IV

(Informaciones)

INFORMACIÓN PROCEDENTE DE LAS INSTITUCIONES, ÓRGANOS Y ORGANISMOS DE LA UNIÓN EUROPEA

PARLAMENTO EUROPEO

PREGUNTAS ESCRITAS FORMULADAS CON SOLICITUD DE RESPUESTA ESCRITA

Preguntas escritas formuladas por los diputados al Parlamento Europeo y las respuestas de una de las instituciones de la Unión Europea

(2013/C 234 E/01)

Sumario **Página**

E-002544/12 by Véronique Mathieu to the Commission
Subject: European strategy to combat violence against women
Version française 13
English version 15

E-002546/12 by Claudio Morganti to the Commission
Subject: Use of animals for vivisection and scientific testing
Versione italiana 17
English version 18

E-002560/12 by Zigmantas Balčytis to the Commission
Subject: Improvement of the ecological status of Draudeniai lake
Tekstas lietuvių kalba 19
English version 20

E-002561/12 by Zigmantas Balčytis to the Commission
Subject: EU financing for events and programmes related to the European Year for Active Ageing and Solidarity between Generations (2012)
Tekstas lietuvių kalba 21
English version 22

E-002569/12 by Zigmantas Balčytis to the Commission
Subject: The use of electronic signatures
Tekstas lietuvių kalba 23
English version 24

E-002574/12 by Richard Falbr to the Commission
Subject: Czech audit authority
České znění 25
English version 26

E-002576/12 by Sophia in 't Veld to the Commission
Subject: Twitter uploading users' smartphone contacts
Nederlandse versie 27
English version 29

E-002577/12 by Tamás Deutsch to the Commission
Subject: Further strengthening of economic and trade relations between the EU and Taiwan
Magyar változat 30
English version 31

E-002578/12 by Ashley Fox to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Israeli Supreme Court ruling
English version 32

E-002832/12 by Edward McMillan-Scott to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Israeli Supreme Court decision on ownership of natural resources in the West Bank
English version 32

E-002843/12 by Catherine Bearder to the Commission
Subject: Israeli High Court judgment allowing the exploitation of West Bank quarries
English version 32

E-003013/12 by Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Article 55 of the Fourth Hague Convention
English version 33

E-003277/12 by Andrew Duff to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Israeli Supreme Court judgment on quarrying in the Occupied Territories
English version 33

E-002582/12 by Sophia in 't Veld and Philippe De Backer to the Commission
Subject: Follow-up to the Common Principles for Bank Account Switching
Nederlandse versie 34
English version 36

E-002592/12 by Ashley Fox to the Commission
Subject: Portugal's online gambling legislation
English version 38

P-002598/12 by Tamás Deutsch to the Commission
Subject: The participation of Commissioner Andor at the European Commission meeting on 22 February 2012
Magyar változat 39
English version 40

E-002605/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Explosions in Brazzaville
Versione italiana 41
English version 42

E-002611/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Data and statistics on car sales in Member States
Versione italiana 43
English version 44

E-002613/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Worker crushed to death under a stage set
Versione italiana 45
English version 46

E-002618/12 by Barry Madlener to the Commission
Subject: Turkey considers annexing Northern Cyprus
Nederlandse versie 47
English version 48

E-002619/12 by Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska to the Commission
Subject: Foetal alcohol syndrome (FAS)
Wersja polska ... 49
English version ... 50

E-002620/12 by Angelika Werthmann to the Commission
Subject: Piracy on the high seas
Deutsche Fassung ... 51
English version ... 53

E-002791/12 by Sergio Berlato to the Commission
Subject: Incident in the Indian Ocean
Versione italiana ... 52
English version ... 53

E-002622/12 by Cecilia Wikström, Sophia in 't Veld, Sonia Alfano, Nadja Hirsch, Stanimir Ilchev, Louis Michel, Sarah Ludford, Jens Rohde, Nathalie Griesbeck and Frédérique Ries to the Commission
Subject: The situation of the Greek asylum system
българска версия ... 55
Dansk udgave ... 57
Deutsche Fassung ... 59
Version française ... 61
Versione italiana ... 63
Nederlandse versie ... 64
Svensk version ... 66
English version ... 67

E-002625/12 by Barry Madlener to the Commission
Subject: Erdoğan: less schooling, more Koran
Nederlandse versie ... 68
English version ... 69

P-002628/12 by Alexander Mirsky to the Commission
Subject: Voting rights for non-citizens of Latvia in local elections
Latviešu valodas versija ... 70
English version ... 71

E-002635/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Forest assets and European rules
Versione italiana ... 72
English version ... 74

E-002636/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Anorexia and bulimia on the increase in Europe
Versione italiana ... 75
English version ... 76

E-002637/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Alcohol consumption in Europe
Versione italiana ... 77
English version ... 78

E-002638/12 by Piotr Borys, Filip Kaczmarek, Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska, Krzysztof Lisek, Jolanta Emilia Hibner, Paweł Zalewski, Artur Zasada, Małgorzata Handzlik, Jerzy Buzek, Rafał Trzaskowski and Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz to the Commission
Subject: Programme for education, training, youth and sport for the years 2014-2020 —'Erasmus for all'
Wersja polska ... 79
English version ... 80

E-002653/12 by João Ferreira, Ana Miranda, Guido Milana, Pat the Cope Gallagher and Alain Cadec to the Commission
Subject: Information about fleets, total catches and value of landed catches in the Member States
Versión española ... 81
Version française ... 82
Versione italiana ... 83
Versão portuguesa ... 84
English version ... 85

E-002664/12 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: EU Court of Auditors' recommendations of March 2011
Versiunea în limba română ... 86
English version ... 87

P-007730/12 by Richard Ashworth to the Commission
Subject: Broadband provision in South East England
English version ... 88

P-007731/12 by Maria do Céu Patrão Neves to the Commission
Subject: Milk production in danger of extinction in some European regions: case of Portugal
Versão portuguesa ... 89
English version ... 91

E-007732/12 by Philip Bradbourn to the Commission
Subject: Restriction on cabin baggage allowance
English version ... 93

E-007734/12 by Christel Schaldemose to the Commission
Subject: Discrimination against EU citizens
Dansk udgave ... 94
English version ... 95

E-007737/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Soya: possible side effects and information on recommended daily intake
Versione italiana ... 96
English version ... 97

P-007738/12 by Nessa Childers to the Commission
Subject: Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications
English version ... 98

E-007739/12 by Judith A. Merkies to the Commission
Subject: Definition of 'residues'
Nederlandse versie ... 99
English version ... 101

E-007741/12 by Daniël van der Stoep to the Commission
Subject: Advertising campaign for the CE mark
Nederlandse versie ... 102
English version ... 103

P-007743/12 by Lucas Hartong to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Posts in the European External Action Service (EEAS)
Nederlandse versie ... 104
English version ... 105

E-007744/12 by Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Brazil and killings of environmental activists
English version ... 106

E-007745/12 by Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: Power Line Technology (PLT) apparatus
English version ... 107

E-007746/12 by Graham Watson to the Commission
Subject: VAT and self-storage units
English version ... 108

E-007748/12 by Roberta Angelilli and Giovanni La Via to the Commission
Subject: MUOS installation and possible infringement of environmental impact and public health directives
Versione italiana ... 109
English version ... 111

E-007750/12 by Ivo Belet to the Commission
Subject: Licensing for medicines containing dextropropoxyphene
Nederlandse versie ... 113
English version ... 114

E-007753/12 by Mikael Gustafsson to the Commission
Subject: Protection of Natura 2000 areas
Svensk version ... 115
English version ... 116

E-007754/12 by Amelia Andersdotter to the Commission
Subject: Follow-up to Commission's answer to Question E-005616/2012
Svensk version ... 117
English version ... 118

P-007756/12 by Catherine Grèze to the Commission
Subject: Trade agreement between the European Union, Colombia and Peru
Version française ... 119
English version ... 120

P-007757/12 by Maria do Céu Patrão Neves to the Commission
Subject: Importance of television and radio to the outermost regions in cases of natural disaster
Versão portuguesa ... 121
English version ... 122

E-007758/12 by Bendt Bendtsen to the Commission
Subject: Sudden amendment to rates of Norwegian customs duty on hydrangeas
Dansk udgave ... 123
English version ... 124

E-007759/12 by Sarah Ludford to the Commission
Subject: 'Science: It's a Girl Thing!' initiative
English version ... 125

E-007762/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Urban areas in the 2014-2020 cohesion policy
Versione italiana ... 126
English version ... 127

E-007763/12 by Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă to the Commission
Subject: Livestock breeding — and impact of drought
Versiunea în limba română ... 128
English version ... 129

E-007764/12 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: European Union's own resources
Slovenské znenie ... 130
English version ... 131

E-007766/12 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: Use of antibiotics for animals
Slovenské znenie ... 132
English version ... 133

E-007772/12 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: Free movement in the European Union
Slovenské znenie ... 134
English version ... 135

E-007773/12 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: System of passengers' rights
Slovenské znenie ... 136
English version ... 137

E-007774/12 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: European Citizens' Initiative
Slovenské znenie ... 138
English version ... 139

E-007781/12 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: The death penalty in the world
Slovenské znenie ... 140
English version ... 141

E-007782/12 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: International controls on arms dealing
Slovenské znenie ... 142
English version ... 143

P-007785/12 by Daniël van der Stoep to the Commission
Subject: Practical implications of the Cookies Directive
Nederlandse versie ... 144
English version ... 145

E-007787/12 by Nathalie Griesbeck to the Commission
Subject: Retirement pensions of cross-border workers
Version française ... 146
English version ... 147

P-007791/12 by Anderson Martina to the Commission
Subject: Eradication of child poverty in the north of Ireland
English version ... 148

E-007792/12 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Possible infringement of the Birds Directive caused by the capture of songbirds
Versión española ... 149
English version ... 150

E-007793/12 by Jörg Leichtfried to the Commission
Subject: Ban on the marketing of cosmetics tested on animals
Deutsche Fassung ... 151
English version ... 152

E-007794/12 by Jörg Leichtfried to the Commission
Subject: EU-subsidised road construction in Hungary
Deutsche Fassung ... 153
English version ... 154

P-007796/12 by Juan Fernando López Aguilar to the Commission
Subject: Forest fire on La Gomera
Versión española ... 155
English version ... 156

P-007797/12 by Robert Sturdy to the Commission
Subject: EU-South Korea free trade agreement and crude oil prices
English version ... 157

E-007803/12 by Francisco Sosa Wagner to the Commission
Subject: Pollution in the Bay of Algeciras — Follow-up question
Versión española ... 158
English version ... 159

E-007808/12 by Julie Girling to the Commission
Subject: Follow-up on funding for superfast broadband
English version ... 160

E-007809/12 by Roberta Angelilli to the Commission
Subject: Possibility of funding for the art and history association of Tarquinia and the refurbishment of the museum of pottery from mediaeval Corneto
Versione italiana ... 161
English version ... 162

E-007811/12 by Paweł Robert Kowal to the Commission
Subject: Imposition of anti-dumping duty (12.1%) on phosphorus imported to EU Member States
Wersja polska ... 163
English version ... 164

E-007813/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: New shift in illegal migration flows in Greece
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 165
English version ... 166

E-007815/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Debt Servicing Fund
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 167
English version ... 168

E-007953/12 by Georgios Papanikolaou to the Commission
Subject: Common public debt guarantee scheme for the eurozone
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 167
English version ... 168

E-007821/12 by Phil Bennion and George Lyon to the Commission
Subject: Outbreaks of legionnaires' disease
English version ... 169

E-007822/12 by Roger Helmer to the Commission
Subject: Regulation (EU) No 1007/2011
English version ... 170

E-007826/12 by Marek Henryk Migalski to the Commission
Subject: Arrests of Internet opposition group moderators in Belarus
Wersja polska ... 171
English version ... 172

E-007829/12 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Russian membership of WTO and trade in agricultural products
Versiunea în limba română ... 173
English version ... 174

E-007832/12 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: EU-Moldova trade relations
Versiunea în limba română ... 175
English version ... 176

E-007835/12 by Roger Helmer to the Commission
Subject: New coal-fired power stations in Germany
English version ... 177

E-007840/12 by Crescenzio Rivellini, Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, Raffaele Baldassarre and Barbara Matera to the Commission
Subject: ILVA
Versione italiana ... 178
English version ... 180

E-007846/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Health effects of electronic cigarettes
Versione italiana ... 182
English version ... 183

E-007847/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: Online cartoons encourage consumption of psychotropic drugs among children
Versione italiana ... 184
English version ... 185

E-007851/12 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Arrival of a group of 68 illegal immigrants on a Spanish island
Nederlandse versie ... 186
English version ... 187

E-007852/12 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Arrival of between 150 and 160 African immigrants in Malta
Nederlandse versie ... 188
English version ... 189

E-007855/12 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: Rising price of cereals on the international markets
Versão portuguesa ... 190
English version ... 191

E-007856/12 by João Ferreira to the Commission
Subject: Food dependency on outside countries
Versão portuguesa ... 192
English version ... 193

P-007860/12 by Gaston Franco to the Commission
Subject: Accounting rules for emissions and removals of greenhouse gases resulting from LULUCF activities: forest fires
Version française ... 194
English version ... 195

E-007863/12 by Véronique Mathieu to the Commission
Subject: DVDs and warning pictograms
Version française ... 196
English version ... 197

P-007864/12 by Derek Vaughan to the Commission
Subject: Newcastle disease in pigeons
English version ... 198

P-007873/12 by Eleni Theocharous to the Commission
Subject: Take-up of structural funds by the Republic of Cyprus
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 199
English version ... 200

E-007875/12 by Izaskun Bilbao Barandica to the Commission
Subject: Extortion of European businesses in Morocco
Versión española ... 201
English version ... 202

E-007878/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Tolls (4)
Versión española ... 203
English version ... 204

E-007881/12 by Martin Ehrenhauser to the Commission
Subject: VP/HR — Security rules for the European External Action Service (EEAS)
Deutsche Fassung ... 205
English version ... 206

E-007888/12 by Keith Taylor to the Commission
Subject: Wild animals kept as pets in the European Union
English version ... 207

E-007890/12 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Commissioner active in election campaign
Nederlandse versie ... 208
English version ... 209

E-007895/12 by Jacek Włosowicz, Zbigniew Ziobro, Jacek Olgierd Kurski and Tadeusz Cymański to the Commission
Subject: Living conditions of residents of the Górna Krasna nature reserve
Wersja polska ... 210
English version ... 211

E-007897/12 by Liam Aylward to the Commission
Subject: Smoke-free environments
Leagan Gaeilge ... 212
English version ... 213

E-007902/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: New calculation of eligibility for structural funds (2014-2020)
Versão portuguesa ... 214
English version ... 215

E-007903/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: New calculation of eligibility for cohesion fund (2014-2020)
Versão portuguesa ... 216
English version ... 217

E-007904/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Economic basis for calculating capping
Versão portuguesa ... 218
English version ... 219

E-007905/12 by Nuno Teixeira to the Commission
Subject: Changes to the specific additional allocation (2014-2020)
Versão portuguesa ... 220
English version ... 222

P-007906/12 by Matteo Salvini to the Commission
Subject: Funding for apiculture in the Autonomous Province of Trento
Versione italiana ... 224
English version ... 226

E-007907/12 by Jo Leinen to the Commission
Subject: Anti-dumping investigation into dumped imported tableware from China
Deutsche Fassung ... 228
English version ... 229

E-007908/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: European drought and the anticipated release of EU CAP funds to Croatia
Versione italiana ... 230
English version ... 231

P-007913/12 by Ricardo Cortés Lastra to the Commission
Subject: Action on falling prices in the milk sector
Versión española ... 232
English version ... 233

E-007917/12 by Raül Romeva i Rueda to the Commission
Subject: Waste management in Mallorca
Versión española ... 234
English version ... 235

P-007922/12 by Adrian Severin to the Commission
Subject: Blocking of certain prerogatives of the interim President of Romania
Versiunea în limba română ... 236
English version ... 237

P-007926/12 by Erminia Mazzoni to the Commission
Subject: Revision of Directive 2001/37/EC on tobacco products
Versione italiana ... 238
English version ... 239

E-007927/12 by Ana Miranda to the Commission
Subject: Tolls for using Catalan motorways
Versión española ... 240
English version ... 241

E-007934/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: Tattoos: contaminated ink
Versione italiana ... 242
English version ... 243

E-007938/12 by Oreste Rossi to the Commission
Subject: New microchip for Parkinson's patients
Versione italiana ... 244
English version ... 245

E-007944/12 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Malmström's desire to further greatly increase immigration into Europe (follow-up question)
Nederlandse versie ... 246
English version ... 247

E-007946/12 by Auke Zijlstra to the Commission
Subject: Boat carrying African illegal immigrants to Lampedusa sinks
Nederlandse versie ... 248
English version ... 249

P-007947/12 by Vicky Ford to the Commission
Subject: Fees for meat inspection
English version ... 250

E-007948/12 by Salvador Sedó i Alabart to the Commission
Subject: Too few young people going into higher education in Catalonia
Versión española ... 251
English version ... 252

E-007956/12 by Mara Bizzotto to the Commission
Subject: The consequences for consumers, and thousands of workers, of possible changes to European legislation on the sale of tobacco
Versione italiana ... 253
English version ... 254

E-007958/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Judgment of the Court of Justice of the EU on flight cancellation insurance
Version française ... 255
English version ... 256

E-007961/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Commission's adoption of a list of health claims made on foods
Version française ... 257
English version ... 258

E-007962/12 by Marc Tarabella to the Commission
Subject: Serious shortcomings in waste management
Version française ... 259
English version ... 260

E-007980/12 by Nuno Melo to the Commission
Subject: EU-China trade relations
Versão portuguesa ... 261
English version ... 262

E-008008/12 by Gaston Franco to the Commission
Subject: Migration of food packaging inks into foodstuffs: need for EU regulation
Version française ... 263
English version ... 264

E-008013/12 by Rareş-Lucian Niculescu to the Commission
Subject: Gliadin content of wheat flours
Versiunea în limba română ... 265
English version ... 266

E-008030/12 by Monika Flašíková Beňová to the Commission
Subject: The problem of maritime piracy
Slovenské znenie ... 267
English version ... 268

P-008051/12 by Mario Mauro to the Commission
Subject: Solidarity fund for the floods in Liguria in October 2011
Versione italiana ... 269
English version ... 270

E-008080/12 by Niki Tzavela to the Commission
Subject: Trade with China
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 271
English version ... 272

P-008102/12 by Konrad Szymański to the Commission
Subject: Future of the Third Energy Package in Moldova
Wersja polska ... 273
English version ... 274

P-008103/12 by Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz to the Commission
Subject: Hydrotreated vegetable oil technology — additional question
Wersja polska ... 275
English version ... 276

E-008108/12 by Nikolaos Chountis to the Commission
Subject: Measures to secure the re-opening of the Sikiarideio Foundation
Ελληνική έκδοση ... 277
English version ... 278

P-008114/12 by Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova to the Commission
Subject: Granting of financial assistance under the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) in 2012
българска версия ... 279
English version ... 280

P-008132/12 by Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris to the Commission
Subject: Change in intended use of buildings that have benefited from EU funding
Versione italiana ... 281
English version ... 282

P-008146/12 by Olga Sehnalová to the Commission
Subject: Poisoning cases caused by methanol in the Czech Republic
České znění ... 283
English version ... 284

E-008201/12 by Ian Hudghton to the Commission
Subject: EU regulation on mandatory airline insurance for ticket sales
English version 285

E-008204/12 by Ivo Belet to the Commission
Subject: Cancellation of Air Baltic flight
Nederlandse versie 286
English version 287

P-008210/12 by Claudio Morganti to the Commission
Subject: Chinese export subsidies
Versione italiana 288
English version 289

P-008219/12 by Ramon Tremosa i Balcells to the Commission
Subject: Biogas production — retroactive implementation of Royal Decree-Law 1/2012 and private investment in renewables penalised in Spain
Versión española 290
English version 291

E-008232/12 by Charles Tannock to the Commission
Subject: ECB moves
English version 292

P-008255/12 by Lorenzo Fontana to the Commission
Subject: Developments in regard to alleged practices cited in Question P-003205/2011
Versione italiana 293
English version 294

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002544/12
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(6 mars 2012)

Objet: Stratégie européenne de lutte contre la violence envers les femmes

Une enquête d'Eurobaromètre en 2010 sur la violence envers les femmes montre que 62 % des Européens estiment que des mesures doivent être prises prioritairement contre les actes de violence commis à l'encontre de femmes. L'Union européenne s'est déjà engagée à travers différents textes législatifs, rapports, et résolutions contre les violences envers les femmes.

Aucune stratégie n'a cependant été clairement définie. Ainsi, aucun cadre juridique exhaustif n'établit de normes minimales de protection des droits des femmes dans l'Union européenne, alors que les violences se perpétuent. Il est important d'établir une stratégie européenne qui prenne en compte toutes les formes de violence, y compris les mutilations génitales féminines, qui concernent 500 000 femmes et jeunes filles en Europe.

Dans sa résolution du 26 novembre 2009 sur l'élimination de la violence à l'égard des femmes, le Parlement européen a invité la Commission à soumettre au Parlement et au Conseil un plan d'action de l'Union, ciblé et plus cohérent, pour lutter contre toutes les formes de violence à l'égard des femmes. En outre, le Conseil a demandé à la Commission, dans ses conclusions concernant l'éradication de la violence à l'égard des femmes dans l'Union européenne, adoptées le 8 mars 2010, de concevoir une stratégie européenne pour prévenir et combattre la violence à l'égard des femmes.

La Commission européenne s'était alors engagée à présenter en 2011-2012 une communication relative à une stratégie visant à combattre la violence envers les femmes, la violence domestique et les mutilations génitales féminines, à laquelle devait faire suite d'un plan d'action de l'UE.

La Commission pourrait-elle nous indiquer ce qu'il en est de ce projet de stratégie.

Pourrait-elle, en particulier, répondre aux questions suivantes:

1. Pourquoi la Commission n'a t-elle toujours pas présenté une telle stratégie?

2. Une telle stratégie est-elle toujours prévue et envisagée?

3. Quel en est le calendrier?

4. Quelles autres mesures la Commission envisage t-elle de proposer afin de lutter contre les violences envers les femmes et en particulier les mutilations génitales féminines qui continuent de représenter une réalité inquiétante?

Réponse donnée par M^me^ Reding au nom de la Commission
(24 avril 2012)

La Commission est déterminée à mener des actions fortes pour lutter contre toutes les formes de violence à l'égard des femmes, comme le confirment le programme de Stockholm et la stratégie pour l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes (2010-2015). La Commission s'efforce de favoriser l'autonomisation des femmes, la conscientisation du public et des parties prenantes, l'échange de bonnes pratiques et l'amélioration de la collecte des données. Le programme Daphné III apporte un soutien financier à la réalisation de projets transnationaux dans ce domaine.

La Commission prend également des mesures en matière de justice pénale et a légiféré sur la traite des êtres humains ([1]), sur les abus sexuels et l'exploitation sexuelle des enfants ([2]) et sur les droits des victimes. En mai 2011, elle a présenté un train de mesures en faveur des victimes et notamment une proposition de directive sur les droits des victimes de la criminalité s'appuyant sur la législation européenne existante et renforçant les droits des victimes. Cette proposition couvre le droit au respect et à la reconnaissance, le droit de fournir et de recevoir des informations et le droit à la protection. Elle vise également à garantir que les besoins des victimes soient évalués individuellement et que

([1]) Directive 2011/36/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 5 avril 2011 concernant la prévention de la traite des êtres humains et la lutte contre ce phénomène ainsi que la protection des victimes et remplaçant la décision cadre 2002/629/JAI du Conseil, JO L 101 du 15.4.2011, pp. 1-11.

([2]) Directive 2011/93/UE du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 13 décembre 2011 relative à la lutte contre les abus sexuels et l'exploitation sexuelle des enfants, ainsi que la pédopornographie et remplaçant la décision-cadre 2004/68/JAI du Conseil, JO L 335 du 17.12.2011, pp. 1-14.

les plus vulnérables, comme les victimes de violences sexuelles, reçoivent un traitement spécial adapté à leur cas ([3]). Le train de mesures en faveur des victimes comprend également une proposition de règlement relatif à la reconnaissance mutuelle des mesures de protection en matière civile, qui complète la décision de protection européenne récemment adoptée (laquelle s'applique aux affaires pénales). Ces deux instruments permettront de faire en sorte que les mesures prises dans un État membre puissent être reconnues dans un autre État membre afin d'éviter que les victimes perdent leur protection en cas de déménagement ou lorsqu'elles voyagent.

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/criminal/victims/docs/com_2011_275_fr.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002544/12
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(6 March 2012)

Subject: European strategy to combat violence against women

A 2010 Eurobarometer survey on violence against women reveals that 62 % of Europeans believe that urgent measures must be taken to address acts of violence committed against women. The European Union has already committed itself to this issue through various pieces of legislation, reports and resolutions on violence against women.

However, there has been no clearly defined strategy. There is thus no comprehensive legal framework establishing minimum standards of protection for women's rights in the European Union; meanwhile, this violence continues. It is important to set out a European strategy that takes into account all forms of violence, including female genital mutilation, which affects 500 000 women and girls across Europe.

In its resolution of 26 November 2009 on the elimination of violence against women, the European Parliament called on the Commission to submit to Parliament and the Council a targeted and more coherent European Union action plan to combat all forms of violence against women. Furthermore, in its conclusions on the eradication of violence against women in the European Union, adopted on 8 March 2010, the Council requested that the Commission draft a European strategy to prevent and combat violence against women.

The European Commission had thus committed to issuing a communication in 2011-2012 relating to a strategy aimed at combating violence against women, domestic violence and female genital mutilation, which was to be followed by a European Union action plan.

Could the Commission inform us of the current situation as regards the draft strategy?

Could it respond specifically to the following questions:

1. Why has the Commission still not presented such a strategy?

2. Is such a strategy still planned and envisaged?

3. What is the timeframe for it?

4. What other measures does the Commission plan to propose in order to combat violence against women and particularly female genital mutilation, the prevalence of which continues to be an alarming problem?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2012)

The Commission is committed to a strong policy response to combat all forms of violence against women, as confirmed in the Stockholm Programme and the strategy for equality between women and men (2010-2015). The Commission works for the empowerment of women, awareness raising, the promotion of exchanges of good practices and the improvement of collection of data. The Daphne III Programme provides financial support for the implementation of transnational projects in this field.

The Commission is also taking measures in the criminal justice area and has put in place legislation on human trafficking ([1]), on sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children ([2]) and on the rights of victims of crime. In May 2011, it presented the Victims' Package including a proposal for the directive on the rights of victims of crime that builds on existing EU legislation and strengthens the rights of victims. The proposal includes the right to respect and recognition, the right to provide and receive information, and right to protection. It also aims at ensuring that the needs of victims are individually assessed and that the most vulnerable including victims of sexual violence receive specific treatment appropriate to their requirements ([3]). The Victims' Package also includes a proposal for a regulation on mutual recognition of protection measures in civil matters, which complements the recently adopted European

([1]) Directive 2011/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2011 on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/629/JHA, OJ L 101, 15.4.2011, p. 1-11.
([2]) Directive 2011/93/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on combating the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2004/68/JHA, OJ L 335, 17.12.2011, p. 1-14.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/criminal/victims/docs/com_2011_275_en.pdf

Protection Order (which applies in criminal matters). These two instruments will ensure that protection measures issued in one Member State can be recognised in another Member State to avoid that the victims loses their protection if they move or travel.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002546/12
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(6 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Tratta di animali per vivisezione e sperimentazione scientifica

Nei giorni scorsi è arrivato in Italia, vicino a Monza, un carico composto da oltre un centinaio di scimmie, provenienti dalla Cina e destinate a un laboratorio che si occupa di vivisezione e sperimentazione scientifica.

Questa doveva essere solo la prima di una serie di spedizioni che avrebbero portato in Italia oltre 900 animali di questa specie, sempre provenienti dal paese asiatico. Fortunatamente, grazie alla mobilitazione di associazioni animaliste e ai controlli delle autorità sanitarie, si è riuscito a far desistere l'azienda multinazionale proprietaria del laboratorio dall'intraprendere questo tipo di pratiche scientifiche, e le scimmie già arrivate dovrebbero essere state rispedite in Cina. Un numero così elevato di esemplari avrebbe sicuramente comportato notevoli problematicità, in quanto sarebbe stato difficilmente possibile garantire condizioni igienico-sanitarie adeguate per gli animali, senza considerare i risvolti etici della questione.

Ciò premesso, può la Commissione far sapere se è a conoscenza di questa vicenda specifica?

Come ritiene sia stato possibile autorizzare una simile tratta di animali, senza valutarne approfonditamente tutti gli aspetti?

Quali misure sono previste a livello europeo per la tutela e la salvaguardia della dignità di questi animali da laboratorio?

Risposta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(27 aprile 2012)

La Commissione non era a conoscenza di questa situazione.

Le norme sanitarie per i movimenti all'interno dell'Unione e per le importazioni di scimmie (simiae e prosimiae) figurano nella direttiva 92/65/CEE ([1]), che all'articolo 5 dispone che tali animali formino oggetto di scambi soltanto in provenienza da e a destinazione di organismi, istituti o centri ufficialmente riconosciuti dalle autorità competenti degli Stati membri. Le condizioni per il riconoscimento di tali organismi o centri figurano nell'allegato C della suddetta direttiva.

La direttiva 2010/63/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio sulla protezione degli animali utilizzati a fini scientifici ([2]) sostituirà la direttiva 86/609/CEE ([3]). Si applicherà a decorrere dal 1º gennaio 2013 a tutti gli animali utilizzati o destinati ad essere utilizzati nelle procedure scientifiche. Rafforzerà e migliorerà sensibilmente le condizioni degli animali tuttora necessari a tali scopi, ad esempio richiedendo sistematicamente la valutazione e l'autorizzazione dei progetti. Contiene una serie di disposizioni destinate a ridurre al minimo possibile l'uso e la sofferenza degli animali nelle procedure scientifiche, si concentra sulla comunicazione degli sviluppi in questo settore e migliora sensibilmente l'alloggiamento e la cura degli animali impiegati a fini sperimentali.

([1]) Direttiva 92/65/CEE del Consiglio, del 13 luglio 1992, che stabilisce norme sanitarie per gli scambi e le importazioni nella Comunità di animali, sperma, ovuli e embrioni non soggetti, per quanto riguarda le condizioni di polizia sanitaria, alle normative comunitarie specifiche di cui all'allegato A, sezione I, della direttiva 90/425/CEE, GU L 268 del 14.9.1992.

([2]) Direttiva 2010/63/UE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 22 settembre 2010, sulla protezione degli animali utilizzati a fini scientifici — Testo rilevante ai fini del SEE, GU L 276 del 20.10.2010.

([3]) GU L 358 del 18.12.1986.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002546/12
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(6 March 2012)

Subject: Use of animals for vivisection and scientific testing

In the past few days, a shipment arrived in Monza in Italy containing over a hundred monkeys from China, destined for a laboratory which carries out vivisection and scientific experiments.

This was to be just the first in a series of shipments which would have brought 900 animals of this species into Italy, all coming from China. Fortunately, thanks to the mobilisation of animal rights organisations and health authority inspections, the multinational company which owns the laboratory has successfully been prevented from carrying out these scientific practices, and the monkeys that have already arrived are to be shipped back to China. Such a large number of specimens would surely bring with it significant problems, such as the difficulty in guaranteeing adequate hygiene and sanitary conditions for the animals, let alone the ethical implications of the matter.

In view of the above, can the Commission say if it is aware of this incident?

How, in the Commission's opinion, was it possible to authorise such animal trading without considering all the aspects in detail?

What measures are planned at a European level to protect and safeguard the dignity of these laboratory animals?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(27 April 2012)

The Commission was not aware of this situation.

The animal health requirements for intra Union movements and imports of apes (simiae and prosimiae) are laid down in Directive 92/65/EEC ([1]), which in its Article 5 prescribes that such animals can only be consigned to a body, institute or centre approved by the competent authorities of the Member States. Requirements for the approval of such bodies, institutes or centres are established in Annex C to that directive.

Directive 2010/63/EU on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes ([2]) will replace Directive 86/609/EEC ([3]). It will enter into force on 1 January 2013. It covers all animals used, or destined to be used in scientific procedures. It will strengthen, and significantly improve conditions for those animals still needed to be used in procedures by, for example, requiring systematic project evaluation and authorisation. It contains a number of measures designed to minimise as far as possible the use and suffering of animals in scientific procedures, focuses on reporting on developments in this area and significantly improves the housing and care of experimental animals.

([1]) Council Directive 92/65/EEC of 13 July 1992 laying down animal health requirements governing trade in and imports into the Community of animals, semen, ova and embryos not subject to animal health requirements laid down in specific Community rules referred to in Annex A (I) to Directive 90/425/EEC, OJ L 268, 14.9.1992.

([2]) Directive 2010/63/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 September 2010 on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes Text with EEA relevance, OJ L 276, 20.10.2010.

([3]) OJ L 358, 18.12.1986.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-002560/12
Komisijai
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(2012 m. kovo 6 d.)

Tema: Draudenių ežero ekologinės būklės gerinimas

Lietuvos Tauragės rajono savivaldybės administracija įgyvendina projektą „Draudenių ežero ekologinės būklės gerinimas“, kurio finansavimo ir administravimo sutartis pasirašyta 2011 m. gegužės 30 d.

Supaprastintas atviras Draudenių ežero valymo darbų konkursas (toliau – Pirkimas) buvo paskelbtas 2011 m. liepos 15 d., 2011 m. rugpjūčio 1 d. atplėšti vokai su pasiūlymais, 2011 m. rugpjūčio 22 d. pateikta keletas pasiūlymų. Iki šiol dar nėra pasirašyta Draudenių ežero valymo darbų sutartis, kadangi šio ežero valymo darbų pirkimo procedūros sustabdytos. Viešųjų pirkimų tarnyba atlieka supaprastinto atviro konkurso „Draudenių ežero valymo darbai“ įvertinimą. 2011 m. gruodžio 12 d. Viešųjų pirkimų tarnyba informavo Tauragės rajono savivaldybės administraciją, jog tarnyba kreipėsi į Europos Komisiją (toliau – Komisija) dėl nuomonės, susijusios su Pirkimo objekto rūšies nustatymo teisėtumu, pateikimo.

Atsižvelgiant į tai, kad iki šios dienos tebėra sustabdytos Pirkimo procedūros, o Komisijos nuomonės pateikimas gali užtrukti, baiminamasi, kad iki Projekto finansavimo pabaigos (t. y. 2013 m. birželio 30 d.) nebus įgyvendintas Projektas ir nebus pasiekti Projekte numatyti rodikliai.

Ar Komisija gali nurodyti, kada ji planuoja pateikti nuomonę dėl minėtojo Pirkimo?

Ar Komisija yra nustačiusi specialias taisykles, per kiek laiko ji turi pateikti nuomonę, kad būtų išvengta nereikalingo darbų sustabdymo ir užtikrintas projekto įgyvendinimas numatytu laiku?

M. Barnier atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. gegužės 16 d.)

Gerbiamasis Parlamento narys teiraujasi dėl klausimo, susijusio su ežero dugno valymo darbais. Šį klausimą Tauragės rajono savivaldybės administracija iš pradžių nusiuntė Lietuvos viešųjų pirkimų tarnybai, o ši toliau jį persiuntė Komisijos tarnyboms. Tokį pat klausimą Viešųjų pirkimų tarnybai yra išsiuntusi ir Alytaus rajono savivaldybės administracija. Abiem atvejais klausimas buvo susijęs su tuo, kokios rūšies sutartims reikia priskirti aptariamąsias viešojo pirkimo sutartis: viešojo darbų pirkimo sutartims ar viešojo paslaugų pirkimo sutartims.

2012 m. kovo 9 d. Komisijos tarnybos Lietuvos viešųjų pirkimų tarnybą elektroninėmis priemonėmis informavo, kad sandoris turi būti vertinamas vadovaujantis taisyklėmis, reglamentuojančiomis tą sutarties dalį, kuri sudaro pagrindinį jos dalyką ar dominuojantį elementą. Jos taip pat atkreipė Lietuvos valdžios institucijų dėmesį į tai, kad tik už konkrečią procedūrą atsakinga perkančioji organizacija, remdamasi turima informacija, gali nustatyti sutarties rūšį ir tuomet taikyti tinkamas viešųjų pirkimų taisykles. Sprendimą dėl procedūros taikymo pradžios ar sustabdymo turi priimti perkančioji organizacija, o patikslinimai dėl atitinkamų ES teisės aktų aiškinimo, kuriuos Komisija prašoma pateikti, tam sprendimui poveikio nedaro.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002560/12
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(6 March 2012)

Subject: Improvement of the ecological status of Draudeniai lake

The administration of Tauragė district municipality is implementing a project for improvement of the ecological status of Draudeniai lake, the financing and administration contract of which was signed on 30 May 2011.

A simplified open invitation to tender for Draudeniai lake cleaning works (hereinafter: tender) was announced on 15 July 2011, tenders were opened on 1 August 2011, and several proposals were offered on 22 August 2011. A contract for Draudeniai lake cleaning works has yet to be signed because the lake cleaning works tender procedures have been suspended. The Public Procurement Office is carrying out an evaluation of the simplified open tender regarding Draudeniai lake cleaning works. On 12 December 2011 the public procurement office informed Tauragė district municipality administration that the office had contacted the European Commission (hereinafter: Commission) concerning the issuing of an opinion regarding the legality of grading the tender subject matter.

Given that to this day, the tender procedures remain suspended, and that it may be some time before the Commission presents its opinion, there are fears that the project will not be implemented until the end of the project's financing (i.e. 20 June 2013), and the targets included in the project will not be achieved.

Can the Commission indicate when it plans to present an opinion on the abovementioned tender?

Has the Commission set out special rules on the time it has to present an opinion in order to avoid the unnecessary suspension of works and ensure the implementation of the project within the envisaged timeframe?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(16 May 2012)

The Honourable Member refers to a question related to the purification of a lake floor sent initially by the administration of the region of Taurage to the Lithuanian Public Procurement Office, which has transmitted it onwards to the Commission services. The same question has also been sent to the Public Procurement Office by the administration of the region of Alytus. In both cases the question concerned the classification of the public procurement contracts at stake as public works contract or public services contract.

The Commission services replied to the Lithuanian Public Procurement Office on the 9 March 2012, by electronic communication indicating that the transaction must be assessed on the basis of the rules which govern the aspect which constitutes the main object or predominant feature of the contract. They also drew the attention of the Lithuanian authorities to the fact that only the contracting authority in charge of a specific procedure is in a position to classify contracts and to consequently apply correct public procurement rules, on the basis of information at its disposal. Any decision on the launch or suspension of the procedure is the responsibility of the contracting authority and is not contingent on any clarifications regarding interpretation of the applicable EC law requested to the Commission.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-002561/12
Komisijai
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(2012 m. kovo 6 d.)

Tema: ES finansavimas renginiams ir programoms, susijusiems su pagyvenusių žmonių aktyvinimo ir jaunimo solidarumo metais (2012 m.)

2012 m. yra paskelbti pagyvenusių žmonių aktyvinimo ir jaunimo solidarumo metais. Įvairios organizacijos iš Lietuvos domisi galimybėmis organizuoti renginius, konferencijas ir užsiimti kita su šių metų tema susijusia veikla, kuria skatinama geresnė vyresnio amžiaus žmonių integracija į visuomenę.

Viena iš tokių organizacijų yra jau šešiolika metų Vilniuje veikiantis Trečiojo amžiaus universitetas.Tai yra nepelno siekianti savarankiška respublikinė organizacija, savo veikla užtikrinanti geresnę vyresnio amžiaus žmonių socialinę integraciją į visuomenę, skatinanti jų efektyvų ir turiningą gyvenimą, palaikant jų darbingumą bei fizinį aktyvumą.

Norėjau sužinoti, ar yra numatyta galimybė tokiems projektams skirti finansavimą iš ES fondų ar kitų ES finansavimo šalinių? Jei taip, prašyčiau nurodyti galimus finansavimo šaltinius.

L. Andoro atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. balandžio 20 d.)

Komisija norėtų atkreipti gerbiamo Europos Parlamento nario dėmesį į savo atsakymą į rašytinį klausimą E-11891/2011 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&reference=A6-2011-011891&language=EN

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002561/12
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(6 March 2012)

Subject: EU financing for events and programmes related to the European Year for Active Ageing and Solidarity between Generations (2012)

2012 has been declared the *European Year* for *Active Ageing* and *Solidarity* between Generations. Various organisations from Lithuania are interested in opportunities to organise events, conferences and undertake other activities linked to this year's theme, which encourages better integration of the elderly into society.

One organisation is the University of the Third Age, which has been operating in Vilnius for 16 years. This is a non-profit, independent, country-wide organisation, working to guarantee better social integration of the elderly into society, encouraging them to lead a full and meaningful life, and supporting their employment and physical activity.

I want to ask the Commission if provisions have been made to allocate financing for such projects from EU funds or other EU sources of financing? If so, can it indicate possible sources of financing?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(20 April 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-11891/2011 ([1]).

([1]) See http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getAllAnswers.do?reference=E-2011-011891&language=EN.

(Tekstas lietuvių kalba)

Klausimas, į kurį atsakoma raštu, Nr. E-002569/12
Komisijai
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(2012 m. kovo 6 d.)

Tema: Elektroninio parašo naudojimas

Vystantis elektroniniam verslui ir atsiradus didesniam poreikiui sudaryti sutartis elektroniniu būdu, tiek juridiniams, tiek fiziniams asmenims svarbūs tapo siunčiamų duomenų autentiškumo užtikrinimo klausimai. Elektroninis parašas turi didelį potencialą ir nemenkas galimybes. Naudojant elektroninį parašą galima ekonomiškiau ir tikslingiau teikti viešąsias paslaugas ir vykdyti kitas procedūras.

Viename iš pagrindinių Baltijos jūros regiono strategijos antrojo ramsčio projektų numatyta: „Plačiau naudoti elektroninius parašus ir (arba) e. atpažintį“.

Noriu paklausti Komisijos, kaip siekiama užtikrinti, kad elektroninį parašą ir atpažinties programas būtų galima naudoti tarpvalstybiniu lygmeniu?

Kokie bendri informacinės visuomenės projektai pradėti, įskaitant elektroninį balsavimą ir kitas viešąsias ir privačias elektronines paslaugas?

Kokios šalys dalyvauja įgyvendinant šį projektą?

Kiek lėšų reikia ir kiek lėšų šiuo metu skirta šiam projektui įgyvendinti?

Komisijos narės N. Kroes atsakymas Komisijos vardu
(2012 m. balandžio 13 d.)

Siekdama padidinti patogumą vartotojams ir pasitikėjimą vidaus rinkoje, Komisija planuoja iki 2012 m. vasaros priimti teisės aktų sistemos pasiūlymą dėl elektroninės atpažinties, tapatumo patvirtinimo ir parašo. Jame turėtų būti numatytas e. atpažinties sistemų pripažinimas tarpvalstybiniu mastu ir siekiama stiprinti Direktyvos 1999/93/EB nuostatas dėl e. parašo, kad būtų užtikrintas tarpvalstybinis sąveikumas, įskaitant susijusias patikimas elektronines paslaugas, tokias kaip laiko fiksavimas.

Pavyzdžiui, įgyvendinami projektai, kuriais remiamos tarpvalstybinių elektroninių paslaugų, teikiamų naudojant e. atpažintį ir e. parašą, plėtra ir diegimas. Tai vadinamieji „didelio masto bandomieji projektai“, pradėti įgyvendinti pastaraisiais metais ES lygmeniu (ES finansuoja 50 % visų projektų sąnaudų):

— SPOCS, www.eu-spocs.eu – parama Paslaugų direktyvos įgyvendinimui; dalyvauja AT, FR, DE, EL, IT, LI, LU, MT, NL, NO, PL, PT, RO, SL, SE ir UK. Kaina – 24 mln. EUR.

— STORK, www.eid-stork.eu – parama sąveikaujančių elektroninės atpažinties sistemų diegimui; dalyvauja AT, BE, EE, FR, DE, IT, LU, NL, PT, SL, ES, SE, UK, NO, SK, LI ir IS. Kaina – 27 mln. EUR.

— PEPPOL, www.peppol.eu – parama sąveikaujančių e. viešųjų pirkimų sprendimų diegimui; dalyvauja AT, DK, FI, FR, DE, EL, IT, NO, PT, SE ir UK. Kaina – 31 mln. EUR.

— epSOS, www.epsos.eu – parama sąveikaujantiems e. sveikatos sprendimams; dalyvauja AT, BE, CZ, DK, EE, FI, FR, DE, EL, HU, IT, MT, NO, PL, PT, NL, SV, SL, ES, SE, CH, TR ir UK. Kaina – 37 mln. EUR.

— eCodex, www.e-codex.eu – parama sąveikaujančių e teisingumo sprendimų diegimui; dalyvauja AT, BE, CZ, EE, FR, DE, EL, HU, IT, MT, NL, PT, RO, ES ir TR. Kaina – 14 mln. EUR.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002569/12
to the Commission
Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)
(6 March 2012)

Subject: The use of electronic signatures

With the development of e-commerce and the increased demand for contracts concluded electronically, the question of guaranteeing the authenticity of data sent has become important for both legal and natural persons. The electronic signature has great potential and substantial opportunities. The use of electronic signatures makes it possible to provide public services and carry out other procedures in a more cost-efficient and targeted manner.

One of the main projects of the second pillar of the strategy for the Baltic Sea Region is to 'increase the use of electronic signatures/e-identification'.

I would like to ask the Commission how to ensure that electronic signature and recognition programmes can be used at cross-border level?

What joint projects have been launched in the area of the information society, including electronic voting and other public and private electronic services?

Which countries are involved in the implementation of this project?

How much funding is required and how much funding is currently allocated for the implementation of this project?

Answer given by Mrs Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(13 April 2012)

With a view to boosting user convenience, trust and confidence in the internal market, the Commission plans to adopt before Summer 2012 a proposal for a legislative framework on electronic identification, authentication and signature. It should provide for mutual recognition of eID across borders and seek to enhance the provisions on e-signatures of Directive 1999/93/EC to achieve cross-border interoperability, including for related electronic trusted services such as time stamping.

Examples of projects to support the development and usage of cross-border electronic services using eID and e-signature are the so-called 'large scale pilots' launched at EU level in recent years (EU funding: 50 % project total cost):

— SPOCS, www.eu-spocs.eu, supporting the implementation of the Services Directive; involving AT, FR, DE, EL, IT, LI, LU, MT, NL, NO, PL, PT, RO, SL, SE, and UK. Cost: EUR 24 million;

— STORK, www.eid-*stork.eu,* supporting the deployment of interoperable eIDs; involving: AT, BE, EE, FR, DE, IT, LU, NL, PT, SL, ES, SE, UK, NO, SK, LI and IS. Cost: EUR 27 million;

— PEPPOL, www.peppol.eu, supporting the deployment of interoperable eProcurement solutions; involving: AT, DK, FI, FR, DE, EL, IT, NO, PT, SE and UK. Cost: EUR 31 million;

— epSOS, www.epsos.eu, supporting interoperable eHealth solutions; involving: AT, BE, CZ, DK, EE, FI, FR, DE, EL, HU, IT, MT, NO, PL, PT, NL, SV, SL, ES, SE, CH, TR and UK. Cost: EUR 37 million;

— eCodex, www.e-codex.eu, supporting the deployment of interoperable eJustice solutions; involving AT, BE, CZ, EE, FR, DE, EL, HU, IT, MT, NL, PT, RO, ES and TR. Cost: EUR 14 million.

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení E-002574/12
Komisi
Richard Falbr (S&D)
(6. března 2012)

Předmět: Český auditní orgán

1. Jaká pochybení Komise zjistila v souvislosti s prací Českého auditního orgánu v roce 2011?

2. Považuje Komise práci Českého auditního orgánu a zprávy a dokumenty jím poskytnuté za plně důvěryhodné?

3. Vzhledem k tomu, že Český auditní orgán je horizontální kontrolní orgán pro všechny programy v České republice, může nedostatečná práce auditního orgánu znamenat blokaci všech plateb pro všechny fondy v České republice v roce 2011?

4. Jakým způsobem budou pochybení uvedená v otázce č.1 napravena?

5. Existují jakékoli jiné sporné otázky horizontální úrovně spojené s neefektivním utrácením peněz Evropské unie v České republice, které Komise v minulých letech řešila?

Odpověď pana Hahna jménem Komise
(26. dubna 2012)

1. Komise zjistila v souvislosti se zřízením a prací Českého auditního orgánu (AO) tyto skutečnosti:

— potřebu zlepšit vedení a dozor AO v oblasti auditní činnosti prováděné pověřenými auditními subjekty (PAS),

— potřebu zajistit, aby postavení pověřených auditních subjektů a jejich zaměstnanců umožňovalo plnou nezávislost těchto PAS na řídících funkcích,

— potřebu zajistit odpovídající pokrytí všech klíčových požadavků řídících a kontrolních systémů v systémových auditech a

— potřebu zdokonalit postupy řešení a nápravy nesrovnalostí.

2. a 4. Za účelem zlepšení efektivnosti a účelnosti práce Českého auditního orgánu dojednala Komise s českými orgány akční plán pro přijetí nezbytných správních kroků do července 2012.

3. Ano, případná nedostatečná práce Českého auditního orgánu může znamenat blokaci všech plateb pro všechny fondy v České republice.

5. V České republice (stejně jako ve všech ostatních členských státech) Komise nepřetržitě hodnotí a monitoruje řídící a kontrolní systém pro politiku soudržnosti. Jsou-li zjištěny závažné nedostatky, Komise přijme příslušná opatření. Případné zjištěné neoprávněné výdaje se odečtou ze žádostí o platbu potvrzených Komisi českým certifikačním orgánem.

Komise rovněž požadovala, aby byla uplatněna opatření v oblasti ověřování prováděných řídícím orgánem, včetně pravidel pro zadávání veřejných zakázek, a v oblasti správní kapacity.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002574/12
to the Commission
Richard Falbr (S&D)
(6 March 2012)

Subject: Czech audit authority

1. What failings did the Commission identify in the work of the Czech audit authority in 2011?

2. Does the Commission consider the work of the Czech audit authority as well as the reports and documents provided by this authority to be wholly reliable?

3. Given that the Czech audit authority is the horizontal supervisory authority for all programmes in the Czech Republic, could the audit authority's inadequate work result in the blocking of all payments to all funds in the Czech Republic in 2011?

4. In what way will the failings referred to in the first question be rectified?

5. Has the Commission addressed any other horizontal issues associated with the inefficient spending of European Union funds in the Czech Republic in past years?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(26 April 2012)

1. The Commission has identified the following issues related to the set up and functioning of the Czech audit authority (AA):

— the need to enhance guidance and supervision by the AA regarding the audit work carried out by the Delegated Audit Bodies (DABs);

— the need to ensure that the positioning of the DABs and their staff allows full independence of the DABs from the managing functions;

— the need to ensure adequate coverage in system audits of all key requirements of the management and control systems; and

— the need to improve the procedures for the treatment and recovery of irregularities.

2 and 4. In order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the work of the Czech AA, the Commission agreed with the Czech authorities an action plan to take the necessary administrative steps by July 2012.

3. Yes, if there is inadequate work of the Czech audit authority it can result in blocking of all payments to all funds in the Czech Republic.

5. The Commission assesses and monitors the management and control system in place for cohesion policy in the Czech Republic (as in all other Member States) on a permanent basis. In case serious deficiencies are detected, the Commission takes the appropriate measures. Any detected irregular expenditure is deducted from the payment claims certified by the Czech certifying authority to the Commission.

The Commission has also requested measures to be implemented in the areas of management verifications, including public procurement rules, and of administrative capacity.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002576/12
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE)
(6 maart 2012)

Betreft: Het uploaden van de smartphonecontacten van gebruikers door Twitter

Via een functie in de mobiele applicatie van Twitter kunnen gebruikers Twittercontacten opzoeken in hun smartphonecontacten. Gebruik van deze optie op de mobiele applicatie van Twitter houdt in dat Twitter alle smartphonecontacten van de gebruiker naar zijn eigen server uploadt en de gegevens 18 maanden lang bewaart. In de privacyverklaring van het bedrijf staat niet dat Twitter de smartphonecontacten van zijn gebruikers uploadt.

1. Is de Commissie ervan op de hoogte dat Twitters smartphoneapplicatie het bedrijf de mogelijkheid biedt alle smartphonecontacten van zijn gebruikers, inclusief namen, telefoonnummers en e-mailadressen, naar zijn eigen server te uploaden en de gegevens 18 maanden lang te bewaren?

2. Beseft de Commissie dat Twitter met deze functie toegang krijgt tot telefoonnummers van Twittergebruikers die nooit zelf hun telefoonnummer of hun toestemming aan Twitter hebben gegeven? Beseft de Commissie dat Twitter met deze functie toegang krijgt tot de persoonlijke gegevens van mensen die helemaal geen band hebben met Twitter, maar louter een contact van een Twittergebruiker zijn?

3. Is de Commissie van mening dat deze applicatie in overeenstemming is met de EU-wetgeving inzake gegevensbescherming, in het bijzonder de algemene Richtlijn 95/46/EG betreffende gegevensbescherming en Richtlijn 2002/58/EG betreffende privacy en elektronische communicatie?

4. Denkt de Commissie dat de Amerikaanse autoriteiten toegang zouden kunnen krijgen tot de gegevens die op de Twitterserver zijn opgeslagen? Weet de Commissie of de Amerikaanse autoriteiten ooit een dwangbevel tegen de server van Twitter hebben uitgevaardigd? Zal de Commissie dit onderzoeken?

5. Welke stappen onderneemt de Commissie om ervoor te zorgen dat de EU-wetgeving inzake gegevensbescherming volledig wordt nageleefd en dat de privacy en de persoonlijke gegevens van EU-burgers volledig worden beschermd?

Antwoord van mevrouw Reding namens de Commissie

(19 april 2012)

De Commissie is zich bewust van de privacyrisico's die voortvloeien uit het toenemende gebruik van mobiele toepassingen, waarmee zeer uiteenlopende gebruikersinformatie, zoals de geolocatie van de gebruiker, zijn contacten en gespreksgegevens enz., automatisch kan worden opgeslagen vanaf een mobiel apparaat.

De vraag kan inderdaad worden gesteld of die verwerking de persoonsgegevens van gebruikers op een rechtmatige manier gebeurt. Volgens Richtlijn 95/46/EG ([1]) inzake gegevensbescherming mogen persoonsgegevens enkel worden verzameld voor welbepaalde, uitdrukkelijk omschreven en gerechtvaardigde doeleinden en verder niet op een andere manier worden verwerkt. Bovendien mag de gegevensverwerking slechts geschieden als wordt voldaan aan een van de beginselen vastgelegd in artikel 7 van diezelfde richtlijn. In haar voorstel voor een verordening inzake gegevensbescherming ([2]), die de voornoemde richtlijn zal vervangen, heeft de Commissie voorgesteld deze rechten te versterken om ervoor te zorgen dat persoonsgegevens doeltreffend worden beschermd, onafgezien van de gebruikte technologie, en dat de voor de verwerking verantwoordelijken zich bewust zijn van hun verantwoordelijkheid en de gevolgen die het gebruik van nieuwe technologieën met zich meebrengt voor de gegevensbescherming.

Bovendien waarborgt Richtlijn 2002/58/EG ([3]) betreffende privacy en elektronische communicatie, zoals gewijzigd bij Richtlijn 2009/136/EG ([4]), het vertrouwelijke karakter van communicatie en moeten de gebruikers op de hoogte worden gebracht en hun toestemming geven voordat gegevens die zijn opgeslagen in, bijvoorbeeld, smartphones, mogen worden verwerkt.

([1]) PB L 281 van 23.11.1995, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1995:281:0031:0050:NL:PDF.
([2]) COM(2012) 11.
([3]) PB L 201 van 31.07.2002, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32002L0058:nl:HTML.
([4]) PB L337 van 18.12.2009, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:337:0011:0036:NL:PDF.

Onverminderd de bevoegdheden van de Commissie als hoedster van de Verdragen, vallen het toezicht op en de handhaving van de wetgeving inzake gegevensbescherming, ook wat applicaties voor smartphones betreft, onder de bevoegdheid van de nationale autoriteiten, met name de toezichthoudende autoriteiten voor gegevensbescherming. De Commissie is niet bevoegd om toezicht uit te oefenen op de naleving van de bepalingen door de voor de verwerking verantwoordelijken, om mogelijke gevallen van niet-naleving te onderzoeken of om sancties op te leggen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002576/12
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE)
(6 March 2012)

Subject: Twitter uploading users' smartphone contacts

A feature on Twitter's mobile application allows users to search Twitter contacts in their smartphone contacts. When this option is used on Twitter's mobile application, Twitter uploads all the users' smartphone contacts to its own server and stores the data for 18 months. The company's privacy policy does not disclose that Twitter uploads the smartphone contacts of its users.

1. Is the Commission aware of the Twitter smartphone application providing the possibility for Twitter to upload all its users' smartphone contacts including names, phone numbers and email addresses to its own server and store the data for 18 months?

2. Does the Commission realise that with this feature Twitter gains access to phone numbers of Twitter users who never gave their phone number, or their consent, to Twitter themselves? Does the Commission realise that with this feature Twitter gains access to the personal data of individuals who have no link to Twitter at all, but are just a contact of a Twitter user?

3. Does the Commission consider this application to be in line with EU data protection laws, more specifically with the General Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC and the e-Privacy Directive 2002/58/EC?

4. Does the Commission consider that the US authorities would be able to gain access to these data stored on Twitter's server? Does the Commission know whether Twitter's server has ever been subpoenaed by the US authorities? Will the Commission investigate this?

5. What will the Commission do to ensure that EU data protection laws are fully respected, and that EU citizens' privacy and personal data are fully protected?

Answer given by Mrs Reding on behalf of the Commission
(19 April 2012)

The Commission is aware of the data protection risks arising with the growing use of mobile applications, which can capture a broad range of user information from a mobile device automatically, including the user's geolocation, list of contacts, call logs etc.

This raises concerns as to the lawful processing of the users' personal data. According to the Data Protection Directive 1995/46/EC ([1]), personal data must be collected for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes and not further processed in a way incompatible with those purposes. Moreover, data processing will only be legitimate if one of the grounds set out in Article 7 of the directive is met. In its proposal for a Data Protection Regulation ([2]), which will replace the Data Protection Directive, the Commission has proposed reinforcing these rights in a bid to ensure the effective protection of personal data, regardless of the technology used, and that data controllers are aware of the implications of the use of new technologies on data protection and their respective obligations.

In addition, the ePrivacy Directive 2002/58/EC ([3]) as amended by Directive 2009/136/EC ([4]) guarantees the confidentiality of communications and require users to be informed and give their consent before processing of data stored in, for instance, smart phones.

Without prejudice to the powers of the Commission as guardian of the Treaties, the supervision and enforcement of data protection legislation, including for applications for smart phones, falls under the competence of national authorities, in particular data protection supervisory authorities. The Commission has no competence to monitor the compliance of data controllers, investigate possible cases of non-compliance, or to impose penalties.

([1]) OJ L 281, 23.11.1995, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:1995:281:0031:0050:EN:PDF
([2]) COM(2012)11.
([3]) OJ L 23, 25.1.2002, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2002:023:0034:0034:EN:PDF
([4]) OJ L 337, 18.12.2009, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:337:0011:0036:EN:PDF

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés E-002577/12
a Bizottság számára
Deutsch Tamás (PPE)
(2012. március 6.)

Tárgy: Az EU és Tajvan közötti gazdasági és kereskedelmi kapcsolatok további erősítése

Az Európa 2020 stratégia kimondja, hogy „az EU jólétének alapja a kereskedelem", és elismeri a kereskedelem szerepét Európa növekedésének és versenyképességének előmozdításában. Tajvan, mely a világ 24. legnagyobb gazdasága a 16. legnagyobb kereskedelmi forgalommal, az EU 15. legnagyobb kereskedelmi partnere, és az EU Tajvan legnagyobb külföld befektetője, 2011-ben 52,56 milliárd USA-dollárra rúgó kétoldalú kereskedelemmel. Ez EU és Tajvan közötti kereskedelem az utóbbi években folyamatosan nőtt, és e növekedést tovább segítette a 2011 januárja óta a tajvani állampolgároknak adott schengeni vízummentesség. Továbbá 2011 májusában az Európai Parlament elfogadott egy, a közös kül- és biztonságpolitikáról szóló állásfoglalást, amely határozottan támogatja az EU és Tajvan közötti gazdasági kapcsolatok erősítését, valamint az EU és Tajvan közötti gazdasági együttműködési megállapodás aláírását.

Mindezen pozitív fejlemények ellenére az EU és Tajvan közötti jelentősebb kereskedelmi kapcsolatok lehetősége még mindig nincs kellő mértékben kihasználva. Mindkét félnek további erőfeszítéseket kell tennie a kétoldalú gazdasági kötelékek mélyítése és a kölcsönös befektetések növelése érdekében, különösen a Tajvan és a kínai anyaország között folyamatosan javuló kapcsolatok fényében. A gazdasági együttműködési keretmegállapodás és az elmúlt három és fél évben született 15 egyéb megállapodás Tajvan és a kínai anyaország között nyilvánvaló jele e javulásnak. Az EU és Tajvan közötti gazdasági együttműködési keretmegállapodás tehát nem csupán a felek kölcsönös előnyére szolgálna, és megfelelne az EU jelenlegi kereskedelmi politikájának, hanem javítaná az EU-nak a kínai anyaország piacához való hozzáférését is, ezáltal egy háromszorosan is nyertes kereskedelmi stratégiát eredményezve.

Milyen konkrét kezdeményezéseket tervez az EU a közeljövőben az EU és Tajvan közötti kereskedelmi és befektetői kapcsolatok további erősítése érdekében?

Karel De Gucht válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. április 10.)

A Bizottság teljes mértékben támogatja az Európai Unió és Tajvan közötti jó kereskedelmi és befektetési kapcsolatok további erősítését. A Tajvannal történő éves konzultációk, a magas rangú tisztviselők szintjén zajló félidős értékelés, valamint négy munkacsoport biztosítja a kapcsolat továbbfejlődését.

A Kína és Tajvan közötti gazdasági együttműködési keretmegállapodás megkötése a Tajvani-szoros két partja közötti kapcsolatok javulását jelzi, és a Bizottság szorosan figyelemmel kíséri e fejleményeket.

A Bizottság úgy véli, hogy bármely jövőbeli gazdasági együttműködés esetén figyelembe kell venni Tajvan sajátos pozícióját és státuszát. A tisztelt képviselő által előterjesztett érvek egyike az volt, hogy egy az EU és Tajvan közötti gazdasági együttműködési megállapodás a tajvani szaktudásnak és földrajzi elhelyezkedésnek köszönhetően több lehetőséget biztosítana az uniós vállalkozások számára a Kínával folytatott kereskedelem tekintetében is. Bármilyen meghozandó lépést pozitívan kell elbírálniuk mindazoknak, akik egy ilyen háromszorosan is nyertes kereskedelmi stratégia előnyeit szeretnék élvezni. A Bizottságnak a kereskedelemről, növekedésről és globális ügyekről szóló 2010-es közleménye ([1]) többek között az Indiával, Kanadával, a Dél-amerikai Közös Piaccal (Mercosur) és Szingapúrral folyó szabadkereskedelmi megállapodások megkötését prioritásként kezeli. Az EU jelenleg vizsgálja annak lehetőségét, hogy szabadkereskedelmi megállapodást kössön Japánnal.

A rendelkezésre álló források és az időzítés korlátai miatt, valamint Tajvan sajátos státuszát is figyelembe véve, a Bizottság úgy ítéli meg, hogy pillanatnyilag nincs aktualitása egy, az Európai Unió és Tajvan közötti gazdasági együttműködési megállapodásnak. Az EU és Tajvan a konzultációk és megbeszélések jelenlegi keretein belül keresik annak lehetőségeit, milyen további lépéseket tehetnek kereskedelmi és befektetési kapcsolataik fejlesztése és erősítése érdekében.

([1]) COM(2010) 612 végleges.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002577/12
to the Commission
Tamás Deutsch (PPE)
(6 March 2012)

Subject: Further strengthening of economic and trade relations between the EU and Taiwan

The Europe 2020 strategy states that 'the EU has prospered through trade' and recognises the role played by trade in fostering European growth and competitiveness. Taiwan, the world's 24th largest economy, with the 16th largest trade volume, is the EU's 15th largest trading partner and the EU is Taiwan's main foreign investor with two-way trade amounting to USD 52.56 billion in 2011. Trade between the EU and Taiwan has risen consistently in recent years and this growth has been further boosted by the Schengen visa waiver granted to Taiwan citizens since January 2011. Moreover, the European Parliament adopted a CFSP resolution in May 2011, strongly supporting the enhancement of EU-Taiwan economic ties and the signing of an EU-Taiwan economic cooperation agreement (ECA).

Despite these positive developments, the potential for greater EU economic and trade relations with Taiwan remains largely underexploited. Both sides should make further efforts to deepen bilateral economic ties and to increase mutual investment, especially as relations between Taiwan and mainland China are steadily improving. The Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA) and 15 other agreements concluded over the past three and a half years between Taiwan and mainland China are clear signs of this improvement. An EU-Taiwan ECA would not only be mutually beneficial and in line with the EU's current trade policy but would also improve the EU's market access to mainland China, thus creating a 'triple-win' trade strategy.

What concrete initiatives does the EU envisage in the near future to enhance EU-Taiwan trade and investment relations?

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

The Commission fully supports strengthening the already good trade and investment relations between the EU and Taiwan. That relationship is carried forward by annual consultations with Taiwan, by a mid-term review at senior official level together with four working groups.

The conclusion of the Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement between China and Taiwan shows signs of improving cross strait relations and the Commission is following these developments closely.

The Commission considers that any further economic cooperation with Taiwan needs to take account of Taiwan's particular position and status. One of the arguments put forward by the Honourable Member is that an EU-Taiwan Economic Cooperation Agreement (ECA) will provide increased opportunities for EU business with China itself, via Taiwanese expertise and location. Any steps taken would also need to be seen as positive by all those seeking to benefit from any such 'triple-win' trade strategy. The Commission's 2010 communication, 'Trade, Growth and World Affairs' ([1]) includes the completion of ongoing Free Trade Agreement (FTA) negotiations such as with India, Canada, Mercosur, Singapore etc as a priority. The EU is now also examining a possible FTA with Japan.

Within these constraints of resources and timing and taking account of the particular status of Taiwan, the Commission does not consider that an EU-Taiwan ECA should be pursued at this point. Within the current framework for consultation and discussion the EU and Taiwan are exploring what further steps can be taken to best develop and strengthen their trade and investment relationship.

([1]) COM(2010) 612 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002578/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(6 March 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Israeli Supreme Court ruling

One of my constituents has expressed concern over a recent ruling by Israel's Supreme Court. The Court has decided that Israeli companies are entitled to profit from West Bank resources. This verdict came as a result of a petition by the Israeli human rights organisation Yesh Din which argued that mining in the West Bank, which is worth USD 900 million to Israeli companies, is illegal under Articles 43 and 55 of the Fourth Hague Convention.

What steps are being taken by the Vice-President/High Representative on the matter?

Question for written answer E-002832/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Edward McMillan-Scott (ALDE)
(13 March 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Israeli Supreme Court decision on ownership of natural resources in the West Bank

On 26 December 2011, Israel's Supreme Court ruled that Israeli companies are entitled to profit from West Bank resources. This decision came as a result of a petition by the Israeli human rights organisation Yesh Din, which claimed that mining in the West Bank, which is worth USD 900 million to Israeli companies, is illegal under Articles 43 and 55 of the Fourth Hague Convention and of the 'usufruct rule' in particular (Article 55).

The usufruct rule is a long-standing principle of international law, which says that an occupying power is an administrator of the territories and must safeguard its capital for the benefit of the local population. The natural resources of an occupied territory do not belong to the occupying power for it to exploit.

The Court ruling went on to state that international laws do not fit the 'reality on the ground' of long-term occupation and should be adapted accordingly to suit Israel's ongoing occupation; in this light, Israel will continue to contravene the 'usufruct rule' in the West Bank.

As a key player in the Middle East peace process through its role in the Quartet, the EU has been working hard for a two-state solution. Therefore:

1. Does the Vice-President/High Representative agree that the abovementioned decision of the Israeli Supreme Court endangers the two-state solution?

2. Will the Vice-President/High Representative release a statement about the ruling?

3. Will the EEAS and EU Delegation in the West Bank investigate the situation on the ground in relation to Israeli mining in the West Bank, and the Israeli Supreme Court decision, and report back to the European Parliament with particular focus on the legality of the Court decision and what next steps the EEAS will take?

Question for written answer E-002843/12
to the Commission
Catherine Bearder (ALDE)
(14 March 2012)

Subject: Israeli High Court judgment allowing the exploitation of West Bank quarries

On 26 December 2011 the Israeli High Court of Justice handed down a judgment (HCJ 2164/09) in response to a petition submitted by Yesh Din challenging the legality of Israeli quarrying activities in the West Bank. The judgment held that the quarrying was legal because of the duration of Israeli occupation and that it brought benefits to the Palestinian people, in the form of employment.

Yesh Din has now submitted a motion for an *en banc* review of the petition by all the judges of the Court, with support from a panel of Israeli international law scholars. This panel has provided a document stating that the High Court of Justice judgment incorrectly interprets Articles 43 and 55 of the Hague Regulations. The judgment also appears to set a worrying precedent for the exploitation of other resources in the West Bank, such as water. This has implications for the successful development of a two-state solution, which the EU has promoted.

1. In the light of the above, can the Commission confirm whether it is aware of this ruling of the Israeli High Court of Justice?

2. Is the Commission prepared to make a statement expressing disapproval of this ruling? If not, why not?

Question for written answer E-003013/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(20 March 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Article 55 of the Fourth Hague Convention

Article 55 of the Hague Convention (IV) regarding the Laws and Customs of War on Land and its annex: Regulations concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land of 18 October 1907 state that: 'The occupying State shall be regarded only as administrator and usufructuary of public buildings, real estate, forests, and agricultural estates belonging to the hostile State, and situated in the occupied country. It must safeguard the capital of these properties, and administer them in accordance with the rules of usufruct'.

However, I understand that, following a petition by human rights organisation Yesh Din, the Israeli Supreme Court has recently decided (ruling HCJ 2164/09) that Article 55 does not require the occupying power to 'safeguard the capital' of the occupied party's natural resources and that Israel's use of quarries is limited and does not amount to destroying capital. In addition, the court decided to take into account the fact that the West Bank had been under a prolonged and continuing occupation, so that the territory's economic development could not wait until the occupation ended.

1. Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of this judgment?

2. Does the Vice-President/High Representative share the Israeli Court's interpretation of this international convention?

3. What representations, if any, have been made on behalf of the EU regarding this judgment?

Question for written answer E-003277/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(27 March 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Israeli Supreme Court judgment on quarrying in the Occupied Territories

What is the reaction of the Vice-President/High Representative to the judgment of the Israeli Supreme Court of 26 December 2011 (HCJ 2164/09) concerning the petition by the Yesh Din association against quarrying activity in the Occupied Territories?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(11 May 2012)

High Representative/Vice-President Ashton is aware of the judgment rendered by the High Court of Justice of Israel on 26 December 2011. The European External Action Service is currently examining the implications of this ruling and its compatibility with the Oslo Accords and International Humanitarian Law. It will seek further clarification from interested parties.

The EU Delegation in Tel Aviv is monitoring further developments on this issue, in particular any decision that may be taken by Yesh Din to pursue other legal avenues.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002582/12
aan de Commissie
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) en Philippe De Backer (ALDE)
(6 maart 2012)

Betreft: Nadere uitwerking van de gemeenschappelijke beginselen voor overstappen naar een andere bank

De gemeenschappelijke beginselen betreffende het overstappen naar een andere bank ([1]), die sinds november 2009 van toepassing zijn, voorzien in een evaluatieprocedure die moet worden uitgevoerd door een instantie waarbij ook nationale consumentenorganisaties zijn betrokken, door een onafhankelijk orgaan of autoriteit, dan wel — indien geen van deze oplossingen mogelijk is — door een onafhankelijke adviseur of consulent, die in overleg met de nationale consumentenverenigingen moet worden aangewezen. De Europese Commissie en de Europese consumentenverenigingen dienen regelmatig te worden geïnformeerd over de uitwerking van de gemeenschappelijke beginselen.

Blijkens het op 24 februari 2012 in „Europa" verschenen persbericht met als titel „Consumenten die overstappen naar een andere bank — 8 van de 10 mystery shoppers stuiten op problemen" is de Europese Commissie momenteel aan het zoeken naar mogelijke manieren om de bij een bankoverstap optredende manco's adequaat aan te pakken ([2]).

Kan de Commissie derhalve de volgende punten nader verduidelijken:

1. De Commissie heeft in 2008 een rapport gepubliceerd en voorstellen aangekondigd met betrekking tot overstappen naar een andere bank. Kan zij uitleggen waarom zij sindsdien op dit punt geen verdere stappen meer heeft ondernomen?

2. Is de Commissie van oordeel dat de in de lidstaten toegepaste normen voor de hele EU voldoende zijn geharmoniseerd om een soepele overgang te bewerkstelligen naar grensoverschrijdende bankoverstappen, zoals was voorzien in haar voorstellen uit 2008?

3. Zo niet, is de Commissie dan voornemens de gesignaleerde tekortkomingen te verhelpen door met wetgevingsvoorstellen te komen? Zouden die voorstellen ook het plan kunnen behelzen om een EU-breed systeem van meeneembare bankrekeningnummers op te zetten?

Antwoord van de heer Dalli namens de Commissie
(24 april 2012)

1. Een van de doelstellingen van de mededeling van de Commissie „Een interne markt voor het Europa van de 21ste eeuw" is dat consumenten vrij tussen aanbieders kunnen bewegen en makkelijker van bankrekening kunnen veranderen ([3]). De mededeling ging vergezeld van een werkdocument van de diensten van de Commissie over initiatieven op het gebied van financiële diensten voor particulieren ([4]), waarin de Commissie aankondigde van plan te zijn de banksector aan te sporen tot het opstellen van gemeenschappelijke regels over het veranderen van bankrekening. In reactie hierop heeft de European Banking Industry Committee de Gemeenschappelijke Beginselen voor het veranderen van bankrekening („Common Principles for bank account switching", of CP) opgesteld, die op 1 november 2009 moesten ingaan. Bij de in de CP voorziene controle op de uitvoering, een jaar nadat zij voor de lidstaten waren gaan gelden, werden geen grote gebreken geconstateerd. De Commissie heeft echter de effectiviteit van de CP middels een „mystery shopping study" beoordeeld, en in de op 24 februari 2012 gepubliceerde resultaten wezen op belangrijke zwakheden. Dit was een essentiële stap alvorens verdere beleidsinitiatieven op dit gebied te overwegen.

2. Van het begin af aan waren de CP bedoeld voor het veranderen van bankrekening op nationaal niveau. Verdere beleidsactie voor grensoverschrijdend veranderen zou kunnen worden overwogen zodra op nationaal niveau één stel regels voor verandering van bankrekening operationeel is.

De Commissie zal het huidige beleid op het gebied van binnenlandse en grensoverschrijdende verandering van bankrekening opnieuw beoordelen.

([1]) http://www.eubic.org/Position%20papers/2008.12.01 %20Common%20Principles.pdf
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/164&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=fr.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0724:FIN:NL:PDF.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/citizens_agenda/docs/sec_2007_1520_en.pdf

3. De Commissie beoordeelt momenteel de noodzaak van een wetgevingsvoorstel op het gebied van bankrekeningen, waarin verandering van bankrekening meegenomen wordt. Op 20 maart 2012 is een openbare raadpleging van start gegaan ([5]).

De haalbaarheid van het opzetten van een EU-breed systeem van meeneembare bankrekeningnummers zal worden geanalyseerd, samen met andere mogelijke beleidsopties binnen de context van dit initiatief.

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/consultations/2012/bank_accounts_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002582/12
to the Commission
Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE) and Philippe De Backer (ALDE)
(6 March 2012)

Subject: Follow-up to the Common Principles for Bank Account Switching

The Common Principles for Bank Account Switching ([1]) applicable since November 2009 foresee an evaluation process that will be conducted by a body involving national consumer associations, or by an independent body or authority, or, where neither of these solutions is possible, by an independent consultant or adviser, who will be selected in agreement with national consumer associations. The European Commission and European consumer associations should be regularly informed on the operation of the Common Principles.

According to the Europa press release of 24 February 2012 entitled 'Consumers: Switching bank accounts — 8 out of 10 mystery shoppers faced difficulties', the European Commission is now assessing possible courses of action to adequately address the shortcomings identified with switching ([2]).

Can the Commission clarify the following points?

1. The Commission issued a report and announced proposals for account switching in 2008. Can the Commission explain why since then it has taken no further steps on this issue?

2. Does the Commission consider that the standards applied in the Member States have been sufficiently harmonised across the EU to allow for a smooth transition to cross-border account switching, as foreseen in its 2008 proposals?

3. If not, does the Commission consider addressing the identified shortcomings by making legislative proposals? Would such proposals take into consideration the idea of setting up an EU-wide bank account number portability system?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(24 April 2012)

1. The Commission set an objective to enable consumers to move freely between providers and switch bank accounts easily in its communication 'A single market for 21st century Europe' ([3]). The communication was accompanied by the Commission staff working document on the initiatives in the area of retail financial services ([4]), where the Commission announced its intention to invite the banking industry to develop a set of common rules on bank account switching.

As a result the European Banking Industry Committee developed the Common Principles for bank account switching (CP), with a target implementation date of 1 November 2009. Monitoring provisions in the CP foresaw a review one year following the date due for implementation in Member States, which reported no major shortfalls. However the Commission carried out an assessment of the effectiveness of the CP through the mystery shopping study whose results were published on 24 February 2012, indicating major weaknesses in the effectiveness of the CP. This was an essential step prior to considering any further policy initiatives in this area.

2. From the outset the CP were intended to apply solely to switching at the national level. Any further policy action to cover cross-border switching could be considered once a single set of rules covering bank account switching were in operation at the national level.

The Commission will reassess current policy on bank account switching including cross-border switching.

([1]) http://www.eubic.org/Position%20papers/2008.12.01 %20Common%20Principles.pdf
([2]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/12/164&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=fr.
([3]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2007/com2007_0724en01.pdf
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/citizens_agenda/docs/sec_2007_1520_en.pdf

3. The Commission is currently evaluating the need for a legislative proposal in the area of bank accounts that will cover bank account switching. A public consultation was launched on 20 March 2012 ([5]).

The feasibility of the setting up of an EU-wide bank account number portability system will be analysed together with other possible policy options within the context of this initiative.

([5]) http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/consultations/2012/bank_accounts_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002592/12
to the Commission
Ashley Fox (ECR)
(6 March 2012)

Subject: Portugal's online gambling legislation

The Commission concluded on 23 June 2011 (in answer to my Written Question E-004933/2011) that the Portuguese Decree-Law No 282/2003 of 8 November 2003 regulating the operation by electronic means of gambling in Portugal should 'have been notified at a draft stage according to this directive (Directive 98/34/EC)'.

The Commission had earlier qualified on 18 October 2008 the Decree-Law No 282/2003 in its written observations in the CJEU Case C-42/07, concerning Liga Portuguesa de Futebol Profissional, as a technical regulation and therefore falling within the meaning of Article 1(11) of Directive 98/34 (Commission's written observations in Case C-42/07, para 41). All other Member States have acknowledged this and have duly notified their draft laws regulating online gambling: e.g. just recently Spain, Denmark, Italy, Belgium, Austria, France, Germany and the United Kingdom. More than three years have passed since the Commission's written observations, and Portugal still seems reluctant to acknowledge its obligations under Directive 98/34/EC.

In September 2011, the Court of First Instance of Oporto applied Decree-Law No 282/2003 against an operator regulated within the EU and thus ignored the jurisprudence of the CJEU on the effect of the failure to comply with Directive 98/34/EC. Shortly afterwards, the same court denied that operator's appeal to suspend the decision. As a consequence of these decisions by the local court, this European operator was forced to stop all advertising and sponsorship activities for Portuguese football and sports in order to avoid severe fines.

1. Does the Commission consider that the national court has rightfully ignored the CJEU jurisprudence on the effect of a failure to notify under Directive 98/34/EC?

2. When is the Commission considering initiating an infringement proceeding against Portugal for its failure to notify Decree No 282/2003?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(16 April 2012)

1. As stated in the answer to the Honourable Member's Written Question E-4933/2011, Decree Law No 282/2003 has not been notified at a draft stage according to Directive 98/34/EC ([1]).

According to the Court's CIA Security judgment of 30 April 1996 ([2]), Articles 8 and 9 of Directive 98/34/EC 'are to be interpreted as meaning that individuals may rely on them before the national court which must decline to apply a national technical regulation which has not been notified in accordance with the directive' ([3]).

The Honourable Member informed the Commission that 'in September 2011, the Court of First Instance of Oporto applied Decree Law No 282/2003 against an operator regulated within the EU and thus ignored the jurisprudence of the CJEU on the effect of the failure to comply with Directive 98/34/EC. Shortly afterwards, the same court denied that operator's appeal to suspend the decision.'

The Commission would like to underline that Article 267 TFEU provides that any court or tribunal of a Member State, 'if it considers that a decision on the question is necessary to enable it to give a judgment', may request the CJEU to give a ruling concerning the interpretation of the Treaties or of acts of the institutions of the Union. This article also states that courts or tribunals 'against whose decision there is no judicial remedy under national law' are obliged to refer the question to the CJEU.

2. The Commission as guardian of the Treaties has the discretionary power to launch infringement procedures in the event of failure to notify a legislation containing technical regulations. This discretionary power will be used taking into account all the circumstances of the case including the case law of the CJEU on gambling.

