute an anti-competitive practice. To the Commission's knowledge, the agreements in question do not impose an obligation to grant exclusivity to the Windows operating system or prevent distributors from selling or pre-installing other PC operating systems. Similarly, an obligation to return both operating system and computer in the event of complaints appears to be a logical consequence of those two products being sold together and therefore does not in itself appear to constitute an anti-competitive practice.

Finally, the fact that Microsoft may set standards for the amount of RAM and for the screen sizes of PCs sold with the Windows PC operating system appears to be a technical requirement, and as such, does not in itself appear to be an anti-competitive practice.

In the light of the above, at this stage, the Commission does not intend to take specific enforcement action on these issues.

The Commission remains committed to ensuring the full implementation of the European competition rules in the IT sector.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007249/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20. juni 2013)

Om: Regulering af laksefiskeriet i Østersøen

EU er for øjeblikket ved at udarbejde en forvaltningsplan for laksefiskeriet i Østersøen med henblik på beskyttelse af de vilde laksestammer, hvilket indebærer indførelse af restriktioner for såvel erhvervsfiskeri som rekreativt fiskeri. Europa-Parlamentet har således stillet krav om, at det rekreative fiskeris fangster af laks i Østersøen skal registreres og dermed skal indgå i den samlede, nationale kvote, som typisk indfiskes hurtigt af erhvervsfiskerne

På den danske ø Bornholm frygter man imidlertid konsekvensen af et sådant registreringskrav, da det rekreative laksefiskeri indbringer mange millioner kroner årligt til øen i en tid, hvor erhvervsfiskeriet ikke blot af laks er i tilbagegang, og man derfor må søge alternative indtægtskilder. Særlig de tilrejsende trollingbåde, som hvert år besøger øen, frygtes at ville udeblive grundet usikkerhed om fortsat mulighed for laksefiskeri. Dette underbygges også af EU's handlingsplan, hvoraf det fremgår (side 6), at Kommissionen er bekendt med den store økonomiske betydning også det rekreative laksefiskeri har for Bornholm ([1]).

Kan Kommissionen bekræfte, at lystfiskeres fangst vil tælle som en del af den nationale kvote for erhvervsfiskeri?

Vil Kommissionen i bekræftende fald overveje at lade dette forslag udgå i betragtning af den store betydning, dette vil have for lystfiskere, samt disse fiskeres relativt set lille andel af den samlede laksefangst samt den betydelige — og erkendte — konsekvens for en sårbar økonomi som Bornholms?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Maria Damanaki
(4. september 2013)

Kommissionen vedtog i august 2011 sit forslag til Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning om en flerårig plan for laksebestanden i Østersøen og for fiskeriet efter denne bestand (KOM(2011)0470 endelig). En af de foranstaltninger, der foreslås af Kommissionen, er at modregne fangster i forbindelse med rekreativt laksefiskeriet i den nationale kvote på samme måde, som det allerede gøres i erhvervsfiskeriet. Europa-Parlamentet støttede denne foranstaltning som anført i Parlamentets lovgivningsmæssige beslutning ([2]).

Foranstaltning blev foreslået for at bidrage til bæredygtigt fiskeri og opnå bedre fangstdata, der er af største betydning for den videnskabelige vurdering af laksebestanden i Østersøen. Det er velkendt, at rekreativt fiskeri har en stor indvirkning på niveauet af laksebestanden i Østersøen, men på grund af utilstrækkelige data og manglende kontrol er der ikke foretaget nogen egentlig vurdering af, hvor betydelig, denne indvirkning er. Kommissionen agter derfor at lade denne foranstaltning blive stående i forslaget.

Når Europa-Parlamentet og Rådet har vedtaget forslaget, har medlemsstaterne fortsat ret til at fordele fiskerimulighederne, blandt deres erhvervs- og/eller rekreative fiskeri på grundlag af de metoder, som de finder passende.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/maritimeaffairs_fisheries/consultations/baltic_salmon/consultation_document_en.pdf
([2]) Nr. A7-0239/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007249/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Regulation of salmon fishing in the Baltic Sea

The EU is currently devising a management plan for salmon fishing in the Baltic Sea with a view to protecting wild salmon stocks. This involves imposing restrictions on both commercial and leisure fishing. In this connection the European Parliament has demanded that recreational fishing of salmon in the Baltic Sea be registered and thus form part of the overall national quota, which is typically rapidly fished by commercial fishermen.

On the Danish island of Bornholm, however, there is fear about the consequences of such a registration requirement, since recreational salmon fishing brings in many millions of DKK annually to the island at a time when commercial fishing — not just of salmon — is on the decline and alternative sources of income need to be found. In particular it is feared that the trolling boats which visit the island every year will stay away because of uncertainty about continued salmon fishing opportunities. This view also receives support from the EU Action Plan which makes clear (p. 6) that the Commission is aware that recreational salmon fishing too is of great importance for Bornholm ([1]).

Can the Commission confirm that leisure fishermen's catches will count as part of the national commercial fishing quota?

If so, will the Commission consider dropping this proposal in view of the major impact this would have on leisure fishing, which represents only a relatively small share of total salmon catches, and of the serious consequences — which it recognises — that this would have on a vulnerable economy such as that of Bornholm?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(4 September 2013)

The Commission adopted its proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a multiannual plan for the Baltic salmon stock and the fisheries exploiting that stock in August 2011 (COM/2011/0470 final). One of the measures proposed by the Commission is to count the catches made in recreational salmon fishery against the national quota in the same way as it is already done in commercial fishery. The European Parliament supported this measure as indicated in its legislative resolution ([2]).

This measure has been proposed in order to contribute to the sustainable fishery and to obtain better catch statistics which are of utmost importance for the scientific assessment of the salmon stock in the Baltic Sea. It is known that recreational fishing has an important impact on the level of the Baltic salmon stock, but a significant impact is not properly assessed owing to the lack of adequate data and controls. Therefore the Commission intends to keep this measure in the proposal.

Once the proposal is adopted by the European Parliament and the Council, Member States will continue to have the right to distribute the fishing opportunities among their commercial and/ or recreational fishery based on any chosen method as deemed fit.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/maritimeaffairs_fisheries/consultations/baltic_salmon/consultation_document_en.pdf
([2]) document number A7-0239/2012.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007250/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20. juni 2013)

Om: Lissabon-traktatens sikkerhedspolitiske elementer og NATO

Den svenske forsvarsminister har udtalt, at Sverige ikke har behov for at være medlem af NATO, da Lissabon-traktaten indeholder sikkerhedsforanstaltninger i tilstrækkeligt omfang ([1]).

Argumentet består således i, at Lissabon-traktaten foreskriver, at hver medlemsstat forpligter sig til at hjælpe sine nabolande. Desuden mener den svenske forsvarsminister, at der i tilfælde af en nødsituation eller et direkte angreb på en medlemsstat, vil tilkomme hjælp fra andre medlemsstater grundet den gensidige afhængighed indenfor EU.

Spørgeren ønsker derfor oplyst, om Kommissionen deler den svenske forsvarsministers opfattelse af, at Lissabon-traktaten kan sidestilles med NATO-pagten?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af José Manuel Barroso
(12. august 2013)

Det er korrekt, at traktaten om Den Europæiske Union (TEU) fastsætter, at hvis »en medlemsstat udsættes for et væbnet angreb på sit område, skal de øvrige medlemsstater i overensstemmelse med artikel 51 i De Forenede Nationers pagt yde den pågældende medlemsstat al den hjælp og bistand, der ligger inden for deres formåen« (artikel 42, stk. 7, i TEU). Artikel 222 i traktaten om Den Europæiske Unions funktionsmåde fastsætter desuden, at »Unionen og dens medlemsstater handler i fællesskab på et solidarisk grundlag, hvis en medlemsstat udsættes for et terrorangreb eller er et offer for en naturkatastrofe eller en menneskeskabt katastrofe«.

De traktater, som Den Europæiske Union hviler på, er imidlertid ikke sammenlignelige med Den Nordatlantiske Traktat, fordi NATO adskiller sig fra EU, hvad angår medlemsskab og denne traktats meget specifikke rækkevidde og mål vedrørende forsvars- og sikkerhedsspørgsmål.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/defence/119894.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007250/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Security policy elements in the Treaty of Lisbon and NATO

The Swedish Minister for Defence has stated that Sweden does not need to become a member of NATO because there are adequate safeguards in the Treaty of Lisbon ([1]).

It is argued that the Treaty of Lisbon requires Member States to assist each other. The Swedish Minister for Defence furthermore takes the view that, in the event of an emergency or a direct attack on a Member State, assistance would be forthcoming from other Member States, given the interdependence which exists in the EU.

Does the Commission agree with the Swedish Minister for Defence that the Treaty of Lisbon is comparable to the NATO treaty?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

The Treaty on European Union (TEU) indeed provides that 'if a Member State is the victim of armed aggression on its territory, the other Member States shall have towards it an obligation of aid and assistance by all the means in their power, in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter' (Article 42(7)TEU). In addition, Article 222 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) provides that the 'Union and its Member States shall act jointly in a spirit of solidarity if a Member States is the object of a terrorist attack or the victim of a natural or man-made disaster'.

However, the Treaties on which the European Union is founded are not comparable to the North Atlantic Treaty as the NATO differs from the EU in terms of membership and its very specific scope and objective concerning defence and security issues.

([1]) http://euobserver.com/defence/119894.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007251/13
to the Commission
Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: ACAA (Agreement on Conformity Assessment and Acceptance of industrial products) between the EU and Israel

Article 9(1) of the ACAA between the European Union and the State of Israel provides that Israel shall nominate a Responsible Authority for the effective implementation of Community and national law. It should forward this nomination to the EU stating the territory for which the Responsible Authority is competent. Currently Israel has not specified the territory for which its Responsible Authority is competent. Thus, according to Israeli law, it would also be competent for the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT). The Commission acknowledged this notification in February 2013 specifying that the acknowledgement does not alter the EU's position that the legitimate jurisdiction of Israeli authorities does not extend to territories brought under Israeli jurisdiction after 1967.

Article 5 of the ACAA allows industrial products that are 'lawfully placed on the market' in Israel to be placed on the EU market without being subject to further control.

1. In view of the statements made by the Foreign Affairs Council on 10 December 2012 declaring settlements illegal under international law, does the Commission not agree that settlement products may not be considered as 'lawfully placed on the market'?

2. If so, how will the Commission ensure that settlement products do not come on to the EU market? And does the Commission intend to communicate that view to the authorities of the Member States in charge of controlling conformity of products with European requirements?

3. Has Israel already forwarded to the Commission its nomination of a Responsible Authority in accordance with Article 9(1) of the ACAA? If so, did the Commission acknowledge this nomination?

4. If a nomination has been made, did Israel specify that the territory for which the Responsible Authority is competent does not include the OPT?

5. In view of the fact that the Commission is aware that Israel defines its territory as including the OPT, does the Commission consider that a unilateral disclaimer by it would be sufficient to ensure that the ACAA 'unequivocally and explicitly' indicates its inapplicability to the OPT?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(13 August 2013)

The Commission recalls that the Agreement on Conformity Assessment and Acceptance of industrial products (ACAA) is a Protocol to the EU-Israel Association Agreement, whose scope does not include the territories under Israeli administration since 1967. Under international law, the EU does not recognise the legality of the Israeli settlements in those territories. The ACAA does not alter that fact.

During the negotiation of the ACAA, the Commission received confirmation from Israeli authorities that there is no production of pharmaceutical products in Israeli settlements. This has been confirmed by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) which are closely monitoring the situation in terms of industrial production or development in the Israeli settlements.

For the purpose of Article 9 of the ACAA, as related to the annex on Mutual Acceptance of Industrial Products — Pharrmaceutical Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP), Israel designated on 14 January 2013 the Ministry of Health as the responsible authority for the State of Israel. In its reply of 4 February 2013, the Commission has acknowledged this designation indicating that 'The European Union's acknowledgement does not alter the European Union's position that the legitimate jurisdiction of Israeli authorities does not extend to the territories brought under Israeli administration since 1967'.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007252/13
adresată Comisiei
Cătălin Sorin Ivan (S&D)
(20 iunie 2013)

Subiect: Studiul limbilor clasice în Uniunea Europeană

Timp îndelungat, studiul limbilor clasice a fost elementul central al educației superioare în Europa. Am observat recent că, în învățământul secundar și în universități, studiul limbii grecești vechi și a limbii latine se află într-o scădere lentă. Numeroase departamente nu sunt finanțate în mod corespunzător și mulți studenți și-au pierdut interesul ca rezultat al crizei financiare și a cererii scăzute de pe piața forței de muncă.

— Este conștientă Comisia de problema cu care se confruntă studiul limbilor clasice în Uniunea Europeană?

— A propus Comisia măsuri adecvate pentru a asigura un viitor departamentelor de limbi clasice?

Răspuns dat de dna Vassiliou în numele Comisiei
(23 iulie 2013)

În ceea ce privește întrebările legate de studiul limbilor clasice în învățământul secundar și terțiar, distinsul membru trebuie să aibă în vedere faptul că, în conformitate cu articolul 165 din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene, responsabilitatea conținutului și a organizării sistemelor educaționale și de pregătire profesională rămâne în sarcina statelor membre. Comisia nu are competența de a acționa în acest domeniu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007252/13
to the Commission
Cătălin Sorin Ivan (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: The study of classics in the European Union

The study of classics was the core of higher education for a long period of time in Europe. I have noticed recently that in secondary schools and universities there is a slow decline in the study of Ancient Greek and Latin. Many departments are not funded properly, and many students have lost interest as a result of the financial crisis and weak demand in the labour market.

— Is the Commission aware of the problems that the study of classics faces in the European Union?

— Has the Commission proposed appropriate steps to ensure a future for classics departments?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

Concerning the questions related to the study of classics in secondary and tertiary education, the Honourable Member will be aware that in accordance with Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union the responsibility for the content and organisation of education and training systems rests with Member States. These are not matters on which the Commission has competence to act.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007253/13
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin/Hohe Vertreterin)
Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE) und Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE)
(20. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Aufhebung des Waffenembargos gegen Syrien

Im Hinblick auf den Beschluss des Rates vom 28. Mai 2013, das Embargo der EU für Waffenlieferungen an die syrische Opposition nicht zu verlängern, wird die Kommission um folgende Auskünfte ersucht:

1. Mit welchen Kontrollen wird dafür gesorgt, dass die Auslieferung von Waffen und Munition nicht zu Menschenrechtsverletzungen führt?

2. Welche Rechenschaftsverfahren werden eingeführt, damit die Aufbewahrung, Registrierung und Nutzung von Waffen und Munition ordnungsgemäß erfasst werden kann?

3. Sind politische Beratungen zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten zum Austausch von Informationen über militärische Lieferungen nach dem Auslaufen des Embargos geplant?

Antwort von Frau Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(3. September 2013)

Das Waffenembargo der EU gegen Syrien ist am 31. Mai ausgelaufen. Die Frage einer etwaigen Ausfuhr von Rüstungsgütern nach Syrien fällt also jetzt in die nationale Politik der Mitgliedstaaten.

In einer Erklärung des Rates zu Syrien sagten die Mitgliedstaaten am 27. Mai zu, dass sie im Rahmen ihrer nationalen Politik nach Maßgabe strenger Kriterien verfahren werden. Insbesondere würden Waffen lediglich dem syrischen Oppositionsbündnis für den Schutz von Zivilisten bereitgestellt und Garantien hinsichtlich der Endverbraucher verlangt. Es obliegt den Mitgliedstaaten, dafür zu sorgen, dass diese Kriterien erfüllt werden, sollten Waffenlieferungen nach Syrien in Betracht gezogen werden.

In diesem Zusammenhang haben die Mitgliedstaaten am 27. Mai auch erklärt, dass sie vorerst keine Waffen nach Syrien liefern. Außerdem haben eine Reihe von Mitgliedstaaten bilateral erklärt, dass sie auch weiterhin keinerlei Waffen nach Syrien liefern werden.

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin hat keine Kenntnis von geplanten politischen Beratungen zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten zum Austausch von Informationen über etwaige militärische Lieferungen.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-007253/13
komissiolle (Varapuheenjohtajalle / Korkealle edustajalle)
Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE) ja Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE)
(20. kesäkuuta 2013)

Aihe: VP/HR – Syyriaa koskevan asevientikiellon poistaminen

Neuvosto päätti 28. toukokuuta 2013 olla jatkamatta EU:n asetoimituskieltoa Syyrian oppositiolle. Tähän päätökseen liittyen kysymme seuraavaa:

1. Miten varmistetaan, että aseiden ja ammusten toimittaminen ei lisää ihmisoikeuksien loukkauksia?

2. Mitä tarkastusmenettelyjä otetaan käyttöön, jotta voidaan varmistaa aseiden ja ammusten varastoinnin, rekisteröinnin ja käytön asianmukainen seuranta?

3. Onko jäsenvaltioiden kesken suunniteltu poliittista yhteydenpitoa tietojen vaihtamiseksi vientikiellon jälkeisestä sotilaallisten välineiden viennistä?

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtaja Catherine Ashtonin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(3. syyskuuta 2013)

EU:n asevientikielto Syyriaan päättyi 31. toukokuuta. Mahdollinen Syyriaan suuntautuva asevienti kuuluu nyt jäsenvaltioiden kansallisen politiikan piiriin.

Neuvosto antoi 27. toukokuuta Syyriaa koskevan julkilausuman, jossa jäsenvaltiot ilmoittivat noudattavansa tiukkoja kriteerejä kansallisessa politiikassaan erityisesti aseiden viemisen osalta. Mahdollinen asevienti suuntautuisi näin ainoastaan Syyrian oppositioryhmien liittoumalle siviiliväestön suojelemiseksi ja niin, että aseiden loppukäyttäjistä on varmuus. Jäsenvaltioiden vastuulla on varmistaa, että nämä kriteerit täyttyvät, mikäli asevientiä Syyriaan harkitaan.

Jäsenvaltiot myös ilmoittivat 27. toukokuuta, että ne eivät tässä vaiheessa vie aseita Syyriaan. Lisäksi useat jäsenvaltiot ovat kahdenvälisesti ilmoittaneet, että ne eivät tulevaisuudessakaan vie aseita Syyriaan.

Korkean edustajan, varapuheenjohtajan tietoon ei ole tullut, että jäsenvaltioiden kesken olisi suunniteltu poliittista yhteydenpitoa tietojen vaihtamiseksi mahdollisesta sotilaallisten välineiden viennistä.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007253/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE) and Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Waiver of the arms embargo against Syria

With regard to the Council's decision of 28 May 2013 not to extend the EU's embargo on supplying arms to the Syrian opposition, we would like to ask the following questions:

1. What checks will be carried out to ensure that the issuing of weapons and ammunition does not contribute to human rights abuses?

2. What accounting procedures will be put in place to ensure proper tracking of the storage, registration and use of any arms and ammunition?

3. Are political consultations planned among Member States regarding the exchange of information on post-embargo military transfers?

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

The EU arms embargo against Syria has expired on 31 May. Possible export of arms to Syria is now a matter of Member States' national policies.

Member States have declared in a Council Declaration on Syria on 27 May that they are to proceed in their national policies on the basis of strict criteria notably that arms would be supplied, only to the Syrian Opposition Coalition, for the protection of civilians and with guarantees about who the end-users will be. It is for Member States to ensure that these criteria are fulfilled in case delivery of arms to Syria would be considered.

In this respect Member States have also declared on 27 May that they would not deliver arms to Syria at this stage. In addition, a number of Member States have bilaterally declared that they would continue not to deliver arms to Syria at all.

The HR/VP is not aware of any political consultations planned among Member States regarding an exchange of information on possible military transfers.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007254/13
al Consiglio
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: jihadista italiano muore in Siria

Il 18 giugno 2013, varie fonti di notizie hanno riferito che il cittadino italiano ventenne, Giuliano Delnevo da Genova, era stato ucciso in Siria. Il giovane, che si era convertito all'Islam, prendendo il nome di Ibrahim, è stato trovato morto con ancora il passaporto italiano che ha aiutato a identificarlo.

Era sotto inchiesta in Italia per il reclutamento di terroristi e, secondo il quotidiano Corriere della Sera, era passato in Siria dalla Turchia nel 2012. L'agenzia di notizie ANSA ha osservato che il Dipartimento delle informazioni per la sicurezza (DIS) in Italia, ha voluto dare rassicurazioni che non c'era nessun grande rischio di diffusione di reclutamento di terroristi nel paese: «L'Italia non è un centro di raccordo per il reclutamento di terroristi, si tratta solo di poche persone», ha dichiarato il Direttore del DIS, Giampiero Massolo.

Il caso di Delnevo riflette un problema diffuso costituito da giovani europei che si radicalizzano e scelgono di andare in Siria per combattere a fianco delle forze anti-Assad.

1. Alla luce del caso di Giuliano Delnevo, quali passi è disposto ad effettuare il Consiglio per monitorare le reti di reclutamento in Europa il cui obiettivo è di inviare combattenti anti-Assad in Siria?

2. Quale sostegno è disposto il Consiglio a offrire alle organizzazioni per la deradicalizzazione e ad altri gruppi affini che lavorano con le persone sospettate di voler combattere in Siria?

Risposta
(16 settembre 2013)

Il Consiglio è preoccupato per la minaccia generale posta dai combattenti stranieri. Il 7 e 8 marzo il Consiglio ha discusso la situazione dal punto di vista della sicurezza nel Sahel/Maghreb e le sue implicazioni per la sicurezza interna dell'UE. I combattenti stranieri sono stati una delle questioni principali affrontate nel dibattito. La suddetta questione dei combattenti stranieri viene altresì trattata nel quadro dell'attuazione della strategia antiterrorismo dell'Unione europea ed è parte delle attività della rete per la sensibilizzazione in materia di radicalizzazione (RAN), un'iniziativa intrapresa dalla Commissione nel 2011.

Il Consiglio ha discusso la questione generale dei combattenti stranieri e rimpatriati sotto il profilo dell'antiterrorismo, in particolare per quanto riguarda la Siria, nella sessione del 6 e 7 giugno. Il coordinatore antiterrorismo dell'UE è stato invitato a presentare al Consiglio una relazione sull'attuazione delle misure per affrontare il problema dei combattenti stranieri nel dicembre 2013.

La discussione si incentra:

sulla necessità di una valutazione comune del fenomeno dei giovani europei che vanno in Siria per la jihad e sulla necessità di ottenere una migliore visione dei diversi gruppi che combattono in Siria;

sulle misure per impedire le partenze di giovani per la Siria ed offrire loro assistenza al ritorno;

sulla segnalazione degli spostamenti e la risposta della giustizia penale;

sulla cooperazione con i paesi terzi.

Il Consiglio ha considerato l'importanza di entrambi i punti a cui l'Onorevole parlamentare fa riferimento e una serie di misure è stata proposta in tale contesto. I lavori sono attualmente in corso in questi ed altri settori indicati come prioritari. Il Consiglio prevede di fare il punto sui progressi compiuti nel dicembre 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007254/13
to the Council
Fiorello Provera (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Italian jihadist dies in Syria

On 18 June 2013, various news sources reported that 20-year-old Italian national, Giuliano Delnevo from Genoa, had been killed in Syria. The young man, who had converted to Islam, took the name Ibrahim and was found dead with his Italian passport still on him, which helped identify him.

He was under investigation in Italy for terrorist recruitment and, according to the newspaper *Corriere della Sera*, crossed into Syria from Turkey in 2012. The news service ANSA noted that Italy's Security Intelligence Department (DIS) wanted to give assurances that there was no major risk of widespread terrorist recruitment in the country: 'Italy is not a hub for terrorist recruitment, this is just a few individuals', said DIS Director Giampiero Massolo.

The case of Delnevo reflects a widespread problem of young Europeans who are becoming radicalised and who choose to go to Syria in order to fight alongside anti-Assad forces.

1. In light of the case of Giuliano Delnevo, what steps is the Council prepared to take in order to track recruitment networks within Europe whose objective is to send anti-Assad fighters to Syria?

2. What support is the Council prepared to offer to deradicalisation organisations and other similar groups working with individuals who are suspected of wanting to fight in Syria?

Reply
(16 September 2013)

The Council is concerned at the general threat posed by foreign fighters. On 7 and 8 March, the Council discussed the security situation in the Sahel/Maghreb and its implications for EU internal security. Foreign fighters was one of the main issues covered by that debate. This issue of foreign fighters is also being addressed within the framework of the implementation of the EU Counter-Terrorism Strategy and is part of the activities of the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN), an initiative undertaken by the Commission in 2011.

The Council discussed the general issue of foreign fighters and returnees from a counter-terrorism perspective, in particular with regard to Syria, at its meeting on 6 and 7 June. The EU Counter Terrorism Coordinator (CTC) was invited to present a report to the Council in December 2013 on the implementation of measures to address the problem of foreign fighters.

Discussion focuses on:

— the need for a common assessment of the phenomenon of these young Europeans going to Syria for the Jihad and the need to get a better picture of the different groups fighting in Syria;

— measures to prevent youngsters from departing to Syria and to offer assistance upon their return;

— detection of travel movements and the criminal justice response;

— cooperation with third countries.

The Council has considered the importance of both points to which the Honourable Member refers and a number of measures have been suggested in this context. Work is currently ongoing in these and other areas that were set out as priorities. The Council plans to take stock of progress in December 2013.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007255/13
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Bambini lasciati inavvertitamente in auto dai genitori o dalle persone che se ne occupano

Molti genitori o altri incaricati portano i bambini a scuola o negli asili nido ogni giorno, prima di recarsi al lavoro.

A volte può accadere che il genitore o altri siano così concentrati o preoccupati per questioni di lavoro, o forse così stanchi, da dimenticare di fermarsi di fronte alla scuola o all'asilo, e continuino invece fino al posto di lavoro. Se il bambino dorme o è molto tranquillo, il genitore può lasciare l'auto e andare a lavorare senza ricordare che il bambino è ancora in macchina. Incidenti siffatti sono stati segnalati e hanno portato alla morte del bambino per disidratazione o ipertermia, poiché dopo varie ore in macchina la temperatura all'interno era diventata troppo alta o troppo bassa (ipotermia).

Neonati o bambini piccoli lasciati all'interno di un veicolo possono morire di ipertermia in poche ore, anche quando la temperatura esterna non è particolarmente calda. L'ipertermia può verificarsi anche in giorni non caldi con appena 22 °C, quando all'interno di una macchina si può giungere a 47 °C. Durante i mesi caldi, le temperature in auto possono aumentare di 10-15 gradi Celsius ogni 15 minuti.

I bambini sono più vulnerabili all'ipertermia rispetto agli adulti, in quanto la loro temperatura corporea sale da tre a cinque volte più velocemente di quella di un adulto a causa delle più basse riserve d'acqua. L'ipertermia può verificarsi in appena 20 minuti, e la morte nel giro di due ore. La maggior parte delle vittime di incidenti di ipertermia in auto sono tra gli 0 e i 4 anni di età.

Ciò che rende la morte ancora più tragica, forse, è il fatto che in molti casi è il risultato di dimenticanza piuttosto che di abbandono, che si verifica quando i genitori o i «custodi» distratti ma altrimenti responsabili, inavvertitamente lasciano un bambino in macchina. La maggior parte non si rende nemmeno conto di aver dimenticato il bambino fino alla fine della giornata, quando ne scopre il cadavere.

La Commissione non crede quindi che potrebbe essere utile incoraggiare i produttori di automobili a introdurre un dispositivo che avverta non solo il conducente e gli eventuali passeggeri, ma anche la gente per la strada, quando un bambino è lasciato solo in macchina? Inoltre non si potrebbe, a lungo termine, rendere siffatto dispositivo obbligatorio in ogni nuova auto prodotta?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(5 agosto 2013)

La Commissione è a conoscenza dei drammatici casi di genitori o altri adulti che dimenticano in automobile i bambini loro affidati e condivide pienamente la preoccupazione espressa dall'onorevole parlamentare.

Per quanto riguarda l'utilità di dotare obbligatoriamente le automobili di sensori in grado di avvisare i genitori della dimenticanza, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-007574/2011 di Guido Milana, Gianni Pittella, David-Maria Sassoli e Debora Serracchiani ([1]).

La Commissione non dispone di prove di un aumento della frequenza di tali eventi incresciosi nel corso degli ultimi due anni. Tuttavia, continuerà a monitorare attentamente la situazione e a considerare tutti gli aspetti pertinenti che potrebbero essere realisticamente affrontati in modo adeguato mediante norme sugli autoveicoli e sui seggiolini per bambini.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007255/13
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Children inadvertently left in cars by parents or caregivers

Many parents or caregivers take their small children to school or to daycare centres every day, before driving to their own workplace.

Sometimes it may happen that the parent or caregiver is so focused on or concerned about work issues, or perhaps so tired, that he or she forgets to stop in front of the school or daycare centre, and instead continues on to his or her workplace. If the child is sleeping or very quiet, the parent could leave the car and go to work unaware that the child is still in the car. Incidents such as this have been reported, ending in the death of the child from thirst or hyperthermia, as after prolonged hours in the car the temperature inside had become too high or too low.

Infants or young children left inside a vehicle can die of hyperthermia in a few hours, even when the temperature outside is not especially hot. Hyperthermia can occur on days as cool as just 22 °C, when the inside of a car can easily reach 47 °C. During warm weather, car temperatures can rise by between 10 and 15 degrees Celsius every 15 minutes.

Children are more vulnerable to hyperthermia than adults, as their body temperature rises three to five times as fast as an adult's because of their lower water reserves. Hyperthermia can occur in as little as 20 minutes, and fatalities within two hours. Most of the victims of hyperthermia incidents in cars are between 0 and 4 years of age.

What makes the deaths all the more tragic, perhaps, is the fact that many are a result of forgetfulness rather than neglect, occurring when distracted but otherwise responsible parents or caretakers inadvertently leave a child in a car. Most do not even realise they had forgotten the child until the end of the day when they discover the body.

Does the Commission therefore believe it may be beneficial to encourage car manufacturers to introduce a device which would alert not only the driver and any passengers, but also people on the streets when a small child is left alone in the car? Furthermore, could such a device in the long term become mandatory in every new car produced?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The Commission is aware of the very sad incidents of parents or caregivers forgetting children in car seats and fully shares the main concern expressed by the Honourable Member.

With regard to the usefulness of introducing 'parent alert sensors' as mandatory equipment of motor vehicles, the Commission would like to refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007574/2011 by On. Guido Milana, On. Gianni Pittella, On. David-Maria Sassoli and Sig.ra Debora Serracchiani ([1]).

The Commission has no evidence indicating that the frequency of such tragic events has increased over the past couple of years. Nevertheless, the Commission will continue to monitor carefully the situation and study all relevant aspects which could realistically and appropriately be addressed through vehicle and child seat legislation.

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

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007256/13
til Kommissionen
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20. juni 2013)

Om: Passagerrettigheder i tilfælde af flyaflysninger eller -forsinkelser

Snevejr medfører meget ofte forstyrrelser af flyvninger overalt i EU. Sådanne forsinkelser, omlægninger og aflysninger forlænger rejsetiden betydeligt og medfører alvorligt besvær og ekstra omkostninger for passagererne.

De fleste flyselskaber nægter at godtgøre de ekstraudgifter, der opstår som følge af en omlægning af flyruten, idet de påpeger, at der ikke skal udbetales EU-kompensation i tilfælde af »ekstraordinære omstændigheder«.

Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 261/2004 indfører fælles bestemmelser om kompensation og bistand til luftfartspassagerer ved aflysning eller forsinkelser.

Er luftpassagerer beskyttet af EU-lovgivning i tilfælde af dårlige vejrforhold, for så vidt som omlægninger eller aflysninger af flyafgange forårsager alvorligt besvær og ekstra udgifter for passagererne?

Har flyselskabet i tilfælde af »særlige omstændigheder« ret til at lande i en hvilken som helst lufthavn, hvor det er muligt, og ingen forpligtelse til at yde passagererne nogen form for bistand, og kan det nægte at yde nogen som helst kompensation for udgifter forbundet med viderebefordring til den oprindelige lufthavn eller til det bestemmelsessted, der er aftalt med passagererne?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Siim Kallas
(31. juli 2013)

I medfør af forordning (EF) nr. 261/2004 ([1]) kan luftfartspassagerer kræve erstatning, hvis deres flyafgang aflyses med kort varsel, medmindre luftfartsselskabet kan godtgøre, at aflysningen skyldes usædvanlige omstændigheder, som ikke kunne have været undgået, selv om alle forholdsregler, der med rimelighed kunne træffes, faktisk var blevet truffet. Det bør derfor vurderes fra sag til sag, om ugunstige vejrforhold fritager luftfartsselskabet for at yde kompensation i tilfælde af en aflysning eller en omlægning af flyruten. I den forbindelse kan en omlægning af flyruten sidestilles med en aflysning af en flyafgang ([2]).

Imidlertid er luftfartsselskabet altid forpligtet til at tilbyde flypassagererne forplejning (f.eks. drikkevarer, måltider og indkvartering om nødvendigt) og omlægning af rejsen, når en flyvning aflyses med kort varsel eller omdirigeres til en anden lufthavn — uanset omstændighederne. Desuden gælder det, at hvis en by, et byområde eller en region betjenes af flere lufthavne, og det transporterende luftfartsselskab tilbyder en passager en flyvning til en alternativ lufthavn i forhold til den, som reservationen gælder for, betaler luftfartsselskabet omkostningerne ved at overføre passageren til den lufthavn, som reservationen blev foretaget til, eller til et andet nærliggende bestemmelsessted efter aftale med passageren ([3]).

([1]) Europa-Parlamentets og Rådets forordning (EF) nr. 261/2004 af 11. februar 2004 om fælles bestemmelser om kompensation og bistand til luftfartspassagerer ved boardingafvisning og ved aflysning eller lange forsinkelser (EUT L 46 af 17.2.2004, s. 1).

([2]) EF-Domstolen har fastslået, at da en flyvning forudsætter en rute, som er fastlagt af luftfartsselskabet, dvs. den strækning flyet skal tilbagelægge fra afgangslufthavnen til ankomstlufthavnen, følger det heraf, at for at en flyvning kan anses for gennemført, er det ikke tilstrækkeligt, at flyet er afgået i overensstemmelse med den planlagte rute, men at det også skal være nået frem til dets bestemmelsessted, som anført på nævnte rute. Den omstændighed, at flyet afgår, men efterfølgende vender tilbage til afgangslufthavnen uden at have nået det bestemmelsessted, som er anført på ruten, medfører, at den oprindeligt planlagte flyvning ikke kan betragtes som værende gennemført. Sag C-83/10 — dom af 13. oktober 2011.

([3]) Forordning 261/2004, artikel 8, stk. 3.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007256/13
to the Commission
Morten Messerschmidt (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Passenger rights in the event of cancellation or delay of flights

Snowfall very often disrupts flights throughout the EU. Such delays, diversions and cancellations significantly prolong people's travelling time and cause serious inconvenience and extra costs for passengers.

Most airlines refuse to refund the extra costs incurred by diversion of the flight, claiming that EU compensation does not have to be paid where there are 'extraordinary circumstances'.

Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishes common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of cancellation or delay of flights.

Are passengers protected by EU legislation in the event of bad weather conditions owing to which diversion and cancellation of flights cause serious inconvenience and extra costs to passengers?

Or, in a case where 'extraordinary circumstances' are applicable, does the airline have the right to land in any possible airport, and is it under no obligation to provide passengers with any kind of assistance, and entitled to refuse to reimburse costs for onward transport to the original airport or to a destination agreed with the passengers concerned?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

Under Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 ([1]), air passengers may claim compensation in case their flight is cancelled at short notice except if the air carrier can prove that the cancellation is caused by extraordinary circumstances which could not have been avoided even if all reasonable measures had been taken. Whether a cancellation or flight deviation in the context of adverse weather conditions relieves the air carrier from compensation must therefore be appreciated on a case-by-case basis. In this context, a deviated flight could be assimilated with a cancelled flight ([2]).

However, the air carrier is always under the obligation to offer care (e.g. drinks, meals, accommodation where necessary) and re-routing to the passengers when a flight is cancelled on short notice or deviated to another airport, irrespective of the circumstances. Furthermore, when, in the case where a town, city or region is served by several airports, the operating carrier offers a passenger a flight to an airport alternative to that for which the booking was made, it shall bear the cost of transferring the passenger to the airport for which the booking was made, or to another close-by destination agreed with the passenger ([3]).

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights, OJ L 46, 17.2.2004.

([2]) The European Court of Justice has held that, since a flight implies an itinerary fixed by the air carrier, i.e. the journey to be made from the airport of departure to the airport of arrival, for a flight to be considered to have been operated, it is not enough that the aeroplane left in accordance with the scheduled itinerary, but it must also have reached its destination as appearing in the said itinerary. The fact that take-off occurred but that the aeroplane then returned to the airport of departure without having reached the destination appearing in the itinerary means that the flight, as initially scheduled, cannot be considered as having been operated: Case C-83/10, judgment of 13 October 2011.

([3]) Regulation 261/2004, Art. 8(3).

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007258/13
à la Commission
Anne Delvaux (PPE)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Indemnités pour le volontariat international

Au sein de l'Union européenne, beaucoup d'organisations permettent aux citoyens européens de participer à des activités de volontariat à l'étranger. Ces programmes sont d'une importance capitale puisque, non seulement, ils permettent une citoyenneté active mais aussi parce qu'ils portent les valeurs fondamentales de l'Europe ainsi que le respect de la diversité culturelle.

Cependant, la limitation des remboursements des frais encourus lors de tels échanges (particulièrement importants dans le cadre d'échanges internationaux) limite la concrétisation d'un certain nombre de projets. En effet, si les volontaires ne sont pas rémunérés pour leur travail, la plupart de leurs frais (voyage, logement, etc.) sont pris en charge à travers différentes formes d'indemnités.

Ces indemnités sont plafonnées en fonction des législations nationales et diffèrent d'un État membre à l'autre au sein de l'Union européenne.

1. De quelle marge de manœuvre la Commission dispose-t-elle afin de relever ces plafonds fixes, jugés trop bas par les organisations de volontariat des États membres?

2. Quelles initiatives la Commission peut-elle prendre dans l'objectif d'harmoniser les systèmes d'indemnités nationaux en ce qui concerne les programmes de volontariat au sein de l'Union?

3. D'un point de vue administratif, quelle initiative la Commission pourrait-elle prendre pour faciliter les échanges volontaires intra-européens?

Réponse donnée par M. Andor au nom de la Commission
(13 août 2013)

Le sujet abordé par les deux premières questions ne relève pas des compétences de la Commission.

En ce qui concerne la troisième question sur la facilitation des échanges volontaires intra-européens, l'Union s'emploie à promouvoir le volontariat transfrontalier chez les jeunes.

La recommandation du Conseil relative à la mobilité des jeunes volontaires dans l'Union européenne (2008) ([1]) encourage les États membres à promouvoir cette mobilité en améliorant la coopération entre les organisateurs d'activités de volontariat dans différents pays, qu'ils soient issus de la société civile ou des pouvoirs publics. La Commission soutient la mise en œuvre de cette recommandation par l'échange d'informations et d'expériences, ainsi que par le développement d'une plateforme en ligne pour le volontariat des jeunes, dans le cadre du nouveau portail européen de la jeunesse, afin de faciliter l'accès aux offres de volontariat.

([1]) Recommandation du Conseil du 20 novembre 2008 relative à la mobilité des jeunes volontaires dans l'Union européenne (JO C 319 du 13.12.2008).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007258/13
to the Commission
Anne Delvaux (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Allowances for international volunteering

Within the European Union, many organisations allow citizens to participate in voluntary work abroad. These programmes are of vital importance, as not only do they foster active citizenship, they also convey core European values as well as respect for cultural diversity.

However, the limited allowances towards expenses incurred during such exchanges (which are especially significant in the context of international exchanges) limit the implementation of a number of projects. While volunteers are not paid for their work, most of their expenses (travel, accommodation, etc.) are offset by various types of allowances.

These allowances are capped in accordance with national legislation, and they vary from one Member State to another within the European Union.

1. How much leeway does the Commission have with regard to increasing these fixed ceilings, which Member States' volunteering organisations think are too low?

2. What initiatives could the Commission take, with the goal of harmonising national allowances systems for volunteering programmes within the Union?

3. From an administrative point of view, what initiative could the Commission take in order to facilitate volunteering exchanges within Europe?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(13 August 2013)

The matter referred to by the first two questions is not within the Commission's remit.

As regards the third question on the facilitation of volunteering exchanges within Europe, the Union is actively promoting volunteering across borders in the youth field.

The Council Recommendation on the Mobility of Young Volunteers across the EU (2008) ([1]) encourages Member States to promote such mobility by enhancing cooperation between organisers of voluntary activities in different countries, whether civil society or public authorities. The Commission supports the implementation of this recommendation through exchange of information and experiences, and through the development of an online Youth Volunteering Platform as part of the new European Youth Portal to make the supply of volunteering opportunities more accessible.

([1]) Council Recommendation of 20 November 2008 on the mobility of young volunteers across the European Union [OJ C 319, 13.12.2008].

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007262/13
aan de Commissie
Philip Claeys (NI)
(20 juni 2013)

Betreft: Bescherming en restauratie van cultureel erfgoed in Noord-Cyprus — werken aan moskeeën

Volgens een eerder antwoord E-009182/2012 is de „Commissie zich bewust van de kritieke staat van veel van de historische kerken in het noordelijke deel van Cyprus". Waarom beschikt de Europese Commissie niet over een gedetailleerde inventaris van dit patrimonium? Wanneer zal de Europese Commissie beginnen met het opmaken hiervan en het bewaken van de vooruitgang inzake bescherming en restauratie?

De Commissie bevestigde mij dat zij zich ondergeschikt maakt aan een lijst opgesteld door een commissie van de twee gemeenschappen met 40 prioritair te herstellen eigendommen. Zo zou Europees geld gaan naar o.a. de restauratie van vier moskeeën.

Graag ontving ik een kopie van deze volledige lijst van 40 eigendommen. Om welke vier moskeeën gaat het hier? Waar zijn zij gelegen? In welk jaar werden zij gebouwd? Welke omstandigheden rechtvaardigen werken uitgevoerd aan deze gebouwen? Welk bedrag wordt voor de werken aan elk van deze moskeeën voorzien?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(5 september 2013)

In 2010 heeft de EU via haar bijstandsprogramma voor de Turks-Cypriotische gemeenschap en op verzoek van het Europees Parlement een studie gefinancierd over het onroerende culturele erfgoed van Cyprus. De studie ter ondersteuning van het onder beide gemeenschappen ressorterende Technisch Comité voor het culturele erfgoed, dat onder auspiciën van de Verenigde Naties werkt, heeft geleid tot een lijst van meer dan 2300 culturele monumenten.

Naar aanleiding van deze studie hebben de leiders van beide gemeenschappen een akkoord bereikt over een lijst voor het hele eiland van 40 monumenten die met voorrang hersteld moeten worden ([1]). De lijst omvat vijfentwintig kerken, acht moskeeën, drie badhuizen, de citadel van Famagusta/toren van Othello, een klooster, een madrasa, en een aquaduct met watermolen.

Uit deze lijst heeft het Technisch Comité van beide gemeenschappen in 2012 elf culturele monumenten op het hele eiland aangeduid waarvoor spoedmaatregelen nodig zijn. Om ervoor te zorgen dat de financiering efficiënt en doeltreffend is, en gezien de complexe politieke situatie, wordt de EU-financiering gebruikt voor steun aan de door het Comité van beide gemeenschappen gekozen projecten.

Vier van deze elf monumenten die voor EU-spoedmaatregelen in aanmerking komen, zijn moskeeën: de moskee van Denya bij Nicosia (spoedwerkzaamheden voltooid in april 2013, met een budget van ongeveer 66.000 EUR); de Mustafa Pasja-moskee in Famagusta (10 000 EUR); de moskee van Evretu/Dereboyu (30 000 EUR) en de moskee van Çerkez (10 000 EUR). Behalve de Mustafa Pasja-moskee bevinden zich alle moskeeën in door de regering gecontroleerde gebieden.

([1]) De vraag van het geachte Parlementslid om toegang tot de lijst van de 40 prioritaire monumenten is doorgestuurd naar de bevoegde diensten van de Commissie en zal worden behandeld in het kader van Verordening (EG) nr. 1049/2001 inzake de toegang van het publiek tot documenten. Verordening (EG) nr. 1049/2001 van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 30 mei 2001 inzake de toegang van het publiek tot documenten van het Europees Parlement, de Raad en de Commissie (PB L 145 van 31.5.2001).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007262/13
to the Commission
Philip Claeys (NI)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Conservation and restoration of the cultural heritage in Northern Cyprus — work on mosques

According to a previous answer, to Question E-009182/2012, 'the Commission is aware of the critical state of many of the historic churches in the northern part of Cyprus'. Why does the Commission not have a detailed inventory of this heritage? When will the Commission begin to compile one and to monitor the progress of conservation and restoration?

The Commission confirmed to me that it was guided by a list drawn up by a bi-communal committee indicating 40 properties whose restoration was to be assigned priority. As a result, European funding would be provided, *inter alia*, for the restoration of four mosques.

I should appreciate it if I could receive a copy of this complete list of 40 properties. Which are the four mosques to be restored? Where are they? In what year were they built? What circumstances justify work on these buildings? How much funding will be allocated to the work on each of these mosques?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2013)

In 2010, the EU financed a study on the immovable cultural heritage of Cyprus through its aid programme for the Turkish Cypriot community and at the request of the European Parliament. The study in support of the bi-communal technical committee on Cultural Heritage operating under UN auspices led to a list of more than 2 300 cultural heritage sites.

Following this study, both community leaders agreed on an island-wide list of 40 monuments for priority works ([1]). The list includes 25 churches, eight mosques, three baths, the Famagusta citadel/Othello tower, one monastery, one madrasa, and one aquaduct/mill house.

From this document, the bi-communal technical committee identified in 2012 eleven cultural heritage sites throughout the island in need of emergency measures. In order to make the funding efficient and effective, and given the complex political environment, EU funding is devoted to support the projects chosen by the bi-communal committee.

Four of these eleven sites identified for EU-funded emergency interventions constitute mosques: the Deneia/Denya Mosque near Nicosia (emergency work completed in April 2013 with a budget of around EUR 66 000); the Mustafa Pasha Mosque located in Famagusta (EUR 10 000); the Evretu/Dereboyu Mosque (EUR 30 000) and the Çherkez Mosque (EUR 10 000). All but the Mustafa Pasha Mosque are located in government-controlled areas.

([1]) The Honourable Member's request for access to the list of 40 priority sites has been passed to the competent Commission services and will be treated under Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 regarding public access to documents.
Regulation (EC) Bi 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents, OJ L 145, 31.5.2001.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007263/13
aan de Commissie
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(20 juni 2013)

Betreft: Afrikaanse Varkenspest Smolensk

In Smolensk, Rusland is een nieuwe uitbraak van Afrikaanse Varkenspest gerapporteerd. Bij eerdere uitbraken (o.a. 2011) kreeg Rusland de situatie slecht onder controle, deels omdat de grenscontroles van aan Rusland grenzende landen niet adequaat en effectief zijn. Het gevaar heerst dat de Afrikaanse varkenspest overslaat naar EU-lidstaten.

1. Wat is de actuele situatie op het gebied van de Afrikaanse Varkenspest in landen grenzend aan de Europese Unie?

2. Deelt de Commissie de zorg dat Rusland dat de grenscontroles van aan Rusland grenzende landen niet adequaat en effectief zijn?

