

26 July 1991 defining the territory of Member States for the purpose of the implementation of Article 1 of Council Directive 89/130/EEC, Euratom on the harmonisation of the compilation of gross national product at market prices (⁽¹⁾).

Gibraltar is not part of the economic territory within the terms of the implementing rules for this decision and so is not included in the NUTS classification.

(⁽¹⁾) OJ L 240, 29.8.1991.

(2004/C 51 E/027)

WRITTEN QUESTION E-0471/03
by Erik Meijer (GUE/NGL) to the Council

(20 February 2003)

Subject: Serbian and Albanian initiatives to speed up a permanent solution to the administration of Kosovo

1. Is the Council aware that the Serbian Prime Minister Zoran Djindjic wants to convene a conference in the summer of 2003 to discuss the future of Kosovo, which has no longer been under Serbian control since 1999, and that after the withdrawal of half the NATO troops from Kosovo by the end of 2003 he wants the Serbian army to return to the area, partly because the preamble to the constitution of 4 February 2003 for the new federation of Serbia and Montenegro says that Kosovo should be part of the territory of Serbia?
2. Is the Council also aware that 42 members of the Kosovon Parliament have called for the independence of Kosovo to be declared in February 2003, partly in order to give the inhabitants better protection against the feared return of domination by Serbia of the predominantly Albanian-speaking population?
3. Does the Council see the Serbian Prime Minister's claim as a means of securing the support of domestic public opinion after the elimination of ex-president Kostunica of former Yugoslavia who has twice failed to be elected president of Serbia, as compensation for giving up rights to the much smaller state of Montenegro, or as a bargaining chip to allow Serbia subsequently to take over Republika Srpska, also inhabited by Serbs, in neighbouring Bosnia-Herzegovina?
4. What does the Council consider can be done in the immediate future to allay the concerns felt on both sides as far as possible and to find solutions that are seen by both the Albanians and Serbs as steps towards good neighbourly relations, such as the extension of Albanian autonomy and the strengthening of cooperation between the Serbs now effectively spread over three states, Serbia, Republika Srpska and Kosovo, north of Mitrovica/Kosovska Mitrovica?

Source: De Volkskrant newspaper, 5 and 8 February 2003.

(2004/C 51 E/028)

WRITTEN QUESTION E-0472/03
by Erik Meijer (GUE/NGL) to the Council

(20 February 2003)

Subject: Circumstances, procedures and timescale for settling the future of Kosovo before possible EU accession

1. How long does the Council think it will be possible to maintain the current status of Kosovo as a de facto UN and EU protectorate with, on the one hand, an external Administrator and, on the other, its own parliament, government and president, joint use of the currency of 12 EU Member States, but without its own foreign relations and with formal recognition of the area as part of a State which in practice no longer exercises any control over it and the authority of which is totally rejected by the vast majority of the population?

2. How can the Council prevent uncertainty about the future and impatience for a solution leading to renewed tension rather than good neighbourly relations between bordering areas inhabited by Serbs and Albanians?
3. Will the Kosovo regime be determined in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the inhabitants of the area concerned before any EU accession by Kosovo, or a state of which Kosovo is part?
4. Under what circumstances and procedures and on what timescale will a decision be taken on the future status of Kosovo? How are all the parties involved being consulted? How will the Council ensure that this solution leads to lasting peace and democracy?

Source: De Volkskrant newspaper, 5 and 8 February 2003.

**Joint answer
to Written Questions E-0471/03 and E-0472/03**

(29 September 2003)

The Council is fully aware of the statements made by the Serbian PM Zoran Djindjic on Kosovo prior to his assassination. It is also fully aware of the recent initiative of some members of the Kosovo Assembly to pass a resolution on the Independence of Kosovo. In the GAERC Conclusions of 24 February 2003 the Council '... urged all parties, both in Belgrade and in Pristina, to refrain from any unilateral initiatives which were incompatible with the objective of a multiethnic and democratic Kosovo and may jeopardise stability and the normalisation process not only in Kosovo but in the entire region'. The Secretary General/High Representative for CFSP, Javier Solana, in direct contacts both with the authorities and in Pristina has also reiterated and emphasised the concern of the Council about recent destabilising statements and initiatives and urged all parties to refrain from unilateral acts.

The Council firmly believes that all aspects of UN Security Council Resolution 1244 remain valid. The final status of Kosovo will need therefore to be addressed in due course in line with that Resolution, involving the Government in Belgrade and the elected leaders and representatives of the local political institutions in Pristina.

In supporting the UNMIK and the UN Secretary General's Special Representative, the Council supports unreservedly the 'standards before status' policy. This policy is an essential prerequisite to facilitation at the appropriate time of the political process designed to determine Kosovo's future status in accordance with Resolution 1244. In this connection, the Council in its conclusions of 24 February 2003 gave UNMIK's efforts to gradually transfer remaining competencies to the provisional institutions of self-government in Kosovo by the end of 2003, except those reserved for the SRSG under UN Security Council Resolution 1244, its full support. It also reiterated in its conclusions of 14 April 2003 the importance it attached to the most recent initiative of the SRSG to initiate direct dialogue between Belgrade and Pristina on practical issues of mutual interest.

(2004/C 51 E/029)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-0476/03
by Erik Meijer (GUE/NGL) to the Commission**

(20 February 2003)

Subject: Government's right of veto as a minority shareholder to safeguard continuity of operations and a universal postal service in the Netherlands

1. Can the Commission confirm that it does not intend to authorise the Netherlands government, as a minority shareholder in the former state post office PTT, later known as KPN and then TPG after the telephone sector was split off, to continue to exercise the casting vote held by a shareholder with a golden share, which would mean that the government would no longer have the right to veto strategic decisions, such as take-over by another firm?