([1]) Directive 98/34/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 June 1998 laying down a procedure for the provision of information in the field of technical standards and regulations, OJ L 204, 21.7.1998.
([2]) C-194/94 *CIA Security International SA* v *Signalson SA and Securitel SPRL*. Judgment of 30 April 1996.
([3]) C-194/94 *CIA Security*, par. 55.

(Magyar változat)

Írásbeli választ igénylő kérdés P-002598/12
a Bizottság számára
Deutsch Tamás (PPE)
(2012. március 7.)

Tárgy: Andor biztos részvétele az Európai Bizottság 2012. február 22-i ülésén

2012. február 22-én az Európai Bizottság azt javasolta, hogy 2013. januári hatállyal függesszék fel a 495 184 000 euró összegű, Magyarországnak szánt kohéziós támogatás folyósítását, mert a Bizottság szerint az ország nem fog megfelelni jövő évre vállalt hiánycéljainak. A befagyasztani javasolt források a bruttó hazai össztermék (GDP) 0,5 százalékát, az összes kötelezettségvállalás 29 százalékát teszik ki. Az Európai Bizottságnak a magyar kohéziós források befagyasztására irányuló javaslata több szempontból is súlyos jogi és politikai kérdéseket vet fel, azonban most egy másik fontos kérdéssel kapcsolatban szeretnék választ, magyarázatot kapni.

Az Európai Bizottság február 22-i ülésén egy, az Unió és Magyarország számára egyaránt történelmi jelentőségű, mindeddig precedens nélküli döntést készült meghozni. Mindezt azonban figyelmen kívül hagyva, Andor László, az Európai Bizottság foglalkoztatásért, szociális ügyekért és társadalmi összetartozásért felelős biztosa egyéb programja miatt nem vett részt a testület ülésén. Elfogadhatatlan, hogy egy biztos (egy közpénzből fizetett tisztségviselő) egy budapesti szakszervezeti rendezvényen tart előadást, miközben az Európai Bizottság egy példátlan lépés megtételére készül Brüsszelben. Méltatlan a magyar és az európai polgárok bizalmára az a biztos, aki egy ilyen fontos kérdés tárgyalásakor kivonja magát a döntés felelőssége alól, és csupán írásban juttatja el véleményét a Bizottsághoz, ahelyett, hogy személyesen venne részt az ülésen és foglalna állást. Különösen igaz ez ebben az esetben, amikor a biztos állampolgári hovatartozása miatt az adott tagállam gazdasági állapotáról olyan információkkal rendelkezhet, melyeket a Bizottságnak mindenképpen figyelembe kellett volna vennie. Andor biztos távolmaradása megütközést váltott ki Magyarországon. Magyarország korábbi uniós biztosa (2004-2009 között Kovács László) is úgy vélte, Andor László rossz döntést hozott, amikor a Bizottság ülése helyett egy másik programot választott. Mindezek alapján kérdezem Andor Lászlót, hogy uniós biztosként mivel tudja magyarázni távolmaradását egy olyan európai bizottsági üléséről, amikor a testület egy példátlan döntés meghozatalára készült a hazáját illetően? Kérdezem továbbá, hogy Andor László biztosi megbízatásának ideje alatt a biztosi kollégium hány ülést tartott, és az ülésekről hány alkalommal maradt távol a foglalkoztatásért, szociális ügyekért és társadalmi összetartozásért felelős biztos?

José Manuel Barroso válasza a Bizottság nevében
(2012. április 3.)

Elsősorban feladatai ellátásából (intézményközi ügyek, illetve Unión belüli vagy harmadik országokba történő utazások) adódhat az, hogy egy bizottsági tag a testületi ülésen nem tud részt venni.

A Bizottság minden egyes ülése a jelenléti ív kitöltésével zárul, amely belekerül az eljárásról készült, a testület által jóváhagyott jegyzőkönyvbe, melyet az Europa-honlapon közzétesznek, és az az alábbi internetcímen bármikor elérhető:

— A Bizottság munkája: http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/collegemeetings/index_fr.htm

— Nyilvános dokumentumtár:
http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/registre.cfm?CL=hu (Dokumentumkeresés + Típus: „PV” + végleges változatok)

Andor biztos a testületi ülések döntő többségén részt vesz. A Bizottság tevékenységéhez való folyamatos hozzájárulását elismerjük és nagyra értékeljük.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002598/12
to the Commission
Tamás Deutsch (PPE)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: The participation of Commissioner Andor at the European Commission meeting on 22 February 2012

On 22 February 2012, the European Commission recommended that payment of the cohesion funding intended for Hungary, amounting to EUR 495 184 000, be suspended as of January 2013 because, according to the Commission, the country will not meet its deficit targets undertaken for next year. The resources which would be frozen amount to 0.5 % of the gross domestic product (GDP) and 29 % of all commitments. The Commission proposal aimed at freezing Hungary's cohesion funds raises legal and political questions that are serious from several points of view. Now, however, I would like an answer, an explanation for another important issue.

At its 22 February 2012 meeting the European Commission was preparing to make an unprecedented decision of historic importance both for the EU and Hungary. In spite of this, however, László Andor, Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, did not attend the meeting due to another engagement. It is unacceptable for a Commissioner (an official paid from public funds) to be giving a lecture at a trade union event in Budapest while the European Commission is preparing to take an unprecedented step in Brussels. A Commissioner who evades decision-making responsibility when an issue of such importance is being discussed and merely sends his written opinion to the Commission instead of attending the meeting in person and adopting a position is unworthy of the trust of Hungarian and European citizens. This is especially true in this case, when due to his citizenship the Commissioner may possess information about the economic status of the Member State in question that would have been essential for the Commission to consider. The absence of Commissioner Andor caused indignation in Hungary. Hungary's previous EU Commissioner (László Kovács, 2004-2009) agreed that László Andor made a poor decision in choosing a different event instead of the Commission meeting. In view of this I ask Mr Andor how can he explain his absence, as an EU Commissioner, from a European Commission meeting when the Commission was preparing to make an unprecedented decision in connection with his home country. Furthermore, I would like to know how many times the College of Commissioners has met during László Andor's appointment as Commissioner and from how many meetings the Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion was absent.

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(3 April 2012)

The reasons for the absence of the Members of the Commission at the College meetings are mainly related to the exercise of their duties, involving interinstitutional issues or travels within the EU or in third countries.

Each meeting of the Commission concludes with an attendance record which is recorded in the minutes of the proceedings as approved by the College, and it is also published on the Europa website and can be accessed at any time on the following address:

— Work of the Commission: http://ec.europa.eu/atwork/collegemeetings/index_fr.htm

— Public registry of documents: http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/registre.cfm?CL=fr (select search + type 'PV' + final versions)

Commissioner Andor has participated in the overwhelming majority of the College meetings. His contribution to the work of the Commission has always been both highly appreciated and highly regarded.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002605/12
alla Commissione (Vicepresidente/Alto rappresentante)
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: VP/HR — Esplosioni a Brazzaville

Sciagura a Brazzaville, capitale della Repubblica del Congo: 146 persone sono morte e 237 sono rimaste ferite in una serie di esplosioni avvenute, per cause probabilmente accidentali, in un deposito d'armi saltato in aria in una caserma. Il bilancio è stato confermato dal personale dell'obitorio, che ha contato 146 cadaveri. Fonti ospedaliere hanno riferito che 237 persone stanno ricevendo soccorso. L'esplosione ha distrutto diversi edifici e oltre duemila persone hanno dovuto abbandonare le case. Alcune persone sono rimaste intrappolate in una chiesa crollata, ma il numero non è ancora noto.

Le cinque violente esplosioni sono avvenute attorno alle 8 ora locale e si sono succedute poi fino alle 11 circa, mezzogiorno in Italia. La zona dell'incidente è stata isolata dalle forze dell'ordine mentre diversi elicotteri sorvolano la zona. Crollati diversi edifici nell'area a ridosso del deposito, per cui diverse famiglie sono rimaste senza casa.

Tutto ciò premesso, può dire l'Alto Rappresentante se è in contatto con la Delegazione dell'UE in Congo per stabilire se, effettivamente, le cause delle esplosioni sono accidentali e se si temono ripercussioni terroristiche?

Risposta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(24 maggio 2012)

Di fronte alle dimensioni del disastro, l'Unione europea, attraverso gli Stati membri e la Commissione europea (in particolare con l'azione umanitaria e di protezione civile), ha preso delle misure di emergenza immediatamente dopo la sciagura per portare il proprio sostegno alla popolazione congolese. La Commissione europea ha adottato un intervento d'urgenza di 1,25 milioni di EUR per contribuire alla bonifica del sito e per assistere gli sfollati. Kristalina Georgieva, Commissaria europea responsabile per la risposta alle crisi, si è recata a Brazzaville il giorno dopo l'esplosione.

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente, in stretto contatto con la delegazione UE a Brazzaville, ha accolto favorevolmente l'iniziativa del Presidente della Repubblica del Congo Denis Sassou Nguesso di istituire una commissione d'inchiesta per determinare le cause dell'incidente. Secondo le informazioni disponibili, un cortocircuito potrebbe essere all'origine delle esplosioni nel deposito di armi. L'Unione europea continuerà a seguire attentamente gli sviluppi dell'indagine.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002605/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Explosions in Brazzaville

Disaster in Brazzaville, capital of the Republic of Congo: 146 people died and 237 were injured in a series of explosions, probably accidental, which occurred in a weapons depot at a barracks. The final number has been confirmed by mortuary staff, who counted 146 bodies. Hospital sources reported that 237 people were receiving treatment. The explosion destroyed several buildings and more than 2 000 people were forced to leave their homes. Some people were trapped in a church as it collapsed, but their exact number is not yet known.

The five violent explosions took place at around 8 a.m. local time, continuing until around 11 a.m., 12 noon in Italy. The area of the incident was closed off by police, while several helicopters surveyed the area. Several buildings in the immediate vicinity of the depot collapsed, leaving several families homeless.

In view of the above, can the High Representative say whether she is in contact with the EU Delegation in the Congo to determine whether, in fact, the explosions were caused accidentally and that they do not fear terrorist repercussions?

(Version française)

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

Devant l'ampleur du désastre et dès le lendemain de la catastrophe, l'Union Européenne par le biais de ses États-membres et de la Commission européenne — principalement son action humanitaire et de protection civile — a pris des mesures de première urgence pour apporter son soutien aux populations congolaises. La Commission européenne a pris une décision d'urgence de 1,25 million d'euros pour contribuer à la dépollution du site et pour apporter un soutien aux déplacés. Mme Kristalina Georgieva, Commissaire européen chargée de la réaction aux crises, s'est rendue à Brazzaville dès le lendemain de l'explosion.

La Vice-présidente/Haute Représentante de l'UE, en étroit contact avec la délégation de l'UE à Brazzaville, a salué la mise en place par le Président de la République du Congo Denis Sassou Nguesso, d'une Commission d'enquête pour connaître l'origine de l'accident. Selon les informations disponibles, un court-circuit serait à l'origine du début des explosions du dépôt d'armes. L'Union européenne continuera de suivre avec attention les développements de l'enquête.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002611/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Dati e statistiche sulla vendita di automobili nei Paesi membri

Nel mese di febbraio, in Italia, si è registrato un calo delle immatricolazioni (-18,9 % con 130.661 vetture vendute). Se si considera anche il crollo di gennaio, la frenata è del 17,7 %. In flessione anche i trasferimenti di auto usate (-16,8 % con 339.756 vetture).

Sono numeri che spingono gli esperti a rivedere al ribasso le stime per il 2012, nonostante il massiccio ricorso ai «chilometri zero». Di «débâcle» parlano i concessionari di Federauto, che stima a 1,5 milioni le vendite nel 2012 (sono state 1,74 milioni nel 2011).

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. È a conoscenza dei dati sulla vendita di autovetture in Italia?

2. Intende fornire dati e statistiche aggiornate sulla vendita delle automobili nei vari Paesi membri?

Risposta data da Antonio Tajani a nome della Commissione
(26 aprile 2012)

La cifra delle vendite di automobili nuove è effettivamente un indicatore chiave per l'industria automobilistica europea, come anche per l'economia nel suo insieme. Per tale motivo, la Commissione conosce e segue da vicino l'evoluzione delle vendite di automobili in Italia e negli altri Stati membri. Questi dati sono pubblicati regolarmente da diversi attori, come le associazioni di settore, i media specializzati in economia e gli analisti di mercato.

La Commissione fornisce dati sulle vendite di automobili nei diversi Stati membri; nel prontuario statistico tascabile pubblicato annualmente *Statistical pocketbook on EU transport* figurano dati relativi alle registrazioni di veicoli nuovi. L'ultima versione di questa pubblicazione è reperibile al seguente indirizzo:
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/publications/statistics/doc/2011/pocketbook2011.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002611/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: Data and statistics on car sales in Member States

In February vehicle registrations in Italy fell (by 18.9 %, with 130 661 vehicles sold). Taking into consideration the fall in January, the slowdown amounts to 17.7 %. Second-hand car sales also fell (by 16.8 %, with 339 756 vehicles sold).

These figures are making experts revise their estimates for 2012 downwards, despite the massive use of 'ex-demo cars' (with zero or limited mileage). Federauto, whose dealers are talking about a 'debacle', estimates that 1.5 million vehicles will be sold in 2012 (sales in 2011 totalled 1.74 million).

1. Is the Commission aware of the data on car sales in Italy?

2. Will it provide updated data or statistics on car sales in the various Member States?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(26 April 2012)

The sales figures of new cars are indeed a key indicator for the European automotive industry, as well as for the economy as a whole. Therefore, the Commission is indeed aware and following closely the evolution of car sales in Italy as in the different other Member States. These data are published on a frequent basis by a number of actors, such as trade associations, economic media and market analysts.

The Commission provides data on car sales in the various Member States; it includes data on new vehicle registrations in its yearly statistical pocketbook on EU transport. The latest version of this publication can be found here: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/publications/statistics/doc/2011/pocketbook2011.pdf

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002613/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Morto operaio schiacciato da un palco

Un operaio di 31 anni, Matteo Armelini, di Roma, è morto ed altri due sono rimasti feriti nel crollo di una struttura del palco in allestimento che lunedì sera avrebbe dovuto ospitare il concerto di Laura Pausini al PalaCalafiore, il palasport di Reggio Calabria. La tragedia è avvenuta nella notte, intorno alle 2 del mattino del 5 marzo.

Un cedimento strutturale ha fatto crollare e «scivolare» la struttura metallica sovrastante il palco, che si è abbattuta sulle gradinate e su alcuni operai che erano intenti a fissare le illuminazioni aeree. La struttura ha colpito in pieno uno degli operai, che è morto sul colpo. Altri due suoi colleghi, rimasti feriti in maniera non grave, sono stati portati in ospedale.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. intende la Commissione, a seguito dell'ennesima tragedia nell'allestimento di un palco e della scenografia di grandi eventi musicali, aumentare la sicurezza per gli operai addetti, coordinando l'azione di controllo da parte degli Stati membri e rivedendo i regolamenti sulla sicurezza?

2. L'Italia applica in modo corretto la Direttiva 92/57/CEE, riguardante le prescrizioni minime di sicurezza e di salute da attuare nei cantieri temporanei o mobili?

Risposta data da László Andor a nome della Commissione
(26 aprile 2012)

La direttiva quadro ([1]) sulla sicurezza e la salute dei lavoratori durante il lavoro, che si applica a tutti i settori di attività e concerne tutti i tipi di rischio, stabilisce disposizioni sostanziali per il miglioramento della salute e sicurezza dei lavoratori. Conformemente all'articolo 6 della direttiva il datore di lavoro prende le misure necessarie per evitare, valutare e combattere i rischi, tenendo conto della natura delle attività e delle dimensioni dell'impresa. I cantieri del tipo menzionato dall'Onorevole deputato sono coperti dalla direttiva 92/57/CEE ([2]), che stabilisce requisiti minimi di salute e sicurezza per i cantieri temporanei o mobili e si prefigge di prevenire i rischi definendo una catena delle responsabilità in cui rientrano tutte le parti coinvolte. Inoltre, la direttiva 2009/104/CE ([3]) stabilisce disposizioni concernenti in particolare i rischi legati all'uso di attrezzature di lavoro. In particolare, la sezione 4 dell'allegato II della direttiva fissa disposizioni relative all'uso di attrezzature di lavoro messe a disposizione per l'esecuzione di lavori temporanei in quota.

Le direttive dell'Unione europea devono essere recepite nel diritto nazionale e attuate dagli Stati membri. Inoltre, le autorità nazionali competenti sono responsabili di far rispettare la legislazione nazionale e di applicare le eventuali sanzioni necessarie. La direttiva 92/57/CEE è stata recepita nel diritto italiano dagli articoli da 88 a 104 del decreto legislativo n. 81 del 9 aprile 2008.

([1]) Direttiva 89/391/CEE del Consiglio, del 12 giugno 1989, concernente l'attuazione di misure volte a promuovere il miglioramento della sicurezza e della salute dei lavoratori durante il lavoro, GU L 183 del 29.6.1989, pag. 1.

([2]) Direttiva 92/57/CEE del Consiglio, del 24 giugno 1992, riguardante le prescrizioni minime di sicurezza e di salute da attuare nei cantieri temporanei o mobili, GU L 245 del 26.8.1992, pag. 6.

([3]) Direttiva 2009/104/CE del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 16 settembre 2009, relativa ai requisiti minimi di sicurezza e di salute per l'uso delle attrezzature di lavoro da parte dei lavoratori durante il lavoro, GU L 260 del 3.10.2009, pag. 5.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002613/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: Worker crushed to death under a stage set

A 31 year-old worker, Matteo Armelini from Rome, was killed and two others were injured when a stage set collapsed as it was being erected for a Laura Pausini concert, which was due to take place on Monday night at the PalaCalafiore sporting arena in Reggio Calabria. The tragedy occurred during the night, at around 2 a.m. on 5 March.

A structural failure caused the metal structure to collapse and 'slip' forward over the stage, striking the tiered seating and several workers who were securing aerial lighting at the time. The structure landed squarely on one of the workers, who was killed instantly. Two of his workmates sustained minor injuries and were taken to hospital.

In view of this, could the Commission answer the following questions:

1. Following innumerable tragedies relating to stage and stage set construction for large musical events, does the Commission intend to ensure safety for workers by coordinating checks by Member States and revising safety regulations?

2. Is Italy correctly applying Directive 92/57/EEC on the implementation of minimum safety and health requirements at temporary or mobile construction sites?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(26 April 2012)

The framework Directive ([1]) on safety and health of workers at work, which applies to all sectors of activity and relates to all types of risk, lays down substantive provisions on improving workers' health and safety. In accordance with Article 6 of the directive, the employer is to take the measures necessary to avoid, evaluate and combat risks, taking the nature of the activities and the size of the undertaking into account. Sites of the type referred to by the Honourable Member are covered by Directive 92/57/EEC ([2]), which lays down minimum safety and health requirements for temporary or mobile construction sites and seeks to prevent risks by establishing a chain of responsibility linking all the parties involved. In addition, Directive 2009/104/EC ([3]) lays down provisions relating specifically to risks involving the use of work equipment. In particular, Section 4 of Annex II to the directive sets out provisions concerning the use of work equipment provided for temporary work at a height.

European Union directives have to be transposed into national law and implemented by the Member States. Furthermore, the competent national authorities are also responsible for enforcing the implementation of national legislation and applying any penalties necessary. Directive 92/57/EEC was transposed into Italian law by Articles 88 to 104 of Legislative Decree No 81 of 9 April 2008.

([1]) Council Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work, OJ L 183, 29.6.1989, p. 1.

([2]) Council Directive 92/57/EEC of 24 June 1992 on the implementation of minimum safety and health requirements at temporary or mobile construction sites, OJ L 245, 26.8.1992, p. 6.

([3]) Directive 2009/104/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 concerning the minimum safety and health requirements for the use of work equipment by workers at work, OJ L 260, 3.10.2009, p. 5.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002618/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(7 maart 2012)

Betreft: Turkije denkt over het annexeren van Noord-Cyprus

Als de onderhandelingen over eenwording van Cyprus blijven doormodderen, zal Turkije overwegen het Turkse deel van het eiland te annexeren. Dat zei de Turkse minister van Europese Zaken Egemen Bagis zondag. Het EU-land Cyprus bestaat sinds 1974 uit een Grieks en een Turks deel. De Grieks-Cypriotische leider Dimitris Christofias en zijn Turks-Cypriotische collega Dervis Eroglu hebben de laatste jaren weinig voortgang geboekt bij hun onderhandelingen. Veel Turkse Cyprioten zijn overigens tegen aansluiting bij Turkije. Op het Turkse deel bevinden zich al tienduizenden Turkse militairen. De gemoederen zijn opgelopen, omdat er gasboringen zijn gepland bij Cyprus.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht ([1]) „Turkije denkt over het annexeren van Turks-Cyprus"?

2. Hoe beoordeelt de Commissie de uitspraken van de Turkse minister van Europese Zaken en medeonderhandelaar Egemen Bagis waarin hij zegt dat Turkije bereid is om het noorden van Cyprus te annexeren?

3. Is de Commissie het met de PVV eens dat o.a. na de Turkse bezetting van Noord-Cyprus, de illegale gas- en olieboringen ([2]) en nu het dreigement van annexatie Turkije wederom aantonen dat het land totaal niet thuishoort in de EU? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Welke stappen gaat de Commissie ondernemen om te voorkomen dat Turkije het noorden van Cyprus annexeert?

5. Wanneer zijn de bedreigingen van Turkije voor de Commissie genoeg geweest en stopt zij met de toetredingsonderhandelingen?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(2 mei 2012)

Betreffende de uitspraken waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst, wil de Commissie benadrukken dat zij van mening is dat er slechts één optie is: de hereniging van het eiland in een uit twee gemeenschappen en twee zones bestaande federatie. De Commissie zal er bij alle belanghebbenden op blijven aandringen in deze zin te handelen.

De Commissie verwijst verder naar de conclusies van de Europese Raad van 9 december 2011, waarin de Europese Raad zijn ernstige bezorgdheid uitspreekt over de Turkse uitspraken en bedreigingen, en naar de conclusies van de Raad van 5 december 2011, waarin de Raad zijn verwachting uitspreekt dat Turkije de lopende onderhandelingen actief zal steunen om te streven naar een rechtvaardige, alomvattende en duurzame regeling van het Cyprusprobleem binnen het kader van de VN, in overeenstemming met de desbetreffende resoluties van de VN-Veiligheidsraad en de beginselen waarop de Europese Unie is gegrondvest.

Wat het toetredingsproces betreft, vestigt de Commissie de aandacht van het geachte Parlementslid op de bepalingen die duidelijk worden uiteengezet in het onderhandelingskader van 2005, waarmee alle lidstaten hebben ingestemd, en op het besluit van de Raad van december 2006.

([1]) http://www.nu.nl/buitenland/2755627/turkije-denkt-annexeren-turks-cyprus.html
([2]) http://euobserver.com/1016/115373

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002618/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: Turkey considers annexing Northern Cyprus

If negotiations on the unification of Cyprus continue aimlessly, Turkey will consider annexing the Turkish part of the island. That is what Turkey's Minister for European Affairs, Egemen Bağış, said on Sunday. EU Member State Cyprus has comprised a Greek and a Turkish part since 1974. The Greek Cypriot leader, Dimitris Christofias, and his Turkish Cypriot counterpart, Derviş Eroğlu, have made scant progress in their negotiations over the last few years. Many Turkish Cypriots are against joining Turkey. Tens of thousands of Turkish troops are already stationed in the Turkish part. Emotions are running high because of plans to drill for gas off Cyprus.

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report ([1]) 'Turkey considers annexing Turkish Cyprus'?

2. What is the Commission's view of the statements by Turkey's Minister for European Affairs and co-negotiator, Egemen Bağış, in which he says that Turkey is prepared to annex the north of Cyprus?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that, among other things, after the Turkish occupation of Northern Cyprus, the illegal gas and oil drilling ([2]) and now the annexation threat, prove once again that Turkey has absolutely no place in the EU? If not, why not?

4. What steps will the Commission take to prevent the annexation of Northern Cyprus by Turkey?

5. When will the Commission have had enough of Turkey's threats and put an end to the accession negotiations?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(2 May 2012)

Regarding the statements the Honourable Member refers to, the Commission would like to stress that it considers there to be only one option: the reunification of the island in a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation. The Commission will continue calling on all stakeholders to act in this sense.

The Commission furthermore refers to the conclusions of the European Council of 9 December 2011, in which the European Council expressed serious concern with regard to Turkish statements and threats and to the Council conclusions of 5 December 2011, in which the Council expressed its expectation that Turkey actively supports the ongoing negotiations aimed at a fair, comprehensive and viable settlement of the Cyprus problem within the UN framework, in accordance with the relevant UN Security Council resolutions and in line with the principles on which the Union is founded.

Regarding the accession process the Commission would like to draw the Honourable Member's attention to the provisions clearly set out in the Negotiating Framework agreed by all Member States in 2005 and the Council decision of December 2006.

([1]) http://www.nu.nl/buitenland/2755627/turkije-denkt-annexeren-turks-cyprus.html
([2]) http://euobserver.com/1016/115373.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002619/12
do Komisji
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(7 marca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Alkoholowy zespół płodowy (FAS)

Spożywanie alkoholu podczas okresu ciąży jest najbardziej znaną przyczyną wad wrodzonych oraz zaburzeń rozwojowych wśród noworodków nie tylko w Unii Europejskiej, ale na całym świecie. Niestety, wiele kobiet w ciąży jest nieświadomych faktu, iż nawet w niewielkich ilościach, alkohol zakłóca normalny rozwój i może poważnie uszkodzić płód. Statystyki pokazują, iż wiele kobiet spożywa alkohol podczas okresu ciąży – 25 % w Hiszpanii do 35 %-50 % w Holandii, a w Wielkiej Brytanii czy Irlandii nawet do 79 %.

We wrześniu 2011 r., Komisja Europejska włączyła się w seminarium, które organizowałam w Parlamencie Europejskim w Brukseli na temat alkoholowego zespołu płodowego.

W związku z powyższym zwracam się z uprzejmym zapytaniem:

Czy Komisja mogłaby przedstawić, jakiego typu akcje, kampanie społeczne będą podejmowane w Europie celem powiadomienia obywateli o szkodliwych efektach spożywania alkoholu podczas ciąży?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Johna Dallego w imieniu Komisji
(26 kwietnia 2012 r.)

Narażenie na szkodliwy wpływ alkoholu w okresie ciąży wpływa na rozwój płodu i może spowodować szkody dla zdrowia na całe życie. Podnoszenie świadomości wśród kobiet i osób z ich otoczenia, w środowisku medycznym i wśród ogółu społeczeństwa ma zasadnicze znaczenie dla zapobiegania negatywnym skutkom. Dlatego też najważniejszym priorytetem strategii Unii Europejskiej (UE) w zakresie wspierania państw członkowskich w ograniczaniu szkodliwych skutków spożywania alkoholu ([1]) jest ochrona dzieci, młodzieży i dzieci nienarodzonych.

Komitet ds. Krajowej Polityki i Działań stanowi dla państw członkowskich forum do wymiany dobrych praktyk. Francja wprowadziła na napojach alkoholowych obowiązkowe ostrzeżenia przed spożywaniem alkoholu w okresie ciąży. W Zjednoczonym Królestwie rząd zwrócił się do producentów alkoholu o wprowadzanie na swoich produktach takiego ostrzeżenia na zasadzie dobrowolności. Ponadto ponad połowa państw członkowskich UE realizuje kampanie w zakresie podnoszenia świadomości ryzyka związanego ze spożywaniem alkoholu podczas ciąży.

Ważne działania podejmowane są również przez członków Europejskiego Forum ds. Alkoholu i Zdrowia. Obejmują one akcje członków organizacji pozarządowych w zakresie działań podnoszących stan świadomości, jak też dobrowolne programy znakowania i kampanie internetowe ostrzegające o zagrożeniach wynikających ze spożywania alkoholu w okresie ciąży, realizowane przez niektórych producentów alkoholu. Informacje o podejmowanych działaniach są udostępniane publicznie ([2]).

Komisja zorganizowała ponadto w grudniu 2011 r. spotkanie z organizacjami zaangażowanymi w prace związane z uszkodzeniami płodu spowodowanymi przez alkohol, w celu znalezienia możliwych efektów synergii we wspólnych lub wzajemnie wspieranych działaniach ([3]).

([1]) Komunikat Komisji z dnia 24 października 2006 r. „Strategia UE w zakresie wspierania państw członkowskich w ograniczaniu szkodliwych skutków spożywania alkoholu", COM(2006) 625 (wersja ostateczna).
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/pl/com/2006/com2006_0625pl01.pdf

([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahf/index.jsp

([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/alkohol/docs/ev_20111208_mi_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002619/12
to the Commission
Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: Foetal alcohol syndrome (FAS)

The consumption of alcohol during pregnancy is the best-known cause of birth defects and developmental disorders in newborns, not only in the European Union but also throughout the world. Unfortunately, many pregnant women are unaware of the fact that even small amounts of alcohol can impede normal development and may cause serious damage to the foetus. Statistics show that many women drink alcohol during pregnancy — from 25 % in Spain to 35-50 % in the Netherlands and up to 79 % in the United Kingdom and Ireland.

In September 2011, the Commission participated in a seminar that I organised in the European Parliament in Brussels on the issue of foetal alcohol syndrome.

In connection with the above, I would like to ask the following question:

Could the Commission provide information on the kind of actions or social campaigns that will be undertaken in Europe in order to inform citizens about the harmful effects of drinking alcohol during pregnancy?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(26 April 2012)

Exposure to alcohol during pregnancy influences the development of the foetus and may cause lifelong damage. Raising awareness among women, the people around them, the medical community and the wider society is essential for preventing harm. This is why the first priority of the European Union (EU) strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol related harm ([1]), is protecting children, young people and the unborn child.

The Committee on National Policy and Action provides a forum for Member States to exchange good practice. France has introduced a mandatory warning against alcohol during pregnancy on alcoholic drinks. In the UK, the Government has asked alcohol manufacturers to put such a warning on their products on a voluntary basis. Moreover, more than half of EU Member States are carrying out campaigns to raise awareness of the risks of alcohol during pregnancy.

Important actions are also taken by members of the European Alcohol and Health Forum. This includes commitments on awareness raising by NGOs members, as well as voluntary labelling schemes and web based campaigns to warn about the risks of alcohol during pregnancy put forward by some alcohol producers. Commitments are publicly available ([2]).

Moreover, the Commission organised a meeting in December 2011 with organisations working on alcohol related foetal damage to explore possible synergies through joint or mutually supportive work ([3]).

([1]) Communication from the Commission of 24 October 2006, 'An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm', COM(2006) 625 final, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0625en01.pdf
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/eahf/index.jsp
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/alcohol/docs/ev_20111208_mi_en.pdf

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002620/12
an die Kommission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(7. März 2012)

Betrifft: Hochsee-Piraterie

Am 15. Februar 2012 starben zwei indische Seemänner vor der Küste des indischen Bundesstaates Kerala im Kugelhagel eines italienischen Sicherheitsteams. Die Italiener dachten, dass die beiden Seemänner Piraten waren. Die beiden Italiener waren keine angeheuerten Privatleute, sondern Soldaten eines bewaffneten Sicherheitsteams (Vessel Protection Detachment). Latorre Massiliamo und Salvatore Girone, zwei Angehörige der italienischen Marine, befinden sich zurzeit in Indien in Haft. Der indischen Verfassung nach könnten die beiden Soldaten zum Tode verurteilt werden. Das italienische und das indische Auswärtige Amt beraten über mögliche Lösungen dieses Zwischenfalles, während die Soldaten im Gefängnis von Poojarupa verbleiben.

1. Hat sich der Europäische Auswärtige Dienst bereits um dieses Problem gekümmert?

2. Welche Maßnahmen hat er bereits ergriffen?

3. Welche Maßnahmen hat die Kommission für den Schutz der Seeleute und der europäischen Soldaten in den von Piraterie bedrohten Ländern und Küsten ergriffen?

4. Gedenkt die Kommission mit den italienischen Behörden an der Freilassung der Soldaten mitzuwirken?

5. Wird der Europäische Auswärtige Dienst für diplomatische Unterstützung bei der Lösung des Konflikts zwischen Italien und Indien sorgen, falls die beiden Soldaten zum Tode verurteilt werden?

Gemeinsame Antwort von Frau Catherine Ashton — Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin im Namen der Kommission
(21. Mai 2012)

Die Hohe Vertreterin/Vizepräsidentin hat die in der schriftlichen Anfrage genannte Angelegenheit von Anfang an genau und in enger Verbindung mit dem italienischen Außenministerium verfolgt.

Der Europäische Auswärtige Dienst (EAD) hat Demarchen bei der indischen Botschaft in Brüssel unternommen und der Leiter der EU-Delegation in Delhi hat dies bei seinen indischen Amtskollegen getan. Damit hat der EAD die politische Dimension dieses Falles und die Notwendigkeit, eine zufriedenstellende Lösung zu finden, vermittelt.

Dieser Vorfall hat noch weiter verdeutlicht, dass eine eingehendere Beschäftigung mit dem Thema des bewaffneten Personals auf Handelsschiffen (sowohl des militärischen, wie im Fall der Angehörigen der italienischen Marine, als auch des privaten Personals) erforderlich ist, um es vor seeräuberischen Handlungen zu schützen. Die indische Regierung hat sich bereit erklärt, sich gemeinsam mit der EU aktiv, sowohl bilateral als auch in den wichtigsten einschlägigen multilateralen Foren, mit dem Thema des bewaffneten Personals auseinanderzusetzen, um zu verhindern, dass sich derartige Vorfälle wiederholen.

Der EAD steht in ständigem Kontakt mit der italienischen Regierung und den indischen Amtskollegen.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002791/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(12 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Incidente nell'Oceano Indiano

Nel corso del mese di marzo, due militari del Battaglione San Marco a bordo del mercantile Enrica Lexie, stanziato a 30 miglia dalla costa indiana, hanno fatto fuoco contro due pescatori indiani, uccidendoli.

Per la forza armata italiana «la dinamica dei fatti è ancora tutta da verificare», ma secondo le prime indiscrezioni filtrate attraverso i media e le autorità locali pare che i due militari abbiano scambiato i due pescatori per pirati. La marina italiana sottolinea che l'atteggiamento del peschereccio indiano era stato giudicato chiaramente ostile, tipico dei pirati: le modalità di avvicinamento erano le stesse già seguite in operazione di abbordaggio e il peschereccio non aveva risposto ai segnali di avvertimento. Si è pertanto trattato di un tragico incidente che, tuttavia, sta creando importanti tensioni politiche e diplomatiche tra l'Italia e l'India.

Il problema principale è che non si riesce a sciogliere il nodo sulla giurisdizione: i militari italiani nel frattempo rimangono detenuti nel carcere centrale di Trivandrum nello Stato del Kerala.

Tutto ciò premesso, si interroga la Commissione per sapere quali azioni ha messo in campo al fine di tutelare il rispetto dei diritti fondamentali di due cittadini dell'Unione europea in sede di controversia in acque internazionali.

Considerata la necessità di non lasciare sola l'Italia nella risoluzione di questa controversia, si chiede altresì quali azioni intende assumere l'Unione europea nei confronti di un Paese che non rispetta gli accordi internazionali. Anche per evitare un pericoloso precedente che riguarda tutti i militari europei impegnati nell'attività internazionale di contrasto alla pirateria.

Risposta congiunta data dall'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton a nome della Commissione
(21 maggio 2012)

L'Alta Rappresentante/Vicepresidente Catherine Ashton ha seguito da vicino, fin dall'inizio, la vicenda riferita nell'interrogazione scritta, in stretta collaborazione con il ministero italiano degli Affari esteri.

Il servizio europeo per l'azione esterna (SEAE) ha avviato iniziative diplomatiche presso l'ambasciata indiana a Bruxelles, e il capo della delegazione dell'UE a New Delhi ha fatto altrettanto presso i suoi omologhi indiani. Il SEAE ha sottolineato la dimensione politica del caso e il bisogno di trovare una soluzione che soddisfi le parti.

L'incidente ha posto ulteriormente in risalto l'esigenza di un maggiore impegno per affrontare in modo più globale la questione del personale armato (sia militare, come nel caso dei marò italiani, sia privato) impiegato sui mercantili per proteggerli dagli assalti dei pirati.

Il governo indiano è d'accordo nell'impegnarsi attivamente con l'UE in merito a tale questione, tanto bilateralmente quanto presso i principali consessi multilaterali sull'argomento, allo scopo di prevenire il ripetersi di incidenti simili.

Il SEAE resta in costante contatto con il governo italiano e con i suoi omologhi indiani.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002620/12
to the Commission
Angelika Werthmann (NI)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: Piracy on the high seas

On 15 February 2012, off the coast of the Indian State of Kerala, two Indian seamen died in a hail of bullets fired by an Italian security team, who believed the two men to be pirates. The two Italians, Massimiliano Latorre and Salvatore Girone, were not privately hired individuals, but rather members of an armed Italian Navy security team (Vessel Protection Detachment). They are currently under arrest in India and, under the Indian Constitution, could be condemned to death. The Italian and Indian Foreign Ministries are discussing possible ways of dealing with this incident, while the soldiers remain in Poojarupa prison.

1. Has the European External Action Service (EEAS) already taken steps to address this problem?

2. What measures has it taken?

3. What measures has the Commission taken to protect seafarers and members of European armed forces in countries and along coastlines threatened by piracy?

4. Is the Commission considering backing the Italian authorities in their efforts to secure the release of the servicemen?

5. Will the EEAS provide diplomatic support for the efforts to resolve the conflict between Italy and India should the two servicemen be sentenced to death?

Question for written answer E-002791/12
to the Commission
Sergio Berlato (PPE)
(12 March 2012)

Subject: Incident in the Indian Ocean

During the month of March, two soldiers from the San Marco battalion on board the freighter *Enrica Lexie*, stationed 30 miles off the Indian coast, fired at two Indian fishermen, killing them.

The Italian armed forces have stated that the full facts have not yet been ascertained, but according to initial leaks from the media and local authorities, it appears that the two soldiers mistook the two fishermen for pirates. The Italian navy emphasises that the behaviour of the Indian fishing boat was judged to be clearly hostile, typical of that of pirates: its manner of approach was the same as that seen in boarding manoeuvres and the fishing vessel did not respond to warning signals. It was therefore a tragic incident which, however, is creating major political and diplomatic tension between Italy and India.

The main problem lies in the fact that it is proving impossible to resolve the jurisdiction issue. In the meantime, the Italian soldiers are still detained in the central prison of Thiruvananthapuram in the State of Kerala.

In view of this, can the Commission state what action it has taken to protect the fundamental rights of two EU citizens involved in a dispute in international waters?

Given that Italy must not be left to resolve this dispute alone, what measures does the EU intend to take against a country that does not respect international agreements, not least to avoid setting a dangerous precedent affecting all European soldiers engaged in international efforts against piracy?

Joint answer given by High Representative/Vice-President Ashton on behalf of the Commission
(21 May 2012)

The High Representative/Vice-President (HR/VP) has closely followed the issue referred to in the written question from the outset, in close liaison with the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The European External Action Service (EEAS) has made demarches to the Indian Embassy in Brussels, and the Head of the EU Delegation in Delhi has done likewise with his Indian counterparts. In doing this, the EEAS has been conveying the message of the political dimension of this case and the need to find a satisfactory solution.

This incident has further highlighted the need to continue working on addressing more comprehensively the issue of armed personnel (both military, as in the case of the Italian marines, and privately contracted) deployed on merchant vessels to protect them against acts of piracy.

The Indian Government has agreed to actively engage with the EU on the issue of armed personnel, both bilaterally and in the main multilateral fora concerned, with the aim of preventing such incidents from happening again.

The EEAS remains in constant contact with the Italian Government and with its Indian counterparts.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор E-002622/12
до Комисията
Cecilia Wikström (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Станимир Илчев (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), баронеса Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jens Rohde (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE) и Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(7 март 2012 г.)

Относно: Положението с гръцката система за убежище

Отдавна съществува загриженост относно положението с убежището в Гърция. Страната се състои от острови с граници, които се контролират трудно и привличат много мигранти и лица, търсещи убежище. Гърция не разполага с функционираща система за приемане на лица, търсещи убежище, и обработване на техните случаи (през януари 2011 г. Европейският съд по правата на човека счете Гърция за виновна за това, че лицата, търсещи убежище, и мигрантите с неуредено положение живеят в унизителни условия); и в момента е изправена пред икономически проблеми.

В края на 2010 г. гръцките органи поеха ангажимент да извършат обширна реформа на политиката за убежище и миграция и приеха национален план за действие по отношение на управлението на убежището и миграцията. Съгласно първия тримесечен доклад на работната група на Комисията за Гърция (17 ноември 2011 г.) е постигнат известен напредък по този план, който включва създаването на звено за подкрепа за исканията за предоставяне на убежище, увеличаване на броя на положителните отговори на исканията за предоставяне на убежище и създаването на орган, който да отговаря за надзора на мигрантите при пристигането им.

Необходими са, обаче, повече действия. Според НПО като „Лекари без граници“ и „Human Rights Watch“, както и според Комисията, хуманитарната ситуация в центровете за задържане в региона Еврос, на границата с Турция, все още е много лоша. Мигрантите и лицата, търсещи убежище, все още биват държани в условия, неотговарящи на стандартите, и помощта за непридружавани деца мигранти е незначителна или такава изобщо липсва. Няма вероятност това състояние на нещата да се подобри, тъй като понастоящем Гърция очаква пристигането на около 400 души всеки ден, много от тях без какъвто и да е документ за самоличност, което още повече усложнява ситуацията.

Въпреки че Комисията е предоставила финансиране на Атина, изграждането на центрове за мигрантите например изостава от графика и продължава по-дълго от очакваното. Изглежда гръцките органи имат проблеми с усвояването на европейските средства, заделени за подобряване на гръцката система за убежище.

Какво възнамерява да направи Комисията, за да гарантира използването от страна на гръцките органи на ресурсите, които са им предоставени, правилното изразходване на ресурсите и бързото подобряване на ситуацията в центровете за задържане в Еврос?

Отговор, даден от г-жа Малмстрьом от името на Комисията
(15 май 2012 г.)

Комисията непрекъснато подпомага Гърция в усилията ѝ да реформира своите политики в областта на убежището и миграцията. Гърция е една от основните бенефициери на Общата програма „Солидарност и управление на миграционните потоци“, като досега по нея бяха разпределени средства в размер на 309 млн. EUR. ЕС предоставя експертна помощ на място в сътрудничество с националните власти, ВКБООН и МОМ. Комисията е готова да продължи да оказва подкрепа в тази насока, но Гърция трябва да засили своите усилия.

За Комисията е от приоритетно значение да се гарантира, че гръцките власти ще използват целесъобразно наличната финансова подкрепа за преодоляване на хуманитарната криза в региона на Еврос, както и да се постигне трайно подобрение на условията на приемане на лицата, нуждаещи се от международна закрила. От жизненоважно значение за гръцките власти е рационализирането на механизма за постигане на целите на национално равнище, като бъдат премахнати ограниченията и бъде засилено управлението на фондовете.

В това отношение Комисията и нейните служби поддържат редовно тясно сътрудничество с компетентните гръцки органи както на етапа на планиране, така и по време на изпълнението на съответните проекти, като предоставят експертни познания и консултации, включително чрез редовни посещения в Гърция.

Подкрепа се предоставя и от работната група на ЕС за Гърция, създадена от Комисията за подпомагане на Гърция, включително чрез максимално увеличаване на усвояването на финансовата помощ на ЕС и изпълнението на плана за действие относно реформата в областта на управлението на миграцията и убежището.

Но държавите членки са тези, които носят основната отговорност за гарантиране, че техните национални административни процедури и ресурси позволяват навременното и ефикасното изпълнение на действията, планирани в рамките на съответните фондове на ЕС.

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-002622/12
til Kommissionen
Cecilia Wikström (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Stanimir Ilchev (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jens Rohde (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE) og Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(7. marts 2012)

Om: Situationen med det græske asylsystem

Situationen for asylansøgere i Grækenland har i længere tid givet anledning til bekymring. Landet består af øer, og grænserne er vanskelige at kontrollere, hvilket tiltrækker mange migranter og asylansøgere. Der findes intet fungerende system for modtagelse af asylansøgere og behandling af disses ansøgninger (Den Europæiske Menneskerettighedsdomstol afsagde i januar 2011 dom mod Grækenland på grund af landets nedværdigende behandling af asylansøgere og ulovlige migranter), og landet står for øjeblikket over for omfattende økonomiske problemer.

De græske myndigheder forpligtede sig ved udgangen af 2010 til at gennemføre en omfattende reform af deres asyl- og indvandringspolitik, da de vedtog en national handlingsplan om behandling af asylansøgere og migranter. Ifølge den første rapport fra Kommissionens taskforce for Grækenland (af 17. november 2011) er der opnået visse fremskridt inden for rammerne af denne plan, bl.a. oprettelse af en støtteenhed for indgivelse af asylansøgninger, et stigende antal positive svar på asylansøgninger og etablering af en myndighed med ansvar for at føre tilsyn med migranter, når de ankommer.

Men der er behov for mere. Den humanitære situation i tilbageholdelsescentrene i Evros på grænsen til Tyrkiet er stadig meget ringe ifølge oplysninger fra ngo'er som Læger Uden Grænser og Human Rights Watch og ifølge Kommissionen. Migranter og asylansøgere tilbageholdes stadig under umenneskelige forhold, og der er kun ringe eller slet ingen støtte til uledsagede mindreårige flygtninge. Forholdene vil næppe blive forbedret, da der hver dag ankommer omtrent 400 personer til Grækenland, hvoraf mange ikke er i besiddelse af nogen form for identifikationspapirer, hvilket gør situationen endnu vanskeligere.

Selv om Kommissionen har stillet midler til rådighed for regeringen i Athen, er bl.a. opførelsen af flygtningecentre forsinket og tager længere tid end forventet. De græske myndigheder synes at have problemer med at udnytte de EU-midler, der er afsat til forbedring af deres asylsystem.

Hvad vil Kommissionen gøre for at sikre, at de græske myndigheder udnytter de midler, som de har fået stillet til rådighed, anvender dem på en hensigtsmæssig måde og hurtigt afhjælper den humanitære situation i tilbageholdelsescentrene i Evros?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Cecilia Malmström
(15. maj 2012)

Kommissionen har hele tiden støttet Grækenlands indsats for at reformere landets asyl- og migrationspolitik. Grækenland er en af hovedmodtagerne fra det generelle program om solidaritet og forvaltning af migrationsstrømme, idet grækerne har fået bevilliget 309 mio. EUR indtil nu. EU har i samarbejde med de nationale myndigheder, FN's Højkommissariat for Flygtninge og Den Internationale Organisation for Migration stillet eksperter til rådighed, og Kommissionen er parat til at fortsætte sin støtte, men Grækenland er nødt til at gøre mere selv.

Det har høj prioritet for Kommissionen at sikre, at de græske myndigheder udnytter den finansielle støtte, de har til rådighed, til at gøre noget ved den humanitære krise i Evrosregionen og til at foretage vedvarende forbedringer af modtageforholdene for folk, der har behov for international beskyttelse. Det er afgørende, at de græske myndigheder effektiviserer anvendelsen af midler på nationalt niveau ved at fjerne begrænsninger og styrke forvaltningen af midlerne.

I den henseende har Kommissionen og dens tjenestegrene et tæt, regelmæssigt samarbejde med de kompetente græske myndigheder, både i planlægningsfasen og under gennemførelsen af projekter, hvor den yder eksperthjælp og rådgivning. Det foregår bl.a. gennem regelmæssige besøg i Grækenland.

Også taskforcen for Grækenland yder støtte. Den er oprettet af Kommissionen for at hjælpe landet bl.a. med at styrke udnyttelsen af EU's finansielle bistand og gennemføre handlingsplanen om reform af migrations- og asylforvaltning.

Ikke desto mindre er det primært medlemsstaternes ansvar at sikre, at deres nationale forvaltningsprocedurer og -ressourcer gør det muligt rettidigt og effektivt at gennemføre de foranstaltninger, der er planlagt i de pågældende EU-fondes regi.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-002622/12
an die Kommission
Cecilia Wikström (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Stanimir Ilchev (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jens Rohde (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE) und Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(7. März 2012)

Betrifft: Das griechische Asylsystem

Seit Langem gibt die Asylsituation in Griechenland Anlass zur Besorgnis. Das Land besteht aus Inseln, deren Grenzen nur schwer zu kontrollieren sind, ein Umstand, der viele Migranten und Asylsuchende anlockt. Es fehlt an einem funktionierenden Aufnahme — und Bearbeitungsverfahren für Asylanten (im Januar 2011 verurteilte der Europäische Gerichtshof für Menschenrechte Griechenland, weil das Land Asylsuchende und illegale Migranten unter erniedrigenden Bedingungen aufnimmt). Außerdem hat das Land derzeit mit wirtschaftlichen Problemen zu kämpfen.

Ende 2010 verpflichteten sich die griechischen Behörden, eine umfassende Reform ihrer Asyl — und Migrationspolitik durchzuführen und nahmen einen Nationalen Plan für Asyl — und Migrationsbewältigung an. Dem ersten vierteljährlichen Bericht der Taskforce der Kommission für Griechenland (17. November 2011) zufolge wurden im Rahmen des Plans gewisse Fortschritte erzielt. Der Plan umfasst die Schaffung eines Unterstützungsteams für Asylanträge, eine größere Zahl positiver Bescheide auf Asylanträge und die Schaffung einer Stelle, die für die Kontrolle der Migranten bei ihrer Ankunft zuständig ist.

Allerdings sind weitere Maßnahmen vonnöten. Die humanitäre Lage in den Aufnahmezentren in Evros an der Grenze zur Türkei ist jedoch nichtstaatlichen Organisationen wie „Ärzte ohne Grenzen" oder „Human Rights Watch" und der Kommission zufolge nach wie vor überaus prekär. Migranten und Asylsuchende werden immer noch unter unzulänglichen Bedingungen festgehalten und unbegleitete Migrantenkinder werden kaum oder gar nicht unterstützt. Dieser Zustand dürfte sich auch kaum verbessern, da täglich rund 400 neue Migranten in Griechenland eintreffen, von denen viele keine Ausweispapiere mit sich führen, wodurch die Lage noch weiter verschlimmert wird.

Zwar hat die Kommission Athen Mittel zur Verfügung gestellt, der Aufbau beispielsweise von Migrantenzentren liegt jedoch hinter dem Zeitplan zurück und braucht mehr Zeit als vorgesehen. Die griechischen Behörden tun sich offensichtlich schwer damit, die zur Verbesserung ihrer Asylverfahren vorgesehenen europäischen Fördermittel aufzubrauchen.

Was gedenkt die Kommission zu unternehmen, um sicherzustellen, dass die griechischen Behörden die ihnen zur Verfügung gestellten Mittel auch tatsächlich verwenden, die Finanzmittel ordnungsgemäß einsetzen und die humanitäre Lage in den Aufnahmelagern in Evros zügig beheben?

Antwort von Frau Malmström im Namen der Kommission

(15. Mai 2012)

Die Kommission unterstützt laufend die Bemühungen Griechenlands zur Reformierung seiner Asyl — und Migrationspolitik. Griechenland ist eines der Hauptempfängerländer von Mitteln aus dem generellen Programm „Solidarität und Steuerung der Migrationsströme", aus dem bisher 309 Mio. EUR bereitgestellt wurden. Die EU hat in Zusammenarbeit mit den nationalen Behörden, dem UNHCR und der IOM (Internationale Organisation für Migration) Unterstützung durch Experten vor Ort geleistet. Die Kommission ist bereit, diese Unterstützung fortzusetzen, doch Griechenland muss seine eigenen Bemühungen verstärken.

Für die Kommission ist es vorrangig, zu gewährleisten, dass die griechischen Behörden die vorhandene finanzielle Unterstützung sowohl zur Behebung der humanitären Krise in Evros als auch zur nachhaltigen Verbesserung der Aufnahmebedingungen für Personen, die internationalen Schutzes bedürfen, einsetzen. Für die griechischen Behörden ist es unabdinglich, den Durchführungsmechanismus auf nationaler Ebene zu straffen, indem Hindernisse beseitigt und die Mittelverwaltung verbessert werden.

In dieser Hinsicht halten die Kommission und ihre Dienststellen ihre regelmäßige enge Zusammenarbeit mit den zuständigen griechischen Behörden sowohl im Planungsstadium als auch während der Durchführung wichtiger Projekte aufrecht, indem sie Fachwissen und Beratung bereitstellen und regelmäßige Besuche in Griechenland durchführen.

Unterstützung kommt auch von der „EU-Task Force für Griechenland“, die von der Kommission zur Unterstützung Griechenlands eingerichtet wurde und die auf die Maximierung der Absorption der finanziellen Unterstützung der EU und die Umsetzung des Aktionsplans für Migrationsmanagement und Asylreform achtet.

Es liegt jedoch vornehmlich in der Verantwortung der Mitgliedstaaten, dafür zu sorgen, dass ihre nationalen Verwaltungsverfahren und Ressourcen in der Lage sind, die im Rahmen der jeweiligen EU-Fonds geplanten Maßnahmen zeitnah und wirksam umzusetzen.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002622/12
à la Commission
Cecilia Wikström (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Stanimir Ilchev (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jens Rohde (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE) et Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(7 mars 2012)

Objet: Situation du régime d'asile en Grèce

Les préoccupations concernant la situation de l'asile en Grèce ne sont pas nouvelles. Le pays comprend de très nombreuses îles avec des frontières qui sont difficiles à contrôler et qui attirent de nombreux migrants et demandeurs d'asile; il manque en outre d'un système de réception et de traitement des demandes d'asile (en janvier 2011, la Cour européenne des Droits de l'homme a établi que la Grèce s'était rendue coupable d'héberger des demandeurs d'asile et migrants irréguliers dans des conditions dégradantes); enfin, ce pays est actuellement confronté à une situation économique difficile.

À la fin de l'année 2010, les autorités grecques se sont engagées à mettre en œuvre une vaste réforme de leurs politiques d'asile et de migration et ont adopté un plan national sur la gestion de l'asile et de la migration. Selon le premier rapport trimestriel de la task force de la Commission pour la Grèce (17 novembre 2011), des progrès ont été réalisés dans le cadre de ce plan, qui comprennent la création d'une unité de soutien pour les demandes d'asile, une augmentation du nombre de réponses favorables aux demandes d'asile, et la mise en place d'une autorité responsable de la surveillance des migrants à leur arrivée.

Mais cela ne suffit pas. La situation humanitaire dans les centres de détention de la région d'Evros, à la frontière avec la Turquie, est encore très inquiétante selon des ONG telles que Médecins sans frontières et Human rights watch. Les migrants et les demandeurs d'asile continuent d'être détenus dans de très mauvaises conditions, et les migrants mineurs non accompagnés ne bénéficient que de peu d'assistance, voire d'aucune assistance. Cette situation ne devrait pas s'améliorer bientôt, dans la mesure où la Grèce voit arriver quotidiennement près de 400 personnes, dont un grand nombre sont dépourvues de tout document d'identité, ce qui ne fait que compliquer encore la situation.

Alors que la Commission a débloqué des fonds pour Athènes, la construction de centres d'accueil appropriés pour les migrants, par exemple, demeure très loin en-deçà des attentes. Les autorités grecques semblent avoir des problèmes pour absorber les fonds européens destinés à l'amélioration de leur système d'asile

Quelles mesures le Conseil compte-t-il prendre pour encourager les autorités grecques à utiliser les ressources qui ont été mises à leur disposition, à dépenser ces ressources de façon appropriée et à remédier rapidement à la situation humanitaire qui prévaut dans les centres de détention de la région d'Evros?

Réponse donnée par Mme Malmström au nom de la Commission
(15 mai 2012)

La Commission apporte un soutien permanent à la Grèce pour l'aider à réformer ses politiques d'asile et de migration. La Grèce est un des principaux bénéficiaires du programme général «Solidarité et gestion des flux migratoires» dont 309 millions d'euros lui ont été alloués jusqu'à présent. L'UE a fourni une assistance d'experts sur le terrain, en collaboration avec les autorités nationales, le HCR et l'OIM. La Commission est disposée à poursuivre ce soutien, mais la Grèce doit intensifier ses propres efforts.

Pour la Commission, il est prioritaire de s'assurer que les autorités grecques feront bon usage de l'aide financière disponible pour faire face à la crise humanitaire que connaît la région de l'Evros et pour apporter une amélioration durable aux conditions d'accueil des personnes ayant besoin d'une protection internationale. Il est essentiel que les autorités grecques rationalisent le mécanisme de fourniture de l'aide au niveau national, en supprimant les entraves et en renforçant la gestion des fonds.

À cet égard, la Commission et ses services entretiennent, sur une base régulière, une coopération étroite avec les autorités grecques compétentes, tant au stade de la planification qu'au cours de la mise en œuvre des projets correspondants, en fournissant une expertise et des conseils, y compris au moyen de visites régulières en Grèce.

La Task force de l'UE pour la Grèce apporte également son appui. Elle a été créée par la Commission afin d'aider la Grèce, notamment pour optimaliser l'absorption de l'aide financière de l'UE et la mise en œuvre du plan d'action pour la gestion des migrations et la réforme du droit d'asile.

C'est néanmoins aux États membres qu'il appartient avant tout de veiller à ce que leurs procédures administratives et leurs ressources nationales permettent la mise en œuvre efficace et en temps utile des mesures planifiées dans le cadre des Fonds correspondants de l'UE.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002622/12
alla Commissione
Cecilia Wikström (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Stanimir Ilchev (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jens Rohde (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE) e Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(7 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Situazione del sistema di asilo in Grecia

La situazione del sistema di asilo vigente in Grecia è fonte di preoccupazioni da ormai lungo tempo. Il paese è costituito da isole i cui confini sono difficili da controllare e che attraggono molti migranti e richiedenti asilo; non dispone di un sistema funzionante per l'accoglienza dei richiedenti asilo e il trattamento delle loro domande (nel gennaio 2011 la Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo ha condannato la Grecia in quanto i richiedenti asilo ed i migranti irregolari soggiornano nel paese in condizioni degradanti) ed è attualmente confrontato a seri problemi economici.

Alla fine del 2010 le autorità greche si sono impegnate ad attuare una vasta riforma delle proprie politiche in materia di asilo e migrazione ed hanno adottato un piano nazionale sulla gestione dell'asilo e della migrazione. In base alla prima relazione trimestrale della Task Force della Commissione per la Grecia, del 17 novembre 2011, il piano d'azione ha permesso di realizzare alcuni progressi, tra cui la creazione di un servizio di sostegno per i richiedenti asilo, l'accoglimento di un maggior numero di richieste d'asilo e l'istituzione di un ente responsabile della supervisione dei migranti al loro arrivo.

È tuttavia necessario fare di più. La situazione umanitaria nei centri di detenzione di Evros, al confine con la Turchia, è ancora molto grave, secondo le informazioni di ONG come Médecins Sans Frontières e Human Rights Watch e della Commissione. Le condizioni di detenzione dei migranti e dei richiedenti asilo continuano ad essere precarie e l'assistenza ai minori non accompagnati è scarsa o del tutto assente. Molto verosimilmente, la situazione non è destinata a migliorare, dal momento che in Grecia arrivano ogni giorno circa 400 migranti, molti dei quali sono privi di documenti d'identità, il che complica ulteriormente la situazione.

Malgrado le risorse che la Commissione ha messo a disposizione delle autorità di Atene, la costruzione di centri per migranti è in ritardo e sta richiedendo più tempo del previsto. Le autorità greche sembrano avere problemi ad assorbire i fondi europei destinati al miglioramento del loro sistema di asilo.

Può il Consiglio indicare in che modo intende garantire che le autorità greche utilizzino le risorse a loro disposizione, spendano i fondi in modo appropriato e pongano rapidamente rimedio alla situazione umanitaria nei centri di detenzione di Evros?

Risposta data da Cecilia Malmström a nome della Commissione
(15 maggio 2012)

La Commissione sostiene costantemente gli sforzi della Grecia volti a riformare le sue politiche in materia di asilo e migrazione. La Grecia è uno dei principali beneficiari del programma generale «Solidarietà e gestione dei flussi migratori», per cui sono stati stanziati finora 309 milioni di EUR. L'UE ha fornito l'assistenza di esperti sul campo, in collaborazione con le autorità nazionali, l'Alto Commissariato delle Nazioni Unite per i rifugiati e l'Organizzazione internazionale per le migrazioni. La Commissione è pronta a portare avanti le attività di sostegno, ma la Grecia deve intensificare i propri sforzi.

Per la Commissione è prioritario fare in modo che le autorità greche facciano buon uso dei fondi a disposizione per far fronte alla crisi umanitaria nella regione dell'Evros e per migliorare in maniera sostenibile le condizioni di accoglienza delle persone che necessitano di protezione internazionale. È fondamentale, per le autorità greche, ottimizzare il meccanismo di esecuzione a livello nazionale, rimuovendo gli ostacoli e rafforzando la gestione dei fondi.

Al riguardo la Commissione e i suoi servizi stanno cooperando strettamente con le autorità nazionali competenti, su base regolare, sia nella fase di pianificazione che al momento dell'attuazione dei progetti, fornendo consulenze specialistiche anche attraverso visite regolari sul posto.

Ulteriore sostegno proviene dalla task force dell'UE sulla Grecia, che la Commissione ha istituito per aiutare il paese a massimizzare la capacità di assorbimento del sostegno finanziario proveniente dall'Unione e attuare un piano d'azione sulla gestione dei flussi migratori e sulla riforma dell'asilo.

Tuttavia, spetta in primo luogo agli Stati membri assicurare che le loro procedure amministrative e le risorse nazionali permettano un'attuazione efficiente delle azioni pianificate sulla base dei fondi UE.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002622/12
aan de Commissie
Cecilia Wikström (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Stanimir Ilchev (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jens Rohde (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE) en Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(7 maart 2012)

Betreft: De situatie van het Griekse asielsysteem

Reeds sinds lange tijd bestaan er zorgen over de asielsituatie in Griekenland. Het land bestaat uit eilanden met moeilijk te controleren grenzen, hetgeen een grote aantrekkingskracht uitoefent op migranten en asielzoekers. Het land ontbeert een functionerend systeem voor de opvang van asielzoekers en de verwerking van asielaanvragen (in januari 2011 oordeelde het Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens dat Griekenland zich schuldig maakt aan de opvang van asielzoekers en illegale migranten onder mensonterende omstandigheden). Bovendien kampt het land op dit moment met economische problemen.

Eind 2010 hebben de Griekse autoriteiten toegezegd een drastische hervorming van hun asiel— en migratiebeleid door te voeren en zij hebben een nationaal plan voor asiel— en migratiebeheer aangenomen. Volgens het eerste kwartaalverslag van de taakgroep voor Griekenland van de Commissie (17 november 2011) is er in het kader van dit plan enige vooruitgang geboekt, waaronder de oprichting van een ondersteuningseenheid voor asielaanvragen, een toename van het aantal ingewilligde asielaanvragen en de totstandbrenging van een autoriteit die belast is met het toezicht op binnenkomende migranten.

Er moet echter meer gebeuren. De humanitaire situatie in detentiecentra in de provincie Evros bij de grens met Turkije blijft volgens ngo's als Artsen zonder Grenzen en Human Rights Watch en volgens de Commissie erg slecht. De omstandigheden waaronder migranten en asielzoekers worden vastgehouden zijn nog steeds ondermaats, terwijl nauwelijks of geen bijstand wordt verleend aan minderjarige migrantenkinderen zonder begeleider. Een verbetering van deze stand van zaken is niet waarschijnlijk, aangezien in Griekenland dagelijks 400 nieuwe migranten arriveren, vaak zonder identificatiedocument, hetgeen de situatie nog complexer maakt.

Hoewel de Commissie Athene middelen ter beschikking heeft gesteld, ligt bijvoorbeeld.d. bouw van centra voor migranten achter op schema en deze duurt langer dan verwacht. De Griekse autoriteiten lijken problemen te ondervinden bij de absorptie van de Europese middelen die zijn uitgetrokken voor de verbetering van hun asielsysteem.

Wat is de Commissie voornemens te doen om ervoor te zorgen dat de Griekse autoriteiten gebruik maken van de middelen die hun ter beschikking zijn gesteld en deze op gepaste wijze besteden zo.a. de humanitaire situatie in detentiecentra in Evros snel verbetert?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(15 mei 2012)

De Commissie heeft de inspanningen van Griekenland voor de hervorming van zijn asiel— en migratiebeleid voortdurend ondersteund. Griekenland is een van de belangrijkste begunstigden van het algemeen programma „Solidariteit en beheer van de migratiestromen". In het kader van dat programma heeft het land tot nu toe 309 miljoen EUR ontvangen. De EU heeft deskundige bijstand ter plaatse geboden, in samenwerking met nationale autoriteiten, de UHNCR en de IOM. De Commissie is bereid om dergelijke ondersteuning voort te zetten, maar Griekenland dient zijn eigen inspanningen te vergroten

Het is een prioriteit van de Commissie ervoor te zorgen dat de Griekse autoriteiten de beschikbare financiële steun goed benutten om de humanitaire crisis in de regio Evros aan te pakken en de omstandigheden waaronder mensen die internationale bescherming nodig hebben, worden opgevangen, duurzaam te verbeteren. Het is van essentieel belang dat de Griekse autoriteiten het uitvoeringsmechanisme op nationaal niveau stroomlijnen, waarbij beperkingen worden opgeheven en het beheer van de financiële middelen wordt verbeterd.

De Commissie en haar diensten handhaven in dit kader een nauwe en regelmatige samenwerking met de bevoegde Griekse autoriteiten, zowel in het voorbereidend stadium als tijdens de uitvoering van de betreffende projecten, waarbij deskundigheid en advies wordt geboden, onder andere door Griekenland regelmatig te bezoeken.

Ook wordt ondersteuning geboden door de EU-Task Force voor Griekenland, die de Commissie heeft opgericht om Griekenland bij te staan, onder meer door te zorgen voor een maximale absorptie van de financiële bijstand van de EU en de uitvoering van het actieplan inzake migratiebeheer en de hervorming van het asielstelsel.

Het is echter primair de verantwoordelijkheid van de lidstaten om ervoor te zorgen dat hun nationale administratieve procedures en middelen de tijdige en efficiënte uitvoering mogelijk maken van de in het kader van de betreffende EU-fondsen geplande acties.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-002622/12
till kommissionen
Cecilia Wikström (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Stanimir Ilchev (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jens Rohde (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE) och Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(7 mars 2012)

Angående: Förhållandena i det grekiska asylsystemet

Problemen med asylsituationen i Grekland är av gammalt datum. Landet består av öar med gränser som är svåra att kontrollera och som därför drar till sig många migranter och asylsökare. Grekland saknar en fungerande flyktingmottagning och asylhandläggning (i januari 2011 konstaterade Europadomstolen att Grekland låtit asylsökare och illegala migranter leva under undermåliga förhållanden) och står nu inför ekonomiska problem.

I slutet av 2010 lovade de grekiska myndigheterna att göra en omfattande reform av sin asy-ch migrationspolitik och antog en nationell plan för asylfrågor och migrationshantering. Enligt den första kvartalsrapporten (av den 17 november) från kommissionens arbetsgrupp för Grekland har vissa framsteg gjorts enligt planen. Bland annat har en stödenhet för asylansökningar inrättats, allt fler asylsökare har fått ett positivt svar på sin asylansökan och en myndighet som ansvarar för att se till migranterna när de anländer har inrättats.

Men det behövs mer. Den humanitära situationen i flyktingförläggningarna i Evros, på gränsen till Turkiet, är fortfarande mycket svår, hävdar frivilligorganisationer som Läkare utan gränser, Human Rights Watch samt kommissionen. Migranter och asylsökare hålls fortfarande kvar i undermåliga förhållanden, och underåriga utan medföljande vuxen får föga eller inget stöd. Situationen kommer knappast att förbättras, eftersom 400 nya människor anländer till Grekland varje dag. Många av dem har inga identitetshandlingar, vilket gör situationen ännu mer komplicerad.

Även om kommissionen beviljat Aten medel släpar exempelvis byggandet av anläggningar för migranter efter i tidtabellen och tar längre än väntat. De grekiska myndigheterna verkar ha problem med att använda de EU-medel som öronmärkts för att förbättra deras asylsystem.

Vad ämnar kommissionen göra för att se till att de grekiska myndigheterna använder de resurser som tilldelats dem, använder resurserna på ett ändamålsenligt sätt och snabbt åtgärdar den humanitära situationen i flyktingförläggningarna i Evros?

Svar från Cecilia Malmström på kommissionens vägnar
(15 maj 2012)

Kommissionen har hela tiden stött Greklands insatser för att reformera sin asy-ch migrationspolitik. Grekland är en av de största mottagarna av stöd från ramprogrammet för solidaritet och hantering av migrationsströmmar, och har hittills tilldelats 309 miljoner euro. EU har tillhandahållit expertkunnande på plats i samarbete med de nationella myndigheterna, UNHCR och IOM. Kommissionen är beredd att fortsätta detta stöd, men Grekland måste öka sina egna insatser.

Det är en prioritet för kommissionen att se till att de grekiska myndigheterna utnyttjar det tillgängliga ekonomiska stödet för att hantera den humanitära krisen i Evros-regionen och för att åstadkomma en varaktig förbättring av mottagningsvillkoren för personer som behöver internationellt skydd. Det är av avgörande betydelse att de grekiska myndigheterna rationaliserar formerna för genomförandet på nationell nivå, genom att avskaffa begränsningar och stärka förvaltningen av medlen.

Kommissionen och dess avdelningar upprätthåller ett nära och regelbundet samarbete med de behöriga grekiska myndigheterna, såväl på planeringsstadiet som under genomförandet av projekt, där den tillhandahåller expertkunnande och rådgivning. Detta sker bland annat genom regelbundna besök i Grekland.

Stöd tillhandahålls också av EU:s arbetsgrupp för Grekland som inrättats av kommissionen för att bistå landet, bland annat med att maximera utnyttjandet av EU:s ekonomiska stöd och genomföra handlingsplanen för migration-ch asylhantering.

Det är dock i första hand medlemsstaternas ansvar att se till att deras nationella administrativa förfaranden och resurser gör det möjligt att i tid och på ett effektivt sätt genomföra de åtgärder som planeras inom ramen för de berörda EU-fonderna.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002622/12
to the Commission
Cecilia Wikström (ALDE), Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE), Sonia Alfano (ALDE), Nadja Hirsch (ALDE), Stanimir Ilchev (ALDE), Louis Michel (ALDE), Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE), Jens Rohde (ALDE), Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE) and Frédérique Ries (ALDE)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: The situation of the Greek asylum system

The concerns about the asylum situation in Greece are longstanding. The country is made up of islands with borders that are difficult to control, attracting a lot of migrants and asylum-seekers; it lacks a functioning asylum reception and processing system (in January 2011, the European Court of Human Rights found Greece guilty of hosting asylum-seekers and irregular migrants in degrading conditions); and it is currently facing economic problems.

At the end of 2010, the Greek authorities committed themselves to implement a vast reform of their asylum and migration policies, adopting a National Plan on Asylum and Migration Management. According to the first quarterly report from the Commission Task Force for Greece (17 November 2011), some progress has been achieved under the plan, which includes the creation of a support unit for asylum requests, an increased number of favourable answers to asylum requests, and the setting in place of an authority responsible for the oversight of migrants when they arrive.

But more is needed. The humanitarian situation in detention centres in Evros, at the border with Turkey, is still very bad according to NGOs like Médecins Sans Frontières and Human Rights Watch, and according to the Commission. Migrants and asylum-seekers continue to be detained in substandard conditions, and there is little or no assistance to unaccompanied migrant children. This state of play is not likely to improve as Greece now sees the arrival of around 400 people every day, many of them without any identification document, making the situation even more complicated.

While the Commission has made funding available for Athens, the construction of centres for migrants, for example, is behind schedule and takes longer than expected. The Greek authorities seem to have problems in absorbing the European funds earmarked for improving their asylum system.

What does the Commission intend to do to ensure that the Greek authorities use the resources that have been made available to them, spend the resources appropriately and rapidly remedy to the humanitarian situation in detention centres in Evros?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(15 May 2012)

The Commission has been continuously supporting Greece's efforts to reform its asylum and migration policies. Greece is one of the main beneficiaries of the General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows', with EUR 309 million allocated so far. The EU has provided expert assistance on the ground, in collaboration with national authorities, the UNHCR and the IOM. The Commission stands ready to continue such support, but Greece needs to step up its own efforts.

For the Commission, it is a priority to ensure that the Greek authorities will make good use of the available financial support to address the humanitarian crisis in the Evros region as well as to make a sustainable improvement in reception conditions for people in need of international protection. It is crucial for the Greek authorities to streamline the delivery mechanism at national level, removing constraints and reinforcing management of the funds.

In this regard, the Commission and its services are maintaining close cooperation with the competent Greek authorities on a regular basis, both at the planning stage and during implementation of relevant projects, with the provision of expertise and advice, including through regular visits to Greece.

Support is also provided by the EU Task Force on Greece established by the Commission to assist Greece, including by maximising the absorption of EU financial assistance and the implementation of the action plan on migration management and asylum reform.

It is, however, primarily the responsibility of Member States to ensure that their national administrative procedures and resources allow for the timely and efficient implementation of the actions planned under the relevant EU funds.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-002625/12
aan de Commissie
Barry Madlener (NI)
(7 maart 2012)

Betreft: Erdogan: minder school, meer Koran

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht ([1]) „Turkey: Erdogan's reforms: less schooling, more Koran"?

2. Kan de Commissie bevestigen dat er nieuwe wetgeving, afkomstig van de islamitische AK-partij, in het Turkse parlement op tafel ligt dat als doel heeft om de schooldagen te verminderen om zodoende meer Koranscholen en het dragen van hoofddoeken op school te promoten?

3. Is de Commissie met de PVV van mening dat door het dragen van hoofddoeken op scholen de seculariteit van het Turkse onderwijs onder zware islamitische druk staat? Zo ja, heeft dit dan enige gevolgen voor het toetredingsproces van Turkije tot de EU? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Füle namens de Commissie
(11 mei 2012)

De Commissie volgt het huidige debat binnen het Turkse parlement en de Turkse maatschappij over de wetgeving tot wijziging van de wet op basisonderwijs op de voet. De Commissie is van oordeel dat er over elke belangrijke wijziging van het onderwijssysteem een brede consensus moet bestaan en moedigt alle partijen aan om een constructieve dialoog aan te gaan zo.a. een consensus kan worden bereikt.

De Commissie zal de wet in detail onderzoeken zodr. zij door het Turkse parlement is aangenomen. Het ontwerp waarover momenteel wordt gedebatteerd, bevat een aantal positieve elementen, zoals de uitbreiding van verplicht onderwijs van acht naar twaalf jaar, wat met name in rurale en voorstedelijke gebieden in het oosten en zuidoosten van het land mogelijk tot een aantal verbeteringen op het vlak van schoolverlaten en absenteïsme kan leiden. Ook kinderen van seizoenarbeiders zouden baat kunnen hebben bij de nieuwe aanpak van thuisonderwijs.

Specifieke aspecten, zoals onderwijs voor meisjes of kinderarbeid, dienen evenwel via passende wetgeving te worden onderzocht en behandeld.

Als een land dat over toetreding tot de EU onderhandelt, dient Turkije in de praktijk het recht op onderwijs te garanderen voor iedereen, jongens of meisjes, in stedelijke of landelijke gebieden, volgens het EU-acquis, de bepalingen van het Europees Verdrag tot bescherming van de rechten van de mens en de jurisprudentie van het Europees Hof voor de rechten van de mens.

([1]) http://www.ansamed.info/ansamed/en/news/sections/politics/2012/02/24/visualizza_new.html_104136312.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002625/12
to the Commission
Barry Madlener (NI)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: Erdoğan: less schooling, more Koran

1. Is the Commission familiar with the report ([1]) 'Turkey: Erdoğan's reforms: less schooling, more Koran'?

2. Can the Commission confirm that new legislation, drafted by the Islamist AKP party and aimed at reducing the number of school days in order to promote more Koran schools and wearing headscarves at school, has been introduced in the Turkish Parliament?

3. Does the Commission agree with the PVV that through the wearing of headscarves at school, the secularity of Turkish education is under heavy Islamic pressure? If so, does this have any implications for Turkey's accession process to the EU? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Füle on behalf of the Commission
(11 May 2012)

The Commission follows closely the current debate within the Turkish parliament and society on legislation amending the law on primary education. The Commission believes any important changes to the educational system should be subject to a broad consensus and encourages all sides to engage in a constructive dialogue so that such a consensus can be reached.

The Commission will examine the law in detail once adopted by the Turkish parliament. The draft being currently debated contains some positive elements such as the extension of compulsory education from eight to 12 years, which could potentially bring some improvements to the persisting drop-out and absenteeism rates notably in rural and suburban areas in the East and South-east of the country, and children of seasonal workers could benefit from the new approach to home schooling.

But specific aspects such as education of girls, or child labour, need to be analysed and addressed through appropriate legislative provisions.

Turkey, as a country negotiating accession to the EU needs to guarantee in practice the right to education for all, boys or girls, in urban or rural areas, according to the EU acquis, the provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights.

([1]) http://www.ansamed.info/ansamed/en/news/sections/politics/2012/02/24/visualizza_new.html_104136312.html

(Latviešu valodas versija)

Jautājums, uz kuru jāatbild rakstiski, P-002628/12
Komisijai
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(2012. gada 7. marts)

Temats: Latvijas nepilsoņu tiesības balsot pašvaldību vēlēšanās

Latvijas Republikas Augstākā Padome 1991. gada 15. oktobrī pieņēma rezolūciju par "pilsoņu tiesību atjaunošanu un naturalizācijas pamatnoteikumiem", sadalot – pretēji starptautiskajām tiesību normām – visus Latvijas iedzīvotājus vai nu pilsoņos, vai citos iedzīvotājos un paredzot, ka valsts, kas tikko kā bija beigusi pastāvēt, iedzīvotāji ir tiesīgi izvēlēties pilsonību. Ir svarīgi piebilst, ka 1990. un 1991. gadā nacionālās minoritātes atjaunotajā neatkarīgajā Latvijas Republikā bija pilntiesīgi pilsoņi, kuri piedalījās Augstākās Padomes vēlēšanās, uzskatīja Latviju par savu dzimteni un gribēja tās neatkarību.

Atbilstīgi 2011. gada 1. janvāra datiem valstī vēl bija palikuši 326 735 nepilsoņi (14,6 % no kopējā valsts iedzīvotāju skaita). Lielākoties nepilsoņi ir veci cilvēki, kas dzimuši Latvijā (kad tā ietilpa PSRS). Šiem cilvēkiem ir ārkārtīgi grūti iemācīties latviešu valodu tādā līmenī, lai no galvas atcerētos Latvijas konstitūciju, un iemācīties valsts vēsturi latviešu valodā, kas ir priekšnoteikumi, lai izietu tā saukto naturalizācijas procesu. Tādējādi nepilsoņi, kas ir 15,0 % no visiem valsts iedzīvotājiem, nevar piedalīties vietējos politiskajos procesos, t. i., viņiem pilnībā ir liegta līdzdalība savas izcelsmes valsts politiskajā un sociālajā dzīvē.

ANO Cilvēktiesību komiteja, ANO Rasu diskriminācijas novēršanas komiteja, Eiropas Padomes Parlamentārā asambleja, Eiropas Padomes vietējo un reģionālo pašvaldību kongress, Eiropas Padomes cilvēktiesību komisārs, Eiropas Komisija pret rasismu un neiecietību, kā arī EDSO Parlamentārā asambleja ir ieteikuši veikt pasākumus, lai nepilsoņi varētu piedalīties pašvaldību vēlēšanās. Eiropas Parlaments 2004. gada 11. marta rezolūcijā par Komisijas visaptverošo pārraudzības ziņojumu par gatavību pievienoties ES ierosināja Latvijas iestādēm paredzēt iespēju ļaut nepilsoņiem, kuri ilgu laiku ir bijuši tās iedzīvotāji, piedalīties vietējo pašvaldību vēlēšanās. Šī problēma rada Latvijā etnisko spriedzi, kā to skaidri liecināja nesen notikušais referendums (2012. gada 19. februārī) par oficiālas valodas statusa piešķiršanu krievu valodai Latvijā.

Parlaments 2009. gada 22. aprīļa rezolūcijā par Lūgumrakstu komitejas apspriedēm 2008. parlamentārajā gadā mudināja Komisiju cieši uzraudzīt un veicināt Latvijas nepilsoņu statusa noregulēšanu.

1. Vai Komisija piekrīt tam, ka Latvijas valdībai būtu jādod nepilsoņiem iespēja balsot pašvaldību vēlēšanās?

2. Vai Komisija piekrīt tam, ka demokrātijas deficīts Latvijā varētu norādīt uz to, ka pastāv reāli draudi nopietniem demokrātijas un cilvēktiesību, kā arī pamatbrīvību principu pārkāpumiem?

Atbildi Komisijas vārdā sniedza Viviāna Redinga
(2012. gada 3. aprīlis)

Komisija lūdz godājamo Parlamenta deputātu atsaukt atmiņā atbildi, ko tā sniedza uz rakstisko jautājumu E-9818/2010 ([1]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer P-002628/12
to the Commission
Alexander Mirsky (S&D)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: Voting rights for non-citizens of Latvia in local elections

On 15 October 1991, the Supreme Council of the Latvian Republic adopted a resolution 'on the restoration of the rights of citizens and on the basic conditions of naturalization', dividing — in defiance of international law — all Latvian inhabitants into either citizens or other inhabitants, and stipulating that the population of a state that has just ceased to exist is eligible to 'opt' for the choice of citizenship. It is important to note that, in 1990-1991, national minorities in the restored independent Latvian Republic were fully-fledged citizens who participated in the election of the Supreme Council, considering Latvia to be their motherland and wanting it to be independent.