3. Welke maatregelen neemt of heeft de Commissie genomen om het overslaan van de Afrikaanse Varkenspest naar lidstaten binnen de Europese Unie te voorkomen?

Antwoord van de heer Borg namens de Commissie
(29 juli 2013)

Er zijn onlangs uitbraken van Afrikaanse Varkenspest (AVP) gemeld in de Russische Federatie en Belarus, dicht bij de EU-grenzen.

De Commissie is bezorgd over deze situatie, maar heeft geen bewijs dat de controles aan de EU-grenzen niet adequaat of effectief zouden zijn.

De invoer in de Unie van levende varkens, varkensvlees, of varkensvleesproducten uit Rusland en Belarus die het risico van Afrikaanse varkenspest met zich meebrengt, is niet toegestaan. Er is voorzien in controles op de bagage van reizigers die de Unie binnenkomen om de invoer van deze gevaarlijke producten te voorkomen. De Commissie heeft ook aanvullende maatregelen genomen om ervoor te zorgen dat voertuigen die gebruikt werden voor het vervoer van dieren in Rusland en Belarus alleen naar de Unie kunnen terugkeren wanneer zij naar behoren worden gereinigd en ontsmet.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007263/13
to the Commission
Esther de Lange (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: African swine fever in Smolensk

A fresh outbreak of African swine fever has been reported in Smolensk, Russia. When previous outbreaks occurred, for example in 2011, Russia had difficulty in bringing the situation under control, partly because the border controls of countries bordering on Russia are not adequate or effective. There is a danger that African swine fever may spread into EU Member States.

1. What is the current situation with regard to African swine fever in countries bordering on the European Union?

2. Does the Commission share the concern that the border controls of countries bordering on Russia are not adequate or effective?

3. What measures will the Commission take, or has it taken, to prevent African swine fever from spreading to Member States within the European Union?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

Outbreaks of African swine fever (ASF) have been recently reported in the Russian Federation and Belarus, close to the EU borders.

The Commission is concerned about this situation, but does not have evidence that controls at EU borders are not adequate or effective.

Imports into the EU of live pigs and pork, or pork products, that may pose an ASF risk are not permitted from Russia and Belarus. Provisions are in place regarding the checks to be carried out on the luggage of travellers entering the Union to prevent introduction of those risky products. The Commission has also adopted additional measures to ensure that vehicles which were used for the transport of animals in Russia and Belarus can only re-enter the Union if they are appropriately cleansed and disinfected.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007266/13
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Trudna sytuacja pracowników zakładu Valdi Ceramika

Pracownicy fabryki ceramiki ściennej i podłogowej VALDI CERAMIKA poinformowali nas o trudnej sytuacji ekonomicznej ich zakładu. Przedsiębiorstwo funkcjonuje od 2011 r. W marcu 2012 r. firma dawała zatrudnienie dla 130 osób. Obecnie w zakładzie pracuje około 40 osób ([1]).W ramach działania „Inwestycje w innowacyjne przedsięwzięcia Programu Operacyjnego Innowacyjna Gospodarka 2007-2013" przedsiębiorstwo miało otrzymać dofinansowanie z funduszy unijnych na poziomie 41 480 762 złotych.

Ostatecznie firma została wsparta środkami w wysokości około 32 mln złotych. Polska Agencja Rozwoju Przedsiębiorczości wstrzymała wypłatę około 8,7 mln zł. z całości kwoty 41 480 762 zł. Według rzecznika PARP zakwestionowane środki dotyczyły zakupu gruntu i poniesiono je niezgodnie z zapisami umowy o dofinansowanie spółki. Z zarzutami PARP nie zgodził się prezes fabryki ([2]).Obecnie problemy ekonomiczne w spółce pogłębiają się. Firma ma odcięty gaz i wodę. Dodatkowym problemem jest nieterminowe regulowanie pensji.

Według informacji Tygodnika Koneckiego (nr 25/769 z 17.6.2013 r.) Konecki Urząd Pracy podpisał dwie umowy dotyczące dofinansowania na utworzenie stanowisk pracy dla bezrobotnych. W lipcu 2010 r. na 15 stanowisk na sumę 277 tys. zł. i w listopadzie 2010 r. na 12 stanowisk na sumę 222 tys. zł. Daje to łączną kwotę blisko pół miliona złotych dofinansowania dla 27 stanowisk pracy dla bezrobotnych. Zgodnie z umową pomiędzy PUP i VALDI Ceramika stanowiska pracy miały być utrzymywane przez dwa lata.

Na 26 czerwca br. przewidziana została licytacja komornicza, na której zlicytowane zostaną całe składy płytek ceramicznych (por. Tygodnik Konecki, nr 25 (769) z 17.6.2013 r.). W związku z powyższym chciałbym zapytać:

1. Czy Komisja zna trudną sytuację pracowników fabryki VALDI Ceramika z siedzibą w Stąporkowie?

2. Czy Komisja może przeznaczyć środki z Europejskiego Funduszu Społecznego w celu pomocy dla zwalnianych pracowników zakładu VALDI Ceramika?

3. Jak wysokie środki może przeznaczyć Komisja Europejska z funduszy Europejskiego Funduszu Społecznego w związku z pomocą dla zwalnianych pracowników fabryki VALDI Ceramika?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(5 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Komisja jest świadoma sytuacji zakładu Valdi Ceramika, nie posiada jednak żadnych uprawnień do ingerowania w decyzje przedsiębiorstwa. Mimo to Komisja zachęca pracodawców do stosowania dobrych praktyk w zakresie społecznie odpowiedzialnego zarządzania zmianami.

Komisja z udziałem właściwych organów krajowych sprawdzi, czy jednostka gospodarcza, o której mowa, otrzymała dotacje UE zgodnie z zasadami pomocy państwa, oraz – jeżeli tak było – czy należycie przestrzegano przepisów prawa. Obowiązkiem państw członkowskich jest zapewnienie, aby pomoc przyznana w ramach programów objętych wyłączeniem grupowym spełniała wszystkie wymogi rozporządzenia Komisji (WE) nr 800/2008 ([3]) (ogólne rozporządzenie w sprawie wyłączeń blokowych), w tym zasadę utrzymania inwestycji przez okres pięciu lat (lub trzech lat w przypadku MŚP) po jej zakończeniu, zgodnie z art. 13 ust. 2 wspomnianego rozporządzenia. Programy objęte wyłączeniem grupowym podlegają systematycznemu monitorowaniu przez Komisję.

Polski Program Operacyjny Kapitał Ludzki, współfinansowany przez EFS, zapewnia wsparcie dla osób w szczególnie trudnej sytuacji na rynku pracy, m.in. za pośrednictwem środków przeciwdziałania negatywnym konsekwencjom procesów dostosowawczych (na przykład programów w zakresie zwolnień monitorowanych dla pracowników restrukturyzowanych przedsiębiorstw). Wybór działań objętych finansowaniem pozostaje w gestii właściwych organów krajowych ([4]), które mogą dostarczyć dalszych informacji.

([1]) http://www.muratorplus.pl/biznes/firmy-i-ludzie/otwarcie-fabryki-valdi-ceramica_70394.html
http://www.strefabiznesu.echodnia.eu/artykul/valdi-ceramica-w-coraz-wiekszej-agonii
([2]) http://wiadomosci.onet.pl/regionalne/kielce/valdi-ceramica-pracownicy-dostali-zalegle-wyplaty,1,5069049,wiadomosc.html
([3]) Dz.U. L 214 z 9.8.2008, s. 3.
([4]) http://www.pokl.sbrr.pl/

W przypadku gdyby zwolnienia w zakładzie Valdi Ceramika zostały spowodowane globalizacją handlu, przy jednoczesnym spełnieniu innych stosownych warunków, Polska mogłaby ubiegać się o finansowanie z Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji (EFG). Szanowny Pan Poseł może uzyskać informacje, czy planowane jest złożenie wniosku w tej sprawie, u osoby wyznaczonej do kontaktów w zakresie EFG dla Polski ([5]).

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=pl

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007266/13
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Difficulties facing workers at Valdi Ceramika

Workers at the Valdi Ceramika wall and floor tiles factory have informed us of the difficult economic situation the plant is facing. The company has been operating since 2011. In March 2012 the company was employing 130 workers. There are now around 40 people working there ([1]). The company was to have received EU funding of PLN 41 480 762 under the 'Investments in innovative projects' measure of the Innovative Economy Operational Programme 2007-2013.

In the end, the company received funding of approximately PLN 32 million. The Polish Enterprise Development Agency (PARP) withheld a payment of approximately PLN 8.7 million from the total amount of PLN 41 480 762. According to a PARP spokesperson, the funds in question relate to the purchase of land and were incurred in contravention of the provisions of the company's funding agreement. The accusations made by the PARP are contested by the factory's managing director ([2]). Now the company is sinking deeper into financial difficulty. The gas and water supply have been cut off. Another problem is that salaries are not being paid on time.

According to the local press (*Tygodnik Konecki* No 25/769 of 17 June 2013), the Konecki Labour Office has signed two financing agreements for the creation of jobs for the unemployed. In July 2010 for 15 jobs (PLN 277 000) and in November 2010 for 12 jobs (222 000). This makes a total amount of nearly half a million złoty to create 27 jobs for unemployed workers. According to an agreement between the PUP and Valdi Ceramika, jobs were to have been safeguarded for two years.

On June 26 this year the stocks of ceramics were auctioned off by the bailiffs (Tygodnik Konecki No 25 (769) of 17 June 2013). In light of the above,

1. Is the Commission aware of the difficult situation facing workers at the Valdi Ceramika factory in Stąporków?

2. Can the Commission allocate funds from the European Social Fund to help the workers at the factory who have been made redundant?

3. What level of funding can the Commission allocate from the European Social Fund to help workers at the Valdi Ceramika factory who have been made redundant?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The Commission is aware of the situation at Valdi Ceramika, but has no power to interfere in company's decisions. It encourages employers, however, to follow good practices in socially responsible management of change.

The Commission will verify with relevant national authorities if the enterprise received EU grants under the state aid rules, and should this be a case if the rules were duly respected. It is duty of Member States to ensure that aid granted under block exempted schemes meets all requirements of the Commission Regulation (EC) 800/2008 ([3]) (General Block Exemption Regulation), including the rule on the maintenance of the investment during 5 years (or 3 years in the case of SMEs) after its completion according the Art 13(2) of the said Regulation. Block exempted schemes are under systematic monitoring by Commission.

The Polish Human Capital Operational Programme co-financed by the ESF provides assistance for individuals in a particularly difficult situation on the labour market, including through measures counteracting negative implications of adaptation processes (for example outplacement programmes for employees of restructured companies). The selection of operations for funding is a responsibility of relevant national authorities ([4]), which can provide further information.

([1]) http://www.muratorplus.pl/biznes/firmy-i-ludzie/otwarcie-fabryki-valdi-ceramica_70394.html
http://www.strefabiznesu.echodnia.eu/artykul/valdi-ceramica-w-coraz-wiekszej-agonii.
([2]) http://wiadomosci.onet.pl/regionalne/kielce/valdi-ceramica-pracownicy-dostali-zalegle-wyplaty,1,5069049,wiadomosc.html
([3]) OJ L 214/3 of 9.8.2008.
([4]) http://www.pokl.sbrr.pl/.

If the redundancies from Valdi Ceramika were caused by trade related globalisation, and other relevant conditions are fulfilled, Poland could apply for funding from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF). The Honourable Member may wish to communicate with the EGF Contact Person for Poland should he wish to know whether an application is being planned ([5]).

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=581&langId=pl.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007267/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Adoção na União Europeia

A adoção de crianças constitui uma matéria de particular sensibilidade e que, por princípio, deve estar sujeita às legislações nacionais, mais vocacionadas para o seu acompanhamento e para o estabelecimento de padrões mais condizentes com as realidades nacionais que visam regular. Não obstante, a dignidade da pessoa e, no caso vertente, o especial cuidado que os superiores interesses do menor exigem, recomendam o cumprimento das convenções internacionais a seu respeito, o estudo das melhores práticas e a troca de experiências entre os Estados-Membros.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Como avalia o grau de cumprimento das convenções internacionais sobre a adoção na União Europeia?

2. Acompanha os esforços dos Estados-Membros que visam fazer face ao flagelo do tráfico de crianças que afeta, sobretudo, os países mais pobres e as pessoas de mais fracos recursos? De que formas e com que resultados?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

A adoção não se encontra regulada ao nível da União Europeia. No plano internacional, a Comissão apoia a correta aplicação da Convenção da Haia relativa à Proteção das Crianças e à Cooperação em matéria de Adoção Internacional, de 1993, participando regularmente nas comissões especiais convocadas no âmbito da Conferência da Haia de Direito Internacional Privado. Essas reuniões visam o aperfeiçoamento do funcionamento da convenção e o intercâmbio das melhores práticas. A Comissão incentiva os países terceiros a tornarem-se Parte na convenção, para que se reforce a cooperação internacional neste domínio ([1]).

Ao nível nacional, a adoção continua a relevar da competência dos Estados-Membros. No entanto, Convenção Europeia em matéria de Adoção de Crianças (revista), do Conselho da Europa, de 27 de novembro de 2008, estabelece normas comuns na matéria. Esta convenção pretende ter em conta a evolução social e jurídica, não deixando de ter presente a Convenção Europeia dos Direitos do Homem e a prevalência dos superiores interesses da criança sobre quaisquer outras considerações ([2]). Não sendo a União Parte nessas convenções, e na ausência de legislação da UE relativa à adoção, a Comissão não tem competência institucional para apreciar o grau de cumprimento das mesmas pelos Estados-Membros.

O combate ao tráfico de crianças constitui uma prioridade para a União. De acordo com os dados constantes do primeiro relatório da UE sobre o tráfico de seres humanos, 15 % das suas vítimas são crianças. A Directiva 2011/36/UE ([3]) dispõe sobre a prevenção do tráfico de seres humanos e a protecção, a assistência e o apoio a dar às crianças que dele são vítimas, em particular às crianças não acompanhadas. Refira-se que a estratégia da UE ([4]) inclui acções concretas, centradas nas crianças que são vítimas deste flagelo, além de orientações sobre os sistemas de proteção das crianças.

([1]) Todos os Estados-Membros da UE são Parte na Convenção da Haia de 1993.
([2]) Ponto da situação respeitante às assinaturas e ratificações: http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?CL=FRE&CM=&NT=202&DF=&VL=
([3]) Diretiva 2011/36/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 5 de abril de 2011, relativa à prevenção e luta contra o tráfico de seres humanos e à proteção das vítimas, e que substitui a Decisão-Quadro 2002/629/JAI do Conselho.
([4]) Estratégia da União Europeia para a erradicação do tráfico de seres humanos 2012-2016, COM(2012) 286 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007267/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Adoption in the EU

The adoption of children is a particularly sensitive issue that should, on principle, be subject to national legislation. However, it should be possible to monitor this legislation and set out standards better suited to the national situations they aim to regulate. Nevertheless, human dignity and the need to pay particular attention to the best interests of minors mean it is advisable to observe and respect international conventions on the matter, as well as to study best practices and exchange experiences between Member States.

1. What is the Commission's assessment of the level of compliance with international conventions on adoption in the EU?

2. Does it monitor the Member States' efforts to address the scourge of child trafficking, which predominantly affects the poorest countries and the people who are worst-off? If so, how and with what results?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

Adoption is not regulated at EU level. At international level, the Commission supports the correct implementation of the 1993 Hague Convention on Inter-country Adoption by participating on a regular basis to the Special Commissions organised in the context of the Hague Conference on Private International Law. These meetings are aimed at improving the functioning of the Convention and at exchanging best practises. The Commission encourages third countries to become parties to the Convention with a view to strengthening international cooperation in this matter ([1]).

At national level, adoption remains within the competence of the Member States. However, the Council of Europe Convention on the Adoption of Children (revised) of 27.11.2008 sets out common standards in the matter. The aim of the Convention is to take account of social and legal developments while keeping to the European Convention on Human Rights and bearing in mind that the child's best interests must always take precedence over any other considerations ([2]).

As the EU is not a Party to these Conventions, and lacking any EU legislation on adoption, the Commission has no institutional powers to assess the level of compliance by the Member States.

Addressing child trafficking is a priority for the EU. According to first EU data report on trafficking in human beings 15% of victims are children.The directive 2011/36/EU ([3]) sets out provisions on prevention of trafficking in human beings, and the protection, assistance and support of child victims, including unaccompanied child victims. Furthermore, the EU Strategy ([4]) contains concrete actions focusing on child victims, including guidelines on child protection systems.

([1]) All EU Member States are already Party to the 1993 Hague Convention.
([2]) State of play of signatures and ratifications: http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?NT=202&CM=8&DF=&CL=ENG.
([3]) Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA.
([4]) The EU Strategy towards the Eradication of Trafficking in Human Beings 2012-2016 COM(2012) 286 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007269/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Despedimento coletivo na empresa Schenelleke, Palmela, Portugal

A *Schenelleke*, empresa de logística integrada, que garante a gestão completa do fornecimento a fábricas de montagem e de componentes para automóveis, opera no complexo Industrial de Palmela, prestando serviços à *Autoeuropa*.

Tendo como justificação as quebras de produção provocadas pela diminuição substancial do poder de compra dos consumidores e o seu empobrecimento decorrente das medidas de austeridade impostas pelo «Memorando de Entendimento», a empresa decidiu proceder ao despedimento coletivo de 42 trabalhadores.

Assim, solicito à Comissão que me informe do seguinte:

1. A referida empresa recebeu quaisquer apoios comunitários? Se sim, para que fins foram concedidos e que compromissos foram assumidos aquando da concessão dos apoios? Considera que, a existirem compromissos, estes estão a ser postos em causa pela administração da empresa?

2. Que medidas tenciona tomar, tendo em conta os graves problemas sociais e económicos existentes em Portugal, onde o desemprego não cessa de aumentar?

3. Que tipo de apoios pode esta empresa ou o Governo português solicitar para evitar que estes trabalhadores fiquem desempregados?

Resposta dada por Olli Rehn em nome da Comissão
(7 de agosto de 2013)

Segundo as informações das autoridades portuguesas, as empresas «Schnellecke — Logística e Transporte, Lda.» e «Schnellecke Portugal, Unipessoal Lda.», ambas operando em Palmela, receberam apoio financeiro do Fundo Social Europeu (FSE), no montante de 17 850,32 EUR e 44 103,30 EUR, no período de programação 2000-2006, para medidas relativas à aprendizagem ao longo da vida e investimento nos recursos humanos.

O desemprego em Portugal tem vindo a aumentar desde há vários anos. Por conseguinte, é importante que este problema seja resolvido através de políticas estruturais adequadas.

A Comissão considera que a execução do programa de ajustamento económico, que tem uma agenda de reformas estruturais ambiciosa, é a estratégia certa para fazer com que Portugal se torne um país mais competitivo, capaz de relançar um crescimento económico sustentável e criar emprego. Além disso, um número considerável de políticas ativas do mercado de trabalho encontra-se em fase de implementação, numa tentativa de atenuar o impacto da crise a curto prazo. Mais concretamente, ações específicas, como o «Impulso Jovem» ou o «Estímulo 2013» procuram facilitar o acesso dos grupos mais vulneráveis ao mercado de trabalho. As empresas podem igualmente beneficiar das medidas gerais de apoio empresarial existentes no quadro dos fundos estruturais. Para informações mais pormenorizadas, deve-se consultar diretamente as autoridades encarregadas da gestão dos diferentes programas.

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-007269/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Mass redundancies at Schnellecke in Palmela, Portugal

Schnellecke is an integrated logistics provider that manages the complete supply chain for motor-vehicle assembly and component factories. It operates in Portugal's Palmela industrial complex, and provides services to the AutoEuropa assembly plant.

The company has justified its decision to make 42 workers redundant *en masse* using decreases in production caused by the substantial reduction in consumer purchasing power and impoverishment resulting from the austerity measures imposed by the 'memorandum of understanding'.

1. Has this company received any kind of EU aid? If so, for what purpose was this aid allocated and what commitments did the company make when the aid was granted? If the company management did make commitments, does the Commission believe they are being broken?

2. Given the serious social and economic problems in Portugal, where unemployment continues to rise, what measures does the Commission intend to take?

3. What type of support can this company or the Portuguese Government request to prevent these employees from being made redundant?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

According to information from the Portuguese authorities, 'Schnellecke — Logística e Transporte, Lda' and 'Schnellecke Portugal, Unipessoal Lda', both operating in Palmela, received financial support of EUR 17.850,32 and EUR 44.103,30 from the European Social Fund (ESF), in the 2000-2006 programming period, for measures on lifelong learning and investment on human resources.

Unemployment in Portugal has been on the rise for several years. It is therefore important that this problem is being tackled by appropriate structural policies.

The Commission considers that the implementation of the Economic Adjustment Programme, which pursues an ambitious agenda of structural reforms, is the right strategy to make Portugal a more competitive country, capable of resuming sustainable economic growth and creating employment. In addition, a significant number of Active Labour Market Policies are being implemented to help cushion the impact of the crisis in the short term. Particularly, specific actions such as 'Impulso Jovem' or 'Estímulo 2013' aim at improving the labour market access for the most vulnerable groups. Companies can also benefit from the general business support measures existing within the framework of the Structural Funds. For more detailed information the managing authorities of the different programmes should be consulted directly.

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.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007270/13
à Comissão(Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Invasão do Iraque

Dez anos decorridos sobre a invasão do Iraque, é justo recordar um milhão e meio de iraquianos que morreram em consequência da guerra. Cinco milhões de pessoas estão deslocadas no interior ou no exterior do país. Há um milhão de viúvas e cinco milhões de órfãos (números divulgados pelo Conselho dos Direitos Humanos da ONU). Neste sentido, é igualmente justo recordar o embargo que estrangulou o Iraque entre 1991 e 2003.

Nos últimos dez anos, as forças militares dos EUA e dos seus aliados procederam a ataques deliberados contra a população civil, tanto em operações terrestres como aéreas. Fizeram uso de armas proibidas com consequências devastadoras, que se sentem hoje e se sentirão a longo prazo, quer para as pessoas, quer para os solos, as águas e o meio ambiente. Estes factos são testemunhados por estudos científicos independentes, designadamente os que se debruçaram sobre o caso da cidade de Faluja. Os ocupantes destruíram toda a organização estatal e social iraquiana e acicataram divisões sectárias, religiosas e étnicas. Montaram um sistema prisional baseado em detenções sistemáticas, sem acusação e sem julgamento, na tortura e na pena de morte. Criaram um regime de terror que liquidou centenas de professores, médicos, cientistas, artistas, jornalistas. Uma vez mais, estes factos são confirmados por muitas organizações que têm estudado a situação no país.

A retirada oficial das tropas dos EUA, em final de 2011, não libertou o Iraque. Os EUA mantêm 15 mil tropas no terreno e milhares de mercenários pagos pelas grandes companhias que exploram os recursos naturais iraquianos, particularmente o petróleo.

Desde as primeiras semanas da ocupação, a população iraquiana resistiu. Desde 2011, grandes movimentos civis levantaram-se e prosseguem hoje em todo o Iraque essa luta. Tais movimentos defendem quer objetivos políticos nacionais, como a unidade do país e a rejeição do sectarismo, quer exigências do dia-a-dia, como trabalho, condições sanitárias e educacionais, libertação dos presos políticos, justiça.

No quadro das relações que estão a ser desenvolvidas com o Iraque e para que elas possam ser respeitosas, não considera necessário exigir:

O respeito pelo direito do povo iraquiano à plena soberania?

A retirada de todas as forças ocupantes e o fim de qualquer tutela estrangeira sobre o Iraque?

O pagamento, pelos invasores, de reparações de guerra?

O julgamento dos responsáveis pela invasão e pelos crimes entretanto cometidos?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(19 de agosto de 2013)

A UE reiterou insistentemente, nomeadamente em Conclusões do Conselho, o seu empenho na independência, soberania, unidade e integridade territorial do Iraque, na linha das resoluções aplicáveis do Conselho de Segurança das Nações Unidas.

A UE tem apoiado reiteradamente a reconstrução do Iraque e a sua transição para a democracia. Desde 2003, a UE concedeu mais de mil milhões de euros de fundos.

A UE não tem conhecimento da presença de tropas estrangeiras ativas, desde a retirada dos EUA em 2011. As questões relacionadas com eventuais reparações de guerra e julgamentos de pessoas, que o Senhor Deputado suscita, são questões a resolver pelos próprios iraquianos.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007270/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Invasion of Iraq

Ten years after the Iraq invasion it is important to remember the 1.5 million Iraqis who died as a result of the war. 5 million people have been displaced either within the country or abroad. There are 1 million widows and 5 million orphans (figures published by the UN Human Rights Council). It is also important to remember the sanctions that throttled Iraq between 1991 and 2003.

Over the last 10 years, the military forces of the US and its allies have carried out deliberate attacks on the civilian population, in both ground and air operations. They used banned weapons, with devastating consequences that are felt now and will be felt in the long term, both by people, and by the soil, water and the environment. These facts are borne out by independent scientific studies, particularly those on the city of Fallujah. The occupiers destroyed Iraqi state and social structures, and fomented sectarian, religious and ethnic divisions. They set up a prison system based on systematic detention, without charge or verdict; on torture and the death penalty. They established a reign of terror that took out hundreds of teachers, doctors, scientists, artists and journalists. Once again, these facts are confirmed by numerous organisations that have been studying the situation in the country.

The official withdrawal of US troops in late 2011 has not freed Iraq. The US still has 15 000 troops on the ground and thousands of mercenaries in the pay of big companies exploiting Iraq's natural resources, particularly oil.

The Iraqi people have been resisting since the first few weeks of the occupation. Large-scale civil movements have emerged since 2011, and the struggle is now being upheld throughout Iraq. These movements advocate both political objectives, such as national unity and the rejection of sectarianism, and to day-to-day concerns, such as employment, healthcare and education, the release of political prisoners, and justice.

So as to maintain and develop a respectful ongoing relationship with Iraq does the Vice-President/High Representative not agree it is necessary to demand:

Respect for the Iraqi people's right to full sovereignty?

The withdrawal of all occupying forces and an end to any foreign control over Iraq?

Payment of war reparations by the invaders?

The trial of those responsible for the invasion and for the crimes committed since then?

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

The EU has repeatedly reiterated its commitment, notably through Council Conclusions, to the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Iraq, in consistency with the relevant United Nations Security Council Resolutions.

The EU has consistently supported Iraq's reconstruction and transition to democracy. Since 2003, the EU has provided over 1 billion euro of EU funds.

The EU is not aware of active foreign military troops, after the US withdrawal at the end of 2011. Questions related to eventual war reparations and trial of persons, that the honourable member is raising, are issues to be dealt with by Iraqis themselves.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007271/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Eletrificação da Linha do Minho

A Linha do Minho encontra-se eletrificada até ao ramal de Braga, sendo que a extensão entre Nine e Valença não se encontra modernizada nem eletrificada. Tal situação traz diversos problemas e deixa inexplorado o potencial de aproveitamento desta linha. É prejudicial para o desenvolvimento desta região, uma vez que os comboios que circulam neste troço são tracionados a diesel, o que faz com que as viagens sejam muito demoradas.

Assim sendo, pergunto à Comissão?

— Quais os fundos comunitários atribuídos até ao momento para a eletrificação da Linha do Minho?

— Que informações tem sobre este processo?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(12 de agosto de 2013)

Antes do final do atual período de programação, Portugal tenciona utilizar o Fundo de Coesão (FC), através do programa de desenvolvimento territorial POVT, para financiar dois projetos importantes da linha ferroviária do Minho que incluem a eletrificação das linhas: a derivação da Trofa, com cerca de 37 milhões de euros de financiamento da UE e a modernização do troço Nine/Valença (1.ª fase), com cerca de 45 milhões de euros de financiamento da UE.

As autoridades portuguesas indicaram a sua intenção de prosseguir com o financiamento da modernização do troço Nine/Valença (2.ª fase) no período de 2014-2020. No entanto, tal deveria ser contemplado no âmbito dos programas de 2014-2020, que ainda têm que ser redigidos e negociados.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007271/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Electrification of the Minho rail line

Portugal's Minho rail line is electrified up to the Braga branch line, but the extension between Nine and Valença has been neither modernised nor electrified. This situation causes several problems and leaves this line's potential untapped. This is damaging to the development of the region, since the trains operating on this stretch of line are diesel-powered, which makes travel very slow.

— What EU funds have been allocated to the electrification of the Minho rail line to date?

— What information does the Commission have on this process?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

Before the end of the current programming period, Portugal intends to use the Cohesion Fund (CF), through the 'Territorial Development' (POVT) programme, to finance two major projects of the Minho railway line, which include the electrification of the lines: the Trofa bypass with some EUR 37 million of EU funding and the Modernisation of the section Nine/Valença (1st phase) with some EUR 45 million of EU funding.

The Portuguese authorities have indicated their intention to continue with the financing of the modernisation of the section Nine/Valença (2nd phase) in the 2014-2020 period. That however, would need to be included in the framework of the 2014-2020 programmes, which have yet to be drafted and negotiated.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007272/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Revisão do sistema de proteção de dados da UE

Está em processo de conclusão a proposta de reforma do chamado sistema de proteção de dados da UE. Para além de retirar da competência das instituições soberanas dos Estados-Membros e do respetivo quadro constitucional (indo mesmo contra ele) a definição da legislação correspondente nesta área, tudo aponta para que se criem mais exceções às já anteriormente criadas, passando da recolha «mínima necessária» de dados para uma recolha «não excessiva», colocando em causa os direitos e garantias fundamentais dos cidadãos dos países da UE, nomeadamente o seu direito à privacidade.

1. Que papel têm tido os EUA no processo de revisão do sistema de proteção de dados da UE?

2. Que papel têm tidos os grandes gigantes da Internet (Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, Facebook, PalTalk, AOL, Skype, Youtube e Apple) ou os seus representantes nesta revisão?

3. E de que forma é que este processo está relacionado ou poderá ser influenciado pela negociação do Acordo de Livre Comércio UE-EUA?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(24 de setembro de 2013)

1. A Comissão aplicou os procedimentos normais para a adoção do Regulamento Geral relativo à Proteção de Dados ([1]). O processo incluiu várias consultas públicas às quais responderam numerosos intervenientes dos setores económico, académico, da sociedade civil, institucionais e estatais, incluindo também os governos de países terceiros, nomeadamente os Estados Unidos da América.

2. No contexto das consultas públicas acima referidas, a Comissão iniciou dois exercícios de consulta separados, que se realizaram em 2009 e 2010 ([2]). Algumas das empresas referidas deram os seus contributos no âmbito desses exercícios, os quais foram publicados no sítio Web da Comissão.

3. O Acordo de Comércio Livre UE-EUA terá como principal finalidade aceder aos mercados mais importantes a nível do comércio e do investimento. O Acordo não envolverá a negociação de normas em matéria de proteção de dados. A proteção de dados está fora do âmbito dessa negociação.

([1]) COM(2012) 11 — Regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo à proteção das pessoas singulares no que diz respeito ao tratamento de dados pessoais e à livre circulação desses dados (Regulamento Geral sobre a Proteção de Dados).

([2]) Para obter informações adicionais sobre estes exercícios, consultar: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/data-protection/review/actions/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007272/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Review of the EU data protection system

The proposal for reforming the so-called EU data protection system is currently being concluded. Setting out legislation in this area seems to reduce the powers of the sovereign institutions of the Member States, as well as diminishing and even running counter to their own constitutions. Furthermore, everything points towards it creating even more exceptions than have already been instated, moving from the 'minimum necessary' data collection to 'not excessive' collection. This jeopardises the fundamental rights and guarantees of EU citizens, and particularly their right to privacy.

1. What role has the US played in the process of reforming the EU data protection system?

2. What role have the Internet giants — Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, Facebook, Paltalk, AOL, Skype, YouTube and Apple — and their representatives played in this review?

3. How is this process related to or could it be influenced by negotiations for the EU-US free trade agreement?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(24 September 2013)

1. The Commission applied standard procedures for the adoption of the General Data Protection Regulation ([1]). The process included several public consultations to which a multiplicity of economic, academic, civil society, institutional and state actors, have responded including also governments of third countries, such as the United States of America.

2. Within the context of the public consultation referred to above, the Commission initiated two separate consultation exercises, which took place in 2009 and 2010 ([2]). Some of the companies referred to submitted contributions in the context of these exercises, which have been published on the website of the Commission.

3. The EU-US free trade agreement will focus on reaching market access objectives relevant for trade and investment. The agreement will not involve the negotiation of data protection standards. Data protection is outside the scope of the negotiation.

([1]) COM(2012) 11 — REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (General Data Protection Regulation).

([2]) For more detailed information on these consultation exercises please see http://ec.europa.eu/justice/data-protection/review/actions/index_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007273/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Armazenagem de dados pelos EUA

Foi revelado que a Agência Nacional de Segurança (NSA) dos EUA armazena informações relativas às chamadas efetuadas nesse país pelos operadores Verizon, AT&T e Spring e acede aos servidores de nove gigantes da Internet — Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, Facebook, PalTalk, AOL, Skype, Youtube e Apple. A plataforma de alojamento de ficheiros Dropbox deverá ser acrescentada brevemente. A NSA pretende abrir novas unidades no deserto do Utah com capacidade para processar e arquivar até cinco vezes o volume de tráfico de Internet a nível mundial.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Tem conhecimento desta situação?

2. Pretende efetuar diligências junto da Administração dos EUA para averiguar se esta armazenagem de informações e o seu «tratamento» incluem igualmente dados ou informações de cidadãos de países da UE?

3. Sendo empresas multinacionais como a Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, Facebook, PalTalk, AOL, Skype, Youtube e Apple gigantes que dominam em larga medida a Internet, que medidas podem ser tomadas para garantir que estas empresas não utilizem os dados armazenados para fins comerciais ou outros?

4. Qual é a justificação para a armazenagem dos dados pelas empresas, qual é o tempo de armazenagem e quem tem acesso aos mesmos e para que fins?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(2 de setembro de 2013)

A Comissão remete a Senhora Deputada para a resposta dada à pergunta escrita E-007934/2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007273/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Data storage by the US

It has been revealed that the US National Security Agency (NSA) stores information regarding calls made in the country through the operators Verizon, AT&T and Spring, and accesses the servers of nine Internet giants: Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, Facebook, Paltalk, AOL, Skype, YouTube and Apple. The file-storing platform Dropbox is shortly to be added to this list. The NSA intends to open new units in the Utah desert capable of processing and storing up to five times the global volume of Internet traffic.

1. Is the Commission aware of this situation?

2. Does it intend to check with the US Government whether the storage and 'processing' of this information also includes the data or information of EU citizens?

3. Multinationals like Microsoft, Yahoo, Google, Facebook, Paltalk, AOL, Skype, YouTube and Apple are giants that dominate the Internet; what steps can the Commission take to ensure that these companies do not use stored data for commercial or other ends?

4. What is the justification for companies storing data, for how long is it stored, and who has access to it and for what purposes?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(2 September 2013)

The Commision would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-007934/2013.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007275/13
à Comissão
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Multas aos bancos — Lavagem de dinheiro

O Ministério da Justiça dos EUA aplicou multas recorde a dois colossos bancários, o inglês HSBC e o suíço UBS. No primeiro caso, a acusação prende-se com lavagem de dinheiro e transações ilegais. No segundo, com a manipulação dos índices Libor e Euribor para proveito próprio.

As acusações contra o HSBC incluem a lavagem de milhares de milhões de dólares dos cartéis de droga colombianos e mexicanos (entre outros) e a violação de inúmeras leis bancárias importantes.

A multa ao HSBC faz parte de um acordo ao abrigo do qual o banco não será levado a tribunal, aparentemente porque as autoridades estaduais e federais decidiram não formalizar acusações contra o HSBC, com receio de que tal pudesse pôr em perigo um dos maiores bancos mundiais e, em última análise, desestabilizar o sistema financeiro global. A chantagem que «justificou» a injeção de biliões em dinheiros públicos para salvar bancos falidos é agora invocada para não proceder judicialmente contra a lavagem do dinheiro da droga.

Igual pretexto foi invocado para não levar ninguém do UBS a tribunal: funcionários do Departamento de Justiça dos EUA decidiram não formalizar a acusação contra a empresa sedeada em Zurique, por receio de que tal poderia pôr em perigo a sua estabilidade. A banca não vai à barra. A justiça não é igual para todos.

1. Tem informações sobre estes casos? Como os avalia?

2. Tem conhecimento de que as operações que levaram as autoridades norte-americanas a aplicar multas a estes bancos estejam relacionadas ou envolvam operações dos mesmos em países da UE? Se sim, que operações?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

O HSBC está estabelecido na UE ao abrigo de uma licença emitida pela *Prudential Regulation Authority* (autoridade de regulação) do Reino Unido. A Comissão está ao corrente, através dos meios de comunicação social, das acusações formuladas contra o HSBC nos Estados Unidos da América, mas não está em posição de formular um parecer circunstanciado, para além de reiterar o seu compromisso de assegurar a transposição para a legislação da UE das normas internacionais do Grupo de Ação Financeira Internacional (GAFI) de 2012 relativas ao branqueamento de capitais, que insistirão na aplicação eficaz das regras em matéria de luta contra o branqueamento de capitais.

Em 19 de dezembro de 2012, o Departamento de Justiça e a *Commodity Futures Trading Commission* (Comissão de mercados a prazo de mercadorias) dos EUA, a Autoridade de serviços financeiros do Reino Unido e a Autoridade Suíça de supervisão do mercado financeiro aplicaram ao UBS uma coima de 500 milhões de EUR pelo seu papel na manipulação das taxas de referência LIBOR e Euribor ([1]). O delito ocorreu em todo o mundo, incluindo o Japão, a Suíça, os EUA e o Reino Unido. A Comissão congratula-se com a ação fiscalizadora a fim de assegurar a integridade dos mercados.

A Comissão adotou igualmente alterações às suas propostas de regulamento ([2]) e de diretiva ([3]) relativa ao abuso de informação privilegiada e à manipulação do mercado no sentido de proibir claramente a manipulação desses parâmetros de referência. Estas alterações estão prestes a ser objeto de um consenso. Além disso, a Comissão lançou um processo de consulta ([4]) com vista a identificar lacunas no processo de definição de parâmetros de referência. Está atualmente prevista para 2013 uma proposta de legislação.

([1]) http://www.fsa.gov.uk/library/communication/pr/2012/116.shtml
([2]) Proposta alterada de um regulamento relativo ao abuso de informação privilegiada e à manipulação do mercado, COM(2012) 2011/0295 (COD): http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/securities/abuse/index_en.htm
([3]) Proposta alterada de uma diretiva relativa às sanções penais por abuso de informação privilegiada e manipulação do mercado, COM(2012) 2011/0297 (COD): http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/securities/abuse/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/consultations/2012/benchmarks_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007275/13
to the Commission
Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Fines for banks: Money laundering

The US Department of Justice has imposed record fines on two banking giants: the British HSBC and Swiss UBS. In the former case, the charge relates to money laundering and illegal transactions. In the latter, it concerns manipulation of the Libor and Euribor rates for personal profit.

The charges against HSBC include (amongst others) the laundering of billions of US dollars for Colombian and Mexican drug cartels, and breaches of countless banking laws.

The HSBC fine is part of an agreement under which the bank will not be brought to trial, apparently because the state and federal authorities decided not to bring formal charges against HSBC, fearing that doing so could endanger one of the world's largest banks and risk destabilising the global banking system. The blackmail that 'justified' injecting billions in public funds into saving failed banks is now again being invoked in order to avoid bringing legal proceedings for laundering drug money.

The same pretext was used for not bringing anyone at UBS to trial: US Department of Justice officials decided not to bring formal charges against the Zurich-based company out of fear that doing so could jeopardise its stability. The bank will not end up in the dock. All are not equal in the eyes of the law.

1. Does the Commission have any information about these cases and what is its opinion of them?

2. Does it know if any of the transactions that led the US authorities to impose fines on these banks relate to or involve the banks' operations in EU countries and, if so, which transactions?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

HSBC is established in the EU under a licence issued by the UK's Prudential Regulation Authority. The Commission is aware, through media reports, of the charges brought against HSBC in the U.S., but is not in a position to formulate a detailed opinion, other than to re-state its commitment to ensuring the implementation into EU legislation of the 2012 FATF international standards on money laundering, which will place increased focus on effective implementation of Anti-Money Laundering rules.

On 19 December 2012, UBS was fined USD 1.5bn by the U.S. Department of Justice and Commodity Futures Trading Commission, UK Financial Services Authority and Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority for its role in the manipulation of the LIBOR and EURIBOR benchmarks ([1]). The misconduct occurred in locations around the world including Japan, Switzerland, the USA and the UK. The Commission welcomes supervisory action to ensure the integrity of markets.

The Commission has also adopted amendments to the proposals for a regulation ([2]) and a directive ([3]) on insider dealing and market manipulation to clearly prohibit the manipulation of benchmarks. These are close to agreement. Furthermore, the Commission launched a consultation ([4]) aimed at identifying shortcomings in the benchmark process. A proposal for legislation is now foreseen in 2013.

([1]) http://www.fsa.gov.uk/library/communication/pr/2012/116.shtml.
([2]) Amended proposal for a regulation on insider dealing and market manipulation, COM(2012) 2011/0295 (COD): http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/securities/abuse/index_en.htm
([3]) Amended proposal for a directive on criminal sanctions for insider dealing and market manipulation, COM(2012) 2011/0297 (COD): http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/securities/abuse/index_en.htm
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/consultations/2012/benchmarks_en.htm

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007276/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Relações UE — Brasil — ponto da situação

A Comunicação da Comissão Europeia COM(2007) 0281, de 30 de maio, reconheceu expressamente que o «diálogo UE — Brasil não foi suficientemente explorado, processando-se sobretudo no âmbito do diálogo UE — Mercosul. O Brasil será o último dos países "BRICS" a reunir-se com a UE numa Cimeira. Chegou o momento de olhar para o Brasil como um parceiro estratégico, um ator económico de primeiro plano na América Latina e um líder regional».

Assim, pergunto à Vice-presidente/Alta Representante:

— Em que medida a União Europeia melhorou as formas de diálogo com o Brasil?

— Considera que a União Europeia já olha para o Brasil como um parceiro estratégico, um ator económico de primeiro plano na América Latina e um líder regional? De que formas isto se manifesta?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(8 de agosto de 2013)

A UE estabeleceu uma Parceria Estratégica com o Brasil em julho de 2007 aquando da realização da primeira reunião da Cimeira UE-Brasil em Lisboa. A Parceria Estratégica conduziu a uma grande intensificação e diversificação das relações bilaterais. Foi formalizada mediante o acordo sobre um Plano de Ação Conjunto, renovado de três em três anos. Desde então, foram realizadas seis cimeiras, institucionalizadas reuniões periódicas de diálogo político a nível ministerial e de altos funcionários, bem com lançados mais de 30 domínios/setores de diálogo que se encontram atualmente em curso.

A UE mantém relações ativas com o Brasil a nível bilateral e nos fóruns multilaterais, debruçando-se sobre questões como as alterações climáticas, os direitos humanos, a proteção do ambiente, a ciência, tecnologia e inovação, a energia, o desenvolvimento regional, a consolidação da paz, a prevenção de conflitos e muitos outros domínios de interesse comum.

É possível consultar informações sobre as cimeiras e as respetivas declarações conjuntas no sítio Web do Serviço Europeu para a Ação Externa: http://eeas.europa.eu/brazil/index_pt.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007276/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — EU-Brazil relations: state of play

Communication from the Commission COM(2007) 0281, of 30 May, explicitly recognised that 'EU-Brazil dialogue has not been sufficiently exploited and carried out mainly through EU-Mercosur dialogue. Brazil will be the last "BRICS" to meet the EU in a Summit. The time has come to look at Brazil as a strategic partner as well as a major Latin American economic actor and regional leader'.

Can the Vice-President/High Representative state:

— How has the EU improved its dialogue with Brazil?

— Does she believe that the EU already sees Brazil as a strategic partner as well as a major Latin American economic actor and regional leader? If so, in what ways?

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

The EU established a Strategic Partnership with Brazil in July 2007 when the very first EU-Brazil Summit meeting was held in Lisbon. The Strategic Partnership has generated a major intensification and diversification of the bilateral relationship. It was formalised via the agreement on a Joint Action Plan that is renewed every third year. Six Summits have since been held, regular political dialogue meetings at Ministerial as well as senior officials' level have been institutionalised, and more than 30 areas/sectors of dialogue have been opened and are currently ongoing.

The EU actively engages with Brazil bilaterally as well as in the relevant multilateral fora on issues such as climate change, human rights, environmental protection, science, technology and innovation, energy, regional development, peace building and conflict prevention and many more areas of common interest.

Information about Summit meetings and the related Joint Statements is available on the European External Action Service website at http://eeas.europa.eu/brazil/index_en.htm.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007277/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Combate à contrafação

A contrafação constitui um dos principais flagelos da economia global e, não obstante os esforços para a combater, é evidente a manifesta incapacidade dos Estados individualmente considerados para levarem esta luta a bom termo. São hoje claros os riscos para a saúde e segurança dos consumidores que a aquisição de produtos contrafeitos pode acarretar.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Dispõe de dados sobre a quantidade de bens contrafeitos presentemente em circulação na União e o volume de negócios que os mesmos geram?

— Que resultados apresentam as medidas de combate à contrafação que vem adotando?

Resposta dada por Michel Barnier em nome da Comissão
(9 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão está atualmente a trabalhar com o Observatório Europeu das Infrações aos Direitos de Propriedade Intelectual para avaliar de modo mais exato as atividades de infração aos DPI, com o objetivo de orientar melhor as suas respostas estratégicas neste domínio. Encomendou e publicou um relatório sobre os métodos de estimativa existentes e suas insuficiências em 2011 ([1]), que serve de base para este trabalho. A importância da dimensão e a agudização do problema podem ser parcialmente avaliadas pelas apreensões nas alfândegas da UE em consequência de presumidas violações dos DPI. Em 2011, as autoridades aduaneiras registaram mais de 91 000 casos de detenção deste tipo, o que representa um aumento de 15 % em relação a 2010. Estimou-se que o valor dos 114 milhões de artigos apreendidos, em termos de produtos genuínos equivalentes, era superior a 1,2 mil milhões de EUR. .

A Comissão não dispõe atualmente de uma avaliação exata do impacto das medidas destinadas a combater a contrafação, mas está a ponderar uma série de ações para resolver esta situação. .

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/iprenforcement/docs/ipr_infringment-report_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007277/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Combating counterfeiting

Counterfeiting is one of the main scourges of the global economy and, despite efforts to combat it, it is clear that Member States are plainly unable to win this fight alone. The risks to the health and safety of consumers potentially involved in purchasing counterfeit products are now clear.

— Does the Commission have any figures on the volume of counterfeit goods currently in circulation in the EU and the turnover they account for?

— What results have measures taken to combat counterfeiting had?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The Commission is currently working with the European Observatory on IP infringements to improve the measurement of IP infringing activities within the EU in order to better target its policy responses in this field. It commissioned and published a report on existing estimation methodologies and their shortcomings in 2011 ([1]) which is serving as the basis of this work. The significance of the scale and growth of the problem can be partially assessed by customs seizures in the EU for suspected violations of IPR. In 2011 customs authorities recorded more than 91,000 such detention cases: an increase of 15% compared to 2010. The value of the 114 million detained articles in terms of equivalent genuine products was estimated to be over EUR 1.2 billion.