As of 1 January 2011, there remained 326 735 non-citizens in the country (14.6 % of the total population). In general, non-citizens are elderly people who were born in Latvia (when it was part of the USSR). It is extremely difficult for these persons to learn the Latvian language to a proficient degree, to memorize the Constitution of Latvia by heart and to learn the country's history in Latvian, all requisites for passing the so-called naturalization process. As a result, non-citizens, comprising 15.0 % of the country's population, cannot participate in local politics, i.e. are completely excluded from participation in the political and societal life of their home country.

The UN Human Rights Committee, the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe, the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance and the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly all recommend that measures be taken to make it possible for non-citizens to participate in local elections. In its resolution of 11 March 2004 on the Commission's comprehensive monitoring report on the state of preparedness for EU membership, the European Parliament proposed that the Latvian authorities envisage the possibility of allowing non-citizens who are long-time inhabitants to take part in local self-government elections. This problem stokes ethnic tensions in Latvia, as was made clear by a recent referendum (on 19 February 2012) on giving the Russian language official status in Latvia.

In its resolution of 22 April 2009 on the deliberations of the Committee on Petitions during the year 2008, the Parliament urged the Commission closely to monitor and encourage the regularisation of the status of non-citizens in Latvia.

1. Does the Commission agree that the Latvian Government should make it possible for non-citizens to vote in local government elections?

2. Does the Commission agree that the democratic deficit in Latvia may indicate a clear risk of a serious breach of the principles of democracy and of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E- 9818/2010 ([1]).

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

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002635/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Patrimonio forestale e norme europee

Le foreste svolgono una funzione essenziale per preservare gli equilibri ecologici fondamentali, in particolare per quanto riguarda il suolo, il regime delle acque, il clima, la fauna e la flora. Tali equilibri ecologici sono indispensabili per l'agricoltura sostenibile e per la gestione dello spazio rurale.

La Comunità europea e gli Stati membri attribuiscono un'importanza particolare alla protezione del patrimonio forestale e al riguardo hanno assunto impegni a livello internazionale in materia di sviluppo sostenibile delle foreste e di protezione degli ecosistemi forestali, in particolare nel quadro della Conferenza mondiale delle Nazioni Unite sull'ambiente e sullo sviluppo svoltasi a Rio nel 1992 e che si terrà di nuovo il prossimo giugno. Gli incendi forestali costituiscono oggi il principale fattore di rischio per la conservazione di questi ecosistemi per una loro gestione sostenibile. In Italia il fenomeno degli incendi ha subito un andamento altalenante, con un periodo notevolmente critico a metà degli anni '80. La superficie maggiormente interessata dal fenomeno è rappresentata dal ceduo semplice e matricinato.

Tutto ciò premesso, può la Commissione:

1. Elencare quali sono le normative europee in merito alla salvaguardia del patrimonio forestale, finalizzate a proteggere un bene pubblico che è considerato di pari importanza ai terreni agricoli nel contrastare il cambiamento climatico e la perdita di biodiversità?

2. Considerando che i rischi principali che minacciano le foreste in Europa occidentale sono essenzialmente dovuti a tempeste ed alluvioni, mentre nell'Europa meridionale a causare i maggiori danni sono gli incendi boschivi, quali sistemi di allerta rapida sono previsti dalle normative europee per proteggere questo capitale naturale?

Risposta data da Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(27 aprile 2012)

La risoluzione del Consiglio relativa ad una strategia forestale per l'Unione europea (1999/C 56/01) ha istituito un quadro per le azioni nel settore forestale a sostegno di una gestione sostenibile delle foreste. Il piano d'azione dell'UE per le foreste adottato nel 2006 si basa sulla relazione di attuazione della strategia forestale dell'Unione europea e sulle relative conclusioni del Consiglio. Attualmente la Commissione sta lavorando a una nuova strategia dell'UE per le foreste che sarà adottata nel 2013.

Il regolamento (CE) n. 1698/2005 ([1]) prevede un sostegno a favore delle misure forestali attraverso i programmi di sviluppo rurale.

Per quanto riguarda la salvaguardia della natura, è necessario che gli Stati membri garantiscano la conformità con le direttive dell'UE «Habitat» e «Uccelli selvatici» che hanno istituito la rete dei siti Natura 2000. Le specie e gli habitat per i quali sono stati designati i siti devono essere conservati o ripristinati in un buono stato di conservazione.

Inoltre, secondo la direttiva sulla valutazione dell'impatto ambientale 85/337/CEE ([2]), i progetti che possono avere un notevole impatto ambientale, in particolare per la loro natura, le loro dimensioni o la loro ubicazione, devono essere sottoposti a una valutazione del loro impatto sull'ambiente prima del rilascio dell'autorizzazione.

La protezione contro l'introduzione e la diffusione nell'UE di organismi nocivi, compresi i parassiti forestali nemici delle foreste, è garantita dalla direttiva 2000/29/CE ([3]).

La Commissione gestisce i seguenti sistemi di allarme tempestivo:

— sistema europeo d'informazione sugli incendi forestali (EFFIS http://effis.jrc.ec.europa.eu//)

— sistema europeo di allarme inondazioni (EFAS http://floods.jrc.ec.europa.eu/efas-flood-forecasts).

([1]) GU L 277 del 21.10.2005.
([2]) GU L 175 del 5.7.1985.
([3]) GU L 169 del 10.7.2000.

Secondo la direttiva sulle alluvioni ([4]), gli Stati membri devono anche sviluppare piani di gestione del rischio di alluvione entro il 2015, compresi provvedimenti relativi alle previsioni delle alluvioni e ai sistemi di allarme tempestivo.

([4]) Direttiva 2007/60/CE, GU L 288 del 6.11.2007.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002635/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: Forest assets and European rules

Forests play an essential role in preserving fundamental ecological balances, particularly in relation to the soil, the water system, the climate, fauna and flora. These ecological balances are vital for sustainable agriculture and the management of rural areas.

The European Union and the Member States place particular emphasis on the protection of forest assets and in that context have made international commitments regarding the sustainable development of forests and the protection of forest ecosystems, particularly in the framework of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio in 1992, and to be held again this June. Forest fires are today the main risk factor for the conservation of these ecosystems for sustainable management. In Italy the number of fires has gone up and down, with a particularly critical period in the mid-1980s. The areas that are mainly affected by fires are ordinary and pollarded copses.

1. Can the Commission list the EU legislation on the safeguarding of forest assets that aims to protect public property which is considered just as important as agricultural land in combating climate change and biodiversity loss.

2. In view of the fact that it is basically storms and floods that pose the main risks to forests in western Europe, while in southern Europe forest fires cause the most damage, what early warning systems does EC law provide for to protect this natural capital?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(27 April 2012)

The Council Resolution on a forestry strategy for the European Union (1999/C 56/01) established a framework for forest-related actions in support of sustainable forest management. The EU Forest Action Plan adopted in 2006 builds on the report on implementation of the EU Forestry Strategy and consequent conclusions by the Council. Currently the Commission is working on a new EU Forest Strategy which will be adopted in 2013.

Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005 ([1]) provides support for forestry measures through the rural development programmes.

As regards nature protection, the Member States need to ensure compliance with the EU Habitats and Birds Directives which established the network of Natura 2000 sites. The species and habitats for which the sites have been designated are to be maintained or restored in a favourable conservation status.

In addition, according to the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive 85/337/EEC ([2]), projects likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue, *inter alia*, of their nature, size or location, must be made subject to an assessment of their environmental effects prior to development consent.

Protection against the introduction and spread in the Union of harmful organisms, including forest pests, is offered by Directive 2000/29/EC ([3]).

The Commission operates the following early warning systems:

— European Forest Fire Information System EFFIS (http://effis.jrc.ec.europa.eu/);

— European Flood Alert System, EFAS (http://floods.jrc.ec.europa.eu/efas-flood-forecasts).

According to the Floods Directive ([4]), Member States must also develop flood risk management plans by 2015, including measures related to flood forecasting and early warning systems.

([1]) OJ L 277, 21.10.2005.
([2]) OJ L 175, 5.7.1985.
([3]) OJ L 169, 10.7.2000.
([4]) Directive 2007/60/EC, OJ L 288, 6.11.2007.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002636/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Anoressia e bulimia in aumento in Europa

Nei paesi industrializzati sono in continuo aumento i disturbi psichici alimentari denominati anoressia e bulimia. Il problema riguarda per il 90 % il sesso femminile, sopratutto ragazze e donne tra i 13 e i 30 anni di età.

Il fenomeno è quasi sconosciuto nel terzo mondo e pare che, nei paesi industrializzati, sia indotto dal modello occidentale di aspetto fisico e anche di forma fisica.

In una società nella quale sono ormai crollati i valori tradizionali e dove la vera cultura è stata sostituita da una sottocultura diffusa dai mass-media, sopratutto i giovani sono facile preda di queste patologie, ponendo il loro aspetto fisico al vertice di ogni loro interesse.

L'anoressia nervosa è caratterizzata dal rifiuto del cibo che nasce dal terrore di ingrassare. Oltre al digiuno, l'anoressico spesso si auto provoca il vomito anche dopo aver ingerito minime quantità di cibo.

La bulimia è un problema dell'alimentazione per cui una persona ingurgita una quantità di cibo esorbitante, perde completamente il controllo sull'atto del mangiare e continua a ingerire cibo finché non si sente male.

Dopo l'abbuffata, il bulimico si auto provoca il vomito per tranquillizzare la propria coscienza.

Negli ultimi venti anni, anche se le rilevazioni non sono chiare a causa dei diversi criteri diagnostici utilizzati, è apparso evidente un aumento notevole dei disturbi alimentari. Gli studi condotti negli Stati Uniti e in Europa negli anni '70 rilevavano una prevalenza dello 0.5-0.6 % per l'anoressia e del 2 % per la bulimia nella popolazione a rischio. Queste percentuali aumentavano in maniera considerevole (dal 6 % al 22 %) se si tenevano in considerazione anche i comportamenti alimentari indicatori di rischio.

Alla luce dei fatti sopraesposti, può la Commissione rispondere ai seguenti quesiti:

1. è in possesso di dati sulle percentuali relative alla diffusione di anoressia e bulimia nei diversi Stati Membri?

2. Intende prevedere campagne d'informazione destinate ai giovani (soprattutto tra le ragazze e le categorie più a rischio)? Nell'affermativa, quali ne saranno le modalità? Non ritiene che, a tal fine, sarebbe opportuno prevedere un Anno europeo sull'importanza della corretta alimentazione nella prevenzione dei disturbi alimentari?

Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(25 aprile 2012)

1) La Commissione non dispone di dati sulla prevalenza dell'anoressia e della bulimia negli Stati membri dell'Unione europea (UE) e non è in condizione di intraprendere una raccolta di dati su tali turbe.

2) La Commissione non intende condurre campagne di informazione sull'anoressia e la bulimia. La Commissione rinvia però l'Onorevole deputato al progetto Pro-Youth co-finanziato dal programma Sanità dell'UE e volto a promuovere la salute mentale e a prevenire i disordini alimentari tra i giovani. Il progetto, diretto dall'università di Heidelberg in Germania, e a cui partecipano sette Stati membri, ha costituito un portale su Internet ([1]) che offre informazioni, opportunità di scambio e sostegno sulle questioni legate alla salute mentale, e in particolare alle turbe dell'alimentazione. Il progetto ha preso il via il 1º aprile 2011 e avrà una durata di tre anni.

([1]) La homepage e il portale di Pro-Youth possono essere consultati all'indirizzo: http://www.pro-youth.eu/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002636/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: Anorexia and bulimia on the increase in Europe

In industrialised countries, psychological eating disorders such as anorexia and bulimia are becoming more widespread. Ninety per cent of cases are found in females, especially girls and women aged between 13 and 30 years old.

The phenomenon is almost unheard of in the third world and it seems that, in industrialised countries, it is driven by the Western model of physical appearance and body shape.

In a society in which traditional values have now collapsed and where true culture has been substituted by a widespread subculture of mass media, young people in particular are easily afflicted by these disorders, making their physical appearance their number one concern.

Anorexia nervosa is characterised by the refusal to eat for fear of putting on weight. In addition to abstinence from food, anorexia often causes individuals to make themselves vomit, even after having eaten very small quantities of food.

Bulimia is an eating disorder in which individuals binge-eat a huge quantity of food, completely losing control over their eating and continuing to eat until they feel unwell.

After binging, bulimics make themselves vomit in order to ease their conscience.

In the last 20 years, even though there is no clear data due to the range of diagnostic criteria that are used, it is evident that there has been a notable increase in eating disorders. Studies conducted in the United States and Europe in the 1970s showed a prevalence of 0.5-0.6 % for anorexia and of 2 % for bulimia in the population at risk. These statistics increase significantly (from 6 % to 22 %) if eating habits that indicate risk are also taken into consideration.

In view of this:

1. Does the Commission have percentage data on the spread of anorexia and bulimia throughout the Member States?

2. Does the Commission intend to run an information campaign aimed at young people (targeting young girls and high risk categories in particular)? If so, how will this be implemented? Does the Commission not believe that, in light of this, it would be opportune to plan a European year on the importance of a good diet in the prevention of eating disorders?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(25 April 2012)

1. The Commission does not have data on the prevalence of anorexia and bulimia in the European Union (EU) Member States and is not in a position to undertake data collection on these disorders.

2. The Commission does not intend to carry out information campaigns on anorexia and bulimia. Nevertheless, the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the ProYouth-project co-financed by the EU Health Programme aiming at promoting mental health and at preventing eating disorders among young people. This project, led by the Heidelberg University in Germany and involving seven Member States, has established an Internet portal ([1]) which offers information, exchange opportunities and support on mental health issues, specifically eating disorders. The project started on 1 April 2011 and will run for a period of three years.

([1]) The ProYouth-Homepage and portal can be consulted under: http://www.pro-youth.eu/.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002637/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Consumo di alcol in Europa

Responsabile del 9 % della spesa sanitaria nei Paesi europei e uno dei fattori di rischio più elevati per la salute dell'uomo, l'alcol è oggi una delle principali cause di mortalità e morbilità. Il consumo di prodotti alcolici, sostanze psicoattive che possono portare a dipendenza, produce danni non solo al bevitore ma anche alle famiglie e al contesto sociale allargato, in quanto può indurre comportamenti violenti, abusi, abbandoni, perdite di opportunità sociali, incapacità di costruire legami affettivi e relazioni stabili, invalidità, incidenti sul lavoro e sulla strada.

I giovani, più vulnerabili rispetto agli effetti fisici e psichici dell'alcol, sono considerati particolarmente a rischio. Un giovane su quattro tra i 15 e i 29 anni, in Europa, muore a causa dell'alcol, primo fattore di rischio di invalidità, mortalità prematura e malattia cronica nei giovani. Tra il 40 % e il 60 % di tutte le morti nella regione europea dovute a ferite intenzionali e accidentali sono attribuibili, secondo l'Oms Europa, al consumo di alcol che costa, nel complesso, alla società una quantità pari al 2-5 % del Pil.

Politiche e azioni di salute pubblica mirate a ridurre i danni causati dall'alcol sono quindi considerate di massima priorità.

Alla luce di quanto precede, può dunque la Commissione far sapere quali normative ha promosso nella lotta all'abuso del consumo di alcol, soprattutto tra i giovani, e se negli Stati Membri esistono programmi e strategie europee anti-alcol che abbiano come scopo quello di sensibilizzare gli adolescenti a diminuire l'abuso di prodotti alcolici?

Risposta data da John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(26 aprile 2012)

La Commissione condivide le preoccupazioni dell'onorevole deputato sugli effetti nocivi dell'abuso di alcool, in particolare tra i bambini e i giovani. È in tale spirito che è stata adottata nel 2006 una strategia volta ad affiancare gli Stati membri nei loro sforzi per ridurre i danni derivanti dal consumo di alcool ([1]), strategia che indica quale tematica chiave d'intervento la tutela dei bambini e dei giovani.

La legislazione in questo ambito rientra per l'essenziale nelle competenze degli Stati membri. Nel contesto della strategia summenzionata la Commissione ha incoraggiato l'innalzamento dell'età minima per l'acquisto di bevande alcoliche. Nel contesto dell'azione dell'UE per la sicurezza stradale la Commissione ha inoltre raccomandato l'abbassamento del livello di alcolemia nel sangue in particolare per quanto concerne i giovani guidatori ([2]). La Commissione è compiaciuta nel constatare la convergenza dei regolamenti degli Stati membri su tali punti. In molti Stati membri le scuole conducono campagne di prevenzione dell'alcolismo su scala nazionale, molto spesso in forza di un obbligo legale.

La Commissione ha inoltre istituito il Forum Alcool e salute per mobilitare l'azione volontaria da parte degli attori interessati. Diverse delle oltre 200 iniziative lanciate dai membri del Forum sono rivolte ai giovani. Nell'ultimo quinquennio il programma Salute dell'UE ha ulteriormente sostenuto diversi progetti multi-paese volti a far opera di sensibilizzazione e a ridurre il danno dell'alcool tra i giovani. Ciò ha contribuito a una più ampia sensibilizzazione e ad attività di prevenzione del danno in tutta l'UE.

([1]) Comunicazione della Commissione del 24 ottobre 2006, «Strategia comunitaria volta ad affiancare gli Stati membri nei loro sforzi per ridurre i danni derivanti dal consumo di alcool», COM(2006)625 definitivo.
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0625en01.pdf.

([2]) Raccomandazione della Commissione, del 17 gennaio 2001, sul tasso massimo di alcolemia (TA) consentito per i conducenti di veicoli a motore, 2001/116/CE (GU L43 del 14.2.2001).
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32001H0115:EN:NOT.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002637/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Frances Silvestris (PPE)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: Alcohol consumption in Europe

Alcohol consumption, whose effects account for 9 % of health expenditure in European countries and which is one of the most serious risk factors for human health, is today one of the main causes of mortality and morbidity. The consumption of alcoholic products, which contain psycho-active substances that can create dependency, causes harm not only to drinkers but also to their families and to society as a whole, in that it can lead to violent behaviour, abuse, neglect, loss of social opportunities, an inability to develop emotional ties and stable relationships, disability and accidents at work and on the road.

Young people, who are more vulnerable to the physical and psychological effects of alcohol, are at greater risk. In Europe, one young person in four aged between 15 and 29 dies as a result of alcohol consumption, which is the prime risk factor for disability, premature death and chronic illness among young people. According to WHO/Europe, between 40 % and 60 % of all deaths in the European region resulting from intentional and accidental injuries can be attributed to alcohol consumption. Overall, it costs society between 2 and 5 % of GDP.

Public health policies and measures designed to reduce the damage caused by alcohol are therefore regarded as having very high priority.

In view of the above, can the Commission state what legislative measures it has put forward to combat alcohol abuse, particularly among young people, and whether there are European anti-alcohol programmes and strategies aimed at raising awareness among young people of the importance of not consuming alcoholic products to excess?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(26 April 2012)

The Commission shares the Honourable Members' concern about the harmful effects of alcohol abuse, in particular in children and young people. It is in this spirit that the European Union (EU) strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm was adopted in 2006 ([1]) and presents protecting children and young people as a key theme for action.

Legislation in this area falls mainly under Member States' competence. In the context of the abovementioned strategy, the Commission has promoted a higher minimum age for buying alcoholic beverages. As part of EU action for road safety, the Commission has also recommended to lower the permitted blood alcohol level in particular for young drivers ([2]). The Commission is pleased to note convergence in Member States' regulations on these points. In many Member States, schools carry out alcohol prevention education nation-wide, quite often as a legal obligation.

In addition, the Commission has established the Alcohol and Health Forum to mobilise voluntary action by stakeholders. Many of the over 200 initiatives launched by Forum members are targeted towards young people. During the past five years, the EU Health Programme has further supported several multi-country projects to raise awareness and reduce harm from alcohol among young people. This has contributed to a wider range of awareness raising and harm prevention activities across the EU.

([1]) Communication from the Commission of 24 October 2006, 'An EU strategy to support Member States in reducing alcohol-related harm', COM(2006) 625 final, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2006/com2006_0625en01.pdf

([2]) Commission Recommendation of 17 January 2001 to Member States on the maximum permitted blood alcohol content (BAC) for drivers of motorised vehicles, 2001/116/EC (OJ L 43, 14.2.2001), http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32001H0115:EN:NOT

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-002638/12
do Komisji
Piotr Borys (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Artur Zasada (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jerzy Buzek (PPE), Rafał Trzaskowski (PPE) oraz Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz (PPE)
(7 marca 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Program w zakresie kształcenia, szkolenia, młodzieży i sportu na lata 2014-2020 – „Erasmus dla wszystkich"

Projekt rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady ustanawiającego program „Erasmus dla wszystkich", wspólnotowy program w zakresie kształcenia, szkolenia, młodzieży i sportu, całkowicie odbiega od dotychczasowej praktyki przygotowania programów wspólnotowych adresowanych podmiotowo do kluczowych grup beneficjentów. Taka korzystna sytuacja ma miejsce w ramach obecnie funkcjonujących programów –„Uczenie się przez całe życie" oraz „Młodzież w działaniu", w których wyróżnione są podprogramy oraz akcje skierowane do konkretnych grup docelowych. Struktura tych programów zapewnia łatwą identyfikację, do kogo skierowane są działania oraz poszczególne akcje. Natomiast nowy program przewiduje podejście przedmiotowe, które nie zakłada wyodrębniania działań sprofilowanych dla poszczególnych kategorii odbiorców. W efekcie niektórzy beneficjenci, m.in. szkoły oraz młodzież niestudiująca, będą rywalizować o środki w ramach nowego programu z beneficjentami o zupełnie innym profilu instytucjonalnym (np. z dużymi uniwersytetami). Tym samym mniejsze podmioty, np. małe szkoły czy nieduże organizacje pozarządowe, mogą mieć zamknięty dostęp do środków europejskich.

W jaki sposób Komisja może zagwarantować dotychczasowym beneficjentom programu „Młodzież w działaniu" oraz „Uczenie się przez całe życie", w tym małym szkołom oraz młodzieży szkolnej i niestudiującej, że szanse na uzyskanie finansowania w ramach nowej propozycji nie ulegną pogorszeniu?

W projekcie znajdują się zapisy mówiące o komplementarności i współpracy nowego programu z właściwymi europejskimi politykami i funduszami, w tym w szczególności z Europejskim Funduszem Społecznym oraz pozostałymi instrumentami finansowymi dotyczącymi zatrudnienia i włączenia społecznego, Europejskim Funduszem Rozwoju Regionalnego, programami w zakresie badań i innowacji, a także instrumentami finansowymi dotyczącymi sprawiedliwości i obywatelstwa, zdrowia, programami współpracy zewnętrznej oraz instrumentami pomocy przedakcesyjnej (art. 19). Nie jest jednak jasne, w jaki sposób KE planuje poprawić i zwiększyć współpracę pomiędzy ww. instrumentami.

W jaki sposób będzie działał mechanizm wzajemnego uzupełniania się programu „Erasmus dla wszystkich" oraz funduszy europejskich? Kto będzie odpowiedzialny za zarządzanie współdziałania programu i EFS? Czy powstaną szczegółowe wytyczne dotyczące wzajemnego uzupełniania się programu „Erasmus dla wszystkich" i EFS?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarz Androullę Vassiliou w imieniu Komisji
(14 maja 2012 r.)

Wniosek dotyczący programu „Erasmus dla wszystkich" ma na celu promowanie zintegrowanego podejścia w ramach polityki dotyczącej kształcenia, szkolenia i młodzieży, tak by uczenie się przez całe życie było dostępne dla większej liczby obywateli. Program ten da młodym ludziom, zarówno pozostającym w ramach formalnej, jak i pozaformalnej edukacji, więcej szans na zdobycie doświadczeń za granicą – poprzez odbycie części okresu nauki, udział w działaniach wolontariackich lub staż w przedsiębiorstwie.

„Erasmus dla wszystkich" skierowany jest do wszystkich sektorów kształcenia, szkolenia i młodzieży, tak jak obecne programy „Uczenie się przez całe życie" i „Młodzież w działaniu". Nie ma ograniczeń co do wielkości organizacji lub instytucji, które mogą wziąć udział w programie. We wniosku Komisji nie przewidziano, by małe szkoły lub organizacje pozarządowe miały konkurować z uniwersytetami lub placówkami naukowymi. Szczególny nacisk kładzie się na europejską wartość dodaną, która powinna być podstawowym wymogiem wsparcia każdego działania na poziomie UE.

Jeżeli chodzi o komplementarność funduszy, zostanie ona zapewniona na różnych poziomach w toku realizacji programów oraz poprzez współpracę poszczególnych służb Komisji. W dokumentach wykonawczych, w szczególności we wspólnych ramach strategicznych funduszy strukturalnych, wskazane zostaną kwalifikujące się grupy docelowe. Wytyczne znajdą się również w przewodniku dla beneficjentów programu „Erasmus dla wszystkich". Zgodnie z zasadami prawidłowego i skutecznego zarządzania należy poszukiwać synergii między wszystkimi funduszami UE oraz unikać podwójnego finansowania.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002638/12
to the Commission
Piotr Borys (PPE), Filip Kaczmarek (PPE), Sidonia Elżbieta Jędrzejewska (PPE), Krzysztof Lisek (PPE), Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE), Paweł Zalewski (PPE), Artur Zasada (PPE), Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), Jerzy Buzek (PPE), Rafał Trzaskowski (PPE) and Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz (PPE)
(7 March 2012)

Subject: Programme for education, training, youth and sport for the years 2014-2020 — 'Erasmus for all'

The proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the 'Erasmus for all' programme, which is a Community programme in the field of education, training, youth and sport, represents a complete departure from the current practice of targeting new Community programmes at key groups of beneficiaries. This beneficial approach has been followed for the current 'Lifelong Learning' and 'Youth in Action' programmes, within which separate provision is made for sub-programmes and actions aimed at specific target groups. The structure of those programmes makes it possible to easily identify those targeted by measures and individual actions. The new programme, however, provides for a subject-based approach which does not distinguish between actions tailored to individual categories of recipients. As a result, under the new programme, some beneficiaries, including schools and young people not studying, will compete for the funds with beneficiaries of an entirely different institutional profile, such as large universities. Access to European funding may thus be blocked for smaller entities, such as small schools or small non-governmental organisations.

How can the Commission guarantee that the chances of obtaining funding for current beneficiaries of the 'Youth in Action' and 'Lifelong Learning' programmes, including small schools, school pupils and young people who are not students, will not be adversely affected under the new proposal?

The draft includes provisions on complementarity and cooperation between the new programme and relevant European policies and funds, including in particular the European Social Fund and other financial instruments in the field of employment and social inclusion, the European Regional Development Fund, research and innovation programmes and financial instruments in the field of justice and citizenship, health, external cooperation programmes and pre-accession aid instruments (Article 19). It is not clear, however, how the Commission is planning to improve and increase cooperation between these instruments.

What will be the mechanism for complementarity between the 'Erasmus for all' programme and the European funds? Who will be responsible for managing the joint operation of the programme and the ESF? Will detailed guidelines be drafted regarding the complementarity between the 'Erasmus for all' programme and the ESF?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(14 May 2012)

The Erasmus for All proposal aims to promote an integrated approach of education, training and youth policies, in order to make lifelong learning a reality for more citizens. It will increase opportunities for young people, both in formal and non-formal education to benefit from an experience abroad, through a study period, participation in a volunteering activity or a placement in an enterprise.

All education, training and youth sectors are targeted by the programme, as is the case today under the LLP and Youth in Action programmes and there is no restriction on the size of organisation or institution which can participate. The Commission proposal does not foresee that small schools or NGOs compete with universities or academic institutions. The emphasis on European added value is particularly stressed and should be a basic requirement of any action to be supported at EU level.

Regarding complementarity between funds, this will be ensured at different levels throughout the implementation of the programmes and through cooperation between the different services of the Commission. The implementing documents, in particular the Common Strategic Framework for the structural funds, will specify eligible target groups and the guide for beneficiaries under Erasmus for All will also provide guidance. All EU funds must seek synergies and avoid risk of double funding in line with sound and efficient management.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-002653/12
a la Comisión
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Guido Milana (S&D), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE) y Alain Cadec (PPE)
(8 de marzo de 2012)

Asunto: Información sobre las flotas, las capturas totales y el valor de las capturas desembarcadas en los Estados miembros

En relación con sus propuestas para la reforma de la Política Pesquera Común, y a la luz de su posible impacto sobre la pesca en pequeña escala (artesanal y costera), ¿puede la Comisión facilitar información actualizada sobre los puntos siguientes?:

1. El número de buques pesqueros de 12 metros o más de eslora total en cada Estado miembro;

2. El número de buques pesqueros de menos de 12 metros de eslora total con artes de arrastre en cada Estado miembro;

3. El número de buques pesqueros de menos de 12 metros de eslora total que pesquen sin artes de arrastre en cada Estado miembro;

4. Las capturas totales (en toneladas) desembarcadas por cada uno de los grupos de buques pesqueros a que se refieren los puntos 1, 2 y 3 en cada Estado miembro; y

5. El valor de las capturas (en EUR) desembarcadas por cada uno de los grupos de buques pesqueros a que se refieren los puntos 1, 2 y 3 en cada Estado miembro.

Respuesta de la Sra. Damanaki en nombre de la Comisión
(23 de abril de 2012)

La información solicitada por Sus Señorías se les enviará directamente a Sus Señorías y a la Secretaría del Parlamento.

El número de buques de cada uno de los segmentos de flota figura en el cuadro 1. El cuadro 2 contiene los datos más recientes sobre desembarques del informe económico anual, en volumen y valor para 2002-2009, que obran en poder de la Comisión, además de una previsión de los datos de 2010 efectuada por el Centro Común de Investigación.

La exactitud de los datos queda limitada a veces por la calidad de las declaraciones de los Estados miembros.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-002653/12
à la Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Guido Milana (S&D), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE) et Alain Cadec (PPE)
(8 mars 2012)

Objet: Demande d'informations relatives aux flottes, au nombre total de captures et à la valeur des captures débarquées dans les États membres

Suite aux propositions qu'elle a présentées dans le cadre de la réforme de la politique commune de la pêche et compte tenu de leur incidence probable sur la petite pêche (artisanale et côtière), la Commission peut-elle fournir des informations précises et actualisées sur:

1. Le nombre de navires de pêche, dans chaque État membre, d'une longueur hors tout égale ou supérieure à 12 mètres;

2. Le nombre de navires de pêche, dans chaque État membre, d'une longueur hors tout inférieure à 12 mètres et utilisant des engins remorqués;

3. Le nombre de navires de pêche, dans chaque État membre, d'une longueur hors tout inférieure à 12 mètres et n'utilisant pas d'engins remorqués;

4. Le nombre total (en tonnes) de captures débarquées par chacun des groupes de navires de pêche mentionnés aux points 1, 2 et 3 ci-dessus dans chaque État membre;

5. La valeur (en euros) des captures débarquées par chacun des groupes de navires de pêche mentionnés aux points 1, 2 et 3 ci-dessus dans chaque État membre?

Réponse donnée par Mme Damanaki au nom de la Commission
(23 avril 2012)

Les informations demandées par les Honorables Parlementaires sont envoyées directement aux Honorables Parlementaires et au secrétariat du Parlement.

Le nombre de navires relevant de chacun des segments de flotte figure dans le tableau 1. Le tableau 2 contient les données les plus récentes relatives aux débarquements, issues du rapport économique annuel dont la Commission disposait, en volume et valeur, de 2002 à 2009 avec des données pour 2010 projetées par le Centre commun de recherche.

L'exactitude des données est parfois limitée par la qualité des déclarations des États membres.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-002653/12
alla Commissione
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Guido Milana (S&D), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE) e Alain Cadec (PPE)
(8 marzo 2012)

Oggetto: Informazioni riguardanti la flotta, le catture totali e il valore delle catture sbarcate negli Stati membri

Con riferimento alle sue proposte concernenti la riforma della politica comune della pesca e alla luce del probabile impatto di quest'ultima sulle piccole imprese (pesca artigianale e costiera), può la Commissione fornire informazioni precise e aggiornate riguardanti quanto segue:

1. il numero dei pescherecci di lunghezza complessiva pari o superiore a 12 metri di ciascuno Stato membro;

2. il numero dei pescherecci di lunghezza complessiva inferiore a 12 metri con attrezzi trainati di ciascuno Stato membro;

3. il numero dei pescherecci di lunghezza complessiva inferiore a 12 metri senza attrezzi trainati di ciascuno Stato membro;

4. il totale delle catture (in tonnellate) sbarcate da ciascuna delle categorie di pescherecci di cui sopra (punti 1, 2 e 3) in ogni Stato membro;

5. il valore delle catture (in euro) sbarcate da ciascuna delle categorie di pescherecci di cui sopra (punti 1, 2 e 3) in ogni Stato membro.

Risposta data da Maria Damanaki a nome della Commissione
(23 aprile 2012)

Le informazioni richieste sono inviate direttamente agli onorevoli parlamentari e al segretariato del Parlamento.

Il numero di pescherecci di ciascun segmento di flotta indicato nell'interrogazione si evince dalla tabella 1. La tabella 2 riporta invece le informazioni più recenti su volume e valore degli sbarchi di cui dispone la Commissione alla relazione economica annuale per il periodo 2002-2009, mentre i dati relativi al 2010 corrispondono alle previsioni del Centro comune di ricerca.

Talvolta l'accuratezza dei dati è limitata dalla qualità delle dichiarazioni degli Stati membri.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-002653/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Guido Milana (S&D), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE) e Alain Cadec (PPE)
(8 de Março de 2012)

Assunto: Informações sobre as frotas, as capturas totais e o valor das capturas desembarcadas nos Estados-Membros

No âmbito das suas propostas de reforma da Política Comum das Pescas e na perspetiva do impacto que elas provavelmente terão na pequena pesca (artesanal e costeira), poderá a Comissão prestar informações precisas e atualizadas sobre:

1. O número de embarcações de pesca com um comprimento total igual ou superior a 12 metros em cada um dos Estados-Membros;

2. O número de embarcações de pesca com um comprimento total inferior a 12 metros que operem com artes rebocadas de malhagem em cada um dos Estados-Membros;

3. O número de embarcações de pesca com um comprimento total inferior a 12 metros que operem sem artes rebocadas de malhagem em cada um dos Estados-Membros;

4. O volume total (expresso em toneladas) das capturas desembarcadas por cada um dos grupos de embarcações de pesca acima referidos (nos pontos 1, 2 e 3) em cada Estado-Membro;

5. O valor (em euros) das capturas desembarcadas por cada um dos grupos de embarcações de pesca acima referidos (nos pontos 1, 2 e 3) em cada Estado-Membro?

Resposta dada por Maria Damanaki em nome da Comissão
(23 de abril de 2012)

As informações que os Senhores Deputados solicitam são-lhes enviadas diretamente, bem como ao Secretariado do Parlamento.

O número de embarcações de cada um dos grupos referidos figura no quadro 1. O quadro 2 contém os mais recentes dados sobre capturas desembarcadas, tal como constam do Relatório Económico Anual ao dispor da Comissão, em volume e em valor para 2002/2009, correspondendo os dados de 2010 a uma previsão do Centro Comum de Investigação.

A exatidão dos dados é por vezes limitada pela qualidade das declarações dos Estados-Membros.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002653/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE), Guido Milana (S&D), Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE) and Alain Cadec (PPE)
(8 March 2012)

Subject: Information about fleets, total catches and value of landed catches in the Member States

In connection with its proposals for the reform of the common fisheries policy and in the light of their likely impact on small-scale fisheries (artisanal and coastal), can the Commission provide accurate, up-to-date information on:

1. the number of fishing vessels of 12 metres or more in overall length in each Member State;

2. the number of fishing vessels of under 12 metres in overall length fishing with towed gear in each Member State;

3. the number of fishing vessels of under 12 metres in overall length fishing without towed gear in each Member State;

4. the total catches (in tonnes) landed by each of the groups of fishing vessels referred to above (at 1, 2 and 3) in each Member State;

5. the value of the catches (in euros) landed by each of the groups of fishing vessels referred to above (at 1, 2 and 3) in each Member State?

Answer given by Ms Damanaki on behalf of the Commission
(23 April 2012)

The information requested by the Honourable Members is sent directly to the Honourable Members and to Parliament's Secretariat.

The number of vessels of each of the requested fleet segments are listed in Table 1. Table 2 contains the latest landings data from the Annual Economic Report available to the Commission in volume and value for 2002-2009 with 2010 data projected by the Joint Research Centre.

The accuracy of the data is sometimes limited by the quality of Member States' declarations.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-002664/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(8 martie 2012)

Subiect: Recomandările din martie 2011 ale Curții de Conturi a UE

În luna martie 2011, Curtea de Conturi a Uniunii Europene a criticat Comisia pentru modul de gestionare a controalelor veterinare la frontiere asupra importurilor de carne şi de produse din carne, prezentând rezultatele unei evaluări. Curtea a concluzionat că există întârzieri în aplicarea unor norme ale UE din 2004 în materie de „igienă animală" şi a semnalat că există o reducere „substanțială" a indicilor de control din cauza unor „acorduri de echivalență" pe care UE le semnează cu țări terțe. Din acest motiv, Curtea de Conturi a făcut o serie de recomandări Comisiei Europene pentru a mări eficiența controalelor veterinare. Comisia este rugată să prezinte progresele înregistrate în vederea îndeplinirii recomandărilor, în perioada de un an scursă de la primirea acestora.

Răspuns dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei
(11 aprilie 2012)

Raportul Curții de Conturi ([1]) subliniază că verificările veterinare la import sunt bine gestionate și că nu există dovezi care să ateste că vreuna dintre crizele sanitare cu care s-a confruntat în ultimii ani Uniunea ar fi fost cauzată de lacune ale acestor verificări. Buna calitate și coerența controalelor la import ale Uniunii sunt reflectate și în raportul Comisiei privind eficiența și coerența controalelor sanitare și fitosanitare la importurile de produse alimentare, hrană pentru animale, animale și plante ([2]).

Întârzierile în aplicarea pachetului legislativ din 2004 privind igiena sunt tratate de Comisie în cadrul revizuirii în curs a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 882/2004 privind controalele oficiale efectuate pentru a asigura verificarea conformității cu legislația privind hrana pentru animale și produsele alimentare și cu normele de sănătate animală și de bunăstare a animalelor. Intenția este, de asemenea, să se verifice nivelurile de control al importurilor conform acordurilor de echivalență încheiate cu țări terțe, ca parte a unei abordări cuprinzătoare și orientate spre evaluarea riscurilor a acestor controale.

([1]) Raportul special nr. 14/2012, publicat la adresa: http://eca.europa.eu/portal/pls/portal/docs/1/7270726.PDF
([2]) Raportul COM (2010)785 publicat la adresa: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0785:FIN:RO:HTML.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-002664/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(8 March 2012)

Subject: EU Court of Auditors' recommendations of March 2011

In March 2011, the Court of Auditors of the European Union presented the results of an evaluation and criticised the Commission for the way in which veterinary checks are carried out at borders on imported meat and meat products. The Court concluded that there were delays in the implementation of 2004 EU rules on 'animal hygiene' and noted that there was a 'substantial' reduction in control measures due to a number of 'equivalence agreements' that the EU signed with third countries. For this reason, the Court of Auditors made a series of recommendations to the European Commission in order to increase the efficiency of veterinary checks.

Can the Commission say what progress has been made in implementing the recommendations over the one-year period that has passed since they were received?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(11 April 2012)

The Court of Auditors' report ([1]) underlines that veterinary import controls are well-managed and that, there is no evidence that any of the health crises suffered by the Union in recent years has been due to shortcomings in those controls. The high quality and consistency of the Union's import controls is also reflected in the Commission report on the effectiveness and consistency of sanitary and phytosanitary controls on imports of food, feed, animals and plants ([2]).

Any delays in implementation of the 2004 hygiene package are being addressed by the Commission within the ongoing review of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules. The intention is to also address the level of checks imposed on imports under equivalence agreements with third countries, as part of an over-arching, risk-based approach to controls.

([1]) Special Report No 14/2012 published on: http://eca.europa.eu/portal/pls/portal/docs/1/7270726.PDF
([2]) Report COM(2010)785 published on: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=en&type_doc=COMfinal&an_doc=2010&nu_doc=0785.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007730/12
to the Commission
Richard Ashworth (ECR)
(29 August 2012)

Subject: Broadband provision in South East England

I write to you concerning the approval currently being sought by Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) on behalf of the British Government. The plan to roll out superfast broadband across 90% of homes and businesses in the UK is in keeping with the Commission's own 2020 Digital Agenda for Europe targets.

Currently there are local authorities who have been promised the necessary resources. They have made plans, based on this promise, to provide broadband to the people they represent. The UK Government has set aside GBP 530 million to implement this policy, and yet I understand that approval under state aid rules is being held up by your department.

By way of example, East Sussex County Council has put aside GBP 15 million, supported by GBP 10.6 million from the Government, and is endeavouring to complete a tendering process for contractor(s) to execute a programme to bring rural broadband access to their rural community from January 2013. This prolonged delay is compounding the increasing economic difficulties faced by these rural communities in my constituency.

Could the Commissioner please advise me on the following:

1. What is the justification for this delay in approval from the Commission?

2. What action is the Commission taking to resolve this issue?

3. How long will it take for this matter to be concluded?

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

The Borders Broadband Herefordshire and Gloucestershire project was notified to the Commission in February this year. The project's funding partner is Broadband Delivery UK ('BDUK') ([1]). In March the Commission sent a request for information to the UK authorities. In May the UK authorities decided to suspend the notification until BDUK umbrella scheme access issues are resolved. They have not re-activated the notification, so the Commission cannot take any action.

The Commission is scrutinizing all state aid broadband measures from all Member States based on the state aid Broadband Guidelines ([2]). The Commission is closely cooperating with the UK Government to decide quickly on the BDUK umbrella scheme, but it is still too early to give indications on timing.

According to the state aid rules, the Commission examines proposed aid within two months. This period starts running once the Commission has received all the information needed to assess the case. The examination is concluded either by a decision not to raise objections or by a decision to initiate Article 108(2) TFEU proceedings if the Commission still has doubts about the compatibility of the notified aid measure with the internal market.

So the length of the process depends on complete notification of the measure, but also on its compliance with the state aid rules. The UK is currently re-examining certain parts of the BDUK scheme to make it conform with the Broadband Guidelines. Individual measures that would be covered by the scheme are on hold until the BDUK scheme has been approved.

The Commission is fully aware of the importance of the measure and it is in close contact with the UK authorities on the BDUK State aid notification.

([1]) BDUK scheme was notified to the Commission on 5 January 2012.
([2]) OJ C 235, 30.9.2009, p. 7.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-007731/12
à Comissão
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(29 de agosto de 2012)

Assunto: Risco de extinção da produção do leite em algumas regiões europeias: o caso de Portugal

A Comissão Europeia abriu, em 20 de agosto de 2012, um concurso público para a análise da evolução do setor do leite pós-2015, uma iniciativa absolutamente necessária dada a ameaça do fim das quotas.

Entretanto, o setor leiteiro está hoje a afundar-se na onda crescente do aumento dos custos de produção, sem que este se repercuta ao longo da fileira. A situação dramática que várias regiões produtivas de leite vêm mais recentemente denunciando é a de diminuição do preço do leite pago aos produtores e também nas prateleiras da comercialização (roçando o dumping) e de aumento dos custos de produção, atualmente derivado sobretudo do aumento do preço dos cereais. Este último aspeto vai-se inevitavelmente agravar devido à seca extrema nos maiores produtores mundiais de cereais — Estados Unidos e Rússia — e à consequente escassez de cereais. A única proposta da Comissão para o setor é o «Pacote do Leite» que não traz nada de novo — os contratos entre produção e indústria já existiam e a distribuição continua excluída dos mesmos —, é insuficiente — não constitui solução para os pequenos produtores ou para as cooperativas que predominam nos EM do Sul — e não entrou sequer em vigor.

Neste contexto, são muitos os produtores que receiam não sobreviver a uma nova campanha e, em Portugal, a Associação dos Produtores de Leite lançou um apelo público, no dia 24 de agosto, «sobre o risco de extinção da produção do leite em Portugal», em que aponta, entre outros aspetos:

a. Descida contínua do preço pago ao produtor, entre 2,5 e 4,5 cêntimos/por litro de leite desde o início do ano, e a previsível continuação desta situação;

b. O aumento dos custos dos fatores de produção, designadamente a duplicação do preço da soja, um dos principais componentes da alimentação das vacas leiteiras em virtude da seca extrema nos maiores celeiros do mundo (EUA e Rússia), bem como a escalada vertiginosa do preço dos combustíveis.

Perante a situação descrita, pergunto à Comissão:

1. O que se propõe fazer para controlar o preço dos cereais?

2. O que está a fazer para promover uma distribuição justa do rendimento ao longo da fileira do leite, viabilizando a sobrevivência dos produtores?

3. Que medidas urgentes vai implementar no setor do leite para promover a sustentabilidade da produção nas regiões que tradicionalmente o produzem, garantindo rendimento justo a quem produz?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(1 de outubro de 2012)

Os preços dos cereais na União Europeia estão ao nível dos preços no mercado mundial e aumentaram significativamente durante o verão, devido às condições climáticas difíceis nos EUA e na região do Mar Negro, que afetaram bastante a colheita prevista. Não se prevê que a situação atual na UE possa gerar problemas graves de abastecimento, pois a última previsão da Direção-Geral da Agricultura e do Desenvolvimento Rural sobre a produção cerealífera é de 279 milhões de toneladas, quantidade próxima da média quinquenal. A situação está, no entanto, a ser acompanhada de perto, tendo em vista a adoção das medidas que se revelem necessárias.

As margens do leite estão, de facto, sob pressão, devido ao efeito conjugado da baixa dos preços no produtor, observada no primeiro semestre de 2012, e do aumento dos preços das rações. Desde maio de 2012, assiste-se, porém, a uma recuperação dos preços dos produtos lácteos e dos preços do leite no mercado «*spot*», que em breve devem refletir-se nos preços do leite no produtor. A última média, correspondente a julho, já mostra que a tendência decrescente parou.

No que respeita aos mecanismos de rede de segurança de que a organização comum de mercado no setor do leite e dos produtos lácteos dispõe para enfrentar situações de crise, bem como aos aspetos do «Pacote do Leite» ([1]) destinados a reforçar o poder negocial dos produtores relativamente aos industriais de produtos lácteos, com vista a uma distribuição mais justa de valor ao longo da fileira, pode a Senhora Deputada consultar a resposta da Comissão à pergunta escrita E-007715/2012 ([2]).

O «Pacote do Leite» será plenamente aplicável a partir de 3 de outubro de 2012. Por conseguinte, é muito cedo para saber que efeitos concretos terá no setor do leite e dos produtos lácteos. No que respeita às medidas previstas nas últimas propostas de reforma da PAC apresentadas pela Comissão, sugere-se à Senhora Deputada a consulta da resposta da Comissão à pergunta escrita E-007121/2012 ([2]).

([1]) Regulamento (UE) n.º 261/2012 do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.º 1234/2007 do Conselho no que diz respeito às relações contratuais no setor do leite e dos produtos lácteos.

([2]) (http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/pt/parliamentary-questions.html).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007731/12
to the Commission
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(29 August 2012)

Subject: Milk production in danger of extinction in some European regions: case of Portugal

On 20 August 2012, the Commission launched a call for tenders for an analysis of the performance of the post-2015 milk sector. Given the threat of milk quotas coming to an end, this was an absolutely necessary initiative.

The milk sector is currently drowning in a rising tide of production costs which are not transmitted along the rest of the chain. The dramatic situation, to which a number of milk-producing regions have recently been drawing attention, involves the drop in both milk prices paid to producers and those on supermarket shelves (bordering on dumping) and the increase in production costs, currently mainly due to rising grain prices. This last aspect will undoubtedly worsen due to the severe drought in the world's main grain-producing regions (the US and Russia) and the ensuing scarcity of cereals. The Commission's only proposal for the sector is the 'milk package', which introduces nothing new (contracts between producers and industry already exist and still exclude distribution), is inadequate (it offers no solutions to small-scale producers or cooperatives, which predominate in the southern Member States) and has not even come into force.

In this context, many producers fear they will be unable to survive another milk year. In Portugal, the national milk producers' association (*Associação dos Produtores de Leite*) launched a public appeal on 24 August 2012, warning of the risk of milk production disappearing in Portugal. Among other aspects, this highlighted:

(a) the continuous fall in prices paid to producers, of between 2.5 and 4.5 euro cents since the beginning of the year, and the likelihood of this continuing;

(b) the rising cost of production inputs, particularly the duplication in the price of soya, one of the main feed components for dairy cows, due to the severe drought in the US and Russia, which are the world's main grain suppliers.

In light of the above situation, can the Commission answer the following:

1. What does it intend to do to control grain prices?

2. What is it doing to promote a fair distribution of income along the milk chain, thereby making it possible for producers to survive?

3. What urgent measures will it apply to the milk sector to promote sustainable production in traditional milk-producing regions and guarantee fair returns to producers?

Answer given by Mr Çioloş on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 2012)

The European cereals prices are in line with the world market prices and have increased significantly during summer due to the difficult climatic conditions in US and the Black Sea region which affects significantly the harvest forecast. It is not foreseen that the current situation in the European Union should create serious problems of supply, the latest Agriculture and Rural Development Directorate-General's cereals crop forecast being at 279 million tonnes, a level close to the five-year average. The situation is however continuously monitored with the view to take measures, if necessary.

Milk margins are effectively under pressure due to the combined effect of the decrease of farm gate milk prices observed in the first half of 2012 and increasing feed costs. Since May 2012, dairy product prices and spot milk prices have however recovered, which should soon be reflected in farm gate milk prices. The latest average for July already shows that the downward trend has stopped.

With regard to existing safety net tools in the common market Organisation for Milk to face crisis situations and to the aspects of the Milk Package ([1]) aimed at strengthening the bargaining power of milk producers vis-à-vis dairy processors, in view of a fairer value distribution along the supply chain, the Honourable Member is kindly referred to the answer given by the Commission to the Written Question E-007715/2012 ([2]).

The Milk Package will be fully applicable from 3 October 2012. It is therefore too early to know which concrete impact it will have on the dairy sector. With regard to the measures foreseen in the latest Commission proposals for reforming the CAP, the Honourable Member is referred to the answer given by the Commission to the Written Question E-007121/2012 ([3]).

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 261/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards contractual relations in the milk and milk products sector.
([2]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([3]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007732/12
to the Commission
Philip Bradbourn (ECR)
(29 August 2012)

Subject: Restriction on cabin baggage allowance

The European Parliament is concerned by some air carriers' restrictions to the cabin baggage allowance ('one bag'-rule). This year, the European Parliament adopted two own-initiative reports which request the European Commission to take action.

Firstly, the Taylor report — on the functioning and application of established rights of people travelling by air — calls for measures that would make it possible to harmonise commercial practice concerning hand luggage so as to protect passengers against excessive restrictions and allow them to carry on board a reasonable amount of hand luggage, including purchases from airport shops.

Secondly, the Bradbourn report — on the future of regional airports and air services in the EU — highlights how airport retail sales have decreased markedly due to the introduction of restrictive policies on hand luggage by some airlines. Given the current aggressive business practice of some low-cost airlines operating from regional airports to take advantage of their dominant position, the report takes the view that these practices represent a breach of competition law, and believes that these restrictions may constitute an abuse of a carrier's dominant position. The report calls for airport retail purchases and other such small carry-on baggage such as handbags and computer cases to be treated as 'essential items', as is currently the case for items such as coats.

In the light of the European Parliament's concerns and its calls for action, and taking into account the impact assessment with a view to the revision of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004:

1. Does the Commission plan to propose measures to impose an EU-wide ban on the so-called 'one bag' rule?

2. If not, could the Commission indicate the reasons why the European Parliament's views are not being followed on this issue?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of the suggestions contained in both reports mentioned by the Honourable Member. It is however not yet in a position to confirm whether or not legislative or non-legislative measures will be pursued. The appropriateness of any intervention would have to be carefully studied.

2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its joined answer to Written Questions E-006860/11, E-006998/11, E-007017/11, E-007088/11, E-006996/11, E-006863/11 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007734/12
til Kommissionen
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(29. august 2012)

Om: Forskelsbehandling af EU-borgere

Jeg er blevet kontaktet af to danske borgere vedrørende en potentiel forskelsbehandling og vil bede Kommissionen om at forholde sig til sagen. De to borgere har på et tidspunkt begge boet og arbejdet i Tyskland (fra 1986 til 1991), og derfor har de fået udbetalt »Rentenversicherung«. I 2005 og 2006 nåede de pensionsalderen, hvorfor udbetalingerne fra Tyskland begyndte. I 2012 sendte det tyske Finanzamt imidlertid et krav om efterbetaling af skat fra 2005. Ifølge de tyske myndigheder er de to danskere ikke omfattet af personfradrag, og derfor skal der betales skat. De har fået oplyst, at personfradraget ikke gælder for folk, der lever uden for Tyskland.

De to danske borgere føler, at de bliver diskrimineret af de tyske myndigheder, og at de ikke er ligestillet med andre pensionsforsikrede borgere i Tyskland, og dette endda selv om de ikke belaster det tyske social- eller sundhedsvæsen.

Jeg er i sagens natur bekendt med, at skattereglerne er meget forskellige fra medlemsstat til medlemsstat, og ønsker ikke blande mig i landenes skatteregelsæt eller -afgørelser. Dog vil jeg pointere, at ikke-diskrimination er en EU-rettighed.

Mit spørgsmål til Kommissionen er derfor:

Har de tyske myndigheder behandlet de danske borgere korrekt, når de ikke giver dette »Freibetrag«? Er der tale om forskelsbehandling?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Algirdas Šemeta
(4. oktober 2012)

Bundfradraget har i henhold til § 32b i den tyske indkomstskattelov til formål at sikre, at et eksistensminimum er fritaget for indkomstskat. Da situationen med hensyn til direkte skatter for hjemmehørende og ikke-hjemmehørende i en stat som udgangspunkt ikke er sammenlignelig, er det rimeligt at forbeholde dette skattefrie beløb for hjemmehørende personer, da der bedst tages højde for eksistensminimum og andre former for godtgørelser i bopælsstaten (yderligere oplysninger findes i EU-Domstolens domme af 12.6.2003 i sag C-234/01, Gerritse, og af 14.2.1995 i sag C-279/93, Schumacker).

Hvis den ikke-hjemmehørende skatteyder har hele eller næsten hele sin globalindkomst fra tyske kilder, skal Tyskland imidlertid indrømme bundfradraget til den ikke-hjemmehørende i overensstemmelse med Domstolens ovennævnte retspraksis, da bopælsstaten ikke kan indrømme bundfradraget. I overensstemmelse hermed indrømmer § 1, stk. 3, i den tyske indkomstskattelov denne kategori af ikke-hjemmehørende skatteydere retten til efter anmodning at blive behandlet på samme måde som hjemmehørende for så vidt angår indkomstbeskatning. Nærmere bestemt indrømmes denne rettighed, hvis mindst 90 % af den pågældende skatteyders indkomst i kalenderåret har været skattepligtig i Tyskland, eller hvis pågældendes indkomst, der ikke er skattepligtig i Tyskland, ikke overstiger bundfradraget for kalenderåret. Den tyske lovgivning er derfor i overensstemmelse med EU-retten.

På baggrund af ovenstående og for så vidt som de pågældende danske borgere ikke opfyldte kravene i § 1, stk. 3, i den tyske indkomstskattelov, er de tyske myndigheders behandling af dem i overensstemmelse med EU's lovgivning på nuværende tidspunkt.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007734/12
to the Commission
Christel Schaldemose (S&D)
(29 August 2012)

Subject: Discrimination against EU citizens

I have been contacted by two Danish nationals concerning a possible case of discrimination and should be grateful for the Commission's view on the matter. The two both lived and worked in Germany from 1986 to 1991 and have therefore received payments under the 'Rentenversicherung' (pension insurance) scheme. In 2005 and 2006 respectively they reached the retirement age at which payments from Germany began. However, in 2012 the German Finanzamt (tax office) sent them a demand for back payment of taxes from 2005. According to the German authorities the two Danes are not covered by the personal allowance, and therefore have to pay tax. It was explained to them that the personal allowance does not apply to people living outside Germany.

The two Danish citizens feel that they have been discriminated against by the German authorities and that they are not being given the same treatment as other citizens covered by the pension insurance scheme in Germany, even though they are not a burden on the German health and social security systems.

I realise of course that by their very nature tax rules differ considerably from one Member State to another, and do not wish to interfere in the Member States' tax regulations or decisions. However, I would like to point out that non-discrimination is a right under EC law.

I should therefore like to ask the Commission::

Did the German authorities treat these Danish citizens correctly in not granting them this 'Freibetrag' (personal allowance)? Does this constitute discrimination?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(4 October 2012)

The basic allowance according to § 32b German Income Tax Act is designed to ensure that an essential minimum of income is exempt from all income taxes. As the situations of residents and of non-residents in relation to direct taxes are not, as a rule, comparable, it is legitimate to reserve this tax free amount to residents, as the essential minimum and other allowances of non-residents are best taken into account in their respective states of residence (see for more detail the judgments of the Court of Justice of the EU of 12.6.2003 in Case C-234/01, *Gerritse* and of 14.2.1995 in Case C-279/93, *Schumacker*).

However, in cases where the non-resident taxpayer earns all or almost all of his/her worldwide income from German sources, Germany has to grant the basic allowance to non-residents according to the above jurisprudence of the Court of Justice, as the residence state cannot grant the basic allowance. Accordingly, § 1(3) of the German Income Tax Act grants this category of non-resident taxpayers, upon request, the right to be treated in the same way as residents for income tax purposes. More precisely, this right is granted if at least 90% of the income of the taxpayer concerned during a calendar year is subject to German income tax or if his income not subject to German income tax does not exceed the amount of the basic allowance in a calendar year. Therefore, the German legislation is in line with EC law.

In view of the above and insofar as the Danish citizens concerned did not fulfil the requirements of § 1(3) of the German Income Tax Act, their treatment by the German authorities is in line with EC law as it currently stands.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007737/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 agosto 2012)

Oggetto: Soia, possibili effetti collaterali ed indicazione del quantitativo giornaliero consigliato

In un recente studio pubblicato sull'autorevole rivista scientifica Neurology, si afferma che la soia è un alimento che apporta benefici all'organismo solo se assunto in piccole quantità. I fitoestrogeni contenuti nella soia aiutano a prevenire l'insorgere di patologie legate alla prostata negli uomini (ad es. il carcinoma). Per le donne la soia è utile come lenitivo contro i sintomi della menopausa, poiché contrasta l'insorgere di vari disturbi tipici o di patologie, tra le quali figurano l'endometriosi e la mastopatia fibrocistica. Tuttavia un eccessivo apporto giornaliero di soia può portare entrambi i sessi ad accusare cefalea ed emicrania persistenti. Ciò è dato dall'azione degli isoflavoni della soia, che a livello cerebrale causano la dilatazione dei vasi arrivando ad influire sui neuroni del grigio periacqueduttale, il principale centro di controllo del dolore emicranico.

— È la Commissione a conoscenza di questo nuovo studio sugli effetti dell'assunzione di soia?

— Anno dopo anno, è in costante aumento il numero di cittadini europei che sceglie un regime alimentare a base vegetariana o vegana. A fronte di ciò nonché a tutela di tutti i consumatori europei, non ritiene che nelle etichette degli alimenti contenenti soia debba essere riportato il quantitativo contenuto in 100 mg o ml di prodotto, accanto a quello giornaliero consigliato, oltre il quale si possono manifestare gli effetti collaterali sopraindicati?

— E non ritiene che, per motivi di esaustività, andrebbero descritti anche questi ultimi, in quanto conseguenze di un eccessivo apporto di soia?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(5 ottobre 2012)

Migliorare l'informazione dei consumatori è una delle sei priorità della «strategia europea sugli aspetti sanitari connessi all'alimentazione, al sovrappeso e all'obesità» ([1]): l'intento principale è quello di garantire la sicurezza alimentare e la fiducia dei consumatori nei prodotti alimentari e nella politica alimentare dell'UE.

In base alla normativa generale dell'UE sugli alimenti ([2]), nei casi in cui la legislazione in materia alimentare sia volta a ridurre, eliminare o evitare un rischio per la salute, viene preceduta da un'analisi del rischio. Occorre in particolare che tale valutazione del rischio, le cui conclusioni sono successivamente valutate dalla Commissione, sia effettuata sulla base dei dati scientifici disponibili. In forza della suddetta normativa, la valutazione del rischio viene condotta dall'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare. Di conseguenza, qualsiasi prescrizione in materia di etichettatura che preveda avvertenze sanitarie o quantitativi giornalieri consigliati per una specifica categoria di prodotto alimentare si basa sui dati scientifici analizzati dall'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare.

La Commissione prende atto dello studio sull'assunzione di soia e sui suoi effetti, compresa l'azione preventiva del cancro alla prostata. In questa fase, tuttavia, non vi sono dati sufficienti tali da giustificare le prescrizioni in materia di etichettatura proposte dall'onorevole parlamentare.

([1]) COM(2007)279 definitivo del 30.5.2007.
([2]) Regolamento (CE) n. 178/2002 del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio, del 28 gennaio 2002, che stabilisce i principi e i requisiti generali della legislazione alimentare, istituisce l'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare e fissa procedure nel campo della sicurezza alimentare (GU L 31 dell'1.2.2002, pag. 1).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007737/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(29 August 2012)

Subject: Soya: possible side effects and information on recommended daily intake

According to a study published recently in the authoritative scientific journal Neurology, soya is a food which has a beneficial effect only if consumed in small quantities. The phyto-oestrogens which it contains help to counter the development of prostate diseases (e.g. cancer) in men. In women, it helps to relieve menopausal symptoms, countering the development of a range of conditions and disorders, including endometriosis and fibroadenosis. However, an excessively high daily intake of soya can result in persistent headaches and migraine in both men and women. This is due to the effects of soya isoflavones, which dilate blood vessels in the brain, affecting the neurones in the periaqueductal grey matter — the main centre for headache pain control.

— Is the Commission aware of this new study on the effects of eating soya?

— The number of Europeans opting for a vegetarian or vegan diet is increasing year on year. In account of this, and with a view to protecting all EU consumers, would it not agree that the labels on products containing soya should show the soya content per 100 mg or ml, as against the recommended daily intake above which such side-effects can develop?

— Would it not agree that the side-effects of consuming an excessive amount of soya should also be indicated, for purposes of completeness?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(5 October 2012)

Improving consumers' information is one of the six priorities of the 'Strategy for Europe on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity-related health issues' ([1]), the main objective being to ensure food safety and consumer confidence in food and EU food policy.

According to the EU General Food law ([2]), where food law is aimed at the reduction, elimination or avoidance of a risk to health, it shall be preceded by a risk analysis. This requires, in particular, a risk assessment to be carried out on the basis of the available scientific data, conclusions of which are further evaluated by the Commission.. Under the abovementioned legislation, the risk assessment is conducted by the European Food Safety Authority. Thus, any labelling requirement providing for health warnings or suggested daily intakes for the specific category of food shall be based on the scientific evidence assessed by the European Food Safety Authority.

The Commission takes note of the study on soya intake and its effects including in prostate cancer prevention. However, at this stage, there is not sufficient data which would justify the labelling requirements as proposed by the Honourable Member.

([1]) COM(2007) 279 final, 30.5.2007.
([2]) Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety, OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007738/12
to the Commission
Nessa Childers (S&D)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications

Would the Commission expand on its joint answer to Written Questions E-012450/2011 and E-000673/2012.

The Commission's words 'They would be subject to the general system' are taken to mean that a non-migrant architect who is not eligible under the automatic system of recognition must instead be eligible to apply under the general system when seeking recognition in the home state alone.

Also, in the third paragraph of the Commission's answer, the word 'qualifications' is understood to mean only the 'formal qualifications' referred to in Article 10(c) and described in Article 3(1)(c) of the directive.

Consequently, the directive is interpreted as dictating that non-migrant architects wishing to pursue the profession in their home state (in accordance with national rules and regulations) must possess a formal qualification rather than a professional qualification as described in Article 3(1)(b).

According to this reading of the Commission's answer, the directive applies to both migrant and non-migrant architects in the Member States and thereby restricts the terms of any grandfathering clause which could be made under Irish Law.

Is this a misunderstanding of Directive 2005/36/EC?

Answer given by Mr Barnier on behalf of the Commission
(28 September 2012)

Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications only concerns professionals who wish to move to another Member State. It does not apply when they seek to practice in the same country in which they obtained their qualifications. The Commission's joint answer to Questions E-012450/2011 and E-000673/2012 ([1]) reflects this principle in stating that persons who do not meet the minimum training requirements of Article 46 'would not be able to benefit from the automatic recognition of their qualifications in another Member State'). The solution is different for a few health professions, such as doctors, according to Article 21(6) of Directive 2005/36/EC.

Consequently, the directive does not restrict the terms of any national law provisions applicable to architects qualified in the territory of the Member State in question.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007739/12
aan de Commissie
Judith A. Merkies (S&D)
(30 augustus 2012)

Betreft: Definitie van „residuen"

Op dit moment is er een gebrek aan duidelijke en samenhangende definities die in alle EU-milieuwetgeving identiek zijn, over essentiële begrippen als „residu" en „bijproduct" en die worden gebruikt in dergelijke wetgeving. Dit leidt tot juridische onzekerheden voor bedrijven die actief zijn op de Europese interne markt. Duidelijke en samenhangende definities zijn belangrijk om eerlijke concurrentie te garanderen; daarom is het cruciaal dat stoffen correct en op dezelfde manier worden ingedeeld in alle lidstaten.

Hierbij moet worden opgemerkt dat het Hof van Justitie van de EU er bij de interpretatie van de definitie van afval op heeft gewezen dat een productieresidu afval oplevert, en productieresidu dan ook heeft gedefinieerd als een ongewenst of onbedoeld product. Het Hof heeft geconcludeerd dat een stof die opzettelijk is geproduceerd geen productieresidu is en dus ook geen afval met zich meebrengt. Het Hof heeft tevens geconcludeerd dat stoffen die ontstaan in een fabricageproces en niet opzettelijk zijn geproduceerd, maar die een bedrijf wel onder economisch gunstige voorwaarden wil benutten of op de markt wil brengen zonder verdere verwerking in een volgend proces, bijproducten vormen ([1]).

In haar antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-004386/12 over hernieuwbare energie en de definitie van residuen verklaarde de Commissie een gemeenschappelijke benadering voor de uitvoering van de richtlijn te ondersteunen, maar zonder daarbij een duidelijk antwoord te formuleren op de vraag hoe ze dit wil aanpakken. Daarom verzoek ik de Commissie de volgende zaken op te helderen:

1. Hoe zal de Commissie garanderen dat de definities van afval, residuen en bijproducten, die zijn vastgesteld door het Hof van Justitie van de EU, duidelijk worden geformuleerd voor de lidstaten om te zorgen voor een samenhangende en uniforme interpretatie en toepassing van de EU-milieuwetgeving in het algemeen en de richtlijn inzake hernieuwbare energiebronnen in het bijzonder, in de hele EU?

2. Zal de Commissie bij haar op stapel staande werkzaamheden op het gebied van duurzaamheidscriteria voor vaste en gasvormige biomassa voorzien in de behoefte om deze definities in verband met de richtlijn inzake hernieuwbare energiebronnen te verduidelijken?

Antwoord van de heer Oettinger namens de Commissie
(12 oktober 2012)

In artikel 3, lid 1, van de afvalstoffenrichtlijn ([2]) wordt een afvalstof gedefinieerd als „elke stof of elk voorwerp waarvan de houder zich ontdoet, voornemens is zich te ontdoen of zich moet ontdoen".

Een productieresidu kan worden beschouwd als een materiaal dat niet opzettelijk in een productieproces is geproduceerd, maar dat al dan niet daadwerkelijk een afvalstof is. Een productieresidu dat voldoet aan de voorwaarden van artikel 5, lid 1, van de afvalstoffenrichtlijn is een bijproduct en is als volgt gedefinieerd: „Een bijproduct is een stof die of een voorwerp dat het resultaat is van een productieproces dat niet in de eerste plaats bedoeld is voor de productie van die stof of dat voorwerp, dat niet als een afvalstof (…) wordt aangemerkt indien wordt voldaan aan [bepaalde] voorwaarden".

In Richtlijn 2009/28/EG ([3]) inzake hernieuwbare energiebronnen wordt geen juridisch bindende definitie gegeven ter omschrijving van een residu of een bijproduct. De mededeling van de Commissie van 2010 inzake de praktische uitvoering van het EU-mechanisme voor duurzame biobrandstoffen en vloeibare biomassa heeft tot doel duidelijker te maken wat moet worden verstaan onder de term residu. Deze mededeling kan echter niet de juridische grondslag leveren om de lidstaten ertoe te verplichten eenzelfde lijst van residuen te gebruiken. De Commissie kan dus uitsluitend haar interpretatie geven ter sturing van wat in de wetgeving van lidstaten al dan niet als een residu moet worden aangemerkt.

([1]) Zaken C-9/00 Palin Granit [2002], C-235/02 Saetti en Frediani [2004] en C-188/07 Commune de Mesquer [2008].
([2]) Richtlijn 2008/98/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 19 november 2008 betreffende afvalstoffen en tot intrekking van een aantal richtlijnen, PB L 312 van 22.11.2008.
([3]) Richtlijn 2009/28/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad van 23 april 2009 ter bevordering van het gebruik van energie uit hernieuwbare bronnen en houdende wijziging en intrekking van Richtlijn 2001/77/EG en Richtlijn 2003/30/EG, PB L 140 van 5.6.2009.

Ter beantwoording van de tweede vraag van het geachte Parlementslid wordt opgemerkt dat een nadere omschrijving van het begrip reststoffen niet het eerste doel is van het komende verslag inzake de duurzaamheid van biomassa. Dit verslag zal focussen op de tenuitvoerlegging van de in het vorige verslag van de Commissie ([4]) vervatte aanbevelingen aan de lidstaten en op de vraag of extra EU-maatregelen vereist en passend zijn om de ongewenste neveneffecten van het gebruik van biomassa in de EU te minimaliseren.

([4]) COM(2010) 11 definitief.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007739/12
to the Commission
Judith A. Merkies (S&D)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: Definition of 'residues'

At present there is a lack of clear and coherent definitions, which are the same in all EU environmental legislation, of essential concepts like 'residue' and 'by-product' used in such legislation. This creates legal uncertainties for companies operating in the EU internal market. Clear and coherent definitions are important to ensure fair competition, and it is therefore essential that materials are correctly classified in the same way in all Member States.

It should be noted that the EU Court of Justice, when interpreting the definition of waste, has pointed out that a production residue constitutes waste, and has defined it as a product not sought or intended as such. It has concluded that a material that is produced intentionally is not a production residue, nor consequently waste. The Court has also concluded that materials resulting from a manufacturing process which are not intentionally produced, but which a company intends to exploit or market on economically advantageous terms in a subsequent process, without prior processing, constitute a by-product ([1]).

In the answer it gave to Written Question E-004386/12 on renewable energy and definition of residues, the Commission stated that it supports a common approach for the implementation of the directive, but does not give a clear answer on how it intends to do this. Therefore, I ask the Commission to clarify the following:

1. How will the Commission make sure that the definitions of waste, residues and by-products, as established by the EU Court of Justice, are set out clearly for the Member States in order to ensure a coherent and uniform interpretation and application of EU environmental legislation in general, and the RES Directive in particular, across the EU?

2. Will the Commission, in its forthcoming work on sustainability criteria for solid and gaseous biomass, address the need to clarify these definitions in relation to the RES Directive?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(12 October 2012)

Article 3(1) of the Waste Framework Directive ([2]) (WFD) defines waste as 'any substance or object which the holder discards or intends or is required to discard'.

A production residue can be construed as a material that is not deliberately produced in a production process but may or may not be a waste. A production residue that fulfils the conditions of Article 5(1) WFD is a by-product and is defined as follows: 'A by-product is a substance or object, resulting from a production process, the primary aim of which is not the production of that item, that will not be regarded as waste, if certain conditions are met.'

Directive 2009/28/EC ([3]) (RED) on renewable energy sources does not contain a legally binding definition of what constitutes a residue or by products. The 2010 Commission Communication on the practical implementation of the EU biofuels and bioliquids sustainability scheme seeks to clarify what should be understood as a residue, but cannot provide a legal basis to enforce Member States to apply the same list of residues. Therefore the Commission can only provide its interpretation and guidance of what should and should not constitute a residue in Member State's legislation.

In answer to your second question, the definition of residues is not the primary focus of Commission forthcoming report on biomass sustainability. It will focus on the implementation of recommendations to Member States contained in the Commission's Report ([4]) and on whether additional EU measures are necessary and appropriate to minimise unwanted side-effects related to bioenergy use in the EU.

([1]) Cases C-9/00 Palin Granit [2002], C-235/02 Saetti and Frediani [2004] and Case C-188/07 Commune de Mesquer [2008].
([2]) Directive 2008/98/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on waste and repealing certain Directives, OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([3]) Directive 2009/28/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC, OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.
([4]) COM(2010)11 final.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007741/12
aan de Commissie
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(30 augustus 2012)

Betreft: Reclamecampagne CE-keurmerk

Hierover wil ik de volgende vragen stellen ([1]).

1. Kunt u aangeven hoeveel deze campagne gekost heeft? Dat wil zeggen, alle kosten die samenhangen met deze campagne. Zo neen, waarom niet?

2. Zijn er nog andere filmpjes gemaakt?

3. Wat is het precieze doel van deze campagne en op welke leeftijdscategorie is deze campagne gericht?

4. Hoe wordt de effectiviteit van deze campagne gemeten?

5. Deelt u mijn mening dat deze campagne volstrekt onduidelijk is voor kinderen? Zo neen, waarom niet?

6. Deelt u de mening dat campagnes gericht op kinderen per definitie zoveel mogelijk vermeden moeten worden?

7. Deelt u de mening dat deze campagne wederom aantoont dat de Europese bureaucratie werkelijk de meest gekke dingen verzint om maar geld uit te kunnen geven? Zo neen, waarom niet?

8. Kunt u mij in een helder en duidelijk document een overzicht geven van alle lopende, afgelopen en toekomstig geplande campagnes, gericht op kinderen en betaald uit Europees geld? Zo neen, waarom niet?

Antwoord van de heer Tajani namens de Commissie
(8 oktober 2012)

De campagne waarnaar het geachte Parlementslid verwijst, wil de consumenten informeren over de veiligheid van speelgoed in het algemeen door een aantal „veiligheidstips" te geven. Zo wordt onder meer geadviseerd bij de aankoop van speelgoed te controleren of het speelgoed een CE-keurmerk draagt. De campagne maakt geen reclame voor het CE-keurmerk maar maakt deel uit van de activiteiten van de Commissie rond de nieuwe richtlijn inzake de veiligheid van speelgoed ([2]): producenten worden bijvoorbeeld opgeleid om ervoor te zorgen dat ze de nieuwe veiligheidsvoorschriften inzake speelgoed correct begrijpen en toepassen, en consumenten wordt geleerd doordachte keuzen te maken bij de aankoop van speelgoed en ervoor te zorgen dat het speelgoed veilig wordt gebruikt.

De campagne voor consumenten is in december 2011 opgestart en omvat een videoclip, een website en kaarten die in speelgoedwinkels worden uitgedeeld. Doel is ouders tips te geven over de aankoop en het veilig gebruik van speelgoed ([3]).

De website en de kaarten zijn intern ontworpen en geproduceerd.

De videoclip heeft 67 355 euro gekost (concept, ontwerp, animatie en muziek) ([4]). De clip richt zich indirect via kinderen (die geboeid worden door de aardige CE-E-robot) vooral op de ouders. Doel is de veiligheid van speelgoed eenvoudig en grappig te illustreren en de ouders bewuster te maken van dit belangrijke thema, zodat ze geen gevaarlijk speelgoed kopen en ongevallen met speelgoed kunnen worden voorkomen. De doeltreffendheid van de campagne wordt gemeten op basis van het aantal in speelgoedwinkels uitgedeelde kaarten (400 000 tijdens de kerstdagen in 2011), het aantal bezoekers van de website, You Tube, EUtube en de specifieke Facebookpagina (het aantal verandert nog voortdurend) en de aandacht die de campagne in de media heeft gekregen (in heel Europa heeft de campagne ruime aandacht gekregen).

([1]) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IyE45yzFlJc & feature=youtu.be.
([2]) PB, L170 van 30.6.2009, blz. 1.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/toys/tst-campaign/index_en.htm
([4]) De kostprijs van de videoclip komt ongeveer overeen met de gemiddelde kostprijs van een videoproductie van deze lengte. De opdracht voor het maken van de clip is gegund na een openbare aanbesteding en weerspiegelt daarom de marktprijzen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007741/12
to the Commission
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: Advertising campaign for the CE mark

I should like to ask the Commission the following questions in connection with the advertising campaign for the CE mark ([1]):

1. Can the Commission state how much this campaign cost, specifying all expenditure incurred in connection with this campaign? If not, why not?

2. Have other such videos been made?

3. What is the precise aim of this campaign and at what age category is it targeted?

4. How is the effectiveness of this campaign measured?

5. Does the Commission agree that this campaign goes completely over children's heads? If not, why not?

6. Does the Commission agree that advertising campaigns aimed at children should by definition be avoided as far as possible?

7. Does the Commission agree that this campaign shows once again that European bureaucrats will think up the craziest things just in order to spend money? If not, why not?

8. Can the Commission provide a clear and unambiguous summary of all current, past and planned advertising campaigns aimed at children and paid for with European money? If not, why not?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(8 October 2012)

The campaign to which the Honourable Member refers intends to provide consumers with information on toy safety in general by offering a number of 'safety tips', one of which is to look for the presence of a CE marking when buying toys. It is therefore not advertising the CE marking, but is rather part of a broader outreach conducted by the Commission on the new Toy Safety Directive ([2]), including training to economic operators to ensure that the new toy safety rules are well understood and applied, and to consumers, to enable them to make informed decisions when buying toys for their children and make sure they are used in a safe way.

The campaign for consumers was launched in December 2011 and consists of a video clip, a website and cards distributed in toy shops, all providing tips to parents on how to safely buy and use toys ([3]).

The website and the cards were designed and produced internally.

The video clip cost EUR 67 355 (concept, design, animation and music) ([4]). It targets in particular parents, indirectly via their children, attracted by the friendly CE-E robot. The aim is to explain toy safety in a simple and funny manner, and raise parents' awareness of this important issue in the interest of avoiding the purchase of inappropriate toys, or accidents from using toys. The effectiveness of the campaign is measured by the number of cards distributed in toy shops (400 000 during the 2011 Christmas holidays), the number of connections to the campaign website, You Tube, EUtube and the dedicated Facebook page (constantly evolving), and the amount of press coverage received (which has been rather extensive all over the EU).

([1]) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IyE45yzFlJc&feature=youtu.be.
([2]) OJ L 170, 30.06.2009, p. 1.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/toys/tst-campaign/index_en.htm
([4]) The cost of this video is about the average for video productions of this length. Video production is procured through competitive tender and therefore the prices reflect market rates.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-007743/12
aan de Commissie (Vicevoorzitter — Hoge Vertegenwoordiger)
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(30 augustus 2012)

Betreft: VP/HR — Posten bij buitenlanddienst EDEO

Volgens het Staffing Report 2012 van EDEO (24.7.2012) bedraagt in 2012 het aantal AD-posten 885 (pagina 3) en het aantal AST-posten 646 (eveneens pagina 3). Volgens de ontwerpbegroting van de Europese Unie voor het begrotingsjaar 2013 bedraagt het aantal AD-posten in 2012 echter 938 en het aantal AST-posten 729 (pagina 53). In dat kader de volgende vragen:

1. Kunt u het significante verschil in aantal posten toelichten c.q. verklaren?

2. Kunt u een overzicht geven van de loonschalen van deze functionarissen?

Uit hetzelfde Staffing Report 2012 van EDEO blijkt dat de landen België, Italië, Spanje en Frankrijk oververtegenwoordigd zijn in de diverse functies die EDEO biedt, met name bij de AST-posten en contractmedewerkers.

3. Kunt u een toelichting geven waarom dit zo is en wat de justificatie is dat deze landen oververtegenwoordigd zijn in het personeelsbestand?

4. Wat gaat u eraan doen om een evenwichtiger personeelsverdeling te krijgen qua nationaliteit van de medewerkers?

5. Kunt u aangeven welke Nederlandse diplomaat/diplomaten op dit moment „(deputy) head of delegation" zijn en wie een AD-positie bekleden?

Antwoord van hoge vertegenwoordiger/vicevoorzitter Ashton namens de Commissie
(2 oktober 2012)

1. Bij alle EU-instellingen is er een verschil tussen het maximumaantal toegestane posten volgens het personeelsformatieplan en het aantal personeelsleden in actieve dienst. Hiermee wordt rekening gehouden bij de begroting voor salarissen en daarmee samenhangende kosten. Er moet enige flexibiliteit zijn voor het gebruikelijke personeelsverloop, posten die niet ingevuld zijn tijdens selectie- en aanwervingsprocedures en het beheer van verschillende categorieën personeel. Deze factoren wegen juist bij de EDEO bijzonder zwaar, aangezien het een nieuwe dienst is, die nog in oprichting is. Daarnaast bevat de personeelsformatie voor 2012 twintig nieuwe AD-posten waarvoor alleen begrotingsmiddelen zijn gereserveerd voor de laatste drie maanden van het jaar.

2. De salarissen van de personeelsleden van de EDEO worden vastgesteld overeenkomstig het personeelsstatuut dat geldt voor alle EU-instellingen.

3. & 4. Het belangrijkste criterium op grond waarvan personeel bij de EDEO wordt aangeworven, is verdienste, waarbij tegelijkertijd wordt gestreefd naar een zinvolle vertegenwoordiging van onderdanen van alle lidstaten. Uit het staffing report blijkt de vooruitgang die de EDEO sinds de oprichting op 1 januari 2011 op dit vlak heeft geboekt. De verdeling naar nationaliteit van AST en arbeidscontractanten wijkt niet wezenlijk af van de situatie in andere instellingen die in Brussel zijn gevestigd.

5. Momenteel telt de EDEO zes Nederlandse diplomaten die afkomstig zijn van het Nederlandse ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken. Vier van hen vervullen een managementfunctie: de directeur Veiligheid in Brussel en de delegatiehoofden in Zuid-Afrika, Colombia en Eritrea.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007743/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Lucas Hartong (NI)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Posts in the European External Action Service (EEAS)

According to the EEAS Staffing Report of 24 July 2012, there are this year 885 officials in AD posts (p. 3) and 646 in AST posts (also p. 3) in the EEAS . However, the draft EU budget for the 2013 financial year gives the number of AD posts for 2012 as 938 and the number of AST posts as 729 (p. 53). That being so, I should like to ask the following questions:

1. Can the VP/HR clarify or explain the significant difference in the number of posts?

2. Can the VP/HR outline the pay scales of these officials?

It also appears from the same EEAS Staffing Report that Belgium, Italy, Spain and France are over-represented in the various posts available within the EEAS, particularly in AST posts and as contract workers.

3. Can the VP/HR explain why this is the case and what justification there is for these countries being over-represented in the staffing of the EEAS?

4. What will the VP/HR do to ensure a more even balance between the nationalities of staff?

5. Can the VP/HR state which Dutch diplomat(s) are currently (deputy) heads of delegation or in AD posts?

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

1. As in all EU institutions, there is a difference between the maximum number of authorised posts in the establishment plan and the number of staff in active service and this is taken into account in the budget for salaries and related costs. This is to allow for normal turnover and posts that are vacant pending selection and recruitment procedures and a necessary degree of flexibility in managing different categories of staff. These factors are particularly significant in the case of the EEAS given the challenges of setting up the new service. In addition, the EEAS establishment plan includes 20 new AD posts in 2012 for which the budget cover is only available for the last three months of the year.

2. The salaries of EEAS staff are set in accordance with the staff regulations common to all EU institutions.

3 and 4. The overriding principle of recruitment to the EEAS is merit, while at the same time aiming for a meaningful presence of nationals from all Member States. The staffing report highlights the progress that the EEAS has made in this respect since its creation on 1 January 2011. The nationalities of AST and contract staff are not out of line with the situation in other Brussels-based institutions.

5. There are currently six Dutch diplomats coming from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, four of them in Management positions: HQ Security Director, and the Heads of Delegation in South Africa, Colombia and Eritrea.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007744/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Brazil and killings of environmental activists

Brazil's Pastoral Land Commission (CPT), which is linked to the Catholic church, has declared that more than 125 environmental activists have been threatened recently. It states that over the last decade a total of 1 855 people have received death threats. Of these, 42 were actually murdered and another 30 suffered attempts on their lives.

For instance, last year the rural leader Adelino Ramos was shot dead in Porto Velho, the capital of Rondônia state. Mr Ramos had denounced illegal logging in the states of Acre, Amazonas and Rondônia.

— Is the Vice-President/High Representative aware of the ongoing extrajudicial killings of environmental activists in Brazil?

— What representations have been made to the Brazilian authorities on this issue, and what support has the EU offered to help tackle this problem?

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

The promotion and protection of Human Rights Defenders lies at the core of the EU's Human Rights Policy. The EU is well aware of the fact that the protection of vulnerable Human Rights Defenders remains a challenge in Brazil. Human Rights Defenders and their advocates continue to report intimidation, bodily harm and death threats.

Brazil launched its National Programme for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders (HRDs) in October 2004. Nevertheless, important challenges remain with respect to the full and effective implementation of the Programme.

The EU has made the issue of HRDs an important element of its cooperation with Brazil on Human Rights and in particular of the EU-Brazil Human Rights Dialogue. At the 3rd session of the dialogue held in Brussels on 10 September 2012, the EU encouraged Brazil to efficiently implement the National Programme for HRDs without undue delay (including the passage of necessary legislation), to confirm the official status of the National Programme for the Protection of HRDs. The EU also addressed recent individual cases of killings of or intimidations to HRDs with particular focus on land and environmental rights defenders.

The EU Delegation in Brazil works in close cooperation with the Human Rights Defenders Programme and the EU is currently financing the drafting of the National Human Rights Defenders' Plan. In addition, the EU Delegation has set out to implement the EU Guidelines for the Protection of Human Right Defenders: (1) an EU focal point for HRDs has been established; (2) a network of relevant authorities and organisations is being developed; and (3) a meeting with like-minded states was first held in 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007745/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: Power Line Technology (PLT) apparatus

Cenelec (the European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardisation), which has responsibility for standardisation in the electrotechnical engineering field, has been working with the National Standards Committees of EU Member States with a view to formulating a new industry standard for Power Line Technology (PLT) apparatus (EN 50561-1).

Within the EU, electromagnetic compatibility and levels of disturbance are laid down in the EMC Directive.

Concerns have been expressed that the possible new PLT standard EN 50561-1 may not be compliant with EC law.

1. In view of this, what steps is the Commission taking to ensure that the new industry standard will adequately comply with EC law?

2. What dialogue have Commission officials held with Cenelec to ensure compliance?

3. Is the Commission confident that the new standard will satisfactorily comply with the EU rules as set out in the EMC Directive?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(16 October 2012)

Power Line Transmission (PLT) is covered by the Electromagnetic Compatibility Directive (EMC) ([1]), which establishes the electromagnetic compatibility essential requirements that electrical equipment has to fulfil to be marketed in the European Union. The goal of the essential requirements is to ensure that the electromagnetic environment in the EU allows the normal functioning of all electrical and electronic appliances, systems and installations, by requesting a harmonised, acceptable level of protection.

The Commission observes that there has been no significant number of PLT disturbance cases until now. The technical development of standards is a matter for the standardisation organisations. At this stage, the Commission is involved as an observer in the work undertaken in CENELEC, as was the case when producing the standard in question. Other stakeholders can also participate as observers. The current results are the outcome of a long process in which all stakeholders participated. To our knowledge the procedure for submitting the draft standard to vote has been scrupulously adhered to.

Once the proposed harmonised standard is submitted to the Commission, the Commission and the Member States have the possibility to raise a formal objection in cases when the standard does not fulfil the essential requirements of the EMC Directive. In the case where there are no formal objections, the Commission accepts the harmonised standard for publication in the Official Journal of the EU.

([1]) Directive 2004/108/EC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007746/12
to the Commission
Sir Graham Watson (ALDE)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: VAT and self-storage units

Council Directive 2006/112/EC sets out the common system of value added tax (VAT) within the European Union. Article 135 of this directive provides for a number of exemptions from VAT, including the leasing or letting of immovable property, the supply of buildings and the supply of land. It is also noted that these provisions are limited, both by some transitional measures and by further optional provisions in Article 15(2) of the directive.

Within the UK, Schedule 9 of the Value Added Tax Act 1994 had exempted supplies of land (subject to a list of specified exceptions) from VAT. This has given rise to 'self-storage' providers who allocate their customers a discrete area of immovable property, so that a part of a building can qualify for VAT exemption under the directive.

— The UK Government is now seeking to extend the scope of VAT to cover self-storage units. Is the Commission aware of these proposals?

— Is the Commission satisfied that the UK approach is compliant with Community law?

Answer given by Mr Šemeta on behalf of the Commission
(2 October 2012)

Article 135.1.l of Council Directive 2006/112/EC requires that Member States exempt the leasing or letting of immovable property from VAT. Article 135.2 however sets out a number of specific exclusions from that exemption and significantly also permits Member States to apply further exclusions to its scope, beyond those specifically mentioned.

On the basis of the information and explanations made available to the Commission, this change presents no conflict with EU VAT law.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007748/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE) e Giovanni La Via (PPE)
(30 agosto 2012)

Oggetto: Installazione MUOS — possibile violazione delle direttive relative all'impatto ambientale e alla salute della popolazione

La Marina militare americana sta costruendo una nuova stazione di telecomunicazioni, Mobile User Objective System (MUOS), nei pressi del comune di Niscemi (Sicilia), in una zona che interessa una popolazione di oltre 300 000 abitanti. I lavori di tale impianto, che secondo alcune stime potrebbe arrivare sino a 2 milioni di Watt di potenza, stanno causando grave allarme e preoccupazione nella popolazione locale, oltre che gravi danni paesaggistici ed ambientali e serie ripercussioni negative sulla fauna e sulla flora presenti. Con l'interrogazione E-005147/2012, veniva già evidenziato come il sito prescelto sia caratterizzato da intense emissioni elettromagnetiche nel campo delle radiofrequenze, in quanto dal 1991 è presente, in prossimità dello stesso abitato, una centrale di telecomunicazione della marina militare USA, la Naval Radio Transmitter Facility (NRTF), che conta 40 antenne in banda HF per comunicazioni di superficie ed una antenna radiatore verticale operante nella banda LF, per comunicazioni sotto la superficie del mare.

Inoltre, la base NRTF si trova all'interno della riserva naturale della Sughereta di Niscemi, inserita nella rete Natura 2000 come sito di importanza comunitaria e sulla quale, in base al piano territoriale del 2008, non è concesso realizzare nuove costruzioni o infrastrutture, compresa l'installazione di antenne e tralicci.

Considerato che rispetto al progetto MUOS non vi è stata alcuna forma di consultazione e partecipazione della popolazione interessata, così come previsto dall'articolo 6 della direttiva 2011/92/UE, si chiede alla Commissione di far sapere se:

— siano state rispettate la direttiva 85/337/CEE, come modificata dalle direttive 97/11/CE e 2003/35/CE (VIA), e la direttiva 2001/42/CE (VAS) che prevedono, tra l'altro, la valutazione d'incidenza riferibile all'articolo 6 della direttiva «Habitat»;

— siano state rispettate le norme ed i principi contenuti nella direttiva 92/43/CEE, modificata dalla direttiva 97/627CE, e nella direttiva 2009/147/CE;

— sia stata correttamente esperita, ai sensi dell'articolo 6, comma 3, della direttiva «Habitat» una valutazione di incidenza, a cui deve essere sottoposto qualsiasi piano o progetto che possa avere incidenze significative su un sito della rete Natura 2000, dato che tale valutazione si applica sia agli interventi che ricadono all'interno delle aree Natura 2000, sia a quelli che pur sviluppandosi all'esterno, possono comportare ripercussioni sullo stato di conservazione dei valori naturali tutelati nel sito, considerata anche la decisione della Commissione 2011/85/UE che adotta i SIC per la regione biogeografia mediterranea;

— sia stato rispettato l'articolo 6 della direttiva 2011/92/UE sulla consultazione e partecipazione popolazione interessata;

— sia disponibile un quadro generale della situazione.

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(17 ottobre 2012)

In merito alle questioni riguardanti la direttiva habitat ([1]), la Commissione conferma che la Sughereta di Niscemi è stata designata quale sito di importanza comunitaria (SIC) con il codice ITA050007 ed è pertanto inserita nella rete Natura 2000. La direttiva habitat non vieta la realizzazione di impianti di telecomunicazione o di altri progetti all'interno dei siti di Natura 2000. La compatibilità di tali progetti con la tutela dei siti interessati deve essere stabilita caso per caso. Spetta alle autorità nazionali competenti valutare se un progetto possa produrre incidenze significative sulle specie e sugli habitat interessati e autorizzarlo solo dopo aver accertato che non pregiudicherà l'integrità del sito.

Dalle informazioni disponibili emerge che è stato condotto uno studio circa le possibili ripercussioni del progetto sul SIC e che, sulla base dei risultati ottenuti, le autorità italiane hanno autorizzato l'installazione in oggetto.

L'articolo 1, paragrafo 3, della direttiva 2011/92/UE ([2]) (nota come direttiva sulla valutazione dell'impatto ambientale o direttiva VIA) prevede che gli Stati membri possano decidere, se così disposto dalla normativa nazionale, di non applicare la direttiva a progetti destinati a scopi di difesa nazionale. Tale disposizione esiste all'interno dell'ordinamento italiano ([3]).

La direttiva 2001/42/CE ([4]) (nota come direttiva sulla valutazione ambientale strategica o direttiva VAS) è applicabile a piani e programmi e non è pertanto pertinente. In ogni caso, la direttiva prevede che i piani e i programmi destinati unicamente a scopi di difesa nazionale possano essere esclusi dall'applicazione delle sue disposizioni.

In conclusione, la Commissione non ravvisa alcuna potenziale violazione delle disposizioni summenzionate.

([1]) GU L 206 del 22.7.1992.
([2]) GU L 26 del 28.1.2012.
([3]) D. Lgs. 3.4.2006 n. 152 e s.m.i.
([4]) GU L 197 del 21.7.2001.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007748/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE) and Giovanni La Via (PPE)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: MUOS installation and possible infringement of environmental impact and public health directives

The US Navy is building a new Mobile User Objective System (MUOS) telecommunications base near Niscemi (Sicily) in an area affecting over 300 000 residents. Work on the base, which could, according to certain estimates, generate up to 2 million watts, is causing serious concern and alarm among local residents, as well as causing serious damage to the landscape and environment and to local fauna and flora. Question for written answer E-005147/2012 reveals that the projected site of the facility is already subject to intense electromagnetic radio frequency emissions from a Naval Radio Transmitter Facility (NRTF) in place since 1991 and using 40 high-frequency antennae for surface communications and a vertical, low-frequency antenna for submarine communications.

Furthermore, the NRTF facility is situated within the Sughereta wildlife reserve in Niscemi forming part of the Natura 2000 network and designated as a site of community importance. Under the 2008 regional development plan, no further constructions or infrastructures including antennae and pylons are authorised there.

Given that the local residents have not been consulted or involved in any way with the projected MUOS facility as required under Article 6 of Directive 2011/92/EU:

— Can the Commission say whether Directive 85/337/EEC, as amended by Directives 97/11/EC and 2003/35/EC (IEA), and Directive 2001/42/EC providing for impact assessment under Article 6 of the 'Habitats' directive have been complied with?

— Have the standards and principles contained in Directive 92/43/EEC, amended by Directive 97/627/EC and Directive 2009/147/EC, been complied with?

— Has an impact assessment been properly carried out under Article 6(3) of the Habitats directive as required for any plan or project which would have a significant impact on a Natura 2000 site, given that it applies to projects situated within the Natura 2000 area and those which, while situated outside the area, could have implications for wildlife conservation within the site, in the light of Commission Decision 2011/85/EU adopting sites of Community importance for the Mediterranean biogeographical region?

— Have the provisions of Article 6 of Directive 2011/92/EU on the consultation and participation of the members of the public concerned been complied with?

— Can the Commission give a general overview of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

As regards the questions concerning the Habitats Directive ([1]), the Commission can confirm that the 'Niscemi sughereta' has been designated as a site of Community importance SCI (code ITA050007) and is therefore part of the Natura 2000 network. The Habitats Directive does not prohibit telecommunications installations or other projects inside Natura 2000 sites. The compatibility of such developments with the protection of the concerned sites needs to be determined on a case by case basis. It is up to the competent national authorities to assess whether a project could cause significant negative effects on the relevant species and habitats and to authorise it only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site.

According to the available information, it appears that a study has indeed been carried out in relation to the possible impacts of the project on the SCI and that, on the basis of its findings, the Italian authorities have granted the authorisation for the concerned installation.

Article 1(3) of Directive 2011/92/EU ([2]) (known as the Environmental Impact Assessment or EIA Directive) gives Member States the discretion not to apply its provisions for projects serving national purposes if this is provided for under national law. Such a provision exists under Italian national law ([3]).

([1]) OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([2]) OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([3]) Legislative Decree (Decreto Legislativo, DL), 03.04.2006, number 152, as amended.

Directive 2001/42/EC ([4]) (known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment or SEA Directive) applies to plans and programmes and is therefore not relevant. In any case, it contains a similar exclusion for plans and programmes whose sole purpose is to serve national defence purposes.

In conclusion, the Commission cannot identify any potential breach of the abovementioned provisions.

([4]) OJ L 197, 21.7.2001.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007750/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(30 augustus 2012)

Betreft: Vergunning voor dextropropoxyfeen bevattende geneesmiddelen

In 2010 besliste de Europese Commissie, na onderzoek door het Europees Geneesmiddelenbureau, om de vergunningen voor het in de handel brengen van dextropropoxyfeen bevattende geneesmiddelen, in te trekken.

Patiënten met chronische pijnen, die voordien deze geneesmiddelen kregen voorgeschreven, zagen zich plots geconfronteerd met het uit de handel nemen ervan.

De alternatieven voldoen echter niet en patiënten worden opnieuw geconfronteerd met chronische pijnen, waardoor hun levenskwaliteit aanzienlijk daalt.

Is de Commissie voornemens om de vergunningen voor deze substantie op korte termijn te herevalueren, en deze patiënten weer uitzicht te geven op een betere toekomst?

Antwoord van de heer Dalli namens de Commissie
(12 oktober 2012)

Overeenkomstig de geneesmiddelenwetgeving ([1]) moet op basis van een beoordeling van de kwaliteit, de veiligheid en de werkzaamheid van een geneesmiddel een vergunning worden afgegeven voordat een geneesmiddel voor menselijk gebruik in de handel wordt gebracht. Voor het geneesmiddel gelden vervolgens surveillancemaatregelen na het in de handel brengen. De vergunning voor het in de handel brengen kan ondermeer om veiligheidsredenen worden gewijzigd, opgeschort of ingetrokken. Wanneer de belangen van de Unie in het geding zijn, wordt de zaak voorgelegd aan het Comité voor geneesmiddelen voor menselijk gebruik (CHMP) van het Europees Geneesmiddelenbureau.

Bij geneesmiddelen die dextropropoxyfeen bevatten, is voor de gehele EU de verwijzingsprocedure van artikel 31 van Richtlijn 2001/83/EG gevolgd[1]. Op basis van de beoordeling van de gegevens betreffende werkzaamheid en veiligheid van deze middelen heeft het CHMP geconcludeerd dat de balans tussen de voordelen en de risico's negatief uitvalt. Daarom heeft de Commissie besluiten vastgesteld die hebben geleid tot het uit de handel nemen van middelen voor oraal gebruik en van zetpillen ([2]), en tot de schorsing van middelen voor parenteraal gebruik ([3]). Beide besluiten voorzien in een periode van 15 maanden voor de uitvoering ervan, zodat de gezondheidswerkers over voldoende tijd beschikken om, rekening houdend met de toestand van de patiënt en met andere factoren van pijnbestrijding, hun patiënten voor te bereiden op een mogelijke omschakeling op bestaande alternatieven.

Om de schorsing te laten opheffen, moeten de vergunninghouders bewijs leveren van een patiëntenpopulatie waarvoor de balans tussen voordelen en risico's van parenteraal gebruik van dextropropoxyfeen positief uitvalt. Nadere informatie over de bovengenoemde besluiten is publiekelijk beschikbaar op de website van DG Gezondheid en Consumenten, onder „EU referrals" ([4]).

([1]) Richtlijn 2001/83/EG van het Europees Parlement en de Raad tot vaststelling van een communautair wetboek betreffende geneesmiddelen voor menselijk gebruik.
([2]) C(2010)4136 van 14.6.2010.
([3]) C(2010)4137 van 14.6.2010.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007750/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(30 August 2012)

Subject: Licensing for medicines containing dextropropoxyphene

In 2010 the Commission decided, following a study by the European Medicines Agency, to withdraw the licences for the marketing of medicines containing dextropropoxyphene.

Patients suffering from chronic pain who had formerly been prescribed these medicines were suddenly faced with its withdrawal from circulation.

However, the alternatives are unsatisfactory and patients are again having to cope with chronic pain, significantly worsening their quality of life.

Does the Commission have any plans in the short term to review the licenses for this substance and thus give these patients a renewed prospect of a better future?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(12 October 2012)

According to pharmaceutical legislation ([1]), before a medicinal product for human use is put on the market in the EU, a marketing authorisation based on evaluation of its quality, safety and efficacy has to be granted. The medicinal product is further subject to post-marketing surveillance. Amongst other, the marketing authorisation may be varied, suspended or revoked because of safety concerns. Where the interests of the Union are involved in such a matter, it shall be referred to the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP) of the European Medicines Agency.

Medicinal products containing dextropropoxyphene have been subject to an EU-wide referral under the article 31 of Directive 2001/83/EC ([1]). Based on the assessment of efficacy and safety data, the CHMP concluded that the benefit-risk balance of these products is negative. On this basis, the Commission adopted Decisions leading to withdrawal of products for oral use and suppositories ([2]) and to suspension of products for parenteral use ([3]). Both Decisions provided for a period of 15 months for implementation, in order to provide healthcare professionals with sufficient time to prepare their patients for a potential switch to existing alternatives, taking into account the condition of the patient and other factors in pain management.

For the suspension to be lifted, the marketing authorisation holders would need to provide the evidence of a patient population in which the benefit-risk balance of parenteral use of dextropropoxyphene is favourable. More information regarding the abovementioned decisions is publicly available on the website of DG Health and Consumers — EU referrals ([4]).

([1]) Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the community code relating to medicinal products for human use as amended.
([2]) C(2010)4136 of 14.6.2010.
([3]) C(2010)4137 of 14.6.2010.
([4]) http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/community-register/html/index_en.htm

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-007753/12
till kommissionen
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(31 augusti 2012)

Angående: Skydd av Natura 2000-områdena

I dagarna har avverkning av skog för att förbereda ett kalkbrott påbörjats i ett område känt som Ojnaredsskogen på Gotland. Detta område är ett så kallat Natura 2000-område och har flera sällsynta arter samt är en viktig grundvattentäkt. Trots detta har ett beslut tagits att området kan upplåtas till att bli ett kalkbrott.

Med hänvisning till Europaparlamentets och rådets direktiv 2006/118/EG angående skydd för grundvattnet mot föroreningar och försämringar, och till att området ingår i Natura 2000 ställer jag frågan vilket skydd dessa områden egentligen har då svensk lagstiftning tillåter att de kan exploateras, och avser kommissionen att agera för att skydda dessa områden från exploatering i framtiden.

Svar från Janez Potočnik på kommissionens vägnar
(11 oktober 2012)

Enligt de uppgifter som kommissionen har tillgång till är det berörda området inte i sig ett Natura 2000-område utan ligger i närheten av två Natura 2000-områden. Kommissionen har begärt ytterligare upplysningar från de svenska myndigheterna för att fastställa om, och i så fall hur, dessa två Natura 2000-områden kan påverkas av anläggningen av ett kalkbrott i närheten. Kommissionen kommer att vidta lämpliga åtgärder om slutsatsen av undersökningen blir att Sverige bryter mot EU-lagstiftningen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007753/12
to the Commission
Mikael Gustafsson (GUE/NGL)
(31 August 2012)

Subject: Protection of Natura 2000 areas

In the last few days work has begun on the clearing of forest to prepare for a limestone quarry in an area known as Ojnaredsskogen on the island of Gotland. This is a Natura 2000 area, it is home to many rare species and is an important groundwater protection zone. In spite of this, a decision has been taken that the area may be made available to become a limestone quarry.

With reference to Directive 2006/118/EC of the European Parliament and the Council on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration, and given that the area is covered by Natura 2000, what protection do such areas really have, since Swedish legislation allows them to be exploited? Does the Commission propose taking action to protect such areas from exploitation in the future?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

According to the information available to the Commission, the area concerned is not in itself a Natura 2000 area but it is located in close proximity to two Natura 2000 sites. The Commission has requested further information from the Swedish Authorities in order to determine whether and how these two Natura 2000 sites might be affected by the establishment of a limestone quarry close by. The Commission will take appropriate action should its investigation lead to an assessment that Sweden is in breach of EU legislation.

(Svensk version)

Frågor för skriftligt besvarande E-007754/12
till kommissionen
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(31 augusti 2012)

Angående: Uppföljning på kommissionens svar till frågan E-005616/2012

Som uppföljning på kommissionens svar till frågan E-005616/2012 har denna parlamentsledamot två följdfrågor:

Vilka anledningar tror kommissionen att det kan finnas att de externa konsulterna inte lyckades hitta 2005 års utredning av UPOV och av denna dra slutsatsen att det finns kvantitativa bevis för att växtförädlarskyddet fungerar som incitament för framställning av nya växtvarianter?

Enligt de av kommissionen anlitade externa utredarna menar representanter för förädlarföretag att växtförädlarskyddet effektivt ger skydd åt nya växtvarianter, medan representanter från rådet och medlemsstaternas regeringar menar att skyddet effektivt skapar incitament för framställning av nya växtvarianter. Har kommissionen några planer på att utreda hur det kommer sig att industriaktörerna framhåller andra fördelar med lagstiftningen än lagstiftarna själva?

Svar från John Dalli på kommissionens vägnar
(11 oktober 2012)

I den studie om effekterna av växtsortskydd ([1]) som Internationella unionen för skydd av växtförädlingsprodukter (UPOV) publicerade 2005 sammanfattas hur skyddet fungerar hos UPOV:s medlemmar, däribland EU:s medlemsstater. Där finns också detaljerade uppgifter om Argentina, Kina, Kenya, Polen och Sydkorea. Uppgifter från Gemenskapens växtsortsmyndighet ingick i rapporten från 1995 till 2005. I rapporten behandlades dessutom utvidgningen av skyddet till att omfatta alla växtarter: 1975 hade växtsortskydd beviljats för 500 arter, vilket 2005 hade ökat till 2 300 arter. De externa konsulterna förtecknade UPOV:s studie i bilagan till sin rapport.

Kommissionen anser att de åsikter som växtförädlare och myndigheter i medlemsstaterna uttryckt inte motsäger varandra. Växtförädlarna anser att systemet för växtsortskydd ger deras framförädlade sorter ett fullgott skydd. Detta har i sin tur lett till att nya sorter tagits fram och skapat möjligheter till avkastning på investeringar. Samtidigt betraktar myndigheterna skyddet som ett verktyg för att främja växtförädling och därmed som ett incitament för växtförädlaren att få ut fler innovationer på marknaden för jordbruksproduktion, t.ex. sorter som är nya och tydligt särskiljer sig från befintliga sorter. Att ett allt större antal sorter skyddas av gemenskapens växtförädlarrätt är ett tydligt tecken på att förordningen om växtförädlarrätt uppfyller sina mål.

([1]) www.upov.int/export/sites/upov/about/en/pdf/353_upov_report.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007754/12
to the Commission
Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE)
(31 August 2012)

Subject: Follow-up to Commission's answer to Question E-005616/2012

In response to the Commission's answer to Question E-005616/2012, I have two follow-up questions:

What reasons, in the Commission's view, can there be for the external consultants' failure to find the 2005 study on the Convention of the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) and conclude from it that there is quantitative evidence that plant variety protection does in fact act as an incentive for the production of new plant varieties?

According to the external consultants used by the Commission, representatives of plant breeding firms consider that plant variety protection does in fact provide protection for new plant varieties, while representatives of the Council and the Member State governments consider that this protection does in fact provide an incentive to the production of new plant varieties. Does the Commission have any plans to investigate how it can be that stakeholders in the industry see a different set of advantages in the legislation than the legislators themselves?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The 2005 International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) study on the effects of variety protection ([1]) provided an overall view on the protection in the UPOV Members, including the EU, and detailed information on Argentina, China, Kenya, Poland, and South Korea. The data from the Community Plant Variety Office were included in the report from 1995 to 2005. It addressed also the extension of the protection to all plant species: in 1975, variety protection had been granted for 500 species, growing to 2 300 by 2005. The external consultants listed the UPOV study in the annex of their report.

The Commission considers that the views expressed by breeders and authorities of Member States are not mutually exclusive. Breeders consider that Plant Variety Protection regime provides protection for their breeding works, resulting in new varieties, and opportunities for return on investment, while authorities consider it as a tool to promote breeding activity and consequently as an incentive for the breeder to make available on the market more innovations, e.g. varieties which are new and distinct from existing ones, for the agricultural production. The steadily growing number of varieties protected by a Community Plant Variety Right is a clear indication that the regulation on Plant Variety Protection achieves its objectives.

([1]) www.upov.int/export/sites/upov/about/en/pdf/353_upov_report.pdf

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-007756/12
à la Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(3 septembre 2012)

Objet: Accord commercial entre l'Union européenne, la Colombie et le Pérou

Votre réponse à ma question écrite E-00171/2012 comporte quelques imprécisions et lacunes que j'aimerais voir clarifiées. Il y avait 5 tirets. Je me permettrai de revenir sur ces derniers, en reprenant la numérotation utilisée dans la question précédente.

1. Le Pérou et la Colombie bénéficient actuellement du régime SPG+ qui offre un tarif zéro pour ainsi dire à tous les produits. Dans votre réponse, vous parlez de 500 nouvelles lignes non libéralisées dans le cadre du SPG+ qui bénéficieraient d'un traitement préférentiel échelonné en vertu du nouvel accord. Les annexes de l'accord n'indiquent cependant pas quelles sont ces 500 nouvelles lignes, par rapport à celles du SPG+. Pourriez-vous fournir cette liste? Quels sont les produits susceptibles de faire varier significativement la gamme exportatrice habituelle de ces pays vers l'UE?

2. Je n'ai pas eu de réponse à ma question portant sur le lactosérum. Serait-il possible d'en avoir une? Le lactosérum a-t-il été intégré dans la liste de produits libéralisés en vue d'une production industrielle d'aliments? Si oui, la demande vient-elle des producteurs européens produisant en Colombie et au Pérou?

4. La fiche d'information du 20 novembre 2011, à laquelle vous faites référence, stipule que, dans le cas du chapitre «commerce et développement soutenable», «l'application de sanctions est exclue, car la menace de sanctions ne serait pas appropriée, voire inefficace, et que des pénalités économiques ne feraient que pénaliser les plus nécessiteux». Mais cela est également vrai pour les autres chapitres de l'accord. Pourquoi n'y appliquez-vous pas la même logique et menacez-vous de sanctions qui peuvent pénaliser des secteurs industriels, de services ou d'agriculture entiers?

5. Concernant la question sur les indications géographiques (IG), pouvez-vous confirmer que, par rapport aux plus de 100 IG inscrites par l'UE, la Colombie n'en a inscrit que 2 et le Pérou 4? Comment envisagez-vous de compenser le déséquilibre colossal qui sera occasionné par la différence de traitement administratif nécessaire et la surcharge à venir pour les pays andins? Merci de répondre au tiret 5 en ce sens.

Réponse donnée par M. De Gucht au nom de la Commission
(2 octobre 2012)

Les listes tarifaires dans les accords commerciaux ou préférentiels de l'UE sont établies selon la nomenclature des lignes tarifaires. La couverture plus complète qu'offre cet accord commercial, comparé au système de préférences généralisées (SPG+), peut être identifiée en comparant les deux annexes pertinentes. Bien que les bénéfices de l'accord aillent au-delà de la couverture des lignes tarifaires, le montant des droits de douane finaux économisés par les deux pays est estimé à environ 250 millions d'euros par an, les économies concernant des produits comme la banane, les raisins de table, la viande bovine, la viande de volaille, le sucre, le riz et les agrumes.

L'élimination des droits sur les produits laitiers, y compris le lactosérum, est intégrée dans les listes tarifaires. Les négociations ont pris en compte les points de vue des industries concernées des deux parties.

La prévisibilité et la transparence sont indispensables pour permettre aux entreprises d'accroître les flux d'échanges et d'investissements. Ainsi, un processus transparent et clairement ordonné de règlement des différends est un élément clé de tout accord commercial, surtout lorsqu'il est accompagné de la possibilité de suspendre les avantages commerciaux en dernier recours. Toutefois, concernant le chapitre sur le commerce et le développement durable, la Commission pense que les mécanismes de dialogue, d'arbitrage et de surveillance mis en place peuvent davantage promouvoir et préserver des niveaux élevés de protection du travail et de l'environnement qu'une approche fondée sur des sanctions.

La Colombie et le Pérou ont demandé respectivement deux et quatre indications géographiques protégées et les procédures sont achevées. La plupart des Indications géographiques de l'UE ont également été publiées et le délai d'opposition est passé. La charge de travail administratif qui y est liée est gérée grâce à une collaboration étroite des administrations, y compris des délégations de l'UE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007756/12
to the Commission
Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Trade agreement between the European Union, Colombia and Peru

Your reply to my Written Question E-007171/2012 is unclear and incomplete on a number of points which I should like to have clarified with specific reference to four of the five paragraphs of my previous question.

1. Peru and Colombia currently benefit from the GSP plus regime effectively imposing zero tariffs on all their products. In your answer you refer to 500 additional non-liberalised lines to which a graduated preferential treatment would apply under the new GSP plus agreement. However, the annexes to the agreement do not specifically identify the 500 additional lines. Can the Commission provide a list? Which products might significantly affect the usual range of exports from these countries to the EU?

2. I did not receive a reply to my question relating to lactoserum. Would it be possible for a reply to be given? Has lactoserum been included in the list of liberalised products with a view to the industrial production of foodstuffs? If so, has this request come from European producers in Colombia and Peru?

3.The information sheet of 20 November 2011 to which the Commission refers stipulates in the chapter on trade and sustainable development that the application of sanctions is excluded since to threaten sanctions would be not only inappropriate but also ineffective and that economic penalties would simply cause the poorest to suffer. However, this also applies to the other chapters of the agreement. Why does the Commission therefore not apply the same logic throughout and why does it threaten sanctions which would penalise industrial services or entire farming sectors?

4. With regard to geographical indications (GI) referred to in the fifth indent of my previous question, can the Commission confirm that, of the 100 GIs registered with the EU, only two have been registered by Colombia and four by Peru? How does it intend to offset the colossal imbalance arising from the difference in administrative treatment required and the excessive burden which will be borne by the Andean countries?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(2 October 2012)

The tariff schedules in EU trade agreements or preferential arrangements are arranged according to tariff line nomenclature. The wider coverage of this Trade Agreement as compared to GSP+ can be identified by comparing the two relevant annexes. While the benefits of the agreement go beyond tariff line coverage, final tariffs saved by the two countries are estimated at some EUR 250 million per year, with savings in products such as bananas, table grapes, bovine meat, poultry meat, sugar, rice, citruses.

The elimination of duties on dairy products, including lactoserum, is included in the tariff schedules. The negotiations took into account the views of relevant industries on both sides.

Predictability and transparency are vital for businesses to increase trade and investment flows. Thus, a clearly sequenced and transparent dispute settlement process is a key part of any trade agreement, with a potential suspension of trade benefits as a last resort. However, for the Chapter on Trade and Sustainable Development, the Commission believes that the created dialogue, arbitration and monitoring mechanisms can promote and preserve high levels of labour and environmental protection better than a sanction based approach.

Colombia and Peru asked for protection of two and four Geographical Indications (GIs) and the procedures are complete. The majority of EU submitted GIs have also been published and passed the opposition period. Related administrative workload is addressed by close collaboration of the administrations, including by EU Delegations.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita P-007757/12
à Comissão
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(3 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Importância da TV e Rádio para as RUP em cenários de catástrofes naturais

O arquipélago dos Açores, enquanto Região Ultraperiférica, distante e isolada no oceano, sofre de um elevado grau de probabilidades de catástrofe natural, a que acresce alto risco de acidentes sísmicos, uma vez que está situado em 3 placas tectónicas. Eis por que as suas 9 ilhas têm obrigatoriamente de estar ligadas pelo Serviço de Proteção Civil.

São conhecidas as dificuldades de comunicação nas RUP, sobretudo em situações de catástrofe e acidente sísmico. Nesses casos, sabe-se comprovadamente que o único meio de comunicação que se mantém estável e que constitui o primeiro e o grande apoio da população e dos próprios Serviços de Proteção Civil é a ligação via rádio e televisão.

A RTP Açores, Rádio e Televisão de Portugal nos Açores, presta atualmente um serviço público que liga em rede as 9 ilhas que compõem os Açores, sendo absolutamente vital que possam dispor de meios tecnológicos de informação e comunicação adequados para prestar o apoio devido também em situações de catástrofes naturais e risco sísmico. Tal exigirá a possibilidade de beneficiar de fundos e/ou programas para melhor garantir a qualidade desse apoio.

Assim, pergunto à Comissão Europeia:

— Tem a CE presente a situação descrita? Que medidas tomou e/ou prevê tomar neste âmbito?

— Existem programas de apoio à renovação do equipamento e das instalações do serviço público de televisão e rádio nas RUP? Neste caso, quais? Caso contrário, preveem criar fundos para este efeito?

— Existem programas de apoio aos meios de comunicação em situações de emergência que possam ser atribuídos ao serviço público de televisão e rádio? Neste caso, quais? Caso contrário, preveem criá-los e integrá-los nos fundos de proteção civil?

— Atendendo ao papel do serviço público de rádio e televisão e à importância das comunicações nas RUP, pergunto ainda se já apoiam e em que modalidades apoiam, ou estão a pensar apoiar estes serviços?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(15 de outubro de 2012)

1. A Comissão está consciente da importância da rede RTP Açores e do seu papel de comunicação em caso de catástrofes naturais. Atualmente, a Comissão não tem qualquer plano para tomar medidas em relação à rede.

2. O Fundo Europeu de Desenvolvimento Regional (FEDER), programa para os Açores («Proconvergência» 2007/2013), pode apoiar as melhorias em matéria de acessibilidade e a utilização de tecnologias de informação e comunicação, em especial através da aquisição de equipamentos de tratamento de dados e do financiamento das infraestruturas e da ligação a redes de banda larga. Este programa financia ainda projetos relacionados com o desenvolvimento e a aplicação de planos de intervenção de emergência, de redes de telecomunicações de emergência e as situações de emergência. Os atuais programas do FEDER para as duas regiões ultraperiféricas portuguesas, Madeira e Açores, não preveem o financiamento de projetos no domínio de equipamentos ou instalações de rádio e televisão públicas.

3., 4. As necessidades específicas das regiões ultraperiféricas estão igualmente identificadas na Decisão 2007/162/CE do Conselho, de 5 de março de 2007, que institui um Instrumento Financeiro para a Proteção Civil. As ações de informação ao público no domínio da proteção civil podem ser financiadas com base no artigo 4.°, n.° 1, alínea c), dessa decisão. Estão incluídas disposições similares na proposta de um novo Mecanismo de Proteção Civil da União ([1]), que é atualmente objeto de um processo legislativo ordinário. Tal permitiria o financiamento de ações de apoio relativas à informação pública, à educação, à sensibilização e correspondentes ações de divulgação destinadas a minimizar os efeitos das catástrofes.

([1]) Proposta de decisão do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa a um Mecanismo de Proteção Civil da União (COM(2011)934 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007757/12
to the Commission
Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Importance of television and radio to the outermost regions in cases of natural disaster

The archipelago of the Azores, as an outermost region which is distant and isolated in mid-ocean, is exposed to a high risk of natural disaster, as well as being earthquake-prone due to its location on the edge of three tectonic plates. It is essential for its nine islands to be connected by the civil protection service.

The communication problems affecting the outermost regions are well known and all the more acute in situations of natural disaster or earthquake. At these times, it has been shown that the only stable form of communication and the main, primary source of assistance to the population and emergency services is the connection via radio and television.

Portuguese Azores Radio Television (RTP *Açores*) currently provides a public service linking the nine islands of the Azores in a single network. It is of vital importance that they have access to adequate communications and information technology resources with which to provide proper support during natural disasters or earthquakes, and they need to be able to benefit from funding and/or programmes to better guarantee the quality of this support.

— Is the Commission aware of this situation? What measures has it taken or does it plan to take in relation to it?

— Are there any programmes currently in existence to support and renew public radio and television equipment and facilities in the outermost regions? If so, which ones? If not, is there any plan to set aside funding for this purpose?

— Do any programmes exist to support the communication media in emergency situations, which could be used to assist public radio and television services? If so, which ones? If not, is there any plan to create such programmes and include them in civil protection funding?

— In view of the role of public radio and television services and the importance of communications in the outermost regions, are these services already being supported and, if so, how? If not, is there any plan to provide support for them?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

1. The Commission is aware of the existence of the RTP Açores network and its communication role in the event of natural disasters. The Commission has no current plans to take measures in relation to the network.

2. The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) programme for Açores, 'Proconvergência' 2007-2013, could support accessibility improvements and use of information and communication technologies, in particular through the acquisition of data-processing equipment and the financing of infrastructure and connection to broadband networks. This programme also finances projects related to the development and implementation of emergency contingency plans, telecommunications emergency networks and emergency situations. The current ERDF programmes for the two Portuguese outermost regions, Madeira and Azores, do not provide financing for projects in the field of public radio and television equipment or facilities.

3-4. The specific needs of the outermost regions are also identified in Council Decision 2007/162/EC of 5 March 2007 which established a civil protection financial instrument. Public information actions in the field of civil protection can be financed on the basis of Article 4(1) (c) of that Decision. Similar provisions are included in the proposed new EU civil protection mechanism ([1]), which is currently under ordinary legislative procedure. This would allow funding to support actions related to public information, education, awareness raising and associated dissemination actions meant to minimise the effects of disasters.

([1]) Proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Union Civil Protection Mechanism (COM(2011) 934 final).

(Dansk udgave)

Forespørgsel til skriftlig besvarelse E-007758/12
til Kommissionen
Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)
(3. september 2012)

Om: Pludselig ændring af norske toldsatser for Hortensia

Norge har til skade for gartnere i EU, herunder gartnere fra Holland, Tyskland og Danmark, for nylig ændret i klassificeringsbestemmelserne for blomster og planter, så toldsatsen for eksempelvis Hortensia Marcrophylla er steget fra 0 til 72 % fra den ene dag til den anden. Toldsatsen for Hortensia Kalanchoe er også blevet ændret.

Ovennævnte skal ses i sammenhæng med, at der siden EØS-aftalens ikrafttrædelse i 1994 kun er indgået to aftaler (i henholdsvis 2002 og 2010) om yderligere liberalisering.

I det norske dagblad »Dagens Næringsliv« gør den norske økonomiminister opmærksom på, at der måske endda kommer flere tiltag.

Er Kommissionen enig i, at Norge misbruger toldsatserne og opretholder et toldværn, der ikke er en del af den seneste aftale med Norge om handelssamarbejde og ånden i EØS-aftalens Artikel 19?

Er Kommissionen enig i, at Norge ønsker og får adgang til det europæiske marked for egne varer, for eksempel laks, mens de ustraffet får lov til at blokerer for EU-virksomheders afsætning af varer ved at jonglere med toldsatser og klassificeringsbestemmelser?

Hvad har Kommissionen mulighed for at gøre, og hvad agter Kommissionen at foretage sig i denne anledning?

Svar afgivet på Kommissionens vegne af Karel De Gucht
(16. oktober 2012)

Kommissionen er i øjeblikket ved at undersøge spørgsmålet om tariferingen af *Hydrangea macrophylla* i norsk toldnomenklatur, som det ærede medlem omtaler. I henhold til cirkulæret af 10. juli 2012 fra de norske myndigheder, bør *Hydrangea macrophylla*, hvis importeret som potte- eller udplantningsplante i blomst — også når planten allerede har formet en træagtig stilk og stamme — være klassificeret under en tarifering underlagt en 72 % importtold, når oprindelsesstedet er inden for EU. For at afslutte undersøgelsen har Kommissionen anmodet om detaljerede oplysninger vedrørende varebeskrivelsen og de tidligere anvendte KN-koder.

Kommissionen noterer sig også den norske regerings nylige beslutning om i budgetpakken for 2013 at foreslå en ændring fra specifik told (fast beløb pr. vægtenhed) til værditold (dvs. en given procentdel af den endelige pris) for visse landbrugsprodukter.

Artikel 19 i aftalen om Det Europæiske Økonomiske Samarbejdsområde (EØS-aftalen), som det ærede medlem peger på, fastsætter en fælles målsætning om parternes fortsatte bestræbelser med henblik på at opnå en gradvis liberalisering af handelen med landbrugsprodukter. Vores dialog om handelssamarbejde med de norske myndigheder vil i overensstemmelse med artikel 19 fortsætte. I den forbindelse vil Kommissionen bede den norske regering give oplysninger om, hvordan den mener, at foranstaltningerne er i overensstemmelse med de eksisterende forpligtelser i henhold til EØS-aftalen og gældende bilaterale aftaler mellem Norge og EU, der er indgået i overensstemmelse med artikel 19 i EØS-aftalen.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007758/12
to the Commission
Bendt Bendtsen (PPE)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Sudden amendment to rates of Norwegian customs duty on hydrangeas

Norway has recently amended its classification rules for flowers and plants, so that the rate of customs duty on hydrangeas (Hydrangea macrophylla), for example, has risen from 0% to 72% overnight, a measure that is detrimental to the interests of gardeners in the EU, including Holland, Germany and Denmark. The customs duty on Kalanchoë has also been amended.

In connection with the above it should be noted that since the entry into force of the EEA Agreement in 1994 only two agreements on further liberalisation have been concluded, in 2002 and 2010 respectively.

In the Norwegian daily '*Dagens Næringsliv*' the Norwegian Minister for Economic Affairs notes that there may be further measures still to come.

Does the Commission agree that Norway is abusing customs rates and raising a customs shield which forms no part of the most recent agreement with Norway on trade cooperation and is not in the spirit of Article 19 of the EEA Agreement?

Does the Commission agree that Norway wishes to access the European market for its own goods, such as salmon, and yet is permitted with impunity to block the sale of goods by EU firms by juggling with customs rates and classification rules?

What is the Commission able to do, and what action does the Commission propose to take on this matter?

Answer given by Mr Karel De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(16 October 2012)

The Commission is currently examining the issue of customs classification of *hydrangea macrophylla* in Norwegian customs nomenclature that is referred by the Honourable Member. According to the circular of 10 July 2012 by the Norwegian authorities, *hydrangea macrophylla,* if imported as a houseplant or bedding plant in bloom — including when the plant has already formed a woody stem and trunk — should be classified under a tariff classification subject to a 72% import duty when originating in the EU. To finalise the examination, the Commission has asked for detailed information concerning the description of the product and customs codes used in the past.

The Commission also takes note of the recent decision by the Norwegian Government to propose, within the budget package for 2013, to transfer specific duties (a fixed amount applicable per each unit of weight) to *ad valorem* duties (that is, a given percentage on the final price of the product) for certain agricultural products.

Article 19 of the European Economic Area (EEA) Agreement highlighted by the Honourable Member stipulates a common objective to continue the efforts of the parties with a view to achieving progressive liberalisation of agricultural trade. Our trade cooperation dialogue with Norwegian authorities, in accordance with Article 19, will continue. In this framework, the Commission will ask Norway to provide explanations on how it sees the conformity of those measures with existing commitments under the EEA Agreement and the bilateral Agreements currently in force between Norway and the EU concluded according to Article 19 of the EEA Agreement.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007759/12
to the Commission
Baroness Sarah Ludford (ALDE)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: 'Science: It's a Girl Thing!' initiative

The Commission's DG for Science and Innovation recently launched a new campaign ('Science: It's a Girl Thing!' ([1])) to encourage women to take up careers in science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM) fields. While I welcome this campaign, its promotional video featured a rather stereotypical view of women and their presumed interest in make-up and fashion which could be deemed patronising towards women in general, and especially those considering a career in science. This video was heavily criticised, and was removed within 24 hours.

In recent years the number of women entering university in STEM subjects has increased; however, the number of women working in related fields remains low. Recent research ([2]) suggests that campaigns that counter stereotypes of women in science by featuring hyper-feminine female scientists do not increase interest among teenage girls already interested in STEM fields, and in fact reduce interest among those who already have a negative conception of female STEM professionals.

Why did the Commission decide to use a style of promotion that reinforces stereotypes of women and risks undermining female scientists? Did the Commission consider a more balanced, mature and intellectual way of increasing interest in STEM professions among girls? Does the Commission intend to start a campaign to make STEM careers more welcoming towards women and combat prejudice and discrimination in this field?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

The 'Women in Research and Innovation' campaign is part of a wider EU strategy for gender equality in research and innovation. It comprises a broad range of activities which aim to 1) address the under-representation of women in research careers at all levels, 2) integrate the gender dimension in research and innovation content and 3) modernise research institutions, in particular their human resources management.

The video 'Science : It's a Girl Thing!' was a small part of the campaign and does not reflect the overall tone and content of the other activities which include an interactive website, national events and involve women scientists as role models. The website ([3]) contains video profiles of role models, science facts and figures and descriptions of careers that can spring from studies in science.

National events will take place in autumn 2012 in five countries as a pilot phase and will address teenage girls aged 13-18. It will aim to show girls that science could be a great opportunity for them and that research and innovation will benefit from a higher participation of women.

In addition, the recently adopted Communication 'A Reinforced European Research Area Partnership for Excellence and Growth ([4])' has a strong component on gender equality. It announces a Commission Recommendation to the Member States on modernising research institutions in order to promote gender equality.

([1]) http://science-girl-thing.eu.
([2]) Betz, D. and Sekaquaptewa, D.: 'My Fair Physicist? Feminine Math and Science Role Models Demotivate Young Girls', Social Psychological and Personality Science, 27 March 2012.
([3]) www.ec.europa.eu/science-girl-thing.
([4]) COM(2012)392, 17/07/2012.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007762/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Aree urbane nella politica di coesione 2014-2020

La politica di coesione 2014-2020 vede fra i suoi obiettivi primari la coesione territoriale, che si impernierà sulle strategie macroregionali, ma che darà risalto anche al ruolo delle aree urbane.

La Commissione può chiarire:

— come ritiene di sviluppare i programmi della politica di coesione in modo da integrare maggiormente il ruolo delle aree urbane?

— se saranno sviluppabili programmi che vedranno protagoniste le aree urbane, non solo a livello nazionale e regionale, ma anche in strutture di «Gruppi di Città» e, in caso affermativo, secondo quali modalità?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(11 ottobre 2012)

Nel progetto di regolamento sul Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale (FESR) relativo al periodo 2014-2020, la Commissione propone di destinare allo sviluppo urbano sostenibile almeno il 5 % delle risorse che il FESR stanzia a livello nazionale, delegandone alle città la gestione attraverso i cosiddetti *investimenti territoriali integrati* (ITI). Con gli ITI si possono riunire finanziamenti erogati per priorità diverse sparse nei programmi.

All'atto della preparazione dei documenti di programmazione si deve tener conto delle esigenze di sviluppo delle zone urbane. Contratti di partenariato stabiliranno le modalità per garantire un approccio integrato all'uso dei fondi del QSC per lo sviluppo sostenibile delle aree urbane. I programmi devono inoltre definire il contributo all'approccio integrato per lo sviluppo territoriale e indicare eventualmente un progetto di strategia integrata per lo sviluppo delle aree urbane.

A tutti i livelli, regionali o subregionali, si possono concepire ITI destinati a promuovere lo sviluppo urbano. È tuttavia importante che l'area coperta da un ITI sia un territorio funzionale. Gli ITI possono riguardare regioni funzionali transfrontaliere (conurbazioni transfrontaliere, zone di montagna, bacini idrografici) e macroregioni.

La proposta della Commissione comprende anche l'istituzione di una piattaforma, detta di sviluppo urbano, che amplii le competenze e lo scambio di pratiche esemplari fra più città. La stessa proposta prevede inoltre che, su iniziativa della Commissione, il FESR sostenga azioni innovative nel campo dello sviluppo urbano sostenibile.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007762/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Urban areas in the 2014-2020 cohesion policy

One of the primary objectives of cohesion policy for 2014-2020 is territorial cohesion, which will focus on macro-regional strategies, but will also highlight the role of urban areas.

Can the Commission clarify:

— how it will develop cohesion policy programmes in order better to incorporate the role of urban areas;

— whether it will be possible to develop programmes that focus on urban areas, not only at national and regional level, but also in structures such as 'City Groups'; if so, how will this be done?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The Commission has proposed, in the draft regulation concerning the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) for 2014-20, to ring-fence at least 5% of ERDF resources allocated at national level for sustainable urban development, to be delegated to cities for management through Integrated Territorial Investments (ITIs). These ITIs make it possible to bundle funding from several priorities in programmes.

During the preparation of programming documents, development needs of urban areas should be taken into account. Partnership Contracts should set out arrangements to ensure an integrated approach to the use of CSF funds for the sustainable development of urban areas. Programmes should also set out the contribution to the integrated approach for territorial development, including — where appropriate — a planned integrated approach to the development of urban areas.

ITIs promoting urban development can be set up on any sub-regional or interregional level. It is important, however, that the area covered by an ITI is a functional territory. ITIs can target cross-border functional regions (cross-border urban conurbations, mountainous areas, river basins) as well as macro-regions.

The Commission proposal also includes the setting up of an urban development platform to promote capacity building and exchanges of experience on good practice between cities. Furthermore, the Commission proposal includes the possibility for ERDF to support, at the initiative of the Commission, innovative actions in the field of sustainable urban development.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007763/12
adresată Comisiei
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(3 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Sectorul zootehnic — secetă

Existența unui important număr de ferme zootehnice din România, dar și din alte state membre unde în acest an a fost secetă este amenințată în mod serios de recenta creștere dramatică a prețului cerealelor în Uniunea Europeană, cauzată mai ales de condițiile de mediu extreme și neprevăzute, precum și de speculații. Spre exemplu, în România seceta a distrus în acest an aproape jumătate din culturile de cereale și plante tehnice și aceasta îi afectează în mod direct pe crescătorii de animale. Volatilitatea de pe piețele de cereale riscă să cauzeze dereglări importante în toate sectoarele zootehnice, la momentul în care acestea sunt obligate să se conformeze unor standarde din ce în ce mai stricte în domeniul siguranței alimentare, al mediului și al bunăstării animalelor.

În aceste condiții, are în vedere Comisia să elibereze stocuri de intervenție de cereale pentru a veni în ajutorul crescătorilor de animale din statele membre afectate de secetă? Ce alte măsuri are în vedere Comisia pentru a sprijini aceste sectoare în a face față actualei situații? Are în vedere Comisia introducerea de măsuri adaptate la piață pentru a putea face față problemei volatilității prețurilor?

Răspuns dat de dl Cioloș în numele Comisiei
(4 octombrie 2012)

Comisia este pe deplin conștientă de dificultățile financiare cu care se confruntă fermierii europeni ca urmare a condițiilor climatice nefavorabile, precum seceta extremă din anumite regiuni. Pentru a contribui la atenuarea dificultăților respective, Comisia a luat deja o serie de măsuri.

Până la sfârșitul lunii iunie 2012, cu scopul de a facilita aprovizionarea pieței europene cu cereale, Regulamentul (UE) nr. 569/2012 al Comisiei ([1]) a suspendat, până la 31 decembrie 2012, taxele vamale pentru contingentul tarifar de import pentru grâul comun de altă calitate decât cea superioară.

Până la sfârșitul lunii august, Comisia a autorizat statele membre să plătească avansuri din plățile directe către fermieri începând cu 16 octombrie 2012 (Regulamentul de punere în aplicare (UE) nr. 776/2012 al Comisiei ([2])).

Datorită nivelului ridicat al prețurilor europene în ultimii doi ani consecutivi de comercializare, nu există stocuri de intervenție de cereale disponibile pentru punerea în liberă circulație pe piața internă.

— Comisia monitorizează impactul recentei creșteri a costului furajelor în sectorul zootehnic. În vederea facilitării aprovizionării cu furaje în acest sector, ar putea fi luată în considerare prelungirea suspendării actuale a taxelor vamale în cadrul contingentelor tarifare pentru grâul comun de altă calitatea decât cea superioară și pentru orzul furajer pentru restul anului de comercializare 2012/2013 (de la 1 ianuarie până la 30 iunie 2013).

([1]) JO L 169, 29.6.2012, p. 41.
([2]) JO L 231, 28.8.2012, p. 8.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007763/12
to the Commission
Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Livestock breeding — and impact of drought

A large number of livestock holdings in Romania and other Member States affected this year by drought are being seriously jeopardised by the recent dramatic increase in cereal prices in the European Union, particularly as a result of extreme and unexpected climatic conditions, as well as by speculation. For example, in Romania approximately half the cereal and technical plant crop has been destroyed this year by drought, directly affecting stock breeders. Cereal market volatility is likely to cause major disruption in all livestock sectors, which are at the same time being required to meet increasingly strict food safety, environmental and animal welfare standards.

In view of this, will the Commission release cereals from intervention stocks so as to assist stock breeders in the drought-stricken Member States? What other measures are being envisaged by the Commission to assist this sector in the current crisis? Will it adopt suitable market measures in response to price volatility?

Answer given by Mr Çioloş on behalf of the Commission
(4 October 2012)

The Commission is well aware of the financial difficulties encountered by European farmers due to unfavourable weather conditions, such as extreme drought in some regions. In order to help alleviate these difficulties, the Commission already undertook some actions.

By the end of June 2012, with a view to facilitating the supply of the European cereal market, Commission Regulation (EU) No 569/2012 ([1]) suspended, until 31 December 2012, the customs duties on import tariff quota of soft wheat other than high quality.

By the end of August, the Commission allowed Member States to advance direct payments to farmers from 16 October 2012 (Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 776/2012) ([2]).

Due to the high level of European prices since two consecutive marketing years, there are no intervention stocks of cereals available for the release on the internal market.

— The Commission is monitoring the impact of the recent feed cost increase in the livestock sector. In order to facilitate the feed supply for that sector, it could be considered to prolong the current suspension of the duties within the tariff rate quotas for soft wheat other than high quality and feed barley for the rest of the marketing year 2012/2013 (1 January to 30 June 2013).

([1]) OJ L 169, 29.6.2012, p. 41.
([2]) OJ L 231, 28.8.2012, p. 8.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007764/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Vlastné zdroje Európskej únie

Európska komisia navrhuje zavedenie dvoch nových vlastných zdrojov Európskej únie, ktorými sú daň z finančných transakcií a modernizovaná DPH. Tento krok uľahčí konsolidáciu rozpočtov všetkých členských štátov, a to znížením príspevkov do spoločného rozpočtu Únie. Modernizovaná DPH je nový impulz rozvoja vnútorného trhu v tejto oblasti a zavedenie dane z finančných transakcií umožní, aby následky súčasnej krízy v Európe začal znášať konečne aj finančný sektor. Navyše sa odhaduje, že do roku 2020 by nové vlastné zdroje mohli predstavovať takmer polovicu príjmov rozpočtu Európskej únie.

Akým spôsobom chce Európska komisia presvedčiť členské štáty o tom, že zavedenie dane z finančných transakcií a modernizovanej DPH ako nových vlastných zdrojov EÚ je krok správnym smerom?

Odpoveď pána Lewandowského v mene Komisie
(11. októbra 2012)

Dôvody návrhu komplexnej reformy systému financovania EÚ sa uvádzajú v príslušnej dôvodovej správe k jednotlivým návrhom právnych predpisov. Východisková analýza je zdokumentovaná a uverejnená v pracovnom dokumente útvarov Komisie „Financovanie rozpočtu EÚ: správa o fungovaní systému vlastných zdrojov“ ([1]).

Komisia vykonáva svoju inštitucionálnu úlohu vysvetľovaním, objasňovaním a obhajobou svojich legislatívnych návrhov na relevantných fórach, napríklad v pracovnej skupine Rady pre vlastné zdroje, v rámci Coreper II a v Rade pre všeobecné záležitosti. Európsky parlament má k dispozícii aj pracovné dokumenty, prezentácie, neoficiálne dokumenty a súbory, ktoré Komisia vypracúva na uľahčenie legislatívnych postupov.

Komisia verí, že Európsky parlament bude naďalej zohrávať konštruktívnu úlohu v dosiahnutí zhody o balíku viacročného finančného rámca/vlastných zdrojov do konca roku 2012.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/documents/fin_fwk1420/proposal_council_own_resources__annex_en.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007764/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: European Union's own resources

The Commission is proposing the introduction of two new own resources for the European Union, the financial transactions tax and a modernised VAT regime. This move will facilitate consolidation of all Member States' budgets by reducing their contributions to the common budget of the Union. VAT modernisation is designed to give new impetus to the development of the internal market in this area and introduction of the FTT to finally transfer some of the burden of the crisis in Europe to the financial sector itself. It is estimated that by 2020 the new own resources could represent almost half the revenue of the EU budget.

How does the Commission intend to convince Member States that introducing the financial transactions tax and modernising VAT as new EU own resources are steps in the right direction?

Answer given by Mr Lewandowski on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The rationale for proposing a comprehensive reform of the system for financing the EU budget is outlined in respective explanatory memoranda of the pertinent draft legislation. The analytical groundwork is documented and published in the Commission Staff Working Paper 'Financing the EU budget, Report on the Operation of the Own Resources System' ([1]).

The Commission assumes its institutional role by explaining, clarifying and defending its legislative proposals in the relevant fora such as the Council's Own Resources Working Group, Coreper II and the General Affairs Council. Working documents, presentations, non-papers and fiches that are produced by the Commission to facilitate legislative procedures are available to the European Parliament as well.

The Commission trusts that the European Parliament will continue to play a constructive role in finding agreement on the Multiannual Financial Framework/Own Resources package by the end of 2012.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/documents/fin_fwk1420/proposal_council_own_resources__annex_en.pdf

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007766/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Používanie antibiotík pre zvieratá

Odborníci dlhodobo upozorňujú na skutočnosť, že nadmerné používanie antibiotík je nebezpečné ako pre ľudí, tak aj pre zvieratá. Takmer polovica antibiotík, ktoré sa v Európe predpisujú je určená práve pre ne. Takéto antibiotiká sa však nepoužívajú len na liečbu zvierat, ale aj na povzbudenie rastu a prevenciu chorôb. Rutinné používanie antibiotík u zvierat sa všeobecne považuje za rizikový faktor vzniku rezistencie. Stopy po antibiotikách v potravinách živočíšneho pôvodu môžu dokonca zvyšovať odolnosť voči antibiotikám u ich konzumentov, to znamená, že antibiotická rezistencia sa môže zo zvierat na ľudí prenášať.

Akým spôsobom Európska komisia bojuje proti nadmernému používaniu antibiotík v živočíšnej výrobe a proti nebezpečnej antibiotickej rezistencii, ktorá ohrozuje chov dobytka v Európe, ako aj verejné zdravie jej obyvateľov?

Odpoveď pána Dalliho v mene Komisie
(12. októbra 2012)

Komisia odkazuje váženú pani poslankyňu na svoju odpoveď na písomné otázky E-010443/2011, E-006000/2011, E-001117/2012, E-001221/2012, E-000251/2012, E-000298/2012, E-002779/2012, E-003505/2012 a E-003197/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007766/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Use of antibiotics for animals

Experts have long warned that the overuse of antibiotics is dangerous for both humans and animals. Almost half of the antibiotics used in Europe are prescribed for animals, and not just for treatment purposes, but also for growth promotion and disease prevention. Routine use of antimocrobials in animals is widely seen as a risk factor in the increasing resistance to antibiotics. Antibiotic residues in foods of animal origin can even increase consumers' resistance to antibiotics, in other words, antibiotic resistance can pass from animals to humans.

What action is the Commission taking against overuse of antibiotics in animals bred for food and against the risk of antibiotic resistance, which poses a threat to the European livestock sector and to human health?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(12 October 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Questions E-010443/2011, E-006000/2011, E-1117/2012, E-1221/2012, E-000251/2012, E-000298/2012, E-002779/2012, E-003505/2012 and E-003197/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007772/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Sloboda pohybu v Európskej únii

Zavedenie Schengenského priestoru patrí medzi najväčšie úspechy Európskej únie. Podľa prieskumu považuje Schengen za najpozitívnejší výsledok európskej integrácie až 62 % obyvateľov EÚ. V poslednej dobe však nastali udalosti, ktoré garancie voľného cestovania a slobody pohybu výrazne ohrozujú. Reforma Schengenského priestoru, na ktorej sa v júni tohto roka dohodli ministri vnútra v Rade EÚ, umožňuje opätovné dočasné zavádzanie vnútorných hraničných kontrol, Parlament a Komisia majú byť navyše zbavené spolurozhodovania, a o tejto závažnej otázke majú byť len informované. Spolu s nemeckými kontrolami českých autobusov a mobilnými kontrolami na holandských hraniciach vzbudzujú udalosti posledných dní vážne obavy zo znovuzavedenia hraničných kontrol.

Aké konkrétne opatrenia zamerané na ochranu a presadzovanie slobody pohybu prijala Európska komisia v poslednej dobe?

Odpoveď pani Malmströmovej v mene Komisie
(15. októbra 2012)

Možnosť cestovať v rámci schengenského priestoru bez hraničných kontrol je jedným z najviac oceňovaných úspechov Európskej únie. Cieľom návrhov Komisie zo septembra 2011, ktoré sa týkajú správy schengenského priestoru, je zachovanie tohto úspechu. Komisia sa preto naďalej usiluje o riešenie na úrovni EÚ a dúfa, že Európsky parlament a Rada sa teraz zapoja do plodného dialógu o podstate jej návrhov. Komisia je pripravená zohrávať konštruktívnu úlohu pri týchto konaniach.

Okrem toho Komisia bude aj naďalej analyzovať jednotlivé prípady možných porušení *schengenského acquis*. Týka sa to okrem iného posúdení, či policajné opatrenia na vnútorných hraniciach členských štátov alebo v ich blízkosti predstavujú neoprávnené hraničné kontroly alebo majú rovnaký účinok ako hraničné kontroly. V súčasnosti sa okrem iného vyšetrujú aj nemecké kontroly českých autobusov, o ktorých sa zmieňuje vážená pani poslankyňa, ako aj iné prípady.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007772/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Free movement in the European Union

The establishment of the Schengen area is one of the greatest successes of the European Union. According to surveys, Schengen is regarded as one of the most positive achievements of European integration by some 62% of European citizens. Recently, however, incidents have occurred that seriously put at risk the guarantees of free movement and freedom to travel. The reform of the Schengen area on which the interior ministers agreed in Council in June allows for repeated temporary imposition of internal border controls; furthermore, the Parliament and Commission are to be stripped of codecision powers and are merely to be kept informed of developments in this important field. Recent events, together with the controls of Czech coaches conducted by the German authorities and with the mobile controls carried out at the Dutch borders, give rise to serious concerns that border controls are likely to be reintroduced.

What specific measures has the Commission taken recently in order to protect and promote freedom of movement?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The possibility to travel within the Schengen area without being subjected to border control is one of the most valued achievements of the European Union. The Commission's Schengen governance proposals from September 2011 aim at safeguarding this achievement. The Commission continues to strive for an EU-based solution and hopes that the European Parliament and the Council will now engage in a fruitful dialogue on the substance of its proposals. The Commission is ready to play a constructive role in these proceedings.

Furthermore, the Commission will continue to analyse, on a case by case basis, possible violations of the Schengen *acquis*. This regards *inter alia* assessments on whether police measures at or near Member States' internal borders constitute illegal border checks or have an effect equivalent to border checks. Current investigations include the German controls on Czech buses, mentioned by the Honourable Member, as well as other cases.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007773/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Systém práv cestujúcich

Práva cestujúcich sú upravené vo viacerých právnych predpisoch Európskej únie. Odlišujú sa na základe druhu použitej dopravy. Obyvatelia EÚ však svoje práva dostatočne nepoznajú a kompetentné orgány práva cestujúcich veľmi často jednoducho ignorujú. Informovanosť cestujúcich je nedostatočná, pretože dopravcovia si neplnia svoju informačnú povinnosť. Problémy ďalej spôsobuje najmä meškanie či rušenie spojov, manipulácia s batožinou, nejasné určovanie cien alebo nedostatočné prešetrenie sťažností cestujúcich.

Považuje Komisia súčasne platný systém na ochranu práv cestujúcich za dostatočný, alebo plánuje určité revízie, prípadne úplne nové pravidlá ochrany?

Odpoveď pána Kallasa v mene Komisie
(17. októbra 2012)

Prijatím práv cestujúcich v autobusovej a autokarovej doprave v roku 2011, ktoré ešte musia nadobudnúť účinnosť, EÚ ako prvý región na svete komplexným spôsobom zahrnula súbor základných pravidiel týkajúcich sa práv cestujúcich do všetkých druhov dopravy: leteckej, železničnej, vodnej i cestnej. Komisia už prijala horizontálne oznámenie, v ktorom objasnila spoločné zásady pre všetky druhy dopravy ([1]), hoci sa domnieva, že v tomto štádiu je priskoro uvažovať o jedinom nariadení, ktoré by sa mohlo vzťahovať na cestujúcich v rámci všetkých druhov dopravy. V rámci revízie nariadenia 261/2004 o právach cestujúcich v leteckej doprave zvažuje, ako treba riešiť niektoré zo zistených problémov vrátane nutnosti lepšieho presadzovania a väčšej jednoznačnosti pravidiel. Pripravuje aj novú informačnú kampaň, ktorá sa má spustiť začiatkom roku 2013.

Popri súčasnej revízii jedného nariadenia a v situácii, keď dve nariadenia ešte nenadobudli účinnosť, Komisia nepredpokladá ďalšiu revíziu ani celkové prepracovanie politiky v oblasti práv cestujúcich. Komisia sa domnieva, že pri riešení prípadných problémov, ktoré vzniknú, je v prvom rade náležité uplatňovať existujúce právne predpisy, a to najmä prostredníctvom ich lepšieho presadzovania.

([1]) KOM(2011) 898 v konečnom znení.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007773/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: System of passengers' rights

Passengers' rights are laid down in a number of European Union laws. They vary depending on the mode of transport used. EU citizens do not, however, know their rights as passengers well enough and the authorities responsible often simply ignore these rights. There is insufficient consumer awareness because carriers are not fulfilling their obligation to inform passengers of their rights. Further problems are caused by delays, missed connections and cancellations, baggage handling, unclear pricing or failure to investigate travellers' complaints.

Does the Commission consider the current system for protecting passenger rights is adequate or is it planning to revise, or indeed totally overhaul, the relevant rules?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

With the adoption of passenger rights for bus and coach transport in 2011, which still have to enter into force, the EU is the first region of the world that has a comprehensive integrated set of basic passenger rights rules in all modes: air, rail, waterborne and road transport. Although the Commission considers that it is too early at this stage to envisage a single regulation which would cover passengers in all transport modes, it has already adopted a horizontal Communication in which it clarified the common principles for all modes ([1]). It is considering how to address some of the problems identified, including the need for a better enforcement and more clarity in the rules, in the scope of the review of Regulation 261/2004 on air passenger rights. It is also preparing a new information campaign to be launched in early 2013.

With one Regulation currently under review, and two Regulations not yet entered into force, the Commission does not envisage to put forward another revision or a total overhaul of the passenger rights policy. In order to address possible problems arising, the Commission considers that it is relevant to first make use of the existing legislation, notably through better enforcement.

([1]) COM(2011) 898 final.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007774/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Európska občianska iniciatíva

V apríli 2012 nadobudla účinnosť európska občianska iniciatíva. Ide o nástroj, prostredníctvom ktorého môžu občania Európskej únie ovplyvňovať legislatívu a program EÚ. Ak chcú euroobčania vyzvať Komisiu na vypracovanie určitého legislatívneho návrhu, ktorý patrí do jej kompetencie, iniciátori musia získať minimálne 1 milión podpisov občanov EÚ z minimálne siedmych členských štátov. Doposiaľ bolo zaregistrovaných celkovo 9 iniciatív, z ktorých jedna bola stiahnutá.

Ako Komisia hodnotí doterajší záujem európskych občanov ovplyvňovať legislatívu Európskej únie prostredníctvom európskej občianskej iniciatívy?

Odpoveď pána Šefčoviča v mene Komisie
(11. októbra 2012)

Od nadobudnutia platnosti iniciatívy európskych občanov Komisia dostáva pravidelné žiadosti o registráciu navrhovaných iniciatív občanov (doteraz 22). Tieto iniciatívy sa týkajú mnohých rôznych otázok a prichádzajú od širokého spektra organizátorov ([1]), čo jednoznačne ukazuje záujem občanov EÚ o túto novú formu demokratickej účasti.

Je ešte stále veľmi skoro na hodnotenie vplyvu na zákonodarstvo EÚ, kým nie sú k dispozícii komparatívne informácie o úspešne uzatvorených iniciatívach. Nezávisle od ich výsledku však svojou povahou vyvolajú nadnárodné diskusie o otázkach, ktoré sú predmetom obáv alebo záujmu občanov v rámci celej EÚ, čo zasa priamo alebo nepriamo ovplyvní agendu EÚ.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/citizens-initiative/public/initiatives/ongoing.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007774/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: European Citizens' Initiative

In April 2012 the European Citizens' Initiative came into force. This is an instrument that allows citizens of the European Union to influence EC law-making and the EU agenda. If EU citizens want to call on the Commission to draw up a particular legislative proposal (within its remit), the initiators of the request must secure a minimum of one million signatures, from at least seven of the 27 Member States. So far, nine such initiatives have been registered, one of which has been withdrawn.

How does the Commission evaluate the interest shown so far by European citizens in influencing the EU's legislative programme by means of the Citizens' Initiative?

Answer given by Mr Šefčovič on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

Since the European Citizens' Initiative came into force, the Commission has been receiving regular requests for the registration of proposed citizens' initiatives (22 to date). These cover many different topics and come from a broad spectrum of organisers ([1]),clearly demonstrating the interest of EU citizens in this new form of democratic participation.

These are still very early days, and it is not yet possible to assess citizens' influence on EC law-making until comparative information on successfully closed initiatives becomes available. But regardless of their outcome, they will, by their very nature, generate transnational debates on issues of concern or interest to citizens from across the EU, which will in turn directly or indirectly have an impact on the EU agenda.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/citizens-initiative/public/initiatives/ongoing.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007781/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Trest smrti vo svete

Medzinárodná organizácia Amnesty International vydala ešte v marci tohto roku svoju výročnú správu s názvom Rozsudky smrti a popravy 2011. Zo správy vyplýva, že počet popráv v krajinách, kde sa trest smrti uplatňuje, v roku 2011 výrazne stúpol. Popravených bolo najmenej 676 ľudí a na vykonanie trestu smrti čakalo na konci roka 18 750 ľudí. V roku 2010 bolo popravených o 149 ľudí menej, pričom sa popravovalo iba v 20 zo 198 štátov sveta. Najväčší nárast zaznamenaných popráv nastal na Blízkom východe, takmer o 50 % oproti roku 2010. Čína popravila v minulom roku viac ľudí ako celý svet dohromady.

Bude sa Európska komisia predmetnou správou zaoberať?

Akú konkrétnu činnosť v poslednej dobe Komisia vyvinula s cieľom prispieť k zrušeniu trestu smrti vo svete?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(17. októbra 2012)

Komisia si pozorne preštudovala výročnú správu Amnesty International.

EÚ sa aktívne angažuje v reakcii na zvyšujúci sa počet popráv prostredníctvom celého radu nástrojov vrátane stanovísk a vyhlásení, demaršov na diplomatickej úrovni adresovaných konkrétnym štátom, ako napríklad v prípade Iránu, dialógov o ľudských právach v krajinách, kde sa pravidelne ukladá trest smrti a vystupovaním na mnohostranných fórach, najmä v rámci OSN.

V súlade s usmerneniami EÚ Komisia prostredníctvom Európskeho nástroja pre demokraciu a ľudské práva (EIDHR) podporuje aj celosvetový boj proti trestu smrti. V rámci tohto úsilia sa od roku 2007 vynaložilo 20 miliónov EUR na projekty, ktoré priniesli konkrétne výsledky. V rámci EIDHR sa v súčasnosti podporuje 11 prebiehajúcich projektov a deväť nových projektov sa pripravuje. Najnovšia výzva na predloženie návrhov „Opatrenia na podporu usmernení EÚ o zrušení trestu smrti“ bola uzavretá v apríli 2012 a oznámenie o výsledkoch vyhodnotenia úplných formulárov žiadosti bolo odoslané listom v máji 2012. Projekty sa vyberali na základe kritéria vyváženosti aktivít medzi jednotlivými regiónmi, v ktorých sa stále praktizuje trest smrti. K týmto aktivitám patrí právna pomoc väzňom, konzulárna pomoc, podpora právnych a ústavných reforiem, monitorovanie podmienok ukladania trestu smrti a uplatňovanie minimálnych medzinárodných štandardov. Okrem toho všetky projekty obsahujú odborné vzdelávanie, výskum a štúdie, ako aj verejné propagačné kampane a zvyšovanie informovanosti. Cieľom je oboznamovať občanov v cieľových regiónoch s existenciou a frekvenciou nespravodlivých rozsudkov trestu smrti a vybudovať miestne kapacity na odhaľovanie justičných omylov.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007781/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: The death penalty in the world

In March 2012, Amnesty International published its annual report entitled 'Death sentences and executions in 2011', from which it emerges that the number of executions in those countries that apply the death penalty rose markedly in 2011. At least 676 people were executed and a further 18 750 were awaiting the death sentence at the end of the year. In 2010, 149 fewer people had been executed, in only 20 of the world's 198 states. The greatest increase in recorded executions in 2011 took place in the Near East, where the total was up by almost 50% over the number for 2010. China executed more people last year than the rest of the world put together.

Will the Commission be examining the AI report in question?

What specific action has the Commission taken recently with the aim of having the death penalty abolished throughout the world?

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

The Commission has taken careful note of the annual report produced by Amnesty International.

The EU is active in responding to increases in executions, through a variety of instruments including statements and declarations, diplomatic level demarches to specific countries, sanctions, such as in the case of Iran, human rights dialogues where the death penalty is regularly raised and action in multilateral fora, especially at the UN.

In line with the EU Guidelines, the Commission, through the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), also supports the worldwide fight against the death penalty. This has involved more than EUR 20 million worth of projects since 2007 with concrete results . The EIDHR supports 11 ongoing projects and nine new projects currently under preparation. The last call for proposals 'Actions supporting the EU Guidelines on the abolition of Death penalty' was closed in April 2012 and the notification of results of the evaluation of the full application forms was sent by letter in May 2012. The projects have been selected on the basis of a balance of activities between regions where the death penalty is still practised. Activities include legal assistance to prisoners, consular assistance, legal and constitutional refort support, monitoring of conditions of the use of death penalty and application of international minimum standards. In addition all projects involve training, research and studies, public advocacyi and awareness raising activities. This is with the aim of educating citizens across the target regions about the reality and frequency of wrongful capital convictions, and building local capacities to expose miscarriages of justice.

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-007782/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3. septembra 2012)

Vec: Medzinárodná kontrola obchodovania so zbraňami

Obchod so zbraňami je v súčasnej dobe riadený embargami Bezpečnostnej rady OSN alebo EÚ. Tieto však častokrát prichádzajú neskoro a nie sú dostatočne účinné. Podľa údajov, ktoré zverejnila organizácia Amnesty International, je pritom za rok zbraňami zabitých v priemere pol milióna žien, mužov a detí. Ďalšie tisíce ľudí sú zbraňami zmrzačené alebo mučené. Rozširovanie zbraní sa nedostatočne kontroluje a súčasná situácia podporuje porušovanie ľudských práv, spôsobuje narastanie chudoby a stupňovanie konfliktov. Medzinárodná zmluva, ktorá by štáty zaväzovala, aby obchodovanie so zbraňami podmienili dodržiavaním ľudských práv, neexistuje.

Čo konkrétne robí Európska komisia preto, aby bola prijatá medzinárodná zmluva, ktorá zabráni medzinárodným transferom zbraní, ktoré by mohli byť zneužité na závažné porušovanie ľudských práv a medzinárodného humanitárneho práva?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(4. októbra 2012)

V oblasti obchodovania so zbraňami kladie EÚ dôraz najmä na transparentnosť a zodpovednosť. Demonštruje to najmä prostredníctvom spoločnej pozície 2008/944/SZBP z 8. decembra 2008, ktorou sa vymedzujú spoločné pravidlá upravujúce kontrolu vývozu vojenskej technológie a materiálu, a následných podporných činností vykonávaných zo strany EÚ na podporu sprostredkovania noriem EÚ týkajúcich sa kontroly vývozu zbraní do viacerých tretích krajín, najmä do bezprostredne susediacich krajín.

Na medzinárodnej úrovni EÚ podporovala rokovania o uzavretí právne záväznej zmluvy o obchodovaní so zbraňami (ATT), v ktorej by boli stanovené čo možno najprísnejšie medzinárodné normy regulujúce legálny medzinárodný obchod. V posledných rokoch EÚ vo veľkej miere diplomaticky aj finančne podporovala v zmluve uvedené zásady väčšej transparentnosti a zodpovednosti v oblasti obchodovania so zbraňami a usilovala sa o zvýšenie povedomia medzi členskými štátmi OSN. EÚ sa konzistentne zasadzovala o zahrnutie silných a spoľahlivých parametrov týkajúcich sa transferu zbraní do zmluvy ATT. Podľa EÚ by sa v tejto zmluve malo stanoviť, že ak transfer zbraní predstavuje porušenie medzinárodných záväzkov alebo ak existuje zreteľné riziko, že tieto zbrane budú použité na závažné porušovanie medzinárodných právnych predpisov v oblasti ľudských práv alebo medzinárodného humanitárneho práva, takéto transfery zbraní nebudú povolené. Toto stanovisko EÚ odhodlane bránila na diplomatickej konferencii v júli v New Yorku, kde sa rokovalo o zmluve ATT. Keďže v júli 2012 nebola dosiahnutá dohoda, pokiaľ ide o konečné znenie zmluvy ATT, EÚ sa bude aj v blízkej budúcnosti naďalej usilovať, aby zmluva ATT bola úspešne uzatvorená na začiatku roka 2013.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007782/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: International controls on arms dealing

The trade in arms is currently controlled by embargoes laid down by the UN Security Council and the EU. These often come too late and are too ineffective. According to Amnesty International, on average half a million women, men and children are killed each year by means of weapons, and thousands more are crippled or tortured with weapons. The controls on the spread of weapons are inadequate and the current situation facilitates human rights violations, increases poverty and escalates conflicts. No international agreement binding states to make arms trading compliant with respect for human rights exists.