The Commission does not currently dispose of exact measurements on impacts of measures to combat counterfeiting, but is currently considering a range of actions to remedy this situation.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/iprenforcement/docs/ipr_infringment-report_en.pdf

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007278/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Dependência energética da União Europeia

É conhecida e vem sendo amplamente discutida a dependência energética da União Europeia e a necessidade estratégica de a reduzir; são também conhecidos os desafios à estabilidade da União que essa fragilidade concita.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que medidas tomou ou prevê tomar no sentido de contribuir para a redução da dependência energética da União Europeia?

— Considera que se encontram assegurados os fornecimentos energéticos de que a União necessita e que os fornecedores da União apresentam níveis de fiabilidade e estabilidade política e social adequados à manutenção dos referidos fornecimentos?

Resposta dada por Günther Oettinger em nome da Comissão
(8 de agosto de 2013)

Os esforços sustentados para diminuir a dependência energética da UE já estão a dar fruto, mas são necessários progressos adicionais. Em primeiro lugar, a UE promoveu políticas e legislação ambiciosas para melhorar a sua eficiência energética e reduzir o consumo de energia. O Roteiro para a Energia até 2050 ([1]) sublinhou a importância de continuar a melhorar a eficiência energética a médio e longo prazo, o que permitirá tornar a nossa economia menos vulnerável a ruturas do aprovisionamento e aos voláteis mercados internacionais da energia, para além das reduções das emissões de GEE daí resultantes.

Em segundo lugar, para reduzir a sua dependência das importações de combustíveis fósseis, por vezes originários de regiões com condições geopolíticas difíceis, a UE conduz uma agenda externa que procura diversificar a origem e as rotas de fornecimento e intensificar os diálogos políticos e em matéria de regulamentação com os seus principais parceiros energéticos ([2]). Por último, o desenvolvimento de recursos energéticos endógenos, como as energias renováveis contribuirá também para reduzir a dependência das importações.

Até ao final de 2013, espera-se que a Comissão apresente propostas mais concretas no quadro das políticas climáticas e energéticas, com base num Livro Verde da Comissão, adotado em 27 de março de 2013 ([3]). Este quadro terá por objetivo contribuir para reduzir a dependência energética na próxima década.

([1]) COM(2011) 885/2 final.
([2]) Ver a Comunicação da Comissão «A política energética da UE: Estreitar os laços com parceiros para além das nossas fronteiras», COM(2011) 539 final.
([3]) COM(2013) 169 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007278/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: The EU's energy dependency

The European Union's energy dependency and the strategic need to reduce it are well known and have been widely discussed; the threats to the EU's stability caused by such vulnerability are also well known.

— What steps has the Commission taken or does it plan to take to help reduce the EU's energy dependency?

— Does it think that the energy supplies the EU needs are guaranteed and that the EU's suppliers are sufficiently reliable and stable in political and social terms to maintain said supplies?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

Sustained efforts to decrease EU energy dependency are already having an effect, but further progress is required. Firstly, the EU has promoted ambitious policies and legislation to improve its energy efficiency and reduce energy consumption. The Energy Roadmap 2050 ([1]) underlined the importance of continuing to improve energy efficiency in the medium to long term as this will make our economy less vulnerable to supply disruptions and volatile international energy markets, in addition to the resulting reductions of GHG emissions.

Secondly, to reduce its dependence on fossil fuel imports, sometimes originating from geopolitically challenging regions, it leads an external agenda based on the diversification of supply countries and routes and the strengthening of political and regulatory dialogues with its main energy partners ([2]). Finally, the development of indigenous energy resources such as renewable energies will also help to reduce the import dependence.

The Commission is expected to come forward with more concrete proposals for a 2030 Framework for climate and energy policies by the end of 2013, on the basis of a Commission's Green Paper adopted on 27 March 2013 ([3]). This framework will aim to contribute to reduced energy dependence in the decade to come.

([1]) COM(2011) 885/2 final.
([2]) See The Commission's Communication 'The EU Energy Policy: Engaging with Partners beyond Our Borders', COM(2011) 539 final.
([3]) COM(2013) 169 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007279/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Desproteção dos consumidores face às companhias aéreas

A desproteção dos consumidores face às companhias aéreas vem merecendo uma reação europeia de modo a prever a avaliação das companhias, promover o auxílio aos passageiros prejudicados e contemplar indemnizações pelos danos e perdas sofridos.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Considera que a União já dispõe de meios jurídicos aptos a assegurar uma proteção adequada aos consumidores?

— Estas medidas têm em conta a fragilidade financeira das companhias aéreas e não constituem obstáculos desnecessários ao seu funcionamento?

Resposta dada por Siim Kallas em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

O Regulamento (CE) n.° 261/2004 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 11 de fevereiro de 2004, estabelece regras comuns para a indemnização e a assistência aos passageiros dos transportes aéreos em caso de recusa de embarque e de cancelamento ou atraso considerável dos voos. O Regulamento (CE) n.° 2027/97 relativo à responsabilidade das transportadoras aéreas no que respeita ao transporte de passageiros e suas bagagens por via aérea ([1]) prevê a proteção dos passageiros dos transportes aéreos no que respeita à responsabilidade em caso de acidente e problemas com a bagagem.

A Comissão adotou em 13 de março de 2013, uma proposta de alteração do Regulamento (CE) n.° 261/2004 e do Regulamento (CE) n.° 2027/97. A proposta visa melhorar a aplicação e o respeito dos direitos dos passageiros dos transportes aéreos e garantir um custo financeiro realista para as transportadoras aéreas.

Em 18 de março de 2013, a Comissão adotou igualmente uma comunicação sobre a proteção dos passageiros em caso de insolvência das companhias aéreas ([2]). Enumera formas de melhor garantir que os direitos decorrentes do Regulamento (CE) n.° 261/2004 são efetivamente respeitados em caso de insolvência das companhias aéreas. A Comissão incentiva os Estados-Membros a assegurarem o controlo da solidez financeira das companhias aéreas da União Europeia, em especial com vista a evitar o impacto negativo das insolvências nos passageiros. A Comissão organizou, em 9 de julho de 2013, uma reunião com os Estados-Membros.

([1]) Ver COM(2013) 130 final.
([2]) COM(2013) 129.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007279/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Consumers' lack of protection in respect of airlines

Consumers' lack of protection in respect of airlines calls for a European response that provides for the assessment of airlines, promotes assistance for affected passengers and sets out compensation for damages and losses.

— Does the Commission think that the EU already has the right legal tools to ensure adequate consumer protection?

— Do these measures take account of the precarious financial situation of airlines and are they not unnecessary obstacles to their operation?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishes common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights. Regulation (EC) No 2027/97 on air carrier liability in respect of the carriage of passengers and their baggage by air ([1]) provides protection of air passengers with regard to accident liability and mishandled baggage.

The Commission adopted on 13 March 2013 a proposal for the amendment of Regulations (EC) No 261/2004 and (EC) 2027/97. The proposal seeks to improve the application and the enforcement of air passenger rights and to ensure a realistic financial cost for air carriers.

On 18 March 2013, the Commission also adopted a communication on passenger protection in case of airline insolvency ([2]). It details ways how to better ensure that rights flowing from Regulation 261/2004 are effectively honoured in cases of airline insolvency. The Commission encourages Member States to ensure the monitoring of the financial fitness of EU airlines with a particular view to avoid the negative impact of bankrupcies on passengers. A meeting with Member States was organised on 9th July 2013 by the Commission.

([1]) COM(2013) 130 final.
([2]) COM(2013) 129.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007280/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização (FEG)

O recurso generalizado ao Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização (FEG) torna evidente que os efeitos deste fenómeno se têm repercutido por toda a parte, confirmando, assim, a sua necessidade e atualidade. Se a globalização se tem revelado globalmente benéfica, há, no entanto, que atender às circunstâncias em que, por sua causa, diversos setores são afetados.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Como avalia o recurso dos Estados-Membros ao Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização?

— Quantos trabalhadores já beneficiaram dele?

— Considera que a sua formulação é adequada para cumprir o objetivo a que se destina?

Resposta dada por László Andor em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

Desde que entrou em funcionamento em 2007, registaram-se 119 candidaturas ao apoio do FEG, apresentadas por 20 Estados-Membros. Cerca de 473 milhões de euros foram solicitados, a fim de auxiliar 99 245 trabalhadores despedidos. A Comissão controla periodicamente os casos apresentados ao FEG e verificou que, em geral, os Estados-Membros estão a utilizar o Fundo de forma adequada. A taxa de reinserção dos trabalhadores no emprego dada pela avaliação intercalar era de 41,8 % no momento em que as medidas foram concluídas, não obstante o facto de os mercados de trabalho estarem a ser afetados pela crise económica e financeira mundial. As taxas de reintegração também aumentaram rapidamente após o termo do período de execução, mostrando que os trabalhadores tinham beneficiado das ações e melhorado as suas oportunidades no mercado de trabalho.

A avaliação intercalar confirmou que o FEG constituía um valor acrescentado significativo para os trabalhadores assistidos e as regiões afetadas. Por conseguinte, a Comissão adotou uma proposta de regulamento sobre o Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização para o período de 2014-2020 ([1]). Essa proposta introduz várias alterações ao regulamento atual, que conduzirão a mais melhoramentos no funcionamento do Fundo. A Comissão propôs, por exemplo, reintroduzir um critério de crise como base para os critérios dos pedidos de intervenção do FEG. O apoio do Parlamento será crucial no processo legislativo para assegurar a adoção final do Regulamento a tempo de ser implementado em 1 de janeiro de 2014.

([1]) COM(2011) 0608 final — 2011/0269 (COD).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007280/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF)

Widespread use of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund shows that the effects of globalisation have been felt everywhere, thus confirming that the fund is necessary and relevant. While globalisation has been shown to be beneficial at a global level, it is nevertheless necessary to pay attention to the circumstances in which, due to its effects, various sectors have been affected.

— What view does the Commission take of the Member State's use of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund?

— How many workers have benefited from it?

— Does the Commission think that the fund is properly set up for achieving its intended purpose?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

There have been 119 applications to the EGF since the start of its operations in 2007; these were submitted by 20 Member States. Some EUR 473 million have been requested to help 99 245 redundant workers. The Commission regularly audits EGF cases and has found that generally Member States are using the Fund well. The rate of reintegration of workers into employment was found in the Mid-Term Evaluation to have been 41.8% at the time when measures were concluded, despite the fact that labour markets were being affected by the global financial and economic crisis. Reintegration rates also rose rapidly after the end of the implementation period, showing that workers had benefited from the measures and improved their opportunities in the labour market.

The mid-term evaluation confirmed that the EGF has delivered significant added value for the assisted workers and affected regions. The Commission therefore adopted a Proposal for a regulation on the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund for the period 2014-2020 ([1]). This proposal introduces various changes to the current Regulation which will lead to further improvements in the functioning of the Fund. For instance, the Commission has proposed to reintroduce a crisis criterion as grounds for applications for EGF support. Parliament's support will be critical in the legislative process to ensure the final adoption of the regulation in time for implementation on 1 January 2014.

([1]) COM/2011/0608 final — 2011/0269 (COD).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007281/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Fundo de Solidariedade da União Europeia — avaliação e perspetiva

A solidariedade entre Estados-Membros da União Europeia e, em particular, o apoio europeu aos Estados vitimados por catástrofes constituem um sinal claro de que a União Europeia não é já apenas um espaço de livre comércio e demonstrou ser capaz de permanecer unida na adversidade, mesmo nas situações de particular exigência humana e material.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que avaliação faz da atual situação do Fundo de Solidariedade, nomeadamente quanto à sua capacidade de efetivamente acorrer a situações de calamidade e de minorar os seus efeitos?

— Como perspetiva o futuro do Fundo?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(6 de agosto de 2013)

O Fundo de Solidariedade foi criado em 2002, na sequência das inundações na Europa Central, para que a UE possa fazer face às grandes catástrofes. Até agora, foram mobilizados mais de 3,2 mil milhões de euros de ajuda do Fundo, destinados a 23 países para os ajudar a dar resposta às consequências financeiras das catástrofes naturais. O apoio do Fundo complementa os esforços dos países para realizar as seguintes operações essenciais de urgência: a) restauração imediata do funcionamento das infraestruturas, b) alojamento temporário, c) garantir as infraestruturas de prevenção e proteger o património cultural e d) operações de limpeza. Neste contexto, o fundo tem provado ser um instrumento eficaz e uma expressão da solidariedade europeia.

No entanto, a experiência adquirida mostra que há limitações e fragilidades no funcionamento do Fundo. Assim, em 2011, a Comissão adotou uma comunicação sobre o futuro do Fundo de Solidariedade ([1]), que prepara o caminho para uma proposta de alteração do regulamento vigente. A proposta tem por objetivo tornar o fundo mais eficaz para fazer face a catástrofes, dar-lhe mais visibilidade e tornar os seus critérios de intervenção mais claros. A proposta ([2]) foi adotada pela Comissão em 25 de julho de 2013 e transmitida ao Conselho e ao Parlamento.

O principal objetivo da proposta é agilizar e simplificar a utilização do Fundo. A nova legislação irá conduzir a pagamentos mais rápidos da ajuda, nomeadamente através da introdução da possibilidade de fazer pagamentos adiantados, se forem solicitados. Visa igualmente clarificar as questões relativas à elegibilidade, em especial em caso de catástrofes regionais, e incentivar os Estados-Membros a porem em prática medidas mais eficazes em matéria de prevenção dos riscos de catástrofe.

([1]) COM(2011) 613 final.
([2]) COM(2013) 522 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007281/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: European Union Solidarity Fund — assessment and prospects

Solidarity among EU Member States and, in particular, European support for states affected by disasters is a clear sign that the EU is no longer just a free trade area and has demonstrated its ability to remain united in adversity, even in situations that place high demands on human and material resources.

— What is the Commission's assessment of the current situation of the Solidarity Fund, particularly as regards its capacity effectively to help in disaster situations and mitigate their effects?

— What are the Fund's future prospects?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(6 August 2013)

The Solidarity Fund was created in 2002 following the floods in Central Europe to enable the EU to respond to major disasters. Until now, over EUR 3.2 billion in aid from the Fund have been mobilised to help 23 countries bear the financial burden inflicted on them due to different natural disasters. The support from the Fund complemented the efforts of the countries to carry out the following essential emergency operations: a) immediate restauration to working order of infrastructure, b) temporary accommodation, c) securing of preventive infrastructures and cultural heritage and d) cleaning-up-operations. In this context the Fund has proven to be an effective tool and an expression of European solidarity.

Nonetheless the experience gathered shows that there are limitations and weaknesses in the operation of the Fund. To this end, in 2011, the Commission adopted a communication on the Future of the Solidarity Fund ([1]) which paved the way for a proposal to amend the current Regulation. The proposal aims to make the Fund more responsive in the face of disasters, more visible and its operational criteria clearer. The proposal ([2]) was adopted by the Commission on 25 July 2013 and has been transmitted to Council and Parliament.

The main aim of the proposal is to facilitate faster and simpler use of the Fund. The new legislation will lead to more rapid payments of the aid, in particular through the introduction of advanced payments upon request. It is also designed to clarify eligibility questions, particularly in the case of regional disasters, and to encourage Member States to implement more effective disaster risk prevention measures.

([1]) COM(2011)613.
([2]) COM(2013)522.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007283/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Iniciativa de Cidadania Europeia

O artigo 11.° do Tratado de Lisboa constitui uma inovação que visa dar aos cidadãos a possibilidade de expressarem os seus pontos de vista sobre a União. O seu número 4 consagra a possibilidade de um grupo de cidadãos poder lançar iniciativas legislativas e assim participar na formulação de políticas europeias.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— A iniciativa de cidadania europeia tem efetivamente contribuído para aproximar os cidadãos da política europeia e relançar o debate transfronteiriço sobre questões que dizem respeito a todos os cidadãos de todos os Estados-Membros? Em que termos?

— Considera que os decisores políticos motivam adequadamente os cidadãos para a dimensão europeia da política?

— Considera que, tal como presentemente existe, este procedimento é claro, simples e acessível aos cidadãos?

Resposta dada por Maroš Šefčovič em nome da Comissão
(8 de agosto de 2013)

Desde a entrada em vigor do regulamento relativo à iniciativa de cidadania ([1]), a 1 de abril de 2012, a Comissão registou 21 propostas de iniciativa de cidadania europeia. Entre estas, até hoje, 16 propostas continuam a receber declarações de apoio e cobrem uma grande variedade de temas. Segundo as informações publicadas pelos respetivos organizadores, muitas delas terão recolhido várias centenas de milhares de declarações de apoio na UE. Em especial uma delas, com o título «A água e o saneamento são um direito humano! A água é um bem público, não uma mercadoria!», anunciou ter atingido mais de 1,5 milhões de declarações de apoio e o número mínimo exigido em 12 Estados-Membros.

Estes elementos demonstram o interesse dos cidadãos por este novo instrumento, bem como o seu potencial para criar debates para lá das fronteiras e influenciar a tomada de decisões a nível da União.

Tudo isto demonstra igualmente que, apesar de algumas dificuldades iniciais, o procedimento é tão claro e acessível quanto possível, garantindo a seriedade e a credibilidade do instrumento.

([1]) Regulamento (UE) n.° 211/2011 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 16 de fevereiro de 2011, sobre a iniciativa de cidadania (JO L 65 de 11.3.2011, p. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007283/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: European Citizens' Initiative

Article 11 of the Treaty on European Union is an innovation that aims to give citizens the chance to express their point of view on the EU. Paragraph 4 of that article makes it possible for a group of citizens to propose legislative initiatives and thereby participate in European policy-making.

— Has the European Citizens' Initiative effectively helped bring citizens and European policy closer together and reignite cross-border debate on issues that concern all citizens of all Member States? In what ways?

— Does the Commission think that policy-makers adequately promote the European dimension of politics among citizens?

— Does it think that, in its current form, this procedure is clear, simple and accessible to citizens?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Šefčovič au nom de la Commission
(8 août 2013)

Depuis l'entrée en application du règlement relatif à l'initiative citoyenne ([1]) le 1er avril 2012, 21 propositions d'initiative citoyenne ont été enregistrées par la Commission. Parmi celles-ci, à ce jour, 16 propositions recueillent toujours des déclarations de soutien. Elles couvrent une grande variété de sujets. D'après les informations publiées par leurs organisateurs respectifs, plusieurs d'entre elles auraient collecté plusieurs centaines de milliers de déclarations de soutien à travers l'UE. En particulier, l'une d'entre elles, intitulée «L'eau et l'assainissement sont un droit humain! L'eau est un bien public, pas une marchandise!» a annoncé avoir atteint plus de 1,5 million de déclarations de soutien et le nombre minimum requis dans 12 États membres.

Ces éléments démontrent l'intérêt des citoyens pour ce nouvel outil ainsi que son potentiel pour créer des débats au-delà des frontières et influencer la prise de décision au niveau de l'Union.

Cela montre également que, malgré quelques difficultés initiales, la procédure est aussi claire et accessible que possible, tout en assurant le sérieux et la crédibilité de l'instrument.

([1]) Règlement (UE) n° 211/2011 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 16 février 2011 relatif à l'initiative citoyenne (JO L 65 du 11.3.2011, p. 1).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007284/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Promoção do espírito empresarial

Face à desaceleração da economia europeia, em particular a da zona euro, torna-se crucial a promoção do espírito empresarial na União Europeia.

Esta deve ser entendida pelas instituições europeias e pelos governos nacionais como um elemento crucial para fazer face aos desafios que se apresentam ao tecido produtivo europeu.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Por que formas procura promover o espírito empresarial na União Europeia? Com que resultados?

— Não julga que esta promoção também deve verificar-se pela remoção de obstáculos artificiais e burocráticos à atividade empresarial? E que muito há ainda a fazer neste tocante?

Resposta dada por Antonio Tajani em nome da Comissão
(1 de agosto de 2013)

A Comissão gostaria de remeter o Senhor Deputado para a resposta à pergunta E-003469/2013 ([1]) que descreve o Plano de Ação «Empreendedorismo 2020» e os seus três pilares de ação.

O segundo pilar de ação do Plano de Ação destaca a importância de «criar um ambiente em que os empresários possam florescer e crescer». A redução da carga regulamentar e administrativa terá um papel importante na implementação deste pilar de ação.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007284/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Promoting entrepreneurship

In view of Europe's economic slowdown, particularly in the euro area, it is essential to promote entrepreneurship in the EU.

European institutions and national governments should see this as a crucial element of tackling the challenges facing Europe's productive sectors.

— In what ways is the Commission trying to promote entrepreneurship in the EU and with what results?

— Does it agree that this promotion should also include removing artificial and bureaucratic obstacles to entrepreneurial activity, and that there is still much to be done in this respect?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Question E-003469/2013 ([1]) describing the Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan and its three action pillars.

The second action pillar of the action plan highlights the importance of 'creating an environment where entrepreneurs can flourish and grow.' The reduction of regulatory and administrative burden will play an important role in the implementation of this action pillar.

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

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007285/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Regiões Ultraperiféricas — ponto da situação

A particular situação social e económica estrutural das regiões ultraperiféricas da União Europeia justificou plenamente a sua inclusão nos Tratados e o tratamento mais favorável de que vêm sendo objeto.

Em momentos de crise, de grande instabilidade nos mercados, a dependência económica de um pequeno número de produtos ou setores de produção constitui fator adicional de risco para regiões já de si particularmente isoladas e dependentes do exterior.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Como avalia a presente situação das regiões ultraperiféricas da União?

— Quais são os principais problemas com que se defrontam?

— Por que formas pode a União apoiá-las de modo mais eficaz e reprodutivo?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(8 de agosto de 2013)

A última avaliação da Comissão sobre a forma como a situação das regiões ultraperiféricas (RUP) deve ser abordada é descrita na sua Comunicação de junho de 2012 ([1]). A situação económica e social global nos últimos anos tem revelado uma deterioração geral num contexto mais amplo de recessão económica a nível europeu e mundial, embora haja diferenças importantes entre as várias regiões.

A maior parte das RUP está atrasada relativamente à média da UE espelhada numa gama de indicadores sociais e económicos. É esse o caso, nomeadamente, das taxas de (des)emprego, dos níveis de educação, do PIB *per capita* (exceto nos casos da Madeira e das Ilhas Canárias), dos níveis de cuidados de saúde e de proteção do ambiente — com uma tendência para uma maior vulnerabilidade das RUP ao impacto da crise económica do que dos Estados-Membros a que pertencem, pelo menos em parte devido às circunstâncias específicas reconhecidas no artigo 349.° do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia.

O objetivo último da estratégia da Comissão para as regiões ultraperiféricas é que estas se tornem mais autónomas, economicamente mais fortes e mais capazes de criar empregos sustentáveis, tirando partido das vantagens ímpares de que dispõem e do valor acrescentado que representam para a União Europeia. A União Europeia, em estreita parceria com as autoridades nacionais e regionais (por exemplo, através dos planos de ação apresentados pelas RUP no final de junho de 2013), continuará a envidar todos os esforços no âmbito das suas competências para alcançar esse objetivo ([2]).

([1]) COM(2012) 287 final.
([2]) Ver a comunicação de junho de 2012 [COM(2012) 287 final] para conhecer as ações concretas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007285/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Current situation of the outermost regions

The special structural social and economic situation of the EU's outermost regions fully justifies their inclusion in the Treaties and the more favourable treatment they receive.

In times of crisis and great market instability, economic dependence on a small number of products or production sectors is another risk factor for regions that are already particularly isolated and dependent on other countries.

— How does the Commission assess the current situation of the EU's outermost regions?

— What are the main problems facing them?

— How can the EU support them more effectively and productively?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

The Commission's most recent assessment on how the situation of the outermost regions (ORs) should be tackled is outlined in its communication of June 2012 ([1]). The overall economic and social situation in the last years has generally deteriorated against a background of the wider European and global economic recession, although there are important differences between individual regions.

Most of the ORs are below the EU average in a range of social and economic indicators. This is notably the case for (un)employment rates, education standards, GDP per capita (except for Madeira and the Canary Islands), levels of healthcare and environmental protection with a tendency for the ORs to be more susceptible to the impact of the economic crisis than the Member States to which they belong, at least partly due to the specific circumstances recognised in Article 349 of the Treaty on the Functioning of European Union.

The ultimate goal of the Commission's strategy in favour of the ORs is that they become more self-reliant, economically more robust and better able to create sustainable jobs, by capitalising on the unique assets that each OR possesses and the ORs' added value for the European Union. The European Union, in close partnership with the national and regional authorities (e.g. via the action plans submitted by the ORs at the end of June 2013), will continue to do its utmost within its remit to achieve such a goal ([2]).

([1]) (COM(2012)287 final).
([2]) See the communication of June 2012 (COM(2012) 287 final) for concrete actions.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007286/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Ciel européen rouge du sang des employés aériens

Le projet qui fâche ces derniers jours vise à unifier la navigation aérienne en Europe, en créant six zones géographiques au sein desquelles on utiliserait notamment un système informatique commun. Alors qu'à Bruxelles nous avons un excellent service météo, on pourrait décider de tout centraliser en Allemagne.

1. La Commission n'agit-elle pas sous la pression des compagnies qui veulent réduire les taxes d'aéroport qu'elles doivent verser?

2. La réforme ne risque-t-elle pas de mettre en concurrence certains pans de la gestion du trafic aérien?

3. La réforme ne favoriserait-elle pas l'externalisation de missions?

4. À combien la Commission estime-t-elle le nombre de pertes d'emplois suite à la réforme?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(14 août 2013)

L'initiative du ciel unique européen 2+ (SES 2+) vise à faire face aux coûts élevés liés à la prestation de services de navigation aérienne en Europe.

1. La Commission constate notamment que le système européen est environ 70 % moins performant que les systèmes étrangers comparables, ce qui place nos compagnies aériennes dans une position économique défavorable. Notre proposition consiste donc à présenter de nouvelles mesures destinées à assurer la compétitivité de notre système de transport aérien.

2. La réforme vise à instaurer des conditions de marché saines et transparentes dans les domaines où un véritable marché est réalisable, les services essentiels demeurant des monopoles soumis à la réglementation économique.

3. La proposition devrait conduire à la création de services d'appui spécialisés qui seront mieux à même de développer les secteurs correspondants et d'améliorer les services.

4. L'analyse d'impact menée par la Commission indique que, même dans la situation la plus défavorable, l'initiative contribuera à la création nette d'environ 4 000 emplois.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007286/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Airline staff see red over European sky

The project which has caused anger over recent days is designed to unify air navigation in Europe, by creating six geographic zones in which one common IT system is used. Even though we have an excellent metro service in Brussels, why not centralise everything in Germany?

1. Is the Commission not acting under pressure from companies looking to reduce the airport taxes they have to pay?

2. Does the reform not risk creating competition between certain sections of air traffic management?

3. Will the reform not favour the externalisation of missions?

4. How many jobs does the Commission consider will be lost as a result of the reform?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(14 August 2013)

The Single European Sky 2+ (SES 2+) initiative is intended to address the continued high cost of air navigation service provision in Europe.

1. The Commission notes in particular that the European system is roughly 70% less efficient than comparable foreign systems which put our airlines at an economic disadvantage. It is hence our proposal to bring forward new measures to ensure the competitiveness of our air transport system.

2. The reform is intended to give rise to healthy and transparent market conditions in those areas where a true market is feasible, whilst maintaining the core services as a monopoly under economic regulation.

3. The proposal is expected to lead to the creation of specialised support services that can better develop their corresponding sectors and improve services.

4. The Commission's impact analysis indicates that even in the most adverse case, the initiative will contribute to the net creation of roughly 4 000 jobs.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007287/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Clauses de confidentialité applicables au financement en matière de Droits de l'homme dans le contexte de la presse et des médias

La Commission ne devrait-elle pas repenser les clauses de confidentialité applicables au financement en matière de Droits de l'homme dans le contexte de la presse et des médias, dans la mesure où ces clauses sont susceptibles de discréditer les journalistes, les médias ou les ONG et de nuire ainsi à la crédibilité des activités de l'Union en matière de Droits de l'homme, qui, en elles-mêmes, sont ouvertes et transparentes?

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission
(16 août 2013)

Les projets financés par l'Union européenne, notamment dans le cadre de l'instrument européen pour la démocratie et les Droits de l'homme (IEDDH), sont publics par défaut. Les clauses de confidentialité ne s'appliquent que lorsqu'un programme est particulièrement sensible et que le bénéficiaire demande explicitement qu'un projet spécifique soit totalement ou partiellement confidentiel. La confidentialité signifie que le bénéficiaire n'est pas tenu de respecter les règles de visibilité décrites dans les conditions générales des contrats, et que l'UE ne publie pas les activités ou les résultats confidentiels du projet lorsqu'une telle publicité peut mettre les personnes et les organisations concernées en danger. Compte tenu de ces considérations, la Commission n'est pas d'avis qu'il faille réviser ces clauses de confidentialité.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007287/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Confidentiality clauses applicable to financing in connection with human rights within the context of the press and the media

Should the Commission not rethink the confidentiality clauses applicable to financing in connection with human rights within the context of the press and the media, insofar as such clauses may discredit journalists, the media or NGOs and undermine the credibility of Union activities in the field of human rights, which themselves are open and transparent?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(16 August 2013)

Projects financed by the European Union, including under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), are public by default. Confidentiality clauses only apply when a programme is particularly sensitive and when the beneficiary explicitly requests that a specific project should be fully or partly confidential. Confidentiality means that the beneficiary is not obliged to comply with the visibility rules described in the general conditions of the contracts, and that the EU will not publicise the confidential activities/results of the project if this may put the persons and the organisations involved in danger. The Commission is not of the opinion, in the light of these considerations, that these confidentiality clauses need to be revised.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007288/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Stratégie en matière de liberté de la presse

La Commission compte-t-elle, comme le lui suggère le Parlement, adopter dans les meilleurs délais une stratégie en matière de liberté de la presse et des médias, dans le cadre de la politique extérieure de l'Union, et intégrer les recommandations que contient le présent rapport dans les futures lignes directrices sur la liberté d'expression (en ligne et hors ligne)?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Kroes au nom de la Commission
(5 août 2013)

Dans tous les domaines qui relèvent de sa compétence, la Commission se doit de veiller à ce que les droits consacrés dans l'article 11 de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne, y compris la liberté et le pluralisme des médias, soient respectés.

La Commission analyse actuellement les résultats de consultations publiques lancées à la suite de la publication du rapport indépendant du groupe de haut niveau sur la liberté et le pluralisme des médias, le 21 janvier 2013. Une de ces consultations portait sur les recommandations du groupe de manière générale, tandis que l'autre concernait plus spécifiquement l'indépendance des autorités réglementaires nationales de l'audiovisuel. Toute décision concernant des mesures de suivi qui seraient prises, dans les limites des compétences de l'Union européenne, prendra en considération les réponses à ces consultations. Dans ce contexte, la Commission souhaite également mentionner les travaux actuels concernant les lignes directrices sur la liberté d'expression, qui ont trait à la politique extérieure de l'Union et font suite au plan d'action de l'Union européenne en faveur des Droits de l'homme et de la démocratie. Les mesures éventuelles tiendront également compte des résolutions du Parlement européen relatives à la liberté et au pluralisme des médias.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007288/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Strategy for the freedom of the press

Does the Commission intend, as suggested by Parliament, to adopt post haste a strategy for the freedom of the press and the media, within the framework of the Union's external policy, and to integrate the recommendations contained in the present report in future guidelines on freedom of expression (both on and offline)?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

In all areas within its competence, the Commission is bound to ensure that the rights enshrined in Article 11 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, including media freedom and pluralism, are respected.

The Commission is currently analysing results of public consultations launched in following the presentation of the independent report of the High Level Group on Media Freedom and Pluralism which was published on 21 January 2013. One consultation addressed overall the recommendations of the group and one specifically the independence of National Audiovisual Regulatory Authorities. The decision on any possible follow-up actions within the limits of the competences of the European Union will take account of the responses to those consultations. In this context the Commission also would like to point to the present work on Guidelines on Freedom of Expression which relate to external policy of the Union following the EU Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy. Any possible follow-up to the consultation will take into account the relevant resolutions of the European Parliament on media freedom and pluralism.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007289/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Alerte pour les viandes

La Commission partage-t-elle l'avis qu'il est indispensable d'étendre aux fraudes alimentaires le système d'alerte européen qui permet, aujourd'hui, l'échange d'informations entre États membres lorsqu'un risque pour la santé humaine est détecté, lié aux denrées alimentaires ou aux aliments pour animaux?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(25 juillet 2013)

Lors de l'affaire de la viande de cheval, le système d'alerte rapide pour les denrées alimentaires et les aliments pour animaux (RASFF) a été utilisé pour échanger des informations, bien que les cas de fraude alimentaire ne relèvent pas toujours de son champ d'application. Cette affaire a mis en évidence le fait que, sous sa forme actuelle, le RASFF ne permettait pas de répondre à toutes les particularités liées à la fraude alimentaire. La Commission réfléchit actuellement à la manière d'y remédier.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007289/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Meat alert

Does the Commission endorse the view that the European warning system which currently allows information to be exchanged between Member States when a risk to human health is detected from foodstuffs or feedingstuffs should be extended to food fraud?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

During the horsemeat affair, the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF) was used to exchange relevant information despite the fact that food fraud cases do not always fall within its scope. The case also highlighted that the RASFF's current design does not allow it to cater for all of the specificities related to food fraud. The Commission is reflecting upon how this could be addressed.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007290/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Tester les viandes

Une première batterie de tests menés dans les vingt-sept États membres, à la suite du scandale des plats faussement estampillés bœuf, avait révélé en avril qu'environ un produit alimentaire sur vingt contrôlés en Europe, et près de trois fois plus en France, contenait de la viande de cheval.

La présence de phénylbutazone, un anti-inflammatoire interdit dans l'alimentation humaine, avait, par ailleurs, été décelée dans 0,5 % des carcasses de cheval testées.

Ces pourcentages sont bas, mais j'aurais préféré qu'ils soient plus faibles encore.

1. Pourquoi, alors, la Commission ne lance-t-elle pas une deuxième batterie de tests?

2. La Commission nous rejoint-elle dans l'idée qu'il serait utile de voir si, après ces premiers tests, ces pourcentages ont évolué à la baisse ou pas?

3. La Commission partage-t-elle l'idée qu'une recommandation n'est pas suffisante et qu'une obligation serait plus adéquate?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(25 juillet 2013)

1-2. La Commission et les États membres examineront prochainement la possibilité de lancer une deuxième série de tests dans le cadre d'un plan de contrôle coordonné. Qu'un tel plan soit ou non mis en place à l'échelle de l'Union européenne, il convient de préciser que la plupart des États membres ont déjà inclus les tests appropriés dans leur plan de contrôle «normal».

3. En ce qui concerne les contrôles officiels, la Commission a adopté récemment une proposition visant à revoir les règles existantes ([1]). Celle-ci lui permet, entre autres, d'adopter des plans de contrôle coordonnés obligatoires dans des cas semblables à l'affaire de la viande de cheval.

([1]) COM(2013)265 final, 2013/0140 (COD) du 6 mai 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007290/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Meat testing

A first battery of tests carried out in the twenty-seven Member States in the wake of the scandal of meals wrongly labelled as containing beef revealed that, in April, approximately one foodstuff out of twenty checked in Europe and almost three times that number in France contained horsemeat.

The presence of phenylbutazone, an anti-inflammatory prohibited in food for human consumption, was also detected in 0.5% of the horse carcasses tested.

These percentages are low, but I would prefer them to be lower still.

1. Why, therefore, has the Commission not launched a second battery of tests?

2. Does the Commission endorse the idea that it would be useful to see whether or not the percentages have fallen since those first tests?

3. Does the Commission endorse the idea that a recommendation is not enough and that an obligation would be more appropriate?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

1 and 2. The Commission and Member States will soon discuss the possibility of launching a second round of testing under the auspices of a coordinated control plan. It should be noted that, irrespective of whether such an EU-wide plan is actually implemented, most Member States are already including the relevant tests in their 'normal' national control plans.

3. Regarding official controls, the Commission recently adopted a proposal to review existing rules ([1]). The proposal allows, amongst other things, for the Commission to adopt mandatory coordinated control plans in cases such as the horsemeat affair.

([1]) COM(2013) 265 final; 2013/0140 (COD) of 6 May 2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007291/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Plainte des brasseurs belges

Fin 2012, la France a décidé, dans le cadre de l'élaboration de son budget, d'augmenter de 180 % les accises sur la bière. Le vin, boisson nationale par excellence dans l'Hexagone, n'a pas reçu le même traitement. Cette taxe constitue un coup dur pour l'industrie brassicole belge. La France absorbe, en effet, près d'un tiers de l'ensemble des 10,6 millions d'hectolitres de bière belge vendus à l'étranger.

1. N'y a-t-il pas pour la Commission une atteinte au principe européen de liberté d'établissement?

2. Comment juge-t-elle les propos tenus dans ce dossier au Sénat français par Jérôme Cahuzac, alors ministre du budget? Pour rappel, il y avait justifié la mesure en soulignant que les petits brasseurs produisant moins de 200 000 hectolitres seraient moins touchés (hausse des accises limitée à 50 %). Une manière de dire que seuls les grands brasseurs… étrangers le seront! Les Belges exportent 3,5 millions d'hectolitres vers la France. Avec les Danois et les Néerlandais, ils sont les plus gros du secteur outre-Quiévrain.

3. La Commission juge-t-elle discriminatoire l'exemption de la hausse des accises que la France a introduite pour le vin et le champagne?

Réponse donnée par M. Šemeta au nom de la Commission
(22 août 2013)

Pour autant qu'ils se conforment aux dispositions de la directive 92/84/CEE du Conseil et que leurs règles n'établissent pas de discrimination directe ou indirecte en faveur des produits nationaux, les États membres sont libres de déterminer les taux de droits applicables à chaque catégorie de boissons alcooliques selon leurs préférences.

Les taux minimaux varient de zéro pour le vin à 550 euros par hl d'alcool pur, et aucune modification n'y a été apportée depuis 1992, pas même pour tenir compte de l'inflation ou dans le cadre d'une indexation.

La France a pendant longtemps été l'un des États membres imposant les droits d'accise les plus faibles pour la bière dans l'Union.

La directive 92/83/CEE autorise les États membres à appliquer des taux d'accise réduits aux entreprises ne produisant pas plus de 200 000 hl de bière par an. Ces taux doivent être appliqués de la même manière aux brasseries nationales et aux brasseries situées dans d'autres États membres.

En ce qui concerne l'existence d'une discrimination, la Commission renvoie l'Honorable Parlementaire à sa réponse donnée à la question écrite E-010183/2012.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007291/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Complaint by Belgian breweries

In late 2012, France decided during budget preparations to increase excise on beer by 180%. Wine, the national drink *par excellence* in metropolitan France, did not receive the same treatment. This tax has hit the Belgian brewing industry extremely hard. France accounts for nearly one-third of the 10.6 million hectolitres of Belgian beer sold abroad.

1. Does the Commission not see this as an attack on the European principle of freedom of establishment?

2. What is its view of the speech given on this topic in the French Senate by former Minister for the Budget Jérôme Cahuzac? For the record, he justified the measure by pointing out that small breweries producing less than 200 000 hectolitres would be less affected (the increase in excise is capped at 50%). That is one way of saying that only the large foreign breweries will be affected. Belgium exports 3.5 million hectolitres to France. With Denmark and the Netherlands, it is the biggest in the sector outside France.

3. Does the Commission consider that the exemption from the increase in excise which France has introduced for wine and champagne is discriminatory?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(22 August 2013)

Provided that Member States comply with the provisions of Council Directive 92/84/EEC and their rules do not directly or indirectly discriminate in favour of domestic products, they may determine the rates of duty for each category of alcoholic beverage as they see fit, according to their preferences.

The minimum rates range from zero for wine up to EUR 550 per hl of pure alcohol and there has been no amendment in these minima since 1992 even to adapt them for inflation / index linking.

France historically was one of the lower charging (excise duty rates) Member States for beer in the EU.

Directive 92/83/EEC allows Member States to apply reduced rates of excise duty to undertakings producing no more than 200 000 hl of beer per year. These rates must be applied equally to domestic breweries and breweries located in other Member States.

As regards the existence of discrimination, the Commission refers the Honourable Member to its answer given to Written Question E-010183/2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007295/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Hongrie: familles en danger

Les avertissements ont beau se multiplier depuis trois mois, le premier ministre Viktor Orban fait la sourde oreille. Les critiques sur le quatrième remaniement apporté à la Constitution hongroise il y a quelques semaines sont pourtant convergentes: ces nouveaux changements menacent le respect des droits fondamentaux dans ce pays.

La définition de la famille y a été réduite à sa plus stricte expression, excluant les couples de même sexe, mais aussi les cohabitants non mariés.

1. La Commission trouve-t-elle cela acceptable?

2. Comment compte-t-elle réagir?

3. Fondamentalement, cela veut dire que si j'ai un enfant avec mon partenaire, nous ne sommes pas considérés comme une famille. La Commission n'estime-t-elle pas qu'en plus d'être lourdement discriminatoire, cela pourrait avoir de graves conséquences en matière de protection sociale?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(20 août 2013)

Conformément aux traités sur lesquels se fonde l'Union européenne ([1]), la Commission européenne n'a pas de compétences générales pour intervenir auprès des États membres en matière de droits fondamentaux. Elle ne peut le faire que lorsqu'il s'agit d'une question de droit de l'Union européenne. La définition de «famille», telle que mentionnée dans la question de l'Honorable Parlementaire et telle que consacrée par l'article L.1 de la Loi fondamentale de Hongrie, ne semble pas être liée à l'application du droit de l'Union européenne. Par conséquent, la Commission n'est pas en mesure de donner suite à cette question.

La Commission rappelle que la Commission de Venise du Conseil de l'Europe a analysé, dans son avis rendu le 17 juin 2013 ([2]), la définition de «famille» telle qu'elle figure dans l'article L.1 de la Loi fondamentale de Hongrie, au regard de la jurisprudence de la Cour européenne des Droits de l'homme. La Commission de Venise en a conclu que, conformément à cette jurisprudence, la définition de «mariage» comme étant l'union d'un homme et d'une femme relève de la marge d'appréciation des autorités hongroises. Selon la Commission de Venise, l'article L.1 de la Loi fondamentale ne devrait pas exclure d'autres garanties de la famille et de la vie familiale. L'article 12 de la Convention européenne des Droits de l'homme (CEDH) garantit le droit au mariage d'un homme et d'une femme. Au cours des dernières décennies, la Cour européenne des Droits de l'homme a progressivement élargi le champ d'application de l'article 8 de la CEDH sur le droit au respect de la vie privée et familiale.

([1]) Traité sur l'Union européenne et traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne.
([2]) Avis sur le quatrième amendement à la Loi fondamentale de Hongrie, adopté par la Commission de Venise lors de sa 95^e^ session plénière (Venise, les 14 et 15 juin 2013) et rendu le 17 juin 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007295/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Hungary: families in danger

Despite increasing warnings over the past three months, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán has turned a deaf ear. Yet criticisms of the fourth reform to the Hungarian Constitution a few weeks ago arrive at the same conclusion: these new changes are a threat to respect for fundamental rights in this country.

The definition of the family has been reduced to the narrowest possible definition, excluding same-sex couples and also unmarried cohabiting couples.

1. Does the Commission think this is acceptable?

2. How does it intend to respond?

3. Basically, this means that if I have a child with my partner, we are not considered a family. Does the Commission not think that besides being extremely discriminatory, this could have serious consequences for social protection?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2013)

Under the Treaties on which the European Union is based ([1]), the European Commission has no general powers to intervene with the Member States in the area of fundamental rights. It can only do so if an issue of European Union law is involved. The definition of family as referred to in the question of the Honourable Member and as enshrined in Article L.1 of the Hungarian Fundamental Law, does not appear to be related to the implementation of European Union law. For this reason, it is not possible for the European Commission to follow up on this issue.

The Commission recalls that the Venice Commission of the Council of Europe in its opinion issued on 17 June 2013 ([2]) analysed the definition of family as used in Article L.1 of the Hungarian Fundamental Law from the perspective of the case law of the European Court of Human Rights. The Venice Commission concludes that according to this case-law, the definition of 'marriage' as the union of a man and a woman falls within the margin of appreciation of the Hungarian authorities. According to the Venice Commission, Article L.1 of the Fundamental Law should not exclude other guarantees of family and family life. Article 12 of the European Convention on Human Rights ('ECHR') guarantees the right of a man and a woman to marry. In the last decades, the European Court of Human Rights has gradually broadened the scope of Article 8 ECHR on the right to family life.

([1]) Treaty on European Union and Treaty on the functioning of the European Union.
([2]) Opinion on the Fourth amendment to the Fundamental Law of Hungary, adopted by the Venice Commission. at its 95th Plenary Session (Venice, 14-15 June 2013), issued on 17 June 2013.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007297/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Hongrie: absence de liberté de la presse

Les avertissements ont beau se multiplier depuis trois mois, le Premier ministre Viktor Orban fait la sourde oreille. Les critiques sur le quatrième remaniement apporté à la Constitution hongroise il y a quelques semaines sont pourtant convergentes: ces nouveaux changements menacent le respect des droits fondamentaux dans ce pays.

De sombres nuages pèsent également sur la liberté de la presse, soumise à une forme d'autocensure. La loi sur les médias évoque notamment de manière peu claire des reportages «au contenu équilibré» et elle prévoit de lourdes amendes en cas d'infraction. Les journalistes sont donc amenés à prendre des mesures d'autocontrôle pour éviter de s'exposer à des problèmes.

1. La Commission trouve-t-elle ces mesures acceptables alors que cela va clairement à l'encontre du principe de liberté de la presse?

2. Comment compte-t-elle réagir?

3. Est-il concevable que les autorités européennes ne sanctionnent pas clairement un pays dans lequel les principaux journaux et grands médias publics sont liés au pouvoir qui, selon des témoignages recueillis par Human Rights Watch, ne se gêne pas pour se montrer dirigiste dans le traitement de l'information? Ne recevant pas de subsides, les médias indépendants sont pour leur part confrontés à des difficultés financières. D'autant plus que certains annonceurs publicitaires s'en détournent par crainte de perdre des contrats publics. Autant de manières subtiles d'étouffer les voix d'opposition.

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Kroes au nom de la Commission
(1^er^ août 2013)

La Commission a déjà examiné plusieurs questions relatives à la liberté et au pluralisme des médias en Hongrie, et est parvenue à un accord avec les autorités hongroises concernant plusieurs modifications visant à conformer la réglementation à la directive «services de médias audiovisuels». Toutefois, la Commission est consciente des autres préoccupations exprimées par plusieurs ONG et le Conseil de l'Europe, et continue d'assurer un suivi attentif.

La Commission veille au respect des droits et principes garantis par la Charte des droits fondamentaux, et notamment son article 11 relatif à la liberté d'expression et d'information (y compris la liberté et le pluralisme des médias). Conformément à l'article 51, paragraphe 1, de la Charte, les dispositions de cette dernière s'adressent aux États membres uniquement lorsqu'ils mettent en œuvre le droit de l'Union. Même pour les matières qui ne présentent aucun rapport avec le droit de l'Union, les États membres sont tenus de respecter les obligations qui leur incombent en ce qui concerne les droits fondamentaux en vertu des accords internationaux, de la Convention européenne des Droits de l'homme et de la législation nationale.