What specifically is the Commission doing about getting an international agreement adopted that would ban the international transfer of weapons that could be used to commit serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law?

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

Transparency and responsibility are key for the EU with regard to the arms trade, as demonstrated by Common Position 2008/944/CFSP of 8 December 2008 governing the control of export of military equipment and the subsequent outreach activities carried out by the EU to promote EU arms export control standards towards a number of third countries, in particular in its close neighbourhood.

At international level, the EU has been at the forefront to promote the negotiation of a legally binding Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) establishing the highest possible international standards to regulate the legal international trade. In recent years, the EU has allocated significant diplomatic and financial resources to promote the Treaty's principles of greater transparency and responsibility in arms trade and to raise awareness of UN member states. The EU has consistently advocated for the inclusion of strong and credible transfer parameters in the ATT. The EU believes that the ATT should require that when arms transfers violate international obligations or there is a clear risk that arms are used for serious violations of international human rights law or international humanitarian law, such arms transfers must be denied. This position was firmly defended by the EU at the ATT diplomatic conference mandated to negotiate the Treaty in New York last July. While no agreement could be found in July 2012 on the final text of the ATT, the EU will spare no efforts in the near future to sustain the momentum for a successful conclusion of the ATT process in early 2013.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord P-007785/12
aan de Commissie
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(3 september 2012)

Betreft: Praktische implicaties van de cookie-richtlijn

De gevolgen van Richtlijn 2009/136/EG aangaande het gebruik van cookies worden duidelijk op veel websites. De meldingen die men ontvangt op websites leiden tot veel irritatie.

Ten eerste is er totaal geen sprake van eenvormigheid. Bij elke website krijgt men een andere tekst in een andere vorm gepresenteerd.

Ten tweede belemmeren de meldingen het gebruik van het internet. In de aard van het internet is gelegen dat men van site naar site „surft". Het is dus niet uitzonderlijk dat men bij elke muisklik weer een melding gepresenteerd krijgt. Op smartphones is dit nog veel vervelender, aangezien men elke keer op zoek moet naar een minuscuul knopje om cookies te accepteren, te weigeren of de melding te laten verdwijnen.

Afgezien van de irritatie bij gebruikers van websites, heeft de richtlijn ook tot gevolg dat eigenaars van websites veel moeten investeren in het aanpassen van hun websites om te voldoen aan de eisen. Dit lijkt mij onwenselijk.

Een groot deel van de problematiek zou opgelost kunnen worden door de eisen van de richtlijn op browserniveau te implementeren. Immers, de ontwerpers van de browser kunnen de meldingen op gemakkelijke wijze eenvormig maken, het voorkomt investeringen aan de kant van de eigenaren van websites en zou tot aanzienlijk minder irritatie bij gebruikers leiden.

Daarbij ben ik van mening dat het mogelijk moet zijn voor gebruikers om in de browser instellingen te kunnen maken voor welke soort websites cookies per definitie geaccepteerd worden. Dit om te voorkomen dat men bij elke website wederom wordt geconfronteerd met een cookiemelding. Gebruikers zijn hier niet bij gebaat, als men zich al bekommert om de plaatsing van cookies.

Bent u bereid om de richtlijn aan te passen om tegemoet te komen aan deze problematiek door de implementatie van de cookiemeldingen naar het browserniveau te verplaatsen i.p.v. de aanbieder van de website?

Antwoord van mevrouw Kroes namens de Commissie
(2 oktober 2012)

De herziene e-Privacy-richtlijn ([1]) omvat een nieuwe door het Europees Parlement ingevoerde bepaling waarbij het voortaan uitsluitend is toegestaan om op de computer of een ander digitaal apparaat van een gebruiker informatie op te slaan of toegang te verkrijgen tot reeds opgeslagen informatie, zoals cookies, op voorwaarde dat die betrokken gebruiker daarvoor toestemming heeft verleend na te zijn voorzien van duidelijke en volledige informatie over de doeleinden van desbetreffende operatie. Overeenkomstig de overwegingen van de herziene e-Privacy-richtlijn, kunnen gebruikers toestemming geven op elke wijze die hen in staat stelt vrijelijk een specifieke en geïnformeerde indicatie te geven omtrent hun wensen. Deze methode moet zo gebruikersvriendelijk mogelijk zijn.

Na de omzetting van de herziene richtlijn zijn de verstrekkers van diensten van de informatiemaatschappij, na de verwerking van hun cookies te hebben geanalyseerd, begonnen met het verbeteren van hun transparantie en hebben zij gebruikers op verschillende manieren meer controle gegeven.

Volgens de e-Privacy-richtlijn moet, wanneer dit technisch mogelijk en doeltreffend is, gebruik worden gemaakt van passende browserinstellingen om door te geven dat de gebruiker toestemming verleent. De Commissie is het ermee eens dat het ontwerp van browsers een belangrijke rol kan spelen om gebruikers meer controle te geven over het gebruik van cookies en soortgelijke middelen zonder afbreuk te doen aan hun internetbeleving. Ter ondersteuning van deze aanpak heeft de Commissie de desbetreffende sector gevraagd een algemene *do not track*-norm voor het Web te ontwikkelen ([2]), voortbouwend op het normaliseringsproces van het World Wide Web Consortium (W3C). Het is de bedoeling uitvoerig toe te lichten hoe consumenten hun trackingvoorkeuren kunnen aangeven en hoe websites en gelieerde ondernemingen deze voorkeuren moeten erkennen en eerbiedigen. De Commissie is van mening dat de norm zo volledig mogelijk moet zijn zodat gebruikers exact weten wat bedrijven die zich aan de norm houden met hun informatie doen.

([1]) Richtlijn 2009/136/EG, PB L 337 van 18.12.2009.
([2]) Neelie Kroes, toespraak van 22 juni 2011: http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/11/461.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007785/12
to the Commission
Daniël van der Stoep (NI)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Practical implications of the Cookies Directive

The implications of Directive 2009/136/EC on the use of cookies are becoming clear on many websites. The messages that appear when accessing websites cause a great deal of irritation.

First of all there is absolutely no uniformity. Each website presents a different text in a different form.

Secondly these messages hamper the use of the Internet. It is in the nature of the Internet that one surfs from one site to another. It is therefore not unusual, on each click of the mouse, to be faced with yet another message. This is even more of a nuisance on smart phones, since one has to search for a tiny button each time to accept or reject cookies or to get the message to disappear.

Apart from the annoyance to website users, the directive also means that website owners have to invest a lot of money in adapting their websites to comply with the directive's requirements. That seems to me undesirable.

A large part of the problem could be resolved by implementing the directive's requirements at browser level. The designers of browsers could easily make the messages uniform: this would save website owners investments and would result in considerably less annoyance to users.

I also consider that it should be possible for users to determine in their browser settings the kinds of websites for which cookies are to be accepted. This would avoid their being faced with yet another cookie message on every website. Users would have no need for such messages if the acceptance of cookies had already been dealt with.

Is the Commission prepared to adapt the directive in order to counteract this problem by shifting the implementation of cookie messages to browser level instead of leaving it to the website provider?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(2 October 2012)

The revised e-Privacy Directive ([1]) includes a new provision, introduced by the European Parliament, that allows the storing of information or the gaining of access to information already stored, such as cookies, on a user's computer or other digital device only on the condition that the user concerned has given his or her consent, having been provided with clear and comprehensive information about the purposes of the processing. According to the recitals of the revised e-Privacy Directive, users may give consent by any appropriate method enabling a freely given, specific and informed indication of their wishes. The method should be as user-friendly as possible.

Following transposition of the revised Directive, information society services, having analysed the processing of their cookies, have begun to improve their transparency and give users more control, in a number of different ways.

According to the ePrivacy Directive, if technically possible and effective, appropriate browser settings could be used to transmit user consent. The Commission agrees that the design of browsers could play an important role in giving individuals more control over the use of cookies and similar devices without jeopardising their Internet experience. To support this approach, the Commission has called on industry to develop a general 'do-not-track' standard for the Web ([2]), building on the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) standardisation process. It is intended to detail both how consumers can express their tracking preferences, as well as how websites and their affiliates will acknowledge and honour those preferences. In the Commission's view, the standard must be rich enough for users to know exactly what compliant companies do with their information.

([1]) Directive 2009/136/EC, OJ L 337, 18.12.2009.
([2]) Neelie Kroes, speech of 22 June 2011: http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/11/461.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007787/12
à la Commission
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)
(3 septembre 2012)

Objet: Retraites des travailleurs transfrontaliers

L'article 45 du traité sur l'Union européenne garantit la libre circulation des travailleurs. Depuis 2005, suite à un jugement de la Cour constitutionnelle allemande et suite à une modification du régime fiscal allemand, les retraites allemandes versées aux travailleurs frontaliers établis dans d'autres États membres de l'Union européenne font l'objet d'une imposition en Allemagne. Ces travailleurs sont alors soumis à une double imposition puisqu'ils sont non seulement imposables dans leur pays de résidence mais également en Allemagne.

Par ailleurs, l'administration fiscale allemande impose ces travailleurs sans appliquer les abattements auxquels ont droit les résidents allemands. Cette inégalité entre travailleurs européens pourrait donc être considérée comme le résultat de l'application de mesures discriminatoires vis-à-vis des retraités transfrontaliers. La Commission a déjà souligné qu'elle ne considérait pas la double imposition juridique, qui résulte de la coexistence de deux régimes fiscaux, comme contraire au droit de l'Union. Toutefois, cette double imposition n'est-t-elle pas de nature à constituer un obstacle au bon fonctionnement du marché intérieur et au principe de libre circulation des travailleurs?

Par ailleurs, la Commission a entrepris une évaluation de la fiscalité des 27 États membres de l'Union européenne durant l'année 2012 afin de déterminer s'il existait des manquements dans ce domaine de la part de certains États, notamment vis-à-vis des travailleurs transfrontaliers.

Eu égard à ce qui précède, la Commission est invitée à répondre aux questions suivantes:

1. Est-elle d'ores et déjà en mesure de transmettre les résultats de cet examen, notamment en ce qui concerne l'Allemagne?

2. Quelles sont les solutions envisagées par la Commission dans ce domaine, notamment en ce qui concerne la problématique de la double imposition?

3. Si des mesures discriminatoires ont été appliquées par l'État allemand à des anciens travailleurs transfrontaliers, quels sont les types de mesures envisagés par la Commission dans le cas où l'Allemagne, comme tout autre État membre ne respectant pas les principes de l'Union en matière de libre circulation, persisterait à ne pas modifier sa législation?

Réponse donnée par M. Šemetaon au nom de la Commission
(17 octobre 2012)

1. La Commission n'est pas en mesure de transmettre les résultats de l'évaluation car ils portent sur des infractions potentielles.

2. En 2011, la Commission a examiné les problèmes de double imposition que les citoyens et les entreprises rencontrent encore sur le marché intérieur ([1]). Elle mettait en évidence des solutions possibles, telles qu'un forum sur la double imposition, une proposition de code de conduite sur la double imposition et un mécanisme d'arbitrage contraignant et elle examine actuellement en détail ([2]) les solutions envisagées en vue de décider de la meilleure façon d'aller de l'avant dans ce domaine. La Commission prévoit en outre d'organiser un atelier dans les mois à venir afin de permettre aux États membres de partager les meilleures pratiques en ce qui concerne le traitement du large éventail de problèmes fiscaux transfrontaliers auxquels sont confrontés les citoyens de l'UE et qui ont été décrits par la Commission en 2010 ([3]).

3. S'il est constaté que l'Allemagne a pratiqué une discrimination à l'encontre d'anciens travailleurs frontaliers, la Commission ouvrira une procédure d'infraction conformément à l'article 258 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne. Si l'Allemagne ne se conforme pas à la position de la Commission, cette dernière pourra porter l'affaire devant la Cour de justice de l'UE.

([1]) COM(2011) 712.
([2]) Voir feuille de route à l'adresse suivante: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/planned_ia/docs/2013_taxud_001_arbitration_for_double_taxation_disputes_en.pdf
([3]) Communication «Lever les obstacles fiscaux transfrontaliers pour les citoyens de l'Union européenne» — COM,(2010) 769 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007787/12
to the Commission
Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)
(3 September 2012)

Subject: Retirement pensions of cross-border workers

Article 45 of the Treaty on European Union guarantees the free circulation of workers. Since 2005, following a judgment by the German constitutional court and an amendment of the German tax system, German pensions paid to cross-border workers living in other EU Member States are subject to tax in Germany. These workers thus face dual taxation, as they are subject to tax both in their countries of residence and in Germany.

The German fiscal system also taxes these workers without applying the reductions to which German residents are entitled. This inequality among European workers could therefore be seen as due to the application of measures which discriminate against cross-border workers. The Commission has already emphasised that it does not consider double taxation, resulting from the coexistence of two separate tax systems, to be against EC law. Nevertheless, is this dual taxation not likely to form an obstacle to the smooth functioning of the internal market and to the principle of free movement of workers?

The Commission has carried out an assessment of taxation in the 27 EU Member States during 2012, with a view to establishing whether or not certain States were failing to meet their obligations in this field, particularly in relation to cross-border workers.

In light of the above, can the Commission answer the following:

1. Is it it able to forward the results of this assessment, particularly in relation to Germany ?

2. What solutions is the Commission able to propose on this subject, particularly as regards the problem of double taxation?

3. If Germany is found to have discriminated against former cross-border workers, what sort of steps can the Commission take if Germany, or any other Member State which fails to respect the Union's principle of free circulation, refuses to change its legislation?

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

1. The Commission is not able to forward the results of the assessment, as they concern potential infringements.

2. The Commission in 2011 examined the problems of double taxation that citizens and companies still encounter in the internal market ([1]). It identified possible solutions, such as a Forum on double taxation, a proposal for a code of conduct on double taxation and a binding arbitration mechanism and it is currently examining these possible solutions in detail ([2]) with a view to deciding on the best way forward in this area. In addition, the Commission aims to hold a workshop in the coming months to allow Member States to share best practices in dealing with the wide range of cross-border tax problems facing EU citizens that the Commission described in 2010 ([3]).

3. If Germany is found to have discriminated against former cross-border workers, the Commission will open an infringement procedure in accordance with Article 258 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU. If Germany does not comply with the position taken by the Commission, the Commission may refer the matter to the Court of Justice of the EU.

([1]) COM(2011)712.
([2]) See roadmap at: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/planned_ia/docs/2013_taxud_001_arbitration_for_double_taxation_disputes_en.pdf.
([3]) Communication 'Removing cross-border tax obstacles for EU citizens' — COM(2010) 769 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007791/12
to the Commission
Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Eradication of child poverty in the north of Ireland

Can the Commission outline in detail how much EU funding has been allocated to date to action to eradicate child poverty in the north of Ireland?

Can the Commission also detail under which EU programmes these funds were allocated?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

The Commission recognises the need to combat child poverty and prevent the transmission of disadvantage across generations as part of efforts to address poverty and social exclusion. On 6 July 2012 the Council adopted a CSR ([1]) under the Europe 2020 strategy calling on the United Kingdom to 'Ensure that planned welfare reforms do not translate into increased child poverty' and to 'Fully implement measures aiming to facilitate access to childcare services'.

EU funding sources, and in particular the Structural Funds, can support such actions as childcare, housing support for severely disadvantaged communities and children, educational support at a very early age, and the transition to quality community-based care. As the Northern Ireland ESF programme does not specifically cover child poverty, no quantitative financial information is directly available, but it indirectly enables beneficiaries to gain qualifications allowing them access to the labour market and to further education. They are thus moved out of the benefit system, and the ESF contributes to eradicating child poverty.

Furthermore, additional schemes are also contributing to combat children's food deprivation: the European School Milk Scheme is providing children with quality dairy products, contributing to a healthy way of living and to a nutritional education. 1.2 million children have been participating in the UK in the school-year 2010/2011, representing an EU expenditure of EUR 5.2 million for and covering 436 000 tonnes of products subsidised. The UK has opted not to participate in the EU School Fruit Scheme, which provides children with fruit and vegetables at school, and in the Most Deprived Programme, which aims to distribute food products to the neediest EU citizens.

([1]) Country-Specific Recommendation.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007792/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(4 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Posible vulneración de la Directiva de Aves por la captura de fringílidos

El pasado noviembre de 2011 se aprobó en el Parlament de Catalunya el Decreto-ley 2/2011 que modifica el texto refundido de la ley de protección de los animales, estableciendo un régimen provisional de capturas en vivo y posesión de pájaros fringílidos: pinzones, jilgueros, verderones y pardillos (conocidos popularmente como cantores) para la cría en cautividad, dirigida a la actividad tradicional de canto durante 2011. Este Decreto-ley tiene como única finalidad la captura de los pájaros fringílidos con el objetivo de mantenerlos enjaulados. Además, la Generalitat ha eliminado estos animales del catálogo de especies protegidas del territorio catalán, atentando así contra la biodiversidad de Cataluña en un momento en el que la mayoría de las poblaciones de estos pájaros se encuentran en franca regresión.

Este Decreto-ley podría ir tanto contra la legislación básica estatal, especialmente contra la Ley 42/2007 del Patrimonio Natural y de la Biodiversidad, como contra la legislación europea, en su Directiva 2009/147/CE relativa a la conservación de las aves silvestres. De esta manera, la Generalitat de Catalunya estaría actuando en contra del interés público y medioambiental de la sociedad y, en particular, contra la sostenibilidad del medio ambiente y de las especies de pájaros fringílidos.

1. ¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre este Decreto-ley?

2. ¿Cree la Comisión que la Generalitat de Catalunya está vulnerando la legislación europea, y en especial la Directiva 2009/147/CE relativa a la conservación de las aves silvestres?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de octubre de 2012)

El artículo 9, apartado 1, letra c), de la Directiva sobre aves ([1]) autoriza la aplicación limitada de excepciones para la captura de especies, con el fin de evitar la endogamia de las poblaciones cautivas.

Este parece ser el objetivo del Decreto-Ley 2/2011 de la Generalitat de Catalunya relativo a la cría y a la reproducción de especies de ave en cautividad. Esta norma modifica el apartado 3 del artículo 34 de la Ley de protección de los animales ([2]) y establece un régimen provisional aplicable a la captura de cuatro especies de la familia *Fringillidae* del 16 de noviembre al 31 de diciembre de 2011.

La Comisión está examinando aún el Decreto-Ley con el fin de comprobar que se ajusta plenamente a la Directiva sobre aves.

([1]) Directiva 2009/147/CE, de 30 de noviembre de 2009, relativa a la conservación de las aves silvestres (DO L 20 de 26.1.2010).
([2]) Decreto-Ley 2/2008, de 15 de abril, de protección de los animales.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007792/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Possible infringement of the Birds Directive caused by the capture of songbirds

In November 2011 the Catalan Parliament adopted Decree-Law 2/2011 amending the recast text of the Catalan regional law on animal protection to create a provisional period during which the live capture and possession of birds of the fringillidae family — chaffinches, goldfinches, greenfinches and linnets (popularly known as songbirds) — is permitted, allowing them to be held in captivity and trained for traditional singing competitions during 2011. The sole purpose of this law is to allow the capture and caging of songbirds. What is more, the Generalitat has removed these birds from the catalogue of protected species in Catalonia, thereby prejudicing Catalan biodiversity at a time when most populations of these birds are clearly receding.

This decree-law may also infringe Spanish national law, in particular Law 42/2007 on natural heritage and biodiversity, and European law, in the form of Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds. Thus, the Generalitat's action appears contrary to the public and environmental interests of society and, in particular, to environmental sustainability and the survival of songbird species.

1. What is the Commission's opinion of this decree-law?

2. Does the Commission believe that the Catalan Government is infringing European law, in particular Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

Article 9.1.c) of the Birds Directive ([1]) allows the limited application of derogations to capture species in order to prevent genetic inbreeding of captive stocks.

This appears to be the objective of the Catalonian Government 2/2011 Law Decree, which relates to the breeding and reproduction of bird species in captivity. This rule amended Article 34.3 of the Law on protection of Animals ([2]), and established a provisional regime for capturing four species of the *Fringillidae* family from 16 November to 31 December 2011.

The Commission is still examining this Law Decree to ensure that it fully complies with the Birds Directive.

([1]) Directive 2009/147/EC ,of 30 November, on the conservation of wild birds, OJ L 20, 26.1.2010.
([2]) Law-Decree 2/2008, of 15 April, on Protection on Animals.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007793/12
an die Kommission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(4. September 2012)

Betrifft: Verkaufsverbot für in Tierversuchen getestete Kosmetika

Ab 2013 soll in Europa ein Verkaufsverbot von in Übersee mithilfe von Tierversuchen hergestellten Kosmetika gelten. Medienberichten zufolge will Gesundheitskommissar John Dalli Ausnahmeregeln für das ab März 2013 geplante totale Verkaufsverbot auch für außerhalb der EU hergestellte Kosmetikprodukte zulassen und somit gleichzeitig die Frist für das Verkaufsverbot (März 2013) nach hinten verschieben.

1. Beabsichtigt die Kommission wirklich, die Umsetzungsfrist von März 2013 nach hinten zu verschieben?

2. Warum werden bereits bestehende Alternativen zu Tierversuchen nicht zugelassen?

3. Wie rechtfertigt die Kommission eine derartige Missachtung einer geltenden Vorschrift?

4. Welche speziellen Ausnahmeregelungen plant die Kommission?

Antwort von Herrn Dalli im Namen der Kommission
(5. Oktober 2012)

Die Kommission möchte den Herrn Abgeordneten auf ihre früheren Antworten zu ähnlichen Fragen hinweisen, wobei E-005016/2012 ([1]) die neueste ist. Wie dort erläutert, untersucht die Kommission die Auswirkungen des Verkaufsverbots für 2013 sowie Möglichkeiten zur Milderung dieser Auswirkungen. Die Kommission hat in dieser Angelegenheit noch keine endgültige Entscheidung getroffen.

Für die Genehmigung der Verwendung alternativer Methoden wurde der Prozess zur Validierung alternativer Methoden innerhalb der Europäischen Union in den letzten Jahren weiter verbessert und vereinfacht.

Mit der Richtlinie 2010/63/EU ([2]) wurde die Rolle des Europäischen Zentrums zur Validierung alternativer Methoden (ECVAM), nun bekannt als Referenzlabor der Europäischen Union für alternative Methoden zu Tierversuchen (EURL ECVAM), gestärkt. Die wissenschaftliche Beratung, die der Wissenschaftliche Beratende Ausschuss des ECVAM (ESAC) bereitstellt, wurde vom Stakeholder-Dialog getrennt, der im ECVAM-Stakeholderforum (ESTAF) stattfindet. Auch für die Bewertung der Relevanz neu vorgeschlagener alternativer Methoden durch die Regelungsstellen vor Zulassung zum Validierungsverfahren wurde ein neues Verfahren eingerichtet. Zu diesem Zweck wurde die Vorabbewertung der regulatorischen Relevanz (PARERE) eingeführt. Das Problem mit der Frist 2013 liegt jedoch eher in der mangelnden Verfügbarkeit alternativer Methoden begründet, wie bereits bei der Beantwortung früherer Anfragen erläutert. EURL ECVAM spielt ebenfalls eine Schlüsselrolle bei der Unterstützung der Forschung nach solchen Methoden im Rahmen seiner wissenschaftlichen und koordinatorischen Aufgaben innerhalb des SEURAT-1 ([3])-Projekts.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) ABl. L 276 vom 20.10.2010, S. 33.
([3]) http://www.seurat-1.eu/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007793/12
to the Commission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Ban on the marketing of cosmetics tested on animals

A ban on the sale in Europe of cosmetics produced overseas using animal testing is due to come into force in March 2013. According to media reports, Health Commissioner John Dalli wants to permit exemptions to the total ban on these cosmetic products, including those manufactured outside the EU, thereby postponing the date for the ban (March 2013) to a later date.

1. Does the Commission really intend to postpone the implementation deadline of March 2013?

2. Why are alternatives to animal testing that are already available not permitted?

3. How does the Commission justify such disregard for existing legislation?

4. What special exemptions is the Commission planning?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(5 October 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to earlier answers to similar questions, the most recent being E-005016/2012 ([1]). As indicated in this answer, the Commission is analysing the impacts of the 2013 marketing ban and possible ways of mitigating these impacts. The Commission has not yet taken a final decision on this matter.

As regards permitting the use of available alternative methods, the process of validation of alternative methods in the Union has been further improved and streamlined in recent years.

Directive 2010/63/EU ([2]) has strengthened the role of the European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods (ECVAM), now referred to as the European Union Reference Laboratory on Alternatives to Animal Testing (EURL ECVAM). The scientific advice, provided by the ECVAM Scientific Advisory Committee (ESAC), has been separated from the stakeholder dialogue, provided by ECVAM Stakeholder Forum (ESTAF). A new process was also put in place to assess the relevance of a newly proposed alternative method by regulators prior to its acceptance into the validation process. To this end the Preliminary Assessment of Regulatory Relevance (PARERE) was set up. However, as pointed out in the answers to the earlier questions the issue faced in relation to the 2013 deadline is rather the unavailability of alternative methods in the first place. EURL ECVAM also plays a key role in contributing to the research for these methods with its scientific and coordination roles within the SEURAT-1 ([3]) project.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html
([2]) OJ L 276, 20.10.2010, p. 33.
([3]) http://www.seurat-1.eu/.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007794/12
an die Kommission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(4. September 2012)

Betrifft: EU-geförderter Straßenbau in Ungarn

Eine österreichische Bürgerin hat auf folgenden Umstand hingewiesen: In einem bislang unberührten und mehrere km² umfassenden Areal um Hévíz in Ungarn ist eine trassierte Straße entstanden. Diese wird angeblich von der EU gefördert. Das Straßenbauprojekt mit einer Länge von 4 km hat laut der österreichischen Bürgerin keine erkennbare Anbindung an bestehende, ähnlich ausgebaute Straßen. Das EU-geförderte Projekt wird von der einheimischen Bevölkerung abgelehnt.

1. Warum wurde diese Straße gebaut und mit EU-Geldern gefördert?

2. Wäre es nicht besser gewesen, die Erneuerung bzw. Verbesserung bestehender Straßennetze zu fördern?

Antwort von Herrn Hahn im Namen der Kommission
(11. Oktober 2012)

Das vom Herrn Abgeordneten angesprochene Projekt dient dem Bau einer Umgehungsstraße um die Stadt Hévíz. Mit dieser Straße soll der übermäßige Durchgangsverkehr im Stadtzentrum gemildert werden. Der Europäische Fonds für regionale Entwicklung stellt 2,8 Mio. EUR für das Projekt bereit.

Das Projekt besteht aus vier Teilen, die parallel umgesetzt werden; alle vier Teilprojekte sollen bis Ende 2013 fertiggestellt sein. Der erste Teil betrifft die Erneuerung und den Ausbau der Hauptstraße Nr. 75 (1,5 km); der zweite Teil ist ein neu gebauter zweispuriger Straßenabschnitt; der dritte Teil umfasst zwei neu gebaute zweispurige Straßenabschnitte; der vierte Teil besteht in der Anpassung der bestehenden zweispurigen Streckenführung. Das Projekt ist verbunden mit dem Ausbau der Hauptstraße Nr. 76, so dass die europäischen Vorgaben vollständig erfüllt werden. Verkehr in Richtung Flughafen Sármellék, Kis-Balaton sowie zu den touristischen Zielen Hévíz und Keszthely und in Richtung Autobahn M7 wird am Stadtzentrum von Hévíz vorbeigeführt, so dass Verkehrsaufkommen, Lärm und Luftverschmutzung reduziert werden.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007794/12
to the Commission
Jörg Leichtfried (S&D)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: EU-subsidised road construction in Hungary

An Austrian citizen has reported that a road has been built in a hitherto unspoilt area of several square kilometres around Heviz in Hungary. Its construction has apparently been subsidised by the EU. The Austrian citizen can see no discernible connection between the 4 km long road and any similar existing roads. The local population is opposed to the EU-subsidised project.

1. Why was this road built and subsidised with EU money?

2. Would it not have been better to subsidise the repair or improvement of the existing road network?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The project mentioned by the Honourable Member aims at creating a bypass road around Héviz in order to alleviate the impact of heavy road traffic on the city. The European Regional Development Fund is providing EUR 2.8 million for this project.

The project consists of four parts which are realised in parallel; all four are foreseen to be ready by the end of 2013. The first part is the renovation and reconstruction of main road n°75 (1.5 km); the second part is a newly built two-lane section; the third part consists of two newly built two-lane sections; and the fourth part is the correction of the existing two-lane alignment. The project is linked to the reinforcement of main road n°76 in order to comply with European requirements. Traffic heading to Sarmellek Airport, to the Kis-Balaton region and to tourism destinations Heviz and Keszthely, as well as towards the Motorway M7, will bypass Heviz city centre, thus reducing congestion, noise and pollution.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-007796/12
a la Comisión
Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D)
(4 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Incendio en La Gomera

El grave incendio declarado el pasado 4 de agosto en la isla canaria de La Gomera, declarada Reserva de la Bioesfera, ha afectado a 4 000 hectáreas de terreno, de las cuales 900 pertenecen al Parque Nacional de Garajonay (un 25 % del parque), enclave Red Natura 2000, lo que supone el 11 % del total de la superficie de la isla. Los daños ocasionados en viviendas, infraestructuras y zonas forestales han sido valorados en más de 71 millones de euros. A la enormidad de los desperfectos materiales habrá que sumar, asimismo, el impacto negativo que el incendio ocasionará sobre la vida cotidiana y social de la población de la isla, especialmente sobre el turismo, una de las principales actividades económicas del archipiélago.

A tenor del alcance de la catástrofe, ¿activará la Comisión el Fondo de Solidaridad destinado a la recuperación de la actividad económica de la región afectada, máxime teniendo en cuenta que se trata de una región ultraperiférica y que, de acuerdo con el artículo 2 del Reglamento (CE) n° 2012/2002, debe concederse una especial importancia a dichas regiones?

Respuesta del Sr. Hahn en nombre de la Comisión
(10 de octubre de 2012)

El 23 de septiembre 2012, las autoridades españolas presentaron a la Comisión una solicitud de ayuda financiera del Fondo de Solidaridad de la UE en relación con el desastre causado por los incendios forestales ocurridos en La Gomera. La presentación de dicha solicitud es una condición necesaria para activar dicho Fondo, ya que la Comisión no puede hacerlo por iniciativa propia. La solicitud se está evaluando actualmente, teniéndose en cuenta todos los factores relevantes, incluida la situación de La Gomera como parte de una región ultraperiférica. Si se cumplen las condiciones establecidas en el Reglamento (CE) n° 2012/2002, por el que se crea el Fondo de Solidaridad, la Comisión propondrá que se active dicho Fondo y solicitará al Parlamento Europeo y al Consejo que aprueben un importe adecuado de ayuda.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007796/12
to the Commission
Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Forest fire on La Gomera

The serious fire which broke out on 4 august 2012 on the island of La Gomera (Canary Islands), which is a biosphere reserve, has affected 4 000 hectares of land, or 11% of the islands total surface area. Of these, 900 hectares belong to the Garajonay National Park, a Natura 200 site, and form 25% of its total area. The damage to homes, infrastructure and forest areas has been valued at over EUR 71 million. In addition to the huge material damage caused by the fire, it will seriously affect the everyday and social life of the island's population and, in particular, tourism, which is one of the archipelago's main economic activities.

In view of the extent of the disaster, does the Commission intend to activate the Solidarity Fund to assist the island's economic recovery, particularly taking into account that the area in question is an outermost region and as such should be given special attention under the terms of Article 2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(10 October 2012)

On 23 September 2012, the Spanish authorities submitted an application to the Commission for financial assistance from the EU Solidarity Fund relating to the disaster caused by the forest fires on La Gomera. This is a necessary condition for activating the Solidarity Fund as the Commission may not do it upon its own initiative. The application is now being assessed taking into consideration all relevant factors, including the status of La Gomera as part of an outermost region. If the conditions laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 2012/2002 establishing the Solidarity Fund are found to be met, the Commission will propose activating the Solidarity Fund and will request the European Parliament and the Council to approve an appropriate amount of aid.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007797/12
to the Commission
Robert Sturdy (ECR)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: EU-South Korea free trade agreement and crude oil prices

According to EU industry sources, South Korea has been importing increasing amounts of North Sea crude oil since the entry into force of its free trade agreement with the EU on 1 July 2011. It has been suggested that this has resulted in price hikes and increased demand for what are already limited resources.

How, and to what extent, did the Commission, prior to and during the negotiations on the agreement, assess the impact it would have on crude prices and the security of energy supply within the EU and its potential impact on the European refining industry?

Is the Commission currently monitoring and evaluating its impact on that sector and on energy supply?

If deemed appropriate, is there any mechanism available by which the Commission could seek to review the agreement's coverage of crude oil exports, including limitations thereon?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(3 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of an increase in crude oil exports from the EU to South Korea since the entry into force of the EU-South Korea Free Trade Agreement (FTA) on 1 July 2011. This increase can mainly be explained by the geopolitical situation in the Middle East, in particular the impact of sanctions on Iran, and the necessity for South Korea to find alternative sources of supply. These geopolitical factors and supply concerns have contributed to the upward trend in Brent and other oil benchmark prices since 2011.

The Commission undertook several studies examining the potential impact of this FTA and continues to closely monitor the implementation of the Agreement, including its economic impact. However, no specific analysis was undertaken of the impact of the FTA on crude oil prices, the security of energy supply or on the European refining industry.

The FTA does not foresee the retroactive exclusion of products from the scope of the Agreement.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007803/12
a la Comisión
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Contaminación en la bahía de Algeciras — Repregunta

En varias ocasiones he llamado la atención sobre el deterioro y los riesgos de alta contaminación en la bahía de Algeciras debido a la actuación de las autoridades gibraltareñas. Las últimas noticias han incrementado esta preocupación porque se han publicado fotografías que muestran cómo cada mañana se vierten residuos generados por el aeropuerto que contienen líquidos de limpieza de las pistas y de las basuras recogidas.

Pregunto a la Comisión: ¿Qué medidas inmediatas y eficaces se piensa tomar para solucionar este grave atentado ecológico.

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(15 de octubre de 2012)

Sobre la base de la información proporcionada por Su Señoría, la Comisión se pondrá en contacto con el Reino Unido para comprobar las circunstancias denunciadas.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007803/12
to the Commission
Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Pollution in the Bay of Algeciras — Follow-up question

On a number of occasions I have drawn attention to the deteriorating situation and major risks of pollution in the Bay of Algeciras that are the result of action by the Gibraltar authorities. These concerns were heightened recently when photographs were published showing waste from the airport, including runway cleaning fluids and rubbish, being dumped on a daily basis.

What immediate, effective action is the Commission intending to take to stop this serious environmental damage?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

On the basis of the information provided by the Honourable Member, the Commission will contact the United Kingdom to ascertain the allegations pertaining to this case.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007808/12
to the Commission
Julie Girling (ECR)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Follow-up on funding for superfast broadband

Further to my recent Written Question E-005843/2012 regarding funding for superfast broadband, the answer subsequently given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission implied that it had not received the necessary information to make further progress on funding requests. Please can the Commission confirm that it has since received all of the information requested from UK authorities relevant to broadband funding, both in South West England and across the UK?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The Borders Broadband Herefordshire and Gloucestershire project was notified to the Commission in February this year. The project's funding partner is Broadband Delivery UK ('BDUK') ([1]). In March the Commission sent a request for information to the UK authorities. In May the UK authorities decided to suspend the notification until the BDUK umbrella scheme access issues are resolved. They have not re-activated the notification, so the Commission cannot take any action.

The Commission has not yet received a full reply to its latest request for information on the BDUK scheme. Indeed, the UK is currently examining the BDUK scheme to make sure that all aspects of the scheme are in conformity with the Broadband Guidelines ([2]). Individual measures that would be covered by the scheme are on hold until the BDUK scheme has been approved.

The Commission is closely cooperating with the UK Government to decide quickly on the BDUK umbrella scheme, but it is still too early to give indications on exact timing.

([1]) The BDUK scheme was notified to the Commission on 5 January 2012.
([2]) OJ C 235, 30.9.2009, p. 7.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007809/12
alla Commissione
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(4 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Possibili finanziamenti per la valorizzazione della «Società Tarquiniense d'Arte e Storia» e la ristrutturazione del «Museo della Ceramica d'uso a Corneto»

La «Società Tarquiniense d'Arte e Storia» di Tarquinia, in Provincia di Viterbo, è un Ente Morale che ha tra i suoi scopi quello di valorizzare il locale patrimonio artistico e storico, promuovendo iniziative finalizzate alla tutela e alla conoscenza della cultura cittadina e del territorio della città. Nel corso degli anni ha già sovvenzionato il restauro della propria sede nel duecentesco «Palazzo dei Priori», varie chiese antiche sparse sul territorio comunale di Tarquinia ed il restauro delle statue del famoso Presepio settecentesco presente in una chiesa. Anche nel campo archivistico la Società Tarquiniense effettua opere di recupero e conservazione di archivi di nobili famiglie, continuamente consultati da studiosi e ricercatori. Inoltre, dal 1972 la «Società Tarquiniense d'Arte e Storia» pubblica un bollettino annuale nel quale vengono riportati i risultati delle ricerche e degli studi effettuati.

Infine, all'interno del Palazzo dei Priori vi è il Museo della Ceramica «d'uso a Corneto» che raccoglie oltre 200 ceramiche di età medioevale e rinascimentale ritrovate nel centro storico di Tarquinia. Della raccolta sono esposti i pezzi meglio conservati, che rappresentano una testimonianza insostituibile per la conoscenza delle produzioni che giunsero a Corneto tra il XIII e il XVIII secolo. Tuttavia l'intera collezione necessita di una continua manutenzione oltre che di una adeguata sistemazione per poter usufruire dell'intera collezione non ancora visibile.

Tutto ciò premesso, si interroga la Commissione:

1. per sapere se vi sono finanziamenti per la conservazione e valorizzazione del museo;

2. per sapere se vi sono finanziamenti per la ristrutturazione del duecentesco «Palazzo dei Priori»;

3. per avere un quadro generale della situazione.

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(10 ottobre 2012)

I progetti cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare potrebbero beneficiare di un sostegno finanziario dei Fondi strutturali, nel rispetto delle disposizioni specifiche del programma regionale per il Lazio 2007-2013. Questo programma definisce i tipi di aiuti erogati dal Fondo europeo di sviluppo regionale per la regione nell'ambito dell'attuale periodo di riferimento, nel quadro della priorità II «Ambiente e prevenzione dei rischi» che offre la possibilità di sostenere gli interventi in favore del patrimonio artistico e culturale della regione Lazio.

In base al principio di gestione condivisa applicato alla gestione della politica di coesione la selezione dei progetti e la loro attuazione competono alle autorità nazionali. Per maggiori informazioni la Commissione suggerisce pertanto all'onorevole parlamentare di contattare direttamente l'autorità che gestisce il programma:

Autorità di gestione del programma operativo regionale della Regione Lazio 2007-2013
Via R. R. Garibaldi, 7
00145 Roma
adgcomplazio@regione.lazio.it

Rispetto a progetti analoghi finanziati in altri Stati membri attraverso con fondi della politica di coesione, il sito web sulle politiche regionali della Commissione ha una banca dati specifica dedicata ai vari tipi di progetti finanziati dalla politica di coesione al seguente indirizzo: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/projects/stories/index_it.cfm

La Commissione osserva che il mantenimento e il riassetto del museo non rispetterebbero le condizioni di partecipazione al programma «Cultura», che riguarda i progetti di cooperazione culturale che associano paesi diversi.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007809/12
to the Commission
Roberta Angelilli (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Possibility of funding for the art and history association of Tarquinia and the refurbishment of the museum of pottery from mediaeval Corneto

The objectives of the 'Società Tarquiniense d'Arte e Storia', in the town of Tarquinia, in the province of Viterbo, include fostering the local artistic and historic heritage by instigating measures to protect, and raise awareness of, the culture of Tarquinia and the surrounding area. Over the years, the association has helped to fund the restoration of the 13th century 'Palazzo dei Priori' where it is based, as well as a number of ancient churches situated within the municipality and the statues forming one local church's famous 18th century Nativity scene. The association also plays an active role in retrieving and conserving the family archives of the local nobility, which are constantly consulted by scholars and researchers. Since 1972, the association has also published an annual magazine which reports on the findings of such studies.

Finally, the 'Palazzo dei Priori' also houses the 'Museo della Ceramica d'uso a Corneto', which has on display the best-preserved items of its collection of over 200 items of medieval and Renaissance pottery and ceramics dug up in the old town centre, thus providing a unique insight into the work produced in the town (then known as Corneto) between the 13th and the 18th centuries. The whole collection needs to be continuously maintained, however, and also to be properly organised to ensure that the part of the collection not yet on display is put to good use.

In view of the foregoing:

1. Would the Commission state whether funding exists for the maintenance and refurbishment of the museum?

2. Would the Commission state whether funding exists for the refurbishment of the 13th century 'Palazzo dei Priori'?

3. Would the Commission provide a general overview of the situation?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(10 October 2012)

The projects referred to by the Honourable Member could be eligible for financial support from the Structural Funds, subject to compliance with the specific provisions of the 2007-13 regional programme for Lazio. This programme defines the types of support provided by the European Regional Development Fund to the region under the current period, within priority II 'Environment and Risk prevention' and which allows the possibility to support interventions in favour of the artistic and cultural heritage of Lazio.

In line with the shared management principle used for the administration of cohesion policy, project selection and implementation is the responsibility of national authorities. For more information, the Commission therefore suggests that the Honourable Member contact directly the managing authority of the programme:

Managing Authority Regional Operational Programme Lazio for 2007-13
Via R. R. Garibaldi, 7
00145 Roma
adgcomplazio@regione.lazio.it

With respect to similar projects financed in other Member States through cohesion policy Funds, the Commission's regional policy website has a specific database devoted to the various types of projects financed by cohesion policy at the following address: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/projects/stories/index_en.cfm

The Commission notes that the maintenance and refurbishment of the museum would not fulfil the conditions for participation in the Culture Programme which concerns cultural cooperation projects involving different countries.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007811/12
do Komisji
Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)
(4 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Nałożenie cła antydumpingowego (12, 1 %) na fosfor importowany do krajów UE

W związku z sytuacją związaną z działaniami Wydziału Handlu KE w sprawie nałożenia cła antydumpingowego (12, 1 %) na fosfor importowany do krajów UE, jako surowiec dla firm w UE oraz faktem, że sprawa była przedmiotem obrad Komitetu Doradczego, który nie poparł wniosku Komisji o wprowadzenie cła tymczasowego, pozwalam sobie zapytać, w jaki sposób działania te spełniają zasady konkurencji oraz czy dysponujemy symulacjami, jakie mogą być ich potencjalne skutki, jeśli chodzi o sytuację ekonomiczną zakładów korzystających z fosforu oraz jakie mogą być potencjalne skutki społeczne bankructw takich firm np. jeśli chodzi o poziom bezrobocia.

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Karela De Guchta w imieniu Komisji
(17 października 2012 r.)

Komisja jest odpowiedzialna za przeprowadzanie dochodzeń dotyczących zarzutów o stosowanie dumpingu przez producentów z państw spoza Unii Europejskiej (UE). Podstawowym rozporządzeniem antydumpingowym UE jest rozporządzenie Rady (WE) nr 1225/2009 z dnia 30 listopada 2009 r. w sprawie ochrony przed przywozem produktów po cenach dumpingowych z krajów niebędących członkami Wspólnoty Europejskiej ([1]), które jest zgodne z Porozumieniem antydumpingowym Światowej Organizacji Handlu (WTO).

W tych ramach prawnych Komisja zazwyczaj działa na podstawie skargi, która musi zawierać wystarczające dowody *prima facie* wykazujące istnienie dumpingu wyrządzającego szkodę przemysłowi unijnemu.

Możliwy wpływ cła antydumpingowego nałożonego na przywóz na konkurencję na rynku unijnym oraz na przemysł przetwórczy to istotne i szczegółowo analizowane elementy dochodzenia antydumpingowego. Przed wprowadzeniem środków, Komisja, z chwilą ustalenia istnienia dumpingu wyrządzającego szkodę, musi również ocenić, czy skutki ewentualnego cła antydumpingowego nie naruszają ogólnego interesu Unii.

Jeżeli chodzi o prowadzone dochodzenie w sprawie przywozu białego fosforu pochodzącego z Kazachstanu, Komisja postanowiła nie wprowadzać tymczasowych środków antydumpingowych i kontynuować dochodzenie. Stwierdzono faktycznie, że niektóre aspekty, w szczególności związek przyczynowy oraz wpływ środków na przemysł przetwórczy należy dokładniej zbadać przed dokonaniem ostatecznych ustaleń. Wszystkim zainteresowanym stronom dostarczono dokumentację zawierającą szczegółowe informacje dotyczące niewprowadzania tymczasowych środków i poproszono je o zgłaszanie uwag w tej sprawie.

([1]) Dz.U. L 343 z 22.12.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007811/12
to the Commission
Paweł Robert Kowal (ECR)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Imposition of anti-dumping duty (12.1%) on phosphorus imported to EU Member States

In connection with the EC Directorate-General for Trade's imposition of an anti-dumping duty (12.1%) on phosphorus imported by companies as a raw material to EU Member States, and the fact that this matter was discussed by the Advisory Committee, which did not support the Commission's conclusion on introducing a temporary duty, I should like to put the following questions to the Commission:

How do these actions comply with competition rules?

Have any simulations been carried out into the potential impact on the financial situation of facilities using phosphorus?

What is the potential social impact of such companies going bankrupt, e.g. in terms of unemployment levels?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

The Commission is responsible for investigating allegations of dumping by exporting producers in countries outside the European Union (EU). The EU's basic anti-dumping Regulation is Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 of 30 November 2009 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community ([1]), which complies with the World Trade Organisation's (WTO) Anti-dumping Agreement.

Within this legal framework the Commission usually acts on the basis of a complaint which has to contain sufficient prima facie evidence showing the existence of dumping causing injury to the Union industry.

The possible impact of an anti-dumping duty on imports on competition in the Union market and on the downstream industry are important elements of an anti-dumping investigation and are investigated in detail. Indeed the Commission, once established the existence of injurious dumping has also to assess if the impact of a possible anti-dumping duty is not against the overall interest of the Union before measures can be imposed.

With regard to the ongoing investigation relating to imports of white phosphorus originating in Kazakhstan, the Commission has decided not to impose provisional anti-dumping measures and to continue with the investigation. Indeed, it was considered that certain aspects, including in particular causality and the impact of the measures on the downstream industry, need to be further investigated before any final determinations can be made. All parties concerned were provided with a detailed information document about the non-imposition of provisional measures and were invited to comment.

([1]) OJ L 343, 22.12.2009.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007813/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(4 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Νέα αλλαγή των παράνομων μεταναστευτικών ροών στην Ελλάδα

Οι συντονισμένες προσπάθειες για την καταπολέμηση της παράνομης μετανάστευσης που επιχειρούνται το τελευταίο διάστημα στην Ελλάδα από το αρμόδιο Υπουργείο στην περιοχή του Έβρου έχει επιφέρει αξιοσημείωτα αποτελέσματα. Είναι ενδεικτικό ότι στον Έβρο έχει σχεδόν μηδενιστεί η ροή παράνομων μεταναστών καθώς, ενώ στις 2 Αυγούστου είχαν συλληφθεί για παράνομη είσοδο 447 αλλοδαποί, το διήμερο 25 και 26 συνελήφθησαν μόλις 2 και στις 22 Αυγούστου κανείς. Παρά ταύτα, η παράνομη μετανάστευση αναζητεί νέες διεξόδους και συγκεκριμένα παρατηρείται και πάλι αυξημένη πίεση στα νησιά του Ανατολικού Αιγαίου. Για παράδειγμα κατά τη διάρκεια του Αυγούστου, στη Σύμη, το Φαρμακονήσι, τη Σάμο και τη Λέσβο συνελήφθησαν 146 παράνομοι μετανάστες.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Σκοπεύει να εισηγηθεί την ενίσχυση της παρουσίας της Frontex στην θαλάσσια περιοχή του Ανατολικού Αιγαίου προκειμένου να αναχαιτιστούν οι διελεύσεις από την νέα αυτή δίοδο;

Απάντηση της κας Malmström εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή γνωρίζει ότι η αύξηση των ελέγχων στα χερσαία σύνορα μεταξύ Ελλάδας και Τουρκίας οδήγησε σε αύξηση της παράνομης μετανάστευσης από τη θάλασσα.

Η Επιτροπή θεωρεί ότι η κατάσταση απαιτεί τη συμμετοχή του Frontex με σκοπό τη στήριξη των ελληνικών αρχών στην επιτήρηση των θαλάσσιων συνόρων με την Τουρκία. Προς τούτο, με αίτημα του Frontex, η Επιτροπή πρότεινε στη δημοσιονομική αρχή να αποδεσμεύσει 4,5 εκατ. ευρώ από σχετικό αποθεματικό, ώστε να υπάρχει περιθώριο ανταπόκρισης σε τυχόν επείγοντα περιστατικά στη Μεσόγειο.

Αυτό θα συμβάλει ιδιαίτερα στην αύξηση του δυναμικού επιτήρησης και ανταπόκρισης στην ξηρά και στη θάλασσα σε σχέση με τις εν εξελίξει κοινές επιχειρήσεις Ποσειδών και Αινείας με σκοπό την αντιμετώπιση και την πρόληψη της αυξανόμενης ροής παράνομων μεταναστών στην περιοχή τον Σεπτέμβριο και τον Οκτώβριο, καθώς και τον πλήρη σεβασμό των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και την τήρηση των διεθνών υποχρεώσεων και ιδίως της αρχής της μη επαναπροώθησης.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007813/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: New shift in illegal migration flows in Greece

Concerted efforts to combat illegal migration undertaken recently in Greece by the Ministry responsible in the Evros region have achieved remarkable results. The flow of illegal immigrants in Evros has almost dried up: whereas on 2 August 447 foreigners were arrested for illegally entering the country, on 25 and 26 August only 2 were arrested altogether and not one was arrested on 22 August. However, illegal migration always seeks new channels and there has been increased pressure on the islands of the eastern Aegean in particular. For example, during August 146 illegal immigrants were arrested in Symi, Farmakonissi, Samos and Lesbos.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— Will it propose increasing the presence of Frontex in the maritime area of the eastern Aegean in order to stem the transit of illegal immigrants through this new channel?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(10 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the fact that increased controls at the land border between Greece and Turkey have resulted in an increase of irregular migration via sea.

The Commission considers that the situation requires the involvement of Frontex in order to support the Greek authorities in the surveillance of the Maritime border with Turkey. For that reason, at the demand of Frontex, the Commission has proposed to the budgetary authority to release the EUR 4.5 million which had been put in reserve in order to respond to any possible emergency situations arising in the Mediterranean Sea.

This reinforcement would in particular help to increase the surveillance and response capacity by air and sea of the ongoing Joint Operation Poseidon Sea and of the Joint Operation Aeneas in order to tackle and prevent the increasing flow of irregular migrants in the area for the months of September and October, while ensuring full respect of human rights and international obligations, notably the principle of non-refoulement.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007815/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(4 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Ταμείο Εξυπηρέτησης Χρέους

Οι αποκαλούμενοι «σοφοί» της γερμανικής οικονομίας προτείνουν την σύσταση ενός Ειδικού Ταμείου Εξυπηρέτησης του Χρέους και έκδοση κοινών χρεογράφων μεταξύ των «17» κρατών μελών ώστε να αντιμετωπιστεί η κρίση χρέους στην Ευρωζώνη. Σύμφωνα με το προτεινόμενο σχέδιο, στο ειδικό ταμείο θα μπορούν να διοχετεύονται τα χρέη των κρατών μελών που υπερβαίνουν το 60 %. Αυτό το τμήμα του χρέους των κρατών-μελών θα καλύπτεται με την έκδοση κοινών χρεογράφων 25ετούς διάρκειας, τα οποία θα εκδίδονται μόνον εάν οι κυβερνήσεις δεσμεύονται για την αποπεράτωση μεταρρυθμίσεων και την εφαρμογή δημοσιονομικών μέτρων.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

— Συμμερίζεται την ανάγκη δημιουργίας Ταμείου Εξυπηρέτησης Χρέους και έκδοσης κοινών χρεογράφων μεταξύ των «17» κρατών μελών ώστε να αντιμετωπιστεί η κρίση χρέους στην Ευρωζώνη;

— Προτίθεται η Επιτροπή να εισηγηθεί έναν τέτοιο μηχανισμό;

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-007953/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(7 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Κοινή εγγύηση δημόσιου χρέους στην ευρωζώνη

Μιλώντας στην Επιτροπή Οικονομικής και Νομισματικής Πολιτικής του ΕΚ, τη Δευτέρα 3 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012, ο Επίτροπος για θέματα Οικονομικών και Νομισματικών Υποθέσεων κ. Ο. Ρεν ανέφερε μεταξύ άλλων: «Αυτό (σ.σ. η δημοσιονομική ένωση) θα μπορεί να συμπεριλαμβάνει συντονισμένη ή κοινή εγγύηση κρατικών χρεών».

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Η θέση αυτή της Επιτροπής έχει κατατεθεί υπόψη του Συμβουλίου;

2. Είναι σε θέση να παραθέσει περισσότερα στοιχεία αναφορικά με την σκέψη αυτή, τις προτάσεις, τον τρόπο λειτουργίας κτλ;

Κοινή απάντηση του κ. Rehn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(10 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η ερώτηση E-007815/12 συνυποβλήθηκε με την ερώτηση E-007953/12, οπότε η ίδια απάντηση καλύπτει και τις δύο ερωτήσεις ([1]).

Μετά τη δημόσια διαβούλευση που διεξήχθη με αντικείμενο την Πράσινη Βίβλο για τα ομόλογα σταθερότητας, η οποία ολοκληρώθηκε κατά το τρέχον έτος, η Επιτροπή μελετά περαιτέρω ορισμένες πτυχές του θέματος, οι οποίες συνδέονται με τη δυνατότητα έκδοσης κοινών χρεογράφων.

Επιπλέον, είναι απαραίτητο να ενισχυθεί περαιτέρω η Ευρωπαϊκή Νομισματική Ένωση (ΕΝΕ), παράλληλα με τις συνεχιζόμενες προσπάθειες εξυγίανσης και μεταρρύθμισης των κρατών μελών, ώστε να καταστεί η κοινή έκδοση βιώσιμη επιλογή μεσοπρόθεσμα, από πολιτική και οικονομική άποψη. Πρέπει να εξασφαλιστούν οι προϋποθέσεις υπό τις οποίες η πρόταση αυτή θα γίνει ελκυστική για όλα τα κράτη μέλη.

Υπ' αυτή την έννοια, η διαδικασία εμβάθυνσης της ΕΝΕ μπορεί να ανοίξει επίσης τον δρόμο για πιο συγκεκριμένα βήματα προς την κοινή έκδοση.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007815/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Debt Servicing Fund

The so-called 'wise men' of the German economy have mooted the idea of a special fund for debt servicing and issuing common bonds between the 17 eurozone Member States in order to tackle the debt crisis in the eurozone. Under the proposed plan, debts of Member States that exceed 60% will be able to be channelled into this special fund. This portion of Member States' debts will be covered through the issuing of common 25-year bonds, which will be issued only if governments commit themselves to completing reforms and implementing fiscal measures.

In view of the above, will the Commission say:

— Does it agree on the need for a fund to service debts and issue common bonds between the 17 eurozone Member States to tackle the debt crisis in the eurozone?

— Will it to recommend that such a mechanism be set up?

Question for written answer E-007953/12
to the Commission
Georgios Papanikolaou (PPE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Common public debt guarantee scheme for the eurozone

Addressing the EP Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on Monday 3 September 2012, Olli Rehn, the Commissioner responsible for economic and monetary affairs, indicated that 'this (i.e. fiscal union) could … involve coordinated or even common … debt issuance'.

In view of this:

1. Has the Commission's position been brought to the attention of the Council?

2. Can it give further details regarding this idea, recommended solutions, modus operandi, etc.?

Joint answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(10 October 2012)

Question E-007815/12 is joined with Question E-007953/12 so the same answer is given for both of them ([1]).

Following the public consultation of the Green Paper on Stability Bonds that concluded earlier this year, the Commission is further studying several specific aspects linked to the possible common issuance of bonds.

Furthermore, the further overall strengthening of the European Monetary Union (EMU), together with ongoing consolidation and reform efforts by Member States, is necessary to make common issuance a politically and financially viable option for the medium term. Conditions must be found under which such proposal would become attractive in all Member States.

In that sense, the integral process of deepening EMU can also pave the way for considering more concrete steps towards common issuance.

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007821/12
to the Commission
Phil Bennion (ALDE) and George Lyon (ALDE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Outbreaks of legionnaires' disease

Can the Commission update us on the work of ELDSnet (the European Legionnaires' Disease Surveillance Network), following the recent outbreaks of legionnaires' disease in Edinburgh (Scotland) and Stoke-on-Trent (England)?

1. Is there any coordinated European plan to enhance the work of the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control on this issue, and can we expect any more formal structure for the sharing of best practice?

2. Is progress being made through laboratory research with a view to finding a breakthrough to help combat this highly problematic disease?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(8 October 2012)

The European Legionnaires' Disease Surveillance Network (ELDSnet) is an EU surveillance network operating under Decision 2119/98/EC ([1]). The ELDSnet was co-funded under the European Union (EU) public health programme and it is now coordinated by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). Its main aim is to provide capacity to detect, assess, and prevent outbreaks of legionellosis within the EU/ European Economic Area (EEA) countries.

A number of outbreaks of legionellosis have been managed under the provisions set under Decision 2119/98/EU. After the notification to the Commission and to the Member States, the ECDC prepares a rapid threat assessment of the outbreak using the data provided by ELDSnet. Afterwards, the threat assessment is circulated to the Public Health Authorities in Member States through the Early Warning and Response System (EWRS), and on that basis, the EU response is launched including regular exchanges of information. So far no additional formal arrangements for sharing of best practice are considered necessary. The same mechanism applies to other communicable diseases and it has been proved to work well.

Concerning research, important advances have been made in the field of improving methods for the detection of the organism and genetic characterisation of the legionella bacteria. However the most recent advancements cannot be considered a breakthrough in combating the disease, where the main need is the appropriate management of the risk of contamination of installations such as wet cooling systems, whirlpools and cold and warm water systems.

([1]) http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1998D2119:20090807:EN:PDF.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007822/12
to the Commission
Roger Helmer (EFD)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Regulation (EU) No 1007/2011

This regulation requires that, by 2014, all garments sold in the Member States carry a statement in the local language indicating their textile composition, and that this statement be visible at the point of sale.

— Is the Commission aware of the very serious problems that this is creating for garment importers in Europe?

A firm in my East Midlands (UK) region imports garments from the Far East and sells them on in a number of Member States. Although the regulation takes effect in 2014, this firm has already been advised by agents and distributors in Italy and Germany that they will in future not accept any stock which is not compliant. But the firm has non-compliant stock both in its UK warehouse and on the water.

The regulation as it stands requires importers to ensure that the label appears in up to 23 languages, if they want to have the flexibility to sell across the EU. It must be firmly affixed, which means (in effect) sewn into a seam. This will be a very large label which is inconvenient both for manufacturers and for consumers.

Moreover, on garments such as shirts, which are often cellophane-wrapped at the point of sale, it is difficult to see how the label can be both securely sewn in and visible outside or through the packaging.

A key objective of the EU is to facilitate trade between Member States. This regulation appears to have the opposite effect.

— Can the Commission offer any flexibility in the timing or implementation of this very worrying regulation?

Answer given by Mr Tajani on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

According to Regulation (EU) No 1007/2011 ([1]), textile products marketed in the EU need to be labelled or marked so as to provide information about their fibre composition. The labelling or marking shall be provided in the official language of the Member State on the territory of which the textile products are made available to the consumer, unless the Member State concerned provides otherwise.

Regulation (EU) No 1007/2011 provides for a transitional period during which textile products which comply with Directive 2008/121/EC ([2]) and which were placed on the market before 8 May 2012 may continue to be made available on the market until November 2014. During this period, economic operators are then allowed to, but not obliged to, trade products that are not yet compliant with the new Regulation.

The regulation also provides that the labelling or marking of textile products shall be durable, easily legible, visible and accessible and, in the case of a label, firmly attached. In the cases specified in Article 14.2, labels or markings may, however, be replaced or supplemented by accompanying commercial documents.

The Commission is not aware of serious problems reported by garment importers in Europe with regard to the labelling provisions of the new Regulation. Besides the transitional period, the regulation does not provide for further flexibility in the timing or implementation. The Commission is, nevertheless, engaging with the national authorities of Member States and also with stakeholders to examine issues related to the correct and smooth application of this new Regulation.

([1]) Regulation (EU) No 1007/2011 of the European Parliament and the Council of 27 September 2011 on textile fibre names and related labelling and marking of the fibre composition of textile products — OJ L 272, 18.10.2011.
([2]) Directive 2008/121/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 January 2009 on textile names — OJ L 19, 23.1.2009.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007826/12
do Komisji
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(4 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Zatrzymania moderatorów opozycyjnych grup internetowych na Białorusi

W ubiegłym tygodniu w Mińsku funkcjonariusze służb specjalnych zatrzymali kilku moderatorów i aktywnych uczestników opozycyjnych grup na portalach społecznościowych. KGB włamało się na strony różnych grup opozycyjnych, m.in. „Mamy dość tego Łukaszenki", która według jej moderatorów miała 37 tys. użytkowników, oraz „Tylko SZOS". Funkcjonariusze wykasowali również wszystkie wpisy oraz zaczęli zamykać dostęp użytkownikom.

31 sierpnia 2012 r. zapadły pierwsze wyroki w tej sprawie – na 5 dni aresztu skazano Pawła Jeucichiejeua, Andrejowi Tkaczouowi wymierzono karę 7 dni aresztu. Obu uznano za winnych drobnego chuligaństwa. Moderator grupy „Mamy dość tego Łukaszenki" Aleh Szramuk z Witebska oraz moderator grupy „Stop Łuka", niepełnoletni Raman Pratasiewicz z Mińska zostali zwolnieni po przesłuchaniu w KGB.

Obrońcy praw człowieka podkreślają, że zatrzymania i przeszukania prowadzone były z pominięciem zasad prawnych, a jeden z zatrzymanych został dotkliwie pobity przez milicję.

Jak potwierdzają wydarzenia z ostatniego tygodnia, władze białoruskie wywierają coraz większą presję wobec opozycjonistów i starają się zastraszyć przedstawicieli społeczeństwa obywatelskiego przed wyborami parlamentarnymi, które zostały wyznaczone na 23 września.

W związku z tym zwracam się z zapytaniem, czy Komisja posiada informacje na temat zatrzymań i wyroków dla moderatorów opozycyjnych grup na portalach społecznościowych i czy ma zamiar podjąć interwencję w tej sprawie?

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

Unia Europejska jest w pełni świadoma aresztowań, o których wspomina Szanowny Pan Poseł oraz coraz częstszych doniesień o prześladowaniach w związku z wyborami parlamentarnymi z 23 września.

Unia Europejska nadal wyraża głębokie zaniepokojenie brakiem wolności słowa, demokratycznych wartości oraz rządów prawa i stale wzywa Białoruś do odejścia od represyjnej polityki i do porzucenia represyjnych działań.

Unia Europejska konsekwentnie wzywała Białoruś do pełnego poszanowania jej międzynarodowych zobowiązań w odniesieniu do praw człowieka oraz rządów prawa i wartości demokratycznych. W związku z powyższym Unia Europejska ponagliła Białoruś między innymi do wypełnienia zaleceń zawartych w ostatnim sprawozdaniu Wysokiego Komisarza Narodów Zjednoczonych ds. Praw Człowieka, które m.in. wzywają rząd do zagwarantowania wolności słowa oraz stworzenia otoczenia prawnego i praktyk prawnych sprzyjających rzeczywistej wolności mediów, zaniechania praktyk cenzury oraz autocenzury oraz zagwarantowania, że środki kontroli Internetu są minimalne i że uregulowania nie prowadzą do cenzury mediów elektronicznych i ograniczania wolności słowa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007826/12
to the Commission
Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Arrests of Internet opposition group moderators in Belarus

In Minsk last week, secret service agents arrested several moderators and active participants in social-network-based opposition groups. The KGB hacked into the websites of various opposition groups, including 'We have had enough of Lukashenko!' — which according to its moderators had 37 000 users — and 'Only SHOS'. The agents also deleted all entries and set about shutting down users' access to the sites.

On 31 August 2012, the first sentences were handed down in this case. Pavel Yetsikhiyeu was sentenced to five days' imprisonment, and Andrey Tkachou was sentenced to seven days' imprisonment. Both were convicted of 'petty hooliganism'. The moderator of the 'We have had enough of Lukashenko!' group, Aleh Shramuk of Vitebsk, and the moderator of the 'Stop Luka!' group, Raman Pratasevich — a minor — from Minsk, were freed following interrogation by the KGB.

Human rights defenders stress that the arrests and searches were conducted in contravention of legal principles. Furthermore, one of those arrested was seriously beaten by the police.

As demonstrated by the events of last week, the Belarusian authorities are putting increasing pressure on opposition activists and are trying to intimidate civil society representatives in the run-up to the parliamentary elections, which are due to be held on 23 September 2012.

Is the Commission aware of the arrests and sentencing of the moderators of social-network-based opposition groups, and does it intend to intervene in this matter?

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

The EU is well aware of the arrests mentioned by the Honourable Member and of the increased reports of repression in the run up to the 23 September parliamentary elections.

The EU continues to express grave concern regarding the lack of freedom of expression, the rule of law and democratic principles, and we continue to call for the repressive policies and actions to be reversed.

The EU has consistently called upon Belarus to fully respect its international commitments as regards human right, the rule of law and democratic principles. In this context, the EU has, *inter alia*, urged Belarus to follow the recommendations of the latest UN HCHR report on Belarus, which, *inter alia*, call on the government to ensure freedom of expression and create a legal environment and practices conducive to the effective freedom of the media; eliminate the practice of censorship and self-censorship; and ensure that Internet control measures are minimal and that regulations do not lead to censorship of electronic media and freedom of speech.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007829/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Aderarea Rusiei la OMC și comerțul cu produse agricole

În luna august, Rusia a aderat la Organizația Mondială a Comerțului (OMC), fapt care presupune obligația de a respecta norme și obligații multilaterale pentru schimburile comerciale reciproce. Comisia este rugată să prezinte strategia sa pentru a asigura respectarea acestor norme în domeniul comerțului cu produse agricole, domeniu în care s-au înregistrat în trecut deficiențe majore.

Răspuns dat de dl De Gucht în numele Comisiei
(11 octombrie 2012)

Comisia salută aderarea Rusiei la OMC după 18 ani de negocieri și consideră că acest lucru va avea un efect pozitiv asupra condițiilor de desfășurare a schimburilor comerciale și a investițiilor între Uniunea Europeană și Rusia. Acest fapt va îmbunătăți condițiile pentru realizarea de investiții și competitivitatea economiei Rusiei. Dat fiind că UE este primul partener comercial al Rusiei și Rusia este al treilea partener comercial al UE, aderarea Rusiei la OMC va spori, fără îndoială, comerțul și investițiile reciproce.

Cu toate acestea, pentru ca acest lucru să devină realitate, Rusia trebuie să respecte obligațiile care îi revin în cadrul OMC. Comisia este îngrijorată de măsurile protecționiste menținute sau instituite de Rusia odată cu aderarea la OMC. Câteva exemple de astfel de măsuri protecționiste sunt taxa de reciclare pentru vehiculele importate introdusă la 1 septembrie 2012, interzicerea importurilor de porci care nu sunt destinați reproducției și de rumegătoare din UE introdusă în martie 2012, interzicerea importurilor de porci de reproducție din Germania și faptul că taxele de import pentru anumite produse cum ar fi cartonul nu au fost puse în aplicare în mod corespunzător. Comisia poartă în prezent discuții bilaterale cu Rusia privind toate aceste aspecte, inclusiv cele legate de produsele agricole. Comisia va lua în considerare, fără îndoială, utilizarea tuturor opțiunilor pentru a rezolva aceste probleme, inclusiv întâlnirile sau soluționarea litigiilor într-un cadru multilateral.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007829/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: Russian membership of WTO and trade in agricultural products

In August, Russia became a member of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), requiring it to comply with multilateral trading standards and obligations. What strategy will be adopted by the Commission to ensure compliance with trading standards regarding agricultural products, an area in which there have been major shortcomings in the past?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The Commission welcomes Russia's WTO accession after 18 years of negotiations as it will have a positive impact on the conditions of trade and investment between Russia and the European Union. It will improve the investment conditions and the competitiveness of the Russian economy. The EU being the first trading partner of Russia and Russia the third trading partner of the EU, the WTO accession of Russia will certainly increase our mutual trade and investment.

Nevertheless, for this to happen, Russia needs to comply with its WTO obligations. The Commission is concerned by the protectionist measures maintained or put in place by Russia upon its WTO accession. Some examples of these protectionist measures are the recycling fee for imported vehicles introduced on 1 September 2012, the import ban on non-breeding pigs and ruminants from the EU introduced in March 2012, the import ban of breeding pigs from Germany, and the fact that import tariffs for certain products like paper board have not been correctly implemented. The Commission is currently engaged in bilateral talks with Russia on all these issues including these related to agricultural goods. The Commission will certainly consider using all options to solve these issues including multilateral fora or dispute settlement.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-007832/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Relațiile comerciale UE — Moldova

În Republica Moldova sunt în derulare dezbateri la nivel politic și public privind eventuala integrare a statului în Uniunea Vamală Rusia — Kazahstan — Belarus. Comisia este rugată să precizeze în mod oficial dacă această eventuală aderare este compatibilă cu acordurile comerciale încheiate cu Uniunea Europeană și care ar fi consecințele în planul relațiilor comerciale UE — Moldova.

Răspuns dat de dl De Gucht în numele Comisiei
(11 octombrie 2012)

În acest moment, singurul acord comercial cu o componentă legată de comerț pe care Moldova l-a semnat cu UE este Acordul de parteneriat și cooperare (APC). APC nu este un acord preferențial. În prezent, UE și Moldova poartă negocieri pentru semnarea unui nou Acord de asociere (AA) menit să înlocuiască actualul APC. Zona de liber schimb complex și cuprinzător, care este, de asemenea, în curs de negociere, va face parte din acord.

Principalul motiv pentru care aderarea Republicii Moldova la uniunea vamală între Rusia, Kazahstan și Belarus nu ar fi compatibilă cu încheierea unui acord de liber schimb complex și cuprinzător cu UE ar fi faptul că Moldova și-ar pierde competența exclusivă cu privire la politica sa de comerț exterior.

Acest lucru ar însemna că UE s-ar confrunta cu o parte contractantă diferită la acordul de liber schimb complex și cuprinzător. Deoarece uniunea vamală are un regim comercial unic față de țările terțe, UE nu poate încheia un acord de liber schimb complex și cuprinzător în mod separat cu țările membre ale uniunii vamale, ci numai cu uniunea vamală în întregime. Aceasta înseamnă că zona de liber schimb complex și cuprinzător ar trebui, de asemenea, să includă teritoriul celorlalte trei state membre ale uniunii vamale (al căror consimțământ ar fi, de asemenea, necesar). Cu toate acestea, în prezent UE nu are în vedere încheierea unui acord de liber schimb complex și cuprinzător cu uniunea vamală, dat fiind că numai unul dintre cele trei state membre ale uniunii vamale (Rusia) este membru al OMC.

Dacă Moldova va deveni membră a Uniunii vamale, acest lucru va însemna că actualele negocieri pentru un acord de liber schimb complex și cuprinzător cu Moldova nu ar mai putea fi continuate și că nu ar mai fi posibilă o relație comercială preferențială între Uniunea Europeană și Moldova.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007832/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: EU-Moldova trade relations

Political and public discussions are in progress in the Republic of Moldova on the possibility of that country becoming a member of the Russia-Kazakhstan-Belarus Customs Union.

Can the Commission state officially whether this potential membership is compatible with the trade agreements Moldova has signed with the European Union, and what its upshot would be in terms of EU-Moldova trade relations?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

At this stage, the only agreement with a trade element the Republic of Moldova has signed with the EU is the partnership and cooperation agreement (PCA). The PCA is not a preferential agreement. The EU and Moldova are in the process of negotiating a new Association Agreement (AA) to replace the current PCA. The Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) which is also now being negotiated will be part of it.

The main reason why the Republic of Moldova's membership in the customs union between Russia, Kazakhstan and Belarus would not be compatible with concluding a DCFTA with the EU would be Moldova's loss of its exclusive competence on its foreign trade policy.

This would mean that the EU would face a different contracting party to the DCFTA. Because the customs union has a unified trade regime towards third countries, the EU can not conclude DCFTAs with separate members of the customs union, but only with the customs union as a whole. This implies that the DCFTA would also have to encompass the territory of the three other customs union members (whose consent would also be required). However, the EU is at this stage not envisaging a DCFTA with the customs union as sofar only one of the three customs union's member (Russia) is a WTO member.

The result of Moldova becoming a member of the customs union would thus be that the current negotiations for a DCFTA with Moldova could no longer be continued and that a preferential trade relation between the European Union and and Moldova would no longer be possible.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007835/12
to the Commission
Roger Helmer (EFD)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: New coal-fired power stations in Germany

Is the Commission aware that Germany has recently opened a new 2200 MW coal-fired power station near Cologne ([1])?

Is the Commission aware of press reports that 23 new coal-fired power plants are currently under construction in Germany?

Does the Commission believe this is compatible with the EU's Large Combustion Plants Directive?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Commission is not aware of Germany's plans as regards the opening or building of individual power plants. Member States are under no obligation to inform the Commission of such specific plans.

Since 2011, under Council regulation (EU, Euratom) No 617/2010 ([2]), Member States must notify the Commission every two years regarding the overall capacity of their energy infrastructure investments.

The construction of combustion installations with a heat output above 300 MW is subject to an environmental impact assessment, in accordance with Directive 2011/92/EU ([3]). Energy plans also have to undergo an assessment, in accordance with Directive 2001/42/EC ([4]), if the conditions of Articles 2a and 3(2) are met. Under both Directives, consultation with the public and the environmental authorities is a key feature.

Pursuant to Article 33 of Directive 2009/31/EC ([5]), Member States shall ensure that operators of combustion plants of 300 MWe or more assess the availability of suitable storage sites, as well as the technical and economic feasibility of transport facilities and retrofitting for CO_2 capture before the original construction or operating licences are granted.

The Honourable Member is referring to Directive 2001/80/EC ([6]), which sets limits for the emission to air of dust, SO_2 and NO_x from large combustion plants. However, this directive does not impose restrictions on the investment plans for thermal power plants of individual Member States, nor of their energy mix.

([1]) http://tinyurl.com/cd5yaoo.
([2]) OJ L 180, 15.7.2010.
([3]) OJ L 26, 28.1.2012.
([4]) OJ L 197, 21.7.2001.
([5]) OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.
([6]) OJ L 309, 27.11.2001.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007840/12
alla Commissione
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE) e Barbara Matera (PPE)
(4 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Caso ILVA

Uno studio commissariato dalla procura di Taranto sull'impatto ambientale dello stabilimento Ilva di Taranto ha dimostrato come le emissioni di polveri sottili (P10) provenienti dall'acciaieria, oltre a creare pericoli per la salute degli operai che lavorano all'interno della struttura, provocherebbero un innalzamento della mortalità e dei ricoveri per patologie tumorali in tutta l'area limitrofa. Per tale ragione, il Tribunale del riesame di Taranto ha sancito il sequestro dell'impianto fino alla sua riqualificazione. Il protrarsi di tale situazione, unito alle difficoltà di risanamento della più grande acciaieria d'Europa, potrebbe comportare il licenziamento dei circa 13 000 operai che lavorano presso l'Ilva.

Si chiede pertanto alla Commissione quanto segue:

— non crede che vi sia una evidente sperequazione tra le tecnologie e le risorse utilizzate negli anni dallo Stato italiano per l'ammodernamento e la sostenibilità ambientale delle acciaierie presenti nel Nord Italia, che mai hanno danneggialo la salute e il benessere della popolazione, e quelle utilizzate all'Ilva di Taranto, che fino a pochi anni fa era statale?

— Non ritiene che sia necessario trovare una soluzione di equilibrio tra il diritto fondamentale alla salute delle persone che vivono nelle aree limitrofe e il diritto al lavoro degli operai di tale stabilimento?

— Non ritiene che gli organi nazionali competenti dovrebbero dare piena attuazione alla direttiva del 1996 riguardante l'istituzione dell'Autorizzazione integrata ambientale (AIA), recepita solo parzialmente dallo Stato italiano?

— Non crede che, in seguito ai lavori della Commissione europea per la concessione della «nuova» Autorizzazione integrata ambientale (AIA) all'Ilva, si dovrà procedere non solo all'attuazione di un programma di riqualificazione dell'impianto ma anche a una bonifica ambientale?

— Non crede che il caso descritto rientri nei parametri previsti dal regolamento (CE) n. 1927/2006 che istituisce un Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione, secondo il quale le autorità nazionali, qualora i licenziamenti abbiano un'incidenza grave sull'economia e sull'occupazione locale, possono presentare domanda di finanziamento?

Risposta di Janez Potočnik a nome della Commissione
(17 ottobre 2012)

L'Italia deve garantire sul proprio territorio nazionale la piena e corretta attuazione della legislazione unionale, compresa la direttiva 2008/1/CE sulla prevenzione e la riduzione integrate dell'inquinamento (direttiva IPPC — Integrated Pollution Prevention and Contro) ([1]), a prescindere dal proprietario, dal gestore o dall'ubicazione dell'impianto industriale in questione. La Commissione ha avviato un procedimento di infrazione nel 2008, in quanto vari impianti italiani erano sprovvisti di autorizzazione IPPC. L'ILVA è oggetto di un'indagine, condotta della Commissione, volta ad appurare se la direttiva IPPC sia stata applicata pienamente e correttamente.

A norma della direttiva IPPC, le autorità competenti devono definire le condizioni di autorizzazione sulla base delle migliori tecniche disponibili per garantire che l'attività industriale operi in modo efficiente ed efficace ed impedisca/riduca l'impatto negativo sull'ambiente e la salute pubblica.

Le autorità nazionali italiane sono competenti a decidere se debba essere rilasciata all'ILVA una nuova autorizzazione IPPC e quali condizioni debbano esservi stabilite. Quanto alla bonifica ambientale da parte dell'ILVA, le autorità competenti devono garantire l'applicazione della direttiva sulla responsabilità ambientale (direttiva 2004/35/CE) ([2]) e di tutte le altre pertinenti disposizioni del diritto nazionale.

([1]) GU L 24 del 29.1.2008.
([2]) GU L 143 del 30.4.2004.

In questa fase, non sembra che il Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione (FEG) possa fornire assistenza ai lavoratori che rischiano di essere licenziati, in quanto il loro licenziamento non appare connesso a mutamenti intervenuti nella struttura del commercio mondiale come previsto invece dal regolamento FEG ([3]).

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

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007840/12
to the Commission
Crescenzio Rivellini (PPE), Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Raffaele Baldassarre (PPE) and Barbara Matera (PPE)
(4 September 2012)

Subject: ILVA

A study commissioned by the public prosecutor of Taranto on the environmental impact of the Ilva plant in Taranto has shown that not only are the emissions of particulate matter (P10) from the steelworks a hazard for the health of the workers inside but they also increase cancer mortality and hospitalisation rates throughout the surrounding area. For this reason, the Taranto Court of Appeal has confirmed the seizure of the plant until it is upgraded. This ongoing situation, coupled with the difficulty of regenerating the largest steelworks in Europe, could result in the laying off of some 13 000 workers at Ilva.

Can the Commission therefore answer the following questions:

— Does it not think there is a clear inequality between the technology and resources used over the years by the Italian Government for the modernisation and environmental sustainability of the steelworks in northern Italy, which have never harmed the health and well-being of the local population, and those used at Ilva in Taranto, which until a few years ago was government-owned?

— Does it not agree that a balanced solution needs to be found between the fundamental right to health of the people living in surrounding areas and the right to work of the workers at this factory?

— Does it not agree that the competent national bodies should fully implement the 1996 directive on the establishment of Integrated Environmental Authorisation (IEA), which has been only partially implemented by the Italian Government?

— Does it not think that, further to the work done by the Commission to grant the 'new' Integrated Environmental Authorisation (IEA) to Ilva, not only does a programme to upgrade the plant need to be implemented, but the environment also needs to be reclaimed?

— Does this case not fall within the parameters laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006 establishing the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund, according to which, when redundancies have a serious impact on the local economy and employment, the national authorities can apply for funding?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

Italy must ensure the full and correct implementation of EU legislation, including Directive 2008/1/EC on integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC), ([1]) in its national territory, irrespective of the owner, the operator or the location of the industrial installation concerned. The Commission launched an infringement proceeding in 2008 as several Italian installations lacked an IPPC permit. As to ILVA, it is subject to an investigation by the Commission whether the IPPC Directive has been fully and correctly applied.

Under the IPPC Directive, the competent authorities must set permit conditions using the best available techniques to ensure that the relevant industrial activity operates in a way that is efficient, effective and that prevents/reduces the adverse impacts on the environment and public health.

The Italian national authorities are competent to decide whether a new IPPC permit must be issued to ILVA and what conditions should be set out therein. As to the clean-up of the environment affected by ILVA, the competent authorities are to ensure the application of the EU environmental liability Directive (2004/35/EC) ([2]) and any other relevant national legal provisions.

([1]) OJ L 24, 29.1.2008.
([2]) OJ L 143, 30.4.2004.

At this stage, it does not seem that the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) could provide any assistance to the workers whose redundancies are being considered because these do not appear to be linked to structural changes in world trade patterns, as required by the EGF Regulation ([3]).