La vice-présidente Kroes a mis sur pied le groupe indépendant de haut niveau sur la liberté et le pluralisme des médias. À la suite de la présentation du rapport de ce groupe, la Commission a lancé deux consultations publiques, l'une portant sur les recommandations formulées par le groupe, et l'autre portant spécifiquement sur l'indépendance des autorités réglementaires nationales de l'audiovisuel. Toute décision concernant d'éventuelles actions de suivi à entreprendre dans les limites des compétences de l'Union européenne tiendra compte des réponses aux consultations. La Commission donne également suite à la demande du Parlement européen de mettre en place deux projets pilotes en 2013, à savoir les essais et la mise en œuvre de l'Outil d'observation du pluralisme dans les médias par une entité indépendante et la création d'un Centre européen de liberté de la presse et des médias.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007297/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Hungary: lack of freedom of the press

Warnings have been increasing thick and fast for three months, but Prime Minister Viktor Orbán has turned a deaf ear. However, criticism of the fourth review of the Hungarian constitution carried out a few weeks ago is divided: these new changes put respect for fundamental rights at risk in this country.

Dark clouds are also gathering over the freedom of the press, which is subject to a sort of self-censorship. The media law refers somewhat obscurely to 'balanced' reporting and makes provision for heavy fines in the event of infringement. Journalists therefore have to impose self-control in order to avoid risking problems.

1. Does the Commission consider that these measures are acceptable, given that this clearly flouts the principle of the freedom of the press?

2. How does it intend to react?

3. How come the European authorities have not clearly sanctioned a country in which the main newspapers and major mass media are linked to the government which, according to testimony gathered by Human Rights Watch, has no compunction in treating information in a dictatorial manner? As they receive no subsidies, the independent media face financial difficulties. especially as certain advertisers are being put off through fear of losing public contracts. All very subtle ways of silencing the opposition.

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

The Commission already discussed issues related to media freedom and pluralism in Hungary and it agreed with the Hungarian authorities on several modifications with a view to bring the law in line with the Audiovisual Media Services Directive. However, the Commission is aware of the remaining concerns expressed by NGOs and the Council of Europe. The Commission continues to closely monitor the situation.

The Commission ensures the respect of rights and principles enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights, including Article 11 on freedom of expression and information (encompassing media freedom and pluralism). According to Article 51(1), the Charter applies to Member States only when they are implementing EC law. Even where there is no link to EC law, Member States are bound to respect their obligations regarding fundamental rights, resulting from international agreements, the European Convention on Human Rights and from national legislation.

Vice-President Kroes set up the independent High Level Group on Media Freedom and Pluralism. Following the presentation of the report by this group, the Commission launched two public consultations, one on the recommendations of the group and one specifically on the independence of national audiovisual regulatory authorities. Any decision on possible follow-up actions within the limits of the competences of the EU will take account of the responses to the consultations. The Commission also follows up on the request by the European Parliament to implement two pilot projects in 2013, concerning the testing and implementation of the Media Pluralism Monitoring tool by an independent entity and a European Centre for Press and Media Freedom.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007299/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Hongrie sans justice

Les avertissements ont beau se multiplier depuis trois mois, le Premier ministre Viktor Orban fait la sourde oreille. Les critiques sur le quatrième remaniement apporté à la Constitution hongroise il y a quelques semaines sont pourtant convergentes: ces nouveaux changements menacent le respect des droits fondamentaux dans ce pays. Mes questions portent ici plus précisément sur l'appareil juridique, totalement muselé.

1. La Commission trouve-t-elle normal que l'indépendance de la justice hongroise ne soit plus garantie?

2. La Commission compte-t-elle accepter longtemps que, dans un État membre, la Cour constitutionnelle ne puisse plus se référer à sa propre jurisprudence rendue avant le 1er janvier 2012, et cela alors qu'elle avait adopté par le passé des décisions consolidant le respect des droits fondamentaux et d'autres critiquant directement les changements législatifs opérés par le gouvernement Orban?

Réponse donnée par Mme Reding au nom de la Commission
(5 août 2013)

En tant que gardienne des traités, la Commission a fait part de ses inquiétudes au sujet de l'indépendance de la justice en Hongrie à plusieurs occasions en 2012 et 2013 et, lorsque c'était nécessaire, elle a pris des mesures correctrices efficaces.

Le 6 novembre 2012, la Cour de justice (CJ) a confirmé l'analyse juridique de la Commission concernant l'abaissement soudain de l'âge de départ à la retraite des juges en déclarant que la législation hongroise correspondante n'était pas compatible avec le droit de l'Union. Actuellement, la Commission contrôle l'application d'une nouvelle loi visant à faire respecter l'arrêt de la CJ et vérifie que la réintégration des magistrats révoqués se déroule comme annoncé.

À la suite d'échanges avec les services de la Commission, les autorités hongroises ont confirmé, le 7 juin 2013, leur intention de supprimer de la loi fondamentale de Hongrie la possibilité de prélever une taxe spéciale pour les arrêts de la CJ comportant des obligations de paiement et d'abolir le système de réattribution des affaires entre juridictions. La Commission s'est félicitée de ces initiatives et contrôlera dorénavant les mesures d'exécution qui s'imposent.

Le 9 juillet 2013, le Conseil a adopté une recommandation à l'intention de la Hongrie visant à renforcer encore le pouvoir judiciaire et faisant suite à une proposition présentée par la Commission dans le contexte du semestre européen 2013 pour la coordination des politiques économiques.

Quant aux inquiétudes concernant la position du président de l'Office national de la justice et le rôle de la Cour constitutionnelle en Hongrie, la Commission renvoie à l'avis rendu par la commission de Venise le 17 juin 2013. La Commission demande aux autorités hongroises de prendre dûment en compte cet avis et d'y répondre en totale conformité avec les principes, les règles et les valeurs de l'Union européenne et du Conseil de l'Europe.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007299/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Hungary without justice

Warnings have been increasing thick and fast for three months, but Prime Minister Viktor Orbán has turned a deaf ear. However, criticism of the fourth review of the Hungarian constitution carried out a few weeks ago is divided: these new changes put respect for fundamental rights at risk in this country. My questions here concern the legal apparatus, which is totally muzzled.

1. Does the Commission consider it normal that the independence of the Hungarian judiciary is no longer guaranteed?

2. Does the Commission intend to accept for any length of time that, in a Member State, the Constitutional Court can no longer refer to precedents which it set before 1 January 2012, even though it has previously passed judgments consolidating respect for fundamental rights and directly criticising the legislative changes made by the Orbán administration?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The Commission, as guardian of the Treaties, has on several occasions in 2012 and 2013 expressed its concerns about the independence of the judiciary in Hungary, and has taken effective remedial action, where necessary.

The ECJ confirmed on 6 November 2012 the legal analysis of the Commission concerning the sudden lowering of the retirement age of judges, by declaring the related Hungarian legislation incompatible with EC law. The Commission is currently monitoring the application of a new law seeking to comply with the judgment of the ECJ and is verifying that the reinstatements of dismissed judges are being carried out as announced.

Following an exchange with the services of the Commission, the Hungarian authorities confirmed on 7 June 2013 their intention to remove from the Fundamental Law of Hungary the possibility of levying an ad hoc tax for ECJ judgments entailing payment obligations and to abolish the system of transfer of cases between courts. The Commission has welcomed these intentions and will now monitor the necessary implementing steps.

On 9 July 2013, the Council adopted a recommendation to Hungary to strengthen further the judiciary, following a Commission proposal made in the context of the 2013 European Semester of economic policy coordination.

On the concerns relating to the position of the President of the National Judicial Office and the role of the Constitutional Court in Hungary, the Commission refers to the opinion of the Venice Commission issued on 17 June 2013. The Commission expects that the Hungarian authorities will take due account of this opinion, and address it in full accordance with both European Union and Council of Europe principles, rules and values.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007300/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Doação de órgãos — melhores práticas

A discrepância da percentagem de doadores de órgãos nos diversos países europeus parece indicar que alguns dos sistemas dos Estados-Membros serão mais eficazes que outros devendo, por isso, ser estudados e, eventualmente, adotados por aqueles que revelem menores índices de sucesso. Para além da adoção das melhores práticas, é evidente que, num assunto intimamente relacionado com a saúde e a vida dos cidadãos, se torna necessário otimizar recursos e aproveitar coletivamente da escala europeia de oferta de órgãos. Não faz qualquer sentido que alguém morra por não ter um órgão disponível no seu país quando, ao lado, ele pode existir e estar disponível.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Como se encontra atualmente a adoção de melhores práticas no tocante à doação de órgãos na União?

— Considera que se encontram devidamente otimizados os recursos e aproveitada coletivamente a oferta de órgãos à escala europeia?

— Crê que atualmente são efetivamente acompanhados quer os transplantados quer os doadores altruístas e voluntários, em relação aos quais as nossas sociedades não podem deixar de ter uma dívida de gratidão?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(25 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão remete o Senhor Deputado para as suas respostas às perguntas E-513/2013, E-780/2013, E-1680/2012, E-78013/2012 e E-10591/2011 ([1]).

O mandato da UE no domínio da dádiva e transplantação de órgãos centra-se em aspetos de qualidade e segurança, como estipulado no Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia. Para ajudar a aumentar a disponibilidade de órgãos, a Comissão adotou um Plano de Ação ([2]), que visa facilitar o intercâmbio de melhores práticas neste domínio, através de grupos de trabalho da UE e projetos no âmbito do programa de saúde ([3]).

Entre 2007 e 2011, o número de transplantações aumentou de forma constante, passando de 24 941 para 26 150. Cada vez mais, estão a desenvolver-se melhores práticas, por exemplo, em domínios como identificação de dadores, melhor utilização de órgãos e intercâmbios transfronteiras sempre que os órgãos não possam ser utilizados a nível nacional.

Através de acordos bilaterais e multilaterais, os países da UE trocam órgãos ou tratam doentes de outros Estados-Membros, a fim de otimizar a utilização dos órgãos disponíveis. Para melhorar ainda mais a cooperação neste domínio, a UE financia atualmente o projeto Foedus ([4]).

A fim de assegurar normas de qualidade e segurança em relação aos órgãos destinados a transplantação, foi adotada uma diretiva ([5]). Embora o acompanhamento efetivo dos doentes envolvidos em transplantações de órgãos continue a ser da responsabilidade das entidades nacionais, o projeto Efretos ([6]) faculta uma metodologia normalizada para o efeito. Os Estados-Membros são convidados a seguir essa metodologia, como indicado em recentes conclusões do Conselho ([7]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Comunicação da Comissão — Plano de ação no domínio da dádiva e transplantação de órgãos (2009-2015): Reforçar a cooperação entre os Estados-Membros, COM(2008) 819 final.
([3]) A lista de projetos está disponível em: http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html
([4]) Ação comum destinada a facilitar o intercâmbio de órgãos doados nos Estados-Membros da UE; http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/news/news232.html
([5]) JO L 207 de 6.8.2010. Diretiva 2010/53/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 7 de julho de 2010, relativa a normas de qualidade e segurança dos órgãos humanos destinados a transplantação.
([6]) http://www.efretos.org
([7]) Conclusões do Conselho sobre a dádiva e a transplantação de órgãos, JO C 396 de 21.12.2012, p. 12.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007300/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Organ donation — Best practices

The differing organ-donor rates in the various European countries seem to indicate that some Member States have more effective systems than others. These should therefore be studied and potentially adopted by those with lower success rates. This area is so closely connected with people's health and their lives that, in addition to adopting best practices, there is a clear need to optimise resources and make use of the organs available collectively at European level. It makes no sense for someone to die because there is no organ available in their country, when it may exist and be available elsewhere.

Can the Commission state:

— What is the state of play regarding the adoption of best organ-donation practices in the EU?

— Does it believe that resources are properly optimised and that use is being made of the organs available collectively at European level?

— Does it believe that there is effective monitoring both of recipients, and of altruistic and voluntary donors, to whom our societies owe a debt of gratitude?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to questions E-513/2013, E-780/2013, E-1680/2012, E-78013/2012 and E-10591/2011. ([1])

The mandate of the EU in organ donation and transplantation focuses on quality and safety aspects as stipulated in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. To help increase organ availability, the Commission adopted an Action Plan ([2]) that aims at facilitating the exchange of best practices in this area, via EU working groups and projects under the Health Programme ([3]).

Between 2007 and 2011 the number of transplants increased steadily from 24941 to 26150. Best practices are increasingly developed, for example on donor identification, best use of organs, and cross border exchanges when organs cannot be used domestically.

Via bilateral and multilateral agreements, EU countries exchange organs or treat each others' patients to optimise the use of available organs. To further improve cooperation in this area, the EU is currently funding the FOEDUS project ([4]).

To ensure quality and safety standards for organs intended for transplantation, a directive ([5]) was adopted. While the effective monitoring of patients concerned by organ transplants remains national responsibility, the EFRETOS project ([6]) offers a standardised methodology for this purpose. Member States are invited to follow it, as stated in recent Council conclusions. ([7])

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) Communication from the Commission 'Action Plan on organ donation and transplantation (2009-2015): Strengthened Cooperation between Member States', COM(2008) 819/3.
([3]) The list of projects is available at http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/projects/database.html
([4]) Joint Action on Facilitating exchange of organs donated in EU Member States; http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/news/news232.html
([5]) OJ L 207, 6.08.2010. Directive 2010/53/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2010 on standards of quality and safety of human organs intended for transplantation.
([6]) http://www.efretos.org.
([7]) Council conclusions on organ donation and transplantation (2012/C 396/03).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007301/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Parceria euro-mediterrânica — ponto da situação

Qualquer observador isento dirá que a parceria euro-mediterrânica não tem progredido tanto quanto seria desejável e que ainda muito há a fazer para que esta adquira uma verdadeira forma e um conteúdo concreto e produtivo.

Assim, pergunto à Vice-presidente/Alta Representante:

— Que passos concretos deu a União Europeia ultimamente, juntamente com os seus parceiros, no sentido de promover e estruturar uma parceria euro-mediterrânica capaz de vencer os medos, as diferenças e as desconfianças e projetar-se decisivamente no futuro?

Resposta dada pela Alta-Representante/Vice-Presidente Ashton em nome da Comissão
(3 de setembro de 2013)

Na sequência da Primavera Árabe, a UE deu um novo impulso às parcerias regionais, à sua crescente ajuda económica e à construção de pontes com as sociedades civis do Sul do Mediterrâneo.

A UE, juntamente com a Jordânia, é copresidente da União para o Mediterrâneo (UpM), o único fórum regional no qual Israel e a Palestina se reúnem e cooperam em projetos regionais (as atividades da UpM concentram-se em projetos concretos nos domínios de desenvolvimento empresarial, transportes, energia, ambiente e água, ensino superior e investigação, assuntos sociais e civis). Estão planeadas quatro reuniões ministeriais para 2013 ([1]). A Líbia é observadora da UpM. A UE está igualmente a desenvolver as suas relações com a Liga dos Estados Árabes (LEA), tal como sublinhado na reunião ministerial UE-LEA realizada em novembro de 2012, a qual deu ótimos resultados.

Para além dos 3,5 mil milhões de EUR já programados para 2011-2013, a UE mobilizou mais de 660 milhões de EUR em novas subvenções a favor da Vizinhança Meridional ([2]).

O Banco Europeu de Investimento (BEI) pode conceder empréstimos adicionais até 1,7 mil milhões de EUR e o mandato alargado do Banco Europeu de Reconstrução e Desenvolvimento (BERD) permite-lhe canalizar um montante adicional de mil milhões de EUR para a região.

Foi criado um Instrumento para a Sociedade Civil com um montante de 36 milhões de EUR para o período de 2011-2013 com o objetivo de apoiar a sociedade civil a promover a reforma; foi lançado um novo programa regional implementado pelo Conselho da Europa, com o objetivo de promover a governação, a proteção dos direitos humanos e o apoio à reforma do sistema judiciário; o financiamento da Fundação Anna Lindh foi aumentado e a UE financia o recentemente criado «Fundo Europeu para a Democracia». Foi concedido um financiamento adicional para Erasmus Mundus, Tempus e para a Fundação Europeia para a Formação.

([1]) Os temas serão: mulheres, comércio, transporte e energia.
([2]) Nomeadamente através do programa SPRING, com a concessão de fundos adicionais aos parceiros que se empenhem e demonstrem alcançar progressos em matéria de reformas democráticas, com, apoio à reforma nos âmbitos da governação, direitos humanos e Estado de direito, bem como desenvolvimento socioeconómico inclusivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007301/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Euro-Mediterranean partnership: state of play

Any impartial observer would say that the Euro-Mediterranean partnership has not made as much progress as one would like, and that there is still much to do before it really takes shape and becomes truly productive.

Can the Vice-President/High Representative state:

— What concrete steps has the EU taken recently, alongside its partners, towards promoting and structuring a Euro-Mediterranean partnership capable of conquering fear, differences and mistrust, and surviving into the future?

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

In the wake of the Arab Spring, the EU has given new impetus to regional partnerships, its increased economic aid and built bridges with civil societies from the Southern Mediterranean.

The EU, with Jordan, is co-president of the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM), the only regional forum in which Israel and Palestine sit together and cooperate on regional projects (UfM activities concentrate on concrete projects in the areas of business development; transport, energy; environment and water; higher education and research; social and civil affairs). Four Ministerial meetings are planned for 2013 ([1]). Libya has joined the UfM as an observer. The EU is also developing its relations with the League of Arab States (LAS), as highlighted by the successful EU-LAS ministerial meeting held in November 2012.

In addition to the EUR 3.5 billion already programmed for 2011-2013, the EU has mobilised over EUR 660 million in new grants for the southern Neighbourhood ([2]).

The European Investment Bank (EIB) can provide additional loans for up to EUR 1.7 billion and the enlarged European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) mandate enables it to channel an extra EUR 1 billion to the region.

A Civil Society Facility was created with EUR 36 million over 2011-2013 to support civil society in promoting reform; a new regional programme implemented by the Council of Europe, aiming at promoting governance, protection of human rights and supporting the reform of the judiciary was launched; funding to the Anna Lindh Foundation was increased and the EU is funding the newly created 'European Endowment for Democracy'. Additional funding was granted to Erasmus Mundus, Tempus and the European Training Foundation.

([1]) Topics will be: women, trade, transport and energy.
([2]) Notably through the SPRING programme, providing additional funding to partners committed to, and showing progress in, democratic reform, with assistance to reform in the areas of governance, human rights and the rule of law and inclusive socioeconomic development.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007302/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Programa conjunto de reinstalação da União Europeia

A reinstalação de refugiados tem-se mostrado necessária sempre e quando os países terceiros de acolhimento não dispõem de condições para que aqueles aí se estabeleçam em segurança e com capacidade de subsistência.

Neste tocante, é sentida pelas diversas entidades que atuam no terreno a necessidade de combater este problema à escala europeia.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Considera que o programa conjunto de reinstalação será o meio adequado para lhe fazer face?

— Concorda com a necessidade de maior cooperação entre Estados-Membros e com os Estados de primeiro acolhimento de modo a poder ser dada uma resposta duradoura, sustentável e articulada a este grave problema humanitário?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(1 de agosto de 2013)

Em situações em que o seu regresso ao país de origem ou a integração local é impossível ou inviável, o Alto Comissário das Nações Unidas para os Refugiados considera que a reinstalação constitui uma opção desejável, oferecendo uma solução sustentável para os refugiados. É também um sinal de solidariedade internacional, não só com os refugiados de conflitos prolongados, mas também com os países de acolhimento.

Considerando que a decisão de autorizar ou não locais de reinstalação cabe, em última análise, às autoridades dos Estados-Membros, a Comissão considera que o Programa Conjunto de Reinstalação da UE constitui um instrumento importante para proporcionar um incentivo político e financeiro aos Estados para que considerem a possibilidade de desenvolver um programa de reinstalação ou, caso já tenham uma tradição de reinstalação, de aumentar o número de refugiados a reinstalar. É também um sinal político forte de unidade para a comunidade internacional e, em especial, para os Estados-Membros que acolhem grandes populações de refugiados, sobre a importância que a União Europeia e os seus Estados-Membros atribuem aos grupos vulneráveis ou a situações de crise (de longa duração) que requerem especial atenção. Estes princípios são reiterados na proposta de um Programa Conjunto de Reinstalação da UE no âmbito do futuro Fundo para o Asilo e a Migração, que se encontra em negociação com os colegisladores.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007302/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: EU joint resettlement programming

Refugees have needed resettling whenever host third countries have lacked the conditions for them to establish themselves safely and sustainably.

In this respect, the various entities active on the ground have felt the need to combat this problem at European level.

— Does the Commission consider the joint resettlement programme the most appropriate means of tackling this problem?

— Does it agree that there needs to be more cooperation between the Member States and the initial host states, so that there can be a lasting, sustainable and joined-up response to this serious humanitarian problem?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(1 August 2013)

In situations where return to the country of origin or local integration is either impossible or not feasible, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees considers resettlement to be a desirable option offering a sustainable solution for refugees. It is also a sign of international solidarity, not only with refugees from protracted conflicts, but also with the host countries.

Considering that the decision of whether or not to provide resettlement places rests ultimately with the authorities of the Member States, the Commission considers the Joint EU Resettlement Programme an important tool to provide a political and financial incentive to Member States to consider developing a resettlement programme or, if they already have a tradition of resettlement, to increase the number of refugees that they resettle. It is also a strong political signal of unity to the international community, and in particular to the states that host large refugee populations, about the importance that the European Union and its Member States attach to vulnerable groups or (protracted) crisis situations that require special attention. These principles are reiterated in the proposal for a Joint Union Resettlement Programme under the future Asylum and Migration Fund, which is currently being negotiated with the co-legislators.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007303/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Normas de qualidade e segurança dos órgãos humanos destinados a transplantação

A escassez de órgãos para transplante tem vindo a alimentar um mercado infame que afeta, sobretudo, países do terceiro mundo mas que tem atingido pessoas carenciadas no Leste da Europa.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Considera que, atualmente, a União Europeia dispõe de regras e procedimentos que a colocam num patamar de elevada exigência e de responsabilidade quanto a estas questões?

— Nomeadamente, crê que pacientes e doadores têm condições, acompanhamento e proteção devidas?

Resposta dada por Tonio Borg em nome da Comissão
(26 de julho de 2013)

A Diretiva 2010/53/UE ([1]) foi adotada em 2010 para proteger os doadores e os recetores, devendo ser transposta pelos Estados-Membros até 27 de agosto de 2012. Nos termos da diretiva, os Estados-Membros devem, entre outros, assegurar que a dádiva de órgãos, por dadores vivos ou dadores *post mortem*, seja voluntária e gratuita, que os doadores sejam cuidadosamente selecionados por profissionais qualificados, e ainda procurar garantir o acompanhamento dos dadores vivos, em particular. A diretiva convida ainda os Estados-Membros a estabelecer sanções aplicáveis em caso de infração à diretiva, devendo estas ser eficazes, proporcionadas e dissuasivas.

Além disso, o tráfico de seres humanos para efeitos de remoção de órgãos foi criminalizado pela Diretiva 2011/36/UE ([2]), que obriga os Estados-Membros a estabelecerem sanções penais para estas infrações. Por último, foi estabelecido o «Plano de ação no domínio da dádiva e transplantação de órgãos» ([3]) da UE, a fim de responder ao desafio global de aumentar a disponibilidade de órgãos.

Por conseguinte, a Comissão considera que as normas em vigor estabelecem requisitos adequados para garantir a qualidade e a segurança da dádiva de órgãos na UE. A Comissão está atualmente a preparar um inquérito sobre a transposição correta da Diretiva 2010/53/UE pelos Estados-Membros, que deverá estar concluído até ao final do corrente ano e revelar quaisquer deficiências na transposição integral das regras preconizadas na diretiva.

([1]) JO L 207 de 6.8.2010. Diretiva 2010/53/UE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 7 de julho de 2010, relativa a normas de qualidade e segurança dos órgãos humanos destinados a transplantação.
([2]) JO L 101 de 15.4.2011.
([3]) COM(2008) 819 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007303/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Standards of quality and safety of human organs intended for transplantation

The lack of organs for transplantation has been fuelling a scandalous market, particularly in developing countries, but which has also been affecting deprived people in Eastern Europe.

— Does the Commission believe the EU currently has rules and procedures that impose strict requirements and responsibility in respect of these issues?

— Specifically, does it believe that patients and donors have the proper conditions, monitoring and protection?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

Directive 2010/53/EU ([1]) was adopted in 2010 to protect donors and recipients, and had to be transposed by the Member States by 27 August 2012. The directive requires Member States, among others, to ensure that donations of organs from deceased and living donors are voluntary and unpaid, that donors are carefully selected by qualified professionals, and that they shall endeavour that there is a follow-up for living donors specifically. Furthermore, the directive calls on Member States to put in place penalties, applicable to infringements of the directive, which are effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

In addition, trafficking in human beings for the purpose of organ removal has been criminalised by Directive 2011/36/EU ([2]) which obliges Member States to set criminal penalties for such offences. Finally, the EU Action Plan on Organ Donation and Transplantation ([3]) has been put in place with a view to tackling the overall challenge of increasing organ availability.

The Commission therefore believes that the current rules provide adequate requirements to ensure the quality and safety of organ donation in the EU. The Commission is currently preparing a survey on the proper transposition of Directive 2010/53/EU by the Member States, which should be finalised by the end of this year and should reveal any deficiencies in the full transposition of the directive's rules.

([1]) OJ L 207, 6.08.2010. Directive 2010/53/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 July 2010 on standards of quality and safety of human organs intended for transplantation.
([2]) OJ L 101, 15.4.2011.
([3]) COM(2008) 819/3.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007304/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Agravamento das condições ambientais registadas no mar Mediterrâneo

A excessiva exploração de recursos pesqueiros, o aquecimento, a poluição, o desaparecimento de fauna e flora autóctone e o surgimento de espécies provindas de outros lugares concorrem para a urgência de uma resposta integrada e coordenada entre o máximo possível de Estados costeiros mediterrânicos. A União Europeia tem um papel particularmente relevante neste esforço comum.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— De que modo poderá a União contribuir para este esforço necessariamente conjunto e procurar congregar as vontades coincidentes dos seus parceiros mediterrânicos?

— Que avaliação faz dos esforços para criar uma gestão integrada da zona costeira do mar Mediterrâneo?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(23 de agosto de 2013)

A UE é parte na Convenção de Barcelona para a Proteção do Meio Marinho e da Região Costeira do Mediterrâneo, tal como todos os países ribeirinhos do mar Mediterrâneo. Aplicando a Diretiva-Quadro Estratégia Marinha ([1]) — cujo objetivo consiste em alcançar ou manter, o mais tardar em 2020, um bom estado ambiental no meio marinho — e comprometendo-se a promover, no âmbito da Convenção, as estratégias por ela impostas, os Estados-Membros da UE podem contribuir grandemente para a resolução dos problemas com que se confronta o Mediterrâneo.

Nos países mediterrânicos, estão a ser realizadas várias ações com vista à gestão integrada da zona costeira (GIZC). Concretamente, a Conferência das Partes na Convenção de Barcelona, em 2009, adotou um protocolo vinculativo GIZC (Protocolo sobre a Gestão Integrada da Zona Costeira do Mediterrâneo ([2])), que entrou em vigor em março de 2011. Em fevereiro de 2012, a Conferência das Partes adotou um plano de ação para a execução do protocolo no período 2012-2019, plano esse que estabelece um roteiro de execução, incluindo o estabelecimento de estratégias regionais e nacionais. O plano de ação será sujeito a exame e avaliação intercalares em 2014. Por outro lado, a Comissão propôs um novo instrumento jurídico que reúne o ordenamento do espaço marítimo e a gestão costeira integrada na UE ([3]), visando contribuir para uma maior integração na formulação de políticas e na cooperação transfronteiriça. A proposta está atualmente a ser debatida pelos colegisladores.

([1]) Diretiva 2008/56/CE do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho, de 17 de junho de 2008, que estabelece um quadro de ação comunitária no domínio da política para o meio marinho (Diretiva-Quadro Estratégia Marinha).
([2]) JO L 34 de 4.2.2009, p. 19.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0133:FIN:PT:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007304/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Worsening environmental conditions recorded in the Mediterranean

Overfishing, rising temperatures, pollution, the disappearance of native flora and fauna, and the increase in foreign species urgently require an integrated and coordinated response from the largest possible number of Mediterranean coastal states. The EU has a particularly important role to play in this common endeavour.

— According to the Commission, how can the EU contribute to this necessarily joint effort and seek to bring its Mediterranean partners on board?

— What is its assessment of the efforts to create integrated coastal zone management for the Mediterranean?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(23 August 2013)

The EU is a Party to the Barcelona Convention for the protection of the marine environment and the coastal region of the Mediterranean, as are all countries having a Mediterranean shoreline. By implementing the Marine Strategy Framework Directive ([1]) which aims to achieve or maintain good environmental status in the marine environment by the year 2020 at the latest, and engaging within the framework of the Convention to promote its approaches, the EU Member States can make a considerable contribution to addressing the challenges faced by the Mediterranean.

The Mediterranean countries are engaged in a variety of efforts to implement integrated coastal zone management (ICZM). In particular, the 2009 Conference of the Parties (COP) of the Barcelona Convention adopted a binding ICZM Protocol ([2]) which entered into force in March 2011. In February 2012 the COP adopted an Action Plan for the implementation of the Protocol 2012-2019 which sets out the roadmap for implementation, including the establishment of regional and national strategies. The action plan will be subject to a mid-term review and evaluation in 2014. Furthermore, the Commission has proposed a new legal instrument bringing together Maritime Spatial Planning and Integrated Coastal Management ([3]) within the EU designed to contribute to more integrated policy-making and cross-border cooperation. The proposal is currently under discussion by the co-legislators.

([1]) Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Parliament and of the Counsil of 17 June 2008 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy (Marine Strategy Framework Directive).
([2]) OJ L34 4.2.2009.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2013:0133:FIN:EN:PDF.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007305/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Esfera pública europeia

Globalmente positiva e muito necessária, a criação de uma esfera pública europeia tem resvalado na indiferença dos povos e no desinteresse das opiniões públicas nacionais que não parecem acompanhar o investimento maciço em informação e divulgação feito pelas instituições e que, antes, se vêm distanciando do projeto europeu de modo preocupante.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Que medidas tomou ou prevê tomar no sentido de promover a criação de uma esfera pública europeia com a qual os povos dos Estados-Membros se identifiquem?

— Que montantes destinou, no período 2009-2013, para informação e divulgação?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(23 de agosto de 2013)

As ações de comunicação da Comissão Europeia são motivadas pelo desejo de envolver os cidadãos, escutar as suas preocupações e, assim, reforçar um espaço público europeu, tal como evidenciado no discurso sobre o estado da União proferido o ano passado pelo Presidente Durão Barroso. Um dos principais objetivos é discutir os assuntos europeus do ponto de vista europeu.

O Ano Europeu dos Cidadãos de 2013 (que será avaliado no final do projeto) foi concebido, em conjunto com o Parlamento Europeu, como o instrumento para assegurar um maior envolvimento. No contexto do Ano Europeu dos Cidadãos, a Comissão está a organizar cerca de 45 «diálogos com os cidadãos» para os ouvir diretamente. A par de membros da Comissão, participam nesses eventos deputados do Parlamento Europeu e políticos eleitos a nível nacional e regional. A ambição da Comissão é promover uma nova forma de fazer política: envolver os cidadãos antes de tomar decisões políticas que têm impacto direto no seu quotidiano. Os diálogos com os cidadãos continuarão a desenrolar-se na perspetiva das eleições europeias de 2014.

A recomendação da Comissão para as próximas eleições do Parlamento Europeu defende igualmente um espaço público europeu, através da sugestão de candidatos europeus para o cargo de Presidente da Comissão, destacando o papel das famílias políticas europeias e preconizando a realização do ato eleitoral no mesmo dia em todos os Estados-Membros. Evidentemente, a Comissão apoiará igualmente a campanha de comunicação do Parlamento Europeu.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007305/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: European public sphere

Creating a European public sphere is a generally positive and very necessary move. However, despite the European institutions investing heavily in information and dissemination, the people of Europe are indifferent to or uninterested in it and, more worryingly, appear to be distancing themselves from the European project.

— What steps has the Commission taken or does it plan to take to promote the creation of a European public sphere with which the people of the Member States can identify?

— What sums has it channelled into information and dissemination in the period 2009-2013?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(23 August 2013)

The European Commission's communication activities are driven by the desire to involve citizens and listen to their concerns — and thereby strengthen a European Public Space as highlighted in last year's State of the European Union speech by President Barroso. One of the central aims is to discuss European affairs from European point of view.

The European Year of Citizens 2013 (which will be evaluated at the end of the project) has been designed, together with the European Parliament, as the vehicle for stronger engagement. In the context of the European Year of Citizens, the Commission is organising about 45 Citizens' Dialogues in order to listen directly to citizens. Next to Members of the Commission, Members of the European Parliament as well as national and regional elected politicians take part. The Commission's ambition is nothing short of a new way of making policy: involving citizens before taking political decisions that directly impact upon their daily lives. The dialogues with citizens will continue in the run-up to the European elections in 2014.

The Commission's Recommendation for the next election of the European Parliament also supports a European Public Space by suggesting European candidates for the post of President of the Commission, by highlighting the role of European party families and advocating to vote on a single day in all Member States. Of course the Commission will also support the European Parliament's communication campaign.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007306/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Gestão dos biorresíduos na União Europeia

A observação empírica da quantidade de biorresíduos que diariamente deitamos fora e que decorrem dos nossos consumos privados tornam patente a necessidade de explorar convenientemente as melhores formas de os aproveitar e de minorar o seu impacto no ambiente. Se aos consumos privados juntarmos os consumos industriais, esta necessidade rapidamente assume contornos de urgência, devendo motivar quer os decisores políticos quer os especialistas a persistir no estudo de processos e métodos mais adequados.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Dispõe de dados quanto à produção de biorresíduos na União Europeia?

— Considera que se encontra assegurada a gestão adequada deste tipo de resíduos?

— Que medidas tomou ou prevê tomar neste tocante?

Resposta dada por Janez Potočnik em nome da Comissão
(9 de agosto de 2013)

Os dados sobre a gestão dos biorresíduos na UE e as ações a adotar previstas foram expostos na Comunicação da Comissão relativa às futuras etapas na gestão dos biorresíduos na União Europeia [COM(2010) 235 final] ([1]) e respetivo anexo [SEC(2010) 577 final] ([2]). A ação mais importante descrita na Comunicação consiste na revisão dos objetivos constantes da Diretiva 2008/98/CE relativa aos resíduos ([3]) (Diretiva-Quadro «Resíduos») e na Diretiva 1999/31/CE relativa à deposição de resíduos em aterros ([4]) (Diretiva «Aterros»), com a possibilidade de reforçar os objetivos existentes ou até de incluir outros novos relacionados com os biorresíduos. Esta ação está atualmente a ser objeto de consultas às partes interessadas a nível da UE ([5]). A segunda medida importante é a fixação de normas aplicáveis em toda a UE para os produtos de compostagem e de digestão anaeróbia no âmbito do procedimento de «fim do estatuto de resíduo». A Comissão está atualmente a concluir a análise técnica sobre esta matéria.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0235:FIN:PT:PDF
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/compost/pdf/sec_biowaste.pdf
([3]) JO L 312 de 22.11.2008.
([4]) JO L 182 de 16.7.1999.
([5]) http://www.wastetargetsreview.eu/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007306/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Managing bio-waste in the EU

Empirical research into the quantity of bio-waste we discard every day as a result of our private consumption clearly shows that we need to explore appropriately the best ways of making use of it and minimising its environmental impact. If we add industrial consumption to private waste, this need quickly becomes an emergency that should drive both political decision-makers and specialists to continue studying the most suitable processes and methods.

— Does the Commission have data on bio-waste production in the EU?

— Does it believe that the proper management of this type of waste has been ensured?

— What measures has it taken or does it intend to take in this regard?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

Data on bio-waste management in the EU and actions planned to be taken have been outlined in the communication from the Commission on future steps in bio-waste management in the European Union (COM(2010)235 final) ([1]) and its Annex (SEC(2010) 577 final) ([2]). The most important action described in the communication is the review of the targets included in Directive 2008/98/EC on waste ([3]) (the 'Waste Framework Directive') and Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste ([4]) (the 'Landfill Directive') with a possibility to strengthen existing or even include new bio-waste related targets. This action is currently subject to EU-wide stakeholders consultations ([5]). The second important measure is setting EU-wide standards for compost and digestate under the 'end of waste' procedure. The Commission is currently finalising the technical analysis on this matter.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/compost/pdf/com_biowaste.pdf ;.
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/compost/pdf/sec_biowaste.pdf
([3]) OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([4]) OJ L 182, 16.7.1999.
([5]) http://www.wastetargetsreview.eu/.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007307/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Melhor legislação

A legislação europeia continua a padecer dos males que lhe são frequentemente apontados: volume excessivo, complexidade desadequada, hermetismo evitável, ininteligibilidade, remissões em cadeia, objetos e âmbitos de utilidade e justificação discutíveis.

Esta circunstância não só afasta os cidadãos das decisões tomadas a nível europeu como contribui para alimentar o debate, nem sempre muito razoável nem rigoroso, sobre a intrusão europeia em matérias sobre as quais não teria que se pronunciar ou legislar.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

De que modo pretende prosseguir o esforço de simplificar a legislação que emana da União e de a tornar mais acessível e inteligível aos cidadãos?

Resposta dada por Maroš Šefčovič em nome da Comissão
(23 de julho de 2013)

A Comissão está a simplificar a legislação e a melhorar a sua qualidade, através de uma ampla gama de esforços, como avaliações de impacto, apreciações, aconselhamento, apoio na execução. Desde 2005, a Comissão aprovou 640 iniciativas de simplificação, codificação ou reformulação e foram revogados mais de 4 450 atos jurídicos. Estão acessíveis em todas as línguas da base EUR-Lex versões consolidadas de todos os regulamentos e diretivas que sofrem alterações, versões essas que se atualizam duas a quatro semanas após cada alteração. Paralelamente, está também a ser bastante melhorado o acesso eletrónico a todo o acervo legislativo da UE: em 2011, foi lançado o balcão único eletrónico no domínio judicial — o «Portal Europeu da Justiça»; em 1 de julho de 2013, entrou em vigor o Regulamento (CE) n.° 2006/2013, que confere efeitos jurídicos à publicação eletrónica do Jornal Oficial da União Europeia; está em linha, desde março, o novo portal comum EUR-Lex, com novos diretórios sobre legislação da UE e documentos conexos, processos legislativos, acesso à versão do JO que faz fé e estruturas melhoradas de busca e transmissão de informações. A Comissão vai igualmente prosseguir os seus esforços para melhorar a qualidade da elaboração de propostas de legislação da UE, em colaboração com o Parlamento Europeu e o Conselho, a fim de assegurar textos legislativos mais concisos e legíveis.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007307/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Better legislation

European legislation continues to suffer the ills that are frequently attributed to it: excessive volume, inappropriate complexity, avoidable lack of clarity, unintelligibility, continual cross-referencing, and subjects and scopes of questionable use and justification.

This fact not only distances the public from decisions made at European level, it also fuels the not always reasonable or rigorous debate regarding European intrusion into matters on which it should not comment or legislate.

How does the Commission intend to pursue efforts to simplify EU legislation, and make it more accessible and intelligible to the public?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(23 July 2013)

The Commission is simplifying legislation and improving its quality through a broad range of efforts which include impact assesment, evaluation, consultation and support for implementation. Since 2005 the Commission approved 640 simplification, codification or recasting initiatives. More than 4 450 legal acts have been repealed. Consolidated texts of all amended regulations and directives are accessible in all languages online in EUR-Lex and are updated within two to four weeks of every amendment. In parallel, electronic access to the full body of EC law is also being significantly improved: the electronic one-stop-shop in the area of justice — the 'e-Justice Portal', was launched in 2011. On 1 July 2013, Regulation 2006/2013 came into force giving legal effect to the electronic publication of the Official Journal. The new EUR-Lex Common Portal is online since March, with new directories on EC law and related documents, legislative procedures, access to the authentic OJ and improved search and reporting facilities. The Commission will also continue its efforts to improve the quality of the drafting of its proposals for EU legislation, working with the European Parliament and Council to ensure more concise and readable legislative texts.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007308/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Papel das macrorregiões na futura política de coesão

Tendo em conta, nomeadamente, a aplicação prática da estratégia da União Europeia para o Báltico, como avalia o futuro papel das macrorregiões na política europeia de coesão?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

O valor acrescentado das estratégias macrorregionais, tanto para os Estados-Membros como para as suas regiões, ficou demonstrado no recente relatório de avaliação da Comissão ([1]). A abordagem macrorregional reforça a abordagem da UE em relação à futura política de coesão de crescimento e coesão territorial. Incentiva a tomada de decisão política, a nível coletivo, e exorta a uma maior integração e coordenação. 55 % das partes interessadas na estratégia da União Europeia para a região do mar Báltico consideram-na como uma estratégia regional construtiva que concretiza passo a passo uma implementação mais coerente das medidas políticas a nível da UE.

A Comissão considera que o período atual é um indicador fundamental do papel das estratégias para as macrorregiões na futura política de coesão. Uma das importantes conclusões apresentadas no relatório é a necessidade de melhorar a execução das suas estratégias. As estratégias são iniciativas pilotadas pelos Estados-Membros e o seu papel na futura política de coesão está firmemente relacionado com as escolhas em termos de programação e implementação dos próprios Estados-Membros.

([1]) COM(2013) 468 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007308/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: The role of macroregions in future cohesion policy

In view of the practical implementation of the EU strategy for the Baltic Sea Region, what role does the Commission believe macroregions will play in future European cohesion policy?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The added-value of macro-regional strategies for both Member States and their regions has been demonstrated by the recent Commission evaluation report ([1]). The macro-regional approach reinforces the EU's approach to future cohesion policy of growth and territorial cohesion. It fosters political decision-making at a collective level and encourages greater integration and coordination. 55% of the European Union of the Baltic Sea Region stakeholders see the strategy as providing regional building blocks for more coherent EU-level policy implementation.

The Commission considers that the current period is a crucial indicator for the role of macro-regional strategies in future cohesion policy. A significant conclusion in the report is the need to further improve the implementation of the strategies. The strategies are Member State led initiatives and their role in future cohesion policy lies firmly in the programming and implementation choices of the Member States themselves.

([1]) COM(2013) 468 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007309/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Gabinete Europeu de Apoio em matéria de Asilo

O Gabinete Europeu de Apoio em matéria de Asilo pode constituir um passo importante no sentido da adoção de melhores práticas, do estreitamento de relações de confiança entre Estados e na consequente melhoria no intercâmbio de informações.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

— Considera que o Gabinete Europeu de Apoio em matéria de Asilo contribui para conciliar os legítimos interesses e preocupações dos nacionais dos Estados-Membros com as necessidades daqueles que os procuram? Por que formas?

Resposta dada por Cecilia Malmström em nome da Comissão
(5 de agosto de 2013)

Ao estabelecer o sistema europeu comum de asilo, foram tidas em conta as necessidades, os interesses legítimos e as preocupações. Ao consultar os Estados-Membros e outras partes pertinentes, dando apoio e desenvolvendo cooperações concretas, o Gabinete Europeu de Apoio em matéria de Asilo contribui para assegurar que a nova legislação seja corretamente implementada de forma coerente e equilibrada.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007309/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: European Asylum Support Office

The European Asylum Support Office (EASO) could be an important step towards adopting best practices, establishing closer relationships of trust between Member States and consequently improving the exchange of information.

— Does the Commission believe that the EASO contributes to reconciling the legitimate interests and concerns of the nationals of Member States with the needs of asylum-seekers, and how?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

In establishing the Common European Asylum System, needs, legitimate interests and concerns have been taken into account. By consulting Member States and other relevant stakeholders, providing support and developing practical cooperation, the European Asylum Support Office is contributing to ensure that the new legislation will be implemented in a coherent and balanced manner.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007310/13
an die Kommission
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)
(20. Juni 2013)

Betrifft: Kinderarbeit im Kakaosektor

Laut Unicef üben weltweit mehr als 215 Millionen Kinder eine gefährliche Tätigkeit aus, von denen immer noch 158 Millionen Kinder zwischen 5 und 14 Jahren alt sind. Trotz der Unterzeichnung des Internationalen Kakao-Übereinkommens von 2010 wurden seitdem kaum Anstrengungen unternommen, der Kinderarbeit ein Ende zu setzen. Die Erhebung einer Studie an der US-amerikanischen Tulane-Universität besagt, dass noch immer über 820 000 Kinder in der Elfenbeinküste und ca. 1 Million Kinder in Ghana unter Bedingungen, die laut internationalen Bestimmungen von IAO und UN strengstens verboten sind und auch gewisse Gefahren darstellen, auf Kakaoplantagen arbeiten.

Vor dem Hintergrund der Entschließung des Europäischen Parlaments vom 29.2.2012 zu Kinderarbeit im Kakaosektor (P7_TA(2012)0080) stellen sich folgende Fragen:

1. Ist die Kommission über die geschilderte Situation bereits informiert bzw. sind der Kommission weitere Missstände in anderen Mitgliedstaaten des Internationalen Kakao-Übereinkommens von 2010 bekannt?

2. Was hat die Kommission bis dato zum Schutz der Menschenrechte im internationalen Handel auf diesem Gebiet geleistet und welche weiteren Schritte wird sie zukünftig einleiten, um solchen Missständen entgegenzuwirken?

3. Sieht die Kommission eine Verbesserung der bisherigen Intransparenz der Produktionsbedingungen im Kakaosektor?

4. Zieht die Kommission eine Ausweitung sowie ausweitende Umsetzung des Harkin-Engel-Protokolls in Betracht?

5. Das Parlament weist in der oben erwähnten Entschließung darauf hin, dass das Europäische Komitee für Normung (CEN) unlängst beschlossen hat, einen Projektausschuss einzurichten, der sich mit der Erarbeitung einer europäischen Norm für rückverfolgbaren, nachhaltig produzierten Kakao befasst. Wie sieht die Kommission die Einführung eines Legislativtextes, der die Rückverfolgung von nachhaltig produziertem Kakao ermöglicht?

Antwort von Herrn Piebalgs im Namen der Kommission
(12. August 2013)

1. Die Kommission verurteilt entschieden Verstöße gegen die im Internationalen Kakao-Übereinkommen von 2010 ([1]) vorgesehenen Bestimmungen zur Kinderarbeit und gegen das Übereinkommen Nr. 182 der ILO ([2]) über die schlimmsten Formen der Kinderarbeit (WFCL) und das Übereinkommen Nr. 138 über das Mindestalter für die Zulassung zur Beschäftigung.

2. Im Einklang mit ihrem entschlossenen Engagement für Schutz und Förderung der Rechte des Kindes weltweit hat die Kommission auf Basis der bestehenden Rechtsgrundlage konkrete Strategien sowohl für die internen Politikbereiche als auch im Außenbereich entwickelt. Um sicherzustellen, dass die Rechte von Kindern vollständig verwirklicht werden, und in einem integrierten Ansatz angemessen auf deren grundlegenden Bedürfnisse einzugehen, arbeitet die Kommission im Bereich des Sozialschutzes ([3]) an geeigneten Maßnahmen zur Verbesserung der Lebensbedingungen, was Familien und Kindern unmittelbar zugutekommt ([4]). Im Bereich der Handelspolitik bietet das jüngste Arbeitspapier zum Thema Handel und Kinderarbeit („Trade and WFCL“ ([5])) eine umfassende Darstellung des aktuellen Sachstands.