([3]) Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 December 2006 on establishing the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund, OJ L 406, 30.12.2006.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007846/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Effetti sulla salute delle sigarette elettroniche

Le sigarette elettroniche sono dispositivi che emulano le normali sigarette, consentendo al fumatore di inalare vapore acqueo contenente nicotina, apparentemente senza gli effetti cancerogeni derivanti da una normale combustione.

L'università di Atene ha condotto recentemente uno studio sugli effetti a breve termine delle sigarette elettroniche sull'apparato respiratorio su un campione di 32 soggetti (8 non fumatori del tutto sani, 11 fumatori senza patologie diagnosticate e 13 individui affetti da asma o bronco pneumopatia cronica ostruttiva) e lo ha presentato alla conferenza «European Respiratory Society» di Vienna. Il test consisteva nel far fumare a tutti sigarette elettroniche per 10 minuti e procedere immediatamente con test miranti a valutare la funzionalità dell'apparato respiratorio; i risultati hanno mostrato come tutti i soggetti, tranne quelli già affetti da patologie debilitanti per bronchi e polmoni, avessero una resistenza alle vie respiratorie quasi triplicata nel breve periodo.

La Commissione è a conoscenza di questa sperimentazione e come ne valuta i risultati?

Ritiene di promuovere uno studio più esteso e specifico sugli effetti delle sigarette elettroniche sulla salute di chi le usa?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(10 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione ringrazia l'onorevole parlamentare di aver portato alla sua attenzione il recente studio condotto sugli effetti delle sigarette elettroniche sull'apparato respiratorio e la rimanda alla risposta data all'interrogazione scritta E-6243/12 ([1]). La Commissione ritiene che ulteriori studi sugli effetti delle sigarette elettroniche potrebbero contribuire a migliorare la conoscenza relativa a tali articoli.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007846/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Health effects of electronic cigarettes

Electronic cigarettes are devices which simulate normal cigarette smoking by enabling a smoker to inhale water vapour containing nicotine, apparently without the carcinogenic effects of normal cigarette smoke.

A recent study by the University of Athens on the short-term effects of electronic cigarettes on the respiratory mechanism, conducted on a sample of 32 people (8 healthy non-smokers, 11 smokers with no known illnesses and 13 people suffering from asthma or chronic obstructive bronco-pathologies) was presented at a European Respiratory Society Conference in Vienna. The study consisted of the whole sample population smoking electronic cigarettes for 10 minutes and then having their respiratory function tested immediately. The findings showed that across the whole population, with the exception of those already suffering from debilitating bronchial and pulmonary problems, respiratory tract resistance almost tripled over a short period.

Is the Commission aware of this experiment, and what is its assessment of its results?

Does it not consider that a more extensive and in-depth study should be conducted on the effects of electronic cigarettes on the health of people who smoke them?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(10 October 2012)

The Commission thanks the Honourable Member for bringing to its attention this recent study on the effect of electronic cigarettes on lung function and would like to refer the Member to its answer to Question E-6243/12 ([1]). The Commission believes that further studies of electronic cigarettes could help to improve knowledge on these products.

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007847/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Le vignette online inducono il consumo di psicofarmaci tra i bambini

Negli Stati Uniti e in Gran Bretagna sono in aumento i siti online di case farmaceutiche in cui, attraverso storie a fumetti di supereroi che soffrono di ADHD (sindrome di iperattività) vengono spiegati ai bambini e ai loro genitori quali sono i sintomi di questo disturbo e i metodi migliori per porvi rimedio. Spesso però questo tipo di pubblicità invita all'assunzione di psicofarmaci dagli effetti collaterali molto pericolosi per i bambini. Da un anno l'associazione «Giù le Mani dai Bambini» denuncia questo tipo di marketing ingannevole, chiamato «disease mongering» (traffico legato alle malattie), atto alla fabbricazione ad arte di malattie, quali l'ADHD, che negli ultimi anni hanno garantito introiti proficui alle case farmaceutiche statunitensi e britanniche. Questa associazione è il Comitato per la farmacovigilanza pediatrica più rappresentativo in Italia e sottolinea anche la scarsa chiarezza delle schede dei farmaci, in cui gli effetti collaterali e le possibili interazioni con altri farmaci sono spiegati in maniera sommaria, non garantendo ai genitori dei bimbi iperattivi la giusta informazione sui rischi che l'assunzione di potenti psicofarmaci può causare nei loro figli.

È la Commissione a conoscenza della pratica del «disease mongering» (traffico legato alle malattie)? Se sì, può far sapere se esistono studi UE circa eventuali interessi comuni tra case farmaceutiche e associazioni mediche, che possono favorire la sponsorizzazione di determinati psicofarmaci, ad esempio metanfetamine per curare l'ADHD?

Nel caso in cui non esistano già studi al riguardo, prevede di avviarne a breve? Se tali studi confermassero le denunce dell'associazione sopracitata riguardo agli alti rischi cui vanno incontro i bambini, cui è stata diagnosticata l'ADHD, e che quindi assumono regolarmente psicofarmaci per curarla, come valuta la Commissione la proposta di limitare l'accessibilità a quei siti farmaceutici che sponsorizzano tali farmaci?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(15 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione è a conoscenza delle pratiche definite «disease mongering».

A seconda delle modalità di realizzazione di tali pratiche, esse potrebbero costituire una violazione delle attuali disposizioni della legislazione farmaceutica dell'UE, in particolare del divieto di pubblicizzare presso il grande pubblico farmaci disponibili unicamente su prescrizione.

Secondo le informazioni di cui dispone la Commissione, non esistono studi su eventuali interessi comuni fra case farmaceutiche e associazioni mediche che favoriscono la sponsorizzazione di psicofarmaci disponibili a livello europeo. Poiché l'applicazione delle suddette disposizioni legislative spetta agli Stati membri, la Commissione non intende effettuare studi di questo tipo.

In tale contesto, la Commissione desidera ricordare che aveva previsto di operare un chiarimento delle norme esistenti sulla pubblicità di medicinali disponibili unicamente su prescrizione con le sue proposte del 10 dicembre 2008. L'obiettivo delle proposte riguardava il mantenimento di un rigoroso divieto di pubblicizzare tali farmaci direttamente ai consumatori, nonché la definizione di norme chiare sulle modalità di fornitura di informazioni pertinenti sui siti web. Nel novembre 2010, la Commissione aveva presentato proposte modificate, che accoglievano in ampia misura gli emendamenti adottati dal Parlamento europeo in prima lettura. Sfortunatamente, nel maggio 2012, il Consiglio ha semplicemente dichiarato che non era possibile ottenere la maggioranza qualificata su una posizione comune basata sulle suddette proposte e ha sospeso il dibattito.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007847/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Online cartoons encourage consumption of psychotropic drugs among children

In the United States and the UK there are an increasing number of pharmaceutical company websites which, through comic strips of superheroes suffering from ADHD (Attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder) explain to children and their parents what the symptoms of this disorder are and the best ways to remedy it. Often, however, this type of advertising encourages the taking of psychotropic drugs with side effects that are very dangerous for children. For the past year, the association *Giù le Mani dai Bambini* ('Hands Off Children') has been reporting this type of deceptive marketing known as 'disease mongering', which purposely fabricates diseases such as ADHD which in recent years have guaranteed substantial profits for U.S. and UK pharmaceutical companies. This association is the most representative paediatric drug safety monitoring committee in Italy and also highlights the lack of clarity on drug information sheets, where side effects and possible interactions with other drugs are explained in a perfunctory manner, failing to provide parents of hyperactive children with proper information on the risks that taking powerful drugs can pose to their children.

Is the Commission aware of the practice of disease mongering? If so, can it say whether there are any EU studies on possible common interests linking pharmaceutical companies and medical associations that could encourage the sponsorship of certain psychotropic drugs, such as methamphetamine to treat ADHD?

If no such studies have yet been carried out, will the Commission do so shortly? Should these studies confirm the reports by the abovementioned association about the hazards for children who have been diagnosed with ADHD and therefore regularly take drugs to treat it, what does the Commission think of the proposal to limit access to all pharmaceutical sites that sponsor these drugs?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the so-called disease mongering practice.

Depending on how such disease mongering is done, it could violate existing provisions of EU pharmaceutical legislation, in particular the ban to advertise prescription-only medicines to the general public.

To the Commission's knowledge, there are no studies on possible common interests linking pharmaceutical companies and medical associations that encourage the sponsorship of psychotropic drugs available at European level. As the enforcement of the above legislative provisions is a responsibility of Member States, the Commission does not plan to carry out such a study either.

In this context the Commission would like to recall that it envisaged clarifying the existing rules on advertising on prescription-only medicines through its proposals of 10 December 2008. The proposals aim was to continue the strict prohibition of direct-to-consumer advertising of these medicines while setting out clear rules on how to provide pertinent information through websites. In November 2010, the Commission presented its modified proposals which to a large extent took up the amendments adopted by the European Parliament in first reading. Unfortunately, in May 2012, the Council simply stated that there was no possibility to obtain a qualified majority in the Council in favour of a common position based on these proposals and discontinued their discussion.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007851/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(5 september 2012)

Betreft: 68 illegalen aangekomen op Spaans eiland

Na Lampedusa en Malta is nu Isla de la Tierra aan de beurt. Op dit Spaanse onbewoonde eilandje, voor de kust van Marokko, zijn gisteren 68 illegale immigranten zwemmend aangekomen; zij waren vanaf het Marokkaanse strand vertrokken. Woensdag waren al 19 illegale immigranten op Isla de la Tierra aangekomen. Het is de eerste keer dat men probeert via deze route de EU te bereiken. De Spaanse regering overlegt momenteel met Marokko over de aanpak van deze illegale immigratie.

De Spaanse Guardia Civil heeft de meeste migranten, die naar Spanje wilden, ondertussen van het eiland verwijderd en overgedragen aan de Marokkaanse politie. Tien migranten zijn tóch tot Spanje toegelaten.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met de berichten „Illegalen zwemmen naar Spaans eiland" ([1]) en „Spanje en Marokko halen migranten van eiland" ([2])?

2. Wat vindt de Commissie van de illegale immigrantenstroom vanuit Marokko naar Isla de la Tierra? Vindt de Commissie het goed dat het merendeel van de immigranten naar Marokko is teruggestuurd? Betreurt de Commissie het dat tien immigranten tóch tot Spanje, en daarmee tot de EU, zijn toegelaten? Zo neen, waarom niet? Op grond waarvan zijn deze immigranten toegelaten?

3. Is de Commissie van plan om in dergelijke situaties voortaan Frontex in te zetten? Zo neen, waarom niet?

4. Heeft de Commissie lering getrokken uit de massale immigrantenstroom vanuit Noord-Afrika naar Lampedusa — en ondertussen ook naar Malta — en de negatieve gevolgen daarvan? Is de Commissie dientengevolge van plan te voorkomen dat Isla de la Tierra, en andere eilanden, net zo met immigranten overspoeld zal worden als Lampedusa en daarmee een volgende „toegangspoort tot de EU" zal worden? Zo neen, waarom niet?

5. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat de EU niet nog meer immigranten kan gebruiken? Zo neen, staat de Commissie het dan op z'n minst Nederland toe om de immigranten — die via duistere routes de EU wisten binnen te komen — aan de Nederlandse grens tegen te houden en terug te sturen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(15 oktober 2012)

De Commissie is op de hoogte van de gebeurtenissen op Isla de Tierra en heeft Spanje verduidelijking gevraagd om te kunnen vaststellen of de regels van het EU-acquis nageleefd zijn. De Commissie hecht veel belang aan de bestrijding van illegale migratie en ze wil de na te leven internationale en EU-verplichtingen in herinnering brengen, vooral die ten aanzien van personen die internationale bescherming behoeven.

Frontex is sterk aanwezig in het westelijk deel van de Middellandse Zee, waar het het Europees patrouillenetwerk Indalo inzet om de regionale overeenkomsten inzake grensbewaking en samenwerking met de betrokken derde landen in het westelijk deel van de Middellandse Zee te verbeteren. Het Europees patrouillenetwerk Minerva wordt ingezet om de grenscontrole in de Spaanse havens Algeciras, Ceuta en Tarifa tijdens het vakantieseizoen in de zomer te versterken.

Het ziet ernaar uit dat de gebeurtenis op Isla de Tierra een alleenstaand geval is, maar de Commissie zal de situatie verder volgen.

([1]) http://www.powned.tv/nieuws/buitenland/2012/09/illegalen_zwemmen_naar_eiland.html
([2]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2664/Nieuws/article/detail/3310796/2012/09/04/Spanje-en-Marokko-halen-migranten-van-eiland.dhtml?utm_source=RSSReader & utm_medium=RSS.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007851/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Arrival of a group of 68 illegal immigrants on a Spanish island

After Lampedusa and Malta, now it is Isla de la Tierra's turn. Yesterday 68 illegal immigrants reached the uninhabited Spanish island by swimming from the nearby Moroccan coast. The previous Wednesday a further 19 illegal immigrants had already reached Isla de la Tierra in the same way. This is the first time that an attempt has been made to enter the EU via this route. The Spanish Government is currently holding talks with Morocco on the approach to be taken to this form of illegal immigration.

The Spanish Guardia Civil has now removed most of the immigrants seeking to enter Spain from the island and handed them over to the Moroccan police. Ten immigrants have been allowed to enter Spain.

1. Is the Commission aware of the reports entitled 'Illegal immigrants swim to Spanish island' ([1]) and 'Spain and Morocco remove immigrants from island' ([2])?

2. What view does the Commission take of the sudden arrival of groups of illegal immigrants from Morocco on Isla de la Tierra? Does the Commission approve of the fact that most of the immigrants have been sent back to Morocco? Does the Commission deplore the fact that 10 immigrants have been allowed to enter Spain, and therefore the EU? If not, why not? Why have these immigrants been allowed to enter the EU?

3. Does the Commission plan to deploy Frontex officers if similar situations arise in the future? If not, why not?

4. Has the Commission learned lessons from the mass arrivals of immigrants from North Africa in Lampedusa — and in the meantime also in Malta — and the resulting problems? Does the Commission plan to take action to ensure that Isla de la Tierra, and other islands, are not overwhelmed by influxes of immigrants, as Lampedusa was, and thus become further 'gateways to the EU'? If not, why not?

5. Does the Commission agree that the EU cannot take in any more immigrants? If not, will the Commission at least allow the Netherlands to deny entry to immigrants who have sought to reach the EU by obscure routes?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of the events which occurred in Isla de Tierra and has requested clarifications to Spain in order to ascertain whether EU *acquis* rules have been respected. The Commission attaches high importance to the fight against irregular migration, and recalls that there are EU and international obligations to be respected, notably in regard to persons in need of international protection.

Frontex has a strong presence in the Western Mediterranean, with European Patrol Network (EPN) Indalo which aims to improve regional border surveillance and cooperation arrangements with the relevant third countries in the western Mediterranean area and EPN Minerva which aims to strengthen the border control during the summer holiday season, in the Spanish ports of Algeciras, Ceuta and Tarifa.

For the moment, the incident in Isla de Tierra seems an isolated case, but the Commission will continue to monitor the situation.

([1]) http://www.powned.tv/nieuws/buitenland/2012/09/illegalen_zwemmen_naar_eiland.html
([2]) http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2664/Nieuws/article/detail/3310796/2012/09/04/Spanje-en-Marokko-halen-migranten-van-eiland.dhtml?utm_source=RSSReader&utm_medium=RSS.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007852/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(5 september 2012)

Betreft: 150 tot 160 Afrikaanse migranten aangekomen op Malta

150 tot 160 Afrikaanse migranten hebben Malta bereikt. Maltese strijdmachten (AFM) melden dat reddingsteams een boot met negentig mensen uit Somalië en Eritrea naar het eiland hebben gebracht.

Eerder werd een opblaasbare boot met 60 migranten onderschept en naar het eiland gebracht.

De Maltese en Italiaanse grenscontrole is gewaarschuwd voor een nieuwe migrantenstroom vanuit Noord-Afrika naar de EU.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Twee boten met 160 Afrikaanse migranten aangekomen op Malta" ([1])?

2. Wat vindt de Commissie ervan dat Malta, en daarmee de EU, een nieuwe migrantenstroom vanuit Noord-Afrika te wachten staat? Is de Commissie voornemens dit tegen te houden? Is de Commissie van plan Frontex in te zetten? Zo neen, waarom niet?

3. Volgens welke route zijn de migranten vanuit Somalië — Eritrea naar Malta gevaren? Wat was het eerste veilige land dat zij op hun route zijn tegengekomen?

4. Heeft de Commissie lering getrokken uit de massale migrantenstroom vanuit Noord-Afrika naar Lampedusa en de negatieve gevolgen daarvan? Is de Commissie dientengevolge van plan te voorkomen dat Malta net zo met migranten overspoeld zal worden als Lampedusa? Zo neen, waarom niet?

5. Deelt de Commissie de mening dat de EU niet nog meer migranten kan gebruiken? Zo neen, staat de Commissie het dan op z'n minst Nederland toe om de migranten die op Malta aankomen aan de Nederlandse grens tegen te houden en terug te sturen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(15 oktober 2012)

De Commissie volgt de illegale migratie naar de EU via de Middellandse Zee aandachtig en is op de hoogte van de door het geachte Parlementslid vermelde gebeurtenis.

Frontex is aanwezig in de Middellandse Zee met verschillende gezamenlijke operaties, met name de gezamenlijke operatie Hermes die bijzondere aandacht schenkt aan de routes van Tunesië en Libië naar Italië, en de gezamenlijke operatie Poseidon Sea die als doel heeft om illegale migratie vooral van het westelijk deel van de Turkse kust en Egypte naar Griekenland en Italië aan te pakken. Op dit moment zijn er geen specifieke Frontex-operaties bezig rond Malta, gezien er geen akkoord is tussen Malta en andere landen over de ontscheping van opgepakte migranten.

De illegale migranten die naar Malta komen, zijn vooral afkomstig van Somalië en reizen eerst door Libië. Het is aan Malta om overeenkomstig het EU-acquis de status van die personen te bekijken en om te beslissen of zij zouden mogen blijven of zouden moeten terugkeren naar hun land van oorsprong. Migranten zonder wettelijk recht om te blijven, mogen in geen geval naar andere EU landen reizen.

De Commissie wijst erop dat de internationale en EU-verplichtingen nageleefd moeten worden door de lidstaten wanneer zij actie ondernemen om illegale migratie te bestrijden, vooral wat betreft personen die internationale bescherming behoeven.

([1]) http://www.demorgen.be/dm/nl/990/Buitenland/article/detail/1486723/2012/08/16/Twee-boten-met-160-Afrikaanse-migranten-aangekomen-op-Malta.dhtml.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007852/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Arrival of between 150 and 160 African immigrants in Malta

A group of between 150 and 160 African immigrants have reached Malta. The Maltese armed forces have reported that rescue teams towed a boat containing some 90 people from Somalia and Eritrea to the island.

Earlier an inflatable with some 60 immigrants on board had been intercepted and towed into port in Malta.

The Maltese and Italian border control authorities have been warned to expect a new influx of immigrants into the EU from North Africa.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report entitled 'Two boats with some 160 African immigrants reach Malta' ([1])?

2. What is the Commission's response to the fact that Malta, and therefore the EU, is facing a new wave of illegal immigration from North Africa? Is the Commission prepared to take action to combat this influx of immigrants? Does the Commission plan to deploy Frontex officers? If not, why not?

3. What route did the immigrants take from Somalia/Eritrea to Malta? What was the first safe country they passed on their route?

4. Has the Commission learned lessons from the mass influx of immigrants from North Africa which the Italian island of Lampedusa was forced to cope with and the resulting problems? Is the Commission prepared to take action to ensure that Malta is not overwhelmed in the same way as Lampedusa was? If not, why not?

5. Does the Commission agree that the EU cannot take in any more immigrants? If not, will the Commission at least allow the Netherlands to deny entry to the immigrants who have arrived in Malta?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Commission is following closely irregular migration towards the EU via the Mediterranean and is aware of the events mentioned by the Honourable Member.

Frontex is present in the Mediterranean with several Joint Operations, notably OJ Hermes with a special focus on the routes from Tunisia and Libya to Italy and OJ Poseidon Sea with the objective of tackling irregular migration mainly from the Western Turkish coast and Egypt towards Greece and Italy. No specific Frontex operations are currently taking place around Malta, as there is no agreement between Malta and other countries on the disembarkation of detected migrants.

Irregular migrants to Malta mainly originate from Somalia and transit through Libya. It is Malta's responsibility to examine the status of those persons to assess whether they should be permitted to stay or returned to their countries of origin in accordance with EU *acquis*. In any event, migrants with no legal entitlement to stay are not permitted to travel to other EU countries.

The Commission points out that the EU and international obligations must be respected by Member States when they take action to combat irregular immigration, notably in regard to persons in need of international protection.

([1]) http://www.demorgen.be/dm/nl/990/Buitenland/article/detail/1486723/2012/08/16/Twee-boten-met-160-Afrikaanse-migranten-aangekomen-op-Malta.dhtml.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007855/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(5 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Subida do preço dos cereais nos mercados internacionais

Os preços dos cereais nos mercados internacionais, de acordo com os dados da FAO, sofreram um aumento de 17 por cento de junho para julho, esperando-se novos e ainda mais graves aumentos. A especulação com os preços dos cereais, expressa no Mercado de Futuros da Bolsa de Chicago, regista lucros escandalosos e desumanos com retornos idênticos, por exemplo, aos das trocas comerciais com o Ouro. Uma das consequências desta especulação é a tragédia da fome. Assim foi em 2007 e em 2008 e assim poderá voltar a suceder num futuro próximo.

A política de ocupação de terras agrícolas para produção de matérias-primas, incluindo o uso de cereais como o milho, para o fabrico de biocombustíveis é uma das razões para a subida do preço dos cereais nos mercados internacionais.

Em face desta evolução preocupante e dos riscos evidentes que a situação comporta, solicito à Comissão que me informe sobre o seguinte:

1. Que medidas foram adotadas pela UE desde a crise alimentar de 2007/2008 e até ao presente momento, tendo em conta os efeitos da especulação sobre a disponibilidade de alimentos?

2. Que avaliação faz a Comissão da evolução recente dos preços dos cereais nos mercados internacionais?

3. Que medidas adicionais irá adotar em face desta evolução?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(9 de outubro de 2012)

Além de elaborar e contribuir para programas de ajuda humanitária nas zonas afetadas, o objetivo da Comissão consiste em aumentar a transparência nos mercados financeiro e físico, contribuindo para o seu melhor funcionamento, o que permitirá aos reguladores e aos participantes no mercado apreender melhor a interação entre mercados financeiros e mercados físicos de produtos de base, assim como evitar práticas abusivas. A Comissão adotou várias propostas legislativas destinadas a reforçar os mercados financeiros, nomeadamente os mercados de produtos derivados, e a assegurar a integridade dos mercados, bem como a proteção dos investidores. Além disso, adotou o Regulamento Infraestrutura do Mercado Europeu, relativo aos instrumentos derivados do mercado de balcão, às contrapartes centrais e aos repositórios de transações. A Comissão participa ativamente nos debates do G20 sobre a volatilidade dos preços, que levaram ao estabelecimento do Sistema de Informação do Mercado Agrícola (SIMA) e do Fórum de Resposta Rápida, com o objetivo de coordenar as reações políticas por parte dos participantes em caso de crises alimentares.

A nível mundial, a maioria dos mercados está em alta desde o início de agosto de 2012, devido às perspetivas de quebra da produção de milho nos Estados Unidos e de trigo na região do mar Negro. A redução da oferta e as perspetivas de redução das existências no final da campanha de 2012/2013 fizeram aumentar os preços a nível mundial.

O Grupo de Informação AMIS reunir-se-á em outubro de 2012 para debater a situação do mercado mundial; se necessário, seguir-se-á uma reunião do Fórum de Resposta Rápida. A Comissão continua a adaptar as políticas pertinentes às condições do mercado e aos desafios emergentes, como ficou demonstrado pelas recentes propostas para a CAP no horizonte 2020.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007855/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Rising price of cereals on the international markets

According to data provided by the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), cereal prices increased by 17% between June and July 2012, and further, even higher, increases are expected. Speculation in cereal prices, as expressed on the Chicago futures market, is giving rise to scandalous and inhuman profits on a par with those obtained from trading in gold. One of the consequences of this speculation is the tragedy of hunger, as was the case in 2007 and 2008, and may well be so again in the near future.

The policy of taking over agricultural land for the production of raw materials for biofuel, and the use of cereals such as corn for this purpose, is one of the reasons why cereal prices have increased on the international markets.

In view of this worrying development and the obvious dangers associated with it, could the Commission answer the following:

1. What measures has the EU adopted since the 2007-2008 food crisis and up to the present moment to counter the effects of speculation on the food supply?

2. How does the Commission view the recent evolution of cereal prices on the international markets?

3. What further steps will it take to address this situation?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

In addition to providing and contributing to humanitarian relief programs to affected areas, the Commission's goal is to improve transparency on the financial and physical markets which should contribute to a better functioning of markets. This would allow regulators and market participants to better understand the interaction between financial and physical commodity markets, and help to prevent abusive practices. The Commission adopted a number of legislative proposals to strengthen financial markets, including commodity derivatives markets (MiFID) and to ensure market integrity and investor protection (MAD). Moreover, the Commission adopted the European Market Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR) on Over-The-Counter derivatives, central counterparties and trade repositories. The Commission actively participates in G20 discussions on price volatility, including the setting up of the Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS) and a Rapid Response Forum, which aims at coordinating policy reaction among participants in case of food crises.

At the world level, markets are mostly increasing since the beginning of August 2012, bolstered by deteriorating US maize production prospects and falling expectations for Black Sea wheat crops. Tight supplies and prospects of lower world 2012/13 ending stocks increased the world prices.

The AMIS Information Group will meet in October 2012 to discuss the global market situation and if needed, a meeting of the Rapid Response Forum will follow. The Commission continues to adapt the relevant policies in light of market conditions and emerging challenges, as demonstrated by the recent proposals on the CAP towards 2020.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007856/12
à Comissão
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(5 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Dependência alimentar em relação ao estrangeiro

Em Portugal, regista-se uma preocupante situação de dependência alimentar em relação ao estrangeiro, particularmente no que toca a cereais, oleaginosas e proteaginosas — a base fundamental da alimentação humana.

A balança comercial de produtos agrícolas, por exemplo, agravou-se 9 % em 2011, face ao ano anterior. A produção nacional de cereais só assegura cerca de 20 % das necessidades atuais. Tudo isto se verificou não obstante a redução do mercado interno provocada pelo programa FMI-UE atualmente em curso. O défice de produção cerealífera e pecuária reflete-se, sobremaneira, no défice brutal da balança comercial em bens agroalimentares, que se aproxima dos 4 000 milhões de euros por ano.

Os produtores de leite — que hoje se manifestaram em Lisboa — designadamente da Região de Entre Douro e Minho vão ver o preço do leite baixar mais um cêntimo, o que perfaz uma quebra de três cêntimos e meio, só este ano. Isto acontece depois das rações terem aumentado em cerca de 25 % e o gasóleo em cerca de 7 %.

Tendo em conta esta situação, pergunto à Comissão:

1. Que análise faz das consequências do desligamento das ajudas diretas aos agricultores da produção (que vem permitindo a latifundiários e grandes empresas receberem enormes somas de dinheiro público sem obrigatoriedade de produzir bens agroalimentares), nomeadamente ao nível das quebras de produção registadas em países como Portugal? Que medidas pensa adotar para contrariar esta situação?

2. Tendo em conta a persistência de uma grave crise no setor leiteiro e a manifesta insuficiência das medidas adotadas pela Comissão neste domínio até ao momento, que outras medidas pondera adotar caso a situação continue sem melhoras ou venha mesmo a piorar, como vem sucedendo em Portugal?

3. Faz a Comissão alguma avaliação periódica do nível de dependência alimentar dos diferentes Estados-Membros? Não considera essa informação necessária, por razões óbvias de segurança alimentar, entre outras?

Resposta dada por Dacian Cioloş em nome da Comissão
(15 de outubro de 2012)

A Comissão entende que a dissociação dos pagamentos diretos tem dado bons resultados, pois permite que os agricultores ponderem as suas decisões de produção com base nos sinais do mercado e na procura real, sem que tal afete o nível dos pagamentos diretos. A possibilidade de manter pagamentos associados em condições específicas permite que os Estados-Membros respondam às necessidades de setores vulneráveis. Embora a proposta da PAC pós-2013 mantenha as orientações gerais das anteriores reformas da PAC no sentido de uma orientação para o mercado, pretende-se melhorar o direcionamento dos pagamentos diretos através de várias medidas, incluindo a possibilidade de pagamentos associados numa base voluntária em circunstâncias bem justificadas. O segundo pilar da PAC propicia aos Estados-Membros instrumentos que lhes permitem a prossecução de objetivos específicos.

No que respeita ao setor do leite, os preços no produtor estiveram sujeitos a pressão no primeiro semestre do corrente ano devido ao padrão sazonal da produção leiteira, exacerbado pela oferta crescente a nível mundial. Todavia, a situação não pode ser considerada crítica ao nível da União. Acresce ainda que a evolução dos preços dos produtos de base durante os meses de verão sugere o aumento dos preços do leite no produtor nos próximos meses. No entanto, há problemas específicos em certos tipos de explorações devido à sua dependência da compra de alimentos, cujos preços têm vindo a aumentar. Entre as medidas destinadas a reduzir a pressão nessas explorações inclui-se a possibilidade do adiantamento dos pagamentos diretos para 2013 e a ativação dos auxílios *de minimis* até 7 500 euros por exploração durante três anos.

Além disso, a Comissão interage com os Estados-Membros em causa, no sentido de analisar as propostas que apresentem sobre novas medidas no âmbito da atual PAC.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007856/12
to the Commission
João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Food dependency on outside countries

Portugal is facing a worrying situation in which it is dependent on outside countries for food supplies, particularly grains, oils and proteins, which are all basic elements of human diet.

By way of example, Portugal's trade balance for agricultural products fell by 9% in 201 compared with the previous year. National cereal production covers about 20% of present needs. This trend is noticeable despite the reduction in the internal market caused by the application of the current IMF-EU programme in Portugal. The deficit in grain and meat production is clearly reflected in the drastic deficit in the trade balance for agro-food products, which stands at around EUR 4 billion per year.

Milk producers — who today staged a demonstration in Lisbon — particularly those in the Douro-Minho region, are seeing the price of milk drop by another cent, making an overall drop of three cents so far this year. This has been accompanied by a rise of almost 25% in the price of feed and almost 7% in that of diesel.

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

1. How does it assess the results of the decoupling from production of direct aid to farmers (allowing large landowners and major enterprises to receive huge amounts of public money with no obligation to produce agro-food products), particularly in terms of the breakdown in production being experienced in countries such as Portugal? What measures does the Commission intend to introduce to remedy this situation?

2. In view of the ongoing serious crisis in the milk sector and the evident inadequacy of the measures so far adopted to address it by the Commission, what other measures is it considering introducing if the situation fails to improve or even worsens, as is the case in Portugal?

3. Does the Commission carry out any periodic assessment of the level of food dependency in the various Member States? Does it not consider this information necessary, for obvious reasons of food security, among other reasons?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Commission considers that the decoupling of direct payments has been successful in allowing farmers to consider their production decisions based on market signals and actual demand, and without affecting the level of direct payments. The possibility to maintain coupled payments under specific conditions allows Member States to address the needs of vulnerable sectors. While the proposal on the CAP post-2013 maintains the general direction of previous CAP reforms towards market orientation, it aims to improve the targeting of direct payments through various measures, including the possibility for voluntary coupled payments under well justified circumstances. The second pillar of the CAP provides Member States with instruments to pursue specific objectives.

Regarding the milk sector, farm gate milk prices have been under pressure in the first half of the year due to the seasonal pattern of milk production, exacerbated by the increased milk supply worldwide. However, the situation cannot be qualified as a crisis at Union level. Furthermore, commodity price developments observed during the summer months suggest a rebound in farm gate milk prices over the coming months. However, particular problems for certain types of holdings are occurring as a result of their dependence on purchased feed, for which prices have been increasing. Measures to alleviate the pressure on such holdings include the possibility of advanced direct payments for 2013 and the activation of *de minimis* aids up to EUR 7 500 per holding on a three year period.

Moreover, the Commission is closely working with the concerned Member Sates in order to analyse their proposals on new measures in the light of current CAP.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite P-007860/12
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(5 septembre 2012)

Objet: Règles de comptabilisation des émissions et absorptions de gaz à effet de serre résultant des activités UTCATF: le cas des feux de forêt

Dans la proposition de décision relative aux règles comptables et aux plans d'action concernant les émissions et les absorptions de gaz à effet de serre résultant des activités liées à l'utilisation des terres, au changement d'affectation des terres et à la foresterie (COM(2012)0093 — C7-0074/2012 — 2012/0042(COD)), l'article 9, intitulé «Règles comptables pour les perturbations naturelles», établit des dispositions permettant aux États membres d'exclure des calculs relevant de leurs obligations comptables les émissions non anthropiques de gaz à effet de serre par des sources causées par des perturbations naturelles, dans le respect des conditions du paragraphe 2.

Durant l'été 2012, des incendies ont dévasté des milliers d'hectares de forêt en France, en Espagne, au Portugal, en Italie et en Grèce.

Dans de nombreux cas, ces incendies résultaient d'actes illégaux et criminels, hors du contrôle des États.

Selon les dispositions de l'article 9 mentionné ci-dessus, ces événements sont-ils considérés comme «non anthropiques»? L'article 9 pourrait-il également couvrir ce type de feux de forêt?

Réponse donnée par Mme Hedegaard au nom de la Commission
(5 octobre 2012)

La proposition de la Commission COM(2012) 93 prévoit des dispositions spécifiques permettant aux États membres d'exclure de leurs calculs les *émissions non anthropiques de gaz à effet de serre* dues à des perturbations naturelles échappant à leur contrôle. Les critères d'exclusion applicables aux émissions provenant des feux de forêts sont identiques aux conditions établies au niveau international. La Commission entend garantir que les dispositions relatives aux émissions dues à des perturbations affectant les forêts qui peuvent bénéficier de l'exclusion dans l'UE sont cohérentes avec les dispositions prévues par le protocole de Kyoto. Toutefois, étant donné que les règles relatives à l'exclusion des émissions dues à des «perturbations naturelles» n'ont été adoptées que récemment, nous ne disposons pas encore d'indications ou d'expérience concernant leur application ou interprétation dans un contexte international. La conférence des parties à la convention des Nations unies sur le changement climatique a demandé au groupe d'experts intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat d'élaborer des orientations en vue de l'application des règles adoptées au niveau international.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007860/12
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Accounting rules for emissions and removals of greenhouse gases resulting from LULUCF activities: forest fires

In the 'proposal for a decision on accounting rules and action plans on greenhouse gas emissions and removals resulting from activities related to land use, land use change and forestry' (COM(2012)0093 — C7-0074/2012 — 2012/0042(COD)), Article 9, entitled 'Accounting rules for natural disturbances', lays down provisions that enable Member States to exclude non-anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions by sources resulting from natural disturbances from calculations relevant to their accounting obligations, provided that the conditions set out in paragraph 2 are met.

During the summer of 2012, fires destroyed thousands of hectares of forest in France, Spain, Portugal, Italy and Greece.

In many cases, these fires were the result of illegal and criminal acts, beyond the control of Member States.

Under the provisions of the abovementioned Article 9, are these events considered 'non-anthropogenic'? Could Article 9 also cover this type of forest fire?

Answer given by Ms Hedegaard on behalf of the Commission
(5 October 2012)

In the Commission's Proposal COM(2012)93, specific provisions allow Member States to exclude from their accounting *non-anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions* resulting from natural disturbances beyond their control. The exclusion criteria for emissions from forest fires are identical to the conditions decided at international level. It is the intention of the Commission to ensure that the emissions from forest disturbances eligible for exclusion in the EU will be consistent with those under the Kyoto Protocol. However, given that the rules on excluding emissions from 'natural disturbances' have only recently been decided upon, there are yet no guidelines or practice on their application and interpretation under the international framework. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has been requested by the Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Convention on Climate Change to elaborate guidance for the application of the rules adopted at the international level.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007863/12
à la Commission
Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(5 septembre 2012)

Objet: DVD et pictogrammes d'interdiction

L'importante production cinématographique en Europe est une richesse culturelle dont nous pouvons nous prévaloir. Sa diversité et sa qualité entretiennent le rayonnement culturel européen.

Cependant les standards appliqués en termes de protection de l'enfance sont très différents selon les pays européens. Dans certains pays un film sera interdit aux personnes de moins de 16 ans, et dans d'autres le même film aurait seulement été interdit aux personnes de moins de 18 ans. Cependant la libre circulation des biens en Europe permet également aux DVD de circuler librement, et les marquages et pictogrammes différents selon les pays peuvent porter à confusion, et ainsi donner accès à des enfants à certaines images qui ne sont pas adaptées à leur jeune âge.

La Commission peut-elle répondre aux questions suivantes:

1. Qu'est-il fait au niveau européen quant à ses pictogrammes différents sur les DVD?

2. Quelle forme de coopération existe entre les autorités européennes de contrôle de l'audiovisuel, notamment afin de prévenir une telle situation?

3. La Commission européenne a-t-elle prévu d'agir dans ce domaine dans les prochaines années?

Réponse donnée par Mme Kroes au nom de la Commission
(9 octobre 2012)

En ce qui concerne la classification et l'interdiction des films en fonction de l'âge, la protection des mineurs et le contrôle du respect des dispositions en la matière relèvent de la compétence des États membres et chaque pays possède son propre système de classification conformément à sa propre législation.

Pour ce qui est de l'harmonisation des systèmes nationaux de protection et de classification en fonction de l'âge, d'après le rapport sur la protection des mineurs ([1]) de la Commission, la plupart des États membres considèrent que leur système de classification peut être amélioré, mais il n'y a pas de consensus quant à l'utilité et à la faisabilité de systèmes multisupports et/ou paneuropéens de classification des contenus médiatiques, alors que le secteur des jeux vidéos s'est doté du système PEGI (Pan-European Games Information System — Système paneuropéen d'information sur les jeux). Le PEGI est un système d'autorégulation du secteur équivalant à un système paneuropéen de classification par catégorie d'âge fondé sur l'adhésion volontaire. Il permet de garantir à la fois un degré élevé de protection des mineurs dans l'Union européenne et un haut niveau d'harmonisation des normes de protection.

Dans le cadre du programme pour un Internet plus sûr ([2]), la Commission élabore des politiques et finance des projets visant à susciter une prise de conscience quant aux contenus préjudiciables auxquels les enfants sont exposés sur l'Internet, à mieux cerner ce phénomène et à mettre en place les mesures qui s'imposent pour protéger ces derniers. L'an dernier, 31 entreprises ont répondu à l'appel lancé par Mme Kroes, vice-présidente de la Commission, les invitant à participer à un processus d'autorégulation afin de faire de l'Internet un environnement mieux adapté aux enfants ([3]). Ces entreprises s'emploient actuellement à trouver des solutions plus efficaces en menant des actions dans cinq domaines concrets, visant notamment à étendre l'utilisation des systèmes de classification des contenus et à développer une approche de la classification en fonction de l'âge reconnue par tous, qui puisse être utilisée dans l'ensemble des secteurs et offrir aux parents des catégories d'âges aisément compréhensibles.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/reg/minors/rec/2011_report/index_fr.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/index_en.htm
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/11/1485&format=HTML&aged=1&language=FR&guiLanguage=fr.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007863/12
to the Commission
Véronique Mathieu (PPE)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: DVDs and warning pictograms

The considerable output of the European film industry is a cultural asset of which we can be proud. Its diversity and quality contribute to Europe's cultural influence.

However, the standards used to protect children vary widely from one European country to another. Whereas in some countries a film may be limited to over-16s, in others the same film may be labelled over-18 only. Since the free movement of goods in Europe also applies to DVDs and the different markings and pictograms used from one country to another may give rise to confusion, children may be being exposed to images which are unsuitable for their age group.

1. What has been done at European level about the different pictograms used on DVDs?

2. What sort of cooperation exists between the European audiovisual monitoring authorities aimed at preventing this situation?

3. Does the Commission intend to take any action on this matter in the next few years?

Answer given by Ms Kroes on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

As far as age ratings and restrictions for films are concerned, the primary responsibility for protection of minors and the enforcement of protection requirements falls under the competence of the Member States and each country has its own system of ratings in accordance with its own laws.

As regards the harmonisation of national protection and age rating systems, one finding of the Commission report on the protection of minors ([1]) is that while most Member States see scope for improving their age rating and classification systems, there is no consensus on the helpfulness and feasibility of cross-media and/or pan-European classification systems for media content, contrary to the video games sector equipped with PEGI — Pan-European Game Information System. PEGI, which is a industry's self-regulatory system, effectively amounts to a voluntary pan-European age rating system. It is maintaining both a high degree of protection for minors in the European Union and a high level of harmonisation in protection standards.

With the Safer Internet programme ([2]) the Commission develops policies and funds projects to raise awareness and build knowledge about harmful content children encounter online and about implementing appropriate protection measures. Thirty-one companies signed up to Vice-President Kroes' invitation to work in a self-regulatory process to make the Internet a better place for children last year ([3]). These companies are currently engaged in working towards better solutions on 5 concrete areas — among them to work for wider use of content classification systems and to have a generally valid approach to age-rating, which could be used across sectors and provide parents with understandable age categories.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/avpolicy/reg/minors/rec/2011_report/index_en.htm
([2]) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/sip/index_en.htm
([3]) http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/11/1485&format=HTML&aged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=fr.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007864/12
to the Commission
Derek Vaughan (S&D)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Newcastle disease in pigeons

1. Does the 60-day prohibition on movement (quarantine) apply to racing pigeons which have been vaccinated against Newcastle disease?

2. Can individual Member States apply flexibility with regard to the length of quarantine involved?

3. Should appointed vets inspect and investigate all suspected cases of Newcastle disease detected in pigeons?

4. Should individual Member States notify the relevant authorities of outbreaks of Newcastle disease?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 2012)

Council Directive 92/66/EEC ([1]) lays down the measures that Member States must apply in the event of an outbreak of Newcastle disease in poultry, racing pigeons and other captive birds.

Article 19 of that directive requires Member States to ensure that where carrier pigeons are suspected of being infected with Newcastle disease, that the official veterinarian immediately starts official investigations for confirming or notifying the presence of the disease, in particular by taking samples for laboratory examination or having them taken. For the laboratory diagnosis and confirmation of Newcastle disease the presence of the virus must be demonstrated by its isolation and characterisation according to Annex III to the directive.

Upon official confirmation of the disease, the competent authority shall either order the killing and safe disposal of the birds or at least ban the movements of these birds outside the pigeon house or holding for at least 60 days after the clinical signs of Newcastle disease have disappeared. In addition, any matter or waste accumulated during the 60-day period and likely to be contaminated shall be effectively destroyed or treated.

Vaccination of pigeons against Newcastle disease is an effective tool to prevent clinical signs, but cannot guarantee protection from infection. In case vaccinated birds become infected with the field strain, they pose a risk for virus transmission to other birds and therefore the same disease control measures must be applied as for non-vaccinated infected birds.

([1]) OJ L 260, 5.9.1992, p. 1.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης P-007873/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Eleni Theocharous (PPE)
(5 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Διαρθρωτικά Ταμεία και βαθμός απορροφητικότητας της Κυπριακής δημοκρατίας

Επειδή τα διαρθρωτικά ταμεία συνιστούν σημαντικά εργαλεία για την κάλυψη των ανισομερειών εντός των περιφερειών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης καθώς και πηγές ανάπτυξης, θα θέλαμε να γνωρίζουμε από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή το βαθμό απορροφητικότητας της Κυπριακής δημοκρατίας και αν η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή είναι ικανοποιημένη ή αν θα έπρεπε να γίνουν επιπρόσθετες κινήσεις προκειμένου να αυξηθεί η απορροφητικότητα της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας.

Απάντηση του κ. Hahn εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(2 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Έως τα τέλη Σεπτεμβρίου 2012, το ποσοστό απορρόφησης των διαρθρωτικών ταμείων και του Ταμείου Συνοχής για την περίοδο 2007-2013 στην Κύπρο είναι 43 % έναντι 42 % που είναι ο μέσος όρος στην ΕΕ.

Όσον αφορά το Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης (ΕΤΠΑ) και τα συγχρηματοδοτούμενα από το Ταμείο Συνοχής προγράμματα, έχει επιτευχθεί μέχρι σήμερα ομαλή υλοποίηση. Ορισμένες παρεμβάσεις προχωρούν πολύ καλά. Ωστόσο, οι κυπριακές αρχές θα πρέπει να δώσουν μεγαλύτερη προσοχή σε πρωτοβουλίες έρευνας και καινοτομίας, καθώς και σε παρεμβάσεις στον περιβαλλοντικό τομέα που δεν προχωρούν τόσο εύρυθμα όσο οι δράσεις στους τομείς των μεταφορών, του παραγωγικού περιβάλλοντος και της αναζωογόνησης των αστικών και αγροτικών περιοχών, όπου σημειώνεται ικανοποιητική πρόοδος.

Όσον αφορά το συγχρηματοδοτούμενο πρόγραμμα του ΕΚΤ, η υλοποίησή του προχωρά με ικανοποιητικό ρυθμό. Οι υπεύθυνοι υλοποίησης του προγράμματος, ωστόσο, θα χρειαστεί να εντείνουν τις προσπάθειές τους, ώστε οι παρεμβάσεις τους να είναι καλής ποιότητας και έγκαιρες. Οι κυπριακές αρχές θα πρέπει να συνεχίσουν να κινητοποιούν τα διαθέσιμα κονδύλια για την προώθηση της απασχόλησης, τη βελτίωση της απασχολησιμότητας του εργατικού δυναμικού, την ενίσχυση της σχέσης αγοράς εργασίας και εκπαιδευτικού συστήματος και τη βελτίωση της αποτελεσματικότητας των δημόσιων υπηρεσιών απασχόλησης.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007873/12
to the Commission
Eleni Theocharous (PPE)
(5 September 2012)

Subject: Take-up of structural funds by the Republic of Cyprus

In view of the substantial contribution made by the structural funds to offsetting regional imbalances within the EU and boosting growth, can the Commission indicate the take-up rate of these funds in the Republic of Cyprus? Is it satisfied with the take-up figures or are additional measures are necessary to increase them?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(2 October 2012)

By mid-September 2012, the absorption rate of the Structural and Cohesion Funds for the 2007-2013 period in Cyprus is 43% against an EU average of 42%.

As regards the ERDF and Cohesion Fund co-financed programmes, a smooth implementation has been achieved so far. Certain interventions are advancing very well. However, the Cypriot authorities should give more attention to research and innovation initiatives as well as to interventions in the environmental sector which are not advancing so smoothly as the actions in the sectors of transport, productive environment and revitalisation of urban and rural areas which are progressing satisfactorily.

As concerns the ESF co-financed programme, its implementation is progressing at a satisfactory pace. Project promoters, however, will need to intensify efforts in order to implement interventions of a good quality in a timely manner. The Cypriot authorities should continue to swiftly activate the funding available to promote employment, improve people's employability, enhance the labour market relevance of the education system, and improve the effectiveness of the public employment services.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007875/12
a la Comisión
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Extorsión a empresarios europeos en Marruecos

En las últimas semanas he recibido varias comunicaciones de empresarios españoles que muestran una grave preocupación por la escalada de agresiones y problemas que vienen sufriendo algunas empresas europeas radicadas en Marruecos por parte de las autoridades de aquel país. Los últimos problemas han afectado especialmente a firmas relacionadas con la transformación del pescado y la construcción. La preocupación es tal que se ha constituido una Asociación de Empresarios Afectados por la Extorsión en Marruecos (AAEM) que ha desplegado ya varias actividades y solicitado entrevistas con las autoridades españolas para denunciar su situación.

1. ¿Tiene constancia la Comisión de la existencia de problemas de extorsión pública y/o privada de la que son víctimas empresas europeas radicadas en Marruecos?

2. ¿Conoce la Comisión la existencia de asociaciones de empresarios constituidas expresamente para hacer frente a esta problemática y, en caso afirmativo, considera de interés intercambiar información con ellas?

3. ¿Considera las prácticas que denuncian estos empresarios compatibles con el estatus especial que vincula el reino de Marruecos a la Unión Europea?

Respuesta del Sr. De Gucht en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de octubre de 2012)

La Comisión está al corriente de algunos casos de extorsión entre particulares en Marruecos, pero desconoce que haya habido casos en los que estén implicadas las autoridades públicas.

La Comisión siempre está dispuesta a atender los problemas concretos a los que se enfrentan las empresas europeas en terceros países.

Las relaciones de la UE con Marruecos se rigen por el Acuerdo de Asociación que entró en vigor en 2000, así como por el Plan de Acción, que establece un conjunto global de prioridades. Este Plan respalda el objetivo marroquí de poner sus estructuras económicas y sociales más en consonancia con las de la UE. La profundización de las relaciones con Marruecos debe entenderse como un medio más para mejorar el clima empresarial en este país respecto a la UE y luchar contra cualquier práctica ajena a la legalidad.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007875/12
to the Commission
Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Extortion of European businesses in Morocco

In recent weeks I have been contacted on several occasions by Spanish firms expressing serious concern at the increasingly aggressive behaviour of the Moroccan authorities towards Spanish companies based in that country. Companies operating in the fish processing and construction sectors in particular are the latest to have been targeted. Their concern is such that an association for companies affected by extortion in Morocco has been established, the Asociación de Empresarios Afectados por la Extorsión en Marruecos (AAEM). It has already begun to take action and has requested talks with the Spanish authorities.

1. Is the Commission aware of attempts by authorities and private individuals to extort money from European companies based in Morocco?

2. Is it aware that associations of businesspeople have been set up specifically to address these problems? If so, would it consider holding talks with them?

3. Does it consider the practices denounced by these firms to be in keeping with the special status afforded to Morocco by the European Union?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The Commission is aware of some cases of extortion among private individuals in Morocco but not of such cases related to public authorities.

The Commission is always willing to listen to specific problems European businesses are facing in third countries.

The EU's relations with Morocco are governed by the Association Agreement that entered into force in 2000 as well as the action plan that sets out a comprehensive set of priorites. The latter supports the Moroccan objective of bringing its economic and social structures more into line with those of the EU. The deepening of the relations with Morocco has to be seen as a means to further improve the business climate with the EU and fight against any mispractice.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007878/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Peajes (4)

En referencia a la respuesta de la Comisión a la pregunta E-005816/2012, de 26 de julio de 2012, el Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión afirma que «la Comisión apoya el principio del usuario "pagador" como forma de financiar los costes de mantenimiento, y, dependiendo de las circunstancias de la construcción, de la infraestructura» […] «En una coyuntura de crisis y de reducción del gasto público en infraestructuras, estas inversiones precisarán de una aplicación más general del principio del "usuario pagador" para poder colmar los déficits de financiación actuales y previstos en el futuro».

En caso de un posible rescate internacional de España ¿podrían estas recomendaciones de buenas prácticas de la «aplicación más general del usuario pagador» pasar a ser de obligado cumplimiento con el fin de garantizar un funcionamiento más eficiente y racional de la red de carreteras españolas y que sea menos discriminatorio para los ciudadanos catalanes?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(17 de octubre de 2012)

Si bien la Comisión apoya la aplicación del principio del «usuario pagador», no está en condiciones de opinar sobre las posibles condiciones de un eventual programa para España.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007878/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Tolls (4)

In the answer given to Question E-005816/2012 on 26 July 2012, Mr Kallas, on behalf of the Commission, said that 'the Commission supports the "user pays" principle as a way to finance the costs of maintaining, and, depending on the circumstances of constructing, infrastructure…These investments will, in times of crisis and in times of falling public spending on infrastructure, require a broader application of the "user pays" principle to bridge the current as well as the expected future financing gap.'

In the event of an internationally-funded bail-out of Spain, could these best practice recommendations, namely the 'broader application of the "user pays" principle', be made compulsory in order to ensure that the Spanish road network functions more efficiently and intelligently and in a way that is less discriminatory towards Catalan citizens?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

While the Commission supports the application of the user pays principle, it is not in a position to comment on any possible conditions for any eventual programme for Spain.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007881/12
an die Kommission (Vizepräsidentin / Hohe Vertreterin)
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(6. September 2012)

Betrifft: VP/HR — Geheimschutzordnung des EAD

In der Antwort des Rates auf die Anfrage E-4211/2010 vom 17. Juni 2010 heißt es: „Die Geheimschutzordnung des EAD ist noch nicht festgelegt. Der Entwurf eines Beschlusses des Rates über die Organisation und die Arbeitsweise des Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienstes sieht jedoch vor, dass der EAD bis zum Erlass dieser Ordnung in Bezug auf den Schutz von Verschlusssachen die Sicherheitsvorschriften des Rates anwendet."

1. Wurde die Geheimschutzordnung des EAD inzwischen festgelegt? Wenn nicht, warum nicht?

2. Inwieweit unterscheidet sich die neue Geheimschutzordnung des EAD von den Sicherheitsvorschriften des Rates und den Sicherheitsvorschriften der Kommission?

Um Verwaltungslasten zu verringern, wurden diese Fragen in einer Anfrage zusammengefasst und die einzelnen Fragen mit einer laufenden Nummer versehen. Die Kommission wird höflich darum ersucht, die einzelnen Fragen unter Anführung der jeweiligen Nummerierung zu beantworten.

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

1. Die Sicherheitsvorschriften für den Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst (EAD) wurden im Beschluss der Hohen Vertreterin der Europäischen Union für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik vom 15. Juni 2011 über die Sicherheitsvorschriften für den Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst (2011/C 304/05) festgelegt.

2. Die EAD-Sicherheitsvorschriften, die in Absprache mit den Mitgliedstaaten, der Kommission und dem Generalsekretariat des Rates umgesetzt und derzeit überarbeitet werden, stehen mit den Grundsätzen und Mindeststandards des Ratsbeschlusses vom 31. März 2011 über die Sicherheitsvorschriften für den Schutz von EU-Verschlusssachen (2011/292/EU) ([1]) im Einklang.

Was andere Sicherheitsaspekte als den Schutz von EU-Verschlusssachen betrifft, so wird der EAD nach den Artikeln 1 und 10 des Ratsbeschlusses vom 26. Juli 2010 über die Organisation und die Arbeitsweise des Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienstes (2010/427/EU) ([2]) eigene Regeln für die Erfüllung seiner Aufgaben und die Erreichung seiner Ziele festlegen.

Bis dahin wendet der EAD nach Artikel 10 Absatz 2 des Ratsbeschlusses 2010/427/EU diesbezüglich die Sicherheitsvorschriften der Kommission an.

([1]) ABl. L 141 vom 27.5.2011.
([2]) ABl. L 201 vom 3.8.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007881/12
to the Commission (Vice-President/High Representative)
Martin Ehrenhauser (NI)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: VP/HR — Security rules for the European External Action Service (EEAS)

The Council's answer to Written Question E-4211/2010 of 17 June 2010 states the following: 'The security rules for the EEAS do not yet exist. However, the draft Council Decision establishing the organisation and functioning of the EEAS provides that until such security rules exist, with regard to the protection of classified information the EEAS will apply the Council's security regulations.'

1. Have security rules for the EEAS been laid down in the meantime? If not, why not?

2. In what ways do the EEAS's new security rules differ from the Council's and the Commission's security regulations?

In order to reduce the administrative burden, I have tabled these questions as one single parliamentary question and given each question a number. Please answer each question individually, referring to its number.

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

1. The European External Action Service (EEAS) security rules have been laid down in the decision of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy of 15 June 2011 on the security rules for the European External Action Service (2011/C 304/05).

2. The EEAS security rules — actually under revision and implementation in consultation with Member States, the Commission and the General Secretariat of the Council — are in line with the basic principles and minimum standards set out in the Council Decision of 31 March 2011 on the security rules for protecting EU classified information (EUCI) (2011/292/EU) ([1]).

As regards aspects of security other than the protection of EUCI, the EEAS will lay down its own rules, necessary to perform its tasks and attain its objectives, pursuant to Articles 1 and 10 of Council Decision of 26 July 2010 establishing the organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service (2010/427/EU) ([2]).

Until such time, the EEAS, in accordance with Article 10(2) of Council Decision 2010/427/EU, applies the Commission's provision on security in these domains.

([1]) OJ L 141, 27.5.2011.
([2]) OJ L 201, 3.8.2010.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007888/12
to the Commission
Keith Taylor (Verts/ALE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Wild animals kept as pets in the European Union

The recently adopted EU Strategy for the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2012-2015 ([1]) acknowledges that 'Member States shall, since animals are sentient beings, pay full regard to the welfare requirements of animals' ([2]). I fully welcome the fact that the strategy's extended remit now covers wild animals in captivity.

The findings of a report on EU pet markets are therefore relevant ([3]).

The report states that mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians are often kept in cramped conditions such as rows of plastic boxes, which do not allow the animals to express normal behaviour. The animals concerned manifest numerous 'captivity stress'-related abnormal behaviours and high mortalities.

1. In view of these findings, I would like to ask the Commission what measures are being taken to ensure that the behavioural and psychological needs of live animals in captivity, and specifically those traded as pets, are continually being provided for?

2. Furthermore, is the Commission satisfied that European citizens are sufficiently informed about the appropriate care of the myriad of animal species available as pets so as to safeguard not only the wellbeing of the animals, but also the safety of the public?

3. If not, what measures could be taken to ensure that the welfare of both animals and the public is sufficiently protected?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Commission is aware that wild animals kept and traded as pets may pose a risk to human and animal health, animal welfare, and the environment.

EU legislation to reduce the abovementioned risks is already in place as regards the keeping of wild animals in zoos ([4]) and on the welfare requirements for the protection of animals transported for commercial reasons ([5]), which also cover animals of non-domesticated species. In addition, EU animal health requirements for imports and intra-EU trade of certain species of wild animals are also in place. For matters which are not regulated at EU level, the Member States maintain the responsibility to further regulate these issues within their territory, if they deem it necessary.

([1]) COM(2012) 6 final/2.
([2]) Article 13 of the TFEU.
([3]) http://www.apa.org.uk/pdfs/AmphibianAndReptilePetMarketsReport.pdf
([4]) Directive 1999/22/EC (OJ L 94, 9.4.1999, p. 24).
([5]) Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 (OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1).

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007890/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(6 september 2012)

Betreft: Commissaris die zich mengt in verkiezingscampagne

Europese commissaris Neelie Kroes heeft haar mening geuit over de verkiezingscampagne in Nederland en zich negatief uitgelaten over de Partij voor de Vrijheid in een video die is uitgezonden door de NOS ([1]). Met haar uitlatingen en optreden heeft zij wellicht de publieke opinie beïnvloed en zo zich gemengd in de verkiezingscampagne.

Volgens de gedragscode voor commissarissen moeten commissarissen zich onthouden van verklaringen of acties in het openbaar ten gunste van een politieke partij. Als zij deelnemen aan een verkiezingscampagne moeten zij de voorzitter in kennis stellen van hun voorgenomen deelname en van de rol die zij naar verwachting zullen spelen. De voorzitter besluit of de verwachte rol verenigbaar is met de positie van een commissaris.

1. Wanneer en hoe heeft mevrouw Kroes de voorzitter in kennis gesteld? Wanneer heeft de voorzitter besloten dat haar deelname verenigbaar is met haar positie als commissaris? Indien dat zo is, onder welke voorwaarden?

Mevrouw Kroes heeft getracht de campagne te beïnvloeden ten gunste van haar eigen partij, hetgeen een overtreding is van de gedragscode.

2. Welke sancties staan er op deze handelswijze?

3. Wanneer worden de sancties uitgevoerd?

4. Meent de Commissie dat het de moeite waard is een gedragscode te hebben als niemand zich eraan houdt?

Antwoord van de heer Barroso namens de Commissie
(3 oktober 2012)

De uitlatingen van vicevoorzitter Kroes in de door het geachte parlementslid genoemde video-uitzending kunnen niet als inmenging in de recente Nederlandse verkiezingscampagne worden beschouwd.

Mevrouw Kroes corrigeerde slechts onjuiste informatie over de kosten van de Europese Unie voor haar lidstaten en burgers, zonder voor een bepaalde partij campagne te voeren. Zij nam, samen met een aantal leden van het Europees Parlement van verschillende politieke overtuiging, in het kader van de recente Nederlandse verkiezingscampagne deel aan een discussie over de sociale media om de vragen van burgers over Europa te beantwoorden.

Het is een van de taken van de leden van de Commissie om de Europese Unie en haar beleid toe te lichten en correcte feitelijke informatie ter zake te verschaffen.

([1]) http://nos.nl/video/414626-kroes-wil-de-andere-kant-van-het -verhaal-vertellen.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007890/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Commissioner active in election campaign

Commissioner Kroes has expressed her views regarding the current election campaign in the Netherlands and has made a negative statement about the Party for Freedom, in a video broadcast by the NOS channel ([1]). Her statements and actions may have influenced public opinion, thereby constituting an interference in the election campaign.

The Code of Conduct for Commissioners states that 'Commissioners should abstain from making public statements or interventions on behalf of any political party' and that, should they wish to participate in an election campaign, 'they should inform the President of their intention to participate and the role they expect to play'. It is for the President of the Commission to decide whether the proposed role is compatible with the position of a Commissioner.

1. When and how did Ms Kroes inform the President of the Commission? Did the President decide that her participation was compatible with her position as Commissioner, and if so, when and subject to what conditions?

Given that Ms Kroes has attempted to influence the campaign in favour of her own party, thus placing herself in breach of the Code of Conduct:

2. What are the sanctions for such behaviour?

3. When will those sanctions be imposed?

4. Does the Commission believe that the Code of Conduct is worth having if no-one observes it?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(3 October 2012)

Vice-President Kroes' declarations contained in the video broadcast referred-to in the question of the Honourable Member can not be considered as a participation in the recent Dutch election campaign.

Without campaigning for any specific party, Mrs Kroes merely corrected inaccurate factual information about the cost of the European Union to its Member States and citizens. Together with several Members of the European Parliament from different political affiliations, Commissioner Kroes participated in a platform on social media, in the context of the recent Dutch election campaign, in order to answer citizens' questions concerning Europe.

It is part of Commissioners' duties to explain and provide correct factual information on the European Union and its policies.

([1]) http://nos.nl/video/414626-kroes-wil-de-andere-kant-van-het-verhaal-vertellen.html

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej E-007895/12
do Komisji
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD) oraz Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)
(6 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Sytuacja życiowa mieszkańców rezerwatu Górna Krasna

W ostatnim czasie mieszkańcy, którzy zamieszkują rejony objęte programem Natura 2000, coraz częściej protestują w sytuacji, gdy niemożność jakiejkolwiek ingerencji w objęte tą ochroną obszary powoduje, że corocznie podtapiane są domy, które zamieszkują.

Dokładnie taka sytuacja ma miejsce w gminie Stąporków, w rejonie rezerwatu Górna Krasna. W minionym miesiącu temat przedstawiany był przez świętokrzyskie media ([1]) ([2]) ([3]).

Trudno nie zgodzić się z burmistrz Stąporkowa, która mówi o dramacie rodzin żyjących na zalewowym terenie, w sołectwach Bień i Luta. Podkreśla przy tym, że trzeba mieć na uwadze dbałość o środowisko przyrodnicze, ale nie wolno się wobec tego odwracać w tej sytuacji plecami do mieszkańców.

Ochrona przyrody w ramach programu Natura 2000 jest konieczna, a sam program Natura 2000 jest w tym zakresie niezwykle cennym wspólnym porozumieniem krajów Unii Europejskiej. Jednak warto się przy tym zastanowić, czy pewna ingerencja w jej walory musi, w pewnych konkretnych przypadkach, naruszać ogólny, wyjątkowy dobrostan tej niezwykłej natury?

W związku z powyższym pragniemy zapytać:

1. Czy zdaniem Komisji tak sztywne regulacje dotyczące programu Natura 2000 w każdym przypadku są w pełni uzasadnione?

2. Czy nie należałoby poprzez indywidualne, szczegółowe badanie poszczególnych przypadków wprowadzać zasady pewnych wyjątków dotyczących programu Natura 2000, gdy tak naprawdę ingerencja w środowisko objęte programem jest znikoma, a z drugiej strony ta ingerencja pozwoliłaby chronić dobytek życia mieszkańców terenów, o których mowa?

3. Czy znana jest Komisji trudna sytuacja mieszkańców obszarów rezerwatu Górna Krasna, którzy, jak donoszą w artykułach prasowych, corocznie są podtapiani, a przez to niszczony jest dobytek ich życia?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Janeza Potočnika w imieniu Komisji
(11 października 2012 r.)

Ad. 1 i 2. Dyrektywa w sprawie siedlisk przyrodniczych ([4]), która stanowi podstawę prawną sieci Natura 2000, przewiduje elastyczny mechanizm gwarantujący, że plany i przedsięwzięcia, w tym te dotyczące środków ochrony przeciwpowodziowej, mogą być realizowane na obszarach Natura 2000, jeśli nie mają one negatywnego wpływu na ich integralność. Państwa członkowskie mogą także zatwierdzać plany i projekty, które będą miały negatywny wpływ na integralność obszaru, pod warunkiem że 1) nie istnieją inne, mniej szkodliwe rozwiązania alternatywne; 2) plan lub przedsięwzięcie należy przeprowadzić ze względu na nadrzędny interes publiczny; 3) wprowadzono środki kompensujące konieczne do zapewnienia spójności sieci Natura 2000. Wytyczne „Natura 2000 a gospodarka wodna" ([5]), wydane przez Generalną Dyrekcję Ochrony Środowiska, wyjaśniają te zobowiązania w sposób bardziej szczegółowy.

Ad. 3. Komisja nie była wcześniej świadoma sytuacji mieszkańców Górnej Krasny. Komisja zachęca władze polskie i mieszkańców społeczności lokalnych do poszukiwania wspólnego rozwiązania, które byłoby w stanie pogodzić środki ochrony przeciwpowodziowej z potrzebą ochrony obszarów Natura 2000.

([1]) http://tygodnik.net.pl/index.php/staporkow/3253-czy-melioryzacja-zagrozi-rezerwatowi-w-krasnej.
([2]) http://www.echodnia.eu/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20120803/POWIAT0105/120809623.
([3]) http://m.kielce.gazeta.pl/kielce/1,106510,12298164,Spor_o_melioracje_rezerwatu___To_czlowiek_jest_najwazniejszy_.html
([4]) Dyrektywa Rady 92/43/EWG z dnia 21 maja 1992 r. w sprawie ochrony siedlisk przyrodniczych oraz dzikiej fauny i flory, Dz.U. L 206 z 22.7.1992.
([5]) http://www.gdos.gov.pl/files/Materialy-i-publikacje/Natura-2000-a-gospodarka-wodna.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007895/12
to the Commission
Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD), Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD) and Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Living conditions of residents of the Górna Krasna nature reserve

Residents of regions covered by the Natura 2000 programme have recently been protesting with increasing frequency as they are faced with a situation in which the prohibition on interfering in any way with areas protected under the programme results in their homes being flooded each year.

This is precisely the situation that is facing the municipality of Stąporków, which is located in the Górna Krasna nature reserve region. This issue has been raised by the Świętokrzyskie regional media in the last month ([1]) ([2]) ([3]).

It is hard to disagree with the mayor of Stąporków, who spoke of the dramatic situation facing families living in the villages of Bień and Luta, which are located in the flood area. She emphasises that looking after the natural environment must be kept in mind, but that this objective should not lead one to turn one's back on residents.

Protecting the environment through the Natura 2000 programme is necessary, and the programme itself is, in terms of environmental protection, an exceptionally valuable agreement between EU Member States. However, it is worth considering whether adjusting some of its aspects, in certain specific cases, would necessarily disturb the general wellbeing of our wonderful natural environment.

1. In the Commission's view, are the decidedly inflexible regulations concerning the Natura 2000 programme fully justified in every case?

2. Would it not be preferable, following a thorough assessment of individual cases, to introduce rules establishing exceptions under the Natura 2000 programme? In any case, environmental interference in those areas covered by the programme would be minimal and would, furthermore, allow the residents of the areas concerned to protect the possessions that they have accumulated over a lifetime.

3. Is the Commission aware of the difficult situation faced by residents of the Górna Krasna nature reserve area who, as the media report, experience annual floods which result in the destruction of their homes and possessions?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

1 and 2. The Habitats Directive ([4]), which is the legal basis for the Natura 2000 network, provides a flexible mechanism which guarantees that plans and projects, including those concerning flood protection measures, can be carried out on Natura 2000 sites if they do not adversely affect the integrity of the site. Member States can also approve plans and projects which will adversely affect the integrity of the site on condition that 1) there are no other less detrimental alternatives; 2) the plan or project has to be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest; 3) compensatory measures necessary to ensure the coherence of Natura 2000 have been introduced. The guidance document 'Natura 2000 and water management' ([5]) issued by the Polish nature protection authorities (GDOŚ) explains these obligations in more detail.

3. The Commission was not previously aware of the situation of the Górna Krasna residents. The Commission would encourage the Polish authorities and the residents of the local communities to jointly look for a solution which would reconcile the flood protection measure with the need to protect the Natura 2000 site.

([1]) http://tygodnik.net.pl/index.php/staporkow/3253-czy-melioryzacja-zagrozi-rezerwatowi-w-krasnej.
([2]) http://www.echodnia.eu/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20120803/POWIAT0105/120809623.
([3]) http://m.kielce.gazeta.pl/kielce/1,106510,12298164,Spor_o_melioracje_rezerwatu___To_czlowiek_jest_najwazniejszy_.html
([4]) Council Directive 92/43/EEC, of 21 May 1992, on the protection of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora, OJ L 206, 22.7.1992.
([5]) http://www.gdos.gov.pl/files/Materialy-i-publikacje/Natura-2000-a-gospodarka-wodna.pdf

(Leagan Gaeilge)

Ceist i gcomhair freagra scríofa E-007897/12
chuig an gCoimisiún
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(6 Meán Fómhair 2012)

Ábhar: Timpeallachtaí gan cead caite iontu

Ina fhreagra ar an gCeist Scríofa E-007312/2012 maidir le bearta in aghaidh tobac i ngluaisteáin, thug an Coimisiún chun suntais Moladh 2009 ón gCoimisiún maidir le timpeallachtaí gan cead caite iontu. Sa Mholadh sin, iarrtar ar na Ballstáit a saoránaigh a chosaint go hiomlán ó nochtadh do dheatach athláimhe faoi dheireadh 2012, agus leagtar béim ar leith ar an mbaol do leanaí maidir le deatach athláimhe ó thobac.

I bhfianaise an spriocdháta atá sonraithe do dheireadh na bliana seo, an bhféadfadh an Coimisiún a mheasúnú a thabhairt faoi ghníomhaíochtaí na mBallstát chun timpeallachtaí gan cead caite iontu a áirithiú. Cad é measúnú an Choimisiúin maidir leis an ngníomhaíocht atá glactha ag Éirinn, agus an gcoimeádfar spriocdháta dheireadh 2012?

Freagra ón gCoimisinéir Dalli thar ceann an Choimisiúin
(15 Deireadh Fómhair 2012)

Sa Mholadh ón gComhairle maidir le timpeallacht gan cead caite a eisíodh in 2009 ([1]) moltar do na Ballstáit bearta a dhéanamh faoi dheireadh 2012 ar a dhéanaí chun cosaint éifeachtach a sholáthar ar nochtadh daoine do dheatach tobac. Ina theannta sin, iarrtar ar an gCoimisiún ann tuairisc a thabhairt ar chur chun feidhme, feidhmiú agus tionchar na ngníomhartha beartais a cuireadh chun cinn sa Mholadh.

Nuair a chuir Éire toirmeasc iomlán ar chaitheamh tabac i dtionscal an fháilteachais in 2004, bhí sí ar an gcéad tír san AE sin a dhéanamh, agus tá an reachtaíocht atá ag an tír sin i dtaobh caitheamh tobac fós níos cuimsithí ná an reachtaíocht atá ag bunáite thíortha na hEorpa.

Tá an Coimisiún i mbun faisnéis a bhailiú faoi láthair i dtaobh na mbeart atá déanta ag na Ballstáit agus ba cheart go bhfoilseodh sé tuarascáil sa chéad leath de 2013 maidir le cur chun feidhme an mholta.

([1]) Moladh ón gComhairle an 30 Samhain 2009 maidir le timpeallacht gan cead caite (IO, C296, 5.12.2009, lch. 4.).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007897/12
to the Commission
Liam Aylward (ALDE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Smoke-free environments

In its answer to Written Question E-007312/2012 regarding anti-tobacco measures in cars, the Commission highlighted the 2009 Council Recommendation on smoke-free environments. This recommendation calls on Member States to fully protect their citizens from exposure to tobacco smoke by the end of 2012, with a particular emphasis on the dangers of second-hand tobacco smoke for children.

In light of the deadline set for the end of this year, could the Commission give its assessment of Member States' action to ensure smoke-free environments? What is the Commission's assessment of the action taken by Ireland, and will the deadline of the end of 2012 be met?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Council recommendation on smoke-free environments from 2009 ([1]) recommends Member States to take measures to provide effective protection from exposure to tobacco smoke at the latest by end 2012. It also invites the Commission to report on the implementation, functioning and impacts of the policy measures proposed by the recommendation.

Ireland was the first country in the EU to introduce a total ban on smoking in the hospitality industry in 2004, and their smoke-free legislation is still among the most comprehensive in Europe.

The Commission is now collecting information on the actions taken by Member States and should subsequently publish a report on the implementation of the recommendation in the first half of 2013.

([1]) Council Recommendation of 30 November 2009 on smoke-free environments (OJ C 296, 5.12.2009, p. 4.).

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007902/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Novo cálculo de elegibilidade dos fundos estruturais (2014-2020)

Considerando que:

— A 1 de julho de 2013, a Croácia irá tornar-se o 28.° Estado-Membro da União Europeia, tendo direito a receber verbas comunitárias para os investimentos que efetuar nas mais diversas áreas temáticas;

— Devido à entrada da Croácia na União Europeia, a Comissão Europeia apresentou, em julho de 2012, uma proposta (COM(2012)0388 final) que altera os valores do quadro financeiro plurianual para o período 2014-2020;

— Devido à publicação de novos dados estatísticos a nível nacional e regional, a metodologia de cálculo dos fundos estruturais para o período 2014-2020 foi modificada;

— Segundo a referida proposta da Comissão Europeia, «a média trienal que determina a elegibilidade passa em 2007-2009 para o PIB regional e em 2008-2010 para o RNB»;

— Compreende-se assim que as verbas a alocar a cada região europeia terão em conta a média do PIB regional entre 2007-2009;

— Portugal possui 7 regiões europeias, nomeadamente o Norte, Centro, Lisboa e Vale do Tejo, Alentejo, Algarve, Madeira e Açores.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o valor do PIB de cada região portuguesa em 2007, 2008 e 2009?

2. Segundo a nova metodologia de cálculo, quantas regiões europeias existem nas 3 categorias definidas — Regiões de convergência, Regiões intermédias e Regiões de competitividade e emprego?

3. Tendo em conta as novas perspetivas financeiras para a Política de Coesão, o PIB regional e o número de regiões europeias consagradas em cada uma das 3 tipologias de regiões, qual o valor que deve ser alocado a cada uma das regiões portuguesas?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(5 de outubro de 2012)

1. O PIB/habitante (medido em paridades do poder de compra), expresso em índice da média UE27, das regiões NUTS 2 portuguesas é o seguinte

Região NUTS 2	2007	2008	2009
Norte	62,4	62,4	63,6
Algarve	87,7	86,0	84,6
Centro	65,6	64,0	66,5
Lisboa	110,3	109,4	112,4
Alentejo	73,1	71,5	72,2
Região Autónoma dos Açores	71,9	72,7	75,2
Região Autónoma da Madeira	101,0	103,0	104,9

2. Tendo em conta os dados médios regionais do PIB/habitante, relativos aos 3 anos (2007, 2008 e 2009), existem na UE27 69 regiões menos desenvolvidas, 52 regiões de transição e 15 regiões mais desenvolvidas.

3. A afetação indicativa das dotações por região será determinada pela Comissão, tendo em conta os resultados das negociações do Conselho relativas ao quadro financeiro plurianual.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007902/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: New calculation of eligibility for structural funds (2014-2020)

On 1 July 2013, Croatia will become the 28th EU Member State, with the right to receive Community funding for investments in a wide variety of fields.

In view of Croatia's accession, the Commission presented a proposal (COM(2012)0388 final) in June 2012, modifying the amounts provided for in the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework.

Following the publication of new statistical data at national and regional level, the method used to calculate the structural funds for the period 2014-2020 was modified.

According to the abovementioned Commission proposal, 'the three-year average determining eligibility shifts to 2007-2009 for regional GDP and to 2008-2010 for GNI'.

This means that the funding allocation for each European region will be based on average regional GDP for the period 2007-2009.

Portugal has seven European regions: Northern Portugal, Central Portugal, Lisbon and the Tagus Valley, Alentejo, Algarve, Madeira and the Azores.

1. What was the GDP of each Portuguese region in 2007, 2008 and 2009?

2. Under the new method of calculation, how many European regions are included in the three categories, defined as convergence regions, intermediate regions and regions of competitiveness and employment?

3. In light of the new financial perspectives for cohesion policy, regional GDP and the number of European regions listed under each regional category, what amount should be allocated to each of the Portuguese regions?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(5 October 2012)

1. The GDP/head (measured in Purchasing Power Parities), expressed as index of the EU-27 average, of the Portuguese NUTS2 regions, was as follows:

NUTS2 region	2007	2008	2009
Norte	62.4	62.4	63.6
Algarve	87.7	86.0	84.6
Centro	65.6	64.0	66.5
Lisboa	110.3	109.4	112.4
Alentejo	73.1	71.5	72.2
Região Autónoma dos Açores	71.9	72.7	75.2
Região Autónoma da Madeira	101.0	103.0	104.9

2. Taking into account the 3-year average regional GDP/head data (years 2007, 2008 and 2009), the EU-27 would count 69 less developed regions, 52 transition regions and 150 more developed regions.

3. The indicative allocations per region will be determined by the Commission following the outcome of the negotiations in the Council on the multi-annual financial framework.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007903/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Novo cálculo de elegibilidade do Fundo de Coesão (2014/2020)

Considerando que:

— A 1 de julho de 2013, a Croácia irá tornar-se o 28.° Estado-Membro da União Europeia, tendo direito a receber verbas comunitárias para os investimentos que efetuar nas mais diversas áreas temáticas;

— Devido à entrada da Croácia na União Europeia, a Comissão Europeia apresentou, em julho de 2012, uma proposta (COM(2012)0388 final) que altera os valores do quadro financeiro plurianual para o período 2014/2020;

— Devido à publicação de novos dados estatísticos a nível nacional e regional, a metodologia de cálculo dos fundos estruturais para o período 2014/2020 foi modificada;

— Segundo a referida proposta da Comissão Europeia, «a média trienal que determina a elegibilidade passa em 2007/2009 para o PIB regional e em 2008/2010 para o Rendimento Nacional Bruto»;

— Compreende-se assim que as verbas do Fundo de Coesão a alocar a cada Estado-Membro terão em conta o Rendimento Nacional Bruto (RNB) para o período 2008/2010;

— O Fundo de Coesão prevê o reforço da coesão económica e social, através do financiamento equilibrado de projetos no domínio do ambiente e redes transeuropeias de infraestruturas de transportes;

— O Parlamento Europeu entende que também deverão ser elegíveis as infraestruturas nacionais de transporte e não apenas as que possuem ligações transeuropeias.

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual o valor do RNB de cada Estado-Membro em 2007, 2008 e 2009?

2. Segundo a nova metodologia de cálculo, quais os Estados-Membros que têm um RNB inferior a 90 % da média europeia e são assim elegíveis para o Fundo de Coesão?

3. Qual o valor do Fundo de Coesão que caberá a cada Estado-Membro da União Europeia?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(17 de outubro de 2012)

1. O RNB *per capita* de cada Estado-Membro (em PPC e expresso em índice da média da UE-27) está disponível no anexo que enviamos diretamente ao Senhor Deputado e ao Secretariado do Parlamento.

2. De acordo com os dados utilizados para a atualização proposta pela Comissão sobre o quadro financeiro plurianual, seriam plenamente elegíveis para o Fundo de Coesão os seguintes Estados-Membros: Bulgária, República Checa, Estónia, Grécia, Chipre, Letónia, Lituânia, Hungria, Malta, Polónia, Portugal, Roménia, Eslovénia e República Eslovaca.

3. Os montantes das dotações do Fundo de Coesão por Estado-Membro serão determinados quando estiverem concluídas as negociações no Conselho sobre o quadro financeiro plurianual.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007903/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: New calculation of eligibility for cohesion fund (2014-2020)

On 1 July 2013, Croatia will become the 28th EU Member State, with the right to receive Community funding for investments in a wide variety of fields.

In view of Croatia's accession, the Commission presented a proposal (COM(2012)0388 final) in June 2012, modifying the amounts provided for in the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework.

Following the publication of new statistical data at national and regional level, the method used to calculate the structural funds for the period 2014-2020 was modified.

According to the abovementioned Commission proposal, 'the three-year average determining eligibility shifts to 2007-2009 for regional GDP and to 2008-2010 for GNI'.

This means that the funding allocation for each European region will be based on average regional GDP for the period 2007-2009.

The Cohesion Fund aims to strengthen economic and social cohesion through balanced funding for projects in the field of environment and trans-European transport infrastructure networks.

Parliament understands that national transport infrastructures should also be eligible, regardless of whether they involve trans-European connections.

1. What was the GDP of each Member State in 2007, 2008 and 2009?

2. Under the new method of calculation, which Member States have a GNI which is less than 90% of the European average, making them eligible for the Cohesion Fund?