([1]) ICA.
([2]) Internationale Arbeitsorganisation.
([3]) Mitteilung „Sozialschutz in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit der Europäischen Union“ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/social-protection/documents/com_2012_446_de.pdf
([4]) Mitteilung „Außenmaßnahmen der EU: Ein besonderer Platz für Kinder“ http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0055:FIN:DE:PDF
([5]) Arbeitsdokument der Kommissionsdienststellen zum Thema Handel und schlimmste Formen der Kinderarbeit („Trade and WFCL“) http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/may/tradoc_151114.pdf

3. Als positive Entwicklungen sind die verstärkte Sensibilisierung der Öffentlichkeit sowie das Interesse der Kakaoverbände und deren Erklärungen über die Transparenz der Kakaoerzeugungsbedingungen zu werten. Die Kommission begrüßt das zunehmende Engagement der Kakaowirtschaft, privater Verbände und der Produzenten in den Partnerländern zur Bekämpfung der schlimmsten Formen der Kinderarbeit.

4. Die Kommission würde die Verlängerung oder Ausweitung der Anwendung des Protokolls ([6]) im Einklang mit dem ILO-Übereinkommen Nr. 182 (Harkin-Engel-Protokoll) unter Verantwortung der Vereinten Nationen unterstützen.

5. Die Einrichtung eines Projektausschusses durch das CEN ([7]), der sich mit einer rückverfolgbaren und nachhaltigen Kakaoproduktion befasst, wird begrüßt. Die Kommission trifft zudem regelmäßig mit EU- und internationalen Kakaoverbänden zusammen und unterstützt deren Engagement für CSR ([8])-Maßnahmen, insbesondere in den Bereichen Kinderarbeit (WFCL), Transparenz und Rückverfolgbarkeit.

([6]) Protokoll über Anbau und Verarbeitung von Kakaobohnen und Folgeerzeugnissen.
([7]) Europäisches Komitee für Normung.
([8]) Soziale Verantwortung der Unternehmen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007310/13
to the Commission
Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Child labour in the cocoa industry

According to Unicef more than 215 million children worldwide work in dangerous conditions. Of these, 158 million children are aged between 5 and 14. Despite the signing of the 2010 International Cocoa Agreement, hardly any efforts have been made since then to bring child labour to an end. A study by Tulane University in the United States has found that more than 820 000 children in Côte d'Ivoire and approximately one million children in Ghana are still working on cocoa plantations under hazardous conditions that blatantly contravene the international regulations of the ILO and the UN.

In light of the European Parliament resolution of 29 February 2012 on child labour in the cocoa sector (P7_TA(2012)0080) certain questions arise.

1. Has the Commission already been informed of these facts and does it know of further abuses in other states signatory to the 2010 International Cocoa Agreement?

2. What has the Commission done to date to protect human rights in international trade in this industry and what further steps will it introduce in future, in order to counteract such abuses?

3. Does the Commission see any signs of greater transparency over production conditions in the cocoa industry, which has been lacking until now?

4. Is the Commission considering extending the Harkin-Engel Protocol or broadening its implementation?

5. In the aforementioned resolution, Parliament pointed out that the European Committee for Standardisation (CEN) recently decided to set up a project committee to manage development of a European standard for traceable, sustainably produced cocoa. How would the Commission view the introduction of a legislative text to make it possible to trace sustainably produced cocoa?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

1. The Commission resolutely condemns the infringement of the 2010 ICA ([1]) regarding child labour abuse and ILO ([2]) Conventions' violation 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) and 138 on the minimum age of work.

2. In its firm commitment to protect and promote children's rights at a global level the Commission has developed various concrete internal and external policies under existing legal basis. In order to ensure full realisation of children's rights and to appropriately respond to their basic needs in an integrated approach, the Commission works on adequate social protection ([3]) interventions by improving living standards which directly benefit families and children ([4]). Regarding trade policy, the recent Staff Working Document 'Trade and WFCL' ([5]) provides a comprehensive presentation.

3. An increase in public awareness and the cocoa associations' concerns and declarations on the transparency of cocoa production conditions are positive developments. The Commission welcomes the increasing engagement of the cocoa-supply-chain, private associations and partner country producers to combat WFCL.

4. The Commission would support the extension or broadening of the implementation of the Protocol ([6]) in compliance with ILO Convention 182 (Harkin-Engel Protocol) under the UN responsibility.

([1]) International Cocoa Agreement.
([2]) International Labour Organisation.
([3]) Communication 'Social Protection in the EU Development Cooperation', http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/social-protection/documents/com_2012_446_en.pdf
([4]) Communication 'A Special Place for Children in EU External Action',. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0055:FIN:EN:PDF
([5]) Staff Working Document 'Trade and WFCL', http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/may/tradoc_151114.pdf
([6]) Protocol for the Growing and Processing of Cocoa Beans and their Derivative Products.

5. The set-up of a project committee by the CEN ([7]) to work on traceable and sustainable cocoa production is welcome. The Commission also regularly meets EU and international cocoa associations and supports their engagement towards CSR ([8]) practices, in particular on WFCL, transparency and traceability.

([7]) European Committee for Standardisation.
([8]) Corporate Social Responsibility.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007311/13
προς την Επιτροπή
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(20 Ιουνίου 2013)

Θέμα: Καταστροφή της πολιτιστικής μας κληρονομιάς

Σύμφωνα με πρόσφατη ανακοίνωση της Europa Nostra, της κορυφαίας ευρωπαϊκής οργάνωσης για την πολιτιστική κληρονομιά, ανάμεσα στα 7 πολιτιστικά μνημεία της Ευρώπης που διατρέχουν τον μεγαλύτερο κίνδυνο καταστροφής είναι και η νεκρή ζώνη, η οποία διαχωρίζει την πρωτεύουσα της Κύπρου. Οι δεκαετίες ερήμωσης έχουν οδηγήσει στην καταστροφή της αξιόλογης αρχιτεκτονικής που κοσμούσε την περιοχή με μοναδικά μεσαιωνικά, νεοκλασικά αλλά και παραδοσιακά κτίρια. Επιπλέον, καταστροφικές συνέπειες εντοπίζονται επίσης στην ποιότητα του περιβάλλοντος και των συνθηκών διαβίωσης ολόκληρου του κέντρου της Λευκωσίας.

Αποτελεί λοιπόν αναντίλεκτη διαπίστωση πως απαιτείται άμεση δράση διάσωσης της περιοχής.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Μπορεί η ΕΕ να λάβει άμεσα μέτρα για την αναβίωση της περιοχής, μέσω της συντήρησης των ιστορικών κτιρίων της νεκρής ζώνης; Υπάρχουν επιπρόσθετα ευρωπαϊκά κονδύλια, τα οποία θα μπορούσαν να αξιοποιηθούν άμεσα στην νεκρή ζώνη προκειμένου να διαφυλάξουμε την πολιτιστική μας κληρονομιά;

Απάντηση του κ. Füle εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(5 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013)

Η Επιτροπή είναι ενήμερη για την κατάσταση των κτηρίων στην ουδέτερη ζώνη.

Μέσω του προγράμματος βοήθειας προς την τουρκοκυπριακή κοινότητα, η Επιτροπή είχε χρηματοδοτήσει την αποκατάσταση των προσόψεων των κτηρίων κατά μήκος της μιας πλευράς του σημείου διέλευσης πεζών της οδού Λήδρας που οριοθετεί τη ζώνη ασφαλείας. Γενικότερα, η Επιτροπή στηρίζει το έργο του «ενιαίου ρυθμιστικού σχεδίου της Λευκωσίας», το οποίο αποβλέπει στη διαφύλαξη και αποκατάσταση ορισμένων τμημάτων της εντός των τειχών Λευκωσίας.

Με το πρόγραμμα αυτό, η Επιτροπή στηρίζει το έργο της δικοινοτικής τεχνικής επιτροπής για την πολιτιστική κληρονομιά που τελεί υπό την αιγίδα των Ηνωμένων Εθνών. Η δικοινοτική τεχνική επιτροπή είναι αυτή που αποφασίζει σε ποια έργα θα δοθεί προτεραιότητα βάσει του καταλόγου 40 μνημείων από ολόκληρο το νησί επί του οποίου συμφώνησαν σε πολιτικό επίπεδο οι δύο ηγέτες. Ο κατάλογος δεν περιλαμβάνει κτήρια στην ουδέτερη ζώνη. Για να εξασφαλισθεί η αποδοτικότητα και αποτελεσματικότητα της χρηματοδότησης, και δεδομένου του πολύπλοκου πολιτικού περιβάλλοντος, η χρηματοδότηση της ΕΕ επικεντρώνεται στη στήριξη των έργων που επιλέγει η δικοινοτική επιτροπή.

Το ζήτημα που έθεσε το Αξιότιμο Μέλος καταδεικνύει για μία ακόμη φορά τον επείγοντα χαρακτήρα της συνολικής διευθέτησης του Κυπριακού.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007311/13
to the Commission
Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Destruction of our cultural heritage

According to a recent announcement by Europa Nostra, the leading European cultural heritage organisation, one of the seven cultural sites in Europe most at risk of destruction is the buffer zone dividing the capital of Cyprus. Decades of neglect have led to the destruction of the remarkable architecture that adorned the area with unique mediaeval, neoclassical and traditional buildings. In addition, the consequences for the quality of the environment and living conditions in the entire centre of Nicosia have been catastrophic.

It is therefore an incontrovertible fact that immediate action is required to preserve the area's cultural heritage.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

Can the EU take immediate steps to revive the area through the preservation of historic buildings in the buffer zone? Are additional European funds available, which could be used directly in the buffer zone to enable us to preserve our cultural heritage?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(5 September 2013)

The Commission is aware of the state of buildings in the buffer zone.

Through the Aid Programme to the Turkish Cypriot community, the Commission had financed the restoration of the facades of the buildings alongside one side of the Ledra street crossing point delimiting the buffer zone. More generally, the Commission is supporting the work of the 'Nicosia Master plan', which aims at preserving and rehabiliting some parts of the walled city of Nicosia.

With the programme, the Commission is supporting the work of the bi-communal technical committee on cultural heritage operating under UN auspices. It is for the bi-communal technical Committee to decide which projects to prioritise based on the island-wide list of 40 monuments agreed at political level by both leaders. The list does not include buildings in the buffer zone. In order to make the funding efficient and effective, and given the complex political environment, EU funding is devoted to support the projects chosen by the bi-communal Committee.

The issue raised by the Honourable Members once again emphasises the urgency of reaching a comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007314/13
à la Commission (Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: VP/HR — Rohingyas: minorité la plus persécutée du monde

Les Rohingyas sont la minorité la plus persécutée au monde. Les propos du président birman, le 12 juillet dernier, devant le commissaire des Nations unies pour les réfugiés en disent long: si Thein Sein défend le dialogue avec les minorités ethniques (et même avec leur éventuel bras armé), il dit à propos des Rohingyas qu'«il est impossible d'accepter leur présence en Birmanie, qu'ils sont entrés illégalement dans le pays et qu'ils ne font pas partie du système ethnique birman». Quant à la «dame de Rangoun», interrogée sur leur sort lors de son voyage en Europe, fin juin, Aung San Suu Kyi a hésité à prendre leur défense en appelant simplement à la «réconciliation nationale».

Les autorités birmanes agissent de manière inacceptable. Les forces de sécurité birmanes n'ont protégé ni les Arakanais ni les Rohingyas contre les attaques commises de part et d'autre, et ont ensuite déclenché une campagne de violences et de rafles massives contre les Rohingyas. Le gouvernement affirme s'engager pleinement pour mettre un terme aux conflits et aux violences ethniques, mais les récents événements qui ont eu lieu dans l'État d'Arakan montrent que persécutions et discriminations cautionnées par le gouvernement perdurent.

1. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante compte-t-elle affirmer sa totale opposition à ce qui se passe là-bas et fustiger le pouvoir birman?

2. La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante compte-t-elle également agir sévèrement face au comportement du Bangladesh qui refoule les réfugiés Rohingyas au mépris du droit international? Ceux qui ont pu rester au Bangladesh sont contraints de vivre cachés et n'ont accès ni aux soins ni à une aide alimentaire.

3. La communauté internationale semble aveuglée par un éclairage romantique du grand changement qui serait en train d'advenir en Birmanie: on signe de nouveaux accords commerciaux et, alors même que les exactions continuent, on lève les sanctions. En récompense des réformes entreprises par le nouveau gouvernement depuis la dissolution de la junte en mars 2011, l'Union européenne a suspendu en avril, pour un an, la plupart de ses sanctions. Pas évident que les Rohingyas bénéficient pleinement du pactole. Après analyse des derniers événements, d'une atrocité absolue, la Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante compte-t-elle réviser son jugement?

Réponse donnée par M[me] Ashton, Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante au nom de la Commission
(5 septembre 2013)

L'Union européenne saisit chaque occasion de faire part de son inquiétude concernant la propagation de la violence à l'encontre des musulmans et la situation des Rohingyas, que ce soit sur le plan bilatéral ou international, y compris avec les pays voisins comme le Bangladesh. La situation des Rohingyas a été ouvertement abordée dans la résolution des Nations unies sur la situation des Droits de l'homme au Myanmar du 21 mars 2013, qui exhorte le gouvernement à modifier les lois qui refusent aux Rohingyas, entre autres, le droit à l'enregistrement des naissances, le droit de se marier, la liberté de circulation, ainsi que l'égalité d'accès à la citoyenneté.

L'UE fournit déjà une assistance humanitaire et une aide au développement aux personnes déplacées dans l'État de Rakhine (principalement des Rohingyas), ainsi qu'aux réfugiés en Thaïlande et au Bangladesh. Un programme de 25 millions d'euros pour soutenir le processus de paix devrait être adopté dans le courant de l'année. Il visera à promouvoir le dialogue et la réconciliation, tout en améliorant les conditions de vie (fourniture de services de base).

Le Conseil des affaires étrangères du 22 avril 2013 a décidé de lever toutes les sanctions (à l'exception de l'embargo sur les armes), tout en encourageant expressément le gouvernement à rechercher et à mettre en œuvre des solutions durables en ce qui concerne le statut des Rohingyas. L'Union européenne continuera de dialoguer avec le gouvernement sur cette base. Il n'est pas envisagé de reconsidérer cette décision à l'heure actuelle.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007314/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — The Rohingya people — the world's most persecuted minority

The Rohingya people are the world's most persecuted minority. The remarks made by Burma's President, Thein Sein, to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on 12 July 2013 speak volumes. Although Mr Sein advocates dialogue with ethnic minorities (and even with any armed groups representing them), he said of the Rohingya people that it was impossible to tolerate their presence in Burma, as they had entered the country illegally and were not ethnically Burmese. As for the 'Lady of Rangoon', when asked about the fate of the Rohingya people during her visit to Europe at the end of June, Aung San Suu Kyi was reluctant to come to their defence, simply calling for 'national reconciliation'.

The Burmese authorities are acting in an unacceptable manner. Burmese security forces failed to protect the Arakan and Rohingya from each other and then unleashed a campaign of violence and mass roundups against the Rohingya. The government claims it is committed to ending ethnic strife and violence, but recent events in Arakan State demonstrate that state-sponsored persecution and discrimination are continuing.

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to make clear her total opposition to what is happening in Burma and to reprimand the Burmese authorities?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative also intend to clamp down on Bangladesh for its disregard of international law in sending back Rohingya refugees? Those who have been able to stay in Bangladesh are forced to live in hiding with no access to food aid or healthcare.

3. The international community appears to be blinded by a romantic narrative of sweeping change in Burma, signing new trade deals and lifting sanctions even while the abuses continue. In recognition of the reforms undertaken by the new government following the dissolution of the junta in March 2011, the EU suspended most of its sanctions for a year. There is little sign that the Rohingya people are benefiting to any extent from the country's new-found prosperity. In the light of recent events — which constitute nothing less than an atrocity — does the Vice-President/High Representative intend to reconsider her decision?

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

The EU uses every opportunity to raise concerns regarding the spread of anti-Muslim violence and the situation of Rohingya, both bilaterally and at international level, including with neighbouring countries such as Bangladesh. The situation of the Rohingya was explicitly addressed in the UN's Resolution on the Situation of Human Rights in Myanmar of 21 March 2013 which urges the government to amend laws that deny the Rohingya, *inter alia*, the right to birth registration, to marry and freedom of movement, including equal access to citizenship.

The EU is already providing humanitarian and development assistance to Internally Displaced People in Rakhine State (mainly Rohingya), and to refugees in Thailand and Bangladesh. A programme of EUR 25 million to support the peace process is expected to be adopted later this year. It will aim at fostering dialogue and reconciliation, while improving livelihoods (provision of basic services).

The Foreign Affairs Council on 22 April 2013 decided to lift all sanctions (with exception of the arms embargo), while explicitly encouraging the government to pursue and implement durable solutions to the status of the Rohingya. The EU will continue to engage with the government on this basis. There is no intention to reconsider that decision at this stage.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007315/13
au Conseil
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Sanction envers le gouvernement hongrois

Les avertissements ont beau se multiplier depuis trois mois, le Premier ministre Viktor Orban fait la sourde oreille. Les critiques sur le quatrième remaniement apporté à la Constitution hongroise il y a quelques semaines sont pourtant convergentes: ces nouveaux changements menacent le respect des droits fondamentaux dans ce pays.

1. Le Conseil compte-t-il rester aveugle devant ce qu'impliquent ces modifications? N'estime-t-il pas qu'elles donnent une prééminence juridique malsaine au parti présidentiel, le Fidesz, qui dispose des pleins pouvoirs grâce à sa majorité des deux tiers au Parlement?

2. Le Conseil appuie-t-il la lettre des ministres des Affaires étrangères allemand, danois, finlandais et hollandais adressée à José Manuel Barroso dans laquelle ils dénoncent, eux aussi, cette situation?

Réponse
(28 octobre 2013)

Le Conseil ne commente pas la situation politique interne d'un État membre; il ne lui appartient pas non plus de formuler des commentaires sur les avis exprimés par la Commission. En ce qui concerne la suite à donner à la lettre des ministres des affaires étrangères allemand, danois, finlandais et néerlandais, la question a été examinée par le Conseil à différentes reprises (le 22 avril et les 6 et 26 juin 2013).

Le 6 juin 2013, le Conseil a adopté des conclusions sur les droits fondamentaux et l'État de droit et sur le rapport 2012 de la Commission sur l'application de la Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne (doc. 10168/13).

Dans ces conclusions, le Conseil a invité la Commission à faire avancer le débat, conformément aux traités, sur la nécessité éventuelle d'une méthode systématique, fondée sur la collaboration, pour mieux protéger les valeurs fondamentales de l'Union, et sur la forme qu'elle pourrait prendre. Il a énoncé plusieurs éléments susceptibles d'alimenter cette réflexion. Le Conseil a invité la Commission à développer en 2013, sur cette base, un processus de dialogue ouvert, de débat et de coopération avec tous les États membres, les institutions de l'UE et l'ensemble des acteurs concernés.

Il est prévu que la Commission élabore d'ici la fin de l'année un document d'orientation sous la forme d'une communication, ainsi que le président Barroso l'a annoncé lors du discours qu'il a prononcé devant le Parlement européen le 11 septembre 2013.

Le Conseil a aussi réaffirmé sa volonté de coopérer avec la Commission dans le cadre de ce processus et d'examiner plus avant, lors de ses prochaines sessions, la nécessité éventuelle de méthodes ou d'initiatives visant à mieux protéger les valeurs fondamentales, en particulier l'État de droit et les droits fondamentaux des personnes dans l'Union, ainsi que la forme qu'elles pourraient prendre.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007315/13
to the Council
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Reprimanding the Hungarian Government

The warnings have been coming almost every day for the last three months, but Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban has ignored them all. Critics of the fourth revision of the Hungarian Constitution, which came into force a few weeks ago, agree that the new changes pose a threat to fundamental democratic rights in Hungary.

1. Does the Council intend to go on ignoring the implications of these constitutional changes? Does it not take the view that they are creating a situation in which the prime minister's party, Fidesz, which has unlimited powers to legislate by virtue of its two-thirds majority in Parliament, would enjoy an unhealthy, legally sanctioned position of hegemony?

2. Does the Council support the views expressed in the letter to José Manuel Barroso from the German, Danish, Finnish and Dutch Ministers of Foreign Affairs in which the latter also condemn the current state of affairs?

Reply
(28 October 2013)

The Council does not comment on the internal political situation in individual Member States, nor is it appropriate for the Council to comment on views expressed by the Commission. As regards follow-up to the letter from the German, Danish, Finnish and Dutch Ministers of Foreign Affairs, this has been examined by the Council on several occasions (22 April and 6 and 26 June 2013).

On 6 June 2013 the Council adopted conclusions on fundamental rights and rule of law and on the Commissions' 2012 Report on the Application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (doc. 10168/13).

In these conclusions the Council called on the Commission to take forward the debate in line with the Treaties on the possible need for and shape of a collaborative and systematic method to better safeguard fundamental values of the Union. The Council outlined several elements relevant for such reflections. The Council asked the Commission on that basis to take forward in 2013 a process of inclusive dialogue, debate and engagement with all Member States, EU institutions and relevant stakeholders.

The Commission is expected to prepare an options paper in the form of a communication by the end of the year as announced by President Barroso in his speech in the European Parliament on 11 September 2013.

The Council also reiterated its commitment to working with the Commission in this process, and to giving further consideration at its forthcoming meetings to the possible need for and possible shape of methods or initiatives to better safeguard fundamental values, in particular the rule of law and the fundamental rights of persons in the Union.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007316/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Sanctionner le gouvernement hongrois

Les avertissements ont beau se multiplier depuis trois mois, le Premier ministre Viktor Orban fait la sourde oreille. Les critiques sur le quatrième remaniement apporté à la Constitution hongroise il y a quelques semaines sont pourtant convergentes: ces nouveaux changements menacent le respect des droits fondamentaux dans ce pays.

1. La Commission compte-t-elle rester aveugle devant ce qu'impliquent ces modifications? N'estime-t-elle pas qu'elles donnent une prééminence juridique malsaine au parti présidentiel, le Fidesz, qui dispose des pleins pouvoirs grâce à sa majorité des deux tiers au Parlement?

2. Pourquoi n'invoque-t-on pas l'Article 7 du traité européen afin de parer à cette évolution progressive et pernicieuse des valeurs fondamentales?

3. La Commission appuie-t-elle la lettre des ministres des Affaires étrangères allemand, danois, finlandais et hollandais adressée à José Manuel Barroso dans laquelle ils dénoncent, eux aussi, cette situation?

Réponse donnée par M[me] Reding au nom de la Commission
(9 septembre 2013)

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à se reporter à sa réponse à la question écrite E-005496/2013.

La lettre du 6 mars 2013 adressée par les ministres des affaires étrangères de l'Allemagne, des Pays-Bas, du Danemark et de la Finlande au président Barroso, à laquelle l'Honorable Parlementaire fait référence, ne mentionne pas la situation en Hongrie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007316/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Reprimanding the Hungarian Government

The warnings have been coming almost every day for the last three months, but Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban has ignored them all. Critics of the fourth revision of the Hungarian Constitution, which came into force a few weeks ago, agree that the new changes pose a threat to fundamental democratic rights in Hungary.

1. Does the Commission intend to go on ignoring the implications of these constitutional changes? Does it not take the view that they are creating a situation in which the prime minister's party, Fidesz, which has unlimited powers to legislate by virtue of its two-thirds majority in Parliament, would enjoy an unhealthy, legally sanctioned position of hegemony?

2. Will it invoke Article 7 of the Treaty on European Union to deal with this insidious undermining of fundamental values?

3. Does the Commission support the views expressed in the letter to José Manuel Barroso from the German, Danish, Finnish and Dutch Ministers of Foreign Affairs in which the latter also condemn the current state of affairs?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(9 September 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-005496/2013.

The letter of the Foreign Ministers of Germany, The Netherlands, Denmark and Finland to President Barroso of 6 March 2013, to which the Honourable Member refers, does not mention the situation in Hungary.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007317/13
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Effet cancérigène des antidiabétiques

Une enquête sur la sécurité de nouveaux médicaments contre le diabète, les agonistes des récepteurs du GLP-1, menée par le *British Medical Journal* (BMJ), entraîne déjà de nombreuses réactions d'experts médicaux qui reprochent aux autorités de ne pas réagir suffisamment rapidement dès les premiers signes avant-coureurs et aux laboratoires de ne pas communiquer l'ensemble des résultats de leurs essais cliniques.

Ces nouveaux médicaments contre le diabète, connus sous le nom d'agonistes des récepteurs du GLP-1 sont devenus un traitement «de choix» du diabète et rapportent des milliards de dollars à l'industrie pharmaceutique. Ils traitent le diabète de type 2 par régulation de la glycémie et réduisent aussi l'appétit et sont donc actuellement testés comme traitement possible de l'obésité.

Le BMJ et Channel 4, une chaîne privée britannique, se sont associés pour mener l'enquête sur les risques éventuels liés à la prise d'agonistes des récepteurs du GLP-1, dont le risque de cancer. Ils concluent qu'il existe des preuves suggérant des risques possibles liés à ces médicaments et qui n'auraient jamais été publiées. Des études indépendantes, dont trois publications de cette année, remettent en cause les études menées par les laboratoires fabricants. Pour aboutir à ces conclusions, les auteurs du BMJ ont ainsi passé en revue des milliers de pages de documents réglementaires et trouvé des données inédites qui suggèrent ces effets indésirables, en particulier au niveau du pancréas. L'équipe du BMJ signale aussi que, malgré ces études suggérant des «failles» de sécurité, les laboratoires n'ont pas entrepris de nouvelles études critiques et, d'ailleurs, les régulateurs ne leur ont pas demandé.

1. La Commission peut-elle demander plus de transparence dans la communication des données d'études et ordonner l'ouverture d'un véritable dialogue sur les problèmes de sécurité du médicament?

2. La Commission confirme-t-elle que la question de la sécurité de cette classe de médicaments se pose?

3. La Commission va-t-elle demander le retrait de ces médicaments dans l'attente de nouvelles études?

Réponse donnée par M. Borg au nom de la Commission
(31 juillet 2013)

La Commission s'engage à garantir une meilleure transparence des données provenant d'essais cliniques. La récente proposition de règlement relative aux essais cliniques de médicaments à usage humain ([1]) prévoit que le promoteur soumette à la base de données de l'UE un résumé des résultats de l'essai clinique. La base de données de l'UE est accessible au public à moins que la confidentialité ne soit justifiée pour les motifs suivants: protection des données à caractère personnel ([2]), protection d'informations confidentielles à caractère commercial ou surveillance effective de la conduite d'un essai clinique par un État membre.

La législation de l'UE dans le domaine de la sécurité des médicaments a été récemment renforcée en 2010 et 2012 ([3]). Elle a instauré, entre autres, un comité d'évaluation du risque pharmaceutique ([4]) auprès de l'Agence européenne des médicaments (EMA), dont la tâche consiste notamment à traiter les signaux de sécurité des médicaments.

([1]) Proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil relatif aux essais cliniques de médicaments à usage humain, et abrogeant la directive 2001/20/CE, COM(2012) 369 final — 2012/0192 (COD)3.

([2]) Règlement (CE) nº 45/2001 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 18 décembre 2000 relatif à la protection des personnes physiques à l'égard du traitement des données à caractère personnel par les institutions et organes communautaires et à la libre circulation de ces données, JO L 8 du 12.1.2001.

([3]) Règlement (CE) nº 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); directive 2001/83/CE instituant un code communautaire relatif aux médicaments à usage humain (JO L 311 du 28.11.2001).

([4]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/about_us/general/general_content_000538.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058058cb19

La Commission a accordé des autorisations de mise sur le marché pour des médicaments contenant des agonistes GLP-1, c'est-à-dire des mimétiques de l'incrétine. L'évaluation initiale a permis d'établir que ces derniers pouvaient présenter un risque d'effets secondaires sur le pancréas et les plans de gestion des risques concernant ces médicaments recommandent aux titulaires d'une autorisation de mise sur le marché de les surveiller attentivement afin de détecter d'éventuels effets indésirables. De rares cas de pancréatite aiguë ont été signalés en relation avec l'utilisation de ces médicaments et les informations sur le produit contiennent les avertissements appropriés. De plus, l'étude Safeguard financée par la Commission se penche, entre autres, sur les preuves d'un risque de pancréatite médicamenteuse liée aux mimétiques de l'incrétine autorisés avant 2011. En vue de déterminer la nécessité de prendre une mesure réglementaire, l'EMA examine actuellement les résultats ([5]) qui semblent indiquer un risque accru de pancréatite et de modifications cellulaires précancéreuses chez des patients traités par les agonistes GLP-1.

([5]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/news_and_events/news/2013/03/news_detail_001753.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004d5c1

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007317/13
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Carcinogenic effects of diabetes drugs

An investigation conducted by the *British Medical Journal* (BMJ) into the safety of new diabetes drugs, known as glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) agonists, has already prompted numerous responses from medical experts criticising the manufacturers involved for not publishing the full results of their clinical trials and the authorities for not reacting quickly enough to the initial warning signs.

These new diabetes drugs have become the medication of choice for diabetics and have earned the pharmaceuticals industry billions of dollars. GLP-1-based drugs treat type-2 diabetes by regulating blood sugar levels and suppressing appetite; the drugs are currently being tested as a possible treatment for obesity.

The BMJ and Channel 4 (a UK private television channel) jointly investigated the possible risks linked to taking GLP-1-based drugs, including the possible increased risk of cancer. They found evidence pointing to possible risks associated with these drugs. Independent studies, including three published this year, have raised concerns about the trials carried out by the drug manufacturers. In arriving at these conclusions, the BMJ reviewed thousands of pages of regulatory reports and found unpublished data pointing to unwanted side effects, affecting the pancreas in particular. The BMJ also found that, despite these reports highlighting safety concerns, manufacturers had failed to carry out fresh critical safety studies; and that regulators had indeed not asked them to do so.

1. Will the Commission call for more transparency in the publication of the findings of studies and genuine dialogue about drug safety issues?

2. Can it confirm that there are real safety issues surrounding this class of drugs?

3. Will it call for these drugs to be withdrawn pending fresh studies?

Answer given by Mr Borg on behalf of the Commission
(31 July 2013)

The Commission is committed to ensure better transparency on data from clinical trials. The recent proposal for a regulation on clinical trials on medicinal products for human use ([1]) foresees that the sponsor shall submit to the EU database a summary of the results of the clinical trial. The EU database shall be publically accessible unless confidentiality is justified for reasons of protecting personal data ([2]), commercially confidential information or ensuring the effective supervision of a clinical trial by a Member State.

EU legislation in the area of safety of medicines has been recently strengthened in 2010 and 2012 ([3]). Among other it has established a Pharmaceutical Risk Assessment Committee ([4]) at the European Medicines Agency (EMA), which tasks include to address medicines' safety signals.

([1]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council on clinical trials on medicinal products for human use and repealing Directive 2001/20/EC, COM(2012) 369 final, 2012/0192 (COD)3.

([2]) Regulation (EC) 45/2001 of the European Parliament and the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data, OJ L 8, 12.01. 2001.

([3]) 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, Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use, OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, as amended.

([4]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/about_us/general/general_content_000538.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058058cb19.

Marketing authorisations for medicinal products containing GLP-1 agonists, i.e. incretin mimetics, have been granted by the Commission. Effects on the pancreas were identified as their possible risk during the initial evaluation, the risk management plans for these medicines instruct the marketing authorisation holders to closely monitor for adverse effects on the pancreas. Rare cases of acute pancreatitis have been reported with these medicines and the product information contains relevant warnings. In addition, a Safeguard study, which is funded by the Commission, is currently investigating, among others, evidence for drug-induced pancreatitis of incretin mimetics that were authorised before 2011. The EMA is currently investigating the findings ([5]) that suggest an increased risk of pancreatitis and precancerous cellular changes in patients treated with GP-1 agonists to determine the need for a regulatory action.

([5]) http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/news_and_events/news/2013/03/news_detail_001753.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004d5c1.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007318/13
à la Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Intempéries en France

Plusieurs régions françaises ont subi d'importantes intempéries ces dernières semaines, qui ont occasionné de lourds dégâts, des destructions et même des victimes humaines.

Ces intempéries contribuent à amplifier encore sérieusement les difficultés des agriculteurs et viticulteurs qui subissent des pertes de récoltes voire des amputations de leurs élevages.

Une solidarité européenne est indispensable pour aider les collectivités locales et les agriculteurs à faire face aux dégâts ainsi causés et aux pertes qu'ils vont subir.

Les épisodes d'intempéries deviennent fréquents dans plusieurs pays de l'Union européenne; aussi:

1. La Commission compte-t-elle fournir une aide urgente aux secteurs agricoles et viticoles touchés par les intempéries?

2. La Commission ne pense-t-elle pas qu'il faut mettre en place un fonds d'aide au monde agricole face aux calamités climatiques?

3. Quelles mesures peut proposer la Commission afin d'aider les exploitations agricoles et viticoles touchées par les intempéries?

Réponse donnée par M. Hahn au nom de la Commission
(12 août 2013)

1. Si le Fonds de solidarité de l'UE (FSUE) peut, dans certaines circonstances, accorder une aide financière pour répondre à une demande des autorités nationales, ce Fonds ne peut être utilisé que pour certains types d'opérations d'urgence publiques. Les dommages privés, y compris les dommages causés aux entreprises et aux exploitations agricoles, ne sont pas couverts par ce Fonds. La politique agricole commune (PAC) ne prévoit pas d'instruments spécifiques d'aide d'urgence autres que ceux qui figurent dans la réglementation actuelle et autres que la mesure destinée à rétablir le potentiel de production agricole et sylvicole dans le cadre de la politique de développement rural.

2. L'adaptation au changement climatique constitue l'un des défis auxquels le récent accord politique sur la réforme de la PAC devra faire face. Les États membres seront en mesure d'encourager les agriculteurs à s'associer aux mécanismes de prévention des risques ([1]) dans le cadre des programmes de développement rural. La mesure ayant pour objectif la reconstitution du potentiel de production agricole et sylvicole endommagé par des catastrophes naturelles sera maintenue. L'aide en faveur de l'assurance-récolte par l'intermédiaire du règlement OCM ([2]) unique est un autre moyen de contribuer à préserver les revenus des producteurs lorsque ceux-ci sont touchés par des catastrophes naturelles ou des phénomènes météorologiques défavorables.

3. Si l'État français décidait de faire une demande d'aide au titre du FSUE, la Commission devrait déterminer si les conditions de mobilisation de ce Fonds sont remplies ([3]). Cette aide peut être utilisée pour des opérations telles que le nettoyage, pour les services de secours ou pour le rétablissement des infrastructures. Les programmes français de développement rural pour la période 2007-2013 comprennent une mesure visant à la reconstitution du potentiel de production agricole endommagé par des catastrophes naturelles. Les agriculteurs peuvent demander un soutien du Feader ([4]) pour des investissements destinés à rétablir le potentiel de production dans les régions ayant déclenché cette procédure, pour autant que le préfet ait décrété l'état de catastrophe naturelle.

([1]) Régimes d'assurance ou fonds de mutualisation.
([2]) Organisation commune des marchés.
([3]) Dommages directs supérieurs à 3,7 milliards d'euros, répercussions graves et durables sur les conditions de vie et la stabilité économique de la région touchée.
([4]) Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007318/13
to the Commission
Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Extreme weather events in France

A number of French regions have suffered extreme weather events in recent weeks, which have caused serious damage, destroyed property and in some cases left people injured and dead.

These extreme weather events have made life even more difficult for farmers and winegrowers, who have suffered bad harvests and lost livestock.

Europe must rally round to help local communities and farmers to deal with the damage and the losses they are facing.

Extreme weather events are becoming more frequent in a number of EU countries.

1. Will the Commission provide emergency aid to the farming and winegrowing sectors affected by the extreme weather events?

2. Does it not think that an aid fund should be set up to help farmers cope with climate-related disasters?

3. What measures can it propose to help the farmers and winegrowers hit by the extreme weather events?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

1. While, under certain conditions, the EU Solidarity Fund (EUSF) may grant financial assistance following an application from national authorities, it may only be used for certain types of public emergency operations. Private damage, including damage to businesses and in agriculture, may not be covered. The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) does not provide for specific emergency aid instruments other than those foreseen in the current legal framework or the measure aiming at restoring agricultural and forestry production potential under rural development policy.

2. Adaptation to climate change is one of the challenges of the recent political agreement on reformed CAP. Member States will be able to encourage farmers to take part in risk prevention mechanisms ([1]) under rural development programmes. The measure for restoring agricultural and forestry production potential damaged by natural disasters will be maintained. Support for harvest insurance through the single CMO ([2]) regulation is another way to help safeguarding producers' incomes where these are affected by natural disasters or adverse climatic events.

3. Should the French Government decide to apply for EUSF assistance, the Commission will assess whether the conditions for mobilising it are met ([3]). Aid could be used for operations such as cleaning up, rescue services or restoring to working order of infrastructure. The 2007-2013 French rural development programme includes a measure aiming at restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters. Farmers can claim EAFRD ([4]) support for investments related to restore the production potential in those regions which have activated it and if the Préfet has declared a state of natural disaster.

([1]) Insurance schemes or mutual funds.
([2]) Common Market Organisation.
([3]) Direct damage above EUR 3.7 billion/serious and lasting repercussions on living conditions and the economic stability of the affected region.
([4]) European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007319/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Preoccupanti aspetti ambientali e sanitari relativi all'obsoleto impianto siderurgico in crisi denominato «Ferriera di Trieste»

La Ferriera di Trieste, sita nel densamente abitato rione di Servola, è un obsoleto stabilimento siderurgico specializzato nella produzione di ghisa, da molti anni oggetto di polemiche a causa dell'emissione di inquinanti. Le analisi effettuate nel 2007 dal CIGRA (Centro Interdipartimentale di Gestione e Recupero Ambientale) dell'Università degli Studi di Trieste, su richiesta della locale Procura della Repubblica, infatti, rilevavano nella zona preoccupanti valori di benzo(a)pirene, in media pari a 21 ng/m^3 (con picco a 90 ng/m^3), a fronte del limite di 1 ng/m^3 imposto dalla direttiva 2004/107/CE; quanto alle concentrazioni di PM10, queste si rivelavano sistematicamente superiori al limite di 50 µg/m^3 stabilito dalla direttiva «aria» 2008/50/CE, e risultavano fuori norma, altresì, i valori di PM2,5. I test realizzati, infine, riscontravano persino una significativa mutazione del DNA delle cellule umane esposte a tali emissioni ([1]). Recentemente, è stato accertato un drammatico collegamento tra l'impianto e l'insorgenza di neoplasie nei suoi ex dipendenti. Secondo gli esiti di un'indagine epidemiologica effettuata dall'ASS (l'Azienda per i Servizi Sanitari) n. 1 di Trieste, su incarico anche il tal caso dalla locale Procura della Repubblica, il rischio di insorgenza di un tumore ai bronchi o ai polmoni negli operai della Ferriera di Trieste è più alto del 50 % rispetto al resto della popolazione. Dal 1974 al 1994, infatti, si sono verificati quasi 300 casi su un campione di 2.142 dipendenti ([2]). A partire dal 21.12.2012, l'impianto è stato commissariato per stato d'insolvenza, ed è in fase di studio un piano industriale di riqualificazione/riconversione. Il Comune di Trieste ha nominato quale proprio consulente nella procedura un ex direttore dell'impianto, ora indagato nell'ambito di una vicenda di smaltimento illecito di rifiuti provenienti dalla struttura stessa ([3]), decisione che ha destato non poche perplessità in seno all'opinione pubblica e alle locali associazioni ambientaliste ([4]). La Commissione, che ha appena varato il nuovo Piano strategico volto a preservare la competitività della siderurgia UE ([5]):

1. è a conoscenza degli allarmanti dati emersi sullo stato di salute degli ex operai della struttura?

2. Non ritiene opportuno che tale indagine venga estesa anche alla popolazione residente nella zona?

3. Può chiarire in quale modo il succitato piano coinvolgerà la struttura e se verranno tenute in debito conto le problematiche ambientali e sanitarie emerse, accanto alle esigenze economico/produttive e occupazionali?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(30 agosto 2013)

1. La Commissione non era a conoscenza dell'indagine epidemiologica condotta dalle autorità sanitarie locali di Trieste in merito a casi di cancro tra gli ex dipendenti della «Ferriera di Trieste». Per la protezione dei lavoratori esposti a sostanze chimiche in generale e a sostanze cancerogene e mutagene in particolare esiste un'ampia legislazione dell'UE ([6]). Tuttavia, l'applicazione delle disposizioni nazionali comprese le misure in materia di valutazione del rischio e di gestione del rischio rientrano nelle responsabilità delle autorità nazionali.

2. La legislazione dell'UE non prescrive nessuna indagine epidemiologica tra la popolazione che vive vicino a un impianto siderurgico. Pertanto, una decisione a tal fine rientra nelle responsabilità delle autorità competenti dello Stato membro.

([1]) Cfr. Relazione del CIGRA di data 21.9.2007, presente nel sito dell'associazione «Circolo Miani»: http://goo.gl/jwyJw
([2]) Cfr. Reportage del quotidiano «La Repubblica»: http://goo.gl/ALGR1
([3]) Secondo le indagini, tra il 2007 e il 2008 almeno 10.000 tonnellate di rifiuti usciti dalla Ferriera di Trieste sarebbero stati destinati a discariche non autorizzate/non idonee a Trento, Montecchio Precalcino (in provincia di Vicenza) e Piombino (in provincia di Livorno). Cfr. http://goo.gl/nLzBC
([4]) Cfr. Comunicato stampa rilasciato a riguardo dall'associazione ambientalista Legambiente di Trieste: http://goo.gl/RdTFA
([5]) Piano strategico UE presentato in data 11.6.2013: http://goo.gl/dUIKY
([6]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1998L0024:20070628:IT:PDF and http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:158:0050:0076:IT:PDF

3. A giugno la Commissione ha presentato un piano d'azione ([7]) per una siderurgia europea competitiva e sostenibile al fine di aiutare il settore ad affrontare le sfide odierne e porre le basi per la competitività futura. La Commissione è consapevole delle implicazioni sanitarie e ambientali di certe industrie siderurgiche in Europa e il piano d'azione affronta gli aspetti della produzione economica, dei requisiti occupazionali e delle problematiche ambientali con un approccio omnicomprensivo. In ciò rientra l'invito alla Banca europea per gli investimenti a contemplare la possibilità di erogare finanziamenti ad impianti che rispettino la direttiva sulle emissioni industriali ([8]) al fine di prevenire danni alla salute umana e all'ambiente.

([7]) COM(2013) 407.
([8]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:334:0017:0119:IT:PDF

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007319/13
to the Commission
Andrea Zanoni (ALDE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Alarming environmental and health issues related to the obsolete Trieste ironworks in crisis

The '*Ferriera di Trieste*' (Trieste ironworks), located in the densely populated area of Servola, is an obsolete iron and steel plant specialising in the production of cast iron. For many years it has been the subject of controversy because of its emission of pollutants. Tests carried out in 2007 by CIGRA (Interdepartmental Centre for the Management and Rehabilitation of the Environment), University of Trieste, at the request of the local Prosecutor's Office, have detected alarming values of benzo(a)pyrene in the area — with an average of 21 ng/m3 (peaking at 90 ng/m^3), compared to the limit of 1 ng/m^3 laid down by Directive 2004/107/EC. As regards PM10 concentrations, these were shown to be systematically higher than the 50 ug/m^3 limit laid down by the Air Directive (2008/50/EC), while PM2.5 values were also higher than the legal levels. Last but not least, the tests even showed a significant mutation in the DNA of human cells exposed to such emissions ([1]).

In addition, a dramatic link has recently been found between the ironworks and the incidence of cancer among the former employees of the plant. According to the results of an epidemiological survey carried out by the Trieste Local Health Authority (ASS) No 1, again upon the instructions of the local Prosecutor's Office, the risk of developing lung or bronchial cancer for workers at the Trieste ironworks is 50% higher than that of the rest of the population. From 1974 until 1994 there were almost 300 cases of such cancer out of a sample of 2 142 employees ([2]). Since 21 December 2012 the plant has been put under temporary receivership for insolvency, and an industrial plan for redevelopment/conversion is being drawn up. The Municipality of Trieste has appointed as its adviser in the procedure a former director of the ironworks, who is now under investigation for the illegal disposal of waste from the plant itself ([3]) — a decision that has caused considerable consternation among the public and local environmental groups ([4]). Since the Commission has just launched its new strategic plan aimed at keeping the EU steel sector competitive ([5]), can it answer the following questions:

1. Is it aware of the alarming data emerging on the state of health of the former workers at the plant?

2. Should such an investigation not be extended also to the resident population of the area?

3. Can it clarify how the abovementioned plan will involve the ironworks in question and whether the environmental and health issues that have emerged will be taken into account, alongside economic/production and employment requirements?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(30 August 2013)

1. The Commission was not aware of the epidemiological survey carried out by the Trieste Local Health Authority regarding cancer cases of former employees of the 'Ferriera di Trieste'. For the protection of workers exposed to hazardous chemicals in general and carcinogens and mutagens in particular, there is comprehensive EU legislation ([6]). However, the enforcement of national provisions including on risk assessment and risk management measures is the responsibility of the national authorities.

2. EU legislation does not require any epidemiological survey of the population living near ironworks. Hence, a decision to such effect falls under the responsibility of the competent authorities in the Member State.

([1]) See CIGRA report dated 21 September 2007, on the website of the Circolo Miani association: http://goo.gl/jwyJw.
([2]) See report by daily newspaper La Repubblica: http://goo.gl/ALGR1.
([3]) According to the investigation, between 2007 and 2008 at least 10 000 tonnes of waste from the Trieste ironworks were sent to unauthorised/unsuitable landfill sites in Trento, Montecchio Precalcino (province of Vicenza) and Piombino (province of Livorno). See: http://goo.gl/nLzBC.
([4]) See press release from the Trieste environmental association Legambiente: http://goo.gl/RdTFA.
([5]) EU strategic plan submitted on 11 June 2013: http://goo.gl/dUIKY.
([6]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1998L0024:20070628:EN:PDF and http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:158:0050:0076:EN:PDF

3. In June, the Commission put forward an action plan ([7]) for the European steel industry to help this sector confront today's challenges and lay the foundations for future competitiveness. The Commission is well aware of the health and environmental issues of certain steelworks in Europe and the action plan addresses economic production, employment requirements and environmental issues through a comprehensive approach. This includes an invitation to the European Investment Bank to consider financing for compliance with the Industrial Emissions Directive ([8]) in order to prevent damage to human health and the environment.

([7]) COM(2013) 407.
([8]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:334:0017:0119:EN:PDF

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007320/13
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Unicef stima la presenza di 150 milioni di bambini lavoratori nel mondo

Lo scorso 12 giugno l'Unicef ha celebrato la «Giornata contro il lavoro minorile». Secondo una stima recente presentata da questa organizzazione, nel mondo, sono centocinquanta milioni i bambini, tra i 5 e i 14 anni, che sono impiegati nel lavoro minorile. L'Unicef sottolinea che una gran parte dei minori è impiegata nelle forme peggiori di lavoro: lavori che prevedono carichi pesanti, contatto con sostanze chimiche e un orario di lavoro prolungato. In particolare, il 60 % di questi risulta impiegato nell'agricoltura, il 26 % nei servizi e il 7 % nell'industria.