3. What amount will each EU Member State be entitled to under the Cohesion Fund?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

1. The GNI per capita (in PPS), expressed as index of the EU-27 average, of each Member State is available in the annex which is sent directly to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of Parliament.

2. According to the data used for the updated Commission proposal on the multi-annual financial framework, the following Member States would be fully eligible for the Cohesion fund: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia and Slovak Republic.

3. The amounts of the Cohesion Fund allocations per Member State will be determined at the finalisation of the negotiations in the Council on the multiannual financial framework.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007904/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Base económica de cálculo do Capping

Tendo em conta que:

— Nas propostas de regulamentos para a Política de Coesão 2014/2020, o Quadro Estratégico Comum define que os fundos estruturais devem estar limitados a um valor máximo equivalente a 2,5 % do PIB de cada Estado-Membro;

— Têm sido levantadas muitas dúvidas relativamente a esta percentagem máxima que pode condicionar a atribuição de valores justos aos países menos desenvolvidos, podendo ainda estar em discordância com o princípio de coesão económica, social e territorial definido no Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia;

— No Conselho existem várias discussões sobre este tema, sendo que algumas delegações se opõem à proposta apresentada pela Comissão Europeia de limitar os fundos estruturais a 2,5 % do PIB;

— A 1 de julho de 2013, a Croácia irá tornar-se o 28.° Estado-Membro da União Europeia, tendo direito a receber verbas comunitárias para os investimentos que efetuar nas mais diversas áreas temáticas;

— Devido à entrada da Croácia na União Europeia, a Comissão Europeia apresentou, em julho de 2012, uma proposta (COM(2012)0388 final) que altera os valores do quadro financeiro plurianual para o período 2014/2020;

— Nessa proposta, é referido que «as dotações máximas para os Estados-Membros sujeitos a um limite de 2,5 % do PIB nacional são calculadas com base nas previsões da primavera de 2012 e nas projeções de médio prazo atualizadas».

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Qual a base económica inerente ao processo de cálculo do *Capping*? Quais os indicadores a utilizar e respetivos anos de referência para calcular o valor do *Capping*?

2. Segundo os indicadores da Comissão e a informação constante na nova proposta do quadro financeiro plurianual, qual o valor máximo de cada Estado-Membro equivalente a 2,5 % do PIB nacional?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(10 de outubro de 2012)

1. O cálculo do *capping* tem como base o PIB nacional, expresso em euros. Recorrendo às previsões da primavera de 2012 e às projeções de crescimento a médio prazo, a Comissão aplicou as taxas previstas de crescimento real do PIB por cada Estado-Membro e por ano, para obter uma série de valores estimados relativos ao PIB de cada Estado-Membro até ao ano 2020, e expressos em preços de 2011.

2. A Comissão publicará as dotações para cada Estado-Membro quando o Conselho chegar a um acordo final em relação ao quadro financeiro plurianual.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007904/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Economic basis for calculating capping

In the proposals for cohesion policy regulations 2014-2020, the common strategic framework provides that the structural funds should be restricted to a maximum equivalent to 2.5% of each Member State's GDP.

Many doubts have been raised in relation to this maximum percentage, which could affect the allocation of fair amounts to the least developed countries and conflict with the principle of economic, social and territorial cohesion enshrined in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

There have been various discussions in the Council on this matter, and some delegations oppose the Commission's proposal to restrict the structural funds to 2.5% of GDP.

On 1 July 2013, Croatia will become the 28th EU Member State, with the right to receive Community funding for investments in a wide variety of fields.

In view of Croatia's accession, the Commission presented a proposal (COM(2012) 0388 final) in June 2012, modifying the amounts provided for in the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework.

This proposal states that 'the maximum envelopes for those Member States subject to a cap of 2.5% of national GDP are now calculated on the basis of the Spring 2012 forecast and updated medium-term projections'.

1. What is the economic basis of the process used to calculate capping? What indicators and reference years are used to calculate the capping amount?

2. According to the Commission's indicators and the information provided in the new proposal for a multiannual financial framework, what is the maximum amount allocated to each Member State as equivalent to 2.5% of its national GDP?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(10 October 2012)

1. The calculation of the capping is based on national GDP, expressed in Euro. Using the spring 2012 forecasts and the medium-term growth projections, the Commission has applied the forecasted real GDP growth rates per Member State and per year in order to obtain a series of forecasted GDP figures for each Member State, until the year 2020, and expressed in 2011 prices.

2. The Commission will publish the allocations per Member State when a final agreement on the multi-annual financial framework has been reached in the Council.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007905/12
à Comissão
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Novo valor da dotação específica adicional (2014/2020)

Considerando que:

— A 1 de julho de 2013, a Croácia irá tornar-se o 28.° Estado-Membro da União Europeia, tendo direito a receber verbas comunitárias para os investimentos que efetuar nas mais diversas áreas temáticas;

— Devido à entrada da Croácia na União Europeia, a Comissão Europeia apresentou, em julho de 2012, uma proposta (COM(2012)0388 final) que altera os valores do quadro financeiro plurianual para o período 2014/2020;

— Devido à publicação de novos dados estatísticos a nível nacional e regional, a metodologia de cálculo dos fundos estruturais para o período 2014/2020 foi modificada;

— Segundo a referida proposta da Comissão Europeia, «a média trienal que determina a elegibilidade passa em 2007/2009 para o PIB regional e em 2008/2010 para o RNB»;

— Compreende-se assim que as verbas a alocar a cada região europeia terão em conta a média do PIB regional entre 2007/2009.

— Segundo a resposta (E-009784/2011) do Comissário Europeu da Política Regional, Johannes Hahn, as regiões NUTS-2 elegíveis para a referida dotação específica são: Canárias (Espanha), Guadalupe, Martinica, Guiana Francesa, Ilha da Reunião (França), Região Autónoma dos Açores e Região Autónoma da Madeira (Portugal), Itä-Suomi, Pohjois-Suomi (Finlândia), Mellersta Norrland e Övre Norrland (Suécia);

— Segundo a resposta (E-005952/2012) do Comissário Europeu da Política Regional, Johannes Hahn, «o Conselho Europeu decidiu que Mayotte se tornaria uma região ultraperiférica a partir de 1 de janeiro de 2014. A Comissão tenciona propor um ajustamento do quadro financeiro plurianual, adiantando uma dotação para Mayotte segundo os mesmos critérios que os utilizados na proposta original».

Pergunta-se à Comissão:

1. Devido ao facto de Mayotte ser considerada uma Região Ultraperiférica, qual o novo montante global da dotação específica adicional para o período 2014/2020?

2. Qual o valor do PIB em 2007, 2008 e 2009 de cada Região Ultraperiférica e Região escassamente povoada que terão direito a receber financiamento no âmbito da dotaçãoespecífica adicional em 2014/2020?

Resposta dada por Johannes Hahn em nome da Comissão
(15 de outubro de 2012)

1. O montante total previsto para a dotação adicional especial será determinado quando a dotação adicional para Maiote for definida. A definição da dotação adicional para Maiote dependerá da validação dos indicadores estatísticos necessários para Maiote, atualmente em fase de análise pelo Eurostat.

2. O PIB *per capita* (medido em Paridades de Poder de Compra e expresso em índice da média da UE27) das regiões ultraperiféricas e escassamente povoadas é o seguinte:

.

Região NUTS 2	2007	2008	2009
Canárias	92,3	88,7	87,3
Guadalupe	65,7	65,2	65,9
Martinica	72,1	71,0	71,8
Guiana Francesa	50,6	50,1	52,8
Reunião	63,7	65,6	66,8
Região Autónoma dos Açores	71,9	72,7	75,2
Região Autónoma da Madeira	101,0	103,0	104,9
Itä-Suomi	87,9	89,9	85,3
Pohjois-Suomi	101,8	104,4	94,6
Mellersta Norrland	109,7	114,6	109,8
Övre Norrland	114,6	119,2	105,6

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007905/12
to the Commission
Nuno Teixeira (PPE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Changes to the specific additional allocation (2014-2020)

On 1 July 2013, Croatia will become the 28th EU Member State, with the right to receive Community funding for investments in a wide variety of fields.

In view of Croatia's accession, the Commission presented a proposal (COM(2012)0388 final) in June 2012, modifying the amounts provided for in the 2014-2020 multiannual financial framework.

Following the publication of new statistical data at national and regional level, the method used to calculate the structural funds for the period 2014-2020 was modified.

According to the abovementioned Commission proposal, 'the three-year average determining eligibility shifts to 2007-2009 for regional GDP and to 2008-2010 for GNI'.

This means that the funding allocation for each European region will be based on average regional GDP for the period 2007-2009.

In his answer to Question E-009784/2011,Regional Policy Commissioner Johannes Hahn said that the Nuts-2 regions eligible for the special allocation would be the Canary Islands (ES); Guadeloupe, Martinique, Guyana, Reunion (FR); Autonomous Region of the Azores, Autonomous Region of Madeira (PT); Itä-Suomi, Pohjois-Suomi (FI); Mellersta Norrland and Övre Norrland (SE).

In his answer to Question E-005952/2012, Regional Policy Commissioner Johannes Hahn said 'the European Council decided that Mayotte would become an outermost region as from 1 January 2014. The Commission intends to propose an adjustment to the multiannual financial framework by adding an allocation for Mayotte, following the same criteria as those used in the original proposal'.

1. What will be the total amount attributed to the specific additional allocation for the period 2014-2020, now that Mayotte is to become an outermost region?

2. What is the GDP for 2007, 2008 and 2009 for each of the outermost and sparsely populated regions which will be eligible for funding under the specific additional allocation during the period 2014-2020?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

1. The total amount for the special additional allocation will be determined when the additional allocation for Mayotte is defined. The definition of the additional allocation for Mayotte will depend on the validation of the necessary statistical indicators for Mayotte, currently under review by Eurostat.

2. e GDP/head (measured in Purchasing Power Parities and expressed as index of the EU-27 average) of the outermost and sparsely populated regions is as follows:

NUTS2 region	2007	2008	2009
Canarias	92.3	88.7	87.3
Guadeloupe	65.7	65.2	65.9
Martinique	72.1	71.0	71.8
Guyane	50.6	50.1	52.8
Réunion	63.7	65.6	66.8
Região Autónoma dos Açores	71.9	72.7	75.2
Região Autónoma da Madeira	101.0	103.0	104.9
Itä-Suomi	87.9	89.9	85.3
Pohjois-Suomi	101.8	104.4	94.6
Mellersta Norrland	109.7	114.6	109.8
Övre Norrland	114.6	119.2	105.6

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007906/12
alla Commissione
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(6 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Finanziamento di attività nel settore agricolo dell'apicoltura da parte della Provincia Autonoma di Trento

Il finanziamento di attività nel settore agricolo dell'apicoltura da parte della Provincia Autonoma di Trento comprese nel Piano di sviluppo rurale 2007 — 2013, in particolare per quanto riguarda l'applicazione della misura 311 (iniziative agrituristiche) per le aree rurali classificate D, quindi con problemi complessi di sviluppo, sono state finanziate mediante l'erogazione in 10 rate annuali costanti, che totalizzano il contributo complessivo concesso in unica soluzione maggiorato degli interessi calcolati al tasso del 2,24 %.

Il contributo erogato di fatto viene parzialmente eroso dal maggior costo del denaro e quindi una parte del finanziamento invece di essere destinato al buon fine dell'iniziativa è destinato a spesa di carattere finanziario.

Le norme cui le delibere provinciali fanno riferimento sono le seguenti:

— Legge provinciale 28 marzo 2003, n. 4 s.m.i. e in seguito denominata L.P. 4/2003;

— Vista la Legge Provinciale 29 dicembre 2005, n. 20 recante disposizioni per la formazione del bilancio annuale 2006 e pluriennale 2006-2008 della Provincia Autonoma di Trento (legge finanziaria) ed in particolare l'art. 43 «Modificazioni della legge provinciale 28 marzo 2003, n. 4»;

— Visto il regolamento (CE) n. 1857/2006 della Commissione del 15.12.2006 relativo all'applicazione degli articoli 87 e 88 del trattato agli aiuti di stato a favore delle piccole e medie imprese attive nella produzione di prodotti agricoli e recante modifica del regolamento (CE) n. 70/2001;

— Vista la Comunicazione della Commissione n. (GU C 319 del 27.12.2006, pagina 1) che definisce gli orientamenti comunitari per gli Aiuti di Stato nel settore agricolo e forestale 2007-2013;

— Vista la deliberazione n. 3006 del 21 dicembre 2007, come modificata con deliberazione n. 122 del 25 gennaio 2008 e n. 876 del 4 aprile 2008 con cui sono stati disciplinati alcuni criteri e modalità per l'attuazione delle iniziative previste dagli articoli 17, 25, 42, 44 e 46, comma 1 e 3 della L.P. 4/2003;

— Considerato che le sopra citate deliberazioni sono state notificate con la forma dell'esenzione — ai sensi del Regolamento (CE) n. 1857/2006 — ai competenti uffici della Commissione europea e che la medesima ha pubblicato le decisioni in merito all'approvazione della disciplina degli articoli come di seguito:

1. XA 169/2008 ART. 25 di data 17.4.2008;

2. XA 170/2008 ART. 44 di data 17.4.2008;

3. XA 171/2008 ART. 42 di data 17.4.2008;

4. XA 172/2008 ART. 17 di data 17/04/2008;

5. XA 173/2008 ART. 46, comma 1 di data 17.4.2008;

Tale contributo è conforme alla norma comunitaria?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloş a nome della Commissione
(1º ottobre 2012)

La misura 311 del programma di sviluppo rurale della Provincia di Trento prevede il sostegno alle aziende agricole a conduzione familiare che diversificano l'attività orientandola verso agriturismo, attività ricreative e didattico-culturali, artigianato, vendita diretta di prodotti non agricoli e attività che contribuiscono alla diffusione di tecnologie di informazione e comunicazione. La misura non prevede nessun finanziamento per l'apicoltura.

L'apicoltura è finanziata soltanto dalla misura 121 (Ammodernamento delle aziende agricole) del programma di sviluppo rurale mediante interventi finalizzati alla costruzione e alle migliorie di fabbricati e macchinari aziendali per la conservazione, la lavorazione e la commercializzazione di prodotti agricoli.

Le misure di aiuto previste dagli articoli 17, 25, 42, 44 e 46 della citata legge provinciale 28 marzo 2003, n. 4, erano state comunicate alla Commissione a norma delle disposizioni sulle esenzioni del regolamento (CE) n. 1857/2006 relativo all'applicazione degli articoli 87 e 88 del trattato agli aiuti di Stato a favore delle piccole e medie imprese attive nella produzione di prodotti agricoli, e registrate come aiuti esentati dall'obbligo di notifica in virtù del medesimo regolamento. Quest'esenzione implica che gli aiuti in questione sono compatibili con il mercato interno ai sensi dell'articolo 107, paragrafo 3, lettera c), del TFUE.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007906/12
to the Commission
Matteo Salvini (EFD)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Funding for apiculture in the Autonomous Province of Trento

Funding for apiculture in the Autonomous Province of Trento under the 2007-2013 rural development plan with particular respect to the implementation of measure 311 (agri-tourism initiative) for Category D rural areas facing complex development problems, has taken the form of 10 annual and equal instalments, an annual interest rate of 2.24% being applied to the resulting total.

In fact, the funding is being partially eroded by the higher cost of money, which means that some of it is being used to meet financial charges rather than for its intended objective.

In view of the following legislation referred to by the provincial authorities:

— Provincial Law No 4 of 28 March 2003 and amendments thereto, subsequently referred to as LP 4/2003 and to:

— Provincial Law No 20 of 29 December 2005 containing provisions for the 2006 annual budget and the 2006-2008 multiannual budget of the autonomous province of Trento (financial law) and in particular Article 43 containing amendments to the Provincial Law No 4 of 28 March 2003;

— Commission Regulation (EC) 1857/2006 of 15 December 2006 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty to state aid to small and medium-sized enterprises active in the production of agricultural products and amending Regulation (EC) No 70/2001;

— the Commission Communication (OJ C 319, 27.12.2006, p. 1) containing Community guidelines for state aid in the agricultural and forestry sector 2007 to 2013;

— Resolution No 3006 of 21 December 2007, as amended by Resolution 122 of 25 January 2008 and Resolution 876 of 4 April 2008, laying down criteria and procedures for the launching of the initiatives referred to under Articles 17, 25, 44 and 46 (1)and(3) of LP 4/2003;

— whereas notification of the above was given — under the exemption provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 — to the Commission, which has published the decisions concerning the following:

1. XA 169/2008 Art. 25 of 27 April 2008;

2. XA 170/2008 Art.44 of 17 April 2008;

3. XA 171/2008 Art. 42 of 17 April 2008;

4. XA 172/2008 Art. 17 of 17 April 2008;

5. XA 173/2008 Art. 46 (1) of 17 April 2008:

Can the Commission say whether these funding arrangements are in accordance with Community law?

Answer given by Mr Çioloş on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 2012)

Measure 311 of the rural development programme of Trento foresees support to members of a farm household who diversify into non-agricultural activities, such as agro-tourism, recreational, cultural information activities, craft activities, direct sale of non-agricultural products and activities contributing to the diffusion of information-communication technologies. There is no funding foreseen for apicultures under this measure.

Beekeeping is financed only under measure 121 (Modernisation of agricultural holdings) of the rural development programme through interventions aiming at the construction and improvement of holding facilities and equipments for the conservation, processing and marketing of farm products.

The aid measures under Articles 17, 25, 42, 44 and 46 of the mentioned Provincial Law No 4 of 28 March 2003 had been communicated to the Commission under the exemption provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1857/2006 on the application of Articles 87 and 88 of the Treaty to state aid to small and medium-sized enterprises active in the production of agricultural products and registered as aids exempted from notification by virtue of the same regulation. This exemption entails that the mentioned aides are compatible with the internal market within the meaning of Article 107(3)(c) of TFEU.

(Deutsche Fassung)

Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung E-007907/12
an die Kommission
Jo Leinen (S&D)
(6. September 2012)

Betrifft: Anti-Dumping-Untersuchung bezüglich der Dumping-Einfuhren von Geschirr aus China

Die Kommission hat eine Anti-Dumping-Untersuchung bezüglich der Dumping-Einfuhren von Geschirr aus China eingeleitet. Ich bin beunruhigt über die Anzahl der Unternehmensschließungen und der Arbeitsplatzverluste, zu denen es in der gesamten EU infolge unlauterer Handelspraktiken bei Keramikgeschirr aus China gekommen ist.

Die Kommission wird daher um folgende Auskünfte gebeten:

1. Hat die Kommission eine Bewertung der Auswirkungen vorgenommen, welche die Dumping-Einfuhren von Geschirr aus China für die europäischen Hersteller von Keramikgeschirr haben?

2. Hat die Kommission Anti-Dumping-Zölle in Erwägung gezogen, um gleiche Wettbewerbsbedingungen bei Keramikgeschirr in Europa zu schaffen?

3. Ist sich die Kommission bewusst, in welche Lage die europäische Geschirrindustrie geraten könnte, wenn keine Anti-Dumping-Zölle erhoben werden?

Antwort von Herrn De Gucht im Namen der Kommission
(8. Oktober 2012)

Am 16. Februar 2012 leitete die Kommission ein Antidumpingverfahren betreffend die Einfuhren von Geschirr und Haushaltsgegenständen aus Keramik mit Ursprung in der Volksrepublik China ein. Etwaige vorläufige Maßnahmen müssten bis spätestens 15. November 2012 und etwaige endgültige Maßnahmen bis 15. Mai 2013 oder spätestens sechs Monate nach der Einführung vorläufiger Maßnahmen eingeführt werden.

Da dieses Verfahren derzeit noch läuft und sich in einem frühen Stadium befindet, ist noch nicht bekannt, ob und welche Maßnahmen eingeführt werden. Die Kommission bewertet unter anderem, ob die Hersteller von Keramikgeschirr und -haushaltswaren in der Union durch die gedumpten Einfuhren aus China geschädigt werden und ob es im Interesse der Union ist, in Anbetracht der Auswirkungen dieser Einfuhren auf die wirtschaftlichen Interessen der gesamten Union Maßnahmen einzuführen. Der Herr Abgeordnete kann sich darauf verlassen, dass die Auswirkungen der Tatsache, dass keine Anti-Dumping-Zölle eingeführt wurden, auf die Geschirrindustrie der Union Teil dieser Untersuchung der Unionsinteressen sind.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007907/12
to the Commission
Jo Leinen (S&D)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Anti-dumping investigation into dumped imported tableware from China

The Commission has initiated an anti-dumping investigation into dumped imported tableware from China. I'm alarmed by the number of factories closed and the number of jobs lost across the EU as a result of unfair trade practices involving ceramic tableware from China.

I ask the Commission to answer the following questions:

1. Has the Commission undertaken an assessment of the impact on European ceramic tableware producers of dumped imported tableware from China?

2. Does the Commission envisage anti-dumping duties as a means to create a level playing field for the marketing of ceramic tableware in Europe?

3. Is the Commission aware of what could happen to the European tableware industry if such anti-dumping duties are not imposed?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(8 October 2012)

On 16 February 2012, the Commission initiated an anti-dumping investigation on imports of ceramic tableware and kitchenware originating in the People's Republic of China. Provisional measures, if any, would be imposed by 15 November 2012 at the latest and definitive measures, if any, by 15 May 2013 or six months after the imposition of provisional measures at the latest.

Given that this proceeding is currently ongoing and at an early stage, it is not known yet whether there will be any measures and their level. The Commission is *inter alia* making an assessment of whether Union ceramic tableware and kitchenware producers are suffering from dumped imports from China and of whether it is in the Union interest to impose measures, in view of their impact on the economic interests of the Union as a whole. The Honourable Member can be reassured that the impact of the absence of anti-dumping duties on the Union tableware industry is part of that Union interest analysis.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007908/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(6 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Periodo di siccità in Europa e svincolo anticipato dei Fondi PAC dell'UE alla Croazia

L'UE è stata colpita negli ultimi mesi da una grave siccità, danneggiando il settore agricolo e in particolare la regione Veneto. La siccità minaccia oltre 360 000 ettari di terre coltivabili, il che significa che le perdite in termini di produzione potrebbero essere addirittura dell'80 %. In considerazione della gravità del periodo di siccità, il settore agricolo del Veneto rischia di subire perdite fino a 1 miliardo di euro.

Anche la Croazia, che entrerà far parte dell'UE nel luglio 2013, è confrontata a una grave siccità. Essa, nonostante abbia fatto importanti passi in avanti verso l'attuazione della politica di sviluppo rurale, conformemente alle norme dell'UE, non ha avuto negli ultimi anni una politica agricola stabile Stando alle relazioni apparse, è previsto che nel 2012 la Croazia riceverà 3,5 miliardi di euro dai fondi UE.

Il governo italiano ha chiesto di poter ricevere entro il 16 ottobre 2012 i finanziamenti relativi alla PAC 2012, anticipatamente rispetto a quanto programmato, per rafforzare il sostegno finanziario a disposizione degli agricoltori della regione e delle imprese agricole.

1. In considerazione delle informazioni di cui sopra, può la Commissione confermare che la Croazia riceverà i fondi UE per aiutare il settore agricolo nel 2013?

2. Quale sarà la natura di Tali fondi, e verranno svincolati prima o dopo che la Croazia diventerà membro dell'UE?

3. Dato che l'Italia è uno Stato membro dell'UE, può la Commissione fornire informazioni sulla natura del sostegno che essa fornirà all'Italia a causa della siccità, e confermare altresì se abbia valutato la richiesta del governo italiano relativa allo svincolo anticipato dei fondi 2012 della PAC?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(15 ottobre 2012)

In risposta alla prima e alla seconda domanda dell'onorevole parlamentare, la Croazia potrà usufruire del sostegno nell'ambito della PAC a partire dal 1º luglio 2013, quando diventerà uno Stato membro dell'Unione europea.

Da tale data la Croazia potrà usufruire di tutte le misure unionali di sostegno dei mercati.

Per quanto riguarda il regime di aiuti diretti, gli agricoltori croati presenteranno le domande per l'anno civile 2013 e cominceranno a ricevere i pagamenti dall'esercizio finanziario 2014, che per il FEAGA ha inizio il 16 ottobre 2013, esattamente come gli altri Stati membri dell'Unione europea.

Per quanto riguarda lo sviluppo rurale nell'ambito del secondo pilastro della PAC, la Croazia potrà usufruire della dotazione piena del FEASR a partire dal 1º gennaio 2014 (non è previsto un passaggio graduale al regime di aiuti). Attualmente la Croazia è beneficiaria dei programmi IPARD di preadesione. Nel 2013 riceverà una dotazione annuale completa nell'ambito dell'IPARD in cambio della mancata applicazione del programma del FEASR nel secondo semestre del 2013.

In relazione alla terza domanda, l'onorevole parlamentare troverà una replica dettagliata nella risposta alla Sua interrogazione scritta E-7740/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/it/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007908/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: European drought and the anticipated release of EU CAP funds to Croatia

The EU has been hit by a severe drought in recent months, placing a strain on agricultural sectors and particularly in the Italian region of Veneto. More than 360 000 hectares of arable land are at risk from the drought, meaning that production losses could be as high as 80 percent. Given the severity of the drought, Veneto's agricultural sector is at risk of incurring losses of up to one billion euros.

Croatia, which is due to join the EU in July 2013, is also facing a severe drought. This country, despite making some important steps towards implementing a rural development policy in line with EU standards, has lacked a stable agricultural policy for the last twenty years. According to reports that have emerged, it is anticipated that Croatia will receive EUR 3.5 billion from EU funds in 2012.

The Italian Government has requested that it receive CAP 2012 funding by 16 October 2012, earlier than scheduled, in order to increase financial support available to the region's farmers and agricultural enterprises.

1. Taking the above information into consideration, can the Commission confirm that Croatia will be receiving EU funds to help its agricultural sector in 2013?

2. What will be the nature of these funds, and will they be released before or after Croatia becomes a member of the EU?

3. Given that Italy is a Member State of the EU, can the Commission provide information on the nature of the support it will provide drought-stricken Italy, and also confirm whether it has considered the Italian Government's request for the early release of CAP 2012 funds?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

In reply to the first and the second question of the Honourable Member, Croatia will be eligible for support under CAP as from 1 July 2013 as an EU Member State.

As of this moment Croatia will become eligible for all relevant EU market support measures.

As for the direct aids scheme, Croatian farmers will introduce their applications for calendar year 2013 and will start receiving the payments as from budget year 2014, which for EAGF starts on 16 October 2013 (following the same rule as for current EU Member States).

With regard to rural development under the second pillar of the CAP, Croatia will be eligible for its full EAFRD allocation as from 1 January 2014 (without any phasing-in). Currently Croatia is a beneficiary of the pre-accession IPARD programmes. In 2013 it will receive a complete annual allocation for IPARD as an exchange for the non-implementation of EAFRD programme during the second half of 2013.

As regards the third question, the Honourable Member will find a detailed reply in the answer provided to her Written Question E-7740/2012 ([1]).

([1]) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-007913/12
a la Comisión
Ricardo Cortés Lastra (S&D)
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Acciones ante la caída de los precios del sector lechero

Los precios de la lecha han caído drásticamente desde mediados del 2011, concretamente en España los ganaderos cobran actualmente una media de 0.29 céntimos de euros por litro de leche. Situación inaceptable para un sector que vive desde hace tiempo en condiciones extremadamente duras. Una realidad que no se adecua a las declaraciones del Comisario, que insiste en que la caída del precio en el sector lácteo no es suficiente para activar las ayudas, sin tener en cuenta otros factores como el aumento del precio de los alimentos para el ganado.

1. ¿Por qué la Comisión sigue sin actuar para activar las ayudas al sector ante la drástica bajada de los precios de la leche?

2. ¿Piensa la Comisión revisar los márgenes establecidos para la activación de las ayudas al sector teniendo en cuenta otros criterios, como por ejemplo, el precio de los piensos o la situación de profundo deterioro estructural del sector en los distintos países?

3. La vigilancia de los precios es necesaria, pero ¿piensa la Comisión poner en marcha otras medidas que ataquen de raíz los problemas de precio, producción y venta de la leche y sus derivados?

Respuesta del Sr. Cioloş en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de octubre de 2012)

1. Desde marzo hasta agosto, cuando se observó una presión sobre los precios de la leche en la explotación, se pusieron a disposición de los agentes económicos los instrumentos de la red de seguridad en virtud del Reglamento único para las OCM ([1]). Sin embargo, ni ofrecieron mantequilla ni leche desnatada en polvo a la intervención, ni participaron en la licitación relativa a las restituciones por exportación. Solo se recurrió a las ayudas al almacenamiento privado de mantequilla. El volumen acumulado en 2012 asciende a 133 300 toneladas, lo que debe considerarse dentro de lo normal. En la actualidad, los precios están subiendo.

2. La Comisión está examinando el impacto del reciente aumento del coste de los piensos en el sector ganadero, incluido el lácteo. Se prevé que la cosecha de cereales de la UE sea de algo menos de 280 millones de toneladas, esto es, tan solo un 3 % menos que la media de cinco años.

3. En su propuesta de nuevo Reglamento de la OCM única ([2]), la Comisión ha propuesto reforzar la red de seguridad en el sector lácteo. En concreto, ha propuesto que la ayuda al almacenamiento privado se conceda en el futuro también al almacenamiento de leche desnatada en polvo y que se tengan en cuenta «los precios medios registrados en el mercado de la Unión y los precios de referencia de los producto afectados o la necesidad de responder a una situación del mercado especialmente difícil o a la evolución económica del sector en uno o varios Estados miembros», entre otras condiciones para decidir si se conceden ayudas.

Además, el paquete de medidas sobre la leche ([3]), que tenía por objeto consolidar la capacidad de negociación de los productores de leche frente a los fabricantes de productos lácteos, entró en vigor el 3 de octubre de 2012 y brinda la oportunidad a las organizaciones de productores de conseguir una distribución más justa del valor a lo largo de la cadena de suministro.

([1]) Reglamento (CE) n° 1234/2007 del Consejo, por el que se crea una organización común de mercados agrícolas y se establecen disposiciones específicas para determinados productos agrícolas (Reglamento único para las OCM).
([2]) COM(2011) 626 final, de 12 de octubre de 2011.
([3]) Reglamento (UE) n° 261/2012 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, que modifica el Reglamento (CE) n° 1234/2007 del Consejo en lo que atañe a las relaciones contractuales en el sector de la leche y de los productos lácteos.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007913/12
to the Commission
Ricardo Cortés Lastra (S&D)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Action on falling prices in the milk sector

Milk prices have fallen drastically since mid-2011. Farmers in Spain are now paid an average of EUR 0.29 per litre of milk. This is an unacceptable situation for a sector that has been experiencing extremely harsh conditions for some considerable time. Nor does this correspond to the Commissioner's statements insisting that prices in the milk sector have not fallen sufficiently for aid to be activated, but which do not take into account other factors, such as the rise in stock feed prices.

1. Why has the Commission still not moved to activate aid for the sector in view of the drastic fall in milk prices?

2. Is the Commission planning to review the margins for activating aid for the sector bearing in mind other criteria such as, for instance, the price of fodder or the serious structural decline the dairy sector is suffering in different countries?

3. Vigilance over prices is necessary, but is the Commission planning to introduce other measures to strike at the root of the problems with the price, production and sale of milk and its by-products?

Answer given by Mr Cioloş on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

1. From March till August, when pressure was observed on farm gate milk prices, the safety net tools under the single CMO Regulation ([1]) were at the disposal of operators. However, these offered no butter or skimmed milk powder to intervention, nor did they take part in the tender for export refunds. Only the private storage aid for butter was used. The cumulative volume for 2012 is 133 300 tons, which is to be considered within a normal range. Presently prices are moving upward.

2. The Commission is monitoring the impact of the recent feed cost increase in the livestock sector, including milk. EU cereals harvest is expected to be slightly below 280 million tons, which is only 3% below the five year average.

3. In its proposal for a new Single CMO Regulation ([2]) the Commission has proposed that the safety net should be strengthened for the milk sector. In particular, it is proposed that private storage aid should in future also be available for skimmed milk powder and that the conditions under which the Commission may decide to grant aid shall take into account 'average recorded Union market prices and reference prices for the products concerned or the need to respond to a particularly difficult market situation or economic developments in the sector in one or more Member States'.

Furthermore the Milk Package ([3]) aimed at strengthening the bargaining power of milk producers vis-à-vis dairy processors entered into force on 3 October 2012. It offers the opportunity for producer organisations to achieve a fairer value distribution along the supply chain.

([1]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 establishing a common organisation of agricultural markets and on specific provisions for certain agricultural products (Single CMO Regulation).
([2]) COM(2011) 626 final of 12 October 2011.
([3]) Regulation (EU) No 261/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards contractual relations in the milk and milk products sector.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007917/12
a la Comisión
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Residuos Mallorca

La consellera de Medi Ambient del Consell de Mallorca, Catalina Soler, explicó que en la tramitación del proyecto de ley de medidas urgentes para la activación económica en materia de industria y energía, el Partido Popular presentó una serie de enmiendas para permitir la incineración de residuos de todo tipo (incluyendo los de origen animal) en la planta de Son Reus ([1]).

La modificación permitirá a Mallorca incinerar a partir del próximo año residuos de otros países de la UE, hecho que implicaría la necesaria autorización de la Comisión Europea. Según el gobierno, la importación de dichos residuos tiene como objetivo reducir el coste de la tasa de residuos.

La Directiva de Residuos 2008/98/CE ([2]) establece una jerarquía de residuos, donde la incineración aparece como último recurso. A su vez aclara que la «incineración o coincineración con valorización energética tendrá como condición que esta valorización de energía se produzca con un alto nivel de eficiencia energética».

La importación de residuos llevará a una mayor incineración de residuos, hecho que tendrá inevitablemente una repercusión en las emisiones de la zona y en la contaminación ambiental. La Directiva 85/337/CEE establece el impacto ambiental obliga a hacer una evaluación sobre «instalaciones de tratamiento de los residuos y de las aguas».

— ¿Conoce la Comisión estas enmiendas?

— ¿Qué opinión tiene la Comisión sobre la posibilidad de que el Gobierno balear apruebe una ley que permite importar residuos de otros Estados miembro para incinerarlos?

— ¿Cuál será la respuesta de la Comisión si el Gobierno balear aprueba estas medidas?

— ¿Considera las medidas una violación a la jerarquía de residuos de la UE?

— ¿Obligará a realizar un estudio de impacto medioambiental?

Respuesta del Sr. Potočnik en nombre de la Comisión
(11 de octubre de 2012)

La Comisión no conoce todos los pormenores de este asunto en concreto.

Según la información que obra en poder de la Comisión, la ampliación de la planta incineradora de Son Reus ya fue sometida en 2007 a una evaluación de impacto ambiental con arreglo al Derecho de la UE en materia de medio ambiente. Esta planta se considera incineradora con recuperación de energía conforme a lo dispuesto en el anexo II de la Directiva marco sobre residuos ([3]) (DMR).

En la jerarquía de residuos establecida en el artículo 4 de la DMR, la recuperación de energía es superior a la eliminación de residuos mediante su depósito en vertederos, por ejemplo. La razón es que la incineración con recuperación de energía arroja, en general, mejores resultados medioambientales que las prácticas de vertido. Según el Reglamento sobre traslados de residuos ([4]) (títulos II y III), los Estados miembros están autorizados a realizar traslados para operaciones de recuperación dentro de la UE si se observa el marco de procedimiento pertinente.

([1]) http://ultimahora.es/mallorca/noticia/noticias/local/govern-cambia-ley-para-poder-traer-mallorca-basura-otros-paises-europa-govern-pagara-canon-consell-por-tratamiento-lodos-depuradoras.html
([2]) http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/environment/waste_management/ev0010_es.htm
([3]) Directiva 2008/98/CE, DO L 312 de 22.11.2008.
([4]) Reglamento n° 1013/2006, DO L 190 de 12.7.2006.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007917/12
to the Commission
Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)
(6 September 2012)

Subject: Waste management in Mallorca

Mallorca's regional minister for the environment, Catalina Soler, has explained that during the elaboration of the draft law on urgent measures to reactivate the economy in the spheres of industry and energy, the People's Party (PP) presented a series of amendments to allow the incineration of all types of waste (including waste of animal origin) at the plant at Son Reus ([1]).

The amendment will enable Mallorca to incinerate waste from other European countries from next year onwards, something which has to be authorised by the Commission. According to the regional government, the aim of this initiative is to reduce the annual amount paid by residents for waste collection.

The Waste Directive 2008/98/CE ([2]) establishes a waste hierarchy in which incineration is the option of last resort. It also makes it a condition of 'incineration or co-incineration with energy recovery that the recovery of energy take place with a high level of energy efficiency'.

The importation of waste will lead to an increased quantity of waste being incinerated, which will in turn have an impact in terms of emissions and environmental pollution in the area. According to Directive 85/337/CEE, environmental impact requires the assessment of water and waste treatment facilities.

— Is the Commission aware of these amendments?

— How does the Commission view the possible approval by the Government of the Balearic Islands of a law allowing waste to be imported from other Member States for incineration?

— How will the Commission respond if the government of the Balearic Islands approves these measures?

— Does it consider that these measures infringe the EU's waste management hierarchy?

— Will it require an environmental impact assessment to be carried out?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The Commission is not aware of all the details of this particular case.

According to the information available to the Commission, the extension of the incinerator at Son Reus has already been subjected to an environmental impact assessment pursuant to the relevant EU environmental law in 2007. This plant qualifies as an incinerator with energy recovery pursuant to the Annex II to the Waste Framework Directive ([3]) (WFD).

In the waste hierarchy, set out in Article 4 of the WFD, energy recovery ranks higher than disposal of waste such as landfilling. This is so because incineration with energy recovery generally yields better environmental results than disposal practices. Under the Waste Shipment Regulation ([4]) (Titles II and III), Member States are allowed to carry out shipments destined for recovery operations within the EU if the relevant procedural framework is observed.

([1]) http://ultimahora.es/mallorca/noticia/noticias/local/govern-cambia-ley-para-poder-traer-mallorca-basura-otros-paises-europa-govern-pagara-canon-consell-por-tratamiento-lodos-depuradoras.html
([2]) http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/environment/waste_management/ev0010_en.htm
([3]) Directive 2008/98/EC, OJ L 312, 22.11.2008.
([4]) Regulation 1013/2006, OJ L 190, 12.7.2006.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris P-007922/12
adresată Comisiei
Adrian Severin (NI)
(7 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Blocarea exercitării unora din atribuțiile Președintelui interimar al României

În luna iulie 2012 Parlamentul României a hotărât suspendarea Președintelui României, Traian Băsescu și declanșarea unei proceduri de demitere prin referendum.

În consecință, exercitarea funcției prezidențiale a fost transferată unui președinte interimar.

Președintele Comisiei Europene, Jose Manuel Barroso, a cerut Președintelui interimar al României, Crin Antonescu, ca în timpul interimatului său să nu exercite unele din atribuțiile sale constituționale, precizând că refuzul acestei solicitări va atrage sancționarea României de către Uniunea Europeană.

Rugăm Comisia să precizeze:

1. Care au fost rațiunile politice care au justificat cererea imperativă ca Președintele interimar al României să nu își exercite toate atribuțiile constituționale (exemplu: numirea șefilor Procuraturii cărora le-a expirat mandatul, exercitarea dreptului de grațiere, înlocuirea șefilor instituțiilor de forță ale statului etc.).

2. Care este temeiul legal pentru formularea cererii ca Președintele interimar al României să nu își exercite toate atribuțiile constituționale (articolele tratatelor europene care permit Comisiei Europene să limiteze atribuțiile constituționale ale șefilor statelor membre).

Răspuns dat de dl Barroso în numele Comisiei
(9 octombrie 2012)

În urma evenimentelor politice recente din România, Comisia și-a exprimat profunda preocupare cu privire la respectarea statului de drept, rolul Curții Constituționale și independența sistemului judiciar din România. Aceste preocupări au fost detaliate în raportul adoptat de Comisie la 18 iulie 2012 cu privire la progresele realizate de România în cadrul mecanismului de cooperare și de verificare (MCV) ([1]). Acest mecanism stabilește obiective de referință explicite cu privire la sistemul judiciar și lupta împotriva corupției. Raportul Comisiei a prezentat în detaliu o serie de recomandări care să contribuie la înlăturarea preocupărilor Comisiei și a invitat autoritățile române să ia măsuri imediate pentru a răspunde acestor preocupări. În scrisorile adresate Comisiei, prim-ministrul Ponta a confirmat că toate aceste cerințe au fost sau urmează să fie îndeplinite.

Aceste aspecte sunt în centrul tratatelor UE, fiind, de asemenea, relevante pentru funcționarea mecanismului de cooperare și de verificare. Comisia monitorizează îndeaproape situația și va adopta un alt raport în cadrul MCV spre sfârșitul anului, cu scopul de a evalua dacă preocupările Comisiei în ceea ce privește statul de drept și independența sistemului judiciar au fost abordate și dacă echilibrul democratic a fost restabilit.

([1]) COM (2012) 410 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007922/12
to the Commission
Adrian Severin (NI)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Blocking of certain prerogatives of the interim President of Romania

In July 2012, the Romanian Parliament voted to suspend the President of Romania, Traian Băsescu, and launched a referendum on his dismissal.

As a result, responsibility for exercising his Presidential duties was transferred to an interim President.

The President of the European Commission, Jose Manuel Barroso, requested the interim President of Romania, Crin Antonescu, not to exercise certain of his constitutional prerogatives during that interim period, saying that the EU would impose penalties on Romania should he refuse.

Can the Commission state:

1. What the political justifications were for the peremptory request that the interim President of Romania not exercise all his constitutional prerogatives (e.g.: appointment of Chief Public Prosecutors, exercising of the right of pardon, replacement of the heads of the state's military institutions, etc.).

2. What the legal basis was for the request that the interim President of Romania should not exercise all his constitutional prerogatives (i.e. under which articles of the European Treaties can the European Commission limit the constitutional powers of the Heads of Member States)?

Answer given by Mr Barroso on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

Following recent political events in Romania, the Commission expressed its serious concerns in relation with the respect for the rule of law, the role of the Constitutional Court and the judicial independence in Romania. These concerns were detailed in the report adopted by the Commission on 18 July 2012, on Romania's progress under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM) ([1]). This mechanism sets out explicit benchmarks on the judiciary and the fight against corruption. The Commission report detailed a series of recommendations to help resolve the Commission's concerns, and invited the Romanian authorities to take immediate action to address these. In letters to the Commission, the Prime Minister Ponta confirmed that all these requirements have or will be met.

These issues lie at the heart of the EU Treaties, as well as being relevant to the operation of the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism. The Commission is closely monitoring the situation and will adopt a further report under the CVM towards the end of the year in order to assess whether the Commission's concerns regarding the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary have been addressed and whether democratic checks and balances have been restored.

([1]) COM(2012)410 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-007926/12
alla Commissione
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE)
(7 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Revisione della direttiva 2001/37/CE sui prodotti del tabacco

La Commissione europea (DG SANCO) sta lavorando alla revisione della direttiva 2001/37/CE e la sua proposta legislativa sembra orientarsi sulla standardizzazione del prodotto e del pacchetto, sull'introduzione del pacchetto generico e sull'obbligo di introdurre avvertenze sanitarie con foto di dimensioni tali da coprire una parte consistente del pacchetto nonché sul divieto di esposizione dei prodotti del tabacco presso i punti vendita.

Considerato quanto sopra indicato, può la Commissione indicare:

1. in quale modo intende assicurare il rispetto della competenza degli Stati membri in materia di sanità pubblica;

2. in che modo ritiene che la standardizzazione del pacchetto e la dimensione delle avvertenze incidano direttamente sulla salute dei consumatori;

3. se non ritiene che il divieto per i produttori di tabacco di utilizzare i loro marchi e differenziare i loro prodotti da quelli della concorrenza e quello per i rivenditori di esporre i prodotti al consumatore violino le regole della concorrenza e limitino l'ingresso nel libero mercato dell'UE;

4. se intende includere nella valutazione di impatto un'analisi circa la conformità della sua proposta alle costituzioni degli Stati membri e alla Carta dei diritti fondamentali dell'UE, che garantiscono il diritto alla proprietà e la libertà di espressione?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(1º ottobre 2012)

1. La proposta rispetterà pienamente la ripartizione di competenze stabilita dal trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea. Si baserà sull'articolo 114 che attribuisce al Parlamento e al Consiglio il potere di adottare misure che hanno per oggetto l'instaurazione e il funzionamento del mercato interno. Spetta alla Commissione garantire un elevato livello di protezione della salute nella sua proposta.

2. La Commissione sta prendendo in considerazione una serie di opzioni alternative e non ha ancora stabilito una posizione definitiva. L'adozione della proposta legislativa è prevista per la fine del 2012. Vari studi hanno dimostrato che i pacchetti possono attrarre le persone inducendole a fumare e trasmettere ai fumatori e ai potenziali consumatori informazioni fuorvianti sui rischi del tabagismo. ([1])

3. Si sta attualmente analizzando l'impatto delle diverse opzioni alternative sull'economia e sull'occupazione, compreso il potenziale impatto sulla concorrenza e sul mercato interno.

4. La valutazione d'impatto riguarda il tema dei diritti fondamentali, compresa la Carta dell'UE.

([1]) Moodie C, Ford A. Young adult smokers' perceptions of cigarette pack innovation, pack colour and plain packaging. AMJ 2011;19:174-180. Moodie C, Ford A, Mackintosh AM, Hastings G. Young People's Perceptions of Cigarette Packaging and Plain Packaging: An Online Survey. Nicotine Tob Res 2012;14:98-105.Hammond D, Parkinson C. The impact of cigarette package design on perceptions of risk. J Public Health. 2009;31:345-53. Hammond D, Dockrell M, Arnott D, Lee A, McNeill A. Cigarette pack design and perceptions of risk among UK adults and youth. Eur J Public Health 2009; 19: 631-7. Mutti S, Hammond D, Borland R, Cummings MK, O'Connor RJ, Fong GT. Beyond light and mild: cigarette brand descriptors and perceptions of risk in the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. Addiction 2011;106:1166-75.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007926/12
to the Commission
Erminia Mazzoni (PPE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Revision of Directive 2001/37/EC on tobacco products

The Commission (DG SANCO) is working on the revision of Directive 2001/37/EC and its legislative proposal seems to be geared to the standardisation of products and packages, the introduction of generic packaging and a requirement to introduce health warnings with pictures large enough to cover a substantial part of the packet, in addition to a ban on displaying tobacco products in retail outlets.

In view of the above, can the Commission say:

1. how it intends to ensure that the competence of the Member States with regard to public health is respected;

2. how it thinks that the standardisation of packaging and the size of the warnings will directly affect the health of consumers;

3. whether it does not agree that the ban on tobacco manufacturers using their own brands and differentiating their products from those of competitors and the ban on retailers displaying products to consumers are in breach of competition rules and restrict entry into the free EU market;

4. whether it intends to include in its impact assessment an analysis on the compliance of its proposal with the constitutions of the Member States and with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, which guarantees the right to property and freedom of expression?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(1 October 2012)

1. The proposal will fully respect the division of competence as set out in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. It will be based on its Article 114 empowering the Parliament and the Council to adopt measures for the establishment and functioning of the internal market. The Commission should aim at ensuring a high level of health protection in its proposal.

2. The Commission is considering a number of policy options and has not yet reached a final position. The adoption of the legislative proposal is planned by the end of 2012. Studies have demonstrated that packages have the potential to attract people into smoking and to mislead smokers and potential consumers about the risks of smoking ([1]).

3. The impact of different policy options on the economy and on employment is being analysed, including the potential impact on competition and the internal market.

4. The impact assessment addresses the issue of fundamental rights, including the EU Charter.

([1]) Moodie C., Ford A. Young adult smokers' perceptions of cigarette pack innovation, pack colour and plain packaging. *AMJ* 2011;19:174-180. Moodie C., Ford A., Mackintosh A.M., Hastings G. Young People's Perceptions of Cigarette Packaging and Plain Packaging: An Online Survey. *Nicotine Tob Res* 2012;14:98-105. Hammond D., Parkinson C. The impact of cigarette package design on perceptions of risk. *J Public Health*. 2009;31:345-53. Hammond D., Dockrell M., Arnott D., Lee A., McNeill A. Cigarette pack design and perceptions of risk among UK adults and youth. *Eur J Public Health* 2009; 19: 631-7. Mutti S., Hammond D., Borland R., Cummings M.K., O'Connor R.J., Fong G.T. Beyond light and mild: cigarette brand descriptors and perceptions of risk in the International Tobacco Control (ITC) Four Country Survey. *Addiction* 2011;106:1166-75.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007927/12
a la Comisión
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(7 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Tarifas de los peajes en las autopistas catalanas

El porcentaje de autopistas de peaje en Catalunya, en comparación a otros territorios de la Unión Europea, es proporcionalmente muy elevado. Asimismo, desde que en 1998 se cambió la normativa estatal española y se eliminó la obligación de reinvertir los beneficios de la concesionaria en nuevas infraestructuras, no han parado de crecer las prórrogas a las concesiones así como los precios para los que se hacen efectivas las concesiones y que deben pagar los ciudadanos. Así las cosas, actualmente los tramos de autopista catalana son también los más caros de Europa. El tramo de autopista de peaje entre El Pertús y Sijan (70 km), bajo jurisdicción francesa, por ejemplo, cuesta 4,77 euros a los usuarios; en cambio, siguiendo el mismo trazado hacia Catalunya, bajo jurisdicción española, entre la Frontera y Girona Sur, el coste es de 6,00 euros, es decir un 26 % más caro.

1. ¿Puede asegurar la Comisión Europea que en las autopistas catalanas se cumplen los requisitos establecidos en el artículo 7, letras b) y h), de la Directiva 93/89/CEE del Consejo, de 25 de octubre de 1993, según el cual las tarifas deben estar relacionadas con los costes de construcción, explotación y ampliación de la red de infraestructuras?

2. ¿Cómo es posible que los tramos concedidos a Abertis sean más caros que otros tramos similares existentes en el resto de Europa?

Respuesta del Sr. Kallas en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de octubre de 2012)

La Comisión desea informar a Su Señoría de que, mediante sentencia de 5 de julio de 1995 en el asunto C-21/94 (Parlamento Europeo contra Consejo), el Tribunal de Justicia de las Comunidades Europeas anuló la Directiva 93/89/CEE del Consejo, de 25 de octubre de 1993. Esta Directiva fue sustituida posteriormente por la Directiva 1999/62/CE, relativa a la aplicación de gravámenes a los vehículos pesados de transporte de mercancías por la utilización de determinadas infraestructuras.

A la Comisión también le gustaría llamar la atención de Su Señoría sobre el hecho de que la Directiva 1999/62/CE se aplica a los gravámenes impuestos a los vehículos pesados de transporte de mercancías por el uso de la infraestructura de carreteras, mientras que su Señoría se refiere a los peajes por el uso de dicha infraestructura por los turismos. No existe actualmente una normativa europea específica sobre los peajes (gravámenes basados en la distancia recorrida) de los turismos. Respecto a los gravámenes basados en la duración, la Comisión ha adoptado recientemente una Comunicación [COM(2012)199 final] en la que se explica cómo se aplican los principios de no discriminación (artículo 18 del TFUE) y proporcionalidad del Tratado en el caso de las viñetas para los automóviles.

La Comisión informa a Su Señoría de que, el 10 de agosto, la Comisión puso en marcha una consulta pública en Internet sobre la tarificación del uso de la infraestructura de carreteras (el plazo es el 4 de noviembre). Uno de los aspectos objeto de esta consulta pública es la falta de transparencia y el riesgo de discriminación al fijar, actualizar y cobrar los peajes y gravámenes aplicables a los turismos. La consulta pública forma parte de los trabajos preparatorios de los servicios de la Comisión dirigidos a estudiar si ha lugar a nuevas iniciativas sobre la tarificación vial.

La Comisión no dispone de información suficiente para responder a la segunda pregunta.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007927/12
to the Commission
Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Tolls for using Catalan motorways

In comparison to other parts of the European Union, the proportion of Catalonia's motorways for which road users are required to pay a toll is very high. Following changes to Spanish law in 1998 which did away with the requirement to reinvest profits in new infrastructure, concessions have been consistently extended and the prices which concessionaires must charge to make their operations viable, and which are passed on to road users, have consistently increased. Catalan motorways are now the most expensive in Europe as a result. For example, the stretch of the toll motorway between Le Perthus and Sigean (70 km), which is under French jurisdiction, costs road users EUR 4.77. Further along the same route in Catalonia, drivers must pay EUR 6 to travel between the border and South Girona, under Spanish jurisdiction. The Catalan stretch of the motorway is thus 26% more expensive than the French stretch.

1. Does the Commission think that Catalan motorways are operated in a way which meets the requirements of points (b) and (h) of Article 7 of Council Directive 93/89/EEC of 25 October 1993, which states that toll rates should be related to the costs of constructing, operating and developing the infrastructure network?

2. Why is it that the stretches of toll motorways operated by the company Abertis are moreexpensive than similar stretches of road in other parts of Europe?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that by judgment of 5 July 1995 in Case C-21/94 European Parliament v. Council the Court of Justice of the European Communities annulled Council Directive 93/89/EEC of 25 October 1993. This directive was later replaced by Directive 1999/62/EC on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures.

The Commission would also like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the fact that directive1999/62/EC applies to road charges levied for the use of road infrastructure by heavy goods vehicles, while the Honourable Member refers to the tolls for the use of such infrastructure by cars. There is currently no specific European legislation governing tolls (distance-based charges) for cars. On time-based charges, the Commission recently adopted a communication (COM(2012) 199 final) which explains how the Treaty principle of non-discrimination (Art. 18 TFEU) and the principle of proportionality apply in the case of vignettes for cars.

The Commission informs the Honourable Member that on 10 August it launched an Internet public consultation on the charging of the use of road infrastructure (deadline 4 November). One of the aspects covered by this public consultation is the lack of transparency and the risk of discrimination in the way in which tolls and charges applicable to cars are fixed, updated and levied. The public consultation is part of the preparatory work of the Commission's services to explore the scope for possible new initiatives on road charging.

The Commission does not have sufficient information to be able to answer the second question.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007934/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Tatuaggi con inchiostro contaminato

Nelle ultime settimane, è stata pubblicata, sul sito della Food and Drug Administration (FDA), una nota relativa alle infezioni causate da un batterio presente nell'inchiostro per la realizzazione dei tatuaggi. L'allarme è stato dato perché sono stati numerosi i casi di malattie provocate dal batterio M.chelonae, responsabile di infezioni alle articolazioni o ad altri organi. Tra la fine del 2011 e gli inizi del 2012, in almeno quattro Stati degli USA, si sono verificate infezioni con serie complicazioni. La FDA ha specificato che tali inchiostri e pigmenti possono essere contaminati da batteri, funghi e muffe. Si sta indagando per accertare se questo inchiostro sia o meno utilizzato anche in altri Paesi.

Considerato che il numero di persone che si avvicina al mondo dei tatuaggi è in crescente aumento, soprattutto tra i giovani, può dire la Commissione se è al corrente di questo inchiostro contaminato e se intende avviare una procedura di controllo e di selezione del materiale che entra nell'UE al fine di proteggere e tutelare i cittadini europei?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(11 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione non è a conoscenza della contaminazione microbiologica trasmessa da inchiostro da tatuaggio cui fa riferimento l'onorevole parlamentare.

Effettuare controlli sui prodotti che entrano nell'UE è compito delle autorità doganali e di vigilanza del mercato degli Stati membri. Essi dispongono di tutti i poteri necessari a controllare e ad adottare misure su prodotti, anche sugli inchiostri da tatuaggi, passibili di compromettere la salute e la sicurezza dei cittadini della UE. Il sistema RAPEX ([1]) di scambio rapido d'informazioni fa sì che informazioni sui provvedimenti presi in uno Stato membro circolino rapidamente in tutta la UE. Ciò permette anche alle autorità di altri Stati membri di prendere misure adeguate sui prodotti in questione. La Commissione non intende pertanto affrontare procedimenti aggiuntivi sui prodotti che entrano sul mercato della UE.

Riguardo ai prodotti da tatuaggio, la Commissione sta riflettendo se sia necessario intervenire come UE in seguito al diffondersi di preoccupazioni per gli effetti sulla salute di tali prodotti e all'adozione di varie normative nazionali in diversi Stati membri.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/safety/rapex/index_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007934/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Tattoos: contaminated ink

Some weeks ago, the website of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) issued a warning on an infection triggered by bacteria found in tattoo ink. The alarm was raised following the outbreak of many cases of this illness, which was caused by the bacteria *M.chelonae* and which affects the joints and organs. Between late 2011 and early 2012, infections and serious complications were reported in at least four US states. The FDA has stated that these inks and pigments may have been contaminated with bacteria, fungus and mould. Inquiries are under way to see if this ink is also in use in other countries.

Since more and more people are considering having tattoos, especially the young, can the Commission state whether it knows about this contaminated ink, and whether it intends to introduce a monitoring and filtering process for materials entering the EU in order to protect and safeguard EU citizens?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

The Commission is not aware of the microbiological contamination of tattoo ink the Honourable Member is referring to.

Monitoring consumer products entering the EU is the task of Member State customs and market surveillance authorities. They have all the powers necessary to control and take measures on products, including tattoo inks that would compromise the health and safety of EU citizens. The rapid information exchange system RAPEX ([1]) ensures that information about measures taken in one Member State swiftly circulates across the EU. This enables other Member States' authorities to also take appropriate action on the concerned products. The Commission therefore does not intend to introduce a further process regarding products entering the EU.

With respect to tattoo products as such, the Commission is reflecting about the need of possible EU intervention following concerns about the health effects of these products and the adoption of national legislation in several Member States.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/consumers/safety/rapex/index_en.htm

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007938/12
alla Commissione
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Nuovo microchip ad ago utile per i malati di Parkinson

Oggi la malattia colpisce circa il 3 per mille della popolazione in generale e circa l'1 % di quella sopra i 65 anni. In Italia i malati di Parkinson sono circa 300 000, per lo più di sesso maschile (1,5 volte in più), con età d'esordio compresa fra i 59 e i 62 anni. Età d'esordio da riconsiderare: l'immagine che la malattia riguardi solo le persone anziane non corrisponde più alla realtà. L'età d'esordio del Parkinson si fa, infatti, sempre più giovane (un paziente su quattro ha meno di 50 anni, il 10 % ha meno di 40 anni), per il fatto che la scienza è oggi in grado di porre una diagnosi ai primi sintomi, quando la malattia è ancora in fase precocissima. Inoltre, si ipotizza che mediamente, rispetto al momento della prima diagnosi, l'inizio del danno cerebrale sia da retrodatare di almeno 6 anni.

Considerando che la malattia è sempre più diffusa, è stato studiato da un gruppo di scienziati la possibilità di utilizzare un microchip ad ago in silicio, facilmente impiantabile nel cervello, in grado di stabilire una comunicazione bidirezionale con i neuroni cerebrali.

Alla luce di quanto precede, intende la Commissione riconoscere l'importanza di questa malattia? Quali strumenti intende utilizzare al fine di promuovere e implementare la ricerca scientifica?

Risposta di Máire Geoghegan-Quinn a nome della Commissione
(11 ottobre 2012)

Il sostegno alla ricerca sulle malattie neurodegenerative ha rivestito importanza prioritaria nell'intero arco del Settimo programma quadro di ricerca e sviluppo tecnologico (7° PQ, 2007-2013) ([1]), nell'ambito del quale dal 2007 sono stati destinati alla ricerca in questo settore oltre 400 milioni di EUR, di cui circa 165 milioni di EUR per il morbo di Parkinson.

In particolare, il progetto RENACHIP ([2]) coordinato dall'Università di Newcastle, che studia la sostituzione funzionale di una porzione di cervelletto con un chip, ha beneficiato di finanziamenti per 2,6 milioni di EUR. Nell'ambito di tale progetto è stata sviluppata una tecnologia riabilitativa e sostitutiva costituita da un chip di silicio che si interfaccia bidirezionalmente con l'input e l'output dei sistemi neuronali per recuperare funzioni cerebrali compromesse. In futuro questa tecnologia potrebbe trovare applicazione in nuovi metodi di cura del morbo di Parkinson.

Inoltre, attraverso il progetto JUMPAHEAD ([3]), la Commissione finanzia la realizzazione dell'iniziativa di programmazione congiunta relativa alle malattie neurodegenerative, in particolare il morbo di Alzheimer (JPND — *Joint Programming Initiative on Neurodegenerative Diseases*), un'iniziativa guidata dagli Stati membri ([4]) che mira ad accrescere l'impatto della ricerca europea in questo settore coordinando e potenziando gli sforzi compiuti nei vari paesi.

Infine, Orizzonte 2020, il prossimo programma quadro dell'Unione europea per la ricerca e l'innovazione, con ogni probabilità offrirà ulteriori opportunità per sostenere la ricerca sul morbo di Parkinson e su altre malattie neurodegenerative.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/home_it.html
([2]) http://www.renachip.org/default.aspx.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/medical-research/brain-research/projects/jumpahead_en.html
([4]) http://www.neurodegenerationresearch.eu/.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007938/12
to the Commission
Oreste Rossi (EFD)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: New microchip for Parkinson's patients

Parkinson's disease currently affects about 3 per thousand of the general population and around 1% of the over-65s. In Italy, there are around 300 000 Parkinson's patients, most of whom are male (1.5 times more than women), with an average onset age of between 59 and 62. This onset age needs to be reviewed, however, as it is no longer true that the disease affects only older people. Parkinson's disease is, in fact, affecting younger and younger people (one in four patients is now younger than 50 and 10% are younger than 40). Science is now able to diagnose the disease at its initial symptoms, when the disease is still at a very early stage. Furthermore, it is assumed that on average, the onset of brain damage predates the moment of diagnosis by at least 6 years.

Given that the disease is becoming more widespread, a group of scientists has studied the possibility of using a needle-shaped silicon microchip that can be easily implanted in the brain and can establish bidirectional communication with the brain's neurons.

Given the above, will the Commission recognise the significance of this disease? What tools will it use to promote and implement the relevant scientific research?

Answer given by Ms Geoghegan-Quinn on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

Support for research on neurodegenerative diseases has been a priority throughout the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7, 2007-2013) ([1]), with more than EUR 400 million dedicated to research in this area since 2007, including some EUR 165 million on Parkinson's disease.

In particular, the project 'Rehabilitation of a Discrete Sensory Motor Learning Function by a Prosthetic Chip' (RENACHIP) ([2]), coordinated by the University of Newcastle, was supported with EUR 2.6 million. Within this project, a rehabilitation and substitution technology comprising a silicon processing chip bi-directionally interfacing with in- and outputs of neuronal systems has been developed to recover lost brain functions. In the future, this technology might be applied to novel approaches for the treatment of Parkinson's disease.

With the JUMPAHEAD project ([3]), the Commission also supports the implementation of the Joint Programming Initiative on Neurodegenerative Diseases, in particular Alzheimer's (JPND), a Member States-led initiative ([4]) which aims at increasing the impact of European research in this area by coordinating and strengthening efforts across countries.

Finally, Horizon 2020, the next EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, will likely provide further opportunities to support research on neurodegenerative diseases including Parkinson's.

([1]) http://cordis.europa.eu/home_en.html
([2]) http://www.renachip.org/default.aspx.
([3]) http://ec.europa.eu/research/health/medical-research/brain-research/projects/jumpahead_en.html
([4]) http://www.neurodegenerationresearch.eu/.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007944/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 september 2012)

Betreft: Malmström wil nog veel meer immigratie naar Europa (vervolgvraag)

Op 29 augustus 2012 heeft Eurocommissaris Malmström namens de Commissie antwoord gegeven op schriftelijke vraag E-007179/2012.

Eurocommissaris Malmström heeft gezegd dat nog veel meer immigratie voor Europa een „kans" zou zijn. Welke landen bedoelt Malmström hier?

In concreto: voor welke landen is nog veel meer immigratie een „kans" en voor welke minder of niet?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(9 oktober 2012)

Zoals vermeld in het antwoord op schriftelijke vraag E-007179/2012, blijven de lidstaten verantwoordelijk voor het bepalen van het aantal economische migranten dat zij willen toelaten. Volgens het Verdrag betreffende de werking van de EU heeft de Unie tot taak een gemeenschappelijk immigratiebeleid te ontwikkelen dat moet leiden tot een efficiënt beheer van de migratiestromen en een billijke behandeling van onderdanen van derde landen die legaal in de lidstaten verblijven. Bij de uitoefening van haar taken houdt de Commissie rekening met de situatie in de hele Europese Unie.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007944/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Malmström's desire to further greatly increase immigration into Europe (follow-up question)

On 29 August 2012 Commissioner Malmström answered Written Question E-007179/2012 on behalf of the Commission.

Commissioner Malmström has said that much more immigration into Europe could be 'an opportunity'. Which countries is Malmström referring to here?

For exactly which countries is much more immigration an 'opportunity', and which countries stand to benefit much less or not at all?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

As stated previously in the reply to Written Question E-007179/2012, Member States remain responsible for determining the number of economic migrants they admit. The Treaty on the Functioning of the EU has conferred on the Union the task to develop a common immigration policy aimed at ensuring efficient management of migration flows and fair treatment of third-country nationals residing legally in Member States. When carrying out its duties, the Commission takes into account the situation in the entire European Union.

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-007946/12
aan de Commissie
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 september 2012)

Betreft: Boot met illegale Afrikaanse immigranten naar Lampedusa

Nabij het Italiaanse eiland Lampedusa is een tien meter lange houten vissersboot met meer dan 100 illegale Afrikaanse immigranten, vertrokken vanuit Tunesië, gezonken. Volgens de Italiaanse kustwacht konden helaas slechts 54 opvarenden worden gered.

1. Is de Commissie bekend met het bericht „Schipbreuk illegalen bij Lampedusa" ([1])?

2. Hoe verklaart de Commissie het dat de laatste tijd almaar meer boten met illegale Afrikaanse immigranten de EU proberen te bereiken — niet alleen via Lampedusa, maar ook via Malta en Isla de la Tierra?

3. Wat gaat er gebeuren met de 54 opvarenden die konden worden gered? Worden zij tot de EU toegelaten of teruggestuurd?

4. Is de Commissie ertoe bereid Frontex in te zetten om zo te voorkomen dat nog meer boten met illegale Afrikaanse immigranten de EU kunnen bereiken? Zo neen, waarom niet? Wat gaat de Commissie er dan tegen ondernemen?

5. Op welke manier gaat Eurosur dergelijke drama's voorkomen?

Antwoord van mevrouw Malmström namens de Commissie
(15 oktober 2012)

De Commissie houdt de onregelmatige migratie naar de EU via de Middellandse Zee aandachtig in het oog en is op de hoogte van de door het geachte Parlementslid vermelde gebeurtenis. Hoewel de cijfers niet vergelijkbaar zijn met die van 2011, tonen ze toch aan dat de druk van onregelmatige migratie hoog blijft in 2012.

Het is aan Italië om de status van de 54 geredde personen te bekijken en om te beslissen of zij zouden mogen blijven of zouden moeten terugkeren naar hun land van oorsprong, overeenkomstig het EU-acquis, onder meer op het gebied van asiel en internationale bescherming.

Frontex is actief in de Middellandse Zee met verschillende gezamenlijke operaties, onder meer met GO Hermes, waarin bijzondere aandacht wordt besteed aan de routes van Tunesië en Libië naar Italië.

De preventie van illegale migratie is een duidelijke doelstelling van het Europees grensbewakingssysteem (EUROSUR) ([2]). De lidstaten doen er samen met Frontex alles aan om EUROSUR operationeel te maken vanaf 1 oktober 2013 en bij het Parlement ligt momenteel een voorstel voor een wetgevingskader om dit mogelijk te maken.

Het onaanvaardbare sterftecijfer van migranten in de Middellandse Zee is vooral te wijten aan het gebruik van kleine en niet-zeewaardige boten. Deze boten zijn bijzonder moeilijk waar te nemen en op te sporen. EUROSUR zal ervoor zorgen dat kleine boten gemakkelijker kunnen ontdekt, geïdentificeerd en opgespoord worden en daardoor bijdragen tot de vermindering van het verlies van mensenlevens en de opsporings- en reddingsacties die worden uitgevoerd in nauwe samenwerking met de verantwoordelijke reddingscoördinatiecentra vergemakkelijken.

([1]) http://nos.nl/artikel/415815-schipbreuk-illegalen-bij-lampedusa.html
([2]) Voorstel voor een verordening van het Europees Parlement en de Raad tot instelling van het Europees grensbewakingssysteem (EUROSUR), COM(2011) 873 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007946/12
to the Commission
Auke Zijlstra (NI)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Boat carrying African illegal immigrants to Lampedusa sinks

A 10 metre-long wooden fishing boat carrying more than 100 African illegal immigrants which had departed from Tunisia sank near the Italian island of Lampedusa. According to the Italian coastguard, unfortunately only 54 of the people on board could be rescued.

1. Is the Commission aware of the report entitled 'Illegal immigrants suffer shipwreck near Lampedusa' ([1])?

2. How does the Commission explain the fact that in recent times more and more boats carrying African illegal immigrants have been seeking to reach the EU, not only via Lampedusa, but also via Malta and Isla de la Tierra?

3. What will be done with the 54 people who were rescued? Will they be allowed into the EU or will they be sent back to their countries of origin?

4. Is the Commission prepared to deploy Frontex officers in order to prevent even more boats carrying African illegal immigrants from reaching the EU? If not, why not? What action will the Commission actually take to halt this influx of immigrants?

5. What action is Eurosur taking to prevent similar disasters?

Answer given by Ms Malmström on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Commission is following closely irregular migration towards the EU via the Mediterranean and is aware of the events mentioned by the Honourable Member. While the numbers are not comparable to those of 2011, they show that irregular migratory pressure remains high in 2012.

It is for Italy to examine the status of the 54 persons rescued to assess whether they should be permitted to stay or returned to their countries of origin in accordance with EU *acquis*, including on asylum and international protection.

Frontex is present in the Mediterranean Sea with several Joint Operations, notably OJ Hermes with a special focus on the routes from Tunisia and Libya to Italy.

The prevention of irregular migration is a clear objective the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur) ([2]). Both Member States and Frontex are working towards making Eurosur operational as of 1 October 2013 and a proposal on the legislative framework to enable this is currently before Parliament.

The use of small and unseaworthy boats is the main reason for the unacceptable death toll of migrants in the Mediterranean. These boats are extremely difficult to detect and to track. Eurosur will contribute to reducing the loss of lives, by improving the detection, identification and tracking of small boats, thereby facilitating Search and Rescue operations in close cooperation with responsible Rescue Coordination Centres.

([1]) http://nos.nl/artikel/415815-schipbreuk-illegalen-bij-lampedusa.html
([2]) Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the European Border Surveillance System (Eurosur), COM(2011) 873 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-007947/12
to the Commission
Vicky Ford (ECR)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Fees for meat inspection

Under Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, abattoirs in the European Union should be charged a minimum price for the provision of meat inspectors. There have been suggestions that some Member States may be either simply not charging these amounts or charging the fee but not collecting due payments.

Article 65 of the same regulation calls for a report to address the issue of collection of inspection fees. The external evaluation necessary for this report (published in 2009) found that 3 Member States did not collect all mandatory inspection fees.

— What action has the Commission taken on the report's findings regarding the collection of inspection fees?

— What recent evidence does the Commission have that such charges are being uniformly levied across the European Union, particularly with regard to slaughter inspection?

— Does the Commission have evidence as to whether such charges, if levied, are actually being collected by Member States from abattoirs?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(28 September 2012)

The report to which the Honourable Member refers has been followed by a comprehensive review of the relevant provisions of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 ([1]) (Articles 26 to 29), the outcome of which is being fed into a broader exercise aimed at reforming the general framework set up by that regulation for the organisation and financing of official controls along the food chain. Such proposal, to be adopted by the Commission in the coming months, will be part of a legislative package which will also aim at reviewing the Union's animal and plant health rules and the rules on plant reproductive materials.

Studies and evidence available on the application of existing rules on fees show that there is no uniformity in the amounts charged by the Member States' competent authorities to compensate for the costs of slaughter inspection and that fees vary across Member States and in some cases within Member States. Importantly, also uneven is the extent to which fees charged on operators enable the competent authorities to recover their costs.

The Commission has no evidence or indication to suggest that fees due by abattoirs are not collected.

([1]) OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita E-007948/12
a la Comisión
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(7 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: El abandono escolar en Cataluña

Según cifras recientes, el 26 % de los jóvenes entre 18 y 24 años no continúa sus estudios tras la educación secundaria en Cataluña. Se trata de una cifra que pese a haberse reducido en los últimos tres años, continúa por encima de la de la media europea.

Éste constituye el problema más grave del sistema educativo catalán, pero también el de muchos países europeos. Los expertos señalan que el elevado índice de abandono se debe principalmente que el sistema educativo no ofrece opciones de escolarización suficientemente atractivas como para alentar a los jóvenes a continuar estudiando.

Por otro lado, la falta de adecuación de los niveles formativos a las necesidades del mercado laboral puede comportar la pérdida de una generación de jóvenes talentosos.

El objetivo de reducción del abandono escolar fijado por la Estrategia Europea para 2020 es del 10 %, dieciséis puntos menos que ahora.

¿Cuáles son las recomendaciones de la Comisión para combatir el abandono escolar de aquí a 2020?

¿Cómo pretende evitar la Comisión la pérdida de los talentos de aquellos jóvenes que optan por no proseguir con sus estudios ante la falta de oportunidades laborales?

¿Considera necesaria la Comisión la modernización de la educación superior con el fin de adaptarla a las exigencias del mercado de trabajo actuales?

Respuesta de la Sra. Vassiliou en nombre de la Comisión
(9 de octubre de 2012)

En septiembre de 2011, la Comisión Europea expuso su estrategia para la modernización de los sistemas de educación superior en Europa ([1]). En ella se destaca la importancia de garantizar que haya un número suficiente de personas que tengan estudios superiores completos a fin de proporcionar las capacidades y actitudes necesarias para producir sociedades sostenibles y un crecimiento económico sólido. En particular, la Comisión insiste en la importancia de una orientación y un asesoramiento de buena calidad para los futuros estudiantes y para los que ya cursan estudios superiores, de una ayuda financiera adecuada para los estudiantes y de incentivos bien concebidos para aumentar la proporción de estudiantes que completan sus estudios y reducir la duración excesiva de los mismos.

La agenda de modernización de la UE también hace hincapié en la necesidad de mejorar la calidad y la pertinencia de la educación superior, lo cual implica centrarse en garantizar que los programas de educación superior ayuden a los estudiantes a desarrollar conocimientos y capacidades pertinentes para el mercado de trabajo, con un apoyo adecuado a los profesores de educación superior, un uso efectivo de la tecnología y una mayor cooperación con los empleadores y otras partes interesadas. En este contexto, es importante que los sistemas de educación nacionales ofrezcan una variedad adecuada de oportunidades a quienes abandonan prematuramente la escuela, teniendo en cuenta las distintas necesidades y capacidades de cada persona, lo que incluye una variedad diversificada de programas de educación superior —con cursos orientados a la formación profesional y de ciclo corto que sean de buena calidad—, así como cursos de formación profesional complementaria de alta calidad, que dejen abierta la posibilidad de acceder posteriormente a la educación superior.

([1]) Véase el documento COM(2011) 567 final.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007948/12
to the Commission
Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Too few young people going into higher education in Catalonia

According to recent figures, 26% of 18 to 24 year-olds in Catalonia leave education once they have completed secondary school. Although this figure has fallen over the past three years, it is still higher than the European average.

This is the most serious problem affecting the education system in both Catalonia and many European countries. Experts say that the main reason why so many young people are choosing not to go into higher education is because the system is not sufficiently attractive to encourage young people to continue their studies.

A further problem is the failure to tailor teaching to the needs of the labour market, which could lead to an entire generation of young talent being lost.

What does the Commission recommend should be done to encourage more young people to go into higher education between now and 2020?

What does the Commission intend to do to ensure that the talents of young people who choose not to continue their studies because of a lack of employment opportunities do not go to waste?

Does it think that the higher education system needs to be modernised in order to tailor it to today's labour market requirements?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

The European Commission set out its strategy for the modernisation of higher education systems in Europe in September 2011 ([1]). It highlights the importance of ensuring that sufficient numbers of individuals complete higher education to provide the skills and attitudes necessary to produce sustainable societies and strong economic growth. In particular, the Commission stresses the importance of good quality guidance and counselling for prospective students and those already in higher education, adequate financial support for students and well-designed incentives to increase completion rates and reduce excessive study duration.

The EU's modernisation agenda also emphasises the need to improve the quality and relevance of higher education. This implies a focus on ensuring higher education programmes help students to develop knowledge and skills relevant to the labour market, with appropriate support for higher education teachers, effective use of technology and improved cooperation with employers and other stakeholders. In this context, it is important that national education systems provide an adequate range of opportunities for school-leavers, taking account of individuals' differing needs and capacities. This includes a diversified range of higher education programmes — including good quality vocationally oriented and short-cycle courses — and high quality vocational further education courses, which leave open the possibility of subsequently progressing to higher education.

([1]) See COM(2011)567 final.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta E-007956/12
alla Commissione
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(7 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Possibile modifica della normativa europea sulla vendita dei tabacchi e conseguenze per i consumatori e migliaia di lavoratori

È in fase di elaborazione da parte della Commissione un documento che andrà a modificare le disposizioni della direttiva 2001/37/CE sul ravvicinamento delle disposizioni legislative, regolamentari e amministrative degli Stati membri relative alla lavorazione, alla presentazione e alla vendita dei prodotti del tabacco. Fra le modifiche che si vorrebbero apportare vi sarebbero il divieto di esposizione dei prodotti da fumo, l'imposizione di un pacchetto del tutto generico senza marchio del produttore, dove troveranno maggior spazio immagini shock con la finalità di scoraggiare gli acquirenti e un taglio unico del formato di sigarette; infine, si chiederebbe un utilizzo omogeneo degli ingredienti per uniformarne il gusto e il sapore.

Conferma la Commissione che questa proposta di modifica normativa è attualmente in fase di preparazione nei termini sopra descritti? Entro quando sarà pronta la documentazione definitiva da sottoporre a Consiglio e Parlamento?

Ritiene che la strategia migliore per tutelare la salute delle persone sia dissuaderle dall'acquisto di sigarette, omologando il mercato della produzione e della vendita?

Non reputa che le persone verrebbero danneggiate nel loro essere «consumatori», in quanto, da un lato, si impedirà loro di scegliere il prodotto in base al marchio o al produttore e, dall'altro, le si obbligherà ad acquistare un prodotto unico, per dimensione, sapore e gusto?

Ha preso in considerazione la Commissione i danni che l'introduzione di tali norme causerebbero in termini economici e occupazionali sia nel comparto produttivo agricolo sia in quello della distribuzione e della vendita al dettaglio?

Come valuta le ipotesi di una rinnovata spinta al mercato del contrabbando e della contraffazione dei prodotti da fumo conseguente all'eventuale introduzione di tali proposte?

Risposta di John Dalli a nome della Commissione
(9 ottobre 2012)

La proposta di revisione della direttiva sui prodotti del tabacco è in fase di elaborazione e non è stata ancora presa alcuna decisione definitiva in merito al suo contenuto. La Commissione intende adottare la proposta legislativa entro la fine del 2012.

La Commissione ritiene che, per lottare efficacemente contro il tabagismo, sia necessario adottare una serie di misure cumulative da utilizzare in modo complementare.

La Commissione sta analizzando l'impatto delle varie opzioni strategiche, in particolare sull'economia, sull'occupazione e sulla sanità pubblica. Tale valutazione considera le potenziali conseguenze per i produttori, i dettaglianti e gli altri operatori economici che partecipano alla distribuzione dei prodotti del tabacco come pure il potenziale impatto sul traffico illecito. La valutazione dell'impatto sarà pubblicata insieme alla proposta legislativa.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007956/12
to the Commission
Mara Bizzotto (EFD)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: The consequences for consumers, and thousands of workers, of possible changes to European legislation on the sale of tobacco

The Commission is currently drafting a document which would amend the provisions of Directive 2001/37/EC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco products. The proposed changes would include banning the display of tobacco products; the introduction of mandatory, standard, unbranded packaging prominently displaying images designed to shock potential consumers and deter them from purchasing the products; and the imposition of a standard design for all cigarettes. Finally, manufacturers would be required to standardise the ingredients used to ensure all their respective products tastes and smelled the same.

Can the Commission confirm that a legislative proposal is currently being drawn up along the lines outlined above? When will the finalised version of the proposal be submitted to the Council and to Parliament?

Does the Commission consider that the best approach to protecting people's health is to dissuade them from purchasing cigarettes, while standardising their production and sale?

Does the Commission not take the view that people would be undermined, as consumers, if they were prevented from selecting products on the basis of the brand or manufacturer and their choice was restricted to a generic product with a standard size, taste and smell?

Has the Commission taken into account the damage that the introduction of this legislation could do to the economy and to employment in the agricultural sector, the distribution sector and the retail sales sector?

What is its view of the possibility that the introduction of the proposed legislation would boost the market in counterfeit goods and the production of counterfeit tobacco products?

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

The proposal for a revised Tobacco Products Directive is under preparation and no final decision has been taken as regards the content of the proposal. The Commission plans to adopt the legislative proposal before the end of 2012.

The Commission believes that efficient tobacco control consists of a range of cumulative measures used in a complementary manner.

The Commission is analysing the impact of various policy options, including on the economy, on employment and public health. This assessment addresses the potential impact on growers, retailers and other economic actors involved in distribution of tobacco products as well as potential impact on illicit trade. The Impact Assessment will be published together with the legislative proposal.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007958/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 septembre 2012)

Objet: Arrêt de la Cour de justice de l'UE sur les assurances annulation des billets aériens

1. La Commission peut-elle faire savoir comment elle envisage de faire appliquer le plus rapidement possible l'arrêt de la Cour de justice de l'UE du 19 juillet 2012 qui dit pour droit qu'«un vendeur de voyages aériens ne peut inclure par défaut l'assurance annulation de vol lors de la vente de billets d'avions sur Internet», ainsi que tous les «suppléments de prix optionnels»?