Nei paesi in via di sviluppo molti bambini sono costretti a lavorare perché sono orfani o separati dalle famiglie o perché devono sostenere il reddito familiare. La recente crisi finanziaria globale ha ulteriormente spinto i minori ad avviarsi precocemente al lavoro, specie verso le forme di lavoro più pericolose.

Alla luce di questi dati preoccupanti, può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

— al fine di supportare gli Stati membri nella tutela dei diritti dei bambini nel mondo, ritiene opportuno sviluppare delle linee guida in materia?

— Ritiene che la diffusione della cultura della «responsabilità sociale d'impresa», che consiste nella promozione presso le aziende del rispetto dei diritti dei bambini nei luoghi di lavoro, possa contribuire a ridurre la crescita del fenomeno del lavoro minorile?

— Quali sono le azioni che essa ha già intrapreso e/o intende intraprendere per spezzare il circolo vizioso «povertà-lavoro minorile — ignoranza — povertà» che, secondo le stime dell'Unicef, risulta essere alla base della problematica del lavoro minorile?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(12 agosto 2013)

La Commissione è fermamente impegnata a tutelare e a promuovere i diritti dei minori. Il programma UE per i diritti dei minori ([1]) è incentrato su settori come la giustizia a misura di minore, la lotta contro la violenza e proteggere i bambini vulnerabili sia all'interno che all'esterno dell'UE.

La politica esterna dell'UE sui diritti dei bambini è in linea con la comunicazione della Commissione «Riservare ai minori un posto speciale nella politica esterna dell'UE» ([2]) e il relativo piano d'azione ([3]). Questo quadro a livello di UE sostiene le azioni degli Stati membri nei limiti delle competenze dell'UE. Inoltre, tutti gli Stati membri hanno ratificato la Convenzione ONU sui diritti dell'infanzia ([4]).

Nel dialogo con i paesi partner, la Commissione promuove la ratifica e l'attuazione delle convenzioni n. 138 e 182 dell'Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro (OIL) sull'abolizione del lavoro minorile.

([1]) COM(2011) 60 definitivo.
([2]) COM(2008) 55 definitivo.
([3]) SEC(2008)136.
([4]) UNCRC (United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child).

La Commissione sostiene attivamente la diffusione delle pratiche ([5]) previste nell'ambito della responsabilità sociale delle imprese ([6]). Nelle politiche di sviluppo dell'UE si punta sempre di più sulle sinergie con il settore privato, riconoscendo così la necessità di favorire la responsabilità sociale delle imprese in tutta la catena di approvvigionamento. Ciò comprende la lotta contro il lavoro minorile ([7]) in linea con i principi e gli orientamenti riconosciuti a livello internazionale in materia di responsabilità sociale delle imprese, quali gli orientamenti dell'OCSE ([8]) destinati alle imprese multinazionali ([9]) e i principi guida dell'ONU sulle imprese e sui diritti umani ([10]). Di recente la Commissione ha inoltre pubblicato orientamenti sui diritti umani per tre settori di attività ([11]) al fine di contribuire a renderli operativi.

È stato osservato che la diffusione del lavoro minorile diminuisce man mano che i paesi escono dalla povertà. La Commissione si è impegnata al fine di garantire un'esistenza dignitosa per tutti ([12]) nell'ambito del quadro globale post 2015 e appoggia gli approcci integrati come una migliore nutrizione, la salute riproduttiva e i diritti delle madri. Alla luce della vulnerabilità dei bambini nei confronti dei rischi nutrizionali e di salute, si promuovono sistemi di protezione sociale di base ([13]) affinché le famiglie e i bambini possano trarne un beneficio diretto.

([5]) Responsabilità sociale delle imprese — cfr. la comunicazione della Commissione «Strategia rinnovata dell'UE per il periodo 2011-2014 in materia di responsabilità sociale delle imprese», COM(2011) 681 definitivo.
([6]) COM(2011) 681 definitivo, «Strategia rinnovata dell'UE per il periodo 2011-2014 in materia di responsabilità sociale delle imprese».
([7]) Comunicazione COM(2011) 681 definitivo, «Strategia rinnovata dell'UE per il periodo 2011-2014 in materia di responsabilità sociale delle imprese».
([8]) Organizzazione per la cooperazione e lo sviluppo economico.
([9]) http://www.oecd.org/corporate/mne/1922428.pdf
([10]) http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesBusinessHR_EN.pdf
([11]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sustainable-business/corporate-social-responsibility/human-rights/index_en.htm
([12]) COM(2013) 92 definitivo.
([13]) COM(2012) 446 definitivo.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007320/13
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Unicef estimate of 150 million children engaged in child labour worldwide

12 June 2013 marked the Unicef World Day Against Child Labour. Unicef recently estimated that 150 million children between the ages of 5 and 14 are engaged in child labour worldwide. The organisation draws attention to the fact that a large number of these children are employed in the worst forms of work including heavy lifting, handling chemical substances and working long hours. 60% of these children are employed in agriculture, 26% in services and 7% in industry.

In developing countries, many children are forced to work because they are orphans or have been separated from their families, while others have to help maintain their family's income. The recent global financial crisis has pushed even more minors into beginning work early, especially into the most dangerous forms of work.

— In light of this worrying information, can the Commission state whether it would consider it appropriate to draw up guidelines in the interests of supporting the Member States in protecting children's rights throughout the world?

— Does it believe that the spread of a 'corporate social responsibility' culture promoting children's rights in the workplace could help to combat child labour?

— What action has it already taken and/or does it intend to take to break the vicious cycle of 'poverty-child labour-ignorance-poverty', which is at the root of the problem of child labour according to Unicef?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(12 August 2013)

The Commission is firmly committed to protecting and promoting the rights of the child. The EU Agenda for the Rights of the Child ([1]) focuses on areas such as child-friendly justice, fighting violence and protecting vulnerable children both inside and outside the EU.

The EU external policy on the rights of the child is in line with A Special Place for Children in EU External Action ([2]) and its Action Plan ([3]). This EU framework, within the EU competence, supports Member State actions. In addition, all Member States have ratified the UNCRC ([4]).

In its dialogue with partner countries the Commission promotes the ratification and implementation of International Labour Organisation (ILO) conventions 138 and 182 on the elimination of child labour.

The Commission actively supports the uptake of CSR ([5]) practices ([6]). Synergies with the private sector are increasing in EU Development policy recognising the need to support CSR throughout the supply chain. This includes combatting child labour ([7]), in line with internationally recognised CSR principles and guidelines, such as the OECD ([8]) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises ([9]) and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights ([10]). The Commission has also recently published human rights guidance for three business sectors ([11]) to help operationalize them.

([1]) COM(2011) 60 final.
([2]) COM(2008) 55 final.
([3]) SEC(2008) 136.
([4]) United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.
([5]) Corporate Social Responsibility — see Commission Communication 'A renewed strategy 2011-2014 for Corporate Social Responsibility' COM(2011) 681 final.
([6]) COM(2011)681 final, 'A renewed EU strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social Responsibility'.
([7]) Communication COM(2011) 681 final, 'A renewed EU Strategy 2011-14 for CSR'.
([8]) Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
([9]) http://www.oecd.org/corporate/mne/1922428.pdf
([10]) http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesBusinessHR_EN.pdf
([11]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sustainable-business/corporate-social-responsibility/human-rights/index_en.htm

The incidence of child labour has shown to decline as countries climb out of poverty. The Commission is committed to working for A Decent Life for All ([12]) as part of the post-2015 agenda and endorses holistic and integrated approaches such as improved nutrition, reproductive health and rights of mothers. Because of children's vulnerability to nutritional and health risks, basic social protection systems ([13]) are promoted to directly benefit families and children.

([12]) COM(2013) 92 final.
([13]) COM(2012) 446 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007321/13
alla Commissione
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Dazi doganali cinesi sul vino europeo

La recente introduzione di misure anti-dumping sull'importazione di pannelli solari prodotti in Cina ha provocato una dura reazione da parte del governo cinese, che ha successivamente aperto un'inchiesta e minacciato apertamente di voler introdurre a sua volta dazi doganali sul vino proveniente dall'UE, uno dei settori di eccellenza delle esportazioni europee.

Questa misura difatti andrà a colpire principalmente le esportazioni dei tre paesi europei che avevano apertamente appoggiato il provvedimento in Commissione europea: Francia, Spagna e Italia. Secondo le statistiche del 2012 le esportazioni UE di vino in Cina sono state pari ad un volume di 763 milioni di euro, di cui 77 per l'Italia, 89 per la Spagna e 546 per la Francia.

In questo contesto politico ed alla luce delle informazioni sopra riportate, tutto fa presumere che la Cina potrebbe introdurre i dazi come misura di ritorsione alla misura europea riguardante i pannelli solari.

Alla luce di questi dati, e del potenziale pericolo per l'esportazione del vino europeo, si chiede alla Commissione quali misure s'intende intraprendere affinché non venga pregiudicato l'interesse dei paesi esportatori di vino, e nello specifico quali misure preventive sono in esame per prevenire l'introduzione di tali dazi doganali.

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(20 agosto 2013)

La Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla risposta fornita all'interrogazione scritta E-005790/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=IT/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007321/13
to the Commission
Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Chinese duties on European wine exports

The recent introduction of anti-dumping measures on imports of solar panels manufactured in China has prompted a strong reaction from the Chinese Government, which, in response, has launched an enquiry and openly threatened to introduce duties on European wine exports, one of the areas of excellence of EU exports.

This measure will mainly impact on the three EU countries — France, Spain and Italy — which had openly supported the Commission's anti-dumping measures. According to 2012 statistics, EU exports of wine to China were worth EUR 763 million, of that sum; Italy accounted for 77 million, Spain for 89 million and France for 546 million.

In this political context and in light of the above, there is strong evidence that China may be introducing the duties as a means of retaliation against the European anti-dumping measures on solar panels.

In light of this information and of the potential threat to EU wine exports, can the Commission state what action it intends to take to ensure that the interests of the wine exporting countries are not affected? More specifically, what preventative measures are being considered to stop these duties from being introduced?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(20 August 2013)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to previous Written Question E-005790/2013 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/QP-WEB/application/home.do?language=EN/

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007322/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Situazione delle missioni cristiane in Africa

Sono sempre più numerose le missioni cristiane in Africa, dato che si fa rilevante soprattutto per il contributo dei religiosi indiani — 2500 sacerdoti e 6000 suore — trasferitisi nel continente negli ultimi decenni.

Come sottolineato più volte da organizzazioni internazionali quali l'UNICEF e *Save the Children*, sono molti i giovani africani che non riescono a beneficiare appieno dei risultati dei progetti di cooperazione allo sviluppo europei, incontrando difficoltà rilevanti nel frequentare la scuola, nel vivere dignitosamente all'interno del contesto familiare e nell'inserirsi in ambiti lavorativi estranei alla criminalità organizzata.

L'Africa soffre, più di altri continenti, di una fine piuttosto tardiva del periodo colonialista e soprattutto delle politiche di apartheid. I missionari svolgono un'attività rilevante nel contesto in cui operano perché si prendono cura degli abitanti dei villaggi, istruiscono i giovani e forniscono assistenza sanitaria elementare.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è in possesso di dati certi circa l'impatto positivo dell'opera delle missioni cristiane in Africa?

2. Quali misure intende adottare a sostegno delle attività dei missionari e a tutela della loro stessa persona, contro gli atti di cristianofobia che li investono?

Risposta di Andris Piebalgs a nome della Commissione
(8 agosto 2013)

1. La Commissione non è in grado di dare informazioni precise sull'impatto dell'opera dei missionari cristiani in Africa. Da un lato, la comunità dei missionari cristiani in Africa è molto grande e comprende svariate confessioni, dall'altro la Commissione non dispone di alcuno studio generale in materia. La Commissione potrebbe all'occorrenza fornire l'esito della valutazione di singoli progetti finanziati dall'Unione europea se l'onorevole deputato ci trasmette i riferimenti precisi per l'identificazione di tali progetti, condotti da missionari e beneficiari di fondi dell'UE.

2. In maniera più generale, l'UE è fermamente impegnata a promuovere e proteggere la libertà di religione e di credo, ovunque e per chiunque. L'adozione, il 24 giugno 2013, di orientamenti specifici a questo riguardo ne è il segno tangibile. In tale documento l'UE ribadisce in special modo la propria imparzialità e la propria equidistanza da ogni religione e credo. La scelta dei progetti di cooperazione da finanziare poggia quindi esclusivamente sulla loro qualità e non sull'affiliazione religiosa di chi li realizza. Per quanto concerne le attività dei missionari di natura puramente religiosa, l'UE difende il fatto che la condivisione di informazioni su religioni o credo e l'impegno in attività di persuasione al riguardo siano tutelati dal diritto internazionale, purché tali attività non abbiano carattere coercitivo né minino la libertà altrui.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007322/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Christian missionaries in Africa

The number of Christian missionaries in Africa is on the increase. Many of the missionaries come from India, which has sent 2500 priests and 6000 nuns to the continent over recent decades.

International organisations such as Unicef and Save the Children have frequently pointed out that many young Africans are unable to take full advantage of EU development cooperation projects, finding it extremely difficult to attend school, live a dignified family life and find employment that is not linked to organised crime.

Africa has suffered more than any other continent as a result of the fact that colonial rule ended relatively late there and, in particular, the imposition of apartheid policies. Missionaries play a key role on the continent, taking care of villagers, educating young people and providing basic healthcare.

1. Can the Commission provide reliable information on the positive impact of Christian missionaries' work in Africa?

2. How does it intend to support the missionaries in their work and protect them against the anti-Christian hostility to which they are exposed?

(Version française)

Réponse donnée par M. Piebalgs au nom de la Commission
(8 août 2013)

1. La Commission n'est pas en mesure de donner une information précise sur l'impact du travail des missionnaires chrétiens en Afrique. D'une part la communauté des missionnaires chrétiens en Afrique est très large et recouvre plusieurs obédiences, d'autre part, la Commission ne dispose d'aucune étude générale sur la question. La Commission serait en mesure, le cas échéant, de faire part des résultats d'évaluation de projets précis financés par l'Union européenne dans la mesure où l'Honorable Parlementaire nous transmet des références précises sur l'identification de ces projets mis en œuvre par des missionnaires et ayant bénéficié de fonds de l'UE.

2. De manière plus générale, l'UE est résolument engagée dans la promotion et la protection de la liberté de religion et de conscience, partout et pour tous. L'adoption le 24 juin 2013 de lignes directrices spécifiques sur ce sujet en est le signe tangible. L'UE y rappelle notamment son impartialité et le fait qu'elle ne prend parti pour aucune religion ou conviction particulière. Le choix de financer des projets de coopération ne s'appuie donc que sur leur qualité et non pas sur l'affiliation religieuse de ceux qui les mettent en œuvre. S'agissant des activités purement religieuses des missionnaires, l'UE défend le fait que l'échange d'informations sur les religions ou les convictions et la participation à des activités de persuasion en la matière sont protégés par le droit international, à condition que ces activités n'aient pas de caractère coercitif et n'entravent pas la liberté d'autrui.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007323/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Torture della polizia a danno dei civili — Il caso di Irfan Masih in Pakistan

L'operaio Irfan Masih è stato fermato dalle forze di polizia pakistane a Islamabad lo scorso 8 giugno, trattenuto per più di una settimana e nel frattempo costretto a confessare un omicidio mai commesso, perché sottoposto a trattamenti inumani e degradanti. È morto il 16 giugno a causa delle lesioni riportate e i medici hanno rilevato la frattura di 22 ossa nel suo corpo.

Considerando che le forze di polizia pakistane hanno riconosciuto le proprie responsabilità ma imputano il decesso di Masih alla sua «incapacità di reggere le torture», e che nessuna autorità giudiziaria ha mai autorizzato la custodia cautelare della vittima;

osservando altresì che in Pakistan si sono già registrati numerosi casi di abuso di potere e malagiustizia: torture nei commissariati di polizia, omicidi ad opera delle guardie carcerarie, morti sospette dopo sentenze di piena assoluzione pronunciate dai tribunali;

mettendo infine in evidenza la normativa internazionale, in particolare gli articoli 11 e 12 della convenzione contro la tortura approvata dall'Assemblea Generale delle Nazioni Unite nel 1984, secondo i quali, rispettivamente, «ogni Stato Parte esercita una sorveglianza sistematica sulle norme, direttive, metodi e pratiche d'interrogatorio e sulle disposizioni concernenti la custodia e il trattamento delle persone arrestate (…)» e «ogni Stato Parte provvede affinché le autorità competenti procedano immediatamente ad un'inchiesta imparziale ogniqualvolta vi siano ragionevoli motivi di credere che un atto di tortura sia stato commesso in un territorio sotto la sua giurisdizione»;

si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se sia a conoscenza delle violenze perpetrate dall'autorità pubblica in Pakistan;

2. quali misure intenda adottare per fare pressione affinché sia fatta luce sulle circostanze della morte di Irfan Masih e siano condannati i responsabili.

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

L'UE viene regolarmente informata dei presunti casi di abusi perpetrati dalle autorità pubbliche in Pakistan.

Nell'ambito del dialogo sui diritti umani, l'UE solleva sistematicamente la questione del rispetto dei diritti civili, politici e umani in Pakistan e invita le autorità nazionali ad adottare misure per garantire la protezione fisica e i diritti di tutti i cittadini del paese. L'UE esorta costantemente il governo pakistano ad attuare appieno la Convenzione contro la tortura, ratificata dal Pakistan nel 2010.

Le autorità pakistane sanno perfettamente che la qualità delle nostre relazioni dipende dai progressi compiuti sul fronte dei diritti umani e dello Stato di diritto. L'accesso del paese al SPG+ dell'UE dipende inoltre dall'effettiva attuazione di molteplici convenzioni internazionali sui diritti umani, come la Convenzione contro la tortura.

In parallelo, l'UE sostiene progetti intesi a migliorare l'accesso alla giustizia e la qualità dell'applicazione della legge in Pakistan, in particolare in collaborazione con la polizia e i pubblici ministeri. L'UE finanzierà anche progetti di sviluppo delle competenze delle istituzioni federali e provinciali, allo scopo di aumentare la sensibilizzazione ai diritti umani e la tutela degli stessi, favorire l'accesso alla giustizia per i gruppi vulnerabili e rafforzare le organizzazioni della società civile.

Attraverso l'iniziativa europea per la democrazia e la tutela dei diritti umani (EIDHR) l'UE sostiene attualmente azioni specifiche che tentano di affrontare determinati aspetti della tutela dei diritti umani in Pakistan. Un progetto attualmente in corso con Oxfam GB prevede iniziative di formazione destinate alle forze di polizia e alle autorità penitenziarie per evitare che le donne private della loro libertà vengano sottoposte a tortura. Oxfam e i suoi partner stanno inoltre partecipando attivamente ad un'iniziativa della società civile che prevede l'elaborazione di una legge che garantisca l'integrazione della convenzione contro la tortura nel diritto nazionale. Un progetto di Plan International, che si è concluso da poco, ha inoltre previsto la collaborazione con la polizia di Islamabad e consentito a 5 000 agenti di seguire corsi di formazione sui diritti dell'uomo, delle donne e dei minori.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007323/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Torture of civilians by the police — the case of Irfan Masih in Pakistan

On 8 June 2013, factory worker Irfan Masih was stopped by Pakistani police in Islamabad and detained for more than a week. He was subjected to inhuman and degrading treatment and was forced to confess to a murder he did not commit. Mr Masih died on 16 June owing to the injuries he sustained and the doctors who examined his body found that 22 bones had been broken.

The Pakistani police have accepted responsibility, but have gone no further than to state that Mr Masih died because he was 'unable to withstand the torture'. Furthermore, no warrant was issued for his detention.

Many abuses of power and of the justice system have been recorded in Pakistan including cases of torture at police stations, murders committed by prison guards and suspicious deaths following acquittal by the courts.

Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention against Torture adopted by the United Nations in 1984 state that 'each State Party shall keep under systematic review interrogation rules, instructions, methods and practices as well as arrangements for the custody and treatment of persons subjected to any form of arrest (…)' and 'each State Party shall ensure that its competent authorities proceed to a prompt and impartial investigation, wherever there is reasonable ground to believe that an act of torture has been committed in any territory under its jurisdiction'.

1. Is the Commission aware of the abuses committed by public authorities in Pakistan?

2. What pressure does it intend to bring to bear on Pakistan with a view to ensuring the real circumstances of Irfan Masih's death are brought to light and those responsible are punished?

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

The EU is regularly made aware of alleged abuses committed by public authorities in Pakistan.

As part of its human rights dialogue, the EU has systematically raised issues related to the respect of civil, political and human rights in Pakistan, and has called on the Pakistan authorities to adopt measures to ensure the physical protection and rights of all Pakistani citizens. The EU is urging the Government of Pakistan to fully implement the Convention against Torture (CAT), which Pakistan ratified in 2010.

The Pakistan authorities are well aware that the quality of our relations depends on progress in human rights and the rule of law. Pakistan's access to the EU GSP+ also depends on the effective implementation of several international human rights conventions, such as the CAT.

In parallel, the EU is supporting projects which are intended to improve access to justice and also to improve the quality of law enforcement in Pakistan, not least with the police and prosecution services. The EU will also be funding capacity-building projects in Pakistan's federal and provincial institutions to improve awareness and protection of human rights, access to justice for vulnerable groups and strengthen civil society organisations.

The EU currently supports specific actions through the European initiative for democracy and human rights (EIDHR) which seek to address specific aspects of Pakistan's human rights performance. An ongoing project with Oxfam GB is providing training to police and detaining authorities to ensure that women deprived of freedom are not subject to torture. Oxfam and its partners have been actively involved in a civil society initiative to draft a torture bill to ensure the integration of the CAT in national law. A recently completed project by Plan International worked with the Islamabad Police and trained 5000 police officers in human rights, women's and children's rights.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007324/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Chiusura delle scuole cattoliche da parte del governo di Hamas

Il governo di Hamas ha recentemente emanato un decreto attraverso il quale impone l'islamizzazione di tutti gli istituti scolastici della striscia di Gaza, uniformandoli così a quanto previsto dalla *sharia*.

Considerando che le tre scuole maggiormente a rischio di chiusura sono tre istituti cattolici che educano circa mille studenti in totale, la maggior parte dei quali di fede musulmana, consentendo a ragazzi di ogni età di istruirsi usufruendo di canali di apprendimento spesso gratuiti, perché finanziati da fondi internazionali;

osservando inoltre che la distinzione delle classi in maschili e femminili a partire dall'età di dieci anni, come stabilito dallo stesso Hamas per uniformare il sistema scolastico alla legge islamica, verrebbe a costare svariati milioni di dollari per gli edifici scolastici e costringerebbe i religiosi a cedere le loro scuole alle autorità palestinesi;

sottolineando infine che il provvedimento di Hamas ha bloccato la costruzione di altri tre istituti cristiani per i quali i permessi di costruzione erano già stati concessi, e che questa decisione impedisce a migliaia di studenti di ogni fede di accedere all'istruzione, riconosciuta come un diritto fondamentale dei fanciulli in virtù dell'articolo 14 della CEDU;

si chiede alla Commissione:

1. se sia in possesso di dati recenti in relazione al numero di scuole non-islamiche a rischio di chiusura nella striscia di Gaza;

2. se intenda adottare misure volte a risolvere la situazione e a ripristinare il diritto degli allievi e delle famiglie all'accesso al sistema educativo.

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

È difficile determinare con certezza il numero di scuole minacciate di chiusura dalle autorità de facto. Tuttavia, la legge avrebbe un impatto su tutte le scuole, non solo quelle cristiane, e potenzialmente anche su altri istituti. Sebbene l'attuazione di questa nuova misura sia in teoria prevista per l'inizio dell'anno scolastico nel settembre 2013, è difficile immaginare come possa essere effettivamente messa in atto, tenuto conto della mancanza di mezzi delle scuole in questione. Fino ad oggi non è stata chiusa nessuna scuola.

Per quanto concerne le scuole di Gaza in generale, comprese quelle gestite dall'Agenzia delle Nazioni Unite per il soccorso e l'occupazione (UNRWA), l'UE è consapevole del fatto che la maggior parte dei ragazzi e delle ragazze nella Striscia di Gaza frequentano già classi separate. Tuttavia, la recente decisione delle autorità de facto di attuare la separazione in tutte le scuole sembra rientrare in una preoccupante tendenza delle autorità ad imporre la loro ideologia alla società di Gaza.

Fintantoché la Striscia di Gaza rimane politicamente separata dalla Cisgiordania, però, i mezzi a disposizione dell'UE per affrontare adeguatamente tali questioni sono limitati.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007324/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Hamas government to close Catholic schools

The Hamas government recently issued a decree stipulating that all schools in the Gaza Strip must conform to Shariah law.

The schools most at risk of closure are three Catholic schools, which have a total of approximately one thousand students, most of whom are Muslim, and which provide schooling for children of all ages, often for free since they receive international funding.

The decree stipulates that girls and boys should be educated separately from the age of 10 in accordance with Islamic law, which would require schools to spend millions of dollars on making the necessary alterations to their premises, thus in practice forcing the religious groups running them to hand the schools over to the Palestinian authorities.

The ruling by Hamas has blocked the construction of three other Christian schools, for which planning permission had already been granted, and would also prevent thousands of students of all faiths from exercising their fundamental right to education, as provided for in Article 14 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU.

1. Does the Commission have up-to-date figures on the number of non-Islamic schools facing closure in the Gaza Strip?

2. Does it intend to take step to remedy this situation and ensure that parents and their children can continue to have free access to the education system?

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

It is difficult to determine with certainty how many schools are under threat of being closed down by the de-facto authorities. Nonetheless, the law would have an impact on all schools not just on Christian ones and potentially also on other institutions. While the implementation of this new measure would potentially be foreseen for the start of the school year in September 2013, it is difficult to envisage how it would actually be implemented due to lack of means for the schools concerned. To date no school has been closed.

Concerning Gaza's schools in general, the EU is aware of the fact that most boys and girls are already taught separately in the Gaza Strip, including in United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) schools. Nevertheless, the recent decision by the de facto authorities to enforce segregation for all schools is part of a worrying trend whereby the authorities appear to be imposing their ideology on the Gaza society.

That said, as long as the Gaza Strip remains politically separated from the West Bank, the EU has limited means to adequately address these issues.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007325/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Uccisione di un cittadino italiano reclutato per la guerra in Siria

Lo scorso 18 giugno è stata diffusa la notizia della morte di un cittadino italiano 23enne convertitosi all'islam e recatosi in Siria per partecipare agli scontri. Fonti giornalistiche autorevoli, tra cui anche il quotidiano francese «Le Figaro», hanno citato il coordinatore Ue anti-terrorismo Gilles De Kerchove, per il quale l'arruolamento di nuovi soldati da parte di gruppi armati islamisti rappresenterebbe un grave problema. Sarebbero infatti circa 800 i combattenti partiti dall'Europa verso la Siria per prendere parte al conflitto, almeno 50 di questi cittadini italiani.

La Comunicazione della Commissione al Parlamento europeo e al Consiglio (COM(2010)0386 dal titolo La politica antiterrorismo dell'UE: principali risultati e sfide future contiene una parte in cui sottolinea la necessità di ravvicinare le disposizioni nazionali riguardanti la pubblica provocazione per commettere reati di terrorismo, il reclutamento e l'addestramento a fini terroristici.

Inoltre giungono notizie riguardanti la scoperta di campi di addestramento per nuovi terroristi a PISA, nel febbraio del 2010, e sull'Etna, nel mese di aprile di quest'anno.

Infine la risoluzione del Parlamento europeo del 14 dicembre 2011 sulla strategia antiterrorismo dell'UE P7_TA(2011)0577 ricorda che «la radicalizzazione e il reclutamento rappresentano a lungo termine la minaccia più importante e persistente (…) e costituiscono pertanto l'asse su cui l'UE deve concentrare le proprie strategie di prevenzione per contrastare il terrorismo proprio all'inizio della catena».

Alla luce di queste considerazioni può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

— è a conoscenza di dati aggiornati relativi al numero di cittadini europei ora coinvolti nella guerra in Siria?

— Quali investimenti ha realizzato, nell'anno corrente, per prevenire il fenomeno dell'addestramento e del reclutamento ai fini terroristici?

Risposta di Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(26 agosto 2013)

La Commissione è profondamente preoccupata per la possibile minaccia alla sicurezza dell'UE rappresentata dalle persone che si recano in Siria per combattere, e in particolare da coloro che si uniscono a gruppi affiliati ad Al-Qaeda. Il controllo dell'effettivo numero di queste persone e la valutazione del potenziale pericolo che i rimpatriati possono costituire è competenza e responsabilità degli Stati membri.

La Commissione continua ad adoperarsi per aiutare gli Stati membri a far fronte alle problematiche determinate dalla radicalizzazione e dal reclutamento nelle fila del terrorismo. Questa è una delle priorità per la sicurezza interna. La rete di sensibilizzazione al problema della radicalizzazione (RAN), avviata dalla Commissione nel 2011, collabora con un'ampia gamma di professionisti provenienti da tutta Europa allo scopo di scambiare informazioni sul modo migliore di affrontare la questione.

Per garantire che la strategia dell'UE volta a combattere la radicalizzazione e il reclutamento sia mirata ed efficace, il 7 giugno 2013 il Consiglio ha adottato conclusioni in cui ne chiede l'aggiornamento. La Commissione è stata invitata a presentare una comunicazione che delinei misure concrete per prevenire e contrastare l'estremismo violento, basate, tra l'altro, sulle esperienze della RAN. La comunicazione terrà conto del ruolo dei professionisti che lavorano in prima linea e dell'esperienza degli Stati membri.

Al contempo, la Commissione continua a finanziare progetti che trattano il problema della radicalizzazione attraverso il programma specifico «Prevenzione e lotta contro la criminalità», il cui obiettivo è contrastare la radicalizzazione come fenomeno all'origine del terrorismo e dell'estremismo violento, rafforzare la partecipazione della società civile a livello locale e individuare le migliori prassi da seguire in tale ambito.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007325/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Killing of an Italian citizen recruited to fight in the war in Syria

On 18 June 2013 it was reported that a 23-year-old Italian citizen who had converted to Islam and travelled to Syria to take part in the conflict there had died. Authoritative news sources, including the French newspaper *Le Figaro*, have cited the EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator, Gilles De Kerchove, who seemingly regards the recruitment of new soldiers by armed Islamist groups as a serious problem. Indeed, some 800 fighters are thought to have left Europe for Syria in order to take part in the conflict, with at least 50 of them coming from Italy.

The communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council (COM(2010)0386) entitled 'The EU Counter-Terrorism Policy: main achievements and future challenges' contains a section emphasising the need to approximate national provisions on public provocation to commit a terrorist offence, recruitment for terrorism and training for terrorism.

Furthermore, there are reports of training camps for new terrorists being discovered in Pisa, in February 2010, and on Mount Etna, in April of this year.

Lastly, the European Parliament resolution of 14 December 2011 on the EU Counter-Terrorism Policy (P7_TA(2011)0577) recalls that 'radicalisation and recruitment pose the most significant and continuous long-term threat […] and thus constitute the axis on which the EU must focus its counter-terrorism prevention strategies at the very beginning of the chain'.

— Does the Commission have any up-to-date information concerning the number of European citizens now involved in the war in Syria?

— What investment has the Commission made this year to prevent recruitment and training for terrorism?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(26 August 2013)

The Commission is deeply concerned by the possible threat to EU security of individuals travelling to Syria to fight there, especially those joining groups affiliated with Al-Qaeda. Monitoring the actual number of such individuals and assessing potential threat that the returnees may pose is the competence and responsibility of Member States.

The Commission continues to work on ways to assist Member States in addressing the challenges posed by radicalisation and recruitment into terrorism. This is one of the internal security priorities. The Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) launched by the Commission in 2011 works with a wide range of practitioners from all over Europe to exchange information on how best to address that challenge.

To ensure that the EU Strategy for Combatting Radicalisation and Recruitment is focused and effective, on 7 June 2013 the Council adopted conclusions calling for its update. The Commission has been invited to present a communication outlining concrete measures on ways to prevent and counter violent extremism, based *inter alia* on experiences of the RAN. The communication will take into account the role of first line practitioners and the experience of Member States to address this issue.

At the same time, the Commission continues to provide funding to projects addressing the issue of radicalisation, through the Specific Programme 'Prevention of and Fight against crime' aimed at countering the phenomenon of radicalisation leading to terrorism and violent extremism, strengthening civil society engagement at the grass-roots level, and identifying best practices in this area.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007326/13
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto Rappresentante)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Nomina di un estremista islamico a capo della provincia di Luxor, in Egitto

Il Presidente egiziano Mohamed Morsi ha di recente nominato, quale autorità provinciale a Luxor, il militante islamico Adel Asaad El-Khayat. Si tratta di un esponente del gruppo politico musulmano conservatore Gamaa al-Islamiya.

Nel 1997, El-Khayat è stato implicato nell'attacco al tempio di Deir el-Bahri, costato la vita a 58 turisti. Oltretutto, i membri del suddetto gruppo hanno più volte minacciato di far esplodere i templi di Luxor in quanto simboli di idolatria.

Il movimento dissidente *The Rebels*, nato nel 2011 con la Rivoluzione dei Gelsomini e composto soprattutto da studenti e liberi pensatori, ha già raccolto 13 milioni di firme per chiedere le dimissioni del presidente Morsi, colpevole di aver nominato ai vertici strategici membri del movimento islamico radicale.

Ciò premesso, può l'Alto Rappresentante rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. quale modello di dialogo politico intende adottare per l'Egitto?

2. Quali azioni intende attuare per garantire la sicurezza dei turisti europei in visita nel paese medio-orientale, soprattutto quelli di fede non musulmana?

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

In seguito agli avvenimenti critici verificatisi di recente in Egitto, l'AR/VP ha emanato una serie di dichiarazioni (3, 7 e 8 luglio 2013 ([1])) in cui invita tutte le parti a tornare rapidamente a un processo democratico totalmente inclusivo, comprendente l'organizzazione di elezioni presidenziali e parlamentari libere ed eque e l'approvazione di una costituzione, per consentire al paese di riprendere e portare a termine la transizione democratica.

Per quanto riguarda i problemi di sicurezza sollevati dall'onorevole deputato, l'UE appoggia le iniziative volte a mantenere la calma e far regnare la pace sociale e politica in tutto l'Egitto, come indicato dall'AR/VP in tutti i contatti con i leader egiziani e dal rappresentante speciale dell'UE nei contatti sul campo. Inoltre, il peggioramento delle condizioni di sicurezza in alcune zone dell'Egitto è strettamente legato alla difficile situazione economica, che è al centro del programma di cooperazione dell'UE nel paese.

Infine, l'Unione europea segue con attenzione la situazione in loco nell'ambito del dialogo con le principali parti interessate al fine di adottare le misure del caso, in particolare nelle circostanze attuali, in funzione del contesto politico. L'UE rimane inequivocabilmente impegnata a sostenere le aspirazioni del popolo egiziano verso la democrazia e la governance inclusiva.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137704.pdf
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137798.pdf
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137857.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007326/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Appointment of Islamic extremist ads governor of Luxor

The Egyptian President, Mohammed Morsi, recently appointed Adel Asaad el-Khayat, an Islamist militant, as the new governor of Luxor Province. El-Khayat is a member of the conservative Islamic group al-Gamaa al-Islamiya.

In 1997, el-Khayat was involved in the attack on the Deir el-Bahri temple complex, in which 58 tourists were killed. Moreover, members of this group have threatened several times to blow up the Luxor temples, which they regard as symbols of idolatry.

The opposition movement 'Rebel', which was formed in 2011 during the Jasmine Revolution and consists mainly of students and free-thinkers, has to date collected 13 million signatures calling for the resignation of President Morsi, who is held responsible for the appointment of radical Islamists to key posts.

In light of this situation, would the High Representative say:

1. what form of political dialogue she intends to engage in with Egypt;

2. what action she intends to take to ensure the safety of European tourists, in particular non-Muslims, visiting this Middle Eastern country?

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

The HR/VP, in the light of recent critical developments in Egypt, issued a series of statements (3, 7 and 8 July 2013 ([1])) urging all sides to rapidly return to the democratic process, including the holding of free and fair presidential and parliamentary elections and the approval of a constitution, to be done in a fully inclusive manner, so as to permit the country to resume and complete its democratic transition.

Regarding the security concerns raised by the Honourable Member, the EU is supporting efforts to preserve calm and bring social and political peace across Egypt as stated by the HR/VP in all her contacts with Egyptian leaders, and by the EU Special Representative in contacts on the ground. The worsening of the security situation in some areas of Egypt is also closely related to the difficult economic situation which is at the core of the EU cooperation's agenda in the country.

Finally, the EU is continuously monitoring the situation on the ground in dialogue with key stakeholders in order to take the appropriate measures, particularly under the present circumstances, according to the political context. The EU remains unequivocally committed to supporting the Egyptian people in their aspirations to democracy and inclusive governance.

([1]) http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137704.pdf
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137798.pdf
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/foraff/137857.pdf

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-007327/13
Komisijai
Rolandas Paksas (EFD)
(2013 m. birželio 20 d.)

Tema: Tarybos reglamento (EB) Nr. 73/2009 taikymas naujosiose valstybėse narėse

Remiantis Reglamento (EB) Nr. 73/2009 10 straipsniu „Specialiosios moduliavimo naujosiose valstybėse narėse taisyklės“, sprendžiant moduliacijos taikymo klausimą naujosiose valstybėse narėse turi būti lyginami ne atskirų ūkininkų grupių išmokų lygiai, bet išmokų lygiai valstybėse narėse: naujosiose (jų išmokų lygis nurodytas Reglamento (EB) Nr. 73/2009 121 straipsnyje) ir senosiose (ES-15).

Atkreiptinas dėmesys į tai, kad ES-15 valstybėse yra didelė grupė ūkininkų, kurie gauna mažiau nei 5000 eurų išmokų ir kuriems jokia moduliacija netaikoma. Jų išmokų lygis yra 100 proc. Tuo tarpu pagal Reglamento (EB) Nr. 73/2009 121 straipsnį tiesioginių išmokų lygis naujosiose valstybėse narėse 2012 metais buvo 90 proc. Šis 90 proc. paramos lygis yra nustatytas valstybės mastu ir yra vienodas tiek ūkininkams, gaunantiems daugiau nei 5000 eurų, tiek ūkininkams, gaunantiems mažiau nei 5000 eurų.

Todėl norėčiau sužinoti, ar yra teisinga lyginti Reglamento (EB) Nr. 73/2009 121 straipsnyje nustatytą valstybės mastu 90 proc. išmokų lygį naujosiose narėse su grupės ES-15 šalių ūkininkų (tik tų, kurie gauna daugiau nei 5000 eurų) išmokų lygiu, juo labiau, kad minėtajame Reglamento (EB) Nr. 73/2009 10 straipsnyje aiškiai nustatyta, kad turi būti lyginami valstybių narių išmokų lygiai?

Koks buvo bendras visų ES-15 valstybių, t. y. visų dydžių ūkininkų grupių kartu, o ne atskiros ūkininkų grupės, kurie gauna daugiau nei 5000 eurų, išmokų lygis 2012 metais?

Ar, įvertinus aukščiau išdėstytus argumentus, Komisijos nuomone, vis dėlto teisėtai ir teisingai buvo taikoma moduliacija Lietuvos ūkininkams, ypač nepasibaigus Stojimo akte sutartam išmokų didėjimo iki 100 proc. 2013 m. pereinamajam laikotarpiui?

D. Cioloş atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2013 m. rugpjūčio 5 d.)

Pagal Tarybos reglamento (EB) 73/2009 ([1]) 7 straipsnį visose valstybėse narėse moduliavimas taikomas visoms tiesioginėms išmokoms, kurios turi būti skiriamos ūkininkui, kaip apibrėžta šiuo reglamentu, išskyrus tiesiogines išmokas iki 5 000 EUR.

To paties reglamento 10 straipsnyje numatytos specialiosios moduliavimo ES-12 valstybėse narėse taisyklės, visų pirma, kad jis taikomas tik jei tiesioginių išmokų lygis tose valstybėse narėse konkrečiais kalendoriniais metais yra bent jau toks pats kaip kitose valstybėse narėse, atsižvelgiant į moduliavimą. ES-12 ir ES-15 valstybių narių tiesioginių išmokų lygio palyginimui naudojamas 121 straipsnyje numatytas tiesioginių išmokų įvedimo lygmuo.

Siekiant laikytis pirmiau minėtų nuostatų ir taip užtikrinti, kad ūkininkams, turintiems teisę gauti didesnes nei 5 000 EUR tiesiogines išmokas, visose valstybėse narėse būtų taikomos vienodos sąlygos, 2012 m. ES-15 valstybėse narėse 5 000-300 000 EUR sumoms buvo taikomas 10 % moduliavimas, o ES-10 valstybėse narėse dėl tiesioginių išmokų įvedimo pagal 121 straipsnį tokio paties dydžio sumoms buvo taikomas 0 % moduliavimas. Šios moduliavimo dalys 300 000 EUR viršijančioms sumoms visose valstybėse narėse buvo 4 procentiniais punktais didesnės.

([1]) OL L 30, 2009 1 31.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007327/13
to the Commission
Rolandas Paksas (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Application of Council Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 in the new Member States

In accordance with Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, Article 10 on the Special rules for modulation in the new Member States, when applying modulation in the new Member States, it should not be compared with direct payment levels for individual farmer groups, but with the payment levels of Member States, both new (the payment level in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, Article 121 thereof) and old (EU-15).

Please note that there is a large group of farmers within the EU-15 who receive less than EUR 5 000 in payments and who are not subject to modulation. Their payment level is at 100%. Meanwhile, under Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, Article 121, the level of direct payments in the new Member States in 2012 was at 90%. This percentage is established at the state level and is the same for both farmers receiving over EUR 5 000 and those receiving less than EUR 5 000 in payments.

Therefore, I would like to know if it is fair to compare the state-wide payment level of 90% in the new Member States (Regulation (EC) No 73/2009, Article 121) with the payment levels of EU-15 farmers (only those who receive in excess of EUR 5 000), considering that Article 10 of the aforementioned Regulation (EC) No 73/2009 clearly states that the direct payment level should at least be equal to the then applicable level in the Member States.

What was the total direct payment level for all EU-15 farmer groups in 2012, not individual farmer groups (those who receive in excess of EUR 5 000)?

Given these arguments, does the Commission still believe that modulation was legally and accurately applied to Lithuanian farmers, especially before the end of the transition term of 2013 agreed upon in the Act of Accession, during which the payment level was supposed to increase to 100%?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

Modulation according to Article 7 of Council Regulation (EC) 73/2009 ([1]) is applied in all Member States on the level of total direct payments to be granted to a farmer as defined by this regulation with an exemption for amounts of direct payments up to EUR 5 000.

Article 10 of the same Regulation provides for special rules for modulation in the EU-12; in particular that it shall apply only if the level of direct payments in those Member States for a specific calendar year is at least equal to the then applicable level of direct payments in the other Member States, taking into account modulation. For the comparison of the level of direct payments between EU-12 and EU-15 the level of introduction of direct payments according to Article 121 shall be used.

To respect the abovementioned provisions and thus ensure that farmers entitled to direct payments in excess of EUR 5000 are treated equally in all Member States, in 2012, 10% modulation was applied to amounts between EUR 5 000 and EUR 300 000 in EU-15 while 0% modulation was applied for the same amounts in EU-10 due to the introduction of direct payments according to Article 121. Such percentages of modulation were increased by 4 percentage points for amounts exceeding EUR 300 000 in all Member States.

([1]) OJ L 30, 31.1.2009.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007328/13
do Komisji
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(20 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Rozporządzenie ograniczające limity kwotowe programów pomocowych dla osób niepełnosprawnych

Wraz z dniem 1.1.2014 r. w życie wejść ma projekt rozporządzenia Komisji w sprawie wyłączeń blokowych (WE) nr 800/2008, który zastąpi wygasający 31.12.2013 r. obecnie obowiązujące rozporządzenie Komisji (WE) nr 600/2008 z dnia 6.8.2008 r. W związku z planowanym projektem, w ostatnim czasie moje biuro otrzymało sporą ilość listów od obywateli zaniepokojonych nadchodzącymi zmianami.

Projekt rozporządzenia (WE) nr 800/2008 wprowadza roczne limity kwotowe, dotyczące programów pomocowych dla osób niepełnosprawnych. Komisja proponuje, aby kwoty te wynosiły 0,01 % PKB kraju członkowskiego z poprzedniego roku – w przypadku Polski byłoby to 40 mln euro, lub kwotę wynoszącą równowartość 100 mln euro, czyli około 420 mln złotych.

Dla porównania, roczne dofinansowanie przez Państwowy Fundusz Rehabilitacji Osób Niepełnosprawnych obecnie wynosi 750 euro, czyli około 3 mld złotych rocznie. Liczby te dotyczą 18 600 pracodawców zatrudniających 240 000 osób niepełnosprawnych.

Projekt rozporządzenia przewiduje co prawda notyfikacje pomocy udzielanej dla zakładów, po wykorzystaniu dofinansowania. Jednak od dnia zgłoszenia zapotrzebowania na otrzymanie takiej pomocy, do decyzji Komisji może upłynąć do 18 miesięcy. W opinii niektórych oznacza to, że nastąpi likwidacja Zakładów Pracy Chronionej, a najbardziej poszkodowane zostaną osoby ze znacznym stopniem niepełnosprawności.

W związku z powyższym, chciałbym zapytać:

1. Czy powyższe wnioski Komisja uznaje za słuszne i zgodne z faktycznymi ustaleniami rozporządzenia?

2. Na jakim etapie znajduje się praca nad projektem?

3. Czy wejście w życie powyższego rozporządzenia rzeczywiście spowoduje zapaść na rynku pracy osób niepełnosprawnych?

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007343/13
do Komisji
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(20 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Interpelacja odnośnie projektu nowego rozporządzenia w sprawie wyłączeń grupowych

W dniu 10 maja 2013 r. Komisja Europejska opublikowała projekt nowego rozporządzenia w sprawie wyłączeń grupowych (GBER). W projekcie tym znajduje się kilka propozycji, które mogą wywołać negatywne skutki dla osób niepełnosprawnych.

Proponowane jest ograniczenie wysokości kwoty dofinansowania na jeden program pomocowy do 0,01 % PKB. Wartość 0,01 % PKB nie może jednak przekroczyć 100 mln euro. W Polsce, gdzie rocznie wydaje się około 3 mld zł na dofinansowania na rzecz osób niepełnosprawnych, nowe przepisy oznaczałyby drastyczne zmniejszenie pomocy do ok. 159 mln zł (ok. 40 mln euro). Przekroczenie tego pułapu wymagałoby zgody od Komisji Europejskiej.

W art. 27 projektu rozporządzenia mówi się o zmniejszeniu maksymalnej kwoty pomocy na szkolenia z 80 % do 70 %. Propozycja ta może ograniczyć możliwości podnoszenia kwalifikacji pracowników niepełnosprawnych i podnoszenia ich konkurencyjności na rynku pracy.

Projekt przewiduje również wyłączenie dofinansowania na pracownika niepełnosprawnego, zatrudnionego na stanowisku, na którym poprzednio pracowała osoba niepełnosprawna zatrudniona na czas określony.

W związku z konsultacjami w ramach proponowanego rozporządzenia, zwracam się do Komisji z następującymi pytaniami:

— Co jest powodem włączenia osób niepełnosprawnych w projekt rozporządzenia, w czasie gdy właśnie te osoby najbardziej narażone są na negatywne konsekwencje kryzysu gospodarczego i polityki cięć prowadzonej przez państwa członkowskie?

— Czy istnieje możliwość wyłączenia osób niepełnosprawnych z projektu rozporządzenia i nieobejmowania nowymi przepisami funduszy pomocowych dla osób niepełnosprawnych?

Wspólna odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Joaquina Almunię w imieniu Komisji
(5 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Komisja jest zaangażowana w obronę praw niepełnosprawnych pracowników.

W kontekście trwającego procesu przeglądu ogólnego rozporządzenia w sprawie wyłączeń blokowych proponuje się poszerzenie zakresu rozporządzenia wraz z jednoczesnym wzmocnieniem środków ochrony, w szczególności wymogów przejrzystości i oceny bardzo dużych programów pomocy, potencjalnie w dużym stopniu zakłócające konkurencję. Ocena ma kluczowe znaczenie dla zapewnienia bardziej skutecznego i wydajnego wykorzystania funduszy publicznych w dobie ograniczeń budżetowych.

Próg proponowany w ogólnym rozporządzeniu w sprawie wyłączeń blokowych powodujący obowiązek zgłoszenia bardzo dużych programów może spowodować konieczność notyfikacji niektórych polskich programów w zakresie pomocy na zatrudnienie osób niepełnosprawnych. Niemniej jednak wspomniany próg został przedstawiony w projekcie ogólnego rozporządzenia w sprawie wyłączeń blokowych, na temat którego Komisja aktualnie gromadzi opinie poprzez konsultacje społeczne i dyskusje z państwami członkowskimi. Komisja otrzymała uwagi dotyczące projektu ogólnego rozporządzenia w sprawie wyłączeń blokowych od wielu obywateli oraz organizacji reprezentujących osoby niepełnosprawne, a także od polskich władz. Komisja przeanalizuje te uwagi i rozważy, jak najlepiej zająć się poruszonymi kwestiami dla dobra osób niepełnosprawnych. Należy podkreślić, iż Komisja z pewnością nie zamierza zaostrzyć szczegółowych warunków zgodności ustalonych w ogólnym rozporządzeniu w sprawie wyłączeń blokowych związanych z pomocą dla pracowników niepełnosprawnych w stosunku do obowiązujących obecnie zasad.

Zmieniony wniosek dotyczący ogólnego rozporządzenia w sprawie wyłączeń blokowych zostanie opublikowany w Dzienniku Urzędowym przed końcem roku i będzie ponownie przedmiotem konsultacji społecznych. Osoby niepełnosprawne, reprezentujące ich organizacje oraz krajowe administracje będą mogły w ten sposób uważnie śledzić postęp w zakresie wyłączeń blokowych oraz zostaną poproszone o zgłoszenie swoich uwag.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007328/13
to the Commission
Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Regulation introducing quota limits on aid programmes for disabled persons

Commission draft Regulation (EC) No 800/2008 (General block exemption Regulation) — replacing the current Commission Regulation (EC) No 800/2008 of 6 August 2008, which expires on 31 December 2013 — is set to enter into force on 1 January 2014.

Draft Regulation (EC) No 800/2008 introduces annual quota limits on aid programmes for disabled persons. The Commission proposes that these quotas be set at 0.01% of a Member State's GDP for the previous year. In Poland's case, this would amount to EUR 40 million or a quota of EUR 100 million (PLN 420 million).

For comparison, the annual funding provided by Poland's National Fund for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled amounts to EUR 750 million, or roughly PLN 3 billion. These sums affect 18 600 employers who employ 240 000 disabled persons.

The draft regulation also provides for the notification of aid granted to workplaces after it has been taken up. However, up to 18 months can pass between announcing the need for such aid and the Commission taking a decision. Some think that this will result in the closing down of sheltered working establishments, and that the profoundly disabled will be the hardest hit.

In light of the above:

1. Does the Commission consider the above conclusions to be correct and consistent with the provisions of the regulation?

2. What is the state of play of work on the draft?

3. Is it accurate to say that the entry into force of this regulation will result in a collapse ofthe labour market for disabled persons?

Question for written answer E-007343/13
to the Commission
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Draft proposal for a new General Block Exemption Regulation

The Commission published a draft proposal for a new General Block Exemption Regulation (GBER) on 10 May 2013. Some of the proposals contained in that draft could have negative repercussions for disabled persons.

It is proposed that the yearly funding for each aid scheme should account for no more than 0.01% of national GDP, with an upper limit of EUR 100 million. In Poland, where some PLN 3 billion is providing in funding for disabled persons each year, this percentage limit would drastically reduce the amount of aid that could be provided, to around PLN 159 m (approximately EUR 40 m). That limit could only be exceeded with the Commission's approval.

In Article 27 of the draft, which covers training aid, the maximum aid intensity would be brought down from 80% to 70% of the eligible costs. This could make it more difficult for disabled workers to reskill and thus become more competitive on the labour market.

The draft also rules out funding for disabled workers recruited to a post previously occupied by a disabled worker employed under a fixed-term contract.

In connection with the consultations on the draft regulation, would the Commission say:

— Why disabled persons have been included within the scope of the draft regulation, given that they are precisely the people who are most exposed to the adverse effects of the current economic crisis and the budget cuts being made by Member States?

— Whether it would be possible for disabled persons to be excluded from the scope of the draft regulation so that the new provisions would not apply to aid for such persons?

Joint answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(5 August 2013)

The Commission is committed to defending the rights of the disabled workers.

In the context of the ongoing review of the General block exemption Regulation (GBER), it is proposed to couple the extension of the regulation's scope with increased safeguards, in particular, transparency requirements and evaluation of very large and potentially more distortive aid schemes. This evaluation is key to ensuring more effective and efficient use of public funds in the times of budgetary constraints.

The threshold proposed in the GBER for notification of very large schemes might trigger the need to notify certain Polish schemes for employment aid for disabled persons. However, this threshold is proposed in a draft GBER, on which the Commission services are collecting views during the public consultation and in discussions with Member States. The Commission has received feedback on the draft GBER from many citizens and disabled people's organisations as well as from the Polish authorities. It will now analyse this feedback and consider how best to address the concerns expressed to the benefit of disabled persons. It should indeed be stressed that the Commission certainly does not intend to make the specific compatibility conditions in the GBER relating to the support of disabled workers stricter than the existing rules.

The revised proposal for the GBER will be published in the Official Journal before the end of the year and will again be subject to public consultation. Disabled people, their organisations and national administrations will therefore be able to follow closely the developments in the area of the block-exempted aid and will be asked for their opinions.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007329/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Promoção da democracia e dos direitos humanos à escala global em coordenação com os EUA

A União Europeia assume repetidamente a centralidade da defesa e promoção da democracia e dos direitos humanos não só no seu discurso mas, sobretudo, na sua prática política. Há, por isso, toda a necessidade e até urgência de conduzir este esforço de modo coordenado com os Estados Unidos da América com quem partilha a civilização e os principais valores.

Assim, pergunto à Alta Representante:

1. Em que medida a União Europeia coordena a sua ação no domínio da defesa e promoção da democracia e dos direitos humanos no mundo com a dos Estados Unidos da América?

2. Que projetos comuns nestes domínios se encontram presentemente em curso? Que resultados apresentam?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(19 de agosto de 2013)

A União Europeia e os Estados Unidos da América partilham a ambição de defender e apoiar a democracia e os direitos humanos em todo o mundo. A UE e os EUA comprometeram-se a promover a democracia, a paz e a prosperidade em conjunto e juntamente com outros parceiros, nomeadamente na Declaração da Cimeira de 2011 relativamente ao Médio Oriente e Norte de África. São feitas estreitas consultas sobre a situações de países terceiros e fazem-se intercâmbios sobre as respetivas atividades, incluindo no terreno. A cooperação em geral faz-se de forma paralela, com objetivos semelhantes ou idênticos, e não sob a forma de projetos conjuntos formais.

A UE e os EUA também cooperam estreitamente em fóruns multilaterais para defender e fazer avançar o respeito universal pelos direitos humanos e os princípios democráticos. Existem iniciativas e eventos conjuntos, assim como apoio mútuo para apoiar iniciativas específicas por país ou temáticas. Um exemplo é a cooperação na Assembleia Geral das Nações Unidas relativamente à Resolução bienal «Reforço do papel das Nações Unidas na consolidação de eleições genuínas e periódicas e na promoção da democratização», proposta de dois em dois anos pelos EUA e copatrocinada por todos os Estados-Membros da UE. Além disso, juntaram-se à UE várias ONG dos EUA especializadas na observação de eleições para promoverem a adoção e aplicação da Declaração Internacional de Princípios para a Observação Internacional de Eleições.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007329/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Promotion of democracy and human rights around the world in coordination with the United States

Defending and promoting democracy and human rights is consistently a core aspect of the European Union's discourse and, above all, its political practice. It is therefore absolutely necessary and even urgent to pursue this effort in a way that is coordinated with the United States, which has the same civilisation and fundamental values.

1. To what extent does the European Union coordinate its action with the United States when it comes to defending and promoting democracy and human rights around the world?

2. What joint projects in this area are currently under way? What results have they had?

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

The EU and the US share the ambition to defend and support democracy and human rights around the world. The EU and US have committed to promoting democracy, peace and prosperity jointly and together with other partners, for instance in the 2011 Summit Declaration with regard to the Middle East and North Africa. There is close consultation on third country situations and exchange on respective activities, including on the ground. Cooperation tends to run in parallel, with similar or the same objectives, rather than in the form of formal joint projects.

The EU and the US also cooperate closely in multilateral fora to defend and advance the universal observance of human rights and democratic principles. There are joint initiatives and events, and mutual support to country-specific or thematic initiatives. One example is the cooperation at the UN General Assembly on the biennial Resolution on 'Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization', initiated every two years by the US and co-sponsored by all EU Member States. In addition, the EU has been joined by several US NGOs active in election observation in promoting the adoption and implementation of the International Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007330/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: OLAF — meios materiais e humanos

O OLAF vem desenvolvendo um trabalho meritório no combate à fraude a nível europeu. O reforço dos meios de que dispõe e do seu quadro de pessoal são plenamente justificados.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Considera que o OLAF se encontra dotado dos meios e funcionários suficientes para que possa cumprir mais eficazmente a importante missão que se lhe encontra cometida?

2. Concorda que um OLAF mais forte, mais independente e mais atuante é essencial para uma União que se deseja mais transparente e entendível pelos cidadãos?

Resposta dada por Maroš Šefčovič em nome da Comissão
(25 de julho de 2013)

1. A Comissão considera que, com um total de 441 membros do pessoal, o OLAF dispõe de um nível adequado de recursos para desempenhar as suas tarefas. A Comissão decidiu atribuir seis postos adicionais ao OLAF, em 26 de junho de 2013 ([1]), com vista a reforçar a sua capacidade para lidar com um aumento do número de investigações relativas a casos de fraude e de irregularidades que afetam os interesses financeiros da UE.

2. A Comissão sempre foi partidária de um OLAF forte, independente e ativo e considera que a recente reforma do Regulamento OLAF deverá contribuir para este objetivo.

([1]) SEC(2013)370, de 26 de junho de 2013, Documento V bis (Afetação complementar dos recursos humanos para 2013).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007330/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) — material and human resources

OLAF has been doing a commendable job in combating fraud in Europe. It is entirely justified to give it more resources and staff.

1. Does the Commission think that OLAF has enough resources and staff to be able to carry out its important task more effectively?

2. Does it agree that a stronger, more independent and more active OLAF is vital for an EU that wants to be more transparent and understandable for the European public?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

1. The Commission considers that, with a total of 441 members of staff, OLAF has an appropriate level of resources to perform its tasks. The Commission decided to allocate six additional posts to OLAF on 26 June 2013 ([1]) to strengthen its capacity to deal with an increased number of investigations relating to fraud and irregularities affecting the EU financial interests.

2. The Commission has always been in favour of a strong, independent and active OLAF and considers that the recent reform of the OLAF Regulation should contribute to this aim.

([1]) SEC(2013)370 of 26 June 2013, Document V bis (Complementary allocation of human resources for 2013).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007331/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Apoio a países terceiros especialmente dependentes

A União Europeia, apesar da crise que atravessa e os problemas internos que afetam as suas populações, não deve descurar o apoio que concede aos países em desenvolvimento nem permitir que estes decaiam para aquilo que se convencionou designar por «geografia da fome».

Alguns destes países estão dependentes em grande medida da produção de um ou de poucos produtos, muitas vezes agrícolas, encontrando-se, por isso, particularmente expostos às oscilações dos mercados.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. De que modos concretos auxilia estes países e com que resultados?

2. Quais são, em seu entender, os casos mais preocupantes face à presente conjuntura de crise económico-financeira?

Resposta dada por Andris Piebalgs em nome da Comissão
(8 de agosto de 2013)

Apesar da crise económica na Europa, a UE está firmemente empenhada em manter ou reforçar o nível de assistência às pessoas que vivem em países terceiros expostos a insegurança alimentar e nutricional e às pessoas que vivem em países vulneráveis. Muitas pessoas expostas à insegurança alimentar dependem da agricultura para os seus rendimentos e abastecimento alimentar, pelo que são vulneráveis a uma excessiva volatilidade dos mercados, para além dos vários outros riscos a que estão expostas.

Através da programação para o período 2014-2020, a Comissão está a promover uma estratégia de resposta à insegurança alimentar e nutricional baseada em três pilares, a saber: i) agricultura sustentável; ii) nutrição; iii) capacidade de resistência às crises alimentares. A estratégia assenta na ideia de que é necessário adotar uma visão de longo prazo e assumir um compromisso duradouro a fim de assegurar uma redução sustentável da subnutrição, em vez de limitar a ação a uma resposta aos efeitos das crises. Quando aplicável, a Comissão promove a diversificação económica como medida para reduzir a exposição às crises económicas. Sempre que necessário, a assistência humanitária também é prestada através de uma combinação de instrumentos de assistência alimentar.

A fragilidade constitui também uma das principais preocupações. Por este motivo, foi aprovada uma Comunicação ([1]) em 2012 para ajudar os países a estar mais bem preparados para crises de diferentes tipos, incluindo as crises económicas. A Comunicação foi seguida de um plano de ação que reforçava a concentração nos países frágeis e expostos a catástrofes, definindo ações que devem ser postas em prática para reduzir a sua vulnerabilidade. Em conformidade com o princípio da diferenciação exposto na «Agenda para a Mudança» ([2]), a Comissão está agora a adotar uma abordagem que permita que a UE destine um maior volume e parte da ajuda aos países mais carenciados e às situações em que a sua assistência possa ter um verdadeiro impacto, como no caso dos Estados frágeis.

([1]) COM(2012) 586 final.
([2]) COM(2011) 637 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007331/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Support for particularly dependent third countries

In spite of the crisis the European Union is going through and the internal problems affecting its people, it must not neglect the support that it gives to developing countries or allow them to fall into what is commonly referred to as 'the geography of hunger'.

Some of these countries are largely dependent on the production of one or just a few products, very often agricultural products, and are therefore particularly vulnerable to market fluctuations.

1. In what specific ways does the Commission help these countries and with what results?

2. In the Commission's view, which countries give the most cause for concern in view of the current economic and financial crisis?

Answer given by Mr Piebalgs on behalf of the Commission
(8 August 2013)

Despite the economic crisis in Europe, the EU is strongly committed to maintaining or strengthening the level of assistance to people living in third countries exposed to food and nutrition insecurity and to those in vulnerable countries. Many people exposed to food insecurity depend on agriculture for their income and food supply and, thus, they are vulnerable to excessive market volatility, beyond several other risks to which they are exposed.

Through programming for the 2014-2020 period, the Commission is promoting a response strategy to food and nutrition insecurity based on three pillars, namely: i) sustainable agriculture, ii) nutrition and iii) resilience to food crises. The strategy is built on the idea that long-term vision and lasting commitment are necessary to ensure that under-nutrition is reduced in a sustainable way instead of limiting the response to the effects of crises. When applicable, the Commission promotes economic diversification as a measure to reduce exposure to economic crises. Whenever necessary, humanitarian assistance is also provided, through a mix of food assistance tools.

Fragility is also a major concern. For this reason, a communication ([1]) was approved in 2012 to help countries to be better prepared for crises of different types, including economic crises. An action plan followed the communication enhancing the focus on fragile and disaster prone countries, identifying actions which needed to be put in place to reduce their vulnerability. In line with the differentiation principle outlined in the 'Agenda for Change' ([2]), the Commission is now taking an approach leading to increased volume and share of EU aid to the countries most in need and where EU assistance can have a real impact, including fragile states.

([1]) COM(2012) 586 final.
([2]) COM(2011) 637 final.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007333/13
à Comissão
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: Proteção de dados pessoais

Os dados pessoais, a sua proteção e o direito individual a essa mesma proteção constituem matérias que têm merecido crescente interesse por parte dos decisores políticos e da própria sociedade civil. Os meios tecnológicos disponíveis constituem um importante desafio ao respeito pela privacidade individual. Este conceito tem também vindo a ser posto em causa devido à crescente exposição, voluntária e involuntária, a que hoje os cidadãos estão sujeitos. Estes deparam-se igualmente com a tensão crescente entre direito individual à privacidade e direito coletivo à segurança.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Como articula estas questões com os parceiros internacionais da União Europeia?

2. Considera que se encontra assegurado um justo equilíbrio entre os direitos fundamentais em conflito? Continua empenhada na sua compatibilização?

Resposta dada por Viviane Reding em nome da Comissão
(10 de setembro de 2013)

A proteção dos dados pessoais é um direito fundamental na Europa, consagrado no artigo 8.° da Carta dos Direitos Fundamentais da União Europeia, bem como no artigo 16.°, n.° 1, do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia (TFUE). As propostas da Comissão Europeia relativas a uma reforma das atuais regras da UE em matéria de de proteção, atualmente em exame por parte dos colegisladores, reforçarão os direitos individuais.

Não existe qualquer conflito entre o direito fundamental à liberdade e à segurança e o direito fundamental à proteção dos dados pessoais.

A acção da União em matéria de direitos fundamentais vai além das suas políticas internas. A Carta também é aplicável à acção externa da União. Em conformidade com o artigo 21.° do TUE, a acção da União na cena internacional destina-se a promover em todo o mundo a democracia, o Estado de direito, a universalidade e indivisibilidade dos direitos do Homem e das liberdades fundamentais, o respeito pela dignidade humana, os princípios da igualdade e solidariedade e o respeito pelos princípios da Carta das Nações Unidas e do direito internacional.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007333/13
to the Commission
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Personal data protection

Personal data, personal data protection and the right of the individual to the same protection are issues that have increasingly been attracting interest from policy-makers and civil society. Available technology poses a significant challenge to respect for individual privacy. This concept, too, has been called into question by the increasing voluntary and involuntary exposure to which Europeans are now subjected. Europeans are also encountering the growing tension between the individual's right to privacy and the collective right to security.

1. How does the Commission broach these issues with the EU's international partners?

2. Does it think that a fair balance has been struck between conflicting fundamental rights? Is it still committed to making these rights compatible?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(10 September 2013)

Personal data protection is a fundamental right in Europe, enshrined in Article 8 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, as well as in Article 16(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). The European Commission's proposals for a reform of the current EU data protection rules, currently under examination by the co-legislators, will strenghten individual's rights.

There is no apparent conflict between the fundamental right to liberty and security and the fundamental right to personal data protection.

The Union's work in the area of fundamental rights extends beyond its internal policies. The Charter also applies to its external action. In accordance with Article 21 TEU, the Union's action on the international scene is designed to advance in the wider world democracy, the rule of law, the universality and indivisibility of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for human dignity, the principles of equality and solidarity and the respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007334/13
à Comissão (Vice-Presidente/Alta Representante)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 de junho de 2013)

Assunto: VP/HR — Serviço Europeu de Ação Externa — meios materiais e humanos

Os primeiros tempos de efetiva existência do Serviço Europeu para a Ação Externa recomendam especial atenção por parte das instituições europeias e dos Estados-Membros de modo a poderem monitorizar devidamente a sua ação, identificarem os seus principais problemas e procurarem resolvê-los.

Assim, pergunto à Alta Representante:

1. Que avaliação faz do funcionamento do SEAE?

2. Recebeu propostas ou recomendações das instituições europeias e dos Estados-Membros no sentido de promover a melhoria do seu funcionamento?

3. Considera que o SEAE dispõe de meios humanos e técnicos e uma dotação orçamental adequados às suas competências?

Resposta dada pela Alta Representante/Vice-Presidente Catherine Ashton em nome da Comissão
(19 de agosto de 2013)

1. A próxima avaliação do trabalho do SEAE será a oportunidade para a AR/VP apresentar a sua apreciação do funcionamento e das atividades deste serviço.

2. Os Estados-Membros, o Parlamento Europeu e outros intervenientes têm feito muitas observações e sugestões durante a preparação da avaliação. Em especial, os Estados-Membros debateram esta questão na reunião de Gymnich em Dublin, a 22 e 23 de março.

A AR/VP apresentou a sua posição no debate do PE em sessão plenária, a 12 de junho, em resposta ao relatório da Comissão dos Negócios Estrangeiros sobre esta matéria.

3. O presente contexto orçamental difícil na UE constitui naturalmente um entrave ao nível de ambição de desenvolvimento deste serviço.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007334/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Diogo Feio (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — European External Action Service — material and human resources

In the early days of its effective existence, the European institutions and Member States should pay special attention to the European External Action Service (EEAS) so that they can properly monitor its activities, identify its main problems and seek to resolve them.

1. What is the Vice-President/High Representative's assessment of the functioning of the EEAS?

2. Has she received any proposals or recommendations from the European institutions and the Member States to encourage improvement in how it functions?

3. Does she think that the EEAS has human and technical resources and a budget that are commensurate with its powers?

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

1. The forthcoming review of the EEAS will be the opportunity for the HR/VP to present her assessment of the operating and functionning of the Service.

2. There have been many comments and suggestions from Member States, the European Parliament as well as other actors in the preparation of the review. In particular there was a discussion among FMs at the Gymnich meeting in Dublin on 22-23 March.

The HR/VP set out her position in the plenary debate in the EP on 12 June in response to the report from the Foreign Affairs Committee on this topic.

3. The present acute budgetary context in the EU is naturally a constraint on the level of ambition for the development of the Service.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení P-007335/13
Komisi
Pavel Poc (S&D)
(20. června 2013)

Předmět: Porušování legislativy, vlastnických a občanských práv vlastníků zemědělských pozemků v obci Żurawlow ze strany Chevron Polska

Od 3. června 2013 protestují zemědělci z obce Żurawlów a ze sousedních vesnic Rohy, Szczelatyn a Siedlisko v gmině Grabowiec v jihovýchodním Polsku proti nezákonné činnosti polské společnosti Chevron Polska. Společnost získala dne 6. prosince 2007 licenci 30/2007/p na průzkum břidlicového plynu v oblasti Grabowiec o rozloze asi 1 200 km^2 zahrnující 19 obcí v okolí města Zamość. Koncese byla udělena na průzkumné vrty do hloubky 3 800 m dne 6. června 2012. Tato koncese zanikla z důvodu propadnutí lhůty.

Dne 30. listopadu 2012 na základě protestů zemědělců a jejich právních kroků ministerstvo životního prostředí Polska sdělilo, že řízení bude pokračovat podle plánu vydaného rozhodnutí o prodloužení koncese. K dnešnímu dni však řízení ministerstva životního prostředí Polské republiky nebylo zahájeno.

Chevron stáhl svou žádost o rozhodnutí o environmentálních podmínkách pro umístění investic do Żurawlowie a podle vyjádření mluvčí státní televize dne 15. července 2012 ustoupil od realizace vrtů v gminách včetně Grabowiec.

Přestože neexistuje platná licence k provádění průzkumných vrtů v gmině Grabowiec, pokusil se Chevron Polska dne 3. června 2013 na pronajatých pozemcích v Żurawlowie započít práce pro výstavbu oplocení, převoz kontejnerů, technických zařízení pro plošné osvětlení a generátorů elektrické energie. Zemědělci z okolních obcí zablokovali vjezdy pro další plánované práce, a nenechali v nich firmu pokračovat. Byla předvolána policie a starosta Grabowiec.

1. Je Komise informována o této situaci a pokud ano, jaké učinila nebo hodlá učinit kroky?

2. Je si Komise vědoma toho, že v těsné blízkosti lokality se nachází vzácné mokřadní oblasti NATURA 2 000?

3. Je si Komise vědoma toho, že povolení k průzkumu a těžbě břidlic byla vydána i pro ty oblasti Polska, které patří k největším zásobárnám pitné vody v zemi?

4. Má Komise prostředky a možnosti, jak zasáhnout proti ohrožování veřejného zdraví a životního prostředí v případě průzkumných vrtů a těžby břidlicového plynu?

Odpověď pana Potočnika jménem Komise
(19. července 2013)

Komise nesleduje podrobně konkrétní případy těžby břidlicového plynu v jednotlivých lokalitách nebo oblastech. Je na členských státech, aby zajistily – prostřednictvím náležitého posouzení, povolovacích řízení a sledování činnosti – že veškerý průzkum či těžba energetických surovin, včetně těch, u nichž se používá hydraulické štěpení, jsou v souladu s požadavky stávajících právních předpisů v EU. K těmto předpisům patří mimo jiné ustanovení o posuzování vlivu na životní prostředí a o účasti veřejnosti ([1]), o ochraně povrchových a podzemních vod ([2]), o nakládání s odpady ([3]) a o ochraně přírodních stanovišť ([4]).

Komise zařadila do svého pracovního programu na rok 2013 „Rámec pro environmentální, klimatické a energetické posouzení, který umožní bezpečnou a zabezpečenou nekonvenční těžbu uhlovodíků“, jako novou iniciativu (u které bude provedeno posouzení dopadu). Tato iniciativa si klade za cíl mimo jiné vytvořit rámec pro řízení rizik a zajistit maximální právní srozumitelnost a předvídatelnost pro účastníky trhu i občany v celé EU. Během její přípravy budou důkladně zváženy i podobné otázky, jaké předložili Evropského parlamentu, i všechny možné varianty řešení.

([1]) Směrnice 2011/92/EU o posuzování vlivů některých veřejných a soukromých záměrů na životní prostředí (Úř. věst. L 26, 28.1.2012, s. 1).
([2]) Směrnice 2000/60/ES, kterou se stanoví rámec pro činnost Společenství v oblasti vodní politiky (Úř. věst. L 327, 22.12.2000, s. 1), a směrnice 2006/118/ES o ochraně podzemních vod před znečištěním a zhoršováním stavu (Úř. věst. L 372, 27.12.2006, s. 19).
([3]) Směrnice 2006/21/ES o nakládání s odpady z těžebního průmyslu a o změně směrnice 2004/35/ES (Úř. věst. L 102, 11.4.2006, s. 15).
([4]) Směrnice 92/43/ES o ochraně přírodních stanovišť, volně žijících živočichů a planě rostoucích rostlin (Úř. věst. L 206, 22.7.1992, s. 7).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007335/13
to the Commission
Pavel Poc (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Chevron Poland's violations of the law and of the property rights and civic rights of owners of farm land in the village of Żurawlów

Since 3 June 2013, farmers from the village of Żurawlów and the neighbouring villages of Rogów, Szczelatyn and Siedlisko in Grabowiec commune, southern Poland, have been protesting against illegal activities being carried out by the Polish company 'Chevron Poland'. On 6 December 2007, the company obtained concession No 30/2007/p to explore for shale gas in the Grabowiec area. The area covered by the concession is approximately 1 200km^2 and it includes 19 municipalities in the vicinity of the city of Zamość. A concession for exploratory drilling up to a depth of 3 800m was granted on 6 June 2012. This concession expired when the deadline lapsed.

On 30 November 2012, in the face of protests and legal action from farmers, the Polish Ministry of the Environment stated that it would resume the procedure on the basis of a planned decision to prolong the concession. However, the Polish Ministry of the Environment has thus far failed to undertake such a procedure.

Chevron withdrew its application for a decision on environmental conditions with regard to investing in Żurawlów. According to a statement made on state television by a spokesperson on 15 July 2012, the company also called a halt to drilling work in Grabowiec and other communes.

Although no valid licence exists for the drilling of exploratory wells in Grabowiec commune, Chevron Poland made attempts on 3 June 2013, on leased land in Żurawlów, to start work on building fences and transporting containers, technical installations for area lighting and electric generators. Farmers from surrounding villages blocked off the entrances to the site and prevented the company from continuing with its planned work. The police and the Mayor of Grabowiec were summoned.

1. Is the Commission aware of this state of affairs? If so, what steps does it intend to take?

2. Is the Commission aware that rare Natura 2000 wetland areas are located in close proximity to the site?

3. Is the Commission aware that permits for exploration and for the extraction of shale gas were granted in respect of areas in which Poland's largest freshwater reservoirs are located?

4. What measures can the Commission take to tackle the threat posed to public health and the environment by the drilling of exploratory wells and the extraction of shale gas?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(19 July 2013)

The Commission does not follow in detail specific shale gas exploitation operations in individual locations or regions. It is the responsibility of the 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*, provisions on environmental impact assessments and public participation ([1]), the protection of surface and groundwater ([2]), on waste management ([3]) and on the conservation of natural habitats ([4]).

The Commission included in its 2013 Work Programme an 'Environmental, Climate and Energy Assessment Framework to Enable Safe and Secure Unconventional Hydrocarbon Extraction' as new initiative (subject to an Impact Assessment). This initiative aims *inter alia* at delivering a framework to manage risks as well as to provide maximum legal clarity and predictability to both market operators and citizens across the EU. Issues such as those raised by the Honourable Members as well as all relevant policy options will be duly considered in this frame of work.

([1]) Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on environment (OJ L 26/1, 28.01.2012).
([2]) Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (OJ L 327, 22.12.2000, p. 1) and Directive 2006/118/EC on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration (OJ L372/19, 27.12.2006).
([3]) Directive 2006/21/EC on the management of waste from extractive industries and amending Directive 2004/35/EC (OJ L 102, 11.4.2006, p. 15).
([4]) Directive 92/43/EC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (OJ L 206, 22.7.1992, p. 7).

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-007336/13
a la Comisión
Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)
(20 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: Estado de la investigación sobre el proyecto de Red Eléctrica Española para la construcción de una línea de muy alta tensión en Santa Coloma de Gramenet (Barcelona)

En su respuesta a la pregunta parlamentaria E-010635/2012 con fecha de 23 de enero del presente año, el Comisario Potocnik anunciaba que, en el marco de la investigación que estaba llevando a cabo, la Comisión Europea se encontraba a la espera de recibir contestación al requerimiento enviado a las autoridades españolas en referencia al proyecto de construcción de una línea eléctrica de muy alta tensión entre los municipios de Setmenat y Santa Coloma de Gramenet (Barcelona).

Paralelamente, el Gobierno local de la ciudad de Santa Coloma de Gramenet depositó ante la Comisión Europea una queja denunciando el incumplimiento de la Directiva 2011/92/UE relativa a la evaluación de impacto ambiental.

Teniendo en cuenta que:

— la misma Comisión ha reconocido que un proyecto de estas características se encuentra sujeto a las disposiciones del anexo I de dicha Directiva y que, por lo tanto, debe ser sometido obligatoriamente a la preceptiva evaluación de impacto medioambiental de conformidad con lo establecido en los artículos 5 a 10,

— la Comisión había anunciado como fecha límite para la recepción de la información requerida a las autoridades españolas finales de enero del 2013,

Cabe formular las siguientes preguntas:

¿Podría la Comisión informar del estado de la investigación abierta sobre el proyecto de la red de muy alta tensión en Santa Coloma de Gramenet? ¿Ha recibido ya la Comisión respuesta de las autoridades españolas? ¿Podría la Comisión detallar el contenido de dicha respuesta?

¿Ha podido confirmar la Comisión la infracción en este caso de la Directiva 2011/92 relativa a la evaluación de impacto y los posibles incumplimientos de las disposiciones del Convenio de Aarhus contenidas en la misma Directiva sobre acceso a la información y participación de los ciudadanos?

¿No considera la Comisión que, ante las evidencias descritas, se debería sugerir a las autoridades españolas el establecimiento de una moratoria a dicho proyecto como medida preventiva de aplicación inmediata?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(26 de julio de 2013)

En el marco de la investigación en curso, la Comisión ya ha recibido de las autoridades españolas los informes elaborados por la administración nacional (Ministerio de Energía y Ministerio de Medio Ambiente) y por la administración regional (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña).

Como indica Su Señoría, la Comisión también ha recibido una denuncia sobre dicho proyecto de línea de alta tensión en el municipio de Santa Coloma de Gramenet (Barcelona). La Comisión está analizando la respuesta de las autoridades españolas y la información facilitada por el denunciante en relación con el cumplimiento de los requisitos pertinentes del Derecho medioambiental de la UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007336/13
to the Commission
Maria Badia i Cutchet (S&D)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Investigation into Red Eléctrica Española's plans to build a high-voltage power line in Santa Coloma de Gramenet (Barcelona)

In its answer to Question E-010635/2012 on 23 January 2013, Commissioner Potočnik said that, in the context of its ongoing investigation, the Commission was waiting for the Spanish authorities to reply to its request concerning the project to build a high-voltage power line between the municipalities of Setmenat and Santa Coloma de Gramenet (Barcelona).

In the meantime the local authorities in Santa Coloma de Gramenet have lodged a complaint with the Commission in respect of a breach of Directive 2011/92/EU concerning environmental impact assessments (EIAs).

Bearing in mind that:

— the Commission has acknowledged that a project of this kind is subject to the provisions of Annex I to the directive and should therefore undergo the mandatory EIA provided for in Articles 5 to 10;

— the deadline set by the Commission for receiving the information requested from the Spanish authorities was the end of January 2013;

Can the Commission say what stage has been reached in the ongoing investigation into the Santa Coloma de Gramenet high-voltage network project? Has it now received a reply from the Spanish authorities? What information did they provide?

Has it been able to confirm that there has been a breach of Directive 2011/92/EU on impact assessments and possible violations of the provisions (included in the directive) of the Aarhus Convention relating to access to information and public participation?

In the light of the evidence, does it not agree that the Spanish authorities should be advised to suspend the project until further notice as a preventive measure?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(26 July 2013)

In the framework of the ongoing investigation, the Commission has already received from the Spanish authorities the reports elaborated by the national administration (Ministry for Energy and Ministry for Environment) and the regional administration (Autonomous Community of Cataluña).

As mentioned by the Honourable Member, the Commission has also received a complaint concerning this power line project in the municipality of Santa Coloma de Gramenet in the province of Barcelona. The Commission are currently analysing the response of the Spanish authorities and the information provided by the complainant, as regards compliance with the relevant requirements under EU environmental law.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-007337/13
aan de Commissie
Philippe De Backer (ALDE)
(20 juni 2013)

Betreft: Procedure aanbestedingen voor infrastructuurwerken

Antwerpen is aangemerkt als knooppunt op de core-netwerken van het toekomstig Ten-T netwerk. In het verleden heeft de Europese Commissie de Antwerpse mobiliteit gesteund door middel van Tent-T investeringen. Momenteel wordt een gedeelte van het Tent-T geld geblokkeerd binnen de Europese Commissie wegens problemen met de voortgang van de werken „Oosterweel". Het oorspronkelijke project „Oosterweel" werd door een besluit van de Vlaamse regering in maart 2010 fundamenteel gewijzigd. Na dit besluit wil de Vlaamse regering de werken in het kader van dit project toewijzen aan het aannemersconsortium Noriant. Daarvoor heeft de Vlaamse regering een aanmelding van staatssteun gedaan bij DG Concurrentie. Aangezien het een aanbestedingsdossier betrof heeft DG Concurrentie het dossier doorgestuurd naar DG Markt. Een tweede dossier dat de Vlaamse regering aanhangig heeft gemaakt bij de EC betreft de concessie van BAM die moet overgaan naar de NV Liefkenshoektunnel. Ook hierover heeft overleg plaatsgevonden met de EC inzake de „in house" regels en de consolidatie van beide entiteiten in de Vlaamse begroting. Gezien de cruciale impact van het Masterplan Mobiliteit 2020 op Antwerpen en de Europese transportsector moeten er dringend stappen vooruit gezet worden en daarom heb ik enkele vragen aan de Commissie:

1. Heeft de Vlaamse regering een notificatie staatssteun gedaan bij DG Concurrentie? Zo ja, wat was de uitkomst van deze procedure?

2. Is de Vlaamse regering doorverwezen door DG Concurrentie naar DG Markt, omdat het een dossier van Europese aanbesteding betreft? Zo ja, wat is de uitkomst en timing van het overleg met DG Markt? Moet of zal DG Markt een beslissing meedelen aan de Vlaamse regering en in welk tijdsbestek?

3. Heeft de Commissie of de betrokken Commissaris(sen) al een tussentijdse mededeling aan de Vlaamse regering gedaan over de aanbesteding en/of de daaraan gekoppelde staatssteun?

4. Zijn er nog andere vragen gesteld aan de EC of Commissaris(sen) die gelinkt zijn aan Oosterweel?

5. Het tweede dossier omtrent de concessie van de NV BAM — NV Liefkenshoek werd ook voorgelegd aan de Commissie. Wat is de stand van zaken in dit dossier? Moet of zal DG Markt een beslissing meedelen aan de Vlaamse regering en in welk tijdsbestek?

Antwoord van de heer Barnier namens de Commissie
(24 juli 2013)

1. Op 1 december 2011 heeft België overeenkomstig de regels inzake staatssteun en om redenen van rechtszekerheid het voornemen van de Vlaamse regering bekendgemaakt om Noriant de opdracht voor de bouw van een tunnel onder de Schelde en bouwwerken op de linkeroever in Antwerpen toe te kennen. Op 23 maart 2012 heeft België de diensten van de Commissie verzocht de staatssteunprocedure te schorsen, om de kwesties in verband met de aanbesteding van dit project te kunnen verduidelijken.

2. De kwestie is verschillende keren op technisch niveau besproken met de relevante diensten van de Commissie. Het doel was om tijdens deze informele besprekingen de specifieke omstandigheden van de betrokken openbare aanbesteding te verduidelijken en de aandacht van de Belgische autoriteiten te vestigen op het wettelijk kader waaraan moet worden voldaan. Bij de besprekingen mag niet vooruit worden gelopen op de uiteindelijke beslissing van de Belgische autoriteiten. Daarom hoeft de Commissie in deze context geen beslissing te nemen.

3. De Commissie of de betrokken commissarissen hebben de Belgische autoriteiten geen formeel tussentijds antwoord gegeven. Zoals hierboven is aangegeven, werd de verwerking van de aangemelde staatssteun op verzoek van de Belgische autoriteiten geschorst, zodat zij de aanbestedingskwesties van de aanmelding kunnen verduidelijken.

4. De Commissie heeft een klacht op grond van de regels inzake staatssteun ontvangen, die verband houdt met het aangemelde project. Voorts heeft een groep burgers opmerkingen over dit project aan de Commissie doen toekomen.

5. Er zijn allerlei discussies geweest over uiteenlopende aspecten in verband met de aanbesteding van het Oosterweel-project. De bedoeling was om zo de Belgische autoriteiten te helpen zoeken naar passende oplossingen die overeenstemmen met het EU-recht. Bij dergelijke informele besprekingen die op verzoek van de Belgische autoriteiten plaatsvinden, hoeft de Commissie geen beslissing te nemen.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007337/13
to the Commission
Philippe De Backer (ALDE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Tendering procedure for infrastructural projects

Antwerp has been designated as a future Ten-T core network hub, having already received Commission support in the form of Ten-T mobility investment. However, some of this funding is currently being withheld by the Commission because of problems with work on the 'Oosterweel' connection, the original project having been fundamentally altered in March 2010 by the Flemish Government, which now wishes to award the contract to the Noriant consortium. In this connection, it has forwarded a notification of state aid to DG Competition, which in turn forwarded the file to DG Markets in connection with the tender specifications. The Flemish Government has since submitted a second file from NV BAM (Holding Company Antwerp Mobility) regarding the NV Liefkenshoek toll tunnel concession. This has also been the subject of deliberations with the Commission regarding in-house rules and Flemish budget consolidation for the two organisations. Given the crucial importance of the 2020 Mobility Masterplan for Antwerp and the European transport sector, it is urgently necessary to take action.

In view of this:

1. Can the Commission say whether the Flemish Government has forwarded a notification of state aid to DG Competition? If so, what was the upshot?

2. Was the Flemish Government referred by DG Competition to DG Markets on the matter of European tendering specifications? If so, when was the matter discussed with DG Markets and what conclusions were reached? Is DG Markets required to inform the Flemish Government of its decision and within what period?

3. Have the Commission or the relevant Commissioners, forwarded an interim reply to the Flemish Government regarding the tendering procedure and/or the relevant state aid?

4. Have any other questions been put to the Commission or the Commissioners relating to the Oosterweel project?

5. What progress has been made on the second file submitted by NV BAM regarding the NV Liefkenshoek toll tunnel concession? Is DG Markets required to inform the Flemish Government of its decision and within what period?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(24 July 2013)

1. On 1 December 2011 Belgium notified under the state aid rules for reasons of legal certainty the intention of the Flemish Government to award to Noriant the realisation in Antwerp of an immersed Scheldt Tunnel and left bank constructions. On 23 March 2012, Belgium asked the Commission services to suspend the state aid procedure in order to clarify the public procurement issues raised by this project.

2. The matter has been discussed several times at technical level with the relevant Commission services. Such informal discussions aimed at clarifying the specific circumstances of the public procurement procedure at issue and at drawing the Belgian authorities' attention to the legal framework to be complied with. As those discussions may not prejudice what the Belgian authorities will finally decide, there is no decision to be taken by the Commission in this context.

3. The Commission or the relevant Commissioners did not provide a formal interim reply to the Belgian authorities. As indicated above, at the request of the latter, the handling of the state aid notification was suspended in order to allow them to clarify the public procurement aspects of the notification.

4. The Commission received a complaint under the state aid rules in relation to the notified project. In addition, a citizen's organisation provided comments on this project to the Commission.

5. Several discussions took place regarding various public procurement aspects of the Oosterweel project with a view to facilitating the search by the Belgian authorities for appropriate and EU-law compliant solutions. Such informal discussions taking place at the Belgian authorities' request do not require a decision from the Commission.

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys P-007338/13
komissiolle
Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE)
(20. kesäkuuta 2013)

Aihe: Nuorisotyöttömyyden torjuntaan tarkoitettujen määrärahojen akuutti tarve

Nuorisotyöttömyys on etenkin talouskriisimaissa noussut räjähdysmäisesti. Se uhkaa syrjäyttää kokonaisen sukupolven työelämästä ja yhteiskunnasta. Esimerkiksi Kreikassa ja Espanjassa joka toinen nuori on työtön tai vailla koulutuspaikkaa. Yhteensä yli 7,5 miljoonaa nuorta on ilman työtä tai opiskelupaikkaa.

Nuorten oikeuksien kannalta tilannetta pahentaa se, että sekä koulutuksesta että sosiaaliturvasta leikataan, osin myös tukipakettien tiukkojen ehtojen vuoksi. Samalla työttömyyden kustannukset rasittavat kriisimaiden talouksia entisestään.

Osana ratkaisua komissio on esittänyt rakennerahastojen käyttämistä työpaikkojen luomiseen nuorille. Lisäksi nuorisotakuun toteuttamiseen on varattu 6 miljardin määräraha vuosille 2014–2020.

EU-rahoituksen saaminen käyttöön kuitenkin kestää usein valitettavan kauan, jopa vuosia. Hakumenettely on usein monimutkainen. Ottaen huomioon työttömyyskriisin vakavuuden olisi rahoitusta saatava paljon nopeammin.

Miten komissio aikoo varmistaa, että nuorisotakuun määräraha ja rakennerahastojen kautta nuorten työllisyyden edistämiseen varatut varat saadaan käyttöön mahdollisimman nopeasti?

László Andorin komission puolesta antama vastaus
(18. heinäkuuta 2013)

Komissio katsoo arvoisan parlamentin jäsenen tavoin, että nuorisotyöttömyyden torjuntaan tarvitaan kiireellisiä EU:n tason toimia. Jotta Euroopan sosiaalirahastosta (ESR) ja sen yhteydessä nuorisotyöllisyysaloitteesta saataisiin ripeämmin tukea nuorisotyöttömyyden hoitoon, komissio on nopeuttanut tarvittavia säädösehdotuksia ja esittänyt ne Euroopan parlamentille ja neuvostolle maaliskuussa 2013.

Komissio esitti 19. kesäkuuta tiedonannossaan *Yhteistyötä Euroopan nuorten hyväksi: Kehotus toimiin nuorisotyöttömyyttä vastaan* ([1]), että koko 6 miljardin euron summa otettaisiin käyttöön maksusitoumuksina seuraavan monivuotisen rahoituskehyksen kahden ensimmäisen vuoden aikana muuttamalla seuraavan monivuotisen rahoituskehyksen aikataulutusta. Näin jäsenvaltiot saisivat nuorisotyöllisyysaloitteen puitteissa saatavilla olevan rahoituksen käyttöönsä jo vuonna 2013. Edellytyksenä on kuitenkin myös se, että jäsenvaltiot toimittavat asiaan liittyvät toimenpideohjelmansa nopeasti hyväksyttäviksi. Komissio on ehdottanut nuorisotyöttömyyttä käsittelevien toimintaryhmien ottamista uudelleen käyttöön tukemaan ja nopeuttamaan toimenpideohjelmien valmistelua ja neuvomaan, miten EU:n rahoitusta voidaan parhaiten käyttää nuorisotakuiden täytäntöönpanoon.

Lisäksi 26.–28. kesäkuuta kokoontuneen Eurooppa-neuvoston päätelmissä todettiin, että maksut nuorisotyöllisyysaloitteen 6 miljardin euron määrärahoista olisi suoritettava seuraavan monivuotisen rahoituskehyksen ensimmäisten kahden soveltamisvuoden aikana, jotta aloite täyttäisi täysin tehtävänsä.

ESR:n ja nuorisotyöllisyysaloitteen hallinnointi on kuitenkin jaettua. Tämä tarkoittaa sitä, että investoinneista päättävät asiasta vastaavat hallintoviranomaiset kussakin jäsenvaltiossa. Nuorisotyöllisyyden tukitoimien toteuttamisen nopeus riippuu näin ollen lähinnä näistä viranomaisista ja toimenpiteiden täytäntöönpanosta vastaavista elimistä.

([1]) KOM(2013)0447 lopullinen.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007338/13
to the Commission
Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Acute need of funding to combat youth unemployment

There has been a drastic rise in youth unemployment, particularly in the countries hit by the economic crisis. It threatens to exclude a whole generation from working life and from society. In Greece and Spain, for example, every second young person has no job or place on a training course. In total over 7.5 million young people are not in employment or training.

This situation, with its impact on the rights of young people, is exacerbated by cuts to both training and social security, partly owing to the stringent terms of the bailouts. At the same time the costs of unemployment are putting an even greater strain on the economies of the crisis-hit countries.

As part of the solution the Commission has proposed using the structural funds to create jobs for young people. In addition, EUR 6 billion have been earmarked for the Youth Guarantee for the years 2014-2020.

However, making EU funds available often takes a regrettably long time, sometimes even years. The application procedure is often complicated. Given the severity of the unemployment crisis, it ought to be possible to obtain funding much more quickly.