2. D'une manière plus générale, cette pratique visant à demander au consommateur d'effectuer une démarche pour refuser un service qu'il n'a pas explicitement demandé, étant contraire au règlement (CE) n° 1008/2008, la Commission peut-elle indiquer comment elle entend sanctionner toutes les compagnies qui en abusent de plus en plus sur Internet?

Réponse donnée par M. Kallas au nom de la Commission
(10 octobre 2012)

La Commission invite l'Honorable Parlementaire à prendre connaissance de sa réponse à la question écrite n° E 7523/2012 ([1]).

([1]) Disponible à l'adresse http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/fr/parliamentary-questions.html

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007958/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Judgment of the Court of Justice of the EU on flight cancellation insurance

1. Can the Commission state how it plans to enforce, as soon as possible, the judgment of the Court of Justice of the EU of 19 July 2012, which ruled that 'a person selling air travel may not include flight cancellation insurance as a default setting when selling air tickets over the Internet', and that this also applied to all other 'optional price supplements'?

2. More generally, given that this practice, which requires the consumer to opt out of a service that has not been explicitly requested, is in contravention of Regulation (EC) No 1008/2008, can the Commission state when it intends to take action against all of the companies that are increasingly abusing this practice on the Internet?

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

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question E-7523/2012 ([1]).

([1]) Available at http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/parliamentary-questions.html

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007961/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 septembre 2012)

Objet: Adoption par la Commission d'une liste d'allégations de santé portant sur les denrées alimentaires

La Commission européenne a approuvé le 16 mai 2012 une liste de 222 allégations de santé portant sur les denrées alimentaires, qui entrera en vigueur en décembre 2012.

A contrario, cette décision entraîne l'interdiction à la même date de milliers d'allégations en circulation depuis de nombreuses années dans tous les États membres.

La Commission peut-elle faire savoir comment elle entend faire respecter dans des délais aussi brefs cette décision et contrôler ou faire contrôler son application par les États membres, en prenant en considération son impact sur la santé et l'information des consommateurs?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(15 octobre 2012)

La Commission fait remarquer que l'application du droit de l'Union européenne, y compris celle du règlement (UE) nº 432/2012 ([1]) établissant une liste des allégations de santé autorisées, relève de la compétence des États membres et de leurs autorités de contrôle nationales.

Dans ce contexte, la Commission s'efforcera, si nécessaire, de faciliter les discussions afin de garantir une application adéquate et cohérente du règlement.

Si la Commission est informée d'une application inadéquate du règlement par les autorités de contrôle nationales, elle peut, en vertu du traité, prendre des mesures pour remédier à ce problème.

([1]) JO L 136 du 25.5.2012, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007961/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Commission's adoption of a list of health claims made on foods

On 16 May 2012, the Commission approved a list of 222 health claims made on foods, which will enter into force in December 2012.

However, this decision will also lead to the banning on the same date of thousands of health claims that have been in circulation in all Member States for many years.

Can the Commission state how it intends to ensure that this decision is respected, given the tight deadline?

How will the Commission monitor its implementation, or ensure that the Member States monitor its implementation, while taking account of its impact on consumer health and awareness?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Commission notes that the implementation of EC law, including Regulation (EC) No 432/2012 ([1]) establishing the list of permitted health claims, falls under the responsibility of Member States and their national controlling authorities.

In that context, the Commission will endeavour to facilitate discussions, if necessary, in order to ensure correct and coherent implementation of the regulation.

If the Commission is made aware of incorrect implementation of the regulation by national controlling authorities, it may, according to the Treaty, take action to address the issue.

([1]) OJ L 136, 25.5.2012.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-007962/12
à la Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 septembre 2012)

Objet: Graves lacunes dans la gestion des déchets

Les résultats d'une étude récente de la Commission européenne publiée en juillet 2012 ont mis en évidence de graves lacunes dans la gestion des déchets de 10 États membres. Les économies potentielles qui pourraient être réalisées par une révision des politiques de traitement des déchets pourraient atteindre 72 milliards d'euros par an et créer 400 000 emplois d'ici 2020.

La Commission peut-elle faire savoir quelles mesures concrètes elle envisage de prendre pour encourager les 10 États membres concernés à prendre des mesures rapidement et en plus des «feuilles de route» présentées le 7 août 2012?

Réponse donnée par M. Potočnik au nom de la Commission
(17 octobre 2012)

La première démarche entreprise par la Commission est l'organisation de dix ateliers dans ces États membres qui connaissent de graves lacunes dans la gestion des déchets. Les ateliers se dérouleront entre septembre et novembre 2012. Un séminaire de synthèse sera organisé à Bruxelles au cours du premier semestre de l'année 2013.

Il s'agit d'un processus informel de promotion de la conformité visant à déterminer les options permettant d'améliorer les systèmes de gestion des déchets municipaux et de mettre en œuvre les principales exigences fixées par la directive-cadre sur les déchets ([1]), notamment en ce qui concerne la hiérarchie des déchets et l'objectif de recyclage des déchets ménagers.

Les feuilles de route que la Commission a présentées sont uniquement destinées à mieux cibler les discussions avec les États membres et ne seront pas formellement adoptées. Toutefois, elles devraient aider les États membres dans la conception et la mise en œuvre de leurs plans de gestion des déchets.

([1]) JO L 194 du 25.7.1975, p. 1.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007962/12
to the Commission
Marc Tarabella (S&D)
(7 September 2012)

Subject: Serious shortcomings in waste management

The results of a recent Commission study published in July 2012 point to serious shortcomings in waste management in 10 Member States. The potential savings to be made by revising waste treatment policies could reach EUR 72 billion annually, and 400 000 jobs could be created between now and 2020.

What specific steps does the Commission plan to take in order to encourage the 10 Member States concerned to take action quickly and to adopt the roadmaps presented on 7 August 2012?

Answer given by Mr Potočnik on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

The first step taken by the Commission is the organisation of ten workshops in those Member States facing serious shortcomings in waste management. The workshops will take place between September and November 2012. A wrap-up seminar will be held in Brussels in the first half of 2013.

This is an informal compliance-promotion process aimed at identifying options to upgrade municipal waste management systems and implement key requirements under the Waste Framework Directive ([1]), notably the waste hierarchy and the recycling target for household waste.

The road maps that the Commission has circulated are only aimed at having a more focused discussion with Member States and will not be formally adopted. However, they should help Member States in the design and implementation of their waste management plans.

([1]) OJ L 194, 25.7.1975.

(Versão portuguesa)

Pergunta com pedido de resposta escrita E-007980/12
à Comissão
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 de setembro de 2012)

Assunto: Relações comerciais UE-China

No seguimento da falência e do encerramento de fábricas de painéis solares, foi apresentada à Comissão Europeia uma queixa «antidumping» contra empresas chinesas por parte de um consórcio de cerca de 20 produtores europeus responsáveis por um quarto da fabricação de painéis solares da UE.

Considerando que:

— No ano passado, a China, que é responsável por dois terços da produção mundial, exportou painéis solares no valor de 21 mil milhões de euros para a UE, cerca de 80 % dos painéis exportados;

— No espaço de poucos anos, a China tornou-se no maior produtor mundial de painéis solares, enquanto a UE é o maior mercado para os produtos chineses;

Pergunto à Comissão:

1. Confirma as suspeitas de violação da legislação «antidumping» por empresas chinesas, que, alegadamente, vendem painéis solares abaixo do preço de custo?

2. Tendo já a China ameaçado retaliar impondo restrições comerciais à UE, se Bruxelas prosseguir com a investigação, que avaliação faz a Comissão das possíveis consequências para as relações comerciais entre UE-China?

Resposta dada por Karel De Gucht em nome da Comissão
(17 de outubro de 2012)

1. Em 6 de setembro de 2012, a Comissão lançou um inquérito *anti-dumping* relativo às importações de painéis solares e seus componentes essenciais (isto é, células solares e «wafers» solares) originários da China. A denúncia apresentada pela indústria da União incluía elementos suficientes que demonstravam 1) um eventual *dumping* de preços pelos produtores-exportadores no mercado da UE, 2) um prejuízo sofrido pela indústria da União e 3) um possível nexo de causalidade entre as importações objeto de *dumping* e o prejuízo sofrido pela indústria da União. A Comissão considerou existirem suficientes elementos de prova *prima facie* para dar início a um inquérito e, consequentemente, foi legalmente obrigada a fazê-lo. A Comissão irá agora investigar os factos e publicará as suas conclusões provisórias até junho de 2013.

2. Os instrumentos de defesa comercial são regidos por regras precisas definidas pela Organização Mundial do Comércio (OMC). Se as condições aplicáveis se encontrarem preenchidas, a Comissão é obrigada, nos termos do direito da UE, a iniciar inquéritos para além de considerações de ordem política, incluindo quaisquer consequências sobre as relações comerciais bilaterais. A Comissão tem conhecimento dos artigos de imprensa que relatam ameaças de retaliação por parte da China. Todavia, até agora não existiu qualquer notificação formal relativa a qualquer novo inquérito pela China. Se, e quando, a China iniciar um inquérito desse tipo, estará vinculada pelas mesmas regras e condições rigorosas da OMC, tal como a UE. A Comissão irá verificar de perto se essas regras são cumpridas e estará pronta a considerar todas as opções possíveis, caso o inquérito seja apenas resultado de uma retaliação por parte da China. A Comissão já empreendeu ações a nível da OMC contra a política chinesa de retaliação em matéria de instrumentos de defesa comercial e, se necessário, não hesitará em prosseguir nessa via.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-007980/12
to the Commission
Nuno Melo (PPE)
(10 September 2012)

Subject: EU-China trade relations

In the wake of bankruptcies and closures of solar panel factories, a consortium of around 20 European producers responsible for a quarter of EU solar panel manufacturing lodged an anti-dumping complaint with the Commission against Chinese firms.

Last year China, which accounts for two thirds of world production, exported solar panels worth EUR 21 billion to the EU, some 80% of exported panels. In the space of a few years, China has become the world's largest producer of solar panels, while the EU is the largest market for Chinese products.

1. Can the Commission confirm the suspected infringements of anti-dumping legislation by Chinese firms, which have allegedly been selling solar panels below cost price?

2. Given that China has already threatened to retaliate by imposing trade restrictions on the EU if Brussels continues its investigation, how does the Commission assess the possible consequences for trade relations between the EU and China?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

1. On 6 September 2012, the Commission launched an anti-dumping investigation into imports of solar panels and their key components (i.e. solar cells and solar wafers) originating in China. The complaint lodged by the Union industry included sufficient elements showing (1) possible price dumping by the exporting producers on the EU market, (2) injury suffered by the Union industry, and (3) a possible causal link between the dumped imports and the injury suffered by the Union industry. The Commission has found that there is sufficient prima facie evidence to warrant the opening of an investigation and therefore was legally obliged to do so. The Commission will now investigate the facts of the case and will issue its provisional findings before June 2013.

2. Trade defence instruments are governed by precise rules defined by the World Trade Organisation (WTO). If the relevant conditions are fulfilled, the Commission is required under EC law to initiate investigations aside from political considerations, including any consequences on bilateral trade relations. The Commission is aware of press articles reporting threats of retaliation by China. However, there has been no formal notification of any new investigation by China to date. If and when China would initiate such an investigation, it would be bound by the same strict WTO rules and conditions as the EU. The Commission would closely monitor whether these rules would be complied with and would stand ready to consider all the possible options if the investigation would be just result of retaliation by China. The Commission has previously already taken action at WTO level against China's policy of retaliation in trade defence instruments and would not hesitate to continue if necessary.

(Version française)

Question avec demande de réponse écrite E-008008/12
à la Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(11 septembre 2012)

Objet: Migration des encres alimentaires d'emballage dans les aliments: opportunité d'une réglementation européenne

Les emballages à base de papier et de carton pour les produits alimentaires connaissent une croissance rapide en réponse aux préoccupations environnementales des utilisateurs, notamment du fait de la promotion du recyclage.

Néanmoins, différents tests menés en Allemagne, en Suisse et en France sur des produits de consommation courante ont démontré la migration de dérivés pétroliers présents dans les encres d'emballage et le carton vers les aliments, et ce, à des niveaux préoccupants.

Face à ce constat, la Commission a décidé de saisir l'Agence européenne pour la sécurité des aliments, l'EFSA, basée à Parme.

La Commission peut-elle dire:

1. Si l'EFSA a, depuis, réalisé une étude sur la toxicité des huiles minérales saturées sur l'homme?

2. Si elle a elle-même étudié l'opportunité d'une règlementation européenne sur les huiles minérales garantissant l'absence de dérivés pétroliers issus d'emballages dans les aliments?

3. Quel serait l'impact économique d'une telle réglementation sur la filière du recyclage du papier, qui participe aux efforts de développement durable de l'Union européenne, et si elle a consulté l'industrie du papier à ce sujet?

4. Quelles seraient les solutions de remplacement réalistes pour les industriels utilisant des encres minérales?

5. Comment elle entend garantir aux consommateurs des produits à la fois à haute valeur environnementale mais aussi sanitaire?

Réponse donnée par M. Dalli au nom de la Commission
(12 octobre 2012)

1. L'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments a publié le 6 juin 2012 un avis scientifique sur les hydrocarbures d'huiles minérales dans les denrées alimentaires ([1]).

2. La Commission étudie la nécessité de mesures spécifiques de l'Union européenne (UE) concernant les huiles minérales dans les encres d'imprimerie, le papier et le carton, dans la perspective d'une analyse d'impact qui sera effectuée en 2013 sur des domaines non encore harmonisés touchant aux matériaux en contact avec les denrées alimentaires ([2]).

3. Au cours de cette analyse d'impact, la Commission prendra également en considération l'incidence sur le développement durable. Les parties concernées, l'industrie du papier notamment, seront consultées.

4. L'analyse d'impact visera à déterminer l'étendue du problème et envisagera différentes solutions possibles, en tenant compte de l'existence d'options de remplacement pour les encres d'imprimerie contenant des huiles minérales.

5. La législation actuelle de l'UE sur les matériaux en contact avec des denrées alimentaires fait obligation aux fabricants de mettre sur le marché des matériaux sûrs [règlement (CE) nº 1935/2004 ([3])]. En particulier, elle exige que les matériaux ne libèrent dans les denrées alimentaires aucune substance susceptible de menacer la santé humaine. Les États membres peuvent se réclamer de cette législation et retirer dès maintenant les produits dangereux du marché.

([1]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/fr/efsajournal/pub/2704.htm
([2]) Feuille de route bientôt disponible à l'adresse suivante: http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/planned_ia/roadmaps_2012_en.htm
([3]) Règlement (CE) n° 1935/2004 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 27 octobre 2004 concernant les matériaux et objets destinés à entrer en contact avec des denrées alimentaires et abrogeant les directives 80/590/CEE et 89/109/CEE (JO L 338 du 13.11.2004, p. 4).

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008008/12
to the Commission
Gaston Franco (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Migration of food packaging inks into foodstuffs: need for EU regulation

There has been a rapid expansion in paper and card-based packaging for foodstuffs in response to consumers' environmental concerns, especially since recycling has been promoted.

Nevertheless, several tests conducted in Germany, Switzerland and France on currently-available consumer products have shown that worrying levels of the petroleum products found in packaging inks and card migrate into foodstuffs.

In view of those findings, the Commission decided to refer the matter to the European Food Safety Agency (EFSA) in Parma.

Can the Commission state:

1. whether the EFSA has since conducted a study on the toxicity to man of saturated mineral oils?

2. whether it has itself considered the need for EU regulation of mineral oils to ensure that food packaging contains no petroleum derivatives?

3. what the actual economic impact of such regulation would be on the paper recycling process, which is part of Europe's attempt to achieve sustainable development, and whether it has consulted the paper industry on this matter?

4. what the realistic alternatives would be for manufacturers who use mineral inks?

5. how it plans to ensure that consumer products are not only highly eco-friendly but also perfectly safe?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(12 October 2012)

1. The European Food Safety Authority published on 6 June 2012 a scientific opinion on mineral oil hydrocarbons in food ([1]).

2. The Commission is considering the necessity for specific EU measures on mineral oils in printing inks and paper and board in the context of an impact assessment on as yet non-harmonised areas in food contact materials ([2]) to be performed during 2013.

3. In the context of this impact assessment the Commission will also consider the impact on sustainability. Stakeholders, including the paper industry, will be consulted.

4. The impact assessment will analyse the extent of the problem and consider different options for its solution, taking into account the availability of alternatives for mineral oil-containing printing inks.

5. The current EU legislation on materials in contact with food already requires manufacturers to place on the market safe materials (Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 ([3])). In particular, it requires that materials shall not release substances into the food that may endanger human health. On this basis Member States can already act now and take unsafe products from the market.

([1]) http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2704.htm
([2]) Roadmap to be available soon at http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/planned_ia/roadmaps_2012_en.htm
([3]) Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 October 2004 on materials and articles intended to come into contact with food and repealing Directives 80/590/EEC and 89/109/EEC, OJ L 338, 13.11.2004, p. 4.

(Versiunea în limba română)

Întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns scris E-008013/12
adresată Comisiei
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(11 septembrie 2012)

Subiect: Conținutul de gliadină al făinii de grâu

Potrivit unor cercetări recente (Dr. cardiolog William Davis, citat de CBS News), făina consumată în prezent ar proveni dintr-un tip de grâu mult diferit de grâul existent în trecut, care ar fi rezultatul modificărilor genetice din perioada 1960 — 1970. Grâul rezultat în urma acestui proces ar conține o nouă proteină numită gliadină, diferită de gluten. Această proteină este un tip de opioid, care îi afectează pe consumatori, influențând receptorii specializați din creier și stimulând pofta de mâncare, determinând un consum suplimentar mediu de 440 de calorii zilnic.

Comisia este rugată să precizeze dacă are cunoștință de rezultatele acestor cercetări, dacă le consideră veridice și dacă apreciază că se impun măsuri în vederea unei mai bune selectări a tipurilor de grâu cultivate.

Răspuns dat de dl Dalli în numele Comisiei
(15 octombrie 2012)

Glutenul este un complex de proteine din anumite cereale, cum ar fi grâul. Este un amestec de două proteine, gliadină și glutenină. Gliadina este fracțiunea proteică a glutenului solubilă în alcool ([1]) și este prezentă în mod natural în grâu.

Comisia nu este la curent cu rezultatele cercetării menționate de distinsul membru cu privire la influența gliadinei asupra receptorilor din creier și asupra poftei de mâncare.

([1]) A se vedea, de exemplu, avizul Autorității Europene pentru Siguranța Alimentară privind evaluarea produselor alergenice în scopul etichetării, EFSA Journal (2004) 32, 1-197, http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/32.pdf

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008013/12
to the Commission
Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: Gliadin content of wheat flours

According to research by the cardiologist Dr William Davis (as quoted by CBS News), the flour we eat today comes from a very different type of grain than was previously used, following a process of genetic modification over the period 1960-70. The grain which emerged from that process is said to contain a new protein called gliadin, which is different from gluten. It is an opioid which affects consumers by influencing specialised receptors in the brain and stimulating appetite, leading to an average additional consumption of 440 calories per day.

Can the Commission state whether it is aware of the findings of this research, whether it considers them accurate and whether it feels action is needed in order to improve selection of the types of grain grown?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

Gluten is the protein complex in certain cereals such as wheat. It is a mixture of two proteins, gliadin and glutenin. Gliadin is the alcohol-soluble protein fraction of gluten ([1]), and it is naturally present in wheat.

The Commission is not aware of the results of the research quoted by the Honourable Member about the influence of gliadin on receptors in the brain and appetite.

([1]) See for example the European Food Safety Authority's opinion on the evaluation of allergenic foods for labelling purposes, EFSA Journal (2004) 32, 1-197, http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/32.pdf

(Slovenské znenie)

Otázka na písomné zodpovedanie E-008030/12
Komisii
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11. septembra 2012)

Vec: Problematika námorného pirátstva

Námorné pirátstvo je pálčivý problém. Mimoriadne kritická je najmä situácia pri somálskom pobreží. V roku 2011 tam bolo oznámených 28 únosov plavidiel, 470 únosov námorníkov a 15 vrážd. V súčasnosti je asi 191 námorníkov držaných v Somálsku v pozícii rukojemníkov a za viac ako 7 lodí sa požaduje výkupné. Takáto situácia ohrozuje regionálnu stabilitu, svetový obchod a všetky formy námornej dopravy. Viac ako 80 % dopravy v rámci svetového obchodu pritom prebieha na mori.

Akým spôsobom Komisia bojuje proti námornému pirátstvu?

Mieni byť Komisia v súvislosti so súčasnou situáciou v Somálsku a námorným pirátstvom určitým spôsobom aktívna?

Odpoveď podpredsedníčky Komisie/vysokej predstaviteľky Ashtonovej v mene Komisie
(17. októbra 2012)

Problém pirátstva rieši Komisia prostredníctvom komplexných opatrení. Dva významné prvky predstavuje zvládnutie pirátstva na mori a skoncovanie s beztrestnosťou. Iné sa týkajú vybudovania regionálnych kapacít a stabilizácie samotného Somálska.

Komisia priamo podporuje krajiny regiónu, ktoré prijali transfery na trestné stíhanie jednotkami EUNAVFOR Atalanta, a s OSN vytvorila spoločný program na podporu kapacít v justícii.

V rámci nástroja stability Komisia disponuje viacerými podpornými programami vrátane programu pre dôležité námorné trasy s rozpočtom 7,6 mil. EUR. V nadväznosti na požiadavku parlamentu sa okrem toho zaviedol pilotný program, ktorého cieľom je preskúmať technické možnosti, ako zvýšiť povedomie orgánov v regióne Afrického rohu o námornej problematike. V rámci 10. ERF je k dispozícii program na začatie budovania námornej bezpečnosti s rozpočtom 2 mil. EUR, ktorého cieľom je poskytnúť výraznú podporu regiónu s cieľom riešiť problém pirátstva. Uvedené iniciatívy sú úzko koordinované s misiou SBOP pre program budovania regionálnych námorných kapacít (EUCAP NESTOR).

Komisia je zároveň pevne odhodlaná podporovať Somálsko pri hľadaní dlhodobých riešení aktuálnej krízy, najmä v oblasti vzdelávania a stimulovania hospodárskeho rozvoja. EÚ je doteraz najväčším darcom Somálska, keďže na rozvojovú pomoc vyčlenila 412 mil. EUR, a to prostredníctvom Európskeho rozvojového fondu na obdobie rokov 2008 až 2013.

EÚ podporuje budovanie bezpečnostných kapacít Somálska, najpriamejšie výcvikom somálskych vojakov v rámci Výcvikovej misie EÚ, ale je aj najväčším darcom prostriedkov mierovej misie Africkej únie AMISON.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008030/12
to the Commission
Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)
(11 September 2012)

Subject: The problem of maritime piracy

Piracy at sea is a pressing problem. In particular, the situation off the coast of Somalia is exceptionally critical. In 2011 pirates hijacked 28 ships, kidnapped 470 seafarers and killed 15 people. Currently, about 191 seamen are being held as hostages in Somalia and at least seven ships are being held for ransom. This situation is a threat to regional stability, world trade and all forms of maritime transport. More than 80% of world trade is transported by sea.

What measures is the Commission taking to combat maritime piracy?

Does the Commission intend to take further action with respect to the current situation in Somalia and to piracy at sea?

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

The Commission is addressing the problem of piracy through comprehensive actions. Containing maritime piracy at sea and ending impunity are two important elements. Others relate to building regional capacities and the stabilisation of Somalia itself.

The Commission directly supports countries in the region which accepted transfers for prosecution by EUNAVFOR Atalanta and established a joint programme with the UN in support of judicial capacities.

Under the Instrument for Stability (IfS), the Commission has several support programmes, including the Critical Maritime Routes Programme (EUR 7.6 million). Furthermore, following a request of the Parliament, a pilot programme was put in place to explore technical possibilities to increase the maritime Awareness (PMAR) with authorities in Horn of Africa. Under the 10th EDF a Maritime security start-up Programme of EUR 2 million is in place and aims to prepare an substantial support to the region to tackle piracy. The above interventions are closely coordinated with the CSDP mission for Regional Maritime Capacity Building Programme (EUCAP NESTOR).

In parallel, the Commission is also strongly committed to support Somalia in finding long term solutions to the ongoing crisis, especially in the area of education and stimulating economic development. To date, the EU is the biggest donor to Somalia having allocated EUR 412 million for development aid through the European Development Fund for the period 2008 to 2013.

The EU is supporting the development of Somali security capacities, most directly by training Somali soldiers under the EU Training Mission but also as the main donor to the African Union peacekeeping mission Amisom.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-008051/12
alla Commissione
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(12 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Fondo di solidarietà per le alluvioni avvenute in Liguria nell'ottobre 2011

In seguito alla domanda presentata dall'Italia lo scorso dicembre per accedere al Fondo di solidarietà dell'Unione europea a seguito delle disastrose alluvioni che colpirono la Liguria e la Toscana nell'ottobre 2011, la Commissione europea ha approvato nel marzo 2012 la mobilitazione del Fondo di solidarietà.

Sulla base del fatto che la procedura di bilancio relativa all'applicazione del Fondo di solidarietà per le alluvioni dell'ottobre 2011 in Liguria e Toscana è stata completata in data 12 giugno 2012, si chiede alla Commissione europea come mai, nonostante la procedura sia stata completata, i fondi non sono ancora stati erogati?

Risposta di Johannes Hahn a nome della Commissione
(15 ottobre 2012)

Il periodo di tempo che intercorre tra la data di presentazione al Fondo di solidarietà della UE della domanda di sostegno e il pagamento della relativa sovvenzione varia da 6 a 19 mesi. Di solito, tra domanda e versamento della sovvenzione trascorrono poco meno di 12 mesi.

Nel caso della Liguria, la Commissione doveva giungere a un accordo con le autorità italiane sulle modalità di utilizzazione della sovvenzione. Essa potrà essere versata non appena sarà stato firmato l'accordo di attuazione con l'Italia (ottobre 2012, probabilmente).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008051/12
to the Commission
Mario Mauro (PPE)
(12 September 2012)

Subject: Solidarity fund for the floods in Liguria in October 2011

In March 2012, in response to the request submitted by Italy last December for assistance from the European Union's Solidarity Fund to help meet costs arising from the disastrous flooding in Liguria and Tuscany in October 2011, the Commission approved the use of the Solidarity Fund for this purpose.

As the budget procedure relating to the use of the Solidarity Fund for the floods of October 2011 in Liguria and Tuscany was completed on 12 June 2012, why have the funds not yet been transferred?

Answer given by Mr Hahn on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The time between the date of application for EU Solidarity Fund support and the payment of a grant varies between 6 and 19 months. On average, the time between application and payment of the grant is just under 12 months.

In the case of Liguria, the Commission has come to an agreement with the Italian authorities on how the grant is to be used. The grant can be paid out as soon as the Implementation Agreement with Italy is signed (expected in October 2012).

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008080/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(13 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Εμπορικές συναλλαγές με την Κίνα

Στην εφημερίδα Herald Tribune στις 6 Σεπτεμβρίου αναφέρεται η πρόθεση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής να διεξάγει έρευνα σχετικά με τις τιμές των solar panels που εφαρμόζει η Κίνα. Από τη πλευρά της η Κίνα, σε περίπτωση επιβολής κυρώσεων, απειλεί με κυρώσεις κατά των ευρωπαϊκών κρασιών που εισάγονται στη Κίνα.

Ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

Ποιές είναι οι πλέον πρόσφατες εξελίξεις στο θέμα αυτό;

Απάντηση του κ. De Gucht εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(15 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Η Επιτροπή κίνησε έρευνα αντιντάμπινγκ σχετικά με τις εισαγωγές φωτοβολταϊκών και των βασικών μερών τους (π.χ. ηλιακά στοιχεία και ηλιακά πλακίδια) από την Κίνα στις 6 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012. Η Επιτροπή έχει τη νομική υποχρέωση να διεξάγει έρευνα αντιντάμπινγκ εάν λάβει από τον ενωσιακό κλάδο παραγωγής μια δεόντως τεκμηριωμένη καταγγελία με επαρκή στοιχεία που να αποδεικνύουν ότι οι παραγωγοί-εξαγωγείς από μία ή και περισσότερες χώρες εφαρμόζουν πολιτική ντάμπινγκ σε ένα συγκεκριμένο προϊόνστην ΕΕ προκαλώντας ζημία στον ενωσιακό κλάδο παραγωγής.

Η Επιτροπή είναι απολύτως ενήμερη για τα δημοσιευμένα άρθρα που αναφέρουν ότι η Κίνα αντιδρώντας στην εν λόγω έρευνα απειλεί με κυρώσεις προωθώντας τη διαδικασία εμπορικής άμυνας κατά των εισαγωγών κρασιού που προέρχονται από την ΕΕ. Προς το παρόν, η Επιτροπή δεν έχει λάβει καμία επίσημη ανακοίνωση από τις αρχές της Κίνας όσον αφορά στην επικείμενη έναρξη μιας τέτοιας ενέργειας ή καταγγελία από την τοπική βιομηχανία κατά του κρασιού της ΕΕ. Εάν και όταν κινηθεί ενέργεια μέτρων εμπορικής άμυνας κατά των εισαγωγών κρασιού από την ΕΕ, η Επιτροπή θα ενημερώσει αμέσως τα κράτη μέλη και θα συμμετάσχει δραστήρια στην υπεράσπιση των δικαιωμάτων της αλλά και των δικαιωμάτων των θιγόμενων εξαγωγέων της ΕΕ και των κρατών μελών. Η Επιτροπή θα επιβλέπει στενά την τήρηση των κανονισμών του Παγκόσμιου Οργανισμού Εμπορίου και θα χειριστεί το θέμα μαζί με τις κινεζικές αρχές. Σε περίπτωση που πρόκειται να επιβληθούν οριστικά μέτρα, θα εξεταστούν όλες οι εναλλακτικές επιλογές.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008080/12
to the Commission
Niki Tzavela (EFD)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Trade with China

The Herald Tribune of 6 September refers to plans by the Commission to investigate the price of solar panels from China, which threatening to respond to the imposition of any penalties with tariffs of its own on wines imported from Europe.

Can the Commission indicate what have been the most recent developments in this connection?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Commission initiated an anti-dumping investigation into imports of solar panels and their key components (i.e. solar cells and solar wafers) from China on 6 September 2012. The Commission is under a legal obligation to launch an anti-dumping investigation if it receives a properly documented complaint from the Union industry with sufficient evidence that exporting producers from one or more countries are dumping a certain product into the EU and causing injury to the Union industry.

The Commission is well aware of press articles reporting that China is threatening to retaliate in response to this investigation by launching a trade defence proceeding against imports of wine originating in the EU. At the moment, the Commission has not received any formal notification from the Chinese authorities concerning an imminent initiation of such a proceeding or a recept of a complaint from the local industry against EU wine. If and when a trade defence proceeding would be initiated against imports of EU wine, the Commission would immediately inform the Member States and actively participate in the proceeding to defend its rights and the righs of affected EU exporters and Member States. The Comission would monitor very closely the respect of the World Trade Organisation rules and would take this up with the Chinese authorities. In case definitive measures were to be imposed, all options would be considered.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-008102/12
do Komisji
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(13 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Przyszłość trzeciego pakietu energetycznego w Mołdawii

11 września br. premier Federacji Rosyjskiej Dimitrij Miedwiediew przedstawił premierowi Mołdawii Vladowi Filatowi ultimatum dotyczące negocjacji cen rosyjskiego gazu na rynek mołdawski, który w 100 % jest uzależniony od dostaw rosyjskich.

Warunkiem obniżenia cen jest rezygnacja z wdrożenia trzeciego pakietu energetycznego w Mołdawii. To samo ultimatum powtórzył dzień później rosyjski minister ds. energetyki Aleksandr Nowak. Mołdawia zobowiązała się do wdrożenia zasad konkurencji na rynku gazu wraz z wejściem do Wspólnoty Energetycznej.

Od 1998 r. Mołdawia jest uczestnikiem europejskiej polityki sąsiedztwa. Zgodnie z Porozumieniem o współpracy i partnerstwie (PCA) UE-Mołdawia celem współpracy jest m.in. zbliżanie porządków regulacyjnych między UE a Mołdawią oraz reforma rynku energii.

Presja ekonomiczna wywierana przez Rosję ma na celu zablokowanie reform, których realizacja wynika z europejskiej polityki sąsiedztwa.

— Czy Komisja zamierza udzielić wsparcia Mołdawii w toczącym się sporze o wprowadzenie konkurencyjnych zasad działania rynku energetycznego?

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

Kwestie te były ostatnio przedmiotem rozmów premiera Filata i komisarza Günthera Oettingera, natomiast służby Komisji pozostają w ścisłym kontakcie z władzami Mołdawii w tych sprawach. Komisja analizuje obecnie, w jaki sposób można wesprzeć Republikę Mołdawii w jej wysiłkach na rzecz wzmocnienia rynku energii i bezpieczeństwa energetycznego w perspektywie krótko– oraz długoterminowej, w kontekście członkostwa tego państwa we Wspólnocie Energetycznej.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008102/12
to the Commission
Konrad Szymański (ECR)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Future of the Third Energy Package in Moldova

On 11 September 2012, Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev presented Moldovan Prime Minister Vlad Filat with an ultimatum concerning negotiations on the price of Russian gas on the Moldovan market. Moldova is 100% dependent on Russian gas imports.

This ultimatum makes a reduction in gas prices conditional upon Moldova abandoning the introduction of the Third Energy Package. The ultimatum was repeated one day later by Russian Energy Minister Alexander Novak. Moldova committed itself to introducing competitive principles on the gas market when it acceded to the Energy Community.

Moldova has been involved in European Neighbourhood Policy since 1998. Under the EU-Moldova Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA), the aims of cooperation include the approximation of the regulatory systems of the EU and Moldova and reform of the energy market.

The economic pressure exerted by Russia is aimed at blocking reforms arising from European Neighbourhood Policy.

— Does the Commission intend to provide support to Moldova in its ongoing struggle to introduce competitive principles in the energy market?

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

These issues were discussed most recently between Prime Minister Filat and Commissioner Oettinger and the Commission services are in close contact with the Moldovan Authorities on these matters. The Commission is analysing how to help the Republic of Moldova to strengthen its energy market and energy security in the short as well as in the long run, in the context of the its Energy Community membership.

(Wersja polska)

Pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-008103/12
do Komisji
Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz (PPE)
(13 września 2012 r.)

Przedmiot: Technologia hydrorafinacji oleju roślinnego – dodatkowe pytanie

Bardzo dziękuję za udzielenie odpowiedzi na pytanie wymagające odpowiedzi pisemnej P-006693/2012 dotyczące technologii hydrorafinacji oleju roślinnego w celu uzyskania parafiny HVO (hydrorafinowanego oleju roślinnego). W oparciu o moje kompleksowe zrozumienie kwestii związanej z przetwarzaniem odnawialnych olejów w obecności wodoru chciałbym zapytać o stanowisko Komisji w sprawie technologii hydrorafinacji.

Proces hydrorafinacji polega na wymieszaniu destylatów oleju napędowego z olejem roślinnym o pewnym stężeniu i poddaniu otrzymanej mieszanki obróbce wodorem na katalizatorach CoMo i NiMo przy wysokiej temperaturze i ciśnieniu. Podczas tego procesu destylaty oleju napędowego podlegają odsiarczaniu i z olejów roślinnych uzyskiwane są parafinowe węglowodory oleju napędowego. Zachodzą tu również pewne katalityczne procesy rozkładowe (kraking), w wyniku których z oleju roślinnego uzyskuje się biopropanol.

— Czy stosowanie procesu hydrorafinacji można uznać za jeden ze sposobów spełniania wymogów dyrektywy 2009/28/WE (przy założeniu, że zawartość i objętość energii, typowe ograniczenie emisji gazów cieplarnianych i standardowe ograniczenie emisji gazów cieplarnianych należy obliczać na podstawie danych podawanych przez producenta)?

Odpowiedź udzielona przez komisarza Günthera Oettingera w imieniu Komisji
(11 października 2012 r.)

Dopóki spełnione są kryteria zrównoważonego rozwoju określone w dyrektywie w sprawie odnawialnych źródeł energii [1], hydrorafinacja, o której wspomina Pan Poseł, może być jednym ze sposobów produkcji odnawialnych biopaliw.

[1] Dyrektywa Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady 2009/28/WE z dnia 23 kwietnia 2009 r. w sprawie promowania stosowania energii ze źródeł odnawialnych zmieniająca i w następstwie uchylająca dyrektywy 2001/77/WE oraz 2003/30/WE, Dz.U. L 140 z 5.6.2009.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008103/12
to the Commission
Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz (PPE)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Hydrotreated vegetable oil technology — additional question

Thank you very much for your answer to Written Question P-006693/2012 concerning hydrotreated vegetable oil (HVO) technology. Based on my comprehensive understanding of the issue of the processing of renewable oils in the presence of hydrogen, I would like to ask you about the Commission's position on co-hydrotreating technology.

The co-hydrotreating process consists in mixing straight-run gas oil and vegetable oil in certain concentrations and treating the resulting mixture with hydrogen over CoMo/NiMo catalysts at high temperature and pressure. During this process, straight-run gas oil is de-sulphurised and paraffinic hydrocarbon components of diesel fuel are produced from vegetable oils. Some cracking reactions on catalysts take place as well, with the result that bio-propane is also produced from vegetable oil.

— Can such co-hydrotreating be considered as one of the ways to fulfil the requirements of Directive 2009/28/EC (on the understanding that energy content/volume, typical greenhouse gas emission savings and default greenhouse gas emission savings should be calculated on the basis of the producer's figures)?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

As long as the sustainability criteria, as laid down in the Renewable Energy Directive ([1]), are respected, such co-hydrotreating, as referred to by the Honourable Member, can be one of the ways to produce renewable biofuels.

([1]) Directive 2009/28/EC of the Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC, OJ L 140, 5.6.2009.

(Ελληνική έκδοση)

Ερώτηση με αίτημα γραπτής απάντησης E-008108/12
προς την Επιτροπή
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(13 Σεπτεμβρίου 2012)

Θέμα: Μέτρα για την επαναλειτουργία του «Σικιαρίδειου Ιδρύματος»

Το «Σικιαρίδειο Ίδρυμα», «Κέντρο ανοιχτής φροντίδας για την κατάρτιση παιδιών και νέων με νοητική υστέρηση και μαθησιακές δυσκολίες», ανακοίνωσε ότι διακόπτει τη λειτουργία του για το σχολικό έτος 2012-2013 εξαιτίας της μη καταβολής από το αρμόδιο Υπουργείο Υγείας της οφειλόμενης κρατικής επιχορήγησης με αποτέλεσμα 200 παιδιά με νοητική στέρηση και μαθησιακές δυσκολίες να βρίσκονται στο δρόμο. Το εν λόγω ίδρυμα συγχρηματοδοτείται από τον κρατικό προϋπολογισμό (υποχρέωση που απορρέει από το Νόμο 1604/1939), τα ασφαλιστικά ταμεία των παιδιών, και τις δωρεές ιδιωτών. Όπως αναφέρει η Διοίκηση του Ιδρύματος, εξαιτίας της ελλιπούς και συνεχώς μειούμενης κρατικής επιχορήγησης την τελευταία διετία, (από τα 810 907 ευρώ το έτος 2010 στα 150 000 ευρώ την προηγούμενη σχολική χρονιά) έχει επιτευχθεί σημαντική περιστολή του κόστους με αποτέλεσμα τη μείωση του προσωπικού από τα 60 άτομα στα 35, τη μείωση του μισθολογικού κόστους και του κόστους μεταφοράς των παιδιών. Φέτος οι ελληνικές αρχές έχουν καταβάλει μόλις το 16 % του εγκεκριμένου προϋπολογισμού του 2012, ποσό που αντιστοιχεί σε δύο μήνες λειτουργίας με αποτέλεσμα την αδυναμία πλέον του Ιδρύματος να καλύψει τις λειτουργικές του δαπάνες. Όπως αναφέρει χαρακτηριστικά σε επιστολή της προς τους γονείς των παιδιών η Διοίκηση του Ιδρύματος: «Σας γνωρίζουμε ότι βρισκόμαστε στη δυσάρεστη θέση να σας ανακοινώσουμε ότι μετά από εβδομήντα χρόνια προσφοράς στην ελληνική κοινωνία, το ίδρυμα αδυνατεί να καλύψει τις λειτουργικές του δαπάνες. Το ίδρυμα μας δεν θα είναι σε θέση να παράσχει στις εγκαταστάσεις του τις υπηρεσίες ανοικτής φροντίδας και κατάρτισης τις όποιες παρείχε και οι εγκαταστάσεις θα παραμείνουν κλειστές. Κατόπιν τούτου θα πρέπει να μεριμνήσετε για εναλλακτικές λύσεις για την φροντίδα και κατάρτιση των αγαπημένων και σε μας παιδιών σας».

Λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τα ανωτέρω και το γεγονός των τεράστιων περικοπών που έχουν επιβληθεί σε εφαρμογή του Μνημονίου στην Εκπαίδευση και την Πρόνοια ερωτάται η Επιτροπή:

1. Πως σχολιάζει την κατάσταση που έχει δημιουργηθεί στο εν λόγω Ίδρυμα;

2. Τι μέτρα προτίθεται να λάβει προκειμένου να επαναλειτουργήσει το Ίδρυμα ώστε τα 200 παιδιά με νοητική στέρηση να συνεχίσουν να λαμβάνουν την κατάλληλη φροντίδα και κατάρτιση;

Απάντηση της κας Βασιλείου εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής
(17 Οκτωβρίου 2012)

Ο κύριος βουλευτής θα γνωρίζει ότι, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 165 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, η ευθύνη για το περιεχόμενο και την οργάνωση των συστημάτων εκπαίδευσης και κατάρτισης ανήκει εξ ολοκλήρου στα κράτη μέλη. Το εν λόγω άρθρο περιλαμβάνει ρυθμίσεις για τη χρηματοδότηση ιδρυμάτων, όπως εκείνο στο οποίο αναφέρεται ο κύριος βουλευτής.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008108/12
to the Commission
Nikolaos Chountis (GUE/NGL)
(13 September 2012)

Subject: Measures to secure the re-opening of the Sikiarideio Foundation

The 'Sikiarideio Foundation', an open-care training centre for children and young adults with intellectual and learning disabilities, has announced that it is now compelled to suspend its activities for the 2012-2013 academic year, effectively leaving 200 children with intellectual and learning disabilities to their own devices, since it has not received the government grant owing to it from the Health Ministry. The secretariat of the foundation, which receives financial support from the State (under Law 1604/1939), from its pupils' insurance funds and from private donations, has announced that inadequate and constantly diminishing State funding over the last two years (down from EUR 810 907 for 2010 to EUR 150 000 for the previous school year) has forced it to cut costs for personnel, reducing the number of staff from 60 to 35, salaries and transport services for the children. This year the Greek authorities have disbursed only 16% of the agreed budget for 2012, enough for two months, leaving the foundation now unable to cover its operational costs. A letter from its secretariat to the children's parents accordingly reads as follows: 'We regret to inform you that, after 70 years of service to the Greek community, our foundation is unable to meet its running costs and is therefore no longer in a position to continue to provide open-care training and instruction on its premises, which will now remain closed. It will therefore be necessary for you to seek alternative solutions for the care and education for your children, whom we hold in such affection.' In view of this and of the massive education and welfare cuts that are being imposed in order to comply with the memorandum of understanding:

1. What view does the Commission take of this state of affairs regarding the above foundation?

2. What measures will it take in a bid to re-open the foundation to ensure that its 200 pupils with intellectual disabilities continue to receive suitable care and instruction?

Answer given by Ms Vassiliou on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

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 entirely with Member States. This includes arrangements for the funding of foundations like the one to which the Honourable Member refers.

(българска версия)

Въпрос с искане за писмен отговор P-008114/12
до Комисията
Филиз Хакъева Хюсменова (ALDE)
(14 септември 2012 г.)

Относно: Относно предоставяне на финансова помощ през 2012 г. от Европейския фонд за приспособяване към глобализацията

На кои страни е предоставяна финансова помощ през 2012 г. от Европейския фонд за приспособяване към глобализацията (ЕФПГ), и в частност по чл. 2, буква „в“ от регламента на фонда, отнасящ се до малки пазари на труда? Искала ли е България финансиране от фонда през 2012 г. и в какъв размер?

Счита ли Комисията, че следва да се оптимизират условията за отпускане на финансови средства от фонда през новия програмен период, така че и по-малки страни, в които няма много големи фирми с по 500 работника, също да могат да се възползват от средства от фонда?

Споделя ли Комисията мнението, че е целесъобразно в новия регламент да бъде увеличена общата сума за извънредни случаи на повече от 15 % от годишната максимална сума на ЕФПГ?

Отговор, даден от г-н Андор от името на Комисията
(9 октомври 2012 г.)

1. На 20 септември 2012 г. на четири държави членки са предоставени финансови средства, платими през 2012 г. от Европейския фонд за приспособяване към глобализацията (ЕПФГ): Австрия (предоставени финансови средства по 1 заявление за подкрепа от фонда), Италия (1 заявление), Португалия (1 заявление) и Испания (2 заявления). В нито един от посочените случаи средствата не са отпуснати по заявления, подадени съгласно член 2, буква в) от Регламента за ЕФПГ ([1]).

2. До момента България не е искала финансово участие от страна на ЕФПГ през 2012 г.

3. Както посочва уважаемият член на Парламента, член 2, буква в) от Регламента за ЕФПГ дава възможност на държавите членки да кандидатстват за финансиране от фонда дори ако обичайните критерии за намеса не са изцяло изпълнени (по-специално когато съкратените работници са по-малко от 500), когато това е надлежно обосновано в изключителни случаи или поради мащаба на съответния пазар на труда. Комисията смята, че тази разпоредба предоставя достатъчна гъвкавост на ЕФПГ за предприемането на мерки по специфичните проблеми, с които се сблъскват по-малките държави членки. Поради тази причина тя предложи ([2]) разпоредбата да остане в сила и при бъдещата дейност на ЕФПГ.

Освен това заявления за получаване на финансови средства от ЕПФГ, предвиждащи участието на малки и средни предприятия (т.е. дружества с по-малко от 500 работници), се допускат за финансиране от фонда, при условие че предприятията са разположени в една и съща географска област и работят в един и същ икономически отрасъл.

4. В рамките на сега действащия регламент за ЕФПГ общата сума на наличните средства за действия в изключителни случаи нито веднъж не е достигнала 15 % от годишната сума, с която разполага ЕФПГ. Поради това Комисията смята, че този праг е подходящ, и предложи той да бъде запазен и през бъдещия програмен период.

([1]) Регламент (ЕО) № 1927/2006 (ОВ L 48, 22.2.2008 г., стр. 82.
([2]) COM (2011) 608 окончателен, Предложение за регламент на Европейския парламент и на Съвета относно Европейския фонд за приспособяване към глобализацията (ЕФПГ) (2014 — 2020 г.).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008114/12
to the Commission
Filiz Hakaeva Hyusmenova (ALDE)
(14 September 2012)

Subject: Granting of financial assistance under the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) in 2012

Which countries were granted financial assistance in 2012 from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF), and more particularly Article 2(c) of the regulation establishing that Fund, which is aimed at small labour markets? Did Bulgaria seek assistance from the Fund in 2012 and, if so, what was the sum?

Does the Commission not consider that the conditions under which financing from the Fund is released should be optimised in the new programming period, so that even smaller countries, in which there are few companies with over 500 employees, can also benefit from assistance from the Fund?

Does the Commission not agree that it would be expedient, under the new rules, for the overall amount available in exceptional circumstances to be increased to more than 15% of the maximum annual amount available under the EGF?

Answer given by Mr Andor on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

1. On 20 September 2012, four Member States had received a financial contribution paid in 2012 from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF): Austria (1 contribution), Italy (1), Portugal (1) and Spain (2). None of these contributions related to applications submitted under Article 2(c) of the EGF Regulation ([1]).

2. Bulgaria has not yet requested any contribution from the EGF in 2012.

3. As pointed out by the Honourable Member, Article 2(c) of the EGF Regulation allows the Member States to apply for EGF funding even if the normal intervention criteria are not entirely met (in particular when the number of redundancies is lower than 500), when this is duly justified by exceptional circumstances or the size of the labour market concerned. The Commission considers that this provision provides the EGF with enough flexibility to address the specific issues of smaller Member States. For this reason, it has proposed ([2]) to maintain it for the future EGF.

Besides, applications for EGF funding involving small- and medium-sized enterprises (i.e. companies employing less than 500 workers) are eligible for EGF contributions, provided that these enterprises are located in the same geographic area and operate in the same economic sector.

4. Under the current EGF Regulation, the overall amount available in exceptional circumstances has never reached 15% of the annual amount available to the EGF. The Commission therefore considers it appropriate and has proposed to maintain it for the future programming period.

([1]) Regulation (EC) No 1927/2006, OJ L 48, 22.2.2008, p. 82.
([2]) COM(2011) 608 final, Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF) 2014-2020.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-008132/12
alla Commissione
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Mutamento della destinazione d'uso di immobili che hanno beneficiato di finanziamenti europei

Nel 1996, con decisione C(95)1073, la Commissione europea ha approvato il programma operativo 1994-1999 (POP) per gli interventi strutturali comunitari nella Regione Puglia (Italia) al fine di finanziare il «Programma regionale macelli».

In attuazione del programma operativo sopracitato, il Consiglio regionale della Puglia ha approvato l'apposita misura 4.2.7. POP avente il seguente oggetto: «Adeguamento dei macelli pubblici alle norme sanitarie di sicurezza» e facente parte del POP Puglia 1994/99 — sez. FEOGA.

Il finanziamento, accordato tra gli altri comuni anche al Comune di Andria in data 22 marzo 2005, è stato approvato con un atto unico di collaudo e contestualmente tutti gli atti sono stati inviati alla Regione Puglia, che ha provveduto tempestivamente alla liquidazione del saldo finale.

Una volta finalizzate le opere architettoniche necessarie alla costruzione del macello, precisamente negli anni 2007 e 2008, il Comune di Andria ha indetto ben due gare per l'affidamento in concessione della gestione del mattatoio comunale e dei servizi di macellazione che, tuttavia, sono andate deserte, probabilmente per i mutati assetti economici nell'ambito delle macellazioni delle carni, monopolizzati dalla grande distribuzione.

1. Alla luce di quanto sopra indicato, può la Commissione chiarire se le disposizioni comunitarie impongono un vincolo di destinazione dell'immobile sopraddetto, realizzato con i finanziamenti FEOGA?

2. Eventualmente, quali sono i limiti temporali che permettano la riconversione della destinazione d'uso dell'immobile, nell'intento di adibire lo stabile sempre al settore agroalimentare o attinente la lavorazione e/o commercializzazione di prodotti agricoli (es. mercato generale ortofrutticolo)?

Risposta di Dacian Cioloș a nome della Commissione
(12 ottobre 2012)

I progetti cofinanziati da fondi UE sono stati richiesti al fine di garantire la realizzazione degli obiettivi stabiliti dal Programma approvato dalla Commissione europea e di soddisfare i limiti e le condizioni stabiliti dal programma, così come le relative disposizioni nazionali in materia.

Durante il periodo di programmazione 1994-1999, la durata degli investimenti effettuati con fondi UE è stata definita a livello nazionale e regionale: il beneficiario doveva, in linea di principio, garantire che il contributo UE restasse acquisito ad un'operazione di investimento per 5 anni per quanto riguarda gli impianti mobili e per 10 anni per quanto riguarda i beni e le infrastrutture immobili, a partire dalla data di completamento dell'opera.

Per maggiori dettagli a riguardo, l'onorevole parlamentare può rivolgersi alle competenti autorità regionali:
Autorità di Gestione Regione Puglia
Settore Agricoltura, Lungomare Nazario Sauro, 45-47
I-70121 BARI
(autoritadigestionepsr@regione.puglia.it).

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008132/12
to the Commission
Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Change in intended use of buildings that have benefited from EU funding

In 1996, by Decision C (95) 1073, the Commission approved Operational Programme 1994-1999 (MOP) for Community structural assistance in the Puglia region (Italy) in order to finance the regional slaughterhouses programme.

In implementation of the abovementioned programme, the Regional Council of Puglia approved specific measure 4.2.7. MOP concerning the following subject: 'Adaptation of health and safety standards in public slaughterhouses', which was part of the MOP for Puglia 1994/99 — EAGGF section.

The funding, granted also to the municipality of Andria on 22 March 2005, was approved after a single inspection and, at the same time, all relevant documents were sent to the Puglia Region, which promptly settled the final balance.

Once the architectural work necessary for the construction of the slaughterhouse had been finalised, more specifically in the years 2007 and 2008, the municipality of Andria issued two invitations to tender for the contract to manage the municipal slaughterhouse and its slaughtering services. However, no bids were received, probably because of the changed economic circumstances in the slaughtering sector of the meat industry, which is being monopolised by large retailers.

1. Can the Commission clarify whether, under Community law, there are any binding requirements relating to the intended use of the abovementioned construction, built with EAGGF funding?

2. If necessary, what are the time limits within which a change of intended use could be requested for this building, so that it could nevertheless be used for the agri-food sector or for the processing and/or marketing of agricultural products (e.g. as a general fruit and vegetable market)?

Answer given by Mr Cioloș on behalf of the Commission
(12 October 2012)

Projects co-funded by EU funds were requested to ensure the achievement of the objectives set out in the Programme approved by the European Commission and to comply with the limits and conditions set out in the program, as well as with the relevant national provisions.

During the programming period 1994-1999, the durability of investment carried out with EU funds were defined at national and regional level: the beneficiary had in principle to ensure that an investment operation retains the EU contribution during 5 years for moveable equipment and 10 years for immovable property and infrastructure, counting from the date of completion of the work.

For more details on this issue, the Honourable Member may address the competent Regional Authorities:
Managing Authority for Puglia
Department of Agriculture, Lungomare Nazario Sauro, 45-47,
I-70121 BARI
(autoritadigestionepsr@regione.puglia.it).

(České znění)

Otázka k písemnému zodpovězení P-008146/12
Komisi
Olga Sehnalová (S&D)
(17. září 2012)

Předmět: Otravy způsobené metylalkoholem v České republice

Dne 6. září byla v České republice identifikována dvě úmrtí způsobená přítomností metylalkoholu v alkoholických nápojích vypitých otrávenými jedinci. Dnes, 17. září, je ve spojitosti s otravami metylalkoholem v České republice identifikováno celkem již 20 obětí a další desítky osob jsou hospitalizovány s otravou.

Dosavadní vyšetřování ukazují, že otravy byly způsobeny požitím padělků alkoholických nápojů prodávanými jak na tržnicích, tak v kamenných obchodech pod falešnými etiketami. Byl vypracován seznam etiket lahví, ve kterých byl nalezen závadný alkohol (možné padělky).

V souvislosti s rostoucím počtem případů otrav bylo v ČR rovněž přijato mimořádné opatření, kterým byl až do odvolání zakázán prodej alkoholických nápojů s 20% či vyšším podílem alkoholu. Toto opatření se však nevztahuje na vývoz těchto lihovin.

Některé členské státy EU již však pozastavily obchodování s tímto alkoholem pocházejícím z České republiky. Byly rovněž zaznamenány první případy otravy v jiném členském státě (Slovensko) způsobené požitím českého alkoholu, zakoupeného přes online internetový obchod.

1. Spravuje Komise pro tyto a podobné případy systém automatického varování na úrovni všech členských států EU, který slouží k rychlému a dostatečnému přenosu informací zabraňujících šíření otrav v rámci vnitřního trhu?

2. Jaká konkrétní opatření v podobných případech přijímá Komise, aby nedošlo k ohrožování životů spotřebitelů v rámci vnitřního trhu?

3. Byla Komise o této mimořádné události náležitě informována ze strany příslušných českých úřadů?

Odpověď Johna Dalliho jménem Komise
(8. října 2012)

Jakmile české orgány informovaly Komisi o uvedených případech otravy, byly aktivovány všechny existující sítě vytvořené pro řešení takovýchto situací. Jedná se mimo jiné o systém včasné výměny informací pro potraviny a krmiva a systém včasného varování a reakce. Tyto systémy propojují všechny příslušné vnitrostátní orgány a orgány EU s cílem zajistit rychlé šíření informací v celé EU týkajících se zjištění o možných potravinových zdrojích rizika a jejich rozšíření, jakož i o případech ohrožení člověka. Díky systému včasné výměny informací pro potraviny a krmiva byly zpřístupněny všechny dostupné informace o této záležitosti spolu s výsledky šetření, které provedly příslušné české orgány.

Dále byla zorganizována dvě ad hoc zasedání Výboru pro zdravotní bezpečnost (za účasti veřejných orgánů pro ochranu zdraví a bezpečnost potravin) a dvě zasedání Stálého výboru pro potravinový řetězec a zdraví zvířat, při nichž byly členské státy o celé záležitosti informovány. Komise byla kromě toho v každodenním dvoustranném kontaktu s českými orgány, které ji informovaly o dalším vývoji situace.

Podle obecného potravinového práva mohou být přijata bezpečnostní opatření vztahující se na celou Unii v případě, že se dotčený členský stát nedokáže uspokojivým způsobem vypořádat s vážným ohrožením lidského zdraví. K tomu však nedošlo, jelikož Česká republika přijala příslušná opatření, včetně zákazu vývozu dotčených alkoholických nápojů do ostatních členských zemí EU.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008146/12
to the Commission
Olga Sehnalová (S&D)
(17 September 2012)

Subject: Poisoning cases caused by methanol in the Czech Republic

On 6 September 2012 in the Czech Republic, two cases of death by poisoning were identified which were caused by the presence of methanol in the victims' alcoholic drinks. Today, on 17 September 2012, a total of 20 deaths linked to methanol poisoning have been identified, and dozens more people have been hospitalised with poisoning.

The investigations carried out so far demonstrate that the poisonings were caused by drinking bootleg alcoholic drinks sold at markets and in shops under false labels. A list of labels from bottles in which contaminated alcohol was found (possible bootleg alcohol) has been produced.

In view of the growing number of poisoning cases, exceptional measures have been adopted in the Czech Republic, including the ban until further notice on the sale of alcoholic drinks containing over 20% alcohol. However, this measure does not affect the export of these spirits.

Some EU Member States have already suspended trade in such alcohol originating in the Czech Republic. The first poisoning cases caused by Czech alcohol in another Member State (Slovakia) have also been recorded. The alcohol had been purchased from an online shop.

1. Does the Commission oversee an EU-wide automatic warning system for these and similar cases which allows adequate information to be transferred quickly in order to halt the spread of poisonings in the internal market?

2. What specific measures does the Commission adopt in such circumstances in order to prevent a threat to the lives of consumers from arising within the internal market?

3. Was the Commission duly informed of this extraordinary situation by the relevant Czechauthorities?

Answer given by Mr Dalli on behalf of the Commission
(8 October 2012)

As soon as the Czech authorities informed the Commission about the poisoning cases, all existing networks created to manage this kind of incidents were activated. This includes the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed and the Early Warning and Response System. They connect all relevant national and EU authorities and ensure rapid distribution of information throughout the EU on findings in, and distribution of, possible food sources, and human cases respectively. The Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed was used to circulate all available information regarding the incident and the results of the investigations carried out by Czech competent authorities.

Two ad hoc meetings of the Health Security Committee (involving public health and food safety authorities), as well as two meetings of the Standing Commitee of the Food Chain and Animal Health were used to inform the Member States about the incident. Furthermore, the Commission was informed bilaterally on a daily basis by the Czech authorities about any new developments.

According to the General Food Law, Union wide safeguard measures can be taken if a serious risk to human health cannot be contained satisfactorily by the Member State(s) concerned. However, this was not the case as the Czech Republic took the appropriate measures, including a ban of exports of the concerned alcoholic beverages to other EU Member States.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008201/12
to the Commission
Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: EU regulation on mandatory airline insurance for ticket sales

In the first six months of 2012, nine European air carriers ceased operation, filed for insolvency and left thousands of customers without transport and without compensation. It is argued that an EU regulation on mandatory airline insurance for ticket sales would be of benefit to consumers, as it would ensure outgoing money was safe, engender greater trust in airlines and offer airlines the opportunity to compete on the market on an equal footing.

Does the Commission have any opinions on such a proposal?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(15 October 2012)

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to written questions E-7820/2012 and E-007886/2012 ([1]).

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

(Nederlandse versie)

Vraag met verzoek om schriftelijk antwoord E-008204/12
aan de Commissie
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(18 september 2012)

Betreft: Annulering van Air Baltic-vlucht

Op 30 juni 2012 werd Air Baltic-vlucht BT462, van Warschau naar Riga, geannuleerd. Vele passagiers konden pas een dag later via een alternatieve route hun eindbestemming bereiken. Air Baltic geeft een onverwacht technisch defect aan het vliegtuig als reden voor de annulering aan. Air Baltic stelt dat dit technisch defect onvoorzien en onvermijdelijk was en roept daarom buitengewone omstandigheden, volgens Richtlijn 261/2004/EG, in. Passagiers zouden daarom geen aanspraak op compensatie volgens artikel 7 van Richtlijn 261/2004/EG kunnen maken.

Het Europees Hof van Justitie stelt echter in zaak C-549/07 dat bewezen moet worden dat het probleem voortvloeit uit „gebeurtenissen die wegens hun aard of hun oorsprong niet inherent zijn aan de normale uitoefening van de activiteit van de betrokken luchtvaartmaatschappij, en waarop deze geen daadwerkelijke invloed kan uitoefenen".

Kunnen in dit geval buitengewone omstandigheden volgens Richtlijn 261/2004/EG ingeroepen worden?

Hebben de passagiers bijgevolg recht op een compensatie volgens artikel 7 van Richtlijn 261/2004/EG?

Antwoord van de heer Kallas namens de Commissie
(16 oktober 2012)

Volgens Verordening (EG) nr. 261/2004 kunnen buitengewone omstandigheden „zich met name voordoen in gevallen van politieke onstabiliteit, weersomstandigheden die uitvoering van de vlucht in kwestie verhinderen, beveiligingsproblemen, onverwachte vliegveiligheidsproblemen en stakingen die gevolgen hebben voor de vluchtuitvoering van de luchtvaartmaatschappij die de vlucht uitvoert". Zoals het geachte Parlementslid aangeeft, heeft het Hof van Justitie van de EU in de zaak Wallentin-Hermann ([1]) voorts bepaald dat een incident, zoals een technisch probleem, niet onder het concept van buitengewone omstandigheden valt als het voortvloeit uit „gebeurtenissen die wegens hun aard of hun oorsprong niet inherent zijn aan de normale uitoefening van de activiteit van de betrokken luchtvaartmaatschappij, en waarop deze geen daadwerkelijke invloed kan uitoefenen". Elk geval moet dus afzonderlijk worden beoordeeld om te bepalen of zich in een specifieke situatie buitengewone omstandigheden hebben voorgedaan en of deze de verstoring van de vlucht hebben veroorzaakt.

Het recht op compensatie krachtens artikel 7 van de verordening is van toepassing, tenzij duidelijk is aangetoond dat de verstoring werd veroorzaakt door buitengewone omstandigheden. Het is de taak van de nationale autoriteiten en rechtbanken om de omstandigheden van een individueel geval te beoordelen en te bepalen of de uitzondering van artikel 5, lid 3, van toepassing is op de desbetreffende vlucht.

De Commissie wijst erop dat zij voornemens is tegen eind 2012 een herziening van Verordening 261/2004 inzake passagiersrechten voor te stellen. In die context zal zij met name trachten de definitie van „buitengewone omstandigheden" te verduidelijken.

([1]) C-549/07.

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008204/12
to the Commission
Ivo Belet (PPE)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Cancellation of Air Baltic flight

On 30 June 2012 Air Baltic flight BT462, from Warsaw to Riga, was cancelled. Many passengers were unable to reach their final destination via an alternative route until the following day. Air Baltic said that the reason for the cancellation was an unexpected technical problem in the aircraft. Air Baltic claimed that this technical defect was unforeseen and unavoidable and accordingly invoked extraordinary circumstances, under the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004. Passengers would therefore be unable to claim compensation under Article 7 of this regulation.

However, in Case C-549/07 the European Court of Justice stated that it had to be proved that the problem stemmed from 'events which, by their nature or origin, are not inherent in the normal exercise of the activity of the air carrier and are beyond its actual control'.

Is it permissible in this instance to invoke extraordinary circumstances under Regulation (EC) No 261/2004?

Consequently, do the passengers have a right to compensation under Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 261/2004?

Answer given by Mr Kallas on behalf of the Commission
(16 October 2012)

According to Regulation (EC) No 261/2004, extraordinary circumstances 'may, in particular, occur in cases of political instability, meteorological conditions incompatible with the operation of the flight concerned, security risks, unexpected flight safety shortcomings and strikes that affect the operation of an operating air carrier'. As mentionned by the Honourable Member, the EU Court of Justice further specified in the Wallentin-Hermann case ([1]) that an incident such as a technical problem is not covered by the concept of extraordinary circumstances, unless it stems from 'events which, by their nature or origin, are not inherent in the normal exercise of the activity of the air carrier and are beyond its actual control'. It is therefore necessary to assess the merits of each case in order to determine whether 'extraordinary circumstances' occurred in a specific situation and caused the flight disruption.

The right to compensation under Article 7 of the regulation applies unless the disruption was caused by duly proved extraordinary circumstances. It is the role of the competent national authorities and courts to assess the circumstances of any individual case and determine whether the exception foreseen in Article 5.3 applies to the concerned flight.

The Commission would like to point out that it plans to propose a revision of Regulation 261/2004 on air passenger rights by the end of 2012. In this context, it is notably working on clarifying the definition of extraordinary circumstances.

([1]) C-549/07.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-008210/12
alla Commissione
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(18 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Sussidi all'esportazione cinese

Nei giorni scorsi gli Stati Uniti hanno presentato un ricorso presso l'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio (WTO), sostenendo che la Repubblica popolare cinese ha concesso alle sue imprese oltre un miliardo di dollari in sussidi alle esportazioni di auto e componenti, tra il 2009 e il 2011, in palese violazione delle regole previste in seno al WTO.

Ben si capisce come il verificarsi di tali situazioni provochi un danno enorme all'industria del paese che subisce questa concorrenza sleale.

Può la Commissione indicare se anche l'industria automobilistica europea, oggi in pesante difficoltà, è stata oggetto di questo tipo di politiche illegali da parte di Pechino?

In caso affermativo, intende anch'essa predisporre un analogo ricorso al WTO?

Può inoltre verificare quale sia la situazione in riferimento al settore tessile, nel quale la Cina ha già in passato concesso numerosi sussidi statali alle esportazioni?

Risposta di Karel De Gucht a nome della Commissione
(9 ottobre 2012)

La Commissione mantiene stretti contatti con l'industria automobilistica europea. Quest'ultima ha molteplici interessi, nell'UE e sui mercati mondiali, e l'impatto effettivo delle politiche cui si riferisce l'onorevole parlamentare devono pertanto essere oggetto di un esame assai attento. All'onorevole parlamentare non sfuggirà che anche le imprese UE dispongono di strumenti giuridici specifici per denunciare alla Commissione comportamenti anticoncorrenziali sui mercati dei paesi terzi se l'industria dovesse risentire di tali politiche.

Riguardo alla decisione degli USA di avviare una causa davanti all'OMC, la Commissione ha chiesto la qualifica di terzo interessato per l'UE nelle consultazioni di composizione delle controversie in seno all'OMC e continua a seguire da vicino il caso.

Riguardo alla seconda parte dell'interrogazione, il settore tessile e dell'abbigliamento (*textile and clothing sector* — T&C) è stato regolato per molti anni dall'accordo sui prodotti tessili e dell'abbigliamento (*Agreement on Textile and Clothing* — ATC) il cui processo di graduale abolizione è terminato già con l'1 gennaio 2009. L'industria UE del settore tesile e dell'abbigliamento si è progressivamente ristrutturata e modernizzata assumendo un atteggiamento globalmente più aggressivo per adeguarsi all'apertura dei mercati dei paesi terzi. Dopo l'aggiustamento strutturale, che ha spostato la produzione UE verso i segmenti a maggior valore, la situazione della Cina si è stabilizzata e le esportazioni UE di questo settore verso la Cina stanno crescendo. Nei primi 6 mesi del 2012, le esportazioni UE del settore tessile e dell'abbigliamento verso la Cina sono aumentate in valore del 23 % rispetto al 2011 mentre, nel primo semestre del 2012, le importazioni dalla Cina sono diminuite in valore dell'8 % rispetto al 2011.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008210/12
to the Commission
Claudio Morganti (EFD)
(18 September 2012)

Subject: Chinese export subsidies

The United States has in the past few days filed a case with the World Trade Organisation (WTO) on the grounds that, in flagrant breach of the WTO rules, between 2009 and 2011 the People's Republic of China provided its businesses with more than one billion dollars in subsidies for exports of cars and their components.

There is no doubt that unfair competition like this damages the industry in the country on the receiving end enormously.

Can the Commission say whether the European Union's automobile industry, in serious difficulties nowadays, has suffered from illegal policies of this kind by Beijing?

If so, does it also intend to file a similar case at the WTO?

Could it also confirm what the situation is in the textile sector, another sector where China has in the past granted many State export subsidies?

Answer given by Mr De Gucht on behalf of the Commission
(9 October 2012)

The Commission is in close contact with the EU automotive industry. The latter has manifold interests, both in the EU and on global markets, and the effective impact of the policies the Honourable Member is referring to should therefore be carefully studied. The Honourable Member will note that EU companies are also equipped with specific legal tools to complain to the Commission on anti-competitive behaviours on third markets, should industry suffer from such policies.

With respect to the WTO case launched by the United States, the Commission has requested third party status for the EU in WTO dispute settlement consultations and continues to closely follow this case.

As to the textile and clothing (T&C) sector, the latter was subject for many years to the Agreement on Textile and Clothing (ATC), which was gradually phased out by 1 January 2009. The EU T&C industry progressively restructured and modernised reflecting an overall offensive stance in prospect of the opening of third country markets. After this structural adjustment, which moved EU production into the higher-value segments, the situation regarding China is stabilised and EU T&C exports towards China are growing. In the first six months of 2012 EU T&C exports to China grew by 23% in value as compared to 2011. On the other hand, our imports from China decreased by 8% in value during the first half of 2012 as compared to 2011.

(Versión española)

Pregunta con solicitud de respuesta escrita P-008219/12
a la Comisión
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 de septiembre de 2012)

Asunto: Producción de biogás — Aplicación retroactiva del Real Decreto-ley 1/2012 y penalización de la inversión privada en energía renovable en España

En enero de 2012 el Gobierno español publicaba el RDL 1/2012. Con esta aprobación el Gobierno suspendía sine die los procedimientos de Preasignación de retribución y la supresión de los incentivos económicos (PREFO) para nuevas instalaciones de producción de energía eléctrica a partir de fuentes de energía renovables. Algunas tecnologías como el biogás, aún no habían cubierto los cupos que tenían asignados, y muchas empresas se encontraban con los trámites muy avanzados, y después de dos años de tramitación de licencias, proyectos, adquisición de material o terrenos, se vieron enormemente afectados sin previo aviso. Este es el caso de la empresa Aprofitaments Energètics Agrícoles, S.L.: tiene dos plantas de biogás en funcionamiento y en los dos últimos años ha trabajado para obtener todos los permisos, financiación, terrenos y equipamiento para la implantación de dos plantas de biogás nuevas, pero a raíz del RDL 1/2012 queda imposibilitada para llevar a cabo estos proyectos. Muchas empresas e instituciones han enviado reclamaciones pidiendo que, como mínimo, concedieran el PREFO a aquellos proyectos ya tramitados y que ya hubieran obtenido licencias anteriormente a la entrada en vigor del citado Decreto-ley. El artículo 3.3 del RDL 1/2012 anota que «el Gobierno podrá establecer reglamentariamente regímenes económicos específicos para determinadas instalaciones de régimen especial, así como el derecho a la percepción de un régimen económico específico … para aquellas instalaciones de producción de energía eléctrica … biomasa, …». Después de ocho meses aún no se ha planteado ninguna solución al respecto. Teniendo en cuenta que en la «Evaluación del programa nacional de reforma y del programa de estabilidad de España para 2012» ([1]) se afirma que «la suspensión de las ayudas a las energías renovables desalienta la inversión en el sector y hará difícil que España alcance sus objetivos energéticos y climáticos en el marco de la Estrategia Europa 2020».

¿No cree la Comisión que la aplicación del RDL 1/2012 es injusta y penaliza gravemente la inversión en el sector de la energía renovable? ¿Y aún más injusta con las empresas que tienen proyectos en curso?

¿No cree la Comisión que la aplicación del RDL 1/2012 pone en riesgo el cumplimiento de los objetivos establecidos por la Comisión Europea en el Estado miembro de España?

¿Prevé la Comisión alentar al Estado Español con el fin de cumplir con aquellas energías renovables que, sin haber llegado al cupo establecido, han quedado enormemente perjudicadas, lo que pone en peligro también la continuidad de muchas empresas que apostaron por las energías renovables?

Respuesta del Sr. Oettinger en nombre de la Comisión
(16 de octubre de 2012)

Aunque el establecimiento de programas de ayuda a las energías renovables y la elección tecnológica son competencia de los Estados miembros, la Comisión efectúa un seguimiento de la situación en España por si fuera necesario emprender alguna actuación a nivel de la UE.

Según la Comisión, que está evaluando la existencia a primera vista de infracciones de alguna disposición legislativa de la UE, no parece que las medidas adoptadas en España en el ámbito de las ayudas a las energías renovables infrinjan la Directiva sobre este tipo de energías. No obstante, tal como lo señala Su Señoría, la Comisión ha mostrado insistentemente su preocupación por que la aplicación de planteamientos intermitentes y de medidas retroactivas afecte negativamente al clima de inversiones que precisan las energías renovables. En fecha más reciente, la Comisión ha anunciado en su Comunicación «Energías renovables: principales protagonistas en el mercado europeo de la energía» ([2]) que elaborará directrices sobre los regímenes nacionales de ayuda a las energías renovables y sobre las reformas de esos programas, con el fin de garantizar el envío de señales positivas que promuevan la inversión en energías renovables y el desarrollo rentable de estas. La Comisión trata con ello de orientar a los Estados miembros para que, al adoptar medidas, cumplan los compromisos que les corresponden a tenor de lo dispuesto en la Directiva 2009/28/CE y eviten dar un trato injusto a la industria en el futuro.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/swd2012_spain_es.pdf
([2]) COM(2012)271 final: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/communication_2012_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008219/12
to the Commission
Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Biogas production — retroactive implementation of Royal Decree-Law 1/2012 and private investment in renewables penalised in Spain

The Spanish Government published Royal Decree-Law 1/2012 (RDL 1/2012) in January 2012. With the passing of this law, the government suspended *sine die* the 'PREFO' pre-assignment of remuneration procedures and cancelled the financial incentives granted to new installations generating electrical energy from renewable energy sources. Some technologies such as biogas have not yet filled the quotas, while many companies which are well advanced in their project preparations, and have spent the past two years applying for licences, drawing up plans and purchasing equipment or land, have been hit heavily by this with no prior warning. This is the case for Aprofitaments Energètics Agrícoles, S.L.: the company has two biogas plants in operation and has worked hard over the past two years to obtain all the permits, funding, land and equipment it needs to set up two new biogas plants, only to find itself now unable to bring these projects to fruition due to RDL 1/2012. A lot of businesses and institutions have complained, calling for PREFO status to be granted at the very least to previously approved projects that had obtained licences prior to this Decree-Law coming into force. Under Article 3.3 of RDL 1/2012 the Government is empowered to set up specific financial schemes for certain 'special regime' installations and installations generating electrical power, biomass, etc. may benefit from a specific financial scheme. However eight months later there is still no sign of any solution to the problems.

The Commission's 'Assessment of the 2012 national reform programme and stability programme for Spain' ([1]) states that, 'suspending support for renewables discourages investment in the sector and will make it hard to achieve Spain's target under the Europe 2020 energy and climate goals'. With this in mind:

Does the Commission agree that implementation of RDL 1/2012 is unfair and seriously penalises investment in the renewables sector? And that the way it hits businesses with ongoing projects is even more unfair?

Does the Commission agree that implementation of RDL 1/2012 poses a threat to achievement of the Commission's goals in Spain?

Does the Commission plan to encourage Spain to honour its commitments to those renewables whose established quota has not yet been met but which are now placed at a serious disadvantage, which fact also threatens the very existence of many businesses which staked their future on renewable energy?

Answer given by Mr Oettinger on behalf of the Commission
(16 October 2012)

While support schemes for renewable energy and the choice of technology fall within the competence of Member States, the Commission is monitoring developments in Spain, with a view to considering further action at EU level, if necessary.

According to the Commission, the measures adopted in Spain in the area of renewable energy support do not appear to constitute a breach of the renewable Directive and it is assessing if there may be prima facie a breach of any EC law provisions. However, as the Honourable Member notes, the Commission has repetitively stressed its concerns about stop- and-go approaches and retroactive measures negatively affecting the investment climate for renewable energy. Most recently, the Commission has announced in its communication titled 'Renewable Energy: a major player in the European energy market' ([2]) that it will produce guidance on national renewable energy support schemes and on support scheme reforms, to ensure that positive signals are sent to encourage investment in renewable energy and the cost effective development of renewable energy. Through these means the Commission strives to guide Member States as they undertake measures to fulfil their commitments under Directive 2009/28/EC and to avoid unfair treatment of industry in the future.

([1]) http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/swd2012_spain_en.pdf
([2]) COM(2012)271 final, http://ec.europa.eu/energy/renewables/communication_2012_en.htm

(English version)

Question for written answer E-008232/12
to the Commission
Charles Tannock (ECR)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: ECB moves

The job creation role of Europe's small and medium-sized enterprises is essential to economic recovery. Yet ECB data have shown that sharply diverging interest rates have put southern European companies increasingly at a competitive disadvantage to their northern European rivals, creating a fragmentation which undercuts the whole rationale of the euro. This is being caused by banks substantially reducing their crossborder exposures in reaction to the failure of the ECB to take decisive action until very recently. The ECB has made it clear that it will not buy Spanish or Italian Government debt until those countries have applied for assistance under the EFSF/ESM programme. However, there is still no sign that either country at present is likely to do so.

Under what circumstances, if any, would the ECB be prepared to adopt 'first mover' status in order to resolve this deadlock?

Answer given by Mr Rehn on behalf of the Commission
(11 October 2012)

Monetary policy in the euro area is the exclusive competence of the ECB, whose independence is enshrined in the Treaty. The Commission does not interfere in the ECB's design and implementation of monetary policy.

(Versione italiana)

Interrogazione con richiesta di risposta scritta P-008255/12
alla Commissione
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(19 settembre 2012)

Oggetto: Sviluppi sul caso delle presunte pratiche relative all'interrogazione P-003205/2011

Nel marzo 2011, con l'interrogazione P-003205/2011 rivolta alla Commissione europea, l'interrogante chiedeva una valutazione della Commissione sulla conformità con la legislazione comunitaria (in particolare con gli articoli 101 e 102 del TFUE) delle pratiche poste in essere da Audi AG e da Volkswagen Group Italia (VGI).

Considerato quanto richiesto con interrogazione P-003205/2011, che la risposta data dal Commissario Joaquín Almunia conferma che la Commissione è a conoscenza dei fatti esposti dall'interrogante e, in particolare, che il Commissario afferma che «i fatti menzionati nell'interrogazione in questione sono attualmente oggetto di un esame da parte dei suoi servizi», può la Commissione riferire a quali conclusioni siano giunte le valutazioni effettuate dai suoi servizi?

Risposta di Joaquín Almunia a nome della Commissione
(17 ottobre 2012)

La domanda posta dall'onorevole parlamentare riguarda l'indagine avviata dalla Commissione, in seguito a diverse denunce, sulle pratiche messe in atto da Audi AG e Volkswagen Group Italia (VGI), al fine di valutarne la conformità con le norme dell'UE in materia di concorrenza (e in particolare con gli articoli 101 e 102 del TFUE).

L'indagine della Commissione sul caso è ancora in corso e pertanto, come l'onorevole parlamentare capirà, la Commissione non è in grado al momento di pronunciarsi sull'indagine né di trarre conclusioni definitive in merito. L'onorevole parlamentare può tuttavia star certo che la Commissione sta esaminando attentamente la questione e intende completare l'inchiesta in tempi quanto più possibile brevi.

(English version)

Question for written answer P-008255/12
to the Commission
Lorenzo Fontana (EFD)
(19 September 2012)

Subject: Developments in regard to alleged practices cited in Question P-003205/2011

In March 2011, I asked the Commission in Question P-003205/2011 to determine whether or not the practices introduced by Audi AG and Volkswagen Group Italia (VGI) were in line with Community legislation (and in particular Articles 101 and 102 TFEU).

In his answer to Question P-003205/2011 Commissioner Joaquín Almunia confirmed that the Commission was aware of these facts and that 'the facts mentioned in the question concerned are currently being examined by our services'. Could the Commission now report what conclusions it has reached following the investigations by its services?

Answer given by Mr Almunia on behalf of the Commission
(17 October 2012)

The question raised by the Honourable Member concerns the Commission's investigation, following the introduction of several complaints, into practices introduced by Audi AG and Volkswagen Group Italia (VGI) to determine whether or not these are in line with EU competition rules (and in particular Articles 101 and 102 TFEU.

The Commission's investigation in this case is still ongoing. The Honourable Member will understand that the Commission is therefore not in a position, at this stage, to comment on the investigation or to formulate any definitive conclusions. The Honourable Member may however be assured that the Commission is examining closely this matter and intends to complete its investigation without delay.