How does the Commission propose to ensure that the funding under the Youth Guarantee and the funds earmarked for promoting youth employment through the structural funds are made available as quickly as possible?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(18 July 2013)

The Commission shares the view of the Honourable Member that urgent EU level action is needed with regard to fighting youth unemployment. With regard to speeding up the support by the European Social Fund (ESF) and in that context, by the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), to youth employment, the Commission has fast-tracked the necessary legal proposals and presented them to the European Parliament and Council in March 2013.

On 19 June, in its communication *Working together for Europe's young people: A call to action on youth unemployment*, the Commission proposed to make available the entire amount of EUR 6 billion in commitments within the first two years of the next MFF, by adjusting the profile of the next MFF. ([1]) This could allow Member States to access funding under the Youth Employment Initiative already in 2013. However, this also requires that Member States swiftly submit the relevant youth operational programmes for approval. The Commission has proposed to re-launch Youth Employment Action Teams to support and accelerate preparation of operational programmes and to advise on how EU funding can best be used to implement youth guarantees.

Furthermore, the 26-28 June European Council conclusions state that in order for YEI to play its full role, the disbursement of the EUR 6 billion should take place during the first two years of the next Multi-annual Financial Framework.

However, the ESF as well as the YEI are implemented in the system of shared management. This means that investment decisions are taken by responsible Managing Authorities within each Member State. The speed of delivery of measures supporting youth employment therefore depends mainly on these authorities and the bodies responsible for implementing these measures.

([1]) COM(2013) 447 final.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007339/13
do Komisji (Wiceprzewodniczącej/Wysokiej Przedstawiciel)
Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)
(20 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Wiceprzewodnicząca/Wysoka Przedstawiciel – Oficjalny status Naddniestrza

Od 1992 r. Mołdawia nie sprawuje suwerennej kontroli nad oderwanym terytorium Naddniestrza. W dalszym ciągu stacjonują tam wojska rosyjskie, a rząd Naddniestrza ogranicza możliwości kształcenia w języku rumuńskim. Jako państwo wchodzące w skład Partnerstwa Wschodniego i ewentualny przyszły kraj kandydujący do przystąpienia do UE Mołdawia powinna korzystać z takich samych praw do suwerenności, jak każde inne państwo europejskie. Stąd moje pytanie:

1. Jakie wysiłki podejmowane są obecnie przez UE w celu rozwiązania problemu statusu Naddniestrza?

2. Czy przedsiębiorcy w Naddniestrzu będą korzystać z postanowień pogłębionej i kompleksowej umowy o wolnym handlu z Mołdawią po jej podpisaniu, a jeśli tak – to w jakim zakresie?

3. Jaki wpływ na sytuację w Naddniestrzu będzie miało podpisanie umowy o stowarzyszeniu?

4. Czy i jaką pomoc UE wysyła do Naddniestrza i czy ta pomoc jest wykorzystywana w celu wsparcia programów w dziedzinie edukacji i kultury?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Štefana Füleго w imieniu Komisji
(9 sierpnia 2013 r.)

Rozmowy dotyczące Naddniestrza toczą się w formacie 5+2, jednak kwestia samego statusu nie była jeszcze omawiana. UE pełni w tym formacie rolę obserwatora, jednak aktywnie współpracuje z partnerami 5+2, aby osiągnąć postępy na drodze do rozwiązania tego problemu; opowiada się zdecydowanie za ponownie zjednoczoną, trwale funkcjonującą Mołdawią, ze specjalnym statusem dla Naddniestrza.

Kwestia terytorialnego zakresu stosowania jest objęta umową o stowarzyszeniu, która powinna zostać parafowana na szczycie w Wilnie. Założono w niej, że umowa o stowarzyszeniu powinna obowiązywać na całym terytorium Mołdawii. Przedsiębiorstwa w Naddniestrzu będą mogły skorzystać z pogłębionej i kompleksowej umowy o wolnym handlu, gdy tylko umowa o stowarzyszeniu zostanie wdrożona w tej części terytorium Mołdawii. W międzyczasie do końca 2015 r. UE będzie nadal stosowała jednostronną autonomiczną preferencję handlową wobec Mołdawii, która przynosi korzyści również przedsiębiorstwom w Naddniestrzu.

Ustalenia i procedury podejmowania decyzji w zakresie stosowania umowy o stowarzyszeniu na obszarach, na których rząd nie sprawuje faktycznej kontroli, są przedmiotem negocjacji z Mołdawią. UE bierze pod uwagę potrzebę pozytywnego i konstruktywnego rozwiązania problemu Naddniestrza i maksymalizacji korzyści możliwych dzięki umowie o stowarzyszeniu.

UE od 2009 r. coraz aktywniej działała poprzez środki budowy zaufania. Obecnie UE jest zdecydowanie najważniejszym donatorem, jeśli chodzi o środki budowania zaufania i odgrywa coraz aktywniejszą rolę. Trzeci pakiet środków budowy zaufania (12 mln EUR) został uruchomiony na początku 2012 r. i koncentruje się głównie na takich dziedzinach jak rozwój przedsiębiorczości, infrastruktura, środowisko i kwestie społeczne. Obecnie przygotowywany jest czwarty pakiet środków budowy zaufania. UE widzi ogromny potencjał dla przyszłej współpracy w dziedzinie edukacji mimo powiązanych delikatnych kwestii. Kultura również jest jedną z priorytetowych dziedzin w przyszłych środkach budowy zaufania.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007339/13
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: VP/HR — Official status of Transnistria

Moldova has not exercised sovereign control over the breakaway territory of Transnistria since 1992. Russian troops continue to be stationed there, and Romanian-language education remains restricted by the Transnistrian Government. As a member state of the Eastern Partnership and a prospective future EU candidate country, Moldova should enjoy the same sovereign rights as any other European state. In this connection,

1. What efforts are currently being made by the EU to resolve the question of Transnistria's status?

2. Will entrepreneurs in Transnistria use the provisions of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) with Moldova once it has been signed, and if so in what way?

3. What impact will the signing of an association agreement have on the situation in Transnistria?

4. What aid, if any, is the EU sending to Transnistria, and is it being used to support educational and cultural programmes?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(9 August 2013)

The format for discussions on Transnistria (TN) is the 5+2, but the status issue itself has not yet been discussed. The EU is an observer at this format, but works actively with all partners in 5+2 to achieve progress towards the settlement; it remains strongly at a reunited, viable and functional Moldova, with a special status for TN.

The issue of territorial application is covered under the Association Agreement (AA), which is expected to be initialled at the Vilnius Summit, and starts from the principle that the AA should apply to the entire territory of Moldova. The DCFTA will benefit TN and its businesses as soon as the AA can be implemented in that part of the Moldova territory. Meanwhile, the EU will continue applying the unilateral Autonomous Trade Preference to Moldova — also benefitting TN businesses — until end of 2015.

The arrangements and decision-making rules for application of the AA to areas where the Government does not exercise effective control, is a matter under negotiations with Moldova. The EU takes into account the need to engage positively and constructively with TN, maximising the benefits available under the AA.

The EU has been increasingly active through the Confidence Building Measures (CBM) since 2009. The EU is now by far the biggest donor as regards CBMs with an increasingly active role. A third CBMs package (EUR 12 million) has been launched at the beginning of 2012 focusing mainly on the areas of business development, infrastructure, environment and social issues. A fourth CBMs package is currently under preparation. Education is an area where the EU sees great potential for future cooperation in spite of the sensitivities involved. Culture is also regarded as one of the priority areas for future CBMs.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007340/13
à la Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(20 juin 2013)

Objet: Quel avenir pour les relations entre l'Union européenne, l'Ukraine et l'Union douanière eurasiatique?

L'Ukraine est un partenaire important de l'Union européenne, avec qui nous entretenons des liens dans le cadre de la politique de voisinage et du partenariat oriental. Ces relations, nous avons marqué notre volonté de les approfondir, avec la négociation en cours d'un accord d'association, destiné à remplacer l'accord de partenariat et de coopération. Le commissaire Stefan Füle a souligné clairement, au cours de l'assemblée Euronest qui s'est tenue le 28 mai dernier, l'importance de maintenir nos relations à un niveau aussi intense que possible.

Il a rappelé à cette occasion que l'Union européenne a une position claire sur la question du voisinage qu'elle partage avec la Russie. Il a déclaré: «l'Union est prête à engager un dialogue constructif avec son voisin russe et les pays concernés pour résoudre de façon pragmatique les questions encore en suspens quant aux incompatibilités constatées entre la signature d'un accord d'association avec l'Union européenne et l'adhésion à l'Union douanière eurasiatique».

L'Ukraine, qui a signé récemment un mémorandum pour l'approfondissement de la coopération avec l'Union douanière eurasiatique, sera bien entendu au cœur de ces interrogations. Il est donc temps d'en accélérer la résolution, car ces évolutions font planer une lourde incertitude sur l'avenir de nos relations avec certains de nos partenaires stratégiques et posent un certain nombre de questions, notamment en matière énergétique.

Le sommet de Vilnius prévu en novembre prochain est encore loin, nous souhaiterions dès aujourd'hui connaître les options envisagées par la Commission: comment entend-elle agir pour garantir l'équilibre des relations entre l'Ukraine et les Unions européenne et eurasiatique, dans un sens acceptable par tous?

Réponse donnée par M. Füle au nom de la Commission
(21 août 2013)

Dans la déclaration conjointe adoptée lors du sommet UE-Ukraine du 25 février 2013, les deux parties ont réaffirmé leur engagement à l'égard de l'association politique et de l'intégration économique de l'Ukraine avec l'Union européenne, ainsi qu'envers l'éventuelle signature de l'accord d'association établissant une zone de libre échange approfondi et complet, d'ici au prochain sommet du Partenariat oriental qui devrait avoir lieu en novembre.

S'il est vrai que l'Union européenne reconnaît l'importance pour l'Ukraine de maintenir de bonnes relations avec l'ensemble de ses voisins, elle indique clairement que l'intégration de ce pays dans l'union douanière serait techniquement incompatible avec l'accord d'association établissant une zone de libre-échange approfondi et complet et qu'aucune coopération avec l'union douanière ne doit entraver la signature éventuelle de l'accord en question, ni aller à l'encontre des engagements pris par l'Ukraine envers l'UE dans le cadre de cet accord.

L'UE s'attend donc à être consultée par l'Ukraine sur tout projet de coopération avec l'union douanière afin d'éviter les risques de non-conformité avec les dispositions de l'accord d'association.

En ce qui concerne les relations entre l'Union européenne et l'Union eurasiatique, l'UE salue les initiatives d'intégration économique régionale, pour autant qu'elles respectent pleinement les règles de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce, ne créent pas d'obstacles aux échanges et soient ouvertes aux pays faisant le libre choix d'y adhérer. Chaque pays doit décider souverainement et librement de sa participation à tout projet d'intégration, en fonction de son propre intérêt national. De plus, l'intégration régionale ne doit pas avoir de conséquences négatives sur les relations de l'UE avec son voisinage oriental. L'UE est disposée à communiquer sur le plan technique, dans un cadre informel, avec la Commission économique eurasiatique nouvellement créée en vue d'échanger des informations, de résoudre des problèmes immédiats d'ordre pratique ou de rendre possible l'alignement des réglementations de l'Union économique eurasiatique sur celle de l'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007340/13
to the Commission
Rachida Dati (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Future of relations between the European Union, Ukraine and the Eurasian Customs Union

Ukraine is a key partner for the European Union, and we maintain links with the country through both the neighbourhood policy and the Eastern Partnership. The ongoing negotiations on an association agreement intended to replace the partnership and cooperation agreement are proof of our willingness to intensify these relations. During the EURONEST Assembly which took place on 28 May 2013, Commissioner Stefan Füle very clearly emphasised the importance of maintaining the closest possible relations.

He also noted that the European Union had clearly set out its position on the issue of shared neighbourhood with Russia. In his words, 'the EU is prepared to engage in constructive dialogue with its Russian neighbour and the countries involved in order to find a pragmatic solution to the unresolved issues arising from the fact that signature of an association agreement with the European Union would be incompatible with membership of the Eurasian Customs Union'.

Ukraine recently signed a memorandum on the intensification of cooperation with the Eurasian Customs Union and will of course be at the very centre of these discussions. It is therefore time to pick up the pace of efforts to resolve the issue, since these developments have led to a great deal of uncertainty over the future of our relations with some of our strategic partners and give rise to a number of questions, particularly in the field of energy policy.

The Vilnius Summit planned for November 2013 is still a long way off, and we would like to know what options the Commission is currently weighing up: what steps does it plan to take to ensure balanced relations between Ukraine, the European Union and the Eurasian Union, and how will it ensure that these steps are universally acceptable?

Answer given by Commissioner Füle on behalf of the Commission
(21 August 2013)

In the joint statement of the 25 February 2013 EU-Ukraine Summit, both sides reconfirmed their commitment to the political association and economic integration of Ukraine with the EU and to the possible signing of the Association Agreement, with its Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (AA/DCFTA), by the time of the Eastern Partnership Summit in November.

While the EU has acknowledged the importance for Ukraine to keep good relations with all its neighbours, it has made clear that Ukraine's integration with the Customs Union would be technically incompatible with the AA/DCFTA and that any cooperation with the Customs Union should leave intact the possibility of signing the AA/DCFTA and not contradict Ukraine's commitments with the EU under this Agreement.

The EU therefore expects to be consulted by Ukraine on any plans to cooperate with the Customs Union in order to prevent any potential dis-alignment with the AA/DCFTA provisions.

As regards the EU's relations with the Eurasian Union the EU welcomes regional economic integration schemes as long as they fully comply with WTO rules, do not create trade barriers, and are open for countries to join as a result of an autonomous choice. Each country should make free, sovereign decisions on whether to join any integration project, on the basis of its own national interest. Furthermore, regional integration should not have detrimental effects on the EU's relations with its Eastern neighbourhood. The EU is ready to communicate with the newly created Eurasian Economic Commission technically and informally, in view of exchanging information or solving immediate practical problems or enabling regulatory alignment of the Eurasian Economic Union with the EU.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007341/13
alla Commissione
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Fuga di capitali dall'Italia: un fiume di denaro non dichiarato in volo verso la Cina

Secondo le stime della Guardia di Finanza e della Procura di Firenze, si aggira a 4 miliardi la somma evasa al fisco Italiano, nel giro di pochi anni, da diversi imprenditori cinesi che lavorano nel nostro paese. Soldi che sarebbero stati guadagnati grazie allo sfruttamento di manodopera in nero, alla contraffazione di marchi italiani e soprattutto all'evasione fiscale. I fenomeni dell'evasione e della frode hanno già messo in ginocchio la Grecia e continuano ad attanagliare molti paesi europei. Secondo le stime dell'Istat dello scorso novembre, in Italia la sola evasione conta il 17 % del PIL e lo stesso Commissario alla fiscalità Semeta all'inizio di marzo rilevava che il problema in Italia resta ancora molto grave.

In un'Europa che, alla spasmodica ricerca di soldi, riduce il budget per gli aiuti agli indigenti, combattere tali fenomeni è una questione di giustizia sociale. La direttiva 2011/16/UE, in vigore dall'1 gennaio 2013, rafforza la cooperazione amministrativa nel settore fiscale tra gli Stati membri, ma nulla dispone riguardo i capitali che lasciano il territorio dell'UE. Nell'interesse di tutti gli Stati membri bisogna fare il massimo sforzo a favore di una più stretta collaborazione e maggiore coordinamento in materia di fiscalità, nonché optare per lo sviluppo di accordi a livello UE con i paesi terzi e una strategia UE contro i paradisi fiscali.

1. Intende la Commissione proporre una normativa organica sulla materia che preveda un mandato per l'Unione europea come soggetto unico a negoziare accordi fiscali con paesi terzi?

2. Intende essa attivare un piano d'azione per la lotta all'evasione fiscale e la frode oltre a parallele iniziative sui paradisi fiscali e sulle pianificazioni fiscali aggressive?

Risposta di Algirdas Šemeta a nome della Commissione
(7 agosto 2013)

Le convenzioni intese a evitare la doppia imposizione fiscale tra due paesi contengono di norma delle disposizioni in materia di ripartizione della potestà impositiva tra gli stessi nonché disposizioni riguardanti la cooperazione amministrativa nel settore fiscale. La conclusione di tali convenzioni è di competenza degli Stati membri. Pertanto, la Commissione non prevede di chiedere un mandato a tale riguardo. Tuttavia, la Commissione si sta adoperando attivamente per promuovere lo scambio automatico di informazioni affinché diventi il nuovo standard mondiale, come sottolineato dalla recente proposta legislativa volta a estendere il campo di applicazione dello scambio automatico di informazioni di cui alla direttiva 2011/16/UE del Consiglio relativa alla cooperazione amministrativa nel settore fiscale.

La presenza di un accordo sulla doppia imposizione fiscale non garantisce l'eliminazione dell'evasione fiscale negli Stati membri dell'UE, la quale richiede anche la piena utilizzazione degli strumenti dell'UE vigenti, l'adozione e l'attuazione delle proposte presentate e lo sviluppo di nuovi strumenti mirati dell'Unione europea. La Commissione ha delineato la sua strategia in questo settore nella comunicazione del 6 dicembre 2012 inerente al piano d'azione per rafforzare la lotta alla frode e all'evasione fiscale ([1]). Il piano d'azione è stato accompagnato da due raccomandazioni ([2]) volte a incoraggiare gli Stati membri ad adottare una posizione comune più severa contro la pianificazione fiscale aggressiva e i cosiddetti paradisi fiscali.

([1]) COM(2012) 722 definitivo.
([2]) C(2012) 8805 def. e C(2012) 8806 def.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007341/13
to the Commission
Niccolò Rinaldi (ALDE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Capital flight from Italy: a flood of undeclared money heading out to China

According to estimates from the financial police and the public prosecutor's office in Florence, some EUR 4 billion in taxes owed to the Italian revenue agency have been evaded in the past few years by various Chinese entrepreneurs working in Italy. This is money that would have been made through the exploitation of illegal workers, the counterfeiting of Italian brands and, above all, tax evasion. Tax evasion and fraud have already brought Greece to its knees and continue to plague many European countries. According to estimates published by Italy's National Institute for Statistics (ISTAT) in November 2012, tax evasion alone accounts for 17% of Italian GDP. Moreover, in early March 2013 the Commissioner for Taxation, Algirdas Šemeta, himself noted that there was still a big problem in Italy. In a Europe that, in its frantic search for money, is reducing the budget for aid for the most deprived persons, combating these problems is a question of social justice. Directive 2011/16/EU, in force since 1 January 2013, strengthens administrative cooperation in the field of taxation among Member States, but there are no rules on capital that leaves EU territory. For the sake of all the Member States, a huge effort must be made to cooperate more closely and to ensure greater coordination in the field of taxation. Support should also be given to EU-wide agreements with third countries and an EU strategy to combat tax havens.

1. Will the Commission propose a consistent set of rules on this issue that includes a mandate for the European Union as a single entity to negotiate tax agreements with third countries?

2. Will it establish an action plan to combat tax evasion and tax fraud, as well as parallel initiatives on tax havens and aggressive tax planning?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(7 August 2013)

Double tax conventions between two countries typically contain provisions for the division of taxing rights between them as well as regarding administrative cooperation in tax matters. Concluding such double tax conventions is a competence of the Member States. The Commission therefore does not envisage asking for a mandate in this respect. However, the Commission is actively engaged in promoting automatic exchange of information to become the new global standard, as underlined by its recent legislative proposal to extend the scope of automatic exchange of information under Council Directive 2011/16/EU on administrative cooperation in the field of taxation.

The presence of a double tax agreement cannot guarantee the elimination of tax evasion in EU Member States, which also requires the full use of existing EU instruments, the adoption and implementation of pending proposals and the development of new, targeted EU instruments. The Commission set out its strategy in this area in its communication on an Action Plan against tax fraud and tax evasion of 6 December 2012 ([1]). That Action Plan was accompanied by two Recommendations ([2]) encouraging Member States to take a tougher common stance against both aggressive tax planning and on so-called tax havens.

([1]) COM(2012) 722 final.
([2]) C(2012) 8805 (final), and C(2012) 8806 (final).

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007342/13
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD) e Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(20 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Azioni volte ad incrementare la competitività e a migliorare la tracciabilità delle materie prime dell'attività conciaria

La crisi economica ha colpito duramente il settore conciario. Come segnalano numerosi addetti ai lavori in ambito Ue e soprattutto in Italia, il comparto soffre la presenza di costi troppo elevati sulle materie prime. Questi costi sono dovuti principalmente alle misure protezionistiche che i Paesi extra-UE hanno imposto a tutela della loro produzione e che invece l'UE non adotta, nell'ottica di incentivare il libero mercato.

Una gran quantità di misure è già stata discussa a tutela delle materie prime di altri settori produttivi.

Le restrizioni all'uscita delle pelli dai Paesi Terzi, in particolar modo dalla Cina, causano problemi sempre più ingenti al mercato europeo, paralizzando di fatto circa la metà delle risorse mondiali utilizzate dall'industria della lavorazione del cuoio e dei pellami.

Infine la legge italiana 8/2013, attualmente al vaglio della Commissione, reca nuove disposizioni in materia di utilizzo dei termini «cuoio», «pelle» e «pelliccia» e di quelli da essi derivanti o loro sinonimi ed in particolare l'art. 3 sancisce che «è vietato mettere in vendita o altrimenti in commercio con i termini "cuoio", "pelle", "pelliccia" e loro derivati o sinonimi (…) articoli che non siano ottenuti esclusivamente da spoglie di animali lavorate appositamente per la conservazione delle loro caratteristiche naturali».

Può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

— quali rilievi ritiene doveroso sottolineare in riferimento alla suddetta normativa nazionale?

— quali misure ha intrapreso al fine di garantire la tracciabilità dei prodotti in ambito conciario?

— intende adottare misure incisive a tutela delle aziende europee che operano in questo settore?

Risposta di Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(26 agosto 2013)

La corrispondenza amministrativa tra la Commissione e le autorità italiane in merito alla legge italiana n. 8/2013 è ancora in corso, pertanto la Commissione non ha osservazioni in questa fase.

Per quanto riguarda la tracciabilità dei prodotti, la Commissione ha proposto di rafforzare le norme di tracciabilità per tutte le categorie di prodotti di consumo non alimentari nel pacchetto sulla sicurezza dei prodotti e la vigilanza del mercato adottato il 13 febbraio 2013 ([1]). I prodotti in cuoio sono oggetto della proposta di regolamento sulla sicurezza dei prodotti di consumo che fa parte del suddetto pacchetto ([2]). La proposta è attualmente in discussione presso il Parlamento europeo e il Consiglio, nell'ambito della procedura legislativa ordinaria.

Al fine di proteggere le imprese europee e migliorare l'accesso alle materie prime, comprese quelle dell'industria del cuoio, a un prezzo equo, sono stati adottati con successo alcuni provvedimenti nell'ambito della strategia commerciale per le materie prime ([3]). Per informazioni concernenti i risultati positivi di tale strategia, la Commissione rinvia l'onorevole parlamentare alla propria risposta all'interrogazione scritta E-004694/2013 dell'onorevole Mara Bizzotto. La Commissione continuerà a portare avanti i lavori in questo campo.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/safety/psmsp/index_en.htm
([2]) Proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sulla sicurezza dei prodotti di consumo e che abroga la direttiva 87/357/CEE del Consiglio e la direttiva 2001/95/CE, COM(2013)78 def. del 13.2.2013.
([3]) Comunicazione della Commissione al Parlamento europeo e al Consiglio — L'iniziativa «materie prime» — Rispondere ai nostri bisogni fondamnetali per garantire la crescita e creare posti di lavoro in Europa, COM(2008)699 definitivo, modificata dalla comunicazione della Commissione al Parlamento europeo, al Consiglio, al Comitato economico e sociale europeo e al Comitato delle regioni — Affrontare le sfide relative ai mercati dei prodotti di base e alle materie prime, COM(2011)25 definitivo.

Inoltre, la Commissione sta portando avanti l'attuazione della strategia Europa 2020 nel campo della politica industriale, allo scopo di rafforzare la competitività dell'industria, avviando azioni a livello orizzontale e, se del caso, a livello settoriale, anche nel comparto europeo del cuoio. In tale contesto la Commissione ha avviato un processo di valutazione d'impatto per valutare il sistema di etichettatura dell'autenticità del cuoio a livello dell'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007342/13
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD) and Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Measures to increase competitiveness and improve the traceability of raw materials in the leather industry

The economic crisis has hit the leather industry hard. As many of those involved in the industry in the EU and especially in Italy point out, it is suffering as a result of excessive raw-material costs. These costs are mainly due to the protectionist measures that non-EU countries have imposed in order to protect their production but which the EU has failed to adopt, in an effort to boost the single market.

A raft of measures have already been discussed in a bid to protect the raw materials used in other manufacturing sectors.

The restrictions on exports of hides from third countries, especially China, are causing the EU market ever-greater problems and are actually preventing the use of around half of the world's leather and hide resources in the tanning industry.

Lastly, Italian Law No 8/2013, currently being examined by the Commission, contains new provisions on the use of the terms 'leather', 'hide' and 'fur' and derived terms or their synonyms; in particular, Article 3 states that 'it shall be prohibited to sell or otherwise market using the terms "leather", "hide", "fur" and derivatives or synonyms thereof […] articles that are not obtained exclusively from animal skins worked specifically to preserve the natural characteristics thereof'.

— What observations does the Commission see fit to make with regard to this national law?

— What measures has it taken in order to ensure the traceability of goods in the leather industry?

— Will it adopt robust measures to protect European businesses operating in this industry?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(26 August 2013)

The administrative exchanges between the Commission and the Italian authorities regarding the abovementioned Italian Law No 8/2013 are still ongoing, therefore the Commission has no observations at this stage.

As regards traceability, the Commission has proposed reinforced traceability rules for all manufactured non-food consumer products in its Product Safety and Market Surveillance Package adopted on 13 February 2013 ([1]). Leather products are covered by the proposal of the consumer product safety regulation which is part of the abovementioned package ([2]). The proposal is currently being discussed in the European Parliament and the Council, in the ordinary legislative procedure.

In order to protect European businesses and improve access to fair-price raw materials, including those in the leather industry, a number of measures have been successfully taken within the trade strategy for raw materials ([3]). Regarding positive results of this strategy, the Commission would refer the Honourable Members to its answer to Written Question E-004694/2013 by Mara Bizzotto. The Commission will continue to pursue work in this field.

Moreover, the Commission is pursuing the implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy in the field of industrial policy in view of enhancing the competitiveness of industry, by initiating actions at horizontal and, if necessary at sectoral level, including in the European leather sector. In this context, the Commission launched an impact assessment process to assess the leather authenticity labelling system at EU level.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/safety/psmsp/index_en.htm

([2]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on consumer product safety and repealing Council Directive 87/357/EEC and Directive 2001/95/EC, COM(2013) 78 final, 13.02.2013.

([3]) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. The raw materials initiative — meeting our critical needs for growth and jobs in Europe, COM(2008)699 final; revised by Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Tackling the challenges in commodity markets and on raw materials, COM(2011)25final.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007344/13
do Komisji
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(20 czerwca 2013 r.)

Przedmiot: Polityka prorodzinna

Ostatnie lata pokazują, że europejskie społeczeństwo starzeje się. Statystyki jednoznacznie wskazują, że ludzie coraz później zakładają rodziny i coraz rzadziej przyjmowany jest model rodzin wielodzietnych. W dłuższej perspektywie czasu prowadzić to będzie do dużych problemów społeczno-ekonomicznych. W przypadku Polski wg danych Głównego Urzędu Statystycznego liczba osób w wieku 65+ zwiększy się z 5,1 mln w 2010 r. do 8,35 mln w 2035 r. Proces ten będzie przebiegał równolegle ze zmniejszeniem liczby osób w wieku produkcyjnym. Podobna sytuacja ma miejsce w większości krajów europejskich. Uważam, że Unia Europejska musi w związku z powyższym wzmocnić działania na rzecz budowy wspólnego programu polityki prorodzinnej. W Opinii Europejskiego Komitetu Ekonomiczno-Społecznego w sprawie „Rola polityki rodzinnej w procesie przemian demograficznych – wymiana najlepszych rozwiązań praktycznych między państwami członkowskimi." (Dz.U. C 218 z dnia 23.7.2011 str. 7) czytamy, że wśród celów polityki prorodzinnych krajów Unii Europejskiej można wymienić między innymi:

— ograniczenie ubóstwa i utrzymanie dochodów rodzin

— opiekę nad małymi dziećmi i wspieranie rozwoju dzieci

— ułatwienie godzenia obowiązków zawodowych z życiem rodzinnym

— sprostanie wymogowi równości kobiet i mężczyzn

— zadbanie o to by rodzice i przyszli rodzice mogli mieć pożądaną przez nich liczbę dzieci w pożądanym przez nich czasie i zwiększenie tym samym współczynnika dzietności.

Zwracam się z zapytaniem:

Czy w związku z sytuacją demograficzną w krajach członkowskich Komisja rozważa wprowadzenie specjalnych programów wspólnotowych, wspierających europejską politykę prorodzinną z uwzględnieniem wsparcia dla krajów i samorządów realizujących własne programy przyczyniające się do zwiększenia współczynnika dzietności?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza László Andora w imieniu Komisji
(25 lipca 2013 r.)

W swoim komunikacie z 2006 r. pt. „Demograficzna przyszłość Europy – przekształcić wyzwania w nowe możliwości" ([1]) Komisja Europejska podkreśliła pięć obszarów polityki, w których należy zająć się procesem przemian demograficznych i stworzyć zasoby ludzkie. W pierwszym obszarze „Europa sprzyjająca odnowie pokoleń" Komisja opowiada się za stworzeniem warunków wspierających młode osoby, które pragną mieć dzieci.

Niedawno w pakiecie dotyczącym inwestycji społecznych ([2]) uznano zmiany demograficzne za główną siłę podnoszącą skuteczność wydatków społecznych, dzięki czemu Europa może nadal liczyć na odpowiednie zasoby ludzkie. W sprawozdaniu dotyczącym celów wyznaczonych w Barcelonie ([3]) podkreślono, że dostępność placówek opieki nad dziećmi zachęca obywateli do planowania rodziny oraz że państwa członkowskie, które obecnie odnotowują najwyższy wskaźnik urodzeń, to te, które włożyły najwięcej wysiłku, by pomóc rodzicom pogodzić życie prywatne z zawodowym. Państwa te cieszą się również wysokim wskaźnikiem zatrudnienia kobiet.

([1]) Zob. http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=502&langId=en
([2]) Zob. COM(2013) 083.
([3]) Zob. COM(2013) 322.

Wspomniane kierunki w polityce są realizowane również za pośrednictwem programów. Komisja Europejska nie ma wprawdzie konkretnego programu dotyczącego niskiego wskaźnika dzietności, to jednak istnieje kilka innych programów, które mają na celu zaradzenie temu problemowi. Po pierwsze polityka w zakresie płodności i rodziny stanowi ważny obszar badawczego programu ramowego, czego przykładem są projekty Repro ([4]) i „Family Platform" ([5]). Ponadto unijne instrumenty finansowe takiej jak PROGRESS i Europejski Fundusz Społeczny są źródłem finansowania programów i eksperymentalnych projektów wspierających rodzinę, rodzicielstwo oraz pomagających pogodzić pracę z życiem osobistym w UE; przykładem takiego projektu jest Europejska Platforma Inwestowania w Dzieci (EPIC) ([6]), której celem jest dzielenie się doświadczeniami i wiedzą z różnych dziedzin związanych z polityką dotyczącą dzieci i rodziny, a także ustalanie dobrych praktyk i ich ocena.

([4]) Zob.http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/projects/429_en.html
([5]) Zob. http://eldorado.tu-dortmund.de:8080/bitstream/2003/27726/1/Family%20Platform%20Brochure%20I.pdf
([6]) Zob. http://europa.eu/epic/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007344/13
to the Commission
Filip Kaczmarek (PPE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Pro-family policy

It has become clear over recent years that Europe's population is ageing. The statistics show that people are starting a family increasingly late in life and that fewer and fewer couples are having more than one child. If this trend continues, it will lead to major social and economic problems. According to figures released by Poland's Central Statistics Office, the number of over-65s in the country is set to rise from 5.1 million in 2010 to 8.35 m in 2035. The present trend will also result in there being fewer people of working age. The situation is much the same in most of the other EU Member States. In view of this, the EU needs to make greater efforts to establish a common pro-family policy. The European Economic and Social Committee opinion on 'The role of family policy in relation to demographic change with a view to sharing best practices among Member States' (OJ C 218, 23.7.2011, p. 7) highlights the following family policy objectives currently being pursued by Member States:

— reducing poverty and maintaining family incomes;

— supporting early childhood and children's well-being and development;

— helping balance work and family life;

— meeting the requirement for gender equality;

— enabling parents or would-be parents to decide on the number and spacing of their children, thereby increasing the birth rate.

In response to the current population trends in the Member States, is the Commission looking at the possibility of introducing special EU programmes in support of an EU pro-family policy that would include support for national and local programmes that help to raise the birth rate?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(25 July 2013)

In its 2006 Communication 'The demographic future of Europe — from challenge to opportunity ([1])', the European Commission highlighted five policy areas to address demographic change and develop human resources. Its first area, 'Promoting demographic renewal in Europe', advocated creating supportive conditions to the young adults who wish to have children.

More recently, the Social Investment Package ([2]) identified demographic change as a major driver for making social spending more effective so that Europe can continue counting on adequate human resources. The report on the Barcelona objectives ([3]) highlighted that the availability of childcare facilities encourages people to plan a family and that the Member States which currently have the highest birth rates are those which have also done most to facilitate the work-life balance for parents. These countries also have a high rate of female employment.

These policy orientations are implemented also through programmes. While the European Commission does not have a specific programme to address low fertility, several other programmes contribute to the same effect. Firstly, fertility and family policy is an important area in the Research Framework programme, as exemplified by the Repro ([4]) and Family Platform ([5]) projects. Moreover, EU financial instruments such as PROGRESS and the ESF have been funding programmes and experimental projects that support family, parenthood and reconciliation between work and private life in the EU; the European Platform on Investing in Children(EPIC) ([6]) is one such example, which helps to share experience and expertise on different areas related to child and family policy, and identifies and evaluates good practices.

([1]) See http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=502&langId=en
([2]) See COM(2013) 083.
([3]) See COM(2013) 322.
([4]) See http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/projects/429_en.html
([5]) See http://eldorado.tu-dortmund.de:8080/bitstream/2003/27726/1/Family%20Platform%20Brochure%20I.pdf
([6]) See http://europa.eu/epic/

(Suomenkielinen versio)

Kirjallisesti vastattava kysymys E-007345/13
neuvostolle
Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE)
(20. kesäkuuta 2013)

Aihe: Nuorisotyöttömyyden torjuntaan tarkoitettujen määrärahojen akuutti tarve

Nuorisotyöttömyys on etenkin talouskriisimaissa noussut räjähdysmäisesti. Se uhkaa syrjäyttää kokonaisen sukupolven työelämästä ja yhteiskunnasta. Esimerkiksi Kreikassa ja Espanjassa joka toinen nuori on työtön tai vailla koulutuspaikkaa. Yhteensä yli 7,5 miljoonaa nuorta on ilman työtä tai opiskelupaikkaa.

Nuorten oikeuksien kannalta tilannetta pahentaa se, että sekä koulutuksesta että sosiaaliturvasta leikataan, osin myös tukipakettien tiukkojen ehtojen vuoksi. Samalla työttömyyden kustannukset rasittavat kriisimaiden talouksia entisestään.

Osana ratkaisua komissio on esittänyt Euroopan investointipankin määrärahojen käyttöä nuorten työllistämiseen pk-yrityksissä.

EU-rahoituksen saaminen käyttöön kuitenkin kestää usein valitettavan kauan, jopa vuosia. Hakumenettely on usein monimutkainen. Ottaen huomioon työttömyyskriisin vakavuuden olisi rahoitusta saatava paljon nopeammin.

Miten neuvosto aikoo varmistaa, että Euroopan investointipankin kautta pk-yrityksille suunnatut nuorten työllisyyden edistämiseen tarkoitetut määrärahat saadaan käyttöön tehokkaasti ja mahdollisimman nopeasti?

Vastaus
(16. syyskuuta 2013)

Eurooppa-neuvosto pääsi 27. ja 28. kesäkuuta 2013 pidetyssä kokouksessaan [1] yhteisymmärrykseen siitä, että Euroopan investointipankki (EIP) osallistuu nuorisotyöttömyyden torjumiseen nuorisotyöllisyysaloitteellaan ja osaamiseen investoimista koskevalla ohjelmallaan, jotka olisi toteutettava viipymättä.

EIP julkaisi 28. kesäkuuta lehdistötiedotteen [2], jossa se ilmoitti aikovansa käynnistää välittömästi nuorisotyöllisyyttä tukevan ohjelman. Ohjelma perustuu kahteen pilariin. Ensimmäinen pilari on nuorisotyöllisyysaloite, joka edistää pk-yritysten rahoituksen saantia ja antaa EIP:lle mahdollisuuden rahoittaa nuorten työllistämistä pk-yrityksissä. Toinen pilari, osaamiseen investoimista koskeva ohjelma, tukee työtehtävissä tarvittavien taitojen hankkimista ja työpaikkakoulutusta investoinneilla oppilaitoksiin (yliopistoihin, tutkimuslaitoksiin), ammatillisiin koulutusohjelmiin, opintolainoihin ja liikkuvuusohjelmiin.

---

[1] EUCO 104/13.
[2] http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_BEI-13-97_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007345/13
to the Council
Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE)
(20 June 2013)

Subject: Acute need of funding to combat youth unemployment

There has been a drastic rise in youth unemployment, particularly in the countries hit by the economic crisis. It threatens to exclude a whole generation from working life and from society. In Greece and Spain, for example, every second young person has no job or place on a training course. In total over 7.5 million young people are not in employment or training.

This situation, with its impact on the rights of young people, is exacerbated by cuts to both training and social security, partly owing to the stringent terms of the bailouts. At the same time the costs of unemployment are putting an even greater strain on the economies of the crisis-hit countries.

As part of the solution the Commission has proposed that funds from the European Investment Bank be used to get young people into jobs in SMEs.

However, making EU funds available often takes a regrettably long time, sometimes even years. The application procedure is often complicated. Given the severity of the unemployment crisis, it ought to be possible to obtain funding much more quickly.

How does the Council propose to ensure that the funds intended for promoting youth employment through the European Investment Bank are made available efficiently and as quickly as possible?

Reply
(16 September 2013)

The European Council on 27-28 June 2013 ([1]) agreed that the European Investment Bank (EIB) will contribute to the fight against youth unemployment through its 'Jobs for Youth' initiative and its 'Investment in Skills' programme, which should be implemented without delay.

On 28 June, the EIB issued a press release ([2]) announcing that it will launch the dedicated programme with immediate effect. The programme is based on two pillars. The pillar 'Jobs for Youth' will provide SMEs with better access to finance and link EIB financing to the employment of young people in SMEs. The second pillar 'Investment in Skills' will support job-related skills and on-the-job training by investing in educational facilities (universities, research facilities), vocational training programmes, student loans and mobility programmes.

([1]) EUCO 104/13.
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_BEI-13-97_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007346/13
alla Commissione
Andrea Cozzolino (S&D)
(21 giugno 2013)

Oggetto: Stato di assorbimento del fondo FESR in Campania

— Considerato che la dotazione complessiva del fondo FESR 2007-2013 per la regione Campania ammonta (al netto del taglio operato mediante la riprogrammazione attuata attraverso il piano *Azione e Coesione*) a 4 miliardi e 576 milioni di euro;

— considerato che stando ai dati aggiornati al 31 maggio 2013 la regione Campania ha certificato pagamenti a valersi sul fondo FESR per un totale di 1miliardo e 52milioni di euro, con un incremento annuo pari a 325milioni di euro;

— considerato che, alla data del 28 febbraio, la regione Campania risultava aver impegnato quasi l'80 % delle risorse complessive a disposizione;

— considerato che nei soli grandi progetti presentati dalla regione Campania risultano impegnati 2 miliardi e 800 milioni di euro, pari a oltre il 60 % del totale complessivo;

— considerato che, se si esclude il grande progetto *Metropolitana*, gli altri non risultano ancora in cantiere e, di conseguenza, non risultano pagamenti effettuati;

— considerata la evidente disparità tra impegni di spesa e pagamenti certificati;

può la Commissione precisare quanto segue:

1. È essa a conoscenza di un eventuale rischio di disimpegno per le somme allocate nei grandi progetti?

2. Ha essa intrapreso o intende intraprendere iniziative per accelerare la messa in cantiere delle opere previste nei grandi progetti della regione Campania?

3. Ritiene essa probabile o possibile uno stralcio di una parte dei presenti grandi progetti e un loro slittamento a valersi sulla futura programmazione?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(17 luglio 2013)

Come la Commissione ha già dichiarato nella sua risposta all'interrogazione scritta P-005797/2013 ([1]), gli importi stanziati per grandi progetti che non sono stati realizzati o lo sono stati soltanto in parte non vengono necessariamente perduti per via di disimpegno, a patto che il programma in questione presenti una spesa ammissibile alternativa da sostituire alla spesa non realizzata per il grande progetto.

La Commissione ritiene probabile che diversi grandi progetti non verranno completati entro il 31 dicembre 2015 e che verranno quindi in parte trasferiti al nuovo periodo di finanziamento, possibilità prevista negli Orientamenti sulla chiusura dei programmi 2007-2013 (decisione della Commissione C(2013)1573 del 20 marzo 2013).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007346/13
to the Commission
Andrea Cozzolino (S&D)
(21 June 2013)

Subject: ERDF take-up rate in Campania

The aggregate ERDF funding allocated to Campania region for the years 2007 to 2013 (allowing for the cut resulting from reprogramming under the *Azione e Coesione* plan) amounts to EUR 4 576 000 000.

According to the latest figures (as at 31 May 2013), Campania region has certified payments to be made under the ERDF totalling EUR 1 052 000 000, the annual increase being EUR 325 million.

By 28 February 2013, Campania region had committed nearly 80% of the total resources available.

Campania's major projects alone account for EUR 2 800 000 000 in commitments, more than 60% of the aggregate volume.

Apart from *Metropolitana*, none of the major projects has got under way, and payments are not, therefore, being made.

There is a manifest disparity between expenditure commitments and certified payments.

1. Could there be a risk that sums allocated to the major projects might be decommitted?

2. Has the Commission taken or will it take steps to speed up the start of the major projects to be carried out in Campania region?

3. Does the Commission think it likely or possible that some of the funding for the present major projects might be withdrawn and the projects will consequently impinge on future programming?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(17 July 2013)

As the Commission has already stated in its answer to Written Question P-005797/2013 ([1]), amounts allocated to major projects which are not or only partially realised, are not necessarily lost by decommitment, provided the programme concerned has alternative eligible expenditure to substitute for the non-realised expenditure of the major project(s).

The Commission considers it likely that a number of major projects will not be completed by 31 December 2015 and that they will therefore be partly transferred to the next funding period, a possibility foreseen in the Guidelines on the closure of 2007-2013 programmes (Commission Decision C(2013)1573 of 20 March 2013).

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

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007347/13
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 de junio de 2013)

Asunto: PYME y ayudas estatales

La caída del crédito a empresas y familias fue del 10,6 % en 2012 en el Estado español ([1]). Existen distintos motivos que explican este hecho pero uno de ellos es la gran bajada en la tasa de aceptación de crédito por parte de la banca nacionalizada.

Según el Banco de España, 8 de cada 10 créditos son rechazados. Eso representa una caída de más del 50 % del crédito desde el año 2006, en que la tasa de aceptación de créditos era de cinco de cada diez en las entidades ahora nacionalizadas.

¿Cree la Comisión que sería legalmente posible que las nuevas normas de ayudas estatales a la banca incluyan condiciones sobre el crédito a las PYME?

Respuesta del Sr. Almunia en nombre de la Comisión
(29 de julio de 2013)

Según las normas sobre ayudas estatales, uno de los principales objetivos de la reestructuración de los bancos que han recibido ayuda es garantizar su vuelta a la viabilidad y, por ende, a la práctica crediticia sostenible. Para alcanzar este objetivo es necesario, entre otras cosas, reducir los riesgos de sus balances y reformular sus modelos de negocio en torno a aquellas actividades y ámbitos en los que radique su fuerza competitiva.

En España, los bancos acogidos a ayudas estatales representan el 21 % del total del sistema bancario español desde el punto de vista de los activos y el 28 % desde el punto de vista de los préstamos a los clientes. Ello significa que la inmensa mayoría del sector bancario español no necesita ayudas públicas y está en buenas condiciones para proporcionar préstamos sostenibles a la economía real.

En sus decisiones sobre ayudas estatales al sector financiero, la Comisión tiene el mayor cuidado por garantizar que no se pongan en peligro los préstamos a la economía real. En este sentido, en los planes de reestructuración aprobados para los bancos españoles que han recibido ayudas, si bien existen restricciones sobre la cartera de préstamos, no se han impuesto restricciones a los préstamos de dichos bancos a las PYME en sus regiones centrales, reconociendo la importancia de este sector tanto para la economía española como para la recuperación de la viabilidad de los bancos.

La nueva Comunicación Bancaria trata de las ayudas estatales a los bancos desde una perspectiva general. Por ello no conviene incluir normas específicas sobre los préstamos a las PYME aunque es evidente que, a la hora de valorar las ayudas concretas, la Comisión tendrá en cuenta la estabilidad financiera general del sistema y, en consecuencia, también la capacidad del sector bancario para seguir facilitando el crédito adecuado a la economía real.

([1]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/05/07/la-banca-nacionalizada-deniega-8-de-cada-10-creditos-segun-el-bde-120402/

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007347/13
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(21 June 2013)

Subject: Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and state aid

Lending to businesses and households in Spain fell by 10.6% in 2012 ([1]). Among the various explanations put forward is the sharp drop in loan approvals by the nationalised banks.

According to the Bank of Spain, 80% of loan applications are rejected. That represents a drop of more than 50% in the level of lending since 2006, when approval was granted for half of all loans by the banks that are now nationalised.

Does the Commission believe that it would be legally possible for the new rules on state aid to the banks to include conditions on loans to SMEs?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(29 July 2013)

One of the main objectives of the restructuring of aided banks under state aid rules is to ensure their return to viability and, consequently, to sustainable lending. Achieving that goal involves de-risking the banks' balance sheets and redesigning their business models around the activities and areas where their competitive strength lies, among other things.

In Spain, State-aided banks account for 21% of the total Spanish banking system in terms of assets and 28% in terms of lending to customers. This means that the large majority of the banking sector in Spain does not need public support and is well positioned to provide sustainable lending to the real economy.

In its state aid decisions regarding the financial sector, the Commission takes utmost care to ensure that lending to the real economy is not jeopardised. In this regard, in the approved restructuring plans for Spanish aided banks, while there are restrictions on the loan book, no restrictions were imposed on those banks' lending to SMEs in their core regions, in recognition of the importance of that sector both for the Spanish economy and for the return of the banks to viability.

The New Banking Communication deals with state aid to banks from a general perspective. Thus it is not appropriate to include specific rules on lending to SMEs, but it is clear that, when assessing individual aids, the Commission will consider the overall financial stability of the system and therefore also the capacity of the banking sector to continue to provide adequate lending to the real economy.

([1]) http://www.elconfidencial.com/economia/2013/05/07/la-banca-nacionalizada-deniega-8-de-cada-10-creditos-segun-el-bde-120402/